

FURTHER THOUGHTS ON SOME ISSUES OF EARLY OLYMPIC HISTORY

BY DAVID C. YOUNG, CLASSICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE

Since publication of my book *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival*¹, a number of friends in the ISOH have sent me corrections and their thoughts about my new book; several other new studies of Olympic origins have been published; and the first reviews of my book have appeared, one of them here in our journal². Suspecting that *A Struggle for Revival* may provoke further interest and discussion, our editor, Anthony Bijkerk, has suggested that I might elaborate on some of the topics raised there, and I have agreed. For it gives me an opportunity to acknowledge corrections and points made by others who have read it, to update a few items, to correct some errors and omissions myself, and to append a list of “Corrigenda and Addenda”.

Widlund’s corrections. Ture Widlund sent me a friendly, congratulatory letter about my book--with an almost embarrassingly long list of typos and outright errors, for which I thank him heartily. Perhaps the worst is my almost incredibly careless error (pp. 148, 227, n. 1) stating that Thomas Burke (USA) won his heat and the finals of the 1896 high hurdles; it was of course Burke’s teammate Thomas Curtis who won those hurdle races, not Burke. I have it correct on page 152. Other corrections made by Widlund are incorporated into my “Corrigenda and Addenda.”

The Budapest alternative. Where my book discusses political difficulties in Athens with respect to holding the first IOC Games there, I should have mentioned the possibility that Budapest might hold that Olympiad instead, citing George Eisen’s excellent article on that topic³.

To my bibliography of original sources on the 1896 Games, I would now include some items of which I did not know when I submitted my manuscript to the press. They

would have added a few details and some variety to my reports about the actual 1896 contests?

Coubertin’s belief about French physical (and military) degeneracy. In a most cordial letter, Allen Guttmann suggests that, when I proposed that Coubertin formed his notion of French degeneracy vis-à-vis German physical readiness largely at Brookes’ prompting, I overlooked the strong tendency of the French at that time to make the same observation. Perhaps I overstated the case; but I did not say Brookes was the only influence, nor deny French input on Coubertin’s forming this conception. I stated it “did not derive only from the French sources suggested. He probably got that idea, too, mainly from Brookes” (my p. 70, emphasis added). Perhaps my word “mainly” is ill-chosen; and it should read “much of that idea, too, comes from Brookes.” But this theme recurs more frequently in Brookes’ own writings than in Coubertin’s. Since in 1889 Coubertin cites Brookes’ 1866 speech on this very theme and quotes him verbatim⁵-while no one, as I recall, has adduced a passage where he cites Taine, Le Play, or Didon for this idea⁶-I think the evidence suggests that Brookes played an important role, along with (I emphasize) general French thinking in Coubertin’s forming this vital element of his philosophy.

My erroneous statements about an AAC “boycott” of Brookes’ Olympics. Peter Lovesey⁷ kindly corrects my writing of an Amateur Athletic Club (AAC) ‘boycott’ of Brookes’ National Olympian Games (NOG). I judge that he is right, identifying a real flaw in my book⁸. Nowhere in the sources which I used was the word ‘boycott’ actually used. But I concluded that the AAC carried on an unofficial, if not explicit, boycott of the NOA Olympics partly because Lovesey’s book itself states that the AAC was cre-

ated to combat the NOA'S announcement of the 1866 NOG in London; "[The first AAC prospectus] was cobbled together with no more purpose than to thwart [Brookes'] National Olympian Association [NOA]." It appears that I read too much into Lovesey's word "thwart," and others similar there⁹. His letter now quotes John Chambers, principal founder of the AAC stating (February 1866) in a journal editorial, "We shall do all we can to promote the objects of the athletic club and the Olympian Association" (emphasis added¹⁰)."

Yet even in this very editorial, Chambers himself goes on to insist that, "There can be only one locality for the formation of such a club and that is London. The Amateur Element . . . can only hope for undivided success by making London its headquarters . . . London as a centre is . . . essential" (Lovesey, p. 20, emphasis added). These remarks openly conflicted with the first stated goal of the NOA Charter (published before the AAC was formed), to hold Games "in rotation in or near the principal cities or towns of Great Britain" (my *Struggle*, p. 33).

When Chambers insists on "one location," with the "headquarters" and "centre" in London, he surely means that the AAC should be the central "undivided" umbrella for all athletic clubs in Britain. Here he must also have consciously disputed another item in Brookes' published NOA charter: "That this Association [NOA] shall form a centre for the different Athletic, Gymnastic, Boating, Swimming Cricket, and other similar societies...." (my *Struggle*, p. 34, emphasis added). There can be only one "centre" of anything. It is as if Chambers and the AAC invited Brookes and the NOA to abandon the goals of their charter before their first Meeting (or disband). Naturally, the NOA did not accede to that suggestion; there seemed to result an open rift.

"What a blessing it would be to all concerned, or connected with amateur athletic sport, to be in a state of union one with another.... The National Olympian Association was established for this special purpose.... There is no institution in England more entitled than the N.O.A. to hold an Annual Championship Athletic Meeting. It is thoroughly representative, which the Amateur Athletic Club is not."¹¹ Lovesey's letter rightly suggests that most AAC members probably abstained from most NOA games for a variety of reasons, noting first that the leading amateurs in the AAC and in the south were university men, who competed in athletics only during regular school terms--"The summer term was for other pursuits"; and second, that "geography"--the distance from London and the remoteness of a place like Wenlock--probably dissuaded the southern athletes¹².

Thus Lovesey's point seems right, that it was not so much a policy of the AAC, but an attitude which the AAC and its traditions fostered in gentleman amateurs of the south that caused their sparse participation even in the July,

1866 London Olympics¹³, and their general absence from the others. I still doubt that the elitism of the AAC and kindred southern amateurs vs. Brookes' NOA's egalitarianism is irrelevant (see next paragraph). But I admit that I was so intrigued with the seeming paradox--that the founding and bastion institutions of amateurism (itself the cornerstone of the IOC Games for most of a century) had begun as an anti-Olympic movement--that I probably overemphasized the conflict. Naturally, I wish I could rewrite the sections where I spoke of an AAC boycott of the NOG, but cannot. I suggest that readers of my book supplant such phrases as "AAC boycott of" with words such as "AAC's indifference to."

The mechanics clause, attitudes toward social class, and the difference between Brookes (and his NOA) and elitist amateurism (and the AAC). The mechanics clause, which excluded "mechanics, artisans, and labourers" from amateur eligibility (no matter how pure of financial gain) was adopted by the AAC during its second year. But it seems to have been strictly enforced only for club membership; a few (not many) working men--tradesmen, at least--particularly from the north, actually competed in the AAC Amateur Championship meetings, as Lovesey's book notes¹⁴. Brookes and the NOA, however, never adopted the mechanics clause in any form in their amateur definition, and clearly invited working class entries.

In his review of my book, seemingly to correct my comments on the class differences between the NOA and the AAC¹⁵, Hill remarks, "Both Brookes and Coubertin had the attitude toward class that one might expect of their time and backgrounds. Although both were determined that working class men should not be excluded . . . , there was no question of mingling." To equate the background of Brookes, the son of a Shropshire country doctor, with that of Coubertin, a titled nobleman and urban Paris aristocrat, seems an exaggeration. I do not believe Brookes had the customary English attitude toward class, that is, "what one might expect" of him. To improve the lot of working class men was the explicit reason why he founded both the Wenlock Agricultural Reading Society ("with a view toward extending to the working classes those facilities and advantages which wealthier individuals can command at home"); and the Wenlock Olympian Class ("for the moral, physical and intellectual improvement of the Inhabitants of the Town & Neighbourhood of Wenlock and especially of the Working Classes," my pp. 8-9). Such concern for the working class was not "customary," and I think it separates Brookes apart from most non-working class Englishmen of his and even later days. If not unique in this respect, I think Brookes' attitude toward class was atypical. When Coubertin calls him a "Typical Englishman" he misses the mark¹⁶.

