

The Development of Muscular Christianity in Victorian Britain and Beyond

Nick J. Watson
York St. John's College, University of Leeds

Stuart Weir
Christians in Sport, UK

Stephen Friend
York St. John's College, University of Leeds

Introduction

The development of Muscular Christianity in the second half of the nineteenth century has had a sustained impact on how Anglo-American Christians view the relationship between sport, physical fitness, and religion. It has been argued that the birth of Muscular Christianity in Victorian Britain forged a strong “. . . link between Christianity and sport” that “. . . has never been broken” (Crepeau: 2). The emergence of neo-muscular Christian groups during the latter half of the twentieth century (Putney) and the promotion of sport in Catholic institutions, such as the University of Notre Dame, can be seen as a direct consequence of Victorian Muscular Christianity. Modern Evangelical Protestant organizations, such as Christians in Sport (CIS) in England and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes (FCA) in the U.S., have resurrected many of the basic theological principles used to promote sport and physical fitness in Victorian Britain.

The basic premise of Victorian Muscular Christianity was that participation in sport could contribute to the development of Christian morality, physical fitness, and “manly” character. The term was first adopted in the 1850s to portray the characteristics of Charles Kingsley (1819-1875) and Thomas Hughes' (1822-1896) novels. Both Kingsley and Hughes were keen sportsmen and advocates of the strenuous life. Fishing, hunting, and camping were Kingsley's favorite pastimes, which he saw as a “counterbalance” to “. . . education and bookishness” (Bloomfield: 174). Hughes was a boxing coach and established an athletics track and field program and cricket team at the Working Men's College in London where he eventually became Principal (Redmond). Not just writers but social critics, Kingsley and Hughes were heavily involved in the Christian Socialist movement and believed that the Anglican Church had become weakened by a culture of effeminacy (Putney). Kingsley supported the idea that godliness was compatible with manliness and viewed manliness as an “antidote to the poison of effeminacy - the most insidious weapon of the Tractarians - which was sapping the vitality of the Anglican Church” (Newsome: 207). From this, the doctrine of Muscular Christianity was adopted as a response to the perceived puritanical and ascetic religiosity of the Tractarians, later known as the Oxford Movement.

Aside from the religious motivations for the evolution and advancement of Muscular Christianity, the Victorians' preoccupation with health is arguably the most significant factor. “No topic more occupied the Victorian mind than Health . . . they invented, revived, or imported from abroad a multitude of athletic recreations, and England became in Sir Charles Tennyson's

words, the *world's game master*" (Haley: 3). Haley suggests there were three main reasons for the prominence of the concept of the healthy body in the mid-nineteenth century.

First, the Industrial Revolution brought about a Leisure Revolution within the working class population (Cunningham) and played a major role in focusing the Victorian psyche on health. Paradoxically, the automation of industry had led to sedentary lifestyles and as a consequence an exponential rise in cardio-vascular and respiratory disease. In addition, poor conditions and long arduous working hours in the factories resulted in many contracting occupational diseases. Second, the nineteenth century witnessed a number of major developments in medical science. The founding of physiology as a distinct discipline separate from biological science, and the emergence of physiological psychology engendered a holistic understanding of health and an emphasis on the mind-body connection. Third, and often less publicized, there was a real threat of war from a number of European countries and the Americans. Responding to this, the intelligentsia saw the need to protect the British Empire and produce leaders that were well educated and "manly" (Haley). Kingsley and Hughes, amongst other Protestant elite, saw Muscular Christianity as an appropriate vehicle for advancing British imperialism and increasing the health and well-being of the nation (Putney). Through the medium of sport, Kingsley saw the potential for spiritual, moral, and physical development:

. . . in the playing field boys acquire virtues which no books can give them; not merely daring and endurance, but, better still temper, self-restraint, fairness, honor, unenvious approbation of another's success, and all that 'give and take' of life which stand a man in good stead when he goes forth into the world, and without which, indeed, his success is always maimed and partial (Kingsley cited in Haley: 119).

The aim of this essay is to provide an understanding of the historical and theological development of Muscular Christianity in Victorian Britain and how this has contributed to the relationship that exists between Christianity and Sport today. Discussion will focus on the historical and theological roots of the movement and its manifestation in the late twentieth and twenty-first century.

