



Wrestling

E. Norman Gardiner

The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Volume 25 (1905), 14-31.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4269%281905%2925%3C14%3AW%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The Journal of Hellenic Studies is published by The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/hellenic.html>.

The Journal of Hellenic Studies

©1905 The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

WRESTLING.

I.

A.—*The Nature of the Evidence.*

THE popularity of wrestling among the Greeks is proved by the constant use of metaphors from this sport and by the frequency with which scenes from the wrestling ring appear, not only in athletic literature and art but also in mythological subjects. Despite the changes in the spirit of Greek athletics caused by the growth of professionalism, which affected wrestling and boxing more perhaps than any other sport, the popularity of wrestling whether as a pastime or as a spectacle remained unabated. On early black-figured vases Heracles is constantly represented employing the regular holds and tricks of the palaestra not only against the giant Antaeus, but against monsters such as Achelous or the Triton, or even against the Nemean lion, and centuries later we find Ovid and Lucan describing these scenes in language borrowed in every detail from the same source.

Hence the evidence at our disposal is more abundant and more varied than in the case of any other sport, and its interpretation is proportionately difficult. An obvious difficulty lies in the wide diversity of the evidence as to time and place. The majority of the monuments are not later than the fourth century B.C., but geographically they extend from Smyrna and Alexandria to Rome and Etruria, while the scattered records of literature extend from Homer and Pindar to Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus, the bulk of the descriptive evidence being found in the Greek and Roman writers of the Empire. We might have expected that evidence so varied would reflect the local variations in style which we know to have existed,¹ and the changes which so long a period must have introduced, and that it would be impossible to come to satisfactory conclusions. But though we must constantly bear in mind the possibility of such variations, we shall find that the difficulty is more apparent than real, and that the agreement in the evidence is extraordinary. This result may be due partly to the close connexion of athletics with religion, which doubtless tended to preserve unchanged the traditional laws governing the great athletic festivals, and partly to the conservatism of artistic types, and to the imitative character of later art and literature, as a consequence of which the descriptions of Roman poets probably reflect the earlier traditions of Greece more closely than the practices of their own day and country. The chief

¹ Krause, *Gym. der Hell.*, p. 428.

change which we can observe is the increasing popularity of the pankration and its methods as opposed to the more skilful and less brutal methods of true wrestling.

A more real difficulty is found in the technical vocabulary of Greek wrestling, which was as strange and varied as that of our own day. Many of the terms explain themselves; others, especially those connected with the names of places and persons, defy interpretation. We have some hints as to the styles in favour at Sparta and Argos, but 'the Thessalian chip,' 'the Sicilian style,' 'the chip of Phrynichus,' are as unintelligible to us as 'the half-nelson,' or 'Cumberland and Westmorland,' will be to archaeologists of future ages. Almost as puzzling and yet more tantalising on account of the apparent simplicity is the technical use of common words such as βάλλω and its compounds. Scholiasts and lexicographers afford us little assistance in these cases, the only explanation they often vouchsafe for wrestling terms being ἐξαπατᾶν, and we can only conjecture their meaning by careful comparison of the few passages in which they occur.

In the present paper I propose to consider the conditions and general principles of Greek wrestling, reserving for my next article the discussion of the various attitudes, grips, and throws adopted by the Greek wrestler. For our knowledge of the latter we are chiefly indebted to the vase-painter; at present we are concerned for the most part with literary evidence.

B.—*The Oxyrhynchus Papyrus and the Teaching of Wrestling.*

The most important recent contribution to our knowledge of Greek wrestling is the papyrus of the second century A.D. published by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt.² It contains instructions for a wrestling lesson, and throws an interesting light on the methods of Greek training. The various holds and throws appear to have been taught as a kind of drill to one or more pairs of wrestlers. Two interesting parallels are quoted by the editors, a curious passage from the *Asinus* of Lucian illustrating the erotic symplegma³ and an epigram from the *Anth. Pal.* XII. 206 consisting of a dialogue between the instructor and the pupil.

The passage from Lucian contains a multitude of wrestling metaphors, but being mostly connected with the ground wrestling of the pankration they do not concern us at present. The epigram is very instructive; the first couplet contains the trainer's orders

ἦν τοῦτῳ φωνῆς, τὸ μέσον λαβὲ καὶ κατακλίνας
ζεύγνυε καὶ πρώσας πρόσπεσε καὶ κατέχε.

The pupil who is apparently younger than his opponent protests that this is too difficult

² *Ox. Pap.* iii. 466.

³ Lucian, *As.* c. 9. Cp. Aristoph. *Pax* 895, *Av.* 442, and the expressions ἀνακλινοπάλη,

κλινοπάλη; Martial xiv. 201, Suetonius *Domit.* 22. In all these cases the metaphors are from the pankration rather than from true wrestling.

οὐ φρονέεις, Διόφαντε, μόλις δύναμαι γὰρ ἔγωγε
ταῦτα ποιεῖν· παίδων δ' ἡ πάλῃ ἐστ' ἑτέρα.

And the trainer replies by telling Cyris, the other pupil, to pretend to be in difficulties and allow his opponent to make his attack, offering only a passive resistance.

ὄχλοῦ καὶ μένε, Κῦρι, καὶ ἐμβάλλοντος ἀνάσχου·
πρώτον συμμαλετᾶν ἢ μελετᾶν μαθέτω.

Two points deserve notice here. The system of training was progressive, there were special rules for boys and men. Secondly, in this method of teaching the stronger and more experienced must help the weaker. *πρώτον συμμαλετᾶν ἢ μελετᾶν μαθέτω*. This principle of cooperation in antagonistic exercises is a fundamental principle of the remarkable system of training in Japan known as jiu-jitsu. It is arranged beforehand which of the opponents is to win, and the other offers just enough resistance to benefit his adversary to the utmost.⁴

C.—Heats: the Bye.

Competitions in wrestling, boxing, and the pankration were conducted by the Greeks in the same manner as a modern tournament. Lucian's description of the method of drawing lots for the ties at Olympia is well known⁵. Lots marked in pairs with the letters of the alphabet in succession and corresponding to the number of the competitors were thrown into a silver helmet sacred to that purpose from which each competitor in turn drew a letter. In case of an odd number there was only one lot marked with the last letter used. Thus with an entry of seven there would be two A's, two B's, two Γ's, but only one Δ, the drawer of which was the bye or ἔφεδρος. After each round there was a fresh draw conducted in the same way.

