

The First Modern Sport in America: Harness Racing in New York City, 1825-1870

*Melvin L. Adelman**

Historians have assigned the rise of sport in America to the last three decades of the nineteenth century. Although they found antecedents to this development in the antebellum period, especially during the 1850s they presented the era as one of limited sporting activity.¹ This perspective of the pre-Civil War years is unfortunately based on only a handful of studies and most of these examine the changing attitudes towards athletics.² The sporting patterns in New York City between 1820 and 1870 revealed, however, a much more active sporting life than heretofore thought to have existed at that time. Far from mere prefigurings, the framework of modern sport was established during this half century.³

The modernization of harness racing between 1825 and 1870 exemplifies the growth and transformation of sport during this period. An examination of the modernization of trotting⁴ can proceed by employing two ideal sporting types: one premodern and the other modern.⁵ These ideal sporting types need not be perfect representations of actual historical stages, but they may be distinguished by six polar characteristics (see Table 1). The modernization of sport entails the movement of the activity in the direction of the modern ideal type. This movement is generally, although not always, accompanied by a shift in the playing arena from an open to a close one, the increasing presence of spectators and the commercialization of the sport.

Prior to 1825, harness racing was a premodern sport. Trotting consisted primarily of informal road contests which took place mainly in the northeastern section of the country. The sport was unorganized, lacked standardized rules, attracted limited public attention and possessed no permanent records. By 1870, harness racing had become a modern sport. The creation of the National Trotting Association in that year indicates the development of harness racing into a highly organized sport, with fairly uniform rules and with contests tak-

*Mr. Adelman is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Physical Education at the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois.

ing place throughout the country. The modernization of trotting is further illustrated by the coverage harness racing received in the daily and sporting press, the emergence of statistics and records and the appearance in 1871 of the first stud book devoted exclusively to trotting. Finally, harness racing emerged as the first sport to be successfully commercialized. By the mid-nineteenth century, trotting replaced thoroughbred racing as this country's number one spectator sport. Not until after the Civil War did baseball challenge the supreme position of trotting; but by 1870, if not for awhile longer, harness racing remained the nation's leading spectator sport.

Table 1. The Characteristics of Premodern and Modern Ideal Sporting Types

PREMODERN SPORT	MODERN SPORT
1. ORGANIZATION—is either non-existent or at best informal and sporadic. Contests are arranged by individuals directly or indirectly (e.g., tavern-owners, bettors) involved.	1. ORGANIZATION—formal organizations, institutionally differentiated at the local, regional and national level.
2. RULES—are simple, unwritten and based upon local customs and traditions. Variations exist from locale to locale.	2. RULES—are formal, standardized and written. Rules are rationally and pragmatically worked out and legitimized by organizational means.
3. COMPETITION—locally meaningful contests only; no chance for national reputation.	3. COMPETITION—national and international superimposed on local contests; chance to establish national and international reputation.
4. ROLE DIFFERENTIATION—low role differentiation among participants and loose distinction between playing and spectating roles.	4. ROLE DIFFERENTIATION—high role differentiation; emergence of specialists (professionals) and strict distinctions between playing and spectating roles.
5. PUBLIC INFORMATION—is limited, local and oral.	5. PUBLIC INFORMATION—is reported on a regular basis in local newspapers, as well as national sporting journals. The appearance of specialized magazines, guidebooks, etc.
6. STATISTICS AND RECORDS—non-existent.	6. STATISTICS AND RECORDS—are kept, published on a regular basis and are considered important measure of achievement. Records are sanctioned by national associations.

The contention that harness racing was the first modern sport in America does not mean that it was the initial sport to assume modern characteristics. Thoroughbred racing began to modernize during the eighteenth century when per-

manent jockey clubs were established. The modernization of this sport reached its pre- Civil War peak during the 1830s when the sport enjoyed a period of unprecedented growth and prosperity. By the mid-1840s however, the process grounded to a halt when the sport collapsed throughout the North. With horse racing confined mainly to the South during the subsequent two decades, the modernization of the sport remained dormant until the revival of thoroughbred racing in the North in the years immediately following the Civil War. By 1870, nevertheless, the gestalt of horse racing was not as yet modern despite the significant steps in this direction during the antebellum period.⁶

Conversely, the claims that harness racing had become a modern sport by 1870 does not mean to suggest that the modernization of trotting was complete by this date. Rather a key point of this article is that a certain stage is reached as a sport moves along the continuum from the premodern to the modern ideal form in which modern characteristics are sufficiently present to shape the structure and direction of the sport. At this juncture, the sport presents a modern configuration, one which shares more in common with its future than its premodern past. It is in this sense that harness racing had become America's first modern sport by 1870.

Harness racing conjures up a rural image, the sport of the county fair. Trotting was, however, an urban product. The sport first emerged on urban roads and developed its most salient modern characteristics in the city. New York played a more critical role in the development of harness racing than any other city. As early as 1832, the *Spirit of the Times* recognized that New York was the premier city in the breeding and training of trotting horses. Nearly a quarter of a century later, one frequent correspondent to this sporting journal maintained that trotting was indigenous to the Empire City and that there were "more fine horses here than can be found any where else in the world."⁷ The importance of New York to the growth of the sport did not derive solely from the concentration of the best stock in the metropolitan region. New York was the hub of harness racing throughout the period 1825 to 1870. In the nation's most populated city, there were more trotting tracks, more races, including a disproportionate number of the leading contests, and more prize money offered than in any other place in the country. Equally significant, the characteristics of modern harness racing initially appeared in New York. Here the sport was first organized and commercialized. As a result, New York set the pattern that was to be followed on a national scale.⁸

I

Harness racing emerged as a popular pastime in New York and in other parts of the northeast in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.⁹ Sport historians have maintained that the growth of trotting was directly related to the anti-racing legislation passed by several northern states, including New York

State, during this era. Denied the race course, lovers of fast horses took to the “natural track”—the highway. While the road was ill suited for the feet of the running horse, it was the natural home of the trotter. “It is no accident,” a leading historian of the sport contended, “that the racing of trotters began in regions where horses could be ‘raced’ only in defiance of law.”¹⁰

New York State’s anti-racing law, passed in 1802, neither directly nor indirectly influenced the growth of trotting in the Empire City. As enforcement had been lax, horsemen did not have to take to the road as a substitute for the prohibited race course.¹¹ Rather, trotting emerged at this time because improvements in the roads now made the sport possible. One historian noted that “it was only natural that the speed of the harness horse found its first testing ground upon the smooth hard roads whose networks radiated from the northeastern cities . . . especially those of the Boston-New York-Philadelphia regions.”¹²

Sportsmen began racing their “roadsters” (as street trotters came to be called) because it provided them with an amusement which was convenient, participatory and relatively inexpensive. Third Avenue quickly emerged as New York’s major trotting area. Beginning outside the residential portion of the city at that time, the approximately five mile road was perfectly suited for these informal trials of speed. In close proximity to the homes of the horsemen, it was a convenient location for these contests which started upon the completion of the day’s work and which usually lasted until dark. Moreover, numerous taverns dotted the highway where reinsmen could stop, arrange contests and discuss the latest sporting developments.¹³

These impromptu contests appealed to the city’s horsemen because they allowed personal participation. Unlike thoroughbred racing, where the owner and the rider of the horse had long been separated, trotting permitted the sportsman to demonstrate the prowess of his horse, as well as his own skill as a reinsman. Finally, the pastime did not require the capital outlay of thoroughbred racing. The trotter was not a “pure breed,” but rather a horse drawn from the common stock that had the ability to trot. The plebian horses that engaged in these road races, moreover, were almost always used by their owners in their day-to-day activities.¹⁴

Although early nineteenth century trotting consisted almost exclusively of these impromptu contests, permanent structures began to emerge. The first trotting tracks in the New York metropolitan region were mere extensions of the courses used for thoroughbred racing. The most significant of these tracks was located in Harlem and the first recorded performance by an American trotter took place there in 1806. Several years later, the first track constructed exclusively for trotting was built in Harlem next to the Red House Tavern.

The course was the major resort for the Third Avenue road racing crowd and the track was probably constructed for their benefit. While racing took place on both courses, these tracks remained essentially training grounds for the city's roadsters.¹⁵

More formalized matches, either on the city's roads or tracks, were a natural outgrowth of the impromptu races, or "brushes" as they were called, which took place on Gotham's streets. Since the press paid scant attention to these matches information exists on only a few of them. Probably the most important took place in 1818 when William Jones of Long Island, a prominent horseman, wagered Colonel Bond of Maryland a thousand dollars that he could produce a horse that would trot a mile in less than three minutes. The race caused great excitement among the city's sporting crowd. With odds against success, a horse named *Boston Pony* accomplished the feat in just less than the required time.¹⁶

The formation of the New York Trotting Club (NYTC) in the Winter of 1824-1825 marks the first critical step in the modernization of harness racing.¹⁷ The first organized trotting club in America, there is no information on its members, although most were probably drawn from the men who raced their roadsters on Third Avenue and other roads in the New York metropolitan region. The creation of the NYTC was inspired by the success thoroughbred racing had enjoyed in New York after the State revoked its anti-racing legislation in 1821. The NYTC drew its objectives and methods heavily from the experience of horse racing. Similar to the racing organization of its sister sport, the NYTC justified its association on utilitarian grounds (the sport's contribution to the improvement of the breed); instituted regular meetings twice yearly; and, constructed a race course (in Centerville, Long Island) to facilitate the growth of the sport.¹⁸