Historical and Theological Roots of Muscular Christianity

The origins of Muscular Christianity can be traced back to the New Testament where St. Paul and others used athletic metaphors to help describe the challenges of the Christian life (1 Corinthians 6:19; 9:24-25; and 2 Timothy. 4: 7) However, the explicit advocacy of sport and exercise, in the guise of Muscular Christianity, did not evolve until the mid-nineteenth century in Britain, and the source of the idiom has been a point of debate amongst scholars (Redmond). It is commonly accepted that a review of Charles Kingsley's *Two Years Ago* (1857) for the *Saturday Review*, written by the cleric T.C. Sandars was the first place the term appeared (Simon and Bradley). Ironically, Kingsley abhorred it and wrote a vitriolic response to the author who had used ". . . that painful, if not offensive term, 'Muscular Christianity'" (Haley: 109). Thomas Hughes, a friend and supporter of Kingsley, then used the concept in a follow-up to *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857), called *Tom Brown at Oxford* (1861). In contrast to Kingsley, who seemed worried about the negative connotations that may have been attached to the secular phrase "muscular", Hughes used it to promote the athleticism that was so pervasive in his novels

(Winn). This said, Rosen notes that he was careful to clearly distinguish the concept of “muscular Christians” from the “musclemen” (athletes without Christian beliefs): “the only point in common between the two being, that both hold it to be a good thing to have strong and well-exercised bodies . . . Here all likeness ends”, the Christian belief is “. . . that a man’s body is given him to be trained and brought into subjection and then used for the protection of the weak, the advancement of all righteous causes” (Hughes: 99).

Interestingly, Redmond has noted that a closer examination of other children’s literature long before the birth of the concept in Kingsley and Hughes shows that the general thesis of Muscular Christianity was implicit within works published between 1762 and 1857. The work of writers, such as J.J. Rousseau, William Clarke, Dorothy Kilner, William Howitt, and S.G. Goodrich all possess glimpses of the Christian muscular gospel that flowered in the literature of Kingsley and Hughes. In his classic, *Emile* (1762), Rousseau emphasizes the importance of physical education in the development of moral character: “Give his body constant exercise, make it strong and healthy in order to make him good and wise . . . The lessons the scholars learn from one another in the playground are worth a hundred fold more than what they learn in the classroom” (cited in Redmond: 9). In conclusion, Redmond suggests neither Kingsley nor Hughes can be accredited with the original “athletic gospel” but they “reaped the harvest” that gave birth to the Muscular Christian movement during the Victorian period.

Their personal lives, education, and political and theological affiliations heavily influenced Kingsley’s and Hughes’ ideas. The period between 1850-1900 was characterized by social unrest and political instability in the form of labor unrest in the working class population and serious problems with public health (Clark). Both Hughes and Kingsley had been sympathizers of Chartism, a political movement that developed in response to the social injustices suffered by the working classes. As a rector and author of social novels such as *Yeast* (1848), *Westward Ho!* (1855), and *Alton Locke* (1850), Kingsley became widely known as the “Chartist clergyman” (McGlynn). Following the House of Commons’ decision to reject the Chartist Petition in 1848 and the subsequent demise of Chartism, Kingsley and Hughes continued to support the grievances of the working classes as leading proponents of Christian Socialism. They joined forces with other Christian Socialist thinkers such as F.D. Maurice (1805-1872), J.M. Ludlow (1821-1911), and Thomas Arnold (1795-1842). It was Ludlow who convinced Kingsley and Maurice that Christianity and Socialism could be integrated to offer an antidote to the political doctrine of Chartism (Bloomfield).

Although the Christian Socialist movement had a similar goal as Chartism, its primary focus was on providing solutions to social ills through educational and moral change, not change in political legislation (Norman). At the time, this was a radical idea. Before the late 1840s, the Church of England’s attitude to implementing social reform was conservative with leading evangelicals emphasizing the hierarchical class system, thus marginalizing the poor and downtrodden. They saw poverty as being self-inflicted through various sins such as self-indulgence and intemperance (Parsons). The class system was also reinforced during the late nineteenth century by the fashionable concept of Social Darwinism. In short, the primary concern of the Victorian Church of England before the mid-nineteenth century had been to “save the lost” (i.e., to win converts) with concern for social welfare often coming a poor second.

The Christian Socialists heavily criticized the Church's advocacy of the classic political economy and hierarchical class structure, which had contributed to the dehumanizing and neglect of the working class population during the early nineteenth century (Norman). In respect to Muscular Christianity, Kingsley had stressed the social benefits that accrue from participation in athletic activities, especially in terms of demolishing class divisions. Nevertheless, the Christian Socialist idea of a classless society often concealed ". . . a deeper belief in the class system and in the bourgeois hegemony" which is personified by the middle-class boys depicted in Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (Allen: 120). And although implicit, there seems to be what Allen calls a "conceptual dilemma" in Hughes' classic work, between "the classless democracy of the athletic body and the hierarchical structure of the class system" (120-21). This tension was also evident in what Hargreaves calls a "leadership cult," which existed in middle-class public schools where society's leaders were being nurtured.

