CHAPTER VII THE DIRECTION OF A BOUT AND THE JUDGING OF HITS

B. – JUDGING BY JURY

1. The duties of the President.

The President will take up his position at a distance from the piste which will enable him completely to follow the actions of the fencers and will follow the competitors in their movements on the piste.

He directs the bout according to the provisions of the rules (Cf. 227ss, 322ss, 415ss).

2. Positions occupied by the judges.

Two judges are placed on each side of the piste on the President’s right and left respectively, and slightly behind the competitors.

The two judges placed on the President’s right hand should watch the fencer who is placed on the President’s left hand and especially verify the arrival of hits which this competitor may receive.

Similarly, the two judges placed on the President’s left hand should watch the fencer who is placed on the President’s right hand and especially verify the arrival of hits which this competitor may receive (however Cf. 69/4).


(a) Procedure.

The President, who alone is responsible for the direction of the bout, gives the orders. However, any other member of the jury may give the command “Halt”, but only if he thinks that there is an accident.

Similarly the timekeeper stops the bout by calling “Halt” when time expires.

As soon as a judge sees a hit (whether on a valid surface or not) arrive on the fencer whom he is watching he must raise his hand in order to advise the President.

All judging is carried out aloud without the members of the jury leaving the positions they occupy.

The jury is not bound to take account of the acknowledgement of a hit properly made by a competitor (Cf. 606).

The jury first decides as to the materiality of the hit or hits. The President then alone decides against which fencer a hit shall be scored by applying the conventional rules for each weapon.

(b) Materiality of the hit.

As soon as the bout has stopped, the President reconstructs briefly the movements which composed the last fencing phrase before the order “Halt” (this formality is not obligator at epee) and in the course of his analysis he questions the two judges watching one fencer in order to ascertain whether in their opinion any of the movements occurring in his analysis of the phrase has resulted in a hit on the competitor; he then follows the same procedure with two other judges for the other competitor (this formality must be observed at all three weapons).

When the judges are question they must reply in one of the following ways: “Yes”, “Yes but not valid”, “No” or “I abstain”. The president votes last.
The President then aggregates the votes thus made from each side, the opinion of each judge counts as one vote, the opinion of the President counts as one and a half votes while abstentions are not counted at all:

1. If both judges on the same side agree in a positive opinion (either both say “Yes”, or both say “No”, or both say “Yes but not valid”) their judgement prevails.

2. If one of the judges has a definite opinion and the other abstains, the opinion of the Present prevails since his vote is over-riding; if he also abstains, the decision of the judge who has the definite opinion prevails.

3. If the two judges concerned are positive but contrary opinions or if both abstain, the president may decide according to his own observations (1); if he also abstains, the hit is regarded as doubtful (Cf. 5 below)

(1) Examples:

I. Judge A says “no”; Judge B says “yes but not valid”; even if the President considers the hit valid, the judgement must be “no hit”; but in this example since one Judge and the President agree that there has been contact with the point on the opponent, after the decision “no hit” anything which occurs thereafter must be annulled.

II. Judge A says “yes”; but Judge B says “yes but not valid” the President abstains; he cannot therefor score the hit since there is a doubt as to whether it arrived on a valid surface or not; however, since both judges are agreed that there was contact with the point on the opponent, after the decision “no hit” anything which occurs subsequently must be annulled.

4. In the case of a double abstention, the President may, as an exceptional measure, as the opinions of the two other judges if he considers that they were better placed to see the hit – for example: a riposte on the back bade on a fencer who has made a fleche attack and has passed his opponent.

5. A doubtful hit is never scored against the competitor who might have received it; but, on the other hand, any hit made subsequently or simultaneously in the same phrase by the fencer who has thus been granted the benefit of the doubt must also be annulled; (but Cf. 38) as regards a hit made subsequently by the fencer who originally made the doubtful hit, the following course will apply:

   I. If the new hit (remise, redoublement, or riposte) is made by a fencer who made the doubtful hit without any hit having been made by his opponent, this new hit must be scored.

   II. But if the doubt concerns the surface on which the hit arrived (one “Yes” and one “Yes but not valid”) no other hit in this phrase can be scored.

   III. This is also the case if the opponent has made a doubtful hit between the doubtful hit and the new hit made by the competitor.

(c) Validity or priority of the hit.

After the jury had decided the materiality of the hit, the President, acting alone and by applying the conventional rules for each weapon, decides against which fencer a hit is to be awarded, whether both are hit (epee) or if there is no valid hit (Cf. 232ss, 329ss, 416ss)