

This article was published in: Wojciech Liponski & Guy Jaouen (eds.): *Ethnology of Sport*. Special issue of *Studies in Physical Culture and Tourism*, Poznan, 10: 1, 51-73.

Three dimensions of pull and tug Towards a philosophy of popular games

by Henning Eichberg

Contents:

The context of the Inuit game - the cultural approach
Pedagogy of "the unserious" - actual experiences
Evolution and disappearance - historical approaches
The way of contradiction - a philosophical attempt
It - the objective dimension of movement
 Achievement
 Rule
 Instrument, facility, function
 Objectivation, reification and the impossible game
I - The subjective dimension of movement
 Personal and situational experience
 From *Eigen-Sinn* to epistemological solipsism
 Equality, inequality, and the third
You - The relational dimension of movement
 Encounter, the human being as With and Also
 Identity, non-identity, alterity
 Festivity and environment, death and laughter
Ex-centric theory of the body - and squint-eyed research

Two human beings stand shoulder by shoulder. They put their arms around the partner's neck, mutually, symmetrically, like good friends. Opening their lips, they grab with their forefinger into the other's mouth. On a signal, they start pulling. The mouths and cheeks are distorted, the eyes are rolling, the sight gets grotesque features. The competitors keep tugging. Intensifying their draught, they turn their heads outward, trying both to relieve the pain and resist effectively at the same time. Finally, one of them gives up, at first slowly following the pull by turning his head, and then overtly surrendering by turning the rest of his body. He is overcome.

The context of the Inuit game - the cultural approach

We start our intellectual inquiry by the question whether the Inuit game of mouth pull is a sport or could become a sport in modern understanding.

Other similar Inuit games and activities, e.g. Eskimo boxing, or pull-and-tug competitions in other non-Western cultures, have typically been categorized by sport anthropologists as “sport”. Similarly, sport historians have presented old European popular pastimes like *Fingerhakeln* – finger pull, as early forms of “sport”. In fact, at first glance, mouth pull might appear as a bodily action, which is competitive and oriented towards performance. With these elements, mouth tug fulfils the criteria of sport as they have been proposed by erudite sociological analyses which define sport by bodily action, competition, and performance.

On the other hand one might express doubts: Is tug-the-mouth really sport? There is no Olympic discipline of mouth pull, nor will most likely there ever be one. Our doubts reinforce when we have a closer look at the cultural context of the game.

Mouth pull has been practiced in the traditional world of the Inuit, the Arctic Eskimo. During the long and dark winter season when the sun remains below the horizon for weeks or months, people draw closer in their communal long houses where every family disposes over a sort of cell with sleeping banks and an oil lamp. The communal life determines daily life. In the dance houses called *kashim*, the drums are booming and rumbling for permanent festivity. The drum dance, *ingmerneq* or *qilaatersorneq*, makes people high and provokes their laughter. The shamans, called the *angákoq*, practice their ecstatic healing displays, putting their settlement fellows into states of changed consciousness. In this atmosphere of social warmth and intensity it happens that people challenge each other, especially the strong men. Besides fist fights and competitions of lifting and balancing, a lot of pull-and-tug games are practiced – stick tug (*arsáraq* or *quertemilik*), stick match, pulling rope (*norqutit*) or smooth seal skin (*asârniúneq*), arm pull, finger, wrist or hand pull, neck pull, ear or foot pull, elbow pull (*pakásungmingneq*), and wrist press (*mûmigttut*). For competitive pleasure, people may tug or turn each other’s nose, ear, or even testicles (Mauss 1904/05; Jensen 1965; Joelsen in: Idrætten 1978; Keewatin 1989).

In the summer time, the traditional Inuit society change its social character fundamentally. It dissolves into nucleus families forming smaller groups of hunters and gatherers. They meet, however, again at summer festivals, *aasivik*, where drums, dance and competitions play the central role once again.

One of these summer events was portrayed by the famous Greenlandic painter Aron of Kangeq (1822–1869), showing one of the most eccentric pull exercises – the arse pull. In an open-air scene, one sees a group of ten Inuit assembled around two men competing with their trousers down. Jens Kreutzmann (1828–1899), a collector of popular stories and traditions, described in detail how people used a short rope with two pieces of wood fastened at the ends. They put these pieces into their backsides in order to tug the rope by their back muscles (Thisted 1997, 152–154).

Sport or not sport? The particular case of pull-and-tug and the problem of its definition allows for some more comprehensive questions: What is sport? What is play in human life? What is a human being in

movement? From a concrete play, the way leads to fundamental philosophical questions of human movement and human existence.

Pedagogy of “the unserious” - actual experiences

These philosophical reflections are stimulated by actual experiences with play and game in pedagogical practice.

For some years, the International Sports Playground in Gerlev has worked practically and pedagogically against this challenge. The basis for this research has been the fundamental consideration about the place of play and game in the pedagogical world of sport. Game and play are generally regarded as important aspects of sports, though they tend to be neglected in practice in favour of disciplinary training. In sport, play and games are considered educational entertainment for children and are used as warm-up, i.e. as marginal in relation to the central process of achievement. On the ideological level, reference to play and game is often made in Olympic rhetoric. However, play is much more than that, also in relation to sport. It is experimentation, role game and challenge of one's own identity, revolt, team building, flirtation, contest and competitive engagement, processing of fear and anxiety, background for a good laugh... If play were to be taken seriously, a new approach would be required - play and games as *experimentarium*.

The International Sports Playground, which opened in spring 1999, covers an area of three hectares and offers fine views over the Great Belt. The playground is composed of different sites. There is the “natural site” with a lake, a brook, shrubbery and a swamp. The “urban site” features an asphalt rink for skating and street games, and is to include a climbing tower in the near future. Pavilions around the “market place” form the “village site” with equipment for numerous Danish, Swedish, Breton, Flemish and other games. Visitors may test their skills at about fifty or hundred games within the playground area (Møller 1997).

Among these games, which are also described in some handbooks (Andkjær/Møller 1992, Møller 2000), a certain group can be categorized as pull-and-tug games:

Trækkekamp - Pull competition. Two competitors try pulling and other bodily actions, foot against foot and arm against arm, to throw each other off balance

Trække stok or *Svingel* - Pull the stick. Two opponents, sitting feet to feet, seize a short stick and try to pull each other out of the sitting position.

Trække okse - Pull the ox. The same is done by two competitors, who lie backwards on the backs of two assistants who crawl away from each other, pulling the contenders along.

Trække sømandshandske - Pull the sailor's glove. Two opponents, sitting feet to feet, try to pull each other out of their positions. This time the players' fingers are used as a hook, hand in hand.

Stikke Palles øje ud - Cut out Palle's eye. Two competitors seize a long stick, which is placed between their legs. Standing back to back, they

try to pull the opponent towards a certain place, which is usually a plug in the ground. "Palle's eye" can also be a burning candle, which is to be extinguished with a player's own end of the stick.

Grænsekamp - Pull across the border. Two teams challenge each other over a marked line on the ground, trying to pull individual players from the opposing team to one's own side. Players may form chains to hold one another in their own team.

Tovtrækning - Tug-and-pull. This is a well-known team competition, attempted to be transformed into a modern sport.

