



Scholastic Clues in Two Latin Fencing Manuals : Bridging the Gap between Medieval and Renaissance Cultures

Hélène Leblanc, Franck Cinato

► To cite this version:

Hélène Leblanc, Franck Cinato. Scholastic Clues in Two Latin Fencing Manuals : Bridging the Gap between Medieval and Renaissance Cultures. *Acta Periodica Duellatorum*, 2023, 11 (1), pp.39-63. 10.36950/apd-2023-004 . hal-04103790

HAL Id: hal-04103790

<https://hal.science/hal-04103790>

Submitted on 6 Feb 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Scholastic Clues in Two Latin Fencing Manuals: Bridging the Gap between Medieval and Renaissance Cultures

Hélène Leblanc
UCLouvain

in collaboration with Franck Cinato
Université Paris Cité / Université Sorbonne Nouvelle¹

Abstract – Intellectual historians have rarely attended to the genre of fighting manuals, but these provide a new window on long-debated questions such as the relationship between Scholasticism and Humanism. This article offers a close comparison of the first known fencing manual, the 14-th century *Liber de Arte Dimicatoria* (Leeds, Royal Armouries FECHT 1, previously and better known as MS I.33), and the corpus of fighting manuals which underwent a remarkable expansion during the 15th and 16th centuries. While the former clearly shows its origins in a scholastic background, the latter is mainly viewed as reflecting its humanist context. To this historiographical division corresponds a linguistic one: MS I.33 is a Latin text, while the rest of the corpus is mainly written in German and Italian. However, exceptions arise, amongst which, Heinrich von Gunterrodt's *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia: sive de Veris Principiis Artis Dimicatoriae* (1579), the first text which explicitly refers to I.33. This article will compare these two texts, in order to interrogate their common relation to Scholasticism, namely the traditional frame of the knowledge within the medieval and early modern universities. The intent is to show that (at least some) Renaissance fight books include references to Scholasticism and to provide a better qualification of the nature of such references. The general hypothesis is that a large part of the texts—and products of culture—of the Renaissance that have been read, until recently, exclusively in relation to a humanist intellectual background can valuably be interpreted in the context of a Scholasticism that is still vivid during the period in question.

Keywords – Heinrich von Gunterrodt, *Liber de Arte Dimicatoria*, MS I.33, Humanism, Scholasticism

¹ Université Paris Cité and Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, CNRS, Laboratoire d'histoire des théories linguistiques, F-75013 Paris, France.

Praesertim cum omnis intuitiva noticia sit optima definitio, ac reipsa comprobari, et uerberibus demonstrari queat, si uerbis fides non habeatur (Especially since every intuitive knowledge is the best definition; and, if one does not trust the words, one will be able to prove the thing itself by the blows). Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia*, 1579 (MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 20v).²

There seems to be a sharp separation between the *Liber de Arte Dimicatoria* (Leeds, Royal Armouries FECHT 1, better known as MS I.33), namely the oldest fencing book currently known, representing buckler play set of techniques, and dating back to the early fourteenth century (ca. 1280-1320),³ and the majority of the fight books corpus undergoing a remarkable expansion during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

While I.33 is clearly indebted to its medieval-scholastic background, the latter corpus is usually interpreted in connection to its humanist context. This historiographical division matches a linguistic one: I.33 is a Latin text, while the rest of the corpus is mainly written in German and Italian. However, exceptions arise, amongst which Heinrich von Gunterrodt's treatises on fencing. There are two versions of this work: a short, printed, version entitled *De Veris Principiis Artis Dimicatoriae, tractatus brevis* (1579, Wittenberg), and a longer manuscript version, titled *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia: sive de veris principiis artis dimicatoriae* (MS Dresd. C. 15, dated of the same year 1579).⁴

I.33 is rightfully renowned as the first in a long line of treatises. Contrarily, Gunterrodt's text is often only known for being precisely the first to refer to the I.33.

² We are very grateful to François Siedel for his work of edition, transcription and French translation of Heinrich von Gunterrodt's text. The present article reproduces his transcription for MS Dresd. C. 15, f.4r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia*, 1579). We are also grateful to Olivier Dupuis, Benjamin Conan and an anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments.

³ Cinato, 'Development, Diffusion and Reception of the "Buckler Play"', p. 488 and 513. Cinato emphasizes the need to set back the date of creation of I.33 to the last years of the thirteenth century. See also Forgeng, 'Introduction' to *The Medieval Art of Swordsmanship*, p. 7, who agrees with Rainer Leng's datation of the manuscript around 1320-30. See Leng, *Katalog*, pp. 124-6. Jaquet, 'European Fight Books 1305-1630: Classification, typology and comparison', p. 16, adopts a date in 1305.

⁴ See the dedicatory epistle MS Dresd. C. 15, f.4r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia*, 1579). The title of Gunterrodt's work is striking. *Hoplomachia* refers to combat with weapons. The meaning of *sciomachia* is less clear. It refers to combat against a shadow (Gunterrodt gives the Latin translation of *umbrae pugna*, MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 72r), and by extension combat as an exercise. For further information, see Siedel, 'Préface' to Gunterrodt, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat*, t. I, pp. 20-21, who stresses the opposition 'without an adversary' *versus* 'against an adversary' makes more sense than the one contrasting 'without weapons' *versus* 'with weapons'.

This article will compare the anonymous⁵ MS I.33 and Gunterrodt's text, in order to show that Renaissance fight books —or at least some of them— include references to Scholasticism. The general —and more ambitious— hypothesis, is that a large part of the texts —and products of culture— of the Renaissance that have been read, until recently, exclusively in relation to a humanist intellectual background would benefit from being studied within the context of a Scholasticism that is still vivid during the period at stake.

Amongst Gunterrodt's two versions of his treatise, the present article will mainly take into consideration the MS Dresd. C. 15, dedicated to Christian I, Elector of Saxony (1560-1591), which is by far the most detailed and illustrated: while the printed version presents only one illustration, the manuscript presents no less than 5 diagrams and 64 illustrations by Conradus Knobloch.⁶ The MS Dresd. C. 15 is also, in this sense, far closer to I.33 since that latter is also characterized by the preeminent role of images.

The term 'scholastic' is a complex label and the product of a long historiography.⁷ Within the scope of this article it will correspond to the following functional definition: 'used in the medieval and early modern universities, in particular in the faculties of arts and theology'. As it is known and as it is worth stressing here, the medieval arts faculty is composed of the *trivium*: grammar, rhetoric and dialectic and the *quadrivium*: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music. During the Renaissance period, both produced the new division between Humanities (*studia humanitatis*) and philosophy.

Overall, the standard education of the early modern period matches the following table:

Humanist studies	Philosophy
Grammar	Logic
Rhetoric	Natural philosophy (Physics)
Poetry	Metaphysics
History	Ethics

⁵ See Cinato and Surprenant, 'Introduction' to *Le livre de l'Art du Combat*, pp. LXX, and Cinato and Surprenant, 'Luitger par lui-même?'.

⁶ See Siedel, 'Préface' to Gunterrodt, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat*, t. I, pp. 15-17 and t. II pp. 6-7.

⁷ See Cinato and Surprenant, 'Introduction' in *Le Livre de l'Art du Combat*, p. LXV, note 111. On the origins of the signification of the term *scholasticus*, see the seminal work of Paré, Brunet, Tremblay, *La Renaissance au XII^e siècle*, pp. 59-60 et 69-71. More generally, see Geyer (ed.), *Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie*. 2. Teil: *Die patristische und die scholastische Philosophie*, p. 143; Flasch, *Das philosophische Denken im Mittelalter*, pp. 86-90; Schönberger, *Was ist Scholastik?*, pp. 20-28, who nuanced (or criticized) the doctrinal unity of Scholasticism as it has been originally claimed by Fernand Van Steenberghen and Maurice de Wulf. On the label of "Scholasticism" see for a bibliographical overview König-Pralong 2011: 290–294, as well as the introduction to Dekoninck, Guiderdoni, Leblanc, Smeesters, *Clés scolastiques pour la théorie des lettres et des arts des 16^e et 17^e siècles*. Forthcoming.

