

# Sports Spectators from Antiquity to the Renaissance

Allen Guttmann\*

If we define sports as physical contests engaged in for their own sake, that is, as autotelic activities, we can plausibly assert that the Greeks invented sports because they were the first peoples to discover the pleasures of playful physical contests among adults unconcerned for any material advantage.<sup>1</sup> In other words, the Greeks were the first peoples to approach sports not merely as an aspect of cult or a preparation for warfare but as ends in themselves, activities engaged in for intrinsic as well as extrinsic motives. If we define sports in this way, we realize that the study of sports is roughly coeval with sports as an activity. The first ventures into the history of sports are remarkably ancient. The scientific study of sports is, on the other hand, essentially a phenomenon of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the whole history of the history of sports from ancient times to the present, many hundreds, if not thousands, of books have been published. Only a handful of them indicate concern with sports spectators.

The paucity of information, indeed, the rarity of references even to the existence of spectators, has not prevented journalistic and even scholarly disparagement of sports fans. In the words of a trio of sports psychologists, "The discussion of spectatorship amounts to a nearly universal condemnation of the phenomenon."<sup>2</sup> When the commentator is hostile to sports as well as to sports spectators, the denunciation can be vitriolic: "More than twenty-five million Americans," wrote a contributor to *Christianity and Crisis*, "fostered their own dehumanization each weekend last fall as fans of big-time football."<sup>3</sup> That this essay on the alleged dehumanization of sports spectators appeared in an organ of organized Christianity is in itself suggestive. In many of the modern condemnations of sports spectators one seems to hear tones of ancient wrath; one seems almost to hear the voices of the Fathers of the Church as they raged against the abominations of the Circus Maximus and the Colosseum. In the patristic diatribe of Tertullian (ca. 160-ca. 230 A.D.) one can detect the moral concern still shared by twentieth-century critics:<sup>4</sup>

\*Mr. Guttmann is a Professor in the Department of American Studies at Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts.

Look at the populace coming to the show—mad already! disorderly, blind, excited already about its bets! The praetor is too slow for them; all the time their eyes are on his urn, in it, as if rolling with the lots he shakes up in it. The signal is to be given. They are all in suspense, anxious suspense. One frenzy, one voice.

Tertullian's case against the spectators was one which Christian moralists have continued to make from his day to ours, but the most sustained and systematic of modern analyses of sports spectators have issued not from the pens of clerics, most of whom seem anxious to stride vigorously along in the path of "Muscular Christianity," but from the typewriters of Marxist or Neo-Marxist scholars who anatomize the abuses of "capitalist" sports (in the Marxist version) or of *all* sports (in the Neo-Marxist version). In addition to the ideological critique of sport spectatorship, there is a good deal of worry on the part of government officials, sports promoters, journalists, and non-Marxist scholars about sports-related crowd violence.

If one examines what has been written about contemporary sports fans by Marxists, Neo-Marxists, and non-Marxists (three categories which ought logically to account for everyone), one finds an indictment which can be summed up as follows: (1) *Sports spectators are essentially passive*. They do not participate actively in sports. They are, in economic terms, consumers rather than producers of the spectacle. In the more extreme Neo-Marxist version of this charge, it is alleged that sports spectators are "rendered apathetic, manipulated, and fragmented"<sup>5</sup> by the system of capitalist exploitation; they are infantilized and, finally, dehumanized. (2) *Sports spectators are frequently active, but their activity is destructive rather than constructive*. Surrendering their autonomy to the crowd, spectators become an unruly mob, shrieking catcalls and obscenities, throwing bottles and cans, smashing windows and overturning automobiles. Figuratively if not literally intoxicated, spectators can become hooligans whose tumults and riots have left hundreds dead. Although Marxists have sometimes referred to mob violence as a concomitant of spectator sports in capitalist society, Neo-Marxists have tended to assume the catharsis or safety-valve theory and to ignore the phenomenon of crowd violence. Most of the scholarship on riots and tumults has been done by non-Marxists.

I have argued elsewhere that the Neo-Marxist critique of spectator sports in capitalist society can be invalidated on the basis of empirical data recently gathered in both sociological and social-psychological research showing (1) that sports spectators are more likely than non-spectators to be actively involved not only in sports but in cultural activities of all kinds, including politics; (2) that spectator sports actually tend to increase the fans' hostility and aggressiveness rather than to render them apathetic or to provide them with the lucid equivalent of an Aristotelian catharsis.<sup>6</sup>

Whatever their disagreements, Marxists, Neo-Marxists, and non-Marxists have agreed, at least operationally, in their concentration on the present. Scholarship devoted to sports spectators, meagre as it is, is concerned almost exclusively with twentieth-century behavior. Reliable information about sports spectators of the past is in short supply. Even when the historical record of sports and pastimes is rather full, even in those rare cases where historians have written extensively on sports spectators, they have seldom asked the questions about social role and psychological response which are the stock in trade of modern social scientists. The historical documents themselves usually omit the information one most wants because the information was of no interest to contemporary chroniclers. Jean Froissart's multivolume history of the Hundred Years' War describes many a tournament and *pas d' armes*, like the famous one fought by Boucicaut at St. Inglevert in 1389, without saying anything at all about the spectators. When they *are* mentioned in ancient, medieval, Renaissance, or early modern documents, they are, of course, mentioned in ways historically appropriate to the age. Tertullian was obsessed by the religious faith but not with the age, sex, race, or social class of the Romans who thronged the Flavian amphitheater; Ulrich von Liechtenstein had a great deal to say about the damsels and ladies whose favor he sought and before whom he jousted, but it is unlikely that even the cleverest historian with the most sophisticated computer program can tease from his text any quantified data about rates of participation in thirteen-century sports.

These are cautionary remarks. It is difficult to discuss modern spectators and doubly difficult to speak of them in the past. Nonetheless, if one gathers information from a variety of sources and interprets it carefully, one can say a great deal. *Diligentia vincit* (almost) *omnia*.

## I

### Greek and Roman Sports Spectators

In light of the philhellenism which characterizes most modern scholarship, one must be careful of the temptation simply to announce that the Greeks were participants in sports while the Romans were merely spectators, but there is evidence to indicate that this was indeed the case. Physical excellence was part of the Greek ethos. Homer tells that Odysseus, washed ashore among the Phaiakians, was insulted by the allegation, "You are no athlete." Odysseus resents the insult and is eager to demonstrate his prowess. Xenophon relates that Socrates met a physically undeveloped youth and promptly rebuked him, ". . . what a disgrace it is for a man to grow old without ever seeing the beauty and the strength of which his body is capable!"<sup>7</sup> We cannot know from such anecdotes, nor from the Olympic and Pythian odes of Pindar, how many Greeks actually lived up to their ideals of physical excellence, but the archeological evidence suggests that sports were as important a part in Greek life as

politics or drama. Pausanias assured his readers that every *polis* worthy of the name had its gymnasium along with the agora and the theater.<sup>8</sup> At least 126 Greek cities had gymnasia. Pergamon had at least five; Athens had nine public gymnasia and many private ones.<sup>9</sup> Facilities for spectators were originally constructed near holy places, which was appropriate to the cultic aspects of early Greek athletic festivals. The first Olympic contests probably took place on leveled ground near the altars of Zeus and Hera; earth removed in the process was formed into an embankment for the spectators. It was not until the sixth century B.C. that the first stadium was constructed at Olympia.<sup>10</sup> Except for a few officials, the spectators sat or stood upon the ground, as they did in most stadia of the classical era. (The stone seats familiar to modern tourists are from Hellenistic and Roman times, as was the Leonidaion, constructed to house wealthy or politically important visitors to the games.<sup>11</sup>) In classic and Hellenistic times, cities tended to build their stadia adjacent to the gymnasia, which strongly suggests a close connection between active and passive participation in sports.<sup>12</sup>

The nature of the athletic role is in itself indicative of the relation between doing and watching. Except in militaristic Sparta and in Plato's ideal republic, modelled in part upon Sparta, athletics were usually for male citizens, whose physical perfection interested the Greeks more than women's beauty did.<sup>13</sup> Women and slaves were, accordingly, excluded from participation in the sacred athletic festivals at Olympia, Delphi, Korinth, and Nemea. Except for the priestess of Demeter, married women, if not all women, were forbidden to attend the Olympic games even as spectators.<sup>14</sup> We cannot conclude that all the throng of spectators consisted of men who were themselves active athletes, but we can be sure that the women excluded from watching were also excluded from participating.