Trække kat - Pull the cat. Two competitors tie the rope around their bodies, and take positions on the opposite sides of a brook. Then, standing back to back, they try to pull each other into the water.

Snøre vibe - Tie up the pewit. Two competitors tie their feet to each other's with a rope. The aim is to pull the opponent so that he loses the balance and falls to the ground.

Firtræk - Four men's pull. Four persons hold a circle-formed rope and try to pull their opponents into their respective directions, so that they can reach a designated plug on the ground. This includes the tactical element, i.e. cooperation to hinder the others in succeeding so.

Troldehoved or *Balders Bål* - Head of the Troll or Fire of Balder. Players stand in a circle, hand in hand, around a circle-formed rope inside. They try to pull one another into the "inner fire"; a player who steps over the rope is "out". The players must hold firmly by their hands all the time.

Pull games constitute, thus, a considerable group along with other main groups of run-and-catch games, ball games, skittle games, competitions of force or agility, single combat games, and table games. In relation to modern sports, they balance between the possibility of becoming or unbecoming "sportized". Many of the games' arrangements have grotesque elements, not unlike the Inuit arse tug, and make the spectators and the competitors laugh.

In this "experimentarium" of play and games, a number of practical and educational experiences have been collected, with reference to ridiculousness, "unseriousness", gender, violence, etc. The transfer of experiences from action research and participant observation to structured results in theory, is, however, a difficult process, which will take some time. Today it seems as if the telling of history and comparative culture studies would continue to dominate our knowledge in this field.

Evolution and disappearance - historical approaches

Among many societies all over the world, there have been many tug-and-pull games which may look similar to mouth pull, though in a less eccentric way. We know these pull competitions especially from ancient Scandinavia and Celtic cultures as well as from the Pacific, Melanesian and Polynesian societies, and from Africa. They can be interesting subjects of historical and comparative studies.

The richness of forms reaches from simple actions of finger, arm, neck or stick pull to more complex variations, like the Danish “Pull the calf from the cow” (*Rykke kalven fra koen*) or “Pull the ox”. The games may use more complex arrangements of ropes and balance, e.g. “Tie up the pewit”; a rope and a water pool, e.g. “Pull the cat”; or stick and candle, e.g. “Cut out Palle’s eye”. The so-called hide games, Old Norse *skinnleikr*, were different variations of pulling hide or skin, which might have resembled ball games, but also developed towards belt pull (Old Norse *beltadráttir*) and rope pull (*reipdráttir*). A Nordic variation of the latter was “ring pull” – *at toga honk*, where two men, usually in a sitting position, pulled a rope, which was formed as a ring. Similarly to “four men’s pull” this could also become a group game where each player tries to reach a certain object, while the others hinder his attempts with their tricky rhythmic pulls, trying at the same time to reach their own respective objects.

However, the parallels and links between all these popular cultures of pull and tug should not be overemphasized. A medieval Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus wrote about the Danish King Erik Ejegod, who liked tug-of-war and practiced it so busily that he was able, while sitting, to pull four men towards himself with one rope in each hand. This must have been amusing. Another competitor, Erik Målspage, used to pull the rope against Lord Vestmar in the contest for their life. When Erik finally won after a hard fight – “*resisting with full power both with hands and feet*”, as Saxo described it – he neither dismissed the loser with noble “sporty” generosity, nor did the competition break up into laughter in the Inuit way. Erik put his foot on the back of his opponent breaking his backbone and, to be quite sure of his victory, broke his neck, too, with accompaniment of insulting words (Wahlqvist 1979, 125-6).

Whether we believe these stories or not, no matter how representative they may have been, they are evidence of a warrior culture, placing brutal pull and tug in the context of competing and killing. This was markedly different from the social atmosphere of the Inuit winter house, from Bavarian folklore and the modern sport of tug-of-war. The pull is not homogenous.

The way of tug-of-war to modern sport led through the Scottish Highland Games. When these games were resumed in 1819, after a period of English suppression, they included piping, dancing, foot race and stone lifting. Already in 1822, however, it was reported that “*the most remarkable feature was the tearing of three cows limb from limb after they had been felled*” (Novak 1989, 43; Jarvie 1991). Whether the game of tug was an artificial Romantic invention or was really rooted in earlier practices, remains an open question. In any case it was in the 1840s, that tug-of-war appeared in programs of various Scottish Highland Games and soon became a characteristic feature, alongside with tossing the caber, of their athletic profile. In the Scottish Highland Games held in Paris in 1889, the combination of tug-of-war, caber tossing, Highland dancing and tartan

fashion became almost an 'ethno-pop show', organized side by side with the Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show.

During the early take-off of modern sport, that Scottish game met with popular traditions in English villages and towns. At a market place of London, rope pull was annually held on Shrove Tuesday. Up to two thousand people were said to participate in the tug event and held a festivity afterwards when the rope was sold. The custom dated back to the time of King Henry VI and was connected with the fight between a red party and a white party, the former fighting for the king and the latter for the Duke of York (Georgens 1883, 155).

In a parallel way, in the late 18th century philanthropic educationalists had discovered (rediscovered) popular games of tug. They included pull and tug - often in an abstract and systematic way - in their handbooks of exercises, gymnastics and games, together with health-related and moralistic recommendations. In spite of this "pedagogization", pull games were often omitted in the gymnastic literature of the 19th century, until tug-of-war reappeared as a sport by the end of the century.

As a competitive sport, tug-of-war entered the practice of the *Amateur Athletic Association (AAA)* around 1880, and in the early twentieth century was established as an Olympic sport as well. However, it was soon excluded from the Olympic canon, being regarded by serious athletes "as something of a joke" (Arlott 1975, 1058). Since 1958 the Tug of War International Federation (TWIF) has been busy, working on a regular system of championship with weight classes and detailed rules of competition. In 2004, tug-of-war might be expected to return to the Olympic program, however for the time being this seems rather unreal.

History commits not only to evolution but also to disappearance. The exclusion of tug-of-war from the Olympic sport is analytically no less interesting than the reverse, i.e. the modern integration of the game into sport. Historically, the competition of rope pull had its place somewhere between the eccentricity of mouth pull (or even arse pull) and the rationality of modern sport. There is something "unserious" in tug-of-war, too, and this opens for the question, what the "seriousness" of sports consists of.

The way of contradiction - a philosophical attempt

Pull-and-tug has often been regarded as an elementary form of sport - along with running, jumping, and throwing. One of the popular myths is that these "elementary activities" developed in an evolutionary and unavoidable way into modern sports.

Pull-and-tug shows that something might be wrong in this story. Educational practice shows that the definition and delimitation of the so-called "element" are not simply so easy. The historical experience is not only about evolution, but also about disappearance, discontinuity, and change. Philosophy has the critical task to reveal the inner contradictions of the sportive myth and find alternative tales.

With pull-and-tug as a material out of human practice, we can

approach deeper contradictions in human movement, which play and games express. If we choose for the starting point the epistemological contradiction between objectivity and subjectivity, some existential dimensions of human movement culture become visible. With a little help of Martin Buber (1923) we can ask, what the objective "It" and what the subjective "I" in mouth-pull, and more generally in play and games, is. Another question is also how meaningful the contradiction between It and I, and between objectivity and subjectivity is. There is a possibility that this may, however, lead us to some limitations of this binary construction. Do these limitations urge us to think about the third, relational "Thou" of play and game? And where is the place for identity in human movement?