Trotting in New York made significant advances as both a participatory and spectator sport in the two decades following the formation of the NYTC. In 1835, the *Spirit* noted that the "number of fast horses for which our city is so celebrated is steadily accumulating." With some exaggeration, one contemporary observer claimed that "there was scarcely a gentleman in New York who did not own one or two fast (trotting) horses."¹⁹ The rising cost of good roadsters further indicated the increasingly appeal of the sport. During the 1830s the price of the best trotting horses doubled.²⁰ In addition, trotting races on the city's tracks, especially the major ones, generated considerable excitement among New York's sporting crowd. In 1838, the *New York Herald* reported that the contest between *Dutchman* and *Ratner* created "as much interest in our city and neighborhood" as the intersectional horse race between *John Bascombe* and *Post Boy* held in New York two years earlier.²¹

The emerging commercialization of trotting most accurately dramatizes the growth of the sport. By the mid-1830s, entrepreneurs began to tap the public interest in harness races that took place on New York's streets and tracks. The experience of the Beacon Course in nearby Hoboken, New Jersey illustrates the early introduction of the profit motive into trotting. This course was constructed in 1837 for thoroughbred racing. When the sport proved unprofitable the following year, the proprietors of the track started to promote harness racing for the sole purpose of reaping the financial rewards from the gate receipts. By the early 1840s, businessmen had replaced the original sponsors of trotting—the road runners and their associations—as the major promoters of the sport.²²

Although organized trotting made important progress in its first twenty years, it continued to take a back seat to horse racing. The coverage harness racing received in the press defined the secondary status of this turf sport. While trotting won the polite endorsement of New York newspapers, reports of races, even important ones, remained limited. Similarly, harness racing won the approval of sports editors John Stuart Skinner and Cadwallader Colden, but their monthly journals were devoted almost exclusively to thoroughbred racing and provided only the barest summaries and details of the developments on the trotting track. Only William T. Porter's *Spirit* paid any significant attention to trotting and even there the extent of the coverage did not correspond to the growth of the sport.

II

As thoroughbred racing collapsed throughout the North in the decade following the Depression of 1837, the sporting press took increasing note of the activities of the trotting horse. By the early 1840s they suggested that the “ugly duckling” had become the legitimate rival of her more respected sister. In 1847, the *Herald* pointed out that “For several years past, trotting has been gradually taking the precedence of running in this part of the country; while one specie of amusement has been going into decay, the other has risen to heights never before attained.”²³

Contemporaries claimed that the corresponding fates of the two turf sports were closely linked to the characteristics associated with the two different horses. In contrast to the aristocratic and foreign thoroughbred, the trotter was perceived as the democratic, utilitarian, and, by logical extension, the American horse. Implicit was the belief that harness racing surpassed horse racing as the leading turf sport because it more accurately captured the spirit of the American experience.

Henry W. Herbert (better known as Frank Forester) recognized the close connection between the nature of the horses and the popularity of the respective

sports. Since cost restricted the ownership of thoroughbreds to wealthy men, horse racing could never be a popular sport. By contrast, the trotter was common to all and the “most truly characteristic and national type of horse” in America. In this country, the transplanted Englishman concluded, trotting “is the people’s sport, the people’s pastime, and consequently, is, and will be, supported by the people.”²⁴

This perspective provides a good starting point in understanding the maturation of trotting if such terms as democratic, utilitarian and even American are broadly conceived. While contemporaries grossly exaggerated the extent to which the masses owned trotters, ownership of these plebian and relatively inexpensive horses was far more widespread than thoroughbreds.²⁵ Precise data on the owners of trotting horses in New York is non-existent, but available information does permit a profile to be logically deduced. The evidence indicates that only a small number of trotting men came from the “upper Crust.”²⁶ Conversely, the cost and upkeep of trotting horses were still sufficiently high to generally exclude individuals who fell below the middle class. While broad parameters still exist, it appears that trotting owners came from the more prosperous segments of the middle class—men who lived a comfortable, but hardly opulent, lifestyle. Nevertheless, individuals of more moderate means could still own a roadster as a result of the limited price of the horse and their usage in daily activities. This was particularly the case for men working in New York’s various food markets. Their involvement in harness racing gave credence to the common adage that “a butcher rides a trotter” often used to illustrate the democratic nature of the horse.²⁷

The fortunes of the two turf sports, the *Herald* repeatedly insisted, were connected to their utilitarian functions. The decline of horse racing stemmed from the fact that the thoroughbred had little practical benefit. The newspaper conceded that trotting “may not be attended with all the high zest and excitement” of running races, but it is “a more useful sport, as the qualities in the horse which it is calculated to develop are more intimately connected with the daily business of life.”²⁸ The growth of harness racing did reflect shifting patterns of travel. With the improvement of roads and wagons, the driving horse increasingly replaced the saddle horse as the basic means of convoy in the northeastern and Middle Atlantic states. As one scholar pointed out, there was “a direct correlation between the improved modes of transportation and their popular manifestations seen on the trotting track.”²⁹

Since Americans believed that the true nature of the trotter—democratic and utilitarian—could only be developed in this country, they perceived the trotter as a native product although they were familiar with English antecedents. In 1853, the *Herald* wrote, “We are the first who have attached particular importance to the breeding of trotting horses, and in this respect . . . have

shown the practical nature of our character.”³⁰ These assumptions may be passed off as American chauvinism, but the contention that both the horse and the sport were indigenous products does contain merit. Harness racing had been a popular pastime in England, but its emergence as a sport first occurred in the United States.³¹ Similarly, the establishment of a distinct breed of trotting race horse was an American creation, although this process was not completed until the late nineteenth century. More significantly, it was the perception of the trotter as the American horse, more than the reality, which was of critical importance to the growth of the sport. While harness racing never wrapped itself in the flag to the extent that baseball did, nationalistic overtones gave trotting a sanction absent in horse racing.³² Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr. captured these sentiments. He noted that the running horse was a gambling toy, but the trotting horse was a useful animal. Furthermore, “horse racing is not a republican institution; horse-trotting is.”³³

While the contemporary explanation provides a starting point, other critical factors must also be examined if a comprehensive analysis of the maturation of trotting is to be constructed. Trotting’s supreme position in the turf world can be more productively analyzed in terms of three interacting forces: the increasing potential for commercialized amusements made possible by urban and economic expansion; the greater susceptibility of trotting to commercialization than any of its sporting counterparts; and, the more innovative nature of trotting.

The absence of surplus wealth and concentrated populations traditionally restricted the development of commercialized amusements. During the antebellum period, these two major barriers began to dissolve under the impact of urban and economic growth. The expanding economy throughout these years not only produced a significant rise in wealth, but, more importantly, broadened the availability of discretionary income among a wider segment of the population. The concentration of large numbers of people in one area facilitated the creation of a greater number of permanent institutions devoted to commercialized amusements.³⁴ These newer forms of popular entertainment shared three essential properties: they were cheaper, depended on volume, and appealed to a wider segment of the populace. While commercialized amusements increased throughout the first four decades of the nineteenth century, their numbers multiplied rapidly in the two decades preceding the Civil War. As one scholar pointed out, commercialized amusements underwent “an expansion of new proportions” during the lengthy era of general prosperity between 1843 and 1860.³⁵

The plebian character of the trotter and its relatively inexpensive price made the sport more susceptible to commercialization. Since the trotter cost less than the thoroughbred, the prize money offered by track proprietors did not

have to be as great for the owners of the trotters to cover their cost and make a profit. As late as 1860, purses in New York rarely exceeded \$250 and contests could be run for as low as \$10. The stakes were naturally higher in match or privately arranged races. By the 1850s, a few contests went for as much as five thousand dollars per side. In general, however, the amounts fell below that which existed for similar kinds of thoroughbred races. Clearly one does not find anything comparable to the stakes placed on the major intersectional thoroughbred contest, such as between *Eclipse* and *Henry* or *Boston* and *Fashion*, or for that matter the money that could be won in horse racing's larger sweepstake races.

The nature of the trotter facilitated the commercialization of the sport by making more races possible. Whereas a good thoroughbred might race six or seven times a year, the more durable trotter started at least twice as many races annually. Furthermore, a trotter's career lasted longer, many racing into their teens. More importantly, the trotter came from the common horse stock. Consequently, there were simply more of them to race. The impact of the greater numbers can be seen in terms of the respective racing sessions in New York. There were at most three weeks of thoroughbred racing in the city annually; but hardly a week would pass, except in the Winter months, without a trotting match taking place somewhere in the New York metropolitan region.

Finally, harness racing was not bogged down in the "aristocratic" trappings which characterized horse racing. In 1843, the *Spirit* recognized that trotting men were more innovative and aggressive than their horse racing counterparts. As a result of their greater "enterprise, industry and go *aheadiveness*," the sporting journal predicted, harness racing "will soon be a formidable rival to thoroughbred racing in the North." Nearly a quarter of a century later, *Turf, Field and Farm*, essentially a thoroughbred journal, gave the same basic reasons and used exactly the same words in explaining the greater popularity of harness racing.³⁶

Trotting was more innovative than horse racing in two critical ways. The first was a product of the different social backgrounds of those involved in the respective sports. Engaged in thoroughbred racing were wealthy men and/or people from established families. Most of the owners of trotting horses and the proprietors of trotting tracks, however, appear to have been middle class in origin. The different social origins affected the entire tone of the two turf sports. While thoroughbred racing was run for and by the upper class, harness racing enticed a broader segment of the populace. The commercially minded proprietors of trotting tracks catered more readily to all ticket holders than those involved in their sister sport. One does not find connected with trotting complaints of exclusiveness, aristocracy and snobbishness levelled by the

press against the leaders of thoroughbred racing. As a leading sporting journal noted, "Racing will never succeed in New York until it and its attended arrangements are put on a more democratic basis—something approaching the order of the first class trotting races. Then, like the trots, it will get the support of the people."³⁷

In addition, trotting was more innovative because the comparatively new sport was not inhibited by tradition. By the 1840s, horse racing in America had a long heritage on how a thoroughbred race should be conducted. The absence of institutional confinements made it easier for trotting to adjust to commercialization. Similar to their horse racing counterparts, trotting men initially valued a horse which combined speed and endurance. Early trotting contests were raced in heats from one to five miles. By the early 1840s, trotting men broke with this pattern. Most major contests were now one mile heats with the winner required to win three heats. Since the new system placed less strain on the trotter, the horse could race more frequently and thereby more races were possible. Furthermore, harness racing contests took place in a wider variety of styles, giving the sport greater diversity and interest.

