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In a dormitory in late nineteenth-century Wellington, a public school for boys in Berkshire, a young pupil, later to become a leading horticulturalist, attempted to cultivate a window box of rare bulbs, that he had brought to the school from home. But the box was discovered by the Dorm Captain, who threw it to the floor and trampled the plants underfoot. According to an early historian of the school, this act was accompanied by the exclamation: “There is no room for this rotten effeminate stuff here!”[[2]](#endnote-2) This anecdote is typical of the way in which the social role of public schools for boys in modern Britain has been understood. In this story, the school figures as a repressive and sometimes violent space in which an older boy, valorised by the senior system of the school, quite literally stamps out the domestic and the feminine in the younger pupil, destroying a symbol of his home life and helping to sever him from it. The anecdote sits neatly with the stereotype of British public schools, but as this article will demonstrate, this image fails to take account of some important aspects of school life in this era. The worlds of school and home were less separate than has sometimes been assumed. While women and femininity were supposedly banned, the schools were modelled on forms of domestic patriarchal authority that allowed for considerable feminine presence and influence. Schools also required boys to perform basic domestic skills, within a system that created and valorised a specifically masculine form of domesticity. Moreover, family and parental contacts were not necessarily severed by removal to school – both school and home remained important in the emotional life of the boys.

Public schools have long been recognised as a significant force in modern British history, not least because they shaped the characters of the men who went on to govern the nation and produce the nineteenth-century state.[[3]](#endnote-3) The nine great public schools alone - Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Charterhouse, St Paul’s, Westminster, Shrewsbury, Merchant Taylors’, and Rugby - turned out hundreds of young men every year who then went off to university, government and empire.[[4]](#endnote-4) In the late 1980s and 1990s historians turned their attention to the study of masculine identities, and public schools assumed a new importance, as creators of the “masculine character”. [[5]](#endnote-5) In his seminal study of the formation of British male middle-class identity, John Tosh argued that the process of separating boys from the home and sending them off to boarding school from as young as seven years old was vital to the construction of masculinity.[[6]](#endnote-6) The idea that institutions, and associational life, played a fundamental role fostering masculine identities has been further developed by Paul Deslandes in his exploration of student experience at Oxford and Cambridge.[[7]](#endnote-7) Amy Milne-Smith has also demonstrated the importance of institutional life in the creation of class and gender identities in her study of London Clubland.[[8]](#endnote-8) But the everyday domestic worlds of public schools, also arguably a very significant component in the construction of upper and middle class British masculine identity, have yet to be considered in this way.

The idea that the function of these institutions was to separate boys from the home has been closely allied to the argument that women and the feminine were excluded from public schools. In the case of public schools, Tosh contends that “women were effectively banned as points of emotional reference”.[[9]](#endnote-9) Deslandes also explores gendered presence and absence in university life – arguing that the presence of women was regulated and controlled in a way that contributed to the construction of masculine identities.[[10]](#endnote-10) Milne-Smith also suggests that “men incorporated women into their clublife in regulated ways that maintained a predominantly homosocial ethos”.[[11]](#endnote-11) Taking a cue from these interpretations, this article explores ideas of gender and the presence of women in public schools. Elsewhere, the ideology of the household family was used to justify male political authority; middle-class standards of domesticity used to control working-class living practices; and a range of residential institutions drew on domestic ideals and practices.[[12]](#endnote-12) As I will argue here, schools and schoolhouses were also modelled on this – with heads and housemasters cast in patriarchal roles. The importance of the domestic arrangements of the schools, in the form of the house system, has long been recognised.[[13]](#endnote-13) Yet this is usually discussed in the context of inculcating athleticism or perpetuating systems of governance.[[14]](#endnote-14) For the most part, the relationship between schoolhouses and contemporary middle-class domestic space has been overlooked, as has the role of significant women in the schools, such as headmaster’s and housemaster’s wives, and the importance of female spaces such as the housemaster’s drawing room.

While school removed boys from the feminising domesticity of the home, the everyday life of the school itself contributed to the formation of specifically masculine domestic practices, which can help us understand the relationship between masculinity and domesticity in this period. Although Tosh convincingly argues that masculinity was a fundamental part of the home, he also suggests that the later part of the century saw a “flight from domesticity”.[[15]](#endnote-15) However, subsequent historians have shown that men remained involved in home life in a variety of ways.[[16]](#endnote-16) While men’s relationship with domesticity was placed under pressure at the end of the century, this produced new kind of engagement with the home as much as it drove men away. As John Potvin and Matt Cook have demonstrated, the late nineteenth century saw the emergence of queer domestic spaces, creating new forms of masculine domesticity.[[17]](#endnote-17) Examining the everyday life of boys at school allows us to see how masculine domestic practices continued to be constructed and valorised in a period when they were increasingly under pressure. As Deslandes, Milne-Smith and Quintin Colville have shown, in the case of universities, clubs and naval schools, the everyday routines and rituals of these places and their relationship with what was understood as normative domesticity were fundamental to the identities of the men and boys who lived in them.[[18]](#endnote-18) In the schools considered here, domesticity was performed daily through the enactment of everyday routines and rituals, and younger boys often carried out domestic tasks as part of the “fagging” system. These served to create a specifically masculine form of domesticity that was often framed and valorised through the ideals of chivalric masculinity, allowing boys to acquire and assume domestic skills without the taint of femininity or domestic service. Chivalry also encouraged the exercise of a protective form of authority by senior boys.

Yet emotional links with the home, and a more ‘feminised’ sense of domesticity, as we might understand it, were also still present in the schools. As Deslandes points out, the lives of university students should be understood on a basis of both term time and holidays. The institution and home were two separate worlds, but the students inhabited both.[[19]](#endnote-19) A similar approach needs to be taken to the emotional lives of public school boys. The third part of this article focuses on letters written home by boys and considers the interaction between home and institution. Recent studies of the Victorian family have moved away from a static picture of family life, emphasizing its changing nature, the challenges of negotiating relationships over distance and the role of “technologies of writing” in constructing family relations.[[20]](#endnote-20) Examining a collection of letters written by a schoolboy at Winchester College in the 1890s, the final part of the article tracks the development of different epistolary relationships in the family and considers how the boy’s emotional life was shaped both by these interactions and the world of the school. Schoolboys’ constant renegotiations of their position within the family played out on the pages of their correspondence and was an important facet of school and family life. According to a recent study by Patrick Joyce, schools aimed to supplant the home that boys had come from: “boys were deliberately broken or damaged in a hardening process”.[[21]](#endnote-21) This article argues that while school life could be emotionally abrasive, there was no absolute break between home and school. Indeed, schools allowed and encouraged these interconnections in a variety of ways. Boys were not severed from the homes that they had come from but were encouraged to develop new forms of domestic practices within institutional space – building a new identity that encompassed both school and home.