The Christian Socialists, a small but very influential group of academics and Protestant clergy, disseminated their ideas primarily through two journals, *Politics of the People* (1848-1849) and *The Christian Socialist* (1850-1851). F.D. Maurice, who is recognized as the movement's most influential and leading thinker, also founded the Working Men's College in London in 1854, which ran evening classes, thus acting as a vehicle to educate the working class people. The theology that underpinned the Christian Socialist thesis and which complemented Muscular Christianity can be mainly attributed to Maurice. Heavily influenced by the idealism of Coleridge he believed that the Kingdom of God should be accessible to all members of society, a theology of universal brotherhood (Norman). In Maurice's book *The Kingdom of God* (1838) and in a later controversial publication *Theological Essays* (1852), he championed an Incarnational theology, which provided an elevated view of humanity with a stress on the importance of educating the masses to recognize their place in God's Kingdom.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, there had been an emphasis on the Atonement within theological circles. Nevertheless, the advent of the Christian Socialist movement, especially in the work of Maurice, saw a shift ". . . to promote the study of social and political questions in the light of the Incarnation" (Norman: 30). This it was argued, has a sound biblical basis in the teachings of Jesus (e.g., Mark 3:20-30; Matthew 12:25-32; Luke 4) and provided the basis for Kingsley's theological position, which recognized the significance of the embodied soul, and in turn the goodness of athleticism and physical strength in the formation of character. Donald Hall has noted that the frequent reference to the body in the *Politics for the People* and other Christian Socialist literature provides evidence that ". . . the metaphors and pedagogical goals of the Christian Socialists and muscular Christians are inextricably linked" (48). This highlights the importance and significance of Hughes and Kingsley's work within the Christian Socialist movement and its impact upon social and cultural change during the Victorian period. Of the two, Kingsley has written more on the muscular Christian ethic and deserves the credit for providing Muscular Christianity ". . . with a cohesive and conscious philosophy, consisting equally of athleticism, patriotism, and religion" (Putney: 12).

It can be argued that the most significant idea to evolve from Kingsley's corpus of writings is "Christian manliness." His doctrine of masculinity had been originally based upon his ". . . instincts which told him that the life of a clergyman was compatible with married life and with that of a sportsman" (Haley: 111). From this, he sought to provide philosophical and theological

justification for his feelings and borrowed from a diverse group of thinkers. The philosophical lineage of Kingsleyan masculinity is derived from Plato's concept of *thumos*, which he interpreted as a primal manly force involved in sex, morality, and fighting (Rosen). Although Bloomfield acknowledges that it is speculative, she suggests Kingsley's work may have also been influenced by the mystical and occult philosophy of Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772). There are a number of clear parallels in their work and perhaps most significantly their ". . . desire - to seek the relationship between soul and body" (173). Due to the influence of Plato's mind-body dualism and the liberal philosophy of Swedenborg in his work, his more orthodox contemporaries frequently accused Kingsley of Neo-Platonism and Pantheism, an accusation that he angrily refuted. These philosophical roots were formed while he was reading Classics at Cambridge University, where he gained a first class degree. He then developed and focused his ideas into a doctrine of social action and reform through reading the works of, and collaborating with essayist and social historian Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) and theologian F.D. Maurice.

Carlyle had been influenced by the German Romanticist thought of Herder and Goethe. In trying to synthesize what Kant had described as the *noumena* and *phenomena*, Johan Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) had promoted the ". . . veneration of the body as being natural, beautiful manifestation of life and vitality, a vehicle through which, by means of gesture, the soul could speak" (Bloomfield: 180). Hence, it is possible to trace certain elements of German Romanticism in the thought of Kingsley. Haley proposes that Kingsley's notion of the muscular Christian or "healthy hero" was primarily based upon three of Carlyle's ideas: the body is an expression of the spirit and therefore the obedience to healthy impulse is a sign of constitutional harmony; the state of health is acknowledgment of the laws of nature and compliance with these laws; and heroism is a life of action made possible by observing the laws of health (111-12). In light of this, neither Kingsley, Maurice, or Hughes accepted the entire "vague theistic gospel" of Carlyle, but nevertheless it had a significant impact upon their work. Primarily, it was the ". . . angry Old Testament rhetoric of Carlyle's social criticism," which was a ". . . brutally direct stimulus to social action and intervention" that most significantly influenced the Christian socialist theology of Maurice and his associates (Vance: 59).

In Alderson's analysis of Christian manliness in Kingsley's novel *Alton Locke* (1850), he contends that "the imperatives of a counter-revolutionary and Protestant culture . . . enabled the Kingsleyan sense of the ideal male body to become so central to the masculine self-definition of Britain's rulers" (43-44). In addition to the fears within the Protestant elite of the feminization of the Victorian Church, the rise of evolutionary theory and in the late nineteenth century Freudian and Jungian psychologies also helped strengthen Kingsley's notion of masculinity (Rosen). The doctrine of masculinity has been absorbed into the "deep structure" of society and continues to have a pervasive influence in athletics, religion, and men's movements within modern Anglo-American culture. For example, twentieth century men's movements that "seek to rid men of the problems of pre-sixties' macho and post-sixties' sensitivities" owe much to Kingsley (Rosen: 39-40). And in relation to sports participation, Harris proposes that ". . . the muscular novel according to Kingsley and Hughes contributed to the immense vogue of athletics from the late sixties onwards" (11).