The motion for London in 1896 at the 1894 Paris Congress, and the minutes of that congress in IOC archives. A few years ago, in response to a preliminary 1987 article which I published on these topics¹⁷, Norbert Müller wrote me saying that I had mistranslated the French when I quoted the 1894 Paris Congress minutes, “The opinion of the majority of the members was in favor of London” as the location of the first games in 1896. Müller advised me that French “plusieurs” means “several,” or “some,” not “majority.” I did not mistranslate plusieurs, but Müller’s criticism was most justified. He caught me in a (rare, I hope) act of sloppy scholarship. Asked by an editor to shorten a very long article, I combined two different documents into one. My word “majority” rendered French “majorite,” not “plusieurs.” I here explain.

There are in the IOC archives two separate and different versions of the minutes of the June 19, 1894 Olympic subcommittee meeting. I here call them version A and version B. Version A, signed by “The Secretary, Maurice Borel,”¹⁸ has recently been published¹⁹. Version B has never been published. Version A reads at one point, “[S]everal people (plusieurs) had expressed the opinion that the first competition should take place in London in 1896.” But version B read, at a comparable point--before the whole paragraph was crossed out--“The opinion of the majority of the members was in favor of London” (“Le sentiment de la majorité de ses membres était en faveur de Londres”). In my 1987 article, in a note, I combined that sentence of version B with the rest of the equivalent passage in version A. I suspected that to explain the minor differences of the two related documents would not be worth the printer’s ink and my readers’ time. I was wrong, in view of my Mainz colleague’s eagle eye. I here apologize for my inexcusably sloppy scholarship; but the full force of version B’s original text (majorité) remains. And that London was, in fact, the original choice of most delegates seems confirmed by the item in the *Deutsche Turn-zeitung*, which reported that very outcome of the 1894 Paris committee meeting: “Da Paris das Datum 1900 für seine nächste Weltausstellung gewählt hat, so sollen die zweiten Spiele in der französischen Hauptstadt und die ersten im Jahre 1896 in London veranstaltet werden.”²⁰ Thus the glaring question remains; namely, why the almost successful London motion was covered up and forgotten for almost a century, until I published it in 1987 (and the IOC published version A, at least, in 1994).

The choice of Athens for 1896. On this topic, Hill’s review states, “[Young] enjoys speculation.” No, I detest it. But my chronological history needed to account, as best I could, for each critical event. If the hard facts were too few or too confusing to make a conclusion certain, I was compelled to speculate--but only if the inadequate evidence at least

pointed to a possible resolution to a difficulty. On the specific question here, how and why the “1896 Games went to Athens,” I first showed that all previous accounts of the 1894 Congress’s Athens decision are false or literally half-truths. Moreover, they contradict one another. I could not endorse some already published version, since none is true. A new explanation was needed, especially in view of these anomalies: 1) the non-sportsman Vikelas’s sudden, surprising choice as the Olympic subcommittee’s president; 2) the cover-up of the London motion--which most delegates preferred but the Anglophile, Coubertin, forthwith rejected; 3) Coubertin’s previously unknown telegram sent to Athens on June 19--in the midst of congress business; and 4) King George’s premature congratulatory telegram of June 21 (Struggle, pp. 99-103). Pondering the confused sources and those difficulties, I recalled Coubertin’s odd request that his friend Charles Waldstein meet with the Greek royal family to discuss Olympics, just before the Congress, in April 1894²¹. Therein I found a possible--not a certain--resolution to the whole matter: a pre-arranged agreement between Coubertin and the Greek royal family (with Waldstein as middle man) would explain all these anomalies.

I presented that theory, as Mr. Hill kindly notes, not as fact, but as mere speculation--along with some arguments against it (pp. 103-5). I myself am not fully convinced of my own theory, which itself has difficulties; and my many inquiries in Athens have not yet uncovered Coubertin’s June 19 telegram²². I still think a pre-congressional, pre-arranged choice of Athens is “highly likely,” as I wrote. I reckon the odds at about 80%. But that means one chance in five I am quite wrong. I will not be surprised or devastated if evidence turns up to prove my theory in error. In the meantime, if anyone can offer a better theory to explain all the difficulties--almost mysteries--mentioned above, I hope they will communicate it to me or to our journal.

Coubertin’s first contacts and meeting with W.P. Brookes.

Here, too, Mr. Hill stresses my purported love of speculation: “[Young] speculates on what [Coubertin and Brookes] may have discussed when Coubertin went to Much Wenlock” in 1890. I did not speculate at all. Rather, I translated and paraphrased (Struggle, pp. 79-80) Coubertin’s very own words about what the two men did, in fact, discuss in Wenlock: namely, 1) the 1859 Zappas Olympics²³, even the list of victors’ names; 2) the British national Olympics series, including that most important and most forgotten²⁴ London 1866 Olympiad; and 3) Brookes’ dream to revive the Olympic Games on an international basis at Athens. My note there (p. 208, n. 42) directs the doubting reader to those very words of Coubertin (most of which I later translated into English [pp. 81-82])²⁵.

In a closely related matter, Hill says that I say²⁶ that “until [Coubertin] read a packet of materials that Brookes

had sent him in 1889 he had never thought of trying to revive them [the Olympics]. Obviously, Young cannot really demonstrate this, but he does say there is no doubt about it, which seems to me more than he is entitled to . . .” Hill thereby rejects one of the major points of my book.

The question of Coubertin’s originality in conceiving an Olympic revival--or did he first get the idea from Brookes? We have now reached a crucial question, the important issues of source and priority in the ideas that resulted in our own International Olympic Games²⁷. These are issues of interest to all Olympic historians. When I finished research for my book, I knew the myth of Coubertin as sole founder of the Olympics would die hard--that some would simply denounce my conclusions almost as if heresy, and cling to their traditional beliefs, irrespective of the evidence. I doubt that Hill, an excellent scholar himself²⁸, joins that group when he brands “obviously” undemonstrable my claim that Coubertin had no notion of reviving the Olympics until after his contact with Brookes. I rather suspect that Hill wrongly thinks one cannot prove a negative, that such a demonstration could be based only on an argument from silence²⁹. But my thesis here is based on far more than an argument from silence.

Scholarly procedure compels me to conclude that Coubertin did not conceive the idea to revive the Olympics before his contact with Brookes, nor independently of him. Until cogent new evidence is found and presented (I do not deny the possibility), any contrary belief seems nearly untenable. Cogent³⁰ new evidence; “We all know it” or “it is likely” are no longer acceptable arguments. I cite the following grounds for my conclusion.

1) Coubertin makes no reference to any desire to revive the Olympics in any text that I have read or seen cited by others until November 1892 (but that is just the argument from silence).

2) Coubertin’s rival, Paschal Grousset, as a preface to his 1888 proposal for French national games, expressed admiration for the supposed versatility of the ancient tragedian Euripides:

“Why have people not yet understood that the complete man is the one who, like Euripides, can write the *Iphigeneia* with the same hand that had just won an athletic crown at the Olympic Games? Olympic Games: the word has been said. We ought to have our own.” Coubertin immediately

ridiculed Grousset, his plan, and the very idea of modern Olympics:

“[Grousset’s league] makes a great fuss, . . . it has reminiscences of the Olympic Games and visions of ceremonies at the foot of Eiffel Tower, where the Head of State will crown the young athletes with laurel....This is all a lot; it is even too much.”³¹

What Coubertin calls “too much” here is far less than his own later, famous revival proposal.

3) After visiting Brookes in Wenlock in 1890--after learning of his Olympic movement, of his Olympian Games in England, and of his international Olympic revival proposal--Coubertin wrote:

“This movement [Brookes’ British national Olympic movement] was not without use: it gave the partisans of athleticism an occasion to get together and be counted. But soon the eagerness for physical exercises manifested itself with an irresistible power. *There was no longer*³² *any need to invoke memories of Greece and to seek encouragement in the past.* They loved sport for its own sake.”³³

How could anyone already burning with the desire to revive the ancient Greek Olympic Games write, “There was no longer any need to invoke memories of Greece and to seek encouragement in the past”? I do not know. Coubertin’s obvious meaning is that the idea of reviving the Olympic Games was

(or became, prior to 1890) a needless, even useless idea, which it might be better to abandon. If others can explain this sentence otherwise, so as to still retain the idea that Coubertin wanted to revive the ancient Greek Games before 1890, before he heard of--wholly independent of--Brookes’ revival idea, let them explain it. I cannot.