It - the objective dimension of movement

Human movement can be seen as something which produces something. In modern sports, these are results and records. Go-for-it sports but also modern gymnastics and physical education are in a special way built up around this "It". By this reification, sport has differentiated from older games and play. Tug-of-war serves an illustration of this process.

Achievement

When modern sport had taken its definitive modern shape by the end of the nineteenth century, its founders often regarded it as nothing but a "natural" prolongation of older popular practices of game and competition. As these games had traditionally included rope pull, tug-of-war would be regarded as sport, too, or even as a sport of an especially long historical reputation. Its place in the new world of sports was, however, far from being clear. Tug was sometimes treated as part of **gymnastics**, but was also perceived in combination with combat or **fighting sport**, as the latter were practiced by the military and police. In other cases, tug-of-war was regarded as a **heavy athletic** event (German *Kraftsport* or *Schwerathletik*), but also categorized as part of **track-and-field** (German *Leichtathletik*, Danish *fri idræt*). From this multi-dimensionality - which can also be found in many games and forms of play - a controversial question arises: What type of achievement tug-of-war was producing?

Tug-of-war was an evident candidate for the Olympic program. From 1900 until 1920, the rope was pulled at the Olympic Games. In Paris in 1900, a mixed Danish-Swedish team won the first Olympic gold medal. After 1920, however, tug-of-war disappeared as an Olympic discipline and has never returned until today, in spite of many efforts of the Tug of War International Federation.

This discontinuity shows that - in contrast to naive sport ideology - competitions of pull and tug do not as such represent the modern principle of achievement. Concentrated efforts to transform and reorganize the game of pulling were needed to adjust it to the configuration of sportive production of achievement. In sportive tug, the point is no longer an immediate comparison of brute, "primitive" strength here and now, but a systematic development of purpose-oriented skill and technique. In spite of

this "sportizing" transformation, tug-of-war has remained at a distance from the sport of record. How to measure achievement in tug-of-war? The "record" of the longest tug event in history, noted by the *Amateur Athletic Association* and measured in 1938, was 8 minutes and 18.2 seconds. This was no record of achievement, but a typical record of curiosity. In tug-of-war, performance and fascination are to be found at another place than the modern type of quantified record.

In this aspect, the early difficulties in categorization of tug-of-war as a sport become illustrative. Whether tug ranges alongside ballgames and other gymnastic games as *Turnspiel*; alongside running, jumping and throwing, as a track-and-field event; alongside weight lifting and tossing the caber as an athletic event; or alongside wrestling as a sport of combat; the goal of achievement is different each time. Tug and pull is characterized by a conspicuous "impurity" in relation to the rationality of modern achievement. It is not so easy to answer the question, what "It" is which this "sport" shall produce.

Probably there are other features of tug-of-war, which have hindered the integration of the game into the Olympic canon. From popular culture, the tug "sport" has inherited the grunting and grimacing of the actors - and the laughter. It is almost grotesque that the victors, in the moment of their triumph, will probably fall on their arse. Strong men or women, snorting and groaning, and tumbling backwards on the grass - this fits very well a popular culture of play and carnival, linking actors and spectators by a social convulsion of laughter. It does not fit the culture of achievement as it was developed by the industrial bourgeoisie; and it fitted still less to Olympism and its strategy to assimilate sport into aristocratic norms, and to develop a new type of "serious" elitist style. The doubts concerning the seriousness of tug sport may have been enforced by the Olympic event in Paris 1900. After the official Olympic tug, a "friendly" tug was arranged for the American team, which had not been allowed to participate. The event broke up when American spectators rushed forward to join the game (Wallechinsky 1992, 667). Tug was, indeed, "*something of a joke*".

It would be even harder to imagine mouth pull as an Olympic sport. A consequent application of technique and rational skill on mouth pull would lead to mutual mutilation or self-mutilation. An "International Mouth Pull Federation" would sound strange. The "unserious" features of popular laughter and grotesque "carnivalism" stand in the way of consequent "sportification". And though the tugging - or tearing-off nose, ear or mouth may appear as "extreme", it does not even fall under what has become the actual fashion of "extreme sport" either.

It is just by their non-sportive configurations that mouth pull and tug-of-war constitute illustrations of what the configuration of sport is. Sport is not a bodily movement and a competition as such, but follows a specific pattern of **production** - producing results, quantifying the outcome and following the upward line of growth and maximization (Hoberman 1992). Sportive activity produces an objective "It". Sport displays in ritual

forms the productivity of industrial capitalist society. Last but not least, results can be money.

Rule

Achievement is, however, not the only form of reification, which characterizes modern sport. Another form of "It" is the rule. "Make it like this," is the message of the "sport for rules", developed characteristically in modern gymnastics. Here, this is not of primary importance to produce a result, but to complete a given movement "in the right way" - sport appearing as a disciplination of rule correctness. Training is a correction and regulation of movements. Ideally, the trainer or instructor, standing face to face to the exercising athletes, takes a position with panoptic overview, and applies the rules by commanding, inspecting, and reviewing the gymnasts' movements.

Historically, while the sport of results took form in English and Scottish sports, and became the international mainstream in the twentieth century, the sport of rules found its early manifestations in the early nineteenth century in Nordic gymnastics, German gymnastics (*Turnen*), and Slavonic gymnastics (*Sokol*). These were forerunners of modern sports, in some periods also models of opposition against competitive sport and were - all in all - an important under-stream of modern body culture. While sport of achievement reified results, the gymnastic sport of rules reified movements by analytically dissecting them into defined pieces. These elements were trained in certain choreographic patterns, forms and processes, which were codified as gymnastic "systems". Some of these systems referred more to aesthetic, others more to physiological and anatomical rules.

Sport for rules, however, developed not only in contrast to the sport of results. There were assimilation processes too. The discipline of rules entered as training into achievement sport and became a secondary measure to prepare the production of the final top achievement. From this supporting position, the training of rules could make itself more or less independent, creating an autonomous sport of health and an educational sport. In sports pedagogy, for instance, the idea was conceived that the rule was central for the understanding of sport. Sport was in its educational essence a formation and training of rules. In this perspective, keeping the rule appears as the core of sporting sociality, the great "It" of learning through sport.

From the aspect of rules for bodily training, also Inuit games have drawn the attention of educationalists. Supporting the politics of identity of the Inuit societies, which was increasingly gaining cultural and political self-determination during the 1970s and 1980s, several Inuit games were set to rules, including mouth pull.

"Equipment: None. - Stance and Start: Both competitors stand side by side on set line. Inside feet are meeting. Each competitor grabs mouth of opponent with inside hand by going around the neck and grabbing outside corner of opponent's mouth with middle finger. - Movement: On a signal, competitors try to pull opponent to their side of the line. Strongest mouth

wins. - *Judging and Scoring: Wash hands before competition. Best out of three tries*" (Keewatin 1989).