In light of the widespread and prolonged influence of Kingsley's notion of the muscular Christian, there were notable Victorian and post-Victorian writers, such as Gerard Manley

Hopkins (1844-1889) and E.M. Forster (1879-1970), who strongly disagreed with Kingsley's ideas (Putney). Forster suggested that those educated within the movement ended up with "well-developed bodies . . . and underdeveloped hearts" (5). Likewise, in a contemporary analysis of values, sport, and education, Grace suggests, "the irony of muscular Christianity is that it elevated sport more than the Gospels" (17). There were also staunch criticisms from a number of leading professors within American academia, especially before 1880. A major reason for this was the American Civil War. Soldiers hardly needed to prove their manliness on a playing field after demonstrating it on the battlefield and thus often derided the concept of Muscular Christianity (Putney).

One of the key figures in the Oxford Movement, Catholic theologian John Henry Newman (1801-1890), had also publicly voiced his criticisms of Kingsley's philosophy. In his novel *Westward Ho!* (1855), Kingsley attacked the Catholic Church, and specifically its asceticism and condemnation of the flesh, and judged what he called "Mariolatry" as a major reason for the feminization of Victorian culture (Schiefelbein). According to Schiefelbein, this points out that Kingsley himself had been prone to confusion between his ascetic impulses and his sexual desires. The result was the most unfortunate (for Kingsley!) and infamous Kingsley-Newman controversy, which centred on a disagreement over the anthropological nature of man. Kingsley promoted a vision of the "divineness of the whole manhood," a synthesis of mind and body, and an education wherein ". . . one did not need to attend a university to form a manly character" (Haley: 119). While Newman agreed with Kingsley's understanding of the wholeness of man, he rejected his anti-intellectualism and emphasis on the corporeal dimension within the Christian life. In agreement with Newman, Fasick has argued against Kingsley's "hyper-masculinity" commenting, "despite his homage to gentleness and patience, Kingsley's real attraction is apparently to the displays of power and aggression with which he adorns his novels" (109). Haley notes that Newman adopted a more sophisticated approach arguing, "the man of philosophic habit has 'illumination,' not an inborn, infallible guide to conduct," which in turn differentiated between manliness and what Newman called gentlemanliness (Haley: 118). Kingsley had frequently criticized a number of High Anglican and Catholic clergy, but when he personally attacked Newman, Newman was quick to respond producing *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (1864), a rigorous defense of Catholicism. In the eyes of the intelligentsia, this won Newman the debate, much to Kingsley's embarrassment (Putney).

The Fruits of Muscular Christianity: Socio-Cultural Developments in Victorian Britain

Following the rise of Chartism and Christian Socialism, and shifting theological perspectives during the mid-Victorian period, a significant number of the Protestant elite, especially Kingsley and Hughes, advocated the use of sports and exercise to promote the harmonious development of mind, body, and spirit (Hall, 1994). Mathisen identified four models of Muscular Christianity that had developed from the ideas of Hughes and Kingsley by the end of the nineteenth century. These are the classical model, evangelical model, the YMCA model, and the Olympic model. The promulgation of sport and physical pursuits in English Public Schools such as Rugby, Eton, and Uppingham, was arguably the most significant socio-cultural development to evolve from "classical" Muscular Christianity.

During the late 1850s, the tenets of Muscular Christianity became an integral part of the public school educational system. The primary reason was to encourage Christian morality and help develop the character of the future captains of industry and political leaders, and in turn strengthen the British Empire (Wilkinson). Edward Thring (1821-1887), headmaster of Uppingham between 1853-1857, sums this up when he states, “the whole efforts of a school ought to be directed to making boys, manly, earnest and true” (Rawnsley: 12). The main impetus for the integration of the muscular Christian ethic into Public Schools was Thomas Hughes’ book *Tom Brown’s School Days* (1857), a story of a boy whose character was shaped playing sport at Rugby School. Hughes had been heavily influenced by Rev. Dr. Thomas Arnold, his headmaster at Rugby during the 1830s, who instilled in him “. . . a strong religious faith and loyalty to Christ” (Brown: x). Although, it is Arnold that is most frequently cited in the literature as the driving force behind sports in public schools, the Rev. George Cotton had masterminded the sports program at Rugby School under Arnold. Cotton was perhaps the prototype of what Mangan called “a novel kind of school master - the athletic pedagogue” (23).

The Muscular Christianity movement within public schools relied heavily upon the notion of Kingsleyan manliness. The sport of rugby was particularly popular as it gave plenty of opportunity to “take hard knocks without malice” (Mason 1981), a desirable trait in possible future leaders of industry and the military. Rugby, Dobbs suggests, was almost the perfect game for the promotion of Muscular Christianity, and if it had not already existed leaders of the movement would have invented it:

If the Muscular Christians and their disciples in the public schools, given sufficient wit, had been asked to invent a game that exhausted boys before they could fall victims to vice and idleness, which at the same time instilled the manly virtues of absorbing and inflicting pain in about equal proportions, which elevated the team above the individual, which bred courage, loyalty and discipline, which as yet had no taint of professionalism and which, as an added bonus, occupied 30 boys at a time instead of a mere twenty-two, it is probably something like rugby that they would have devised (89).

