John Walton

# Histories of Leisure in the British Setting: Approaches and Controversies

This overview provides an introduction to the ways in which British (or Anglophone)[1] historians have approached the history of leisure in British settings (the use of the plural is a reminder of the extent of the diverse cultural geographies that can be mapped within the United Kingdom and its regions).[2] Despite enduring prejudices, there is nothing intrinsically frivolous about this theme: properly integrated into holistic history it links up with politics, religion, 'governmentality' and the exercise of power, high and low (or polite and popular) culture and the gradations and inter-sections between them. It has become big business on a global scale, with political implications, and not just since the Second World War: one thinks, for example, of the pioneering international tourist enterprise of Thomas Cook and its relationship with the power structures of the British Empire in the late Victorian years, or the complex and contested relationships between sport and politics that came to be associated with the spread of soccer across the world, or cricket across the British Empire, or the development of the Olympic Games.[3] Nor are the links one-way, as these examples indicate: understanding leisure is important to understanding power structures and political cultures just as leisure in its turn cannot be understood without reference to the wider social, cultural, economic and political environment. Leisure is part of the history of everyday life (not a common British formula: we do it, but rarely use the label); but that history has the politics left in, to counter a common frame of mind that sees social history generally, adapting a throwaway remark by G. M. Trevelyan, as 'history with the politics left out'.[4] Nobody should now think that about social history, but some of our more conservative colleagues may still do so about the history of leisure, and even the history of sport.

Defining leisure is not a simple or unchanging matter, especially when it develops a business momentum of its own and therefore becomes entangled with work in business and employment terms. To speak of a time for work and a time for leisure, for example, or of leisure being straightforwardly whatever is not 'work', is to perpetrate a gross oversimplification.[5] This is, after all, a very 'industrial' way of

viewing work and leisure: a perilous dichotomy that tends to prioritise the analysis of society through definitions based on working at a single, defined occupation in the market place, following the reductive assumptions of census takers who ignore the persistence of multiple occupations in lived experience, and to trivialise leisure as something ephemeral and lacking in 'value added' by setting it against 'productive' work. Such a perception helps to explain the slow emergence of leisure, and even of consumption, as legitimate themes for the historian: economic and social historians have tended to give most weight to the production of goods (and more recently activities like financial services) that can be counted, weighed and presented in the form of graphs or tables. It is only recently that growing awareness of the current importance of the constitution of identities through consumption and personal display rather than through occupational status has led to a reassessment of the role of consumption in past societies, not least in the definition and contouring of demand.[6] The older assumptions favoured a disproportionate interest in the historical experience of workers in manufacturing industry, who in turn were more likely to be male, gathered in large units of production, dominant in specialized local economies and therefore highly visible, unionised and politically radical, and generate source material with a focus on social and political problems. These things have been far less true of even of those leisure 'industries' that boast impressive pleasure architecture, such as music-halls, theatres, stadiums and pleasure gardens. They have been important local landmarks and sometimes sites of controversy, but they have played subordinate parts in local economies; and this helps to explain their more belated and limited emergence on to the historical stage, and their relegation to a minor role by most historians even when admittance has been gained.[7]

By emphasizing an exaggerated contrast between 'own time' and 'boss's time', a perceived binary divide between 'work' and 'leisure' also underplays not only the ways in which the former can infiltrate the latter, but also the ambiguities inherent in the former, when 'own time' is almost always the subject of obligations, negotiations and compromises involving family, friends and community as well as performing the necessary tasks of servicing the everyday life of individuals. The point here, though, is that leisure is very seldom an unmediated matter of the choices made by isolated individuals: this is why it generates social and cultural histories, and is not just a matter of the meeting of individual needs through the market place. The boundaries between 'work' and 'leisure', and between different incarnations of 'leisure', are porous and open to transgression, in ways and contexts that change over time and vary between people and places.[8] Leisure is not just a state of not-working (whether in the market place or at essential personal or domestic maintenance): it is 'free' time, ostensibly, in the sense that people have choices about what to do with it, and that it is supposed to be in some way pleasurable. How much autonomy each individual, family or group has enjoyed in making those choices is a crucial area of debate, espe-