Table 1: *the standard education at the edge of modernity*

One began with Humanities, studying grammar, rhetoric, poetry and history. In university, one begins with philosophy (logic, natural philosophy, metaphysics, ethics) and then chooses a superior faculty (medicine, jurisprudence, theology).

It is also worth highlighting two points. First, the above-cited definition assumes that Scholasticism is essentially structured by a hierarchical relation of subordination between philosophy and theology. However, most students were only concerned with philosophy qua propaedeutic to any higher education. Moreover, the sphere of influence of such an academic knowledge and methodology extended well beyond the universities. Second, such a definition considers Scholasticism on a *longue-durée* perspective: Scholasticism is not reduced to medieval philosophy (the reverse being equally false) and is still vivid during the early modern period. Medieval Scholasticism is followed by a late medieval one (14th-15th centuries), and by an early modern Scholasticism (16th-17th centuries). The last remark matches a historiographical issue. In a nutshell, there are two kinds of periodization. The history of ideas, and more particularly of philosophy, has long preferred a narrative by ruptures. According to such a narrative, the Golden Age of Scholasticism extends from 1000 to 1300. It is preceded by the Patristic era and by the Monastic conservation era during early and high medieval periods. It is followed by a trend of “decadent” late Scholasticism, collapsing in front of humanist critics and whose end is marked by the entry into modernity from Descartes to the French revolution. (It is worth mentioning that such a narrative owes much to the humanists themselves.) Such an historiography is counterbalanced by an alternative periodization that assumes a continuist standpoint. In such a view, there is not one but many Scholasticisms. This periodization begins ca 500 with Boethius in the West. It is followed by a First Western Scholasticism (500–1100); then by a Second Western Scholasticism after the entry of Arabic sources in Latin corpus (1100–1500). This periodization also provides space for Modern Scholasticism (Catholic and Reformed) (1500–1800).⁸ The present article is in line with the continuist standpoint.

Let us now go on with our hypothesis: MS I.33 and Gunterrodt’s text can be studied as privileged witnesses of the continuities within the corpus of the fight books, continuity that is structured around particular relations with the academic, a.k.a. scholastic culture. A caveat: the intent of the present article is *not* to claim the existence of a unified and self-conscious tradition, nor to claim that the fight books are direct *products* of Scholasticism. Rather, the present article aims at 1) interrogating the opposition between the medieval I.33 and the successive renaissance treatises, which are often read only in relation to a humanist context; 2) providing the means for a forthcoming broader investigation of the

⁸ See, amongst a large number of studies, Blum, *Philosophenphilosophie und Schulphilosophie*, pp. 158-181; Grendler, ‘The Universities of the Renaissance and Reformation’; and, generally, Weijers, *Le maniement du savoir*. Concerning the manifold scholarship on the topic in the history of philosophy, let us refer to Schmutz, ‘Bulletin de scolastique moderne’ for a complete picture until the 2000s.

cultural context and putative academic culture of the authors of treatises of combat. In other words, Gunterrodt's text can valuably be read with an eye on the scholastic features that it carries, and not only as a humanist adaptation of a medieval text.

The first part of the article will be aimed at grounding the comparison between MS I.33 and MS Dresd. C. 15 by providing further elements on the relation between I.33 and Gunterrodt's work on the one hand, and on the relation between I.33 and Scholasticism. Thus armed, we will be able to interrogate the relation of Gunterrodt's text to Scholasticism, and by doing so, provide elements of understanding on the relations of the fight books authors at the edge of the early modern period and university culture of the same period.

The second part will comprise core of the demonstration to argue that Gunterrodt indeed keeps scholastic features that were present in I.33 but that they appear to be completely different in nature: while in I.33 they are clues of a clerical context of fencing activity and textual production, in Gunterrodt's text they are formal elements that assume the role of legitimizing a text and, maybe, a practice.

I. GROUNDING THE HYPOTHESIS

I.1. First premise: Gunterrodt's text is related to I.33

The relation of Gunterrodt to I.33 is easy to prove since, as said before, Gunterrodt is, to the best of our knowledge, the first author to quote I.33.⁹ It is even the main topic, and sometimes the only one, for which he is famous. Introducing his intended task, Gunterrodt refers to MS I.33 in fol. 17v as a: *Librum vetustissimum compositum a monachis nobilibus*¹⁰ that he was fortunate enough to read and upon which he will rely as a model in order to write his own treatise.

How did Gunterrodt happen to know I.33? It is likely that detached illustrated fragments of I.33 circulated first.¹¹ Only in a second moment of the reception, the treatise reappears

⁹ See Cinato and Surprenant, 'Introduction' in *Le Livre de l'Art du Combat*, pp. XXIII–XXVIII on the Gunterrodt's testimony on the MS I.33, as well as Forgeng (ed.), *The Medieval Art of Swordmanship*, pp. 9–10.

¹⁰ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 17v (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

¹¹ Cinato, 'Development, Diffusion and Reception of the "Buckler Play"', p. 490. The argument is that several collections of disordered images show striking likenesses with the images of I.33. It implies that copies of the illustrations must have been made at different times and must have circulate until Augsburg and Paulus Hector Mair. Mair recomposes a text on the basis of the sole images and does not seem to have any knowledge of the original text. Among the witnesses of the dissemination of I.33 illustrations, let us cite Paulus Hector Mair, Jörg Breu of Augsburg, Jörg Wilhm, Albrecht Dürer, MS Cluny, Ludwig von Eyb, Talhoffer, Paulus Kal, the anonymous *Gladiatoria*. Many of which update the clothes of the characters but not the positions. The favour accorded by the theorists to sword and buckler despite the decline of the practice is striking (Cinato,

in a Franconian monastery in the second half of the sixteenth century. It was still incomplete but had acquired its current form.¹² It then belongs to (or more exactly has been stolen by) Johannes Herwart of Würzburg, belt maker and fencer, who was also Gunterrodt's friend.¹³

Thus, coming to know I.33, Gunterrodt basically writes that he will give the *fundamenta* of the art of combat on the basis of 'a very old book composed by very noble monks'. Two remarks here. First, it is worth noting the plural, as a clue for arguing that Gunterrodt has had a direct contact with the manuscript written by different hands.¹⁴ Second, concerning the 'noble monks', Gunterrodt adopts the inaccurate hypothesis of old and famous war leaders retired into monastery, writing, basically, for reasons of vanity. The hypothesis is doubly mistaken since the teacher-character of I.33 is not a monk but a priest (*sacerdos*).

Besides the famous explicit reference to I.33, all along Gunterrodt's text, the 'old book' appears as its palimpsest. Gunterrodt explicitly claims the vocabulary of I.33 – moreover as a *technical* vocabulary:

*deinde custodiarum (ut monachorum vocabulum technicum retineam) species pictas exhibeam, denique de contrariis earum disseram.*¹⁵

then I will show the kinds of guards (to use the technical term of the monks); finally, I will dissertate on the counters to these.

Gunterrodt adopts the lexicon of the *custodia* (guard) that was one central element of I.33 and he takes the trouble to stress that by doing so he 'keep[s] the technical vocabulary of the monks' (Note that Gunterrodt refers once more to the authors of I.33 as 'monks' and not 'priest').

Let us quote another example:

[...] *inxta Monachorum versiculos:*

Ligans ligati contrarii sunt et irati /

'Development, Diffusion and Reception of the "Buckler Play"', p. 511) and seems to indicate I.33 as an *auctoritas* within an effort of theoretical reflection. Cf. https://wiktenauer.com/wiki/Anonymous_sword_and_buckler_images (last accessed 22 November 2022).