There is no shortage of evidence of life in British public schools, but it requires careful handling. During the nineteenth century, there was a growing demand for institutions to educate not only the sons of the upper classes, but also the well-off amongst the middle. The nine great public schools flourished.[[22]](#endnote-22) A number of new institutions were also established on the public-school model, including Cheltenham, Marlborough, Rossall and Wellington.[[23]](#endnote-23) Public schools produced the leading men of the day, who dominate the historical record. They remain very well-funded institutions with a long-term interest in preserving their heritage and records of the past,[[24]](#endnote-24) and have carefully kept a huge range of documents including the personal papers of old boys. Historians of public schools also tend to have had personal experience of the system. Despite the range of different accounts of school life that survive, there has been a tendency to see the schools as monolithic - and to generalise about a “public school type”.[[25]](#endnote-25) The strength of the public-school stereotype, and the twentieth-century experiences of their historians, have sometimes hidden what was distinctive about nineteenth-century institutional experiences. Autobiographical writings, reflecting on early twentieth-century experience but written at mid-century, are often constructed in relation to a larger cultural shift and critique of the schools that emerged after a series of critical publications came out around the time of the First World War, notably Arnold Lunn's *The Harrovians* and Alec Waugh's *The Loom of Youth.*[[26]](#endnote-26)

In order to get a sense of difference between schools, but to remain focused enough to provide a deep reading of these exceptionally rich archives, this article focuses on three prominent but different public schools: Winchester College; Charterhouse; and Lancing. Winchester was and is a leading public school, and its historic foundation was expanded from the 1860s, and new boarding houses substantially raised the school's capacity.[[27]](#endnote-27) In addition to aristocratic and upper-class boys there were usually around 70 scholars at Winchester, the majority from the professional middle classes. Charterhouse, also a predominantly elite establishment, moved from the City of London on the recommendation of the Clarendon Commission. Substantial new school buildings were opened just outside Godalming in 1872. In contrast, Lancing was established during the nineteenth century by leading churchman Nathaniel Woodard in 1848 in a vicarage at Shoreham, before moving to new buildings on the South Downs in 1857. Lancing was part of the Woodard Schools – an initiative designed to offer a public-school education to a wider social range. An early prospectus declared the school open to “gentlemen of limited means” as well as the sons of clergymen, professionals and tradesmen.[[28]](#endnote-28) Placed together, the three institutions provide a good indication of what was happening in the established but reformed public schools as well as a newer institution that sought to extend public school education to a broader social group. The following discussion is based primarily on a detailed survey of the institutional archives of these schools, including headmasters' reports, committee minutes and school magazines, which provide evidence of how these institutions drew on patriarchal power systems, and dealt with daily domestic matters within the school. As Deslandes has shown, magazines are particularly valuable as they are both directly contemporary and usually widely distributed.[[29]](#endnote-29) Autobiographies and memoirs, although written later, are also useful in that they reveal how old boys felt that parent-like heads and housemasters and basic domestic training had been useful and important in retrospect. However, the main focus of the final section of this article is the exchanges of letters between school boys and their families. Bearing in mind the cultural shifts that shaped later accounts of school life, I suggest that it is these sources, forged on a weekly or sometimes daily basis, that take us closest to the everyday life of Victorian and Edwardian schools, and reveal the profound connection between school and home in this era.

**Public School and the Patriarchal Family**

During the nineteenth century the patriarchal household remained an important organising concept and was used in a variety of social contexts. As Matt McCormack has demonstrated, male political authority and rights continued to be based on an idea that a man represented the household he governed.[[30]](#endnote-30) Shifting working practices and the decline of apprenticeship meant that the household family, in which a patriarch presided over wife, children, journeymen and apprentices who worked together in domestic space, was no longer a dominant social form.[[31]](#endnote-31) But the patriarchal household was reinvented in new, specifically nineteenth-century ways. Significantly, patriarchy was often perceived as a double act. There was an expectation that asylum superintendents and workhouse masters, for example, would be married.[[32]](#endnote-32) The wives of clergymen played a prominent role in their working lives.[[33]](#endnote-33) A new Evangelical emphasis on virtuous fatherhood also placed more emphasis on patriarchy as a moral performance, both in the home and outside it. Public schools were closely attuned to the importance of this ideology and developed their own institutional version of it. Historians of public schools have recognised that there was a new stress on male authority figures, but have sometimes overplayed the absence of women.[[34]](#endnote-34) School life in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries tends to be seen as continuous, a belief often shaped by the writer's own experiences at school.[[35]](#endnote-35) This has obscured the distinctiveness of nineteenth-century public schools, and in particular, their emphasis on the patriarchal household. Given that Victorian middle-class culture placed a strong emphasis on fatherly authority, this should come as no surprise.[[36]](#endnote-36) Schools were presented as patriarchal households led by a headmaster with a wife and family who were also closely involved in the life of the school. The idea was also important in the structuring of domestic arrangements for the boys, which were usually organised into houses, presided over by a housemaster, who again often had a wife who was actively present in the lives of the boys. These households and figures were celebrated and promoted publicly by the schools, in school magazines and later in early school histories. The boys too, often remarked on them in diaries and reminiscences of school life, underscoring their emotional value. Patriarchal models were not deployed in the institutional frameworks of schools in exactly the same way that they operated in households – the powers of women were more formally limited than they might be in the home and boys were always vulnerable to expulsion, for example. Yet their implementation was significant enough to have a powerful effect on the character of the school.

The affinity between the public school and patriarchal household was stressed by school reformers from the first half of the century. The headmaster of Rugby, Thomas Arnold, has often been credited with initiating widespread school reform, and although this has been overstated, Arnold’s ideas did have a strong influence over the creation of a moral atmosphere in schools and the domestic arrangements of the boys.[[37]](#endnote-37) Happily married with eleven children, and a wife who supported his work in the school, Arnold and his family were a model of patriarchy in action.[[38]](#endnote-38) Indeed, at times Arnold even seemed unconvinced that boarding school was the best mode of education for boys as it removed them from the influence of their parents.[[39]](#endnote-39) Arnold’s remedy for this was stronger patriarchal government; giving more power to headmasters and moving boys into houses run by housemasters, a practice increasingly followed in other schools.[[40]](#endnote-40) In the 1850s, French observers visiting English schools were struck by the similarity between the house system and the patriarchal family, in contrast to the more “barrack-like” arrangements in France.[[41]](#endnote-41) The influence of Arnold also seems evident in the Clarendon Commissioners’ report of 1864, which recommended that boys should live in houses governed by housemasters. Eton in particular was criticised for allowing boys to live in “Dames houses” - places adjacent to the school that were run by local women.[[42]](#endnote-42) This, the commissioners felt, was unsatisfactory because: “we cannot think that, generally speaking, a woman is as well able to take charge of the discipline of a large number of boys of the age and class that are to be found at Eton, as a man is."[[43]](#endnote-43) The commissioners did not want to completely exclude female influence but to make sure that overall governance took place within an institutionalized form of patriarchy. Housemasters were often married, the acquisition of a house allowing them to set up a household and generate the financial means to run it.[[44]](#endnote-44)

In the three schools I examine here, the role of the headmaster was particularly important in the second half of the nineteenth century. The power of these men across the sector was strengthened by the 1868 Public Schools Act that increased their autonomy and decreased the entrenched powers of systems of school government that had operated since their medieval foundations.[[45]](#endnote-45) In an era of modernisation, considerable dynamism was required to lead these institutions, and the men at the helm of Charterhouse, Lancing and Winchester were all particularly praised by school historians.[[46]](#endnote-46) At Charterhouse, William Haig Brown (headmaster 1863-98) oversaw the removal of the school from London to Godalming in the 1870s.[[47]](#endnote-47) Lancing's second headmaster Robert Edward Sanderson (headmaster 1862-1889) was held responsible for the consolidation and growth of the school from the early 1860s.[[48]](#endnote-48) Both these men are described as “humanizing” their institutions.[[49]](#endnote-49) Westwards along the South Downs, George Ridding (1867-1884) and William Andrewes Fearon (1884-1901) were both credited with seeing through the modernisation of Winchester.[[50]](#endnote-50) These men also loom large in old-boy memoirs and autobiographies, which emphasise their fatherly role, and their engagement with the boys. According to one 1890s pupil, “The Head Master, Dr Haig-Brown, and his family took a loving interest in every Carthusian”.[[51]](#endnote-51) Sanderson was also noted for his close relationship with the boys.[[52]](#endnote-52) Prior to the arrival of Ridding at Winchester, boys never entered the headmaster’s house and he was known for being distant from the boys.[[53]](#endnote-53) While Ridding changed the school’s atmosphere and arguably did more to modernise it, it was the expansive Fearon who the boys most praised (he was known affectionately as “the bear”).[[54]](#endnote-54)