cially in a society where for most people, as Gary Cross argues, the choice between prioritising free time, in the broadest sense of 'free', on the one hand, and working harder for longer hours to fund the purchase of desirable consumer goods was made or imposed at a popular level in the 1920s and 1930s (thereby elevating consumer shopping to an essential form of leisure, although this development has its broadly middle-class origins in at least the eighteenth century and had been greatly expanded in the nineteenth), and where the pressure to conform to an array of consensually-validated market-oriented leisure and consumption styles has become ever-present.[9] This in turn raises the perennial issue of how far leisure as a commodity in industrial and post-industrial societies has been supply-led, as corporations have imposed their profit-maximising agenda on consumers, and how far provision has been demand-led, as successful entrepreneurs identified what 'the public' (or a profitable concatenation of publics) desired and duly provided it for them.[10]

To complicate matters further, leisure actually merges into work. People work at their leisure in the sense of feeling obliged to undertake the conspicuous consumption, display and high-status activities that others expect of them, and to abjure and condescend towards, even to seek to proscribe, more 'popular', less 'dignified' or even less commodified enjoyments.[11] Or they work at 'leisure' because they are obliged to do what their peer-group wants, or to follow the rituals of a calendar custom, or to conform with the expectations of an employer about how to behave outside the workplace (from Victorian factory workers attending chapel to executives playing golf); and this undermines the elements of choice and pleasure that are essential to the concept. Leisure has also been brought into the workplace: sending the apprentice out for beer to lubricate the afternoon or sustain the night shift in Victorian (and earlier) workshops, doing 'corporation work' (making things for oneself on the employer's machines during working hours), idling and gossiping, and more recently playing computer games at the workplace, are all ways of making inroads of 'own time' into 'boss's time'.[12] But work can also be brought into leisure time: discussing techniques and crafts, competing to display skills (through ploughing contests, for example), pursuing 'recreations' to enhance work skills and capacity for work (hence, in part, some employers' encouragement of sport and excursions), doing a fulfilling rather than a routine domestic task while sitting by the fire and talking (women knitting or making rugs).[13] An agricultural labourer may do the same work on his allotment as in the fields but its identity is changed because he is working for himself and his family, choosing to do it, and (suspicious employers tended to think) putting in more effort as a result.[14]

These cross-currents and complexities bring their own rewards. As studies of the history of leisure in all its diverse incarnations have proliferated over the past quarter-century, its contribution to enhancing our understanding of key themes across the whole domain has become increasingly evident. Approaches through the nature,

use and consumption of leisure time provide a new dimension for classic themes in social, cultural and political history. We can put together leisure and class, work and labour relations; leisure and gender, sexual orientation, race and ethnicity; leisure and space, environment, transport and travel; leisure and religion, morality and governability; leisure, consumption and identity; and leisure, technology and the use of time. Nor are the groupings presented in the previous sentence mutually exclusive, as a moment's thought will demonstrate.

The relationships between leisure and concepts of time have a particularly long pedigree as objects of historical study, harking back to E. P. Thompson's famous article of 1971 on 'Time, work-discipline and industrial capitalism', running through subsequent critiques of that project, embracing work on 'calendar customs', the 'ritual year' and the changing nature of popular holidays, extending to studies of the weekly and daily allocation of time to non-essential pursuits, including the decline of that extension of the festive week-end known as 'St Monday' (protracted and even unresolved as it was in industries such as coal mining) and other irregular working practices, the rise of the 'industrial week-end' and therefore the standard industrial working week in mid-Victorian England, the conflicts over Sunday observance, and the perennial struggle between 'time and money' as the main priority of workforces even when the struggle for bare subsistence had been left behind.[15]

