Lutgeri de arte dimicatoria

Royal Armories Ms. I.33 (olim Gotha Cod. Mbr. I. 115)
Text, translation and commentary

Dieter Bachmann
preliminary version, May 2016

Table of Contents

History of the manuscript

The manuscript now known as I.33 is the oldest extant fencing manual or *Fechtbuch* of the European tradition; it is even, to the best of my knowledge, the oldest dedicated instruction manual for armed combat worldwide. It was most likely made in the first quarter of the 14th century in Germany, presumably in Franconia, although its author may have been of Central German extraction, perhaps from Thuringia. Our other sources for the German fencing tradition are at least two generations younger, and more importantly, they reflect the spirit of the incipient Renaissance, being written on paper by members of the nascent "middle class"; by contrast, this manuscript still stands in the tradition of high medieval literacy, being written on parchment, apparently by professional scribes and illustrators from a monastic background. It is, therefore, our only instruction manual for truly "medieval swordfighting"; even if written after the end of the crusades, its author would have still been born, raised and trained during the later part of the 13th century.

We think that the author was called Luitger (Liutger, Liudger, an not uncommonly given name in medieval Germany) and was a cleric or *pfaffe* with a side-business of acting as fencing master for young noblemen, no doubt over a period of many years. At some point, Luitger was ordained as a priest, and he clearly had the necessary contacts to a monastic scribal workshop to embark on the ambitious project of recording his art in the form of an illustrated manuscript. For two hundred years, the manuscript was kept in an abbey library in Franconia, until it was taken by Johann Herwart of Würzburg, a fencer and soldier serving in the Second Margrave War of 1552-1555. Heinrich von Günderrode, a student of Johann Herwart's, transcribed portions of the text for his own treatise on fencing, published 1579.

The fate of the manuscript over the following century is unknown; but it is likely that it passed into Heinrich's private possession, and perhaps to his heirs, and it was likely during this time that the manuscript was doodled upon by a boy. Eventually, by the later 17th century, it was acquired by the ducal library of Gotha. Its presence in the library is recorded (as no. 76) in the catalogue compiled by Ernst Salomon Cyprian in 1714. In the late 17th century, the existence of the ms. is noted in a treatise (now in Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Guelf. 125.16. Extrav.) on judicial combat in Franconia, mostly based on the manuscripts by Hans Talhoffer. On one page (fol. 45r), a copy of the second image of fol. 26r of our ms. is given, along with the information that there is an entire parchment ms. in which, although "wholly illegible" (*gantz unleserlich*), a *sacerdos* is shown as instructing a *scholaris*.

The manuscript came to the attention of German antiquarians in the 1820s, when a modern inventory of the library was compiled under Georg Rathgeber (librarian from 1826). It was now catalogued as *Codex membranus* I. no. 115, and it was described in the context of German fencing manuals by Ukert (1838). We know that by this time, and therefore presumably since its acquisition by the ducal library, the manuscript had exactly 32 pages. There is a tantalising reference to a single page by Bruns (1799, p. 315). Bruns was librarian at Helmstedt University at the time; he states that he has a single leaf (*ein einzelnes Blatt*) before him, but gives no further identification of its provenance. He believes that he is looking at a Latin translation of Talhoffer's description of judicial combat; however, while Bruns does suggest he had an actual single leaf from this ms., it is not unlikely that he is in fact describing the copy in the Wolfenbüttel ms. mentioned above.

The manuscript apparently became the spoils of war a second time in April 1945, when the U.S. VIII Corps reached Gotha. Just as it had appealed to Johannes Herwart as he was looting the unknown Frankish monastery nearly 400 years before, it seems to have caught the eye of an American soldier,

who took it with him, and who would anonymously sell it at a Sotheby's auction in 1950. It was bought by the Royal Armouries, and was kept in the Tower of London (whence its occasional appellation of "Tower Manuscript") under the new designation of Ms. I.33, until it was moved to the new museum in Leeds in 1996.

The ms. continued to be listed in medievalist treatises on the topic post-1945, notably by Hils (1985), the inventory of German fencing manuscripts that would come to be used by the emerging HEMA community in the 1990s. The manuscript was described in greater detail by Singman (Forgeng) in 1997, followed by his edition in 2003, and it was from here that contemporary study of Liutger's art of fencing developed. Personally, I first came into contact with it in 2002, and for the following decade was an interested observer of the emergence of a coherent interpretation of the art, notably due to Roland Warzecha and associates (dimicator.com) in Germany and to Franck Cinato and associates in France. But it was not until 2012 that I began to practice the system actively and on a regular basis. This new edition revises my first attempt of 2002.