Finally, 4) On 20 July, 1892, Coubertin answered some unanswered letters from Brookes. He tells Brookes about his plans for the forthcoming November “Jubilee” of his USFSA (where he first voiced his own idea of an Olympic revival); he even projects his plans for months thereafter. But he mentions nothing of any plan to propose an Olympic revival at that November Jubilee just four months after this letter. Why, if he already advocated an Olympic revival, would he not mention to Brookes--his “oldest friend”³⁴--his imminent plans to propose it? No one will deny that he already knew of Brookes’ own proposal for international Olympic Games, which the doctor had made repeatedly since 1880 onward. Brookes conveyed that plan to him so clearly that Coubertin himself--in print--reported Brookes’

HOW COULD ANYONE
ALREADY BURNING WITH
THE DESIRE TO REVIVE
THE ANCIENT GREEK
OLYMPIC GAMES WRITE,
THERE WAS NO LONGER
ANY NEED TO INVOKE
MEMORIES OF GREECE
AND TO SEEK ENCOUR-
AGEMENT IN THE PAST?

international Olympic proposal in 1890³⁵. Yet in his July 1892 letter to the doctor, Coubertin makes no mention that he planned any similar proposal. This too is an argument from silence. But was Coubertin so egotistical, calculating, and duplicitous--so coveting all the credit for himself--that in July he purposely kept Brookes in the dark about his own intention in November to reiterate Brookes' proposal? No. It is much more likely that in July, 1892, Coubertin still himself had no notion of seeking to revive the Games.

The tradition that Coubertin single-handedly conceived and founded the modern Olympic movement lies at the heart of all modern Olympic history and ideology--deeply embedded, almost subliminally, in all our minds. But there were some other people, and Brookes is one of them. Some may wonder why I suspect that Coubertin got the idea from Brookes, rather than from someone else or even independently (after and although he had heard it from Brookes) from absorbing the atmosphere of fin de siècle Europe when--many scholars would (wrongly) have us believe--there were so many Olympic revival proposals that the idea somehow almost permeated the air, so to speak. As Hills review puts it, "[I]t seems unlikely that so educated ... a man as Coubertin ... would never have come across the idea that the Games might be revived."

The false notion that there were many other Olympic revival proposals (besides Brookes' and the Zappas Games) to influence Coubertin results mainly, it seems, from a page in MacAloon's *This Great Symbol*. After some sketchy, not wholly accurate details on Brookes himself and the Greek Zappas series, MacAloon wrote:

"There were soundings closer to home, in Paris. The most important of these [was] Grousset's call for the revival of the Olympic Games. According to Gaston Meyer, Ferdinand de Lesseps . . . called for the revival of the Olympic Games in 1885. Demetrios Bikelas . . . living in Paris . . . had been associated with the Zappas Games, and he often proclaimed in print the importance of ancient Olympia. In 1889-90, Coubertin became closely associated with Fr. Didon and General Février, whom he had drawn into his movement. Both men . . . had been students at the seminary of Rondeau{x} near Grenoble, where both had been laureates of the "Olympic Games" which had taken place at that institution for over sixty years. And Georges de Saint-Clair, member of the comité and a man with whom Coubertin was about to become even more closely associat-

ed, apparently called for the revival of the Olympic Games in 1885. In short, the Olympic Idea was pressing in on Coubertin from many directions."³⁶

But these "many directions" were not nearly so many as MacAloon claims.

In fact, if one examines the actual evidence which MacAloon cites, this impressive list--his whole paragraph--goes "poof" into nothing; for he relied on unreliable sources (where he did not misread them). Not one of MacAloon's sentences here is historically accurate--not one is likely to be relevant to Coubertin's thinking or to the origin of our Olympic Games.

Apart from the Zappas Olympic revivals and Brookes' Games, where else might the idea have been "pressing in

on" him from ³⁷. What about MacAloon's list of French antecedents? Grousset? No, Grousset never really suggested reviving the Olympic Games, but merely instituting a French parallel to the Greek Olympics. His proposed games do not bear the name Olympics nor did he call them a revival. And his proposal was vehemently national, almost nationalistic, for the French alone. He did not anticipate, nor even duplicate, Brookes' and Coubertin's call for an international Olympic revival. If Grousset had had such a good idea that the baron borrowed it or tacitly already wanted to replicate it, why would Coubertin have attacked it

DESPITE MACALOON'S
CITED SOURCE (JOHN
GROMBACH), VIKELAS
HAD ABSOLUTELY
NOTHING TO DO WITH
THE ZAPPAS GAMES--OR
EVEN WITH ATHLETICS
UNTIL HE ATTENDED
COUBERTIN'S 1894 PARIS
CONGRESS.

the moment that it saw print?

Vikelas? No. Despite MacAloon's cited source (John Grombach³⁸), Vikelas had absolutely nothing to do with the Zappas Games--or even with athletics until he attended Coubertin's 1894 Paris Congress. He had never made any Olympic revival proposal, nothing that could be "pressing in on Coubertin." de Lesseps? No. Here MacAloon cites Gaston Meyer; but he badly misread Meyer. Meyer does not, in fact, say that de Lesseps proposed to revive the Olympic Games. Rather, he just says that de Lesseps merely expressed the idea "to internationalize sports." But even that is an error. Meyer himself, in turn, seems to have badly misread his own source, Georges Bourdon, who merely says that Saint-Clair, at an 1885 dinner "under the presidency of Ferdinand de Lesseps," advocated "international sporting meetings" (and that Saint-Clair again spoke out for internationalism in 1888). That is all Bourdon says--not a word about any Olympic proposal. Thus no one but MacAloon says that Saint-Clair and "de Lesseps called for the revival of the Olympic Games".³⁹ Unless better con-

temporary evidence is cited, we must conclude that no Olympic revival proposal whatsoever came from either de Saint-Clair or de Lesseps.

That leaves on MacAloon's list of candidates for French Olympic precursors that might have influenced Coubertin only the tiny-literally parochial-one-school games of the "petit séminaire" at Rondeau near Grenoble, instituted in 1832 and continued long into the present century. Though the young Catholic students at Rondeau indeed called them "Olympic Games," they did not regard their modest intramural contests as a true revival of the ancient Games. They said, rather, that their event was "in memory of" the Greek Olympics. Apparently these games never spread outside of the small Rondeau seminary, and knowledge of them seems never to have spread beyond the nearby town of Grenoble until after Coubertin's own Olympic proposal⁴⁰. Both Février and Didon attended the Rondeau seminary and participated in those Olympic Games (1837, 1851, respectively⁴¹). Both later became acquainted with Coubertin.

But was the baron's Olympic idea really influenced by either Février or Didon, or by the Rondeau Games? It is most unlikely. In his recent history of early Olympic events, Boulongne expresses astonishment that "[T]here is no trace of the Rondeau experience, either in the minutes of the USFSA, or in Coubertin's memoirs and correspondence"; for he feels that the Rondeau Games "must have come to the notice" of Parisian sportsmen (p. 37). But it seems they did not; or if they did, too late to influence the baron. I have seen no evidence that Février or Didon themselves ever mentioned the Rondeau Games in public or in print; and the book that makes them known to outsiders was not published until 1894⁴². Février and Coubertin surely came in contact within the sporting circles of Paris; but they were not close⁴³. Coubertin later became closely associated with Father Didon-but not "in 1889-1890" as MacAloon states. He did not even meet Didon until 1891-after he had visited Wenlock in 1890 and heard all about the British and Greek Olympic Games from Brookes. Didon's precedence over Brookes⁴⁴ is impossible.

