The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

RACQUET TRILOGY: LAWN TENNIS, THE WORLD'S FAIR, AND THE EARLY MODERN OLYMPIC GAMES

A Thesis in

Kinesiology

by

Brad William Hummel

© 2020 Brad William Hummel

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Science

May 2020

The thesis of Brad William Hummel was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Mark S. Dyreson
Professor of Kinesiology
Thesis Adviser

Francisco Javier López Frías
Assistant Professor of Kinesiology and Philosophy

Michelle Sikes
Assistant Professor of Kinesiology, African Studies, and History

Jonathan Dingwell
Professor of Kinesiology
Graduate Program Director

ABSTRACT

The revival of the Olympic games orchestrated by the Baron Pierre de Coubertin of France and his supporters provided the opportunity for including modern sports and games in a global athletic festival. Lawn tennis, a nineteenth century derivative of ancient medieval ball games, was an ideal fit for the Olympic movement because of its strong social connections with the upper classes of Europe and North America. The only ball sport on the first Olympic program in 1896, tennis remained a part of the games for their next seven iterations, including the Olympics of 1900 and 1904. The first three Olympic tennis tournaments remain underrepresented in historical scholarship, but demonstrate that the sport was a source of stability and consistency during the developing years of the modern Olympic movement. The 1900 and 1904 tournaments coincided with two world's fairs, but rather than yielding inferior competitions, were relatively successful events for their time. Along with the 1896 event, these tournaments made unique contributions to the growth of the games through furnishing a contemporary sport for the athletic program, providing Olympic opportunities for women athletes, and utilizing the games as a marketable international mega-event.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements……. v

Chapter One. *Bridging Three Athletic Festivals: A Roadmap of Lawn Tennis and the Early Modern Olympic Games*……1

Chapter Two. *The Athenian Dawn of a New Tradition: Tennis Makes the Modern Olympics*……..…….....10

Chapter Three. *A Surprise Success: Tennis on the Ile de Puteaux, 1900*.....35

Chapter Four. *An American Affair: Olympic Tennis at the St. Louis World's Fair of 1904*…….....82

Chapter Five. *A Symphony of Forgotten Planets: The Successful Orchestration of Tennis, the Olympics, and the World's Fair*……...……..…124

Bibliography…….……..136

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A work of historical research such as this simply would not be possible without the support of many individuals to whom I am greatly indebted for their contributions, advice, and encouragement. First thanks must go to the members of my committee chaired by my thesis adviser, Mark Dyreson. Dr. Dyreson's support during the years of research culminating in this project have helped me grow tremendously as a writer and scholar, and taught me that there is always more to learn, and more ways to improve and perfect the historical craft. I have had the pleasure of working directly with Javi Lopez Frias and Michelle Sikes through my time as a graduate assistant at Penn State, and genuinely appreciate the opportunities each offered me, particularly in the realm of teaching. Further thanks go to the many individuals with whom I had the pleasure of working with at the Pennsylvania State University, including my colleagues in the Department of Kinesiology and at the Eberly Special Collections Library, where I spent many long hours both in research and in care of the seminal assembly of sport history resources housed therein. I also appreciate the professional opportunities offered to graduate students by the North American Society for Sport History (NASSH), at whose annual conference I first presented material contained in this thesis.

On a personal level, I must give thanks to those individuals in my life who have instilled in me a love of tennis and the Olympic games. Foremost thanks go to my parents, who provided the first books on the Olympics which I first pored over as an elementary schooler, and who bought me my first tennis racquet. My grandfather, the late William W. Hummel, Sr., passed on to me a love of history and the pursuit of the truth

that I will treasure forever. My high school tennis coach, Todd Snyder, tolerated my desires to be more a student of tennis than a player. While still an undergraduate at Grove City College, the advice of Gary Scott Smith and his colleagues in the Department of History were greatly encouraging as I pursued undergraduate research and articulated a passion for sport history. Last and most of all, I must thank Emily, my beloved wife-to-be, for her constant and unyielding support for me and my studies throughout my graduate school years.

Chapter One

Bridging Three Athletic Festivals:

A Roadmap of Lawn Tennis and the Early Modern Olympic Games

In 1893, during a prolonged musical residency in the United States of America, Czech composer Antonín Dvořák composed his Symphony No. 9 in E Minor, better known as the New World Symphony.[1] Dvořák's symphony, completed the same year as the famed World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, Illinois, sought inspiration from the American musical tradition and even Native American mythos to create a new, modern musical synthesis suitable for a young, vibrant, and growing country.[2] While Dvořák was completing his fabled work, the Chicago world's fair, a sprawling exposition constructed to commemorate the four-hundredth anniversary of the European discovery of the Americas, showcased the latest marvels in a spectacle designed to impress and inspire the imagination. Among those attending the 1893 fair was the baron Pierre de Coubertin, an ambitious French educator who had recently announced a proposal to revive the fair's ancient equivalent in pageantry, the Olympic games.[3] Coubertin, who represented France as an emissary to the fair while touring the United States, used the opportunity to promote the reincarnation of the ancient games, speaking at several esteemed universities and meeting with like-minded American sporting figures to form the American Olympic Committee (AOC).[4] Coubertin's dream was not an imitative re-creation of the ancient festival, exalting solely the classical imagery for which the city-states of ancient Greece came to be remembered, but rather the birth of a new institution

---

[1] John Clapham, *Dvořák* (New York: Norton, 1979), 132–133.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Richard D. Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1976), 80; 83; John J. MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 162-165. Pierre de Coubertin initially announced his idea to revive the Olympic games as a modern festival in a meeting at the Sorbonne in 1892, now referred to as the First Sorbonne Congress. Coubertin's proposal was not received particularly seriously, and it was only after a second effort two years later that he achieved the establishment of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the modern Olympic games.
[4] Mark Dyreson, *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 60; Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Olympics in Athens 1896: The Invention of the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Profile Books, 2004), 73; Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics*, 83; MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 165.

out of nineteenth century amateur sporting culture that expanded the ritual celebration with modern games.[5] It was a symphonic fusion for a new world in which tennis—a game the ancient Greeks never imagined, let alone played—was destined to play an important role.

Coubertin owed much of his inspiration to his travels in the United States and also in the United Kingdom, where his discovery of athletic regimens at elite public schools and exposure to events such as William Penny Brookes' Shropshire Olympics greatly influenced Coubertin's designs on a rotating global sporting festival destined to grace the great cities of the modern world.[6] In the words of the historian Matthew P. Llewellyn in *Rule Britannia,* his seminal work on British nationalism in the context of the modern Olympic games, "the British provided ideological and institutional framework" that supported the reinstitution of the Olympic games at the close of the nineteenth century.[7] They also furnished the Frenchman with exposure to the colorful, multisport gatherings he would soon institute as a gathering place not only for modern athletes, but also for modern games. There in the bucolic pastures of Much Wenlock, Shropshire, wrote his biographer John J. MacAloon, Coubertin discovered his sporting Valhalla: "The playing ground, Coubertin thought, was beautiful for its setting, its grass tracks for footraces and equestrian sports, its cricket and lawn tennis grounds, its 'large and comfortable stands,' its 'open-air swimming tank and its dancing lawn.'"[8]

---

[5] Pierre de Coubertin, "The Olympic Games of 1896," *Century* 53, no. 31 (November 1896), 30-37; MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 142; 172; Bill Mallon and Ture Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland and Company, 1998), 4-6.

[6] Matthew P. Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 1-3; Smith, *Olympics in Athens 1896*, 72-78; MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 147-148.

[7] Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia*, 2.

[8] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 148.

Through twenty-first century eyes the thoughts of tennis played in idyllic places in the Victorian English country side conjure up similar images of a sportsman's Elysian Fields, yet in the final decades of the nineteenth century, there were few sports as rapidly growing or as popular among the upper classes as lawn tennis. Born out of the same spirit of leisure that had seen the birth both of social games such as croquet and public school institutions such as rugby,[9] since its advent in 1874 the new game of lawn tennis had taken sporting enthusiasts by storm.[10] Although earlier forms of tennis had existed for hundreds of years, lawn tennis promised to be a versatile and adaptable outdoor variety that quickly found patrons among the same elite clientele that had supported its predecessors for centuries.[11] Almost immediately after Walter Clopton Wingfield filed a patent for the game of *sphairistikè* on February 23, 1874, the new recreation became a favored pastime in the fashionable circles of Western society.[12] While the sport would ultimately attract a more democratic clientele, lending to its present global popularity,[13] Wingfield's game channeled early support from the aristocracy to make tennis a staple in

---

[9] Elizabeth Wilson, *Love Game: A History of Tennis, From Victorian Pastime to Global Phenomenon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), 9-11; MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 51-77; George E. Alexander, *Lawn Tennis: Its Founders and Its Early Days* (Lynn, Mass.: H. O. Zimman, 1974), 3; Brooks Butler Hays, *Balls on the Lawn: Games to Live By*, illustrated by Jeremy Stein (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2014), 27-29; E. Digby Baltzell, *Sporting Gentlemen: Men's Tennis from the Age of Honor to the Cult of the Superstar* (New York: The Free Press, 1995), 17-19; Robert J. Lake, *A Social History of Tennis in Great Britain* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014), 8-9; Robert J. Lake, "Introduction to the History and Historiography of Tennis," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 1-16, Routledge International Handbooks (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 1-3.

[10] Alexander, *Lawn Tennis*, 15-18; Wilson, *Love Game*, 9-10; Oliver Andrew Grey, "Diamond Jubilee of Lawn-Tennis." *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 157, no. 4105 (30 June 1934), 755; Hollis Smith, "Tennis: Historically Speaking," National Public Parks Tennis Association, Accessed 23 September 2019, http://www.nppta.com/History.htm.

[11] Brad William Hummel and Mark Dyreson, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon: The History of Sponsorship in Tennis," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 19-28 (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 19-22.

[12] Alexander, *Lawn Tennis*, 15-18. Alexander's account of the earliest years of modern lawn tennis includes a copy of Walter Clopton Wingfield's original patent for *Sphairistikè*, which was filed on February 23, 1874.

[13] Hummel and Dyreson, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon," 19-27.

the British social season.[14] "From its conception," writes the noted tennis historian Robert J. Lake, "lawn tennis was a major feature of garden parties, which afforded its hosts, from old and new money alike, excellent opportunities to convey wealth."[15]

By 1877, championship events had been established at the Worple Road ground of the All England Club in the London suburb of Wimbledon.[16] In a decision which sought to restrict participants to only the affluent, the Wimbledon Championships would be open only to amateurs.[17] Tennis' superior standing within the influential upper classes of Great Britain, and soon Europe and North America, along with its close association with the principles of nineteenth century amateurism, ensured the sport would be well within the umbrella of Pierre de Coubertin's modern Olympic idea.[18]

When the Games of the first modern Olympiad came to fruition in Athens, Greece, in the early spring of 1896, lawn tennis would be the first and only ball sport on the Olympic program.[19] The sport would appear again in 1900 in France, in 1904 in the United States, and at each successive Olympics through 1924.[20] Despite its eight

---

[14] Lake, *Social History*, 17.
[15] Ibid., 12.
[16] Baltzell, *Sporting Gentlemen*, 41-44; Alexander, *Lawn Tennis*, 36; John Barrett, *Wimbledon: The Official History of the Championships* (London: CollinsWillow, 2001).
[17] Heiner Gillmeister, *Tennis: A Cultural History* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997), 194.
[18] Cheree Intorre Jones, "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1985, 8; Lake, "History and Historiography," 1-3; Lake, *Social History*, 9; 17; 21; Simon J. Eaves and Tom Higgins, "Lawn Tennis in Ireland: The Untold History, 1870-1914," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 119-129 (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 119-121. Tennis' close association to upper-class amateurism has been explored in Cheree Jones' "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," and more recently and more thoroughly with respect to the United Kingdom by Robert J. Lake, especially in *A Social History of Tennis in Britain*. Ireland's amateur tennis heritage, which furnished a number of early Wimbledon champions (and the first Olympic singles winner, John Pius Boland), is addressed by Simon J. Eaves and Tom Higgins in their recent contribution to the *Routledge Handbook of Tennis*.
[19] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 102; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 117.
[20] The results of these early Olympic games are available in several sources. The most complete record on the games of 1896 through 1920 is Bill Mallon's thorough series *Results of the Early Modern Olympics*. A more concise reference is Wallechinsky and Loucky's *Complete Book of the Olympics*, which includes the top eight finishers and occasional vignettes on the competitors. Jones also discusses each of the early

consecutive appearances during the formative years of the Olympic movement, where the games have been described as a so-called "proving ground" for particular sports and saw the many entries and exits from the competitive program,[21] very little historical scholarship has been dedicated to studying tennis at the earliest modern Olympics. This perhaps has been the result of fewer available primary sources pertaining to tennis at the games of Athens, Paris, and St. Louis, where many of the firsthand accounts of the games focused on the track and field competitions.[22] The little that has been written on the tennis tournaments has been far from flattering. At best they have been called "informal," the term used by 1920 Olympian Alexander Weyand to describe the 1896 event, while others have noticed the relatively small size of the tournaments.[23] Far worse has been said about the 1900 and 1904 Olympics at large. Both games coincided with world's fairs, which many authors have insisted was detrimental to the infantile Olympic movement.[24]

---

tournaments and their results in her 1985 thesis, "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," advised by the late Olympic historian John Apostal Lucas.

[21] David Wallechinsky and Jaime Loucky, *The Complete Book of the Olympics* (London: Aurum, 2008), 1172-1177; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 6-13; International Olympic Committee, "Olympic Results," accessed 21 January 2020, https://www.olympic.org/olympic-results. A more complete discussion of the early Olympic games as a "proving ground" can be found in the notes for the third chapter, which discusses the 1900 Olympic tennis tournament in Paris.

[22] Many of the early Olympic accounts focus on the track and field events, most of which took place in the Olympic stadiums and were of particular importance to the American Olympic contingents. Competitors at the early Olympics, such as George W. Orton, George S. Robertson, and later Thomas P. Curtis published their own firsthand accounts of competing in track and field, adding to a perceived imbalance of source material. It is notable also that a tennis player, John Pius Boland of Ireland, wrote down his own account of his victory in the first Olympic tennis tournament, although his work would not be discovered for many years.

[23] Alexander M. Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), 17; Bill Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 2 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998), 207. It is worth noting that even though Mallon largely condemns the 1900 and 1904 Olympics as poorly executed, he does relay that the 1900 tennis tournament field was of "exceptional quality" for its small size, becoming one of the few to levy a compliment in favor of the event.

[24] Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques* (Lausanne: Bureau International de Pédagogie Sportive, 1931); Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, 2nd ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 21-24; Alfred Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games* (Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics, 1999), 25; Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant*, 20; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games* ix, 4-13; Reet Ann Howell and Max L. Howell, "Paris 1900: The Games of the IId Olympiad," in *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement,* edited by John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle,

Criticism has come from highly respected authors. Bill Mallon, compiler of the most definitive collection of statistical reports on the early modern Olympics, called the 1900 meeting "the worst of games," and along with the 1904 event, "farcical."[25] No less a sport historian than Allen Guttmann called the seemingly helter-skelter 1900 program "a disaster."[26] To summarize an apparent historical consensus, the renowned Olympic scholar David C. Young wrote the following in 1996: "Everyone agrees that the much awaited Paris games in 1900 and the 1904 games at St. Louis were fiascos. The Paris games actually held in 1900 were organized by neither Coubertin nor the IOC; nor were they called Olympics at the time; the St. Louis Olympiad was hardly internationalized and was embarrassing in many ways."[27]

Recently, the tennis tournaments of 1896 and especially 1900 and 1904 have been the subject of much the same criticism that has been levied at these Olympic games as a whole. In "Tennis and the Olympics: An Historical Examination of Their On-Off Relationship Since 1896," a contributing chapter to the *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, historians Matthew Llewellyn and Robert Lake analyze

---

(Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996), 12-17; Graeme Kent, *Olympic Follies: The Madness and Mayhem of the 1908 London Games* (London: JR Books, 2008), 28-29; 143-145; Dick Schaap, *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Knopf, 1975), 77; Victor Breyer, "The £80 Olympics," *World Sports* 15 (May 1949), 28-29; Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 11-12; David C. Young, *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1996), 166. Whether the 1900 and 1904 Olympic games were successful, while not in the direct purview of a discussion on the tennis tournaments, is an important historiographical conversation which is discussed in the chapter covering the Paris games. The above represents a sampling of the negative commentary surrounding the 1900 and 1904 Olympics, some of which has come from highly respected historians of sport and of the Olympic movement. Although perhaps the majority of the scholarship is quick to iterate the shortcomings of the second and third games, an alternative view, advocated in part by Mark Dyreson in *Making the American Team* and by Andre Drevon in the "Paris 1900" chapter of the second edition of Findling and Pelle's *Historical Dictionary of the Olympic Movement*, suggests that partnership with the world's fair during a relatively volatile and developmental period for the games proved something of an incubator for later Olympic growth.

[25] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, ix.

[26] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 22.

[27] Young, *The Modern Olympics*, 166. Escaping the brunt of the criticism is the 1896 event, which has still been positively reviewed in works such as Mandell's *The First Modern Olympics* and MacAloon's *This Great Symbol* for its offering of a concise, if humble, opening to the modern Olympic movement.

Olympic tennis over the entire history of the games, including a brief section on the tournaments of 1896, 1900, and 1904.[28] Llewellyn and Lake apply the same charges of disorganization, low participation, public disinterest, and lack of quality to each of these tennis events that others have submitted against the overall execution of the early games, particularly the Paris and St. Louis Olympics.[29] In a subsection entitled "A troubled beginning," the authors posit that these early games were "inferior to more established competitions, like the Wimbledon Championships,"[30] and point to "less public interest and media attention than track-and-field athletics, swimming, boxing, and other sports" as evidence of their claim.[31]

While no one would contest that Wimbledon was anything less than the world's preeminent tennis title at the close of the nineteenth century, nor that track and field events were not the most popular and most reported upon competitions at the early modern Olympics,[32] the smaller size and sometimes low international turnout at early Olympic tennis tournaments is not sufficient in and of itself to prove that they were low-quality events. At least during the Olympics of Athens, Paris, and St. Louis, tennis was a steady presence in the face of some of the uncertainties of the Olympic movement. From its selection to the first Olympic program published in January 1895 through the first three modern games, lawn tennis was a regular and expected sport that was often

[28] Matthew P. Llewellyn and Robert J. Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics: An Historical Examination of Their On-Off Relationship Since 1896," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 362-371, Routledge International Handbooks (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019).
[29] Ibid., 362-363.
[30] Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 362.
[31] Ibid., 363.
[32] This was especially true in the United States, where American success and failure on the track was considered a sign of health of the American sporting republic. For a complete account of this athletic focus, see Dyreson's *Making the American Team.*

scheduled in proximity to marquee events at the games, such as track and field.[33] Moreover, lawn tennis can be viewed as a pioneering Olympic sport as it was the first ball sport included in the games,[34] the first sport in Olympic history to include a championship event for women,[35] and one of the first sports to exploit the opportunities for marketing and patronage presented by an international stage.[36] All of these were accomplished in the dawning years of a new international sporting festival and in the limelight of two major world's fairs. Though forgotten through time the tournaments may have been, lawn tennis should be remembered as one of the successes of the early modern Olympic games.

[33] "Programme des Jeux Olympiques de 1896 – Athenes," *Bulletin du Comite International des Jeux Olympiques* 2, no. 3 (January 1895): 1. In both the Athens and St. Louis games, tennis took place during the same week as the Olympic track and field events (the same can be said for all of the sports in Athens). In Paris, tennis was scheduled prior to the track and field events, but in the days following Wimbledon, which resulted in an excellent turnout that included several of the world's best tennis players and a number of patrons from the French upper class.
[34] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics,* 102; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 117.
[35] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 24; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics,* 10; 207; Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 144.
[36] Cf. Hummel and Dyreson, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon," 19-27. Early Olympic tennis tournaments were patronized by members of royalty, upper-class society, and in the United States, by the support of the members of the American sporting hierarchy. For individuals such as A. G. Spalding, tennis proved a marketable game which could be advertised to the general public through the concurrent 1900 and 1904 world's fairs.

Chapter Two

The Athenian Dawn of a New Tradition: Tennis Makes the Modern Olympics

Any witness to the 1896 reincarnation of the Olympic games in Athens would have experienced an unparalleled international assemblage of athletes and spectators the likes of which had scarcely been seen in modern days.[37] Among the first notable multisport gatherings of athletes from across the Western world, the first modern Olympics heralded French baron Pierre de Coubertin's vision for a new transnational dialogue intended for the promotion of the virtues of Muscular Christianity and hopes for "securing universal peace."[38] More learned patrons would have discovered no want of similarity between the 1896 meeting and the ancient festival it aspired to revive: spectators of great and common stock packed the Panathenaic, the great Athenian stadium constructed for quadrennial meetings of ancient Greece's best athletes by Greek civilization's most powerful city-state. Therein, athletic youths took flight in track races not unlike the *stade* and *diaulos* held at Olympia until the late fourth century A.D.[39] Likewise, the return of wrestling demonstrated a continued fascination with meritocracy in unarmed combat.[40]

---

[37] Richard D. Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1976), 123. Mandell writes that as many as 120,000 people saw the opening ceremony, which constituted "one of the largest groups of individuals to be assembled for peaceful purposes since ancient times."

[38] Pierre de Coubertin, "The Olympic Games of 1896," Century 53, no. 31 (November 1896), 53; cf. Albert Shaw, "The Re-Establishment of Olympic Games: How International Sports May Promote Peace Among the Nations," *Review of Reviews* (December 1894), 643-646; John J. MacAloon, ed., *Muscular Christianity and the Colonial and Post-Colonial World*, Sport in the Global Society (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2007). Although doubtful if sport alone could end all war, Coubertin firmly believed that sport—and particularly international sport as manifested in the Olympic games—could be integral in mitigating a degree of conflict between the powers of Europe. Coubertin's perspective is echoed by Albert Shaw, who wrote of the possibility of the Olympics serving as a conduit to peace in the December 1894 *Review of Reviews.* John J. MacAloon's edited volume is an excellent resource to explore the influence of Muscular Christianity on modern sport, from the nineteenth century to the present day.

[39] David C. Young, *A Brief History of the Olympic Games* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2004), 135. The *stade* was an ancient Olympic sprint race the length of the stadium, or about 180 meters. The *diaulos* was twice this length and required participants to turn around at end of the stadium and return to the starting point. The *stade* is interchangeably known as the *stadion.*

[40] Charles Waldstein, "The Olympian Games at Athens," *The Field* (May 1896), 28; Young, *Brief History*, 98-99; 115; Alexander Kitroeff, *Wrestling with the Ancients: Modern Greek Identity and the Olympics* (New York: Greenworks, 2004), 11-13. The use of the term "Panathenaic" in this chapter warrants disambiguation, since in Greece it holds both ancient and modern meanings. During Greek antiquity, the

Yet beyond the confines of the marble edifice onlookers would have discovered several sports with little to no heritage in Classical or Greco-Roman Greece. Fencing and open-water swimming both made their debuts, and the recent surge in popularity of cycling encouraged the construction of the first Athenian velodrome.[41] Aside from the first-ever running of the marathon, which was the indisputable emotional highlight among the Greek populace—but a complete divergence from faithful adherence to the traditions of athletic antiquity—among the more noteworthy inclusions at the 1896 Olympic games was the recently developed leisure game of lawn tennis.[42]

When contrasted with the other inaugural Olympic sports, the presence of lawn tennis at the first of Coubertin's Olympics appears a marked idiosyncrasy. Whereas the other events at the first Olympics, from gymnastics to weightlifting, generally measured contenders through races, lifts, bouts, or similar means, tennis is the only discipline held at Athens that could ostensibly be considered a ball game.[43] Moreover, it was among the most modern and least Greco-Roman of sports imaginable. With lawn tennis invented

---

Panathenaic Games occurred ever four years in Athens, although separately from the other Panhellenic Games (Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, Isthmian, Heraean). Created to honor the goddess Athena, the Panathenaic games often featured lavish prizes. Athenians were also financially rewarded by the city-state for success in the Olympic games. Just like the first modern Olympic games saw a prize awarded to George S. Robertson for his Pindaric Ode, the Panathenaic Games awarded not only athletic, but also musical accomplishments. The festival centered around the Panathenaic Stadium, an Athens edifice which hosted many of the athletic events. The modern Panathenaic is the reconstruction of that stadium, which was achieved during the latter nineteenth century through the philanthropy of Evangelos Zappas. Zappas' gift of 600,000 drachmas was used in part to restore the iconic marble stadium. A point of pride for many Greeks, the Panathenaic was once again at the center of a festival at the first modern Olympic games.

[41] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 128. Mandell notes that, in an effort to increase their legitimacy in light of more traditional competitions, "Some uneasy and historically minded promoters of the new Games rationalized that the cycle races were surrogates for the chariot races of antiquity."

[42] Ellery H. Clark, "The Olympic Games of 1896," *Pratt Institute Monthly* 6, no. 6 (March 1898), 167. Clark documents that anywhere between 90,000 and 150,000 spectators cheered Greek peasant Spiridon Louis to victory in the marathon race. Louis immediately became a nationally hero, and received lavish offers for gifts and rewards from his countrymen.

[43] "Ball game," for the purposes of this analysis, consists of any one of a number of athletic activities played between two or more individuals or teams which employs the use of a ball as a primary athletic implement. Other examples of later Olympic ball games include association football, basketball, baseball, and volleyball. While the addition of other ball sports to the Olympic programs cannot be causally linked to tennis, lawn tennis enjoys primacy as the first sport of its kind included in the modern games.

and popularized only twenty years before by the progenitors of modern athletics, the British upper class (rather than the Greeks), tennis would become one of the youngest sports inducted into the Olympic canon.[44] While the new game certainly had roots in medieval European folk traditions, the emerging British version had global aspirations that a place on the Olympic program would certainly advance.[45] Patented in 1874 by its British progenitor, lawn tennis quickly found a comfortable niche in popular leisure culture in the closing decades of the nineteenth century.[46] Proponents of the new sport advertised its social aspects, versatility, and modernity and marketed it in the key outlets, from favorable spreads in magazines devoted to sport and leisure to dazzling world expositions that promoted the most recent consumer sporting equipment.[47]

---

[44] The invention and popularization of lawn tennis in the latter half of the nineteenth century is the subject of some historical debate. While several British claimants attest to having played a variant of the game as early as the latter 1860s, lawn tennis did not become popularly known until it was patented as *Sphairistikè* by Major Walter Clopton Wingfield in February 1874. Its popularity quickly grew in England, continental Europe, and North America, and is the subject of several texts, including most recently and most exhaustively by Robert T. Everitt and Richard A. Hillway in *The Birth of Lawn Tennis* (2018).

[45] Heiner Gillmeister, *Tennis: A Cultural History* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997), 1-127; Robert J. Lake, *A Social History of Tennis in Great Britain* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014), 15-21; Robert J. Lake, "Social Class, Etiquette, and Behavioural Restraint in British Lawn Tennis, 1870-1939," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 28:6 (2011), 878; Brad William Hummel and Mark Dyreson, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon: The History of Sponsorship in Tennis," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, 19-28, edited by Robert J. Lake, Routledge International Handbooks (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 19-21. Gillmeister's *Tennis* remains probably the most exhaustively researched volume written on the late medieval origins of modern lawn tennis; the first two chapters demonstrate early tennis' humble beginnings as a folk sport. Lake has succeeded in demonstrating tennis' close ties to upper- and upper-middle class culture in Britain, which did well to find favor with well-to-do amateur sport promoters, including those in North America and on the continent.

[46] George E. Alexander, *Lawn Tennis: Its Founders and Its Early Days* (Lynn, Mass.: H. O. Zimman, 1974), 15-18. Alexander's account of the earliest years of modern lawn tennis includes a copy of Walter Clopton Wingfield's original patent for *Sphairistikè*, which was filed on February 23, 1874.

[47] Hummel and Dyreson, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon," 19-21; Elizabeth Wilson, *Love Game: A History of Tennis, From Victorian Pastime to Global Phenomenon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016),5-6; 9-11; 28-33; 40; 43; Alexander, *Lawn Tennis*, 23-25; Lake, "Social Class," 878; Lake, *Social History*, 20. The growth of lawn tennis in the Western world was sudden: sporting magazine's such as Britain's *The Field* took an early liking to the game of lawn tennis and featured promotions which engaged sports enthusiasts. Later, a debate about the rules and best practices of the game played out over several issues of *The Field*, many of which are preserved in Alexander's *Lawn Tennis*. It gained respect in elite circles, as Robert J. Lake states, because tennis was "a sport played partially for social prestige" ("Social Class, Etiquette, and Behavioural Restraint in British Lawn Tennis," 878). Both Lake's *A Social History of Tennis in Great Britain* and Elizabeth Wilson's *Love Game* do well to chronicle the sport's ties to social gatherings both in the UK and abroad, the latter also paying additional attention to the

Although there was considerable talk among organizers and promoters of several other games including cricket and football (both of which had longer histories than modern lawn tennis), tennis remained the only ball sport for which victors would be awarded prizes—a silver medal and an olive branch—at the 1896 games.[48] Tennis also stood as the only modern sport for which no attempt was made to justify its inclusion through employing the imagery of classical Greece.[49] In light of the circumstances in which the tournament was held, one is led to question why this relative newcomer to the world of sport was included on the program in the first place. The answer is surprisingly simple: albeit that lawn tennis was not a sport with a long legacy, it particularly satisfied the athletic, cultural, and social tastes of the Olympic organizers. Tennis was a sport popular among the elites who promoted the Athens revival. Its inclusion, while peculiar in contrast to the other sports on the schedule, makes logical sense in light of the urbane, amateur-centric athletic landscape from which both tennis and the modern Olympic movement emerged.

The actual Olympic tournament was noteworthy only in its simplicity and its brevity. As women were not invited to compete at the 1896 games,[50] the only medals

---

globalization of the game as tennis became part of a larger, international leisure culture. World's expositions, such as the Paris' Exposition Universelle of 1900 and St. Louis' Louisiana Purchase Exhibition of 1904 would soon assist in exposing the game and its related equipment to new audiences. At both of these fairs, tennis was also part of the Olympic games.

[48] "Olympic Games," *The Times of London*, 15 April 1896.

[49] George Horton, "The Recent Olympian Games," *The Bostonian* 4, no. 4 (July 1896), 273. There was considerable talk of including any number of other competitions at the 1896 games. Cricket was considered for inclusion at the Second Sorbonne Congress in June, 1894, and according to the account of George Horton, remained on the program as late as March of 1896. It is not particularly clear why a cricket competition failed to materialize, but a match was held at the Paris games four years later.

[50] Cheree Intorre Jones, "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1985, GV993, 9; Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 11. Early in his tenure as IOC secretary, Baron de Coubertin was adamant that, as in the ancient Olympics, women should not compete. Organizers of the Paris 1900 games soon ignored his mandate and introduced several competitions for women. The first woman to win an Olympic

awarded in tennis came in men's singles and doubles. According to the most complete records from Athens, tournament matches took place on April 8, 9, and 11, per the Gregorian calendar,[51] and included thirteen competitors representing seven European countries.[52] Demonstrating a degree of ingenuity, the Greek organizing committee engaged the empty space in the center of the new velodrome for two courts, although most matches were contested at the three courts of the Athens Lawn Tennis Club, situated near both the Ilisos River and the Columns of Jupiter (Temple of Olympian Zeus).[53] Compared to the sophisticated glory of the All England Club or even the popular enthusiasm of the track and field events at the Panathenaic Stadium, the first Olympic tennis tournament was a rather tepid affair. The weather, for one, was ghastly. Coarse winds served as a frigid vestige of winter on the opening day of matches, and tennis was playable only after officials erected a large tent over the clay courts.[54]

Unlike the other early Olympic tennis tournaments that would follow in 1900 and 1904 which boasted above average to first-class competition, the event was hardly a measure of excellence so far as the field of competitors was concerned. Devoid of all of the great champions of the tennis world, whose quality was more thoroughly measured at

---

title in any sport was England's Charlotte Cooper in women's singles, who was also five times the champion at Wimbledon.

[51] In 1896, Greece still employed the historic Julian calendar, which means that tennis events were held on March 28, 29, and 31 according to local chronology.

[52] Bill Mallon and Ture Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 1 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 1998), 107-109. Mallon's excellent series on *The Results of the Early Olympic Games* does a commendable job in filling in many of the gaps in the historic accounts of the first several modern Olympics. Although the scores for most of the matches at the 1896 tournament are still lost to history, Mallon and Widlund provide the most complete record of the tennis competition as it happened.

[53] Coubertin, "Olympic Games of 1896," 32; Jones, "Demise and Revival," 8; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 108-109; Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Olympic Games in Athens 1896: The Invention of the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Profile Books, 2004), 172; Ath. Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens, 1896-1906* (self-published: Vironas-Attica, Greece, 1988), 53. According to Mallon's records, only two matches are confirmed to have been held in the Olympic velodrome.

[54] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 131. Weather conditions on April 8 became so poor as to require the cancellation of all events at the Panathenaic Stadium.

Wimbledon or other elite clubs such as the Newport Casino or Bad Homburg, Athens' tennis showcase included mostly local Greeks along with a handful of foreigners, the majority of whom competed in multiple events.[55] Despite the odd number of entrants into the singles tournament, the organizers drew the competitors into four different groups so that there would be exactly four semifinalists, with several players awarded byes for the opening round of play.[56] Matches began on Wednesday of Olympic week, the same day as many of the other events which took place at venues outside of the Panathanaic Stadium.[57] By Saturday, an Irish Oxfordian named John Pius Boland proved victorious after winning four matches, defeating Dionysios Kasdaglis in straight sets in the championship.[58] The doubles tournament was not nearly so fortunate in its arrangement. Due to the small number of entrants, all three of the medalist pairs contained athletes representing different countries. The British Empire contingent of Australian Edwin Flack and Englishman George Stuart Robertson finished third after failing to win a single match and champions Boland of Ireland and Friedrich Adolph "Fritz" Traun of Germany

---

[55] Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 107; Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 227. Heiner Gillmeister, in his seminal *Tennis: A Cultural History*, has written extensively on the development of lawn tennis at private clubs in Western Europe and the United States, and is the authority on the propagation of the game in his native Germany.

[56] Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 107. There were thirteen competitors in the singles competition, making it impossible to create a balanced bracket amongst the competitors. Thus, the four groups were made out of which four semifinalists ultimately prevailed.

[57] John J. MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 222. While events in the Olympic stadium began with the opening ceremony on Sunday, April 5 (March 24 locally) and continued throughout the week, many of the other Olympic competitions began on Wednesday, April 8 at venues away from the Olympic stadium. In addition to tennis, the royal family opened the shooting competition at Kallithea, the gymnastics events began and featured a competition between Greek and German athletes, and near the Panathenaic and the Athens Lawn Tennis Club, the Zappeion competition hall saw the commencement of the fencing. In a word, Wednesday, April 8, marked the start of the Olympics for a number of modern sports which remain—in one form or another—part of the games to the present epoch.

[58] David Wallechinsky and Jaime Loucky, *The Complete Book of the Olympics* (London: Aurum, 2008), 1020; David C. Young, *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1996), 154; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 109; "Olympic Games," *The Times of London*, 13 April 1896. In a turn of irony, Kasdaglis had originally invited Boland to take part in the tennis tournament. Boland wrote in his diary that he nearly conceded a walkover to his host out of respect.

triumphed after receiving a bye in the semifinals, completing only two matches together as a team.[59] Flack managed to garner the doubles title with Robertson while also starring on the Olympic track, triumphing in the 800-meters and 1500-meters races.[60] Leading later scholars to believe that Olympic tennis was unimportant, tennis was the last event included on the original Olympic program, and the last sport for which medals were distributed at the closing ceremony.[61]

Given that tennis has not been a major component of the historical narrative of the Athens Olympics, where the focus has remained on American success on the track and the Greek triumph in the marathon, it is worth inquiring into why the directors of the 1896 games saw fit to include tennis at all. The organization, promotion, and ultimate success of the 1896 games fell primarily to two distinct governing bodies that, the record shows, did not exactly cooperate during the period prior to the Athens meet. The first of these, the fledgling International Olympic Committee (IOC), led nominally by Greek novelist Demetrius Vikelas but managed in practice by Pierre de Coubertin, coalesced at the Sorbonne in June of 1894 and elected Athens as the first Olympic host city.[62] Coubertin himself outlined what he considered to be the ideal program for the revival and included tennis, a motion readily approved by the notables he invited to join his new

---

[59] Matthew P. Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games*, Sport in the Global Society: Historical Perspectives, eds. Mark Dyreson and Thierry Terret (New York: Routledge, 2012), 10; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 109. Dionysios Kasdaglis of Egypt and Demetrios Petrokokkinos of Greece earned silver, defeating Flack and Robertson in the semifinals. Only five teams total entered the doubles competition.