Content overview

The basic layout of the manual is clearly to first introduce the seven guards, and then treat them in order, followed by the system of four binds and "special *langort*" (with minor additions of "varia" such as *krucke*, *langort*, *vidilpoge*, grappling and "special second guard"). This program is however not followed exactly. There are at least four potentially interfering factors: (a) changes to the program made while work was in progress (b) omissions made by mistake, (c) lost pages and (d) misarrangement of pages when the ms. was bound. It is often difficult to decide which is the case, a circumstance alluded to by CS (p. XCII) in terms of "perte et inachèvement" (i.e. (c) vs. (b)).

There has been a lot of speculation over possible lost pages of the manuscript. Clearly, the process of the manuscript's creation was somewhat chaotic, and pages may have been cut out while the work was in progress, either because of mistakes or for other reasons; while later losses may not be ruled out *a priori*, I do not think it likely that any pages have been lost since the manuscript had been completed, and I suggest that all passages with an apparent lack of coherence can be plausibly explained in other ways.

Excepting the introductory presentation of the seven guards on fol. 1, the material is divided into 40 frusta or "plays" (presumably with an additional play on the lost folium). They are numbered #1 to #41 below (with the numbering of "fragmentary" play #32 kept for consistency with CS but not considered a separate play here).

The first quarter of the manuscript consists of a regular quire (*quaternum*) of four bifolia, containing plays #1 to #8. Here, the original plan is followed, with a detailed presentation of fencing from the first guard including a variety of techniques including overbind and *schiltslac*, *krucke* and *langort*.

Fol. 9 begins with the treatment of the second guard, also as planned, but the project seems to have run into problems here, perhaps it was delayed for a while, in any case the ms. is no longer bound in the form of regular quires, and on fol. 9v, the original scribe (hand A) is replaced by a different one (hand C), who would go on to write the majority of text (with the original scribe returning only for three further folia (26 to 28). The second guard is still treated according to the original plan, in plays #9 to #11, including techniques such as *durchtreten* and *separatio*. Play #12 represents the first interruption of the planned layout in order to show a basic technique which had been omitted in the

material on the first guard.

Plays #13 to #16 again follow the planned layout, discussing the third guard. Play #17 is a single image showing the fourth guard. This is the first time we must ask "perte ou inachèvement", i.e. it is conceivable that a page has been lost here, or alternatively was the play not completed by mistake? From here, the arrangement of the material becomes increasingly erratic. Play #18 still treats fourth guard, but play #19 inserts a disarming technique vs. *langort* seemingly at random. At this point, one would have expected a treatment of fifth guard, but this is omitted, apparently by mistake, and sixth guard is briefly treated in play #20. Play #20 even refers back to the omitted material on fifth guard by saying that sixth guard is only good to deliver "that same thrust" which is also the standard attack from fifth guard.

Now follows a treatment of the system of binds (equivalently, of seventh guard, which is the lower *langort* seeking the bind), in plays #21 to #28. Play #21 is the longest in the book, extending to six images, because it includes an excursus on grappling. Plays #26 and #27 treat *vidilpoge*, which even if outside of the basic system of four binds is explained as being considered still part of the chapter on binds. Play #28 is the second single-image play, showing only the concluding technique, apparently for lack of space (in the text blamed on a mistake of the illustrator's).

Plays #29 to #35 and #39 to #40 cover the "priest's special langort" at length. Here, the order of plays was probably mis-arranged when the manuscript was bound. The proper order should be: #29 to #34, #39, #40, #35. Play #35 is the third single-image play (not counting "play #32"), as play #17 showing fourth guard; this is probably by design, as the text states that the fourth guard does not offer any new possibilities.

The section on special langort is followed by plays #36 to #38, the insertion of the material on fifth guard which had been omitted following play #19. Finally, play #41 on "special second guard" is contained on the last folium, apparently as a kind of addendum or bonus.