There is evidence to indicate that professional athletes, i.e., men whose only occupation was athletic competition, came to dominate Greek athletic festivals, at least numerically. In time, Greek culture accepted even gladiatorial games fought by slaves, which certainly violated classical ideas about social roles, but this was a late development explained by Roman influence. "Greek society was ill with a sickness spread from Rome. It was an instance of the romanization of the Greek world."<sup>15</sup>

Did the romanization of Greece include the development of the unruly mob of spectators, whom Juvenal dismissed with his reference to *panem et circenses*?<sup>16</sup> For that matter, were Greek spectators an unruly lot even in the classic and Hellenistic periods? We know that the Olympic games were occasions for oratory and for poetry, that Herodotus read his history of the Persian wars from the rear portico of the temple of Zeus and that Thucydides heard him and was presumably inspired to go and do likewise,<sup>17</sup> but we have no

warrant to assume that the atmosphere was quietly literary. Olympia and Delphi, with their temples and altars and victors' statues, were sacred sites, but we cannot assume that the Greek spectators behaved with the hushed awe of the modern visitor. Upon the fragment of a vase in the National Museum in Athens, we see the spectators responding with waving arms to the chariot races held in honor of Patroklos (Book XXIII of the *Iliad*).<sup>18</sup> The mere fact that those in charge of the management of the games employed assistants who kept disorderly spectators under control implies a need for imposed restraint.<sup>19</sup>

Epictetus used attendance at the Olympic games as a metaphor for stress and duress<sup>20</sup> and Dio Chrysostom spoke in an oration of the Alexandrian crowd,<sup>21</sup>

When they enter the stadium, it is as though they had found a cache of drugs; they forget themselves completely, and shamelessly say and do the first thing that occurs to them. . . . At the games you are under the influence of some maniacal drug; it is as if you could not watch the proceedings in a civilized fashion. . . . When you enter the stadium, who could describe the yells and uproar, the frenzy, the switches of color and expression in your faces, and all the curses you give vent to?

Dio's passion matches that of Tertullian or the modern moralist appalled by mob behavior, but the question remains: have historians been justified in citing Epictetus on second-century Olympia and Dio on second-century Alexandria as evidence for the habits of spectators who lived six or seven hundred years earlier?<sup>22</sup> We are told that "Crowds at ancient Games were as partisan, as volatile, and as excitable as at any other period of time."<sup>23</sup> But that is precisely what needs to be established. It may be that the atmosphere in second-century Alexandria was unlike that of fifth-century Olympia (or Athens or Syracuse).

It is, in any event, very true that Roman were different from Greek sports. In the first place, the Romans tended to practice physical exercises rather than sports. It was not the activity for its own sake that attracted them as much as its ulterior purpose, usually military.<sup>24</sup> In general, there was hostility to Greek *agones*.<sup>25</sup> Horace reacted typically when he scornfully contrasted Greek sports to "rough Roman drill" (*Satires*, II, ii). Of the athletic events that were a basic aspect of Hellenic civilization, the Romans were attracted mostly by wrestling, boxing, and the brutal *pankration*, which combined wrestling and boxing in a fierce and occasionally mortal combat.<sup>26</sup> The sports for which the Roman are rightly remembered are chariot races and gladiatorial games, both spectator sports. While Greek literature tells us next to nothing about the spectators, Latin history and poetry are rich in references, mostly derogatory.

There can be no question about the division of roles into performer and spectator. Charioteers were as popular as the athletic heroes of the twentieth cen-

tury, but their social status was low. Although some emperors, like Caligula and Nero, sought to humiliate senators and knights (equites) by forcing them into the arena, although Nero emulated professionals and actually drove his own chariot in competitive races, Augustus “sought to enhance *virtus* and *pietas* by preserving the dignity of senators and knights, whose participation he forbade.”<sup>27</sup> Gladiators were occasionally drawn from the class of free men who volunteered to fight in the arena, but they were generally condemned criminals or prisoners of war. The Latin poets are almost always condemnatory when they mention the occasional member of an aristocratic family who entered the arena. In other words, the Greek division into free men who participated and slaves who watched was turned upside down so that the citizen became the observer and the slave performed.

The function of the games was originally religious (gladiatorial combats were instituted as part of funeral rites<sup>28</sup>), but the munera became secular and political. They were, “even in the later Republic, the best means of purchasing popular favor, and, under the Empire, of keeping the populace contented,”<sup>29</sup> which was, of course, the point of Juvenal’s satiric reference to bread and circuses.<sup>30</sup> In other words, public policy encouraged the division between participants and spectators.

Roman games were nothing if not spectacular. The more important of them lasted from daybreak to sunset. The number of participants still impresses the modern imagination. Claudius sponsored a naval battle in 52 A.D. in which 19,000 “Sicilian” and “Rhodian” warriors are said to have clashed upon an artificial lake.<sup>31</sup> Trajan’s Dacian victories were celebrated not only with the column that still stands in the Roman Forum but also with the struggles of 10,000 animals and the same number of gladiators.<sup>32</sup> The number of spectators was unsurpassed until the twentieth century. Rome’s Circus Maximus was extended and enlarged until it held 250,000, a sizable fraction of the entire urban population. In comparison, the Colosseum held a mere 50,000.<sup>33</sup> Social hierarchy took spatial forms. The emperor Claudius provided special seats for senators at the Circus Maximus; Nero provided them for knights.<sup>34</sup> Contrary to Greek custom, men and women sat together. Indeed, sometimes they used the spectacle as an opportunity for sexual adventure. In the *Amores*, Ovid describes the amorous possibilities of the Circus Maximus:

You watch the races, and I watch you—what a wonderful system!

Each of us feasting our eyes on the delights that we prize.<sup>35</sup>

When we read that the arena at Pompeii lured the audience with promises of *vela et sparsiones* (awnings and perfumed sprays), we are apt to think both of the contrasting primitive accommodations at Olympia and of the similarly luxurious boxes available in our modern domed stadia.<sup>36</sup>

Ancient fans took their roles seriously and avidly followed the fortunes of the Blues and the Greens, the Reds and the Whites. In Juvenal's words,<sup>37</sup>

The Circus has captured Rome. The roar that beats on my eardrums  
Tells me the Green has won; for you'd see the city in mourning  
Otherwise, stricken dumb as after the battle of Cannae  
When consuls lay low in the dust.