The number of competitors varied. Sometimes a famous athlete would be allowed a walk-over, in which case he was said to win ἀκουτεῖ. Dromeus of Mantinea won such a victory in the pankration in *Ol.* 75, for the first time on record, says Pausanias.⁶ In an inscription at Olympia⁷ enumerating the victories of the Diagoridae of Rhodes, Dorieus is mentioned as victorious πύξ ἀκουτεῖ. A well-known epigram on Milo⁸ describes a similar victory, but such cases were rare, and the evidence shows that as a rule there were from five to twelve entries, requiring therefore three or four rounds. Thus Pindar describes the pankratiast Alcimedon⁹ and the wrestler Aristomenes¹⁰ as each of them victorious over four rivals, that is, in four rounds. Lucian in the passage referred to above mentions from four to twelve competitors, and the

⁴ H. J. Hancock, *Japanese Physical Training*, *passim*.

⁵ *Hermotim.* 40.

⁶ Paus. vi. 11, 4.

⁷ *Inscript.* v. *Olymp.* v. 153.

⁸ *Anth. Pal.* xi. 316.

⁹ *Ol.* viii. 90, ἐν τέτρασι παίδων ἀπεθήκατο γυίους | νόστον ἔχθιστον.

¹⁰ *Pyth.* viii. 81, τέτρασι δ' ἔμπετες ὑψόθεν σωματέσσι.

evidence of various Olympic inscriptions agrees with such an estimate. A fourth century inscription on Xenocles¹¹ speaks of him as

ἀπτῆς μονοπαλᾶν τέσσαρα σώμαθ' ἐλών.

ἀπτῆς appears to be equivalent to *ἀπτῶς*,¹² and *μονοπάλης*¹³ is used in contrast to the pankratiast of the wrestler pure and simple, to whom it would be an especial distinction never to have been thrown in any round or any bout.

A later inscription on the boxer Philippus¹⁴ tells us that he

τέσσαρας εὐθεία παῖδας ἔκλινε μάχα.

Lastly a long epigram on Ariston,¹⁵ who won the pankration in *Ol.* 207, tells us that there were seven competitors

ἑπτὰ γὰρ ἐκ παίδων παλάμας μόνος οὐκ ἀνέπανσα

and that Ariston himself was victor in three rounds

τρίσσα κατ' ἀντιπάλων ἄθλα κωνεισάμενος.

Ariston claims it as a special merit that he never had the advantage of a bye, but was *ἀνέφεδρος*

*οὐ γὰρ ἐν εὐτυχίῃ κλήρου στέφος ἀλλ' ἐφεδρείης
χωρὶς ἀπ' Ἀλφειοῦ καὶ Διὸς ἠσπασάμεν.*

A competitor who had drawn a bye must have had a great advantage in the next round over a less fortunate rival and the crown must often have depended on the luck of the lot. It is to such an accident that Pindar refers at the close of the Sixth Nemean ode when he says that Alcimidas and his brother were deprived of two Olympic crowns by the *κλᾶρος προπετής*.

The importance of the bye is yet more clearly demonstrated by an inscription of the reign of Trajan in honour of Ti. Claudius Rufus of Smyrna.¹⁶ It describes how having undergone a strict course of training under the eyes of the Hellanodikai he gave an exhibition in the games worthy of Olympian Zeus, and of his own training and reputation. For though *ἀνέφεδρος* he conquered the most formidable opponents in the pankration, and in the final tie, though matched against one who had drawn a bye (*ἐφεδρείαν λελογχότα*), he kept up the struggle till nightfall and made it a draw. The Eleans in consequence passed a special decree allowing him to erect a statue with an inscription commemorating this drawn match which was as honourable as a victory: *τῆς ἱεράς ἦν μόνος ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀνδρῶν ἐποίησεν*. The expression *ἡ ἱερά* appears to have been used for a dead heat or a drawn match because, in such cases, the crowns were dedicated to the god, a practice further

¹¹ *Inscript.* v. *Olymp.*, 164.

¹² Cp. *ib.* 183. Similarly in Phlegon's list of Olympic victors for *Ol.* 177, *Ἰσιῶρος Ἀλεξ-ανδρεὺς πάλιν ἄπτωτος περιόδον*.

¹³ Cp. Paus. vi. 4, 6, epigram on Chilon =

H.S.—VOL. XXV.

Anth. Pal. App. i. 102 and Bacchylides xii. 8.

¹⁴ *Inscr.* v. *Olymp.* 174.

¹⁵ *ib.* 225, 226.

¹⁶ *ib.* 54.

illustrated by another inscription, unfortunately much mutilated, detailing the arrangements for the games of Sebaste at Naples,

ὅσα δ' ἂν τῶν ἀθλημάτων ἔρημα ἢ ἱερά γίγνεται.¹⁷

On Panathenaic and other vases representing boxing and wrestling competitions a third athlete is generally present, who is usually described as an ἔφεδρος. I venture to doubt whether he is correctly so described. The very frequency of this addition suggests that the vase painter thus indicates the general character of the competition as a tournament rather than the presence of an actual ἔφεδρος.

D.—*The Skamma and Various Details as to the Wrestlers.*

The wrestling ground was called the skamma, a term which, as has been explained in a previous article, denotes a place dug up, levelled, and sanded so as to afford a smooth and soft surface.¹⁸ In the palaestra the skamma occupied the open space in the centre, and for actual competitions a similar space must have been provided in the stadium, probably in the semicircular σφενδόνη where such existed. In Heroic times wrestlers and boxers wore a loin-cloth or περιζωμα,¹⁹ which appears occasionally on black-figured vases,²⁰ but all clothing appears to have been discarded before the fifth century. Sometimes indeed we see wrestlers provided with caps protecting the ears, ἀμφώτιδες,²¹ but their use was apparently confined to boys and to practice and was not allowed in open competitions. For similar reasons wrestlers always wore their hair short.²² Before wrestling they not only oiled their bodies but rubbed them with sand, a service which Lucian describes them as performing for one another.²³ The object of this process, on which Lucian waxes eloquent, was partly to harden the skin and check the perspiration, partly to enable the opponents to obtain a firm hold of one another.²⁴

E.—*The Differences between Wrestling and the Pankration.*

In the Greek athletic festivals wrestling, besides being a separate event in the programme, formed part of the pentathlon. As far as we know the wrestling in both cases was governed by the same rules. But wrestling was also one of the elements in the pankration, and in order to decide whether any particular scene or description belongs to wrestling proper or to the

¹⁷ *Ib.* 56, l. 17. Other instances of this phrase and a full discussion of it will be found in the notes on inscription 54 by Dittenberger and Purgold.