This theme is inextricably linked with notions of the sacred and the secular, another binary division that has more validity as an heuristic device to open out lines of enquiry than a supplier of definitive answers; but it draws us into the fruitful field in which leisure and religion can be examined in relation to each other, embracing the idea that religious observance may itself be regarded as a leisure pursuit and religious bodies as trying to attract and retain followers by generating satisfactory social interaction through the pleasures of sociability in essentially secular forms.[16] Attendance at religious services has itself been an important leisure form, even when persistent absentees risked punishment, at least in the form of exclusion from respectable society; but the service as spectacle, the opportunities for making music, the sermon as stimulus to thought, provoker of ribaldry or occasion for peaceful slumber, and the church precincts as locus for the exchange of local information and gossip, have all played their part in the history of religion *as* leisure activity, ebbing and flowing over time and varying in their emphasis between denominations.[17] Beyond the weekly (or more frequent) service as an aspect of the leisure timetable, religion as the basis for calendar customs constitutes an arena for uneasy and conflictive relationships between the sacred, the secular and the profane. Carnival as such has not been a feature of the British festive calendar, except where appropriated for commercial purposes and therefore sanitised accordingly, but the carnivalesque, the temporary ritual inversion of the social order and reversal of the civilising process entailing the suspension or relaxation of taboos and constraints on everyday behaviour, has been a recurrent

but changing element in the observation of religious festivals such as Christmas and Easter, while the promotion of and resistance to the commercialisation of such punctuations of the ritual year have also generated conflict and debate. Negotiations between the 'pagan' and the Christian, or at least about the incorporation of older or different belief systems into festivals in which ecclesiastical buildings and authority may have a role, have attracted historians' attention in local settings across the length and breadth of Britain, from the Up-helly-aa winter solstice ritual and festivities at Lerwick in the Shetland Isles to the Padstow 'Obby 'Oss and the Helston Furry Dance in Cornwall; and here as elsewhere questions of the invention and adaptation of tradition have featured strongly, in association with the transforming or at least unsettling advent of a 'tourist gaze' that immediately compromises and changes the object of its attentions.[18] Rites of passage in the lives of individuals and families have also responded to the changing dialogues and power relationships between the religious, the secular and the profane, as in the observances associated with baptism, marriage and burial, where religious controls have never been complete, but popular magical beliefs have existed alongside or been incorporated into the religious ceremonies, while secularity and commodification have seldom come to dominate unchallenged.[19] A particularly strong theme that has attracted historians' attention has been the role of religion as moral regulator, attempting (with or without the help of the policing powers of the state) to proscribe or discourage particular manifestations of leisure and festivity while providing or promoting acceptable alternatives to them. Religious bodies might campaign against gambling, the sale of alcohol, the provision of public dancing or other aspects of sensual popular entertainment, appealing for changes in the law or its more determined enforcement, and providing counter-attractions to draw the faithful, at least, away from the blandishments of fairgrounds, beerhouses and unconstrained mingling between the sexes. In Peter Bailey's memorable formulation, however, such provision tended to be 'additive rather than substitutive', as Victorian Sunday School pupils would attend the rustic picnic or tea meeting in the afternoon and go on to the more exciting diversions of fairground and cheap theatre or music-hall in the evening.[20]

Such concerns with the regulation of leisure were far from being the sole prerogative of church and chapel, especially as towns grew and problems of urban governance began to seem more pressing from the early nineteenth century onwards. Paternalistic employers played their part, often in conjunction with the religious bodies of their choice, in offering educational provision (schools, libraries, Mechanics' Institutes) and healthy, 'respectable' pleasures (excursions to the countryside or seaside, fetes to celebrate great events in the employer's family, tea meetings, temperance lectures) to try to encourage appropriate self-improvement among the workforce and sustain their efficiency through the responsible use of free time. But these were more in evidence in some towns and districts than in others, and the recipients of these