¹² According to the different studies conducted, there are divergent points of detail, but there is a consensus that the manuscript is missing three bifolia and at least two isolated folios. The various hypotheses were discussed by Binard & Jaquet 2016, with the previous bibliography.

¹³ See MS Dresd. C. 15 fol. 18^r. Herwart of Würzburg would have plundered the manuscript in a monastery in Franconia while serving the armies of Margrave Albert in 1552-54. See Forgeng, 'Introduction' to *The Medieval Art of Swordsmanship*, p. 9.

¹⁴ Cinato and Surprenant, 'Introduction' in *Le Livre de l'Art du Combat*, p. xxv.

¹⁵ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 41^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579). Unless specified otherwise, the English translations are ours. All underlines are ours.

*Ligatus fugit ad partes laterum peto sequi.*¹⁶

[...], according to the little verses of the monks

The one who binds and the one who is bound are contrary and irate;

The one who is bound flees to the side; I seek to pursue.

Gunterrodt correctly quotes the verse ‘Ligans ligati’, frequently recurring in I.33, on the action of binding. Moreover, he has internalized I.33 enough to use expressions such as ‘generalis regula’ in the following lines, or ‘ne ad effectum producat intentionem’; ‘notandum est, quod adversarius primo actu observato’.¹⁷ Such linguistic loans are striking since they match precisely what can be characterised, in MS I.33, as elements of scholastic rationalisation. We will give a more in-depth account of this point in the next section. For now, let us refer to the appendix for further concordances between Gunterrodt’s text and I.33, and consider the relation between both of them as plainly proved.

I.2. Second premise: MS I.33 is the product of scholastic rationalisation of a non-scholastic technique

One way of demonstrating that Gunterrodt is influenced by Scholasticism is to show that he is influenced by the scholastic features of MS I.33. The previous section has shown that the I.33 was a major source for Gunterrodt. The present section aims at asserting that I.33 indeed has spontaneously scholastic features. This is precisely the thesis supported by Cinato and Surprenant in their introduction to MS I.33. It has been reiterated by Forgeng. In essence, Cinato and Surprenant claim that the manuscript is the product of an unknown process of clericalization, Latinization and systematization of a profane, vernacular and oral technique. In short, the manuscript is a work of scholastic rationalization of a non-scholastic technique.¹⁸

¹⁶ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 48^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579). Cf. trans. Forgeng, *The Medieval Art of Swordsmanship*, p. 49 for the translation of the verses. The I.33 includes a small corpus of mnemonic verses (cf. Cinato and Surprenant, ‘Introduction’ in *Le Livre de l’Art du Combat*, p. lxxxviii et annexe 7) which has recently been re-studied with great attention and is the focus of Antti Ijäs’ thesis work (*Study of the Language and Genre of the Royal Armouries MS I.33*, Helsinki, 2022). In his dissertation A. Ijäs discusses carefully the Gunterrodt testimony.

¹⁷ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 48^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579): *Quod si patitur cuspidem in corpus intentum antimachus intrandum est / P (rbo in marg.) per medium veruti adversarii usque ad tuum medium firmum (quod perpetuo observandum est loco generalis regulae, ut restet tibi pars ad defensionem tui corporis, sicut et contra mucro ac quarta pars veruti semper at pene sola ad laesionem inimici aptissima est.* See also MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 49^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

¹⁸ Cinato and Surprenant, ‘Introduction’ in *Le Livre de l’Art du Combat*, p. xxxiv-xlii. See also Forgeng, ‘Introduction’ to *The Medieval Art of Swordsmanship*, p. 19.

This claim is supported by, at least, three kinds of arguments: stylistic / methodological / conceptual (or doctrinal).¹⁹ Cinato and Surprenant stress the scholastic lexicon. They identify within MS I.33 structure homologous elements to the scholastic *expositio*, *lectio*, *glossae*, *quaestiones*, *disputationes*. They identify means of the *probatio per rationes*. They emphasize the pedagogical context represented within the manuscript (two-person demonstrations to a group, omission of defences – reserved for the priest most of the time – that aims at defining the failures of an opponent).²⁰ Cinato and Surprenant also display the seven guards matching the seven liberal arts, the treelike structure of the art of combat (aiming at developing the decisional abilities of the student), the taxonomy of bindings that follows the dichotomic logic of the *divisio*,²¹ the uses of the concepts of *intentio* or of *omissio*.²²

The arguments given in favour of the scholastic interpretation of I.33 are convincing enough to build upon them, going forward, the next section of the present article that will get to the core of the demonstration, asking whether and in what extent, such clues of a ‘scholastic rationalization’ are still present in Gunterrodt’s text.

II. MAPPING THE CLUES OF SCHOLASTICISM IN GUNTERRODT’S *SCIOMACHIA ET HOPILOMACHIA*

II.1. A caveat

Compared to I.33, Gunterrodt’s humanist references are striking. Unsurprisingly, the gap of more than two centuries is manifest. More than that, Gunterrodt’s text, at first sight, seems to be characterised by a typical humanistic appearance, witnessing a radical cultural change. Gunterrodt’s reader is dealing with a mix of humanistic Latin and German words in margins; a huge amount of Greek lexicon and references; numerous references to the Ancients (Horace, Pliny, Plutarch) and an introductory part on the Ancient gymnastic games (namely *lucta* or wrestling, *pugilatus* or boxing; as well as *pancratium*). Gunterrodt also cites the famous humanists Guillaume Budé, and Ravisius.²³ His references are typical of a humanist background. Regarding the Ancients, he cites Plato, Cicero, Plautus, Galenus. He also cites Aristotle, which would have been more typical of a scholastic context if the works referred to had been logic or metaphysics. By contrast, Gunterrodt’s Aristotle is the one of the *Politics* and of the *Ethics*, that pertains clearly to the fields of

¹⁹ It also enables the editors to characterize I.33 as a rare case of ‘scholastic glosses of the image’.

²⁰ Cinato and Surprenant, ‘Introduction’ in *Le Livre de l’Art du Combat*, p. I.XXXVIII.

²¹ Cinato and Surprenant, ‘Introduction’ in *Le Livre de l’Art du Combat*, p. XXXVIII-XXXIX.

²² Cinato and Surprenant, ‘Introduction’ in *Le Livre de l’Art du Combat*, p. XC.

²³ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 9^r and 18^v (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

politics and law where humanist culture mainly spreads. Regarding more modern references, Gunterrodt keeps the same line citing the Italian jurists Baldus of Ubaldis (1327-1400), Bartolus de Saxoferrato (1313-1357) and most of all, Hieronymus Mercurialis (1530-1606), philologist and physician, who was professor in Padova, Bologna and Pisa during the sixteenth century, as well as the author of a famous *De arte gymnastica*.²⁴

However, acknowledging the humanist-type references in Gunterrodt's text does not contradict its continuity with I.33. First of all, various indications point to a reception of the medieval treatise itself within a humanistic context.²⁵ The present article does not intend to deny that Gunterrodt belongs within such a context. Rather, it suggests that it is not contradictory with a scholastic influence, this suggestion assuming that Humanism and Scholasticism are not in every time and every place as strongly antagonistic as polemical writing at the time and historiographic accounts have since claimed.

II.2. Gunterrodt's own relation to Scholasticism

In the previous section (I.2), we noted that proving traces of Scholasticism in Gunterrodt entails proving traces of the scholastic features of MS I.33 in Gunterrodt's text. Before

²⁴ Cf. the Index of the authors cited by Gunterrodt provided by Siedel: Gunterrodt, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat*, t. I, pp. 212-213, as well as the Ongaro, 'Mercuriale, Girolamo', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 73 (2009), online https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/girolamo-mercuriale_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ [last accessed 22 November 2022].

