

The 'Ghosts' of Lawn Tennis Past: Exploring the Forgotten Lives of Early Working-Class Coaching-Professionals

Simon J. Eaves, Robert J. Lake and Stephen Cowdrey

Abstract

This article examines the lives of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century lawn tennis coaching-professionals, notably Tom Burke, Harry Cowdrey, Charles Haggett and George Kerr. These men, considered equally if not more gifted than the first-ranked amateur players of the period, have received scant attention or recognition, either as “expert” players or for their role as coaches/instructors within the “amateur” game. Ostensibly, these working-class boys/men sought employment in clubs, as ball-boys, groundskeepers, stringers and instructors, but, being immediately classified as “professionals”, were subsequently marginalised within clubs and barred from amateur competitions. Few outside of the club environs encountered them, few observed or learned of their skills, and fewer still reported their exploits. While many of the top amateur players of the period recognised the need for coaching-professionals, the British Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) was intransigent. They staunchly refused to sanction professional competitions in Britain, fearing they would provide a pathway away from amateurism, and propel the amateur to seek remuneration from their tennis. Coaching-professionals had little choice but to remain as “servants” within their clubs, confined by the rigid class system and unyielding amateur ethos. Hitherto largely ignored within lawn tennis historiography, these men are the “ghosts” of lawn tennis past.

Keywords: George Kerr, Harry Cowdrey, Charles Haggett, Tom Burke, Anti-Professional

Introduction

‘Or when the lawn
Is pressed by unseen feet, and ghosts return
Gently at twilight, gently go at dawn,
The sad intangible who grieve and yearn;’¹

When T. S. Eliot sat to pen his tribute to Walter de la Mare in the late 1940s, his thoughts, one assumes, had little to do with lawn tennis. Yet, there is, within the fifth stanza, a resonance of tennis at the end of the nineteenth, and beginning of the early twentieth centuries, which encapsulates the game for those who sat outside of the “established” norm, namely: the working-class coaching-professionals, or “pros”, who cultivated their craft to the highest level of expertise, but were denied opportunities to compete and even stand as equals in many if not most clubs, alongside the amateur players whose talents they helped to develop. Indeed, in this period, many ‘unseen feet’ returned on the lawns of England; many tirelessly plied their trade ‘gently at twilight’ and ‘at dawn’; many were the ‘ghosts’, who returned. More pertinently, in the formative years of the game before the First World War, many were the players who were to the outside world ‘intangible’; they were unseen, unimagined and remote from the perceived ideal of the gentleman-amateur player, and the newly established middle-class domain of lawn tennis. These were the players who existed on the periphery of lawn tennis, and who were left to ‘grieve and yearn’ the opportunities the game could offer. These working-class coaching-professionals, though long since deceased remain in the shadows of lawn tennis historiography, often unrecognised and unheralded, and yet their existence and contribution to the development of the game is unquestionable.

With few exceptions, the historiography on the pre-First World War period of the game’s development in the leading tennis nations has largely overlooked the role of early coaching-professionals. Some of the most comprehensive accounts, from Collins, Gillmeister, Jefferys, and Wilson respectively give them but a passing mention,² while focused studies of lawn tennis history in Australia,³ France,⁴ Britain,⁵ and the United States,⁶ ignore them completely. Alan Little’s detailed research on tennis in the French Riviera makes only a handful of passing comments about the coaches working there, despite all of the best clubs employing one, and Joyce Kay’s otherwise excellent work on the role of working-class organisations in providing tennis facilities in Britain overlooks the role of coaches from this same class plying their trade in clubs.⁷ Robert J. Lake’s work on British tennis history goes some way to address the dearth of knowledge about early coaches, but within his most relevant pieces, which include more specific and detailed examinations of the development of the coaching craft in British tennis and a critical case-study of Dan Maskell, the esteemed British coach from the 1930s, there are still perceptible gaps in the research on coaches before the First World War.⁸ Simon Eaves’ work on the ascendancy of Australian tennis before the First World War also adds to this discussion, making a case for a more comprehensive examination,⁹ but overall it would be fair to say that the lives, and crucially the on-court playing achievements, of early working-class coaching-professionals have been overlooked by tennis historians. This is despite their crucial role and significance to amateur tennis during this period, and of how highly they were regarded by both the amateur players they coached and played with/against and, eventually, by the associations that reaped the rewards of enhanced national playing standards and amateur successes.

Indeed, many if not most of the early coaching-professionals were acknowledged by amateur players and officials at the time as experts and artisans, but only occasionally as “players” or legitimate opponents. Thus, it is not an exaggeration to say they have been written out of history, which came in part consequence of being marginalised by the rigid social class structure and unyielding amateur ethos found in Britain and elsewhere. They are truly the ‘ghosts’ of lawn tennis history, and the key aim of this paper is to, essentially, reintroduce these

marginalised players, and explain how, despite valid attempts to integration, the combined barriers of social class, institutionalised discrimination against professionalism, and the entrenched and highly conservative amateur ideal, operated to deny them a stage on which to perform, and ultimately receive the acclaim they deserved. This paper seeks to expose the forgotten lives of working-class coaching-professionals, as a means to offer them their rightful recognition and place in the historiography of lawn tennis.

The Early Years of Amateur Lawn Tennis and the Game's First 'Ghosts'

Throughout the 1880s, the name of Renshaw was synonymous with tennis excellence, as twin brothers Ernest and William came to dispatch the game's earlier champions, like Frank Hadow and John Hartley, who styled their play on real tennis and rackets, playing mostly from the baseline with cuts and screws. The Renshaws' came to dominate with an aggressive game and purposeful style hitherto unseen on Wimbledon's courts, developing new strokes such as the over-head smash and over-head serve.¹⁰ From an early age, they had taken the game seriously, building their own court in the South of France, practicing diligently, analysing their own game, and even making notes on the games of other players.¹¹ The Renshaws' were considered, at the peak of their game, virtually unbeatable. Between 1881 and 1889, one of the twins secured the Wimbledon singles title in every year, excepting Herbert Lawford's five set victory over Ernest in 1887. Unsurprisingly, they also dominated in men's doubles around this time. While debate ensued as to which brother was the better player,¹² most would have concurred with E. B. Noel's succinct statement that they were, collectively, 'the real inventors of the modern game'.¹³

In the period that followed, other players such as Wilfred Baddeley, Joshua Pim, Harold Mahony and Wilberforce Eaves came to the fore, but perhaps the most dominant player was Westminster and Cambridge man, Reginald Frank Doherty, familiarly known in the lawn tennis world as R.F.¹⁴ Alongside his brother H.L. (Laurie), he was, like the Renshaws', the epitome of the perceived ideal lawn tennis player: an amateur in the truest sense of the word, having attained his first Wimbledon Singles Championship in 1897, and thus considered "champion of the world". Virtually unbeatable, except on occasion by his brother, R.F. died of ill health in December 1910 at the modest age of 38, yet 'remained, in the estimation of many of his opponents', according to his obituary in *The Times*, 'the greatest singles player in England'.¹⁵ Barrett and Little agreed, but it was in combination with the successes of his more 'robust' brother, that collectively they 'transformed British lawn tennis from its decline in the mid-1890s to ever rising heights of popularity'.¹⁶ Just days after Laurie's death in August 1919, a *Lawn Tennis & Badminton (LT&B)* correspondent wrote: the brothers 'virtually shared between them the supremacy against players of all types and nationalities for a period of some ten years.'¹⁷