attentions did not always use them in the manner intended. The Working Men's Clubs of the 1860s onwards, for example, were transformed by their members in the late nineteenth century from the decorous venues for self-improvement that their original upper- and middle-class supporters envisaged, into alternative versions of the commercial public house where beer, games and music-hall style entertainment predominated, although a serious-minded parallel tradition of lectures and libraries endured well into the twentieth century, especially in the coal mining communities of South Wales.[21] Much more important was the growing intervention of urban local government in leisure provision and control, especially in the great age of Victorian civic pride and municipal investment in urban infrastructure during the second half of the nineteenth century. Not only did Victorian towns compete to build (in some cases) magnificent town halls and to provide a high standard of public services (gas, water, electricity, tramways), they also looked to the physical and cultural needs of their inhabitants by investing in parks, libraries, museums, art galleries and sporting facilities.[22] These in turn were strictly regulated to preserve respectability and due decorum, and the park keeper and librarian became prominent among the representative figures of petty, rule-bound authority to generations of city children, while museums and art galleries were also consecrated to the directed gaze, the respectful whisper and the subdued acceptance of what was on offer. Any behaviour that did not conform to these expectations was swiftly repressed.[23] As county and municipal authorities developed their powers and defined them in relation to central government, especially from the second quarter of the nineteenth century, their police forces and by-law regimes also built on eighteenth-century initiatives (especially metropolitan ones) to control and regulate behaviour in commercial entertainment premises (public houses, music-halls) and in the streets and squares, arresting and prosecuting obstreperous drunks, discouraging prostitutes and itinerant vendors and intervening to protect the well-dressed and apparently respectable from threat and insult at the hands of groups who congregated on street corners.[24] Such interventions were particularly active, and sometimes contentious, where they focused on emergent shopping, promenading or otherwise exclusive but vulnerable districts where the amenities of the 'respectable' needed to be protected from the contaminating presence of the lower orders, or where they involved assertive police surveillance of licensed premises (especially 'low' ale or beerhouses with working-class clienteles) that were thought to be associated with organised crime or (an overlapping category in the eyes of authority for much of the nineteenth century) political radicalism. Leisure, space, class and policing formed a strongly linked set of themes throughout the period from the seventeenth century, with the emergence of genteel and privileged areas of towns, through the twentieth. The policing of boundaries, whether by coercion or consent, was a particularly important and enduring aspect of all this.[25]

Leisure and class constituted a dominant pairing in the early historiography of leisure in Britain as it emerged during the late 1970s and 1980s. Historians analysed leisure in terms of the social class of providers and participants, noting where the classes mixed and on what terms, what forms of leisure were segregated in the senses that different classes performed or watched them in different places or that they were confined to certain social groups or income levels (definitions of class were of course at issue here), and what kinds of conflict developed around the imperatives to celebrate, enjoy and commemorate and the pressures to discipline, regulate, control and prohibit. The idea that the middle classes could be identified with an impulse to regulate and restrain, whether Evangelical or secular at root, and that the working classes were hedonistic, undisciplined and prone to drunkenness and sexual laxity, was soon exposed as too simple, first by the uncovering of significant strands of working-class respectability (often on their own terms rather than as imposed from above), then by Bailey's argument that respectability was not a permanent state but a role or mode of presenting the self, often calculative in intent, that could be adopted or discarded at will, and finally by Huggins's (and others') highlighting of the consumer-oriented, gambling, disreputable middle class that inhabited the worlds of (for example) horse racing, fox hunting and the classier Victorian brothels.[26]

Analysis of leisure themes through gender has been slow to substitute for, reinforce or cross-cut the original approach to understanding through leisure and class, but a historiography has been emerging over the last two decades, supplemented by emergent attention to leisure and sexual identity on a broader canvas. The work of Judith Walkowitz on women, space, consumption and leisure in Victorian London, and of several authors on female music-hall performers, their acts and their audiences, has been formative here, beginning to redress the balance of a historiography that has tended towards an implicit assumption that commercial leisure outside the home had historically been and long remained a masculine preserve.[27] Leisure outside the home for young working-class women without family responsibilities was a particular concern for social reformers, anxious about the implications for morality, social discipline and (by late Victorian times) the 'future of the race' arising from the relationship between the pursuit of pleasure, personal display, the stimulation of the imagination and the search for a partner among female adolescents. Those paternalistic companies that put on a programme of approved leisure activities for such workforces were, however, in a small and distinctive minority.[28] Work on leisure and the family has begun to explore the ambiguities surrounding the disputed concept of women's domestic leisure, while histories of holidaymaking and the seaside have similarly brought out the intractability of the multiple demands on women's time exerted by the needs of family and the pressure to keep up appearances.[29] Work on female performers in the leisure industries has been more prolific. Whether the considerable literature on prostitution and its regulation should be considered un-