It was important that Haig Brown, Sanderson, and Fearon were married. The wider cultural appreciation of the role of the headmaster's wife is evident in the novel *Tom Brown's Schooldays.* Mrs Arnold, the Headmaster's wife, is portrayed as a powerful influence over the boys.[[55]](#endnote-55) The novel was dedicated to her: “by the author who owes more than he can ever acknowledge or forget to her and hers”. The influence of headmasters’ wives was also feted in the three schools I examine here, particularly at Charterhouse and Winchester. A. H. Tod, the early twentieth-century Charterhouse historian, celebrated Mrs Haig Brown's maternal role by quoting from the school magazine *The Greyfriar* which described her as “the mother of all Carthusians”.[[56]](#endnote-56) Annie Marion Haig Brown's close engagement with the school's affairs is apparent in her compilation of twenty-five volumes of clippings and ephemera relating to the life of the nineteenth-century school, now held in the school archive.[[57]](#endnote-57) In all three schools the headmaster's wife organised regular social activities with the boys in their homes that cemented their role and helped create a sense of warmth and informality.[[58]](#endnote-58) New “men” (as boys at Winchester were known) were invited to breakfast at the Fearons. Frank Lucas (who arrived at the school in 1891) described this in a letter home to his father: “After family prayers we sat down to breakfast, which consisted of hot rolls, toast, fish sausages eggs and coffee, besides ordinary things. Mrs Fearon is very nice indeed.”[[59]](#endnote-59)

At Charterhouse, Lancing and Winchester, boys lived in the house system – that is they inhabited houses separate to the main school buildings (arrangements were slightly different at Winchester but operated on the same principles).[[60]](#endnote-60) Haig Brown and Sanderson were also both housemasters (Fearon had been, but gave up his house on taking up the headship). This role helped strengthen their informal connection with the boys. One pupil who lived in Saunderites (the name given to the Head’s house) in the 1870s described Haig Brown as “the best of friends”.[[61]](#endnote-61) Boys often remembered housemasters’ wives fondly.[[62]](#endnote-62) They worked quietly behind the scenes, determining the all important accommodation arrangements. Some women, however, exerted considerable influence. In the three schools surveyed here, two figures stand out as particularly powerful – Mrs Wilson, the wife of the Second Master at Lancing (1857-1869), and Mrs Richardson, the Second Master's wife at Winchester (1873-1899), known to the boys as “Mrs Dick”.

There is an outpouring of good feeling over these two women in reminiscences. In the 1860s, Frances H.L. Cameron remembered: “I was much struck with the kindness of Mr and Mrs Wilson, and the homelike feeling we had on Sunday mornings when those of their house looked in.”[[63]](#endnote-63) According to one old boy, “Mrs Wilson was loved and adored by all.”[[64]](#endnote-64) Wilson’s house was remembered as “extraordinarily popular”.[[65]](#endnote-65) Mrs Richardson was also widely celebrated. Charles Oman, at Winchester in the 1870s, recalls how “Mrs Dick” became “a sort of second mother to us all: we drank her tea, ate her excellent cakes, and confided to her all our little ambitions and grievances.”[[66]](#endnote-66) In 1906 *The Wykehamist,* the Winchester magazine,published “Mrs Richardson: An Appreciation”, praising the woman who “left College in 1899 a vastly cleaner, healthier, and happier place than she found it in 1872.”[[67]](#endnote-67) Mrs Richardson was valued for her generosity, conversation and strength of character: “The atmosphere that she created was one of spacious sympathies and elevating ideas, and many a College man must owe the great inspiration of his life to her encouragement and tact.”[[68]](#endnote-68)

The power of these women was expressed spatially and materially through their drawing rooms. In middle-class homes, drawing rooms were associated with feminine domestic etiquette and seen as the arena in which a housewife's taste and rules held sway.[[69]](#endnote-69) For Hughes, the headmaster's wife's drawing room could be as formative as the classroom. He opines: “Many is the brave heart now doing its work and bearing its load in country curacies, London chambers, under the Indian sun, and in Australian towns and clearings, which looks back with fond and grateful memory to that School-house drawing room, and dates much of its highest and best training to the lessons learnt there.”[[70]](#endnote-70)A surviving photograph of Mrs Haig Brown's drawing room (Figure One) depicts a high status and elaborately furnished domestic space, complete with the conventional trappings of feminine domesticity, but shields on the fire screens also convey the identity of the school. Memories of school life emphasize the importance of these spaces. G.C. White even went so far as to say that one of the two best features of his memories at Lancing (which he liked generally) was the “Sunday evenings in Mrs Wilson's drawing room… It was her habit to invite all the boys of the house to dinner on Sunday in each term – 4 or 5 every Sunday. Her drawing room was also open to them every Sunday evening 8-10. This was much appreciated and I think it had a refining influence.” [[71]](#endnote-71) The diaries of Sam Brooke, a Lancing schoolboy and inhabitant of Seconds in the early 1860s, suggests that visits to Mrs Wilson’s drawing room could be more frequent – he records playing the piano there regularly on weekday nights, as well as visiting on Sundays.[[72]](#endnote-72) Mrs Dick’s drawing room was also celebrated -- in the historian James Matthew Thompson’s poem about Winchester life in the 1890s: “On Sunday afternoons, when songs were sung, and we small juniors, free from daily chore, consumed plum cake on the drawing room floor.”[[73]](#endnote-73) In addition to providing domestic comforts to small boys, Mrs Dick’s drawing room was the locus for a large social group beyond the school. Conversational standards were high - she was remembered for loving Carlyle, Balzac and Goethe - and older boys who came into the drawing room could expect intellectual as well as social stimulation.[[74]](#endnote-74)

Once inside the drawing room, a schoolboy would also meet the daughters of the house. Here, they made contact with the female world, practiced their manners and even experienced their first frisson of sexual feeling for women. Deslandes has demonstrated that universities provided an institutional framing for the interactions of students and young women, staging balls and other events that helped build normative heterosexual relationships and fashion ideas of romance and sexuality.[[75]](#endnote-75) Although this happened less formally at public schools, the housemaster’s drawing room also seems to have provided an institutionally mediated space for the development of early sexual attachments. At Charterhouse a number of boys remembered the Haig Brown’s daughters, who were affectionately known as “the Olives”. Lucas, on an early visit to Mrs Dick's drawing room, wrote to his parents that he had encountered one of their daughters: “Miss Marguerite Richardson at 20 years is a very dressy fashionable gay sort of young lady.”[[76]](#endnote-76) Later on he got on better with “Popsy” the Richardson's younger daughter. In a letter written in October 1895 he noted: “Took Popsy in [i.e. he led her into dinner]. She was very amusing.”[[77]](#endnote-77) He was perhaps rather disappointed when she got married the following year, although he enjoyed relaying details of her wedding presents and the size of the cake to his mother in a letter.[[78]](#endnote-78) Schoolboys' hearts often fluttered at housemaster's daughters, the subjects of passion from afar. C. Sandford Terry, at Lancing in the early 1880s, remembers sending a Valentine's Day Card to the daughter of a master.[[79]](#endnote-79) Small tokens were seized and cherished – at Winchester in 1912 the warden's daughter Dolly (Mrs Hambey) inflamed a number of boys. In November, one boy noted in his diary: “In the evening Bell met me in the passage & pushing something scented into my face “like a trophy”. He had picked up Mrs (Dolly's) Hambey's hanky which I have still got.”

