

VII	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personne, C. B. Swed. 2. Hall, S. U. S. A. <i>IV</i> 3. Speciale, P. Ital. <i>III</i> 4. Olsen, H. Denm. 5. Martineau, S. ... G. Brit. 6. Willems, V. Belg. <i>V</i> 7. Mordovine, A. ... Russ. 	XII	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Goppold de Lobsdorf, V., sr. ... Boh. <i>VII</i> 2. Peyron, H. G. R. Swed. 3. Alajmo, A. Ital. <i>IV</i> 4. de Samawsky, W. Russ. 5. Toth, P. Hung. <i>V</i> 6. Sauer, A. E. U. S. A. 7. Naumann, A. ... Germ.
VIII	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rayner, H. M. ... U.S.A. <i>V</i> 2. de Samoiloff, W. Russ. 3. Davids, A. Germ. <i>IV</i> 4. Grönvall, N. R. J. Swed. 5. Rechner, V. Boh. 6. di Nola, N. Ital. 7. Zulawsky, B. ... Hung. <i>II</i> 	XIII	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anspach, P. Belg. <i>VIII</i> 2. Montgomerie, R. C. L. G. Brit. <i>VII</i> 3. Hjorth, C. Swed. <i>VI</i> 4. von Tangen, G. Norw. 5. Vigeveno, F. ... Hol. 6. Martucheff, L. ... Russ. 7. Berntsen, O. Denm. 8. Trampler, R. ... Aust.
IX	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diana, D. Ital. 2. Seligman, E. ... G. Brit. <i>III</i> 3. Javurek, J. Boh. 4. Löffler, W. Germ. <i>V</i> 5. Békesy, B. Hung. <i>IV</i> 6. Dereani, F. Aust. 7. Gignoux, J. E. ... U. S. A. 	XIV	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eriksen, B. G. ... Norm. <i>VIII</i> 2. Hassanein, A. M. Egy. 3. de Jakovleff, A. Russ. 4. Lindblom, G. T. Swed. 5. Verderber, R. ... Aust. <i>VII</i> 6. Anspach, H. Belg. <i>VI</i> 7. de Jong, A. E. W. Holl.
X	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Levison, E. Denm. <i>VIII</i> 2. Pajzs, P. Hung. <i>VI</i> 3. Puhm, J. Aust. 4. Castorina, C. ... Ital. 5. Vávra, Z. Boh. 6. Plaskuda, H. Germ. <i>III</i> 7. Bowman, W. L. U. S. A. 	x v	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ziegler, H. Germ. 2. Kriz, F. Boh. 3. Ochs, J. Belg. <i>VIII</i> 4. Setterberg, C. L. Swed. 5. Berti, L. Hung. <i>VIII</i> 6. Cvetko, R. Aust. 7. Östrup, L. C. ... Denm. <i>VII</i>
XI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Belloni, G. Ital. 2. Kudloff, W. Germ. 3. Rom, F. Belg. 4. Bertrain, G. Russ. 5. Golling, F. Aust. <i>VI</i> 6. Jöncke, A. Swed. <i>IV</i> 7. Osier, J. Denm. <i>V</i> 	XVI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Böös, G. O. E. ... Swed. 2. Grineff, L. Russ. 3. Hennet, R. Belg. <i>VII</i> 4. Tucek, J. Boh. 5. Cavallini, F. Ital. <i>VI</i> 6. Breed, G. H. ... U. S. A. 7. Schön, E. Germ. <i>VIII</i>

Elimination series. 2nd Round.

7 July.

I	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tom, L. Belg. 2. Larimer, M. W. U. S. A. 3. Alexander, S. R. G. Brit. 4. Schenker, Z. Hung. <i>I</i> 5. Nadi, N. Ital. <i>II</i> 6. Lichtenfels, J. ... Germ. <i>III</i> 	III	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Földes, D. Hung. <i>IV</i> 2. Berré, M. Belg. 3. Pfeiffer, V. Boh. 4. Breckinridge, S.D. U. S. A. 5. Seligman, E. ... G. Brit. <i>I</i> 6. Speciale, P. Ital. <i>III</i>
II	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tvorzsky, V. ... Boh. <i>I</i> 2. Amphlett, E. M. G. Brit. <i>II</i> 3. Post, A. van Zo U. S. A. 4. Pietrasanta, F. ... Ital. 5. Berthelsen, I.O.H. Denm. 6. Zulawsky, B. ... Hung. <i>III</i> 	IV	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. de Montigny, F. Belg. 2. Hall, S. U. S. A. <i>IV</i> 3. Davids, A. Germ. 4. Békesy, B. Hung. <i>II</i> 5. Jöncke, A. Swed. 6. Alajmo, A. Ital. <i>I</i>