Index of plays (*frusta*)

Text and translation

The two prior editions of the text are referenced by the abbreviations **CS** for Cinato and Surprenant (2009) and **Forgeng** for Forgeng (2003).

Images (*exempla*) are numbered §1 to §128, plays (*frusta*) #1 to #41 (following CS); pages are counted 1r (1) to 32v (64), i.e. giving the *folio* count first with the page count in parantheses.

Introductio

1r (1) §1/§2

Non audet stygius pluto tentare, quod audet *Effrenis monachus plenaque dolis anus*	*Stygian Pluto dares not attempt what a rogue monk* *and a treacherous hag dare do.*
Notandum est quod generaliter omnes dimicatores, sive omnes homines habentes gladium in manibus, etiam ignorantes artem dimicatoriam utuntur hiis septem custodiis de quo habemus septem versus:	Note how in general all fencers, or all men who hold a sword in hand, even when ignorant in the art of fencing, make use of these seven guards, on which we have seven verses:
¶ *Septem [cust]odie sunt sub brach incipiende* *Humero dextrali datur alter, terna sinistro.* *Capiti da quartam da dextro latere quint[a]m.* *Pectori da sextam, postrema sit tibi la[ngort.]*	Seven guards there are, under the arm the first On the right shoulder the second, the third on the left To the head give the fourth, to the right side the fifth To the breast give the sixth, and as the final one have *langort.*
Notandum quod ars dimicatoria sic describitur: dimicatio est diversarum plagarum ordinatio & dividitur in septem partes, ut hic	Note that the art of fencing is described as follows: Fencing is the ordering of various strikes, and it is divided into seven parts as here.

The introductory verse is added on the top margin of the page in a 15th-century hand; see appendix ("Stygius Pluto").

1v (2) §3/4

Nota quod totus nucleus artis dimicatorie consistit in illa ultima custodia que nuncupatur langort pretera omnes actus custodiarum sive gladii determinantur in ea i. finem habent et non in aliis. unde magis considera eam s[up]radi[c]ta prima	Note that the whole core of the art of fencing consists in this final guard which is called *langort*, because(?) in it, all actions of the guards or the sword terminate, i.e. they end in it and not in the others, therefore consider it more than the the above-mentioned first one.
Tres sunt que preeunt relique tunc fugiunt *Hee septem partes ducuntur per generales* *Oppositum clerus mediumque tenet lutegerus.*	There are three which go forward, and the remaining then flee. These seven parts are executed by the common [fencers], Luitger the cleric holds the opposite and the middle.

Gunterrodt: *Tres quae praecedunt, reliquae tantum fugientes.*
The verse is difficult to interpret in detail; see appendix ("Clerus Lutegerus").

Prima custodia (frusta #1–#8)

Frustum 1   play #1

2r (3) §5

✠ *Notandum hic continetur prima custodia, videlicet sub [brachio] obsesseo vero halbschilt Et consulo sano consilio quod ille sub brachio non ducat aliquam plagam quod probat de alkersleiben, per raciones quia partem superiorem attingere non potest. si inferiorem capiti erit perniciosum. sed obsessor intrando, potest eum invadere quandocumque si obmittit quod tenetur, ut infra scriptum est. Versus:* ¶ *Custodia prima retinet contraria bina Contrarium primum halpschil langortque secundum*	Note, here is contained the first guard, viz. the one under the arm, and the siege is *halbschilt*. And I give the sensible counsel that the one under the arm should not execute any strike, as recommends *de Alkersleiben*, for the reason that he cannot reach the upper part; if [he should aim] lower, it would be pernicious to [his] head. But the besieger by entering could invade him at any time if he omits what is <mark style="background-color:red">being held</mark>, as is written below. Verse: The first guard has a two-fold counter: The first counter is *halbshilt*, the second is *langort*.

On "de Alkersleiben" see the appendix.