Thus not one item in MacAloon's list of French candidates is a likely precursor to Coubertin's Olympic idea. The long list evaporates into nothing on examination. That leaves the two items with which MacAloon prefaced his French list, Brookes' actual Olympian Games in England and the actual Zappas Greek Olympics, which the baron

knew about through Brookes. But that is my point. Coubertin not only knew about these two Olympic precursors, he also wrote about them in print before 1892. Along with his astonishment at Coubertin's silence about the Rondeau Games, Boulongne expresses surprise that the baron "never ceased to praise Dr Brookes"⁴⁵, the creator of the Much Wenlock Games in Great Britain." Indeed, in December 1890, *before* he met Didon, Coubertin wrote, "If the Olympic Games that modern Greece could not bring back to life are revived today, we are indebted not to a Greek, but to Dr W.P. Brookes." And in 1897 he still praised Brookes, even mentioning Brookes' 1880's international Olympic Games revival proposals. But he indeed "ceased to praise Dr Brookes" in 1908, when he badly misrepresented

Brookes' intentions and activities, veiling all Brookes' Olympic Games and proposals in complete silence (see below). And in 1932 he erased all record of Brookes from popular Olympic history, by simply forgetting all about him in his *Mémoires olympiques*⁴⁶.

But perhaps Coubertin's early writings tell us something about where and from whom the baron first got the Olympic revival idea. If we exclude Grousset's abortive proposal for nameless national games that would parallel the Olympics, no one has so far cited a contemporary document to prove that Coubertin either had the idea of an Olympic revival or knew it from

anyone else before 1892-yet in 1890 he credited Brookes with actual "Olympic Games. . . revived today." Of course, in 1908 the baron claimed that he, Coubertin, had conceived the idea all by himself, at some "unknown" time ("when. . . I could not say"), with no influence from anyone else. But so also in 1908-termining Brookes "from another age"-he falsely implied that Brookes' games (he carefully avoids the word "Olympic" or "Olympian") never spread beyond his 'little village,' and consisted of nothing but "popular sports," "half-ancient, half-mediaeval," such as "pig-sticking." He omits all mention of Brookes' emphasis on contemporary track and field athletics, his leading role in 19th century British sporting affairs, his 1866 London National Olympiad, his international Olympic proposals, of anything that might put Brookes in a modern and favorable light: just "pig-sticking" for local "farmers." If the baron can misrepresent his knowledge of Brookes' activity that much, he might well misrepresent how he himself first conceived the Olympic revival idea⁴⁷.

Of all the early proposers of Olympic revivals, only

OF ALL THE EARLY
PROPOSERS OF OLYMPIC
REVIVALS, ONLY
BROOKES, LIKE
COUBERTIN, PROPOSED
AN INTERNATIONAL
OLYMPIC REVIVAL.

Brookes, like Coubertin, proposed an *international* Olympic revival, and Coubertin had been to Wenlock (not mid-century Montreal or Grousset's phantom French games). To deny that his visit with Brookes in 1890 could have influenced Coubertin in 1892 seems obstinate, if not illogical⁴⁸. Thus the present state of evidence compels me to believe that Coubertin did not conceive the international Olympic revival idea before he heard it from Brookes, and to suspect that he probably got it from Brookes, certainly more there than from anyone else or from supposed childhood reveries about ancient Olympia (about which place Coubertin never really seemed to know much or care).⁴⁹ Yet Coubertin is indeed the *renovateur* to deny or affirm his originality is probably not even the cardinal question.

Hill broaches that cardinal question as he concludes his critique of my thesis in *Struggle*, almost conceding that Brookes might have played a role in Coubertin's thinking: "Even if the idea came to him, as if out of the blue, through his links with Brookes, what was it that made Coubertin devote his considerable energy to the project? Can it really be traced back to attending village games in the pouring rain in Shropshire?" "[T]hrough his links with Brookes" is not "out of the blue"; yet "out of the blue" seems to be how Coubertin finally made his own first Olympic revival proposal. My book leaves an important question unanswered—I avoided speculating about it, for I do not yet have a clue. Why, sometime between July 20, 1892 (the date of his letter to Brookes) and November 10, 1892 (the date of his first proposal at the USFSA Jubilee) did the baron suddenly change his 1890 opinion that there was no need for modern Olympics, and decide not only to propose but also to spearhead the idea of an international Olympic revival? To me, at least, that remains perhaps the biggest mystery of all about the founding of our Olympic Games. Maybe we will never resolve it, nor Hill's even more important corollary: "[W]hat was it that made Coubertin devote his considerable energy to the project? But devote his energy he did—and he succeeded, as I stress in the sentence that prefaces the concluding paragraphs of my *Struggle* book: "But Coubertin succeeded where the other two [Soutsos and Brookes] appeared to have failed."

Coubertin's zeal and contribution. Akin to Hill's words about Coubertin's devotion of energy are Tony Bijkerk's in a letter to me, where he stresses "[Coubertin's] drive for suc-

cess." Yet Bijkerk's sentence continues, noting that Coubertin's "drive for success with 'his' Olympic Games is still unsurpassed, only equalled by Dr. W.P. Brookes." He adds that this is merely his "personal opinion." But it is highly perceptive, and confirmed elsewhere. So Fernand Landry wrote me that he especially enjoyed the two references in my *Struggle* (pp. 61, 160) to the Irish political activist, Daniel O'Connell. In the second of these, the baron's close friend, William Sloane states, "[T]he power of O'Connell was in [Coubertin], and he adopted the great reformer's motto: 'agitate, agitate, and then agitate'." In the first, Brookes quotes O'Connell's pledge to keep hammering away for his cause, then says that he himself, like the Irish activist, "shall hammer on." This explicit association of both

Brookes' and Coubertin's dedication with O'Connell's reforming zeal reminds us that Brookes brought as much zeal, devoted as much 'energy to the [Olympic] project,' and had the same "drive for success" as Coubertin. Coubertin succeeded; Brookes essentially failed. In my conclusion I suggested the main reason for that difference is that Brookes was too far ahead of his times, while Coubertin was at the very forefront of his. But Coubertin indeed should be credited with originality in one very important respect.

Although I think Brookes, not Coubertin, must be credited with first conceiving and initiating our

movement for international Olympic Games, their proposals were not exactly the same. Probably realizing that international Olympics were not likely to succeed anywhere in 1880, but there was a chance, at least, in Greece (where there already was a strong modern Olympic tradition, Brookes proposed that the Games and the movement have their "centre" in Athens. Coubertin's 1890's intent to internationalize the sites, as well as the athletes, was a first, significantly different. His "ambulatory" plan sought to move the Games around the great cities of the world. When Brookes learned of it in 1894, he perceived that it improved on his own proposals of the 1880s, and wrote to Coubertin: "[Your] plan. . . embracing as it does all nations, is a really superb one."⁵⁰

Some adamant Coubertin devotees might wrongly think my book is an attempt to expose or to discredit Coubertin. It is not. Far from it. I probably could have written such a book. But to do so would have been a disservice not only to Coubertin but—more importantly—also to truth and Olympic history. I believe Coubertin, though not a demi-

ALTHOUGH I THINK
BROOKES, NOT
COUBERTIN, MUST BE
CREDITED WITH FIRST
CONCEIVING AND INITI-
ATING OUR MOVEMENT
FOR INTERNATIONAL
OLYMPIC GAMES, THEIR
PROPOSALS WERE NOT
EXACTLY THE SAME.

god, was a truly great man, a giant, whose imperfections would have been endearing had they not confused Olympic history and obscured the contributions of Brookes and some prescient Greeks, such as Soutsos and Zappas. My book never denies Coubertin's critical role as *renovateur* (I merely argue that a few others besides Coubertin contributed, too, and deserve a similar title). My conclusion (Struggle, pp. 167-169) repeatedly emphasizes that point: "In 1896 Coubertin and the Greeks had surpassed anything their predecessors could have dreamed." "Much of the credit must go to Coubertin. He first formulated the principle, all sports, all nations, all people; he believed it in his heart and adhered to it in his acts. It proved to be the formula that succeeded then and succeeds today." I even went so far as to call Coubertin our Olympic "savior": "Despite the baron's shortcomings in sharing credit with others and his inactivity in 1895, his 1894 congress and his worldwide vision of Olympics aimed at 'all sports for all people' might earn him yet another title, namely, *sauveur*, savior of the Olympic movement and its long-term success."