Much like for the Renshaw's and other contemporaries, the Doherty's rightfully drew deserving accolades from the leading magazines and newspapers. However, whilst these men danced across the green sward, others equally if not more brilliant sat in the shadows, barred from public gaze and the Wimbledon spotlight. Indeed, reading about the exploits of the top-ranked players in the game's formative years, there emerges some unfamiliar names. Given his career and influence on lawn tennis, R.F.'s obituary in *The Times* appears unremarkable. Josiah Ritchie and Spencer Gore are noted as contemporaries, both considered great players, but another less familiar name takes a prominent place in the obituary: 'Cowdray' [sic]. It is stated that, 'to Cowdray [sic]...he usually owes 15'.^{18 19} The inference appears to be that this player was considered a strong opponent, whose "scalp" was highly prized. Cowdrey, though, is not a name famed in the lawn tennis world; few recall him, little is known of his exploits, and yet,

to those few, Henry (Harry) Cowdrey, the son of a cemetery worker, was a legendary, if peripheral, figure. In a letter written by Dan Maskell to a relative of Cowdrey in 1991, he relates the memory of Harry:

Sadly I never met the legendary Harry, but of his fame as a player I never tire of hearing; in fact his personality and tennis technique inspired me to achieve much of my teenage success. Harry apparently was the best player of all the pros at Queen's [Club] and was in great demand by the best amateurs of the day, particularly on the wood covered courts in the winter and in their preparation on grass leading up to the Championships at Wimbledon in late June.²⁰

Harry Cowdrey spent many years at Queen's Club in the 1890s and early 1900s, working alongside fellow coaching-professionals Charles Hierons, William Seymour and Charles Read. Those who visited the West Kensington club could not fail to admire his court play. Writing for *The Star*, New Zealand champion, H.A. Parker, was full of praise: 'Cowdrey, who until quite recently was a "ball boy" at Queen's Club, is unquestionably one of the finest players in the world. On the wooden courts... he is well-nigh invincible and the Dohertys find it difficult to beat him.'²¹ R.B. Hough, in correspondence to the editor of *Lawn Tennis* magazine, declared, 'In my opinion, fit and well, there is no player amateur or professional, who could be classed higher than Cowdrey'.²²

Cowdrey, though, was not the sole player to challenge the might and dominance of the top amateur players of this period. Even earlier, 'in 1890 [Ernest] Renshaw, at the very top of his game, attempted to give Kerr 15. It was a hard battle at that and Kerr won 9-7, 7-9, 10-8.'²³ *Pastime* reported of the coaching-professional George Kerr: 'it is doubtful if our best amateurs could hold their own against [Kerr]', and suggested 'it would be a great boon to lawn tennis spectators if exhibition matches could be arranged ... between "George" and a few of our cracks, say E. Renshaw, E.W. Lewis and H.S. Barlow'.²⁴ A year prior to his encounter with Renshaw, Kerr had played in Newport, Rhode Island against the local pro Thomas Pettitt, 'before a large number of spectators', and was described as showing 'the hardest hitting ever seen' and having 'unerring judgment' in his shots.²⁵ In *Lawn Tennis*, Kerr is described as 'a man of great strength', whose forehand drive 'is not to be beaten'.²⁶ Whilst relatively anonymous today, Kerr, the resident coaching-professional at the Fitzwilliam Club in Dublin, was clearly held in high esteem by many of his contemporaries who tried often, and invariably in vain, to beat him. Indeed, just two days after his fellow countryman Harold Mahony won the Wimbledon singles Championship, Kerr dispatched him in straight sets, after being challenged back in Dublin. It was reasoned: 'after beating everyone in England, he was after Kerr.' So infuriated was Mahony with Kerr's indomitable play, at match point he apparently 'walked up to the net, threw his bat at Kerr and shouted, "There's no beating you".' Seemingly, few did! Apparently, between 1890 and 1899 Kerr would play anyone from anywhere, and 'never lost a match'.²⁷

Not only an accomplished player, Kerr was also an excellent coach. Around the turn of the century, he left the British Isles in search of better wages and working conditions, and a higher social status. In Germany, at this time, the need for tennis coaching was considered of paramount importance.²⁸ Not only were British coaching-professionals employed in German clubs, but a 'school' was also established to develop lawn tennis coaches.²⁹ Kerr was at the forefront of German progress, as Commander George Hillyard saw first-hand when he visited the Turnier Club in Berlin, where Kerr became based, and saw a dozen young boys 'who all had beautiful style and the obvious makings of great players'.³⁰ The Sydney newspaper, *Referee*, suggested that Kerr 'made the game there. The Froitzheims and most of the crack players were pupils of his'.³¹

Another seemingly unbeatable British coaching-professional was Charles Haggett, an Englishman recently imported to New York's West Side Tennis Club from Sweden before the

Great War. He dominated in a one-sided exhibition match against the top-ranked American pro Karl Behr, and he was also considered equal, if not superior, to the top American player of the period, Maurice McLoughlin, alongside occasionally defeating the four-time Wimbledon singles champion (1910-13) from New Zealand, Anthony Wilding, in practice games. While many considered Wilding the world's greatest player, the Australian player Stanley Doust disagreed, and in an article from 1914 entitled 'The World's Best Player', he proffered 'the finest player in the world to be an Englishman named Haggett'.³² Doust reported that he seldom loses a set to McLoughlin, and can 'just about owe Wilding something like 15.'³³ The *Sydney Referee* indicated that Haggett was 'nearly as fine a player as Norman Brookes', the two-time Wimbledon singles champion (1907 & 1914) and Wilding's Australasian Davis Cup teammate, and was also able to concede a 'huge start of owe 40' to A.W. Gore, the 1912 Wimbledon singles champion, before concluding: 'Certainly one could name no amateur who could give Gore such as start'.³⁴

In America, it appears the view of Haggett's merit was similar to those extolled in the Antipodes. In *The Pittsburgh Press*, the bold headline 'Unknown beats all the great tennis champions' proclaimed Haggett 'has beaten all the tennis champions and can do it any time he wants to and by any score he wants to. But you never hear of him.'³⁵ American player, Gustav Touchard, considered Haggett, 'in technique and skill to surpass any player he has ever met'.³⁶ He is 'a versatile young Englishman' wrote one writer, who possessed 'a knowledge of every type of tennis tactic', and at will could 'switch from one method to the next'.³⁷ In England, the sentiment was similar. Haggett, in 1919, was 'probably the best lawn tennis player the world has ever known', claimed the *Daily Express*.³⁸

Haggett's skills were certainly in demand, but like many of his contemporaries, he found greater support and higher wages as a coaching-professional abroad. In 1913, the Americans secured his services to practice with their Davis Cup players prior to their upcoming challenge to Australasia. In this role, his impact was undoubted, as the *Boston Evening Transcript* alluded:

The engagement of Charles E. Haggett, the English professional... has been more than justified by results which have been attained. He has carefully observed the methods of the Australasians, and for the benefit of the American players has duplicated the tactics of the visitors. Most characteristic of the Australasians' stroke is the slanting return which sends the ball across-court to a bound of exasperating lowness. If the American players had been asked to go into the coming competition without having met this style of attack, they would have been greatly handicapped.³⁹

Haggett's achievements were not unique. Other coaching-professionals were lauded, but received scant attention in the press, and the few snippets of information about these players suggests they were high-quality players. In 1903, it was reported that Tom Fleming, the Queen's Club coaching-professional, at one time could concede "half-thirty" to the Doherty brothers.⁴⁰ Another "pro", Thomas Burke, from the Lansdowne Club in Dublin, is compared to the 'unapproached and unapproachable, Dr. Pim', the Wimbledon singles champion in 1893 and 1894.⁴¹ Clearly, Burke was held in high esteem. In *Pastime*, in 1897, in discussing R.F. Doherty, it was suggested that: 'His only superior, perhaps, was the Irish professional Tom Burke'.⁴² His sons, Albert and Edmund, also became top quality players, the former later touring with the American Bill Tilden.

