



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Enabling open access to Birkbeck's published research output

Tom Brown's schooldays: 'sportsex' in Victorian Britain

Journal Article

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/5881>

Version: Accepted (Refereed)

Citation:

Harvey, A. (2012) Tom Brown's schooldays: 'sportsex' in Victorian Britain– <i>Critical Survey</i> 24(1)

© 2012 Berghahn Journals

[Publisher version](#)

All articles available through Birkbeck ePrints are protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

[Deposit Guide](#)

Contact: lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk

***Tom Brown's Schooldays*: 'Sportsex' in Victorian Britain**

Andy Harvey

Abstract

Thomas Hughes' idealised vision of life at Rugby public school is one of the best-known novels in the English language. It was regarded from the outset as a founding text of 'muscular Christianity'. Contrary to the intentions of its author, it helped to inaugurate the cult of 'manly' athleticism that swept through the English public schools in the second half of the nineteenth-century. I argue that the novel reveals tensions around gender and sexuality that were in play among public schoolboys during the second half of the nineteenth-century. These tensions exploded into full public view in the trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895 and were instrumental in helping to establish a structure of homophobia within homosocial settings that has lasted through to the present day.

In this article I argue that *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857) helped to inaugurate a discourse of athletic masculinity that emerged in the public schools during the latter part of the nineteenth-century. It was a discourse seething with ambiguities of gender and sexuality which by the *fin de siècle* had helped to bring into existence a culture of homophobia, theorised by the late Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick as structured along a continuum of homosocial bonds, and which would persist throughout the twentieth-century.¹ As he made clear in his preface to the sixth edition, Hughes intended his novel to be interpreted as a simple tale of how unruly boys can become mature men through the learning of 'moral thoughtfulness'.² However, popular readings of the text as a tribute to athleticism have served to emphasise the place of sport in that developmental process. The tension that arises between Hughes' vision of a moral and gentle masculinity and

later interpretations that valorised rugged physicality is emblematic of some of the uncertainties around gender and sexuality that erupted in the latter part of the century.

One of the keys to understanding the place of sport in *Tom Brown* is to bear in mind the novel's anachronistic structure. Norman Vance suggests that the novel reveals 'the author's response to the contemporary situation of the 1850s but based on the experiences of the younger Tom Hughes in the 1830s and early 1840s'.³ I argue further that a double anachronism is at play. In the first place Hughes set the novel in the 1830s and early 1840s but does not fully historicise the book, bringing to it many of his own adult concerns. Secondly, the book retained massive popularity throughout the latter part of the nineteenth-century, selling over half a million copies by the end of the century. Later readers brought notions of their own to their reading of the novel which, in turn, helped to feed a significant discourse about an athletic 'manliness' that had a profound influence on wider notions of gender and sexuality. Writing about the expansion of team sports that took place in the public schools in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, J. A. Mangan concludes that 'Thomas Hughes' image of the schoolboy had both immediate and lasting appeal. For this reason, machismo was retained yet constrained, pugnacious but pious'.⁴ As public schoolboys moved into other homosocial institutions such as the law, politics and the military, the potent legacy of Hughes' novel would be that a heady mix of muscularity and morality, saturated with gender ambiguities and same-sex desire would also permeate those arenas of masculinity. These unresolved tensions would eventually erupt on to the public scene in the sensational trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895.

Bearing in mind Hughes' own view that 'manliness' was primarily a question of morality and maturity, but also how knowledge of *Tom Brown* lived within the imaginations of later Victorians, the text of the novel will aid understanding of how rapidly shifting notions of gender, sexuality and sport were thought about in the second half of the nineteenth-century. In

unravelling these themes the first task is to consider how sport features in the novel. Given the importance that was later attached to team games I will consider here how *Rugby and Football*, the title Hughes gave to Chapter Five, is represented in *Tom Brown*.