der this heading raises intractable questions, but all women working in the public sphere in leisure-related industries, and especially those (like actors, artistes and barmaids) who traded on glamour and literally made a spectacle of themselves, remained vulnerable to aspersions on their character and moral censure.[30] A trajectory of increasing concern and attempts at intervention in the Victorian years, followed by a more relaxed dominant discourse between the wars and especially since the 1960s, matches developments across the board in the field of leisure and morality, as evidenced at the seaside by the rise and fall of the bathing machine from the mid-eighteenth century as a regulator of sexual mixing and bodily display on the liminal territory of the shoreline, and the emergence and development of freer attitudes to the enjoyment of beach and sea during the twentieth century, first alongside the old regulatory regime, then superseding it.[31] London and the regional capitals provided opportunities for gay leisure subcultures to flourish covertly, becoming more visible to the censorious eye as the prescriptive labelling of gender roles and identities gained ground during and especially after the eighteenth century, and ports and (by the mid-twentieth century) seaside resorts, with their combination of clearly-mapped pleasure zones, relative anonymity and ever-changing populations, came to provide additional opportunities for experimentation and experience with a variety of sexual identities and partners, as the seductively dangerous and transgressive public spaces of the park and the public convenience supplemented the safer and more consensual commercial spaces of the pub, the club and the 'molly-house'.[32]

Discussion of leisure and gender, and indeed leisure and class, brings out the central importance of leisure and related forms of consumption as vehicles for constructing and defining personal identity. This is where the structured, classificatory approaches through 'social science history' intersect with the interest in the construction of personal narratives and representations of the self that preoccupies literary and cultural studies; and histories of leisure provide strong illustrations of the ways in which structural analysis has to take account of individual agency, while individual lives lack meaning and significance without an understanding of the thematic contexts in which they find expression. These tensions are also articulated in histories of leisure and age, with the emergence of literatures on 'old age' and 'middle age' to supplement earlier preoccupations with childhood and adolescence. These are all problematic concepts at the margins, of course: like all such classifications, they are heuristic constructions grounded in a core of shared assumptions about what evidence and experience demonstrate or reinforce in the eyes of the researcher. But this does not make them any less necessary to the task of making provisional attempts to understand historical processes. Assumptions about the binary divide between work and leisure become particularly problematic as childhood becomes defined as a sacred space consecrated to the private sphere, personal development, play and consumption (often vicarious on the part of parents, as the child itself becomes a consumer

item): this has been a complex and contested process since the seventeenth century, and 'leisure and childhood' is still a developing field. 'Leisure and adolescence' as a theme has generated a set of debates about when and how the 'teenager' emerged as a distinctive entity with specialised tastes and consumption patterns, and about the extent, nature and consequences of the emergence of a 'generation gap' in the 1950s and 1960s, whose public expression came mainly in the form of leisure and consumption and the spawning of an increasingly complex range of subcultures whose influence was then carried forward into later life.[33] At the other end of the life cycle, the growing importance of the relationship between old age and notions of 'retirement' also complicates the work/leisure dichotomy in interesting ways, especially where disengagement from the labour market (which may not be complete) is accompanied by the dedication of increasing amounts of time to gardening and domestic maintenance, voluntary work and organised hobbies that may provide or sustain amenities for others to enjoy, as in (for example) working as a warden for the National Trust, helping in a charity shop or acting as a volunteer helper on a preserved railway. The sheer strength and diversity of British voluntary organisations, especially but far from exclusively in their relationship with the ostensibly 'retired', is an aspect of (from one angle) the history of leisure which deserves sustained attention. So do the intersections between leisure, race and ethnicity, whose investigation is still in its infancy, apart from studies in perceived subcultures (especially those associated with twentieth-century music) and the social pathologies associated with drink, drugs and deviance. The nature of this agenda tells us a good deal about the assumptions that need to be challenged, and the contrast with the better-developed United States historiography is highly significant here.[34]