Despite the adoption of patriarchal structures, the role of female authority figures was limited in ways that it might not have been in private homes. How far did the influence of these women go? Not only did Mrs Richardson have a strong influence over the boys in chambers (who were under her husband’s control), but the writer of her appreciation also suggests she had an important effect on boys from other houses. Yet the housemaster’s wife could not intervene in every aspect of the lives of the boys. Bullying in the dormitory, or injustice in the classroom, were matters that were beyond their sphere (although the conversations in Mrs Dick’s drawing room at least suggest that she did take a considerable interest in the intellectual lives of the boys). While housemaster’s wives reigned supreme within the walls of their houses, they could not intervene in the broader domestic organisation of the school. When Mrs Dick attempted to improve the food for the Winchester boys by taking a hand in the college kitchens, she was roundly told that this was not her place.[[80]](#endnote-80) While the adoption of patriarchal roles led women to play a fundamental part of school life, their performance of those roles reinforced a sense of gendered hierarchy. Nevertheless, these women did wield a considerable amount of informal power, especially those whose individual personalities seem to have transcended the confines of gender. Frank Lucas, in a letter home to his mother in 1891, described how a schoolfellow had avoided being sent home for illness having convinced Mrs Dick that he was well: “Of course, as Mrs Dick's word is law with everyone that was quite conclusive.”[[81]](#endnote-81) In the Wilson household, an indication of who the boys felt it was most important to please is indicated by their choice of present for Mr Wilson's birthday. Brooke writes: “We are now getting up a present for Mr. Wilson's birthday, but are as yet undecided as to what it shall be. Some think a ‘Pictorial Tennyson’ others ‘some large vases’ as Mrs Wilson announced to someone the other day, that when she got them, her drawing room would be quite complete... I fancy the vases will be fixed on.”[[82]](#endnote-82) Sure enough, the vases, made of frosted glass and decorated with green and gold serpents, arrived in the drawing room a few days later.

**Fagging and Performing Everyday Domesticity**

While the schools drew on the idea of the patriarchal family and to a certain extent reinforced it, they also produced a distinct form of masculine domesticity through the performance of everyday rituals and routines. Housemasters and their wives had overall responsibility for the domestic management of school houses, and servants were appointed to perform some tasks, but a considerable proportion of mundane domestic activities were carried out by the boys. This was valorised by the system of “fagging” – the practice of younger boys carrying out basic services for senior boys in the school. The nature of fagging varied between institutions and from house to house, but might include running errands, fetching balls or messages, or performing basic domestic tasks such as tidying, cleaning studies, filling baths or simple cooking. Arguably, fagging, which trained boys to obey and later to command, worked within the larger patriarchal system discussed above – boys were effectively being trained to become authority figures. However, for the junior pupils, some of the work involved in fagging came dangerously close to domestic labour, tasks that were culturally recognised as suitable for lower class females, and were routinely performed by servants in middle-class homes. As younger boys carried out jobs for their seniors, these activities aligned the system of seniority in the school with wider social and cultural hierarchies. Yet they were also imagined and framed in such a way as to avoid feminisation or social demotion. The performance of these tasks allowed boys to develop domestic skills and a sense of pride in their environment in a fashion appropriate to their class and gender. Drawing on the medieval heritage of the schools, fagging was valorised by being represented as the performance of chivalric masculinity, the service rendered by a knight to his liege. Michele Cohen has recently drawn attention to the renewed importance of the chivalric model of masculinity in the early nineteenth century.[[83]](#endnote-83) Norman Vance also demonstrates that chivalry was reinvented as part of new understandings of Christian manliness, as well as emphasising “personal honour and public virtue” as in older versions of knightliness.[[84]](#endnote-84) A number of historians have pointed out that chivalry was an important strand in masculine identity in public schools, but there has been little consideration of how far it was embedded in everyday performances or its connection to domesticity.[[85]](#endnote-85) The new emphasis on chivalric ideals of masculine honour provided the ideal framing for the performance of masculine domesticity as service, enabling young middle and upper class men to acquire domestic skills and knowledge in a way that enhanced, rather than compromised, their sense of masculinity. Chivalry also allowed relationships between senior and junior boys to be framed in such a way as to enable the former to exercise a paternal form of authority, ideally, they would protect weaker boys.

While domestic service in the home was very much a backstage activity, hidden from the family and visitors as much as possible, the domestic tasks that were performed by “fags” were foregrounded, celebrated, and openly performed as public rituals. In all three schools the system was passed down from one generation of boys to another, and was often viewed as a traditional practice. For both Charterhouse and Winchester these practices were linked to the school’s identities as medieval institutions. As one Wykehamist memoir put it, it was “recognised as authentic.”[[86]](#endnote-86)

At Winchester, the connection between fagging and the chivalric service ideal was explicit in the language of “Notions”, the extensive special vocabulary that the boys developed to describe places and customs at the College.[[87]](#endnote-87) Male servants in the college were known as “sweaters”, and performing tasks for prefects was also known as “sweat.”[[88]](#endnote-88) The Winton word for servant was not derived from the names given to charwomen or maids, but from a portrait named “The Trusty Sweater” by the boys and also known as “The Trusty Servant”, originally painted by John Hoskyns in 1579.[[89]](#endnote-89) The unusual image shows the figure of a well-dressed part man, part donkey, part deer and part pig, complete with wig and sword, a padlocked mouth, and significantly, a set of tools including what appears to be an early modern broom and pan. The portrait was accompanied by a Latin text extolling the ideal virtues for a pupil including discretion, swiftness and the ability not to be fussy about food (apparently symbolised by the pig). Particularly significant were the last two lines of the poem that emphasised this unusual figure’s knightly credentials and his ability to protect as well as to serve: “Girt with his sword, his shield upon his arm,

Himself and master he’ll protect from harm.”[[90]](#endnote-90) According to Vance, nineteenth-century writers who developed the idea of chivalry placed a new emphasis on the value of service to others.[[91]](#endnote-91) The celebration of this portrait, which clearly linked service with a range of different kinds of tasks including domestic ones, shows how this played out at Winchester. This portrait was idolised by the boys, and often painstakingly drawn and coloured in notions books (which new boys produced every year). The “Trusty Sweater” was the ultimate faithful servant, and was imagined as a focus for the transmission of the school’s ethos of service from one generation of boys to the next. As a newly established school, Lancing did not have the benefit of a medieval site or long-running traditions – yet one way of quickly acquiring prestige was to implement practices such as fagging that were established elsewhere. A comic skit published in the school magazine in 1905, in pseudo medieval language, “Of Fagges” clearly aligned the concept of medieval service and with the school system of fagging.[[92]](#endnote-92) In all three schools the elision of fagging with medieval chivalric ideals allowed domestic work to be performed by boys without a compromising sense of femininity.