²⁵ One of the main clues is the quotation on the first folio of I.33, attributed to a key figure of the Renaissance humanism: Enea Silvio Bartolomeo Piccolomini (1405-1464), later Pope Pius II. Leeds, Royal Armouries FECHT 1 (MS I.33), fol. 1^r reads: *Non aude[re] Stygius Pluto tentare, quod aude[re] / Effrenis Monachus plenaque fraudis anus*, namely 'The devil of hell does not dare attempt that which the / wanton monk dares, and the old woman full of wiles' (transl. Forgeng, *The Medieval Art of Swordmanship*, p. 34). The attribution of the quotation has been made by Jacobs and Ükert, *Beiträge zur ältern Litteratur*, vol. III, p. 138-141. However, the reference within Piccolomini's ginormous work remains untraceable. See Cinato and Surprenant, 'Introduction' in *Le Livre de l'Art du Combat*, p. XXIV, as well as Forgeng, *The Medieval Art of Swordmanship*, p. 34. The few researches made on this issue during the preparation of the present article did not produce more results but the followings. Among the historical uses of 'Piccolomini's' quotation, it is worth noting two cases. First, in Berkenmeyer, *Le curieux antiquaire ou recueil géographique et historique*, t. II, p. 424, the quotation has been attributed to 'the Ancients' in a context in which it refers to Bertholde Swartz (Berthold Schwartz) a fourteenth century Franciscan monk from Mainz, credited with the invention of canon powder: *De sorte que les anciens ont eu raison de dire: Non audit Stygius Pluto tentare, quod audit / Effrenis monachus — — — / C'est-à-dire Le diable n'est pas si osé / Que l'est un Moine debordé*. The vague attribution to 'the Ancients' indicates that the quotation has reached the level of vagueness of a vulgate saying. Second, in Pierre de L'Estoile, *Les belles figures et drolleries de la Ligue avec les peintures placcars et affiches injurieuses et diffamatoires*, fol. xiv, 2nd page reads: *Non aude[re] Stygius Pluto tentare quod aude[re] / Effrenis Monachus plenaque fraudis Anus* (by de L'Estoile's hand). Here the quotation is not attributed to anyone in particular. It refers to the assassination of Henri III by (the Dominican) Jacques Clément. In both cases thus, it is worth noting that the quotation is used to refer to monks with lethal interests.

coming to that however, let us consider what is the putative relation of Gunterrodt himself to the Scholasticism of his own time. First of all, Heinrich von Gunterrodt (1557, Lengefeld – 1618, Padova?) being of noble origin, and since it is known that he has frequented the University of Wittenberg, receives a scholastic training.²⁶ It is known that he studied jurisprudence, hence that he studied at least something of philosophy, namely logic, physics, ethics, and metaphysics. His probable itinerary from Saxony to Padova where he died,²⁷ seems to indicate that he followed the common path, from studying the arts (philosophy) in his German-speaking natal area to specializing (in jurisprudence) in Northern Italy. Such a pattern relates to the difference between German and Italian academic contexts at that time, the superior faculties being poorly represented in the northern universities, leading to the transfer of German students to Italy for specialisation in law or medicine.²⁸ In particular, Padova University was at that time a flourishing centre of studies, especially for jurisprudence and medicine as well as at the crossroads of Humanism and Scholasticism, famous for what has been called the Padovan Aristotelianism, a philosophical movement, influenced by Averroism, and considered to be at the root of modern science.

However, Gunterrodt wrote and published his treatise before his Italian years: at only twenty-two years old, interrupting, according to his own saying, the studies he followed through his *circulus studiorum*:

Id enim et patriae me debere scio, et aetas hoc ipsum mea postulat, cum intra iuuenilem aetatem, hoc est annum 25 (à quo adhuc tribus tantum absum annis) circulus studiorum, quo ad Iuris prudentiam praesertim, absolui magna ex parte debeat.

And, indeed, I know that I owe this to my country; and my age demands this, since, before the end of my youth (i.e. 25 years), an age from which I am so far three years, my *circulus studiorum* (especially my law studies) must be completed to a large extent [our translation].²⁹

²⁶ Siedel, in his foreword to Gunterrodt, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat*, t. I, p. 9 refers to Gunterrodt's name in the *Dritte Matrikel der wittenberger Universität* (Yo (3), 2°). Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Allemagne. URN: urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:3-55871. f.126r, testifying to his registration at the University of Wittenberg in 1573. Concerning Gunterrodt's biographical information in general, see Siedel, 'Préface' to Gunterrodt, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat*, t. I.

²⁷ Siedel, 'Préface' to Gunterrodt, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat*, t. I, p. 12.

²⁸ Grendler, 'The Universities of the Renaissance and Reformation', p. 3.

²⁹ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 2^v (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579). Gunterrodt's *circulus studiorum* could match the medieval *peregrinatio academica* (cf. Knight, 'University', p. 237), not to be confused with the notion of "Grand Tour" which belongs to a related but later and different tradition, namely, between the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries, the traditional trip (not necessarily connected to academic studies) through Europe made by upper-class young European men, with Italy as a key

Arguably, during the period of redaction of his text, he was still studying within an academic context, and thus close to the scholastic environment of Saxony.

II.3. Gunterrodt's *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia* and the scholastic features of I.33

The previous biographical considerations are useful but do not suffice to characterise the relation of Gunterrodt's text to Scholasticism. Our best ally here is the reference of I.33 as a principally scholastic product. Indeed, although and as stressed before, Gunterrodt's references are mostly humanist-type, he explicitly regrets the decline of the art of combat and quotes I.33 all through his work. More than that: I.33 is a structuring under-text for Gunterrodt's whole treatise. Such an admiration in favour of medieval predecessors is not quite typical of the humanist position that tends to criticise what closely precedes in favour of earlier ancient sources. It is difficult to know when Gunterrodt chronologically locates I.33. The only indication he gave is the *vetustissimus* adjective referred to I.33, which could lead to think that Gunterrodt lumps together ancient Greco-Roman references and the medieval production of his own geographical area.³⁰ However, Gunterrodt seems conscious of the heterogeneity of such references: *antiqui* does not equate to *vetus*, and the special treatment of I.33 in Gunterrodt's text (with in particular the insistence on the clerical context of production) goes in favour of the thesis of an original integration of a scholastic reference.

Let us thus consider what MS Dresd. C. 15, namely Gunterrodt's *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia* includes of what made I.33 a scholastic-type text, namely (1) its scholastic vocabulary, (2) its scholastic methodology, (3) its scholastic doctrine.

II.3.1. Scholastic vocabulary

This point would require an in-depth inquiry. For the sake of brevity, the present article will limit itself to the following twofold remark.

On the one hand, it must be conceded that Gunterrodt's language presents obvious stylistic features of humanistic Latin. This aspect is strengthened by his philological interest, typical of Humanism, for giving Greek and German equivalents of Latin terms.

destination. However, *circulus studiorum* could refer merely to a group of studies or the *curriculum* in general. In any case, it is worth remembering that travelling for studies is not typical of a humanist formation.

³⁰ See Cinato, 'Development, Diffusion and Reception of the "Buckler Play"', p. 513 who concluded that Gunterrodt's fidelity to I.33 can be equated to the humanist movement back to Ancient references. It should be interesting to investigate the questions in a broader perspective in comparing several authors on how to handle sources.

On the other hand, Gunterrodt reproduces some expressions of I.33 that have been labelled by Cinato and Surprenant ‘obvious indicators of the university intellectualism’.³¹ However, compared to I.33, the number of occurrences is notably unbalanced. For instance, Gunterrodt uses the verb *notare* in the gerund form *notandum* as in *Ultimo etiam loco notandum est*.³² This is a common point with I.33. However, in I.33 *notare* was the principal verb in no less than 45 of the 114 commentaries. In MS Dresd. C. 15, the verb is used only twice in this sense. Cinato and Surprenant also mentioned the use of the impersonal *patet* with 32 occurrences in I.33 within expressions as *patet per exemplum, ut patet per ymagines*. In MS Dresd. C. 15, it appears only in three occurrences.³³ *Videlicet* was appearing in 32 occurrences, it appears nowhere in MS Dresd. C. 15. Finally, even more strikingly, there is no occurrence of *scholaris* in MS Dresd. C. 15 while the term appears in 81 occurrences in I.33.³⁴

In conclusion, Gunterrodt appears to have rather expunged his own text from the scholastic lexicon that was manifest in I.33.