In the *Satyricon* of Petronius, one of Trimalchio's guests complains of a poor gladiatorial show and looks forward to a better one, including "a girl who fights from a chariot."<sup>38</sup> Pliny the Younger, an informed if not enthusiastic spectator, suggests that the fans often judged the charioteers' performance crassly:<sup>39</sup>

I can find nothing new or different in [the races]: once seen is enough, so it surprises me all the more that so many thousands of adult men should have such a childish passion for watching galloping horses and drivers standing in chariots, over and over again. If they were attracted by the speed of the horses or the drivers' skill, one could account for it, but in fact it is the racing-colours they really support and care about, and if the colours were to be exchanged in mid-course during a race, they would transfer their favour and enthusiasm and rapidly desert the famous drivers and horses whose names they shout as they recognize them from afar. Such is the popularity and importance of a worthless shirt.

A funerary inscription for the oil-dealer Crescens informs survivors that he was a Blue and a Thracian, i.e., a partisan of one of the two main charioteer factions and of the Thracian style of gladiator.<sup>40</sup> Crescens was a slave, but even a patron of the arts like Maecenas displayed a gossip curiosity about individual gladiators and St. Augustine's disciple Alypius suffered a setback when he ventured into the amphitheatre and was overcome:<sup>41</sup>

For so soon as he saw that blood, he therewith drunk down savageness; nor turned away, but fixed his eye, drinking in frenzy, unawares, and was delighted with that guilty fight, and intoxicated with the bloody pastime. Nor was he now the man he came [in as], but one of the throng he [joined].

His momentary paroxysm was, however, milder than that of a certain Felix Rufus, whose grief at the death of his favorite charioteer caused him to fling himself upon the burning funeral pyre.<sup>42</sup>

Small wonder that intensity of this degree led to tumults and disorders which were condemned by pagan as well as by Christian writers. Of the games given by Julius Caesar to celebrate the end of the civil wars, Suetonius wrote,<sup>43</sup>

Such huge numbers of visitors flocked to these shows from all directions that many of them had to sleep in tents pitched along the streets or roads, or on roof tops; and often the pressure of the crowds crushed people to death. The victims included two senators.

When spectators from Pompeii and Nuceria began to fight among themselves, reports Tacitus, the city of Pompeii lost for an entire decade the right to stage games.<sup>44</sup> In 390 A.D., the arrest of a favorite charioteer touched off riots that ended only when Theodosius I had the army slaughter thousands of the rioters.<sup>45</sup>

It has long been maintained that the Roman and especially the Byzantine spectators were a political and religious force. The Blue and Green circus factions have been described as political supporters of one or another emperor and as religious zealots committed to orthodox or to monophysite Christianity. Meticulous modern research has thoroughly discredited this interpretation, but revisionist scholarship leaves untouched the picture of a sport-intoxicated populace whose most fanatical fans were a constant threat to public order despite their relatively small number.<sup>46</sup> It has been estimated that the hard core of the most committed fans were organized into two *demes* of 900 (Blues) and 1,500 (Greens), each led by a *demarch*.<sup>47</sup> Although modern sociologists note a tendency for “soccer hooliganism” and other instances of spectator violence to originate in lower-class resentment, this correlation of low social status and mob behavior seems not to have held in ancient Constantinople. “. . . whatever differences in behaviour and even social class there may have been, partisans of both colours really moved in much the same world: young men with time on their hands—the *jeunesse dorée* rather than a representative cross section of the whole population.”<sup>48</sup>

Neither social privilege nor lack of direct involvement in political and religious controversy prevented the circus factions from causing an immense amount of trouble. Constantinople’s original Hippodrome was built of wood, but, after rioters had set the tiers on fire in 491, 498, 507, and 532, Justinian began reconstruction in marble.<sup>49</sup> It was apparently common in the fifth and sixth centuries for the imperial guard to be called upon to put down faction riots. In the worst of the disorders, the famous Nika revolt of 532 A.D., 30,000 were killed.<sup>50</sup> Of the citizens who defended the city of Antioch against the Persians in the year 540, Procopius remarks that they “used to fight each other in the hippodrome.”<sup>51</sup> The resemblance of Byzantine tumults to the wild celebrations of twentieth-century fans is uncanny; after a victory by one of their faction, the famed Porphyrius, the Greens “erupted into a violence that consumed all comers. . . .”<sup>52</sup> Although historians no longer believe that the Blues and the Greens placed emperors upon the throne and toppled them off again, almost at will, there is every reason to continue to believe that their passionate partisanship was a constant problem for imperial authority. One is tempted to say that the circus factions, blocked from or perhaps uninterested in opportunities to participate in sports, made a sport of rioting.

## II

### Medieval and Renaissance Spectators

Although medieval spectators were often unruly and sometimes riotous, the evidence I have thus far gathered indicates that their disorders never approached the level of tumult exhibited by Byzantine fans. The explanation for a lower level of violence lies partly in the much smaller scale of medieval sports. The grandest tournaments and the most successfully promoted archery contests were diminutive compared to the chariot races of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople. A second reason may be that the social gap between the participant's role and the spectator's was considerably narrower than in imperial Rome.

Since the sports of the Middle Ages tended to be specific to classes or to what one sports historian prefers to call *Lebenskreise*,<sup>53</sup> it is reasonable to look at sports spectators in three categories—in relation to the sports of the nobility, the bourgeoisie, and the peasantry. Although each of the three groups occasionally imitated the contests of the others (there were even tournaments of peasants staged for the amusement of the nobility),<sup>54</sup> there was nonetheless a clear distinction among classes which assigned folk games like medieval soccer to the peasantry, crossbow contests to the middle-class burgher, and tournaments to the knights and squires. It is typical of the state of historical scholarship in general that we know relatively little of the first category, more of the second, and most about the third, with which I shall begin.

For the medieval knight, the line between tournament and battlefield, between mock and real warfare, was thin and often transgressed. "Games resembled war and war resembled games."<sup>55</sup> This was Jusserand's opinion, put forth in 1901. The most detailed of recent studies of knighthood concludes that "tournaments began as mimic wars in the 12th century; wars take on the appearance of mimic tournaments in pages of Froissart in the 14th century."<sup>56</sup> The warlike features of the tournament were especially pronounced in the 12th century when the typical tournament was a melee composed of parties of knights fighting simultaneously, capturing each other, seeking not only glory but also ransoms. Small wonder that it was said of a twelfth-century tournament, "the fracas was such that God's thunder couldn't have been heard."<sup>57</sup> "It was unregulated, it was not a spectacle, and there was little in the way of romantic chivalry attached to it."<sup>58</sup> Since the tournament was not intended primarily as a spectacle, there was little provision for spectators. The typical site was a meadow or field. "The contests seem to have been in open country, featured perhaps with little woods, a bridge and a stream."<sup>59</sup> There was one anticipation of the later *lices closes*—the *recet* or place of refuge, where knights were safe from pursuit.<sup>60</sup> Those who did come to watch were likely to be knights who might suddenly, with no prior notice, decide to join the melee. This was indeed the frequently employed ruse of Phillip, count of Flanders,