¹⁸ *J.H.S.* 1904, p. 73.

¹⁹ *Hom. Il.* xxiii. 683, 700; *Thuc.* i. 6.

²⁰ *E.g. Mus. Greg.* xvii. 1, a; v. Scherer, *De Olympionicarum statuis*, p. 20.

²¹ Panaetius kylix, *Arch. Zeit.* 1878, 11;

Krause, p. 517, n. 20.

²² Philostratus, *Im.* ii. 32; Eurip. *Bacchae*, 455; *Plut. Arat.* ii. 3, 6.

²³ Cp. Ovid, *Met.* ix. 35; Statius, *Theb.* vi. 847.

²⁴ *Anacharsis* 2, 28, 29; *Plut. Symp.* iv. αἱ μὲν γὰρ παλαιόντων ἐπιβολαὶ καὶ ἐλξεις κονιορτοῦ δέονται.

pankration it is important to realise clearly the distinction between the two events.

The first and fundamental difference is that the wrestler merely sought to throw his opponent, victory being decided by the best of three or five bouts, whereas the pankratiast's object was by any lawful means to force his adversary to acknowledge himself defeated, and for this purpose one bout only was necessary. This distinction enables us to decide at once that the descriptions of Ovid, Lucian, Statius, and Heliodorus refer not to wrestling proper but to the pankration, which appealed so much more to the debased taste of the Roman populace.

A throw not being sufficient in the pankration, the struggle was continued on the ground, and we find a distinction made between *ὀρθή πάλη*, the very name of which proclaims the necessity of keeping on the feet, and ground wrestling, called by the Greeks *κύλισις* or *άλίνδησις*, which was confined to the pankration. I hope to show that in the former it was essential to keep on the feet and that a wrestler who touched the ground with his knee or any part of his body except the feet was considered thrown. Hence, whenever we see the struggle continued on the ground, we may feel sure that the pankration and not true wrestling is represented.

Moreover, hitting and kicking were allowed to the pankratiast, and these provide an additional test for distinguishing him from the wrestler who, as has been already noticed, is therefore described as *μονοπάλης*. Probably we may place in the same category seizing an opponent by the legs, but even without this we have sufficient tests.

The distinction between the pankration and wrestling on the one hand and boxing on the other is nowhere more clearly stated than in Theocritus xxiv. 110

ὄσσα δ' ἀπὸ σκελέων ἔδρουστροφοὶ Ἀργόθεν ἄνδρες
ἀλλάλους σφάλλονται παλαίσμασιν, ὄσσα τε πύκται
δεινοὶ ἐν ἰμάντεσσιν, ἅ τ' εἰς γαίαν προπεσόντες
πάμμαχοι ἐξεύροντο σοφίσματα σύμφορα τέχνη.

The *ίμάς* or boxing thong is the characteristic of the boxer, ground wrestling of the pankratiast, the throw of the wrestler.

In this connexion it is worth while to recall the fact that wrestling, at all events in the early days before it was corrupted by professionalism, was free from all suggestion of that brutality which has often brought such discredit on one of the noblest of sports. Tradition represented Palaestra²⁵ the daughter of Hermes as the inventor of the art, and Theseus to whom the rules of wrestling were ascribed is said to have learnt them from Athena herself.²⁶ Grace and skill were of far more account than mere strength,²⁷ and

²⁵ Philostratus, *Im.* ii. 32.

²⁶ Paus. i. 39, 3; Schol. Pindar, *Nem.* v. 49.

²⁷ Cp. Pindar, *Ol.* viii. 19; ix. 91, 110; *Isth.* vi. 20, and *passim*; *Anth. Plan.* iii. 2, App. 86. Aelian, *Var. Hist.* ii. 4, tells us of a trainer who punished a pupil merely because the popu-

lace applauded him: 'ἀλλὰ σὺ γε κακῶς καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἐχρῆν ἐποίησας ὕπερ ἐχρῆν ἕμεινον γένεσθαι· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐπῆνεσαν οἱ τοὶ τεχνικὸν σε δρᾶσαντά τι.' Eurymenes who won a victory at Olympia in 472 B.C. (*v. Ox. Papyri* II. 222) was trained at Samos by Pythagoras, and

the wrestling matches of Theseus and Heracles with Cercyon and Antaeus are but one of the many forms in which the Greeks imaged forth the triumph of civilisation over barbarism.

F.—*Distinctive Features of Greek Wrestling. The Fall.*

The two essential points which distinguish one style of wrestling from another are the definition of a fair throw and the nature of the holds allowed. In most modern styles, including the so-called Graeco-Roman, a man is considered thrown only when both shoulders, or a shoulder and a hip, are touching the ground at the same time, but in the Cumberland and Westmorland style he is thrown if he touches the ground with any part of the body. It has generally been asserted that in Greece the only throw recognised was a throw on the back.²⁸ But this idea seems to be due to the tendency to ascribe to the ancients the practices of modern athletics, a mistake facilitated in this case by the misleading use of the expression Graeco-Roman.

The principal evidence for the view that a clean throw on the back was required is a passage from the *Supplices* of Aeschylus, l. 90, where the chorus dwelling on the inscrutability and infallibility of the ordinances of Zeus exclaims

πίπτει δ' ἀσφαλές οὐδ' ἐπὶ νώτω
κορυφῇ Διὸς εἰ κρανθῆ πρᾶγμα τέλειον.

'The perfect deed ordained by the brow of Zeus falls'—to use a colloquial expression—'on its feet, not on its back.' This meaning of ἀσφαλές agrees perfectly with the common use of the verb σφάλλω as a wrestling term, and the whole expression is obviously intelligible to anyone who has seen a wrestler after being swung round and round by his opponent land safely on his feet. At the same time it is dangerous to draw definite conclusions as to the laws of Greek wrestling from such a passage: for the metaphor, applicable as it is to wrestling proper, is equally applicable to the rough and tumble of the pankration or of actual warfare, where the combatant who is thrown heavily on his back is completely at the mercy of his opponent. But even if we grant the connexion of the passage with wrestling proper, it certainly does not prove that the throw on the back was the only throw that counted; it proves at the most that such a throw was a fair throw, which no one has ever denied. By a curious oversight Paley, who in his note on the lines definitely lays down the law that victory consisted in three clean throws, *i.e.* in the

though small of stature, thanks to the σοφία of Pythagoras, defeated many mighty opponents, Diog. Laert. viii. 1. 12. On the other hand Damagetas in an epigram puts into the mouth of a Spartan youth the typically Spartan boast that he owed his victory to brute force, not to skill

κείνοι τεχνάεντες· ἐγὼ γε μὲν ὡς ἐπέοικε

τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίων παισὶ, βίᾳ κρατέω,
Anth. Plan. I. 1.
and Plutarch, *Apophtegm. Lac. Var.* 27 (233 E), tells us that the Spartans allowed no trainers for wrestling, ἵνα μὴ τέχνης ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ἡ φιλοτιμία γένηται.