[60] Mark Dyreson, *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience*, Sport and Society, eds. Benjamin G. Rader and Randy Roberts (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 46; Graeme Kent, *Olympic Follies: The Madness and Mayhem of the 1908 London Games* (London: JR Books, 2008), 27-28; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 18; 109; Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia*, 10; "Olympic Games," *The Times of London*, 10 April 1896. Flack's victory demonstrated not only the ease with which the few international competitors were able to enter in multiple sporting events, but also that in 1896, a versatile athlete could be just as successful as a single-sport specialist.

[61] George S. Robertson, "The Olympic Games by a Competitor and Prize Winner," *Fortnightly Review* 354 (1 June 1896), 944-957.

[62] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 89.

organization.[63] Initially, it took a considerable degree of encouragement on the part of Coubertin and his supporters to convince Greek leaders to organize an international gathering. With the state bereft of finances and Prime Minister Charilaos Trikoupis vehemently opposed to holding the games at public expense,[64] the Athenian Olympics were saved through the contributions of wealthy notables, and more importantly, the Greek royal family, which directly planned and privately funded the event.[65] Constantine, Crown Prince of Greece, took a surprisingly personal interest in organizing and ensuring the success of the 1896 games, and appointed a "Council of Twelve" to facilitate preparations, of which he was chairman.[66] Rather than take the lead from Coubertin and his supporters, the Greek organizing committee swiftly sidelined foreign influences in an effort to make the games a singularly Hellenic success.[67] Oddly, although the French baron was almost entirely excluded from process of planning and executing the first official modern Olympic games,[68] the committee kept much (if not most) of the original,

---

[63] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 91; "Programme des Jeux Olympiques de 1896 – Athenes," *Bulletin du Comite International des Jeux Olympiques* 2, no. 3 (January 1895), 1. The IOC published in French the program for upcoming Athens Olympics in January 1895, providing for tennis under the rules of All England Lawn Tennis Club (AELTC) and the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC). A unified set of lawn tennis rules was first codified at the MCC in 1875, though the AELTC would manage the laws of the game from 1883.

[64] Laszlo Kun, "The Birth of the Modern Olympic Movement," Lecture, Hungarian Olympic Academy, 27 July 1987.

[65] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 104; Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 116; Kristine Toohey and A. J. Veal, *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective* (Oxfordshire, UK: Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International, 2007), 37; John Lucas, *The Modern Olympic Games* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1980), 46.

[66] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 116; Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens*, 17.

[67] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 112; Toohey and Veal, *Olympic Games: Social Science*, 37; Burton Holmes, *The Olympian Games in Athens* (New York: The McClure Company, 1908), 39. Toohey and Veal claim that the Greek royal family's zeal in endorsing the Athens Olympics reflected the opportunity for the games to increase their reputation as well as renewing national pride in the economically downtrodden state. The capacity for the Olympics to carry such sentiment is reflected in Burton Holmes' beautifully written travelogue on *The Olympian Games in Athens* in which he simply states that "In April, 1896, Athens invited the world to join in a revival of the Olympian Games which had been the glory and the pride of Ancient Greece."

[68] Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 11. Baron de Coubertin made a number of efforts to involve himself in the plans for the first Olympics, but many of these were ignored in favor of the Council

Coubertin-designed program of competitions published early in 1895.[69] Some logistical alterations affected the initial template for the games, resulting in the removal from the program of the equestrian events, mountaineering competitions, cricket matches, and a *paume* tournament (most likely handball).[70] Despite these austerity measures—a tempering of expectations that impacted later Olympic games, including those of Paris (1900) and St. Louis (1904)—lawn tennis was retained as the only ball sport actually contested in Athens.[71]

Considering that both the International Olympic Committee and the Greek Olympic organizers were disposed to include lawn tennis as worthy of the Athenian games, several theories emerge to explain why this young racquet sport made the day,

---

of Twelve's own plans. An example of this is the Olympic velodrome, for which the committee had no design. A proactive Coubertin acquired the architectural plans for the Arcachon velodrome and had them shipped to Greece ahead of the games. The Council chose to use different plans—from a velodrome in Copenhagen—instead. In a separate effort, Coubertin personally made official invitations to these inaugural Olympics, considering more the Games' potential for marked transnational growth than simply a historical recreation of Greece's glory days. While Coubertin's contributions to the execution of the 1896 games (and for that matter, those of the next two Olympics) were modest in comparison to those of the Council of Twelve and the Athens organizers, they evidence that Coubertin's vision for the modern Olympic games was far more international than other Olympic enthusiasts had envisioned. Moreover, this evidence, along with the International Olympic Committee's initial program of January 1895, further augments the argument that from the beginning Coubertin envisioned the Olympics to include modern sports the likes of lawn tennis.

[69] For the original program, see the front page of the January 1895 *Bulletin du Comite International des Jeux Olympiques*.

[70] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics,* 102; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 117. According to Mallon and Widlund, the French *paume*, possibly *jeu de la paume* or court tennis, appears to have been among the sports scheduled but not contested at the 1896 games. Mallon and Widlund admit that this also could have been *longue paume*, as the game is not specified in the original billing. Considering that *longue paume* was a distinctly French outdoor game played predominately in regions in Provence and also famously in Paris' Luxembourg Gardens, this seems unlikely. The same can probably be said for *courte-paume*, a game with origins in the late Middle Ages and popular among Europe's classes from at least the Renaissance and known elsewhere as real tennis or royal tennis. If this was the game Olympic planners had in mind, cancellation was likely inevitable as the indoor predecessor to lawn tennis required a specially constructed court and the first Athens Olympics were prepared for in relatively quick order primarily using existing facilities. This makes just plain *(jeu de la) paume*, or what is known in American English as handball, the most likely candidate for the 1896 program. Requiring substantially less equipment than *courte-paume*, there is still no indication that the game was popular in Greece as it was in France.

[71] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics,* 102; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 117. According to Mallon and Widlund, "paume," possibly *jeu de la paume* or court tennis, appears to have been among the sports scheduled but not contested at the 1896 games.

while others with more demonstrable Grecian ties, such as boxing, were omitted. Any remnant of belief that the organizers sought out only sports with an ancient heritage is dispensed with easily. Pierre de Coubertin himself, in his only thorough review of the inaugural Olympics published in *The Century Magazine*, readily acknowledges a break from the traditions of the premodern sports festival: "The Olympic games which recently took place at Athens were modern in character, not alone because of their programs, which substituted bicycle for chariot races, and fencing for the brutalities of pugilism, but because in their origin and regulations they were international and universal, and consequently adapted to the conditions in which athletics have developed at the present day."[72] The European creators of the modern Olympic movement would have been well aware that tennis did not satisfy the traditional definition of sport within the Greco-Roman world. Yet as will be demonstrated, it did qualify under the uniquely modern definition of sport these promoters adhered to, and thus any pretense of justifying tennis in the context of Ancient Olympic history could be branded as irrelevant.

Similarly, the idea that the motive for lawn tennis' inclusion came from within Greece can quickly be set aside. Ignoring momentarily that the game was already slated for inclusion as per the direction of the IOC, it is intriguing to note the near complete lack of tennis facilities on the Grecian peninsula until new courts were constructed immediately prior to the games. The clay courts within the specially constructed velodrome were commissioned for the Olympic tournament, and the Athens Lawn Tennis Club itself was formally established in expectation of the event.[73] In fact, it appears as though only four tennis facilities existed contemporary to the 1896 games, including the

[72] Coubertin, "Olympic Games of 1896," 39.
[73] Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens*, 53.

newly constructed club at the Ilisos River.[74] The Greeks admittedly knew very little of lawn tennis,[75] and its foreignness is underscored by a dearth of attendance and a later commentator's assessment that the "lawn tennis contest, though considered to be an elegant and noble game, did not hold any interest for the Greek people, since its principle was modern."[76] Broadly speaking, Greek audiences appeared more interested in events that harkened back to the ancient games such as athletics than they were to what John J. MacAloon terms "small-public matches such as tennis and fencing."[77] Unimpressed by firsthand accounts, MacAloon concludes that the audience at the courts was "limited no doubt to foreigners and the handful of well-to-do Greeks who had seen the game played in the fashionable quarters of the continent."[78] The impetus for Olympic tennis clearly came without regard to Hellenic heritage or popularity among potential spectators.

Since there was no inherently Greek reason—ancient or modern—to hold a tournament at Athens, a more logical explanation is that the organizers of the Olympics fancied the game of lawn tennis. This notion seems valid, particularly when considering the evidence of the royal family's role in ensuring the success of the games. Crown Prince Constantine, his brothers Prince George and Prince Nicholas, and their father George I, King of the Hellenes, not only organized and patronized the event, but their daily attendance and hosting of banquets and ceremonies was regularly documented by

---

[74] Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens*, 53. In his comparative account of the 1896 and 1906 games, Tarassouleas enumerates the four tennis facilities extant in Athens prior to the first Olympics. The first of these was the aforementioned Athens Lawn Tennis Club built specifically for the inaugural modern games. A second, public court could be rented out at the Zappion Park. The Panhellinios Association of Athens had its own court, and a fourth private court could be found on Kifissias Avenue. Tarassouleas notes that surrounding the games, "an effort was started to promote lawn tennis in Patras, Zakynthos, and Egion." Tarassouleas' list omits the courts resourcefully encompassed by the Olympic velodrome, which were by all accounts temporary. The two purpose-built Olympic facilities (the Athens Lawn Tennis Club and the velodrome) were the only facilities with multiple courts.
[75] Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 228.
[76] Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens*, 53; MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 222; 225.
[77] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 225.
[78] Ibid., 222.

the international press.[79] Thus it should not be surprising that although many of the match scores from the tennis tournament are missing from contemporary media accounts, historians do have record of a royal audience at the tennis tournament: all three princes watched Boland triumph in the singles final.[80] Even though it is unclear if the intrepid Greek royals witnessed any other tennis matches during the games, their presence at the final along with their equally conspicuous appearance in a designated tent at the inauguration of the velodrome, and their ceremonial opening of both the shooting gallery and fencing hall gave a visible royal endorsement to what could be described as the "new" sports in the Olympic canon.[81] During the weeklong games, Greek royalty made its rounds in an effort to patronize the different sports with relatively even attention, suggesting that they as organizers viewed these modern newcomers to be of equal importance if the Olympic revival was to be a true multisport festival.

At least indirectly, therefore, lawn tennis can be viewed has having received its "royal assent." The Olympic planning committee itself emerged directly from royal involvement in the games and was comprised of wealthy and notable Greek leaders under the direction of Prince Constantine and his Council of Twelve.[82] Since this committee authorized facilities for all these sports—including tennis—to be specially constructed for

---

[79] In both primary and secondary literature, the presence of the royal family at the 1896 Olympic games is well documented, often better than the statistical results of the events themselves. Despite the lack of a representative British national team at Athens, the authoritative London *Times* still readily reported the presence and activities of the Greek royals as often as it did the athletic accomplishments. The Paris edition of the *New York Herald* would later do the same in its daily coverage of the 1900 Olympic tennis tournament, focusing as much on which Paris notables were watching the matches as on those who played them. In 1904, the St. Louis tournament suffered from low international participation but still could count on the support of the American sporting hierarchy. The consistent presence of royalty, nobility, and the sporting class at early Olympic tennis demonstrates the importance of elite patronage to the success of these tournaments and to the larger Olympic movement.

[80] Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 230. Boland wrote about the occasion in his personal diary, which was uncovered when it was anonymously donated to the British Olympic Association.

[81] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 131; Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens*, 51; Lucas, *Modern Olympic Games*, 47; Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 171.

[82] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 116; Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens*, 17.

the Athens Olympics, it is reasonable to conclude that the most powerful leaders in late nineteenth century Greece gave at least tacit, if not active, approval of a lawn tennis tournament.[83]

Royal endorsement alone, however, is insufficient in explaining tennis' inclusion at the expense of other sports. The Greek royals and their noble friends could very well have been aficionados of a game that to this point had developed primarily in Western Europe and the Anglo-American world, but evidence that their personal enjoyment of lawn tennis drove its inclusion simply does not exist.[84] Therefore, it is better to examine the commonalities between the Greek organizers and their IOC counterparts who also prescribed the inclusion of tennis on the Olympic program. Here MacAloon's remark about tennis' patronization "in the fashionable quarters of the continent" becomes particularly pertinent.[85] Similarities between Greek and European promoters are not in the least bit difficult to uncover, and they collectively operated in circles where tennis was popular. All of the leading figures in the early Olympic movement could be considered elite, whether by royal blood, noble birth, or popular esteem. Coubertin, as a titled member of the French aristocracy, invited fellow sport-minded notables and even as distinguished a figure as the Prince of Wales to join him, first at the Second Sorbonne Congress and then as members of the International Olympic Committee.[86] More importantly, his most critical invitations went to two of the leading figures in global

---

[83] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 116; 122; Mandell, *First Modern Olympics* 105; 108. It is worth mentioning that although tennis was among the least established sports in late nineteenth century Greece, it was not the only sport which required new facilities to be constructed. In addition to the Athens Lawn Tennis Club, 1895 also brought the construction of the Olympic shooting hall and the velodrome.

[84] Gillmeister's discussion of the development of lawn tennis features England, France, the United States, and Germany as centers of early activity. Although tennis would become popular in warmer climates, as well, these four states quickly proved successful in the propagation of clubs, players, and major tournaments in the late nineteenth century.

[85] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 222.

[86] Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia*, 5.

sport: Englishman Charles Herbert of the Amateur Athletic Association, and American William Milligan Sloane of Princeton University.[87] In Herbert and Sloane, Coubertin found two of the leading proponents of the principle of amateurism in world athletics. Whereas more contemporary definitions of amateurism have emphasized the prohibition of individual athletes to profit from their participation in sport through salary or endorsement, in Britain and elsewhere in the late nineteenth century, the amateur was celebrated as the upper-class sportsman whose participation in competition was of no financial consequence.[88]

To many of the notables Coubertin courted, this well-bred youth embodied the best possible type of athlete, the kind that should be represented in international competition. Coubertin needed support from men such as Herbert and Sloane for his Olympic games to be a success, and thus the June 1894 meeting at the Sorbonne was advertised as far away as San Francisco under the guise of an "International Congress of Amateurs."[89] At that meeting, not only was Athens selected as the first modern Olympic host city and the earliest program of events proposed, but the delegates concurrently passed judgement on the issue of professionalism in the Olympic games.[90] The Olympics would be idealized as the domain of the gentleman amateur, and financial compensation of any kind was expressly forbidden.[91]

---

[87] Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia*, 5; Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 84; "Olympic Games," *The Times of London*, 6 April 1896.

[88] David C. Young, *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics* (Chicago: Ares, 1984), 18-21. Young articulates that this concept of amateurism was justified through paying homage to ancient Greek athletes, who late Victorian gentlemen claimed were true amateurs. Young thoroughly dismantles this myth as completed unfounded in ancient historical records.

[89] "International Congress of Amateurs," *The Olympic* 1, no. 6 (17 May 1894).

[90] W. B. Curtis, "The New Olympian Games," *Outing* 28 (May 1896), 24; Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 85; 89.

[91] Amateurism is one of the most pronounced issues the Olympic movement has entangled itself with since its inception. Born out of a late nineteenth century climate which exalted the uncompensated, well-bred

While amateurism and the revival of the Olympics were the main issues discussed in Paris, the social climate surrounding the Second Sorbonne Congress also foreshadowed tennis' addition to the Olympic program. Between the meetings of the two commissions which Coubertin created to affirm the amateur ethos and mandate a modern Olympic games, the distinguished emissaries found time for a tennis tournament at the Luxembourg Gardens.[92] So inclined were the founding members of the IOC to partake in the game that it casually made its way onto the program when it was released the following January.[93]

That the Greek organizers for the Athens Olympic games also supported the concept of amateurism is realized in the manner in which the royal family governed the competitions. In deference to their esteem and supposed impartiality, Prince Constantine and his brothers served as officials for the various athletic events.[94] As per the personal account of Ellery H. Clark, the Harvard senior who was the first Olympic champion in

---

man as the ideal athlete, the majority of the Olympic founding fathers insisted on maintaining "amateur purity." Amateur standing was one of the principles agreed upon by the delegates to the Second Sorbonne Congress, and became a requirement for Olympic participants beginning with the 1896 games. For decades, the IOC defended Olympic amateurism, pointing to writers such as E. N. Gardiner, Percy Gardner, and John P. Mahaffy, all of whom claimed that ancient Greek athletes were the equivalent of nineteenth century British amateurs. Mahaffy's account was particularly dubious and erroneous, and according to David C. Young, "was repeatedly judged a poor scholar by his peers" (*The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*, 47). These accounts of the supposed amateurism of the ancient Olympians were the standard interpretation until the advent of Young's *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics.* The seminal 1984 monograph almost single-handedly changed the conversation, proving that defenders of supposed ancient amateurism had relied entirely on erroneous accounts and their own, culturally-bound interpretations of amateurism. Young's volume and subsequent work opened the door for other scholars to examine how amateurism has interfaced with the modern Olympic movement as a whole, as well as individual cases such as the controversy surrounding the amateur athletic community's treatment of Jim Thorpe. Compendiums such as David Wallechinsky's *The Complete Book of the Olympics* and Bill Mallon's *Results of the Early Modern Olympics* series touch on issues of amateurism, as do more completely monographs including Mark Dyreson's *Making the American Team* and Matthew Llewellyn's *Rule Britannia*. Recently, a 2016 book by John Gleaves and Matthew Llewellyn, *The Rise and Fall of Olympic Amateurism*, offers a comprehensive work on the entire historic arc of amateurism in relation to the games, including its replacement in recent decades by new policies favoring the open inclusion of professionals.

[92] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 172.

[93] Cf. "Programme des Jeux Olympiques de 1896 – Athenes," *Bulletin du Comite International des Jeux Olympiques* 2, no. 3 (January 1895), 1.

[94] Ellery H. Clark, "The First Americans at the Olympic Games," *The Youth's Companion* (9 March 1911), 123.

the long jump, the princes' zealous adherence to a certain conception of the ideal amateur athlete sometimes got in the way of maintaining a fair competition:

> My own win was about as close a thing as it could well have been. In America the invariable custom is for the jumper to measure off his run, and to mark the spot where he begins to run his hardest with something which will readily catch the eye. I myself was very dependent upon this mark, and practically lost without it….Thus my discomfiture was great when Prince George of Greece, who was superintending the event, emphatically forbade any measurements or marks. Apparently this, to his mind, savored of 'professionalism.' We made a faint attempt to argue, were promptly suppressed, and remembering the cautions we had received at home, lest possible international bad feeling should arise out of the games, we meekly bowed the decision.[95]

Another Bostonian, triple jump champion James B. Connolly, faced a similar conflict with Prince George when the obstinate royal refused to furnish him with the length of his jumps until after the competition had concluded.[96] Protecting the purity of the elusive amateur ideal at the games apparently superseded the participants' reasonable requests to understand the constraints of the competition.

Further supporting the amateur ethos was the Oxbridge clientele who participated in the games, including the tennis tournament. Singles and doubles champion Boland was recruited directly from the esteemed halls of Oxford, one of the few places in the British Isles where Olympic marketing appeared to gain any traction.[97] Boland's future service as a Member of Parliament representing South Kerry certified him as an ideal amateur.[98]

---

[95] Clark, "First Americans," 123.
[96] James B. Connolly, "Fifteen Hundred Years Later," *Collier's* 98 (1 August 1936), 24.
[97] Llewellyn, *Rule Britannia,* 7; MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 200. MacAloon notes that according to G. S. Robertson, the Oxford advertisements were only available in French and German, a factor which likely contributed to the astonishing low turnout amongst English amateurs.
[98] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 172; Mallon, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 108; Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 228; 232. Boland's tenure as an MP, which spanned 18 years between 1900 and 1918 occurred while his native Ireland was still under British rule but represented in Parliament. Ironically, Boland represented the unified Great Britain and Ireland team but as a politician was an Irish nationalist who advocated home rule. According to Gillmeister, the competitors appear to have been paired in doubles on the basis of convenience. The Greek partnerships were determined beforehand, and although Boland would have preferred to have played with his friend Konstantinos Manos, Manos was already committed so Boland teamed with Fritz Traun.

Similarly, doubles competitor George S. Robertson studied at Oxford's New College, and exhibited his upper-class learning through the Pindaric ode that he recited at the closing ceremony.[99] Both Boland's and Robertson's pedigrees could be considered typical of the roster of competitors at the 1896 Olympics, which also featured American amateurs from Princeton University and the Boston Athletic Association.[100] The games clearly were designed to attract a sophisticated patronage, and, through its short but vibrant history of garden parties and all-white club meets at Wimbledon, lawn tennis was a sport in which affluent audiences regularly engaged.[101]

Equally useful in affirming the aristocratic origins of Olympic tennis is a survey of several other sports that were considered for, but ultimately excluded from, the Olympic program. In his erudite record of disciplines considered for the 1896 games, Olympic historian Bill Mallon lists cricket, equestrian, ice skating, mountaineering, pentathlon, polo, and rowing, along with yachting, which was scheduled for the first Olympics but was ultimately cancelled due to poor weather.[102] While the committee also

---

[99] "Olympic Games," *The Times of London*, 16 April 1896; Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 124.

[100] See the sixth chapter of Ellery H. Clark, *Reminisces of An Athlete: Twenty Years on Track and Field*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1911).

[101] Tennis' unique connection to the upper-class culture of Europe and North America has been discussed extensively in a number of monographs. For a uniquely British perspective on the class dimensions of lawn tennis, Robert J. Lake's 2014 monograph *A Social History of Tennis in Britain* is a recommended read. Lake charts the manner in which the elite origins of the modern game have deeply affected the sport's legacy in the United Kingdom to the present day. The first edition Heiner Gillmeister's *Tennis: A Cultural History* (1997) provides a very substantial history of upper-class tennis from a German perspective, particularly in its ninth chapter, "Tennis Under the Kaiser." A shorter account of the same as pertaining to France can be found in the same volume. Apart from these, many other tennis books have touched on facets of tennis as an affluent pastime, including but not limited to *Love Game* by Elizabeth Wilson (2016) and *The Birth of Lawn Tennis* by Robert T. Everitt and Richard A. Hillway (2019), along with a myriad of earlier texts and primary sources. Lastly, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon: The History of Sponsorship in Tennis," a chapter in *The Routledge Handbook of Tennis* by the author and Mark Dyreson discusses in brief how lawn tennis and earlier forms of tennis found sponsors among upper class audiences, patrons who would foster the game's survival and modern development.

[102] Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 117; Richardson, *The New Olympian Games*, 46. The use of "pentathlon" in connection with the 1896 games poses a bit of a historical quandary. Mallon and Widlund's exhaustive list of sports cancelled does not specify what type of pentathlon the IOC or the Athenian Council of Twelve had in mind. The ancient Olympic pentathlon included five athletic feats

considered the more plebeian football and boxing (the latter of which will be discussed below), it is not in the least an overstatement to say that these additional, modern sports considered for the Athens games were predominately pursuits of the moneyed elite.[103] Only those with access to substantial pecuniary resources could afford the ponies required to partake in equestrian events, including polo and modern pentathlon.[104] Likewise, ice skating required expensive refrigeration and cricket had been appropriated in the latter nineteenth century from an English country game into an avid interest of the landed gentry. Even mountaineering could be considered an elite pastime during the closing decades of the nineteenth century, becoming a popular escapade of "young, wealthy adventurers" and thrill-seekers.[105] With the Sorbonne Congress and the IOC contemplating such gentlemanly—but costly—sporting activities for the Olympic schedule, it may in fact be more surprising that none of them joined tennis at the Athens games. It appears that tennis ultimately was worth the expense of new facilities not for its uniqueness, but instead for its ubiquity within the lives of the European sporting elites.

Considering the variety of upper-class recreations considered for Athens, it is

---

common at the ancient games, consisting of the *stade* or *stadion* (a short sprint of slightly more than 100-meters), the throwing of the javelin and discus, a weighted long jump, and wrestling. The pentathlon's pride of place at the ancient Olympics inspired the development of at least two different modern versions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Of these, the modern pentathlon is best remember and survives as a quadrennial Olympic sport to the present day. Pierre de Coubertin personally claimed to be the progenitor of the modern pentathlon, which consists of fencing, swimming, equestrian show jumping, shooting, and running. However, the sport was not officially contested until the fifth Olympiad in 1912, at Stockholm. This suggests that in 1896, Olympic organizers might have had in mind an event known as the athletics pentathlon, a competition which examined excellence in a series of five track and field events. Nonetheless, the athletics pentathlon was also not included until the 1912 Olympics, when it was famously won by American Jim Thorpe. Original source material addressing the proposed 1896 pentathlon is also vague, although *Scribner's Magazine* correspondent Rufus Richardson pondered why the ancient games staple was not retained. Given these limitations, it seems reasonable to describe the proposed competition simply as "pentathlon" for its few appearances in this text.

[103] Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 117; "Olympic Games," *The Times of London*, 14 April 1896.

[104] See the above comment concerning the ambiguity of the pentathlon at the 1896 games.

[105] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 123.

prudent to juxtapose two other events not included in Coubertin's inaugural Olympics. Despite their ancient origins and long history as a means of combat training, boxing and fighting (the Greek *pankration*) were not included in at the 1896 games. Although varieties of the *pankration* in its original form did not have a quantifiable following in the late Victorian period, boxing was among the most popular recreations in the nineteenth century and would appear a logical inclusion along with similar contests in wrestling and fencing.[106] Nonetheless, it was considered, but eventually dropped from the final program. Thankfully for the historian, there is a definitive record as to why it was removed. Allan Marquand summarized the distinction in the *Public Opinion*: "Wrestling, however, since the days of mythical Theseus, had ceased to be a contest of brute force, and had become a trial of skill. Boxing was a brutal contest, more dangerous and bloody than the modern prize-fight."[107] George Horton, the American consul to Greece, was even more dismissive, declaring that there "will be no pugilism in the Stadium, as the Greek of to-day does not regard it as a civilized sport."[108] Tainted by its association with the plebeian, professional pastime of the lower classes, boxing disagreed violently with the genteel tastes of Coubertin and the Greek organizers.[109] Therefore, the sport was

---

[106] *Pankration* has been compared to the modern mixed-martial-arts, in which combatants observe relatively few restrictions in subduing an opponent. Although unpopular in any organized form the nineteenth century, such forms of fighting have made a marked recovery in the twenty-first century in the form the Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) and similar contests.

[107] Allan Marquand, "The Old Olympic Games," *Public Opinion* 20 (16 April 1896), 501.

[108] George Horton, "Revival of the Olympic Games," *North American Review* 162 (March 1896), 273.

[109] Elliott J. Gorn, *The Manly Art: Bare-Knuckle Prize Fighting in America*, updated edition (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2010), 12-14; 129; 185; 202-204; Elliott J. Gorn and Warren Goldstein, *A Brief History of American Sports* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 114-122; Ruth E. Bleasdale, *Rough Work: British North America and Canada Labourers on the Public Works of 1841 to 1882* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018), 201; Robert G. Rodriguez, *The Regulation of Boxing: A History and Comparative Analysis of Policies Among American States* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2009), 29; Randy W. Roberts, "Eighteenth-Century Boxing," *Journal of Sport History* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1977): 246-259. The sport of boxing has a long and checkered history in Western civilization, particularly since the eighteenth century. As analyzed by Randy Roberts, Elliott Gorn, and others, boxing long held lower-class connotations in places like Great Britain and the United States, where bare-knuckle prize fighting was often

ultimately dismissed from consideration in spite of its comparatively strong ties to the ancient festival. Tennis, a paradigm of the amateur ethos, made the modern games.

Several important conclusions can be gathered from studying the various sports that were excluded from the games. First among these is that the elite organizers of the 1896 Olympic games saw no difficulty including contemporary sports popular among members of their own class along with those of more historic or democratic stock. Tennis and fencing appeared alongside athletics and weightlifting in Athens. Moreover, when it came to determining the final roster of disciplines for the first modern games, organizers placed a higher premium on sports with connections to Victorian amateur gentility than those without such contemporary pedigree, even if those events were practiced regularly since antiquity.[110] This explains why a fledgling sport like lawn tennis was included while boxing, a staple at the games of ancient Olympia, was set aside.[111]

These observations are not enough, however, to account for the singularity of

---

associated with back alleys and underground—even illegal—activities including gambling (Bleasdale, 201). Its raw entertainment value created a paradoxical scenario for its patrons, who were forced to deal with its reputation as an "outlaw" sport. Writes Gorn (12): "Prize fighting was one of the most popular sports among working-class males in the nineteenth century, and great championship battles galvanized men like few other events. It was also illegal." In the United States, it became the most popular lower class sport by the decade before the Civil War (Gorn, 129), but only gained middle-class respectability toward the close of the century. This was due in no small part to the regular reporting on the sport in Richard Kyle Fox's *National Police Gazette* (Gorn and Goldstein, 114-122; Rodriguez, 129), but also the institution of the Marquis of Queensberry rules, the adoption of which brought the bare-knuckle era to a close (Gorn, 203-204). In the middle 1890s, boxing's reputation in more genteel circles was still circumspect, and given that the sport was only beginning to be brought under the broader principles of amateurism (Gorn, 202) , organizers felt that even the modern game would be all too similar to ancient boxing or even *pankration*.

[110]Aside from tennis, a survey of the roster of Olympic sports in 1896 yields a broad range of activities patronized by the amateur class. The most popular sport in Athens, athletics, was largely contested by Greek locals and American amateur champions from Princeton College and the Boston Athletic Association (cf. Mandell; Smith). The combat-oriented sports of fencing and shooting were commonly practiced by the European elite. Although it was ultimately cancelled due to poor weather, sailing as a recreation was also exclusive to communities with considerable financial resources.

[111] Cf. Mallon, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 117. Mallon and Widlund also list "paume" as a sport under consideration for the 1896 Olympics. While it is unclear whether or not this was the French *jeu de la paume*, the historic predecessor to lawn tennis, or another related ball game, it is also interesting to note that the newfangled lawn tennis was selected for the program over its centuries-old forefather, further indicating the preference for sports of contemporary amateur interest among the organizers of the Athens games.

tennis among other sports in the Olympic program. For this reason, one must examine a peculiar phenomenon that faced nearly all of the sports on the Olympic program: justification through the use of classic Olympic imagery. Here the Athens games of 1896 were not alone in their fondness of classical Greece: many of the attempted revivals of the Olympic games prior to Coubertin's were filled with allusions to the historic festivals. Both the Much Wenlock games of Englishman William Penny Brookes and the Greek games established by the estate of Evangelos Zappas integrated both athletic and artistic-cultural elements that hearkened to the pastimes of the local culture.[112] In Greece, the obligation to identify with a Hellenic heritage was viewed by some to be as important, if not superior to, the requirements of staging a bona fide athletic competition.[113] The 1870 Zappas Olympics, for example, "included several contests that reflected either the organizers' wish to mirror antiquity or their penchant for innovation."[114] Among these events were shooting and swimming, both of which would be included as events for the

[112] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 51; 56; Kitroeff, *Wrestling with the Ancients*, 15; Bill Mallon and Ian Buchanan, *The 1908 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 5 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000), 1. Contrary to popular conception, Pierre de Coubertin's series of Olympic games were not the first attempt at a revival of the Greek festival during the nineteenth century, though undoubtedly the have become the most successful. Throughout England, "Olympic" multisport festivals had occurred surrounding holidays in many towns. The most elaborate of these during the nineteenth century were those at Much Wenlock, first held on 22 October 1850 and annually thereafter until 1895. Mallon and Buchanan have likened the festival to "a medieval country fair." Two years before the First Sorbonne Congress, Coubertin visited Much Wenlock during a tour of England he made in October 1890. During the same period in Greece, a large behest by businessman Evangelos Zappas permitted the construction of the Panathenaic Stadium, the Zappeion Hall, and financed four early modern Olympic games held in Athens in 1859, 1870, 1875, and 1888. Both of these series of Olympic revivals were essential predecessors which served as the foundation upon which Coubertin advocated and ultimately established the modern Olympic movement.

[113] Kitroeff, *Wrestling with the Ancients*, 15. This certainly seems to be the case of the 1870 Zappas Olympics, which "bore the strong influence of classical Greek sporting practices." In Kitroeff's assessment, connecting the games to ancient Greece led to the success and popularity of the 1870 venture, since "the ancient elements lent the event a sense of grandeur in the eyes of observers."

[114] Ibid., 16.

games of 1896.[115] Pierre de Coubertin did not shy away from such "innovation" in his own Olympics, but seamlessly soothed classical tastes by justifying the newer sports on the Olympic program through vivid historic images.

Referencing again Coubertin's avid report on the Athens games, first published in the American periodical *The Century Magazine* in November, 1896, one discovers his effortless replacement of the historic with the contemporary. The games, he writes with the utmost sense of justification, "substituted bicycle for chariot races, and fencing for the brutalities of pugilism."[116] As has already been demonstrated, this reasoning allowed for the inclusion of modern sports such as lawn tennis, but the nuance of Coubertin's rhetoric also reveals the delicacy with which these inclusions were made. Nearly every sport that found its way onto the Olympic schedule had some connection either to the ancient festivals proper, or to the equally ancient tradition of military sporting exercises. Sports that were already a part of the ancient Olympic games needed no further validation: track and field and wrestling fell into this camp. Those with connections to military life, including fencing, shooting, gymnastics, weightlifting, and even swimming and sailing could be considered historic on the grounds of proximity to the tests of strength and combat at Ancient Olympia.[117] Coubertin's comparison of cycling to chariot races

---

[115] Kitroeff, *Wrestling with the Ancients*, 16. Boating was also scheduled for the 1870 Zappas Olympics, but was later cancelled. In another historical irony, boating was also removed the 1896 Olympic program after foul weather forced the cancellation of the regatta originally scheduled for April 12 (March 31 in the Julian calendar).

[116] Coubertin, "Olympic Games of 1896," 39.

[117] See especially Wallechinsky, *Complete Book of the Olympics;* Mallon, *The 1896 Olympic Games*; Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 86; Many of the more modern combat sports actually included events designed for members of the military. The best remembered of these is the open-water swimming race open exclusively to sailors in the Greek Royal Navy. The gymnastics competition was dominated by German Turners who, as Mandell writes, were paramilitary athletes whose form of sport was closely tied to nationalistic interests.

represents the most far-fetched of these comparisons; a bizarre analogy made to satisfy the "uneasy and historically minded" patrons of the 1896 games.[118]

Despite the fact that cycling was extremely popular in the Western world at the time of the Athens meet,[119] Coubertin still deemed it necessary to offer an overt connection to the games of old.[120] Critically, one must observe that the same historic justification was not applied in the case of tennis, a sport on par with cycling in popularity, yet even more detached in its character from the Olympics of antiquity.[121] The addition of a ball sport originating in regions north and west of Greece, held at a club only constructed a year before the games,[122] would seem circumspect enough to warrant an explanation at least equal to that received for the inclusion of cycling. The most sensible reason for why no such comparison was made in the literature of the period is that the impresarios of the Athens Olympic games, as well as the founders of the modern Olympic movement, did not believe it to be at all necessary to explain away the inclusion of a sport that was at the heart of the amateur spirit they hoped the games would promote. Contested primarily by wayfaring gentlemen from nation states in which it was already well established, lawn tennis was the paradigm of the new, modern sport the French Baron Coubertin hoped would become a regular feature of the revived Olympic games. A

---

[118] Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 108.
[119] Lucas, *Modern Olympic Games*, 47.
[120] It is important to recognize that such comparisons to the Ancient Olympic Games were not common surrounding the second Olympics in Paris in 1900. There, the games were removed from the imagery of Greek ruins and held not under the direct auspices of the International Olympic Committee, but by various departments of the Paris World's Fair, the *Exposition Universelle*. The Paris organizers made no effort to justify which sporting events they included in the games using historical imagery, but rather scheduled various events which fancied the imagination. While subsequent games curbed the Parisians' more abstract additions, they did not reiterate some of the early Olympic advocates' desires to create an Olympics which primarily served as a historic replica of the Ancient Olympic Games, not a new and distinctly modern institution.
[121] Rufus Richardson, "The New Olympian Games," *Scribner's Magazine* 20, no. 3 (September 1896), 269.
[122] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 49; cf. Mandell, *First Modern Olympics*, 108; Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens*, 53.

cursorily unusual addition to the program, tennis needed no further introduction, because it was already enshrined in legitimacy among the chief patrons of new Olympics: modern, amateur sportsmen of the upper-middle and upper classes. It is in this vein that George Horton speaks when he considers the importance of adding new disciplines to the modern Olympic games:

> Some of the archaeologists will doubtless see an incongruous feature in the introduction of such sports as bicycling and lawn tennis at the Olympian games. Let such draw a moral from the history of the games themselves. Were they not limited at first to mere trials of speed and endurance in footracing? Afterwards chariot racing was introduced, throwing the discus, archery, etc., proving that even in classical times physical training kept abreast of the progress of the world.[123]

A truly revived Olympic games—in the eyes of both Horton and Coubertin—required nothing less than a full commitment to openness with regard to new inclusions on the Olympic program. Yet enough of their contemporaries in Greece did not share the same perspective that they paid homage to the ancient games through colorful analogies. Lawn tennis stands unique among the new sports for being so much a part of the amateur sporting culture of the twilight of the nineteenth century that no additional action had to be taken to vouch for its legitimacy. Unabashedly amateur, and universally respected, tennis crept quietly into the Olympic games. It arrived on the program as an anomalous inclusion, but one uniquely warranted by the elite sporting climate of the Victorian age.