Rugby and Football

Writing in the *Routledge Every Boys Annual* (1869), 'The Old Boy' author of 'Football' boldly states 'all my readers have of course read "*Tom Brown's Schooldays*". If they have not, I advise them to do so at once, for they will there find the best account of a football match that could be written. I can't imagine anyone not liking football after that account'.⁵ Plunged into the game on his first day at school, as a new boy Tom is not part of the School House field team but is required, as was customary at the time, to take a place between the goals and to assist in the defence of the goal if necessary. Displaying heroism in the service of the team, Tom races out from under the goal to throw his body on top of the ball just in time to prevent the opposition School players from scoring a goal:

'Our ball' says the praeposter, rising with his prize; 'but get up there, there's a little fellow under you.' They hauled and rolled off him, and Tom is discovered a motionless body.

Old Brooke picks him up. 'Stand back, give him air,' he says; and then feeling his limbs, adds, 'No bones broken. How do you feel, young un?'

'Hah-hah,' gasps Tom as his wind comes back, 'pretty well, thank you – all right.' (86)

As was customary in the 1830s, this game was organised by the boys and was not part of the formal school curriculum. The great reforming headmaster, Thomas Arnold, had taken up his post at Rugby in 1828 with a mission to bring order and discipline to a previously unruly school. According to Jeffrey Richards, in order to achieve his objective, Arnold believed that boys should develop mature 'manliness' through attention to religious devotion, moral and gentlemanly conduct and intellectual endeavour.⁶ He did not include athleticism in his prescription, which

Arnold only ever tolerated even while his educational ‘system’ provided ample encouragement to games. Yet, by using sport to teach moral lessons, Hughes ‘invests ... football with values Arnold would not have claimed for them’.⁷ To be more accurate, it is Hughes’ readers that made this investment rather than Hughes himself who seems to have been unaware of the athletic beast that his novel was about to unleash. The prominence of the match in the minds of later writers was such that on November 21st 1896 *The Boys Own Paper* said that ‘the late Judge Hughes gave us an inimitable description of a football match as it was played in Arnold’s time (1828 – 1842), with which all boys are, or ought to be, familiar’.⁸ Norman Vance has also commented that ‘the most vivid and exciting parts of *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* are the accounts of football’.⁹ In contrast, Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy argues that, by rights, the novel should be read as a moral tale of growing maturity and knowledge of right from wrong: ‘the bullying, the games, the “boy culture” pranks at the beginning of *Tom Brown* are all relatively short incidents put in, as Hughes said, as “plums” to lead the reader to the moral heart’.¹⁰ But, as Gathorne-Hardy acknowledges, merely knowing Hughes’ intentions misses the point. The fact remained that the book was enormously influential and:

The realism all those readers enjoyed is found precisely in those plums the book is ‘really’ not about ... the apparent concentration on games, due entirely to their intrinsic excitement and the vivacity of Hughes’ prose, allowed later schools to say these had been a major element in Arnold’s Rugby.¹¹

Hughes may have intended to use sport simply as a means to preach his vision of morality, but the prominence he gave to games and the impact those parts of the novel had on readers allowed his intention to escape his grasp. Malcolm Tozer rightly perceives that ‘it was the publication of Thomas Hughes’s *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* that was largely responsible for the tilting of the mid-Victorian ideal of the Christian gentleman towards the physical’.¹² The impact of the book on middle-class attitudes should not be underestimated. Writing in 1901, Cotton Minchin was able to say, ‘thanks to *Tom Brown’s Schooldays*, hundreds of parents have sent their boys to public

schools, who would never have done so, had that book never been written'.¹³ Combined with the vote of confidence given to Rugby School in the report into the public schools by the Clarendon Commission (1864), the novel was hugely influential in informing the newly emerging middle-class parents, who had not had the benefit of a public school education, of what such a school should be like and helped to fuel the demand for such schools.¹⁴ However, *Tom Brown's Schooldays* was very much a fantasy version of a public school. Scholars of the nineteenth-century public schools, including J. R. de S. Honey and John Chandos, have pointed out the dissonance between the *Tom Brown* ideal with the often cold, disease-ridden, rat-infested and brutal reality of public-school life for many of its pupils. Yet, as Honey suggests, it is a reality that upper and middle-class parents were prepared to ignore, preferring to believe in the *Tom Brown* fantasy given the benefits in later life that a public school education could bestow upon their sons.¹⁵