2r (3) §6

¶ *Dum ducitur halpschilt cade sub gladium quoque scutum* *Si generalis erit recipit caput sit tibi stichschlach* *Si religat calcat contraria sint tibi schiltschlac* *Notandum quod [ille] qui iacet superius dirigit plagam post [c]ap. sine schiltslach si est generalis. Si autem uis edoceri consilio sacerdotis tunc religa et calca.* *Nota quod prima custodia videlicet sub brach potest obsederi se ipsa ita videlicet quod obsidens cum eadem custodia potest regentem primam custodiam obsidere nichilominus tamen regens custodiam primam econtrario possessorem obsidere potest obsessione quadam que quodammodo concordat cum possessione que vocatur halpshilt differt tamen in eo quod gladius sub brach extenditur supra scutum taliter quod manus regens scutum includitur in manu regente gladium*	When *halbschilt* is executed, fall underneath sword and shield. If he is common, he will reach [for] the head, then you should do a *stichschlac*. If he binds and presses, you should counter with a *schiltschlac*. Note that the one who lies above will direct a strike to the head without *schiltslac* if he is common. But if you want to be informed by the counsel of the priest, bind and press. Note that the first guard, viz. the one under the arm, can besiege itself, so that the one besieging with this guard can besiege the first guard; but nevertheless the one assuming first guard against the besieger can besiege the siege which corresponds with the siege that is called *halbschilt*, differing in this, that the sword is extended below the arm and above the shield so that the hand holding the shield is included in the hand holding the sword.

CS praise this image as "one of the most beautiful aesthetic successes" of the codex. The postures are drawn very carefully, including an indication that each fencer has the right foot forward, a detail that will not be evident in later figures. The final (and let's face it, rather awkward) paragraph is in hand B and alludes to changed dynamics that arise if first guard is answered with first guard.

→ *calcare*

2v (4) §7

Notandum quod scolaris religat hic et c[alcat] ad hoc ut recipiat schiltslac ut infra. Sed caveat de hiis que sunt facienda ex parte sacerdo[tis quia ...] post religationem sacerdos erit prior ad agendum. Notandum est etiam quod scolaris nichil habet aliud facere quam schiltslac, vel circumdare sinistra manu brachia sacerdotis, videlicet gladium et scutum. *versus: <u>Hic religat calcat scolaris sit sibi schilslach. Sive sinistra manu circumdat brachia cleri.</u>* *Sacerdos autem tria habet facere videlicet mutare gladium ꝗ ut fiat superior || Sive durchtreten || vel <s>sinistra</s> ^{dextra} manu comprehendere brachia scolaris i. Gladium et scutum.* *<u>Hec tria sunt cleri durchtrit mutacio gladii dextra sive manu poterit deprehendere gla. schu.</u>*	Note that the scholar here binds and applies pressure so that he gets to perform a *schiltslac* as [in the image] below. But he should take care that what is to be done on the part of the priest [because] after the bind, the priest will be the first to act. Note also that the priest can do nothing other than a *schiltslac* or embracing with the left hand the arms of the priest, i.e. sword and shield. verse: Here the scholar binds and presses, for him is a *schildschlac*. Or with the left hand he is to embrace the priest's arms. The priest here has three options, viz. sword-change, so that he is above, or *durchtreten*, or with the left/right hand embrace the arms of the scholar, i.e. sword and shield. These three are for the cleric: *durchtrit*, sword-change, or with the right hand he could take the sword [and] shield.

2v (4) §8

Nota quod supradictum est invenies hic exempli g.	Note that what is said above you find in this example [i.e. §8 showing the *schiltslac*].

The final paragraph for §7 (*Hec tria*...) is written vertically on the right margin. The image is damaged, but it is the first of dozen identical images illustrating "overbind" (see §11). This image is also the first instance of a "change of perspective" (i.e. the position of fencers is inverted; this is done on purpose in order to show the hand position of the fencer preforming the technique under consideration, in this case the scholar performing the overbind).
exempli g.: CS *gratia*, Forgeng *gestum*.

Frustum 2   play #2

3r (5) §9/§10

✠ *Notandum quod prima custodia resumitur hic propter quosdam actus illius primi frusti, i. prime custodie de quibus prius actum est. sed omnia que ponuntur hic invenies in primo folio usque ad mutacionem gladii.* *Dum ducitur halpschilt cade sub gladium quoque scutum*	Note that the first guard is resumed here, due to certain actions from the first section, i.e. of the first guard of which was treated before, but all that belongs here you find in the first page, up to the sword-change. When *halpschilt* is assumed, fall under sword and shield.

→ *dum ducitur*
The verse is written between the two images on the left side (the side of the fencer performing the technique).