²⁸ Smith, *Dict. Ant. s.v.* 'lucta.'

adversary being laid on his back three times,' and Mr. Tucker who follows Paley, supply the evidence for their own refutation. 'If a wrestler fell on the knee,' they say, 'it was no defeat,' and in support of this they quote the *Agamemnon* l. 63 sqq. and the *Persae* l. 914.

The passage from the *Agamemnon*,²⁹ proves nothing. *παλαίσματα* is no doubt originally an athletic term, but its metaphorical use to denote any form of struggle is so obvious and so frequent that often it almost ceases to be a metaphor. In the present passage the metaphor of the palaestra is dropped immediately and passes into the language of actual warfare. The words *γόνατος κονίαισιν ἐρειδομένου*—the words for which the commentators quote the passage—though singularly inappropriate to any form of wrestling but ground wrestling, exactly express the attitude of the warrior as we see him represented in the Aeginetan marbles and on many a vase, kneeling down to receive the charge of the enemy, or beaten on to his knees in the *mêlée*. The picture is completed by the words *διακναιομένης κάμακος*. 'The snapping asunder of the spear'³⁰ is a detail which can have no possible connexion with wrestling.

The passage referred to from the *Persae* is far more to the point, but it absolutely contradicts the conclusion in proof of which it is quoted. The chorus lamenting the downfall of Persia cry

Ἀσία δὲ χθών, βασιλεὺ γαίας,
αἰνῶς, αἰνῶς ἐπὶ γόνυ κέκλιται.

Here there can be no doubt that the metaphor is taken from wrestling, nor can there be any doubt that the words express a decisive fall, the very opposite of that described by *πίπτει ἀσφαλές*. The whole context, and the twice repeated *αἰνῶς* leave no doubt of the completeness of the defeat. The very same metaphor is used by Herodotus³¹ in describing the catastrophe which befel the Chians. The gods, he says, had already sent two disasters upon them by way of warning, *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἡ ναυμαχίη ὑπολαβοῦσα ἐς γόνυ τὴν πόλιν ἔβαλε*. The only possible conclusion from these passages is that a wrestler who fell on his knee was thereby defeated.

Mr. Tucker goes further than Paley and asserts that even a throw on the shoulder did not count, quoting in support of this statement the passage from the *Equites* of Aristophanes where the chorus, describing the dogged tenacity of the men of the older generation who had made Athens great, say

εἰ δέ που πέσοιεν ἐς τὸν ὄμον ἐν μάχῃ τινὶ
τοῦτ' ἀπεψήσαντ' ἄν, εἴτ' ἡρνούντο μὴ πεπτωκέναι
ἀλλὰ διεπάλαιον (l. 571).

²⁹ οὕτω δ' Ἀτρώως παῖδας ὁ κρείσσων
ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πέμπει Ξένιος
Ζεὺς, πολυνόρος ἀμφὶ γυναικὸς
πολλὰ παλαίσματα καὶ γυιοβαρῆ
γόνατος κονίαισιν ἐρειδομένου
διακναιομένης τ' ἐν προτελείοις
κάμακος θήσων Δαναοῖσιν
Τρωσὶ θ' ὁμολῶς.

³⁰ I have adopted the old interpretation of this expression, which seems to me so obviously appropriate to the context as to admit of no doubt. If, however, Dr. Verrall's suggestion is correct, that the snapping of the shaft is part of the marriage ceremony, the passage has no connexion at all with wrestling.

³¹ vi. 27.

Once more Mr. Tucker's illustration is fatal to his theory. If the throw on the shoulder was not a fair throw, the force of the passage is lost. The point is that these old Athenians, however clearly they were thrown, would never admit a defeat, but would wipe off the dust and go on wrestling, as though they had not been thrown at all. They wiped off the dust solely to hide the evidence of their defeat: if a fall on the shoulder did not count there was no defeat, and therefore no need for hiding the evidence.

The conclusions which we have drawn from Aeschylus and Aristophanes are confirmed by the epigrammatists who speak impartially of falls on the back, the shoulders, the hip, and the knee. And their evidence is especially valuable because the wrestling expressions are used by them literally, not metaphorically.

For a fall on the back we have the epigram of Philippus on Damostratus, *Anth. Plan.* iii. 25

οὐ κατ' εὐγυρον πάλην
ψάμμος πεσόντος νῶτον οὐκ ἐσφράγισεν.

The epigram ascribed to Alcaeus on Cleitomachus who won a triple victory in the pankration, in boxing and in wrestling, tells us that he never fell on his shoulders, in language which recalls that of Aristophanes

τὸ τρίτον οὐκ ἐκόνισσεν ἐπωμίδας ἀλλὰ παλαίσας
ἀπτῶς τοὺς τρισσοὺς Ἴσθμόθεν εἶλε πόνους.

Anth. Pal. ix. 588.

Little weight can be attached to the epigram³² which relates how Milo advancing to receive the crown fell on his hip (ὄλισθεν ἐπ' ἰσχίου), whereupon the people cried out not to crown a man who had fallen without an adversary, but the epigram on the same athlete assigned to Simonides³³ gives considerable support to our contention as to falling on the knee.

Μίλωνος τόδ' ἄγαλμα καλοῦ καλόν, ὃς ποτε Πίσση
ἐπτάκι νικήσας ἐς γόνατ' οὐκ ἔπεσεν.

The conclusion to which the literary evidence has led us is supported by the evidence of the monuments. If the only fair throw was the throw on the back, we should at least expect to find some representation of it. As it is, there is as far as I know not a single vase, bronze, gem, or coin on which such a throw is depicted. The only possible exceptions are a B.F. hydria in Munich³⁴ representing the struggle between Heracles and Antaeus, and a small bronze of rather doubtful antiquity figured by Montfaucon.³⁵ But inasmuch as in both cases the struggle is still continuing, it is clear that the scene belongs to the pankration rather than to wrestling. On the other hand we have definite evidence as to the fall on the knee in a series of bronzes which appear to be imitations of some well-known Hellenistic

³² *Anth. Pal.* xi. 316.