As coaching-professionals, the Burke family relocated to France and worked in Paris and Nice.⁴³ Burke senior was the tutor at the Tennis Club de Paris as early as 1898, where he was highly influential in the development of French players. 'The great advantage which Vacherot, Aymé, Lebreton and Brosselin, the best of the Frenchmen, possess over their continental rivals, lies chiefly in the excellent coaching of the Irish professional, Burke', wrote

Parmly Paret.⁴⁴ Writing in 1912, Anthony Wilding concurred, noting that up until 1900 French players considered tennis a mere pastime, but latterly the best players all improved greatly under Burke's tuition.⁴⁵

Other British coaching-professionals were equally well regarded. Englishman, George Agutter, practised with, and possibly also offered his coaching services to, the famous Spanish player Manuel Alonso and, as a tennis player, was described as 'the world's best'.⁴⁶ The well-known Queen's Club head professional Charles Hierons could also be added to this list. He was a player held in the highest regard by many who competed against him, and, in 1924, he authored the first-known coaching manual written by a coaching-professional: *How to Learn Lawn Tennis: A Simple Instructive Treatise*. W. Marshall, the one-time coaching-professional at the Craigsidde Hydro Hotel in Llandudno, was similarly highly praised for his game, and in particular his 'nasty shot which he often uses, notably the driving stroke to the right-hand corner'.⁴⁷ Later, the Tennis Club de Paris procured Marshall's services, but his stay in France was short-lived; a severe sunstroke whilst playing at Etretat in the summer of 1901 curtailing his career. In the Melbourne *Leader* in January 1902, 'Deuce' reported that Marshall was now resident in St Anne Lunatic Asylum, under the delusion that he had two heads, and was heard to constantly recite, 'the sun has done this'.⁴⁸

Fleming, Cowdrey, Haggett, Kerr, Burke, Marshall, Hierons and Agutter were merely a few of the growing number of competitive coaching-professionals that emerged in the pre-war era. None of these men ever won, let alone played, at Wimbledon or in a Davis Cup tie; they did not represent their country in any Olympic Games, nor is there any record of them competing in any of the main Continental tournaments. They are the "ghost" figures in the developing world of lawn tennis. With little regard of their exceptional talents, these men were "blackballed" from club memberships and subjected to institutional discrimination against professionalism that ultimately denied them the amateur status necessary to compete. Their exclusion from virtually all amateur competitions reflected the dogmatic viewpoints of tennis authorities, including the (British) Lawn Tennis Association (LTA), the United States Lawn Tennis Association (USLTA), and later, the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF), which, alongside the most prestigious clubs like Queen's and the All England Lawn Tennis Club (AELTC), 'remained populated with exclusive "old-boy" networks and were dominated by well-established, elitist ideologies'.⁴⁹

When the earliest coaching-professionals emerged in the mid-1880s, the sobriquet "professional" was used as a form of disparagement, first to designate their working-class background and assumed personal values, but also to compare them to the despised amateur "pot-hunters" and later, the ex-amateur touring-professionals. While the term "professional" was initially used to signify someone who derived income from being associated with the game, in some allied capacity, be it coach/instructor/trainer, ball-boy, groundsman or racket stringer, it was used mainly as a form of exclusion to signify someone who was *not* an amateur. As the personal qualities of an amateur sportsman were supposedly indicative of his upper/upper-middle-class status, so it was assumed that those who laboured with their hands or served others somehow lacked the ordained gentlemanly qualities associated with amateur sport: honesty, integrity, self-restraint, sportsmanship, humility and grace, to name a few. Thus, the threat of professional "contamination", which was frequently voiced in the pre-war era, was as much about the supposedly unsavoury influences of working-class values as with their actual involvement.⁵⁰ Indeed, for coaching-professionals, their "non-amateur" status was complicated, in that while it appears that money or, more pertinently, the need to earn an income was a critical element in determining their status, the real delineating factor was the social class to which they did *not* belong.⁵¹ Wagg suggested that, regardless of their actual behaviour or actions, middle and upper-class "gentlemen" were pre-defined as amateurs by their social position, and the qualities that constituted this position were continually self-

defined by the amateurs themselves.⁵² Therefore, while the “amateur” sportsman was said to exhibit certain qualities concomitantly associated with the amateur ethos, this did not mean that regular working-class men before the First World War could rise into these positions with their behaviour alone. They could certainly make modest gains in wealth and status and curry favour with their social superiors, but the harder and more rigid social class barriers, namely of education, training, background and employment, existed to limit opportunities for social mobility for the vast majority of working-class coaching-professionals. By being “working-class”, the status of “amateur” in lawn tennis was out of reach; the only option was to be a “professional”⁵³.

It is somewhat ironic that despite being nominally designated as professionals – i.e. those who earned money through their involvement in the game – coaching-professionals in the late-Victorian era earned ‘notoriously low’ wages, which some reports suggested ‘rarely exceeded £1 per week ... even when supplemented by tips’.⁵⁴ Moreover, opportunities to supplement income through competing were scarce. As the pinnacle of the sporting world, amateur competitions were widely accepted as privileges for those who could devote their energies to sport without financial remuneration and who, apparently, played the game more for love than pecuniary reward. Thus, the title “amateur” designated a social-class divide, which was reinforced through the institutional discrimination against professionals in clubs.⁵⁵ Indeed, the working-class and servant/labourer status of the lawn tennis coaching-professional or “pro” was clearly highlighted, as it was in other sports where ‘the status of the professional ... differed little from that of a servant or labourer’.⁵⁶ In 1889, George Kerr was introduced to American readers as ‘a coacher and keeper of the courts’⁵⁷, a title reinforcing the professional player’s working-class background, and in Britain, *The County Gentleman: Sporting Gazette, Agricultural Journal, and “The Man About Town”* reported in 1898: ‘till now the lawn tennis pro has been employed as groundsman, as much as anything else.’⁵⁸

The servant/labourer status of the professional was highlighted even for the most accomplished players. Despite his by now well-known playing and coaching/training prowess, Harry Cowdrey in 1907 was still referred to in the press as, first and foremost, ‘the noted ground man’ of Queen’s Club⁵⁹. Problems for the professional were highlighted by H.L.B. (Herbert L. Bourke), in an article in *LT&B*, in 1908:

I question whether, in any other game, the professional has to hide his light to such an extent as the man behind the scenes at lawn tennis. It is probable that thousands who play lawn tennis would be unable to name a lawn tennis professional, and that a vast majority of players outside such favoured resorts as Queen’s Club and Craigside would be entirely ignorant of the existence of the paid player.⁶⁰

Opportunities to move into amateurism were non-existent for former/current professionals, as Lake argued: ‘Once employed as a “professional”, whether ball-boy, trainer or coach, there remained little recourse.’ In seeking out paid employment in a club such as Queen’s, working-class boys inadvertently secured their ‘exclusion from virtually all amateur competitions’.⁶¹ Indeed, the self-appointed amateur “guardians” – club, tournament and association officials, and established players – worked to ensure there remained a tight hold on working-class involvement. Collectively, they sought to maintain class distinctions and promote amateur traditions that ensured the privilege of playing the foremost competitions remained solely for amateurs.

As the exceptional high quality of their play became better known into the mid-1890s, the leading coaching-professionals took advantage of new opportunities to supplement their income. These emerged slowly, and reflect not only modest societal shifts in broader social-class relations, but also the increasing appreciation for lawn tennis as a spectacle, the rising status of coaching-professionals and the growing recognition of their craft. While the main

thrust of these developments came in the inter-war period, thanks in large part to the achievements of coaching-professionals like Dan Maskell, who helped project the more artistic and creative aspects of his work, the first signs of progress were seen just before the turn of the century.