3v (6) §11

Hic fit religatio ex parte scolaris et omnia alia de quibus superi[u]s dictum est usque infra ad mutationem gladii.	Here is a bind on the part of the scholar, and all other things which were treated above, until the sword-change below.

The first three images of the second play are equivalent to the first play. This is made explicit in the text, the sword-change in the following image being shown as a counter to the overbind.
But note the explicit depiction of step with the left foot forward for the overbind in §11 (based on the position of the rear foot), a detail absent from the equivalent situation as shown in §7.

3v (6) §12

Hic eget scolaris bono consilio quomodo possit resiste[re] huic Et est sciendum quod quando ludus ita se habet ut hic tu[nc] debet duci stich sicut generaliter in libro continetur quamvis non sint ymagines de hoc. *Notandum quod sacerdos mutat gladium hic quia fuit inferior nunc vero erit superior demum seorsum ducit gladium post capud adversarii sui quod nuncupatur nucken de quo generatur separatio gladii et scuti scolaris, <u>unde versus: Clerici sic nukcen generales non n. schutzen.</u>*	Here the scholar gets good counsel as to how he may resist this. And know that when the game is as shown here, then a *stich* must be executed as generally contained in the book, even though there are no images of this [here]. Note how the priest here changes the sword, because it was below and now it will be above; then he puts the sword to his adversary's head, which is called *nucken*, from which results a separation of the sword and the shield of the scholar; hence the verse: So the cleric's *nucken*, [where] the common fencers [will rather?] *schutzen*.

non n.: CS *non nisi*, Forgeng: *non nulli*.
The two paragraphs are arranged on the left and on the right, referring to the scholar and the priest, respectively. The image shows the situation after the sword-change (*mutatio gladii*); the scholar is instructed to counter this with a *stich*, but this isn't pursued further. This is presumably the action depicted in §37 (in play #9), where it is, however, referred to as *stichslac*. The play here instead continues with the action of *nucken* performed by the priest immediately after the sword-change. The last part of the second paragraph is already in reference to the following image on the next page, i.e. the one depicting the priest's *nucken*.
The word is written *nucken* in prose, but then *nukcen* in the verse: is this a simple error, or is the creation of an apparent rhyme with *schutzen* significant?
→ *mutatio gladii* → *nucken*

4r (7) §13

Caveat hic sacerdos ne faciat aliquam moram cum gladio ne generatur ex illa mora actus quidam qui vocatur luctacio sed statim debet reformare ligaturam propter cautionem	Here the priest should take care not to delay with the sword in the slightest, lest out of this delay an action should arise which is called wrestling, but out of caution he must immediately re-establish the bind.

The paragraph is centered on the page above the image, perhaps added as an afterthought as the scribe realised that the description intended for this image has already been given on the previous page.
Image §13 is unique in the book, and CS point out correctly a mistake on the part of the illustrator, who has given the priest two left hands.
→ *luctatio*

Frustum 3

4r (7) §14

✠ *Hic resumitur prima custodia cuius custodie obsessio erit valde rara quia nul[lu]s conswevit eam ducere nisi sacerdos vel sui clientuli, i. discipuli et nuncupatur illa obse[ssio] krucke et consulo bona fide quod ille qui regit custodiam statim post obsessionem ligat quia non est bonum latitare, vel aliquid talium faciat per quod possit salvari, vel saltim ducat id quod ipse possessor ducit*	Here the first guard is resumed, the siege to which guard will be very rare, because nobody is in the habit of performing it except for the priest, or his little clients, i.e. students, and this siege is called *krucke*, and I counsel in good faith that he who assumes the guard should bind immediately after the siege, as it isn't good to lag, or to do any of the things by which he <mark>might</mark> be saved, or that he at least execute the same as the [besieger] did.
Sciendum, quod obsessor non debet h[esitare sed] ducat statim stich post obsess[ionem quia] tunc non potest adversarius delibe[rare quod] intendat et hoc diligenter intell[igatu]r	Know that the besieger must not hesitate but immediately after the siege should execute a *stich*; thus the adversary cannot deliberate on what he might intend and this is to be understood diligently.

The second paragraph is written on the right margin. The emendations of its lacunae are due to Forgeng, whose reading was adopted by CS.

The *krucke* is introduced as an alternative reaction to first guard (other than *halbschilt*), and advertised as a speciality of the priest's system. This position at the same time covers the right side (threatened by first guard) and threatens a thrust to the opponent's sword side.

