In parallel with growing academic interest in, and research on, the history of Association football in the past three decades, there has been a developing interest in the heritage of the game. How has the interest in the heritage of football developed, and what forms has it taken? How far has the growing academic history of the game and the wider public interest in football’s heritage been connected? And what, if anything, has resulted from this interaction?

What do we mean by heritage? To distinguish this from natural heritage we should better use the term cultural heritage. Cultural heritage is the legacy of physical artefacts and intangible attributes of a group or society that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and bestowed for the benefit of future generations. Cultural heritage includes tangible culture (such as buildings, monuments, landscapes, books, works of art, and artefacts) and intangible culture (such as folklore, traditions, language, and knowledge). Tangible culture can also be termed material culture, which is the term used by the rapidly growing cross-disciplinary field of academic study, and is also the term used most widely in museums. While intangible culture is important in relation to football, this chapter will focus primarily on material culture. The key phrase to note is ‘maintained in the present and bestowed for the benefit of future generations’. Heritage is implicitly (but too often not explicitly) about choice, and is therefore highly political. What do we maintain and bestow, and why? The position of football within heritage has changed through time; as with any aspect of heritage it is not fixed, but culturally relative.

This chapter is concerned with Association football, but there is a parallel growing interest in the history and heritage of all the football codes. Nor does this chapter consider the football games which preceded Association football, for two reasons. First, these earlier games are as much the roots of some of the other codes, such as rugby, as of soccer, if indeed there is any connection between the earlier and modern games. Second, the heritage of these earlier forms of football is extremely limited. Harry Langton, the creator of what became the FIFA Collection, which was the founding collection of the National Football Museum for England, was seeking to create a collection which strongly reflected these earlier versions of the game. Indeed, the book of the FIFA Collection he created has the title 1000 Years of Football (Langton, 1996). Yet Langton was able to collect very little material culture relating to these earlier football games. This is not simply because this material had not survived. It is because these earlier football games were limited in their cultural significance, and therefore very little
material culture relating to these ever existed. Their significance has been exaggerated, as historians have sought to find the roots of Association football in the earlier ‘people’s games’, and to find a continuity with Association football, which Collins (2015) has persuasively argued, does not exist. The exception is Cuju in ancient China. This football game, played from the third century BC onwards, had such cultural significance that there is a relative abundance of surviving material culture, so much so that there is a dedicated Cuju museum in China which has a substantial collection. By comparison, for football games in England before Association football there is very little material and visual culture, beyond a few prints. There is much greater surviving material culture for other medieval pastimes and sports, such as bear-baiting and cock-fighting, which suggests that these were much more popular. For example, misericords (small wooden shelves on the underside of a folding seat in a church, installed to provide a degree of comfort for a person who has to stand during long periods of prayer), created from the mediaeval period onwards, were often ornamented with images from daily life and leisure (Remnant, 1969). Out of many thousands, there is just one misericord, dating from the fourteenth century, which features football, which is in Gloucester Cathedral. However, there are far more surviving misericords which feature other aspects of popular culture, including sport, such as bear-baiting. The second football misericord in an English church or cathedral was created in 2001, which is a representation of the then Norwich City goalkeeper Bryn Gunn making a save, to mark the 900th anniversary of Norwich Cathedral! (McFadyen, 2014). There is also far more material culture in the first half of the nineteenth century relating to boxing and cricket. These, rather than football, were the spectator sports of the pre-1863 era, not least because of their connection to gambling.

There is very little material culture for Association football until it became the game of the masses, through the development of the FA Cup, professionalisation and then the Football League, and, above all, as a mass spectator sport. From the beginning of the modern professional game, there rapidly developed a mass, commercial material culture. This can be seen, for example, from the popularity of the collectable Baines cards, aimed at boys, from 1885 onwards, of which more than 20 million were produced (Jackson, 2009a). From the 1880s, there was a wide range of football material culture aimed at the football fan. This ranged from Baines cards, priced at six for a halfpenny, to sculptures and ceramics clearly aimed at relatively affluent middle-class consumers. Football heritage, in the form of popular material culture, largely began with the modern, professional, mass spectator sport.

