A MECHANICAL STYLE IN OUR JOYS:  
TIME, SPACE, AND DISCIPLINE  
IN BRITISH SPORTS, 1860–1900

JAMES CHAPPLE

“Merry jokes are passing round; one is challenging another to an impromptu race; others are wrestling a little, or leaping and the small boys are kicking some old footballs about at the edge of the ground. All this ceases as the four strokes denote the half-hour. The twenty-two players remove their coats.”

INTRODUCTION: CULTURE IS ORDINARY,  
CULTURE IS COMMODITY

The year was 1840, the day Shrove Tuesday, and the’ place Derby, a small town in the East Midlands of England. For as long as anyone could remember, an epic match of football had been played on this day, pitting the parish of All Saints against that of St. Peter’s. The match began when the town clock struck two, and would end when a goal was scored. The division between player and spectator seemed nonexistent, and the teams swelled to many hundreds as the afternoon wore on. The goals (a waterwheel and a nursery-gate, respectively) lay several miles apart. The game would often carry the enthusiastic players into houses, leaving shattered windows and bones in its wake. A favorite tactic of St. Peter’s was to get the ball into the river, where it would float to the waterwheel. Talk was overheard about the imaginative gentleman of years past who had carried the ball through the town’s

2. Shrove Tuesday is the British equivalent of Mardi Gras (“Fat Tuesday,” or the festival day preceding Lent).
sewers, and another who had hidden the ball under his coat in an unsuccessful attempt to saunter to the nursery gate unnoticed.3

A few decades later, on 14 September 1895, the Derby County Football Club played its opening game at a stadium on the west end of town known as “The Baseball Ground.” The man who had braved the sewers in pursuit of local fame would have been aghast at what had happened to the game (in this case, Derby's 2-0 win over Sunderland might have eased the shock).4 10,000 spectators lined up and paid a fee in order to watch uniformed professionals play Association Football for precisely 90 minutes on a strictly delineated field. A uniformed referee bearing a whistle and a clock controlled the game and meted out penalties for any breach of the strictly defined rules. The division between player and spectator seemed complete, and the barrier was guarded by a uniformed policeman. If our sewer-hero had asked for a report of the last Shrove Tuesday match, he would have been sadly told that the game no longer existed—it had struggled on until 1846, when the town magistrates decided that this annual lunacy did not reflect well on a town of civilization and commerce.5

In this paper, I will attempt to track the transformation that occurred in the intervening decades, in the hope that this will illuminate a heretofore neglected component of the newly-fashioned working class, which was meanwhile being folded into the state (the transformation in football takes place between the Reform Act of 1832 and that of 1886, and in the aftermath of the failed Chartist movement).6 A basic assumption will be that sport cannot be investigated on its own, but only in the context of Victorian social and cultural history, especially as it impacted the new formations of the working class. There is a long tradition of attempting to trace the development of the

6. These two Reform Acts (and the Second Reform Act of 1867), drastically increased the proportion of British men allowed to vote, from 10% in 1831 to roughly 70% in 1884. The Chartist Movement, the most widespread British workers’ movement of the century, fizzled in the prosperity of the 1850s.

English working class from a rebellious bunch guided by moral economy and tradition to a basically assimilated one, incorporated into a national culture defined in terms of political economy and the state. E. P. Thompson, like Weber, Tawney, and Halévy before him, pointed towards Methodism as a major force behind this shift. The most influential formulation of recent years is Gareth Stedman-Jones’s “Working-Class Culture and Working-Class

---

Politics in London, 1870–1900.” By examining the culture of the London music halls, which exploded in popularity during this period, he determined that they represented a “culture of consolation” in that the lyrics of the songs and the atmosphere of the hall evinced a bemused but total acceptance of the norms of capitalist society. I am not proposing to replace Stedman-Jones’s or Thompson’s narratives; the flowering of bourgeois hegemony was complex and certainly cannot be traced through any single institution, be it the music hall, the church, or the workplace. But organized football, which became, in Hobsbawm’s words, a “mass proletarian cult” during this period, is an especially important site at which to investigate the contours of the working class’s (re)formation. Association Football, unlike the music hall, was soon exported across the globe, and now occupies a privileged place in an increasingly-globalized leisure culture. An investigation into the constitution of this social practice, which has not changed markedly since the 1890s, allows us to de-familiarize the game and understand the particular, contingent assumptions inscribed on its apparently non-ideological surface.

To be blunt, the game was changed as football players negotiated the new demands and new possibilities introduced by the economic and political changes characteristic of the late nineteenth century. Particularly, the game became hostage to the increasingly hegemonic commodity form. This occurred in two interlocked ways. First, the game became a commodity in that it was bought and sold: for the first time, people paid an entrance fee to watch the game, which was played by professional players. A more profound sign of commodification was that each game became identical (at least in theory). They were reified; that is, they became a “thing” that could be exported across time and space. The 1840 game in Derby had not been a commodity in this sense: it was a custom, it was unique, and it was bound by customary laws instead of written ones. There had to arise a sense that the games being played in Edinburgh, London, and Derby were, essentially, the same game.

Until this occurred, there was no sense in discussing a team’s “record,” or even a “championship.” This commodification required the abstraction and reification of three distinct “things,” all of which had previously been local and concrete: time, space, and discipline. None of these processes were specific to football—in fact, they are linked with, or even fundamental to, the constitution of modernity itself.


This requires, though, a somewhat different approach than that taken by Thompson or Stedman-Jones. They were both interested in the content of their cultural forms: the sermons of the divines, the lyrics of the song. Following Marshall McLuhan, I will look for the message in the form of the activity. The guiding spirit behind this analysis is not E. P. Thompson, who saw culture as a site of conflict, but rather Raymond Williams, who saw it as a way of life. In his seminal 1958 essay, “Culture is Ordinary,” he concluded that “the organization of our present mass culture is so closely involved with
the organization of capitalist society that the future of one cannot be considered except in terms of the future of the other.”10 Elsewhere, he described the provenance of this culture in more detail: while rejecting the simplistic base/superstructure model, he argues that there nevertheless exists a “corporate system,” which he defines as “a central system of practices, meanings and values.” This does not take the form of something so rarefied as “ideology,” but rather appears embedded in a social praxis.11 Hence the significance of investigating the form of the game, instead of focusing solely on the discursive constructions surrounding it: Williams allows us to think about culture as something that one enacts, and not as a metonym for class conflict taking place in the economic sphere. Once the boundary between economic and cultural organization becomes fluid in the way Williams recommends, capitalism can be studied as a form of life, marked by a common set of enacted understandings, and not merely as an economic form which colonizes social and cultural realities. That is, capitalism can be understood as a process that restructures our “commonsense” understanding of the world.

Likewise, football did not develop according to any internal, formal logic, it also cannot be understood as a mere “reflection” of wider social processes, themselves confined to either consciousness or the workplace. Instead, football should be investigated as a site on which new forms of understanding—particularly understandings of time, space, and discipline—are enacted and negotiated. This is not to say that the particular understandings in play were arbitrary or unconnected from the consolidation of capitalism; instead, I assume that the development of Association Football was an integral moment in the consolidation of capitalism. The same logic was at play, I will argue, in the economic and the cultural spheres, and any attempt to strictly distinguish the two is bound to be artificial. My understanding of modernity is one that considers its defining features to be the replacement of traditional authority by bureaucratic institutions dedicated to instrumental rationality. The traditional form of the game was simply no longer tenable as

the English countryside modernized, and the transformation cannot be understood as a series of contingent events. However, this need not be the dismal narrative as suggested by Weber and his Frankfurt School successors, as the introduction of modernizing teleology is not necessarily synonymous with lockstep determinism (Dipesh Chakrabarty’s distinction between “History 1” and “History 2” can be applied to Europe, too).12 If, with Williams, we understand culture as the particular form that ontologically essential being-together takes in a given historical or social context, we can be alive to the ways in which capitalized leisure culture is more complex than a rigid narrative of bureaucratic control would have us believe.