[123] Horton, "Revival," 273. To the best of this historian's knowledge, Horton's report is the only primary text which discusses lawn tennis in conjunction with the cycling as a modern intrusion into the classical Olympic theme, ultimately concluding that the conflict between ancient and contemporary sports is an unnecessary one.

Chapter Three

A Surprise Success: Tennis on the Ile de Puteaux, 1900

Few Olympic historians would argue against the significance of the 1896 Athens games in laying the groundwork for the Olympic movement, a program that would ultimately develop into the world's leading multisport festival. Compared to other early modern Olympics, they were extremely well organized. Indeed, English competitor George Stuart Robertson called them "very nearly perfect." [124] They were also immensely popular among Greeks and Grecophiles the world over. Although the general success of the games could not be attributed to the tennis tournament, which was modest in size and more so in athletic caliber, the festival's ability to inspire passion for cosmopolitan ideals insured its survival. Because of the timely success of events such as the first marathon, in which the surprising victory of the Greek peasant Spiridon Louis became the defining moment of the Athens games,[125] the Olympic movement was fit to subsist through a decade-long period in which enthusiasm for the games grew, albeit at the expense of being organizationally dependent upon other popular international festivals. The next three quadrennial meetings would all be paired with concurrent world's fairs, allowing Olympic interest to grow while the games provided entertainment to countless festival patrons.[126] So too would lawn tennis grow amidst these bourgeoning years of the Olympic movement, through successfully staged tournaments and early integration of the values of the amateur sporting class. Moreover, tennis remained a popular recreation for

[124] George S. Robertson, "The Olympic Games by a Competitor and Prize Winner," *Fortnightly Review* 354 (1 June 1896), 949.
[125] Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Olympics in Athens 1896: The Invention of the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Profile, 2004), 191.
[126] The early growth of the Olympic games alongside the world's fair movement has been explored by a number of sport historians. Among them is Mark Dyreson, who addresses the games from the perspective of exploring early twentieth century American nationalism in the third and fourth chapters of his monograph *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience.* Focusing as much upon Pierre de Coubertin as upon the restoration of the Olympic games, John J. MacAloon chronicles the early growth of the modern Olympic movement in *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games*. MacAloon also details some of Coubertin's later disappointments about the Paris and St. Louis games. Richard D. Mandell also touches on early Olympic growth in *The First Modern Olympics,* and details the *Exposition Universelle* itself in *Paris 1900: The Great World's Fair.*

members of the sporting nobility and *bourgeoisie* which patronized Coubertin's ideals, and would become an expected feature of the summer games for nearly three decades.[127]

The organizers of the 1896 Olympics set an important precedent in including tennis as the first Olympic ball sport. The fruitful tennis tournament, albeit small, laid the groundwork for other ball sports, even team sports, to be included in future games. As early as the Paris games of 1900, the Olympics would play host to a range of other games including cricket, croquet, golf, rugby union, and water polo.[128] Although much of the emphasis at early Olympics remained on the glamour of track and field,[129] ball sports have remained a part of every games since 1896, and in recent decades have increased in number and variety. More importantly, the inclusion of amateur lawn tennis at the first modern Olympics paved the road for the sport to become a mainstay in the next seven

---

[127] The history of early tennis is intertwined with the Olympic games, as both tennis and the Olympics came of age during roughly the same period. The development of lawn tennis as a distinct sport has been the subject of a number of books. One of the earliest was *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis* by George W. Hillyard (1924), then secretary of the All England Club. Another was Stephen Wallis Merrihew's *The Quest for the Davis Cup* (1928). Merrihew's work was particularly important in touching upon the early history of international tennis tours which predicated both the Olympics and Dwight Davis' donation of the International Challenge Cup which would later bear his name. Since Hillyard and Merrihew, the early history of tennis has found its way into USTA volumes including *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis* (1931) and its *Official Encyclopedia of Lawn Tennis* (1972) as well as short accounts such as *Lawn Tennis: Its Founders and Its Early Days* by George E. Alexander (1974) and illustrated works such as *Tennis Nostalgia* by Christopher Dunkley (1998). In recent decades more critical works on the early history of tennis have come to press. *Tennis: A Cultural History* by Heiner Gillmeister (1997) proved a groundbreaking tome on the history of the early modern game and its connections to older forms of tennis and has since seen a second edition. Jean Rafferty assessed the role of women at tennis' greatest tournament with *Ladies of the Court: A Century of Women at Wimbledon* (1984). Within the past decade, Robert J. Lake has published his *A Social History of Tennis in Great Britain* (2014) along with a bevy of peer-reviewed articles on the subject. A popularly accessible but scholarly survey of tennis history can be found in Elizabeth Wilson's *Love Game: A History of Tennis, From Victorian Pastime to Global Phenomenon* (2017). Finally, 2019 brought the publication of two large works on tennis history. The first, *The Birth of Lawn Tennis* by Robert T. Everitt and Richard A. Hillway, questions traditional interpretations of the first years of lawn tennis. The second, the *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, addresses over forty topics related to the sport.

[128] Cf. Bill Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 2 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998).

[129] Bill Mallon and Ian Buchanan, *The 1908 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 5 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000), 12. As an example, Mallon writes of the London 1908 Olympic meeting, which focused on the track and field events at White City Stadium between July 13 and July 25. The tennis events were held in May and earlier in July.

meetings between 1900 and 1924, including the oft-discussed Intercalated Games held in Athens in 1906.[130] This continuity during a period in which sports were regularly being added and removed from the Olympic program is helpful in demonstrating the importance and development of tennis as an Olympic sport.[131] The evolution of Olympic tennis tournaments over time often reflected the expanse of the Olympic organization and its growing international appeal.

To at least some extent, Olympic tennis tournaments appeared to follow the overall tenor of the games in terms of quality of field, number of competitors, and comparative success as an international sporting event. For example, the legendary tennis champions Suzanne Lenglen and Helen Wills graced the interwar games of 1920 and 1924 respectively, played through draws full of international talent, and with little surprise, each walked away with a singles gold medal.[132] It is important to note, however, that such a correlation did not always hold true. The attraction of elite competitors did not

---

[130] In addition to the Intercalated Olympics of 1906, tennis was held at every regular Olympics from 1896 until 1924. At the London 1908 and Stockholm 1912 Games, organizers held both indoor and outdoor tournaments.

[131] David Wallechinsky and Jaime Loucky, *The Complete Book of the Olympics* (London: Aurum, 2008), 1172-1177; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 6-13; International Olympic Committee, "Olympic Results," accessed 21 January 2020, https://www.olympic.org/olympic-results. The early modern games can be viewed as a proving ground for developing the Olympic program, with many sports being added and taken away, particularly in the pre-World War I games, but also into the 1920s. These changes and variations during the first few decades of the modern Olympic movement are understandable given that each games were organized differently in countries with different athletic tastes. The IOC's lack of centralized control over the Paris and St. Louis games augmented the ability of local organizers to design their own programs with unique sporting oddities. Where the Greeks succeeded in executing the first Olympic games with a relatively limited program, the French and Americans elected to schedule an abundance of events, often of inconsistent quality. Authors such as Mallon have noted the Paris world's fair committee's penchant to introduce fanciful but short lived events such as ballooning to the Olympic program, which may have included female participants. Some of the more surprising disciplines are not presently considered to be canon events by the IOC, but the committee nonetheless recognizes achievements in sports such as cricket, polo, and Basque pelota in 1900 and Lacrosse and Roque in 1904. Perhaps the most infamous of these discontinued events was the Paris croquet tournament, which Wallechinsky and Loucky report could only boast a single spectator.

[132] Ellen Phillips, *The VIII Olympiad: Paris 1924- St. Moritz 1928*, The Olympic Century: The Official 1st Century History of the Modern Olympic Movement, 8 (Los Angeles: World Research and Publications, 1996), 94; 99.

ensure a large field or guarantee a successful tournament, and conversely, a tournament with more impromptu organization could sometimes have the good fortune of attracting the best players. In the years before open professionalism in international lawn tennis, all elite tennis champions were amateurs.[133] Although it featured the world's top player, Arthur "Wentworth" Gore, the 1908 indoor tournament was a small affair which took place two months prior to the most important events of the London games.[134] By contrast, the 1908 outdoor tournament boasted a large field, included six rounds of competition, and was hosted at the legendary All England Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club (AELTC) at Worple Road, Wimbledon.[135] The 1924 tournament, which played host to the most accomplished field of all the early Olympic tennis competitions and was part of a very successful second Paris games, nonetheless fielded numerous complaints: players and patrons panned organizers for the poor quality and location of the courts.[136] Great talent and great facilities, it would appear, did not always come hand in hand.

Compared to other Olympic events held in 1900, the tennis meet proved one of the more surprising successes. Despite numerous complaints lodged elsewhere in the games,[137] the tennis tournament exceeded the quality of the 1896 event, and became one of the underreported highlights of the Paris Olympics. Whereas the first of France's

---

[133] It is worth reiterating that during this time period, all of the world's premier tennis players were considered amateurs. That is, they represented the upper classes and did not compete as a means to a living, regardless of whatever nominal prizes or trophies were on offer at tournaments such as the 1900 Paris Olympics. Professionals were considered club laborers, in effect salaried instructors in the game. The modern concept of open professionalism only began to enter the game of tennis from the mid-1920s, when the world's top female player, Suzanne Lenglen of France, signed a touring contract with American C. C. Pyle. With the advent of the Open Era in 1968, all of the world's top tennis players would be professionals paid with tournament prizemoney.

[134] Mallon, *The 1908 Olympics*, 256-258.

[135] Ibid., 257; 259.

[136] Cheree Intorre Jones, "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," Master's thesis (Pennsylvania State University, 1985, GV993), 102.

[137] A number of these complaints in English-language literature centered around the athletics events, which will be discussed with respect to an overall assessment of the Paris games later in this chapter.

Olympic games is probably best remembered for its track and field invitational, which for all its controversy was considered a premier international gathering, lawn tennis was in its own way an equal success to the track tournament despite receiving far less notice from the press.[138] To a level which demonstrates the importance of tennis to the Olympics and to the amateur sporting class which patronized the earliest modern games, the lawn tennis tournament of Paris 1900 stands out for among other reasons, the foresight of organizers to stage a tournament at a well-established sporting club, the quality and breadth of international talent recruited by the tournament's sponsors, and the landmark invitation of women amateurs to join their male counterparts in Olympic competition both in singles and in mixed doubles—contrary to the Baron de Coubertin's vision.

The Paris tennis tournament became an unheralded triumph by overcoming an Achilles heel of early Olympic event planning: inconsistency. Insomuch as the games themselves between Athens 1896 and Stockholm 1912 featured highlights and lowlights in quality of organization and competition between Athens 1896 and Stockholm 1912, so

[138] Examining the imbalanced press coverage between various sporting events is one of the unique challenges encountered through researching the early modern Olympic games. For the 1900 Paris games, we find what might be considered the most imbalanced coverage of any Olympics. Much has been written by authors such as Wallechinsky, Mallon, Weyand, Lucas, to what limited extent the competitions were advertised and the surprising number of athletes who did not know they were competing in the Olympic games. The tennis tournament seems to have been reasonably well reported within Paris, considering the extensive and detailed reporting provided by the English-language Paris edition of the *New York Herald.* Unfortunately for lawn tennis aficionados, the tournament did not appear to be well reported abroad. While the preeminent newspaper of the British Empire, *The Times of London*, provided daily coverage of the happenings at Worple Road during the 1900 Wimbledon Championships just prior to the games, they appear to have neglected to send a reporter across the English Channel for the Olympic event. This was in spite of several of the most preeminent British players competing in the tournament (namely the Doherty Brothers and Charlotte Cooper). The results of the tournament were published in the unofficial report of the games, *Concours Internationaux D'Exercices Physiques et de Sports Rapports* from the Ministry of Commerce, which was not published until after the conclusion of the world exposition. Conversely, track and field received ample contemporary coverage in places such as the United States, where newspapers such as the *New York Times* covered the success of the athletes representing various American colleges, as well as the infamous Sabbatarian controversy in which the American contingent and French officials became embroiled.

did the lawn tennis tournaments wax and wane with the relative competence of the organizing committees. Although this inconsistency in quality control could be seen as far back as the first Olympic tennis tournament, in which records indicate some of the competitors came to Greece for other sports and then joined in the lawn tennis festivities as if on a whim,[139] the almost *ad hoc* appearance of the first Olympic tennis tournament did not for the time detract from tennis' newfound pride of place on the Olympic program.[140] A rather successful tennis tournament at the games of Paris 1900 demonstrated that Olympic tennis could attract top international talent to a prestigious sporting club and be a socially acceptable vessel for the inclusion of women in Olympic competitions.

Although at the Second Sorbonne Congress in 1894 the City of Light was named the *heiress presumptive* to inherit the Olympic mantel after Athens, the founding fathers of the modern Olympic movement could not have foreseen the intense historical debate over the organization, quality, and even canonicity of the 1900 games.[141] Over the past century of Olympic scholarship, writers have debated extensively the place the 1900 games hold comparable to the other quadrennial meets in the Olympic canon. Hindsight has not been kind to the first Paris games, with critics pointing to organizational challenges and the inclusion of obscure competitions as "telltale" signs of the games'

---

[139] Bill Mallon and Ture Widlund, *The 1896 Olympics: Results of All Competitors in All Events, With Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 1 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998), 107; Heiner Gillmeister, *Tennis: A Cultural History* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997), 227; Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 172; Alexander M. Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), 17.

[140] While the first Olympic tennis tournament appeared *ad hoc* because of the tendency of some competitors at the Athens games to enter multiple events, its level of organization was no worse than that of many other Olympic events which attracted predominately local competitors.

[141] W. B. Curtis, "The New Olympian Games," *Outing* 28 (May 1896), 21; Albert Shaw, "The Re-Establishment of Olympic Games: How International Sports May Promote Peace Among the Nations," *Review of Reviews* 10 (December 1894), 645. The Second Sorbonne Congress not only established the Olympic games and assigned the first Olympics to Athens, but accomplished the groundwork for Paris to host the second games in 1900 and a yet unnamed American city to take the third games in 1904 (St. Louis, Missouri would ultimately be named host).

"failure."[142] As early as Pierre de Coubertin's 1931 memoir, chroniclers presented the Games of the II Olympiad as little more than a regrettable but necessary episode in the development of the grand Olympic vision.[143]

In Coubertin's wake, critics wrote damning accounts of the inferiority of the 1900 competitions, condemning many of the events as unworthy of the title "Olympic." Histories of the second summer games both early and more recent have been quick to report that the Olympic program was relegated to a diminutive standing within the concurrent World's Fair. Because the second modern Olympics were held in coincidence with the *Exposition Universelle*, the last of Paris' five great world's fairs, some have argued that such a coupling befuddled the Olympic movement and hampered its organizers' ability to create a viable, recurrent international sporting meet. To its naysayers, the Paris games amounted to nothing more than a little-watched sideshow to

---

[142] As is the case with the St. Louis 1904 games, the structure of competitions at the II and III Olympiads has made it very difficult for the scholars and even the Olympic committee itself to designate retrospectively which competitions were "Olympic" and which were simply exhibition events, part of the World's Fair. Although scholars including Mallon (*The 1900 Olympics, The 1904 Olympics*) have sought to make such a distinction through comparing start lists with those of other international competitions at the time, one can be reasonably certain that no distinction was made between "Olympic" and "non-Olympic" events at the Paris games.

[143] Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques* (Lausanne: Bureau International de Pédagogie Sportive, 1931); Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, 2nd ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 21-24; Alfred Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games* (Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics, 1999), 25; Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant*, 20; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games* ix, 4-13; Reet Ann Howell and Max L. Howell, "Paris 1900: The Games of the IId Olympiad," in *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement,* edited by John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle, 12-17, first edition (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996), 12-17; Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 28-29; 143-145; Dick Schaap, *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*, 3rd ed. (New York: Knopf, 1975), 77; Victor Breyer, "The £80 Olympics," *World Sports* 15 (May 1949), 28-29; Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 11-12; David C. Young, *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1996), 166; Andre Drevon, "Paris 1900," translated by Dominique Leblond, in *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement,* edited by John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle, 27-32, Second edition (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2004), 27-31. This bibliographic litany can be considered a sample of the criticism levied upon the Paris 1900 Olympic games from a variety of authors, both distant and recent. The final article listed, by Andre Drevon, appears in the 2004 second edition of Findling and Pelle's *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement* and should be viewed as something of a corrective of some of the earlier criticism.

the exposition's industrial attractions, rather than being championship events in their own right.[144]

As established an Olympic scholar as David Wallechinsky has maintained that it was a sign of the games' mismanagement that Pierre de Coubertin himself was disregarded by the exposition's organizing committee, which added events for motorboating and balloon-racing designed to interest world's fair patrons.[145] Wallechinsky infers that these events were added in direct defiance to Coubertin's wishes, and arrives at this conclusion by drawing upon the Baron's later autobiography, in which Coubertin disowns the 1900 games for their failure to live up to his own idealistic Olympic vision.[146] Despite Wallechinsky's well-earned reputation as a first-rate student of the modern Olympics, it seems he has relied too heavily on Coubertin's retrospective in forming his opinion of the 1900 games. He is, however, not alone in his assumptions, as more than a handful of other historians, antiquarians, and chroniclers of

---

[144] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 8-9; Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant*, 20-21; 37; Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 11-12; Breyer, "The £80 Olympics," 28-29; *The Olympians: Evolution of the Games* (Montreal: Publinova, 1974), 18; Schaap, *Illustrated History*, 77; Matthew P. Llewellyn and Robert J. Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics: An Historical Examination of Their On-Off Relationship Since 1896," In *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 362-371, Routledge International Handbooks (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 363. Throughout the history of Olympic scholarship and popular writing, the first Paris games have been panned by a variety of critics, most of whom aimed their criticism on the overall organizational difficulties surrounding the games. From glossy large-format anthologies of the games to the meticulous statistical accounts of Bill Mallon and David Wallechinsky, heavy critique of the 1900 Olympics has been standard trade for decades. A recent account from historians Matthew Llewellyn and Robert Lake does not even spare the tennis tournament, blaming a supposed "lack of advertising, inadequate facilities, poor officiating," and untimely scheduling as evidence that the tennis event fared no better than other Paris competitions. Most notably, the brunt of this criticism has come long after the 1900 Olympics and the *Exposition Universelle* have faded in collective memory. However, at least one firsthand witness of Paris' first Olympic effort would later live to mock it: In 1949, Victor Breyer—a regular attendee who saw eight of the first eleven Olympics in person—nicknamed the Second Olympiad "The £80 Olympics," because the gate revenues from the sporting events supposed only amounted to 2000 francs, or 80 pounds sterling.

[145] Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 11.

[146] Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*.

the early Olympics share in the Coubertin school of thought, ranking the Paris stop lowly in terms of overall contribution to the Olympic movement.[147]

Along this line of reasoning, Bill Mallon, compiler of the most complete report to date on the 1900 games, notes the confusing task of determining which events comprised the Olympic program (in stark juxtaposition to twenty-first century Olympics, where the program is agreed upon and published several years in advance).[148] According to Mallon, the odd array of sports included, the want of any branding designating the competitions as "Olympic," and the appendage of the Olympic contests to the larger and more encompassing *Exposition Universelle*, are all indicative of Paris' pitiful and primitive attempt to carry forth the flame of Olympic revival.[149] Mallon even quotes Reet Ann and Max L. Howell in positing that because of the lack of central involvement from Coubertin and the International Olympic Committee (IOC), "it can be successfully argued that no Olympics were held in Paris in 1900."[150]

Mallon's preoccupation with the absence of an Olympic mark is intriguing, particularly since it feigns the latter twentieth-century focus on corporate branding and

---

[147] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 21-24; Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 11; Howell and Howell, "Paris 1900," 17; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, ix; 4-13; Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant*, 20; Schaap, *Illustrated History*, 77; Breyer, "The £80 Olympics," 28-29; Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games*, 25; Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 56; Drevon, "Paris 1900," 27-31. Many histories of the Olympic games have had less than charitable words for the "world's fair games" of 1900. Among the more accomplished are Allen Guttmann and Alfred Senn, who have made their mark upon the discipline of Olympic history with overarching histories of the games. The final two sources listed, the works of Mark Dyreson and Andre Drevon, represent the less popular view that the 1900 Olympic games can, with qualification, be viewed as more successful. Dyreson writes that the "pairing of Olympics and expositions made logistical sense, as the baron de Coubertin understood. World's fairs attracted travelers from all over the globe and served as nexuses for international events" (p. 56). Drevon extends this idea in submitting that while the Olympics were at the time "practically unknown to the public" (p. 27), Coubertin in 1894 strategically elected to align the games with the *Exposition Universelle* in order to maximize exposure for the Olympics alongside a fair that was "a supreme achievement of its kind" (p. 29).

[148] Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant*, 164.

[149] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 7.

[150] Howell and Howell, "Paris 1900," 17; cf. Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 7.

sponsorship that has been a visible part of the Olympics since Los Angeles 1984. A unique symbolic identity for the Olympics had yet to be established at this early stage. The most recognizable symbol of the games, the concentric Olympic rings as displayed on the Olympic flag, would not be introduced until well after the Paris games.[151] The first official Olympic logo did not appear until 1964 in Tokyo.[152] Mallon correctly records that Paris organizers called the competitions *"Concours internationaux d'exercises physiques et de sport*" ("International Physical Exercise and Sport Competitions"), rather than Olympic games as had the 1896 revival. [153] It seems unfair, though, to expect Parisians to value the Olympic name as highly as the Athenians when in fact it was the world's fairs which were more internationally renowned. The historian Mark Dyreson summarized the movement's unique appeal, noting that "World's fairs attracted travelers from all over the globe and served as nexuses for international events."[154] With four previous world's fairs held in Paris under the name *Exposition Universelle* since 1855, the residents of the City of Light were more than familiar with expos' reputation for industrial-age grandeur and international acclaim.[155] Moreover, directly due to the games' heritage in ancient Greece and the successful series of revivals which were held there between 1859 and 1889,[156] the

---

[151] Allen Guttmann, *Games and Empires: Modern Sports and Cultural Imperialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 125.
[152] Ibid., 126.
[153] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 7.
[154] Mark Dyreson, *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience*, Sport and Society, eds. Benjamin G. Rader and Randy Roberts (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 56.
[155] Paris' five "Universal Expositions" had become standard fare during the second half of the nineteenth century. After the first Paris world's fair was held in 1855, four more followed at a rate of once every 11-12 years in 1867, 1878, 1889, and 1900. The fifth and final Paris world's fair was the culmination of these elaborate gatherings which had attracted global audiences since the Second Empire.
[156] John J. MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 151; Kitroeff, *Wrestling with the Ancients: Modern Greek Identity and the Olympics* (New York: Greenworks, 2004), 6. These "Zappas Olympics" were organized with the endowment of a wealthy Greek businessman on four occasions, and are broadly seen as aiding in the popularity of the Olympic idea and setting the stage for the first of Coubertin's Olympics in Athens.

Olympic name would have been a far more important, even expected, inclusion at Athens.[157] In France, where sporting culture emerged from decidedly more modern origins,[158] it seems plausible that the organizers of the *Exposition Universelle* simply chose to employ a term more common than *Jeux Olympiques* in describing the sporting competitions. At any rate, Howell and Howell's bold assertion, that there were no Paris Olympics, comes across as downright silly.[159] This is tantamount to arguing that because it was known at the time as the "AFL-NFL World Championship Game," Super Bowl I was not contested on January 15, 1967.[160] While there is still academic disagreement over which events ought to be included within the purview of the second summer games, to argue that there were no "Olympics proper" simply because no event bore the Olympic moniker seems at best a convenient device introduced by the enterprising authors.

All the same, one can agree with Wallechinsky, Mallon, and the Howells in recognizing that the lack of clarity surrounding the 1900 Olympics proves a difficult challenge for the historian. Considering the idiosyncrasy of the Games of the II Olympiad when juxtaposed with the more refined competition schedules of their twenty-first century counterparts, it is not difficult to understand why Wallechinsky judged both the

---

[157] In his *Wrestling with the Ancients*, Alexander Kitroeff demonstrates the centrality of the ancient Olympics and the Olympic movement at large to Greek identity, a concept which has grown even in the twentieth century but was certainly present in the nineteenth. In the realm of nationalist identity, the word "Olympics" naturally held far more meaning in Greece than it did in France, despite its popularity in the elite sporting circles Coubertin travelled in.

[158] As noted by Richard Holt in *Sport and Society in Modern France*, France had a long history of both plebian and patrician ancient sports at the regional level, but lacked a national tradition in sports like Greece and the Olympics, England and cricket, or Brazil and association football.

[159] Howell and Howell, "Paris 1900," 17. The Howells' commentary on the 1900 world exposition and the Olympic games appears in the 1996 first edition of Findling and Pelle's *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement*. Notably, it was replaced by a different chapter by Andre Drevon in the 2004 edition.

[160] Cf. Peter Hopsicker and Mark Dyreson, eds., *A Half Century of Super Bowls: National and Global Perspectives on America's Grandest Spectacle.* Sport in the Global Society – Historical Perspectives, eds. Mark Dyreson, Rob Hess, and Thierry Terret (London: Routledge, 2018). The name "Super Bowl" was not used until 1969 and only retroactively given to the 1967 and 1968 Championship games.

Paris 1900 and St. Louis 1904 Olympics to be "debacles," and why Mallon would call the former "almost chaotic" and "the worst of games."[161] Organizationally speaking, Coubertin and the IOC could feel a good deal of embarrassment over the 1900 and 1904 Olympics largely because they were unable to exert absolute organizational control.[162] This does not mean, however, that these Olympics can be dismissed on these grounds as largely or wholly unsuccessful. In fact, if tennis at the Paris Olympics is any indication, quite the opposite may be true.

Despite a historiography that contains a number of unflattering accounts of the 1900 Olympics, the evidence against the success of the Paris meeting is far from conclusive. Rather, scholars responsible for condemning the games as a failure have often been guilty of clear (though perhaps not blatant) presentism: when comparing early modern and recent Olympics, it is all too easy to view the former as relics of a less sophisticated time, as simple stepping stones on the path to a more promising Olympic progeny. Admittedly, some of the firsthand material from the Paris games itself gives less than a becoming account of organizers, particularly in the writings of British and North American commentators. For example, one might misunderstand the frustrations of George Washington Orton, the Canadian hurdler and steeplechaser who competed for the United States representing the University of Pennsylvania.[163] Despite an overall positive

---

[161] Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 12; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, ix.
[162] Because of its relatively remote location from the locus of the industrialized world, the 1904 summer games in St. Louis were also more of a product of the world's fair committee than the International Olympic Committee. Although the American Olympic Committee was involved in the games' planning and the IOC sent its own envoy to the games, they were arguably the games with the least amount of influence from the central Olympic committee. Nevertheless, David Lunt and Mark Dyreson have noted in "The 1904 Olympic Games: Triumph or Nadir?" that the IOC maintained a significant, if geographically removed, presence in the planning of the third modern Olympics. This included Coubertin supporting the move from Chicago to St. Louis.
[163] "Paris Games Terminate: Tewksbury's Victory in 200-Meter Race," *New York Times*, 23 July 1900, 7; "Americans Again Lead: Six More Firsts Taken by Yankee Athletes in Paris Games," *New York Times*, 17

impression of the Olympics and the athletes that contested the games, Orton saw the relaxed approach French officials took to the track and field schedule as indicative of their incompetence. He decried "the management of the games" as "very poor, the events being invariably far behind time."[164] Applying such a sentiment to the Paris games or even the world's fair as a whole has sometimes been a stumbling block for Olympic commentators, since many of the contemporary accounts of the 1900 Olympics focused predominantly if not entirely on the July track and field events.[165] Albeit that they were not without flaw, these games, tennis among them, need not receive such an encompassing condemnation.

Despite their comparative humility in scope, scale, and representation to recent games, there is plenty of reason to believe that some (although clearly not all) of the sports competitions at the *Exposition Universelle* were among the most internationally representative and prestigious of their time. In an age in which the globalization of elite organized sport was just beginning to yield multinational competitions in parts of the Western world, it was the Paris fair of 1900, the very best of the *Concours Internationaux*,[166] which gathered athletes from across Europe and its colonial reach to compete for some of the most esteemed sporting titles of the new century.

July 1900, 5; Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904* (St. Louis: Woodward and Tiernan Printing Co., 1905), 144; "George Washington Orton (1873-1958)," *Penn Biographies*, Penn University Archives and Records Center, Accessed 26 November 2018, https://www.archives.upenn.edu/people/1800s/orton_geo_w.html.

[164] George W. Orton, "The Paris Athletic Games," *Outing* 36, no. 6 (September 1900), 690.

[165] Orton's account is an example of this, as well as Francis C. Richter's interview with A. G. Spalding, which appeared in the December 1900 issue of *Sporting Life*.

[166] Arthur Chandler, "Culmination: The Paris Exposition Universelle of 1900," *World's Fair* 7, no. 3 (1987). As compiled by Chandler, the 1900 Paris world's fair attracted a staggering 51 million visitors through its gates, making it the highest attended world expo to that time. The elaborately constructed fair included a number of buildings still part of the Paris cityscape, and featured an incredible 83,000 different exhibitors. Considering its massive size and scope, the 1900 *Exposition Universelle* was a remarkable achievement, one which achieved its primary goal of serving as a capstone to the nineteenth century while setting a standard for technological, cultural, and sporting developments in the twentieth.

Even though Coubertin's Olympic motifs played a light role in the Paris meeting, the games appear to have been taken quite seriously by international competitors and delegations that officially or unofficially represented their homelands in France. Nowhere more obviously was this manifest than in the American dominance of the track and field events, in which competitors from the United States triumphed in eighteen events out of twenty-four.[167] Commentating for the perennial favorite publication of the American sporting class, *Outing*, George W. Orton remarked the earnestness of Anglo-American and Continental competitors alike as much as he chastised the administration of the competitions in the hands of local officials.[168] Orton judged participants to have competed genially and honorably, and the much anticipated success of the American team proved itself "far in the lead" in international athletics.[169] His account chiefly regards the Paris games and the track events in particular as a triumph of what Mark Dyreson terms the American sporting republic, a unique form of nationalism which exported American ideas about the value of athletics as a source of patriotic pride.[170]

To the American sporting class which directly patronized the Olympic movement through organizing the American Olympic Committee and financing the earliest American contingents, a successful Olympic games meant assembling a team that both respectfully represented the United States among its international peers and also demonstrated American physical prowess through triumphs in choice events, which at the

---

[167] Orton, "The Paris Athletic Games," 690.
[168] Ibid., 690-695.
[169] Ibid., 695.
[170] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 2; 71. *Making the American Team* provides a highly recommended discussion on the American sporting republic, specifically the patriotic and nationalistic ways Americans came to view the Olympic games. Dyreson also notes the tendency of Americans to measure the success of Olympic games by the performance of American athletes in favorite events, such as track and field. It proves itself an essential text for understanding contextually the significance of the Olympic Games between 1896 and 1924.

earliest games almost exclusively meant track and field.[171] Even during this extended period of transcontinental *détente* in Europe,[172] "Americans equated Olympic championships with national superiority," Dyreson argued.[173] By their second iteration, nationalistic supporters had uncovered the hidden prestige of the modern Olympic games in constructing patriotic pride and commanding international respect. Not coincidentally, the men who saw the games in these terms were among the most prominent to declare the 1900 Olympics at least a partial success. Chief among them were American sporting class giants, A.G. Spalding and Caspar Whitney.

The United States Commissioner-General to the Paris world exposition, Ferdinand W. Peck,[174] appointed Albert Goodwill Spalding as Director of Athletics in late April, 1900.[175] A sporting goods magnate with a keen interest in crafting American Olympic ideals, Spalding was an original member of the American Olympic Committee from its formation in 1893 and served alongside his brother, Walter.[176] In A. G. Spalding the Paris games found one of the world's most successful and respected sporting leaders in an influential post. As Director of Athletics, he helped ensure the success of the games for which the United States supplied a quarter of the total participants.[177] While the extent of Spalding's influence is uncertain, his attachment to the games along with that other

---

[171] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 63. An official American Olympic Team did not exist until the 1904 team. Therefore, athletes at the Paris 1900 games were only loosely governed by the American Olympic Committee, which nonetheless presented the United States' contingent as a source of national pride in the global sporting environment.
[172] Europe was experiencing an unprecedented period of peace between the conclusion of the Franco-Prussian war in 1871 and the advent of World War I in 1913. During this period, many European states sought both permanent solutions to peace while simultaneously expanding military training efforts in preparation for future international conflicts.
[173] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 71.
[174] Caspar Whitney, "The Way of the Sportsman," *Outing* 36, no. 3 (June 1900), 318.
[175] "Spalding Honored: The Noted Magnate in a Congenial Role," *Sporting Life* 35, no. 6 (28 April 1900), 7.
[176] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 60.
[177] "Spalding Honored," 7.

prominent members of the American athletic establishment, such as *Outing* editor Caspar Whitney, proves the seriousness with which the Americans approached the games, and the capability of the French organizers to attract contestants from across the Atlantic ocean.[178]

For his part, Whitney became chief negotiator for the United States contingent in attempting to win favorable concessions from the French organizers. When the arrangers of the track and field events scheduled competitions on Sunday, July 15, Whitney and Spalding attempted to convince authorities to move the events to Saturday so that the Christian Sabbath might be observed.[179] Perhaps not surprisingly, their efforts fell upon deaf ears. The host facility, le Racing Club de France, had a long history of Sunday morning footraces,[180] and athletics officials considered it untimely to skip competition on the Christian Sabbath after they had already delayed the meet's Saturday races due to the annual celebration of Bastille Day.[181]

In his regular editorial in *Outing*, Whitney made his denunciation of Sabbath sport unmistakably clear: "no association governing any branch of sport," he wrote, "tolerates open competitive games on Sunday, and no club of a desirable class in the United States,

---

[178] Caspar Whitney and A. G. Spalding were at the heart of a dispute with French organizers on holding track and field events on a Sunday, the day after Bastille Day. The Americans initially convinced the Paris organizers to move competition to Saturday, but ultimately moved some competitions back to Sunday, July 16, due to scheduling concerns, much to the chagrin of their American guests.

[179] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 64.

[180] Richard Holt, *Sport and Society in Modern France* (London: Macmillan, 1981), 66; Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 64-71. Holt writes that as early as the 1880s, Racing members would compete in athletics races on Sunday mornings before attending an eleven o'clock Roman Catholic Mass. In the largely Protestant-influenced Anglo-American world, participating in athletics let alone competing on the Sabbath was largely frowned upon. This led to a major conflict within the American Olympic contingent when the University of Pennsylvania allowed its athletes to compete on Sunday, July 15, while other schools such as Syracuse and the staunchly Presbyterian Princeton abstained. In the words of Mark Dyreson, "The attempted Sunday ban of competition indicated the degree to which Americans identified athletic practice with cultural, religious, and political principles" (p. 70).

[181] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 64.

would give them."[182] Regardless of the efforts Whitney and Spalding, whom the former praised as "quite the most persuasive influence which fell upon the Frenchmen,"[183] Whitney returned to the United States indignant about the manner in which the situation was handled and wrote publically of what he considered to be an affront to Anglo-American amateur culture.[184] All the same, upon the American contingent's return Whitney had nothing but high praise for his country's athletes and their "athletic invasion" of Europe. [185] He was pleased, it would seem, with the outcome of the games if frustrated by their execution.