II.3.2. Scholastic methodology

It is to be expected that the methodological aspect of Gunterrodt’s treatise will provide more elements in favour of the present article’s hypothesis. Let us focus on Gunterrodt’s second definition of combat (we will go back to the first just shortly thereafter). This definition remarkably matches the scholastic methodology by definition and divisions (*definitio* or *descriptio*/ *divisio*).

In MS I.33, the text reads: *Notandum quod ars dimicatoria sic describitur: dimicatio est diversarum plagarum ordinatio et dividitur in septem partes ut hic*, namely ‘Note that the art of combat is described as follows: Combat is the organising of various blows and it is divided into seven parts as here’.³⁵ Gunterrodt quotes the text, (re)writing: ‘[...] *et quia monachi probatissimi huius artis scriptores ita nominat qui eam sic definiunt: “Dimicatio est dinisarum plagarum*

³¹ Cinato and Surprenant, ‘Introduction’ in *Le Livre de l’Art du Combat*, p. xxxvi : ‘opérateur flagrant de l’intellectualité universitaire’, see pp. xxxvi-xxxvi for this section.

³² MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 49^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579), see also 59^r.

³³ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 47^r, 49^r, 67^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

³⁴ Cinato and Surprenant, ‘Introduction’ in *Le Livre de l’Art du Combat*, p. xxxvii. In MS Dresd. C. 15, *schola* appears just once in the syntagma *scholae gladiatoriae*. MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 61^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579). Besides, it is worth noting the many uses Gunterrodt makes of *demonstrare* and *demonstratio*. Such a vocabulary fits the idea of giving principles to the art of combat. However, it seems more to be related to geometry and arithmetic than to scholastic logic.

³⁵ Leeds, Royal Armouries FECHT 1 (MS I.33), fol. 1^r, transl. Forgeng, *The Medieval Art of Swordmanship*, p. 34.

ordinatio”, namely ‘...and because excellent monks who have written about this art define it as such: “The combat is an orderly arrangement of the blows that have been divided”’.³⁶

In this passage, Gunterrodt comments on the first term of the precedent definition he gave: *dimicatio*. In order to do so, he explicitly quotes I.33. However, he slightly misreads the text, reading *divisarum* instead of *diversarum*. Admittedly, it could be an error of the copy Gunterrodt read. However, the mention of the ‘division in seven parts’ (corresponding to the sevenfold system of guards in I.33) disappears, and seems so to be transferred, in Gunterrodt’s text, within the prior part of the definition. This suggests that it would be more likely a misinterpretation of Gunterrodt, who merges the part concerning division (that was following the definition in I.33) with the definition of *dimicatio* itself. Regardless of its cause, this kind of mistake is striking because it tends to strengthen the scholastic appearance of the text.³⁷

II.3.3. Scholastic doctrine

Let us now face the doctrinal aspect of the demonstration, and, to do so, let us go back to the first definition of *dimicatio* given by Gunterrodt:

Sit itaque haec Descriptio:

*DIMICATIO est ingenua, uirilis et nobilissima ars gymnastica. Ex principiis naturae, certissimis fundamentis, perfectissimisq[ue] figuris demonstrata, quae et gladiatori, et militi, cuicunq[ue] deniq[ue] ad se, in Pancratio, praeliis et monomachiis, quibuslibet armis manuariis nec non colluctatione, fortiter defendendum, et de antagonista, uel hoste, aut aduersario, uictoriam reportandam prodest.*³⁸

Thus, is this Description:

The COMBAT is a liberal, virile and very noble gymnastic art. Displayed from the principles of nature, very certain foundations and perfect figures, it serves to the fencer, to the soldier and in the end to whomever to defend courageously in the *pancratium*, the battles and the duels by means of all manual weapons—not without the wrestling—and to gain the victory on the antagonist, the enemy or the adversary.

From the standpoint of the present article, this definition presents two striking elements.

³⁶ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 20^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

³⁷ In a similar order of ideas, *ordinatio* which appears in both texts, is also a scholastic-like term (let us for instance think about a theologian such as John Duns Scotus and his *Ordinatio*), indicative of the scholastic intent of proposing systematic treatise or exposition.

³⁸ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 19^v (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

First, the combat is a liberal (*ingenua*) art. Gunterrodt explains in the following lines, that the use of 'liberal' does not deny that the combat is a manual art.³⁹ His intent is not to claim that combat is an intellectual discipline. However, since combat is grounded on certain principles and perfect rules, it is to be located *above* the mechanical arts, namely amongst the liberal arts. Besides, according to Gunterrodt, the athletes do not earn money with their art, which is an additional meaning of 'liberal'.⁴⁰ It would require more time to qualify Gunterrodt's operation of legitimisation of the art of combat within a more global reordination of the liberal arts at the edge of modernity.⁴¹ Let us stress for now, that Gunterrodt strives to locate his topic in relation to a disciplinary field that has been coined by Scholasticism.

Let us briefly recall that medieval Scholasticism provides an educational framework, which opposes seven mechanical arts to seven liberal arts.⁴² Mechanical arts are the following: *vestiaria* (tailoring, weaving); *agricultura* (agriculture); *architectura* (architecture, masonry); *militia* and *venatoria* (warfare, hunting, military education, martial arts); *mercatura* (trade); *coquinaria* (cooking); *metallaria* (blacksmithing, metallurgy) (commerce, agriculture and cooking being later replaced by navigation, medicine, theatrical arts). Liberal arts include on the one hand, the so-called *trivium* with *grammatica* (grammar), *dialectica* (logic), *rhetorica* (rhetorics) and on the other hand, the so-called *quadrivium* with *arithmetica*

³⁹ We are grateful to François Siedel for noting that the intermediary status of combat in Gunterrodt's view is the reason why he does not use *liberalis* in the definition but *ingenua*.

⁴⁰ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 20^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579): *Dico Ingenuum, quia inter liberales artes, quae solum ingenii, non manuum ministerio peraguntur, non potest numerari, cum ad hanc corporis maior quam animi habitus requiratur: quia tamen firmissimis principiis, regulis perfectissimis et ingeniosissimis nititur, artificiosissima antiquitissim[ue] existit, meritò hunc titulum sortitur, nec inter mechanicas sine illiberales recensetur, nam et Iureconsultus l[ege] 4. ff. de his qui notant[ur] infam[ia] inquit.* However, the argument is easily countered: fencing teachers are paid, and there are money prizes during fencing competitions contemporary to Gunterrodt. See Battistini and Corradetti, 'Income and working time of a Fencing Master'; as well as Tlusty, *The Martial Ethics*, p. 215. It is worth noting MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 73^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579), where Gunterrodt, probably aiming at the participants of the *Fechtschulen*, mocks those fencers who take advantage of their bodies for the sake of profit.

⁴¹ See McKeon, 'The transformation of the liberal arts in the Renaissance'. It would be worth comparing Gunterrodt with a larger fight books corpus on the definition of combat and on its characterization as an art or as a science (the first coming to mind being Filippo Vadi who claims that fencing is a science since it derives from geometry and Angelo Viggiani dal Montone who discusses whether fencing is an art or a science).

⁴² The big names at the roots of this classification are Aristotle, Augustine, Iohannes Scottus Eriugena, and Hugh of Saint Victor. Although it becomes established during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, it keeps changing and radically evolves during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. See Allard and Lusignan, *Les arts mécaniques au moyen âge* (especially the articles by Allard, Lusignan and Hall). For more recent references, see De Munck, 'Artisanal knowledge and craftsmanship' and its bibliography.