There is a grotesque sound about these rules. If really strictly applied, they would imply mutilation. The competitive pattern does not fit. The rule of hygienic behavior adds a special note of "something wrong".

The failure of rules for mouth pull illustrates that this tug does not require rules at all. The technique will best be transmitted mimetically, from face to face and from movement to movement. View and feeling are enough. There is hardly anything like "correctness" or "incorrect implementation" in the game. And a systematic training of mouth pull has no meaning, either for educational means or for production of a top result.

In this respect, the gymnastic training of rules was not at all an alternative or resistance to modern sports of achievement, as the ideologists of gymnastics but also advocates of sport have claimed sometimes. Sport of rules was the back-side of the sport of production, both of them being united by reification as the hegemonic over-all tendency.

Instrument, facility, function

Achievement and rule are important, but they are not the only elements in the creation of It-practice in modern body culture. Equipment and facilities made innovation visible, too. New invented instruments were and are a starting point to create new sports - from "machine gymnastics" in the nineteenth century through roller skating, cycling and motor sport, to surfing, mountain biking, hang gliding, inline skating, snow board, and bungee jumping. And we cannot really think of modern sport without a "sportscape" of highly specialized fields and halls for mono-cultures of fenced-off activities. In this respect as well, "sportization" went around pull and tug.

On a more abstract level, i.e. a superstructure above the "It" of sectorial spaces, we find the "function". The "function" of sport and games was invented in order to understand movement culture and to channel it towards certain societal goals. Sports science ascribes to sport certain physiological functions of health, educational functions of personal development, psychological functions like stress reduction, social functions of integration and reduction of violence as well as political functions of state conservation. Concerning dance, the "pattern maintenance", "socialization", "tension management", "adoption to societal goals" and "integration" have been recognized as central, useful functions. Architectural functionalism has created the classic "functions" of residence, work, trade, leisure and traffic in order to justify strategies of urban parcellation.

Functionalism reached a new level in the system theory of Luhmann-type. The system theory exalts sector divisions of administrative practice to some higher type of theoretical, "functional" logic, taking the banal parcellation as an expression of economical, juridical, educational, political, religious, scientific and other functions, which are said to be based on binary codes of global significance. In this model, sport derives from medical and educational functions, which are determined by the codes

of ill/healthy and educated/uneducated respectively; but since the take-off of modernity, sport has developed towards its own autonomous functionality, following the sportive code of win-or-lose.

As accidental and artificial as all these series of assumed functions may look, the different approaches display the common strategy of reification, linked to a program of socio-political stabilization. "Function" is derived from mathematical terminology and from there it receives its "scientific" and "objective" undertones. Function is imagined as a quasi-thing or factor - an "It" of higher quality. The meaning of "function" oscillates somewhere between the essence (*Wesen*), intention, purpose, aim, value, instrumental meaning, cause, reason and driving force (*Triebkraft*). As it is typical for a myth, the ambiguity of the notion is hidden away, and the misty term appears as a convincing expression of the objective truth. What the *Wesen* or essence of a thing really is, may be mystery, but its "function" seems to us clear. Function is, as Norbert Elias put it, a hidden notion of causality (*ein versteckter Ursachenbe-griff*).

The reified "It" of the "function" is furthermore characterized by a conservative undertone. Implicite, the notion postulates some ideal, hegemonic societal goals as "functional" and rejects oppositional values as "dysfunctional". The existing relations of power are, by naming them "function", withdrawn from conflict, naturalized and justified, while subversive dimensions are systematically neglected. "Function" is not what is installed by power, what can be disputed and changed on the base of alternative needs - function is function. It is true, the discourse of a "revolutionary function" is not quite unknown and has been tried now and then, though it proceeds as reifying as the conservative model. It seems not accidental at all that the functionalist reification predominantly goes hand in hand with stabilizing attitudes towards the existing power structures.

We are, thus, warned to use the term of "function" for the analysis of play and game. Which "function" does mouth pull have? Does pull and tug contribute to health, personal development, stress reduction, social integration and pattern maintenance or tension management? Also, the utilitarian functions of "training for work", "preparation for chase" or "exercise for war", which the older ethnology-anthropology assumed for the so-called "primitive" games, are difficult to apply to mouth pull - as to many other games, e.g. ball games. That is why the earlier functionalism had by the notion of "fertility cult" opened the door towards highly speculative imaginations. And indeed, the finger in the sleek, moist, and warm mouth may lead to psychoanalytical interpretations...

Functionalism is not only an academic but political luxury. Western strategies of "sport development aid" for the Third World use functionalist assumptions against the native sports of the non-Western countries. While Western sport is said to serve the development of personality, social and political integration (nation building), identification, health, equality of chances and satisfaction of basic needs, native games like finger pull

are “*folkloristic marginal activities*” without any “functional” value (Digel 1989, 165).

The “function” may, indeed, help to exclude unwanted activity from practice and reflection. It does not help to understand movement culture.

Objectivation, reification, and the impossible game

The results of movement, rule, instrument, place and function give the impression of objectivity. The practice of movement becomes an “It”. What flows, becomes a quasi-object. Mouth pull is illustrative, because it shows how limited this perspective is. In this respect, mouth pull is not only harmless, but also subversive. Or more generally: the practice of popular games is a living critique of modern myths - a practical alternative philosophy.

This critical conclusion does not mean, that objectivation is an evil in itself. The relation between “I” and “It” is neither specifically modern nor illegitimate as such. The objective elements of movement like the glory of victory (which is not identical with modern achievement), the mimetic and repetitive transfer of bodily technique (which is not the same as the modern rule of sport), the agreement over a place of meeting and play (which is not a modern facility) and the myth of what is good and bad (which is not yet the modern “function”) are much more deeply rooted in human cultural existence. The relation of the subjective “I” to the objective world, to “It”, is basic for human beings. This existential objectivation acquired, however, a new expansive dynamic when the configuration of modern achievement production appeared with its quantification of results, its systems of rules, its production of things and its standardization of the sportive space.

It was in the context of the ware-producing society, of industrial productivism and capitalist economy, that the practical reification of life became a problem of new dimensions. Furthermore, the epistemological reification in terms of “function”, “system”, “evolution” etc. became a mythical superstructure, dominating the discourse of modernity. “*Die Zwingherrschaft des wuchernden Es*” was established, “*the dictatorship of the proliferating It*”, as Martin Buber (1923) called it. The golem takes over - the robot servant makes himself Master over the Human Being. Others called this *Entfremdung* - alienation.

Play and game deliver living pictures of these processes, which otherwise have been described in highly abstract terms. These pictures may be illustrative as well as critical. One of the critical pictures is “the impossible game”. Many games are impossible to carry through, if one really follows the rule. If the rule of competition for mouth pull were implemented strictly - “the stronger mouth wins” - it would lead to mutilation. The games of run-and-catch, i.e. a large part of children’s every-day play, are impossible in another way. If all participants are acting according to the rule, running away as quickly as possible, the slowest runner will very soon stay behind in tears and the game will end abruptly. The game, however, lives from continuation and flow. If the process of play

goes on, this can only happen against the rule, against the production of the "fair" result of speed. Instead, the quicker runner will approach the slow one, teasing her, provoking him: "*Du kan ikke fange mig* - you can't catch me". It is in the interest of the quicker runner to be caught. The game lives from the chance, which the stronger runner gives to the weaker one. It is in the interest of all that no loser is produced.