The upshot of Williams’s analysis is that hegemony cannot be understood as a forceful and unidirectional imposition of bourgeois values onto the working class. First, there is evidence that the leisure culture of the working class was changing from within, as the “corporate system” of Victorian capitalism seeped into working-class consciousness.13 There was not a great deal of outcry following the death of the traditional football games, as a certain subset of working people—sometimes known as the “labor aristocracy”—had already been acting as self-appointed conduits of middle-class values. In addition, from the 1880s onwards, football spun out of the middle class’s control: they were largely opposed to professionalization, for instance, and between 1883 and 1914 working-class teams won the cup every year but one. So the story told below is not an instance of bourgeois class domination, but rather of the emergence, between classes, of specifically modern forms of time, space, and discipline.

**PRELUDE: THE RISE AND FALL OF PEDESTRIANISM**

This period was marked by a revolution in leisure, simultaneous to and congruent with the industrial revolution that transformed the workplace.

---

C R E S S I N G S

A brief discussion of another sport—pedestrianism—underscores the typicality of football’s development. In the early part of the century, it defied strict codification and, like the football that would do so much to supplant it, enjoyed tremendous local variation; it seemed not part of any recognizable national league, but was rather tied directly to the irreducibly local cultures of provincial England. Like football, it was standardized, rationalized, and commodified in the middle decades of the nineteenth century.

Pedestrianism was wildly popular in the first half of the century. As the word was used up to 1850 or so, “pedestrianism” referred to any sort of race, some of which mandated walking and many of which were feats of endurance, rather than speed. Its poster child was Captain Barclay, who was most famous for his 1808 match against another famous sportsman named Webster. The contest, on which huge sums were wagered, consisted of walking 1000 miles in 1000 hours. He demolished his competitor and became a celebrity after successfully completing this outrageous venture.14 Unsurprisingly, shorter races were more commonplace. Crowds would congregate to gamble and retreat to the pub after the race.15 These were widely covered in the burgeoning sporting press, some of whose journalists bemoaned the lack of organization. One writer for Bell’s Life in London, for instance, found the sport to be wrapped in “mystery and contradiction,” making it “inconsistent with that degree of order and regularity which ought to prevail on such occasions.”16 Richard Manks, himself a renowned pedestrian, wrote that the sport should be organized like any other: “To have a public referee would do good for the public voice and control, and why should it be otherwise?”17

Until the 1860s, though, the sport remained resistant to any kind of standardization. Bell’s Life, in the absence of any nationwide organization, took upon itself the task of publicizing the events and setting odds. The races, like the Shrovetide football matches, were fundamentally conceived of as concrete and non-repeatable. On 8 August 1847, for instance, there were 27

14. This is discussed in incredible detail in Walter Thom, Pedestrianism (Aberdeen: D. Chalmers and Co., 1813), 161–201.
challenges. They were wonderfully diverse, and only four distances appeared more than once: there were three one-mile challenges, two 440-yard challenges, two 299-yard challenges, and two 120-yard challenges. Thus 18 of the 27 challenges were completely unique (“three laps round Ratcliffe Race Course,” “pick up 150 stones,” etc.). The races did not vary widely; all of the challenges save two were for races of under one mile. It must have been, then, that the pedestrians placed no value on repeatability—each race was a thing in itself. In addition, each of these challenges pitted individuals against one another. There were no leagues, no challenges against all comers, and no matches against time. 18

The lack of regularity was matched by a lack of punctuality. As a writer for Bell’s Life complained, “We have again to reiterate the want of regard to the comforts of the visitors in not getting the races over in reasonable time, and on no occasion has the want of punctuality been more apparent than the present.” 19 The working classes were allowing remnants of their pre-industrial leisure past to seep into pedestrianism, much to the consternation of this reporter: the atmosphere of the pre-industrial wake was marked less by punctuality and comfortable reporters than by grinning contests and grease-pig-wrestling. On 10 January 1847, there was a match in which each contestant had to “hop 200 yards, pick up 100 stones a yard a part, run three miles, eat one pound of beefsteaks, and drink four half-pints of ale, all within one hour and ten minutes.” 20 A race on 31 January, a few weeks later, was preceded by “the performance of an itinerant violinist, accompanied by his son, a self-taught posturer.” 21 But this oppositional culture was, as Raymond Williams would say, “residual” instead of “emergent.” It was not a consciously articulated tactic employed against the hegemonic culture, but rather a residue of anachronistic leisure forms. The itinerant violinist and the festival culture he epitomized did not have long to live.

18. Bell’s Life in London, 8 August 1847, 6. There was occasionally a challenge against anyone who cared to accept it, but these were comparatively rare and do not occur within my sample.
Between 1860 and 1900, pedestrianism would lose this local quality, just as football would during the same period. The authorities, and especially the evangelicals among them, scorned these sorts of amusements. As the sport expanded in popularity, rules were introduced, arenas were enclosed, and distances were standardized. This can be seen as early as 1870 in an article entitled “The Present State of Athletics,” published in *Baily’s Magazine of Sports and Pastimes*. The anonymous author proudly trumpets the scientific progress of pedestrianism: a good stopwatch is now at every race, the grounds are minutely measured, and a table of world records has been introduced.22 An 1880 schedule for the Hull Athletic Club’s summer meet, for instance, lists 8 competitors for the 120-yard hurdle match, meaning that it had become a “standard” race, a concept that had not existed a few decades previously.23 In 1897, Chadwyck Healey defined pedestrianism this way: “By pedestrianism we understand, in racing parlance, the contest between two or more men, or between a man and time, in walking or running.”24 There is no mention here of picking up stones or eating beefsteaks or listening to violinists: things had changed by this point. Football was undergoing a similar process—in the same article, Healey noted that “football has of late years grown into such universal popularity that it may almost be termed the national winter game.”25

THE RISE OF ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL

Between 1840 and 1900, organized football was born, regulated, and spread across England. The speed at which this happened was incredible, as was the complexity of the process. Football had been played, in some form or

22. “The Present State of Athletics,” *Baily’s Magazine of Sports and Pastimes* (1870): 200–01. The rise of the world record is interesting in itself; in order for such a concept to become thinkable, it must be assumed that everyone throughout the world is engaging in the same activity; distances in time and space are rendered irrelevant.
25. Ibid., 164.
other, for several centuries. The game did not exist in isolation, but as part of a widespread festival culture, part of the traditional fabric of pre-industrial Europe—periods in which the “Lord of Misrule” was placed in charge for a day and “the world turned upside down.” Paternalist landowners before the nineteenth century generally allowed such festivities. Arthur Donnithorne, the paternalist landlord in George Eliot’s Adam Bede, encourages one-legged races and greased-pole climbing at his 21st birthday party.\textsuperscript{26} Between 1800 and 1850, however, this culture largely disappeared, succumbing to the holy trinity of nineteenth century England: utilitarianism, evangelicalism, and industrialism.\textsuperscript{27}