So what does football’s tangible heritage, its material culture, consist of? With the plethora of material culture that there is for Association football since the 1880s, how might we usefully classify it? Hardy et al. (2009) have proposed a typology of the material culture of sport. With the proviso that ‘No classification scheme can completely capture the vast material world of sport’, they offer:

- playing equipment (e.g. balls, clubs, rackets);
- venues (e.g. arenas, courts, fields, pools, rings, rinks, tracks);
- training equipment and sport medicine technology (e.g. treadmills, weightlifting machines, heart rate monitors);
- sportswear (worn by players, coaches, band members, cheerleaders, fans);
- prizes (e.g. certificates, medals, ribbons, trophies);
- symbolic artefacts (e.g. colours, flags, mascots, pennants);
- performance measurement technology (e.g. stopwatches, laser beams);
- ephemera and detritus (e.g. discarded ticket stubs, betting slips); and
- memorabilia (collections of any of the above).
This is a useful, if flawed contribution. Some of the categories are problematic. Ephemera, defined as something which has a transitory existence, is not a helpful category, as it can cut across many of the other categories, and in itself it does not define a function of the material. Detritus, defined as ‘waste material or rubbish, especially left after a particular event’ is equally unhelpful. If memorabilia is defined as ‘objects valued for their connection with historical events, culture, or entertainment’, then it is not a category in its own right, it is not a separate type of material, but is the product of collecting, whether by an individual or an institution, such as a museum. Collection would be a better term to use. The material culture of fandom is a key part of the game, but in this typology it is marginalised to sportswear – what fans wear – and ephemera, detritus, and memorabilia, if fans make a collection of their ephemera and detritus. The more major flaw is what is excluded, such as film and video, audio, photography, and the full range of the visual culture of sport, from fine art to the design of a match ticket. Further, certain types of sports artefacts are also excluded, such as toys and games in which playing the sport is simulated in some form, including computer games. The material culture of sport is thus much more varied than the typology of Hardy et al. suggest. An analysis of the classification systems used by sports museums would produce a more complete and useful typology.

Bearing in mind its limits, this typology can be used as a starting point to consider the study of the material culture of football. Very little has been written about the playing equipment for all sports, not just football (Moore, 2013: 403–4). My detailed artefact analysis of the 1966 ball was intended to show what was possible and to encourage other academic studies. I explored in detail the history of the 1966 World Cup Final ball, an undertaking which was highly revealing of the post-war relations between England and Germany. Just before the UEFA Euro 96 tournament the ball was at the centre of a ‘war’ between two British tabloid newspapers, *The Sun* and the *Daily Mirror*, to bring it back to England – from Germany – in an act of ‘cultural restitution’. I argued that:

> Football as a game has become symbolic of the popular perception of the decline of England, the relative failure of the national football team inextricably linked with our decline as a country, and the end of empire. The ball represents a supposedly more positive and hopeful past.