Harness racing surged to the forefront of not only the turf world, but modern sport in general, because more than any other sport of the day it captured the flow of the American experience. In common with other forms of popular entertainment, the emergence of trotting as a spectator sport was a product of the two dynamic forces—urbanization and economic expansion—transforming and modernizing American life. The impact of these agents of change would have been far less had not trotting possessed properties which predisposed it towards commercialization. Here the nature of the horse played a critical role. Of equal significance was the fact that those who governed trotting, at least from the standpoint of sport, internalized the values of modern society. As such, they put a greater premium on innovation rather than tradition, and cash rather than class.

III

Harness racing progressed rapidly as a popular spectator sport both in New York and throughout the country in the two decades preceding the Civil War. While the changes in the social and economic conditions, discussed in the previous section, created the setting for the growth of the sport, performers attracted the crowds. During the early years of organized trotting, numerous horses left their mark on the history of the sport, but it was *Lady Suffolk* who set the standard of excellence and was the sport's first hero.³⁸ The fifteen year career of *Lady Suffolk* (1838-1853), moreover, illustrates the condition and development of trotting during this period.

Foaled in 1833, *Lady Suffolk* was bred by Leonard Lawrence of Suffolk County, Long Island, from whence she drew her name. The *Lady* was a descendant of imported *Messenger*, the founding father of the American trotter, but no preparation was made for a trotting career.³⁹ As a weanling she was sold for \$60, then resold as a two year old for \$90. At age four she was pulling a butcher or oyster cart when David Bryan purchased her for \$112.50 for use in his livery stable. The prowess of the horse went undiscovered until none other than William T. Porter by chance rented her for a tour of the Long Island tracks. The editor of the *Spirit* was impressed with the *Lady's* speed and good gait. He told Bryan that she had too much potential as a racer to be wasted in his stable. In the Spring of 1838, Bryan entered the *Lady* in her first race. The "Old Grey Mare," as she was later affectionately called, completed the mile contest in three minutes flat, winning the fabulous sum of eleven dollars.

Bryan owned *Lady Suffolk* until his death in 1851. Of Irish or Celtic origin, little is known of his background, save for his previous occupation. It is clear, however, that Bryan was the embodiment of the professional ethic which came to dominate the sport. As one historian wrote, "For Bryan, his *Lady Suffolk*, the most loved as well as the most admired horse of her time, was not, first and foremost, a sporting animal—she was a mint of money, a nugget of rich metal to be melted by him in the heat of competition and struck off into dollars."⁴⁰ Bryan raced his grey mare mainly in the New York metropolitan area because this is where he lived and, even more importantly, because the city's courses provided the best financial opportunities. Similar to other professional trotting men of his day, however, Bryan campaigned with *Lady Suffolk* on the growing number of tracks throughout the country, going as far west as St. Louis and as far south as New Orleans.

Bryan had the reputation of being a poor reinsman and he placed excessive demands on *Lady Suffolk*. Nevertheless, he was an unqualified success by the new professional standards. He entered the *Lady* in 162 races and won between \$35,000 and \$60,000.⁴¹ The ability of *Lady Suffolk* to achieve victory, despite the clumsy and inept driving of her owner, derived from her saintly patience, an unbreakable spirit and a remarkable endurance. At age nineteen, her last full year on the turf, the Old Grey Mare demonstrated her tremendous stamina by coming to the start twelve times.

Harness racing had emerged as the nation's leading spectator sport by the time *Lady Suffolk* was retired in the early 1850s. During this decade, the sport emerged as an integral part of the county fair and the public's desire to see harness races resulted in the creation of an ever increasing number of trotting tracks throughout the country. By 1858, one sporting journal estimated that over seventy trotting courses existed in America.⁴²

Expanding coverage of harness racing corresponded with its growth. In New York, the daily newspapers naturally focused on contests within the metropolitan region, but the city-based sporting journals reported on races throughout the country. While trotting men had always been preoccupied with “time” as a measure of their horses’ abilities and performances, statistics and records took on new importance when horsemen began touring the increasing number of tracks in search of fame and fortune. That these measurements served the interest of track promoters and fans of the sport was to a large extent responsible for their expanding value. Since a trotter might visit a city only once a year, proprietors of the courses could use the statistical reputation of a horse to encourage people to come see the race even though they may have never seen him perform. Similarly, statistics nourished fan interest by providing them with a method of evaluating a horse in the absence of personal observation or witnessing the horse race on only a handful of occasions.

Trotting men were not only familiar with unsurpassed performances, but were already cognizant of the concept of the record. In 1860, for example, *Flora Temple*, who succeed *Lady Suffolk* as the “princess of the turf,” sought to break *Dutchman’s* record (7:32.5) for three miles. Since “the watch never breaks and never tires,” *Wilkes’ Spirit of the Times* reported, the effort of *Flora Temple* (eventually unsuccessful) to surpass the time of the then dead horse evoked considerable speculation and discussion.⁴³

New York continued to dominate the development of harness racing even though the sport expanded nationally. At least seven trotting tracks existed in the metropolitan region, with three—Union, Fashion and Centerville Courses—hosting first class contests. More significantly, with the ever increasing importance of gate receipts, trotting in the Empire City drew the largest number of spectators. Between six and eight thousand spectators were usually present at each of the four to six leading matches held annually. However, when *Flora Temple* raced, attendance could jump into double figures. Within a period of seventeen days in 1859, her contests with *Ethan Allen* and then *Princess* drew crowds of 12,000 and 20,000, respectively.

The growth of harness racing as a sports spectacle did not occur without problems. As the commercial and professional ethic came to dominate the sport, suspicions of irregularities on the trotting track markedly increased. The question of the integrity of harness racing produced the first extensive discussion and concern about the honesty of professional-commercial sport. Cries of foul play on New York tracks were already heard as early as the 1830s. The *Spirit* claimed that the public are beginning to express concern about the improprieties on the trotting track and insisted that men of character must immediately rule off the track those who disgrace the sport or else the “trotting course and everything pertaining them must ‘go to pot.’”⁴⁴

While complaints of irregularities persisted, the city's sporting press began to repeat these charges vociferously only in the 1850s. Fundamentally these statements did not vary from the theme, solution and dire predictions offered by the *Spirit* over a decade earlier. In 1857, the *New York Times* asserted that many owners of fast trotters would not allow their horses to compete in races since the courses had "fallen under the control of men who made use of them to subserve their own private interest."⁴⁵

During the next two decades, the New York press emphatically argued that the fixing of races was a common practice.⁴⁶ So often were the charges made that by their sheer numbers this argument becomes a compelling one. Yet was it accurate? It would be naive to assume that no races were rigged, but the claims of widespread manipulation of contests seems grossly exaggerated. Evidence of these "clandestine arrangements" are significantly lacking. It is not surprising, therefore, that the arguments develop a predictable rhythm and break down into vague generalities. In contrast to the contention of rampant wrongdoings, I was impressed at the number of times the favorite, and especially the outstanding horses, won.⁴⁷ Clearly, many of the assertions, which at times border on the incredulous, can be cast aside as sensationalist journalism.⁴⁸ From time to time, moreover, statements in the press not only challenged the prevailing view, but often contradicted previous beliefs.⁴⁹

The rise of the "manipulation theory" derived from three interrelated factors: the non-existence of investigative commissions; the nature of professional sport and the attitude towards professional athletes; and the primitive concept of "upset." In absence of effective investigating commissions as we know them today, charges of irregularities were rarely examined. The lack of this critical institutional structure for the governance of sport facilitated the growth of rumor and innuendo and made personal judgment the sole criteria in deciding the honesty of a race. The case brought against James Eoff illustrates the obvious drawbacks of such a method in determining the integrity of a contest. In 1859, *Princess*, a California mare, was the first horse to make the trip from the West Coast to New York. With little time to recoup from the long journey, she was matched against *Flora Temple*. Hiram Woodruff, the leading antebellum reinsman and a spectator at the contest, wrote that ninety-five percent of the huge crowd felt that *Princess* lost because Eoff, her jockey, pulled the mare. So vociferous was the cry of "fix" that the Union Jockey Club, a thoroughbred organization which owned the course where the race took place, held a rare investigation. There Eoff claimed that the California mare tired because she had not recovered from her trip and could not be pushed any harder. Woodruff felt the explanation was a plausible and truthful one. He further pointed out that not one of the many people who felt the race had been thrown came forward to substantiate their charge.⁵⁰

The nature of professional athletics made creditable the assertion that races were fixed. Since the major purpose of the contest for the professional athlete is to make money, what guarantees exist that he would not manipulate the event to maximize his profit? A certain class bias against the professional athlete accentuated the suspicions inherent within the professional system. While no monolithic view of either the professional athlete or professional athletics existed, the prevailing attitude was that the public was assured honest contests only when the “better class” governed the sport.⁵¹

The strong temptations confronting the professional athlete went far in explaining why the press so vehemently opposed what was known as “hippodroming”—the making of contests for the sole purpose of splitting the gate receipts (in contrast to racing for stakes and purses). With no money depending on the outcome, and therefore with no incentive to win, these “concocted affairs” were perfect races to rig. As the *New York Clipper* pointed out, “Many matches advertised for heavy stakes are merely for ‘gate money’ and so arranged that the winners are known to the ‘initiated’ before the event ever took place.”⁵²