Challenges and Exhibitions

Before the days of product endorsements that inter-war professionals like Dan Maskell enjoyed, opportunities for professional players to supplement their income were rare, but probably much needed. Of his late-19th century days as head professional at the Fitzwilliam Club, George Kerr reminisced that, ‘the only financial benefits for the professional were small side bets when they faced amateurs’.⁶² These were infrequent and, of course, if they lost, did not constitute guaranteed extra income. Some coaching-professionals took to the theatre stage to exhibit their skills to paying audiences, who were keen to witness their playing demonstrations, perhaps to help with their own games or for purely entertainment purposes. In an Adelaide newspaper from 1919, it was reported that:

The latest indoor sport in England is watching professional lawn tennis experts playing on a theatre stage. For the first time in history of the game players recently appeared on the stage of a variety house in London ... and gave the audience an exhibition of the net art. The play in this initial game was between the well-known professionals A.E. Beamish, Charles Lockyer, Charles Hierons and Charles Read. The audience took a keen interest in the games and in the demonstration of strokes and services given by the player-actors before and after the game.⁶³

A decade previously, Hierons had been involved in another unconventional performance, when a rubber lawn tennis court was installed at the Rubber and Allied Industries Exhibition, upon which a ‘professional match’ against Harry Cowdrey took place.⁶⁴ Whether such an event was ever repeated is unknown. However, while such “gimmicks” as the theatre performance and the Industry Exhibition were rare and seemingly short-lived, other opportunities to supplement income arose via more conventional routes, namely: challenge matches.

In 1889, H.W. Spofford, writing in *Outing*, declared a professional match organised by H.A. Ditson had been arranged between Kerr of Dublin and Pettitt of Boston. It was suggested that ‘several of the leading foreign players would accompany’ Kerr.⁶⁵ This, Spofford enthused, was ‘the establishment of international tennis relations’, and, ‘the beginning of an annual interchange of thought, experience and play between [Great Britain and America], which will add to the zest of the game on both sides of the ocean.’⁶⁶ In August and September, three matches were played respectively in Brookline (Massachusetts), Springfield (Massachusetts) and Newport (Rhode Island), with Kerr triumphing two matches to one.⁶⁷ In 1890, Kerr was involved in a rematch with Pettitt at the Fitzwilliam Club in Dublin. As with the 1889 challenge, details of the remuneration are unclear, but the *South Wales Echo*, prior to the Dublin contest, reported that ‘the match is for large stakes, and excites much interest’.⁶⁸

In addition to these “organised” challenges, there is evidence that coaching-professionals played matches for prize-winnings put up by wealthy club members. In 1899, the first known of such an event pitted Tom Fleming of Queen’s Club against W. Marshall of the Craigside Covered Courts in Llandudno, ‘for a purse subscribed for by the lawn tennis members of Queen’s Club’.⁶⁹ In November of 1903, *Lawn Tennis and Croquet (LT&C)* described another match at Queen’s Club between Charles Hierons, the resident “pro”, and Harry Cowdrey of the Tennis Club de Paris, ‘for a purse subscribed by the members’.⁷⁰ It must have generated sufficient public interest as this same match-up was repeated in 1904 for a £20 purse, and was newsworthy enough to receive attention from *The Times*.⁷¹ *LT&C* went on to

suggest a further match between Cowdrey and fellow professional Tom Burke ‘would be of more than ordinary interest’.⁷² In 1905, the following year, Hierons travelled to the Beau Site on the French Riviera to play Fleming, ‘for a purse of 700 francs, subscribed by the visitors’, but it seems the most eagerly anticipated match-up was between Burke and Cowdrey.⁷³

Throughout the pre-war era, more and more of these types of matches took place around this small handful of clubs, and for increasingly larger purses put up by their respective members. The Hierons-Cowdrey contest became an annual fixture, with the winner typically receiving two-thirds and the loser a third of the prize-stake.⁷⁴ Prize winnings for these competitive events remained fairly small, and so success in them did not necessarily guarantee opportunities for social advancement. The £25 prize-fund offered for the 1907 and 1908 Hierons-Cowdrey contests amounted to a present-day value of around £3000, but paled in comparison to what some of the Real Tennis “pros” were making from their contests a decade earlier. In Brighton, between October 17 and 19, 1898, Peter Latham of Queen’s Club played Tom Pettitt for the World Championship and a reported stake of £2000. This was offered in addition to the £600 gate receipts, which were to be divided between the players.⁷⁵

It appears that there is a long history of professional matches that took place in tennis clubs, arranged and subscribed by the members. In providing monetary incentives, it is somewhat ironic that these amateur members were inadvertently encouraging the very antithesis of the amateur game, that is, the drive for winning encouraged by monetary gain. While this gradual development – the professionalisation of lawn tennis – would ultimately prove a key driving force in the institution of a professional championship by amateur officials in the mid-1920s, up until this point the payment to professionals, funded by the amateur membership, held two primary functions.

Firstly, it fulfilled the need to ensure the professional players, who were fundamental to providing high quality practice to members and top amateur players, remained loyal to their club and were not tempted by more lucrative offers from abroad. However, as the game developed on the Continent, the top clubs in Germany, France, Austria, and beyond courted many British professionals who succumbed to the better working conditions, wages, and social standing on offer. H.L.B. was unequivocal in his thinking: ‘The retention of the first class professional player is a valuable asset... inasmuch as a leading amateur can visit his club at any time and be practically assured of good opposition’.⁷⁶

Secondly, the payment provided by club members, either in prize money or tips, reinforced the lack of amateur status of the participating players, the rigid social hierarchy within the establishment, and the concomitant power relations and object-subject dichotomy at play in the spectacle. Within the master-servant relations found in many of the clubs where coaching-professionals were employed, the performing professional was objectified by the viewer, the amateur. These relations, of course, reflected the days of ‘upstairs for the members, downstairs for the pro’s’ [sic], that Dan Maskell recalled in 1991, a year before his death.⁷⁷ There was a ‘strict social protocol’ in which the professionals were barred from mixing with members. The bar was off limits and any meetings with the members ‘had to take place on the steps outside the bar or in the professionals’ room’.⁷⁸

As Lake highlighted, the social separation of working-class professionals and middle/upper-class (amateur) club members was deeply historically-rooted. It was only, really, the ‘largest and wealthiest clubs’ that offered employment to working-class males as coaching-professionals among other roles, such as ‘ball-boys, trainers, racket stringers, and groundsman’. These boys/men ‘were often demeaned, like servants, and denied access to certain entrances, rooms or privileges in the club deemed exclusive to “regular” (i.e. amateur) members’.⁷⁹ No amount of extra wages or prize winnings was able to shift these institutionally discriminatory structures, despite a growing lobby, from both amateurs and professionals in

the early Edwardian era, for coaching-professionals to be given more competitive playing opportunities.