*(Moore, 1997: 121–3)*

There is little I would add to this analysis, except that the history of the ball could be updated and its changed significance explored since this piece was published in 1997. Since then the ball has become one of the most popular items at the National Football Museum, in both Preston and Manchester. It has appeared on television on many occasions. It had its own seat on Eurostar next to me as I took it, courtesy of Eurostar, to a major event during the FIFA World Cup Finals in 2006 at the German Sports and Olympic Museum in Cologne. It has also, for example, been photographed with Joseph S. Blatter, President of FIFA, and the Rt Hon. Gordon Brown MP, Chancellor of the Exchequer, at 11 Downing Street, in 2007. At times I have developed a relationship with it that has anthropomorphised it. We have slept in the same hotel room on several occasions. Or, rather, it has been in the same hotel room as me while I have slept (the anthropomorphising of football’s material culture is worth a study in its own right). As an object, its significance has increased greatly since it came to the National Football Museum, and this is now part of its history. Despite this example, there have been no significant academic studies of football equipment, from balls to crossbars and goalposts. There are two useful websites on the ball (www.soccerballworld.com, http://soccerballscollection.com) and a short study in the UEFA jubilee publication (Cooper et al., 2004).
In terms of football stadiums, Bale’s groundbreaking work opened up and established this as a field of study (Bale, 1993; Bale and Moen, 1995; Bale and Vertinsky, 2004; Gaffney, 2008; Frank and Steets, 2010). Inglis’s detailed studies of stadiums have great value alongside this (1983, 1987, 1990, 1991, 1997, 2000, 2005; Inglis and Miller, 1995; Foster and Inglis, 2012; see also the other titles in Inglis’s *Played in Britain* series of publications). Also of note are Twydell’s general study, his ‘Gone But Not Forgotten’ series of short publications of now defunct clubs and grounds (1991), and Arnot and Heatley’s studies of demolished stadiums (2010). Websites include the ‘Old Grounds’ section on the ‘Football Ground Guide’ site (www.footballgroundguide.com). Of particular note is the magazine, *Groundtastic: The Football Grounds Magazine*. Founded in 1995, this quarterly consists of ‘80 pages packed with articles, photos and news about League, Non-League, Scottish, Welsh, Irish and Foreign football grounds’. Glanville has written a history of Arsenal’s former Highbury Stadium (2006), there is a history of Brentford’s stadiums, of Liverpool FC’s Anfield stadium, and a photographic recording of the creation of Brighton and Hove Albion’s new ground (Chapman and Twydell, 2004; Platt, 2015; Hazlewood et al., 2011). Aerofilms has produced a number of books of football grounds from the air – then and now. All of this demonstrates the validity of Bale’s concept of topophilia in relation to football stadiums, at least in the UK – that fans have a strong affection, if not in fact love, for ‘their’ stadiums. There is also a valuable growing technical literature on sports and football stadium architecture, design, construction, and operation (Bouw and Provoost, 2000; Powell et al., 2005; Marg, 2010; Sheard et al., 2007; Nixdorf, 2008; John et al., 2013; Culley and Pascoe, 2015).

The famous English football manager Brian Clough said that ‘If God had wanted us to play football in the clouds, he’d have put grass up there’. Academics must also study the other essential for any game of football – along with a ball – a pitch. By this I mean not just the pitches of the elite stadiums of the world, or even all formal football pitches used at any level, but any piece of waste ground where children may kick a ball about. The changes in the technology of elite pitches and the development of artificial surfaces make this ripe for study, and indeed there is a plethora of papers on football pitches from a scientific and technical perspective, too numerous to list here. What is needed is studies of the pitch from a cultural and historical perspective. In 2013 the Institute of Groundsmanship undertook a heritage project, which led to an exhibition at the National Football Museum. In terms of ‘training equipment and sport medicine technology’, there is a growing scientific literature on aspects of this (see, for example, Bangsbo et al., 1996; Wesson, 2002; Reilly, 2003; Williams, 2012), but again a lack of cultural and historical studies on this theme.

In terms of sportswear, Morris (1981) offered some interesting insights. Inspired and guided by Moore’s study of the 1966 ball, Hughson and Moore undertook a study of a shirt worn by the great footballer Diego Maradona (2012). Explicitly following the model for artefact analysis developed in *Museums and Popular Culture*, this is a study of the shirt worn by Maradona in the FIFA World Cup Quarter Final match between Argentina and England in 1986, which is now on display at the National Football Museum. Again it is hoped this work will encourage further studies. These can be of the extraordinary – such as a shirt worn by a famous player in a World Cup Final – but equally the ordinary, any football shirt worn by any player, to reveal the extraordinary in the ordinary, because every football shirt has complexity through its design, manufacture, marketing, etc. Stride et al. (2015) have explored English football kit design in the replica kit era. While academics have only recently begun to look at football kits, others have been studying them for some time. There are a number of very useful websites (www.historicalkits.co.uk; www.kitclassics.co.uk; www.oldfootballshirts.com; www.truecoloursfootballkits.com; for England team kits, www.englandfootballonline.com/TeamUnif).
and publications (Bickerton, 1998; Devlin, 2005, 2006). Such is the interest in shirts among fans, that there have been at least three dedicated publications, for Everton, Chelsea, and Arsenal kits (Clearly, 2009; Sports Media, 2011; Elkin and Shakeshaft, 2014). There is also a book of the ‘worst ever’ kits and two works on the origins of club shirts around the world (Moor, 2011; Chandler, 2012; Lions and Ancelotti, 2014). In terms of wider player and fan fashion, Hughson (2015) has considered the off-the-pitch style of 1966 England World Cup winner Martin Peters, and the ‘casual’ fan style has been studied in brief (Lloyd, 1988). The non-academic book *The Fashion of Football*, on players and fans, remains an invaluable work, which should lead to further study (Hewitt and Baxter, 2004), and there should be serious rather than frivolous studies of footballers’ haircuts (Freddi, 2003). Following an earlier work, Williams has begun the academic study of the football boot (McArthur and Kemp, 1995; Williams, 2015).