Dobbs’ reference to rugby as an activity that would distract boys from vice and idleness was closely associated to the two unmentionables of the Victorian period: masturbation and homosexuality (Dobre-Laza). It was hoped that “games and religious worship . . .” would “. . . offer the Muscular Christian substitute gratifications for sexual desire . . .” which may otherwise be expressed in the perceived vice of masturbation (Harrington: 50). Homosexuality was also a major concern of public school masters. Holt has commented that “. . . at precisely the moment when the new norms of maleness were coming into force, the incarnation of the opposite of ‘manliness’ was defined in the form of homosexuality, which for the first time was generally designated a crime in 1885” (90). Thus, Kingsleyan masculinity acted as the antithesis of homosexuality and aesthetics during the Victorian age (Dobre-Laza).

A number of modern sports historians are skeptical about the motivations behind the original muscular Christians and the implementation of these ideas in nineteenth century public schools. For example, Baker (2000) argues that the ideologies behind the promotion of sport in Victorian Schools were primarily related to class, the Protestant work ethic, and the idea of manliness that was pedaled as an antidote to the feminization of the Church. As Grace has argued, Baker

presents a purely functionalist thesis, which has some merit but is a rather narrow and simplistic analysis of a movement that has offered much to our understanding of sport and Christian values. In summary, the birth of Muscular Christianity in nineteenth century public schools has been one of the most significant factors in the development of sport and physical training in our modern educational systems (Mechikoff and Estes).

A form of Muscular Christianity was also adopted as an evangelical tool by a number of individuals and groups during the Victorian period. C.T. Studd (1860-1931), a world-renowned cricketer and leader of the so called Cambridge Seven, and the American lay evangelist Dwight L. Moody (1837-1899), both recognized the compatibility of sport and Christianity. However, their philosophy was not directly in line with “classical” Kingsleyan Muscular Christianity, which was largely a liberal and high Church phenomenon. As evangelicals, they emphasized that sport, although a valid recreational activity, was unimportant compared to gospel ministry. The story of Scotsman Eric Liddell, Olympic athlete, international rugby player, and Christian missionary in the early 1920s, powerfully depicted in the Academy award winning film *Chariots of Fire* (1981), closely resonates with the type of Muscular Christianity advocated by Studd and Moody. Liddell’s decision not to race on a Sunday, due to his Christian faith (Exodus 20: 8), so missing the 100 meter final of the 1924 Olympics and his decision to give up a distinguished athletics career to become a missionary in China (Liddell), demonstrates many of the virtues of the muscular Christian ethic. Vance highlights that Liddell was a popular speaker at evangelical rallies and in universities where students were keen to listen to the testimony and ideas of the “flying Scotsman,” and that Liddell has “carried the neo-evangelical version of what was essentially Victorian Christian manliness into the middle of the twentieth century” (172).

Muscular Christianity also influenced the founding of the British Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) in London in 1844 by George Williams. However, at its inception the YMCA emphasized “. . . bible-study, prayer and education” and had frowned upon sport and athletic activities as an unwanted distraction from evangelism. But they found it increasingly difficult to retain members due to competition with these secular attractions (Vance: 168). Over the next twenty to thirty years more liberal views crept into the philosophy of the YMCA, which had previously been characterized by evangelical piety. Towards the end of the nineteenth century Kingsleyan manliness became a pervasive theme in evangelical literature and rhetoric, and the concept of Muscular Christianity was thoroughly institutionalized into Victorian culture and the YMCA (Rosen). The result was the proliferation of gymnasia and health and fitness programs within the YMCA on both sides of the Atlantic.

The main impetus for the founding of the YMCA in Britain had been the unhealthy social conditions arising from the industrial revolution. Young men, who had previously worked in a rural setting, worked ten to twelve hours a day, six days a week, in factories with generally appalling conditions. Shortly after the founding of the YMCA in Britain, a number of American Protestant ministers from various denominations, along with Captain Thomas Sullivan, formed a YMCA in Boston in 1851. This was based upon the British model and in time led to the development of the YMCA in numerous major American cities. Two hundred and five were established across the states by 1860 (Putney). The lay evangelists Dwight L. Moody and John Mott (1865-1955) were heavily involved with the American YMCA during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Many young men were sent abroad as missionary-like YMCA secretaries and

war workers. This was a major dimension of the significant missionary outreach by Christian Churches around the turn of the century (YMCA).