Other arresting themes in the history of leisure in Britain involve the spatial variable viewed especially in terms of industrial regions, kinds of town (including the unique nature of the metropolis) and of the contrasting landscapes of leisure and tourism; the relationships between leisure and technology, especially the technologies of transport and commercial entertainment, and the changing relationships between the public and the private that developments in these areas have entailed; and the pathologies of leisure, in terms of associated crime, violence and environmental damage. The nature of the relationship between sport and leisure is a strongly-developing field that needs to take account of the growth of professionalism and media influence not just as themes in their own right, but in how we view sport as a so-called 'leisure industry' while taking account of the continuing importance of its voluntary, participatory and less competitive elements.[35]

All these issues continue to be refracted through the theoretical predilections, more or less explicitly articulated, of the contributors to the accumulation of evidence and debate. The dominance of 'leisure and class' in the 1970s fed into a preoccupation with leisure as an aspect of 'social control', which was then heavily criticised

from left and right as theoretically suspect or out of line with the evidence.[36] Debate then turned to the relationship between leisure and hegemony, which soon entailed recognition that (as with social control, and following Gramsci) the imposition of values by a dominant group through the institutions of commercial and voluntary leisure and through systems of policing was necessarily a contested and negotiated process that was doomed to limited success, in so far as it was an articulated project in the first place. A counter-argument from the right insisted that leisure businesses had prospered because they were meeting latent demand, identifying consumer preferences rather than creating them by sinister manipulation in pursuit of control as well as profit.[37] Recognition of the strength, durability and diversity of cultural preferences within the working class, and of the elasticity of the concept of cultural capital, followed on from these discussions, undermining crude and condescending notions of 'mass' leisure that nevertheless remain all to current in (for example) the tourism literature; and notions of the civilising process, as applied especially to football spectatorship, also proved highly contentious in the working out.[38] Questions of globalization, McDonaldization and George Ritzer's related concepts of 'something' (retaining distinctive local content and character) and 'nothing' (the bland standardization favoured by international leisure businesses) have been related in the twentieth-century British context to arguments about the extent and nature of the Americanization of popular culture, but here again the debate has moved on to matters of negotiation rather than imposition.[39] What all this underlines is the enduring importance of the intersections between leisure and politics, not only in the realm of social policy (attitudes to, debates over and legislation about alcohol, gambling, drugs, sport, charities and a range of other issues), but also in terms of the broader relationships between leisure and the whole social fabric. The history of leisure, in other words, has its distinctive contributions to make not only in the fields of social and cultural history, but also in the more conventional ones of politics and social policy. Appreciation of this, when it comes across a broader field, can only enhance its legitimacy in the eyes of outsiders. To those who are already actively involved, that legitimacy could not be clearer.

*Notes*

1   Distinguished contributors to debates from outside Britain have included Peter Bailey (a Briton resident in Canada), Gary Cross, Judith Walkowitz, Chris Waters, and Dagmar Kift.
2   For a valuable introductory overview of the history and historiography of British leisure in the twentieth century, Jeffrey Hill, *Sport, Leisure and Culture in Twentieth-Century Britain*, London: Palgrave, 2002. For illustrations of regional diversity see, for example, Lyn Murfin, *Popular Leisure in the Lake Counties*, Manchester, 1990.
3   Piers Brendon, *Thomas Cook: 150 Years of Popular Tourism*, London: Secker and Warburg, 1991; S. Wagg, *Giving the Game Away*, Leicester University Press, 1995; Gary Whannell and Alan Tomlinson, *Five Ring Circus*, London: Pluto, 1984.

4   For Trevelyan in context, see David Cannadine, *G. M. Trevelyan: a Life in History*, London: HarperCollins, 1992.

5   See, for example, Suzan Lewis, 'The Integration of Paid Work and the Rest of Life. Is Post-Industrial Work the New Leisure?', *Leisure Studies* 22 (2003), 343-55.