Given that competition is central to football, it is perhaps surprising that the prizes – the trophies, medals, etc. – awarded for victory have been so little studied. This can only be explained by the long-standing aversion of historians to the study of artefacts. The National Football Museum commissioned Atherton to undertake a study of the Jules Rimet trophy, with particular reference to its theft in the build-up to the World Cup in England in 1966 (Atherton, 2005, 2008). There has been a study of sports awards, which included football (Russell, 2009). Symbolic artefacts (e.g. colours, flags, mascots, pennants) have been largely ignored, apart from some seminal work by Morris (1981), and a popular book on football mascots in the UK (Minter, 2004).

What Hardy et al. term ephemera and detritus has begun to be considered, in particular by Jackson, who has studied the material culture of football fandom, with particular reference to juvenile fan culture, from 1880 to 1963 (2009a, 2010, 2011). Jackson explored a range of material culture, but focused on collectable cards, postcards, comics, magazines and annuals, autographs, and toys and games. Within this, he opened up the study of the collecting instinct of football fans, which goes back to the Baines cards of the 1880s, and subsequently through postcards, cigarette cards, autographs, cards, and stickers. Other studies have considered cartoons, comic periodicals, and the *FA Book for Boys* (Huggins, 2004; Russell, 2008b). There are also studies of football fanzines and e-fanzines (Jary et al., 1991; Haynes, 1995; Millward, 2008). It is important that such studies engage with the visual design of their subject matter as much as the content. While academics have only just begun to engage with the material culture of football fandom, there are a number of well-researched works by enthusiasts on aspects of this, which Jackson drew upon in his research, on: trade cards; postcards; programmes; comics; and collectable cards, stickers, and albums, respectively (Kreiger, 1983; Ambrosen, 1989; Jovanovic, 2005; Stanley et al., 2006; Riches et al., 2009; Davies, 2010). Panini has begun to publish its back catalogue of football stickers as books and there is a history of these (see, for example, Panini, 2014; Lansdowne, 2015). Lister is an expert on this history of football programmes (1997, 2000, 2013; see also Shaw, 1980). There is a recent populist work on football annuals (Preece and Cheeseman, 2015). The depth of this existing knowledge is demonstrated by the fact that there is a dedicated website on Baines cards (www.bainesfootballcards.co.uk).

While football fans created collections of football memorabilia from the 1880s onwards, there has been a growing culture of football collecting in the past two decades. In part, almost all football fans are collectors, all will have passively acquired programmes, tickets, and the like. But the more active collecting culture which has developed from the 1990s is in part middle-aged football fans (mostly male) who now have disposable income to fill gaps in their boyhood collections, or to create new ones. This ranges from spending a few pounds at collector fairs or
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on internet auction sites such as eBay, through to the seriously wealthy collectors who spend millions of pounds. This reflects, but equally has created, the rapidly growing market for football memorabilia in the last 20 years, including auctions at Sotheby’s and Christie’s. Apart from a few initial reflections by me, this remains unstudied (Moore, 1997: 129–30). Reflecting the cultural significance of football collecting, there is a novel (Richards, 2011), and autobiographical reflections (Davies, 2009: 116–35; Roberts, 2012; Carroll-Smith, 2013).