In terms of promoting Muscular Christianity, Dr Luther H. Gulick (1865-1918), an instructor in the YMCA Training School in Springfield, MA, was perhaps the most influential figure within the YMCA (Putney). Gulick created the distinctive triangular emblem of the YMCA that conceptualized fitness as an integration of mind, body and spirit, and in turn emphasized their muscular Christian ethos. Putney suggests that Gulick campaigned to “. . . Christianize the gym” (Putney: 71) and in turn reinforced the growing relationship between sport and Christianity. The founding of the Boys’ Brigade by Sir William Alexander Smith (1854-1914) in Glasgow in 1883 further strengthened the synthesis of sport and Christianity during the Victorian era. Sport and other activities were used in addition to drills as a means of building Christian manly character. Smith identified the use of outdoor adventure in building character and manliness, and was intrigued by the scouting methods used by soldiers in the Boer war. This led to Smith asking Sir S.S. Baden Powell (1857-1941), a hero of the war, to re-write his *Aids to Scouting* for the Boys Brigade. Eventually, this resulted in the publication of *Scouting for Boys* (1907) and the formation of the Boy Scouts in Britain in 1897, an independent organization, which unlike the Boys Brigade evolved into a mainly secular organization (Vance). The Americans soon followed suit with a number of YMCA staff members playing a key role in establishing the Boy Scouts of America in 1910 (YMCA).

Commenting on the significance of the YMCA and the movement of Muscular Christianity in which it is embedded, the prominent American psychologist G. Stanley Hall stated with great insight that “among all the marvelous advances of Christianity either within this organization [the YMCA] or without it . . . the future historian of the Church will place this movement of carrying the gospel to the body as one of the most epoch making” (377). Over the last one hundred and fifty years the YMCA has evolved into a worldwide organization and respected Christian institution that has made a significant contribution to the promotion of sport and physical training in a Christian context.

The development of the Modern Olympic Games in 1896 by Baron Pierre de Coubertin (1863-1937) also had strong links with the ideology of Muscular Christianity. Notably, early in his life de Coubertin had contemplated entering the priesthood, having been brought up in the Roman Catholic tradition and attending a Jesuit school. However, he could not accept the dogma of the Church and advocated what has been termed “the religion of humanity”^{<5>} (Baker 2001: 15). Nevertheless, “Coubertin wrote in his memoirs that for him ‘. . . sport is religion with Church, dogma, cult . . . but especially with religious feeling’, thus Coubertin . . . clearly had a religious understanding of Olympism” (Kortzfleisch: 231-36). Widund has also noted the similarities between de Coubertin’s understanding of the Olympic ethos and St. Paul’s writings, which encourage us to run the “good race” (1 Corinthians 9:24-25). Addressing the members of the International Olympic Committee at a banquet in London, de Coubertin said “the importance of these Olympiads is not so much to win as to take part . . . The important thing in life is not the triumph but the struggle. The essential thing is not to have won but to have fought well” (Widund: 11). This became the core message of the modern Olympic movement and was borne in part from de Coubertin’s engagement with the Muscular Christian ideal.

After reading a French translation of Thomas Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and consequently visiting Rugby School, de Coubertin saw the athletic traditions of the English public schools system as a vehicle for rebuilding the character of France after the Franco-Prussian war (Vance) and as a perfect model for the rebirth of the Ancient Olympics (776 B.C.). In his own words, the philosophy of the games was "to unite ancient spirit and modern form" (Lammer: 107). He viewed the sports arena as "... a laboratory for manliness ... an incomparable pedagogical tool ... and it was all the invention of the Reverend Thomas Arnold. The Rugby School experiment, he said [inaccurately!], gave birth to 'muscular Christianity' ... a Greek formula perfected by Anglo-Saxon Civilization" (cited in Lucas: 51). In his *Pedagogie Sportive* (1934) de Coubertin credits Kingsley and Arnold as totally altering the direction and definition of non-professional sport (Lucas). This is certainly true and our next task is to briefly outline how Muscular Christianity has impacted upon the modern world where "... the invocation of God and Christ in the world of sports has reached epidemic proportions" (Crepeau: 2).

Bibliography

AIA

2000 Olympic Summer Games 2000 in Sydney: Outreach.
<http://www.aiaeurope.com/english/news/olympics2000-frame.html>. October 25, 2000.

Alderson, David

1996 "An Anatomy of the British Polity: *Alton Locke* and Christian Manliness." Pp. 43-61 in *Victorian Identities: Social and Cultural Formations in Nineteenth-Century Literature*. Edited by Ruth Robins and Julian Wolfreys. New York: St. Martin.

Allen, Dennis W.

1994 "Young England: Muscular Christianity and the Politics of the Body in 'Tom Brown's Schooldays.'" Pp. 114-32 in *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age*. Edited by Donald E. Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ampleforth College

2004 *Mission Statement*: Ampelforth College.
http://www.ampleforthcollege.york.sch.uk/mission_statement.html. April 5, 2004.

Armstrong, Chris

2003 *College Sports: Prodigal Son of "Muscular Christianity"*.
<http://www.christianitytoday.com/history/newsletter/2003/aug15.html>. September 3, 2003.

Baker, William J.

1994 "To Play or to Pray? The YMCA Question in the United Kingdom and the United States, 1850-1900." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 11, 1: 42-62.

2000 "Questioning Tom Brown: Sport and the Character Game." Pp. 7-18 in *A Fair go for All? Current Issues in Australian Sport Ethics*. Edited by John Squires. Sydney: New College Institute for Values Research.