If my conclusion is not clear as to how much I valued Coubertin's contribution, perhaps the dust-jacket of my book (written not by me but by a press publicist) helps: "Instead of a singular vision, Coubertin's contribution was the zeal he brought to transforming an idea that had already evolved over decades into the reality of Olympiad I. . . and of all the Olympic Games held since."

ADDENDUM

I separate the following remarks from the above discussion; for they concern a matter of personal opinion, not of evidence or scholarly dispute⁵¹.

Hill faults me for "twice" using the word "Olympism," because, he says, it is a "meaningless" word or "at best fuzzy." Needless to say, I am in good company. But Hills count is correct; in all my 237 pp. of text and notes I use the word only twice, once with respect to Brookes, once with respect to Coubertin. But both times I use it advisedly⁵². For years, no one disliked this term more than I; for it seemed to me meaningless or at best fuzzy. And I, like many others, spent hours of agony at ancient Olympia-surrounded by great natural beauty and awesome history-struggling with my fellows in International Olympic Academy small group sessions under the Academy's trees, trying to define "Olympism" so we could give our required report back at the general Academy meeting. (Perhaps some other readers have known that same agony under those IOA trees). I began to detest the word "Olympism" all the more, because I saw my fellow delegates truly discomfited because they could not identify this will-o'-the-wisp. But at my third such session, Olympia's trees and history-along with the camaraderie of my group of new-found friends from truly diverse national

and ethnic backgrounds-worked their magic. Those are powerful trees. My group decided-soon after the Libyan delegate gave me a Libyan Olympic Committee pennant (which now proudly decorates my game-room)-that we actually knew what "Olympism" is. Everyone must form their own definition, but I offer ours: 'Olympism is the pursuit of individual human excellence in the context of international brotherhood and good will toward men.' For us, at least, it is no longer meaningless or even fuzzy.

NOTES

1. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore (Maryland) and London, 1996 (Hill's review [see next note] wrongly locates this press in Florida).

2. Wolfgang Decker, G. Dolianitis and K. Lennartz, 100 Jahre Olympische Spiele, Würzburg, 1996; Alain Arvin-Bérod, Les enfants d'Olympie, Paris, 1996; Karl Lennartz, ed., Die Olympischen Spiele 1896 in Athen: Erläuterungen zum Neudruck des Offiziellen Berichtes, Kassel, 1996; E.G. Skiadas, ed., 100 Chronia Neoteri Elleniki Olympiaki Istoría, Athens, 1996; Yves-Pierre Boulongne, Chap. 1 (13-207), in vol. 1 of: The International Olympic Committee-One Hundred Years, 3 vols., Raymond Gafner, ed., Lausanne, 1994-1996; Bill Mallon and Ture Widlund, The 1896 Olympic Games, Jefferson, N.C., USA, 1998; Thanassis Tarassouleas, The Annals of the Pre-Olympic Games Period-Athens 1895-1896, Athens, 1997. I cannot here comment on all these books, but I refer to some below.

Reviews of my book: Robert K. Barney, *Olympika. The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, 6 (1997), 121-128; Anthony O. Edmonds, *Journal of Sport History* 24 (1997), 433-4; Christopher Hill, *Journal of Olympic History* 5, No. 3 [Fall 1997], 40-42. Of these reviews, Barney's is by far the longest, most detailed, accurate, and (in my opinion-perceptive); it rather well summarizes most points and, I hope, achievements of my book. Edmonds clearly judges the topic of Olympic origins unworthy of a whole book, and says I should have condensed it into a "30-page article" instead. He dislikes my documentation and detail. I comment on most of Hill's criticisms in the course of the following remarks. Citations below by author's last name only refer to authors mentioned above in this note. Besides the helpful suggestions of Ture Widlund, Allen Guttmann, and Peter Lovesey mentioned below, other ISOH members have helped, as well. John Lucas, e.g., was first to point out my misspelling of William Milligan Sloane's middle name (and the horrendous typo, "chaosed ged," for "changed," on my p. 107).

3. "The 'Budapest Option': The Hungarian Alternative to the First Modern Olympic Games," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 8 (1991), 124-132 (see also Coubertin, *Mémoires olympiques*, Lausanne, 1977, p. 21).

4. Eugene Andrews, "A First-Hand Account of the First of the Modern Olympic Games," *Cornell Alumni News*, Dec. 1972, 22-24 (a copy in the Gennadius Library in Athens); Burton Holmes, "The Olympian Games," pp. 54-92 in vol. 3, *The Burton Holmes Lectures* (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1901; I thank George Dales and Tony Bijkerk for this reference). Bijkerk and I will soon publish in this journal a collection of eyewitness accounts of the 1896 Marathon, including further additions to the 1896 eyewitness bibliography.

5. See my *Struggle*, pp. 75-6, with notes; cf. 71-2. There I regretted my failure to find the full, original text of this critical June 1889 speech which quotes Brookes. Walter Borgers and Wolfgang Decker kindly found an original copy for me in the Carl-Diem Institut archives. It is, in essence, a seven-page, single-spaced typescript of the speech, obviously just as given. It contains, however, nothing more of interest to the subject of Brookes and Coubertin than what I printed in my book (from an excerpt in Wenlock archives).

6. Perhaps there is such a passage in Coubertin's works written before June, 1889 (when he quoted Brookes's speech); if so, it should be found and presented for scholarly study.

7. Author of the excellent *Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association*, Enfield, 1979.

8. After suggesting my possible error, Lovesey graciously writes, it "does not in any way undermine your central arguments, nor did it mar my enjoyment of the book"; he adds that, in his judgment, it is not a "flaw" in my book. He is too kind; I think it a flaw.

9. Lovesey, pp. 18-21; cf. "[When the NOA announced its Olympiad I for London, 1866] [a] shock-wave ran through the running grounds of the capital. The prospect of athletics controlled from anywhere but London was unthinkable.... The London contingent mobilized as fast as if the French had landed."

10. These precise words (from *Land and Water*, 10 Feb. 1866) are quoted in Lovesey's letter to me; but the parallel quotation in his book (p. 20) omits this sentence.

11. *Athletic World*, 24 May, 1878 (W5.25); quoted in my *Struggle*, p. 58.

12. Lovesey's letter also remarks that in the 1870's the AAC dwindled to almost no members other than Chambers, that it had no power to dissuade athletes from attending the NOA Olympiads of 1874 and 1878. But Lovesey's book also quotes a 1901 speech by Lord Alverstone, president of the AAA, "[W]e of the old Amateur Athletic Club regard with justice the AAA as to a large extent our child.[the AAA] was the outcome of the movement which had given rise to the Amateur Athletic Club some 16 years before" (Lovesey, p. 23).

13. I noted (*Struggle*, p. 35, with 191, n. 45) the com-

plaint of the *Sporting News* that only three "prominent London athletes" competed even in the London NOA Games of 1866. But I wrongly listed A. King as one of the three; King competed (third in the half-mile), but the third "prominent" London athlete was Walter Rye (King's College RC), who won the half-mile race and, after Nurse was disqualified, was named victor in the mile. I thank Mr. Lovesey for this correction. Rye, a vehement elitist amateur, later loudly attacked almost everyone, working class athletes and their attempts to join amateur clubs; Chambers himself; the brothers Waddell, who headed the London AC; and The German Gymnastic Society of E.G. Ravenstein (co-founder, with Brookes, of the NOA); see Lovesey, pp. 24-25.