Despite Caspar Whitney's stark disagreement with the Paris athletic officials, his more genial counterpoint A. G. Spalding gave exceptional praise to the Paris track and field meet upon his return to New York City. In an interview with esteemed American sportswriter Henry Chadwick following the games, Spalding declared that "[n]ever before in the history of modern athletics was there ever such a tournament as that held last summer at the Paris Exposition in which our representative American athletes carried off three-quarters of the honors and prizes."[186] As ecstatic the sporting goods retailer was with American success at the games, he also saw keen to elevate the event to an elite level during his interview. In a moniker which seems incongruous with Mallon's "the

---

[182] Caspar Whitney, "The Way of the Sportsman," *Outing* 36, no. 4 (July 1900), 424. By "respectable class," Whitney referred to upper and middle class American sporting organizations, which refrained from holding competitions on the Sabbath. The only organizations which held Sunday sporting meets in 1900 were comprised of working class members who had no other day available for leisure activities. Whitney and likeminded colleagues hoped to preserve the Olympic games from this plebeian, "professional" association by preventing the French from holding competitions in which Americans were involved on Sunday.
[183] Whitney, "The Way of the Sportsman," 424.
[184] John Apostal Lucas, "Caspar Whitney: The Imperial Advocate of Athletic Amateurism and His Involvement with the International Olympic Committee and the American Olympic Committee, 1899-1912," *Journal of Olympic History* 8, no. 2 (May 2000), 31.
[185] Caspar Whitney, "The Sportsmans View-Point," *Outing* 36, no. 6 (September 1900), 677.
[186] Francis C. Richter, "America on Top in Every Way at the Recent Paris Exposition: Director Spalding in an Interview with Father Chadwick Gives a Condensed Version of His Experiences at the Great World's Fair," *Sporting Life* 36, no. 11 (1 December 1900), 9.

worst of games,"[187] Spalding also referred to the Olympic meeting as "the world's championship in field sports."[188] One can recognize in the commentary of Spalding, Whitney, and their peers in the upper echelons of American amateur sports administration that there was a sense of seriousness and excitement allotted to the track events on the same level as the fanfare given for any international gathering of the time. Insofar as the American contingent was concerned, the 1900 games were approached as no less of a championship meeting than those of Athens four years previous.[189]

Although it is admissible that many of the events of the Paris Olympics did not meet the "world championship" standard set by the track and field program, attracting few competitors from beyond the local area (as did many events at the Athens 1896 and St. Louis 1904 games), they did achieve indelible memory and a quantum of esteem by being annexed to a world-class event, the *Exposition Universelle*. While the memory of world's fairs has generally faded in the public consciousness, the international exposition was very much in vogue at the turn of twentieth century, so much so as they could be considered the world's premier public gatherings. In effect, these assemblages were the precursors to what today's economists and leisure theorists would term mega-events; expansive cultural summits which summon public attention on a massive scale.[190]

---

[187] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, ix.
[188] Richter, "America on Top," 9.
[189] It is important to note again that, as demonstrated by the work of Mark Dyreson and other scholars, Americans viewed the track and field events as the nucleus of the Olympic movement. The American contingent of 1900 treated these events as overriding—if not exclusive—in their importance compared to other Olympic events. Without a dominant performance on the track, American Olympic officials may very well have deemed the Games a failure overall.
[190] Martin Mueller, "What Makes an Event a Mega-Event? Definitions and Sizes," *Leisure Studies* 34, no. 6 (January 2015), 627-642; Maurice Roche, *Mega-Events and Modernity: Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture* (London: Routledge, 2000), 1. According to Maurice Roche, "'mega-events' are large-scale cultural (including commercial and sporting) events which have a dramatic character, mass popular appeal, and international significance. They are typically organized by variable combinations of national governmental and international non-governmental organizations and thus can be important elements in

Peaceful, decorous gatherings of crowds by the tens of thousands were still a relatively new phenomenon of leisure culture in 1900. For centuries, village festivals, games, and carnivals served as the loci of social and sporting life for the small towns of Europe and North America.[191] France was no exception, where the *fête* was a perennial institution on both Church feast days and state holidays well after the fall of the *ancien regime*.[192] *Fêtes* involved nearly all members of a local community, but were largely confined to a specific region and its own particular taste in sports and games, food, and traditions.[193] Since France was without a national sport or national sporting traditional until the end of the nineteenth century, local festivals were the primary venue for sport on a popular level and rarely attracted national or international attention.[194]

By the turn of the twentieth century, however, the Western world was increasingly exposed to the idea of the large-crowd leisure activity as a major attraction and corporate experience. Newly opened working-class resort towns such as Blackpool and Coney Island attracted throngs in Britain and the United States, becoming "the first great popular playgrounds for the industrial working class in the modern world."[195] For the middle and upper classes, World's Fairs became a choice destination of crowds

---

'official' versions of public culture." Roche names both world expositions and Olympic games as prominent examples of mega-events.

[191] Many excellent surveys of medieval to early Modern European and colonial and early American sport have been published over the past several decades which recount the long tradition of local sports and games, which were predominately community or at the most regional gatherings centered around select Holy Days—feat days in the Christian calendar. For further information one may reference the excellent work of Allen Guttmann, *From Ritual to Record*. Readers interested particularly in the local tradition of American sport might reference *A Brief History of American Sports* by Elliott J. Gorn and Warren Goldstein, *American Sports* by Benjamin G. Rader, or any number of equally reputable survey texts on the subject. Most relevant to the Paris 1900 games, Richard Holt has provided a fine introduction for the English-speaking audience with *Sport and Society in Modern France.*

[192] Holt, *Sport and Society*, 6.

[193] Ibid.

[194] Ibid., 7.

[195] Gary Cross and John K. Walton, *The Playful Crowd: Pleasure Places in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 4-6.

interested in "cultured" exhibits and industrial innovations. While many fairs also contained sensationalist elements designed to appeal to members of the lower class,[196] world's fairs by and large heralded recent and ongoing developments in technology, industry, or the arts. As the fairs grew in popularity over the second half of the nineteenth century, so too did a degree of optimism that these gatherings could be an instrument of peaceful cooperation between communities, or even between countries. Mark Dyreson does not overstate the profound influence of the world's fair movement in submitting that "[b]eginning with London's fantastic Crystal Palace Exposition in 1851, world's fairs schooled the West in the gospel of progress."[197]

The unique nature of a vast, rotating global carnival and its ability to sustain international interest was lost on no one, least of all Pierre de Coubertin. Whereas *le Revonateur*'s premier avocation was improving the physical fitness of the French people in light of his country's unexpected defeat in the Franco-Prussian War,[198] Coubertin hoped that sport—and the Olympics as sport's principal transcendent festival—would produce a "moral elite" of individuals who would use friendly competition as a means to physically and morally strengthen his nation.[199] Paradoxically, he did this while advocating the Olympics as an avenue toward international *détente* and peace.[200] In achieving these ambitions the world's fairs played far greater a role than Coubertin

---

[196] Cross and Walton, *The Playful Crowd*, 38; 43.
[197] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 56.
[198] Richard D. Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics*, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1976), xii. The conclusion of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 marked an unusually long period of *détente* among the major European powers which lasted until the beginning of World War I in 1914.
[199] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 72; 80; 166; Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 58.
[200] Pierre de Coubertin, "Does Cosmopolitan Life Lead to International Friendliness?," *American Review of Reviews* 17 (April 1898), 429-434; Pierre de Coubertin, "The Olympic Games of 1896," *Century* 53, no. 31 (November 1896), 37.

himself would admit, and deserve far more credit than many scholars heretofore have acknowledged.

Albeit that Baron de Coubertin later resented the extent to which world's fairs overshadowed the Olympic games of 1900 and 1904,[201] in which he exerted minimal influence,[202] linking sport to a movement as large and successful as the world's fairs would be regarded as detrimental to the future of the games only in hindsight. At the turn of the twentieth century, such alliances were symbiotic relationships which added entertainment value to the fairs, while serving as catalyst for sport. In the era of the early modern Olympics, many world's fairs included athletic competitions, such as those of the 1901 Pan-American Exhibition in Buffalo, New York, which were organized by noted member of the American and International Olympic Committees, James E. Sullivan.[203] They were portrayed in print media as an opportunity to "give a new vim to local competitions of the sort."[204] In the examples of Paris 1900 and St. Louis, the Olympics introduced the broad world's fair audience to the concept of international sport. Prior to the 1890s, relatively few sporting events attracted international participation. This was true even of tennis: Wimbledon began as a domestic English championship meeting in 1877 and grew in foreign participation over the next several decades.[205] The marriage of international sport to major exhibitions brought an opportunity to synthesize

---

[201] The primary source scholars use to discuss Coubertin's later regrets about the 1900 and 1904 are the Baron's *Mémoires Olympiques*, published in 1931 after Coubertin had retired from Olympic activity and a second Paris games were held in 1924 expressly to honor him and to compensate for his minor role in planning the competitions of 1900.
[202] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 7.
[203] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 74.
[204] "James E. Sullivan Will Direct the Greatest Sport Carnival in the History of the World," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 14 February 1904.
[205] For a visual trajectory of how the Championships grew in both the number and nationality of participations over time, one is recommended to view the chronology of draw sheets published in John Barrett's comprehensive overview of the tournament, *Wimbledon: The Official History of the Championships.*

sport with the broader spirit of transnational cooperation and goodwill popular in late nineteenth century politics. Coubertin's moveable feast of Olympic host cities, itself borrowed from the world exposition movement and designed to share the Olympic spirit of civility among the world's cultural capitals, provided the perfect theatre.[206] An international sports program added unscripted drama to the offerings for fair patrons, while simultaneously allotting the young Olympic movement much-desired exposure that would lead directly to its future worldwide success.[207]

The fortuitous union of tennis, global sporting competitions, and transnational exhibitions was made complete in the appointment of A. G. Spalding to his prominent position as the games' Sporting Director. A wholesale supporter of both American republicanism and Coubertin's Olympic ideals,[208] Spalding had previously been responsible for organizing sports competitions at the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893,[209] the Chicago congregation at which Pierre de Coubertin served as a French representative.[210] In tandem with his responsibilities as Sporting Director for the Paris Exposition, Spalding and his firm, A. G. Spalding and Bros., assembled an elaborate display of their catalog of sporting equipment—including numerous tennis implements—at the 1900 Paris world's fair. The company was awarded the "Grand Prix" medal from the organizers of the *Exposition Universelle* in recognition of "the finest and most

---

[206] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 56; Cf. Roche, *Mega-Events and Modernity*, 1.
[207] Roche, *Mega-Events and Modernity*, 1; 13; 15; 18. Roche identifies "dramatic character" as one of the typical qualities of mega-events including world's fairs and Olympic games. As a collective public ritual, "Olympic games events…are simultaneous, dramatic lived experiences for organizers, host cities, participants, visiting spectators" (p. 13).
[208] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 192-193.
[209] "Spalding Honored," 7.
[210] Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics*, 83.

complete line of athletic goods exhibited."[211] Period A. G. Spalding and Brothers sporting manuals capitalized on the company's world's fair recognition. As late as 1903, the year before the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual* prominently displayed a facsimile of Paris Grand Prix medal.[212] Alongside the award Spalding advertised their cornucopia of tennis paraphernalia, ranging from nets and net posts, to court line markers and tennis balls in three performance grades. Crowning the collection were no fewer than a dozen and a half varieties of Spalding tennis racquets, many with memorable names such as "The Ocomo" or "The Geneva."[213] Albert G. Spalding relied on the Olympics and the world's fair as unique opportunities to dazzle the sporting world with new athletic implements and expand the worldwide marketability of lawn tennis.[214]

The American entrepreneur would also be heavily involved in the execution of the 1904 Olympic games, where his company sponsored the Spalding Cup.[215] Although originally awarded to Chicago in 1901, overseers moved the 1904 Olympic games to St. Louis expressly to share in—rather than compete for—public attention with the concurrent world's fair.[216] As would be the St. Louis games which followed, the Olympics of 1900 were very much an integrated part of the world's fair movement. Far from being subjected to external control in attempt to decrease the games' stature, their

---

[211] Jahial Parmly Paret, ed., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual for 1903*, Spalding's Athletic Library (New York: American Sports Publishing, 1903), 264.
[212] Paret, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual for 1903*, 264.
[213] Ibid., 248-253. Spalding's catalogs sold racquets specially designed for gentleman, lady, and junior tennis players.
[214] Paret, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual for 1903*, 247-264; Jahial Parmly Paret, ed., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual for 1900*, Spalding's Athletic Library (New York: American Sports Publishing, 1900), 83-92.
[215] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 91. The Spalding Cup was awarded in 1904 to the American club team which performed best overall in track and field events.
[216] Bill Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 3 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999), 6-7.

appearance in tandem with the *Exposition Universelle* could be regarded as a herald of the games' arrival on a global stage in front of a potential audience of 50 million total fair visitors.[217]

Near the chronological center of the Paris festival, which ran from April to November, was the second edition of the Olympic tennis, held on Ile de Puteaux just days before the track and field events would become the center of press attention.[218] The competition at first appeared less than promising: despite the IOC listing tennis among several other disciplines on the official program published ahead of the Paris gathering, the bureaucracy surrounding the exposition left the tournament in a nebulous state.[219] Due to a variety of factors, many of the more ambitious sporting events associated with the *Exposition Universelle* would ultimately be cancelled before they took place.[220] In the case of lawn tennis, there was no word as to whether there would actually be a competition until just a week before it began, when the Viscomte Léon de Janzé extended an invitation to use his club's facilities.[221] Sport historians Matthew Llewellyn and Robert Lake have suggested that the scheduling of the tournament was poorly conceived, being placed just after the All-England Championships at Wimbledon, considered then as

---

[217] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 8.
[218] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. First Day of Play at the Societé de Sport de I'Ile de Puteaux," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 7 July 1900, 2; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 7-8. The 1900 Olympic tournament's club was known officially in French as the Societé de Sport de I'Ile de Puteaux. In most English sources, it has been referred to as the Ile de Puteaux Club, the Puteaux Club, or simply, the Puteaux. These names will be used interchangeably throughout this chapter.
[219] International Olympic Committee, "Programme des Jeux Olympiques de 1900 – Paris," in Bill Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Modern Olympics, 2 (Jefferson, NC: MacFarland, 1998), 257. Tennis is listed alongside several other sports which in some form were contested in Paris. Among these were court-paume, the ancient game of "royal" or "real" tennis, and longue-paume, a French derivative played outdoors.
[220] Mallon's comprehensive volume of events at the 1900 Olympics is considered to be among the most authoritative records of which events were or were not contested in 1900.
[221] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207.

now the chief attraction for the world's premier tennis players.[222] Due to inclement weather, the timing was indeed tight: the 1900 Olympic championship was contested at the Societé de Sport de l'Ile de Puteaux on the Seine River between July 6 and July 11,[223] just two days following the conclusion of the Wimbledon Championships, which had been extended due to rain.[224] It was a select crowd: the Paris competition fielded just 26 total athletes representing four countries, spread across four separate events.[225] By comparison, the preeminent Wimbledon tournament featured 34 competitors in the Gentlemen's Singles alone in 1900 (along with 16 in the Ladies' Singles) and was experiencing reasonably steady growth.[226]

Despite its modesty in scope and in international representation, the tennis tournament stands out among other events held in Paris for at least three primary reasons, all of which helped make it one of the best of the early Olympic tennis meets. Of the factors influencing the success of second Olympic tennis tournament, its hosting by a prestigious club, its attraction of first-class talent, and its progressive inclusion of women proved most outstanding. From its inception as a club-centric sport, tennis garnered prestige from its association with established members' clubs in England and throughout

---

[222] Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 363.
[223] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207.
[224] "Lawn Tennis: The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 3 July 1900, 7; *The Times of London*, 4 July 1900, 13; "Lawn Tennis: The All-England Championship Meeting," "Lawn Tennis: The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 5 July 1900, 11. Competition on Monday, July 2 was completely cancelled due to rain. The gentlemen's and ladies' singles championships were decided on July 3, leaving the doubles finals for the next day. The unanticipated Wednesday finish at Worple Road left only two days for later-round participants (and one might imagine, some of their supporters) to cross the English Channel for the Olympic tournament.
[225] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 208. Mallon has an interesting method to counting "official" and "unofficial" Olympic events. At Paris there were several tennis events that were designated "handicap" or "professional." Since by standards set later by the IOC these would not have considered part of the Olympic program, Mallon similarly relegates them here. It is important to note, however, that no such distinction was made in Paris, thus leaving the Olympic status of these events very much up for debate.
[226] John Barrett, *Wimbledon: The Official History of the Championships* (London: CollinsWillow, 2001), 256-257.

continental Europe and North America. At the turn of the twentieth century, all of the world's most important tournaments were hosted by these clubs, some of which were particularly devoted to tennis (such as the venerable All England Club), others which built their reputations elsewhere as either sports clubs or general social clubs. The 1900 tournament was held at just one of these sports clubs, the Ile de Puteaux. While the 1896 host, the Athens Lawn Tennis Club, had a decidedly short history as it was especially constructed as a host venue for the first modern Olympics,[227] the Puteaux Club had a much longer history tied to development of France's premier sporting clubs, all of which made headquarters on the island or in the surrounding *arrondissements*. The long, thin island, which stretches around a bend in the Seine not far from the famous thoroughbred racecourse at Longchamp, was considered fertile ground for the construction of a number of private sports facilities. To this day, the island is still filled from bank to bank with a dozen and a half tennis courts, a swimming facility, and an athletics track. But in the 1880s and 1890s, this area was an epicenter of the emerging sporting culture of Third Republic France and its two most prominent members' clubs, le Racing Club de France and le Stade Français.[228]

As chronicled by Richard Holt in his survey of *Sport and Society in Modern France*, both Racing (1882) and Stade (1883) were founded by young students from the Paris lyceum system who established early programs in sports such as crew and athletics, as well as in *bourgeoisie* team sports such as rugby.[229] Unlike older elitist institutions such as the Jockey Club, which by this time was less of a sporting outfit and more of an

---

[227] Ath. Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens, 1896-1906* (Self-published: Vironas-Attica, Greece, 1988), 53.
[228] Holt, *Sport and Society*, 66-67.
[229] Lucien Daniau, "A Century in the Service of Sport," *Olympic Review* no. 171 (January 1982), 33; Holt, *Sport and Society*, 66-67.

exclusive social circle for Parisian blue bloods, these activity-driven clubs fit well with Coubertin's ideal of a sporting class, expanding their membership to include men from the upper-middle class.[230] Access to this supportive clientele combined with a longstanding track-and-field tradition made the Racing Club a preferable host for the athletics events of the *Exposition Universelle*, which held the "grand tournament" on its five hundred meter grass running track.[231] Owing to Racing's continued presence at the pinnacle of French amateur sport, the club would again host Olympic track-and-field in 1924 at its stadium in Colombes.[232]

Along with Stade Français, its chief rival for supremacy among the French sporting class, Racing Club was considered preeminent in most of the team and individual sports patronized by the French *bourgeoisie*, with the exception of tennis. While both Stade and Racing had by 1900 established considerable tennis programs,[233] the Ile de Puteaux was unquestionably the most prestigious tennis club in Paris. Counting 800 members, more than either Racing or Stade and nearly more than both together, the Puteaux measured among the best sports clubs in France, and was the leader in its specialty.[234] Ever the critic of amateur athletics in France, Caspar Whitney would still concede that the club facilities at Puteaux were above the standard of most French members' associations, and equal to those of Racing. "Most of the clubs have grounds," the American wrote in his pre-Olympic assessment of France's athletic programs, "but very few of them have houses, those of the Racing Club and the Ile de Puteaux being the

---

[230] Holt, *Sport and Society*, 176; Caspar Whitney, "Athletic Development in France," *Outing* 36, no. 2 (May 1900), 179. According to Caspar Whitney, Racing had 600 members by 1900. Racing's biggest rival, Stade Francais, could claim only 280 members that year.
[231] Richter, "America on Top," 9; Orton, "The Paris Athletic Games," 690.
[232] Daniau, "A Century in the Service of Sport," 34.
[233] Holt, *Sport and Society*, 178.
[234] Whitney, "Athletic Development in France," 179.

only ones of importance."[235] The Ile de Puteaux was, in Whitney's estimation, the "exceptionally beautiful home" of Parisian tennis at the end of the nineteenth century, and as an 1886 contemporary to le Racing Club de France and le Stade Français, it carried both history and prestige in the world of amateur sport.[236]

Assigning the Olympic tennis tournament to the Puteaux Club elevated tennis' standing to become one of the premier events of the *Exposition Universelle.* Alongside the oft-discussed track-and-field championships, the tennis tournament represented the very best the Paris games had to offer. Both were staged at the most famous Parisian clubs in their respective sports. For tennis, this selection effectively laid the groundwork for the success of the meet. By utilizing facilities familiar to the elite set of tennis players who frequented posh tournaments in resort towns from Newport to Cannes, they invited these top-class international competitors to challenge French standouts on their hallowed home grounds.[237]

---

[235] Whitney, "Athletic Development in France," 179.
[236] Ibid., 179-180.
[237] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. First Day," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 7 July 1900, 2; "Won by Mr. H. L. Doherty," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 13 July 1900, 2; "M. Ayme Wins Lawn Tennis Championship," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 25 June 1900, 3; Whitney, "Athletic Development in France," 179. Some of the most useful sources in representing the Societé de Sport de l'Ile de Puteaux's importance to both to French tennis and to its patrons in the upper-class are the pages of the European Edition of the *New York Herald*, which was published in Paris to an English-speaking audience. Unlike *The Times of London*—which did not cover the Olympic tournament and for the preceding Wimbledon Championships utilized a comparatively staid reporting style which focused exclusively on the featured matches—the *New York Herald, Paris* saw fit to routinely report on the social climate surrounding on each day of the tournament. From these reports one can gather that the tennis tournament was supported by a large gathering of many of the most distinguished nobility in French society, who had postponed the traditional July "flight from Paris" to attend the matches. (The annual "flight" signaled the conclusion of the *Grand Saison*, the spring Parisian social season, and start of a summer and autumn spent in the French countryside.) Even on the first day of competition, "Society was present in force all the afternoon," indicating that the tournament was a marquee event among the sporting class (cf. "Lawn Tennis Tournament. First Day of Play"). Notably, the President of the Puteaux Club himself was the Vicomte Léon de Janzé (cf. "Won by Mr. H. L. Doherty"). The paper states in its July 13 issue that the Vicomte and many of his elite companions had remained in Paris especially to attend the tournament, and that they would be departing immediately following its conclusion. Notwithstanding the Olympic tournament's spectators, the Puteaux was also considered a top-level venue among players and followers of tennis. The Ile de Puteaux Club regularly fielded many of the players in the French national club championships, including in the 1900 tournament at

As a result of their strategic placement of the tournament on five pristine courts within reputable grounds of the Ile de Puteaux,[238] the Paris Olympic organizers exceeded expectations in attracting elite caliber athletes, which they also did to an extent on par with marquee competitions such as the track and field meet. Olympic historian Bill Mallon notes the "exceptional quality" of the field, which compensated substantially for its relatively diminutive size.[239] Headlining the accomplished group was the world's top doubles team, the English brothers Reginald and Laurence Doherty, who were the class of the competition. Reggie and Laurie each won a singles tournament at the Puteaux Club (open amateur and handicap, respectively) and Laurie also shared in the mixed doubles title with fellow Briton Charlotte Cooper.[240]

In an era in which famous doubles duos dominated the world's most important tournaments, the Doherty brothers were the *heirs apparent* to the Wimbledon dynastic tradition established by William and Ernest Renshaw.[241] In 1900, the Dohertys were amidst a tear of five consecutive All-England doubles championships, and by 1905,

---

Auteuil soon-to-be Olympians Charles Sands and André Prévost (cf. "M. Ayme Wins Lawn Tennis Championship.") Even as far away as the United States, IOC member Caspar Whitney praised the Puteaux for having some of the best facilities of any tennis club in France (cf. "Athletic Development in France.").

[238] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. First Day," *The New York Herald, Paris,* 7 July 1900, 2.

[239] Barret, *Wimbledon*, 207.

[240] "Fine Play at Puteaux Club. Most of the Events in the Lawn Tennis Tournament in Semi-Final Stage," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 10 July 1900, 2; "Lawn Tennis at Puteaux. Mr. R. F. Doherty and Miss Cooper beat Mr. H. S. Mahony and Mlle. Prevost," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 12 July 1900, 2; "Won by Mr. H. L. Doherty. Championship Singles at the Ile de Puteaux Lost by Mr. H. S. Mahony," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 13 July 1900, 2. Because it carried no particular distinction, "open amateur" is used here to describe the primary singles and doubles tournaments as opposed to the handicap events. "Regular" seems too pedestrian to describe an elite tournament, and "open" would have been a misnomer considering "open" events in tennis would come to mean open to all, including professionals. "Amateur" also falls short because the handicap event was also for amateurs. "Open amateur" in this instance means the primary tournament open to amateurs at these Olympic games.

[241] As noted in Barrett's *Wimbledon*, the Renshaw brothers won the All-England doubles title five of the six years between 1884 and 1889. Another sibling team, Herbert and Wilfred Baddeley won the title on three occasions between 1891 and 1896. The Dohertys would go on to win Wimbledon doubles seven times in total, including a record run of five straight titles between 1897 and 1901.

would attain the last of their seven together in nine years.[242] They came to Paris on the rise as two of the world's most accomplished players individually and as a team, and their three combined titles at the Olympics would augment their case. After the games, Reginald and Laurence Doherty were the clear choice to lead England's second-ever attempt to win Dwight Davis' International Challenge Cup in 1902.[243] Their strong, quick-tempered play at the 1903 edition of the Cup won England the venerable trophy for the first time, and earned the awe and admiration of American audiences.[244] Writing on the brothers' formidable play, sportswriter John Tyler Bailey would declare that it "is generally believed in America that the Dohertys are superior not only to all living players, but to all the players of the past."[245] With only four recorded defeats in doubles between 1897 and 1906, few could disagree.[246]

Universally esteemed, the brothers could take their pick of the world's best tournaments to grace with their presence. Their appearance at the Olympic tournament can scarcely be seen as anything short of an endorsement of its importance, particularly with respect to its timing relative to the most prestigious tennis event of the year. Because of the rain that washed out the closing Monday of Wimbledon, the gentlemen's doubles challenge round could not take place until Wednesday, July 4.[247] After Reginald Doherty won the singles over fellow Englishman Sydney Howard Smith on Tuesday, the Dohertys

---

[242] Barrett, *Wimbledon*; G. W. Hillyard, *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1924), 104.
[243] Jahail Parmly Paret, "The New Era in American Lawn-Tennis," *Outing* 38, no. 3 (June 1901), 320; Alan Trengrove, *The Story of the Davis Cup* (London: Stanley Paul, 1985), 26-37.
[244] John Tyler Bailey, "The Dohertys: The Secret of Their Success and Their Influence on Lawn Tennis," *Outing* 43, no. 1 (October 1903), 112-113.
[245] Ibid., 112.
[246] Hillyard, *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis*, 113.
[247] "Lawn Tennis," *The Times of London*, 3 July 1900, 7; "Lawn Tennis," *The Times of London*, 4 July 1900, 13; "Lawn Tennis: The All-England Championship Meeting," "Lawn Tennis," *The Times of London*, 5 July 1900, 11.

defended their doubles crown on Wednesday in five sets to close the tournament.[248] Rather than rest on their laurels, both brothers were game enough to cross the English Channel to join the Olympic tournament, which began on Friday, July 6 with just one blank day in the interim.[249] Their commitment to the allure of Olympic tennis undoubtedly enhanced the quality of the six-day tournament, in which Reginald and Laurence would combine to deliver a record-setting performance, leading the field in match wins and medals and cementing the Olympic tournament as one of excellent caliber.[250]

The Doherty brothers' dominance of the Olympic tournament, however, was not without controversy. After the brothers drew each other in the semifinal round of the singles, big brother Reggie elected to concede a walkover rather than face his younger sibling, who went on to defeat Harold S. Mahony in straight sets in the championship.[251] This gesture seems to be as much strategic as it may have been gentlemanly: the French chroniclers who compiled the final report on the *Exposition Universelle* suggested that Reggie believed his brother to be well equipped to beat Mahony, who was an accomplished British champion in his own right, and thus yielded the court to give Laurie

---

[248] "Lawn Tennis," *The Times of London*, 4 July 1900, 13; "Lawn Tennis: The All-England Championship Meeting," "Lawn Tennis," *The Times of London*, 5 July 1900, 11.

[249] "Lawn Tennis Tournament: Arrangements for the International Competition in Connection with the Exhibition," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 5 July 1900, 3.

[250] Another anecdote supporting the centrality of the Dohertys to the success of the Paris tournament is recorded by David Wallechinsky (1984) and by Cherre Intorre Jones (1985). According to Wallechinsky and Jones, audiences at the Ile de Puteaux club were so enamored by the play of the brothers that they requested that the semifinals and finals of the gentlemen's doubles be extended to best three out of five sets from the scheduled two out of three expressly so they could see the great English champions play more tennis.

[251] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. Messrs. H. L. Doherty, Norris, and Mahony Left in the Gentlemen's Singles." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 8 July 1900, 2; Ministere du Commerce de L'Industrie des Postes et des Telegraphes Exposition Universelle Internationale de 1900 a Paris, *Concours Internationaux D'Exercices Physiques et de Sports Rapports*, vol. 1 (Paris: Imprimerie National, 1901), 71.

the best opportunity at a victory.[252] Later commentators have added that the Dohertys refused to play each other except in "major tournaments," by which they exclusively meant Wimbledon.[253] All the same, R. F. Doherty had also just successfully defended his Wimbledon championship (a fact acknowledged even in the French-authored world's fair report), and perhaps he wished his brother a sporting chance at a major international crown. [254]

Regardless of their seminal accomplishments, the Doherty brothers were not the only elite tennis players to participate in the Paris tournament. Harold Mahony, Laurie's opponent in the championship, was a formidable Scottish-Irish standout who had already won the All England crown at Worple Road in 1896.[255] An experienced tennis player who often travelled outside the British Isles, Mahony's international resume served as fine preparation for the Olympic tournament. At the invitation of King Carlos, he played in Portugal with a contingent led by George W. Hillyard, later secretary of the All England Club.[256] One of several British champions to visit the United States during the last decade of the nineteenth century, he toured in 1893 with Manlove F. Goodbody and again in 1895 with Joshua Pim.[257] A third visit as the No. 2 ranked British player in 1897 with third-ranked W. V. Eaves and sixteenth-ranked Harold A. Nisbet was considered by

---

[252] Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 71.
[253] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207; Cheree Intorre Jones, "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," (Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1985, GV993), 10.
[254] Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 71. Further supporting this notion is a note in this same report that suggests that it was customary for the younger H.L. Doherty to retire in favor of R.F., and that in this instance the opposite occurred.
[255] Little and McNichol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 28th ed. (London: All England Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club, 2018), 15; 22-23; 442. The Edinburgh native's Wimbledon title was the last in singles by a Scottish-born champion until the triumph of Andy Murray in 2013. Mahony was also twice the gentlemen's doubles all-comers finalist at the All England Club, in 1892 and in 1903.
[256] Hillyard, *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis*, 182-198.
[257] Stephen Wallis Merrihew, *The Quest for the Davis Cup*, The Lawn Tennis Library, VI (New York: American Lawn Tennis, Inc., 1928), 8.

esteemed tennis voice S. Wallis Merrihew to be the "British Isles' most formidable invasion of America prior to the institution of the Davis Cup," and saw Mahony challenge for the American title in both singles and doubles.[258] Aside from the indomitable Dohertys, Mahony's unusual number of foreign tours in a period before that venerable Cup made international tennis commonplace made him the perfect fit for a unified Great Britain and Ireland team which also included his gentlemen's doubles partner and co-finalist Arthur J. B. Norris and the Charlotte Cooper, the ladies' singles champion.[259]

Admitting that in 1900 the French hosts could only have wished for a team that was as robust as the British, their own Olympic report conceding that their young and relatively inexperienced tennis squad required more complete training, they chose the correct venue to assemble what should be regarded as the best possible home team which could be mustered given the circumstances.[260] As the prominent Puteaux was the home club to many of France's leading tennis players, many of the French entrants came from its ranks.[261] With the top prospect and four-time consecutive French national champion Paul Aymé unfit to compete due to a wrist injury, it was left to a determined roster of French students to handle the Doherty brothers, Mahony, and Norris.[262] It was only fitting

---

[258] Merrihew, *Quest for the Davis Cup*, 9-10.
[259] Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 1020; 1024; 1026; Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 70-71.
[260] Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 71. The report's comparison of the talent of the French students to that of established English champions forms another chapter in a long line of comparisons French sporting authorities made to the athletics programs of England and later the United States. For a more complete survey of this theme in French sporting history, reference *Sport and Society in Modern France* by Richard Holt.
[261] Whitney, "Athletic Development in France," 179; Holt, *Sport and Society*, 178.
[262] "M. Ayme Wins Lawn Tennis Championship," *The New York Herald, Paris,* 25 June 1900, 3; Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 72. Paul Aymé was the prevailing French champion, having won the national championships in 1897, 1898, 1899, and just before the Paris games, in 1900. The latest meeting, which appeared to occur prior to sustaining his wrist injury saw Aymé defeat Prevost and Sands, both of the Ile de Puteaux club. Prior to 1925, which saw the tournament open to international amateurs, the

that a native Parisian, Maxime "Max" Decugis, would lead French efforts at the Olympic tournament.[263] Decugis, still in school and representing his *lycée* of Janson-de-Sailly, began in Paris what would become one of the more remarkable careers in Olympic tennis history.[264] While unable to defeat the more experienced Dohertys, Decugis was the outstanding Frenchman at the Puteaux, securing doubles second in addition to first place in doubles and second in singles in a separate event at the *Exposition Universelle* open exclusively to French *lycée* students.[265] He would go on to become perhaps the most accomplished male French tennis player prior to the advent of the Four Musketeers in middle 1920s, leading the French team in six Davis Cup ties and winning Wimbledon doubles in 1911.[266] His record of eight French national singles championships between 1902 and 1920 would stand for nearly a century.[267] In an Olympic career which would ultimately span two decades and three Olympics, Max Decugis would win six medals in

---

French Championships were open only to members of French clubs and held on a rotating basis between several Parisian clubs, including the Puteaux. After the 1928 construction of Stade Roland Garros for France's defense of the Davis Cup, the tournament has since taken on the French aviator's name as its common name, although it officially remains the *Internationaux de France*.

[263] Bill Mallon and Jeroen Heijmans, *Historical Dictionary of the Olympic Movement*, Historical Dictionaries of Sports, edited by Jon Woronoff, 4th edition (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 2011), 97; Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 71; 339.

[264] "Lawn Tennis Tournament: Arrangements," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 5 July 1900, 3; Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 338-339. The *lycée* academy system serves as the Parisian equivalent of high school. The European Edition of the *New York Herald* relayed that Decugis was in the midst of term examinations just before the tournament, and as of press time the day prior to the commencement of play, organizers were unsure he and his fellow students would be able to compete.

[265] Ministere du Commerce, *Concours Internationaux*, 339. The official report on the 1900 games includes a number of examples of French students competing at the *Exposition Universelle*, including a subsidiary lawn tennis tournament open only to enrollees at the *lycées*. This tournament was won by a Monsieur Vacherot representing l'Intstitut commercial de Paris. Decugis himself claimed second in the competition, and his peer at Janson-de-Sailly, a Monsieur Germot finished a semifinalist. The other semifinalist was a Monsieur Gillou of I'Institut commercial. In a separate doubles event, Decugis and Germot triumphed over Vacherot and Gillou.

[266] Alan Little and Robert McNicol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 23; Davis Cup by Rakuten, "Maxime Degucis," International Tennis Federation, Accessed October 21, 2019, https://www.daviscup.com/en/players/player.aspx?id=800168973.

[267] Mallon and Heijmans, *Historical Dictionary*, 97. Decugis' eight French singles championships between 1902 and 1920 would only be surpassed in 2014 when Spaniard Rafael Nadal won his ninth title at Roland Garros in Paris. His record of 29 total national titles including doubles has not been approached. It is worth noting that the French championships were not open to international competitors until after 1925.

tennis, four of them gold.[268] Decugis' presence along with that of several of his countrymen at the 1900 games signifies that the French tennis community took the tournament just as seriously as their English guests.

Unlike the erstwhile efforts of earlier Olympic revivals, however, the assemblage of accomplished athletes was by no means limited to gentlemen. The presence of women at the Paris tennis competition represents a tremendous milestone in the development of international women's sports, as it marks the first occasion on which females were permitted to participate in the Olympic games. The Ancient Greek Olympics were open exclusively to men as a matter of course,[269] and in keeping with that tradition, neither Pierre de Coubertin nor the local organizers warmed to the idea of including women in the 1896 games.[270] As such, they barred women from competition, who would have to wait four years for their first Olympic opportunities. Even then, fewer than two dozen women competed in only five sports—equestrian, croquet, golf, tennis, and yachting—at the second modern games.[271]

The impetus for the ladies' tennis events at the *Exposition Universelle* was directly linked to the inability of the International Olympic Committee—and its progenitor Pierre de Coubertin in particular— to exert its control over the sports program

---

[268] Mallon and Heijmans, *Historical Dictionary*, 97.