³³ *Anth. Plan.* iii. 24.

³⁴ *Arch. Zeit.* 1878, x.

³⁵ Montfaucon, *Ant. Expl.* iii. 166, 2; Reinach, *Répertoire de la Statuaire*, ii. p. 538.

group.³⁶ They represent a wrestler who has fallen on one knee, while his victorious opponent stands over him, with one hand pressing down his neck and with the other forcing back his arm. We shall have to deal more fully with these bronzes elsewhere: for the present it is enough to notice that the standing wrestler has completed his throw and that there is no suggestion of any further attack or action on his part. His opponent has fallen on his knee, and is defeated.

A possible objection to the view put forward is suggested by a throw commonly represented on red-figured vases and in Etruscan wall-paintings apparently imitated from them. It is possibly the throw described by Lucian as *εἰς ὕψος ἀναβαστάσαι*³⁷ and is known to modern wrestling as 'the flying mare.' The victor throws his opponent clean over his head, but, as he does this, he is sometimes represented as sinking on one knee or on both. If the rule of 'first down to lose' were strictly observed, the wrestler who sinks on his knee should lose the fall. Three explanations are possible. The artist may have taken a liberty with his subject for artistic reasons in order to shorten the group and so make it more suitable to the space at his disposal. Such a motive certainly suggests itself in the case of the B.M. kylix E 94 where the wrestler is sinking on both knees, and the same type is repeated with less reason in an Etruscan wall-painting. A more probable explanation to my mind is that the laws of wrestling, which were evidently very elaborate, allowed such a movement in this particular throw, possibly from motives of humanity in order to lessen the severity of the fall. This idea receives some support from the attitude of the trainer, who when present appears anxious to check any unnecessary violence. A third explanation is suggested by the Baltimore kylix published by Hartwig, *Meisterschal.* Pl. LXIV., which shows on one side two wrestlers obtaining a grip, and on the other the completion of the fall in question. The fallen wrestler is on his back with his legs still in the air, while his opponent kneels over him with his right hand on his mouth and his left raised to strike. This detail proves the scene to belong to the pankration and suggests that this fact may also account for the kneeling position. All the throws of *ὀρθή πάλη* were allowed in the pankration, and this particular throw, involving as it does a heavy fall on the back, may well have been a favourite with the pankratiast as it is to-day with the Japanese wrestler.

G.—*Wrestling in Homer.*

It is unfortunate that we have only one description of a genuine wrestling match of any value, the description in the Iliad. Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus merely imitate and enlarge upon Homer, introducing modifications

³⁶ B.M. *Bronzes* 853; Stephani, *C.R.* 1867, Pl. I.; *Jahrb.* 1898, p. 178; Reinach, *loc. cit.*

³⁷ *Anacharsis* 24. For vase-paintings representing this throw v. Hartwig, *Meisterschalen*, xv. b, and Fig. 20 a, b (= B.M. E 94); for

Etruscan wall-paintings, Dennis, *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*, ii. p. 323 (= Krause, *op. cit.* xii. b, 39 e); 327, 7 (Gori, *Mus. Etr.* iii. 84-87); 333 (= Dar.-Sagl. 4624); 343 (= Krause, xii. b, 39 b, *Mus. Chius.* cxxvi.).

mostly borrowed from the pankration, while the late date of these writers makes their evidence less valuable even than that of the Roman poets.³⁸ But the descriptions of the latter, and with these we may class that in the *Aethiopica*³⁹ of Heliodorus, belong without exception to the pankration type where ground wrestling plays an important part and the fight is always to a finish.

The match between Odysseus and Ajax, as described in the *Iliad*,⁴⁰ is a genuine example of *ὀρθή πάλη*. No time was wasted in the preliminaries. Girding themselves they advanced 'into the midst of the ring and clasped each the other in his arms with stalwart hands like gable rafters of a lofty house.' The attitude familiar to us from the monuments is identical with that adopted by Westmorland and Cumberland wrestlers in the present day. Then came a struggle for a closer grip. 'And their backs creaked gripped firmly (*ἐλκόμενα στερεῶς*) under the vigorous hands, and sweat ran down in streams, and frequent weals along their ribs and shoulders sprang up, red with blood,⁴¹ while ever they strove amain for victory.' But when after much striving neither could gain an advantage, and the spectators grew impatient, Ajax suggested an expedient

ἢ μ' ἀνάειρ' ἢ ἐγὼ σέ.

There is here no suggestion of any trick on the part of Ajax, he merely proposes that each should in turn allow the other to obtain a fair grip and try to throw him by lifting him off the ground.⁴² There is no suggestion of unfairness, but such a contest does give an advantage to the heavier man. Odysseus, however, was equal to the occasion and as Ajax lifted him, not forgetful of his art, he struck him behind the knee with his foot and so brought him to the ground, falling heavily upon him.⁴³ Clearly, if any one won the fall, it was Odysseus. The chip used by Odysseus is that known to modern wrestlers as 'the outside click,' a variety of the backheel invaluable as a defensive move to the light-weight wrestler. 'The most expert light-weight,' says Mr. Armstrong, 'would have no earthly chance with a moderate heavy-weight were it not for the outside click, which should be plied directly he feels himself leaving his mother soil.'⁴⁴ The particular form of this chip where the stroke is made as high up as the knee is known as 'hamming.'

³⁸ Ovid, *Met.* ix. 32 sq.; Lucan, *Phars.* iv. 612 sq.; Statius, *Theb.* vi. 831 sq.

³⁹ P. 433 sq.

⁴⁰ xxiii. 707-739. The quotations are from the translation of the *Iliad* by Messrs. Lang, Leaf, and Myers.

⁴¹ A fragment of a red-figured kylix in Berlin, No. 2276, reproduced by Hartwig, *Meisterschal.*

12, though representing the pankration, gives a realistic illustration of these words. figure to the right is not only bleeding copiously at the nose, but also bears on his back the marks of his opponent's fingers.

⁴² Pausanias viii. 40 describes a similar arrangement in boxing, Creuges and Damoxenus agreeing to strike one another in turn without guarding themselves. This was called a *κλίμαξ*.