Football did not disappear forever, of course—today, it enjoys a special place in the hearts and minds of, quite literally, hundreds of millions of people. This success would have been impossible without the energetic pursuit of rule-standardization that began in the public schools in the 1840s. Football had been played in the public schools for decades by this point, but was not approved of by headmasters; it had a well-deserved reputation as a rough and somewhat uncivilized sport. In the early and middle decades of the nineteenth century, however, the public schools were undergoing a renaissance under the guiding hand of Thomas Arnold, whose trademark brand of muscular Christianity meshed perfectly with the putatively “manly” and “English” sport of football—so long as it was rational and civilized.\textsuperscript{28} In this, of course, they were picking up on a long-lived evangelical tradition of spurning the amusements of the lower orders. They were widely seen, from John Wesley onwards, as violent and not befitting a Christian gentleman.\textsuperscript{29} As the public schools sought to reform themselves and crank out Christian (and im-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26} George Eliot, Adam Bede (New York: Penguin, 1959), Chapter 25.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} This is the basic thesis of Malcolmson, Popular Recreations in English Society, 1750–1850. He argues that the freewheeling culture of popular amusement was culturally and legally displaced by the more restrained and businesslike culture of Victorian Britain, represented by the philosophy of utilitarianism, the religion of evangelicalism, and the economics of industrialism. See also Reid, “Interpreting the Festival Calendar: Wakes and Fairs as Carnivals.”
  \item \textsuperscript{28} “Muscular Christianity” refers to that breed of Christian faith, often associated with the British public schools, that stressed the necessity for vigorous physical activity for a healthy body, a healthy soul, and a healthy nation. For more on this, see Donald Hall, ed., Muscular Christianity: Embodiment the Victorian Age (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
  \item \textsuperscript{29} John Wesley (1703–1791) was the founder of Methodism and thus exercised a huge influence on nineteenth-century British culture.
\end{itemize}
perial) gentlemen, they felt the need to distance their own recreations from the masses as much as possible.

It was not the desire to play other schools that first led to the codification of rules, as this desire was not even coherent until the move towards codification had already begun. Rather, it was the public-school ethos of disciplined aggression. The public school was a place of strict rules and hierarchies. It was this desire for discipline, then, that was the impetus behind the first sets of rules in the 1840s, years before the first inter-school game between Westminster and Harrow, which took place in 1852.\textsuperscript{30} As the 1853 Prospectus of the Harrow Philathletic Club had it, “The encouragement of innocent amusements and recreation must tend greatly to the maintenance of order and discipline throughout the School.”\textsuperscript{31} This was sometimes quite harrowing for the children (no pun intended). A late-nineteenth-century writer remembered the first sets of rules at the Abbeyside School (1856) this way:

I remember with awe the majestic Rawlinson coming round the studies one evening before preparation, and doling out printed cards—one for each boy. On receiving my copy I timidly asked what it was for? “Football rules,” he said, “and you have got to learn them by heart.”—It was said that we should be examined in the rules in a week hence, and that if we failed in a single clause we should be skinned alive.\textsuperscript{32}

Tom Brown, the hero of the popular \textit{Tom Brown's School Days} (1857), is at first advised not to take part in the Rugby game of football. East gives him this rationale: “Why, you don’t know the rules—you’ll be a month learning them.”\textsuperscript{33}

Each school, allowed to develop rules in isolation, drew up rules best adapted to its own environment. The most remarkable example of this was probably the famous Eton Wall Game, which was played on a narrow strip of land that ran 110 meters along a crooked brick wall. The anarchy was such that schools could not play against one another, even after the rise of railroad

\textsuperscript{32} Percy M. Young, \textit{A History of British Football} (London: Stanley Paul, 1968), 76.
travel made it possible and the rise of muscular Christianity made it desirable to test one’s skills against others in a controlled way.

The real impetus behind rule codification was the desire many boys felt to continue their beloved sports at Cambridge. In 1848, a match between groups of Cambridge freshmen was hopelessly chaotic, as each player followed the rules of his home school. This led to the Cambridge Rules of that year, which are the inspiration for contemporary Football Association rules.34 All that was left was for the game to spread out from the university, which was spearheaded by the 1863 foundation of the Football Association. The Association was small at first, and concentrated in the South. Most players were ex-public school men, eager to renew the sports of their youth in an organized fashion: teams had names like the Old Etonians and the Old Harrovians. The Association Cup competition, still the holy grail of English football, was founded in 1871. It was and is a knock-out competition, based on the inter-house league C. W. Alcock, one of the Association’s founders, remembered from his Harrow days. By 1871, then, all of the pieces were in place: teams could join a competitive league united by adherence to the rules of the Football Association. Over the next 20 years, the game exploded both geographically into the North and socio-economically into the working classes, both skilled and unskilled.35

The transmission of organized football from ex-Harrowians at Cambridge to millworkers in Derbyshire was rapid and total. Organized football did not exist together with earlier forms, just as standardized races did not enjoy a happily symbiotic relationship with earlier and less codified forms of pedestrianism. In Derby as elsewhere, traditional modes of leisure disappeared, and by 1888 Gladstone could make the following remarkable proclamation:

The gross and cruel sports, which were rampant in other days, have almost passed from view, and are no longer national. Where they remain,

they have submitted to forms of greater refinement [. . .] But, if less exacting in the matter of violent physical excitement, the nation attaches not less but more value to corporal education, and for the schoolboy and the man alike athletics are becoming an ordinary incident of life.36

What embodied understandings were bound up in this most ordinary of activities? In what ways was the corporate system of late Victorian society inaugurated within the concrete practice of Association Football?

EXCURSUS ON TIME AND SPACE

All play means something.37

Time and space are not simply two ideas out of many that our society constructs for us; they occupy a different order of importance than our culturally constructed ideas of, say, etiquette. Geza Szamosi, a physicist, has called them the “twin dimensions” of our experience, while Marshall Berman has proposed that modernity itself can be defined as a specific mode of experiencing time and space. Pierre Bourdieu has suggested that a culture’s space/time orientation “structure[s] not only the group’s representation of the world but the group itself, which orders itself in accordance with this representation.”38

It has been argued that football, between 1860 and 1900, submitted itself to the temporal and spatial discipline of industrial capitalism.39 That is to say: enclosure and the need for regulated city streets forced football onto defined fields, while more strictly defined work hours forced football into defined temporal borders. This is certainly the case, but I will argue that it is not the whole story. Rather, football was condensed into boundaries that were narrower and more precise than they needed to be, implying that culture, and

in particular modes of perceiving time, space, and authority, had a part to play. Economic and cultural factors mutually reinforced one another; the established form of Association Football represents their intermingling. As E.P. Thompson tells us, “There is no such thing as economic growth which is not, at the same time, growth or change of a culture.”

**TIME**

“It is time for football matches, there is no time for field rambling—nay, that is now counted to be a sin.”

In 1877, *Chambers Edinburgh Journal* crowned a successor to Captain Barclay, the pedestrian wonder: a Welsh bookbinder named William Gale outdid him by walking 1,500 miles in 1,000 hours. A cartoon of the event was published displaying Gale outrunning his fearsome competitor. This competitor was not a fellow pedestrian, as would certainly have been the case thirty years earlier. Gale was racing against Time himself, depicted with the traditional scythe. An elderly man made his way to the track in hopes of seeing this mythological figure, only to be disappointed and ask for a refund, as “the beggar with the scythe hadn’t turned up.”

This story encapsulates the revolutionary changes in temporal consciousness that had altered both the work and leisure hours of the working class. Gale was no longer engaging in concrete sport, pitting himself against a particular person at a particular time. He was racing alone, attempting to break something called a “record.” His activity is abstract: he races against the clock. While the old beggar with the scythe may not have been there in the flesh, the old man was essentially right: time had become abstracted and its ghost chased English workers, both in the factories and the spaces of leisure.