The rule is not the game. The flow of the game is in contradiction to the achievement. The game is what starts beyond the rule and beyond the striving for the result - beyond the "It."

I - The subjective dimension of movement

Beyond the "It" of objectivation we find the subjectivity of the player - the "I." In movement, I experiences something, I experience the other, I experience myself. Movement has a dimension, which withdraws from objectivation, from the It-relation.

Personal and situational experience

In pull, I experience **strength** as my strength, e.g. "I can". Force is felt as a physical power, but also as a radiating energy, i.e. as my **inner force**. Mouth pull has a component of I-proof. I prove my resistance and my perseverance. Do I stand it, do I endure it? In movement, the "I" enters a relation to itself, to its self. In game, I enter into contact with my feelings.

The subjectivity of I-proof has been cultivated in different cultures in different ways. The Inuit practiced a lot of exercises where - like in mouth pull - the point was not so much to win over the other but to endure. The difference between Inuit fist fighting and Western boxing is illustrative. In Inuit fighting, the opponent is not knocked down with a hard kick, but is slapped with the slack hand. This technique cannot produce a knock-out, but each fighter is challenged to endure: "You don't get me down - I stand it." Inuit society cultivated traditionally the strong man, *nipítôrtoq*, whom nobody could force down. "Beat me!" - he challenges all around. People are invited to box him, to tear his nose, to tousle his hair - he remains stolid and laughs.

In our Western world, however, we experience similar situations when the father challenges his small son: "Hit me!" The boy knocks his father in the belly, the father laughs, and both take pleasure. From Bud Spencer we know the entertaining film version. The configuration of sport is different from this. What the sportive fight cultivates as tension, is in those games a demonstration of relaxation and strength, which shows by **laughter**.

Another component of self-experience in mouth pull concerns **intimacy**. The other is breaking through the limits of my body, as it happens in different forms of wrestling, too. And what is more - the other grabs at my mouth. I may be touched by feelings of shame or disgust. Where is my integrity, where is my surface? My bodily "I" is challenged to the limit.

In this bodily clash, **pain** arises. The grip of the other aches me. I suffer and I resist.

In the play between pain and resistance, however, I feel **pleasure**, too. There is flow and energy. I finish the action by laughing.

The subjective experience of mouth pull is an experience of a **situation**. The event is here and now. I pull, I am pulled, pain and pleasure are meeting in the totality of the moment. The "I" has a situational presence similar to what happens in dream and love. The situation, whose totality can never be caught in all its dimensions, constitutes an epistemological contrast to the structures and processes, which can be objectified (Lefebvre 1959).

From *Eigen-Sinn* to epistemological solipsism

In the tension between "It" and "I", modern epistemology has unfolded its main contradiction. The modern science of science consists typically of two main parts: Analytical methods promise "objective" knowledge, the truth of "It", while hermeneutical and phenomenological methods comprise the subjectivity of "I."

Like modern reification, the modern subjectivation follows specific historical and societal dynamics as well. The modern state produces the individual as a subject of panoptical and disciplining strategies. The market produces the individual as a consumer who is going his or her way and chooses from among offers. Individually, everybody is "the smith of one's own fortune": "*I shop, therefore I am*". Identity appears as self, and self as identity, producing the illusion of sameness: I am I. I am myself.

In the superstructure of mainstream discourses and interpretations, the epistemological solipsism treats the human being, as if he or she were alone in the world. The individual is the primary base, and sociality is just something added, something secondary. Sociologists say "individual and society" as if society were not in the body of the individual, but somewhere outside. (It is this separation, which Norbert Elias built his whole figurational sociology up against, but with very limited success.) The discourse of "individualization" translates it into the historical process of modernization and postulates that we are on the way to become our own "*gesamtkunstwerk I*" (Beck 1998).

The modern "I" referring only to itself, appears - as Martin Buber (1923) expressed it - as a ghost behind the modern "It." Where the golem produces results, and nothing but results, the Ego flutters as a bodiless phantom of soul and mind, shadow-like through the factory.

The specific monumentalization of subjectivity and individuality in the process of modernity should - again - not block the view from the fact, that the "I" is a basic relation of the human being. Like the I-It relation, the I-Self is existential. The person has a monological potential, the "I" has *Eigen-Sinn* - a meaning on its own. (In German, *Eigensinn* denotes at the same time one's own, proper and singular import of a being and a capricious, obstinate attitude.)

It is a widespread stereotype that the pre-modern human being had no "I." This assumption follows the colonial myth that "the others" have

“not yet” reached our level of development of subjectivity. However, where people pull the mouth or tug the finger, the person is active; the *eigensinnige* human being is playing the game. Whether modern or pre-modern, whether Inuit or Danish, I experience strength and disgust, pain and pleasure; it is me who laughs and it is me who is in the centre of “the moment”.

The “I” of personal experience is human and universal. The modern subjectivity, in contrast, is historical. The pseudo-sovereignty of the individual is as historically specific as the individuality of choice in a supermarket.

Equality, inequality and the third

Attention to subjectivity in game helps to a deeper understanding of human movement. It turns our attention to the difference between two sets of rules, which contradict each other in the aspect of equality. Pull delivers pictures of this contrast.

One model shows **two equal parties pulling against each other** in order to produce a fair outcome – to produce “It.” Rules aim at creating and guaranteeing the balance, which makes the result fair. Though this pattern may look “natural” from the Western point of view, equality does not deliver the only model of pull.

In another model, we see one person challenging others. **All pull against one.** There is a fundamental imbalance, and this is not a mistake or cheating, it is the meaning of the game. The unequal game shows the force of “myself”.

However, the two models do not tell the whole story. Their contradiction is illustrative, but incomplete. This is shown by games of the *Brobrobrille* type. As one of the most well-known and most-practiced children’s games in Denmark, Brobrobrille combines song and catch-and-pull game. Two children form a bridge with their arms, while other children walk or dance in a row under the bridge and around the two, singing: “*Bro bro brille, klokken ringer elleve... (Bridge, bridge, bridge, the bell is ringing eleven.)*” One by one, the children are caught by the two bridge players and choose one of them, forming – by “secret” and accidental decision – two teams. These teams finally tug against each other. Embracing each other in a long row, the two rows pull their foremen – the “sun” and the “moon” respectively, from each other. The game ends when one team tugs the other over a marked line (Tvermose 1931, 220-230).

Like in other types of joint pulling games, it is difficult to describe this activity in terms of the I-It or I-Self relations only. Neither is the result of the pull – It – of central importance, the two teams being composed unequally and by accidental choice. Nor does the individual experience and the proof of the “I” play any remarkable role, as it is the case in the endurance competition of the “strong men”. A third relation appears: togetherness, body-to-body contact, and the interaction between “I” and “You.”