As Cohen has shown, notions of chivalry in the nineteenth century were strongly gendered, and predicated on the notion that the protection of women was a condition of civilised society.[[93]](#endnote-93) So the adoption of chivalric ideals and symbols in these schools was part of a wider gendered framing of boys’ behaviour, which, like the patriarchal models discussed in section one, positioned boys in relation to women and underpinned their sense of masculinity. But the chivalric model was also valuable in public schools because it offered a compelling means of imagining relationships between men, and how they might perform tasks for each other in knightly service – a brotherhood within an elite - without compromising social standing. A positive view of fagging was quite widespread – and not just among prefects or those who were looking back on their schooldays with rose tinted spectacles. Some of the junior boys interviewed in the Clarendon Report were quite positive about fagging – the anonymous Winchester junior who was interviewed said that it was not as bad as he thought it would be.[[94]](#endnote-94) There is also some direct evidence that it was sanctioned by the boys. At the start of the autumn term in 1908, Head’s House at Lancing held a debate proposing the motion: “this house heartily disapproves the system of fagging”. The then headmaster noted, however, that “The move invoked the well-known attribute of British clemency on behalf of the down-trodden and oppressed – and melted the House to tears but not to votes only 9 being counted for, & 25 against.”[[95]](#endnote-95)

The widespread acceptance of the fagging system among the boys may also have been down to the fact that in the ideal, chivalric version, the weak were protected and even derived some benefits from it. Fagging could involve the exploitation of small boys but at its best helped create a system which encouraged paternalistic protection of the weak. Vance, analysing *Tom Brown*, emphasises the extent to which the Victorian chivalric ideal of service encompassed this kind of protection.[[96]](#endnote-96) Those who wrote about the system in positive terms tended to emphasise the benefits of these relationships. One Wykehamist, writing home in 1855, noted “I am fag to a rather nice kind fellow.”[[97]](#endnote-97) At Winchester fagging was constructed through specific language and rituals that aligned it to the idea of service for a liege, a model that idealised relationships between men and carried with it an idea of protection as well as exploitation. Frank Lucas rather liked fagging when he arrived at Winchester in 1891: “Wilkinson whose valet I shall be is awfully nice I like him awfully”, he wrote to his mother.[[98]](#endnote-98) A few weeks later he continued with this theme:

I want to say a word in favour of the prefects in our upstairs shop. They are all so nice and especially Wilkinson my master. It is not rewardless fagging here, as I will shew you with a few practical instances. To begin with, whenever we have roast beef, Wilkinson had a private Yorkshire pudding. Well I think it is an extremely considerate thing to do to send a piece down to your junior and your valet… prefects always give you something of what you get for them.[[99]](#endnote-99)

Rather carried away with the glamour of the prefects at the new school, Lucas was anxious to praise them and to fit in. Yet this does show how the fagging system brought patronage and protection, as well as exploitation, and how smaller boys might derive considerable satisfaction from small material benefits, such as a share of Yorkshire pudding or a pot of jam. Of course, a dominant or exploitative ‘master’ could also make a fag’s life very difficult, and opened up opportunities for bullying. There is little evidence of routine sexual exploitation as a part of relationships in the fagging system, but as there is plenty of source material that indicates homosexual relationships and activities within these schools it is likely that this happened from time to time.[[100]](#endnote-100)

Fagging became more problematic when the role began to challenge class hierarchies by moving too close to the work of domestic servants. Arnold for example, who promoted the system, argued that a firm line should be drawn between tasks for boys and servants and that fagging should not include everyday domestic activities.[[101]](#endnote-101) According to Arnold: “those menial offices which were exacted from juniors... were only required of them because the attendance of servants was so exceedingly insufficient, and the accommodations of the boys in many particulars so greatly neglected.”[[102]](#endnote-102) There were, he argued, other jobs that allowed the appropriate expression of the authority of senior boys: “There will remain many miscellaneous services, such as watching balls at cricket or fives, carrying messages, etc., which servants undoubtedly cannot be expected to perform, and which yet belong to that general authority vested in boys of the highest form.”[[103]](#endnote-103) The 1864 Commissioners Report indicates that there was a continual slippage between domestic tasks thought appropriate for household servants, and activities undertaken by junior “fags”. A lot of time was spent questioning school authorities and pupils on this system, revealing considerable anxiety about its relationship with domestic service. The interrogation of teachers and boys at Westminster over this issue ran to several pages, and focused on who was responsible for slop disposal.[[104]](#endnote-104) Charterhouse and Winchester were also both found wanting in this area. It was felt that fagging had gone too far at the former, where fags were required to carry large coal scuttles.[[105]](#endnote-105) The summary report on Winchester also noted that: “Some of the services done by the fags are such as might, and as we think, should, be done by servants.”[[106]](#endnote-106) This problem might be compounded when the schools lacked sufficient domestic assistance. The Winchester Headmaster’s report in 1878 noted that the college’s domestic systems were failing, and that there had been a build up of filth in “Chambers”.[[107]](#endnote-107) The situation was made more acute by a lack of supervision of the boys in the early 1870s, which allowed seniors to make extensive and unreasonable demands on their juniors. Charles Oman, who arrived in Chambers at this point, describes his work which included carrying prefects' goods such as books, inkpots and candlesticks, simple cooking tasks such as making of hot chocolate (he particularly hated cleaning the saucepan afterwards) and filling baths with water (another much despised task that often led to squelching for the rest of the day).[[108]](#endnote-108) Elsewhere demands were less exacting, but there was still resentment and some boys believed that they were being made to replace domestic servants. Francis Fletcher Vane, at Charterhouse in the 1870s, observed: “I do not see any excuse why the little fellows should be expected to do household work such as attending at table, waiting on their elders, which can only be justified on the principle of economising on domestic service for the Housemaster.”[[109]](#endnote-109) For Vane, fagging was exploitation pure and simple, and had little to do with the noble ideals of chivalry.

Nonetheless, the fagging system allowed men to develop domestic skills and routines for an everyday masculinity that stayed with them throughout their lives after they left school. Indeed, many boys were comfortable with (although sometimes irritated by) performing what might be viewed as domestic tasks, without feeling diminished or feminised. Fagging duties reduced as a boy was promoted through the school, reinforcing the institution's hierarchical structure, and allowing boys to exercise authority and assume paternalistic responsibilities. Here, fagging worked together with the schools’ broader promotion of patriarchal roles. Boys used the system to mark their progression, and could gain considerable satisfaction from this. “The wretched fags are cleaning out the library and dusting the tables, the wretched animals I do pity them,” wrote W.S. Lawrence from Charterhouse in the late 1860s, smugly, showing off his new status.[[110]](#endnote-110) We might argue that fagging duties simply reinforced the notions of domestic tasks as humiliating chores, to be thrown off when a boy achieved manhood. And yet, the skills involved were often valued in the long term, and continued to be performed as a distinctly masculine form of domesticity. As such, it was necessary to imagine them in ways that distanced them from domestic service, and from constructions of femininity. Chivalry was one way in which this worked, while another way of doing this was to focus on the common-sense value of rough everyday domestic tasks -- blacking shoes and frying bacon, for example, were both seen as useful masculine necessities.[[111]](#endnote-111) Boys were not being taught to bake cakes or starch collars, but to have enough domestic knowledge to function independently. Eustace Tennyson D'Eyncourt, a Hodgsonite at Charterhouse in the 1880s, remarked: “I have long forgotten a great many things I learned in school, but not how to fry sausages and poach eggs!”[[112]](#endnote-112) In learning basic cooking skills, a boy was inculcated into a bachelor system of domestic economy in which a single man learned to provide for himself and to be physically self-supporting away from the conventional domestic unit. Even Arnold was aware of this: “Many a man who went from Winchester to serve in the Peninsula in the course of the last war must have found his school experience and habits no bad preparation for the activity and hardships of a campaign; not only in the mere power of endurance, but in the helpfulness and independence which his training as a junior had given him.”[[113]](#endnote-113) This was an alternative, masculine domesticity – lived in small spaces, replete with the comforts of the small saucepan and frying pan, cooked ad hoc before an open fire. Some also suggested that the system taught boys to treat material things with discipline and respect. Frank Benson, who was at Winchester in the 1890s, remembered being beaten for failing to perform domestic tasks correctly, but felt that this was a good thing in the long run: “Of course, I had to be ‘cut into’ with a ground ash when I did not brush Grimwood’s Sunday coat properly, and folded his trousers into the wrong crease, and of course I thank him now, although I was ungrateful at the time.”[[114]](#endnote-114)