V	1. Notaris, S. Greece	VII	1. Goppold de Lobsdorf, V., jr. ... Boh.
	2. Willems, V. Belg. IV		2. Plaskuda, H. ... Germ.
	3. Rayner, H. M. U. S. A.		3. Hennet, R. Belg. I
	4. Löffler, W. Germ.		4. Montgomerie, R.C. G. Brit. III
	5. Osier, I. Denm. II		5. Verderber, R. ... Aust. IV
	6. Toth, P. Hung. III		6. Östrup, L. C. ... Denm.
VI	1. Fagan, A. W. ... G. Brit.	VIII	1. Levison, E. Denm.
	2. Golling, F. Aust.		2. Schon, E. Germ. II
	3. Pajzs, P. Hung. I		3. Anspach, P. Belg. II
	4. Cavallini Ital. IV		4. Eriksen, B. G. Norw.
	5. Hjort, C. Swed.		5. Berti, L. Hung. II
	6. Anspach, H. Belg. III		6. Ochs, J. Belg.

Elimination series. 3rd Round.

8. July.

I	1. Schenker, Z. ... Hung.	III	1. Lichtenfels, J. ... Germ.
	2. Tvorzsky, V. ... Boh.		2. Zulawsky, B. ... Hung.
	3. Seligman, E. ... G. Brit. win.		3. Speciale, P. Ital. win
	4. Alajmo, A. Ital. win.		4. Toth, P. Hung.
	5. Pajzs, P. Hung.		5. Anspach, H. Belg.
	6. Hennet, R. Belg.		6. Montgomery, R.C. G. Brit. win.
II	1. Nadi, N. Ital. win.	IV	1. Földes, D. Hung.
	2. Amphlett, E. M. G. Brit.		2. Hall, S. U. S. A.
	3. Békessy, B. Hung. win.		3. Willems, V. Belg.
	4. Osier, J. Denm.		4. Cavallini, F. Ital.
	5. Schon, E. Germ.		5. Verderber, R. ... Aust. win
	6. Anspach, P. Belg.		6. Berti, L. Hung. win

Final Round.

8 July.

Nation	Name	No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Wins	Plac- ing
Austria ...	Verderber ...	1	☒	×	○	×	×	○	○	○	4(10)	3
Hungary..	Berti	2	○	☒	○	×	×	○	×	○	4(10)	4
Hungary..	Békessy	3	×	×	☒	×	×	○	×	×	1	7
Italy	Nadi	4	○	○	○	☒	○	○	○	○	7	1
Italy	Speciale	5	○	○	○	×	☒	○	○	×	5	2
Gr. Brit.	Montgomerie...	6	×	×	×	×	×	☒	×	×	0	8
Gr. Brit.	Seligman	7	×	○	○	×	×	○	☒	×	3	6
Italy	Alajmo	8	×	×	○	×	○	○	○	☒	4(11)	5

Result :

1. N. NADI Italy.
2. P. SPECIALE Italy.
3. R. VERDERBER Austria.

The foil, which, at the Olympic Games of London, in 1908 made its appearance only at a display, was now again seen in a competition, and it is difficult to understand why this branch of fencing should not have a place on the programme equally with the épée and the sabre. Granted, it is not the weapon of actual conflict, but then, on the other hand, it is the classic symbol of instruction and refinement in the art of fencing.

The foil represents the speed-moment in the art of fencing, this being a result of the fact that the points of attack for both opponents are always about equally distant from each other. In the case of the épée and the sabre, rapidity of movement plays, in a certain degree, a more subordinate role, as, in a serious attack, the risk is run of being repulsed at a point which is farther forward than that corresponding to the one it was the intention to touch. The rapid, intrepid, and logical play of the foil, with its expression of the real laws of fence is, therefore, quite as entitled to be used in competitions as épée and sabre fencing, which base their claims on a closer approach to the realities of actual combat.

Épée-fencing may be an excellent art but, hitherto, it has not proved itself able to replace fencing with the foil, on which science it has merely exercised an injurious influence.

The fencing with the foil showed, consequently, a falling off in style, both as regards the guard position and the attack, and also in the variations of the play in general. This holds good particularly with regard to the French school, where the difference between foil- and épée fencing is more pronounced than in the Italian, where both the guard positions are as good as uniform, and it was the Italian school, and the Italian fencers, too, that dominated the meeting. From the very beginning, young Nedo Nadi showed himself to be an attractive exponent of the genial art of his native land. The broad, low-lying guard, with the outstretched weapon-arm, was typically Italian. The vibrating muscles, the speaking movements of the disengaged hand, all showed the southern, nervous impatience. One or two preparatory movements when the right moment seemed to have arrived — a cry — a lightning-like lunge — the whole made a delightful, ideal picture of athletic sport. It mirrored, too, the happy confidence of a southern spirit that success has been attained; spring-like comes the elastic recovery after the lunge; the mask is wrenched from the face, showing a delighted smile sometimes changing, the next moment, to the deepest astonishment, should the judge declare "No hit!" It is a pleasure to see this graceful exhibition of power; one is touched by this naive ingenuousness, this innocent by-play. We see a child of the south from the slopes of Vesuvius.