6   Recent examples include M. Berg and H. Clifford, *Consumers and Luxury*, Manchester University Press, 1999; Matthew Hilton, *Consumerism in Twentieth-Century Britain*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

7   For a recent London study, Lynda Nead, *Victorian Babylon*, Yale University Press, 2000.

8   Thomas Wright, *Some Habits and Customs of the Working Classes*, 1867, reprinted Frank Cass, 1967, and *Our New Masters*, 1873, reprinted Frank Cass, 1973, is perceptive and revealing on this.

9   Gary Cross, *Time and Money*, Routledge, 2003.

10   J. Golby and W. Purdue, *The Civilisation of the Crowd*, London: Batsford, 1984.

11   Thorsten Veblen; Nicholas Whittaker, *Platform Souls: the Trainspotter as Twentieth-Century Hero*, London: Gollancz, 1995; Mary Rose and Mike Parsons, *Invisible on Everest*, Philadelphia: Northern Liberties Press, 2003.

12   Melanie Tebbutt, *Women's Talk?*, Aldershot: Scolar, 1995.

13   Murfin (cf. note 2).

14   Jeremy Burchardt, *The Allotment Movement in England 1793-1873*, London: Boydell for the Royal Historical Society, 2002.

15   E. P. Thompson, 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', *Past and Present* 38 (1967, reprinted in his *Customs in Common*), London: Merlin, 1991, 352-403; Douglas Reid, 'Weddings, Weekdays, Work and Leisure in Urban England, 1791-1911', *Past and Present* 153 (1996), 135-63.

16   Stephen Yeo, *Religion and Voluntary Organizations in Crisis*, London: Croom Helm, 1977; Jack Williams, *Cricket and England*, London: Frank Cass, 1999.

17   James Obelkevich, *Religion and Rural Society*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

18   Callum Brown, *Up-helly-aa*, Manchester University Press, 1998; Bob Bushaway, *By Rite*, London: Junction Books, 1982.

19   For example Reid (cf. note 15).

20   Peter Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England*, London: Routledge, 1978.

21   Patrick Joyce, *Work, Society and Politics*, Brighton: Harvester, 1980; Bailey, *Leisure and Class*; Jonathan Rose, *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes*, Yale University Press, 2001.

22   Helen Meller, *Leisure and the Changing City 1870-1914*, Routledge, 1973.

23   Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, London: Routledge, 1995.

24   See most recently Patrick Joyce, *The Rule of Freedom: Liberalism and the Modern City*, London: Verso, 2003.

25   Simon Gunn, *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Classes*, Manchester University Press, 2000; Andy Croll, *Civilizing the Urban*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000.

26   Peter Bailey, *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, Cambridge University Press, 1998; Mike Huggins, *Flat Racing and British Society 1790-1914*, London: Frank Cass, 2000.

27   Judith Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight*, London: Virago, 1992.

28   Cartiona Parratt, *'More than Mere Amusement': Working-Class Women's Leisure in England, 1750-1914*, Boston, Mass.: Northeastern University Press, 2001, especially Chapters 5-6.

29   Claire Langhamer, *Women's Leisure in England 1920-1960*, Manchester University Press, 2000; Murfin (cf. note 2); David Vincent, *Bread, Knowledge and Freedom*, London: Methuen, 1982.

30   For example J. S. Bratton (ed.), *Music Hall: Performance and Style*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986, and Peter Bailey, *Performance and Politics in Popular Drama*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

31   J. K. Walton, *The British Seaside: Holidays and Resorts in the Twentieth Century*, Manchester University Press, 2000; S. Fisher, *Recreation and the Sea*, University of Exeter Press, 1993, chapter by John Travis.

32   Simon Gunn and R. J. Morris (eds.), *Identities in Space*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

33   David Fowler, *The First Teenagers*, London: Woburn, 1995.

34  Marek Kohn, *Dope Girls*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1992.
35  Martin Polley, *Moving the Goalposts*, London: Routledge, 1998.
36  Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class*, Cambridge University Press, 1983.
37  Golby, Purdue (cf. note 10).
38  Hartmut Berghoff *et al.* (eds.), *The Making of Modern Tourism*, London: Palgrave, 2001.
39  George Ritzer, *The Globalization of Nothing*, Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Pine Forge Press, 2003.