(arithmetics), *geometria* (geometry), *astronomia* (astronomy), *musica* (music). Liberal arts will be reframed as *studia humanitatis* during the Renaissance.

Interestingly, one of the arguments of Cinato and Surprenant in favour of interpreting I.33 as a product of scholastic rationalization was the correspondence they observed between of the system of the *septem custodiae* in I.33 and the scholastic classification of the seven liberal arts.⁴³ This correspondence (or analogy) is really of an intellectual nature and even seems artificial in I.33, because the author actually deals with more than seven guards; he therefore chose, within his corpus of guards, to put forward the seven that seemed to him to highlight a rational organisation. Arguably, this is not a strict correspondence, since the scope of application of the medieval *sevenfold system* exceeds by far the topic of the classification of the sciences (seven will be for instance the number of sacraments or sins). However, considering the comparison with Gunterrodt on this aspect, Cinato and Surprenant's interpretation paves the way for this new one: there is an analogy between the sevenfold organization of the fencing system in I.33 and the discussion on combat as a liberal art in Gunterrodt; such an analogy is representative of the (continuous) epistemic translation from medieval to early modern period.

Coming back to Gunterrodt's definition, the second element is the idea, constant in his treatise, of providing foundations and principles to his art. It is expressed by the title *De ueris principiis artis dimicatoriae*.⁴⁴ Gunterrodt is keen on this idea to the point of making it the stumbling block of his critique against Joachim Meyer, whose treatise the *Gründliche Beschreibung der Kunst des Fechtens*, was published two years before (1570). As Gunterrodt wrote, although Meyer seems to understand the art of fencing, he did not show the use of the foundations (*fundamentorum*) of such an art.⁴⁵ That is how Gunterrodt claims to complete Meyer. He aims at giving the *principles* of the art.

Now, the idea of providing *principles* of an art is a very Aristotelian idea. Compared to other kinds of knowledge, the Aristotelian science seeks the causes of its object—science being grounded on undemonstrated principles.⁴⁶ Arguably, Aristotelianism does not equate with Scholasticism—although Aristotelianism is essential to Scholasticism. For instance, there are in Gunterrodt, Aristotelian ideas that are not particularly scholastic. It is the case of the famous golden middle way which states that vice lies in the extremes,

⁴³ Cinato and Surprenant, 'Introduction' in *Le Livre de l'Art du Combat*, p. xxxiv.

⁴⁴ MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 17^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

⁴⁵ *licet aliquid intellexisse uideatur, usum tamen istorum fundamentorum non commonstrauit*. MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 16^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

⁴⁶ Aristotle's theory of science is developed mainly in the *Second Analytics*. See for instance McKirahan, *Principles and Proofs: Aristotle's Theory of Demonstrative Science*.

while virtue lies in moderation.⁴⁷ By contrast, such an example clearly indicates the difference with the idea of the foundation of a science/art on principles that has been a guideline for the whole scholastic knowledge.

III. CONCLUSION: *CUCULLUS NON FACIT MONACHUM SACERDOTE*

The present article gave arguments aiming at stressing the scholastic context of Gunterrodt's fight book *Sciomachia et Hoplomachia*, as an example of Latin Fencing Manual. The demonstration has been grounded on (1) the relation between Gunterrodt's text and I.33 (2) the relation between I.33 and Scholasticism.

The first conclusion is that Gunterrodt undoubtedly abandoned some of the most substantial scholastic features of I.33. It appeared clearly, in particular from a lexical standpoint. From a methodological standpoint however, it seems clear that Gunterrodt is concerned with giving a scholastic appearance to his text. His moments of clumsiness indicate precisely that what counts more is appearance: while in I.33 the scholastic features were the clues of a context of production of the text, in Gunterrodt's text, by contrast, they are intentionally put there in order to provide seriousness and credibility to the work.

This point echoes what Cinato has already noted: although Gunterrodt is sometimes faithful to the medieval *looks* of the characters (according to his own interpretation he depicts them as *monks*),⁴⁸ their postures fit the usage of the second half of the sixteenth century. It is worth noting the contrast offered in this regard by Paulus Hector Mair. In other words: The cowl does not make the monk, or in this case, the priest.

What about scholastic doctrine? Here again, Gunterrodt simply cancels some of the doctrinal elements of I.33. This is the case with the notion of *debitum – mora – omissio* (due, delay and omission), related to scholastic ethics and that helped conceptualizing which blow, with which timing, should be favoured in a specific positional context.⁴⁹ Such a notion does not appear any more in Gunterrodt. However, the elements stressed within Gunterrodt's definition of *dimicatio* lead to a nuanced conclusion according to which Gunterrodt illustrates both a translation of debates as well as the permanence of a large Aristotelian frame.

⁴⁷ *extremis vitium, medium tenuere beati*. MS Dresd. C. 15, fol. 31^r (Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia*, 1579).

⁴⁸ Cinato, 'Development, Diffusion and Reception of the "Buckler Play"', pp. 502-503.

⁴⁹ Cinato and Surprenant, 'Introduction' in *Le Livre de l'Art du Combat*, p. xc; and Cinato, 'Development, Diffusion and Reception of the "Buckler Play"', p. 487.

In other words, there is a twofold conclusion. For the historian of martial arts, considering the three —lexical, methodological and doctrinal— aspects, Gunterrodt's text lies at the crossroads of medieval and renaissance cultures. It seems probable that he only keeps such scholastic features as cosmetic elements and tools of legitimation of his work, which aims at theorising an art whose status would have been vividly discussed. For the historian of ideas and intellectual trends, such a conclusion is not as weak as it seems. It means that for a sixteenth century young Saxon nobleman and fencer, scholastic-appearance aims at providing legitimacy to his art, and, besides, that it is as good a sale pitch as 'pure' humanist references.

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

IV.1. Primary sources

IV.1.1. Fight Books Corpus

Leeds, Royal Armouries, FECHT 1

The Medieval Art of Swordmanship. Royal Armouries MS I.33, ed. by Jeffrey L. Forgeng (Leeds: Royal Armouries, 2018)

Le livre de l'Art du Combat. Liber de arte dimicatoria, édition critique du Royal Armouries MS. I. 33 par Franck Cinato et Didier Surprenant (Paris: CNRS éditions, 2015)

Dresden, Universitätsbibliothek, MS. Dresd. C. 15 (Heinrich von Gunterrodt, *Sciomachia et hoplomachia sive De veris Principiis Artis dimicatoriae. Liber Unus*). Available online: <https://digital.slub-dresden.de/werkansicht/df/95862/7/0/>

Heinrich von Gunterrodt, *De Veris Principiis Artis Dimicatoriae* (Witebergae: Excudebat Mattheus Welack, 1579). Available online: https://books.google.fr/books?id=5KBKAAAACAAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=fr&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Transcription and French translation by François Siedel, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat* (Freyfechter zu Straßburg 2022) tome I. Available online: https://www.elsamhe.fr/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Tome-1_De-ueris-principiis_H-von-Gunterrodt.pdf

Transcription and French translation by François Siedel, *Des véritables principes de l'art du combat* (Freyfechter zu Straßburg 2022) tome II. Available online: https://www.elsamhe.fr/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Tome-2_De-ueris-principiis_H-von-Gunterrodt.pdf

English translation and commentary by Bert Gevaert (Freelance Academy Press, 2014)

IV.1.2. Other Sources

Berkenmeyer, P. L., *Le curieux antiquaire ou recueil géographique et historique*, t. II (Leide: Pierre van der Aa, 1729)

L'Estoile, Pierre de, *Les belles figures et drolleries de la Ligue avec les peintures placars et affiches injurieuses et diffamatoires*, 1580-1606, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département Réserve des livres rares, RES FOL-LA25-6