**Home, Family and School**

As this article has shown so far, Victorian and Edwardian public schools were places where family models, contact with paternal and maternal figures, and masculine forms of domesticity were not just present, but formative. The final section takes this further and reflects on the impact of the boys’ presence at school on families and how far home and institution were emotionally fused.Of course, we need to remember that many middle-class parents *did* believe that it was necessary to separate their boys from the familial home. That’s why thousands of seven year olds were packed off to prep school every year despite parental feelings of guilt.[[115]](#endnote-115) This separation was not absolute, however. Rather the habitual routine of leaving and return imposed by school life – and the means with which families negotiated this – were important to the creation of relationships. In her study of Anglo-Indian families, Elizabeth Buettner has written about the emotional character of a “family life punctuated by habitual separation”, in which letter writing was the central means of maintaining and negotiating relationships.[[116]](#endnote-116) The divide between schoolboys and families was usually less stark. But these relationships were also characterised by the need to negotiate the gap if they were to develop and thrive. As Simon Goldhill has recently argued, the dynamic qualities of the correspondence can also show us how nineteenth century family life was constructed through a culture of writing.[[117]](#endnote-117) Drawing on these approaches, the final section of this article examines letters written home by schoolboys and considers how they can be used to understand family relationships, and the interaction between home and school. In particular it will focus on a large collection of letters written by the schoolboy Frank Lucas, who was at Winchester in the 1890s (Figures Two and Three).

Although schoolboy letters are relatively common in school archives, the Lucas collection, held by Winchester College Archive, is unusual both because of its size (250 letters) but because it includes correspondence between Lucas, his father, mother and two of his sisters. It is not clear why this particular collection is more comprehensive than others, but a concerted attempt must have been made to collect the letters together by the family, perhaps after Lucas’ early death in 1920.[[118]](#endnote-118) Although the letter set is very large, it is possible that some missives do not survive, and as there are no responses to Lucas’ letters we are only able to hear his voice. But the breadth and scope of the collection – and the fact that Lucas’ words are often phrased as a direct response to questions – do allow us to read it in a dynamic way – and we can see the back and forth in the construction of relationships. The letters allow an exploration of the different epistolary relationships that Lucas developed during his seven years at the school (1891-1897), and a consideration of how his family and emotional life was shaped by both institution and home. Lucas’ father, Edgar, was a well-to do solicitor who lived at Netherfield House in Streatham.[[119]](#endnote-119) He was married to Alice Lucas, and they had their first child, Rosamond, in 1877. Francis Herman, or Frank as he was usually known, was born the following year, and Phyllis arrived in 1881. In 1884 and 1885 two further siblings, Cecily and Helga, were born.

Thirteen-year old Frank arrived at Winchester College in the autumn of 1891 and immediately began to write letters home. Initially, he wrote with considerable enthusiasm and thirteen letters were dispatched to Streatham in October alone. At this point he alternated between writing to Edgar and Alice and his two eldest sisters, Rosamond and Phyllis. Frank looked forward to letters from home: “I received the budget of letters this morning they were all very amusing, in fact I fairly roared off the last page and the postscript of Rosamond’s; it was killing. Thank Cecil and Father for their letters to me.”[[120]](#endnote-120) But it was not long before the interests and pressures of school life reduced his output, and in November he notes: “I’m afraid that I have been writing abominably short letters to you all lately, but I have been pressed for time, owing to a good deal of hard mugging.”[[121]](#endnote-121) By the spring term of his first year it was noticeable that he was writing more to his mother, and this pattern continued in the following years. From 1893, his correspondence with his sisters seems to have reduced, and until September 1895 most of his letters were addressed to his mother, with the odd one to his father. At this point, when Frank was seventeen, there are a few more letters to Edgar again and a more extensive exchange with Rosamond, as his relationship with her appears to have deepened.

Frank Lucas’ epistolary relationships varied in terms of the quantity of correspondence but also in tone and subject matter. Letters to Edgar drew on shared masculine assumptions about school life and emphasised the sense of corporate identity within the school. An early letter explains: “I like the life here very much. I prefer it to Private schools’ life. It is freer, and you feel as if the work you are doing is more voluntary here than it was before, besides feeling proud of the glorious old seminary, which it has become your happy lot to become a member of.”[[122]](#endnote-122) Frank wrote to both his father and mother about academic work, but drew more attention to his position within the school in missives to Edgar, frequently mentioning sporting achievement and marks.[[123]](#endnote-123) There are fewer letters to Edgar after Frank’s first months at the school, but he made a point of writing to him on his birthday. [[124]](#endnote-124) There was some intellectual exchange between the two – Edgar was interested in history and Frank’s letters shared opinions about Froude and Horace.[[125]](#endnote-125) Home topics were also discussed, and Frank often enquired after the family’s dog, “Pincher”.[[126]](#endnote-126) The letters written to Edgar are even in tone throughout the correspondence period – they are respectful but also often quite humorous – and contain little evidence of conflict. A single letter written in October 1896, justifying Frank’s expenditure at the college in the context of family financial problems, strikes a more jarring note.[[127]](#endnote-127) But this is a rare moment in a correspondence that suggests a relationship that was perhaps not particularly close, but underpinned by shared identity and mutual understanding.

Other evidence also reveals the way in which male members of the same family often had a shared sense of the life of the school. Indeed, parents often chose schools because of longstanding family associations. Boys expected to follow fathers, brothers or other male relatives. When later headmaster William Fearon arrived at the unreformed Winchester in the 1850s, the other boys asked him why he was there, given that he had no father, brother or uncle who had attended the school.[[128]](#endnote-128) Elder brothers might try and smooth the passage for younger siblings – Sam Brooke, who left Lancing in 1862, tried to set up friendships with suitable boys for his incoming younger brother Robert.[[129]](#endnote-129) A number of Wykehamists commented on the advantages of having a brother at the school who could pass on knowledge of the institution's arcane customs.[[130]](#endnote-130) At Charterhouse it was common for brothers to share rooms.[[131]](#endnote-131) Evelyn Waugh, who was prevented from going to Sherborne by his brother's expulsion and was sent to Lancing instead, gives a sense of the emotional disruption created by being sent to a school that he had no family links with.[[132]](#endnote-132)

One of the strengths of the Lucas correspondence is that it allows us to see Frank Lucas’ different relationships with male and female family members and his interactions with his four sisters, Rosamond, Phyllis, Cecily and Helga. In his first flush of letter writing Frank wrote frequently to Rosamond and Phyllis, in the expectation of replies: “I hope you are all right at home and I expect to hear from you.”[[133]](#endnote-133) The letters are lively in tone and often focused on describing Winchester customs: “Rosamund will be much surprised that I have not been tunded yet.”[[134]](#endnote-134) He does not appear to have corresponded directly with Cecily and Helga who were seven and six the year he went to school. But Phyllis appears to have been tasked with updating him on their exploits.[[135]](#endnote-135) Frank’s later letters show an affectionate interest in his two youngest sisters.[[136]](#endnote-136) But they did not become frequent correspondents, probably because of the gap in age. Both would have been infants when Frank first departed for prep school and it was these relationships that were probably most limited by his absence at school. Following the initial flurry he does not appear to have written to Phyllis much – although he invented a way of playing dominoes by post which she participated in enthusiastically.[[137]](#endnote-137) The lack of correspondence may again be partly explained by the age gap, but Phyllis, who later became a physical education student, may have had less in common with him.[[138]](#endnote-138)