14. See Lovesey, pp. 22-28, where there is also much enlightening, useful material on the important, partly related conflict between the AAC and the London Athletic Club (at which I briefly hinted in *Struggle*, p. 55).

15. Hill (n. 2, above) prefaces his remarks here by suggesting that I do not fully understand "that extraordinary form of social cement, the English class system." To this charge I plead guilty, despite having lived in Oxford for a while.

16. Coubertin, "A Typical Englishman" (Review of Reviews

15 [1897], 62-65) seems a misleading misnomer. For Hills "question of mingling," see Peter Bailey, *Leisure and Class in Victorian England* (London, 1978), p. 131: "Some members of the new athletic clubs were anxious to keep out the lower orders to spare themselves the embarrassment of unwonted physical intimacy in the dressing tent--a matter of some importance to a sensitive person" (quoted from a Victorian era newspaper item. Brookes personally "mingled" daily with the working-class--giving medical treatment to all classes in Wenlock. The same attitude toward class as Coubertin? The thought of the baron dressing the gushing wound of a brick-layer boggles the mind.

17. "Origins of the Modern Olympics," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 4 (1987), 271-300.

18. I suspect he wrote version B as well (the hands are similar), but cannot confirm it since I have in my personal archives, from my 1987 visit to Lausanne, photocopies of selected pages only, not complete documents.

19. François Carrard, ed., *Olympic Congress, the Centennial, 1894-1994*, pp. 44-5 (n.p., n.d., but presumably Paris, 1994). This is a booklet distributed, I think, to delegates at the 1994 Paris Congress of that name (it reached me [a gift from George Dales] after my final ms. for *Struggle* went to the press in Spring 1995).

20. Quoted in *Dokumente zur Geschichte der Olympischen Spiele* (Köln, 1970), p. 5 (emphasis added); my English translation is in *Struggle*, p. 213, n. 10.

21. See *Struggle*, p. 89. On Waldstein, see now Donald Anthony, "The Remarkable Waldstein," *Journal of Olympic History* 5.1 (Spring, 1997), 18-19, and Barney (above, n. 2), p. 126. In 1996, Anthony acquired many of Waldstein's

papers for the IOC archives in Lausanne. Barney suggests that my study would have profited from these papers, but realizes that my ms. was at the press long before they were available.

22. So also Barney--examining Waldstein's papers in Lausanne (above, n. 21) in 1997 in hopes of confirming my theory about his possible 1894 role as a intermediary for Coubertin and the Greek royal family--found nothing (above, note 2).

23. Hills review ("Young goes so far as to say that the greatest importance of the Greek Games of 1859, 1870, and 1875 lay in their influence on Brookes") has helped me see an error in my wording on p. 23: "Without these [1859] games and the 1870 and 1875 Olympics that followed, Brookes never would have been spurred on to found the movement for international Olympics" The main thought stands, but I omit reference to the 1870 and 1875 Games here. That sentence slipped by when I later discovered that--though Brookes knew, in detail, about the 1859 Zappas Olympics--he may never have learned of the 1870 and 1875 Zappas Games.

Hill also says, with respect to my account of the Zappas Games, "[Young] makes too much of the athletic side ... at the expense of the agri-industrial exhibitions which lay at the core." This remark misrepresents what I wrote. I stressed at every point that at every Zappas Olympiad the agri-industrial exhibits (which MacAloon said never happened) far eclipsed the athletic side in emphasis, programming and budget: see *Struggle*, pp. 18, 43, 47, 64-5. I was hardly ignorant of the priority of the agri-industrial competitions--I almost trumpeted it. Perhaps Hill refers to the relative amount of detail I give the two sides. Yet I doubt Hill or anyone else would rather know who made the best soap in Greece in 1870 than who won the first 1859 Olympics event (200 meter race) or that Kardamylakis, a manual laborer from Crete, doubled in 1870.

24. Like the books of Mandell and MacAloon, Hills review (unlike Barney's) omits all mention of the 1866 London National Olympiad, which I regard as one of the more important revelations in my book. Surely it is a major pre-1896 Olympic event, at least compared to the Ramlösa or Rondeau games (duly noted by MacAloon and many others). Not only was it a far larger sporting festival in a far greater city, but also Coubertin knew of it and quoted words from Brookes' 1866 London Olympic speech; whereas he probably never knew of Ramlösa or even Rondeau. I judge the 1866 London Olympics a distant relative of our own IOC Games; I doubt that Sydney 2000 has any genuine connection to the others. The student paper published by A.W. Driega, "Olympic Games before Pierre de Coubertin" (*Journal of Olympic History* 5.2 [Summer 1997], 20-27) has excellent information on the Ramlösa Olympics, perhaps the fullest available, but not a word on the London

Olympiad. So there is good detail on the Ramlösa and especially Rondeau games--but not the slightest mention of the London 1866 Olympics in the new history of Olympic origins by Arvin-Bérod--where (pp. 143-4), with totally muddled dates, he makes the other British national Olympics (of 1867, 1868, and 1877) part of Dover's 17th century Games, not part of the activity of his "Brookes" in "Munch-Wenlock"). So Boulongne, p. 37, also gives details on games of slight relevance at Ramlösa, Poznan, Montreal, and Rondeau, but never mentions Brookes' British National Olympics. The London Games are probably ignored because, after he himself proposed an Olympic revival, Coubertin mentioned only the lesser Games of the British National Olympiads, pretending there had been no London Games (Typical Englishman [above, n. 14], p. 65; see my *Struggle*, p. 83). While the minor Wenlock Games themselves often appear in recent Olympic histories, the 1866 London Olympics do not. In fact, unless people read my *Struggle*, pp. 34-39 (or Sam Mullins' single paragraph on them in his little-known booklet, William Penny Brookes and the Wenlock Games [Leicester, 1896], p. 20), they will never know there were Olympic Games in London, 1866. Few will notice their presence in an inconspicuous box in Rühl's charts in "Olympian Games of Athens in the Year 1877" (*Journal of Olympic History* 5.3 [Fall 1997], 28-31 [30]; or Don Anthony's several accounts, such as his two rather dry sentences on the London Olympics in "100 Years of Olympism in Shropshire" (*Sports Teacher*, 8.4 [April 1901], 16). Are 1866 Olympic Games in a major city of the world, in a famous structure, attended by thousands, cited by Coubertin in 1890 (next note), the occasion of Brookes' speech which Coubertin quoted in 1889 (*Struggle*, p. 75)--of no importance at all? Edmonds (above, n. 2) thinks so; for he faults my book for listing the names of the London Olympic victors. But I judge they are not unimportant, and my *Struggle* accordingly devotes six full pages (33-38) to these virtually unknown London Olympics.

25. "Un essai [de Brookes] fut bien tenté vers 1866 pour étendre et généraliser les jeux olympiques. Un festival eut lieu cette année-là au Palais de Cristale [Londres]. Il fut renouvelé l'année suivante à Birmingham, puis à Shrewsbury. . . Ce mouvement ne fut pas inutile. . . [this important sentence is quoted fuller below; original French, n. 33, below]. Un tentative plus audacieuse encore eut la Grèce pour théâtre. Le Dr Brookes. . . qui entretenu une volumineuse correspondance. . . favorisa la rétablissement à Athènes des jeux olympiques. . . les Hellènes prirent part à une concours. . . J'ai vu dans les annales de Wenlock les résultats de ce concours et les noms des laureates" ("Les Jeux Olympiques à Much Wenlock," *La Revue Athlétique* 1 [1890], 712 [= Textes Choisis 2.83-4]; cf. Coubertin, "Typical Englishman" [above, n. 15], 65). Thus I did not "speculate"--I reported.

Hill, as if faulting my book, also says: “It seems to me that Brookes and Coubertin were drawn together at least as much by their interest in physical education as by the Olympics.” So it seemed to me, too, but I said so more decisively: “focused only on Brookes’ efforts in physical education . . . no interest in Brookes’ Olympic activities” (Struggle, pp. 77-8, emphases added).