The Drive for More Competitive Playing Opportunities amidst an Entrenched Anti-professional Lobby

Before the First World War, fears of professionalism existed inasmuch as it may have signalled a decline in amateurism and the inducement of amateur players to begin to take the game too seriously: to train, receive coaching and move toward pursuing success in lawn tennis as a vocation in itself rather than a mere leisurely diversion.⁸⁰ For most lawn tennis aficionados, the fear only extended as far as pot-hunting – the ostensible pursuit of silverware/trophies ahead of pure enjoyment – rather than full-blown professionalism, but they were well aware of the paths trodden by other sports that, either by force or choice, embraced professionalism. In Britain, amateur associations in football, rugby, athletics, cycling and rowing had each been forced to deal with some of the unsavoury elements associated with the emerging professional impulses of their respective players/teams and the concomitant commercialisation of their competitions.⁸¹ Yet, lawn tennis players, officials and supporters decried “their” sport free from such influences deep into the pre-war era. In 1903, the amateur player and journalist A. Wallis Myers wrote that hitherto ‘the “paid amateur” does not exist, and, moreover, it is difficult to conceive circumstances when it would be worth anyone’s while to bring him into existence’.⁸² Some years later, Dorothea Lambert Chambers remarked of the ‘common fallacy’ to assume that ‘the first-class player is a professional’: ‘Many times people have said to me, “You must be making quite a nice bit of pocket-money from your tennis”. ... [This] annoys me very much’.⁸³ While such attitudes could be considered dismissive, if not naive to the rampantly emerging incidents of pot-hunting and “shamateurism”, they nevertheless indicated the prevailing views of many among the amateur establishment. It is against this backdrop of ignorance to “professionalism” that attitudes toward the institution of a professional championship, or amateur-versus-professional matches, must be seen.

In 1890, the idea of staging a tournament involving the leading amateurs and professionals emerged. ‘Such games would certainly prove very interesting’, reported a *Pastime* correspondent.⁸⁴ To some, the idea may have been interesting, but to others it was viewed with a mixture of contempt and anxiety. In the *Morning Post*, discontent about the encroachment of the professional player was very clear:

Professionalism, which with fatal persistence seems to dog the footsteps of every kind of sport is about to break new ground, and make its way into the hitherto impregnable stronghold of lawn tennis. Professional contests at lawn tennis have before now, we believe, taken place in America, but the first occurrence of the kind in this country... is arranged.⁸⁵

The proposed event never materialised, much to the delight of those who continued to oppose professionalism.

Despite making efforts to arrange and promote more competitive events generally across Britain, such as inter-club and county competitions, the LTA remained lukewarm in their support for coaching-professionals, declining to throw their weight behind the idea of staging professional tournaments for their specific benefit. There existed a ‘determined body of amateur players and administrators who resisted all “professional” impulses’.⁸⁶ In the years prior to the Great War, the term “professional” was still indicative of a person of lower social standing, and during a period when the insurgent middle class threatened aristocratic land-holdings and cultural hegemony, it is perhaps unsurprising that some, if not many, amateur players were unsupportive of any form of amateur-professional integration, which would have

included matches pitching amateurs against professionals and an amateur association sanctioning, and thus having to take an interest in and be present for, a professional tournament.

In an age of heightened status insecurity among the wealthiest and most elite members of British society, many from the upper/upper-middle-class sought to distance themselves, both socially and situationally, from working-class influences and culture. In sport, this was demonstrated in the “distancing” of the amateur from the professional, which reflected more broadly elite-class anxieties of the new social-mobility opportunities emerging for the skilled working class. No longer were individuals held so rigidly within the social class imposed by birth. However, to be integrated fully into the middle-class world, former working-class boys had to distance themselves from their roots. One such player was Dr. Wilberforce Vaughan Eaves.

On the surface, he was an eminent surgeon, a tennis player of the first rank, a Captain in the Royal Army Medical Corps, and evidently a middle-class, privately educated, gentleman.⁸⁷ Yet, if one scratches beneath the surface of this veneer, the story is very different. While his father, William, claimed to have been educated at Eton, he was in fact a baker from the Liverpool docks, whose father, John, was a bankrupt ship bread-baker.⁸⁸ The benefit to Eaves in distancing himself from his working-class background are clear, but of course presents the ultimate and somewhat sad irony of a man outwardly coming to despise the very class from which his own father derived. Despite his familial background, Eaves defied the odds to become a leading English player who travelled tirelessly playing and instructing, but always as an amateur.⁸⁹ During his tour of South Africa in 1908, he had been overcome by heat playing in Johannesburg. When he was restored to consciousness in the Wanderers’ pavilion, it was noted that his first words were, ‘five kings’ palaces, forty shekels of gold, and ten beautiful damsels would not make me a lawn tennis professional’.⁹⁰

Eaves, though, was not a lone voice in his opposition to the professional player, or to the instigation of professional tournaments and championships. His opinion clearly reflected the views expressed by *Lawn Tennis* magazine, which, in 1900, declared it would be ‘sorry if professional matches were ever encouraged in England’.⁹¹ The statement was aimed as a counter to the professional matches and tournaments recently emerging in France. In 1898, the Tennis Club de Paris organised the game between George Kerr and Thomas Burke. Two years later, ‘le Comite des Sports de l’Exposition’ instigated a World Championship played at the Puteaux Club in Paris,⁹² where six professionals, Hierons, Kerr, Fleming, Henton, Marshall and Burke competed. Comments in *Lawn Tennis* on the professional tournaments were clearly an iteration of the concerns of many. However, not everyone held to the exclusivity of the amateur-only ideal.

Charles Voigt, a man who had done much to promote the game on the Continent, took issue, enquiring of the *Lawn Tennis* editor: ‘Can it be possible that you are afraid the professional matches might in any way have an evil effect upon the strict amateur principles which govern our game?’. In a seemingly provocative inference of veiled professionalism amongst the amateur players, he continued:

Or that the crowd who hear and read of the matches and the prize moneys connected with them might be led to infer that “there is something rotten in the state of Denmark” and that lawn-tennis players after all do get paid for exhibiting themselves?⁹³

For Voigt, the 1900 professional championship in Paris, although not sanctioned under any authority, was a success. For others, there appeared to be issues surrounding the ‘prize fighting’ atmosphere of the event. The *Lawn Tennis* editor reinforced his view that, while not opposed to ‘the employment of professionals’, it was not the magazine’s intention ‘to encourage professional matches at tournaments in England, more especially if they are likely to introduce “seconds,” &c., into the game’. Whilst Voigt espoused the cause of the professional in *Lawn Tennis*, the editor of the paper was unmoved, stating emphatically: ‘LAWN TENNIS is an

amateur paper'.⁹⁴ This brought a reply from Harold Mahony, who was present in Paris for the professional tournament, who suggested, in response to concerns over Fleming seemingly acting as assistant to George Kerr, that: 'the reports about "bottle holding" in Paris' only existed in the perhaps too picturesque language of the reporter'. Clearly, as an amateur player, Mahony supported the professional. He concluded his letter, 'Fleming did only for Kerr what I have seen done for dozens of amateurs – he took care of his towel and drink'.⁹⁵ The dogmatic stance adopted by *Lawn Tennis* is not altogether unsurprising given that the magazine was, according to its front-page description, 'The Official Organ of the Lawn Tennis Association'; suffice to say, its editor likely had little choice but to tow the party line.