IV.2. Secondary Literature

Allard, Guy-H. and Serge Lusignan (ed.), *Les arts mécaniques au moyen âge* (Montréal and Paris: Bellarmin and Vrin, 1982)

Battistini, Alessandro and Niki Corradetti, 'Income and working time of a Fencing Master in Bologna in the 15th and early 16th', *Acta Periodica Duellatorum*, Vol. 4, Issue 1 (2016), pp. 153-173

Binard, Fanny and Daniel Jaquet, 'Investigation on the collation of the first Fight book (Leeds, Royal Armouries, Ms I.33)', *Acta Periodica Duellatorum*, Vol. 4, Issue 1 (2016), pp. 3-22

Blum, Paul Richard, *Philosophenphilosophie und Schulphilosophie. Typen des Philosophierens in der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998)

——— *Studies on Early Modern Aristotelianism* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012)

Cinato, Franck, 'Development, Diffusion and Reception of the "Buckler Play": A Case Study of a Fighting Art in the Making', in *Late Medieval and Early Modern Fight Books. Transmission and Tradition of Martial Arts in Europe (14th–17th Centuries)*, ed. by Daniel Jaquet, Karin Verelst, and Timothy Dawson (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016), pp. 481-546

Cinato, Franck and Didier Surprenant, 'Luitger par lui-même? Stratigraphie d'une synthèse médiévale de l'escrime', in *Maîtres et techniques de combat à la fin du Moyen Âge et au début de la Renaissance*, ed. by Fabrice Cognot (Paris, 2006), pp. 81-106

Dekoninck, Ralph, Agnès Guiderdoni, Hélène Leblanc and Aline Smeesters, *Clés scolastiques pour la théorie des lettres et des arts des 16^e et 17^e siècles*, forthcoming

De Munck, Bert, 'Artisanal knowledge and craftsmanship', in *Encyclopedia of Early Modern Philosophy and the Sciences*, ed. by Dana Jalobeanu and Charles Wolfe (Cham: Springer, 2020)

Flasch, Kurt, *Das Philosophische Denken Im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1986)

Geyer Bernhard (ed.), *Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie*. 2. Teil: *Die patristische und die scholastische Philosophie* (Berlin: Mittler, 1928)

Grendler, Paul F., 'The Universities of the Renaissance and Reformation', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Spring, 2004), p. 1-42

Ijäs, Antti, *Study of the Language and Genre of the Royal Armouries MS I.33*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Helsinki, 2022

Jacobs, Friedrich and Friedrich August Ükert, *Beiträge zur ältern Litteratur oder Merkwürdigkeiten der Herzogl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Gotha*, vol. I-III (Leipzig, 1835-1838)

- Jaquet, Daniel, 'European Fight Books 1305-1630: Classification, typology and comparison', *Acta Periodica Duellatorum*, Vol. 8, Issue 1 (2020), pp. 5-24
- Knight, Sarah, 'University', in *The Oxford Handbook of Neo-Latin*, ed. by Sarah Knight and Stefan Tilg (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 233-247
- König-Pralong, Catherine, *Le bon usage des savoirs : Scolastique, philosophie et politique culturelle* (Paris : Vrin, 2011)
- Leng, Rainer, *Katalog der deutschsprachigen illustrierten Handschriften des Mittelalters* Band 4/2, Lfg. 1/2: 38. Fecht- und Ringbücher (München: C. H. Beck, 2008)
- McKeon, Richard P., 'The transformation of the liberal arts in the Renaissance', in *Developments in the Early Renaissance*, ed. by B. S. Levy (Albany: SUNY, 1972), pp. 158-223
- McKirahan, Richard, *Principles and Proofs: Aristotle's Theory of Demonstrative Science* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992)
- Ongaro, Giuseppe, 'Mercuriale, Girolamo', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 73 (2009), online: https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/girolamo-mercuriale_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ [accessed 22 November 2022]
- Paré, Gérard Marie, Adrien Marie Brunet, and Pierre Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XII^e siècle: les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris: Libr. Philosophique J. Vrin, 2000)
- Schmutz, Jacob, 'Bulletin de scolastique moderne (I)', *Revue thomiste*, 100/2 (avril-juin 2000), pp. 270-341
- Schönberger, Rolf, *Was ist Scholastik?* (Hildesheim: Bernard Verlag, 1991)
- Tlusty, B. Ann, *The Martial Ethics in Early Modern Germany, Civic Duty and the Right of Arms* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)
- Weijers, Olga, *Le maniement du savoir. Pratiques intellectuelles à l'époque des premières universités (xiii^e-xv^e siècles)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996)

V. APPENDIX: CONCORDANCES BETWEEN GUNTERRODT'S TEXT AND I.33 (*)

(*) References to images and commentaries (§) are from Cinato & Surprenant edition; at the first occurrence, references have been added according to the Forgeng edition (2018), with, if necessary, indications to A (upper part) or B (lower part).

Gunterrodt (Dresden C.15)	I.33 references
f. 1r. SCIOMACHIA ET HOPIOMACHIA Siue De ueris principiis <i>artis dimicatoriae</i> . Liber unus.	§2 [f. 1r / p. 1] Notandum quod <i>ars dimicatoria</i> sic describitur : dimicatio est ...
f. 17v-18r. ... quoniam et librum uetustissimum compositum a monachis nobilibus (...) ex uetustissima prosapia et clarissima familia <i>de Albensleiben</i> .	§ 5 [f. 2r / p. 3A] ... quod probat <i>De Alkersleiben</i> per rationes...
f. 20r. Dimicatio appello plerunque enim dimico accipitur pro pugno, quod proprie fit re et quia monachi probatissimi huius artis scriptores ita nominat qui eam sic definiunt: <i>Dimicatio est diuisarum plagarum ordinatio</i> .	§2 ... describitur : <i>dimicatio est diversarum plagarum ordinatio</i> et dividitur in septem partes ut hic.
f. 31r. tribus modiis necessario poni quatuor extrema. Ex his autem solidissimum fundamentum deducitur, <i>et totus fere nucleus artis in hoc consistit</i> . Non minimum etiam usum habet, imo universalem constituit regulam versiculus: « extremis vitium, <i>medium tenere beati</i> »	§ 4.1 [f. 1v / p. 2] ... Nota quod <i>totus nucleus artis dimicatorie consistit</i> in illa ultima custodia (...) § 4.2 (...) Oppositum clerus <i>mediumque tenet</i> Lutegerus.
f. 41r. Octavo : framea (Rappier, <i>in marg.</i>) circa quod genus, quoniam pleraque alia iuxta id regulantur (...) deinde <i>custodiarum</i> (<u>ut monachorum vocabulum technicum retineam</u>)	§ 4.1 <i>et passim</i> ... Preterea, omnes actus <i>custodiarum</i> sive gladii determinantur in ea ...