What of those sources not included by Hardy et al. in their typology, such as: film and video; audio, including music; photography and all other aspects of visual culture; and toys and games? While the study of sport in films is a growing field (see Crosson, 2013, for a useful summary), research on football films remains rather limited. Russell’s (2004) study of the Mitchell and Kenyon football films is an excellent example of what could be achieved (see also Huggins, 2007). Audio, in the form of radio recordings, football songs, and fan chants is also largely unexplored. Yet publishers have recognised the popularity of these, and there have been a large number of ‘anthologies’ of football chants in general, and a book series of ‘Best Chants Ever’ for almost every English Premier League and Football League club, which demonstrates the strength and diversity of football chants. Very few of these publications offer any kind of insight and analysis (but see Irwin, 2006). There are also dedicated websites, such as http://terracechants.me.uk, https://fanchants.co.uk, and http://footballchants.org, the latter listing over 15,000 chants. There are also a very large number of popular publications dedicated to football folklore and sayings. Russell and Hill have explored the community singing movement of the 1920s and its relationship to FA Cup Finals, and McGuinness has considered the relationship between football and music (Russell, 2008a; Hill, 2009; McGuiness, 2009). I have considered how those studying sport from the backgrounds of cultural history, art history, and cultural studies have begun to explore the visual culture of sport, including football, whether it be fine art or the design of a match ticket (Moore, 2013: 403; and see Huggins and O’Mahony, 2011). In terms of football, groundbreaking work by Chazaud has led to the study of works of football art, such as Hughson’s analysis of C. R. W. Nevinson’s painting *Any Wintry Afternoon in England*, or Adams and Hughson’s study of John Singer Sargent’s painting *Gassed* (Chazaud, 1998; Hughson, 2011; Adams and Hughson, 2013). There has been a Ph.D. entitled the ‘Representation of Association Football in fine art in England: from its origins to the present day’ (Physick, 2011). Jackson has turned to football cartoons (2009b), Woolridge to the covers of football magazines (2010), and there is a work on football graphics (Leslie and Burgoyne, 1998). Photography is potentially a very rich source for football historians, but this has been little studied to date, whether this be documentary photography, ordinary people’s snapshots, or the work of artists on the game, such as that of Neville Gabie or Stuart Roy Clarke (see, for example, Gabie, 1999, 2004; Clarke, 1999, 2003, 2004, 2010, 2013). Brabazon has made an initial study of Clarke’s work and Wood has reflected on Gabie’s work (Brabazon, 2006: 7–40; Wood and Gabie, 2011). Jackson’s excellent work on football toys and games (2011) was able to draw upon populist works for the history of Subbuteo (Payne, 1996; Tatarky, 2004; Adolph, 2006; Willetts, 2008), an excellent website (www.peter-upton.co.uk/sub1.htm), and a comprehensive website on football toys and games (www.oldfootballgames.co.uk). There are also works on table football or foosball (Lott and Brainard, 2007, 2008). Football computer gaming is a major global phenomenon that deserves further study, beyond populist works (Macintosh and Millar, 2012). Crawford has begun this process (2005).

The study of the visual culture of football is still largely a study of the two-dimensional. There remains a reticence to consider the three-dimensional. Though art historians are more comfortable with artefacts through the study of sculpture, objects remain to a large extent outside the comfort zone of those studying football. Yet ‘history from things’ is no longer a new
Within the growing number of studies of the memorialisation of great figures in sport, especially through statues, there are a number of works which relate to football, including an analysis of the statue of Thierry Henry at Arsenal’s stadium (Thomas and Stride, 2013; Stride et al., 2013a, 2013b; for the wider process of memorialisation, see Huggins, 2002; Russell, 2006; McGuiness, 2012; for UK sporting statues in general, see Hewitt and Lloyd, 2013). Jackson’s groundbreaking study on fan material culture, with the exception of his work on toys and games, was still largely a study of the two-dimensional image rather than of the three-dimensional artefact. While there has been a special issue of the journal *Soccer and Society* on sounds and things, contributions within this on football artefacts fail to adequately engage with the ways in which football’s material culture can be analysed (Moore, 1997: 106–23; Woodward and Goldblatt, 2011).