The suspicions of wrongdoing were justifiably heightened by the less than candid policy of track promoters in billing what was essentially an “exhibition” as a match race for large stakes. This less than honest practice does not prove, however, that the contests were fixed. In 1860, the *Spirit* conceded that hippodroming had become a method of scheduling races, but it doubted “if there is one-tenth part of the rascality on a trotting track that many people suppose.”⁵³

The development of hippodroming was a legitimate response to the financial considerations of both the owners of the horses and the proprietors of the courses rather than being the product of evil intent. Woodruff claimed that *Flora Temple* caused the new system. In a class by herself, the mare “could not get a match on even terms, and was excluded from all purses.”⁵⁴ It is unlikely that *Flora Temple* or any other horse initiated hippodroming. Instead it emerged from the inadequacy of the prevalent winner-take-all system.⁵⁵ The new arrangements made it possible for a horse to be defeated and the owner still be able to cover part of his cost and possibly emerge with a profit. Consequently, it gradually facilitated an expansion in both the number of trotters and races. Equally important for the proprietors, it guaranteed the presence of the super horses that drew the huge crowds. “No matter how these ‘little arrangements’ are concocted,” the *Clipper* was forced to conclude, “it is but fair to say that they generally made interesting races, and in that way the spectators are pleased.”⁵⁶

The most striking fact about the literature of the day was the primitive understanding of the concept of "upset." Nineteenth century writers were conscious that luck played a factor in the outcome of athletic contests and that the more talented performer did not always win. On most occasions when the favorite lost, however, the press and the public offered some excuse for his defeat. As I perceive it, the concept of upset does not automatically entail that luck played a part in the underdog winning, although it may and often does. Rather it is premised on the realization that on certain occasions a competitor can achieve a level of performance which is not his usual standard and quite possibly may never be reached again.

Today it is axiomatic that on any given day any professional athlete or team could defeat any other professional athlete or team. Over the years, the vicissitudes of sport have sufficiently demonstrated the validity of this idea. The legitimacy of even the most unbelievable developments go unquestioned. Jargon ridden as this, perspective has become in our mass communication sporting world, the internalization of this view by the fan and the press alike is mandatory if the integrity of professional sport is to be accepted. Precisely because such an attitude was absent in the early days of professional sport any unexpected occurrence frequently became translated into "fix."⁵⁷

Serious doubts must be raised of the prevalent view that widespread manipulation of races followed on the heels of the growth of professional-commercial harness racing. While dishonest contests occurred in New York, they were the exception rather than the rule. Nevertheless, professionalization did significantly alter the character of these contests. The emphasis of amateur turfmen on style and sportsmanship yielded to the sole objective of success as jockies adopted tricks and tactics which if not outright violations of the rules permitted the drivers to get all he could within them. Such practices were often chastised and contributed to the belief that there was a lack of propriety on the trotting track; but they foreshadowed the pattern which emerged in all professional sports. As one historian pointed out, these techniques were consistent with the dominant American values "in that it was results that counted, not how hard you tried or how sportingly you behaved"⁵⁸

IV

While commercialization became harness racing's leading characteristic by the 1850s, informal trials of speed persisted on New York's streets. With the growth of the city, however, severe restrictions began to be placed on the roadster. By the early 1860s, New York's road runners had moved from Third Avenue to Harlem Lane in the upper part of Manhattan. This location shortly began to succumb to the forces of progress. Dismayed by the prospect of the loss of New York's last good driving area, the editor of *Wilkes' Spirit*

believed that it “was incumbent upon the city's authorities to supply the vacancy created by the occupation of Harlem Lane.” As the headquarters of the fast trotter, anything less, he suggested, “would be a national loss, as well as a municipal sham and disgrace.”⁵⁹

The call for government intervention might be considered a “far sighted” approach, but trotting men took steps more typical of the period. They established private organizations which brought or rented their own tracks. Unlike earlier trotting or jockey clubs, these organizations did not sponsor public or private races, although club members could and probably did arrange contests amongst themselves and their guests. Rather, they were formed to perpetuate an informal pastime no longer possible in the more formalized urban setting.⁶⁰ The first of these clubs was the Elm Park Pleasure Grounds Association established in the late 1850s. The majority of the 400 members were prosperous businessmen, although there were a handful of men of considerable wealth, most notably Cornelius Vanderbilt and Robert Bonner.⁶¹

Of New York’s road drivers, none had a more dramatic impact on the development of harness racing than Robert Bonner. Born in Londonderry, Ireland in 1824, Bonner amassed his fortune by the time he was thirty as the owner of the *New York Ledger*, a weekly family journal.⁶² In 1856, his physician advised him to find an outdoor recreation for health reasons. Bonner then bought a horse and began driving it on New York’s speedways. There he had a few brushes with Vanderbilt. What emerged was a friendly rivalry between these two for the ownership of the best trotters. The Bonner-Vanderbilt duel, a leading turf historian insisted, “marked the beginning of a change that provided the sport not only with strong financial backing but an efficient leadership.”⁶³ While the confrontation between the steamship and newspaper magnates did not initiate a new era, it symbolized and gave impetus to an already existing process.

In the battle between the two giants, Bonner emerged as the king of the road. He spent lavishly in purchasing some of the best trotters of his era. Between 1859 and 1870, Bonner bought thirteen horses at a total cost of \$162,000. His prize purchase was *Dexter* clearly the number one trotter of his day. By the time he retired in 1890, the newspaper magnate had spent nearly half a million dollars for his horses, including \$40,000 each for his stars *Maud S.* and *Pocahontas*.⁶⁴

Bonner’s reputation as a horseman did not derive solely from his ownership of possibly the largest and best stable. A more significant reason, as the *New York Tribune* pointed out, was that he “did more to lift the trotting horse from disrepute to respectability than any other man.”⁶⁵ According to the universally accepted perspective, prior to Bonner’s involvement, acceptable society

viewed the owners of trotting horses as fast men “who spent their afternoons trotting from tavern to tavern . . . (and) had too much money in their pockets.”⁶⁶ Bonner was the critical figure in altering this negative impression. A man of unimpeachable character, the strict Scotch-Presbyterian did not smoke, drink or swear. Moreover, he so violently opposed gambling that he refused to enter his horses in public places. Consequently, Bonner could bring a dignity to the sport that other wealthy *nouveaux*, such as the salty Vanderbilt, never could. Through Bonner’s influence, the ownership of trotting horses won an acceptable position in society, with the result that “Men of affairs, men of money, men of social position began to buy trotters, drive them on the road and even enter them for races on the public tracks.”⁶⁷

That the possession of trotting horses gradually achieved greater respectability in New York society when men of wealth became involved in the sport is undeniable as it was almost inevitable. This development did not emerge from a shift in the attitude of the city’s “upper crust,” but rather from a shift in its composition. As older elites gave way to the onslaught of new wealth, they lost their position as the arbiters of culture. The ascending group, from whom trotting men were overwhelmingly drawn, dictated from its new position the acceptability of its own activity.⁶⁸ The increasing involvement of New York’s affluent in trotting, therefore, can be understood against the background of what a leading scholar of New York elites described as the plutocratic nature of the city’s high society. Since New York society was easily accessible to the newly risen who were uncertain of the traditions and prerogatives of their new class and status, it produced an elite structure which encouraged the pursuit of publicity and created a fashionable style of conspicuous luxury. Although these traits did not emerge as the dominant characteristics of New York society until the 1870s, they were strongly present among the city’s elite even prior to the Civil War.⁶⁹

Nouveaux riches New Yorkers became involved in trotting, as they would in other sports, as a means of status confirmation. Interesting differences existed, however, between trotting and other sporting activities. In the prevailing pattern, new wealth asserted its position by patronizing those sports which had an upper class heritage and/or could be afforded only by men of wealth. In the early years of trotting, the sport shared none of these characteristics. To function as other upper class sports, therefore, exclusiveness had to be created. Two interrelated processes accomplished this transformation: the purchasing of the best trotters at lavish prices and the rationalization of the breeding industry.

The willingness of wealthy men to pay premium prices resulted in their monopoly of the best trotters by the 1870s.⁷⁰ The soaring cost of trotters was in part a product of the growth of the sport and the increasing number of bid-

ders for what is a relatively fixed market; there can be only a few champions per period. However, the law of supply and demand, important though it may be, does not explain the surge in prices. For example, Bonner bought *Dexter* in 1867 for the incredible sum of \$33,000 even though his seller, George Trussle of Chicago, had paid only \$14,000 for the horse two years earlier. Another subtle but significant reason therefore existed for the rising cost. The fabulous sums trotting horses attracted was a critical part of the status game. To have obtained the best horses at anything less than these fantastic sums would have not satisfied the needs of these *parvenus* to demonstrate their wealth and status.