[269] There are reports of a few women who found other ways to participate in the Ancient Olympics. Most notably, women were permitted to own and enter chariots even though they themselves could not race them.

[270] For more detailed study of the Ancient Greek Olympics, please reference the work of David C. Young. Both his *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics* (1984) and *The Modern Olympics* (1996) provide excellent commentary on the nature of Ancient Games, and the efforts made by Coubertin and others to revive the games in the nineteenth century.

[271] Alfred Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games*, 28; International Olympic Committee, "Factsheet: The Games of the Olympiad," updated October 2013, https://stillmed.olympic.org/Documents/Reference_documents_Factsheets/The_Olympic_Summer_Games.pdf. The number of women considered to have participated in the second Olympiad have changed over the years. Senn's 1999 monograph counts eleven women participating in the 1900 Olympics. The official IOC factsheet on the games, however, records twice that number as of 2013.

at the Paris exhibition. The world's fair organizers already being "unwilling hosts" to Coubertin's sporting experiment insomuch as they annexed the games to their already ambitious festival plans, officials had little interest in preserving *le Revonateur*'s idealistic vision for the Olympic movement.[272] On the contrary, the committee's primary interest was creating a compelling array of entertainments for world's fair attendees. This focus on breadth rather than depth of competition explains the ease with which such extraordinary demonstrations as cannon shooting, kite flying, and pigeon racing entered into the sporting program.[273] To add to the confusion, each of these disciplines was governed by a separate subcommittee, operating and officiating events independently from those of the other committees.[274] While Coubertin was modestly involved in the organization of exposition's athletic events, his most notable contribution might have been hosting a party for the athletes at his Paris home on the rue de Lübeck.[275]

So fragmented was the governance of the 1900 gathering that a comprehensive survey of the Paris events would not be compiled until decades later. This often led early historians to overlook the significance of the games, especially the landmark inclusion of women in the tennis tournament. Alexander Weyand, an antiquarian and member of the 1920 American Olympic team, took such a narrow view centered on Coubertin's later memoires, positing that "[s]trictly speaking, the only Olympic sports at Paris were the track-and-field events, and those solely because of the advisory influence of Baron de

---

[272] Weyand, *Olympic Pageant*, 20. As an aside, it is worth noting that *Le Revonateur* was a popular nickname given to Coubertin by French supporters of the Olympic movement given his singularly influential role in reviving the Olympic games as a modern sporting institution.
[273] Ibid., 37.
[274] Weyand, *Olympic Pageant*, 21.
[275] "Athletes Entertained. Received by M. Paul Escudier at the Hotel de Ville Yesterday," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 19 July 1900, 3.

Coubertin."[276] Noting low attendance and disorganization (the main five-day attraction gated only a thousand guests),[277] Weyand, like others, condemned the games as the "sorriest of all modern Olympics."[278] The tennis tournament directly contradicts this narrative. The European copy of the *New York Herald* reported that "several hundreds of spectators" were present on Sunday, July 8, and lists by name the many women of society seen at the contests.[279] Even for the preliminary rounds, quality matches ensured spectator "interest was maintained from start to finish."[280] By any discriminating account, the Olympic tennis event could hardly have been considered "sorry" not only for its presentation at a prominent Paris sporting club and attraction of top-tier talent, but also its notable invitation of female participants.

Despite the Paris organizers' disregard for the principles of Coubertin and his colleagues in the IOC, which resulted in seeking novelty rather than quality, their innovative mentality did prove insightful in adding a singles lawn tennis competition as the first ever Olympic event specifically for women.[281] In contrast to the IOC, the committees of the *Exposition Universelle* had no interest in prohibiting women from

---

[276] Weyand, *Olympic Pageant*, 37. Evidently, Weyand believed that Coubertin's presence was necessary to distinguish an event as Olympic or non-Olympic. One might wonder how he would assess the St. Louis games, for which Coubertin exerted even less of an organizational presence and where he did not bother to attend in person.

[277] Graeme Kent, *Olympic Follies: The Madness and Mayhem of the 1908 London Games* (London: JR Books, 2008), 28. Like Weyand, Kent refers to the "proper" Olympic festival not as the entire six month period during which competitions were held, but the midsummer track and field events proper. The dismal attendance was evidence of the general lack of public promotion the games received.

[278] Weyand, *Olympic Pageant*, 20.

[279] "Puteaux's Lawn Tennis. Interesting Matches Played in Ideal Weather Before a Large Attendance," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 9 July 1900, 3. Note that unlike the track and field meet, which caused a large controversy between American university teams and French officials when races were held the following Sunday, July 15, there was no such ordeal caused by the tennis matches of Sunday, July 8.

[280] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. First Day," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 7 July 1900, 2a.

[281] Events in yachting, equestrian, and croquet were open to both men and women. A separate ladies' event would also be held in golf, but not until the month of October.

competition, so long as they "did not offend against public decency."[282] Since the world's fair committees were more concerned with using sporting events including tennis as subsidiary entertainment to various industrial and artistic exhibitions—which also incorporated contributions by women—the addition of women to the sporting program was viewed as inoffensive and undeserving of authoritarian rebuke.[283] Thus, women were permitted to compete in several events, including yachting and croquet. During the second week of July, the ladies' singles tennis tournament became the first Olympic competition open exclusively to women.[284] Of the approximately twenty-two women known to recorded history to have participated in the 1900 games, seven competed in lawn tennis.[285]

It is worth mentioning that although the ladies' tournament was smaller than the gentlemen's, its seven entrants included several of the most respected women in the amateur tennis world. The champions of Great Britain, the United States, France, and Bohemia were all present, setting up a marquee final that pitted the domestic champion, Helene Prevost, against the world's best singles player at the turn of the century, Charlotte "Chattie" Cooper.[286] The Englishwoman Cooper had already thrice claimed the

---

[282] Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 143; Cf. Kristine Toohey and A. J. Veal, *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective* (Oxfordshire, UK: Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International, 2007), 200. Toohey and Veal report that in both the Paris 1900 and St. Louis 1904 games, women took part without the blessing of the IOC. Thus, women slipped into the Olympic story largely unnoticed.

[283] Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 143-144. The purpose of the Olympic events—to serve as additional programming to the usual world's fair mainstays—did not diminish the quality of field in the ladies' tennis events any more than it did in the gentlemen's. The tennis events collectively exceeded the "sideshow" moniker, becoming championship events in their own right.

[284] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 10.

[285] International Olympic Committee, "Factsheet: Games of the Olympiad;" Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 143; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207-208.

[286] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207.

sport's most illustrious title, taking Wimbledon singles in 1895, 1896, and 1898.[287] Just days before the Olympic tournament she had again reached the challenge round, losing only to Blanche Bingley Hillyard in three tightly contested sets.[288] Cooper would go on to win five All-England championships in total, distinguishing herself as one of tennis' premier early champions.[289] In route to the championship match at the Puteaux, Cooper handily saw off defending U.S. national champion Marion Jones in straight sets, setting up a meeting with Prevost, who prevailed over the Bohemian representative from Prague, Hedwiga Rosenbaumova.[290] The local press expected a substantive showing from Prevost, but she played poorly in the first set and could never fully recover.[291] Cooper's 6-1, 6-4 victory over Prevost distinguished herself as the first female Olympic tennis champion, quietly paving the pathway to a steady increase in women participating in tennis and other Olympic sports.[292]

In truth, the Parisian permissiveness toward women athletes was not without context. Lawn tennis was by design a sport accessible to women of the upper and upper-middle classes, and it fulfilled an important social role in late Victorian society. Whereas most athletic activities were considered overtly masculine and took place in the

---

[287] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 24; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207; Little and McNicol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 34; Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 144-145; Jean Rafferty, *Ladies of the Court: A Century of Women at Wimbledon*, First American Edition (New York: Atheneum, 1984), 29.
[288] "Lawn Tennis Champions: Exciting Play Witnessed at the Wimbledon Courts Yesterday–Rain Stops Just in Time," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 4 July 1900, 1. Hillyard, of England, was the wife of Commander G. W. Hillyard, later president of the All England Club and an author on early tennis history.
[289] Rafferty, *Ladies of the Court*, 29; Little and McNicol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 34; 59; Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 24; Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 144-145; Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 1026. Charlotte Cooper's final two Wimbledon singles championships occurred after she married future Lawn Tennis Association president Alfred Sterry. In accordance with All England Club tradition, Wimbledon records list the champion of 1901 and 1908 as Mrs. A. Sterry.
[290] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. Miss Cooper Beats Miss Jones After a Good Match in the Ladies' Singles," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 11 July 1900, 2; "Lawn Tennis Tournament: Arrangements," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 5 July 1900, 3; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207; 209.
[291] "Lawn Tennis at Puteaux," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 12 July 1900, 2.
[292] Toohey and Veal, *Olympic Games: Social Science*, 198;

patriarchal confines of private clubs, tennis benefitted from being adaptable to garden parties which reinforced social class while providing the young and amorous opportunities for social interaction.[293] Ellen Phillips called it "the perfect sport for chaperoned young men and women of privilege. It was one of the few games they could play together freely."[294] Although the women's game remained vastly different from the men's until well into the twentieth century—their unhurried, deliberative strokes sometimes being derided as "pat-ball" or "patters"—the social necessity of women at tennis parties afforded women a lasting foothold in the development of the sport.[295]

Unmistakably, lawn tennis' broad acceptance in the most fashionable corners of European society helped make it an acceptable sport for women at the 1900 Olympics.[296] Already established at the Athens games as an Olympic sport with excellent amateur credentials and pan-Western popularity, tennis might have provided the first exclusively women's event because the sport carried a minimal amount of social risk.[297] Respectable women could be invited to compete in lawn tennis because it was, as the tennis historian

---

[293] Robert J. Lake, *A Social History of Tennis in Great Britain*, Routledge Research in Sport History (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014), 12.
[294] Ellen Phillips, *The VIII* Olympiad, 91.
[295] Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 186; Wilson, *Love Game*, 51-56; Suzanne Rowland, "Fashioning Competitive Lawn Tennis: Object, Image, and Reality in Women's Tennis Dress 1884-1919," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 173-182, Routledge International Handbooks (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 174-181; Robert J. Lake, "Historical Changes in Playing Styles and Behavioural Etiquette in Tennis: Reflecting Broader Shifts in Social Class and Gender Relations," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 255-265. Routledge International Handbooks (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 255-259. The interaction of women, social class, tennis attire, and playing styles has been examined by a number of authors. Elizabeth Wilson and Suzanne Rowland have each connected tennis attire with speed of playing, with Rowland noting how women made gradual changes to their attire in order to enhance mobility on the court. Lake connects women's play to larger social expectations of upper- and middle-class women during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, suggesting that overly vigorous play was considered unseemly in many club settings.
[296] Toohey and Veal, *Olympic Games: Social Science*, 199.
[297] Arguably, it was tennis expanding popularity among the class of the Olympic organizers that made the sport an easy candidate for inclusion in the original 1896 program. Considering the ready participation of females in club and amateur-circuit tennis, the sport was a cautious first step toward opening the Olympics to women as well as men.

Robert J. Lake has noted, "a sport played partially for social prestige."[298] Reputable tournaments had long since been established at both the Wimbledon (1884) and United States (1887) championships, and at other first-rate venues across the international circuit. More revealing to the intricate social dynamic that benefitted tennis' Olympic status is a second event for women at the Ile de Puteaux tournament, mixed doubles. The first coed team event of any kind on the Olympic program (and along with equestrian and a sister event in badminton, still one of only three sports at the summer games open to mixed-gender teams), the 1900 mixed doubles tournament demonstrated the integral role of women to tennis as both a social institution and a competitive enterprise.[299]

Due in no small part to the obvious occasions for romance and courtship it afforded, mixed doubles became an important aspect of social tennis from the garden party days. Serving the same function as the coed croquet gatherings of the 1860s, mixed doubles in time became a competitive event in its own right.[300] Although it did not achieve full status as a Wimbledon event until 1913,[301] the United States championship in mixed doubles was established in 1892.[302] The 1900 Paris event allowed tennis-playing

---

[298] Robert J. Lake, "Social Class, Etiquette, and Behavioural Restraint in British Lawn Tennis, 1870-1939," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 28:6 (2011), 878.

[299] Olympic Studies Centre, "Equestrian Sport: History of Equestrian Sport at the Olympic Games," OSC Reference Collection, published 19 October 2017; Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 391; 1030-1031. Mixed doubles was introduced for badminton in 1996, and women would first be allowed to compete in equestrian at the 1952 games. Mixed doubles would be held on and off for the next several Olympics, the last in 1924. It was not reintroduced until 2012 London tournament at Wimbledon. Equestrian was held earlier in the world's fair season, but mixed doubles became the first event with men and women competing together as equals on

[300] George E. Alexander, *Lawn Tennis: Its Founders and Its Early Days* (Lynn, Mass.: H. O. Zimman, 1974), 3. Croquet was the most popular sport of Society in England in the 1860s. When lawn tennis was introduced by Walter C. Wingfield in 1874, many croquet clubs converted their lawns to be used as tennis courts. Moreover, just as croquet had been a sport enjoyed simultaneously by men and women, so too did lawn tennis become a sport in which the sexes could compete alongside and against each other.

[301] Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 204.

[302] Bill Shannon, *United States Tennis Association Official Encyclopedia of Tennis,* Centennial ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1981), 237-249.

women to compete in a context that would not have been uncommon in most clubs in Europe and America.

The ingenuity of mixed doubles is that it paired young ladies and gentlemen of elite society in a cooperative exercise that allowed single persons of marriageable age the venue to engage in casual conversation, and of course, test each other's skill in communication and compatibility without the overbearing constraints of a supervised home visit.[303] Mixed doubles pairings were overseen insofar as they took place in the semipublic confines of the members' club under the watchful eyes of elders, but the relative freedom of expression these occasions brought in comparison to more strictly governed social alternatives made them a popular choice of young singles wherever tennis was played.[304]

The same was true of the Parisian clubs that hosted the 1900 Olympics, where all three of the great *bourgeoisie* sporting outfits invited women to partake in tennis events. The impetus for coed tennis was neither less social nor less idyllic in the City of Light as it was elsewhere. As Holt observes: "Private tennis parties were arranged to which suitable young men and women would be invited for tennis followed by tea on the lawn."[305] These gatherings were arranged by clubs and by families as a courtship ritual, with tennis merely as a conduit to achieving favorable marital partnerships within the

---

[303] Holt, *Sport and Society*, 177.

[304] Ibid., 178. Much of tennis early popularity in middle- and upper-class society came from mixed doubles and its unique capability to engage young gentlemen and ladies in an enjoyable athletic activity while still maintaining standards of social decorum demanded by Victorian custom. Its unique arrangement allowed pairs of men and women to engage in conversation and explore compatibility through friendly competition, all in broad daylight and under the tutorage of parents and club officials. Mixed doubles matches and tournaments were popular dates on the social calendar, designed, argues Holt, "to ensure that the 'right sort' of boy met the 'right sort' of girl." On the social level as well as the competitive level, mixed doubles became popular throughout the tennis-playing world, and proved a valuable avenue for women to enter the Olympic games.

[305] Holt, *Sport and Society*, 176.

upper classes. This was true even of Racing Club de France, Stade Français, and Ile de Puteaux, all of which were considered "venues for polite courtship" at which ladies' tennis became both accepted and regular.[306]

When lawn tennis swept Europe as a new pastime in the late 1870s and 1880s, its inclusion in the Olympics, let alone the introduction of ladies' singles and mixed doubles events, was not on anyone's mind. However, the insurgence of tennis as the preferred game of well-to-do women, displacing earlier interest in croquet and badminton, offered an avenue for women to enter the burgeoning Olympic landscape.[307] Since wealthy and well-bred young ladies were already welcome at the Ile de Puteaux long before the River Seine club was nominated to be a host site, it is safe to conclude that the Puteaux club approved of—and likely, even encouraged—the introduction of ladies and mixed doubles events to the Olympic program.

Their decision appears vindicated by the caliber of players who entered the tournament, which demonstrated that championship tennis was not limited to gentlemen. Like the ladies' singles tournament, and for that matter the matter, the gentlemen's singles and doubles, the Olympic mixed doubles championship was considerably well-fielded. With the juggernaut doubles pairing of H. L. and R. F. Doherty already in the draw for the men's competitions, they teamed with Cooper and Jones in the mixed event.[308] Reggie and Chattie defeated singles champion Laurie and semifinalist Marion Jones in the penultimate match, the latter team receiving bronze medals.[309] R. F. Doherty and Cooper's 6-2, 6-4 semifinal victory came as no surprise to local press, as the all-

---

[306] Holt, *Sport and Society*, 178.
[307] Ibid., 177.
[308] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 212.
[309] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. Miss Cooper," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 11 July 1900, 2; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 207; 212.

English side had won numerous titles together including the most recent Irish covered court championship.[310] In the final they defeated the Anglo-French team of Harold Mahony and Helene Prevost two and four, ensuring a second win for Cooper and another second place each for Mahony and Prevost.[311] The Parisian edition of the *New York Herald* reported that the championship round was a "match that attracted the most attention of all," bringing together (notwithstanding R. F. Doherty) the four most outstanding male and female players in the tournament.[312] Though it featured primarily players from the singles competitions, the mixed doubles competition demonstrated the flexibility of tournament participants in taking part in multiple events. It also ensured that the doubles tournaments—gentlemen's and mixed—maintained the same high standard that had been set in the singles events.

Considering that four of the five primary forms of tennis competition all made an appearance at the Ile de Puteaux Club, it is notable that ladies' doubles was left off the 1900 Olympic program. This also was not unusual given common practice at lawn tennis clubs and tournaments of the era. Seemingly the perfect counterpart to the gentlemen's competition, ladies' doubles did in fact have a checkered history in the tennis world, which kept elite competitions from developing until well into the twentieth century.[313] Because women tennis players were burdened with unforgiving costumes and the women's game was notorious for its "gentle" style of play,[314] some guardians of the early

---

[310] "Lawn Tennis Tournament. Miss Cooper," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 11 July 1900, 2.
[311] "Lawn Tennis at Puteaux." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 12 July 1900, 2; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 212.
[312] "Lawn Tennis at Puteaux." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 12 July 1900, 2.
[313] Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 204; Shannon, *Official Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 237-249. As discussed by Gillmeister, ladies' doubles did not make its debut at Wimbledon until 1913, the same year the mixed doubles competition was introduced. At Newport, the U.S. ladies' doubles championship did not materialize until 1899, a full seven years after the mixed doubles tournaments began.
[314] Phillips, *The VIII Olympiad*, 91.

game thought that a doubles version would be simply too pedestrian for the average spectator. These concerns prevailed at tennis' highest level: unwilling to host a tournament full of baseline "pat-ball" players, the All-England Lawn Tennis Club (AELTC) declined to host a ladies' doubles competition in 1885, and would not include the discipline until 1913.[315]

In addition to apprehensions over tempo of play, ladies' doubles also lacked the social capital of mixed doubles, which regardless of the quality of competition could always fall back upon its primary goal of facilitating sensible courtships. At sporting clubs where the presence of women was limited to tennis, ladies' singles and mixed doubles events were often a higher social priority than ladies' doubles. Thus despite the proactivity of tournament officials in including ladies' singles and mixed doubles tournaments, the decision not to hold a ladies' doubles championship indicates that the organizers of the *Exposition Universelle* were still beholden to the conventions of the amateur class, at least with respect to the tennis tournament. Only gradually did women's doubles become a standard feature at international tennis tournaments, and not until well after the Paris games.[316]

Paris, Pierre de Coubertin's beloved capital city, has hosted the Olympics twice, and in 2024 will host for the third time. Many have concluded that the 1900 games, usurped in the circus of one of history's most famous world's fairs, did not do him justice. It is certainly true that Coubertin later lamented the extent to which his own

---

[315] Lake, *Social History of Tennis*, 28; Lake, "Historical Changes in Playing Styles," 257-259. As noted previously, Wimbledon would not host ladies' doubles until 1913. Methodical "pat-ball" was the dominate style of play in the women's game in the 1880s. By 1913, most top women played a more aggressive brand of tennis.

[316] Cf. Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 1029. Women's doubles would not make its Olympic debut until after the Great War, at the 1920 Antwerp games.

vision of an independent Olympic games was, in this instance, subordinated to the *Exposition Universelle.*[317] This hiatus of Olympic independence nonetheless did not bring death to the new Olympic movement, nor did it mean that every event was inferior, poorly executed, or an embarrassment to the concept of international sport competition. Like the track and field meet, which was considered by many to be a success and a "world's championship" in its own right,[318] the tennis tournament proved to be an important part of the Paris sports program and one of the best competitions at these second modern games.[319] Hailed in the Paris edition of the *New York Herald* as "a grand week for players and spectators alike," the tournament proved one of the social highlights of the Paris exhibition and the Olympic games.[320]

To a much greater extent than the 1896 Athens tournament, which had been partially hampered by poor publicity and an inability to attract top-flight tennis players to a new club, the first Olympic tennis competition of the twentieth century achieved success through utilizing an established tennis club, attracting elite competitors after the sport's premier tournament at Wimbledon, and inviting female champions to join the gentlemen in the first Olympic competitions for women. Given the circumstances, the 1900 Paris Olympics did justice to the sport of lawn tennis, and tennis took significant strides in establishing its place as a prominent sport in the early modern Olympics.

---

[317] Pierre de Coubertin, *Mémoires Olympiques*.
[318] Richter, "America on Top," 9.
[319] "Won by Mr. H. L. Doherty," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 13 July 1900, 2.
[320] Ibid.

Chapter Four

An American Affair: Olympic Tennis at the St. Louis World's Fair of 1904

The idea of hosting the third modern Olympic games in the United States seemed a natural one for Pierre de Coubertin and his peers in the International Olympic Committee. After ancestral Athens (1896) and Coubertin's own capital city of Paris (1900), choosing an American host city appeared a logical choice for the games given the country's prowess in sports and enthusiastic support of the burgeoning Olympic movement in general. Interest in awarding the third summer games to the United States appeared as far back as the Second Sorbonne Congress in 1894, where the modern Olympics became a reality and the first games scheduled for Athens.[321] At the Sorbonne, Coubertin and his colleagues established the formula for a rotating international sporting festival, and planned the 1900 games for Paris in conjunction with the *Exposition Universelle*.[322] Furthermore, they set the preliminary groundwork for the third Olympic games to be held under American auspices.[323] In a summary of the congress happenings published in the *Review of Reviews*, Albert Shaw reported that once the Sorbonne delegates had decided on the amateur tenor of the modern Olympics and settled on Athens and Paris as the first two hosts, the United States became the *heir presumptive* to the Olympic mantel.[324] "[I]t is generally assumed," Shaw recorded, "that the Olympic games of 1904 will take place in the United States."[325]

True to form, the Midwestern metropolis of St. Louis would become the host of the Games of the Third Olympiad, but not without many of the same organizational

---

[321] Smith, *Olympics in Athens*, 89.
[322] John Apostal Lucas, "Olympic Genesis: The Sorbonne Conferences of 1892 and 1894," Paper presented at the Third Canadian Symposium on History of Sport and Physical Education, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, August 19-21, 1974, 7; Albert Shaw, "The Re-Establishment of the Olympic Games: How International Sports May Promote Peace Among the Nations," *Review of Reviews* 10 (December 1894), 646.
[323] W. B. Curtis, "The New Olympian Games," *Outing* 28 (May 1896), 21.
[324] Shaw, "The Re-Establishment of the Olympic Games," 645.
[325] Ibid.

controversies which beleaguered the Paris meeting. Like Paris, the St. Louis games were annexed to a world's fair, and they arrived without a separate opening ceremony to delineate the Olympics from the vast and varied spectacle surrounding them.[326] The Louisiana Purchase Exposition, which opened on April 30, 1904 and ran until December 1 of that year,[327] included Olympic sport alongside such diverse mechanical attractions as the then-largest pipe organ ever constructed,[328] and dramatic diversions like "The Creation," a religiously inspired dark ride that would later find a home in Coney Island's Dreamland.[329] Events in tennis, track, and tug-of-war would again be forced to compete for public attention with industrial exhibitions and midway sensations, and with inviting architectural edifices representing every state in the Union. Mississippi's pavilion resembled a southern plantation house; Virginia's was a facsimile of *Monticello*.[330]

In a festival of such scale, the individual disciplines of tennis appear to be small amusements in a sea of entertainment. As did the Paris gathering on the Ile de Puteaux, the St. Louis tennis tournament also transcended this humble station to become one of the better remembered events at America's first Olympic games, receiving national media coverage and attracting accomplished tennis players from across the United States. However unlike in Paris, the tennis tournament—along with the majority of the events at

---

[326] Nina K. Pappas, "The Opening Ceremony of the Olympic Games," Independent Views, *Olympic Review* 165 (July-August 1981), 447.
[327] "Birds-Eye View of the World's Fair," *St. Louis Palladium*, 7 May 1904, 1.
[328] "Beauty, Size and Sentiment of the World's Fair: It is Larger and More Beautiful Than Any Other Exposition Ever Given," *St. Louis Palladium*, 7 May 1904, 3. The pipe organ would later be installed in the Wanamaker Building in Philadelphia, where it remains the world's second-largest musical instrument.
[329] Gary Cross and John K. Walton, *The Playful Crowd: Pleasure Places in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 43. A dark ride is an amusement park attraction which takes guests through a series of scenes, often designed to scare or surprise. This particular attraction excited fairgoers with visual depictions of the Biblical events of Genesis.
[330] "Virginia Building at the World's Fair," *St. Louis Palladium*, 10 September 1904, 1; "Mississippi Building at the World's Fair," *St. Louis Palladium*, 10 September 1904, 4.

the third Olympics—failed to attract a field of competitors that was representative of the international nature of sport. For this reason in particular, along with the omission of a women's tournament and the organizers' decision to pair the championship tournament with ancillary events for sub-elite, local competitors, the 1904 Olympic tennis tournament at St. Louis fell short of achieving the Olympic mission of bringing together an international congress of competitors who represent the pinnacle of their sport.

An examination of the published reports of the 1904 games readily demonstrates a retreat in the structure of the lawn tennis event on a pair of fronts. Whereas the Parisian tennis tournament had represented genuine progress in Olympic tennis over the Athens games by including for the first time ladies' singles and mixed doubles and through attracting international standouts who starred at Wimbledon, the event at St. Louis exhibited a marked step backwards both in terms of inviting women to compete in events which were considered socially appropriate in the early twentieth century and in attracting competitors from outside the host nation.

At the Paris games of 1900, women made their Olympic debut in tennis, golf, yachting, croquet, and equestrian—all sports with established social rapport frequented by upper class women.[331] Surprisingly, none of these sports would return as women's events four years later. While the planning committee removed equestrian events from the program altogether and geographical constraints inhibited yachting, the remaining sports were contested without female participants. Men alone competed in roque, a lawn game similar to croquet which replaced the latter on the 1904 program, and there were no

[331] Bill Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 2 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998), 6.

medal events for women in tennis or golf.[332] In their stead Olympic organizers within the Department of Physical Culture chose only to add two individual competitions and one team event in ladies' archery.[333] Women and girls did compete in a few other sundry events at the Louisiana Purchase Exhibition, but none would be later recognized by the IOC as events in the Olympic games. Among the more notable of these were the victories of Fort Shaw Indian School a series of girls' basketball games, in which they defeated all opponents.[334]

The omission of golf and tennis from the program is particularly striking considering the growing stature women's events held in these disciplines in the first decade of the twentieth century. Above any of the other sports contested at the Olympics to date, golf and tennis were foremost in holding regular competitions for ladies. The periodical *Outing*, a frequent read among the American sporting gentility, featured women's tournaments in its recurring golf coverage for 1904, including the preeminent women's national championship (now the U.S. Women's Amateur) held at the Merion

---

[332] Paula Welch, "Admission to the Programme: A Privilege Earned, Not Given," *Olympic Review* 273 (July 1990), 334; James E. Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904," In *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1905* 18, no. 217, Special Olympic Number Containing the Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1904, ed. James E. Sullivan (New York: American Sports Publishing Company, 1905), 227; 231.

[333] Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904;" David R. Francis, *The Universal Exposition of 1904*, 2 vols. (St. Louis: The Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, 1913), 535. For a discussion of the Department of Physical Culture and its jurisdiction over the St. Louis Olympics, please reference page 535 of the report of David R. Francis.

[334] Linda Peavy and Ursula Smith. "World Champions: The 1904 Girls' Basketball Team From Fort Shaw Indian Boarding School," in *Native Athletes in Sport and Society: A Reader*, edited by C. Richard King, 40-78 (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 41-42; Linda Peavy and Ursula Smith, *Full-Court Quest: The Girls from Fort Shaw Indian School, Basketball Champions of the World* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008), 324. According to Peavy and Smith, while the girls of the Fort Shaw Indian School rightfully earned the title of "world champions" for their success at the World's fair, organizers communicated that the "real" Olympic events were the track and field which took place at the Olympic stadium. By extension, this distinction can apply to the two tennis events named "Olympic" and not to the other, subsidiary events which rounded out the tournament.

Cricket Club in greater Philadelphia.[335] The tournament, won by American Georgianna Bishop, was notable for the participation of English star Charlotte "Lottie" Dod, the present British amateur champion.[336] Dod's adept skill at golf, described by *Outing* golf columnist Van Tassel Sutphen as "well-balanced" and attracting "much curiosity" from tournament-goers, would certainly have made herself a contender had a women's tournament been held in St. Louis.[337] Moreover, the Englishwoman's previous success as a tennis player—she was five times Wimbledon champion—made the lack of opportunities at the third summer Olympics doubly lamentable.[338]

Equitable to those in golf, women tennis players likewise had ample tournament opportunities in 1904. Although few Americans ventured abroad to the Wimbledon Championships, the U.S. Women's National Singles Championship had become a featured event during the final week of June.[339] The women's tournament remained separate from the gentlemen's competition at the Newport Casino, yet no later than 1904 attracted such remarkable talent from across the United States as to make a lack of available female tennis players an inadequate explanation for neglecting an Olympic tournament. In June 1904, Californian May Sutton came east for the first time in her career to win the U.S. National Championship at the Philadelphia Cricket Club, defeating

---

[335] Van Tassel Sutphen, "Golf," *Outing* 45, no. 2 (November 1904), 248; Van Tassel Sutphen, "Some Victories in Golf," *Outing* 45, no. 3 (December 1904), 383; Rhonda Glenn, "Georgianna Bishop Wins Merion's First USGA Championship," 4 February 2013, *United States Golf Association*, http://www.usga.org/articles/2013/02/looking-back1904-us-womens-amateur-21474854305.html.
[336] Glenn, "Georgianna Bishop Wins."
[337] Sutphen, "Some Victories in Golf," 383.
[338] Robert J. Lake, *A Social History of Tennis in Britain*, Routledge Research in Sport History (Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge, 2014), 32; G. W. Hillyard, *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1924), 149; 152. Dod amassed five Wimbledon championships between 1887 (when she was 15) and 1893, and took up amateur golf upon retiring from tennis at a relatively young age.
[339] Bud Collins, *The Bud Collins History of Tennis*, 2nd ed. (New York: New Chapter Press, 2010), 454-483.

fellow American Elizabeth Moore in the challenge round.[340] Sutton's performance was so comprehensive that Moore would later surmise in a memoir that she "gave us all a lesson."[341] The following summer Sutton travelled as far as London to win Wimbledon, becoming the first American to take the All England ladies' singles title.[342] Had an Olympic competition been held, May Sutton would very likely have been the gold medal favorite.

In Missouri, tennis was an exceedingly popular pastime as displayed in a headlining article in the *St. Louis Republic* just days before the start of the tennis tournament. Thanks to rather clement weather in the summer months, the *Republic* reported that "St. Louis is again enraptured with the tennis rage."[343] The sport had blossomed in popularity among the city's social elite. A *Republic* headline proclaimed that "Debutantes and Matrons Have Become Devotees of the Games," playing long days of matches at the St. Louis Country Club and other posh venues in the Midwestern city.[344] Reiterating the sport's popularity are several large pictures accompanying the article representing some of the city's most notable female tennis players.[345] Furthermore, the *Republic* lists a "World's Fair doubles for women," "World's Fair mixed doubles" and a "Louisiana Purchase championship, in singles for men and women" in an article published just a week before the games, although no women are listed therein alongside

---

[340] Bud Collins, *The Bud Collins History of Tennis*, 3rd ed. (New York: New Chapter Press, 2016), 495. Like Wimbledon, the U.S. championships for men and women originally featured an All-Comers round with the winner playing the defending champion in the Challenge round to determine the title.
[341] Elizabeth Moore, "Seventeen Years of Women's Tennis: Despite Five-Set Matches Tournament Play Grows in Popularity Among the Fair Sex." In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 66-68 (New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931), 67.
[342] Lake, *Social History of Tennis*, 78. Sutton would again win the Championships in 1907.
[343] "Many Tennis Players Take Advantage of the Ideal St. Louis Weather," *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.
[344] Hillyard, *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis*, 12; "Many Tennis Players," *St. Louis Republic.*
[345] "Many Tennis Players," *St. Louis Republic*.

the male entrants.[346] It seems not far-fetched to imagine that had the Louisiana Purchase Exposition the foresight to include Olympic ladies' singles and doubles and mixed doubles along with the gentlemen's events, they would have been well-fielded from among St. Louis' tennis-playing class.[347]

Although the absence of women in lawn tennis at the St. Louis games was a notable one, attracting an internationally representative field of competitors proved to be an insurmountable challenge. Here not only tennis, but nearly all sports suffered from the lack of foresight of Olympic organizers: holding the games in coincidence with the Louisiana Purchase Exposition meant that European athletes would be forced not only to cross the Atlantic Ocean by boat, but also travel by train to Missouri, nearly a thousand miles from the coast. To compensate, the Department of Physical Culture knew they had to work hard to promote the games in Europe and the eastern United States. The committee hoped the United States' strong presence at both the Athens and Paris Olympics would inspire reciprocity from the Europeans. Their aspirations could not have been further from reality: few athletes came from abroad, and most of the foreign members of the International Olympic Committee did not make trip.[348] Even Pierre de

---

[346] "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors," *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.

[347] It is worth northing that according to reports on the home cities of players on the Olympic tennis roster, many of the gentlemen who participated in the 1904 tournament came from Missouri and nearby Illinois, further suggesting that a similar sampling of players from local clubs would have partaken in a ladies' championship.

[348] Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904* (St. Louis: Woodward and Tiernan Printing Co., 1905), 21. The official IOC delegation to the 1904 games reportedly included just nine international representatives, most of them coming from Germany, Greece, and Hungary. As listed in the report of Charles J. P. Lucas, they were "Fra. Kemeny, Hungary; S. Stanvoitz, Hungary; Dr. H. H. Hardy, Germany; Dr. W. Gebhardt, Germany; P. J. Mueller, Germany; Jules de Muzsa, Hungary; Hector M. E. Pasmezoglu, Greece; Demetrius Jannapoulo, Greece; Dr. Ralph Hager, Philippine Islands." Among these men, Ferenc Kemeny was the most senior and a founding member of the IOC alongside Coubertin.