While academics have largely ignored the material culture of the game, amateur enthusiasts, as we have seen, have engaged with it. Their research, shared on websites and in publications, is extremely helpful in enabling us to understand the variety of much of this material culture and its development. The growing interest in collecting football memorabilia is reflected in works by auction house sports specialists (Chilcott, 1995; MacDougall and McElroy, 1999; Budd, 2000). Davies’s illustrated history of the game includes chapters on the visual and material culture (2004); there is a study solely on Watford FC (Davidson, 2002); and Mortimer has sought to tell the history of football through 100 artefacts (2014). Above all, there is the online and publishing phenomenon ‘Got, Not Got: The Lost World of Football’, which began as a blog on www.mirrorfootball.co.uk. Unashamedly nostalgic in a Proustian way, the press release for the first, highly successful book in 2011 stated that ‘Got, Not Got’ starts from the premise that:

> Football used to be better in the past … and here’s the proof. GOT, NOT GOT focuses on British football’s apparent lost Utopia of the ’60s, ’70s and ’80s – the fondly remembered ‘Golden Age’ of mudbaths and cloggers, of miniature, carpet-level games and imaginary, comic-fuelled worlds. It evokes the feel and smell of football past, its rituals and relics … GOT, NOT GOT centres around the very ‘stuff’ of all our football-mad childhoods, digging out old programmes and stickers (which weren’t always sticky), dusting off everything from vintage progress charts and league ladders to antique handheld games, petrol freebies and priceless clumps of turf.

(https://gotnotgot.wordpress.com/presspage)

The first general ‘Got, Not Got’ book (Hammond and Silke, 2011) has been followed to date by dedicated works on shirts, photos submitted by readers, and 14 books on the material culture of major English league clubs. This success demonstrates the importance of football’s material culture to a generation of English fans. Nostalgia in sport is not necessarily negative (Moore, 2012: 102–4); and in any case, its power needs to be understood. It is time for academics to engage with this important part of our culture.

Academics studying football from a range of disciplines are just beginning to engage with the visual and material culture of the game. In this they are only a few years behind the museum sector. In contrast, enthusiasts and private collectors have been collecting and studying this heritage for decades, and have detailed knowledge that both museums and academics lack. Part of the issue here is that enthusiasts and collectors, even those of ‘high’ culture, have tended to be patronised by museums and academics. The museum and academia know best. At best collectors are viewed as antiquarians. Yet the collectors have a great deal of detailed knowledge about their collections. More fundamentally, without the collectors of football’s material culture, this could have been lost forever, discarded as rubbish. Many of the major sports
museums and popular culture museums are based on private collections put together by one or more individuals. The National Football Museum was founded by securing £9.3 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund to provide a permanent home for the FIFA Collection. This collection has been put together over a period of 30 years by one Englishman, Harry Langton. He had tried for over 20 years to get public museums interested in displaying his collection, or providing a permanent home for it. Only Tyne and Wear Museums in 1990 borrowed some of it for a temporary display. Langton displayed his collection at the FIFA World Cups in Italy in 1990 and the USA in 1994, when it came to the attention of FIFA. FIFA then bought the collection from him, but decided in 1997 that the planned National Football Museum in Preston would be the best permanent home. This collection, of mostly English material, recognised by the Heritage Lottery Fund at the time of its grant award as the greatest collection of football artefacts in the world, had been sold to FIFA, and could have ended up in Zurich, had not a national football museum been planned. Ironically, in opening the FIFA World Football Museum in Zurich in 2016, FIFA is having to borrow items in the FIFA Collection from the National Football Museum. Similarly, the David France Collection of Everton memorabilia, through a grant of just under £1 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund, has been publicly preserved and made available online (Dunbar, 2008; France and Prentice, 2008).

The private collectors, the enthusiasts, the ‘amateur’ researchers, have played, and should continue to play, a key role in recording and preserving football’s heritage, inside and outside the museum. The best future for football’s heritage will come from academics, non-academic experts, museums and collectors working together, in an equal partnership, recognising the complementary skills and knowledge each brings.
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