You - The relational dimension of movement

In a game we do not only produce "It," nor do we only experience the subjectivity of "I", but we meet each other. Game is an encounter: "Who are you - who am I?" In pull, we meet the other in different relations: I meet the opponent on the other side of the rope, I meet the other on my own side whom I embrace like in Brobrobrille. We meet the spectators and - what is frequently overlooked - we meet the environment as alterity. This meeting should not be understood in idyllic terms only. Encounter can also be dis-encounter; *Begegnung* can be *Vergegnung*, as Buber puts it.

Encounter, the human being as With and Also

Pull - like other types of fight and combat - make us come across **nearness**: You are near me. With your finger in my mouth, you break through my limits of intimacy. This proximity contrasts with the principle of distancing the other, which characterizes the politics of space in modern sport.

Your nearness may become sensible in my **pain**. Pain cannot be measured, that is why it is so problematic for the medical system, which is programmed towards "It" and tries to overcome pain by drugs, doping, or psychological tricks. On the other hand, pain is not only an individual feeling either; it is not only pure subjectivity of the monological "I." Pain comes into being by a collision between me and the world, in a clash with the "otherness." In this respect, pain is close to Buber's *Vergegnung*. You cannot prove your pain for me, but I can meet your pain in fellow feeling. Mouth pull, fight and combat, give evidence about this dialogical relation as well.

We experience encounter and relation by **rhythm**. My movement is a rhythmical answer to your movement, and vice versa. By the to-and-fro of pull, the two opponents find a joint time. In this respect, tug-of-war - like wrestling of the backhold type - is a sort of dance. The rhythm fills the space between you and me.

The You-relation shows not only in the opposition in a fight, but also in the combination of forces, in togetherness by **body contact**. In Swedish games like "To pull the ox" and "To tame the mare", the players lie on the back of their team-mates who crawl away from each other. In the Breton game of "*Ar vazh-a-benn*", each puller is held in the air by three or five comrades, who help in tugging. This type of pull fight results in a common outcome, which is amusing and sensual at the same time. "You" and "we" are linked together. I pull "with" the others and the result is "also" mine - the human being appears as With and Also, *Mitmensch* and *Auch-Mensch*.

In another way, encounter occurs in the **show**, in the meeting of the players and their audience. Mouth pull or any other tug and fight is a display, drama, expression, or performance. The active player enters into dialogue with an audience as an actor. The game creates a scene, a situation of seeing and being seen. There is a reciprocal effect between one's own grotesque body movement and the laughter of the others.

Tug-of-war is said to be "*famous for its vociferous participants and supporters*" (James 2000). In the show, there is interaction by collective cry and shout. The noise expresses passion going high both on the field, in ranks, and in between.

Identity, non-identity, alterity

In the action of pull and fight, identity is expressed. Tug displays a relation between "We" and "You." The game is a bodily practice of nostrification: Who am I, who are you, who are we?

This was expressed in the description of a Danish tug-of-war event in 1938. "*There were gigantic achievements. The blacksmiths quickly defeated the bakers, and the tailors could not stand long time against the coal-heavers who weighed at least twice as much. But there arose a gigantic competition between the dairy workers and the brewery men - and much to the distress of the agitators for abstinence, the beer won. The final was between the brewers and the coalmen, and here the brewery workers had 'to bite the dust'. 'This is not at all surprising,' said the captain of the coal-heavers. 'You only carry the beer, but it is us who drink it.'*"

The contest, described by these words in the Danish daily "*Social Demokraten*" (Hansen 1993), was the highlight of *Fagenes Fest*, the workers' "festival of professions" in Copenhagen in 1938. As "we" and "you", the professional groups challenged each other, displaying an overstressing picture, a sort of caricature of identity.

In *Fagenes Fest* play and movement constituted a theatre of identity. By bodily practice, people were saying "you" and "we" to each other - displaying themselves as bakers and coal-heavers, as men, women and children (socialist scouts), as workers, as Danish workers and as Danish nationals. During the Second World War when Nazi Germany held Denmark occupied, *Fagenes Fest* developed towards a demonstration of national togetherness and attracted the largest spectatorship in its history. Sport in this respect is not only an instrument of national (state) identity policies, but also a bodily way of expression, discovery and display of complex you/we-relations.

The nostrification expressed in the Danish tug was especially complex by displaying non-identity at the same time. The "brewers" of the tug were not only "themselves", but at the same time ironically "non-selves". They played a certain role. In role game, movement is a sort of mask, just as one can play the king, the witch or the fool in a carnival. Role is imitation of the other, whether a proud (re-) presentation, a caricatural mimesis, an impudent travesty - or a grimace of "the quite other". The grimace of mouth pull is not only a part of myself, but also an expression of 'otherness'. I am another, this is what the distorted face tells about my own alterity. The Inuit culture is especially rich with elements of grimacing, grotesque, frightening and ridiculing; it is both expressive and therapeutic. On this basis, modern Inuit theatre - like *Tukak* in Denmark - has developed a dramatic world of its own character (Jørgensen 1979).

Festivity and environment, death and laughter

An important position between identity and non-identity is occupied by the play of gender, the **erotic** dimension of game. The encounter in You-game offers a broad spectrum of erotic display. Games of flirt like Brobrobrille give a chance to touch and to be touched. Tug and wrestling can display gender roles in caricatural, even transvestitic forms. The erotic is a greatly overlooked but effectively exploited aspect of sports (Guttman 1996).

The great meeting in human life is **festivity**, the festive celebration of saying "you" to each other. Festivity puts rhythm into social time by lifting certain situations out of the flow of normality. On the other hand, it is by repetition that festivity creates ritual "holiness". By ritual meeting again and again, the "I" assures itself of the other as "You." In festivity, we get high in the here-and-now together. In this respect, game and festivity are in family, holding the complex balance between both the unique situation and the ritual repetition. And festivity is the social frame for play and game, from mouth pull in the Inuit winter festivity to tug-of-war in Danish workers' *Fagenes Fest*.

The larger part of what modern sports historians have reconstructed as "sports history" is at closer look nothing but a history of festivity. It is true, that the modern disciplinarity of sports has made festivity tendentiously disappear; but through the back door the festivity reappears as a surrogate, a show - the media event of the Olympics.

In game, togetherness is expressed also in a more extensive, trans-human way: the human being is related to the **environment**. Whether we tug the rope over a suburb lawn; whether we pull the finger in a smoky pub or as folklore for a tourist audience; whether the Arctic people pull each other in the over-heated winter house with their naked bodies close to each other, in a smell of carbon dioxide, sweat and train oil, under the deafening noise of the large skin drums - by movement, the human being meets the other, which is larger than the individual. Whether we build climbing architecture for children's game, form thread figures with the hand, roll the marble on the sandy ground or push the swing high up into the air; whether we run on the cinder-path or swim in the lagoon; whether we search the "untouched" nature or challenge the landscape - by movement, the human being says "you" to environment. Game is a sort of living deep ecology.

The terms of meeting and ecology may be misunderstood as idyllic, but this is not the whole story. In games like "To pull the cow to graze" (Danish *Græsse ko*), two opponents tug each other with a rope tied around their necks. In some variations of the game, a pole or a fire is placed between them. You pull my head against the pole, I pull you into the flame - this is what the tug tells, if realized in this full consequence about - **violence** and **death**. In some variants of Scandinavian wrestling, one could break the opponent's back - if it came so far. Whether it really comes so far, this is a theme of the game.