Coubertin, who from the genesis of the Olympic movement believed so strongly in rotating the games among great modern cities, stayed away.[349]

Coubertin's absence came on the heels of a conference with Crown Prince Constantine of Greece following the inaugural Olympics in Athens, which confirmed that Paris would be host in 1900 and that the 1904 games would be held in an American city.[350] When the American Olympic Committee selected Chicago as the host, Coubertin supported the measure at a May 1901 IOC meeting in Paris. "Chicago well deserved to be the scene of the next Olympic games," Coubertin was quoted in the *Chicago Tribune*, adding that "St. Louis had excellent claims, especially in view of the exposition, but they were overshadowed by the advantages offered by Chicago."[351] The Windy City's bid also counted on the advocacy of Amos Alonso Stagg of the University of Chicago, who travelled with the American team to Paris and with his university joined in protesting Sunday competition.[352] Stagg and University of Chicago president William Rainey Harper successfully lobbied Coubertin and the IOC for the 1904 games, which the IOC assigned to the city at its 1901 session.[353] When American president Theodore Roosevelt and Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) secretary James E. Sullivan later came to

---

[349] David Wallechinsky and Jaime Loucky, *The Complete Book of the Olympics*, 2008 ed. (London: Aurum, 2008), 12.
[350] John Apostal Lucas, *The Modern Olympic Games* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1980), 48. At this royal conference, Constantine and Coubertin reached a compromise by which Greece would host a series of parallel competitions called "International Panathenaic Games" which would occur quadrennially in Athens beginning in 1898 or 1902. For a number of political and military reasons, the only one of these competitions which came to fruition was the Intercalated Games of 1906. Despite their international success, the Intercalated Olympics have yet to achieve full recognition by the IOC.
[351] "Joy in Olympian Games: Chicago Prepares to Celebrate Award Made in Paris," *Chicago Tribune*, 22 May 1901, 3.
[352] Mark Dyreson, *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience.* Sport and Society, eds. Benjamin G. Rader and Randy Roberts (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 65; 67.
[353] Ibid., 74-75.

prevail upon the Frenchman to allow the games to be moved to St. Louis, Coubertin was loath to accept the relocation.[354]

In the growing years of the Olympic movement, there was no love lost between Coubertin and Sullivan. Historian Mark Dyreson correctly surmises that they "disliked each other intensely,"[355] and that alone might be enough to explain Coubertin's absence from the St. Louis games. That each man was among the most influential sports administrators of his day with greatly opposed visions surrounding the expansion of the Olympic movement earns Coubertin some sympathy.[356] Each was a partisan nationalist with his own ideas about the utility and future of the Olympic movement. Coubertin wanted no part in Sullivan's American brand of "athletic nationalism" and remained in Europe.[357]

Unwilling himself to attend the St. Louis Olympics, Pierre de Coubertin sent a small IOC delegation to patronize the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and the games. Among those who did come to Missouri was Ferenc Kemény of Hungary, a founding member of the IOC, accompanied by committee colleagues representing Bohemia, Germany, Greece, and the Philippines.[358] The attendance of Bohemian and German delegates is fitting considering that immigrants from both countries had established thriving social enclaves in St. Louis by the early twentieth century. Foreign athletes such as the German gymnasts or Turners were thus well received during their visit to the

---

[354] John Apostal Lucas, "The Dream Persists: The Olympic Games Come Back to Los Angeles," *Olympic Review* 194 (December 1983), 834.
[355] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 74. The attendance of Bohemian and German delegates is fitting considering that immigrants from both countries had established thriving social enclaves in St. Louis by the early twentieth century. Representatives of these countries, such as the
[356] Ibid. Dyreson notes that Sullivan approached to the Olympic games as an avenue for expanding American nationalism in the pre-war twentieth century, whereas Coubertin maintained his position that games ought to serve as a path toward international peace.
[357] Ibid., 73.
[358] Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904*, 21-22; Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 92.

United States.[359] One of the German delegates, Dr. Hugo Hardy, achieved particular notoriety in becoming the only foreign athlete to enter the St. Louis tennis tournament.[360] Hardy, then a resident of Berlin,[361] came to America's first Olympics as the "Imperial German world's fair commissioner," officially representing the German Empire as its designated envoy in St. Louis.[362]

German sports officials made known their plans to send a team to St. Louis months before the signature Olympic events.[363] On May 22, the *New York Times* published a report from its correspondent in Berlin announcing the commissioning of a German Olympic team for 1904.[364] At a May 14 special event at the Berlin Circus Busch, the German Olympic Committee announced that it would dispatch athletes "to St. Louis to take part in swimming, turning, lawn tennis, wrestling, and rowing contests."[365] German athletes arrived in New York City a month later and were entertained by the stalwart New York Athletic Club (NYAC) as well as the German-dominated gymnastics club, the New York Turnverien.[366] There after the team would travel to visit the Chicago

---

[359] "German Athletes to be Entertained," *New York Times*, 22 June 1904, 7.
[360] Bill Mallon, *A Statistical Summary of the 1904 Olympic Games*, Manuscript, (Durham, No. Carolina: October 1981), 40; George R. Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 158; Heiner Gillmeister, *Tennis: A Cultural History* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997), 24; Cheree Intorre Jones, "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," Master's thesis (Pennsylvania State University, 1985, GV993), 102.
; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181.
[361] Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181.
[362] "Olympic Tennis Matches," *Chicago Tribune*, 30 August 1904, 6.
[363] Tennis, along with Track and Field and other popular Olympic sports took place in early September 1904, although other events bearing the Olympic name were held during the larger world's fair window of 30 April to 1 December.
[364] "German Athletes Coming: Teams in the Various Sports for St. Louis Fair," *New York Times*, 22 May 1904, 12.
[365] "German Athletes Coming," *New York Times*, 22 May 1904, 12. The Berlin Circus Busch event was attended by the Crown Prince of Imperial Germany, Wilhelm, son of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Its primary purpose was to raise funds so that amateur athletes could afford to travel from Europe to the United States for the games.
[366] "German Athletes to be Entertained," *New York Times*, 22 June 1904, 7. A *turnverein* is a club where German-style Turner gymnastics are practiced, and were common at the dawn of the twentieth century in American cities with significant German immigrant enclaves, particularly in the Midwest.

Turnverien and the St. Louis Turnverien before competing in the latter city for Olympic honors.[367] Such definitive plans for a German Olympic team under the guidance of Dr. Hardy and his colleagues, Dr. W. Gebhardt and P. J. Mueller,[368] make it unlikely that Hardy's participation in the Olympic tournament was a spur-of-the-moment decision as was the apparent case for some of the athletes who competed in the first Olympic games of Athens.[369] Rather, it highlights a sports official with a unique resolve not only to represent his country's athletes, but compete in an event of personal interest. After his tenure in St. Louis, in which he performed modestly in singles and in doubles, Hugo Hardy continued to serve as a prominent sports official in Germany, eventually serving on the *Deutschen Reichsausschuß für Olympische Spiele* (DRA) during the Weimar Republic.[370]

Aside from Hardy's foray into Olympic tennis, the only other international athlete originally scheduled to compete in tournament was Shunzo Tokaki of Japan. Historian of the 1904 Olympics George R. Matthews reports that Tokaki came to the United States at the behest of the Twiiku Kwai Physical Culture Association with instructions "to make a study of physical culture and in order to detect the deficiencies of the Japanese in athletics."[371] Tokaki took part in the Missouri State Tennis Championships, a lesser tournament held in early July prior to the Olympic tournament in September. Presumably

---

[367] "German Athletes to be Entertained," *New York Times*, 22 June 1904, 7.
[368] Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904,* 21. Germany's three delegates to the third Olympic games ranks as the most among the names listed in the report of Charles J. P. Lucas.
[369] Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Olympics in Athens 1896: The Invention of the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Profile Books, 2004), 3.
[370] Jürgen Court, Deutsche Sportwissenschaft in der Weimarer Republik und im Nationalsozialismus, vol. 2 (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2014), 34. During the Weimar Republic, the DRA became responsible for organizing German Olympic teams and served as a forerunner to the modern incarnation of the German Olympic Committee.
[371] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 158.

satisfied with his research material, Tokaki left town before the Olympic championship began.[372]

The dearth of international competitors caused the tournament to become more or less a national invitational, but with perhaps a little less fanfare than that which accompanied the annual tournament in Newport. This may have been the result of tournament's scheduling: the primary competition dates of August 29 to September 3 fell at the conclusion of a long and action-filled summer on the American lawn tennis circuit, which historically was dominated by weeklong tournaments at exclusive clubs near the Atlantic coast.[373] Tournaments at the venerable venues of the Keystone State, the Merion and Philadelphia Cricket Clubs, were accompanied on the annual tennis schedule by the prestigious Pacific Coast Championships and the Canadian International, held the week before the Olympic tournament at the Ontario resort town of Niagara-on-the-Lake.[374] Thus with a crowded schedule which demanded substantial time and financial resources from regular competitors, the one-off event in St. Louis' specially constructed dirt courts had to compete for attention with the manicured lawns of highly regarded clubs and their equally well respected perennial tournaments.[375] Scheduling the Olympic championship after both the Wimbledon Championships in late June and the United States Tennis Championships in mid-August meant that the sport's biggest tournaments—which commanded both the highest caliber of player and deepest tournament fields—would have passed before entrants boarded their trains to Missouri.[376] Without another major

---

[372] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 158.
[373] "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181; Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 117.
[374] "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times.*
[375] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 158.
[376] Alan Little and Robert McNicol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 28th ed. (London: All England Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club, 2018), 149; "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*. According to Little and

championship to prepare for in the same season, the tennis players who came to the Olympics did so for the tournament's own merits.[377]

Given these circumstances, the third Olympic tennis tournament was, from an American point of view, a success. Despite placing the tournament late in a congested series of popular events, organizers were able to attract several notable American champions to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and the Olympic tournament. Here the timely cooperation between representatives of the Exposition's Department of Physical Culture and the United States National Lawn Tennis Association (USNLTA) proved to the advantage of the tournament, salvaging success from a participant field which would ultimately include neither women nor international competitors (save for Hardy of Germany). In the winter of 1904, the Exposition organizers sought formal approval from the USNLTA for the Olympic tournament. Under the auspices of its president, Dr. James Dwight of the Longwood Cricket Club, the USNLTA sanctioned the St. Louis event at its February 5 annual meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York.[378] Shortly after the congress, the Olympic championship was included with the regular schedule of tournaments for the 1904 tennis year published in a sports column in the *New York*

McNicol's annual *Compendium* for the Championships, the 1904 Wimbledon tournament at the Worple Road ground began on Monday, June 20 and concluded with the Gentlemen's Doubles Challenge Round on Wednesday, June 29. At their February meeting the United States National Lawn Tennis Association (USNLTA) confirmed that the National Championships for gentlemen would take place at the Newport Casino the week of August 16.

[377] "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*. According to the UNLTA's schedule for the games as published in the *New York Times*, the primary tennis season began the week of May 2 and concluded the week of October 4.

[378] "Annual Tennis Meeting: English Plan of Ranking Players Opposed by Delegates," *New York Times*, 6 February 1904, 7. Intriguingly, the *New York Times* also reported that "one of the leading tennis players of the country" (Dwight F. Davis) had gone to Europe in an effort to recruit top players to come to the Olympic event. Regrettably, none of these players materialized save for Hugo Hardy—who was also serving in the capacity of Imperial German World's Fair Commissioner. Neither were the Doherty brothers present in St. Louis or in Newport for the U.S. Nationals, a regrettable absence considering that the team was again champions of Wimbledon in 1904 and still at the height of their tennis powers.

Times.[379] The news report conveyed that USNLTA representatives originally anticipated holding the tournament *before* the "all-comers' National meeting on the courts of the Newport Casino, but later deemed best to have it follow the strictly National event."[380]

The decision to schedule the Olympic tournament after the U.S. Nationals, which were held the week of August 16, would in the course of events be confirmed a wise one.[381] With the St. Louis tournament and its thousand-mile commute postponed three weeks from its original start date of August 8, Newport hopefuls could focus on being in top form for the American championship and buoy their success to pursue the quadrennial Olympic title, rather than use the St. Louis Exposition as a training ground for the U.S. Nationals.[382] More importantly, however, the February foresight of the USNLTA prevented an awkward transition between two different playing surfaces popular at tennis clubs in the early twentieth century. For the Olympic tournament, the Department of Physical Culture constructed dirt courts near the track and field stadium (later to be known as Francis Field) and neighboring the gymnasium being used for exhibiting sports equipment.[383] During the developing years of tennis as an international sport, the term "dirt" was synonymous with what is known in the modern game as a red

---

[379] "Increasing Interest in Tennis," New York Times, 7 February 1904, 17.
[380] Ibid.
[381] Ibid.
[382] James E . Sullivan, ed., *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1904* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1903), 183. The year before the game, A. G. Spalding and Bros. published a list of the major events taking place at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, centering upon the Olympic Games in athletics scheduled for Monday, August 29 to Saturday, September 3. Within this schedule were plans for the tennis tournament to begin on Monday, August 8 and conclude on Saturday, August 13. Such a schedule would have proven a major obstacle for any tennis player wishing to play for the men's singles national championship in Rhode Island, with the tournament beginning the following Monday, August 16. Because titles at Newport were the most prized by American tennis players, this conflict would likely have been disastrous for the Olympic tournament, and conceivably have fielded no players of national, yet alone international, quality.
[383] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 117; 158; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympics*, 181. Francis Field was named after world's fair commissioner David R. Francis and is still an active track venue owned by Washington University in St. Louis.

clay or green clay court; a slow, sliding surface which benefits tenacious, methodical tennis players. Conversely, the United States championships and most of the important tournaments on the American summer circuit were played on lawn tennis' original service, finely rolled grass. It was not as though championship-caliber players were unfamiliar with dirt courts: regular tournaments on clay took place throughout the 1904 season, including a USNLTA-sanctioned tournament at the New York Lawn Tennis Club over Decoration Day weekend.[384] Nevertheless, transitioning from the slow dirt to the far more abundant grass courts, which reward swift movement and volleying at the net, has always been a challenge for even the most seasoned tennis champions. Postponing the Olympic meeting until after the premier grass tournament of the American circuit ensured continuity of surface in training for the national championships and placed the Olympics at the climax of the tennis season.

The rare opportunity to win an Olympic championship at home was not lost on the American tennis-playing fraternity, who now could spend time preparing for what the *New York Times* called "the most important" tournament not on the regular schedule of events.[385] To add to tournament's Olympic luster, they earnestly wished their European brethren might join the field of competitors. In February, Dwight F. Davis, recent donor of the handsome International Challenge Cup for a new team event later renamed in his honor, travelled abroad to Europe in search of Olympic hopefuls.[386] By record of Davis' generosity and reputation in the broader tennis world, one might have suspected the

[384] "Entries for the N. Y. Tennis Club Tourney," *New York Times*, 30 May 1904, 7.
[385] "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17.
[386] "Annual Tennis Meeting: English Plan of Ranking Players Opposed by Delegates," *New York Times*, 6 February 1904, 7; "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17.

excursion to have yielded better results. A college champion for Harvard,[387] Davis was twice the Newport runner-up and in 1901 won the All-Comers at Wimbledon in doubles with Holcombe Ward.[388] The USNLTA had hoped Davis' presence in Europe would attract "champions and experts" of the game to compete both at the Olympics and at Newport for the United States championship.[389] That it did not was a surprising result considering the long history of the international play between the tennis masters of Europe and North America.

As early as the 1880s, founding American greats R. D. Sears and James Dwight had begun the tradition of touring in Europe.[390] Sears—the first American champion in 1881—toured with Dwight in 1884, and Dwight returned in 1885 and 1886, becoming the first American to compete at Wimbledon.[391] On this precedent, the exchange of players from the two continents, and in particular between the United States and Great Britain, became increasingly commonplace. Oliver S. Campbell, William A. Larned, and Clarence Hobart all competed in Europe over the course of the 1890s.[392] Dwight Davis' own 1901 tour with Holcombe Ward, in which the pair competed exclusively in doubles, was a resounding success. While abroad Davis and Ward lost only twice, and only then to the 1900 gold medalists, the Doherty brothers of England.[393] The Dohertys themselves returned the favor in 1902, touring the North American summer circuit and claiming the

---

[387] Dwight F. Davis, "The Establishment of an International Trophy: A Step Toward Placing Tennis Competition on a Universal Basis," In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 69-72 (New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931), 69. "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17.
[388] Bud Collins, *History of Tennis*, 2nd ed., 454-483; Little and McNichol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 23.
[389] "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17.
[390] Allen, *Spalding's Tennis Annual 1904*, 35.
[391] United States Lawn Tennis Association, *United States Lawn Tennis Association Official Encyclopedia of Tennis* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), 20; Stephen Wallis Merrihew, *The Quest for the Davis Cup*, The Lawn Tennis Library, VI (New York: American Lawn Tennis, Inc., 1928), 5.
[392] Merrihew, *Quest for the Davis Cup*, 8; Allen, *Spalding's Tennis Annual 1904*, 35-36; United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 20.
[393] Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 36.

American national championship at Newport.[394] They successfully defended their U.S. championship, along with several other titles, in 1903.[395]

Alas, there would be no international tour in 1904, as not a single member of the strong British tennis contingent would accept Davis' invitation to come to the United States. The prospect of winning the two most-prized titles in North America, it would seem, was not enough to tempt any of the "Old World" greats, who stayed away *en masse* from both Newport and St. Louis that summer. Dwight Davis could not even prevail upon his old foes Reginald and Laurence Doherty to participate,[396] and the tournament was left to suffice with little-heralded Hardy of Germany for international representation.[397]

If judged exclusively by the absence of foreign entrants and a women's event, the modern historian might very well deem the 1904 Olympic tennis tournament a failure. Such a limited analysis, however, ignores the ingenious scheduling and attraction of a formidable field of American competitors which became the very reasons for the event's moderate success. Albeit that the switch from the grass courts of Newport to the dirt of St. Louis was assuredly an abrupt change for most of the participants, the timing of the tournament could not have been better with respect to attracting a talented field and the attention of the local and national press.[398]

---

[394] Collins, *The Bud Collins History of Tennis*, 2nd ed., 454-483.
[395] Allen, *Spalding's Tennis Annual 1904*, 26.
[396] Davis Cup by BNP Paribas, "USA 3:2 Great Britain," International Tennis Federation, accessed 30 June 2013, archived at https://web.archive.org/web/20130630130652/http://www.daviscup.com/en/draws-results/tie/details.aspx?tieId=10003701. The brothers Doherty had competed against Davis and Holcombe Ward in the 1902 rendition of the future Davis Cup. The Dohertys also beat Davis and Ward in the challenge round of the 1901 Championships at Wimbledon.
[397] Bill Mallon, *A Statistical Summary of the 1904 Olympic Games*, Manuscript, (Durham, No. Carolina: October 1981), 40; George R. Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 158; Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 24; Jones, "Demise and Revival of Tennis," 11; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181.
[398] Cf. Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 158.

With the tournament taking place on the final Monday of the month, August 29, and running until the following Saturday, September 3, press attention was piqued as the U. S. Championships had just concluded in Rhode Island on Wednesday, August 24.[399] Moreover, the St. Louis Olympic organizers had timed the tennis tournament to occur concurrently with the track and field meet, to be held the same week at the Olympic stadium.[400] Although it can successfully be argued that the Olympic games, being the athletic extension of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, ran the entire six-month length of that festival, many within the American sporting class believed that the true Olympic games proper consisted only of the track and field events, and specifically only those events occurring the week of August 29.[401] This included 1904 Olympic report author Charles Lucas, who offered a detailed account of each day of the athletics meet but nothing of tennis or any other sporting events held in St. Louis.[402]

Nevertheless, the account of Lucas provides insight as to centrality of the track and field events to the St. Louis Olympic experience as well as how many world's fair patrons may have come into contact with the Olympic tennis tournament. Since track and field was exceedingly popular as an amateur sport in the United States, it is little wonder that even with all of the other attractions available to fairgoers the Olympic meet still grew crowds. Lucas records that a gathering of over three thousand individuals witnessed the first day of competition on what was then as now the campus of Washington University.[403] On Tuesday, the third edition of the Olympic marathon drew an audience

---

[399] A. G. Spalding and Bros, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 5.
[400] Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904*, 9; Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904," 165; Francis, *The Universal Exhibition of 1904*, 539-540; Sullivan, *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1904*, 184.
[401] Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games*, 9.
[402] Ibid.
[403] Ibid., 23.

of over ten thousand at the Olympic stadium alone, with many more lining the roads outside St. Louis.[404]

It seems very possible that many of these same crowds would have witnessed portions of the tennis event, if not for their size but for the proximity of courts as a nearby entertainment source. While at least some of the tennis matches took place at the same time as the track and field, the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* noted on September 4 that the championship matches "drew the applause of the highly interested spectators, of whom there were a goodly number, notwithstanding the counter attraction offered by the final events of the Olympic games."[405] Theoretically, an enterprising spectator could have, in the course of a day or the week, appreciated some of both of these major events. In what might be considered the most successful aspect of the tournament's organization from a spectator's perspective, the Department of Physical Culture constructed the Olympic tennis venue a stone's throw from the stadium and directly before the gymnasium where the gymnastic demonstrations and equipment displays were ongoing.[406] This strategic location, paired with scheduling the tournament for the week in which Olympic sports would receive the most public attention, ensured that tennis would benefit from both a large potential audience and regular reporting in the press. True to form, the results of both the "Olympic" and "World's Fair" tennis matches were reported on locally,

---

[404] Thomas Schmidt, "Architecture at the Service of Sport: Olympic Stadia From 1896 to 1936," *Olympic Review* 225 (July 1986), 398; Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games*, 59.
[405] *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, 4 September 1904; cf. Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 159.
[406] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 117; 158. See below for a discussion of the gymnastic equipment display, which was funded by A. G. Spalding and Bros. as part of a concerted effort to profit from the 1904 games.

regionally by the Associated Press, and in nationally recognized newspapers including the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Times*.[407]

The Department of Physical Culture within the world's fair committee structured the tournament in a fashion which attracted both established and rising national champions and aspiring local challengers. Similar to Paris, which included secondary handicap events,[408] organizers in Missouri provided for four singles and three doubles events at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.[409] For the duration of the St. Louis games the Department cooperated directly with many of the governing bodies of American amateur sport, and appropriately the tennis proceedings were sanctioned by the United States National Lawn Tennis Association (USNLTA) as planned.[410] Beyond its basic structure under the auspices of the Physical Culture Department with the blessing of the USNLTA, the organization of the tennis event becomes a bit more confusing. The Department's effort to include competitors in a variety of ability levels resulted in seven bewilderingly named events: Olympic Singles, Olympic Doubles, World's Fair Singles, World's Fair Doubles, Louisiana Purchase Singles Championship, World's Olympic Championship Doubles, and an Interscholastic Championship.[411] Of these several

---

[407] Much of the local reporting on the 1904 Olympics, including the tennis tournament, took place on the pages of St. Louis' premier newspaper, the *St. Louis Republic*. Associated Press reports reached other areas in the Midwest, such as Cairo, Illinois, where tennis results were printed in *The Cairo Bulletin*. The national reputation of the *Chicago Tribune* and *New York Times* ensured news of the tournament reached areas in which tennis was a popularly followed amateur sport. The *Tribune* and especially the *Times* regularly reported on the American amateur tennis circuit during this area, including tournaments outside of their immediate geographic regions.

[408] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 12; 208; 213-217. Mallon arbitrarily does not include handicap events in his definition of Olympic sporting events. He does, however, make note of the Paris handicap events in his compilation of results from the 1900 games.

[409] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 28-31; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181.

[410] "Annual Tennis Meeting: English Plan of Ranking Players Opposed by Delegates." *New York Times*, 6 February 1904, 7; Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904," 160.

[411] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 29-31; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181.

divisions, only last is truly self-explanatory: it featured competition among school-age students and was won handily by T. F. Stern over St. Louis native Fred J. Tobin, 6-2, 6-0, 6-0.[412] The *New York Times* reported that Stern was a student at Hyde Park High School in Chicago, suggesting that even in the Interscholastic Championship, local challengers met with visiting competitors from other parts of the Midwest and beyond.[413]

Beyond the Interscholastic Championship there was considerable overlap between the draws of the various tournaments designated "Olympic," "World's Fair," "Louisiana Purchase," and even "World's Olympic."[414] At times, this confounding quality to the St. Louis tournament has made it difficult for historians to delineate between what one might consider to be the senior-level, championship tournament and other lesser-stakes events. At some level, differentiating at all between the six remaining singles and doubles competitions is arbitrary and risks discrediting the accomplishments of the gentlemen who won whichever tournaments found inferior. Nevertheless, such a designation, which places the "Olympic Singles" and "Olympic Doubles" disciplines as the marquee events

---

[412] "Tennis Tournament at St. Louis," *Chicago Tribune*, 31 August 1904, 6; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 186; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 31; "Olympic Lawn Tennis Tournament." *New York Times*, 1 September 1904, 5. Disagreement between some of the sources here requires some explanation.. Stern's first initial is reported as "L." in Sullivan's Spalding report, the *Spalding Tennis Annual 1905*, and in Mallon's compendium, *The 1904 Olympic Games*. In the *Chicago Tribune*, he is listed as "L. Stearn." The *New York Times* in its September 1, 1904 edition reports the champion as "T. F. Stern." Mallon contends that the Interscholastic Championship was held on Thursday and Friday of the week of the tennis tournament, with the final between Stern and F. J. Tobin taking place on September 2. However, Stern is already printed in the Thursday, September 1 edition of the *New York Times* as the champion from a cable report dated August 31. Since the *Times* article is senior to both the Spalding Olympic report and *Spalding's Tennis Annual 1905* and is apparently correct as to the concluding date of the tournament, Stern will be referred to as T. F. Stern for the purposes of this chapter. Such a designation is open to historical revision as deemed appropriate. As an additional aside, one should note that Tobin's brother, J. C. Tobin, finished in third place in St. Louis. J. C. lost to Stern 6-4, 6-3 in the semifinal round.

[413] "Olympic Lawn Tennis Tournament," *New York Times*, 1 September 1904, 5.

[414] Oddly, *Spalding's Tennis Annual 1905* fails to list the Olympic Singles and Olympic Doubles, won by Beals C. Wright and the team of Wright and Holcombe Ward, respectively, although it does contain a picture of Wright on page 28 as one of the members of the Olympic Tennis Committee. All five other events, including the Interscholastic Championship in singles, are accounted for in the four-page subsection.

of the 1904 Olympic tennis tournament, is exactly what is accomplished in both primary and secondary sources.

Excepting the otherwise reliable *Spalding's Tennis Annual 1905*, which does not include these two events in its "Olympic Championships" subsection, most of the reporting of the St. Louis tournament gave priority to the Olympic Singles and Olympic Doubles events.[415] The *Chicago Tribune* lists results from the "Olympic championship, singles" first,[416] ahead of scores from the other events of the tournament.[417] In like form the September 5 *New York Times* refers to the Olympic Singles as the "world's championship singles," suggesting its superiority to both the World's Fair and Louisiana Purchase divisions.[418] The *St. Louis Republic* provides additional clarity, designating the main event as the "Olympic world's championship singles" and noting that the World's Fair draws were open to members of USNLTA-affiliated clubs, and that the Louisiana Purchase events were reserved for players residing in the territory of the original Louisiana Purchase of 1803.[419]

Based on reporting from the contemporary press, at least three conclusions can be made regarding the structure of the Olympic tennis tournament. The first of these is that organizers intended a hierarchy which placed the Olympic championship events as the most elite, followed next in talent by the World's Fair events, then the Louisiana Purchase, and lastly, the Interscholastic Championship. A second observation is that it was possible—based on geography, membership, and skill level—for entrants in the

---

[415] A. G. Spalding and Bros, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 28-31.
[416] "Tennis Tournament at St. Louis," *Chicago Tribune*, 31 August 1904, 6.
[417] "Tennis Tournament at St. Louis," *Chicago Tribune*, 31 August 1904, 6; "Olympic Tennis Matches," *Chicago Tribune*, 30 August 1904, 6; "Tennis at the World's Fair," *Chicago Tribune*, 3 September 1904, 6.
[418] "Winners of Olympic Tennis Tourney," *New York Times*, 5 September 1904, 6.
[419] "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors," *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.

Olympic tennis tournament to compete in multiple divisions. For example, the runner-up in the Olympic Singles, Edgar W. Leonard, came through as champion of the World's Fair singles over Alphonzo E. Bell, who himself also participated in the Olympic Singles and Doubles.[420] Since the World's Fair Singles and Doubles were open to members of USNLTA clubs and virtually all of the American standouts were club-affiliated, such an overlap was common.[421] Moreover, according to tournament rules many of the top players in the Midwest would have also qualified for the Louisiana Purchase Singles.[422] In general, this schema resulted in the best-known and highest caliber entrants participating in the Olympic Singles and Doubles, the World's Fair Singles and Doubles being a mix of nationally-known players and local standouts, and the Louisiana Purchase Singles consisting predominately of local competition. There were, however, some exceptions. St. Louis native Dwight Davis entered in—and won—the Louisiana Purchase Singles handily over O. V. Vernon of Kansas City in spite of Davis' own well-known international record.[423]

A third conclusion arising from the first two is the suggestion that only the Olympic Singles and Doubles should be canonized as part of what we consider to be the Olympic games of 1904. This is an especially difficult assertion to make given the degree of overlap in both participation and press coverage of the different events within the St.

---

[420] A. G. Spalding and Bros, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 29; "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors," *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5; "Winners of Olympic Tennis Tourney," *New York Times*, 5 September 1904, 6; "Tennis Tournament at St. Louis," *Chicago Tribune*, 31 August 1904, 6; "Olympic Tennis Matches," *Chicago Tribune*, 30 August 1904, 6; "Lawn Tennis Tournament at St. Louis Ends," *The Cairo Bulletin*, Cairo, Ill., 4 September 1904, 1; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 183-185.

[421] "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors," *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.

[422] Ibid.

[423] "Winners of Olympic Tennis Tourney," *New York Times*, 5 September 1904, 6; A. G. Spalding and Bros. *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 29. Davis' victory in the all-Missouri final was a decisive one, putting away the less experienced Vernon 6-1, 6-3.

Louis tournament, but seems to be a reasonable one given the structure of the tournament as well as considering the manner other events surrounding the Louisiana Purchase Exposition have been regarded by sport scholars. Like the world champion Fort Shaw Indian School girls' basketball team, these events remain a historically important part of the world's fair landscape without being certified Olympic competitions in their own right.[424]

Since the time of the world's fair Olympics of 1900 and 1904, many efforts have been made by historians, antiquarians, and even the International Olympic Committee itself to define which events truly ought to be considered "medal" events for these early games, and which should be considered supplementary, but not essentially championship-level inclusions on the world's fair sporting programs. Such a division seems fitting, as the St. Louis games were the first to award the gold, silver, and bronze medals which are today synonymous with the Olympics and global athletic achievement.[425] As of 2019, the IOC database officially recognizes just two of the 1904 tennis events: the Olympic Singles won by Beals C. Wright and the Olympic Doubles won by Wright and Edgar W. Leonard.[426] This adheres to the discretion made separately by Bill Mallon and David Wallechinsky, both recognized compilers of Olympic statistics between primary Olympic events and subsidiary world's fair contests.[427] Early Olympic tennis researcher Cheree Intorre Jones agrees particularly with Mallon, arguing that the World's Fair and

---

[424] Peavy and Smith, *Full-Court Quest*, 324. Peavy and Smith articulate that the girls' games were understood to be different from the "main" Olympic events, particularly those at the stadium.
[425] Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games 1904*, 13.
[426] International Olympic Committee, "Singles Men – Classement Final," accessed 12 September 2019, https://www.olympic.org/st-louis-1904/tennis/singles-men; International Olympic Committee, "Doubles Men – Classement Final," accessed 12 September 2019, https://www.olympic.org/st-louis-1904/tennis/doubles-men.
[427] Wallechinsky and Loucky, *Complete Book of the Olympics*, 1020; 1024; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 12-13; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 13; Mallon, *A Statistical Summary of the 1904 Olympic Games*, 40-41.

Louisiana Purchase Singles and Doubles constituted "auxiliary events" designed to augment, rather than supersede, the Olympic tournament program.[428]

Mallon's criteria for evaluating early Olympic events read similar to late-twentieth century IOC policies regulating the eligibility of sports seeking entry into the Olympic program. Namely, they must be international, must not include handicap events, must be open to all comers, and must not include the use of motorized vehicles.[429] To this Mallon adds the unwritten rule of the early modern Olympic games—that all competitors must be avowed amateurs.[430] With respect to the St. Louis games, it is clear that Mallon and likeminded scholars have included events that would have been open to international competitors *in theory*, though in most sports including tennis foreign athletes rarely materialized. The third of these criteria—that Olympic activities must be open to all comers—seems reasonable to apply to the residual events of the tennis tournament. As the World's Fair Singles and Doubles required a club membership, the Louisiana Purchase Singles a geographic residency, and the Interscholastic Championship an academic affiliation, all three could rightly be considered sub-Olympic contributions to the tennis program.[431] Effectively, these events were part of the St. Louis world's fair, but not part of the St. Louis Olympics.

It is worth noting here that there is historical precedent in presenting some, but not all of the events of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition as part of the Olympic games. In schedules published ahead of the expo, including the Department of Physical Culture's preliminary program printed in *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1904*, the track

---

[428] Jones, "Demise and Revival of Tennis," 11.
[429] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 12.
[430] Ibid.
[431] "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors," *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.

and field events advertised as the "Olympic Games" were presented in bold font and set apart from the remaining meets, which occurred at almost a weekly basis at the stadium throughout the summer months.[432] These events, which included AAU junior and handicap championships, interscholastic meets for students from Missouri, and even an elementary school field day, were never accepted as part of the genuine, international Olympic program.[433] This is even true of the "Olympic college championships" held June 25,[434] which though bearing the Olympic name was not included by Charles J. P. Lucas as part of the "official" Olympic athletics competition.[435] Therefore it seems prudent for the remaining tennis events to follow the example set by the myriad of athletics meets, considering the World's Fair, Louisiana Purchase, and Interscholastic Championships to be part of the St. Louis exhibition, but not *ipso facto* medal events within the III Olympiad. It does not arise from such a surmise that these events are not worthy of historical consideration *alongside* the Olympic games, as study thereupon arises naturally from the sharing of competitors and source material, simply that previous scholars have been fair in considering these titles of lesser gravitas than the Olympic Singles and Olympic Doubles.

For what it lacked in international quality, the Olympic tennis tournament of St. Louis ultimately featured many of the best American players of the era, as well as rising standouts within the elite amateur circuit. Even though as accomplished a tennis scholar as Heiner Gillmeister chose to dismiss the 1904 tournament—along with those of London

---

[432] Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904," 183-184.
[433] Ibid., 164-165.
[434] Ibid., 165.
[435] Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904*, 9. Like the Olympic games of Athens in 1896 and Paris in 1900, many collegiate athletes competed in the track and field events, including in St. Louis the Olympic meet for which the Spalding Cup was awarded. However, both the schedule of events and Lucas in particular makes clear that the separate "Olympic college championship" was not part of the elite event held August 29 to September 3 and open to all-comers.

(1908) and Stockholm (1912)—as "second-rate with respect to the quality of entries,"[436] the assemblage of a rather accomplished tournament field cannot be so willfully overlooked. One need glance no further than Beals C. Wright, the champion New Yorker who travelled west to take part in the tennis proceedings.[437]

Beals Coleman Wright was born in 1879 in Boston, Massachusetts to a prominent American sporting family.[438] His father George Wright and uncle William Henry "Harry" Wright rank among the greatest players of baseball during the nineteenth century, and were each inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, New York.[439] Being the son of "baseball's first superstar player" would seem a difficult act to follow,[440] but the unquestionable athletic talent Beals Wright brought to tennis would ultimately yield him two Olympic titles, multiple national championships, and enshrinement in one of the first classes of what would become the International Tennis Hall of Fame.[441]

---

[436] Gillmeister, *Tennis*, 232.
[437] "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors." *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.
[438] United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 371; International Tennis Hall of Fame, "Beals Wright," accessed 30 August 2019, https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/beals-wright.
[439] International Tennis Hall of Fame, "Beals Wright," accessed 30 August 2019, https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/beals-wright; National Baseball Hall of Fame, "George Wright," accessed 19 September 2019, https://baseballhall.org/hall-of-famers/wright-george; National Baseball Hall of Fame, "Harry Wright," accessed 19 September 2019, https://baseballhall.org/hall-of-famers/wright-harry; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 182; United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 371; Little and McNichol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 491; Jones, "Demise and Revival of Tennis," 11. George Wright was enshrined in 1937 in the Baseball Hall of Fame's second year through a special committee on early baseball formed by commissioner Kenesaw Mountain Landis. Brother Harry, whom the Hall quotes Henry Chadwick in calling "the father of professional base ball playing," joined his brother in Cooperstown in 1953, just three years before Beals Wright would himself be inducted into the newly created Tennis Hall of Fame and Museum in Newport.
[440] National Baseball Hall of Fame, "George Wright," accessed 19 September 2019, https://baseballhall.org/hall-of-famers/wright-george.
[441] International Tennis Hall of Fame, "Beals Wright," accessed 30 August 2019, https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/beals-wright. Wright was inducted as one of the United States' early tennis greats and today is considered a member of the International Tennis Hall of Fame's Master Player classification.