In contrast, Rosamond, who is listed on the 1901 Census as a Latin Teacher,[[139]](#endnote-139) was only a year older than Frank and shared his intellectual interests. In part, his letters to her reflect a conventionally gendered understanding of their sibling relationship. He quite often asked her to send him domestic items.[[140]](#endnote-140) He devoted a lot of ink to explaining the life of the college to her, something he clearly felt was necessary for a feminine outsider.[[141]](#endnote-141) But in the last three years of the correspondence there is a sense of genuine intellectual exchange. As was the norm in public schools in this era, Frank Lucas spent much time studying and translating classical authors, but he also developed a passion for English poets, describing himself at various point as “mad on Spenser” and “a morass of Byron”.[[142]](#endnote-142) Frank and Rosamond discussed Greek authors, English poets, and exchanged books.[[143]](#endnote-143) It was not simply a case of the brother imparting the fruits of his public-school education to his sister. He also asked for her advice – in February 1896 he requested suggestions for reading for an essay on the ideal historian.[[144]](#endnote-144) Both siblings were intellectually ambitious. In February 1896 Frank wrote to Alice: “As to Rosamond’s scholarship in May year, it is quite possible that the pair of us will be scouring Oxford together for scholarships at that time, which will be highly amusing.”[[145]](#endnote-145)

The person that Frank Lucas wrote to the most was his mother, Alice Lucas. To a certain extent, Alice represented the rest of the family, it was expected that she would relay news to other members, and report back to Frank.[[146]](#endnote-146) As the mother and manager of a large household it was part of Alice’s culturally prescribed role to maintain contact with her son. But the breadth and frequency of the letters – usually sent weekly or fortnightly but every now and then on consecutive days as mother and son wrote back and forth on particularly contentious issues – suggest an individual epistolary and familial relationship of range and depth. Frank tended to use a different tone in letters to his mother compared to those addressed to his father. His early letters to her often seem designed to reassure. For example, he describes the occupants of his dormitory as ‘awfully nice’.[[147]](#endnote-147) Alice was also directly concerned with Frank’s domestic and material needs, and his letters often mention “cargo” (the term given to provisions sent into the school). In the autumn of 1891 his request for “mid-term cargo” included: potted meat, honey, apples, pears, biscuits, chocolate and figs or dates.[[148]](#endnote-148) Domestic detail and Frank’s comfort was a common feature of the correspondence. In February 1892, he writes to her about the quality of beds in his dormitory, noting that these are acceptable but that the pillows are poor and uncomfortable.[[149]](#endnote-149)

Not every schoolboy wrote home at such length, but other correspondence suggests that it was often mothers who wrote the most to their sons, and domestic and material items were frequently at the fore. Anxious mothers plied their sons with things. Food was popular, and given the quality of school fare, supplies from home, sent by mothers and other female relatives, were often viewed as an essential rather than a luxury. George Scott, writing home in May 1864, was particularly appreciative of “cargo” from his Aunt Susan, which apparently had included an almost never-ending ham.[[150]](#endnote-150) Writing to his family in 1891, Lucas described how at Winchester: “somebody splits a cake every night up in chambers.”[[151]](#endnote-151) Such practices could exclude those who could not command cash or a ready supply of goods from home. Robert Graves, at Charterhouse until 1913, suggests that he was unpopular partly because he was short of pocket money, and could not “conform to the social custom of treating my contemporaries.”[[152]](#endnote-152) Graves’ comment here can be read as an implicit criticism of his home and family, who had failed to equip him with adequate means to negotiate public school life. Learning how to ask for provisions in the right way was also important. “Please do not forget the cake I asked for next Sunday. I hope you do not think I am too grasping in the way of cakes,” wrote Geoffrey Polson to his mother from Charterhouse in 1904.[[153]](#endnote-153) The boy’s anxiety conveys a need for the items, but also a desire not to appear too demanding or greedy.

Turning again to the Lucas letters, we can see that domestic discussions were not just about mundane provisioning but were also allowed a re-imagining of the institutional world of the school. In January 1892 Frank Lucas was delighted to acquire a new “toys” in 2nd chamber (the “toys” was a lockable desk-bureau). He was obsessed with obtaining a cloth for it, which he repeatedly demanded in letters to his mother and sister.[[154]](#endnote-154) He was very grateful when his mother produced the item, writing home that “I am delighted with the cloth which surpasses anyone's here. I had no idea it was anything like such a good one. The pattern is awfully nice.”[[155]](#endnote-155) Figure Four shows a photograph of Second Chamber in the late nineteenth century, and reveals the capacity of the personal spaces, granted to the boys within the institution, to display significant items. The objects displayed might make an explicit connection with home life. Lucas wrote home to his mother that “Rosamond’s and Phyllis's [his sisters] and your photographs take an important and conspicuous place in my decorations”.[[156]](#endnote-156)

Lucas’s ability as a correspondent and as a writer increased over time and he often penned vivid images of his life in a semi-domestic setting, particularly in letters to his mother. In October 1896, for example, he wrote: “I am writing this comfortably ensconced in my place, with the satisfactory feeling that everything is in its place. My washing stool is in a magnificent condition with scarlet muslin hangings (3d a yard) freshly washed busts, cut narcissus and geraniums, and two geraniums in pots red and white.”[[157]](#endnote-157) This imagining of the institutional world served a dual purpose – helping Lucas feel at home within the institution and re-assuring his mother of his ability to recreate the domestic world of the home.

In addition to discussing domestic matters, Frank’s letters to Alice are full of current affairs, literature and poetry, as well as his studies at the school. Both mother and son were literary enthusiasts and keen writers – she was clearly highly educated, could read in Greek, and had two translations of Danish novels published during Frank’s school years.[[158]](#endnote-158) In October 1893, he wrote to her about a school debate on the current coal strike,[[159]](#endnote-159) and in November 1894 he outlined a speech for the debating society, in favour of taking a liberal approach to opium.[[160]](#endnote-160) In the same month he wrote that he was devoting all his spare time to Shelley as well as reading Lycida and Arnold – although he preferred the former: “we will read all three in the evenings next vac and we will see if you agree with me”.[[161]](#endnote-161) He wrote to her about his studies in depth and in 1895 about his struggles with an exam in composition which despite his enthusiasm for poetry he found very frustrating. He was anxious to know his mother’s opinion on this issue: “I should like to hear your views on this matter in your next.”[[162]](#endnote-162)