26. Actually I say (p. 84) that it was much later, three years after he received Brookes’ materials that Coubertin first thought of reviving the Olympics.

27. There is no question who proposed the idea first. Brookes formally and publically proposed an international Olympic revival in 1880 (Struggle, pp. 59-61). Unlike other recent accounts of pre-1896 revival activity, Struggle focuses wholly on the Zappas Games in Greece, Brookes’s various Olympics in England, and Coubertin, ignoring other, even earlier attempts at Olympic revivals (see nn. 24, above, and 37, below). My book seeks to discover the origins of our own Olympic movement and our own modern International Olympic Games. My judgment was that other revivals in Ramlösa, Montreal, etc. had no influence on our own movement, and I did not want to confuse my main topic with extraneous materials merely for trivia’s sake. For I believe that our own Games are the lineal descendants of the Zappas Olympics and Brookes’s several Olympian Games in England—that those two Olympic movements became interrelated, inspiring-and profoundly influencing the success of-our IOC Olympiad I in Athens, 1896.

28. See his *Olympic Politics*, 2nd edn., Manchester and New York, 1996 (where much of his first chapter is, as he clearly notes, based on my own earlier articles).

29. In my *Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics* (Chicago, 1984), I proved that the ancient Greeks did not know the concept or practice of amateur athletics (see, e.g., the reviews in *Classical World* 80 [1987], 456 [Traupman] and *Sportwissenschaft* 17 [1987], 100-102 [Weiler]). I did not merely use an argument from silence. I showed not only that there was no ancient evidence for amateurism but also there was overwhelming evidence to the contrary, evidence for an ancient athletic system that could not accommodate amateurism. It is the same with my argument that Coubertin did not conceive the idea to revive the Games before October 1890 (cf. Barney, p. 121). I did not merely point out that there seems to be no evidence that he had such an idea prior to 1890. I also adduced evidence that excludes such a conclusion, evidence the other way. When all available evidence proves an idea untenable, or nearly so, I think a negative has been proved.

30. Dietrich Quanz has kindly sent me an interesting communication in which he quotes (apparently: some missing ‘begin’ and ‘end quote’ marks in Quanz’s letter add to the confusion) an entry in a Hungarian lexicon, *Magyar Pädagogia* (translated for Quanz into German by a

Hungarian). This item says that when Ferenc Kemény was a student at the Sorbonne in the 1880’s, he and Coubertin discussed antiquity and its Olympic Games, “and they dreamed about their resurrection (auferstehung).” But the date of the *Magyar Pädagogia* which Quanz cites is 1960 and--Quanz adds at the end--“es ist also leider keine Originalquelle.”

31. “Tout cela, c’est beaucoup; c’est même trop”: Coubertin, *L’éducation anglaise en France*, Paris, 1889, p. 204 (= *Textes Choisis*, 1.111); see my *Struggle*, pp. 73-4, with p. 205, n. 17. Grousset’s proposal is in: (pseudonym Phillipe Daryl) *Renaissance physique*, Paris, 1888, p. 256. Grousset, despite other Olympic scholars’ statements to the contrary, did not actually propose “a revival of the Olympic Games,” as a careful reading of his text will reveal. His claim that Euripides won a victory at the ancient Olympics is, of course, ridiculous nonsense.

32. The original text in the *Revue athlétique* reads “on n’eût plus besoin”; a textual error in Müller’s *Textes Choisis* version (2.83) prints “on n’eût pas besoin” (fuller quotation of the French in next note). To use Müller’s text here might help my argument a little, but it is not what the baron wrote--one of the reasons why my book cites the original publication for this and some other Coubertin articles (in such cases, my original ms. also cited the more accessible *Textes Choisis*, but my copy editor removed all cross-references to *Textes Choisis*; sorry).

33. Emphases added; quoted in my *Struggle*, p. 82, along with the original French (my p. 208, n. 3): “Ce mouvement ne fut pas inutile. . . Mais. . . on n’eût plus besoin d’invoquer les souvenirs de la Grèce et de chercher des encouragements dans le passé. On aimait le sport pour lui-même,” “Jeux Olympiques à Much Wenlock” (above, n. 25), p. 712 (= *Textes Choisis* 2.83).

34. Typical Englishman (above, n. 14), p. 62. True, here Coubertin obviously puns on Brookes’ advanced age (over 80 when Coubertin met him); but the pun itself proves that Coubertin knew well what “old friend” usually means in English. The July 20 Coubertin letter is in the Wenlock archives, vol. 5.206 (see my *Struggle*, p. 84).

35. “Les Jeux Olympiques ä Much Wenlock,” p. 712 (see further my *Struggle*, p. 82).

36. John J. MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, Chicago, 1981, p. 153.

37. Such earlier, brief revivals as those in Ramlösa and Montreal were forgotten; Coubertin seems not to know of them. He eventually learned of the 18th century “Olympics” of the French Revolutionary state (for which see Arvin-Bérod, pp. 19-40 [who, unfortunately, often cites 20th century, sometimes unpublished studies]). But the Baron’s first reference to those revolutionary Games post-dates IOC Olympiad I (“Introduction” to Part II, in Lambros and Politis, *Olympic Games: 776-1896*, Athens, 1896 [p. 4, 1996

German reprinting]). Coubertin could not have got the idea from Taine, Le Play, or Thomas Arnold, the sources usually named for his inspiration. Not one of these, so far as I have seen, ever mentioned any Olympic revival.

38. Grombach, *Olympic Cavalcade of Sports*, New York, 1956 (p. 9); Grombach's subsequent editions repeat the same error; e.g., *1976 Olympic Guide*, Chicago, 1975, p. 15: "[Vikelas], a holdover from the unsuccessful [Zappas] Games." Grombach's books rarely cite any source for anything, nor this. Vikelas, who had never been in Greece during any Zappas Olympiad, did not even have accurate information on them (see my *Struggle*, p. 234, n. 14). As Vikelas himself asked in 1895, "What did I have to do with athletics?" (*Struggle*, p. 98).

39. At least I find nothing like that in either Meyer or Bourdon (the only sources which MacAloon cites. Gaston Meyer, *Le Phénomène olympique*, Paris, 1960, p. 11); Meyer quotes a 1922 Coubertin statement on Olympics on his p. 10. But his comments on de Lesseps and Saint-Clair seem clearly limited to Coubertin's call to "internationalize" sport quoted in Meyer's subsequent paragraph—a bungled recasting of this single sentence of G. Bourdon's: "[L]e même Saint-Clair, au banquet donné, le 14 novembre 1885, sous la présidence de Ferdinand de Lesseps, n'annonçait-il pas la nécessité de multiplier les rencontres internationales?" (Bourdon, "Le rétablissement des jeux olympiques," *Encyclopédie des sports*, Paris, 1924, I.146-156 [147]).

40. Arvin-Bérod, p. 76: "connus des seuls Grenoblois."

41. Arvin-Bérod, pp. 77, 81.

42. Henry Rousset, *Les Jeux olympiques au Rondeau*, Grenoble, 1894 (the source for much of Arvin-Bérod's information on these games).

43. In passing, Coubertin prints Février's name among others in a list of dignitaries who attended a Parisian sporting event in 1890 (*Batailles de l'éducation physique: Une campagne de vingt-et-un ans, 1887-1908*, Paris, 1908, p. 47); but otherwise his name does not appear in the large collection of Coubertin's writings indexed in Müller's three volume *Textes Choisis*.

44. Arvin-Bérod, who has much detail on their first meeting, gives "2 January, 1891" as the date that Coubertin first met Didon (p. 122).

45. Boulongne, p. 37.

46. "Les Jeux Olympiques à Much Wenlock," (above, n. 25; p. 705); "A Typical Englishman" (above, n. 16; pp. 6265); *Campagne* (above, n. 43), p. 53; *Mémoires olympiques*, Lausanne, 1932 (reprint 1977), where I, at least, have not found Brookes' name.