Ahead of the 1904 Olympic games, Wright had already established himself as one of the most formidable American champions in both singles and doubles. He came to prominence at a young age while still a preparatory school student at the Hopkins School, winning the national interscholastic title at Newport in 1898.[442] After successfully defending his in 1899,[443] Wright would go on to represent Harvard as a collegian.[444] The same year, he travelled west with fellow Harvardians Dwight Davis, Holcombe Ward, and Malcolm Whitman to play exhibition matches in Monterey, California.[445] Wright's success in 1899 led the USNLTA to rank him eighth in their prestigious first ten, the definitive ranking of American male tennis champions. He would maintain his national first ten ranking eleven of the next twelve years.[446] Over the course of Wright's career prior to the St. Louis Olympics, he established a reputation for engaging the drop shot, then new to the sport of tennis. "One tactic I used to employ quite successfully," he wrote following his retirement, "was to chop a ball very short and low and follow it to the net. This was new then so far as I know, and perhaps it was the surprise which kept my opponent from returning it away from my racket, but it was so effective against a back-court player that it is not used more today."[447] Appropriately, the left-handed Wright

---

[442] Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 117; Beals C. Wright, "The Chop Stroke Wins a Championship: A National Title is Won by Standing In on Service and Taking the Ball on the Rise," In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 94-98 (New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 193), 94.
[443] J. Parmly Paret, ed., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual for 1900* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1900), 54-57. In order to qualify for the interscholastic championship, entrants had to win one of five tournaments sponsored by Ivy League schools including Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia. Beals C. Wright had won the Harvard Interscholastic Championship, a well-fielded tournament of 33 tennis players from Harvard's preparatory schools. His younger brother, Irving C. Wright, made the semifinals at the Harvard tournament. In Newport, Beals Wright played Wylie C. Grant, who represented the prep schools of Columbia University, for the championship. He prevailed handily in straight sets, 6-0, 6-2, 6-1.
[444] Jones, "Demise and Revival of Tennis," 11; Davis, "Establishment of an International Trophy," 69.
[445] Davis, "Establishment of an International Trophy," 69.
[446] United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 408-409; 421. The USNLTA began ranking players in 1885. Between 1899 and 1910, Beals Wright was absent from the first ten only in 1909. His brother Irving C. Wright shared honors with Beals as a first ten player in 1905 and 1906.
[447] Wright, "The Chop Stroke," 95.

backed his resourceful drop shot with an excellent net game, making his innovative play a threat in doubles as much as in singles.[448] The well-regarded English tennis commentator Arthur Wallis Myers called the American "a prince among low volleyers," a testament to Wright's mastery at the net.[449]

One of the very keys to Wright's broad success in the dawning years of the twentieth century was his ability to play offensively and aggressively in comparison to many of his opponents. He demonstrated this quality less than three months before the Olympic games in the finals of the Massachusetts State Championship, where *Spalding's* reported he "evinced a confidence and displayed a proficiency that was well worth witnessing."[450] For the duration of Wright's straight-sets win "he made very few mistakes and his playing was characterized by good placing and excellent volleying."[451] By contrast, his opponent and eventual Olympic doubles partner Edgar W. Leonard was said to have been held back by his own "lack of aggressiveness" and unwillingness to play at the net.[452]

Beals C. Wright's performance in the Massachusetts State Championship of 1904 is but one example of the rare form he kept during the season leading up to the St. Louis games, where is steady play would yield him two Olympic titles, and in 1905, the United States Championship and the year-end American No. 1 ranking.[453] He had amassed a solid, though not necessarily spectacular singles season in 1903, reaching the finals at the

---

[448] Jones, "Demise and Revival of Tennis," 11; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 71.
[449] Merrihew, *Quest for the Davis Cup*, 49. Merrihew, a tennis commentator in the first four decades of the twentieth century and one of the sport's first historical chroniclers, quotes his colleague Myers of the *Daily Telegraph* in his 1928 monograph on the formation and history of the Davis Cup.
[450] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 71.
[451] Ibid.
[452] Ibid., 72.
[453] H. P. Burchell, ed., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1906* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1906), 7-15; United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 222; 409.

Crescent Athletic Club and at the Germantown Cricket Club, losing to Holcombe Ward and William A. Larned, respectively.[454] In doubles he was more successful, winning the Seabright Invitation Tournament with Larned and at the Open Tournament at the Hotel Wentworth with his brother Irving C. Wright.[455] Despite losing in the second round of national championship singles to William J. Clothier,[456] Beals Wright's performance in 1903 was enough to earn him fourth in the USNLTA first ten.[457]

The following February, Wright began his 1904 campaign on a strong note at the national indoor championships at Manhattan's Seventh Regiment Armory.[458] While he was not a factor in the singles, he and partner Raymond D. Little reached the doubles championship, losing only to indoor and serve-and-volley expert Wylie C. Grant and Columbia collegian Robert LeRoy in five closely matched sets.[459] This marked the beginning of a terrific doubles season for Wright, which saw him win several titles alongside the number one ranked American in 1904, Holcombe Ward. In June, the pair won the round-robin tournament in Brooklyn's Bay Ridge at the Crescent Athletic Club with a perfect record of 5-0-0.[460] The week of July 25, they claimed the prestigious Eastern Doubles Championship at the Longwood Cricket Club of Boston with a five-set

---

[454] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 90.
[455] Ibid., 92; 96.
[456] Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 15. Clothier was a rather unfortunate early draw for Wright in the 1903 U.S. nationals. Perennially one of the top American gentlemen and an important figure in the development of American Lawn Tennis, he finished the year ranked 3rd by the USNLTA. In Newport, Clothier defeated Wright 4-6, 6-4, 6-4, 6-1.
[457] United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 409; Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 24.
[458] Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 121; "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17.
[459] Wylie C. Grant, "Early Indoor Play: The Game on Boards Necessitates Radical Changes in Methods of Play," in *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 102-106 (New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1904), 104; Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 122; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 5. Two-time defending champions Grant and LeRoy defeated Little and Wright by the score of 9-7, 3-6, 8-6, 4-6, 6-3. Both pair had won their respective semifinal matches in two straight sets.
[460] "Tennis at Bay Ridge: Stubbornly Contested Matches in High-Class Round Robin Tournament," *New York Times*, 22 June 1904, 7; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 89-91.

victory over the Wrenn brothers.[461] The Longwood victory entitled Wright and Ward to meet the Western Doubles champions, Kreigh Collins and Raymond Little, in the doubles national championship match at Newport.[462]

On August 16, just thirteen days before the opening of the Olympic tournament, Beals Wright would win the United States doubles title with Holcombe Ward, defeating Collins and Little 1-6, 6-2, 3-6, 6-4, 6-1.[463] Though Ward, the eventual 1904 national champion in singles, would not join his partner in Missouri, Wright would leave Newport in the best possible form for an Olympic doubles championship.[464] With the absence of Ward at St. Louis, Wright's singles record would likewise appear medal-worthy. In Rhode Island he had advanced to the quarterfinal round in singles, losing only to perennial favorite Larned,[465] and the *St. Louis Republic* pegged "the crack New Yorker" the co-favorite for the Olympic tournament with Pacific Coast champion Alphonzo Bell.[466]

Alphonzo E. Bell, a Los Angeles patrician and future oil millionaire, established himself as one of the western United States' standout players during the 1903 and 1904 tennis seasons. Winner of the 1903 Southern California Championship singles,[467] Bell was handicapped at scratch by the USNLTA in February 1904, indicating that the governing body considered him among the top fourteen gentlemen at the start of the

---

[461] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 32-34.
[462] Ibid., 43. Collins and Little won the Western Doubles Championship at the Kenwood Country Club, Chicago, over the pairing of Waidner and Hunt, 6-4, 6-4, 6-2.
[463] Ibid., 5; 13.
[464] International Tennis Hall of Fame. "Holcombe Ward." Accessed 30 August 2019. https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/holcombe-ward; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 5; 9-11.
[465] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 15.
[466] "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors." *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.
[467] Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 66.

season.[468] The week of July 19 he reached the challenge round at the New York State Championship at Syracuse, defeating LeRoy of Columbia in the all-comers semifinals.[469] A month later, LeRoy would serve as his doubles partner in St. Louis. In the Syracuse doubles, Bell and fellow Californian R. G. Hunt defeated LeRoy and Roy Jones in the title match in four sets.[470] *Spalding's Tennis Annual* considered the contest between LeRoy and Bell "the feature match of the meeting."[471] Both Bell and LeRoy were known for the quick tempo of play, a commonality which suited them well as doubles partners for the Olympic games.[472] Like Wright, Bell also reached the quarterfinals at Newport in 1904, winning four matches and losing only to Clothier.[473] His efforts earned him a ninth place nod in the year-end USNLTA rankings, making him the second-to-highest ranked participant in the Olympic tournament and an imminent threat.[474]

Between Wright and Bell, the St. Louis tournament was well equipped with top-ranked American players who were in excellent form leading up to the Olympic games. Two of the top American collegiate players of the period, Robert LeRoy and Edgar Welch Leonard, joined them in Missouri. LeRoy, still a young contender from Columbia University, would become the intercollegiate champion in October 1904, winning the tournament at the Merion Cricket Club in Haverford, Pennsylvania.[475] His successful runs at several other tournaments, including winning the all-comers singles and doubles

---

[468] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 21; "Increasing Interest in Tennis." *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17. Handicapping took place at the annual USNLTA meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on or around February 6, 1904.
[469] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 74-76. The New York State Championship took place at Syracuse's Sedgwick Farm and Tennis Club. Bell defeated LeRoy 5-7, 6-4, 6-2 in singles. In doubles championship the team of Bell and Hunt defeated LeRoy and Jones 7-5, 6-0, 4-6, 6-2.
[470] Ibid.
[471] Ibid., 74.
[472] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 74.
[473] Ibid., 15.
[474] Ibid., 23.
[475] Ibid., 129-131.

titles in the Metropolitan Championship Singles and fine play at the Hartford, Southampton, and Syracuse tournaments, would earn him the twelfth spot in the USNLTA year-end rankings.[476] Leonard, a recent Harvard graduate, likewise came into 1904 in great form, having been ranked eighth in the official first ten for 1903.[477] Highlighting Leonard's 1903 season was a spot in both the singles and doubles finals of the Canadian Championships, then held at the posh Queen's Royal Hotel in Niagara-on-the-Lake.[478] Although his national ranking would fall to tenth for 1904,[479] he would enter the Olympic games on a confident note, having just reached the semifinals of the national championships. [480] Leonard saw defeat only to eventual champion Holcombe Ward.[481] Wright, Leonard, Bell, and Ward formed a reputable American phalanx at the St. Louis games. Each gentleman ranked upon the best of his peers, their experience on the amateur circuit on display in the manner in which the quartet "dominated" the tournament.[482] The field of twenty-seven singles participants and fifteen doubles pairs contested the Olympic event over six days. [483] Joining the accomplished field were a number of regionally known tennis players from the middle United States. Among them, two Texans from San Antonio, Charles C. Crissern and Semp Russ, along with Chicagoan J. C. Neely and Des

---

[476] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 21, 47-50; 74-76; 86-87; 112-113; United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 409. While not in the first ten, LeRoy was ranked twelfth by the ranking committee, which handicapped him at scratch.
[477] United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 408; Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 24.
[478] Allen, *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 123. In both the singles and doubles, Leonard fell victim to Beals C. Wright who teamed in doubles with his brother Irving C. Wright.
[479] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 21; United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 409.
[480] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 5. While technically this match was the semifinals of the all-comers round, there was no challenge round in Newport because Laurence Doherty neglected to return to the United States to defend his title.
[481] Ibid.
[482] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 159.
[483] Ibid., 160-161.

Moines, Iowa resident W. E. Blatherwick.[484] The *St. Louis Republic* published the full list of entrants, which also included representatives from Kansas, Indiana, Illinois, and New York, affirming its prestige throughout the United States. [485] While some of the lower ranked competitors found success in the non-Olympic events, with Russ of San Antonio and Ralph Cresson of St. Louis winning the world's fair doubles and T. F. Stern winning the interscholastic meet, in both Olympic singles and doubles the foursome of Wright, Leonard, Bell, and LeRoy were the surviving competitors and medalists.[486]

Wright was the tournament standout and demonstrated his status as a highly ranked American champion through maintaining a high level of play. "Wright showed himself to be worthy of the reputation with which he is accredited," reported the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*. "His play was steadily brilliant and he drew the applause of the highly interested spectators…."[487] After seeing off Bell in straight sets, Wright focused his energy on LeRoy, who had come through to the final after a two-set victory over Leonard.[488] Beals C. Wright's 6-4, 6-4 win in the Olympic championship match was a triumph of experience over youth and proved a harbinger of his 1905 victory in the national championships and his later distinction of becoming the first American man to reach the all-comers final at the 1910 Wimbledon Championships.[489] Together, the more

---

[484] "Olympic Lawn Tennis Tournament," *New York Times*, 1 September 1904, 5.
[485] "Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors," *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.
[486] "Winners of Olympic Tennis Tourney," *New York Times*, 5 September 1904, 6; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 186. To win the world's fair doubles, Russ and Cresson defeated the St. Louis team of Dwight Davis and Ralph McKittrick in five split sets, 6-4, 4-6, 6-2, 4-6, 6-0.
[487] *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, 4 September 1904; Cf. Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 159; 220.
[488] Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 184. The Californian Bell could do nothing to upend the Eastern champion Wright in the semifinals, losing 6-3, 6-4. LeRoy defeated Leonard by a similar scoreline of 6-3, 6-3.
[489] "Lawn Tennis Tournament at St. Louis Ends," *The Cairo Bulletin*, Cairo, Ill., 4 September 1904, 1; Matthews, *America's First Olympics,* 159; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 182; 184; Merrihew, *Quest for the Davis Cup*, 43; United States Lawn Tennis Association, *Encyclopedia of Tennis*, 371; International

experienced duo of Wright and Leonard wrapped up the doubles title with a straight sets win over LeRoy and Bell, 6-4, 6-4, 6-2.[490] In Wright's wake, Dwight Davis, the tennis visionary who had worked in vain to attract an international field to the tournament, managed only ninth in the Olympic singles competition.[491]

Aside from a tournament which appeared by all accounts to be a successful, if domestic, display of lawn tennis, the sweeping, theatrical display which was the 1904 St. Louis world's fair additionally positioned the sport for a unique opportunity for broad exposure and marketability to the growing recreational culture of the twentieth century world. In another notable parallel to the 1900 Olympics and universal exposition, the 1904 St. Louis gathering saw the continued—and expanded—influence of American sporting giant Albert G. Spalding and his eponymous sporting goods corporation. While Spalding had made his presence known in Paris as Director of Athletics, inserting himself as chief liaison between the United States' athletes and the games' organizers, back home on American soil he became the American Olympic Committee's revered benefactor.[492] Through his vast resources and influence on the national sporting scene, A. G. Spalding made several critical contributions to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and the St. Louis Olympics. Most ostensibly, he donated the Spalding Cup, a substantial team trophy to be

---

Tennis Hall of Fame, "Beals Wright," accessed 30 August 2019, https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/beals-wright.

[490] "Winners of Olympic Tennis Tourney," *New York Times*, 5 September 1904, 6; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 183.

[491] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 159; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181-184. Davis' ninth place finish and victories in the World's Fair doubles and Louisiana Purchase singles seem all the more impressive considering the level of involvement Davis had in the sport and the exposition at the organizational level. On top of his other duties as donor-founder of the International Challenge Cup and international ambassador and committee member for the USNLTA, Dwight Davis found himself as tournament director for the Olympic tennis tournament.

[492] "Spalding Honored: The Noted Magnate in a Congenial Role," *Sporting Life* 35, no. 6 (28 April 1900), 7.

awarded to the winning club or country in the Olympic track and field meet.[493] During many of the early modern Olympic games, including those in Paris and in St. Louis, the addendum of trophies and prizes for certain events became a common practice, particularly in athletics.[494] Spalding's introduction of a grand prize elevated the stakes in track and field to a competition between the great athletic clubs of the eastern and western United States, further making these events the dominate, although not exclusive, focal point of public attention during the St. Louis games.[495]

The allure of the Spalding Cup undoubtedly played a substantial role at the 1904 Olympics. The quest to obtain the trophy became a major talking point in American newspapers the rivalries renewed during the track and field meet occupy a significant portion of both of the reports published on the games.[496] But while the cup made the headlines, A. G. Spalding's influence in St. Louis was much more far reaching. In addition lending major sponsorship to Olympic athletics, Spalding's company was chosen to furnish and exhibit numerous pieces of sporting equipment for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. In company's own Olympic report for the games, written by rising American Olympic Committee giant James E. Sullivan and presented in *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1905*, an entire pictographic section is dedicated to

---

[493] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 91; Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904*, 105; Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904," 163.

[494] Cf. Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904," 163; The report on the 1904 Olympics written by James E. Sullivan and published in *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1905* includes a detailed list of the "handsome special Olympic souvenir cups" available for victors in nearly every track and field events along with the members of the American sporting class who donated them.

[495] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 91. During the first three Olympic games, there was no unified American Olympic team. In track and field, American athletes competed either independently or represented an athletic club or university. The Spalding Cup was ultimately won by the New York Athletic Club, the eastern powerhouse, over protests from Chicago Athletic Association, the dominate club in the American Midwest.

[496] Cf. Charles J. P. Lucas, *The Olympic Games, 1904.* The track and field rivalry between the New York Athletic Club and the Chicago Athletic Association occupies a major portion of the report of Charles Lucas, a testament to the primacy of the quest for the Spalding Cup during the 1904 Olympics.

Spalding and Brothers' expansive equipment exhibition, which included seemingly every imaginable gymnasium fixture from parallel bars to starter's pistols.[497]

The Spalding Company was duly rewarded by the world's fair committee for its contributions. An advertisement for sporting accoutrements accompanying Sullivan's report happily self-aggrandizes: "A.G. Spalding and Bros., who outfitted the complete gymnasium at the World's Fair and received the Grand Prize and Gold Medal in competition for their exhibit are, to be congratulated on their enterprise."[498] Amidst the ballyhoo surrounding America's games and the values of sporting republic promoted by idealists,[499] the St. Louis fair was in reality as much a lucrative business opportunity for the premier purveyor of American sporting equipment as would present itself in the early twentieth century. Spalding, both the man and the company, took full advantage of the games being held in the United States by increasing their presence from the Paris Olympics and world's fair. Just as in 1900, the presentation of the latest tennis equipment would form an important part of Spalding's business plan.

As a founding member of the American Olympic Committee from 1893 deeply entrenched in the national sporting landscape,[500] Albert Goodwill Spalding wove his brand name into the very fabric of the St. Louis Olympics. He naturally targeted his sponsorship of equipment to disciplines where the Spalding and Bros. name was most recognizable and his company would most stand to profit after the games. The complete supply of athletics implements which accompanied his presentation of the Spalding Cup, for example, enhanced the company's close association with American track and field, as

---

[497] Sullivan, "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904," 284-308.
[498] Ibid., 284.
[499] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 98.
[500] Ibid., 60. Other members of the founding AOC "class" of 1893 included Walter Spalding, Gustavus T. Kirby, James E. Sullivan, Caspar Whitney, and Julian W. Curtiss.

did relevant volumes from *Spalding's Athletic Library*, a series of instructional handbooks covering the breadth of the early twentieth century sports and pastimes.[501] The display of gymnastic equipment for which Spalding and Bros. was so ostentatiously presented with an "award" became an instant selling point for the company. Claiming the endorsement of German Turners, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Amateur Athletic Union, the prizewinning equipment was advertised inside various volumes of the *Spalding Athletic Library* as "the best ever used in connection with a championship meeting."[502] Even in the seemingly unconnected *Spalding's Tennis Annual 1905*, a header at the top of each of over thirty consecutive pages heralds the company's triumph in the supply of Olympic athletic equipment.[503]

Although it was not advertised as broadly or enthusiastically as the large and expensive gymnastic facilities erected nearby, A. G. Spalding and Bros.' presence was felt with equal resound on the tennis courts. Just as in gymnastics and track and field, the Spalding company had much to gain from the sale of tennis equipment and publications. In the early 1900s, tennis handbooks were an important part of *Spalding's Athletic Library*. Handbook No. 157 instructed would-be enthusiasts *How to Play Lawn Tennis* with the "styles and skills of the experts," while manual No. 188 contained the rules of tether tennis, a popular training game.[504] Also on offer was handbook No. 221,

---

[501] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 193.
[502] George T. Hepbrun, ed., *Spalding's Athletic Library Official Basket-Ball Guide for 1905-6* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1905), 1.
[503] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1905), 208-240. The page header reads, "A Special Award and a Grand Prize were won by A. G. Spalding & Bros. at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, 1904, for the best, most complete, and most attractive installation of Gymnastic Apparatus, Base Ball, and Athletic Supplies shown at the World's Fair."
[504] Sullivan, James E., ed., *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1906, Containing Complete List of American Best on Records; Official Report of Athletics at Lewis and Clark Exposition* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1905), 245; 248; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding Lawn Tennis Annual*

Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual, which contained an annual recap of major tennis tournaments including the Olympics and national championships, along with a listing of the first ten amateur players in the United States.[505] All were available to the tennis aficionado at the nominal price of ten cents apiece.[506]

In their handbooks and journals, Albert G. Spalding's firm prominently advertised the wide array of tennis implements available for purchase. Various incarnations of that most important piece of tennis equipment, the racquet, were listed at prices ranging from seventy-five cents for a children's practice model to a princely eight dollars for the Spalding Gold Medal, the company's most handsome racquet designed for elite amateur competitors.[507] Racquet owners were encouraged to protect their investments with leather cases and trapezoid frames, which prevented the natural frames from warp and wear.[508] For setting up one's own court at home or at a club the handbooks advertised tennis nets, poles, straps, balls, line markers, and portable backstops, suggesting Spalding and Bros. as the one-stop venue for every tennis need.[509] Of course, all was advertised to be of the "absolutely best quality" and "more suited to the expert player" than the average piece of tennis ephemera.[510]

The St. Louis Olympics proved the perfect event for Spalding to cement their status as the premier purveyor of American sporting goods, and A. G. Spalding spared no

---

1905, 251; 254. Other Spalding manuals included rules and regulations for games related to tennis, including court tennis, hand tennis, and badminton.

[505] Sullivan, *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1906*, 253; cf. J. P. Allen, ed., *Spalding Lawn Tennis Annual 1904* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1904)*;* cf. A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*.

[506] Sullivan, *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1906*, 245-253.

[507] Allen, *Spalding Lawn Tennis Annual 1904*, 167-168. When accounting for inflation, the Spalding Gold Medal was sold at today's equivalent of well over $200, making it a comparable investment to most modern professional racquets of the highest quality.

[508] Ibid., 168-169.

[509] Ibid., 169-179.

[510] Ibid., 166-167.

measure in confirming that this included tennis. Just as Spalding had ensured that his equipment was used exclusively in the gymnasium and on the athletics track,[511] he also made sure that Spalding and Bros. became the official supplier of tennis implements for the Olympic tournament.[512] In a full-page advertisement placed in the following year's edition of *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual*, the company proudly advertised their prominent role in the St. Louis event, particularly in furnishing the Spalding Championship Tennis Ball for use in all matches.[513] This might have constituted the first corporate sponsorship of an Olympic tennis tournament, and certainly was the first by an American company.

Following the conclusion of the 1904 Olympic games and the close of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, both would be the target for criticism from Coubertin and from later historians who have rightfully pointed out their shortcomings. The dearth of true international representation—and the way in which some foreign athletes were integrated into the Olympic and world's fair activities—warrants genuine criticism.[514] Given the precedent set by the organizers of the Paris games, the reluctance of the Department of Physical Culture to include more events for women in St. Louis amounts to a missed opportunity. This is especially true of tennis, where a vibrant and supportive tennis-playing public would likely have assured the ladies' draw filled with local contenders along, perhaps, with the entry of one or more the national contenders.

---

[511] A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 244-245.
[512] Ibid., 188.
[513] Ibid.
[514] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 81-85; David Lunt and Mark Dyreson. "The 1904 Olympic Games: Triumph or Nadir?," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Olympic Studies*, edited by Helen Jefferson Lenskyj and Stephen Wagg, 43-59 (London: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2012). It must be mentioned that the racist and unfortunate "Anthropology Days" which marred the 1904 Olympic games still remain as a black mark of the games' poor treatment of some international visitors and Native Americans. The "Anthropology Days," which were unrelated to the Olympic tennis events, have been analyzed in great detail in other histories of the 1904 games.

Nevertheless, the overall organizational misgivings of the St. Louis Olympics should not reflect unduly upon the tennis tournament and upon the American tennis community which largely gave it their full and enthusiastic support. The USNLTA took great effort to schedule the tournament at a time most likely to attract top-ranked participants both home and abroad. The efforts of its genial ambassador, Dwight Davis, to travel to recruit among his colleagues in Europe should be remembered as a gracious gesture worthy of a man who inspired international competition through his donation of the International Challenge Cup and who would later represent his country in a career of public service.[515] The gentlemen who ultimately took part in the tournament included some of the most accomplished Americans in the early twentieth century, along with collegiate and local standouts. Finally, the decision by the organizers to hold the lawn tennis event adjacent to the Olympic stadium and the sporting equipment displays denotes a timely understanding of the marketability of a popular and growing recreational pursuit.[516] Expanding his presence from Paris' 1900 world's fair and Olympic games, Albert G. Spalding and his company capitalized on the ability to sponsor, display, and advertise tennis equipment in connection with the games and the exposition, cultivating one of the earliest corporate sponsorship arrangements at a modern Olympics. Hardly a failure, the 1904 Olympic tournament showcased the appealing and marketable sport of lawn tennis in a manner which demonstrated its reliability in the midst of change and unpredictability in the early modern Olympic program.

---

[515] Matthews, *America's First Olympics*, 159. Dwight Filley Davis would later serve as the United States' Assistant Secretary of War and Secretary of War during the Presidency of Calvin Coolidge and later as Governor-General of the Philippines under President Herbert Hoover. He also distinguished himself as a co-founder of the American Legion following the First World War.

[516] For a brief account of the history of sponsorship and patronage in relation to tennis since the middle ages, see "From Folk Game to Elite Past Time: Tennis and Its Patrons" by the author and Mark Dyreson in the *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*.

Chapter Five

A Symphony of Forgotten Planets:

The Successful Orchestration of Tennis, the Olympics, and the World's Fair

The conclusion of the 1904 Olympic games in St. Louis bookended another era within the larger history of both tennis and the Olympic games. After 1904, the universal expositions and the Olympic movement, while both remaining mega-events, would soon become wholly separate affairs. Although the 1908 Olympics would be held alongside the Franco-British Exhibition, beginning with the oft-forgotten Athens Intercalated Games of 1906 the Olympics moved away from convenient coexistence with international expositions to a mature standing as its own independent entity.[517] By 1912, when the games were held in Stockholm, Sweden unaccompanied by a world's fair, this separation would be complete.[518] After six games and the better part of two decades of growth, wrote Olympic historian John Apostal Lucas, "the Olympic Games were becoming famous and were easily the most important sporting event in the world."[519] The Olympic no longer needed a world's fair to ensure that the games were a global gala. Lawn tennis would continue to be a part of the Olympic program through 1924, when a controversy between the IOC and the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF) resulted in the sport's disappearance from the official schedule for six decades.[520]

---

[517] Graeme Kent, *Olympic Follies: The Madness and Mayhem of the 1908 London Games* (London: JR Books, 2008), 28-33. The Franco-British Exhibition was a lesser known though still sizable fair held in London's Shepherd's Bush neighborhood to celebrate the signing of the *Entente Cordial* between France and the United Kingdom in 1904.

[518] Sandra Collins, *The 1940 Tokyo Games: Japan, the Asian Olympics and the Olympic Movement* (London: Taylor and Francis, 2014). For the 1940 Olympics scheduled for Tokyo, Japanese organizers made an effort to reconnect the Olympics and the world's fair movement. However, the Second World War intervened and cancelled both the Tokyo Olympics and the Tokyo world's fair.

[519] John Apostal Lucas, "The Dream Persists: The Olympic Games Come Back to Los Angeles," *Olympic Review* 194 (December 1983), 834.

[520] Cheree Intorre Jones, "The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games—1924 and 1984," (Master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1985), 30-38, 71-72; Matthew P. Llewellyn and Robert J. Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics: An Historical Examination of Their On-Off Relationship Since 1896," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 363-369; Elizabeth Wilson, *Love Game: A History of Tennis, From Victorian Pastime to Global Phenomenon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), 49; Robert J. Lake, *A Social History of Tennis in Britain* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014), 95; 98-100; Erik Engquist, "Baseline: Global Warming," *Tennis* 36, no. 5 (September 2000), 12; 14.

After elite lawn tennis, the Olympic games, and the world's fair movement evolved into distinct entities with separate, if equally transnational, objectives, much of the detail of their early coincidence seems to have been forgotten in the wake. Certainly in the matter of the world's fair Olympics of 1900 and 1904, the historical debate over the quality of these games is open and subject to revision. Nevertheless, it does not appear that poor quality tennis events should be blamed for the ongoing criticism surrounding the Paris and St. Louis games. The Paris event featured an assemblage of some of the greatest competitors in the world of tennis at the turn of the century, including the famed Doherty brothers.[521] It also merited distinction through presenting the first "official" Olympic title to a woman, Charlotte Cooper of Great Britain, when the IOC had yet to sanction women's inclusion in the games.[522] The St. Louis tournament, though without a women's event and unable to furnish an internationally representative draw,[523] still brought together an accomplished field of American men at a time and place conveniently scheduled for competitors and fairgoers.[524] Additionally, both the Paris and St. Louis Olympic tennis events occurred in tandem with the exhibition portions of the world's fairs, where Albert G. Spalding and his company, A. G. Spalding and Bros.,

---

[521] Bill Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*. Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 2 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998), 207-208; Alexander M. Weyand, *The Olympic Pageant* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), 39; Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*, 2nd edition (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 24; "Lawn Tennis Tournament. Arrangements for the International Competition in Connection with the Exhibition," *The New York Herald, Paris*, 5 July 1900, 3.

[522] Guttmann, *The Olympics*, 24; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympics*, 10; 207; Kent, *Olympic Follies*, 144.

[523] Dick Schaap, *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*, 3rd edition (New York: Knopf, 1975), 77; Bill Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 3 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999), 181.

[524] Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181-183; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905* (New York: American Sports Publishing Co., 1905), 28-31. Like the Athens 1896 event, the tournament took place the same week as the track and field events. Unlike the Athens and Paris meets, however, the courts were located next to stadium, allowing additional entertainment for visitors headed to the Olympic stadium. At all three Olympics, tennis was scheduled with consideration given to other events, particularly track and field.

promoted the game and catalogs full of the latest tennis equipment to the globe's consumers.[525]

Together with the Athens tournament of 1896, the first three modern Olympics advertised tennis to the world as a cultured, sophisticated game worthy of the urbane audiences of Coubertin's Olympic invention. At Athens, tennis patrons stood alongside members of the Greek royal family, under whose organizational auspices the first games were made possible.[526] In Paris, the European edition of the *New York Herald* name-dropped the fashionable crowd of elites who postponed their annual flight from Paris summer heat to cheer on French and foreign hopefuls.[527] At St. Louis, influential members of the lawn tennis and broader American sporting communities such as Dwight Davis brought about a tournament that was at least laudable in its efforts if not able to achieve the international standards set by the Parisians.[528] While success in some instances may be considered marginal in comparison with the tremendous scale and scope twenty-first century tournaments, the forgotten efforts of the organizers and

---

[525] The many products offered by A. G. Spalding and Bros. appear in the company's catalogs following the Paris and St. Louis games. Whenever the company received recognition from a world's fair committee for their sporting equipment, the award was duly noted in the pages of *Spalding's Athletic Almanac* and *Spalding's Tennis Annual*. The former publication notably included one of the two reports on the 1904 games, written by amateur sports leader James E. Sullivan.

[526] Richard D. Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 104; Michael Llewellyn Smith, *Olympic Games in Athens 1896: The Invention of the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Profile Books, 2004), 172; 116; Kristine Toohey and A. J. Veal, *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective* (Oxfordshire, UK: Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International, 2007), 37; John Apostal Lucas, *The Modern Olympic Games* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1980), 46; Ath. Tarassouleas, *Olympic Games in Athens, 1896-1906* (self-published: Vironas-Attica, Greece, 1988), 17; 51. As discussed in the second chapter, the Greek royal family was heavily involved in all organizational aspects of the 1896 Olympics, and attended the tennis event firsthand.

[527] "Puteaux's Lawn Tennis. Interesting Matches Played in Ideal Weather Before a Large Attendance," *New York Herald, Paris*, 9 July 1900, 3a; "Won by Mr. H. L. Doherty. Championship Singles at the Ile de Puteaux Lost by Mr. H. S. Mahony," *New York Herald, Paris*, 13 July 1900, 2f.

[528] "Increasing Interest in Tennis," *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17; "Winners of Olympic Tennis Tourney," *New York Times*, 5 September 1904, 6; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 28-31; Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181-186. Davis served as tournament director and led USNLTA efforts to recruit international players to the Olympic tournament. Though his travels abroad were in vain, he nonetheless competed in the Olympic tournament, finishing ninth, and winning one of the subsidiary events.

participants in the first three Olympic tennis events seems reason enough to warrant revisiting their assessment by historians Matthew P. Llewellyn and Robert J. Lake.[529]

Llewellyn and Lake take a long view of Olympic tennis, tempering their enthusiasm for the earliest Olympic tournaments while showing optimism in the return of tennis to the games since the 1980s after a decades-long hiatus.[530] With contemporary Olympic tennis tournaments filled with 64-player singles draws jam-packed with top professionals, owing in no small part to tennis becoming a trial sport for the IOC's decision to allow professionals at the games, it is easy to see how the game has evolved into a thoroughly marketable modern phenomenon.[531] Yet the growth of tennis and the Olympic games into vast, glitzy multinational enterprises does not mean that, in their own time, the early Olympic games were unsuccessful. Indeed, in the midst of the challenges of the bourgeoning Olympic movement, lawn tennis should be understood as part their success.

While they were in fact, as Llewellyn and Lake argue, "inferior to more established competitions, like the Wimbledon Championships," few events (excepting the U. S. Nationals) could muster a large men's singles field.[532] Wimbledon's 1896 draw of 32 in the gentlemen's singles was the highest it had been in fifteen years.[533] Wimbledon and Newport hosted the two largest, most prestigious, and most important tournaments at the turn of the twentieth century, and as such the Athens Lawn Tennis Club's field of

---

[529] Matthew P. Llewellyn and Robert J. Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics: An Historical Examination of Their On-Off Relationship Since 1896," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 362-371.
[530] Ibid., 366-369.
[531] Ibid., 368-369.
[532] Ibid., 362.
[533] Alan Little and Robert McNichol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 28th ed. (London: All England Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club, 2018), 185. As chronicled by Little and McNichol, 1896 would mark the beginning of steady growth for the Wimbledon tournament, and the draw would continue to grow throughout the period, reaching 63 in 1904.

thirteen does not seem nearly so jarring when the location, era, and available modes of transportation are considered.[534] Since few tournaments were truly international in nature, the fact that six countries (seven if Ireland was, as it wished, to be counted separately) were represented in 1896 should be regarded as an achievement in and of itself.[535] Though it appears true by Olympic champion John Pius Boland's own account that his decision to enter the tennis tournament was a relatively spontaneous one, born out of a leisure trip to Greece surrounding the Olympic games,[536] the Olympic tennis historian Heiner Gillmeister has argued that the participation of Boland, Friedrich "Fritz" Traun, and others was far more premeditated than some historians of the first games have suggested.[537]

According to Gillmeister, Boland attended Oxford with Konstantinos Manos, one of the Greek organizers who served on the subcommittee in charge of the lawn tennis tournament. Much like Dwight Davis ahead of the 1904 tournament, Manos sought to recruit Olympians abroad and apparently succeeded in convincing Boland to make the journey to the Attic peninsula.[538] Traun was a regionally successful German player who had acquitted himself well at tournaments in Bad Homburg and in Prague in 1896.[539] "In

---

[534] Bill Mallon and Ture Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 1 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 1998), 107-109; Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 362. By contrast, the four modern Grand Slam tournaments (Australian Open, Roland Garros, Wimbledon, U. S. Open) feature draws of 128 in men's and women's singles and 64 in doubles (48 in mixed doubles. On the men's professional ATP Tour, the smallest tournaments during the regular season have singles draws of at least 28.

[535] Heiner Gillmeister, *Tennis: A Cultural History* (London: Leicester University Press, 1997), 228-231; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 107-109. Great Britain and Ireland was considered a unified team at the early modern Olympics. The 1896 tournament also included representatives from Greece, Hungary, Germany, Australia, and France.

[536] John Pius Boland, *Collected Diaries of John Pius Boland*, Unpublished, British Olympic Foundation Archives; Smith, *Olympics in Athens 1896*, 3; Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 363.

[537] Heiner Gillmeister, "Olympic Tennis: Some Afterthoughts," *Citius, Altius, Fortius* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1995), 23-25.

[538] Ibid., 23.