A remarkable change in attitudes had taken place towards games in the public schools over the course of the period from 1830 to 1880. These changes are summarised by the archivist of Radley College, Tony Money, as 'from direct opposition or indifference, to grudging acceptance, to active support, to compulsion – such was the progress of authority's attitude to organised games throughout the 19th century.'¹⁶ To the ultimate disappointment of its author, *Tom Brown* was both a precursor to and a catalyst for, the 'athletic turn.' In his later writings Hughes made his regret clear, stating that 'athleticism is a good thing if kept in its place, but it has come to be very much over-praised and over-valued amongst us'.¹⁷ Perhaps more startlingly, Hughes came to take a dim view of football: 'the rugby game' he complained, 'is especially brutal. No great skill is requisite, and the game does not seem to me to be worth the risks to life and limb that it involves'.¹⁸ Hughes only had himself to blame for this turn of events because as Dominic Erdozain has recently argued, he 'pushed the physical criterion of godliness to the nth degree and then waxed indignant when people inferred an identity between the spiritual and the physical from [his]

writing'.¹⁹ But it was too late for Hughes to put the genie back in the bottle. Games, and the moral values they were assumed to instil, had become goals in their own right. Hughes may have spectacularly caught his readers with his lure to encourage them to read the novel, but, to use an analogy from the sport of angling, the vast majority of later readers made off with the bait leaving Hughes standing by the riverbank wondering how the catch had got away.

Gender in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*:

Hughes may have conceived of 'manliness' as signifying duty and moral courage, rather than physical prowess, but by the 1880s his novel had been instrumental in the elision of the muscular and the moral within the greatly expanded public school system: by then 'manliness' was virtually synonymous with athleticism. Commenting on the inherent tension between the muscular and the spiritual in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, the literary scholar, Dennis W. Allen, contends that Hughes' problem in representing both values in one body was so great that he chose to use the device of two bodies to solve the problem – Tom and his feeble, but saintly, charge, George Arthur. Allen observes that:

Tom has been given the responsibility of taking care of Arthur. This task is designed to imbue Tom with moral principles, to make him Christian as well as muscular ... By the same token, the relationship is supposed to make Arthur more sturdy, to supplement his spiritual strength with physical vigor.²⁰

Taking up the theme of gender representation, Claudia Nelson argues that since *Tom Brown's Schooldays* is set in the 1830s it is necessarily infused with that period's ideas of masculinity, especially notions of gender androgyny. Nelson maintains that the mid-Victorians 'customarily saw abstinence as both feminine and desirable, androgyny (if not outright feminisation) could appear necessary to human purification'.²¹ Nelson has some support in her contention from Hughes himself. Writing in 1871 he gives a clear exposition of his ideals of 'manliness':

‘Truthfulness, self-control, simplicity, obedience, - these are the great corner-stones, to be welded and bound together by the cement of patience’.²² There is little here to suggest that physicality was of great concern to Hughes and the attributes he cites are neither overtly masculine nor feminine. Nelson argues that Hughes was a strong proponent of the value of androgyny with the implication that a true ‘man’ would be a ‘blend of compassion and courage, gentleness and strength, self-control and native purity... thoroughly androgynous and thoroughly asexual’.²³ She calls as evidence the fact that Tom only develops into a true ‘man’, one who is compassionate as well as brave, through his relationship with the sickly George Arthur, and it is Arthur who teaches Tom these lessons. ‘The Doctor’, the wise and foresighted Headmaster, had paired Arthur with Tom for this purpose, so that Tom’s physical courage and bravery, tested on the rugby field, should be put to the higher purpose of moral rectitude and care for others. Nelson goes so far to suggest that the real ‘man’ in *Tom Brown* is not rugged and hearty Tom but pasty-faced Arthur. For Tom to become a real ‘man’ he needs to learn how to become gentle, thoughtful and kind. George Arthur is both the teacher of those values and the site upon which Tom can put his lessons into practice. Arthur’s frailty is not denigrated as weakness but valorised as a different, yet essential, aspect of masculinity suggesting that, in the mid-nineteenth-century, notions of effeminacy were not yet detached from masculinity but were a part of it. For Hughes ‘manliness’ clearly involved a great deal more than mere physical courage and was incomplete without the necessary ‘thoughtfulness’. Hughes tried to unite the physical and the spiritual but can only do so through the use of two bodies, thus leaving both Tom and Arthur not wholly complete because the ‘competing demands of the physical and the spiritual, embodied in the contrasting somatypes of Arthur and Tom, are finally irreconcilable as corporeal ideals’.²⁴