who waited on the sidelines until there was opportunity to swoop down upon some exhausted combattant and bear him off for ransom. (On at least one occasion the tables were turned and the famed twelfth-century knight-errant William Marshal delayed his entry into the tournament until he saw a chance to capture Count Phillip.<sup>61</sup>) Combats of this unregulated sort were apt to be deadly. At Neuss in 1240, 60 were killed.<sup>62</sup> The violence was not always restricted to the field of combat. "In 1288 knights, disguised as monks and priests, took part in a tournament and then continued their sport with a violent robbery of the merchants of St. Botolph's market."<sup>63</sup> In the course of time, from the twelfth to the sixteenth century, as society itself became less warlike, tournaments became increasingly regulated, safer, less warlike, more pageant and less contest.<sup>64</sup> The tumultuous battles of old, with horses galloping across fields and through villages, was gradually transformed into an elegant sport, into a spectacle where crowds of glittering aristocrats gathered, where 'la grand[e] beauté de France' was on display in all its grace."<sup>65</sup> The joust between two knights became the typical form of encounter rather than the wild clash of groups. Weapons were "rebated" to prevent serious injury. By the sixteenth century, opponents were usually separated by wooden barriers ("tilts") so that head-on collisions were impossible. Since knights passed left arm to left arm, with lances held in the right hand, their weapons struck their opponents' shields at an oblique angle, which made it quite unlikely for a sixteenth-century knight to be unhorsed. (Jousts were usually determined by the number of splintered lances.)

Although it may be difficult for twentieth-century scholars to accept a trend apparently contrary to that of our own day, the spectator's role *increased* as the sport became tamer and more civilized. The importance of the tournament as a spectacle can be seen in the increasingly lengthy "lead time" between the announcement and the occurrence of a tournament. The impromptu joust never disappeared, but the grander tournaments, like modern championships, required months of preparation. For the famous combat at Smithfield in 1467, the challenge was issued two years before the principals finally engaged one another.<sup>66</sup> The growing importance of the spectators changed the nature of the site as well as the time needed for preparations. Stands and pavilions were constructed for the benefit of the spectators, with all the expected gradations by class. By the sixteenth century, the lists "were surrounded by gaily coloured tents and stands were crowded with spectators."<sup>67</sup> At the tournament at Smithfield in 1467, there were galleries for ladies and a separate building for the mayor and the other dignitaries of London; the stands for knights and squires and others of the nobility rose in three tiers, topped by the king's box.<sup>68</sup> When the site of the tournament allowed, spectators crowded into the windows and even upon the roofs of adjacent buildings, as can be seen in an early sixteenth-century miniature by Simon Bening.<sup>69</sup>

These accommodations appear clearly in medieval art, where the spectators,

especially the ladies and damsels, appear in the background but drawn almost as large as the clashing knights of the foreground. Literature is an even more useful source of information about tournament spectators. Generalizing about the twelfth-century tournament as it appears in the romances of Chrétien de Troyes and Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, one early authority remarked, with some slight distortion of the truth, that the spectators were not a “conspicuous feature at a tourney; they are not mentioned in *Erec*, *Cligés* [both by Chrétien], or the *Lanzelet* [of Ulrich]. . . .”<sup>70</sup> As early as the twelfth century, however, Wolfram von Eschenbach’s *Parzival* contained lengthy comments on King Arthur and other royalty hastening with many hundreds of accompanying damsels to see the joust between Gawan and Gramoflanz.<sup>71</sup> How realistically Wolfram wrote is hard to say. One nineteenth-century authority assures us that the tournament of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is preserved “in its most ideal form” in the poems of Wolfram and of Ulrich von Liechtenstein,<sup>72</sup> but there is fantasy enough in these poems, especially in *Parzival*, to justify skepticism about their historicity. *Le Clef d’ Amors*, a thirteenth-century adaptation of Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria*, is characterized by such mundane detail that there is little reason to doubt its testimony to the early popularity of the tournament as a spectator sport. To a young man eager for seduction, the narrator remarks, “All kinds of people come to view / This knightly sport, so why not you?” The crowd includes lovely women as well as tournament buffs.<sup>73</sup>

These tourneys, I repeat, provide  
A fitting field for you who would  
Learn the delights of womanhood.  
For many a fancy wench abounds  
Round and about the tilting grounds;  
Gaily they flock from far and near.

Although we must remain uncertain about the exact moment when the melee was tamed into a spectator sport, we have a great deal of evidence about its transformation into a pageant. Telling of the entry of Queen Isabelle into Paris in 1389, Froissart emphasizes the pageantry. When 1,200 burgesses accompany the queen from St. Denis into the city, when damsels chorus their praises, when an allegorical castle is constructed at Chatelet with a figure of St. Anne lying upon a bed, with twelve young maidens wandering among symbolic animals (a hart, a lion, an eagle symbolizing vulnerability and two forms of protective strength), when an effigy of Saladin’s castle appears, to be attacked and defended by real knights, it is clear that the demonstration of knightly prowess has been overshadowed by the spectacle in which it has been embedded.<sup>74</sup> At the famous *Pas de la Bergère* which René d’ Anjou staged at Tarascon in 1449, there was a thatched cottage occupied by a “shepherdess” and knights disguised as shepherds riding forth from pavilions disguised as cottages; the combat was “almost . . . an afterthought.”<sup>75</sup> *René’s Traicté de la Forme et Devis d’ ung Tournoy* is a compulsively detailed etiquette book

regulating exits and entrances, proper verbal formulae, and appropriate dress.<sup>76</sup> Little is said of the clash of weapons. At the *Pas de l'Arbre d' Or* at Bruges in 1468, "the tournament had become a vehicle for fantastic, even prodigal, artistic expression."<sup>77</sup> A brief quotation from a long description illustrates this fact:<sup>78</sup>

There were two entrances to the lists, one painted with a golden tree from which was suspended a real golden hammer, the other built with two towers which were filled with trumpeters during the contests. Opposite the ladies' seats was planted a pine tree with gilded trunk—the Tree of Gold itself—and a so-called *perron* with three pillars which served as a stage for Arbre d'Or Pursuivant, his dwarf, and the captive giant.

The ceremony was, of course, as elaborate as the stage set. When the Duke of Buckingham staged a tournament at Westminster in 1501, the English showed themselves capable of emulating their Burgundian mentors in these matters. The pageant cars—like modern Rose Bowl floats—were a phantasmagoria of dwarves, giants, wild men, mountains, and allegorical animals (including a unicorn who, quite conventionally, placed his head upon a virgin's lap). The actual tilting, however, was "inept."<sup>79</sup> Perhaps the most interesting tournament to illustrate the transformation from sport to spectacle was that held by Henry VIII in 1511 to celebrate the birth of a son by Catharine of Aragon. Within the vast allegorical pageant, Henry himself appeared as "Ceure loyal" while his fellow challengers, Sir Thomas Knyvet, Sir William Courtenay, and Sir Edward Neville, appeared as "Vailliaunt desyre," "Bone voloyr," and "Joyous panser" (i.e., Loyal Heart, Valliant Desire, Good Will, and Happy Thought). Perhaps the most revealing insight into the relationship of pageantry to sport is contained in the thirty-six vellum membranes of the Great Tournament Roll of Westminster.<sup>80</sup> The Roll is a pictorial representation of the tournament. The first membrane contains a heraldic device; the last contains another device and also a poem. Membranes 24-27 show Henry VIII tilting before the pavilion in which the queen sits; the remaining 30 membranes picture the entry and exit processions.