---

Early industrialists were faced with a rich tradition of working-class leisure life. The year was punctuated by a large number of traditional festivals and wakes, many of which featured football. The working week itself reflected this traditional economy of time. Around 1800, it looked something like this (allowing, of course, for regional variation): Sunday was clearly a day on which no work could be done. This was followed by Saint Monday, the traditional day of leisure and sport. Work would continue at a leisurely pace for the next few days, reaching a fever pitch on Friday and Saturday as workers rushed to complete their quota for the week. Industrialists, however, required a more standard work week. In 1816, one critic sighed that the workers were wont to “play frequently all day on Monday, and the greater part of Tuesday, and work very late on Thursday night, and frequently all night on Friday.”43 The primary reason for this attitude was likely the introduction of steam power. The steam would only be turned on at certain points, and the factory-owners insisted that each worker be at his or her station every moment the precious steam was flowing.44 Punctuality became very important to industrialists, who would lock the gates against latecomers. Doubtless there was considerable leniency on this point, especially in periods of labor scarcity, but, in theory at least, workers who arrived one minute late faced the loss of their job and livelihood. J. Slater Lewis, in his 1896 guide to factory organization, advised that “the gates must be absolutely closed at the prescribed time […] No relaxation whatever must be tolerated.”45 This desire for time discipline led to the gradual disappearance of Saint Monday, which had been largely destroyed by 1850. This may have led to the general decline in leisure activities around that time, so remarked upon by contemporary observers. The workers simply did not have time for play, especially as evangelical Sabbatarianism ruthlessly suppressed all Sunday sport, going so far as to levy fines on playful children.46

This dire situation did not, of course, last forever. Generally speaking, work hours tended to peak in the 1830s. From then on, a series of legislative acts limited them—the 1833 Factory Act provided for a 69-hour week, an 1847 act limited the workday to ten hours, and another in the 1870s limited it one hour further. The Factory Act of 1850 legislated the half-Saturday into existence, mandating that Saturday work at textile mills end at 2 P.M.47 Workers in other fields gained the half-holiday at different times throughout the century, so that by the 1880s, most workers, skilled and unskilled, had gained the coveted half-holiday.48 Essentially, the working class traded Saint Monday for a half-Saturday holiday. Charles Iles, a Birmingham manufacturer, thought it a beneficial trade: “Formerly the workpeople were apt to come in at all times, but the half-holiday enables me still more strongly to insist on regularity, and say, ‘No, you have had your Saturday and must be regular now.’”49

These shifts greatly impacted the temporal organization of leisure. In the early years of the century, leisure time, while concentrated on Saint Monday, was spread throughout the week. Captain Barclay finished his feat on a Wednesday, but this did not keep immense crowds from gathering at Newmarket Heath to cheer him to the finish.50 Into the 1840s, pedestrianism tended to occur on Monday. Bell’s Life publicized 46 matches between 15 February and 14 March 1847: 29 of these took place on Monday, 13 on Tuesday, two on Wednesday, one on Thursday, and one on Saturday (the paper noted that the lone Saturday match was attended by the “half-holiday folks,” who were none too numerous in 1847). William Gale, however, timed his own record-breaking walk so that it would end on a Saturday afternoon, perhaps knowing that his welcoming crowd would be rather small on a Wednesday.51 By 1895, workers were no longer permitted to leave their stations for sporting events, even those of great local interest: the Director-General of Ordnance Factories at the Woolwich Arsenal was forced to an-

50. Thom, Pedestrianism, 127.
nounce in that year that workers would be seriously disciplined if they missed work to watch the local football matches.52

Association Football has always been, primarily, a Saturday afternoon activity. In this sense, it fit perfectly into the time-organization schema already laid out by industry barons. Tony Mason, the author of the most scholarly study on the rise of association football, concludes that the connection between the rise of football and the half-Saturday "can hardly be in doubt."53 But this does not in itself explain the incursion of Time’s scythe into sporting activities. Traditional football often began at noon or 2 P.M.—it was never, so far as I can discover, an all-day activity. In fact, the 90-minute time limit was occasionally inconvenient, especially during the winter months (football season lasted from September to April). In January 1884, for instance, the Preston Herald discussed the difficulty that workers had in getting to the field by 2:30 P.M. when the game was scheduled to start:

Workaday Preston, which only stops its looms at noon and has them to clean before leaving the shed on Saturdays, must have found it a rather difficult matter to get home and dine and dress and get to Deepdale much before the time announced (2:30) for the commencement of the game.54

In December, the sun in Derby sets at around 4:00 P.M. Derby workers, like their unfortunate counterparts in Preston, would have had to hurry from work to see a game that could kick off at 2:30 P.M. at the earliest. In April, on the other hand, the sun does not set until 8:00 P.M., allowing plenty of time for a well-lit match. The political and social history of leisure time cannot in itself explain the introduction of time-discipline into football; left to its own devices, the traditional games would have lasted for hours longer in September than in April.

We must turn, as Thompson suggests, to culture. The perception of time changed radically during the nineteenth century, for a variety of complementary reasons. Moishe Postone, in his Time, Labor and Social Domination,

52. Mason, Association Football and English Society, 1863–1915, 249n49.
53. Ibid., 3.
54. Ibid., 153.
provides a useful way to think about time. He divides temporal regimes into two categories: concrete and abstract. Societies organized by concrete time will implicitly assume organic or natural relations between events: for instance, the harvest itself, rather than the calendar-date of the average harvest, is linked with a festival. Time is, in other words, a dependent variable (dependent, that is, on either natural or social variables, but not abstract temporal ones). Things happen through time, rather than in time. Until about 1300, even the hours of the day were governed by concrete events: sunrise and sunset. The day was divided into 12 hours, but, in terms of abstract time, the length of these hours would vary from day to day as the length of the day changed. The old workweek, marked by Saint Monday and feverish Friday-night work sessions, was concrete in the sense that it was governed by production rather than abstract clock-time.

Football before the 1870s was governed by concrete time. The famous Derby game, for instance, ended when a goal was scored (even nightfall did not stop gameplay). Other matches ended once seven or nine goals had been scored. In some northern villages, a curious game called "pancake football" was played on Shrove Tuesday (sometimes known as Pancake Day). The ball consisted of a bag of corks, and the game ended when the bag burst. The game at Kingston-on-Thames had several balls, and the only rule that the befuddled onlooker could make out was that "the game lasts about four hours, when the parties retire to the public houses." The examples could go on, as there were as many versions of pre-Association football as there were English villages, but the point is clear: despite the astonishing variety of early football games, they were united in that they were organized by concrete time.

As Jacques le Goff and Joseph Needham have shown, concrete time held sway throughout the world until it was supplanted by abstract time in the bourgeois cities of modern Western Europe. This is time as an independent variable, marching on independently of living and acting human beings. The

rise of abstract time was not simply a technological breakthrough; it was not “discovered” by using the right tools (clock), the way the electron was discovered with the microscope. Postone argues for the cultural specificity of abstract time regimes by showing that China in the eleventh century developed a sophisticated water clock capable of measuring abstract time, but failed to use it as a mechanism for organizing social or economic life.\(^{57}\) That is, societies governed by concrete time were not simply awaiting the development of logical and accurate abstract time the way that computer users patiently await an operating system update. On the contrary, the adoption of abstract time was only possible under certain economic and social conditions.

We have already seen the introduction of abstract time into the workplace: if the worker was late, he would lose his job regardless of how many physical products he produced. Abstract time has found its greatest scientific defender in Isaac Newton. In the first book of the *Principia Mathematica* (1689), Newton defines time in this way: “Absolute, true, and mathematical time, of itself and from its own nature, flows equably without relation to anything external.”\(^{58}\) This does not reflect the experience of time found in many cultures or, for that matter, modern physics. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, in his famous work on the Nuer tribes in East Africa, concluded that they do not have a word for “time” at all: “Events follow a logical order, but they are not controlled by an abstract system, there being no autonomous points of reference to which activities have to correspond with precision.”\(^{59}\) It is, for instance, inconceivable that Nuer games would be “timed” in the sense that Association Football was. The Nuer are not alone here—in fact, Newton’s notion of time does not seem to have reached hegemonic status in England until the late nineteenth century.