Other professionals tournaments followed, but such events remained scarce. In 1902, Nice held a tournament, sponsored by a wealthy American offering a \$100 first-prize, and the following year, after a prolonged struggle to receive LTA sanction, the first truly amateur-versus-professional event occurred when Burke and Kerr were beaten convincingly by R.F and H.L. Doherty, the leading amateurs at the time.⁹⁶ In the French periodical, *Tennis*, in 1910, under an article entitled 'Match de Professeurs', the author reported on these early tournaments, but expressed: 'depuis, le silence'.⁹⁷ The sentiment was correct; after these early successes, there was silence in terms of holding any further recognisable, sanctioned tournaments for professionals. During this period, the liberal Edwardian era, the spirit of progressive change likely induced the editor of *LT&B*, in 1907, to throw his support behind Burke and his fellow professionals and welcome the idea of a professional championship; however, they had to wait for a philanthropist to offer a prize for an 'unofficial' challenge.⁹⁸

While coaching-professionals certainly welcomed this support, these sporadic 'unofficial' matches were not what were desired by the professional players. An ongoing official LTA-sanctioned event was problematic, though. An evident barrier to such competitions was the prevailing anti-professional stance by many in the game, whose focus was on maintaining amateurism and the social divide; a lack of sustained support by the LTA; and, a perceived lack of quality in the earlier professional matches. A *LT&B* correspondent claimed that 'these matches... did not present anything out of the ordinary or any points from which the public might profit'.⁹⁹ Tennis writer A. Wallis Myers was also unmoved by the professionals' play, and highlighted some of the exhibitions' shortcomings. Reflecting on several matches played between Fleming and Burke, he remarked that, 'I must confess that the mechanical consistency of their ground strokes and their lack of *finesse* at short range would never impel me to undertake a long journey to see them battle'.¹⁰⁰ While clearly in support of the professional players, Charles Voigt clarified the greatest obstacle for the coaching-professional: 'men like Burke, Kerr and Fleming obtain no decent practice' as they are mainly 'engaged in instructing duffers'.¹⁰¹ Indeed, professionals were pulled between competing obligations, as an instructor, coach, manager, groundsman, and general club "dogsbody", which limited their available time to devote to match-practice.

Those more enlightened realised that if the amateur game was to improve, it had to be led by the coaching-professionals. They argued that if a professional championship was arranged, it would be amateur players who would benefit most in the long run. 'Its institution would unquestionably raise the standard of play and there would be more really good professional players... and fewer who are merely useful for a "knock-up"', argued one lawn tennis writer.¹⁰² Mahony had suggested similarly, nearly a decade earlier, that the professional players 'can give even first-class players hints and suggestions', and R.B. Hough wrote in 1900 of his support for a professional championship, arguing: 'it gives the professional an inducement to improve his game', a point echoed by Charles Voigt and numerous others over the next few years.¹⁰³

In *LT&B* in 1909, it was suggested that the inception of a professional championship was meritorious, and highlighted Charles Heirons' view that the professional should have a

'legitimate goal of ambition and an incentive to keep "fit" and in form, such as would be provided by a championship'.¹⁰⁴ Many supported the idea, writing encouraging letters to the editor, including: Mr. Mewburn, the Honorary Secretary of the LTA; amateur players, G.A. Caridia and C.P. Dixon; W.H. Collins, the former LTA President; and journalist, A. Wallis Myers. Others were vociferous in their condemnation. H. Roper-Barrett, who, in a letter tantamount to a "rant", exhorted the editor:

Sir- On every possible ground, on every possible occasion, and in every possible way I pledge myself to do my utmost to prevent a Championship for professional players receiving the sanction of the LTA or other authority controlling Lawn Tennis Championships, and I sincerely hope you will never refer to the subject again in your paper.¹⁰⁵

Roper-Barrett need not have worried, as the LTA did not intervene to provide much-needed official sanctioning for a professional championship. This brought the following response from F.W. Payn: 'If the LTA wants to improve the standard of play and generally increase the number of good players, they can do no better than increasing the number of good "coaches" for the game by holding a Professional Championship'.¹⁰⁶

As revealed in their antipathy toward supporting coaching-professionals in endeavours to improve their playing standards, the LTA sought to maintain the status quo by discouraging any possibility of adopting a professional mentality. It was thought that, in promoting or even sanctioning a professional championship, the LTA would be in danger of providing a pathway away from amateurism. This is indicative of what Lake argued, regarding 'the fear of "professional contamination" [that] was unmistakably present. ... The amateur fraternity felt threatened by... the exhibition of a "professional" mentality among amateur players'.¹⁰⁷ The 'conservative traditionalists' could ill afford to embrace anything that would encourage the amateur to 'expect remuneration for their efforts, place winning ahead of competing in terms of importance, and take new interest in training, specialisation and the cultivation of excessive muscular development'.¹⁰⁸ For the coaching-professional, therefore, the options were few. They could remain within the confines of the amateur organisation, tow the party line, or look to pastures new.

Conclusion

Sitting in the shadows of the amateur tennis establishment throughout the period before the First World War, by the inter-war period the leading coaching-professionals in Britain and elsewhere began to reveal themselves and demonstrate their extensive talents. As a consequence of the LTA placing greater importance on the pursuit of elite-level success, or rather on Britain returning to front-rank in international competitions, they began to show greater support to coaching-professionals and respect for their craft. Both Charles Hierons and Dan Maskell continued to preach the importance of earning match-play experience, but it was not until 1924 when the LTA sanctioned doubles matches, pitting amateurs against professionals. Won 3-0 by the amateurs, the LTA nevertheless thought it successful enough to warrant hosting five more events in Eastbourne, Manchester, Leeds, Paignton and Teddington.¹⁰⁹ They also sanctioned a British Professional Championship to be held at Queen's Club. Maskell won his first in 1927 and dominated thereafter, winning a total of sixteen times.¹¹⁰

First and foremost, and particularly after he was poached from Queen's Club by the AELTC in 1929, Maskell made a name for himself as a coach and administrator. Keen to enhance the status of coaching-professionals in Britain, to give them more leverage with the LTA and improve their image and status as artisans rather than servants, Maskell sought to unionise coaching-professionals under a single institution. His efforts in this regard were given

extra impetus when, in 1926, Suzanne Lenglen signed a professional contract and so helped, in a single move, to broaden the definition of a “professional” to include ex-amateur touring-professionals. This made it even more important for Maskell and other coaches to distinguish themselves, but also to ally themselves as closely as possible to the LTA’s goals of improving national standards and supporting the best (amateur) players.¹¹¹ His work serving as Davis Cup coach from 1929 onwards most certainly helped in this regard, and when the team triumphed in 1933 he was singled out for particular praise. Among many others, the British star, Fred Perry, spoke very favourably of Maskell’s influence; the decision to take him,

repaid us over and over again. ... He was of immense service to our team, for, apart from his great merits as a coach, he is a fine player – able to play serious sets, on equal terms, or to serve up the stuff one wants for stroke practice.¹¹²

Perry later admitted: Maskell ‘was the only player at home who could ever beat me’.¹¹³ This was a far cry from the pre-war days when coaching-professionals were largely ignored for their coaching and playing abilities. Indeed, it was not until deep into the inter-war period when coaching-professionals began to receive the accolades they deserved, but in their wake was an entire generation from the pre-war era whose stories and incredible successes remained hidden.

Interesting comparisons can be made in these regards between lawn tennis coaching-professionals and golf club “pros”. The Professional Golfers’ Association emerged in 1901 to promote the interests of those who worked in golf clubs as teachers, club-makers and groundsmen, helping to organise a small number of tournaments with cash prizes, but unlike the equivalent organisations that emerged in the interwar period in lawn tennis, they seemed to have had more clout and influence.¹¹⁴ This allowed some, if even a small number of the most talented, of the early pros to at least make a name for themselves and supplement their income. The same could not be said of Harry Cowdrey, Thomas Burke, Charles Haggett and George Kerr, who, despite being equally if not more gifted on the tennis court, remained in the shadows of the Renshaws’, Dohertys’ and other leading amateur players due to the institutional discrimination against professionalism in clubs/tournaments across Britain.