Noting that Hughes allows Arthur to die of a fever, the prominent literary scholar, Alan Sinfield, takes a rather different view arguing that ‘only Tom, the boy with no more than a proper degree of femininity, survives into manhood ... Tom Brown incorporates in himself all that a decent

chap could require of both manliness and gentleness: a lot of the former, and a decent ration of the latter'.²⁵ Ultimately, Hughes's device of using two bodies to produce his vision of a wholesome manliness, with the necessity for one of those bodies to die for the other to fully live, makes his story an unconvincing *Bildungsroman* of passing through boyhood to maturity. Hughes' problem in representing a vision of 'manliness' that encompasses the physical and the spiritual is played out in his difficulty in delineating precisely what masculinity should entail. His failure to resolve this tension may have proved fatal for Hughes conception of 'manliness' as later readers readily identified with the athletic Tom with his life before him and forgot all about 'thoughtful' Arthur, bravely facing up to death.

Sexuality in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*

In addition to its ambiguities of gender representations, the apparently simple moral tale of maturity is also complicated by notions of sexuality that were in play in the mid-nineteenth century. Dennis W. Allen argues that 'the erotic reserve of the Victorian novel is a complex reflection of the difficulty of reconciling nineteenth-century constructions of sex and sexuality with the larger ideological framework of the culture, a response to the contemporary perception that sex and sexuality threaten to disrupt the social order and the self'.²⁶ In this light can the relationship between Tom and little George Arthur be read as just one of mutual teaching as Claudia Nelson suggests? She argues that Tom and Arthur's friendship is rendered non-homoerotic by being set in opposition to the sexual relations to which Hughes avers when Tom and East rough up:

One of the miserable little pretty white-handed curly-headed boys, petted and pampered by some of the big fellows, who wrote their verses for them, taught them to drink and use bad language and did all they could to spoil them for everything in this world and the next.

(155)

In a famous footnote to the passage Hughes says:

A kind and wise critic, an old Rugbaean, notes here in the margin: 'The small friend system was not so utterly bad from 1841-7'. Before that, too, there were many noble friendships between the big and little boys, but I can't strike the passage; many boys will know why it is left in. (fn. 155)

In making the same distinction as Nelson, Jeffrey Richards argues that the relationship between Tom and Arthur should be seen within the schema of 'manly love' that had a spiritual rather than physical underpinning. According to Richards, intense emotional relationships between men were not uncommon in the mid nineteenth-century.²⁷ Hughes appears not to approve of homosexual relations between boys as Tom is relieved that he had not been 'petted' by an older boy so it would seem unlikely that his relationship with Arthur was of a sexual nature. Alan Sinfield also argues that 'a sexual component in male friendship is disavowed via an acknowledgement that it may appear elsewhere in the system'.²⁸ However, as Hughes' footnote indicates, he seems to be perfectly aware that sexual relations between elder and younger boys were a feature of Rugby school life, and concedes that in some cases it may not have been so bad, leaving open a certain ambiguity within the text on boyhood same-sex relationships.