By that time, the clock in the workplace ticked in unison with every other clock in the nation and, in theory, the world. In the early decades of the century, every city in England ran on a different time, for the logical reason that noon—the time at which the sun was directly overhead—occurred at

---

different times. Of course, London and Manchester were not hermetically separated before the age of uniform time. The national mail-coach system, inaugurated in 1784, was the most important precursor to the railroads. Despite its organizers’ best efforts, towns objected to having London time foisted upon them, forcing each coach to keep its own clock.60 The railway system, however, was of such complexity that this was not a feasible solution, so uniform time, based on London time, was introduced throughout England by the 1840s. This was consummated by the completion of Big Ben in 1854, which did not keep London’s time, but England’s time. After the International Meridian Conference in 1884, it would keep the world’s time.

Marie Corelli, a popular British novelist, shows the degree to which this was internalized: when Britain adopted Summer Time in 1916, she stated that the reformers were tampering with “God’s own time,” perhaps forgetting that standard time was only a few decades old.61 Corelli was herself heir to a lengthy tradition of British thought about time, stretching from Newton to the time-obsessed evangelicals and industrialists. Bounderby, in Dickens’s _Hard Times_, admonishes a worker: “You see, my friend, we are the kind of people who know the value of time, and you are the kind of people who don’t.”62 Benjamin Franklin shows that Bounderby was not simply an absurd caricature, reminding his readers: “Do not squander time for that is the stuff life is made of.” Victoria’s Jubilee, the most impressive nationwide celebration of the period, was celebrated around the world by the erection of clock towers, from England to Malaysia.63 The trope of linear progress was also flourishing during this period, of course; late Victorian Britain was a society founded upon and symbolized by the orderly and progressive march of time.

It should not be surprising, then, that Association Football was governed by abstract time. Through the 1840s and 1850s, public schools introduced timekeeping into their games, and match durations were standardized along with everything else in the 1860s and 1870s. There is no conceptual or pragmatic reason why the games could not go on as before: the first team to

60. Ibid., 158–9.
61. Ibid., 2.
score three goals wins, first to seven wins. Keeping in mind that hegemony structures the commonsense of a period, it seems that abstract time had become profoundly commonsensical by the 1880s.

The consequences of time abstraction have proved troubling to many philosophers. Anthony Giddens, for instance, proclaimed that “the commodification of time […] holds the key to the deepest transformations of day-to-day social life that are brought about by the emergence of capitalism.”64 Giddens is correct on the premise that we do not only look to the workplace to find this revolution. If the rise of capitalism truly was linked with a revolution in consciousness, this should be evident in the leisure hours no less than the working ones. Factory owners attested that early workers found their time-regime hostile, and thus would not subject themselves to it. In 1833, for instance, the Factory Commission reported: “On the first introduction of the business, the people were found very ill-disposed to submit to the long confinement and regular industry that is required of them.”65 By the end of the century, the working-class had largely subordinated itself to GMT, which structured their time at work as well as their precious Saturday afternoons.

Gibson and Pickford, whose massive Association Football and the Men Who Made It (1905) was the first major study of the game’s development, point to the importance of abstract time to Association Football.

Football will not lose its hold, or forfeit its attractiveness, so long as the players realize that time is a precious commodity, that the hour and a half allowed for play to be in progress does not permit of a single minute to be wasted.66

Time was no longer governed by the traditional dictates of the concrete temporal economy, but rather the ironclad strictures of the abstract one. “Time is a precious commodity.” These might as well be the words of Benjamin Franklin or Josiah Wedgwood, whose ghosts, scythes extended, haunt the football grounds of the late nineteenth century.

SPACE

"The Park belonged to the Park Keeper, the street to the Children, and not only their street, but every one." 67

Captain Barclay’s great race, like many other early pedestrian matches, took place on a public green. As Barclay’s endeavor neared its end and the crowds increased, there were suggestions that the course be roped off, separating the space of the athlete from that of the spectator. This struck our pedestrian hero as somewhat absurd, and he rejected the idea until, eventually, the crush of the crowd forced the ropes to go up. 68 This became a matter of course in pedestrianism, and especially in football, until space-restriction was found even when not demanded by contingent factors (such as the size of the crowd)—that is, it became culturally determined. The spatial economy of sport, then, follows the same logic as that of the temporal one discussed in the last section: the move towards enclosed fields can only be understood as the dialectical intermingling of mundane necessity and the culture of space.

The taming of the Derby game in 1847 was typical; there were many such suppressions in the middle years of the century, driving contemporary observers to remark, sometimes nostalgically and sometimes joyously, on the demise of the traditional leisure culture of the working classes. As we have seen, this was largely a result of the new models of temporal organization; the full and festive pre-industrial calendar was forced to reform itself. It was also a result of the new spatial economy. Space was restricted much more severely than before as business boomed and people crowded into cities. In 1851, for the first time, England became a predominantly urban nation, and the remaining half-century was marked by the continued growth of large towns and cities: in 1851, 25% of people in England or Wales lived in towns of 100,000

67. This was how Charlie Connor, who grew up in London at this time, remembered his childhood in a letter to a friend written in 1972. Anna Davin, Growing up Poor: Home, School and Street in London 1870–1914 (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1996), 68.
or more, and 44% in towns of 10,000 or more. By 1901, these figures were 44% and 69%, respectively.\textsuperscript{60}

The increasing value of space tended to drive social life onto the streets. Many working-class memoirs, most notably Hoggart’s \textit{The Uses of Literacy}, discuss the resiliency of street life.\textsuperscript{70} Thomas Okey, like many others, remembered that the streets were his only playground during the middle years of the century—he did not swim in a public pool, but rather a canal.\textsuperscript{71} The streets, however, were no longer safe havens for sport. Earlier versions of football were played, among other places, on the streets, and pedestrianism had taken place on the turnpikes. Throughout the nineteenth century, however, Parliament passed bill after bill banning football and other sports from certain public places. The 1835 Highways Act, for instance stipulates, “If any person shall [...] play at football or any other game on any part of the said Highways [...] [he or she] shall for each and every such offense forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding forty shillings.” Of course, such laws had been on the books for centuries, and numerous monarchs had unsuccessfully attempted to ban football in public places. For the first time, though, the attempt was largely successful.

In fact, public spaces began to disappear. This had been going on for centuries, but enclosure seemed to lead to a spatial crisis in the middle years of the century. A typical letter to the \textit{Times}, for instance, complained that there was no longer any place left in Aylesbury to safely play sports: the only non-restricted area left was exceedingly small, dangerous, and full of holes.\textsuperscript{72} In 1861, Birmingham’s Baths and Parks Committee drew attention to the enormity of the problem, while also pointing to the solution:


\textsuperscript{71} Thomas Okey, \textit{A Basketful of Memories: An Autobiographical Sketch} (Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1930), 22. He also notes that attempts to play football in church yards—which had previously been normal—were met with punishment: “We were kept in during the dinner-hour and made to write forty times on our slates, ‘The churchyard is consecrated ground and I must not play therein.’”