species pictas exhibeam, denique de contrariis earum disseram.	
f. 41v. I. (...) aut cum robusto <i>sis in lite ut monachi loquuntur</i>) medium debile ueruti aduersarii. II. (...) Praeterea corpus tuum sine aliquo periculo rarissimus <i>peti</i> possit, aliis adminiculis opus non habes, et meo est melior conditio, quod longius <i>potes sequi</i> duabus partibus nempe <i>intrando (ut dicunt Monachi)</i> vel pingendo post aversum ictum.	§ 15.2-3 [f. 4v / p. 8A] Nota quod quandocumque ligans et ligatus sunt <i>in lite</i> (...) Ligatus fugit ad partes laterum, <i>peto sequi</i>. § 5 <i>etiam</i> § 42 [f. 11r / p. 21B], 94 [f. 24r / p. 47B], 114 [f. 29r / p. 57B] Sed obsessor <i>intrando</i> potest eum invadere quandocumque (...)
f. 44r. III. (...) nec tutus satis, exceptis tamen iis casibus quando <i>ligatio</i>, de qua paulo post facta est. (...) Sequuntur itaque quatuor custodiae, quarum prima, utpote in qua <i>omnes fere actus reliquarum et gladii determinantur, id est finem habent</i> ...	§ 24 [f. 6v / p. 12B] <i>et passim</i> ... Sed superior <i>ligatio</i> semper utilior erit quam inferior. § 4.1 ... Praeterea, <i>omnes actus custodiarum sive gladii determinantur</i> in ea, <i>id est finem habent</i>, et non in aliis.
f. 47r. Ad tertiam partem, quae superest accedo. Nempe <i>DE OBSIDENDO uel LIGANDO (ut vocant monachi)</i>, ubi prima ratio est, ut petatur <i>regens custodiam ab obsessore plaga aut fixura</i> (...) Ibi enim <i>tria</i> tantum <i>habet facere</i>, quorum primum si observat, illi utile est et optimum, tibi tamen ...	§ 6.3 [f. 2r / p. 3B] <i>et passim</i> ita videlicet quod obsidens cum eadem custodia potest <i>regentem primam custodiam obsidere</i>. § 5 <i>et passim</i> ... aliquam <i>plagam</i> ... § 64 <i>et passim</i> postea ... <i>fixuram</i> generalem ... § 7.3 [f. 2v / p. 4A] <i>etiam</i> § 62 [f. 16r / p. 31B] (cf. § 34 [f. 9r / p. 17B]) Sacerdos autem <i>tria habet facere</i>...

f. 48r. ... tibi plaga vel puncto petenda est altera pars corporis qua nudatur, <u>iuxta Monachorum versiculos</u> : <i>Ligans ligati contrarii sunt et irati /</i> <i>Ligatus fugit ad partes laterum peto sequi.</i> ... quod perpetuo observandum est loco <i>generalis regulae</i>, ut restet tibi pars ad defensionem tui corporis ...	§ 15.3 <i>et passim</i> <i>Ligans-ligati contrarii sunt et irati.</i> <i>Ligatus fugit ad partes laterum, peto sequi.</i> § 109 [f. 28r / p. 55A] ... Hec est <i>generalis regula</i> in arte sacerdotis.
f. 49r. ... brachium, circa restrictas manus presetim, caesim vel punctim sauciare, aut ad minimum impedire, ne <i>ad effectum producat intentionem</i>.	§ 124 [f. 31v / p. 62B] ... donec scholaris suam <i>perducit ad effectum intentionem</i> ...
f. 50v. ... Duo enim vincula (ut his verbis hic utar) plus ligant quam unum. Observanda itaque est, ut plurimum, coniunctio artissima armorum, nec temere disiugenda sunt, ne <i>cadendo sub gladium et pugionem (ut loquuntur Monachi)</i> ab adversario creari possit periculum.	§ 6.1 <i>et passim</i> ... Versus : Dum ducitur halpschilt, <i>cade sub gladium quoque scutum</i>.
f. 55v. Duodecimo: Framea coniuncta pelta, parma, clypeo ... Apud Scotos hodie et Anglos in usu. <u>De quo genere praecipue tractant Monachi in isto libro cuius supra memini</u>. Placet igitur carmina quaedam illorum, haud quidem docta, non tamen prorsus inutilia, sed ad rem et propositum nostrum non parum facientia, hic ascribere : <i>Custodia prima retinet contraria bina /</i> <i>Contrarium primum Halbschilt Langort secundum /</i>	§ 5.2 + 6.1 Versus : <i>Custodia prima retinet contraria bina. /</i>

<i>Dum ducitur Halbschild, cade sub gladium quo[[que]] scutum /</i> <i>Si generalis erit recipit C<aput>. sit tibi Stichslach /</i> <i>Si religat, calcat, contraria sint tibi Schildschalch /</i> Rappier und Buklier / Schildt / Tartzschen (in marg. sin.)	<i>Contrarium primum halpschil langortque secundum.</i> + Versus : <i>Dum ducitur halpschild, cade sub gladium quoque scutum.</i> <i>Si generalis erit, recipit capud : sit tibi stichslach.</i> <i>Si religat-calcat, contraria sint tibi schiltslac.</i>
f. 58v. (suite des vers) : <i>Hic religat, calcat scholaris fit quoque Schildslach (!) /</i> <i>Sive sinistra manu circumdat brachia cleri /</i> <i>Hæc tria sunt cleri, durchtritt, mutatio gladi /</i> <i>Dextra sive manu poterit deprehendere gla. scu. /</i> <i>Clerici fit Nucken, generalis non in schützen /</i> <i>Dum ducitur langort , statim liga sub quoque super /</i> <i>Dum subligatus caveas ne decipiaris /</i> <i>Dum subligatus C<aput>. ligantis recipiatur.</i>	§ 7.2 + 7.4 + 12.3 + 24 + 75 [f. 19v / p. 38A] Versus : <i>Hic religat calcat scholaris : sit sibi schilslach</i> <i>Sive sinistra manu circumdat brachia cleri.</i> + <i>Hec tria sunt cleri : durchtrit, mutatio gladii, dextra sive manu poterit deprehendere gla<dium>, schu<tum>.</i> + Unde versus : <i>Clerici sic nucken, generales non nisi schützen.</i> + <i>Dum ducitur langort, statim liga sub quoque supra.</i> + Unde versus : <i>Dum subligaveris, caveas ne decipieris.</i> <i>Dum subligatur, capud ligantis recipiatur.</i>

<u>Tradunt praeterea</u> et duas species custodiarum, quarum alteram propter formam nominant <i>Krucke</i>, alteram <i>Fiedelbogen</i>, quia autem non adeo magnus est earum usus et etiam ex aliis intelligi possunt utrumque attigisse sat sit.	§ 14.1 [f. 4r / p. 7B] ... illa obsessio <i>krucke</i> ... § 85 [f. 22r / p. 43A] ... quedam custodia generalis que nuncupatur <i>vidilpoge</i> ...
63v / 64v ... Ex diametris (ideo ducplicitur ductis, ut repetantur et inverso ordine ad ictus etiam excipiendos ducantur) docentur iuxta ordinem literarum ABC etc. plagae vehementiores quas <u>etiam monachi</u> / ... 64v/ simul protectiones, sive <u>ut isti vocant</u>, <i>custodias (quibus generaliter omnes dimicatores, imo omnes homines tenetes gladium in manibus etiam ignorantes artem dimicatoriam, necessario utantur) esse volunt.</i> <u>De quibus quoque hos composuerunt versiculos :</u> <i>Septem custodiae sunt : sub brachio incipiendae</i> <i>Dextralique humero datur altera, terna sinistro</i> <i>Da capiti quartam, dextro da latere quintam</i> <i>Pectore da sextam, postremaque sit tibi Langort</i> <i>Hae septem partes ducuntur per generales</i>	= § 1.1-2 + § 4.2 <i>1. Notandum quod generaliter omnes dimicatores, sive omnes homines habentes gladium in manibus, etiam ignorantes artem dimicatoriam, utuntur hiis septem custodiis, de quo habemus septem versus :</i> <i>2. Septem custodie sunt, sub brach'incipiende</i> <i>Humero dextrali datur altera, terna sinistro.</i> <i>Capiti da quartam, da dextro lateri quintam.</i> <i>Pectori da sextam. Postrema sit tibi langort.</i> + <i>Tres sunt que preeunt, relique tunc fugiunt.</i> <i>Hee septem partes ducuntur per generales,</i>

<i>Tres sunt quae praecedunt, reliquae tantum fugientes</i> <i>Oppositum Clerus, mediumque tenet Lntegerus</i>	<i>Oppositum clerus mediumque tenet Lntegerus.</i>
f. 67r Ex hemicyclo, sicut ducti solent lineae, aversiones punctiorum, sive <i>fixurarum</i>, <u>ut vocant Monachi nostri</u>, longe tamen certior ex corporis partitione-, defensio contra puncta demonstratur.	<i>passim</i>