47. If "pig-sticking" occurred at the October 1890 Wenlock Olympian Games held in Coubertin's honor, it was unique; for no such event, it seems, took place before or after in the regular Annual Wenlock Olympian Games (all programs are extant). On that same 1908 page (*Campagne*,

p. 53) the baron falsely states there had been no Zappas games after 1859; p. 108 goes even further, feigning that there had never been any Zappas "concours d'exercices physiques" (he carefully avoids the word "Olympics") at all. Yet Coubertin had long known full well of all three Zappas Olympiads, even down to their precise dates (see my *Struggle*, p. 164).

48. The argument *postquam hoc, ergo propter hoc* is a known fallacy, but is not my argument at all. And *postquam hoc, sed nolo* (but I don't want) *propter hoc* is even worse logic.

49. Coubertin was rather benighted about ancient Greece, even Olympia (see my *Struggle*, p. 86, and *Olympic Myth*, pp. 10, 73). Apart from 1927 (when he spent a few hours there to attend a ceremony in his honor), his total time in Olympia was one morning in 1894 (see *Mémoires* [above, n. 46], p. 17). Those of us who have spent days at the site, inhaling its wonders, might think that one morning is not enough to see and assimilate everything. One morning? For the site he says inspired his life's work? Coubertin could, for most of his life, afford the time and money to go almost anywhere he wanted for as long as he wished.

50. See my *Struggle*, pp. 1, 90-91, 167-69. I thank John Lucas for helping me to appreciate this important difference in the revival proposals of Brookes and Coubertin.

51. I do not grasp Hill's final criticism, where he faults my citing the microfilm of the Wenlock documents (while noting that I have "worked with the documents themselves"): "surely it would in the long run be more useful to refer to the original albums." Surely microfilm photos reproduce accurately what is actually on the photographed page. The only risk in using the microfilm is omitted pages. For example (as I noted on my p. 207, n. 30) the microfilm omits the last three pages of perhaps the most important document quoted in my entire book; namely, Coubertin's crucial 9 August, 1890 letter to Brookes, wherein the baron announces his intention to visit Much Wenlock in just two months. (Edmond's review of *Struggle* [above, n. 2] suggests this letter has so little historical importance that it is not even "remarkable," and faults me for quoting from it!) If I had relied solely on the microfilm, I would have had none of that key portion which I reproduce on *Struggle*, p. 77; and I might have suspected that Coubertin came to Wenlock to discuss Olympics as much as physical education, and written a different book). But, in Wenlock (long before Joachim Rühl unselfishly sent me the microfilm), I carefully copied the entire letter into my notes. Thus I did, in fact, refer to the original albums, which—not surprisingly—have the same pagination as their microfilm version (the existence of which Hill seems to prefer I ignore).

52. *Struggle*, p. 54 (Brookes) and p. 89 (Coubertin). The word also occurs in a quotation from Coubertin on my p. 223, n. 2 (where I identify it as a "neologism" of the baron's).

CORRIGENDA for David C. Young, *Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Survival*

Page 2, ¶ 2, line 9: FOR Otto II READ Otto I

22, ¶ 3, 9: FOR with READ which

23, 10-11: delete the words and the 1870 and 1875 Athens Olympics that followed

35, end of ¶ 1, Lovesey quote: FOR cobbled together to thwart READ: cobbled together over Christmas with no more purpose than to thwart

46, 1: FOR most READ much

61, ¶ 2, end: FOR therby READ thereby

70, ¶ 3: FOR He probably got that idea, too, mainly READ much of that idea, too, comes

75, ¶ 2, 6, end: FOR and even repudiated READ and he even repudiated

82, 7th from top: FOR irresistable READ irresistible

88, ¶ 3, next-to-last line: FOR possibility or READ possibility of

100, ∂ ¶, 1st line: FOR

One version . . . once read: “[At] the first meeting, the opinion of the majority

READ: One version . . . once read: “For the first meeting, the opinion of the majority

106, ¶ 1, 1: FOR climaxed with a final plenary session at a READ climaxed, after a final daytime plenary session, with a

107, 2: FOR chaosed ged READ changed

108, 5: FOR M. Callot READ E. Callot

108, ¶ 2, 8-9: FOR Franz Kemeny READ Ferenc Kemeny
same error: Ferenc not Franz, pp. 131, 134, 140, 210 n. 32, 231 n. 36, and 248

109, quotation, ¶ 3, 6: FOR actual project READ present project

115, 2: FOR he had called READ he later called

3: FOR had so entranced, READ so entranced, i.e., delete the word “had”

141, last ¶, 3: FOR Nearly all READ Six of thirteen (credit Widlund) and take 225, n. 25 ‘with a grain of (scholarly) salt.’

141, last ¶: DELETE sentence about Louis Adler (credit Widlund)

148, ¶ 2, 6: FOR Burke READ Curtis (same error at 227, n. 1, but correct at 152, 7; credit Widlund)

149, bottom; and 247: FOR Lawrenceston READ Launceston (the question of spelling Elliot’s first name (227, n. 7) seems settled by Ian Buchanan in *Citius, Altius, Fortius* 3.1 (1995), 20 (credit Widlund).

155,1: FOR only READ not even (credit Widlund)

155, 10: FOR Aristis READ Aristidis (credit Widlund)

156, 5: FOR evening READ morning, and for banquet READ breakfast banquet (credit Widlund)

157, 7: DELETE As only Greek teams entered (credit Widlund)

157, last ¶,3: FOR sixth READ fourth (credit Widlund)

168, 4 from bottom: FOR profoundly influenced King George READ profoundly influenced Brookes, King George
188 n. 16: FOR Nov. 21, 1861 READ Nov. 21, 1860

190, n. 45: FOR A. King (Thames A.C.), third READ Walter Rye (King’s College RC), first

193, header: FOR Pages 31-40 READ Pages 37-40

203 n. 4: FOR Manchester speech READ Manchester letter

206 n. 25, 2: FOR militarisme READ militarisme

210 n. 30: FOR Mulligan READ Milligan

227 n. 7, line 5: FOR 322 READ 324

228 n. 11, line 5: FOR Robinson’s ball-park READ Richardson’s ball-park

234 n. 18, 2: FOR qu’il y a le plus noble READ qu’il y a de plus noble

240, under Decker: FOR Koninuität READ Kontinuität

241, under Giannopoulos: FOR Olympikon READ Olympiakon

242, under Lucas: entry FOR Sloane, FOR Koninuität READ Kontinuität

242, under Luh: FOR Koninuität READ Kontinuität

242, under Lucas: FOR Mulligan READ Milligan

245: FOR Balk READ Balck, Viktor (credit Widlund; name is correct on 108)

246, index, under Comité: FOR Comité, Jules Simon READ Comité Jules Simon

ADDENDA

57, 4: between the words “Zappas Olympiads” and “or just hoping” INSERT” (if he even knew of them; see p. 82 with 208, n. 6)”

123, ¶ 5, 4-5: INSERT Germany, between Hungary and INSERT Gebhardt between Kemeny and

169, 2: at end of sentence ending “around the world” INSERT, such as Herbert

225, n. 25: to words ‘Wallechinsky . . . lists Adler . . . as fourth . . . ADD but wrongly, since Adler, though entered, did not appear in Athens (see Lennartz, *Erläuterungen*, pp. 113-14).

AND DELETE the next sentence (credit Widlund)

240, below last entry FOR Coubertin, at end, ADD: ‘Why I revived the Olympic Games,’ *Fortnightly Review*, 90 (84 N.S.), 110-115.

FOR 250 index, under Olympic movement . . . term movement used ADD 82, 122

I should have added a reference, somewhere, to the possibility that Hungary might host the first IOC Games, and cited George Eisen, “The Budapest Option”, *The Hungarian Alternative to the First Modern Olympic Games: in International Journal of the History of Sport* 8 (1991), 124-132.

I should have added a reference, somewhere, to the 13 April dinner given by Coubertin at the Grand Hotel Phaleron (credit Widlund).