While early golf pros existed on the same side of the servant-master relationship as lawn tennis coaching-professionals and both existed within a similar professional middle-class milieu, because of their early efforts to organise themselves, the former tended to be considered of higher relative status, and this position was supported officially by the amateur golf authorities who sanctioned an “open” championship.¹¹⁵ For lawn tennis professionals, conversely, opportunities to develop and exhibit their skills remained scant, and many amateur players, writers and professional players argued for the instigation of more professional tournaments and a professional championship. In support of this, many felt the club amateur and tournament player would benefit, as with more regular high quality matches, the professionals would improve their playing standards and as such provide better opposition for the amateur in practice sessions. Those in opposition proclaimed the insidious creep of professionalism in the game and the poisonous effect on amateur ideals; a position that was not so strongly established in golf.

Overall, the lack of sustained LTA support effectively prevented the inception of a professional championship in Britain until the mid-1920s. The apparent need by the ruling authorities to maintain social class “segregation” and a lack of official sanctioning of professional tournaments, ensured that the “master-servant” relationship of amateur and professional prevailed. The professional players, while greatly admired, existed within a structure that provided few opportunities for upward social mobility. Denied a stage on which to perform, few people outside of the club environs encountered the professionals, observed or learned of their skills, or reported their exploits. In Britain, the coaching-professionals as players of the pre-Great War period became the “ghosts” who disappeared into the ether. Whilst the leading amateurs of the period have been subject to attention by historians and inducted

into the International Tennis Hall of Fame, almost all of the pre-war coaching-professionals have long since been forgotten, and remain to this day, unheralded.¹¹⁶

¹ T.S. Eliot, 'To Walter de la Mare'. In W.R. Bett, *A Tribute to Walter de la Mare for His 75th Birthday*, (Faber & Faber, 1948).

² Bud Collins, *The Bud Collins History of Tennis: An Authoritative Encyclopedia and Record Book*, (Chicago: New Chapter Press, 2008); Heiner Gillmeister, *Tennis: A Cultural History*, (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1997); Kevin Jefferys, 'The Heyday of Amateurism in Modern Lawn Tennis'. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26, no. 15 (2009a): 2236-52; Kevin Jefferys, 'The Triumph of Professionalism: The Road to 1968'. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26, no. 15 (2009b): 2253-69; Elizabeth Wilson, *Love game: A History of Tennis, from Victorian Pastime to Global Phenomenon*, (London: Serpent's Tail, 2014).

³ Kevin Fewster, 'Advantage Australia: Davis Cup Tennis 1950-1959'. *Sporting Traditions*, 2, no. 1 (1985): 47-68; Graeme Kinross-Smith, 'Privilege in Tennis and Lawn Tennis: The Geelong and Royal South Yarra Examples but Not Forgetting the Story of the Farmer's Wrist'. *Sporting Traditions*, 3, no. 2 (1987): 189-216; Graeme Kinross-Smith, 'Lawn Tennis'. In Wray Vamplew and Brian Stoddart, *Sport in Australia: A Social History* (pp. 133-153). (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Virginia O'Farrell, 'The Unasked Questions in Australian Tennis'. *Sporting Traditions*, 1, no. 2 (1985): 67-86.

⁴ Jean-Michel Faure, 'National Identity and the Sporting Champion: Jean Borotra and French History'. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 13, no. 1 (1996): 86-100.

⁵ Ian Cooper, 'Game, Set & Match: A Developmental Study of Tennis, with Particular Reference to Lawn Tennis'. (Leicester: Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Leicester, 1995); Timothy Todd, *The Tennis Players: From Pagan Rites to Strawberries and Cream*. (Guernsey: Vallancey, 1979); Helen Walker, 'Lawn Tennis'. In Tony Mason, *Sport in Britain: A Social History* (pp. 245-275). (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

⁶ E. Digby Baltzell, *Sporting Gentlemen: Men's Tennis from the Age of Honor to the Cult of the Superstar*. (New York: Free Press, 1995); E.C. Potter, *King of the Court: The Story of Lawn Tennis*, (New York: A.S. Barnes, 1963).

⁷ Alan Little, *The Golden Days of Tennis on the French Riviera 1874-1939*, (London: Wimbledon Lawn Tennis Museum, 2014); Joyce Kay, 'Grass Roots: The Development of Tennis in Britain, 1918-1978'. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 29, no. 18 (2012): 2532-2550.

⁸ Robert J. Lake. *A Social History of Tennis in Britain* (London: Routledge, 2015). See: Robert J. Lake. 'Stigmatised, Marginalised, Celebrated: Developments in Lawn Tennis Coaching 1870-1939'. *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 82-103; Robert J. Lake. "'That Excellent Sample of a Professional": Dan Maskell and the Contradictions of British Amateurism in Twentieth-Century Lawn Tennis'. *Sport in History* 36, no. 1 (2016): 1-25.

⁹ Simon J. Eaves, 'Coaching, Physical Training and the Changing Landscape of Lawn Tennis: Australia's Ascendancy to Dominance in the Pre-Great War era. In Dave Day, *Sport and Leisure on the Eve of the First World War* (pp. 72-97). (Crewe: Manchester Metropolitan University, 2016).

¹⁰ Gillmeister, *Tennis*; Robert J. Lake, 'Social Class, Etiquette and Behavioural Restraint in British Lawn Tennis: 1870-1939'. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 28, no. 6 (2011): 876-894.

¹¹ Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 198.

¹² See: A. Wallis Myers, *The Complete Lawn Tennis Player* (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs and Co., 1908).

-
- ¹³ E. B. Noel, Lawn Tennis at Queen's Club, *The Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*, 16 Nov, 1918, 322-323.
- ¹⁴ The Dohertys at Westminster, *The Times*, 5 August, 1936, 8.
- ¹⁵ *The Times*, 30 December, 1910.
- ¹⁶ John Barrett and Alan Little, *Wimbledon Gentlemen's Singles Champions 1877-2005* (London: Wimbledon Lawn Tennis Museum, 2005), 23.
- ¹⁷ *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 28 August, 1919.
- ¹⁸ *The Times*, 30 December, 1910.
- ¹⁹ 'Owe' and 'Receive' are parts of a handicapped system for tennis. The better players would owe points, and the less able would receive points. Hence, a player who 'owed 15', would start each game on minus 15 points, and a player who 'received 15', would commence each game with plus 15 points.
- ²⁰ Dan Maskell, letter written to author (Stephen Cowdrey), 1991.
- ²¹ *The Star*, 4 December, 1905.
- ²² R. B. Hough, Professional Players, *Lawn Tennis*, 4 February, 1909.
- ²³ George T. Brown. More of Kerr's reminiscences, *American Lawn Tennis*, 15 May, 1918, 57-57.
- ²⁴ *Pastime*, 14 December, 1890, 439.
- ²⁵ *The Sporting Life*, 18 September, 1889, 8.
- ²⁶ A Few Notes on Professionals at the Paris Tournament, *Lawn Tennis*, 18 July, 1900, 218.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*
- ²⁸ Eaves, 'Coaching, Physical Training'.
- ²⁹ Field for Tennis Instructors Grows, *New York Times*, 14 January, 1917, 87.
- ³⁰ George W. Hillyard. *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1924), 245.
- ³¹ Irish Lawn Tennis Coach's Experiences, *Referee*, 24 February, 1915, 10.
- ³² The World's Best Player, *Daily Telegraph*, 1 April, 1914, 7.
- ³³ *Ibid.*
- ³⁴ *Referee*, 4 June, 1913, 10.
- ³⁵ Unknown beats all the great tennis champions, *The Pittsburg Press*, 13 September, 1913, 2.
- ³⁶ Another English Coach Here, *Boston Evening Transcript*, 24 April, 1913, 20.
- ³⁷ *Boston Evening Transcript*, 2 June, 1913, 14.
- ³⁸ *Daily Express*, 10 May, 1919.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ T. Fleming's departure, *Daily Mail*, 30 April, 1903, 6.
- ⁴¹ *The County Gentleman: Sporting Gazette, Agricultural Journal and "The Man About Town"*, 26 February, 1898, 261.
- ⁴² *Pastime*, 12 May, 1897, 22.
- ⁴³ Philippe Brossard. *Prof Ou Champion de Tennis* (Paris: Edicis, 1991), 112.
- ⁴⁴ J. Parmly Paret, Lawn Tennis on the European Continent, *Outing*, 5 August, 1899.
- ⁴⁵ Anthony F. Wilding. *On and Off Court* (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1913), 255-256.
- ⁴⁶ Forest Hills, *The Newtown Register*, 23 August, 1924.
- ⁴⁷ A Few Notes on Professionals at the Paris Tournament, *Lawn Tennis*, 18 July, 1900, 218.
- ⁴⁸ Deuce, Lawn Tennis, *Leader*, 4 January, 1902, 16.
- ⁴⁹ Lake, *A Social History*.
- ⁵⁰ See: Lincoln Allison, *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence* (London: Frank Cass, 2001); Peter Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978); Richard Holt, *Sport and the British* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989); Neil Wigglesworth, *The Story of Sport in England* (London: Routledge, 2007).