In time, literary myth exerted its influence upon what had once been a fiercely martial sport and the bloody struggles of the melee were transformed into dramatic re-enactments of the adventures of King Arthur and the knights of the Round Table, with ingeniously gorgeous stage-sets for the eager impersonations of Lancelot and Tristram, Gawain and Percival, Guinevere and Morgan la Fay.<sup>81</sup> When King René of Anjou played Arthur and his consort took the part of Guinevere, it is quite unlikely that either was in any danger. It was a moment if not an age of romance, and sport had completely disappeared into spectacle.

The sports spectators of Roman and Byzantine times were men more often than women if for no other reason than the traditional Roman emphasis upon

the domestic role of wife and mother. Women were seldom present at the savage melees of the twelfth century. The long biography of William Marshal, perhaps the most famous English knight of the century, was written shortly after his death. It describes his involvement in a dozen tournaments but mentions female spectators at only one of them.<sup>82</sup> If women were present, they were clearly not the focus of concern, but the increase in pageantry coincided and interacted with the rise of romantic chivalry and the cult of courtly love. In the poetic and the prose romance, from Chrétien de Troyes in the twelfth century to Sir Thomas Malory in the fifteenth, convention called upon the knight to serve his lady. What better way visually to demonstrate one's dedication than to carry on the fight before her very eyes? Small wonder that the lady, sitting in her pavilion, lapdog beside her upon an embroidered cushion, became the center of the artist's as well as the combattant's attention. Thus is she pictured in the tapestry *La Dame à la Licorne*.<sup>83</sup> Writing of a tournament held in 1389, the poet Eustache Des Champs, asks his knightly protagonist to "look sweetly at the angels of paradise" sitting in the stands.<sup>84</sup> Beyond a doubt, men who had themselves fought in the lists were the most informed spectators, but the interest of the women seems to have been heightened immeasurably by the fact that *their* champions were in the lists.

The men and women who sat in the pavilions were members of the ruling class. That others were anxious to watch is proven by chronicle and romance. The tournament which excluded the lower orders from the ranks of spectators as well as from the lists seems to have been rare. When Antoine, the Bastard of Burgundy, accepted the challenge of Anthony Woodville, Lord Scales, the city of London seems to have been as excited as a modern metropolis hosting a world championship. When the long-expected tournament took place at Smithfield in the spring of 1467, a public holiday was proclaimed and commoners unable to crowd into the enclosure climbed trees to obtain a glimpse of the marvelous pageantry and the rather disappointing combats.<sup>85</sup> At the tournament held in 1501 to celebrate the birth of Prince Arthur, son of Henry VII, there was a charge for admission, but attendance was far from ruined, and a contemporary chronicler reported of the standing-room-only throng that there "was nothing to the eye but only visages and faces, without appearance of their bodies."<sup>86</sup> That the Renaissance tournament lost none of its appeal can be inferred from a print of 1570 which depicts the fateful joust in 1559 in which Henri II lost his life. In order to observe the tournament held in the square in front of the "ancien hôtel royal des Tournelles" in the Quartier Saint-Antoine of Paris, the spectators filled the stands, crowded into the windows of the buildings fronting the square, and even clambered up to perch like birds upon the rooftops.<sup>87</sup> That medieval tournaments provided entertainment for the entire populace can be seen in literature as well. In his comic poem *Frauendienst*, Ulrich von Liechtenstein sends the rebuffed lover, to whom he gives his own name, off to fight a whole series of tournaments in honor of the aloof and disdainful lady. At the first of them, the whole town turns out:<sup>88</sup>

I tell the truth when I declare  
so many folks were gathered there  
there wasn't any open space  
in all Treviso, not a place  
where we could joust or that allowed  
our steeds to gallop through the crowd.  
We met upon a bridge at last  
but even there were people massed.

The joust is delayed until the magistrate can clear at least some of the spectators away. Sir Thomas Malory's account of a tournament alleged to have occurred centuries earlier, in the interregnum that followed the death of Uther Pendragon, reveals Malory's fifteenth-century assumptions about the popularity of the sport. Malory tells how the young and unknown Arthur was sent home to bring the sword forgotten by Sir Kay. The house was absolutely deserted because *everyone* had gone to see the tournament (and Arthur innocently fetches the only sword he sees, the one that he pulls from a stone, thereby proving himself Britain's rightful king).<sup>89</sup>

With crowds of spectators came the problem of crowd control. Although no sports event of the entire Middle Ages seems to have approached the level of violence reached by the more destructive Byzantine riots, there was reason enough for the gallant young man to worry about the comfort if not the safety of his female companion; as the narrator of *La Clef d' Amors* advised,<sup>90</sup>

Shield her from tread of trampling feet.  
Be on your guard, as well, to soften  
Those jostling jolts that, all too often,  
Come from people sitting near.

There were frequent outbreaks of a more serious nature. The chronicler Matthew Paris wrote in his *Historia Anglorum* of the ill will between the English and their opponents at a tournament in Rochester in 1151, "Crevit igitur ira et odium inter Anglos et alienegas."<sup>91</sup> At a tournament held at Chalons in 1274, Edward I was illegally seized by the Comte de Chalons, whom he had challenged, and a riot broke out in which several people were killed.<sup>92</sup> To prevent such bloodshed, strict rules were promulgated. The *Statuta Armorum*, published by an English committee in the late thirteenth century, reveals a high degree of worry about spectator violence. "And they who shall come to see the Tournament, shall not be armed with any Manner of Armour, and shall bear no Sword, or Dagger, or Staff, or Mace, or Stone. . . ."<sup>93</sup> Since the danger to the noble participants was considerable even in the late medieval and Renaissance tournament, controlling the spectators was seldom the primary worry.

Although the tournament lingered on into the seventeenth century, the most

typical sports event of the later Middle Ages was the archery contest. Among the oldest and most widely practiced of human activities, archery gradually detached itself from considerations of utility such as warfare and hunting and had become a more or less autotelic sport by the early fourteenth century, when the earliest guilds of crossbowmen were founded.<sup>94</sup> Modern research seems to have established the fact that late medieval crossbow guilds were not primarily military or police units. Although their members were a welcome cadre for urban defense in times of crisis when all citizens were summoned to man the city's walls, the guilds were organized as such because middle-class burghers enjoyed the sport. Ironically, guild membership sometimes exempted one from the night watch.

Although the shooting guilds were manifestations of middle-class life, there were subtle distinctions of hierarchy among them. The crossbowmen, whose patron was frequently St. George, were of relatively high status; they were officials, merchants, and sometimes even members of the nobility. The long-bowmen, under the patronage of St. Sebastian, tended to be of the same social groups but to be somewhat less affluent; they were often from the villages rather than the larger towns. Last of all in the procession marched the *nouveaux-riches* with their firearms, with images of St. Barbara.<sup>95</sup> It is likely that each of the groups took at least a spectator's interest in the feats of the others.

As crossbow guilds spread in the fourteenth century from Artois, Brabant, Flanders, and Picardy to northern France and to all of Germany, their annual meets, the *Schützenfeste*, became major festivals combining sports, drunkenness, pageantry, buffoonery, banquets, and dances. Since archery guilds were usually restricted in membership, e.g., that of Abbeville was limited to 50 regular and 25 "associate" members,<sup>96</sup> festivals were frequently occasions for many to watch while few performed. With a complicated instrument like the crossbow, one can be fairly certain that not all of those who took part as spectators were familiar with the fine points of the sport, but the least perceptive of peasants must have understood enough to have appreciated the difference between a hit and a miss, to have rejoiced when one of the local favorites hit the wooden bird customarily used as a target in the archers' rites of spring.