This school has attracted many disciples of late; it embraces, too, the Austrian countries and Germany, but its characteristics vary somewhat, according to the temperament of the various nations amongst whom it is in use. During the Games of Stockholm it was more numerously represented than the French, and, in the final, by no less than six disciples, three Italians, two Hungarians and one Austrian;

the rival school, on the same occasion, boasted but two, both of them entered by Great Britain. The result of the contest can be seen by the table given above.

An examination of the tables shows us, too, the results gained by the different nations and their representatives in the struggle towards the final. To give an account in words of the "varying issue of the fight" would be of little value; the struggle had to be seen to be appreciated. Still, the characteristic features of the two leading schools, the Italian and the French, are deserving of a word or two of mention.

The Italian School, which, on the whole, is faithful to ancient traditions, with its stronger weapon, its larger guard, its more powerful grasp (the hand often being bound fast) gives at once the impression of a more serious conception of the art; the deep-lying guard with the threatening, outstretched arm gives the illusion of actual combat, especially when a fiery temperament sets every force in motion to reach its aim or to avoid defeat. It is temperament that places its seal on this form of the art of fencing. When it leaves its native country and finds a home beneath northern skies, its characteristics alter to a certain degree. In Austria, its disciples are still warm-blooded fencers; but this feature disappears amongst the colder Germanic peoples. This type of fencing therefore, child of speed and power as it is, seems more pristine, more natural, and possesses a certain uniformity of method in the use of the various weapons.

These characteristics appear most clearly when the Italian school is seen side by side with its most successful rival, the French. The last line of one of Coppée's ballads runs: 'Il n'est de fin fleuret qu'en France!' and perhaps the poet is right. Here we meet a lighter weapon, one possessing no special guard, and with the simplest of grasps. These features alone hint at the refined nature of the school, a nature that is quite a natural one. Transplanted to French soil during the Renaissance period, fencing, like other forms of art, put on the features characteristic of French culture — elegance, lucidity, logic. And it is on this basis that its school of fencing has since developed. We see the French guard a calmer one; its movements are not so threatening; it endeavours to oppose elegance to violence, and to meet the impetuous attacks of an opponent with smiling confidence, in full reliance on the superiority of a refined technique. In a powerful hand it possesses equal authority with the Italian, while, just as a result of its more refined temperament, it lends itself more easily to the subtleties of the art. This it is, that, in France, has given rise to the fanatical strife between the fleurettists and the épéeists — a strife which, hitherto, has brought defeat to the first-named, but which, at bottom somewhat artificial, will probably prove beneficial for the development of both weapons.

The influence of the French school has extended to Great Britain, Scandinavia, Russia and, of late, both to North and South America, while, at the same time, it has numerous adherents in all countries where the art of fencing is practised.

It is more than a pity that the French themselves were not present to defend their own school. Nedo Nadi's skill would then most certainly have been put to a severer test — and his glory have been the greater had he still been the victor.

II. A. ÉPÉE TEAM COMPETITION.

9—10 July.

Protocol.

Elimination Series				Final	
1st round		2nd round			
Tuesday, 9 July				Wednesday, 10 July	
9—1.30		2—6.30		9—3	
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Holland. I 3. Germany. II 	I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Holland. Win. 2. Great Britain. Win. 3. Bohemia. 4. Denmark. 	Final	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Holland. 2. Great Britain. 3. Belgium. 4. Sweden.
II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Russia. I 2. Great Britain. I 3. Belgium. II 				
III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bohemia. I 2. Norway. I 3. Sweden. II 	II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Germany. Win. 3. Belgium. Win. 2. Sweden. Win. 1. Greece. 		
IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Denmark. I 2. Greece. II 3. U. S. A. 				

Result:

1. BELGIUM.
2. GREAT BRITAIN.
3. HOLLAND.

The épée competitions began on July 9th. The épée is the arm that, during the last two decades, has worked its way onwards to the first place in fencing programmes; with much grandesse it has compelled the foil to yield its pride of place, and has quite won the favour of the public.

But épée fencing deserves all possible encouragement, for it affords the spectacle of a play as fine, if not finer than that given by the foil, while, at the same time, it demands of its exponent a real knowledge of the art of fencing. The reproach often directed by the lovers of the épée against fencers with the foil, that their play is all too conventional, can, with much show of reason, be also addressed to the former too; the restrictions blamed differing merely in kind. But, by degrees, the influence of international meetings, and the proper elaboration and application of such criticisms, will be sure to rub off the rough corners of both.

The programme of the épée competitions displayed the fine figure of no less than eleven nations prepared to enter the lists. The