Alice Lucas was the family member that Frank Lucas had the most intense epistolary relationship with, but their relations were also emotionally volatile.[[163]](#endnote-163) He sometimes expressed frustration with his mother for her imperfect understanding of school life and there is none of the confidence in a mutual understanding of the institutional world that he had with his father. In a very early letter to Rosamond he told her that Alice had misunderstood the system of punishment in the school (presumably in response to something she has said in her letter).[[164]](#endnote-164) In 1895, when Frank was in his fourth year, he had a rare argument with Alice. She had apparently reproached him for allowing junior boys to smoke at Waterloo Station. He defended himself by arguing that he himself had been smoking during the holidays and his mother had not objected to it, that the station was beyond his jurisdiction as a prefect, and that the boy in question had already suffered from much “sitting on” from his peers (this probably refers to verbal and physical forms of bullying).[[165]](#endnote-165) The tone of the letter is unusually defensive, and it was followed by a second letter a day after, so mother and son were clearly arguing back and forth in the post.[[166]](#endnote-166) For three weeks afterwards there was no further letter to his mother, and, significantly, Rosamond and Edgar received more than their usual share of letters. When he wrote again in mid-October he returned to the subject of school discipline, telling his mother about a recent incident in which he had prevented an unnecessary “licking” of a junior boy by an overzealous prefect by bringing it before the headmaster and at this point there were three letters in quick succession that suggest wrangling over the issue.[[167]](#endnote-167) But the tone was more light-hearted: “The Bear was very nice and sympathetic and quite took my side in this case. Perhaps you would have formed one of the opposition !!!”[[168]](#endnote-168) For the most part their correspondence resumed its usual tone, but there was still the occasional moment of conflict.[[169]](#endnote-169)

Other letters between mothers and sons at school reveal a spectrum of emotional engagement, but they are also often concerned with the mother’s role in the negotiation between the worlds of home and school. In Winchester correspondence these issues often crystallised in discussions of the school’s annual Domun celebrations, when families were invited to visit the school. In 1904 George Scott Moncrieff could not wait for his mother to come to this: “I don't know if you are coming this year. I hope that you will, as things look best in summer. You must come somewhen. When I saw all the assorted maters in Chamber Court, Oh! I thought, how *proud* I'd feel with you, toting you round, till you begged me to stop!”[[170]](#endnote-170) This boy actively sought to pull his mother into the life of the school. Others were more circumspect, perhaps feeling a sense of embarrassment at the prospect of a parental visit. For example, a series of letters from G.R. Snow to his mother in the 1910s repeatedly attempted to put her off.[[171]](#endnote-171) For Snow, these tensions also spilled over into more routine discussions of provisioning. In series of somewhat testy letters he declared that he had no need for a winter coat: “For goodness sake don't imagine I am cold, because I am not in the slightest. There is never any difficulty in lighting the fire, as it always burns up of itself. The new vests are very nice.”[[172]](#endnote-172) There was a mix up over the vests, and a large number, as well as many handkerchiefs, arrived at the school: “Thanks very much for the handkerchiefs, I now have enough for a lifetime,” wrote the ungrateful son.[[173]](#endnote-173) This exchange conveys the mother’s ongoing anxiety and the son’s irritation, a dynamic probably enhanced by separation and not negotiated particularly successfully by either party here.

**Conclusion**

“The exclusion of feminine and domestic life was absolute. We never entered a human dwelling or saw a shop; to a boy like myself coming straight from home, the experience was chilling.”[[174]](#endnote-174) This is how Evelyn Waugh described Lancing in 1917, in his mid-twentieth-century autobiography. For Waugh, the absence of domesticity manifested itself, above all, in lack of women. According to Waugh, all the masters except one were unmarried.[[175]](#endnote-175) “There was no element of domesticity. The headmaster’s wife, living apart, had no business with our welfare.”[[176]](#endnote-176) The tone of Waugh’s description strikes a strong chord with the depiction of public schools in the mid-twentieth century, by both the writers of autobiographies and more recent historians who have seen the schools as bulwarks of masculinity in which there was little or no place for women. Yet this is not a picture that would have been recognised by many who lived and worked in the nineteenth and early twentieth-century schools surveyed here. The character of these schools seems to have altered to some extent in the early twentieth century. While individual housemasters and their wives continued to involve themselves in the lives of the boys at Winchester and Charterhouse, there is some evidence that after the First World War there was less emphasis on the headmaster as a patriarchal figure.[[177]](#endnote-177) Schools were caught up in a larger climate of shifting social values that saw a loss of faith in state and nation and the authority of fathers, precipitated by the First World War.[[178]](#endnote-178) There was a move away from the Victorian celebration of patriarchal domesticity. Arnold’s emphasis on the headmaster as patriarch, and the efforts of the celebrated headmasters of Charterhouse, Lancing and Winchester would have been out of place in this new age. Just as the drawing rooms began to fall out of use in middle-class homes, and to become associated with excessive formality, so too did visits to the drawing rooms of housemaster’s wives decline. Accounts of school life were also increasingly shaped by a new critical cultural tide, which held the schools responsible for social ills. There was less acceptance of institutional fatherly authority among boys, and trenchant criticism of the schools began to emerge in autobiographies, including Robert Graves’ vitriolic depiction of bullying and sexual exploitation at Charterhouse.[[179]](#endnote-179)

Powerful as this picture is, it should not be allowed to obscure the ways in which patriarchy, domesticity and the home were important in Victorian and Edwardian public schools and the lives of the boys who lived in them. It is clear that headmasters in this era drew on models of patriarchal authority that to a large extent were validated and accepted by pupils. Headmasters and housemasters offered an institutionalised version of patriarchy, that drew on the power structures of the household but did not exactly replicate it. Patriarchy involved the active involvement of wives in the day-to-day functioning of the school – both headmasters’ and house masters’ wives could be a very powerful presence, often depending on individual personality. Their drawing rooms were often bastions of female domesticity in the otherwise male dominated world of the school. While the version of patriarchy adopted by the schools ultimately served to reinforce a gendered hierarchy, and placed limits on the role of women, the way in which some women were remembered by the boys suggests that some individuals transcended this. Paternal ideals also shaped the way in which boys were encouraged to interact with each other and to carry out routine domestic tasks within the schools. This can be seen very clearly in the fagging system, which was often framed as chivalric service. Fagging was designed to give boys experience of governance, but also fostered a relationship between senior and junior boys which in its ideal form offered some protection to the weak. Boys were effectively being taught to govern, and to become members of a national elite, but it is worth noting that they were being taught to govern in a certain way. Fagging also had the effect of providing a basic training in domestic tasks that secured young men independence in later life and allowed for a masculine performance of domesticity. Imagining fagging as chivalric service helped masculinise work that was strongly associated with domestic servants in this era, and it allowed boys to learn and perform basic domestic tasks in a way that enhanced their sense of masculine identity without compromising their social standing.

In addition to exploring the power of paternal and maternal roles and masculine domesticity in the world of the school, this article has also argued that there was a final, important way, in which the worlds of home and school remained interlinked – in the emotional lives of schoolboys. Correspondence can help us see the distinctive nature of family relationships forged by the routine of presence and absence that public schools created. The Lucas letters offer an example of how family epistolary relationships played out in different ways – Frank Lucas’ relationship with his father rested on a sense of shared mutual understanding of the world of the school, where as his relationship with his mother, although apparently deeper was also more conflictual – especially when Alice Lucas commented or passed judgement on school affairs. Correspondence was a means of negotiating separation but it also reveals the tensions this created. After his years at Winchester Frank Lucas fulfilled his early promise and took up a scholarship at Cambridge, before entering the Civil Service in the early twentieth century, where he joined the India Office and rose rapidly to become Secretary of the Financial Department in 1917.[[180]](#endnote-180) He married in the early 1900s and had two daughters and son but died early at age 42 from typhoid. His obituary gave the following description: “Lovable, ardent in argument, and inspired by the most genuine humanitarian ideals, he seemed to understand instinctively how to adapt the policy of Whitehall to the new condition of a reformed India.”[[181]](#endnote-181) Lucas’ skills in argument and liberal ideals were undoubtedly influenced and shaped by both his education at Winchester and his epistolary relationship with his mother – home and school came together to create the man that he was to later become.
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