\textsuperscript{72} Letter to \textit{The Times}, 13 November 1844, 7.
[In the parks] the lads find a place of freedom [. . .] playing at marbles, at football, at rounders, quoits, &c &c, none of which could they possess in or near public thoroughfares without offending against the Bye-laws and bringing down upon them the interference of the police.73

Public parks became an important feature of the urban landscape during these years. Like the Association Football fields, they were oppressively rule-bound places, at least compared to the open turnpikes of years past. The place of sports in these parks varied widely from place to place—some benefactors, such as Francis Crosley in Halifax, mandated that no sports of any sort could be played in their parks. The Park Regulations of 1872 were the crowning achievement of this movement. The bill lays out the rules for the Royal Parks, nearly all of which stipulate either that games are prohibited altogether or can only take place within specified areas. Those parks that did permit sports allowed them only in strictly delimited grounds, as can be seen in the designers’ maps, many of which feature a perfectly square or oval clearing marked “football.”74

While the general tendency in nineteenth century Britain was towards a strict delineation of space, it is important to remember Michel de Certeau’s distinction between strategy and tactics, where the former represents institutions of power and the latter represents the practiced and occasionally transgressive engagement with these institutions by actual people.75 The parks certainly never met the high-minded expectations of the Parks Regulation Act; in fact, rule-breakers at Philips Park in Manchester sometimes

---

75. Certeau argues, most prominently in The Practice of Everyday Life, that we misunderstand the past if we focus solely on the institutions of power and the hegemonic meanings they produce. While this field of domination, which he deems “strategy,” is very real, it nonetheless obfuscates the field of meanings produced by consumers who creatively inhabit the spaces of power produced by dominant strategies. This creative reception, called “tactics,” can only be recovered by reading the historical archive against the grain. Michel de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
confronted policemen with copies of the park’s placard, stating that it had been constructed for “the people.” 76 The municipal museum was another space constructed with a strict ideal of decorum in mind, but working-class patrons constantly flouted these norms as well, feasting and cursing as if they were on the street. 77 Will Thorne, later a Labour MP, had this to say about his childhood in Birmingham: “Often the police would interfere with our sport [races] and threaten to arrest us, but in spite of the danger of the law we continued our contests, so keen were we on the competition of it.” 78

That said, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the working class had largely lost control of public space. When Thorne raced, he was not asserting his traditional right to the use of public space, but rather performing a dangerous and criminal act. Early football matches can be seen as the assertion of this right, and their penchant to play through houses represents a positive disregard for the sanctity of private property. As the century wore on, however, this became dangerous. In 1841, for example, one man was sent to jail for two months in 1841 for playing football in a restricted area. 79

It is not surprising, then, that Association Football was played in a strictly defined area: the old expansive games were increasingly impossible as they interfered with commerce and were impracticable in increasingly-crowded cities. But a consideration of the new football code will make clear that, as with time, these restrictions alone cannot possibly account for the move towards spatial commodification. Again, we must look towards the culture of space. In Tess of the d’Urbervilles, Hardy describes a “dark and crooked lane or street not made for hasty progress; a street laid out before inches of land had value.” 80 What happened to this street? How did it hap-

77. Ibid.
78. Bramwell, “Public Space and Local Communities: The Example of Birmingham, 1840–1880,” 43.
79. As reported in The Times, 26 March 1841, 6.
pen, in Lefebvre’s words, that “history [became] experienced as nostalgia, and nature as regret”.

Recent trends in geographical scholarship suggest that this mode of perceiving space is congenial to capitalism, a mode of production which requires the minute division of space into pieces that can be transformed into commodities. Lefebvre was the first to develop this insight, while David Harvey and Edward Soja have attempted to both popularize and expand upon his thought. These scholars argue that space, as much as time, is a social construction. The homogenous space theorized by Newtonian physics, which reaches its apotheosis in the Cartesian coordinate system, bears no resemblance to space as perceived in the everyday. The production of space is governed by the mode of production: as Lefebvre argues, “The shift from one mode [of production] to another must entail the production of a new space.” If a space is constructed by society, it cannot be produced by nature: “The more a space partakes of nature, the less it enters into the social relations of production.”

The rise of Association Football required that each game be identical: the aforementioned C. W. Alcock, one of the Football Association’s most important early administrators, claimed that “one universal game” was necessary to replace the innumerable and irredeemably local games that had been played earlier. The previously cited examples of early football games illuminate their profoundly undisciplined spatial economy, which we might call a concrete spatial regime. What is more, the natural peculiarities of each place shaped the play of the game. Philip Stubbs, a Puritan reformer, declared in 1583 that “on hard stones, in ditch or dale, or whatsoever place it be he [the player] careth not.” Not much changed in the succeeding three hundred years. In 1864, for instance, one contributor to London Society declared, “In traveling through rural districts on Shrove Tuesday, as late as the early part of the present century, it was quite a common thing to find doors and windows

82. Ibid., 46.
83. Ibid., 83.
84. Quoted on Young, A History of British Football, 101.
barricaded up.”86 In Derby, as we have seen, the placement and flow of the river were relevant factors. Even the goals themselves were inextricably linked with local landmarks: the nursery gate and waterwheel in Derby, two mills in Ashbourne, or the harbor and a local hall in Workington.87 The same phenomenon can be found in the public schools; it was perhaps most evident in the Eton Wall game, but Eton was not alone in its embrace of concrete space. Three trees, for instance, interfered with Rugby’s playing field as described in Tom Brown’s School Days, which required adapted forms of play.88 These games were inherently unique: Rugby’s game could not be played at Eton, which featured a crooked wall built in 1717 instead of three trees in an open field, and Derby’s game could not be played in Ashbourne, as the Derwent River in Derby ran towards one goal whereas Henmore Brook in Ashbourne did not favor one goal over the other.

Of course, these spatial peculiarities were annihilated in the Association version of the game, which mandated a standard field that could be, and has been, repeated anywhere in the world. The eventual form that this field took was astonishing in its scientific codification. John Goodall, in his 1898 book, aptly titled Association Football, gave a description of the proper field that is incredible in its detail and worth quoting in full:

The dimensions of the field of play shall be—maximum length, 130 yards; minimum length, 100 yards; maximum breadth, 100 yards; minimum breadth, 50 yards. The field of play shall be marked by boundary lines. The lines at each end are the goal-lines, and the lines at the sides are the touch-lines. The touch-lines shall be drawn at right angles with goal-lines. A flag with a staff not less than 5 feet high shall be placed at each corner. Lines defining 12 yards from the goal-lines and a half-way line shall be marked out, also semicircles defining 6 yards from each goalpost. The center of the field of play shall be indicated by a suitable mark, and a circle a 10-yards radius shall be made round it. The goals shall be upright posts fixed on the goal-lines equidistant from the corner flagstaffs, 8 yards apart, with a bar across

86. J. D. C., “Football at Eton and Harrow,” 247.
88. Hughes, Tom Brown’s School Days, by an Old Boy, 97.
them, 8 feet from the ground. The maximum width of the goal-posts and the maximum depth of the crossbar shall be 5 inches.\textsuperscript{89}

In keeping with the official rules, Goodall allows quite a bit of leeway in terms of the actual dimensions of the field; it is unclear why this was done, as the accepted measurements were 120\times80 yards, and most fields hewed close to this standard. Regardless, the boundaries were to be rigidly marked, and the internal organization of the space identical. Note also that the goals are very strictly defined and eminently repeatable, in contrast to the localized goals of earlier games. The end result of this can be seen in C. W. Alcock’s version of the ideal pitch, published in his book \textit{Association Football} (1890).\textsuperscript{90} It resembles a Cartesian fever-dream more than it does the game of football it purports to represent.

Figure 3. C. W. Alcock, \textit{The Association Game} (London: George Bell, 1890), 41.