The rationalizations of the breeding industry further encouraged the concentration of good trotting horses in the hands of the wealthy. In the mid-nineteenth century, this business required little capital, organization or promotion. Some attention was paid to pedigree; however, lineage was usually guesswork, if not outright falsification. The small scale on which the business was run was not conducive to finely selective breeding, but its random nature had the valuable result of diffusing the blood of the best stock widely throughout the country. This haphazard method, one historian noted, “contributed to the sport a delightful element of uncertainty, discovery and surprise, the satisfaction of making something out of nothing.” This business enabled David Bryan and William M. Rysdyk, a former farm hand, to make their fame and fortune from their horses *Lady Suffolk* and *Hambletonian*, respectively, at a cost of less than \$250 for the two horses.⁷¹

Within two or three decades, small breeders yielded to the larger stables owned by wealthy men for pleasure, profit or both. These well capitalized stock farms gathered the best trotters. Similar to other American industries in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the concentration of talent and wealth permitted the breeding of trotting horses to become a more rationalized process. For the small breeder, the swift trotter was essentially a sideline, although an important one, to the general stud services his horses provided. Above all, the major objective was the procreation of the race and the overall improvement of the breed. In the large stables, speed was the sole objective. Using innovative techniques, the big farms “became laboratories of speed.” As one turf historian concluded, “A system of breeding that had diffused the qualities of the best sires so widely through the common horse stock was replaced by a system more narrowly concentrated but for that reason more likely to produce exceptional results.”⁷²

During the 1870s, four more critical steps were taken to rationalize the breeding industry: (1) the creation of the first turf register devoted exclusively to the trotting horse (1871); (2) the appearance of the first sporting journal, *Wallace's Monthly Magazine*, concerned primarily with trotting affairs (1875);

(3) the formation of the National Association of Trotting Horse Breeders (1876); and, (4) the establishment of a standard breed of trotting horse (1879).⁷³ By the end of this decade, the rationalization of the breeding industry solidified the ownership of the leading trotters in the hands of wealthy men. Unable to compete with the big farms, the horses of the smaller breeders found themselves confined to tracks at county fairs. The day that a horse could be removed from a butcher's cart and become a world's champion was relegated to dime novels and serials in popular magazines.

Neither the shift in the social composition of the owners of trotting horses nor changes in the breeding industry undermined the popularity of harness racing. Since the initial growth of the sport was strongly linked to the inexpensive cost of the trotter and its broadly based ownership, why did trotting continue to enjoy widespread popular appeal in the aftermath of these profound alterations? The persistent perception of the trotter as the democratic and utilitarian horse, despite the changes, played a contributory role. As late as 1884, one newspaper insisted that the "millionaire horsemen with their mammoth establishments and invested thousands, represent but a small fraction of the money employed in this special industry."⁷⁴ While the contention that the average farmer was the backbone of the sport was inaccurate, the tremendous growth of harness racing at the county fair, with its rural connotations, did give the sport a democratic aura.⁷⁵

The symbiotic relationship which already developed between the growth of harness racing, the changes in the breeding industry and the commercialization of the sport was an even more important factor. This linkage made it virtually impossible for the wealthy owners of trotters to create a sport run solely for their own class. While considerations of status contributed to elite involvement in this sport, financial concerns, for the overwhelming majority of these turfmen, were always present.⁷⁶ To offset the surging cost of trotting horses required a corresponding expansion of the economic side of the sport. Consequently, trotting men continued to welcome the public and their money from gate receipts and gambling as a means of defraying their expenses and making a profit.⁷⁷ The ongoing willingness of harness racing to cater to a broad segment of the population resulted in the perpetuation of trotting as the "people's pastime."

V

Harness racing underwent tremendous growth as a commercial-spectator sport in New York in the 1860s. The outbreak of the Civil War brought a brief pause to the general prosperity of the sport, but things were back into full swing by the Fall of 1862. During the following year, trotting in New York appeared to be one continuous stream of match races. Symbolized by a series of six races, each for \$5,000, between *General Butler* and *George Patchen*,

these match races attracted large audiences to the various courses. By 1864, the *Clipper* noted that the previous season was “Successful beyond precedent, alike in the quantity and quality of the sport which it produced.”⁷⁸

More significant for the overall development of trotting than these glamorous races was the increasing size of the purses given by the proprietors and clubs of the various tracks. The prize money tendered at the Fashion Course, for example, more than tripled, increasing from \$3,750 to \$11,500, in the years between 1862 and 1870. By the start of the 1870s, the aggregate sum of the purses offered by New York’s three leading tracks during their weekly sessions exceeded \$25,000. In addition, the proprietors scheduled other purse contests from time to time.⁷⁹ Races which went for no more than \$250 during the 1850s, and were run for about \$1,000 by the early 1860s, could go for as much as \$5,000 by the end of the decade.

An increase in the number of horses coming to the start corresponded with the rise in prize money. Whereas four horses rarely entered a race in the 1850s, this had become the norm by the early 1860s and it was not uncommon to find as many as seven horses in a contest. When there were 78 entries for the ten races held at the Fashion Course in 1864, one sporting journal called it by far the greatest number ever known for a regular meeting.⁸⁰ To facilitate the growing number of horses, the proprietors of the courses adopted the policy of sweepstake racing, long used in horse racing, with nominations to these contests sometimes coming as much as a year in advance.

The rapid expansion of harness racing not only in New York but throughout the nation during this decade, and especially after the Civil War, gave rise to several problems. According to the press, the most serious one remained the specter of the “fix.” Calling upon the proprietors of the courses to cleanse and reform trotting of its evil elements, they continued to prognosticate dire consequences if their advice went unheeded.⁸¹ Nevertheless, no significant action was taken until the Naragansett (RI) Trotting Association called a convention of track operators in late 1869. Meeting in New York the following February, delegates from forty-six tracks in fifteen states established the National Trotting Association for the Promotion of the Interest of the Trotting Turf, later simplified to the National Trotting Association (NTA).

The dual objectives of the NTA were the creation of uniform government and the prevention and punishment of fraud. To facilitate the former goal, the NTA adopted rules which would be used at all tracks in the association. To expedite the later aim, the NTA attempted to buttress the power of local authorities by creating a board of appeals which would rule on all kinds of infractions. To give muscle to this court, it made the suspension on one track applicable to all courses within the federation.⁸²

Turf historians have accepted the desire to reform the evils of the turf as the major factor behind the creation of the NTA. Although they recognized the need for changes in the institutional structure of harness racing, they perceived this development as a means to the larger end.⁸³ Since the contemporary press and these historians grossly exaggerated the degree to which races were fixed, the lofty ideals assigned by these writers must be questioned. At the time of the creation of the NTA, in fact, several individuals asked how the proprietors of the courses, who had at least tacitly accepted the fraudulent behavior even though they may not have been responsible for it, were going to lead a reform movement. Interestingly, the right of track operators to represent the "trotting fraternity" at this convention was based on their vested economic interest in the sport."⁸⁴

The formation of the NTA can be more appropriately examined as a response to what were the major problems of the turf: the inefficiency of uncoordinated local organizations and local rules to meet the needs of the proprietors of the courses and the owners of the horses. As early as 1858, *Porter's Spirit of the Times*, noting the growth of the sport, called for the creation of a national organization to govern harness racing.⁸⁵ Only with the tremendous expansion of trotting in the years following the Civil War, however, did the extant institutional structures of harness racing become incapable of meeting the requirements of the sport. Far from being a means to an end, the new institutions were ends in themselves. The creation of the NTA, to borrow a popular historical phrase, was part of harness racing's "search for order."

Trotting had long been governed solely by local rules. This system did not prove excessively unwieldy when harness racing depended mainly on match races or consisted of contests with small fields comprised largely of neighborhood horses. With the growth of the sport, the older rules became inoperative. In 1862, the Fashion Course rewrote their rules to adjust to the more numerous starters. Such a simple matter as the positioning of the horses on the track prior to each heat, heretofore left to the individual driver, now had to be codified. Moreover, races began to be handicapped to maintain competitive balance between the increasing number of trotters present on the course. In the early 1860s, New York tracks began handicapping by weight, but not until the next decade was the more efficient system of time-classification introduced. The increase in the number of tracks throughout the country was far more significant in producing homogeneity in the rules. To facilitate the easy movement of horses from course to course, standardization of the rules and regulations became necessary.⁸⁶

The NTA drew heavily on the experience of the New York tracks. Since the leading sporting journals were located in Manhattan, New York's rules were the ones published and therefore practiced on a goodly number of courses

throughout the country even prior to the convention.⁸⁷ Moreover, Isaiah Rynders, the only New Yorker on the nine man committee designated to draft the NTA's regulations, was the chairman of this group. John L. Cassady, a delegate at the convention and a leading commentator on the trotting scene, maintained that Rynders was the busiest and most influential member at the convention.⁸⁸

Rynders' presence and influence in the creation of the NTA raises further questions of those who viewed this association as a reform movement led by men in "white hats." A former Mississippi river boat gambler, the founder of the notorious Empire Club, a major New York gang, an active and influential member of Tammany Hall and a leading "shoulder hitter," he was the man, the *Times* claimed, who was most responsible for the "organized system of terrorism and ruffianism in city politics." Clearly, Rynders was the prototype (gambler, ruffian) of the individual who the press frequently complained wielded undo and a negative influence on the sport.⁸⁹ If this was the man who was leading the reform, it may be asked from whom were they reforming the turf?