⁴³ ἄΩς εἰπὼν ἀνάειρε· δόλου δ' οὐ λήθετ' Ὀδυσσεύς·

κόψ' ὕπιθεν κώληπα τυχῶν, ὑπέλυσε δὲ γυῖα

καὶ δ' ἔβαλ' ἐξοπίσω· ἐπὶ δὲ στήθεσσιν Ὀδυσσεύς

κάππεσε. 725-728.

⁴⁴ *Wrestling* (All England Series), p. 8.

Next came Odysseus' turn: he tried to lift Ajax and moved 'him a little from the ground, but lifted him not, so he crooked his knee within the other's (*ἐν δὲ γόνυ γνάμψεν*) and both fell to the ground nigh to each other and were soiled with dust.' Eustathius in his note on the passage says that they fell sideways, *πίπτουσιν πλάγιοι*, and he describes the chip as *μεταπλασμόν* or *παρακαταγωγὴν*, technicalities which appear to correspond to the 'hank' or 'inside click' of to-day. The fall must certainly have been inconclusive, it was what is known in Cumberland as a 'dog fall,' and no amount of ingenuity can assign the victory to Ajax.

At this point Achilles put an end to the contest and awarded to each wrestler an equal prize. Futile efforts have been made to justify this verdict by affirming that Odysseus won the first, and Ajax the second round. As we have seen, in the latter neither could claim the advantage, while in the former whatever advantage was gained belonged to Odysseus, who fell on the top of his opponent. But if Odysseus had won one fall, and Ajax had won neither, it is difficult to understand the justice of dividing the honours, and Odysseus surely was the last man to yield such a point. The explanation is simple: neither bout was conclusive, for neither wrestler kept his feet in either, and the inference is that when both wrestlers fell, no fall could be scored. Whether this principle held good in historical times there is no evidence to determine.⁴⁵ The principle is not unknown to modern wrestling, and the Homeric account establishes some slight presumption in its favour. Possibly it may be implied by Pindar's use of the adjective *ἄπτως* in describing the 'swift and sudden shock' by which Epharmostus threw his opponents.⁴⁶

H.—*Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus.*

The wrestling matches described by Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus need not detain us long. In the former,⁴⁷ the opponents are Ajax and Tydides. In the first bout Ajax obtains a firm grip on Tydides and tries to crush him or bend him backwards (*ἄξει*) but the latter by a combination of strength and skill slips the grip, and obtaining the lower hold lifts Ajax off the ground, getting his shoulder underneath, and at the same time twisting his foot round his opponent's leg 'on the other side,' he brings him to the ground and sits upon him. Tydides is clearly the winner.

In the second round there is a long and tedious struggle for a grip, Tydides trying to obtain a hold round Ajax' thighs. Ajax after vainly endeavouring to force him to the ground obtains a grip round his waist and turns him over heavily in a style which is associated in art especially with

⁴⁵ Nothing can be inferred from Pindar, *Pyth.* viii. 81, *τέτρασι δ' ἔμπετες ὑψόθεν σωματέσσι*. There is no authority for translating *ἔμπετες* 'fell uppermost upon.' Here and in Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1174, which Dr. Fennell in his

edition of the Pythian Odes quotes in support of his translation, *ἐμπίπτειν* has its usual meaning 'to attack.'

⁴⁶ *Ol.* ix. 91.

⁴⁷ *iv.* 215 *sq.*

Theseus.⁴⁸ At this point as in the *Iliad*, Achilles declares the match a draw and divides the prizes.

In Nonnus,⁴⁹ Aristaeus is opposed to Aeacus. The first round follows closely the Homeric model. Aristaeus tries to lift and swing Aeacus, who clicks his left knee with his heel and so throws him backwards. But the second bout diverges widely from Homer. Aeacus tries to lift Aristaeus, but failing to do so he springs suddenly round him and jumps upon his back, twisting his legs round his stomach and knotting his hand round his neck so that he cannot speak. The officials interfere to save him from death; 'for,' says Nonnus, 'there was no law such as later generations long ago devised by which the vanquished could give a sign of his defeat by turning down his thumb.' Here we have passed away from wrestling into the region of the pankration and the gladiatorial shows, and the particular trick described is, as I hope to show when dealing with the pankration, that known as *κλιμακισμός*.

These descriptions, though affording interesting illustrations of various grips, throw little light on the principles of *ὀρθή πάλη*. The only point on which they have any bearing is whether the *τρία παλαίσματα* were three falls or three bouts, whether the wrestler had to win the best of five bouts or of three. Homer's description is in favour of three bouts; Quintus and Nonnus corroborate Homer, but, as they are obviously imitating Homer, their testimony has no independent value. Most of the passages referring to the *τρίαγμός*⁵⁰ admit of either interpretation. But the following line from a fragment of Sophocles 678 clearly implies three falls

τὶν' οὐ παλαίουσ' ἐς τρίς ἐκβάλλει θεῶν ;

So too Apollodorus⁵¹ describing the fight between Heracles and Eryx says that the former *τρίς περιγεγόμενος κατὰ τὴν πάλην ἀπέκτεινε*. With this agree the words of Seneca—*luctator ter abjectus perdidit palmam*—the definition of *τρίαχθῆναι* by Suidas as *τρίς πεσεῖν*, the metaphorical use of *τριάξειν* and its cognates and especially their application to the pentathlon. So, though it is unwise to dogmatise upon a detail so liable to vary with time and place, I believe that three falls were necessary to secure victory, or the best of five bouts.

I.—*Legholds not allowed.*

We come now to the much more difficult question of what grips were allowed. In particular were legholds allowed, and was tripping allowed? The conclusions to which I have come are that in true wrestling no holds

⁴⁸ *E.g.* the Metope from the Theseum.

⁴⁹ *Dionys.* xxxvii. 553–601.

⁵⁰ The evidence on this point is collected in my article on the Pentathlon, vol. xxiii. p. 63 of this *Journal*. The quotation from Plato, *Euthydemus* 277 c, is inaccurate. It should be

'ἔτι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον καταβαλὼν ὥσπερ πάλισμα ὄρμα τὸν νεανίσκον.' The inaccuracy does not affect the argument as the passage still implies three falls, Cleinias having been already twice thrown in the argument.

⁵¹ ii. 5, 10, 10.

were allowed below the waist and that various forms of tripping were allowed, though I doubt whether it was employed so freely as in some modern schools.