As was the case with tournaments, there was a tendency for the printed announcements of a competition to be broadcast ever more widely and for the great shooting festivals to be announced many months in advance. For a match in Augsburg in 1509, invitations were issued seven months in advance.<sup>97</sup> Shorter notice than for the Smithfield tournament of 1467 but long enough to allow for elaborate preparations.

Exactly as with tournaments, the element of pageantry, which by definition shifts the focus from the event itself to the event's effect upon the beholder,

became increasingly important. Just as the antics and convivialities associated with a modern college football game can become more salient than the game itself, the rituals surrounding a major shooting match often overshadowed the achievements of the archers or musketeers. The most memorable occurrence at Strassburg's famous match of May 1342 was not the demonstration of toxophilic skill but the bravado delivery of a kettle of porridge brought by water to win a wager and successfully transported from Zurich to the host city in nineteen hours. In the literature and the art commemorating the match, the kettle of warm porridge looms larger than the achievements of the contestants.<sup>98</sup> By the early seventeenth century, elaborate processions were common and woodcuts and other means of graphic representation show in loving detail who marched where and what they looked like.<sup>99</sup>

Reports about spectator violence have escaped my notice, but a certain amount of rowdy behavior must have been expected. The *Pritschenkönig* apparently combined the roles of policeman and poet-laureate; he was expected to keep order and also to provide festive verses.<sup>100</sup> On at least one occasion, at Nürnberg in 1614, the crowds attending the prize ceremony were so dense that the awards had to be handed out over their heads to the archers who were unable to reach the platform of honor. Good humor, however, seems to have prevailed.<sup>101</sup>

Since historians have traditionally emphasized the deeds of the high and the mighty rather than the "uneventful" lives of the lowly, we know more about the tournaments of the nobility and the *Schützenfeste* of the bourgeoisie than about the athletic pastimes of the peasantry. We know that some peasants ran and jumped and threw and wrestled and that others watched and cheered them, but a paucity of information makes any speculation about active and passive roles difficult in the extreme. The folk-sport about which we are best informed is the medieval ballgame which eventually evolved into soccer, rugby, and American football.

In the course of centuries, this sport changed from wild melees almost as dangerous as the early medieval tournament to ruled and regulated contests, but the process was not completed until long after the waning of the Middle Ages. Football games of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were tumultuous affairs usually played at Shrovetide or Easter and related more or less closely to the religious ceremonies celebrating spring's rebirth. In the words of one modern scholar, the participants in the game of *soule*, the French form of the sport, battled over the ball "like dogs battling for a bone."<sup>102</sup> Writing of British folk-games, a pair of British scholars, describe them as "savagely brawls" engendering "excitement akin to that aroused in battle."<sup>103</sup> That the British version of folk football did not become appreciably more civilized with the arrival of the Renaissance is suggested by Sir Thomas Elyot's condemnation

in *The Governour* (1537) of the “bestly fury, and extreme violence” of the game.<sup>104</sup> Even James I, famed for his defense of the legitimacy of English sports against the Puritans, wished to discourage his subjects from indulging in the game of football because it was “meeter for maiming than making able the [players] thereof. . . .”<sup>105</sup>

In its medieval heyday, the sport was seldom the occasion for violent outbursts of spectator violence because there were generally no spectators as such. When village competed against village, kicking, throwing, and carrying the ball across fields and through narrow streets, everyone was involved—male and female, adult and child, rich and poor, laity and clergy. In a situation of this sort, everyone is a participant. In the terms of modern sociology, there is “the absence . . . of a clearly defined and strictly maintained distinction between players’ and spectators’ roles.”<sup>106</sup> A comic illustration of this annihilation of “role separation” appears in a contemporary account of “knappen” (a folk-game similar to medieval football):<sup>107</sup>

Neither may there be any looker on at this game, but all must be actors, for so is the custom and courtesy of the play, for [anyone] that comes with a purpose only to see the game . . . is made a player. . . .

This is one way to make certain that the fans do not disturb the game.

Gradually, British football—the variety which we know the most about—became somewhat tamer and more civilized. Simultaneously, it underwent the process of modernization which specializes roles and separates the player from the spectator. The citizens of London seem to have reached this stage of differentiation in the late twelfth century, at a time when rural versions of the game were still wildly unregulated affairs. At Carneval, the young men of the city went into the surrounding fields to play ball and their elders watched. In the words of William fitz Stephen:<sup>108</sup>

seniors and the fathers and the wealthy magnates of the city come on horseback to watch the contests of the younger generation, and in their turn recover their lost youth: the motions of their natural heat seem to be stirred in them at the mere sight of such strenuous activity and by their part in the joys of unbridled youth.

Some authorities feel that one civilizing influence upon British football was the Renaissance gentleman’s penchant for Italian travel and his consequent discovery of the aristocratic Italian football game of *calcio*.<sup>109</sup> This sport was particularly popular in the sixteenth century, when Giovanni de’ Bardi wrote his *Discorso sopra il Gioco del Calcio Fiorentino* (1580). Early commentators referred to *calcio* as a *battaglia* like Siena’s *il ginoco della pugna*, but the sixteenth-century version of the game was a highly regulated contest played by teams of 27 on a rectangular field exactly twice as long as it was wide. (The Piazza di Santo Spirito in Florence was a favorite place to play.) Partici-

pation was strictly regulated. The contestants, wrote de' Bardi, should be "gentlemen, from eighteen years of age to forty-five, beautiful and vigorous, of gallant bearing, and of good report. . . ." He urged also that every gentleman-player should wear "goodly raiment and seemly, well fitting and handsome."<sup>110</sup> The reason he gave is precisely that which one expects—the participants must make a good impression upon the spectators. After all, "the fairest ladies of the City and the principal gentlemen are there, to look upon the game; and he who appears badly clad makes but an ill show. . . ."<sup>111</sup> Good looks and "goodly raiment" obviously contribute to the sports spectacle, to the show. It is an aspect of spectator sports which remains with us.

In the case of *calcio*, the strict bifurcation into players' and spectators' roles appears to have occurred simultaneously with what Norbert Elias refers to as the "civilizing process."<sup>112</sup> Although Italian sports of the Renaissance were frequently accompanied by disorders, the strict rules of *calcio* acted to restrain the players just as the spread of norms of civility helped to tame the spectators. When internalized codes were inadequate to prevent outbursts of passion, officials stepped in, on the playing field and off. One aspect of restraint was apparently the Renaissance equivalent of the cops. A contemporary print showing the commencement of a game of football in the Piazza di Sante Croce in Florence depicts the church and its square, the surrounding buildings, the rectangular playing field and the stands (divided into a pavilion for honored guests and "bleachers" for the less favored), and, surrounding the low fence which marked off the playing field, a series of pikemen.<sup>113</sup>

### III

#### Conclusions

Can one generalize about the relation ship between the distinction of the spectators' role and the level of violence associated with sports? Only with great difficulty. The relationship between spectators' role and violence is bound to be affected by many other factors, including the nature of the sport itself (some are intrinsically more violent than others), the social class which plays or watches the game (middle-class players and fans tend to demonstrate more self-restraint than their less advantaged counterparts), national character (Danes are less prone to riot than Mexicans), and the historical context (the Renaissance is usually considered to be a gentler age than the Carolingian period). Given the complexity of the sociological equation, it is probably quixotic for us to seek any kind of simple law. Specifically, there is no reason to conclude on the basis of our present evidence that role specialization in sports is invariably or even usually associated with a decrease in violence. Byzantine fans of Porphyrius the charioteer probably participated in few sports and certainly did not drive chariots; Londoners who watched Lord Scales battle the Bastard of Burgundy may have participated in archery or in

some other sport, but they were not likely to have fought a joust. In respect to chariot races and to tournaments, both were specialized into the spectator's role, but one group was frequently and the other rarely given to outbursts of sports-related violence.