Besides the necessity of uniform rules, the expansion of harness racing made it imperative that the various tracks be coordinated. For New York's major courses it was not so much a question of the need to synchronize their respective schedules as it was the growing competition from the increasing number of tracks emerging outside of Manhattan. With these courses offering good prize money to attract top notch horses to their meetings, even New York lacked the financial resources to meet the combined competition of these tracks. While New York remained the sport's capital, the virtual monopoly it had of the best horses in former days was undermined. In the years immediately following the Civil War, the proprietors of the turf in Gotham were forced to abandon their policy of arranging purse races throughout the year and adopted a more compact racing season.⁹⁰ To guarantee the presence of the best talent, the enlarged market necessitated the creation of some form of systematic scheduling to avoid conflicting engagements.⁹¹

The subsequent development of the NTA goes beyond the scope of this article. Clearly greater research into this organization, as with all phases of harness racing, is necessary. Nevertheless, the perspective drawn from the experience of New York raises questions concerning the traditional view of the formation of this federation. While New York track operators paid lip service to the need to reform the turf, the desire for order, and thereby profit, motivated them to join the national association. Through collective action they could coordinate the activities of the expanding sport, as well as buttress local authority. While the institutional reform checked some of the persistent prob-

lems confronting the turf, they were a product of pragmatic, rather than moral, objectives.⁹²

The formation of the NTA symbolized the transformation of harness racing from a premodern to a modern sport. In contrast to the informal road contests which took place in the northeastern section of the country a half century earlier, harness racing evolved into a highly organized sport, with relatively uniform rules and with contests taking place in all sections of the nation. The emergence of a trotting literature (stud books and *Wallace's Monthly Magazine*) and developments in the breeding industry (the formation of the National Association of Trotting Horse Breeders and the creation of a standard breed) in the 1870s further demonstrated the centralizing and modernizing forces at work in the sport. By this decade, one social historian noted, harness racing "had grown to such mammoth proportions and won a greater share of the public attention than any other public pastime which contributed to the enjoyment of the people."⁹³

Notes

1. For the general view of the sporting patterns of nineteenth century America, see John R. Betts, *America's Sporting Heritage, 1850-1950* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1974), pp. 10-246; John A. Krout, *Annals of American Sport* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929); Foster R. Dulles, *A History of Recreation: America Learns To Play*. 2nd Ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965), pp. 84-99, 136-47, 182-99, 223-29; John A. Lucas and Ronald A. Smith, *Saga of American Sport* (Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1978), pp. 55-302; Dale A. Somers, *The Rise of Sport In New Orleans* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972); Frederic L. Paxson, "The Rise of Sport," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 4 (Sept., 1917), 143-68.

2. For studies dealing with the changing attitudes towards athletics during the antebellum period, see John R. Betts, "Mind and Body in Early American Thought," *Journal of American History*, 54 (Mar., 1968), 797-805; Guy M. Lewis, "The Muscular Christianity Movement," *Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 37 (May, 1966), 27-28,42; John A. Lucas, "A Prelude To The Rise of Sport: Antebellum America, 1850-1860," *Quest*, 11 (Dec., 1968), 50-57; Roberta J. Park, "'Embodied Selves': The Rise and Development of Concern For Physical Education, Active Games and Recreation Among American Women, 1776-1865," *Journal of Sport History*, 5 (Summer, 1978), 5-41; Arthur C. Cole, "Our Sporting Grandfathers: The Cult of Athletics At Its Source," *Atlantic Monthly*, 110 (July, 1932), 88-96. For other works touching on this period, see Jennie Holliman, *American Sport, 1785-1835* (Durham, N.C.: Seeman Press, 1931); Sorem S. Brynne, "Some Sports In Pittsburgh During The National Period," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*, Part I, 51 (Oct. 1968), 345-68, Part II (Jan. 1969), 57-79.

3. Melvin L. Adelman, "The Development of Modern Athletics: Sport In New York City, 1820-1870," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation: University of Illinois, 1980).

4. For the purpose of simplicity and convenience the terms "trotting" and "harness racing" will be used interchangeably, although technically there are differences between the two. Trotting is a style of racing and may occur "in saddle" (the dominant form until the 1840s) or in harness. Harness racing is a method of racing and consists of trotting and pacing gait.

5. My thoughts on the characteristics of premodern and modern ideal sporting types were influenced by Eric Dunning, "The Structural-Functional Properties of Folk Games and Modern Sport," *Sportwissenschaft*, 3 (Jahrgang, 1978), 215-38; Allen Guttmann, *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), pp. 15-55. For a discussion of the usage of ideal sporting types, see Alan G. Ingham, "Methodology in the Sociology of Sport: From Symptoms of Malaise to Weber for a Cure," *Quest*, 31 (1979), 198-211. Also of value was Richard D. Brown, *Modernization: The Transformation of American Life, 1600-1865* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), pp. 3-22.

6. For the limited commercialization and modernization of horse racing prior to 1870, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 74-77, 162-65.
7. *Spirit of the Times* 1 (May 12, 1832): 26 (Mar. 8, 1856): 38.
8. I recognize that an essential characteristic of modern sport is its national dimension. Nevertheless, the evolution of sport from pre-modern to modern can be revealed at a local level. While this paper focuses mainly on the changing pattern of harness racing in New York, I have united, when necessary, my discussion of trotting there with similar developments taking place nationally.
9. For the development of harness racing during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, see Dwight Akers, *Drivers Up: The Story of American Harness Racing* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1938), pp. 27-36.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 29 (27-30); Holliman, *American Sport*, p. 121; John Hervey, *The American Trotter* (New York: Coward McCann, 1947), p. 27.
11. For the continuation of horse racing in New York, see John Hervey, *Racing in America, 1665-1865*. 2 vols. (New York: The Jockey Club, 1944), 1: 136-40, 253-60; Adelman, "Modern Athletics," p. 33. The anti-racing legislation also prohibited trotting and pacing. See *Laws of New York, 25th Session* (Albany, 1802), pp. 69-70. That the bill prohibited these sports illustrates that New Yorkers were familiar with them even prior to the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that the sport enjoyed any degree of popularity prior to 1800.
12. Hervey, *American Trotter*, p. 19.
13. For a discussion of racing and taverns on Third Avenue, see Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 30-31; Abram C. Dayton, *Last Days of Knickerbocker Life In New York* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1897), pp. 237-58; Charles Astor Bristed, *The Upper Ten Thousands: Sketches of American Society* (New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1852), pp. 23-24; *American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine* 8 (Sept., 1836): 41.
14. Until the creation of the Standard-bred light harness horse in 1879, the trotter was a "mongrel horse" although certain well recognized families, such as the Morgans, Bellfounders and Messengers, emerged in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Consequently, the trotting horse during this period was at best "a group of horse families that had a common characteristic, their ability to trot." [Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 106-9; Hervey, *American Trotter*, p. 12].
15. Frank A. Wrench, *Harness Horse Racing In The United States and Canada* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1948), p. 21; Hervey, *American Trotter*, pp. 21-2; Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 28; Dayton, *Last Days*, pp. 245-60. As late as 1847, the Harlem Course was still viewed as the beginner's school for the city's roadsters. See *New York Herald* 28 Apr. 1847.
16. Thomas Floyd-Jones, *Backward Glances: Reminiscence of An Old New Yorker* (Somerville, N.J.: Unionist Gazette Association, 1941), p. 71; Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 13; Hervey, *American Trotter*, pp. 22-23.
17. For the formation of the NYTC, see Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 37-38; Krout, *Annals*, p. 48; Holliman, *American Sport*, p. 122. Johan Huizinga saw the creation of permanent organizations as the starting point of modern sport. See his *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element In Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), p. 196.
18. For the relationship between the formation of the NYTC and the reemergence of horse racing in New York after 1821, see the speech of the president of the NYTC, *New York Evening Post* 20 May 1825. For the parallel developments in horse racing in New York, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 38-39.
19. *Spirit* 5 (Dec. 12, 1835); Henry W. Herbert, *Frank Forester's Horse and Horsemanship Of The United States and the British Providence of North America*. 2 vols. (New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1857), 2: 158. Also see *Turf Register* (Sept., 1836): 41; Dayton, *Last Days*, pp. 245-47; Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 59-60.
20. Peter C. Welsh, *Track and Road: The American Trotting Horse. A Visual Record 1820 to 1900 From The Harry T. Peters "America On Stone" Lithography Collection* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press, 1967), p. 18.
21. *Herald* 11 Oct. 1838. For popularity of trotting as a spectator sport, also see *Post* 19 Sept. 1832; *Spirit* 1 (Sept. 15, 1832), 11 (July 31, 1841): 258; *New York Spectator* 9 Oct. 1829; *New York American* 2 Oct. 1832. For discussion of the race between *Post Boy* and *John Bascombe*, see Hervey, *Racing in America*, 2: 117-19.
22. For the experience of the Beacon Course, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 56-57; Hervey, *Racing in America*, 2:99-100, 103; Harry B. Weiss and Grace M. Weiss, *Early Sports and Pastimes In New Jersey* (Trenton: The Pass Time Press, 1960), p. 124. Also see Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 152.
23. *Herald* 28 Apr. 1847. Also see *Turf Register* 14 (Apr., 1843): 227; *Spirit* 13 (Mar. 18, 1843): 25. For the decline of thoroughbred racing in New York and throughout the North following the Depression of 1837, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 57-64; Hervey, *Racing in America*, 2: 153-54.
24. Herbert, *Frank Forester's*, 2:123, 126-27. Also see, *Turf Register* 14 (Apr., 1843):216-217; *Turf, Field and Farm* 4 (June 12, 1867):387.