Movement and game is also **dangerous**. Children may make themselves or others unconscious, creating situations of fainting fit. And mature people try climbing dangerous rock faces or house facades, having drunk themselves from senses. Game is also playing with risk.

It is just "the impossible game", which demonstrates human mortality. By the impossible game, people play their finality. The human being is not only at home in the game, but also homeless - and a "You", nevertheless.

How to react to homelessness, pain, and the proximity of death? People **laugh**. Laughter is also a way of saying "you". Its bodily expression is a convulsive interaction, reciprocity from face to face, from body to body. Laughter is catching; it is infectious between you and me, like possession. Games are part of popular carnivalism (Bakhtine 1968), contrasting the solemnity of achievement production in "serious" Olympic sport. And on a very basic level, tickling tells the story of a more-than-individual body. I cannot tickle myself, but you can tickle me. For tickling, the "I" needs a "You."

Ex-centric theory of the body - and squint-eyed research

The dialogical relation to "You" turns our attention to an alternative understanding of "the human", which has its centre not in the individual human being as **individual**, but in the intermediary space - the **in-between**. Where the I-perspective centralizes, the You-perspective opens for the ex-centric dimension of "the human". The grimacing mouth pull and other eccentric tugs tell, thus, about the human ex-centricity - a social as well as a bodily story. The human being has no isolated existence. The human is not - not only, not primarily - inside the skin-body, but between other human beings. And this is the case not in an idealistic, bodiless sense, but in a concretely materialistic understanding. In tickling, "You" makes me laugh - and you are necessary, because I cannot tickle myself. By playing hide-and-seek with the baby, *titte-bøh* in Danish, *Guck-guck* in German, we are "away" - and feel the tension tickling in the belly, until the "You" reappears. By making noise - tam-tam - we create rhythm as a relation of resonance between you and me and the environment. Movement is a bodily medium showing - like the navel, the breath and the hearing - that the human being is not alone in the world. Human is the inter-body.

Humanism is inter-humanism.

By the dialogical movement, we are able to transgress the dualism, which has established itself in the theory of the body, confronting the "body we have" with the "body we are". This contrast, as it was unfolded in German theory, can be illustrative and prolific, indeed. To have a body vs. to be a body, was based on a pre-existing dualism in German language between the objective and material *Körper* and the subjective and spiritual *Leib*. *Körper* is the It-body, *Leib* is the I-body. The American philosophy of Somatics has copied this by confronting the objective "body" and the subjective "soma". But this is, again, not the entire story, as the Danish dualism of *krop/legeme* shows, which is constructed in another, more complex way. It is only via the "You" that the body and

movement of the human as a fellow-human (*Mensch* as *Mitmensch*) can be described. The **inter-body is third**.

What we need in order to understand it, is a squint-eyed theory. Squinting means to focus on two points at the same time. We focus on the historical: all is change, all is particular, all is relative here and now. And we focus on the anthropological, existential: all is related to human existence, to existence of human beings in plural, to life as an inter-human and inter-bodily process. When squinting our eyes, we do not produce the wholeness of one consistent picture. There is an overlap – and this will sometimes make us dizzy. But – as the pictures of the *Magic Eye*, the great craze of the 1990s, showed – squinting makes it possible to look behind the surface of things. We are able to see something third. By a technique of bodily ex-centricity we discover patterns. In this respect, the work of the historian-philosopher has a shamanic dimension.

Literature

ANDKJÆR, SØREN/JØRN MØLLER 1992: *Leg selv*. Copenhagen: Gjellerup & Gad.

ARLOTT, JOHN 1975 (ed.): *The Oxford Companion to Sports & Games*. London: Oxford University Press.

BAKHTINE, MIKHAIL 1968: *Rabelais and His World*. Cambridge, London: MIT.

BALCK, VIKTOR 1886/88 (ed.): *Illustrerad Idrottsbok*. Vol.1-3, Stockholm: C.E.Fritze.

BECK, ULRICH 1998: “Gesamtkunstwerk Ich.” In: RICHARD VAN DÜLMEN (ed.): *Erfindung des Menschen*. Wien: Böhlau. Pp.637-654.

BUBER, MARTIN 1923: *Ich und Du*. – In English: *I and Thou*. New York: Collier 1986 (first 1937).

BURAT, TAVO 1990: “Il tiro alla fune.” In: *Lo joà e les omo*, Aosta/Italy, 7, 37-46.

CRAWFORD, SCOTT A.G.M. 1996: “Tug of war.” In: DAVID LEVINSON/KAREN CHRISTENSEN (eds.): *Encyclopedia of World Sport*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO. Pp.1107-1110.

DIGEL, HELMUT/PETER FORNOFF 1989: *Sport in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit*. (= Forschungsberichte des Bundesministeriums für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit. 96) Köln: Weltforum.

DUFAITRE, ANNE 1989: Traditional games. Preliminary observations on the preparation of a national or regional catalogue or inventory. (= Memorandum ACDDS 26.89) Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

EICHBERG, HENNING 1983: “Einheit oder Vielfalt am Ball? Zur Kulturgeschichte des Spiels am Beispiel der Inuit und der Altisländer.” In: OMMO GRUPE et al. (eds.): *Spiel – Spiele – Spielen*. Schorndorf: Hofmann. Pp.131-153.

EICHBERG, HENNING 1990: “Stronger, funnier, deadlier: Track and field on the way to the ritual of the record.” In: JOHN MARSHALL CARTER/ARND KRÜGER (eds.): *Ritual and Record*.