Nonetheless, it may be that there is a complicated sequence of relationships in which a low level of regulation is associated with a low degree of role specialization and with a good deal of violence, by participants and by spectators. The game of "knappen" is an illustration of this. In the development of the sport, rules become more stringent in an attempt to control the violence of the players. Simultaneously, the specialization of roles, both within and without the game, becomes more marked, but the roles of player and spectator can still be exchanged so that today's observer is tomorrow's participant. At this point in the history of the sport, violence is minimized. At still another point, however, the separation of roles becomes so extreme that spectators no longer have any personal experience as players and no longer seek opportunities for participation. Lacking experience as players, the spectators lack expertise as well and now respond less to the fine points of technique and more to the thrills-and-spills side of sports, including the thrill of physical violence. Since the difference between victory and defeat is a crass one which requires no sensitivity to the subtle aspects of the sport, the full-time spectator hungers for victory, which, of course, encourages whatever on-the-field violence is necessary for that happy outcome. When those who organize the sports events actively seek out spectators for political purposes, as in Roman and Byzantine times, or for the monetary advantages that accrue to large attendance figures, as in modern commercialized sports, there will be a tendency to emphasize whatever makes the sport more attractive to the spectator who passes through the turnstile or switches on the television. An interaction is set up which increases the likelihood of violence on and off the field.<sup>114</sup>

I am not yet ready to assert that a paradigm of this sort is actually valid, but I offer it as an indication of the kind of knowledge that historians should, in brave emulation of Arthur's fearless knights, quest for.

## Notes

1. For a discussion of this definition, see my *From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), pp. 1-14.
2. D. Zillmann, J. Bryant, B. Sapolsky, "The Enjoyment of Watching Sport Contests," *Sport, Games, and Play*, ed. J. Goldstein (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1979), p. 302.
3. Eugene Bianchi, "Pigskin Piety," *Christianity and Crisis*, XXX (February 21, 1972), 31.
4. *De Spectaculis*, trans. T. R. Glover (London: Heinemann, 1931), pp. 271, 273.
5. A. Krovoza and T. Leithäuser, Foreword to Gerhard Vinnai, *Fußballsport als Ideologie* (Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1970), p. 8.

6. "Dehumanized Spectator or Active Fan?," *Journal of Popular Culture* (forthcoming).
7. E. Norman Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), p. 71.
8. Willy Zschietzschmann, *Wettkampf- und Übungsstätten in Griechenland*, 2 vols. (Schorndorf: Karl Hofmann, 1960-1961), II, 10.
9. *Ibid.*, 11-15.
10. Hans-Volkmar Herrmann, *Olympia: Heiligtum und Wettkampfstätte* (Munich: Hirmer, 1972), pp. 105-107.
11. Harold Arthur Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London: Hutchinson, 1964), pp. 136-141.
12. Zschietzschmann, *op. cit.*, I, 13; Joachim Ebert, *Olympia* (Vienna: Tusch, 1980), pp. 30-31.
13. E. Norman Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals* (London: Macmillan, 1910), p. 101.
14. Ludwig Drees, *Olympia* (New York: Praeger, 1968), p. 56. For the exceptions to the rules excluding female athletes, see Hans Langenfeld, "Griechische Athletinnen in der römischen Kaiserzeit," *The History, the Evolution and Diffusion of Sports and Games in Different Cultures*, ed. Roland Renson, Pierre Paul de Nayer, Michel Ostyn (Brussels: Bestuur voor de Lichamelijke Opvoeding, de Sport en het Openluchtlevens, 1976), pp. 116-125.
15. Louis Robert, *Les Gladiateurs dans l'orient grec* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1971), p. 263. See also Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Games and Festivals*, p. 178; Alan Cameron, *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), p. 205.
16. The reference is to the tenth satire (translated by Rolfe Humphries, *The Satires of Juvenal* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958], p. 124).
17. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, pp. 43-44.
18. Nicolaos Yalouris, ed., *The Eternal Olympics* (New Rochelle: Caratzas Brothers, 1979), p. 37 (Plate 14); Ebert, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-41 (Plate 76).
19. K. Palaeologos, "The Organization of the Games," *The Eternal Olympics*, ed. Nicolaos Yalouris, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, p. 158.
20. Quoted by Drees, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58.
21. Quoted by Harold Arthur Harris, *Greek Athletics and the Jews* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976), p. 89.
22. The question seems especially relevant in light of the fact that the same second-century quotation is used by almost every historian to make the same point about Greek spectators; see Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, pp. 157-158; M.I. Finley and H.W. Pleket, *The Olympic Games* (New York: Viking, 1976), p. 57.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
24. Martin Vogt, "Der Sport im Altertum," *Geschichte des Sports aller Völker und Zeiten*, ed. G.A.E. Bøggeng, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Verlag von E.A. Seemann, 1926), I, 161.
25. Peter L. Lindsay, "Attitudes towards Physical Exercise Reflected in the Literature of Ancient Rome," *History of Sport and Physical Education to 1900*, ed. Earle F. Zeigler (Champaign, Ill.: Stipes, 1973), p. 179; Ludwig Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, trans. J. H. Freese and Leonard A. Magnus, 4 vols. (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1908-1913), II, 122.
26. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 49.
27. Suetonius, *The Twelve Caesars*, trans. Robert Graves (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1957), pp. 75, 220-222; Wilhelm Backhaus, "Öffentliche Spiele, Sport und Gesellschaft in der römischen Antike," *Geschichte der Leibesübungen*, ed. Horst Uberhorst, 6 vols. (Berlin: Bartels & Wernitz, 1972—), II, 208-209. Ward Briggs, "Augustan Athletics and the Games of Aeneid V," *Stadion*, I (1975), 267-283.
28. Friedländer, II, 41.
29. *Ibid.*, II, 1.
30. *The Satires of Juvenal*, trans. Humphries, *op. cit.*, p. 124.
31. Friedländer, *op. cit.*, II, 75.
32. Michael Grant, *Gladiators* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1967), pp. 35-36.
33. J.P.V.D. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (London: Bodley Head, 1969), pp. 268-269.
34. Suetonius, *op. cit.*, pp. 194, 214.
35. *The Art of Love*, trans. Rolfe Humphries (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957), p. 69; see also

Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* in the same volume (pp. 109-110) and Juvenal's *Satires* (*op. cit.*, p. 35), where he castigates "the tarts who display their wares at the circus."

36. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, p. 49.

37. Juvenal, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

38. Trans. by William Arrowsmith (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959), pp. 42-43.

39. *The Letters of Pliny the Younger*, trans. Betty Radice (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963), p. 236.

40. Friedlander, *op. cit.*, II, 62.

41. Horace, *Satires* (II, vi); Augustine, *The Confessions*, trans. E.B. Pusey (London: J.M. Dent, 1907), pp. 106-107.

42. Balsdon, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

43. *Op. cit.*, pp. 26-27.