2001 *If Christ Came to the Olympics: New College Lectures*. Australia: University of New South Wales Press.

Ballou, Ralph, B.

1973 "Analysis of the Writings of Selected Church Fathers to A.D. 394 to Reveal Attitudes regarding Physical Activity." Pp. 187-99 in *History of Sport and Physical Education to 1900: Selected Topics*. Edited by Earle F. Zeigler. Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Bone, James, and Daniel McGrory

2004 "US Golden Girl Fears Olympic Terror Attack." *The Times* March 30: 3.

Bose, Mihir

2004 "Greeks Step Up Kenteris Grilling." *The Daily Telegraph* August 31.

Bloomfield, Anne

1994 "Muscular Christian or Mystic? Charles Kingsley Reappraised." *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 11 2:172-90.

Brown, Emma

1880 *True Manliness: From the Writings of Thomas Hughes*. Boston. D. Lothrop.

Buckeridge, John

2003 "Christian Sportsman gets Watchdog Role." *Christian Renewal* June: 4.

Clark, Stephen H.

1996 *The Development of Leisure in Britain after 1850*.
<http://www.65.107.211.206/history/leisure2.html>. January 25, 2004.

Coffman, Elesha

2002 *Christian History Corner: Citius, Altius, Sanctus*.
<http://www.christiantytoday.com/ct/2002/105/53.0.html>. February 5, 2004.

Connor, Steven

2003 *Sports Outreach: Principles and Practice for Successful Sports Ministry*. Scotland: Christian Focus Publications.

Crepeau, Richard C.

2001 *Playing with God: The History of Athletes Thanking the "Big Man Upstairs"*. <http://www.poppolitics.com/articles/2001-03-09-sport.shtml>. March 9, 2004.

Cunningham, Hugh

1980 *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution c1780-1880*. London: Croom Helm.

Czech, Daniel R., Craig A. Wisberg, Leslee A. Fisher, Charles L. Thompson, and Gene Hayes

2004 "The Experience of Christian Prayer in Sport - An Existential Phenomenological Investigation." *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 2: 1-19.

Dobre-Laza, Mona

2003 *Victorian and Edwardian Sporting Values*. http://elt.britcoun.org.pl/s_vict.html. February 5, 2004.

Dobbs, Brian

1973 *Edwardians at Play: 1890-1914*. London: Pelham.

Eisen, George

1975 "Physical Activity, Physical Education and Sport in the Old Testament." *Journal of History of Sport and Physical Education* 6: 45-65.

Elliott, Philip

2004 *Super God: 'Jock Idolatry' Gives Evangelical Athletes a Forum at the Super Bowl*. http://www.myinky.com/ecp/religion/article0,1626,ECP_782_2617774,00.html. March 30, 2004.

Fasick, Laura

1993 "The Failure of Fatherhood: Maleness and its Discontents in Charles Kingsley." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 18, 3: 106-11.

Feeney, Robert

1995 *A Catholic Perspective: Physical Exercise and Sport*. US: Aquinas.

Folley, Malcom

2001 *A Time to Jump: The Authorized Biography of Jonathan Edwards*. London: Harper Collins.

Forster, Edward M.

1936 *Abinger Harvest*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Gay, Peter

1992 "The Manliness of Christ." Pp. 102-16 in *Religion and Irreligion in Victorian Society*. Edited by Robert W. Davis and Richard J. Helmstadter. London: Routledge.

Glatz, Carol

2004 "Sports Office Speeds Out of the Blocks." *The Catholic Times* Sunday August 15: 12.

Grace, Damian J.

2000 "Values, Sport and Education." *Journal of Christian Education* 43, 2: 7-17.

Götz, Ignacio, L.

2001 "Spirituality and the Body." *Religious Education* 96, 3:2-19.

Haley, Bruce

1978 *The Healthy Body and Victorian Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hall, Donald E.

1994 "On the Making and Unmasking of Monsters: Christian Socialism, Muscular Christianity, and the Metaphorization of Class Conflict." Pp. 46-65 in *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age*. Edited by Donald E. Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, Granville S.

1902 "Christianity and Physical Culture." *Pedagogical Seminary* 9, 3: 377.

Hargreaves, John E.R.

1986 *Sport, Power and Culture: A Social and Historical Analysis of Popular Sports in Britain*. London: Polity.

Harrington, Henry R.

1971 *Muscular Christianity: The Study of the Development of a Victorian Idea*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Stanford.

Harris, Styron.

1990 "The 'Muscular Novel': Medium of a Victorian Ideal." *Tennessee Philological Bulletin* 27: 6-13.

Hastings, Edward.

2004 "Spirituality in Sport." *Spirituality* May/June: 160-66.

Hastings, Edward, and Len DiPaul

2003 *The Center for Sport, Spirituality and Character Development*. <http://www.neuman.edu>. August 12, 2003.

Hoffman, Shirl J., editor

1992 *Sport and Religion*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Holt, Richard.