The ambiguities of gender and sexuality in *Tom Brown* have been noted in other fiction of the period as 'recent developments in gender studies indicate that the novel as a genre played a central role in the construction and reflection of the plurality of male identities in the mid- to late-Victorian period, exposing masculinity as an unstable and fluid concept'.²⁹ *Tom Brown* is replete with gender androgyny and sexual ambiguity, indicating that the mid-nineteenth century was still a time when such differences were less clearly marked than they became a few years later in the wake of Darwinian theories of natural selection with their emphasis on reproductive sexuality. *Tom Brown* anticipates later nineteenth-century novels, which Heike Bauer argues are characterised by sex and gender fluidity. Bauer contends this fluidity increasingly came into

tension with the late Victorian urge to categorise gender and sexuality within a taxonomic framework of binary oppositions that acted as a powerful incentive to exclude the feminine from the masculine and *vice versa*.³⁰ *Tom Brown* was written in 1857, on the cusp of the decades in which the 'homosexual', as Michel Foucault famously argues in *The History of Sexuality* (1976), was first produced and then denigrated as a legal, medical and social identity. Revealed in the fiction of the period, gender and sexual fluidity came into conflict with the attempted normalisation of sexuality and gender in the latter part of the century and led to acute anxieties, especially among those former public schoolboys who had flirted, and perhaps continued to flirt (or more), with same-sex desire.

It appears that same-sex relations between public schoolboys were known about from at least the 1850s. Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy contends that schools were a riot of homosexual activity, although the extent differed between schools and fell in and out of fashion within a school at different times. Arguing that homosexual desire in *Tom Brown* should be fore-grounded, Maureen Martin argues that Hughes' acknowledgement of schoolboy sexuality reveals a subtext to the novel that runs beneath the Arnoldian morality tale.³¹ Like a dog whistle, that subtext may have been decipherable to those who attended public schools but not to the censor or general reading public. Hughes' euphemistic treatment of homosexuality may have been a nod to the secrets of the 'band of brothers' who attended the public schools. Or it may be that at a time before the onset of the moral panic of the later Victorian period, such relationships were not considered to be particularly noteworthy since notions of sexuality were not yet considered central to boys' development in a cultural regime that valorised maturity. Most boys would achieve exclusive heterosexuality though some would not. However, the memory of same-sex desire would always remain and could never be fully repudiated and would always act as a source of masculine vulnerability that would, in turn, feed a virulent homophobia. As same-sex desire became outlawed in Britain by the Labouchère amendment to the Criminal Law Amendment Act in 1885

it would be ever more necessary to attempt to keep that memory at bay through constant disavowals that could never be fully achieved.

Sport, *Tom Brown*, and the structuring of homophobia

Games soon came to be seen as a means to counter the 'sex problem' in schools. The argument was that if boys could be kept physically exhausted and diverted through sport then they would be too tired to get up to sexual mischief. Schools alighted enthusiastically on this idea and it can be said that the rise of the games cult in schools was significantly driven by the desire to use sport as a means to control schoolboy sexuality: 'Since games had become a way to prove you were manly, and manly meant overcoming sin, and the worst sin was sex – ergo, games overcame sex ... and the whole equation was clear and explicit to all Victorian and Edwardian schoolmasters'.³²

However, it was never a theory that was supported by any evidence and the contrary was more likely to have been the case. For example, the early homosexual activist, Edward Carpenter, recalls his obsession with schoolboy athlete heroes:

I dreamed about them at night, absorbed them with my eyes in the day, watched them at cricket, loved to press against them unnoticed in a football melly, or even to get accidentally hurt by one of them at hockey, was glad if they just spoke to me or smiled; but never got a word farther with it all.³³

Others did get a great deal farther with it and a half century later, in *The Loom of Youth* (1917), Alec Waugh revealed plentiful homosexual activity in his school, Sherborne, a fact made more scandalous since it was virile boys who enjoyed sports who appeared to be most enthusiastically homosexual.³⁴