44. *The Annals of Imperial Rome*, trans. Michael Grant (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1959), pp. 311-312. The event is shown graphically in a famous Roman fresco; see Franz-Joachim Verspohl, *Stadionbanten von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Giessen: Anabas, 1976), p. 79.

45. Backhaus, *op. cit.*, II, 214-215.

46. The definitive study, already cited above, is Alan Cameron's *Circus Factions*.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 101.

49. Rodolphe Guilleard, "The Hippodrome at Constantinople," *Speculum*, XXIII (1948), 678-680.

50. Cameron, *op. cit.*, pp. 278-280.

51. Quoted by Cameron, *ibid.*, p. 125.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

53. Klemens C. Wildt, *Leibesübungen im deutschen Mittelalter* (Frankfurt: Wilhelm Limpert, 1957), p. 6.

54. Franz Begov, "Sportgeschichte der frühen Neuzeit," in Überhorst, *op. cit.*, III, 154.

55. J.J. Jusserand, *Les Sports et Jeux d' Exercice dans l'Ancienne France* (Paris: Plon, 1901), p. 12.

56. Richard Barber, *The Knight and Chivalry* (Ipswich: The Boydell Press, 1974), p. 193. See also Charles Homer Haskins, "The Latin Literature of Sport": "The major sport of the Middle Ages was war, with its adjuncts the tournament, the joust, and the judicial duel" (*Speculum*, II [1927], 238).

57. *L'Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. Paul Meyer, 3 vols. (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1901), III, 74.

58. Stephen H. Hardy, "The Medieval Tournament," *Journal of Sport History*, I, Nr. 2 (November 1974), 96.

59. Francis Henry Cripps-Day, *History of the Tournament in England and France* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1918), p. 29.

60. Jusserand, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

61. Sidney Painter, *William Marshal* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1933), p. 38.

62. Jusserand, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

63. Sydney Anglo, *The Great Tournament Roll of Westminster*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), I, 24.

64. Arthur B. Ferguson, *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1960), p. 14. Anglo, (*op. cit.*, pp. 22-23) and Maurice Keen ("Huizinga, Kilgoar and the Decline of Chivalry," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, N.S., VIII [1977], 1-20) argue that historians have exaggerated the differences between early and late tournaments and that pageantry appeared very early while hard combats continued even in the later years of the sport. Nonetheless, a difference in emphasis can be observed.

65. Jusserand, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

66. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

67. Austin Lane Poole, "Recreations," *Medieval England*, ed. A.L. Poole, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1958), II, 623.

68. R. Coltman Clephan, *The Tournament: Its Periods and Phases* (London: Methuen, 1919), pp. 76-78.

69. Illustrated in Überhorst, *op. cit.*, III, 123.

70. Kenneth Grant Tremayne Webster, "The Twelfth-Century Tourney," *Anniversary Papers by Colleagues and Pupils of George Lyman Kittredge* (Boston: Ginn, 1913), p. 230. Spectators *do* occasionally appear, e.g., *Erec et Enide*, 11.747-862 (trans. W. Wistar Comfort [London: J.M. Dent, n.d.], pp. 10-12).
71. Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, trans. Edwin H. Zeydel and Bayard Quincy Morgan (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951), pp. 275-295.
72. Felix Niedner, *Das Deutsche Turnier im XII. und XIII. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1881), p. 90. A more moderate assessment of the historicity of romance appears in Larry D. Benson's *Malory's Morte D'Arthur* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), a study which is by no means limited to Malory's version of Arthurian romance.
73. Translated by Norman R. Shapiro in *The Comedy of Eros: Medieval French Guides to the Art of Love* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), pp. 19-20.
74. Jean Froissart, *Chronicles*, trans. John Bouchier, 4 vols. (London: J. Davis, 1814), IV, 51-60.
75. Anglo, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
76. See Cripps-Day, *op. cit.*, Appendix VIII, pp. lxxvii-lxxxviii.
77. Anglo, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
80. *Ibid.*, vol. II, reproduces the entire roll.
81. Roger Sherman Loomis, "Arthurian Influence on Sport and Spectacle," *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*, ed. R.S. Loomis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp. 553-558; Ruth Huff Cline, "The Influence of Romances on Tournaments of the Middle Ages," *Speculum*, XX (1945), 204-211; Arno Borst, "Das Rittertum im Hochmittelalter—Idee und Wirklichkeit," *Saeculum*, X (1959), 213-231 (trans. Miriam Sambursky and published in Frederic L. Cheyette, ed., *Lordship and Community in Medieval Europe* [New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968], pp. 180-191).
82. Painter, *op. cit.*, p. 59; Jusserand, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
83. Illustrated in Raymond Rudorff, *Knights and the Age of Chivalry* (New York: Viking, 1974), p. 104.
84. Quoted by Jusserand, *op. cit.*, p. 141.
85. Rosamund Mitchell, *Sir John Tiptoft, 1427-1470* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1938), p. 108; *English Historical Documents*, III, ed. A.R. Myers (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1969), 1170-1174.
86. Anglo, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
87. Reproduced in Jusserand, *op. cit.*, p. 155. The same *Gestalt* appears in an early 17th-century print of a tournament in The Place des Vosges; reproduced in Verspohl, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
88. Ulrich von Liechtenstein, *Frauendienst*, trans. as *Service of Ladies* by J. W. Thomas (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969), p. 107 (stanza 515).
89. Sir Thomas Malory, *Works*, ed. Eugene Vinaver, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), I, 13.
90. *La Clef d'Amors*, cited above, p. 21.
91. Cripps-Day, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
92. Barber, *op. cit.*, p. 189.
93. Quoted in Cripps-Day, *op. cit.*, p. xxv; see also Noel Denholm-Young, "The Tournament in the Thirteenth Century," *Studies in Medieval History*, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, R.W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), pp. 257-261. The date of the Statute is in dispute.
94. See Theo Reintges, *Ursprung und Wesen der spätmittelalterlichen Schützengilden* (Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1963).
95. Roland Renson, "Leibesübungen der Bürger und Bauern im Mittelalter," in Überhorst, *op. cit.*, III, 110.
96. Reintges, *op. cit.*, p. 287.
97. Klaus Zieschang, *Vom Schützenfest zum Turnfest* (Ahrensburg: Czwalina, 1977), p. 47.
98. Hans Germann, *Der Ehrenspiegel deutscher Schützen* (Leipzig and Nürnberg: Thankmar Rudolph, 1928), pp. 87-101.
99. *Ibid.*, pp. 61-67.
100. Hermann Goja, *Die österreichischen Schützengilden und ihre Feste* (Vienna: Verlag Notring der wissenschaftlichen Verbände Österreichs, 1963), pp. 45-84.

101. Germann, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
102. Michel Bouet, *Signification du sport* (Paris: Editions universitaires, 1968), p. 257.
103. Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1979), p. 25.
104. Percy M. Young, *A History of British Football* (London: Arrow Books, 1973), pp. 48-49.
105. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
106. Dunning and Sheard, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
107. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 28.
108. "Description of the City of London (1170-1183)," *English Historical Documents, II*, ed. David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1953), 960.
109. Young, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-71.
110. Quoted in William Heywood, *Palio and Ponte* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1969), p. 166.
111. *Ibid.*, pp. 166-167.
112. See Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, trans. by Edmund Jephcott (New York: Urizen Books, 1978).
113. Heywood, *op. cit.*, facing p. 170.
114. My speculations here are based partly on my own previous work, *From Ritual to Record* (cited above), partly on the work of Eric Dunning (also cited above).