25. In contrast to the view that the trotter was the horse of the masses, only one New Yorker in thirty in 1826 even owned a horse and by 1853 this ratio increased to only one in twenty-three. For figures, see *Herald* 25 Apr. 1853.
26. Frank Forester maintained that prior to 1840 (or before commercialization), trotting was “as completely in the hands of gentlemen sportsmen, as the turf proper.” [Herbert, *Frank Forester’s*, 2: 158]. The evidence does not confirm this thesis. While the owners of thoroughbreds in the New York metropolitan region were from wealthy and/or eminent families, only three New Yorkers actively involved in trotting came from the city’s upper crust. To make this assessment the names of individuals involved in trotting were extracted from the newspapers and then checked against Edward Pessen’s list of the wealthiest New Yorkers in 1828 and 1845. For this list, see his article “The Wealthiest New Yorkers of the Jacksonian Era: A New List,” *New York Historical Society Quarterly*, 53 (April, 1970), 155-72. For the social composition of thoroughbred men in New York between 1821 and 1845, see Adelman, “Modern Athletics,” pp. 66-67.
27. For the involvement of men in New York’s various food markets with trotting, see Floyd-Jones, *Backward Glances*, p. 9.
28. *Herald* 16 May, 25 Apr. 1849, 30 May 1848, 21 June 1853, 4, 10 June 1859, 15 Mar. 1869.
29. Welsh, *Track and Road*, p. 75.
30. *Herald* 25 Apr. 1853.
31. For the differences in the development of harness racing in the United States and England, see Hervey, *American Trotter*, p. 19.
32. For the view of the trotter as an American development, see Robert Bonner, “Papers,” Box 12, 19 Feb. 1895, New York Public Library; Hervey, *American Trotter*, p. 20; Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 29. Harness racing also never suffered from the religious opposition which checked the growth of horse racing in various regions of the country. See *ibid.*, p. 29; Peter C. Welsh, “The American Trotter,” *American Heritage*, 23 (Dec., 1966), 31.
33. For Holmes’ statement, see Lucas and Smith, *Saga*, p. 93.
34. For the urbanization of America during the antebellum period, see Charles N. Glaab and A. Theodore Brown, *A History of Urban America* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 26; Blake McKelvey, *American Urbanization: A Comparative Perspective* (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foreman and Co., 1973), p. 14. For changing economic developments during this period, see George R. Taylor, *The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968); Douglass C. North, *Growth and Welfare. In The American Past: A New Economic History* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. 75-89; Stuart Bruchey, *The Routs of American Economic Growth, 1607-1861* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 141-207.
35. Arthur H. Cole, “Perspectives on Leisure-Time Business,” *Explorations in Entrepreneurial History*, 2nd series, 1 (Summer, 1964), 23, 27-8. It would be erroneous to perceive these commercialized “popular” amusements as being “mass” institutions. Rarely were they patronized by large number of men from the working class. Their support was overwhelmingly drawn from the middle class.
36. *Spirit* 13 (Mar. 18, 1843):25; *Turf, Field and Farm* 4 (June 22, 1867): 387.
37. *Porter’s Spirit of the Times* 1 (Oct. 25, 1856): 132.
38. For the career of *Lady Suffolk*, see John Hervey, *The Old Grey Mare of Long Island* (New York: Derrydale Press, 1936); Hiram Woodruff, *The Trotting Horse of America: How To Train and Drive Him. With Reminiscences of The Trotting Turf*. Edit. by Charles J. Foster, 19th Ed. (Philadelphia: Porter and Coates, 1874), pp. 211-47; Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 49-56.
39. For the impact of *Messenger* on American trotting, see Hervey, *American Trotter*, pp. 28-43; Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 26.
40. Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 49. Bryan’s continual ownership of *Lady Suffolk* was a rarity. During this period, most trotters, including some of the best horses, passed through several owners during their careers.
41. For Bryan’s reputation as a reinsman and his demands on *Lady Suffolk*, see Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 50. By comparing the earnings, number of races and miles raced of *Lady Suffolk* and the three competitors in the intersectional horse races of the 1840s—*Fashion*, *Boston* and *Peytonia*—the differences between trotting and thoroughbred racing can be illustrated. In a nine year career, *Fashion* won \$41,500, by winning 32 out of 36 races. In eight years, *Boston* was triumphant in 40 of his 45 contests winning \$51,700. *Peytonia* won \$62,400, although no figures were available for the length of her career or the number of her victories. Furthermore, *Fashion* raced no more than 260 miles and *Boston* no more than 324 miles during their careers. (Both probably raced much less). By contrast, *Lady Suffolk* ran at least 500 miles and quite possibly as much as 800 miles. The figures on thoroughbreds were drawn from Hervey, *Racing In America*, 2: 175-76, 217-19, 299.
42. *Porter’s Spirit* 3 (Jan. 23, 1858): 329. For the emergence of harness racing at the county fair, see Betts, *Sporting Heritage*, pp. 34-36; Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 105-8; Welsh, “The Trotter,” p. 31.

43. *Wilkes' Spirit of the Times* 3 (Sept. 22, 1860): 54, (Oct. 6, 1860): 76. For the career of *Flora Temple*, see Woodruff, *Trotting Horse*, pp. 247-335; Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 78-89.
44. *Spirit* 7 (Oct. 21, 1837): 284.
45. *New York Times* 16 Apr. 1857.
46. For the complaints of irregularities on the trotting track between 1850 and 1870, see *New York Clipper* 1 (June 25, 1853), (Mar. 25, 1854), 5 (Sept. 26, 1857): 117, 7 (June 25, 1859): 74, 6 (Apr. 9, 1859): 402, 9 (Aug. 10, 1861): 130, (Aug. 31, 1861): 154, 17 (Nov. 20, 1869): 258; *Herald* 17 Sept. 1853, 4 June 1859, 3 Aug. 1860, 25 Sept., 3 Oct., 11 Nov. 1869; *Times* 5 June 1863; *Wilkes' Spirit* 2 (Aug. 13, 1860): 360, 4 (Aug. 10, 1861): 36, 5 (Nov. 23, 1861): 184, (Dec. 7, 1861): 213, 6 (June 21, 1862): 249, (Aug. 2, 1862): 344, 7 (Nov. 8, 1862): 153, 14 (July 7, 1866): 297.
47. Restrictions of time did not permit me to investigate the accuracy of this impression, but the performance of four leading trotters—*Lady Suffolk*, *Flora Temple*, *Dexter* and *Goldsmith Maid*—during this period provides some insights. Of these trotters, *Dexter* won 92 percent of his races, *Flora Temple* 84.82 percent and *Goldsmith Maid* 79.8 percent. These outstanding records minimize the number of opportunities that they could have thrown a race and gives credence to the belief that their defeats were the product of other factors. On the other hand, *Lady Suffolk* won 54.9 percent of her races. Her record could be blamed on Bryan's mismanagement of the horse, but no one questioned his integrity. "Money grubber though he was," Akers noted, Bryan "was too jealous of his grey mare's reputation ever to throw a race." [*Drivers Up*, p. 154]. In contrast to the above horse, *George Wilkes*, a trotter of outstanding potential and in turn an immensely successful progenitor, won 39.15 percent of his races. Such a poor performance record could give credence to Hervey's contention that he "was manipulated in the most discreditable way was an open secret." Nevertheless, the same historian brought compelling evidence that his poor record could be explained as a product of other factors. He noted that *George Wilkes'* owners made great demands on the horse and that the horse regularly performed stud service in conjunction with his trotting campaigns. Furthermore, many of his defeats came at the expense of the leading trotters of his day. Finally, *George Wilkes* had a notorious reputation as a quitter and sulker, a point which this scholar readily accepts as valid. [*American Trotter*, pp. 106-8]. The winning percentages were drawn from the records in *ibid.*, pp. 453-61.
48. In his work on harness racing, Akers devoted an entire chapter, entitled "Sharps and Flats," to the crisis the fixing of races created for the sport. Nevertheless, he conceded that "Not all races, probably not most of them, were dishonestly driven. . . . Much of the ugly gossip could be set down as the malicious imagination of fanatics who looked upon racing and betting as vices." Despite the presence of this brief statement, Akers left the impression, through the choice of his chapter title and the disproportionate amount of space devoted to the fixing of races, that he believed that the manipulation of contests was a widespread practice on trotting tracks. [*Drivers Up*, ch. 11]. Harold Seymour is also guilty of the same type of analysis in his treatment of corruption in baseball. See his *Baseball, The Early Years* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 52-54. For a different view of duplicity on the diamond, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 412-420.
49. *Spirit* 30 (July 28, 1860): 298; *Turf, Field and Farm* 5 (Nov. 30, 1867): 338; *Herald* 6 Apr. 1860.
50. Woodruff, *Trotting Horse*, pp. 296-98. For a somewhat similar incident, see *ibid.*, pp. 262-63.
51. In contrast to trotting, there were almost no charges of fixing of contests in thoroughbred racing in New York between 1820 and 1870 even though jockies were professional athletes and large amounts of money depended on the outcome. Upper class control of the sport was largely responsible for the different attitudes.
52. *Clipper* 6 (Apr. 9, 1859): 402, 1 (Mar. 25, 1854), 7 (June 25, 1859): 74; *Wilkes' Spirit* 2 (Aug. 11, 1860): 356; *Herald* 4 June 1859, 6 Apr., 3 Aug. 1860.
53. *Spirit* 30 (July 28, 1860): 298. While the *Spirit* did not believe that races were fixed, it nevertheless opposed races for gate money.
54. Woodruff, *Trotting Horse*, p. 288.
55. Unlike today, where the purses are divided, albeit unequally, among a certain number of horses, the winners, in the overwhelming number of races, were rewarded the entire purse in the antebellum period. Both thoroughbreds and trotting men recognized the economic problems created by this system as early as the 1830s; however, this method of reward continued to prevail in both turf sports until after the Civil War.
56. *Clipper* 7 (July 16, 1859): 103.
57. Nothing more coherently indicates that nineteenth century writers did not understand the concept of "upset" than the absence in their works of any term which resembles in any way the meaning the term has today.
58. Seymour, *Baseball*, p. 60. For the changing style of professional drivers, see Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 152.

59. *Wilkes' Spirit* 12 (Mar. 25, 1865): 57, (Mar. 18, 1865): 41, (Mar. 11, 1865): 24. For road racing in New York between 1850 and 1870, see Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 90-92; Krout, *Annals*, p. 55; Wheaton J. Lane, *Commodore Vanderbilt, An Epic of the Steam Age* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1942), pp. 162-63; *Clipper* 18 (Apr. 16, 1870): 13.