A precarious line was continuously being drawn between team spirit, hero worship and same-sex desire and between 'manly love' and homosexuality. Joseph Bristow maintains that 'public

schools, those places where the finest men were prepared for the best positions in life, created the conditions where strictly forbidden desires became strong enough to risk expulsion'.³⁵ There is a structure in these discursive regimes of sexuality that can be traced back to *Tom Brown* and the public school system it helped to create. Same-sex desire was forbidden under threat of expulsion, yet that desire was given every opportunity to flourish in the intense homosocial environment that was created, not least in team sports. As *Tom Brown* hints at, same-sex relationships appear to have occurred frequently and were often enthusiastically engaged in by athletes. Yet, as Hughes' coy footnote suggests, such relationships remained taboo, a fact that would have significant consequences in later years as youthful indiscretions became a source of disquiet for many of these alumni who now found themselves in positions of power and influence. The result would be the most profound homophobia as those same alumni attempted to disavow their erotic past and shore up their 'manly' credentials. Their schoolboy sexual experimentations might have been exotic but they were later accompanied by denial, fear, guilt and sublimation.

These pressures came to an explosive head with the trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895. Richard Dellamora identifies the crux of the affair as the tension between the public school version of 'manliness' designed for empire and the renaissance of homosexuality among ex-public-school men which threatened that ideology. It was a tension that existed high in the ranks of the Liberal elite and 'at the time of the Wilde trials, homosexual activity became a matter of concern in the highest political circles, and expedience required that Wilde be sacrificed as a substitute for more highly placed quarry in the Liberal Government and the aristocracy'.³⁶ The message became clear: for male bonding and the power it brought to be sustained it had to be structured through a violent disavowal of the homosexual. Homophobia may be a term that was only invented in the 1970s³⁷, but its constituent structure can be seen to date from the latter part of the nineteenth-century and to be a direct consequence of the discursive regime inaugurated by *Tom Brown*.

The publicity surrounding the Wilde trials finally put on public display the same-sex practices that had otherwise been conducted in private and at the same time disavowed. Now there was no way of keeping those conflicts out of sight. Something had to give and the homophobic structure that sustained homosocial ties while denying homosexual desire meant that Wilde had to be denounced in order to uphold the bonds of the political elite and prevent their own indiscretions from becoming public. The trial was noticeable for how the bodies of Wilde and The Marquess of Queensbury were represented, with the effeminate poet placed in direct opposition to his muscular opponent.³⁸ The image was to be scorched on to the public imagination and became emblematic of the supposed irreconcilable stereotypes of the robust heterosexual sportsman and the weak effeminate homosexual. More than a hundred years later it is an image that has still not been thoroughly overturned as the homosocial institutions of male team sports are still widely regarded as persistent sites of hetero-normative masculinity and homophobia.³⁹ This is *Tom Brown's* toxic legacy.

¹ Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between men : English literature and male homosexual desire* (New York; Guildford: Columbia University Press, 1985).

² Thomas Hughes, *Tom Brown's Schooldays & Tom Brown at Oxford* (London: Wordsworth Classics, 2007), 16. All further references to this edition will be given in the text.

³ Norman Vance, *The sinews of the spirit : the ideal of Christian manliness in Victorian literature and religious thought* (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 135.

⁴ J. A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian public school : the emergence and consolidation of an educational ideology* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1981), 136–7.

⁵ Anon, 'Routledge Every Boys Annual' (1869): 869.

⁶ Jeffrey Richards, "'Passing the love of women": manly love in Victorian society', in J. A. Mangan and James Walvin, *Manliness and morality : middle-class masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (Manchester [Greater Manchester]: Manchester University Press, 1987).

⁷ Derek Birley, *Sport and the making of Britain* (Manchester; New York: Manchester university press, 1993), 210.

⁸ Anon, *The Boys' Own Paper*, 1896.Issue 932; 123.

⁹ Vance, *The Sinews of the Spirit : the Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought*, 135.

¹⁰ Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, *The public school phenomenon* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1979), 86–7.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 87.

¹² Malcolm Tozer, 'Thomas Hughes: "Tom Brown" versus "True Manliness"', *Physical Education Review*, 12, no. 1 1989: 44.

¹³ J.G. Cotton Minchin, *Our Public Schools: Their influence on English History* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co, 1901), 210.