\textsuperscript{89} John Goodall, \textit{Association Football} (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1898), 82–3.
\textsuperscript{90} C. W. Alcock, \textit{The Association Game} (London: George Bell and Sons, 1890), 41.
All of this evinces a reaction against the culture of concrete space as it existed in the traditional game. The rise of the stadium is perhaps the clearest expression of this move. It occasionally required vast quantities of money and effort to bring the chosen ground up to code—that is, modify the space so that it would meet the dictates of the Football Association. The introduction of flood lights in the 1880s added another element, bringing the practice of football closer to the modern superdome, with its positive contempt for nature (climate-controlled, Astroturf, etc.). Floodlit matches were not widely held for a few decades, but the end result was that matches could have a uniform kickoff time: the specifics of a city’s daylight hours became largely irrelevant.\(^91\) Floodlights allowed the game to be played at any time, while space-shaping technologies allowed them to be played in any place. In 1895, for instance, the Bolton Wanderers’ pitch was in a miserable condition. A noisy railway trundled nearby, and one end of the pitch was a cesspool of chemicals and garbage from nearby factories. Earlier players would have shrugged and played in the available space; however, as Simon Inglis describes, “Time and again football clubs [the Wanderers, in this case] were able to transform such willful neglect into order.” Sheffield’s team, for instance, spent 500 pounds to divert a brook that ran across the field.\(^92\)

This abstraction of space—the familiar white line on the green turf—was not simply a convenience. It had disciplinary meaning. It was the line beyond which spectators could not cross, and in some cases, as contemporary paintings show, it was guarded by police. Players themselves were not allowed to leave the ground without the permission of the referee: a memorandum issued by the Football Association in the 1890’s mandated that “any player leaving the field during the progress of a game (except through accident), without the consent of the referee, will be deemed guilty of misconduct, and will render himself liable to be penalized.”\(^93\) Compare this to Lewis’s contemporary advice: “It is, of course, an essential element in the organization of a factory that no person should be allowed to enter or leave it

---

\(^91\) Simon Inglis, *The Football Grounds of Great Britain* (London: Willow Books, 1987), 40. Floodlights were not widely adopted for several decades, but this seems to have been due to technical difficulties rather than principled objection.

\(^92\) Ibid., 70, 95.

\(^93\) Goodall, *Association Football*, 94.
without authority.” The referee is the missing link in this story; the spatial boundaries and time limits are meaningless without a figure of authority to enforce the laws, to discipline the unruly player.

**DISCIPLINE**

“Shobby is a beautiful reader of a newspaper. He do the police in different voices.”

As would be expected, there is no record of an authority figure in early football games. The same might be said of the workplace: in early factories, the workers often controlled their own workplace and could come and go as they pleased so long as the work was finished. In neither case does this mean that there was no authority at all (investigations like this are always in danger of romanticizing the putatively free-wheeling culture of the past). Early games were governed by some form of traditional authority, embedded in common understanding (doubtless there were players who wanted to keep playing once the one goal was scored). The modern form of the game was governed by a modern form of bureaucratic authority, in which a referee, possibly completely unknown to the players, wields disciplinary authority by virtue of his place within a bureaucratic organization, and not his personal virtues. This should be understood together with the development of capitalism as a modernizing force: as Sidney Pollard has written, “Works Rules, formalized, impersonal and occasionally printed, were symbolic of the new industrial relationships.” Wedgwood’s Etruria pottery works were the standard-setter in the late eighteenth century, but many other firms followed suit. Wedgwood’s spirit is behind rule 16 of Harrow’s football rules: “The rules should be put up conspicuously in every House at the beginning of every

---

football quarter, and new boys should be required to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with them.”

Public schools were the first to introduce authority figures on the field, although the modern figure of the “referee” was a long time in coming. By 1847, it was common in some schools to have neutral figures on the ground. Surveillance of the game by authoritative outsiders appeared together with the introduction of written rules. In most cases, each team would nominate an umpire. This umpire did not have the authority to intervene directly in the game, but could only be appealed to once by a team’s captain. The umpires’ occasional disagreement with one another led to the introduction of the referee figure, who was charged with arbitrating between them and made his first appearance at Cheltenham in 1849.

This, then, was the mode of discipline found in early Association Football: two umpires and a referee. As before, the umpires could only be appealed to by the captains, and the referee by the umpires. This represents an awkward transition period between the early games, which were internally self-regulating and based on custom, and the modern sport as it existed around 1900, in which a single referee rules the match. Alcock himself thought this intermediary system absurd: as the game became more serious and professional, rule-breaking became, in his eyes at least, depressingly common, and called for a powerful authority figure. This did not happen until 1891, when a 17-person committee met in Glasgow to iron out this issue. They decided that the umpires should lose their authority; they were banished to the sidelines and given the less impressive, if more accurate, moniker of “linesmen.” The referee himself became the dictator of the game. His rise to power was made complete in 1895, by which time he was equipped with a whistle and the authority to stop play and mete out penalties (including the recently-approved penalty kicks) whenever he wished, whether or not the team captains appealed to him. The game was no longer self-regulating in any sense of the word.

100. Ibid., 38–9.
In 1910, John Cameron, in his *Association football and how to play it*,
could confidently assert that “the most important man on the field is the refe-
eree, as the success of the game depends a great deal on his ability to control
the play and players adequately. He is commonly known as the ‘Knight of the
Whistle.’” He went on to argue that the referee “must be an autocrat.”101 In
his 1899 history of the game, Montague Shearman was in awe of this newly-
minted despot, who “wields a power that is little short of omnipotent.” With
great power, of course, comes great responsibility: “it is obvious that it re-
quires no ordinary man to successfully carry them out.” The referee must be
“absolutely free from fear,” and he must have the courage to cancel the game
should players fail to heed his wishes.102

The rise of the referee, like that of the professionalization with which
it was linked, caused a great deal of consternation among middle class ob-
servers. The public school games were supposed to be self-regulating: the
muscular Christians that Arnold and Hughes wanted to produce certainly did
not need a referee to restrain their behavior, as honesty and honor were cen-
tral components of the public school ideology. The Victorian ideal of “char-
acter” idealized regulation of the self rather than a simple cowering before ex-
ternal authority.103 Major Francis Marindin, the President of the Football
Association in 1882, said that he “looked back with much regret to the
time—not above ten or twelve years ago—when many matches were played
without umpires at all [. . .] and very few, comparatively with a referee.”104

Again, this did not happen in a social vacuum: the rise of the referee
is incoherent, I think, without considering the other institutions of authority
that sprung up in this period. The referee had these autocratic powers, not by
nature of any personal charisma, but rather in that he was a representative of
the Football Association itself, to which objections to his conduct might be
appealed.105 Two parallels might be drawn here.

101. John Cameron, *Association Football and How to Play It* (London: Health and Strength,
1910), 49–50.
103. Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850–1930*
First, and most obviously, the referee appeared not long after the modern police itself. The early nineteenth century witnessed the birth, alongside that of the putatively laissez-faire state, of a modern, disciplined, and bureaucratic police force: the new policemen were designed to serve as impersonal agents of the law. For the first time, they were professional, full-time, and hierarchically organized. Like the referees themselves, and unlike earlier policemen, they did not derive their authority predominantly from any personal qualities but rather from their status as representatives of a much larger institution. Over the last half of the nineteenth century, for instance, policemen freed themselves from control of local municipal boards; they answered only to national institutions that, like the Football Association, were invisible to most. As V. A. C. Gatrell has written, “What the nineteenth century and early twentieth century urban poor experienced was the daily imposition upon them of disciplines which were both alien in origin and coercive in application.”106 In terms of leisure life, memoirs show that the park keeper was seen as a police-like figure.107 The Parks Regulation Act of 1872 says that all park keepers shall “have all such privileges, powers and immunities, and be liable to all such duties and responsibilities, as any police constable.”