60. For discussion of this theme, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 639-640, 709-710.

61. While there is no comprehensive list of EPPGA members, there was a register book for the year 1859-1860. It is perfectly clear that not all the signees of this book were members of the club; one being Senator Stephen Douglas of Illinois. Nevertheless, the repetition of names does indicate that the majority were. The occupation of these members were then examined in the New York City directories. Data could be found on 53 members. Of this group, 25 (47.1%) were either merchants or brokers. Twenty-three (43.3%) other members engaged in service occupations with the majority of this group (12) associated with the food and drink industry. Of the remaining five, three were lawyers and two were clerks. Biographical data on these turfmen was unfortunately limited, but what evidence does exist indicates that they originated mainly from the middle class. In only one case was a member the son of an upper-middle class New Yorker and it is perfectly evident that none of the EPPGA members came from the city's upper class. While more data is still necessary, the evidence tends to support the earlier contention that New York's road runner came mainly from the prosperous segments of the middle class. For the register book, see Elm Park Pleasure Garden Association, "Visitors Book," New-York Historical Society.

62. For background material on Bonner, see his own "Scrapbook of Newspaper Clippings, 1850-1899," 2 vols. New York Public Library; Stanwood Cobb, *The Magnificent Partnership* (New York: Vintage Press, 1945); Charles Morris (ed.), *Makers of New York* (Philadelphia: L.R. Hamersly, 1895), p. 236. Notices of Bonner's death (July 6, 1899) can probably be found in every major American newspaper.

63. Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 95. For the Bonner-Vanderbilt battle, see *ibid.*, pp. 90-104; Lane, *Commodore Vanderbilt*, p. 163; Adelman, "Modern Athletics," 112-13.

64. Bonner, "Papers," v. 1, p. 66; Hervey, *American Trotter*, p. 77; Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 95.

65. *New York Tribune* 7 July 1899,

66. Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 93; Lane, *Commodore Vanderbilt*, p. 164. While New York's upper crust were never supporters of trotting, it is doubtful that its opposition to either the sport or trotting men was as monolithic as these writers suggested. See Dayton, *Last Days*, pp. 237-58; Bristed, *Upper Ten Thousands*, pp. 23-24.

67. Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 95.

68. I found only one individual involved in trotting prior to 1870 (excluding the three noted in the 1830s, see fn. 26) who was a descendant of the city's antebellum elite. The lone case, George B. Alley, moreover, was not a product of the new respectability the ownership of trotting horses won. Involved with trotting prior to Bonner. Alley was "one of the most prominent patrons of the trotter in the Metropolis, if not the foremost among them all" between 1850 and 1870. [Hervey, *American Trotter*, p. 131]. For biographical material on Alley, see *Times* 17 Oct. 1883.

69. For a discussion of New York elites, see Frederic C. Jaher, "Style and Status: High Society in Late Nineteenth-century New York," in *The Rich, the Well Born, and the Powerful: Elites and Upper Classes in History* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1973), pp. 258-84; *idem.*, "Nineteenth-Century Elites In Boston and New York," *Journal of Social History*, 6 (Fall, 1972), 32-77. For the view that New York's upper class during the antebellum period was a stable group, see Edward Pessen, *Riches, Class and Power Before The Civil War* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1973), pp. 84-85, 146. For criticism of this view, see Whitman Ridgway, "Measuring Wealth and Power in Antebellum America: A Review Essay," *Historical Methods Newsletter*, 8 (Mar., 1975), 75; Frederic C. Jaher, "Elites and Equality In Antebellum America," *Reviews In American History*, 2 (Mar., 1974), 86-87.

70. John Elderken, "Turf and Trotting Horse of America," in *Every Horse Owners' Cyclopedia*, edit. by Robert McClure (Philadelphia, 1872), p. 553, quoted in Welsh, *Truck and Road*, p. 18; Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 168-69.

71. Akers, *Drivers Up*, p. 105. For the story of William M. Rysdyk and *Hambletonian*, see *ibid.*, 115-19; Hervey, *American Trotter*, pp. 44-88.

72. Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 168-69.

73. For a very good discussion of these developments, see Hervey, *American Trotter*, pp. 277-92.

74. The quote can be found in Betts, *Sporting Heritage*, p. 145. For the persistence of the utilitarian argument, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 118-120.

75. For the tremendous popularity of harness racing at county fairs in the immediate post-Civil War years, see Betts, *Sporting Heritage*, p. 144.

76. Until recently historians have designated wealthy participants in athletics as "sportsmen." The inference they expected to be drawn from this term was that these rich men eschewed financial considerations and were

involved in sport solely for its own sake. The evidence on New York turfmen, both thoroughbred and trotting, between 1820 and 1870 testifies to the inaccuracy of this impression. While many of these turfmen did not feel compelled to profit from their involvement, they were not out to lose money either. When they could no longer cover their costs, as had been the case with the owners of the thoroughbreds in New York in the 1840s, their involvement in the sport ceased. For further discussion of this theme, see Adelman, "Modern Athletics," pp. 65-68. For other recent challenges to the traditional view, see Steven A. Riess, "The Baseball Magnate and Urban politics in the Progressive Era, 1895-1920," *Journal of Sport History*, 1 (Spring, 1974), 41-62; Jonathan Brower, "Professional Sports Team Ownership: Fun, Profit and Ideology of the Power Elite," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, (1976), 16-51.

77. As early as 1862, the proprietor of the Fashion Course sold to a gambling "auctioneer" the right to handle all the betting on the track. For this privilege, the "pool-seller," as these gamblers were called, paid the proprietor a flat fee. See *Times* 24 July 1862. For a discussion of the "pool system" of wagering, see William H. P. Robertson, *A History of Thoroughbred Racing in America* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964), pp. 93-94.

78. *Clipper* 12 (Dec.17, 1864): 282, 11 (June 6, 1863): 63; *Herald* 11 Sept. 1862; *Times* 11 Sept 1862. 16 Oct. 1864, 8 Sept. 1865; *Wilkes' Spirit* 8 (May 2, 1863): 140, 10 (July 16. 1864): 313, 11 (Oct 8. 1864): 78-79. 12 (Apr. 29, 1865): 132-33.

79. For the figures, see *Times* 18 Mar. 1862; *Wilkes' Spirit* 22 (Apr. 16. 1870).

80. *Wilkes' Spirit* 10 (Mar. 26, 1864): 56.

81. *Clipper* 17 (Nov. 20, 1869): 258, 9 (Aug. 10, 1861): 130, (Aug. 31. 1861): 154; *Herald* Apr. 1860. 25 Sept., 9, 17 Nov. 1869; *Times* 5 June 1863; *Wilkes' Spirit* 2 (Aug. 11, 1860): 360. 4 (Aug. 10. 1861): 36, 7 (Nov. 8, 1862): 153, 14 (July 7, 1866): 297.

82. National Association For The Promotion of the Interest of The Trotting Turf. *Rules and Regulations. Adopted February 4, 1870* (Providence: Providence Press, 1870), p. 19; John Hervey . "American Harness Horse and Horsemen," in *American Harness Racing* (New York: Ralph F. Hartenstein, 1948). p. 32.

83. Hervey, "American Harness Horse," p. 32; Wrench. *Harness Horse Racing*, pp. 16-18; Akers. *Drivers Up*, pp. 161-66.

84. *Wilkes' Spirit* 21 (Jan. 29, 1870): 370-71.

85. *Porter's Spirit* 3 (Jan. 23, 1858): 370.

86. *Wilkes' Spirit* 21 (Jan. 29, 1870): 370; *Times* 12 June 1862. For a discussion of the time-classification system, see Akers, *Drivers Up*, pp. 138-39.

87. For the publication of the *New York* rules, see *Spirit* 8 (Apr. 21. 1838): 80. 11 (Jan. 29. 1842): 569, 13 (June 3, 1843): 156, 18 (May 6, 1848): 128. Dale Somers informs us that the New Orleans Trotting and Pacing Club adopted the rules used at the Beacon Course. See his. *Rise of Sport*, p. 35.

88. *Wilkes' Spirit* 22 (Feb. 26, 1870): 20-21. John L. Cassidy wrote under the name of "Larkin."

89. *Times* 14 Jan. 1885. For additional information on Rynders and his political involvement. see Alexander B. Callow, Jr. *The Tweed Ring* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1966). p. 58; Herbert Asbury. *The Gangs of New York: An Informal History Of The Underworld* (New York: Capricorn Books. 1970). pp. 43-44 Rynders was not the only man of this "ilk" to have sporting associations with the "better class." John Morrissey—the one time heavyweight champion. casino operator and member of the notorious Tweed Ring—and the creme-de-la-creme of New York society were co-partners in establishing racing in Saratoga. New York in 1863. For this connection, see Hugh Bradley, *Such Was Saratoga* (New York: Doubleday. Doran and Co., 1950). pp. 142-45; Bernard Livingston, *Their Turf: America's Horsey Set And Its Princely Dynasties* (New York: Arbor House, 1973), pp. 229-30.

90. *Wilkes' Spirit* 19 (Jan. 30, 1869); 377; *Times* 31 Jan. 1870. The newer racing schedule affected only purse races Match races. sweepstakes and some specially arranged contests continued to be held throughout the year 91. I have found no evidence that the NTA in 1870 or afterwards emerged with a *formal* racing calendar Nevertheless, the creation of systematic schedules. through the federation of local trotting clubs began in the 1870s. The first and by far the most important of these associations was the Grand Circuit established in 1873 The success of this organization "led local associations elsewhere to form similar combinations." In time. an organizational pattern emerged that remains in existence today "In a truer sense than before. harness racing became a 'national sport.' " [Akers, *Drivers Up*, p 141]

92. It is significant to note that Akers conceded that the NTA did not immediately succeed in reforming the trotting turf even though he judged the organization's effort to cleanse the sport of its abuses an overall success. [*Drivers Up*. pp. 164-65].

93. Marshall B. Davidson, *Life In America*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951). 2:35