¹⁴ The Clarendon Commission (1861 – 4) investigated the upper echelons of the English Public School system. Although the report had little by way of immediate effect, its longer term impact in helping to entrench the privileged status of the public schools is not to be underestimated.

¹⁵ See John Raymond De Symons Honey, *Tom Brown's universe : the development of the Victorian public school* (London: Millington Books, 1977) and John Chandos, *Boys together : English public schools, 1800-1864* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

¹⁶ Tony Money, *Manly & muscular diversions : public schools and the nineteenth-century sporting revival* (London: Duckworth, 1997), 124.

¹⁷ Thomas Hughes, *The manliness of Christ* ([S.l.]: Macmillan, 1907), 12.

¹⁸ Thomas Hughes, *Notes for Boys and their Fathers on Morals, Mind and Manners. By an Old Boy [i.e. Thomas Hughes, author of "Tom Brown's Schooldays"]* (London: Eliot Stock, 1885), 168.

¹⁹ Dominic Erdozain, *The problem of pleasure : sport, recreation, and the crisis of Victorian religion* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2010), 110.

²⁰ Dennis W. Allen, 'Young England: muscular Christianity and the politics of the body in Tom Brown's Schooldays', in Donald Eugene Hall, *Muscular Christianity* (Cambridge [GB]: Cambridge university press, 2006), 116.

²¹ Claudia Nelson, 'Sex and the Single Boy: Ideals of Manliness and Sexuality in Victorian Literature for Boys', *Victorian Studies* 32, no. 4 (1989): 529–30.

²² Thomas Hughes, 'Festina Lente', *St. Nicholas*, no. 4 (Thursday February 1, 1871): 245.

²³ Nelson, 'Sex and the Single Boy: Ideals of Manliness and Sexuality in Victorian Literature for Boys', 530.

²⁴ Dennis W. Allen, *supra*, 117.

²⁵ Alan Sinfield, *The Wilde century : effeminacy, Oscar Wilde, and the queer moment* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 62.

²⁶ Dennis W. Allen, *Sexuality in Victorian fiction* (Norman, Okla. u.a.: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1993), xiii.

²⁷ See Jeffrey Richards, *supra*.

²⁸ Alan Sinfield, *supra*, 62.

²⁹ Georgina O'Brien Hill, "'You ain't the man you was": Learning to Be a Man Again in Charles Reade's A Simpleton', *Critical Survey* 23, no. 1 (2011): 75.

³⁰ Heike Bauer, 'Theorizing Female Inversion: Sexology, Discipline, and Gender at the Fin de Siècle', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 18, no. 1 (2009): 84-102.

³¹ Maureen Martin, "'Boys Who Will be Men": desire in "Tom Brown's Schooldays"', *Victorian Literature and Culture* 30, no. 2 (2002): 483-502.

³² Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, *supra*, 169

³³ Edward Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1916), 29.

³⁴ Other public school memoirs recounting homosexual experiences include Phyllis Grosskurth (ed.), *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds* (London: Hutchinson & Co, 1984); Cyril Connolly, *Enemies of Promise* (Andre Deutsch: Trowbridge, 1929).

³⁵ Joseph Bristow, *Empire boys : adventures in a man's world* (London: Harper Collins Academic, 1991), 82.

³⁶ Richard Dellamora, *Masculine desire : the sexual politics of Victorian aestheticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina press, 1990), 196.

³⁷ The term 'homophobia' may have been first used by Dr. George Weinberg in *Society and the Healthy Homosexual* (New York: St. Martins, 1972).

³⁸ In addition to his well-known role in the downfall of Oscar Wilde, the 9th Marquess of Queensbury (1844 – 1900) also lent his name to the rules of boxing. See Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: a modern history* (Oxford [England]; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1989), 90-1.

³⁹ To this day only one British professional footballer, Justin Fashanu, has declared himself to be gay. Tragically, due to the homophobia he experienced, he committed suicide on 2 May 1998. Since then no other professional footballer has "come out". The only two prominent British team sportsmen to declare themselves as gay are Gareth Thomas, the Rugby Union and League player, and Steven Davies, the cricketer.