1990 *Sport and the British: A Modern History*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hughes, Thomas

1861 *Tom Brown at Oxford*. London: Macmillan.

Kortzfleisch, Siegmund V.

1970 "Religious Olympism." *Social Research* 37: 231-36.

Kreider, Anthony J.

2003 "Prayers for Assistance as Unsporting Behavior." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* XXX: 17-25.

Ladd, Tony, and James A. Mathisen

1999 *Muscular Christianity: Evangelical Protestants and the Development American Sport*. Michigan: Baker.

Lammer, Manfred

1992 "Myth of Reality: The Classic Olympic Athlete." *Review for the Sociology of Sport* 18: 64-84.

Liddell, Eric

1985 *The Disciplines of the Christian Life*. Nashville: Abingdon.

Lucas, John A.

1976 "Victorian 'Muscular Christianity': Prologue to the Olympic Games." *Olympic Review* 99/100: 49-52.

Mangan, James A.

1982 "Philathlete Extraordinary: A Portrait of the Victorian Moarlist Edward Bowen. *Journal of Sport History* 9, 3: 23-40.

Mason, Bryan

1981 *Association Football and English Society 1863-1915*. Brighton: Harvester.

1982 *Into the Stadium: An Active Guide to Sport and Recreation Ministry in the Local Church*. UK: Spring Harvest.

Mathisen, James

1994 "Towards an Understanding of Muscular Christianity: Religion, Sport and Culture in the Modern World." Pp. 192-205 in *Christianity and Leisure*. Edited by Paul Heintzman, Glen E. Van Anel, and Thomas L. Visker. Sioux Center, IA: Dordt College.

McGlynn, Hilary, editor

2000 *The Hutchinson Encyclopaedia*. Oxford: Helicon.

McGrath, Alister E., editor

1996 *The NIV Thematic Study Bible*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Mechikoff, Robert, and Steven Estes

2002 *A History of Philosophy of Sport and Physical Education*. London: McGraw-Hill.

The Mendelson Center and Neumann College.

2003 *Mendelson Centre: Ministry through Sports Initiative*. <http://www.nd.edu/~csc/cmts.html>. August 12, 2003.

Newsome, David

1961 *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal*. London: Cassell.

Norman, Edward

1987 "Victorian Values: Stewart Headlam and the Christian Socialists." *History Today* April: 27-32.

Novak, Michael

1976 *The Joy of Sports: End Zones, Bases, Baskets, Balls and Consecration of the American Spirit*. New York: Basic.

2003 Personal Communication, October 14.

Parsons, Gerald, editor

1988 *Religion in Victorian Britain: Vol II*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Putney, Clifford

2001 *Muscular Christianity: Manhood and Sports in Protestant America 1880-1920*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rawnsley, Hardwicke D.

1889 *Edward Thring, Teacher and Poet*. London: T Fisher Unwin.

Redmond, Gerald

1978 "The First Tom Brown's Schooldays: Origins and Evolution of 'Muscular Christianity' in Children's Literature." *Quest* 30: 4-18.

Rosen, David

1994 "The Volcano and the Cathedral: Muscular Christianity and the Origins of Primal Manliness." Pp. 17-44 in *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age*. Edited by Donald E. Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saunders, Martin

2003a "Devonian College Embraces Extreme Sports." *Christian Renewal* November: 5.

2003b "New Course Combines Sport and Theology." *Christian Renewal* May: 7.

Schiefelbein, Michael

1998 "Blighted by a Upas-Shadow: Catholicism's Function for Kingsley in *Westward Ho!*" *Victorian Newsletter* 94: 10-17.

Simon, Brian, and Ian Bradley

1975 *The Victorian Public School*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

Spencer, Albert F.

2000 "Ethics, Faith and Sport." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 12, 1/2: 143-58.

Stevenson, Christopher L.

1997 "Christian Athletes and the Culture of Elite Sport: Dilemmas and Solutions. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 14: 241-62.

Vance, Norman.

1985 *The Sinews of the Spirit: The Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Volkwein, Karin A.E.

1995 "Ethics and Top-Level Sport - A Paradox?" *International Review for Sociology of Sport* 30, 3/4: 311-319.

Watson, Nick J., and Mark Nesti

In press "The Role of Spirituality in Sport Psychology Consulting: An Analysis and Integrative Review of Literature." *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*.

Weir, Stuart

2004 *The Ultimate Prize: Great Christian Olympians*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Widund, Ture

1994 "Ethelbert Talbot His Life and Place in Olympic History." *Citius, Altius, Fortius: The International Society of Olympic History Journal* 2, 2: 7-14.

Winn, William E.

1960 "Tom Brown's Schooldays and the Development of 'Muscular Christianity'". *Church History* 29: 66.

Wilkinson, Rupert

1964 *Gentlemanly Power - British Leadership and Public Schools Tradition*. London: Oxford University Press.

YMCA

2004 *A Brief History of the YMCA Movement*. <http://www.ymca.net/about/cont/history.html>.
March 30, 2004.