Second, as we have seen, the referee’s function mirrors that of the overseer in the workplace. In his nineteenth-century guide to factory organization, J. Slater Lewis describes the function of the ideal foreman in terms eerily reminiscent of Foucault’s description of panoptic surveillance regimes:108

Each Foreman must have an office in a conspicuous part of his shop, from which he can obtain an uninterrupted view of his men. It should be raised several feet above the level of the floor, and provided with as many windows as possible. […] The office should be furnished with a clock.109

The workers, then, were accustomed to a system of social control predicated on sight: the roving eye of the referee and his linesmen mirrors that of the foreman. Each of them, in addition, had the power to levy penalties: ejection, here, as the counterpart to firing.

The referee was not a “reflection” of the foreman or the policeman, but all three are indicative of a new kind of modern society, and none of them can function quite as effectively by themselves. The referee should be seen as a significant figure in this shift, and not a minor one that simply aped the larger social structures. Association Football was the most widespread and popular form of mass leisure in late nineteenth century society; as a foreign visitor reported in 1899, “All is sport in England. It is sucked in with the mother’s milk.”110 The referee on the field and the policeman patrolling the streets outside should be seen as homologous. They both represented the encroachment of a new hegemonic structure of authority, but the consciousness of the players, or the people at large, did not simply remain unchanged. Neither the referee nor the policeman simply enforced bloody rules on a recalcitrant populace, unchanged for centuries. These rules, like the hegemony they represent, were largely internalized. As J. R. Witty would argue in 1960: “The essence of all football law, as with every other kind of law, is that it concerns people who are willing and able to control themselves. They are disciplined from within.”111

CONCLUSION: MODES OF INTERNALIZATION

“There are worse things in life than a tumble on heather,  
And life is itself but a game at football.”112

A visitor to Rugby School today would find a plaque reading as follows: “This stone commemorates the exploits of William Webb Ellis, who with a fine disregard for the rules of football as played in his time first took the ball and ran with it, thus originating the distinct feature of the Rugby

112. Walter Scott, “Football Song” (1815), line 4.
game, A.D. 1823.” In turn, this has widely been taken to represent the origins of American football (I remember imbibing the story in grade school). The Rugby World Cup is named in his honor, and Rugby also hosts the William Webb Ellis Rugby Football Museum, located yards away from his daring feat.

The story, however, is rather apocryphal. As we have seen, there were no rules to break in 1823; while there may have been customary codes, there certainly was never anything written down. In 1978, Malcolm Lee, then the master in charge of Rugby School Football, said,

The point is that the rules of the game as it was played at the school at that time were made by the boys themselves and those rules were constantly revised. If you look at the notes of the Bigside Levees—notes made by the boys themselves—you will see that the rules were discussed almost every time the boys went out to play and that adjustments were frequently made.

As common with apocryphal stories, it is important to consider what made them believable. The stone was set in place in 1900, following a story that had been circulated since 1873 by a Rugby antiquarian named Matthew Bloxam. Bloxam was not present at the supposed event, nor did anyone who was corroborate his story. Regardless, the myth grew from the feeble seeds of Bloxam’s letters to *Meteor*, the Rugby School’s magazine. The story dates, then, from that fertile 20-year period of rule codification that was affecting Rugby and the rest of the nation with it. For Bloxam, as for the legions who have uncritically accepted this myth, it was inconceivable that, as early as 50 years previously, there had been no set rules to break. It was conceptually difficult to grasp the fact that rugby and Association Football had each grown from the same chaotic stock; it was much easier to project the contemporary focus on rules backwards and assume that any variation was a result of willful, if brave, neglect of strictly defined laws.

Bloxam was indicative of a trend. People began to forget about the old forms of football, and even street ball began to take on the characteristics of association football. Children, as always, were enthusiastic footballers. They did not, however, play the rough game of their grandparents: the Education Act of 1870 had sent many of them to school, where they were learning association football. This, then, was the game that could be found on the streets. C. E. B. Russell, a Manchester philanthropist, observed around 1900, “Outdoor games have only one meaning, and that is football, as played under the Association Code.”\footnote{Golby and Purde, The Civilization of the Crowd: Popular Culture in England 1750–1900, 165.} An author in \textit{Contemporary Review} made the same point in 1898:

The organization is most complete. A son of the people, a future labourer or loafer, after kicking the football in a desultory way ever since he could stand alone, finds on going to an elementary school that it is a member of a league, counting its points, making its protests, legislating in the same serious way as its seniors do.\footnote{Ernest Ensor, “The Football Madness,” \textit{Contemporary Review} 74, no. 751 (1898), 752.}

The schools, in London at least, even had leagues and competed against other schools: Hugh Philpott reported that one of these held in 1902 attracted a crowd of 10,000.\footnote{Hugh Philpott, \textit{London at School: The Story of the School Board, 1870–1904} (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1904), 128.}

This does not change the fact, though, that “sons of the people” would kick the ball in the street, or would choose local landmarks as non-reproducible goals, catching a faint echo of the game’s dominant form of two centuries ago. However, this sort of play has now declined tremendously in significance, and is understood and lived as a pale shadow of the televised, commodified version (one need think only of the ubiquitous television commercials in which young boys play in the street, dreaming of World Cup fame). The audience, also, was never as passive as the forms described above suggest; then as now, football crowds were unruly, and the behavior and cultural expression (songs and so on) of the crowd features as a local flavor in an internationally quite uniform game. This cannot, however, be overly romanticized: the street player and the unruly fan, far from implicitly critiquing or emancipating
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themselves from the commodified form of leisure whose development I have described, are entirely and consciously complicit with it, although the tactics implied by the activities here described imply something less than total rational domination. Consider, for instance, an account of a remarkable event in late nineteenth-century Dorking, recorded in a 1905 history of the game: a game of old-style town football broke out, despite police warnings, and went on for several hours. In a further transgression of the now stabilized Association rules, several balls were in play at once.\textsuperscript{119} The eruption of this sort of implicit protest should not be forgotten, but neither should the end result: the game was eventually broken up by the police, and the primary players were served with fines. We could think, also, of the time-honored tradition of heckling the referee or questioning his bias or incompetence: simultaneously, this protest conjures an earlier form of authority (personal virtues instead of bureaucratic position), but also implicitly accepts the authority of the disciplinary official, wishing only that someone else was wearing the uniform. In other words, the vast media apparatus that surrounds the contemporary game, in conjunction with the institutionalized forms of instruction common in schools across the globe, represent a particularly powerful form of strategy that marginalizes the viability and implied resistance of Certeau’s “tactics.”

An 1866 author for the \textit{Saturday Review} was surprised to find that “there is a sort of mechanical style in the measurement of our joys.”\textsuperscript{120} By 1900, this mechanical style had found its way into the workplace, the stadium, the parks, the streets, and the schools—all of those spaces through which a society defines itself. Revolutionary shifts in everyday practice were the inevitable result. The Woolwich Arsenal handbook for the 1894–5 season, reproduced above, shows the end result of this process: every game is assumed to be identical, regardless of whether it is home or away, and the goals considered equivalent.\textsuperscript{121} More than anything else, it resembles a worker’s time sheet, an example of which from 1896 is reproduced below next to the Arsenal handbook. The timesheet implicitly makes the same assumption about a

\textsuperscript{119} Gibson and Pickford, \textit{Association Football and the Men Who Made It}, 18.
\textsuperscript{120} “Holiday Plans,” \textit{Saturday Review} 21, no. 555 (1866), 714.
worker’s commodified hour. Hidden beneath the neat rows of these tables lay
the revolutions in time, space, and authority that made them, and the modern
society they represent, possible.

Figure 4. “Woolwich District Football Handbook, (1894).” Available at New York
Public Library, 19th century microfilm collection.

Figure 5. J. Slater Lewis, The Commercial Organisation of Factories, 507.