By far the most important passage dealing with the first question occurs in Plato *Leg.* vii. 796A, B. Speaking of the style of wrestling which he would encourage in his ideal state he says: *καὶ δὴ τά γε κατὰ πάλην ἃ μὲν Ἄνταιος ἢ Κερκυῶν ἐν τέχναις ἑαυτῶν συνεστήσαντο φιλονεικίας ἀχρήστου χάριν ἢ πυγμῆν Ἐπειὸς ἢ Ἄμυκος, οὐδὲν χρήσιμα ἐπὶ πολέμου κοινωνίαν ὄντα, οὐκ ἄξια λόγῳ κοσμεῖν τὰ δὲ ἀπ' ὀρθῆς πάλης, ἀπ' αὐχένων καὶ χειρῶν καὶ πλευρῶν ἐξείλησεως μετὰ φιλονεικίας τε καὶ καταστάσεως διαπονούμενα εὐσχήμονος ῥώμης τε καὶ ὑγείας ἕνεκα, ταῦτ' εἰς πάντα ὄντα χρήσιμα οὐ παρετέον.* Plato, who was himself an athlete, is here contrasting the methods of ὀρθῆ πάλη, which was an exercise of skill practised in a spirit of honourable rivalry and promoting the healthy and harmonious development of the body, with the more brutal methods elaborated by bullies such as Cercyon and Antaeus for mere personal vainglory and love of strife. His language leaves no doubt that he is really thinking of the pankration which he elsewhere expressly excludes from his state.⁵² The pankratiast, like the bully, sought by all means in his power to reduce his opponent to helplessness and to force him to acknowledge defeat, and the result in both cases was not infrequently fatal. Plato then contrasting wrestling with the pankration defines the former as consisting in the disentangling of neck and hands and sides. These are precisely the holds which we see constantly represented in art, and we may note in passing the accuracy of the description, for the wrestler's art is shown even more in his ability to escape from a grip than in his skill in fixing one.

Plato in this passage makes no mention of legholds, but the scholiast commenting on it tells us that Theseus invented *τὴν ἀπὸ χειρῶν πάλην*, and Cercyon *τὴν ἀπὸ σκελῶν*. Now inasmuch as the wrestling of Cercyon and Antaeus is contrasted with ὀρθῆ πάλη and is therefore connected with the ground wrestling of the pankration, we are justified in also connecting with the latter the phrase *τὴν ἀπὸ σκελῶν*.

The meaning of this phrase is, however, ambiguous; it may denote either legholds, or the use of the legs in tripping. Eustathius clearly understood it in the latter sense, for in his note on the *Iliad* already referred to⁵³ he says of the first bout in which Odysseus struck with his foot the back of Ajax' knee *πρῶτος δέ, φασίν, Κερκυῶν εὗρε τὴν τοιαύτην παλαιστικὴν μηχανὴν καὶ καλεῖται ἰγνύων ὑφαίρεσις*. Evidently the scholiast to Plato and Eustathius drew their information from a common source, or one of them took it from the other. But there seems some reason for supposing that Eustathius has mistaken the meaning of *τὴν ἀπὸ σκελῶν πάλην* and *ἰγνύων*

⁵² *Leg.* 834 A. The verdict of the fourth century should not unduly prejudice us against the pankration. Originally an exercise of skill like boxing and conducted in the true spirit of

sport, like boxing also it degenerated into brutality under the influence of specialisation and professionalism.

⁵³ 1327, 8 R.

ὑφαίρεσις. A writer describing the methods of Antaeus and Cercyon would naturally have in his mind the conventional representations of these giants in art. The discussion of these mythological types must be postponed for the present; it is sufficient here to note that Antaeus is commonly represented either actually seizing or trying to seize Heracles by the ankle, and Cercyon when lifted off his feet by Theseus frequently appears to be catching at the hero's legs.⁵⁴ This trick is generally described as τὸ ἔλκειν, though there is as far as I know no authority for thus narrowing down the meaning of ἔλκειν except a wrong reading in a passage of Lucian's *Dialog. Deorum* vii. 3, where we read χθὲς δὲ προκαλεσάμενος τὸν Ἑρωτα κατεπάλαισεν εὐθὺς οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ὑφελὼν τὸ πῶδε. The old reading for which there seems to be no authority was ὑφέλκων τὸ πῶδε, the new and correct reading ὑφελῶν brings us back to *ὑφαίρεσις*. Even so the passage is ambiguous and might denote equally well a leghold or tripping, but the evidence of the vases seems to me to prove conclusively that 'leg wrestling' traditionally associated with Cercyon was not tripping but seizing the opponent by the leg.

With the mythological scenes we may compare certain Panathenaic vases⁵⁵ where one of the opponents is represented as having caught the other by the leg and lifting him up seems on the point of overthrowing him. His opponent has his arm raised as if about to strike him with his fist, a fact which proves that the scene represents, not as is commonly stated wrestling, but the pankration. The same motive occurs in a long series of the Pamphylian coins of Aspendus, and occasionally upon gems, and the trick might be described as *ἰγνύων ὑφαίρεσις* with quite as much propriety as that employed by Odysseus. In some of these scenes it seems as if one of the pair was endeavouring to kick the other in the stomach,⁵⁶ and that the latter has seized his foot in the air. Kicking was certainly allowed in the pankration, and is alluded to by Theocritus xxii. 66 as one of the distinctions between the pankration and boxing. Amycus, who is put by Plato in the same class as Antaeus and Cercyon, challenges Polydeuces, who asks

πυγμαχῶς ἢ καὶ ποσσὶ θενῶν σκέλος, ὄμματα δ' ὀρθά;

Galen, too, in his amusing vision of an Olympic festival in which the animals wrest all the crowns from man, assigns the prize for boxing to the bull, that for the pankration to the donkey who *λάξ ποδὶ εἰ βούλεται ἐρίσας αὐτὸν τὸν στέφανον οἷσεται*. (*Προτρεπτ. ἐπὶ τέχνας*, 36.)

Here then we have two practices—catching an opponent's leg and kicking—which certainly belong to the pankration and are far more suitable to the character of Cercyon than the trick employed by Odysseus. Kicking

⁵⁴ The vase-paintings representing these two subjects are collected by Klein, *Euphronios*, pp. 122 and 193.

⁵⁵ *M. d. I.* i. 22, 8b and 10b (I have failed to discover where these vases are now); amphora in Lamberg collection, *J.H.S.* i. Pl. VI.