[539] Gillmeister, *Tennis: A Cultural History*, 231; Gillmeister, "Olympic Tennis: Some Afterthoughts," 23.

addition," writes Gillmeister, "Traun had, well before the Games, stated his intention to enter the lawn tennis event, a very little known fact."[540] While this does not negate the claims of Llewellyn and Lake that the first Olympic tennis tournament attracted late and mostly local entries,[541] it does assuage the common misconception that few organizational efforts were undertaken toward making the first Olympic tennis tournament a quality event. If indeed "Olympic lawn tennis suffered a rather inauspicious start,"[542] it was no less inauspicious than the first modern games overall, which for all their success within Greece were little advertised abroad.[543]

In addressing the world's fair Olympics of 1900 and 1904, Llewellyn and Lake adjudicate both tennis tournaments with equal rapidity: "A lack of advertising, inadequate facilities, poor officiating and, in the case of Paris 1900, the scheduling of the Olympic tennis event to commence just three days after the conclusion of Wimbledon, ensured that many of the leading male and female tennis stars stayed away."[544] The authors' summary of these two Olympic events offers much to unpack, but at the same time appears a rather cursory judgment upon these early tournaments. In terms of advertising, the tennis events of 1900 and 1904 received enough public attention to gather a crowd and receive reporting in local, national, and international news sources. One must think immediately of the international edition of the *New York Herald*, whose July 9, 1900 column on the lawn tennis event at the Ile de Puteaux Club lists by name more than three dozen ladies of *le Tout-Paris* (that is, fashionable French society) who were spotted at the previous day's

[540] Gillmeister, "Olympic Tennis: Some Afterthoughts," 23.
[541] Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 362-363.
[542] Ibid., 363.
[543] Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics*, 161-162; Mallon and Widlund, *The 1896 Olympic Games*, 14.
[544] Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 363.

matches.[545] "As for the men," penned the *Herald*, "their name was legion, and there was hardly a well-known sportsman, interested in the game, who was not there."[546] By the account of the *Herald*, the matches were of high quality, so much so that patrons hoped the club would continue host equally large and important tournaments in subsequent years.[547] The 1904 St. Louis event, though not receiving the level of daily coverage offered in 1900, still benefitted from its position near and during the track and field events and results were mentioned in national as well as local press. The *New York Times*, *Chicago Tribune*, and the Associated Press all carried news of the victories of Wright and Leonard to audiences around the United States.[548]

While poor Parisian facilities would later serve as a contributing factor in tennis' removal from the Olympic program after 1924,[549] the Puteaux Club was considered one of the best tennis facilities in all of France at the time of the 1900 games.[550] Despite not benefitting from being held under the auspices of a first-rate sporting club, the 1904 tournament did not appear to warrant complaints from players for its location near what is now Francis Field, unlike the comparatively raucous 1924 event next to the stadium at Colombes.[551] Low-quality officiating likewise does not appear to have been a factor, although it is worth noting that at the second Olympic games, many American athletes lodged complaints regarding the quality of the French officials in charge of the track and

---

[545] "Puteaux's Lawn Tennis. Interesting Matches Played in Ideal Weather Before a Large Attendance," *New York Herald, Paris*, 9 July 1900, 3.
[546] Ibid.
[547] "Won by Mr. H. L. Doherty. Championship Singles at the Ile de Puteaux Lost by Mr. H. S. Mahony," *New York Herald, Paris*, 13 July 1900, 2.
[548] "Olympic Lawn Tennis Tournament," *New York Times*, 1 September 1904, 5; "Tennis at the World's Fair," *Chicago Tribune*, 3 September 1904, 6; "Lawn Tennis Tournament at St. Louis Ends," *Cairo Bulletin*, Cairo, Ill., 4 September 1904, 1.
[549] Jones, "Demise and Revival," 102.
[550] Caspar Whitney, "Athletic Development in France," *Outing* 36, no. 2 (May 1900), 179-180; Richard Holt, *Sport and Society in Modern France* (London: Macmillan, 1981), 178.
[551] Mallon, *The 1904 Olympic Games*, 181; Jones, "Demise and Revival," 102.

field events. George W. Orton, the Canadian middle- and long-distance runner who represented the United States as a member of the University of Pennsylvania team, protested in *Outing* that the events did not start when scheduled, used different starting procedures, and were poorly attended.[552] The track events, however, took place the week following the tennis tournament and at the Racing Club in Colombes, several kilometers from the Puteaux Club.[553] When combined with the negative press the games received in the United States surrounding the Sabbatarian controversy,[554] it is not difficult to see where heavy criticism of French organizers and officials surrounding the marquee athletics contests could be mistakenly be applied to the tennis matches as well.

Other controversies surrounding the Paris games aside, there is much less cause to believe that the tennis matches of the Paris games were poorly scheduled in light of the Wimbledon Championships, that were held in London just days before the Puteaux event.[555] The turnaround for athletes competing both in Wimbledon and the Olympics certainly was tight, with the final matches at Wimbledon taking place on Wednesday, July 4 owing to the cancellation of play on Monday, July 2 because of rain.[556] Yet the athletes most affected by quick turn-around (play began at the Ile de Puteaux Club on

---

[552] George W. Orton, "The Paris Athletic Games," *Outing* 36, no. 6 (September 1900), 690.
[553] Lucien Daniau, "A Century in the Service of Sport," *Olympic Review*, no. 171 (January 1982), 34; Orton, "The Paris Athletic Games," 690; Mark Dyreson, *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 64.
[554] Dyreson, *Making the American Team*, 64-72. The Sabbatarian controversy, detailed in the third chapter, refers to the refusal of some (but not all) American athletes to participate in track and field competitions held on Sunday, July 15. A breakdown in communication between American and French officials resulted in some athletes sitting out of Sunday events while others, including George Orton, chose to compete and even won medals in their stead. This controversy ultimately became the leading story coming out of the games in the United States alongside the American team's domination of most of the athletics events.
[555] "Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 2 July 1900, 13; "Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 3 July 1900, 7; "Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 4 July 1900, 13; "Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 5 July 1900, 11; Cf. Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 363.
[556] Little and McNichol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 154; "Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 4 July 1900, 13.

Friday, July 6), the champion doubles pair Laurence and Reginald Doherty, arrived in Paris on time after winning their five-set Wimbledon challenge round match.[557] Also present was the ladies all-comers winner Charlotte Cooper, who had last played in the challenge round against Blanche Bingley Hillyard on Tuesday, July 3.[558] Cooper was joined in the Paris draw by American Marion Jones, who had just become the first woman from outside the United Kingdom to compete in the ladies' singles at Wimbledon.[559] Naturally, the entire Championships draw did not suddenly make its way across the English Channel to compete at the *Exposition Universelle*, but Llewellyn and Lake's statement "that many of the leading male and female tennis stars stayed away" misreads the actual roster that competed at the Paris Olympics.[560] In an era in which the Doherty brothers dominated men's tennis, both came to Paris along with the highly accomplished Charlotte Cooper.[561] If anything, the scheduling helped Marion Jones who was able to travel from the United States to compete in both tournaments, including singles and mixed doubles in Paris.[562] With this evidence fully measured, the story of tennis at the first three Olympics seems far less the catastrophe that previous scholars regarded it.

The legacy of lawn tennis in the modern Olympic games should be considered that of a model sport in Baron Pierre de Coubertin's new, international athletic experiment. While the reincarnation of the Olympic games also brought back familiar

---

[557] Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 207; "Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 5 July 1900, 11.
[558] "Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting," *The Times of London*, 4 July 1900, 13.
[559] Little and McNichol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 67.
[560] Llewellyn and Lake, "Tennis and the Olympics," 363.
[561] The Doherty brothers would in total win eight Wimbledon doubles titles together and share a total of nine singles titles. They also twice won the United States Championship doubles, and "Laurie" defeated "Reggie" for the 1903 American singles crown.
[562] Jones, "Demise and Revival," 10; Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games*, 207; Little and McNichol, *Wimbledon Compendium*, 67.

contests that echoed the athletic beauty of Greek antiquity, tennis offered a new recreation for a globalizing world at the turn of the twentieth century. Emerging out of the expansive leisure culture of Victorian England that nurtured many modern sports, lawn tennis quickly grew from its adoption as a popular pastime in the 1870s to a marketable game with transnational ambitions.[563] Its unique appeal as an adaptable ball sport posited tennis to be a perfect match for both the Olympic and world's fair movements. While its connections to the British amateur tradition and close association with upper-class society assured that the game would be socially acceptable to the individuals and organizations that patronized the early modern Olympics,[564] tennis capitalized on the world's fair as the perfect theatre in which to showcase its broad appeal and recreational marketability.[565]

In their 2009 contribution to the *Palgrave Handbook of Olympic Studies,* historians David Lunt and Mark Dyreson ruminate over the question of whether the world's fair detracted from—or supported the growth of—the modern Olympic movement.[566] Lunt and Dyreson are quick to note the changes in the structure of the

---

[563] Brad William Hummel and Mark Dyreson, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon: The History of Sponsorship in Tennis," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 19-22; Robert J. Lake, "Introduction to the History and Historiography of Tennis," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 1-3; George E. Alexander, *Lawn Tennis: Its Founders and Its Early Days* (Lynn, Mass.: H. O. Zimman, 1974), 3-38; Wilson, *Love Game*, 9-13; 28-45; Lake, *Social History*, 7-21.

[564] Hummel and Dyreson, "From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon," 20-22; Jones, "Demise and Revival," 8; Lake, "History and Historiography," 1-3; Lake, *Social History*, 9; 17; 21; Simon J. Eaves and Tom Higgins, "Lawn Tennis in Ireland: The Untold History, 1870-1914," in *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 119-129, Routledge International Handbooks (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019), 119-121.

[565] Jahial Parmly Paret, ed., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1903*, Spalding's Athletic Library (New York: American Sports Publishing, 1903), 247-264; Jahial Parmly Paret, ed., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1900*, Spalding's Athletic Library (New York: American Sports Publishing, 1900), 83-92; A. G. Spalding and Bros., *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905*, 188-240; 244-245.

[566] David Lunt and Mark Dyreson. "The 1904 Olympic Games: Triumph or Nadir?," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Olympic Studies*, edited by Helen Jefferson Lenskyj and Stephen Wagg (London: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2012), 43-59.

Olympic games precipitated by their association with the Paris and St. Louis world expositions, noting that "by 1904 Coubertin and the IOC had begun to grow concerned that the Olympics had become minor planets orbiting the brilliant suns of expositions."[567] But lest one conclude that the early Olympic tennis tournaments were meager efforts cobbled together by feeble-minded sporting officials, it behooves one to remember something about suns: they illuminate everything in their path. Elite lawn tennis, the modern Olympic games, and the world's fair movement were destined to be three planetary bodies on decidedly different trajectories for much of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, during their relatively harmonious alignment in the dawning years of the Olympic movement provided a desirable opportunity to showcase a popular and emergent game on the world's biggest stage. Some may question if the world's fairs illuminated the Olympic games; they certainly illuminated tennis, allowing it to grow from an Olympic newcomer into a regular part of the modern games for almost three decades. In the frenzy of the developmental years of the Olympic movement, the success of the first three tennis tournaments demonstrated the value of the new racquet sport to the contemporary sporting kaleidoscope on display at what was destined to become the world's premier athletic gathering.

[567] Lunt and Dyreson, "Triumph or Nadir?," 45.

Bibliography

Olympic Reports

Francis, David R. *The Universal Exposition of 1904*. 2 vols. St. Louis: The Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, 1913.

Lucas, Charles J. P. *The Olympic Games, 1904.* St. Louis: Woodward and Tiernan Printing Co., 1905.

Ministere du Commerce de L'Industrie des Postes et des Telegraphes Exposition Universelle Internationale de 1900 a Paris. *Concours Internationaux D'Exercices Physiques et de Sports Rapports*. vol. 1. Paris: Imprimerie National, 1901.

Sullivan, James E. "Review of the Olympic Games of 1904." In *Spalding's Official Athletic Almanac for 1905* 18, no. 217. Special Olympic Number Containing the Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1904. Edited by James E. Sullivan. New York: American Sports Publishing Company, 1905.

Primary Sources

A.G. Spalding and Bros. *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1905.* Spalding's Athletic Library. New York: American Sports Publishing, 1905.

Allen, J. P., ed. *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1904.* Spalding's Athletic Library. New York: American Sports Publishing, 1904.

"Americans Again Lead: Six More Firsts Taken by Yankee Athletes in Paris Games." *New York Times*, 17 July 1900, 5.

"Annual Tennis Meeting: English Plan of Ranking Players Opposed by Delegates." *New York Times*, 6 February 1904, 7.

"Athletes Entertained. Received by M. Paul Escudier at the Hotel de Ville Yesterday." *The New York Herald, Paris,* 19 July 1900, 3.

Bailey, John Tyler. "The Dohertys: The Secret of Their Success and Their Influence on Lawn Tennis." *Outing* 43, no. 1 (October 1903): 112-113.

"Birds-Eye View of the World's Fair." *St. Louis Palladium,* 7 May 1904, 1.

Boland, John Pius. *Collected Diaries of John Pius Boland*. Unpublished, British Olympic Foundation Archives.

Burchell, H. P., ed. *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual 1906*. Spalding's Athletic Library. New York: American Sports Publishing, 1906.

Butler, Maynard. "The Olympic Games." *Outlook* 53 (30 May 1896): 993-995.

Clark, Ellery H. "The First Americans at the Olympic Games." *The Youth's Companion* (9 March 1911): 123-124.

—. "The Olympic Games of 1896." *Pratt Institute Monthly* 6, no. 6 (March 1898): 163-170.

—. *Reminisces of An Athlete: Twenty Years on Track and Field*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1911.

Connolly, James B. "Fifteen Hundred Years Later." *Collier's* 98 (1 August 1936): 24.

—. "The Spirit of the Olympian Games." *Outing* 48 (April 1906): 101-104.

Coubertin, Pierre de. "Does Cosmopolitan Life Lead to International Friendliness?." *American Review of Reviews* 17 (April 1898): 429-434.

—. *Mémoires Olympiques*. Lausanne: Bureau International de Pédagogie Sportive, 1931.

—. *The Olympic Games BC 776 - AD 1896*. New York: American Olympic Committee, 1896.

—. "The Olympic Games of 1896." *Century* 53, no. 31 (November 1896): 39-53.

Curtis, Thomas P. "High Hurdles and White Gloves." *The Sportsman* 12, no. 1 (July 1932): 60-61.

Curtis, W. B. "The New Olympian Games," *Outing* 28 (May 1896): 21-23.

Davis, Dwight F. "The Establishment of an International Trophy: A Step Toward Placing Tennis Competition on a Universal Basis." In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 69-72. New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931.

Davis, W. J. "Preparations for Reviving the Games." *Public Opinion* 20 (16 April 1896): 501-502.

Engquist, Erik. "Baseline: Global Warming." *Tennis* 36, no. 5 (September 2000): 12-14.

"Entries for the N. Y. Tennis Club Tourney." *New York Times*, 30 May 1904, 7.

"Final Olympic Events Today: One Hundred Meter Run and Discus Throw Are Among the Interesting Features." *Chicago Tribune*, 3 September 1904, 6.

"Fine Play at Puteaux Club. Most of the Events in the Lawn Tennis Tournament in Semi-Final Stage." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 10 July 1900, 2.

"German Athletes Coming: Teams in the Various Sports for St. Louis Fair." *New York Times*, 22 May 1904, 12.

"German Athletes to be Entertained." *New York Times*, 22 June 1904, 7.

Grant, Wylie C. "Early Indoor Play: The Game on Boards Necessitates Radical Changes in Methods of Play." In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 102-106. New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931.

Hepbrun, George T., ed. *Spalding's Athletic Library Official Basket-Ball Guide for 1905 6*. Spalding's Athletic Library. New York: American Sports Publishing, 1905.

Holmes, Burton. *The Olympian Games in Athens.* New York: The McClure Company, 1908. Rprnt. International Paper, 1996.

Horton, George. "The Recent Olympian Games." *The Bostonian* 4, no. 4 (July 1896): 215-229.

—. "Revival of the Olympian Games." *North American Review* 162 (March 1896): 266-273.

"Increasing Interest in Tennis." *New York Times*, 7 February 1904, 17.

"International Athletics." *The Literary Digest* 9, no. 25 (20 October 1894): 746-747.

"International Congress of Amateurs." *The Olympic* 1, no. 6 (17 May 1894).

International Olympic Committee, "Programme des Jeux Olympiques de 1900 – Paris," in Bill Mallon, *The 1900 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*, Results of the Modern Olympics, 2 (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998), 257.

"James E. Sullivan Will Direct the Greatest Sport Carnival in the History of the World." *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 14 February 1904.

"Joy in Olympian Games: Chicago Prepares to Celebrate Award Made in Paris," *Chicago Tribune*, 22 May 1901, 3.

"Lawn Tennis at Puteaux. Mr. R. F. Doherty and Miss Cooper Beat Mr. H. S. Mahony and Mlle. Prevost." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 12 July 1900, 2.

"Lawn Tennis Champions: Exciting Play Witnessed at the Wimbledon Courts Yesterday—Rain Stops Just in Time." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 4 July 1900, 1.

"Lawn Tennis. The All-England Championship Meeting." *The Times of London*, 2 July 1900, 13.

—. *The Times of London*, 3 July 1900, 7.

—. *The Times of London*, 4 July 1900, 13.

—. *The Times of London*, 5 July 1900, 11.

"Lawn Tennis Tournament. Arrangements for the International Competition in Connection with the Exhibition." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 5 July 1900, 3.

"Lawn Tennis Tournament at St. Louis Ends." *The Cairo Bulletin*, Cairo, Ill., 4 September 1904, 1.

"Lawn Tennis Tournament. First Day of Play at the Societé de Sport de I'Ile de Puteaux." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 7 July 1900, 2.

"Lawn Tennis Tournament. Messrs. H. L. Doherty, Norris, and Mahony Left in the Gentlemen's Singles." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 8 July 1900, 2.

"Lawn Tennis Tournament. Miss Cooper Beats Miss Jones After a Good Match in the Ladies' Singles." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 11 July 1900, 2.

"Many Tennis Players Take Advantage of the Ideal St. Louis Weather." *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.

Marquand, Allan. "The Old Olympic Games." *Public Opinion* 20 (16 April 1896): 501.

"M. Ayme Wins Lawn Tennis Championship." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 25 June 1900, 3.

"Mississippi Building at the World's Fair." *St. Louis Palladium*, 10 September 1904, 4.

Moore, Elizabeth. "Seventeen Years of Women's Tennis: Despite Five-Set Matches Tournament Play Grows in Popularity Among the Fair Sex," In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 66-68. New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931.

"Olympic Games." *The Times of London*, 6 April 1896.

—. *The Times of London*, 10 April 1896.

—. *The Times of London*, 13 April 1896.

—. *The Times of London*, 14 April 1896.

—. *The Times of London*, 15 April 1896.

—. *The Times of London*, 16 April 1896.

"Olympian Games for America: Chicago Favored for the Meeting of World's Champions in 1904." *New York Sun*. 12 November 1900, 8.

"Olympic Games Comes to an End." *The Cairo Bulletin*, Cairo, Ill., 4 September 1904, 1.

"Olympic Lawn Tennis Tournament." *New York Times*, 1 September 1904, 5.

"Olympic Tennis Matches." *Chicago Tribune*, 30 August 1904, 6.

Orton, George W. "The Paris Athletic Games." *Outing* 36, no. 6 (September 1900): 690-695.

Paret, Jahial Parmly. "The New Era in American Lawn-Tennis." *Outing* 38, no. 3 (June 1901): 320-324.

—, ed. *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual for 1900*. Spalding's Athletic Library. New York: American Sports Publishing, 1900.

—, ed. *Spalding's Lawn Tennis Annual for 1903*. Spalding's Athletic Library. New York: American Sports Publishing, 1903.

"Paris Games Terminate: Tewksbury's Victory in 200-Meter Race." *New York Times*, 23 July 1900, 7.

"Programme des Jeux Olympiques de 1896 – Athenes." *Bulletin du Comite International des Jeux Olympiques* 2, no. 3 (January 1895): 1.

"Puteaux's Lawn Tennis. Interesting Matches Played in Ideal Weather Before a Large Attendance." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 9 July 1900, 3a.

Richardson, Rufus. "The New Olympian Games." *Scribner's Magazine* 20, no. 3 (September 1896): 267-286.

Richter, Francis C. "America on Top in Every Way at the Recent Paris Exposition: Director Spalding in an Interview with Father Chadwick Gives a Condensed Version of His Experiences at the Great World's Fair." *Sporting Life* 36, no. 11 (1 December 1900), 9.

Robertson, George S. "The Olympic Games by a Competitor and Prize Winner." *Fortnightly Review* 354 (1 June 1896), 944-957.

Shaw, Albert. "The Re-Establishment of Olympic Games: How International Sports May Promote Peace Among the Nations." *Review of Reviews* 10 (December 1894): 643-646.

"Spalding Honored: The Noted Magnate in a Congenial Role." *Sporting Life* 35, no. 6 (28 April 1900), 7.

St Louis Globe-Democrat. 4 September 1904.

Sutphen, Van Tassel. "Golf." *Outing* 45, no. 2 (November 1904): 248.

—. "Some Victories in Golf." *Outing* 45, no. 3 (December 1904): 383.

"Tennis at Bay Ridge: Stubbornly Contested Matches in High-Class Round Robin Tournament." *New York Times*, 22 June 1904, 7.

"Tennis at the World's Fair." *Chicago Tribune*, 3 September 1904, 6.

"Tennis Entry Date Postponed: Will Not Call for Names Until After Newport Meeting." *St. Louis Republic*, 14 August 1904, I-13.

"Tennis Entry List Promises Good Contests: Expected That All the Eastern and Foreign Players Will Compete for Honors." *St. Louis Republic*, 21 August 1904, II-5.

"Tennis Tournament at St. Louis." *Chicago Tribune*, 31 August 1904, 6.

"The Olympic Games." *Baily's Magazine of Sports and Pastimes* 65 (June 1896), 439-441.

"The Revival of the Olympic Games." *Public Opinion* 20 (16 April 1896): 501-502.

"Virginia Building at the World's Fair." *St. Louis Palladium*, 10 September 1904, 1.

Waldstein, Charles. "The Olympian Games at Athens." *The Field* (May 1896): 26-30.

Whitney, Caspar. "Athletic Development in France." *Outing* 36, no. 2 (May 1900): 178-181.

—. "The Month's Review." *Outing* 36, no. 2 (May 1900): 198-211.

—. "The Sportsmans View-Point." *Outing* 36, no. 6 (September 1900): 675-689.

—. "The Sportsmans View-Point." *Outing* 37, no. 2 (November 1900): 214-231.

—. "The Sportsman's View-Point." *Outing* 45, no. 1 (October 1904): 108-112.

—. "The Way of the Sportsman." *Outing* 36, no. 3 (June 1900): 311-326.

—. "The Way of the Sportsman." *Outing* 36, no. 4 (July 1900): 423-436.

"Winners of Olympic Tennis Tourney." *New York Times*, 5 September 1904, 6.

"Won by Mr. H. L. Doherty. Championship Singles at the Ile de Puteaux Lost by Mr. H. S. Mahony." *The New York Herald, Paris*, 13 July 1900, 2.

Wright, Beals C. "The Chop Stroke Wins a Championship: A National Title is Won by Standing In on Service and Taking the Ball on the Rise." In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 94-98. New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931.

—. "Some Famous American Teams: Further Development of Doubles Tactics Brings International Fame to Our Teams." In *Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis*, 99-101. New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931.

Secondary Sources

Alexander, George E. *Lawn Tennis: Its Founders and Its Early Days*. Lynn, Mass.: H. O. Zimman, 1974.

Baltzell, E. Digby. *Sporting Gentlemen: Men's Tennis from the Age of Honor to the Cult of the Superstar.* New York: The Free Press, 1995.

Barrett, John. *Wimbledon: The Official History of the Championships*. London: CollinsWillow, 2001.

Bleasdale, Ruth E. *Rough Work: British North America and Canada Labourers on the Public Works of 1841 to 1882.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018.

Breyer, Victor. "The £80 Olympics." *World Sports* 15 (May 1949): 28-29.

Chandler, Arthur. "Culmination: The Paris Exposition Universelle of 1900." *World's Fair* 7, no. 3 (1987).

Clapham, John. *Dvořák*. New York: Norton, 1979.

Collins, Bud. *The Bud Collins History of Tennis*. 2nd ed. New York: New Chapter Press, 2010.

—. *The Bud Collins History of Tennis*. 3rd ed. New York: New Chapter Press, 2016.

Collins, Sandra. *The 1940 Tokyo Games: Japan, the Asian Olympics and the Olympic Movement*. London: Taylor and Francis, 2014.

Court, Jürgen. *Deutsche Sportwissenschaft in der Weimarer Republik und im Nationalsozialismus*. Vol. 2. Münster: LIT Verlag, 2014.

Cross, Gary and John K. Walton. *The Playful Crowd: Pleasure Places in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Daniau, Lucien. "A Century in the Service of Sport." *Olympic Review* no. 171 (January 1982): 33-34.

Davis Cup by BNP Paribas. "USA 3:2 Great Britain." International Tennis Federation. Accessed 30 June 2013. Archived at https://web.archive.org/web/20130630130652/http://www.daviscup/en/draws-results/tie/details/aspx?tieId=10003701.

Davis Cup by Rakuten. "Maxime Decugis." International Tennis Federation. Accessed 21 October 2019. https://www.daviscup.com/en/players/player.aspx?id=800168973.

DeFrantz, Anita L. "The Changing Role of Women in the Olympic Games." *Olympic Review* 26, no. 15 (June/July 1997): 18-21.

Drevon, Andre. "Paris 1900." Translated by Dominique Leblond. In *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement,* edited by John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle, 27-32. Second edition. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2004.

Dunkley, Christopher. *Tennis Nostalgia.* New York: Rizzoli, 1998.

Dyreson, Mark. *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience.* Sport and Society, edited by Benjamin G. Rader and Randy Roberts. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998.

Eaves, Simon J. and Tom Higgins, "Lawn Tennis in Ireland: The Untold History, 1870-1914." In *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 119-129. Routledge International Handbooks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

Everitt, Robert T. and Richard A. Hillway. *The Birth of Lawn Tennis.* Kingston Upon Thames, UK: Vision Sports Publishing, 2019.

Fifty Years of Lawn Tennis in the United States. New York: United States Lawn Tennis Association, 1931.

"George Washington Orton (1873-1958)." *Penn Biographies*. Penn University Archives and Records Center. Accessed 26 November 2018. https://www.archives.upenn.edu/people/1800s/orton_geo_w.html.

Gillmeister, Heiner. "Olympic Tennis: Some Afterthoughts." *Citius, Altius, Fortius* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1995): 23-25.

—. *Tennis: A Cultural History*. London: Leicester University Press, 1997.

Gorn, Elliott J. *The Manly Art: Bare-Knuckle Prize Fighting in America.* Updated edition. Ithaca,N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2010.

Gorn, Elliott J. and Warren Goldstein. *A Brief History of American Sports*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Grey, Oliver Andrew. "Diamond Jubilee of Lawn-Tennis." *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 157, no. 4105 (Jun 30, 1934): 755.

Guttmann, Allen. *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*. 2nd ed. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

—. *Games and Empires: Modern Sports and Cultural Imperialism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Hays, Brooks Butler. *Balls on the Lawn: Games to Live By*. Illustrated by Jeremy Stein. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2014.

Hillyard, G. W. *Forty Years of First-Class Lawn Tennis*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1924.

Hopsicker, Peter and Mark Dyreson, eds. *A Half Century of Super Bowls: National and Global Perspectives on America's Grandest Spectacle.* Sport in the Global Society – Historical Perspectives, eds. Mark Dyreson, Rob Hess, and Thierry Terret (London: Routledge, 2018).

Holt, Richard. *Sport and Society in Modern France*. London: Macmillan, 1981.

Howell, Reet Ann and Max L. Howell. “Paris 1900: The Games of the IId Olympiad,” in *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement*, edited by John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelle, 12-17. First edition. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996.

Hummel, Brad William and Mark Dyreson. “From Elite Pastime to Global Phenomenon: The History of Sponsorship in Tennis. In *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 19-28. Routledge International Handbooks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

International Olympic Committee. “Doubles Men – Classement Final.” Accessed 12 September 2019. https://www.olympic.org/st-louis-1904/tennis/doubles-men.

—. “Factsheet: The Games of the Olympiad.” Updated October 2013. https://stillmed.olympic.org/Documents/Reference_documents_Factsheets/The_Olympic_Summer_Games.pdf.

—. “Olympic Results.” Accessed 21 January 2020. https://www.olympic.org/olympic-results.

—. “Singles Men – Classement Final.” Accessed 12 September 2019. https://www.olympic.org/st-louis-1904/tennis/singles-men.

International Tennis Hall of Fame. “Beals Wright.” Accessed 30 August 2019. https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/beals-wright.

—. “Dwight Davis.” Accessed 21 September 2019. https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/dwight-davis.

—. “Holcombe Ward.” Accessed 30 August 2019. https://www.tennisfame.com/hall-of-famers/inductees/holcombe-ward.

Jones, Cheree Intorre. “The Demise and Revival of Tennis in the Modern Olympic Games —1924 and 1984.” Master’s thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1985. GV993.

Kent, Graeme. *Olympic Follies: The Madness and Mayhem of the 1908 London Games.* London: JR Books, 2008.

Kitroeff, Alexander. *Wrestling with the Ancients: Modern Greek Identity and the Olympics*. New York: Greenworks, 2004.

Lake, Robert J. "Historical Changes in Playing Styles and Behavioural Etiquette in Tennis:Reflecting Broader Shifts in Social Class and Gender Relations." In *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 255-265. Routledge International Handbooks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

—, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*. Routledge International Handbooks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

—. "Introduction to the History and Historiography of Tennis." In *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 1-16. Routledge International Handbooks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

—. "Social Class, Etiquette, and Behavioural Restraint in British Lawn Tennis, 1870-1939." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, no. 6 (2011): 876-894.

—. *A Social History of Tennis in Great Britain*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014.

Lehigh, Mary H. "The Renaissance of the Olympic Games." *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance* 55 (February 1984): 20.

Little, Alan and Robert McNicol. *Wimbledon Compendium*. 28th ed. London: All England Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club, 2018.

Llewellyn, Matthew P. *Rule Britannia: Nationalism, Identity and the Modern Olympic Games*. Sport in the Global Society: Historical Perspectives, edited by Mark Dyreson and Thierry Terret. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Llewellyn, Matthew P. and John Gleaves. *The Rise and Fall of Olympic Amateurism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2016.

Llewellyn, Matthew P. and Robert J. Lake. "Tennis and the Olympics: An Historical Examination of Their On-Off Relationship Since 1896." In *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 362-371. Routledge International Handbooks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

Lucas, John Apostal. "Caspar Whitney: The Imperial Advocate of Athletic Amateurism and His Involvement with the International Olympic Committee and the American Olympic Committee, 1899-1912." *Journal of Olympic History* 8, no. 2 (May 2000): 30-38.

Lucas, John Apostal papers. Eberly Special Collections Library, Pennsylvania State University.

—. *The Modern Olympic Games*. New York: A. S. Barnes, 1980.

—. "Olympic Genesis: The Sorbonne Conferences of 1892 and 1894." Paper presented at the Third Canadian Symposium on History of Sport and Physical Education, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, August 19-21, 1974.

Lunt, David and Mark Dyreson. "The 1904 Olympic Games: Triumph or Nadir?." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Olympic Studies*, edited by Helen Jefferson Lenskyj and Stephen Wagg, 43-59. London: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2012.

MacAloon, John J., ed. *Muscular Christianity and the Colonial and Post-Colonial World*. Sport in the Global Society. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2007.

—. *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Mallon, Bill. *The 1900 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*. Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 2. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998.

—. *The 1904 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*. Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 3. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999.

—. *The 1906 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*. Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 4. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1999.

Mallon, Bill and Ian Buchanan. *The 1908 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*. Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 5. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000.

Mallon, Bill and Jeroen Heijmans. *Historical Dictionary of the Olympic Movement.* Historical Dictionaries of Sports, edited by Jon Woronoff. 4th edition. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 2011.

Mallon, Bill and Ture Widlund. *The 1896 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*. Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 1. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998.

—. *The 1912 Olympic Games: Results for All Competitors, in All Events, with Commentary*. Results of the Early Modern Olympics, 6. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2002.

Mandell, Richard D. *The First Modern Olympics*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1976.

—. *Paris 1900: The Great World's Fair*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Matthews, George R. *America's First Olympics: The St. Louis Games of 1904.* Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press.

Merrihew, Stephen Wallis. *The Quest for the Davis Cup*. The Lawn Tennis Library, VI. New York: American Lawn Tennis, Inc., 1928.

Mueller, Martin. "What Makes an Event a Mega-Event? Definitions and Sizes." *Leisure Studies* 34, no. 6 (January 2015): 627-642.

National Baseball Hall of Fame. "George Wright." Accessed 19 September 2019. https://baseballhall.org/hall-of-famers/wright-george.

—. "Harry Wright." Accessed 19 September 2019. https://baseballhall.org/hall-of-famers/wright-harry.

Olympic Studies Centre. "Equestrian Sport: History of Equestrian Sport at the Olympic Games." OSC Reference Collection. Published 19 October 2017.

Pappas, Nina K. "The Opening Ceremony of the Olympic Games." Independent Views. *Olympic Review* 165 (July-August 1981): 447-449.

Peavy, Linda and Ursula Smith. *Full-Court Quest: The Girls from Fort Shaw Indian School,Basketball Champions of the World*. Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008.

—. "World Champions: The 1904 Girls' Basketball Team From Fort Shaw Indian Boarding School." In *Native Athletes in Sport and Society: A Reader*, edited by C. Richard King, 40-78. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.

Phillips, Ellen. *The VIII Olympiad: Paris 1924—St. Moritz 1928*. The Olympic Century: The Official 1st Century History of the Modern Olympic Movement, 8. Los Angeles: World Research and Publications, 1996.

Rafferty, Jean. *Ladies of the Court: A Century of Women at Wimbledon*. First American Edition. New York: Atheneum, 1984.

Rhodes, Lynwood Mark. "The First Time America Went to the Olympics - 1896." *The American Legion Magazine* 92, no. 4 (April 1972): 14-18; 34-36; 38.

Roberts, Randy W. "Eighteenth-Century Boxing." *Journal of Sport History* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1977): 246-259.

Roche, Maurice. *Mega-Events and Modernity: Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Rodriguez, Robert G. *The Regulation of Boxing: A History and Comparative Analysis of Policies Among American States*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2009.

Rowland, Suzanne. "Fashioning Competitive Lawn Tennis: Object, Image, and Reality in Women's Tennis Dress 1884-1919." In *Routledge Handbook of Tennis: History, Culture, and Politics*, edited by Robert J. Lake, 173-182. Routledge International Handbooks. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019.

Schaap, Dick. *An Illustrated History of the Olympics*. 3rd ed. New York: Knopf, 1975.

Schmidt, Thomas. "Architecture at the Service of Sport: Olympic Stadia From 1896 to 1936." *Olympic Review* 225 (July 1986): 397-402.

Senn, Alfred. *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games*. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics, 1999.

Shannon, Bill. *United States Tennis Association Official Encyclopedia of Tennis*. Centennial edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1981.

Smith, Hollis. "Tennis: Historically Speaking." National Public Parks Tennis Association. Accessed 23 September 2019. http://www.nppta.com/History.htm.

Smith, Michael Llewellyn. *Olympics in Athens 1896: The Invention of the Modern Olympic Games.* London: Profile, 2004.

Staff of the United States Lawn Tennis Association, eds. *United States Lawn Tennis Association Official Encyclopedia of Tennis*. First Edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Tarassouleas, Ath. *Olympic Games in Athens, 1896-1906*. Self-published: Vironas-Attica, Greece, 1988.

The Olympians: Evolution of the Games. Montreal: Publinova, 1975.

Toohey, Kristine and A. J. Veal. *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective.* Oxfordshire, UK: Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International, 2007.

Trengrove, Alan. *The Story of the Davis Cup*. London: Stanley Paul, 1985.

United States Lawn Tennis Association. *United States Lawn Tennis Association Official Encyclopedia of Tennis.* New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Wallechinsky, David and Jaime Loucky. *The Complete Book of the Olympics.* 2008 ed. London: Aurum, 2008.

Welch, Paula. "Admission to the Programme: A Privilege Earned, Not Given." *Olympic Review* 273 (July 1990): 332-337.

Weyand, Alexander M. *The Olympic Pageant*. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Wilson, Elizabeth. *Love Game: A History of Tennis, From Victorian Pastime to Global Phenomenon.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Young, David C. *A Brief History of the Olympic Games*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2004.

—. *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1996.

—. *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*. Chicago: Ares, 1984.