-
- ⁵¹ Lake. 'Stigmatised, Marginalised, Celebrated'.
- ⁵² Stephen Wagg, 'Base Mechanic Arms? British Rowing, Some Ducks and the Shifting Politics of Amateurism'. *Sport in History*, 26, no. 3 (2006): 534.
- ⁵³ Lake, *A Social History*.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 64.
- ⁵⁵ Lake. 'Stigmatised, Marginalised, Celebrated'.
- ⁵⁶ Neil Tranter, *Sport, Economy and Society in Britain 1750-1914*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 71.
- ⁵⁷ *Outing*, August, 1889, 394.
- ⁵⁸ *The County Gentleman: Sporting Gazette, Agricultural Journal and "The Man About Town"*, 26 February, 1898, 261.
- ⁵⁹ *The Evening Post*, 10 August, 1907.
- ⁶⁰ Professionals in lawn tennis, is a championship needed? *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 3 December, 1908, 22.
- ⁶¹ Lake. 'That Excellent Sample'.
- ⁶² *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 22 April, 1939, 1154.
- ⁶³ A London Innovation, *The Advertiser*, 19 November, 1924, 19.
- ⁶⁴ *The Times*, 25 June, 1914.
- ⁶⁵ *Outing*, August 1889, 394.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁷ James Zug, *Squash: A History of the Game*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007), 298.
- ⁶⁸ *South Wales Echo*, 12 June, 1980, 3.
- ⁶⁹ *Lawn Tennis*, 26 April, 1899, 5.
- ⁷⁰ *Lawn Tennis and Croquet*, 4 November, 1903.
- ⁷¹ *The Evening Express*, 24 October, 1904, 4; *The Times*, 24 October, 1904.
- ⁷² *Lawn Tennis and Croquet*, 2 November, 1904, 426-427.
- ⁷³ *Lawn Tennis and Croquet*, 5 April, 1905, 505-506.
- ⁷⁴ See: *The Bystander*, 9 May, 1906, 301; *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 9 May, 1906; *The Times*, 23 December, 1907; *The Daily Mirror*, 23 December, 1907.
- ⁷⁵ The Tennis Championship, *Baily's Magazine of Sports and Pastimes*, July to December 1898, 418.
- ⁷⁶ Professionals in lawn tennis, is a championship needed? *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 3 December, 1908, 22.
- ⁷⁷ Dan Maskell, letter to author (Stephen Cowdrey), 1991.
- ⁷⁸ Dan Maskell, *Oh I say!*, (London: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1988), 78.
- ⁷⁹ Lake, *A Social History*.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁸¹ See: Derek Birley, *Land of Sport and Glory: Sport and British Society 1887-1910*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995); Tony Collins, *A Social History of English Rugby Union*. (London: Routledge, 2009); Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen, Players: A Sociological Study of the Development of Rugby Football*. (London: Routledge, 2000); Holt. *Sport and the British*; Tony Mason, *Association Football and English Society 1863-1915*. (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1980).
- ⁸² A. Wallis Myers, *Lawn Tennis at Home and Abroad* (London: George Newnes Ltd., 1903), 112.
- ⁸³ Dorothea Lambert Chambers, *Lawn Tennis for Ladies* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1910), 112.
- ⁸⁴ *Pastime*, 24 December, 1890, 439.
- ⁸⁵ *The Morning Post*, 22 May, 1890, 4.
- ⁸⁶ Lake, *A Social History*, 63.

-
- ⁸⁷ Eaves, 'Coaching, Physical Training'.
- ⁸⁸ Bankrupts, *New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal*, 1821, 635.
- ⁸⁹ Eaves, 'Coaching, Physical Training'.
- ⁹⁰ Dr. Wilberforce V. Eaves Is Dead, *American Lawn Tennis*, 15 March, 1920, 578.
- ⁹¹ *Lawn Tennis*, 6 June, 1900.
- ⁹² Match de Professeurs, *Tennis*, 10 July, 1910.
- ⁹³ Charles A. Voigt, Professionals, *Lawn Tennis*, 1 August, 1900.
- ⁹⁴ The Editor, *Lawn Tennis*, 1 August, 1900.
- ⁹⁵ H. S. Mahony, Professionals, *Lawn Tennis*, 22 August, 1900.
- ⁹⁶ The L.T.A. *Lawn Tennis and Croquet*, 30 July, 1902, 292.
- ⁹⁷ Match de Professeurs, *Tennis*, 10 July, 1910,
- ⁹⁸ Professionals in lawn tennis, is a championship needed?, *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 3 December, 1908, 22.
- ⁹⁹ *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 7 January, 1909.
- ¹⁰⁰ Myers, *The Complete*, 304.
- ¹⁰¹ Mr. Voigt's views, *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 7 January, 1909.
- ¹⁰² Professionals in lawn tennis, is a championship needed?, *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 3 December, 1908, 22.
- ¹⁰³ Professionals, H. S. Mahony, 22 August, 1900; Professionals, R. B. Hough, *Lawn Tennis*, 8 August, 1900, 278; Charles A. Voigt, Professionals, *Lawn Tennis*, 1 August, 1900, 258; Professionals in lawn tennis, is a championship needed?, *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 3 December, 1908, 22.
- ¹⁰⁴ Correspondence, *Lawn Tennis and Badminton*, 7 January, 1909.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶ The L.T.A. *Lawn Tennis and Croquet*, 30 July, 1902, 292.
- ¹⁰⁷ Lake, *A Social History*, 65.
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁹ Maskell, *Oh, I Say!*, 50.
- ¹¹⁰ Lake, *A Social History*.
- ¹¹¹ Lake, 'That Excellent Sample'.
- ¹¹² Fred Perry. *Perry Wins! Expert Advice for All on Lawn Tennis* (London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1935), 49, 85.
- ¹¹³ *Lawn Tennis & Badminton*, 1 April, 1948, 206.
- ¹¹⁴ Ray Physick and Richard Holt. "'Big Money": The Tournament Player and the PGA, 1945-75'. In Adrian Smith and Dilwyn Porter, *Amateurs and Professionals in Post-War British Sport* (pp.60-80). (London: Frank Cass, 2000), 60.
- ¹¹⁵ Peter Lewis, *The Dawn of Professional Golf, 1894-1914* (London: New Ridley and Ballater, Hobbs and McEwan, 1995).
- ¹¹⁶ The only pre-war coaching-professional inducted into the International Hall of Fame is Tom Pettitt, which is unsurprising given he was the club "pro" at Newport, where the IHoF is located.