⁵⁶ Lucian, *Anacharsis* 9, refers to kicking in

the stomach, *λακτιζόμενον ἐς τὴν γαστέρα*; cp. Aristoph. *Eg.* 273, 454, *γαστριζεν*. Pollux, iii. 150, includes in his list of terms connected with the pankration, *λάξ ἐνάλλεσθαι*, an expression very descriptive of the left hand pankratiast in the Lamberg amphora.

we know was not allowed in wrestling; legholds are only represented or described⁵⁷ in connexion with the pankration, and from the omission of any mention of them by Plato we may infer that they were not allowed in ὀρθή πάλη. This view is confirmed by the practical consideration of the riskiness of such a trick in a style of wrestling in which it was essential to keep on the feet ὀρθοστάδην, and in which the man who touched the ground even with his knee lost. The wrestler who stoops low enough to seize his opponent's foot is certain to be forced on to his knees if he misses his grip, and according to Statius such a fate actually befel Tydeus in his match with Agyllus

fictumque in colla minatus
crura subit: coeptis non evaluere potiri
frustratae brevitae manus: venit arduus ille
desuper, oppressumque ingentis mole ruinae
condidit.—*Theb.* vi. 876.

Fortunately for Tydeus the match was fought under the rules of the pankration.

L.—*Tripping.*

We have seen how important a part tripping played in the Homeric wrestling match. After Homer we have little evidence beyond the frequent metaphorical use of ὑποσκελίζειν⁵⁸ until we come to Lucian. In the first chapter of the *Anacharsis* describing the athletes in the palaestra he says οἱ μὲν περιπλεκόμενοι ὑποσκελίζουσιν, and again in chapter 24 πολεμῶν ἀνδρὶ ὁ τοιοῦτος συμπλακεῖς καταρρίψει τε θᾶσσον ὑποσκελίσας καὶ καταπεσὼν εἴσεται ὡς ῥᾶστα ἐξανίστασθαι. In the *Oxyrhynchus* wrestling papyrus one of the instructions is σὺ βάλε πόδα, words which seem to denote some movement of the foot for the purpose of tripping an adversary. Lastly, Philostratus, *Gym.* 35, describing the physical qualities of the wrestler, asserts that the βουβῶνες must be εὐστραφεῖς, for so they are συνδῆσαι ἱκανοὶ πᾶν ὅπερ ἂν ἡ πάλη παραδιδῶ καὶ συνδεθέντες ἀνιάσουσι μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνιάσονται. The words 'ὅπερ ἂν ἡ πάλη παραδιδῶ' confine the expression to such clicks as are allowed in true wrestling, excluding the more complicated grips with the legs possible in ground wrestling.

This evidence though somewhat scanty is sufficient to prove that tripping was practised by the Greeks, though probably not to the same extent as in some modern styles. This conclusion is supported by the monuments; for though tripping is as far as I know never represented by the vase painter, it

⁵⁷ Thus in Ovid, *Met.* ix. 37; Lucan, *Phars.* iv. 612; Statius, *loc. cit.* Lucian, *Anacharsis* 1, describes how one youth ἀράμενος τὸν ἕτερον ἐκ τοῖν σκελοῖν ἀφήκεν εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος, but the context proves that he is speaking of the pan-

kration.

⁵⁸ Plato, *Euthydem.* 278 B; Demosthenes 273. ἀγκυρίσαι is used by the comic poets in the same way, Aristoph. *Eq.* 262; Eupolis, *T4ξ.* 6.

is clearly implied in the group of bronzes mentioned above.⁵⁹ In these bronzes the way in which the victor's left foot is twisted round his opponent's clearly shows that he must have employed this foot in twisting him off his balance.

The moment shown in these bronzes, as has been already stated, is one of rest: the standing wrestler has thrown his opponent, and the victory is won. If, however, he were to continue the attack he would fall on his opponent in precisely the attitude represented in the famous Uffizi group of wrestlers. This group belongs to the pankration and not to true wrestling, and I should not have mentioned it here, were it not that the contrary is stated in a most interesting article by Hans Lucas which appeared in last year's *Jahrbuch*,⁶⁰ with much of which I fully agree. Comparing the marble with the wrestling groups in a Roman mosaic from Tusculum,⁶¹ he concludes that the artist of the mosaic had in his mind the marble group, and that the right arm of the victor, which in the restoration is raised with clenched fist as if for striking, is wrongly restored 'because the scene belongs *manifestly* not to the pankration but to wrestling, where striking was not allowed,' and he therefore suggests that he is rather preparing to seize his fallen opponent by the neck in order to strangle him in the manner represented in the mosaic. With the correctness of the restoration I am not concerned here. I will confine myself to two remarks. In the first place the scene does not *manifestly* belong to true wrestling. It has been shown that the wrestler's object was to throw his opponent, and that there is no proof that he had to throw him on his back or force him to acknowledge defeat. In the Uffizi group the undermost wrestler is manifestly down and yet the struggle still continues. Hence it belongs to the pankration. Another equally unfounded statement sometimes urged against the actual restoration of the group is that in the pankration hitting was not allowed when the opponents were on the ground. This is a gratuitous assumption, and is quite contrary to the evidence of the vases. Secondly, supposing that the restoration is wrong and that the motive of the group is τὸ ἄρχεω, I submit that this form of strangling is utterly incompatible with true wrestling inasmuch as its object is not to throw the opponent, but to incapacitate him. Therefore the Uffizi group still belongs to the pankration, as does the corresponding group in the mosaic.

M.—Conclusion.

It may be convenient to sum up the conclusions at which we have arrived:—

1. If a wrestler was thrown on his knee, hip, back, or shoulder, it was a fair fall.

⁵⁹ P. 23 n. 36.

⁶⁰ P. 127 *sqq.*

⁶¹ *M. d. I.* vi. vii. 82, Schreiber, *Atlas* xxiii.
10.

2. If both wrestlers fell together, nothing was counted.
3. Three falls or the best of five bouts were necessary to secure victory.
4. No holds were allowed below the waist.
5. Tripping with the feet was allowed.

These general laws may have been, and indeed were probably modified at different times and different places. We know for example that the Sicilians had rules of their own.⁶² But the general agreement of the evidence seems to show that at all events in the great athletic festivals wrestling was conducted on the above principles.

E. NORMAN GARDINER.

(To be continued.)

⁶² Aelian, *Var. Hist.* xi. 1: Ὀρίκαδμος πάλης ἐγένετο νομοθέτης, καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐπινοήσας τὸν Σικελῶν τρόπον καλούμενον.