- Sports Records and Quantification in Pre-Modern Societies*. New York: Greenwood 1990. Pp. 123-34.
- EICHBERG, HENNING 1989: "Trommeltanz der Inuit - Lachkultur und kollektive Vibration." In: EICHBERG/JØRN HANSEN (eds.): *Körperkulturen und Identität*. Münster: Lit. Pp.51-64.
- EICHBERG, HENNING 1995: "Body, Soma - and Nothing Else? Bodies in Language." In: *Sport Science Review*, Champaign/Ill., 4:1, pp.5-25.
- EICHBERG, HENNING 1997: "Otherness in Encounter. Thinking Folk Identity, Democracy and Civil Society with the Help of Martin Buber." In: Ove Korsgaard (ed.): *Adult Learning and the Challenge of the 21st Century*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, pp.88-99.
- EICHBERG, HENNING 1998: *Body Cultures. Essays on Sport, Space and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- ELIAS, NORBERT 1981: "Zivilisation und Gewalt." In: *Ästhetik und Kommunikation*, Berlin, 10:43, pp.5-12.
- ENDREI, WALTER/LÁSZLÓ ZOLNAY 1986: *Fun and Games in Old Europe*. Budapest: Corvina.
- FLOC' H, MARCEL/FANCH PERU 1987: *C' hoariou Breizh. Jeux traditionnels de Bretagne*. Rennes: Institut Culturel de Bretagne.
- FREY, RICHARD D./MIKE ALLEN 1989: "Alaskan native games - A cross-cultural addition to the physical education curriculum." In: *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, Nov./Dec., pp.21-24.
- GEORGENS, JAN DANIEL 1883 (ed.): *Illustriertes Sport-Buch*. Leipzig, Berlin: Otto Spamer. New ed. Münster: Lit, no year (1980s).
- GRUNFELD, FREDERIC V. et al. 1975: *Spelletjes uit de hele Wereld*. Amstelveen: Plenary Publications.
- GUTSMUTHS 1793: *Gymnastik für die Jugend*. Schnepfenthal. Reprint (= Quellenbücher der Leibesübungen. 1) Dresden: Limpert 1928.
- GUTTMANN, ALLEN 1996: *The Erotic in Sports*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- HANSEN, JØRN 1993: "Fagenes Fest. Working class culture and sport." In: KNUT DIETRICH/HENNING EICHBERG (eds.): *Körpersprache. Über Identität und Konflikt*. Frankfurt/-Main: Afra. Pp.97-129.
- HELLSPONG, MATS 2000a: *Den folkliga idrotten. Studier i det svenska bondesamhällets idrotter och fysiska lekar under 1700- och 1800-tallet*. Stockholm: Nordiska Museets Forlag.
- HELLSPONG, MATS 2000b: "Våldets plats i den traditionella svenska idrotten." In: JOHAN R. NORBERG (ed.): *Studier i idrott, historia och samhälle*. Festschrift for Jan Lindroth. Stockholm: HLS. Pp.63-73.
- HOBERMAN, John 1992: *Mortal Engines. The Science of Performance and the Dehumanization of Sport*. New York: The Free Press.
- HOWELL, REET 1986: "Traditional sports, Oceania." In: DAVID LEVINSON/KAREN CHRISTENSEN (eds.): *Encyclopedia of World Sport*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO. Pp.1083-1093.

Hvorned skal jeg more mig? Samling af Lege og Beskjeftigelser for Børn og unge Mennesker, som kunne tjene til at uddanne Legemet eller skærpe Forstanden. Copenhagen: Pio 1861. (After the English: *The Boy's Own Book.*)

Idrætten i Grønland. Festschrift for the 25th anniversary of Grønlands Idræts-Forbund. No place (Greenland) 1978.

JAMES, TREVOR 2000: "Tug of war." In: RICHARD COX/GRANT JARVIE/WRAY VAMPLEW (eds.): *Encyclopedia of British Sport.* Oxford: ABC-CLIO. Pp.401-402.

JARVIE, GRANT 1991: *Highland Games. The Making of the Myth.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

JENSEN, BENT 1965: *Eskimoisk festlighed.* Copenhagen.

JØRGENSEN, OLE 1979: *Tukak' teatret - Eskimoisk trommesang.* DK: Tukak.

KANEDA, EIKO 1999: "Trends in Traditional Women's Sumo in Japan." In: *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 16:3, pp.113-119.

Keewatin Inuit Associations: *Inuit Games.* Originally published by the Department of Education, Regional Ressource Center, Government of N.W.T. Rankin Inlet 1989.

KORSGAARD, OVE 198: *Kredsgang. Grundtvig som bokser.* Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

LARSEN, HELGE 1972: "Sport hos eskimoerne." In: HENNING NIELSEN (ed.): *For sportens skyld.* Copenhagen, pp.117-127.

LEFEBVRE, HENRI 1959: *La somme et le reste.* Paris: La Neuf de Paris, vols.1-2.

MAUSS, MARCEL/HENRI BEUCHAT 1904/05: "Essai sur les variations saisonnières des sociétés Eskimos." In: *L'année sociologique*, 9, 39-132. - In English: *Seasonal Variations of the Eskimo. A Study in Social Morphology.* London: Henley 1979.

MEYER, A.C. 1908 (ed.): *Idrætsbogen.* Vol.1-2, Copenhagen: Chr. Erichsen.

MØLLER, JØRN 1984: "Sports and Old Village Games in Denmark." In: *Canadian Journal of History of Sport*, 15:2, pp.19-29.

MØLLER, JØRN 1990/91: *Gamle idrætslege i Danmark.* New ed. Gerlev: Idrætshistorisk Værksted 1997, Vols.1-4.

MØLLER, JØRN 1997: "Traditional games - The Danish project." In: Amador Ramirez, Fernando/Ulises Castro Nunez/José Miguel Alamo Mendoza 1997 (coord.): *Luchas, deportes de combate y juegos tradicionales.* Madrid: Gymnos. Pp.771-785

MØLLER, JØRN 2000: *Euroleg. 121 gamle lege og spil fra Idrætshistorisk Værksteds internationale legepark.* Gerlev.

NEWTON, CLYDE/GERALD J. TOFF 1994: *Dynamic Sumo.* Tokyo: Kodansha International.

NOVAK, HELMUT 1989: *Schottische "Highland Games". Traditioneller Volkssport einer ethnischen Minderheit im Wandel der Zeit.* (= Düsseldorf sportwissenschaftliche Studien. 4) Düsseldorf: Institut für Sportwissenschaft der Universität.

SCHECHNER, RICHARD 1993: *The Future of Ritual. Writings on Culture and Performance*. London, New York: Routledge.

SLOTTERDIJK, PETER 1998-99: *Sphären*. Bd.1-2. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

STEJSKAL, MAXIMILIAN 1954: *Folklig idrott*. Helsingfors. Doctoral dissertation at the University of Åbo.

SUTTON-SMITH, BRIAN 1983: "Die Idealisierung des Spiels." In: OMMO GRUPE u. a. (eds.): *Spiel - Spiele - Spielen*. Schorndorf: Hofmann. Pp.60-75.

THISTED, KIRSTEN 1997: *Jens Kreutzmann. Fortællinger og akvareller*. Nuuk: Atuakkiorfik.

TVERMOSE THYREGOD, S. 1931: *Danmarks Sanglege*. Copenhagen: Schönberg.

ULF, CHRISTOPH 1981: "Sport bei den Naturvölkern." In: INGOMAR WEILER: *Der Sport bei den Völkern der alten Welt*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Pp.14-52.

WAHLQVIST, BERTIL 1979: *Vikingarnas vilda lekar*. Stockholm 1978. - In Danish: *Barsk idræt. Sport i vikingetiden*. DK: Hamlet.

WALLECHINSKY, DAVID 1992: *The Complete Book of the Olympics*. London: Aurum.

Some websites of Tug-of-War:

British Tug-of-War Association: <http://www.tugofwar.co.uk/>

Germany: <http://www.tauziehen.de/>

Japan: <http://www2.tokai.or.jp/marutoku/index2.html>

Scotland: <http://www.stowa.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/>

Illustrations

- Mouth pull. From: Keewatin 1989, p. 38.

- Arse pull, painting of Aron of Kangeq, 19th century, the Ethnographic Museum of the University of Oslo. From: Thisted 1997, p.154.

- Anchor woman in a tug-of-war of Danish *Fagenes Fest* 1960, photograph in the ABA, the Danish Trade Unions' Archive. From: Hansen 1993, p.110.

- The dangerous pull of *Græsse ko*, woodcut from Køge, Denmark, 16th century. From: Møller 1990/91, vol. 4, p.19.