CS interpret the image as reflecting the fencers maintaining eye contact *under* the shield. I do not think this is the case: *Krucke* should be performed with a step to the right, and eye-contact is maintained in a line passing left of the shield.

4v (8) §15

Hic ligat sacerdos super obsessioenem discipili, et inmediate veniunt omnia precedentia que prius habueras licet alias duas ymagines non habueris que subsecuntur ubi recipit gla. et scu.	Here the priest binds above the scholar's siege, and immediately there follow all the preceding things, which you had before, although granted, two images you did not yet see, they follow below, where he catches sword and shield.
Nota quod quandocumque ligans et ligatus sunt in lite ut hic, tunc ligatus potest fugere quocumque vult si placet, quod requiritur in omnibus ligaturis sed de hoc debes esse munitus ut ubicumque ligatus sis sequens eum	Note that whenever binder and bound are in conflict as here, then the bound can flee wherever he wants, if he so chooses, and <mark>it is</mark> necessary in all binds. But for this you have to be prepared, that wheresoever the bound [flees], you should pursue him.
Ligans ligati contrarii sunt et irati, ligatus fugit ad partes laterum peto sequi.	Binder and bound are contrary and irate The bound flees to the side, I aim to pursue.

The first occurrence of the *ligans-ligati* verse, written on the left margin; note that the verse is grammatically dubious, you would expect *ligans ligatusque* or something similar. The text is distracted from the play at hand to give general advice on the bind, but §17 below can be seen as immediately following the establishment of the bind in §15.
→ *ligans-ligati*

Hic docet sacerdos discipulum su[um quo]modo debet ex hiis superioribus recipere gladium et scutum et sciendum quod sacerdos non potest absolvi a tali deprehensione sine amissione gladii & scuti	Here the priest teaches his student how from the above he may catch sword and shield, and know that the priest cannot free himself from such an embrace without letting go of his sword and shield.

Hic defendit sacerdos quod superius fecit scolaris	Here the priest defends against what the scholar does above.

Frustum 4

✠ *Hic resumitur prima custodia sed omnia que requiruntur hic habes in eadem excepta sola obmissione ligacionis quam scolaris obmittit.*	Here first guard is resumed, but all that is required here you have likewise [i.e. as discussed above], with the sole exception of the scholar's omission of the bind.

Play #4 simply illustrates the instruction *ducat statim stich* given under §14.

Hic obmisit scolaris quod non ligavit prossus sacerdos intravit et non inmerito quia ubicumque regens custodiam obmittit quod suum est facere obsessor statim debet intrare ut hic	Here the scholar has omitted [all actions], as he did not bind; the scholar enters straight [away], and not without merit, because whenever the one assuming the guard omits that which he has to do, the besieger has to enter as [shown] here.

prossus for *prorsus* or *prosus* "straight ahead, directly, truly"; even though the literal meaning of the adverb is "straight ahead", the intended meaning is not necessarily spatial but rather temporal, i.e. the priest enters "straight away" as the scholar omits the bind, but not necessarily in a straight line.
There is a change of perspective in §19, showing the thrust executed by the priest from the right side as in §108, §111, §115 (but the same action is visible from the left side in §97, §99, §124)
→ *intrare*

Frustum 5   play #5

5v (10) §20

| ✣ ¶ *obsessio ut prius sed ludus variatur* | The siege is as before, but the play is different. |

The sign of the cross in the margin is faded or deleted; the short gloss is written without the initial usually used for new sections, and squeezed between the feet of the fencers in the above image.

6r (11) §21/§22

| *Superius sacerdos obsedit scolarem hic vero scolaris ducit eundem lu actum quem duxit sacerdos sed obsidentis prius est intrare si scolaris obmittit ut infra, preterea caveat* ==sibi== *ne alter recipiat capud quod potest* | Above [in §20], the priest besieges the scholar; here, the scholar performs the same action as the priest, but the besieger is the first to enter if the scholar omits [further action], as below [in §22]. Moreover, he should take care lest the other might reach the head, as he can [do that]. |
| *Ex hiis superio[ri]bus sacerdos intrat ut supra dixi caveat ergo capud.* | From these above actions, the priest enters; as I said above, he should mind the head. |

The text for §21 has a stray *lu*, the beginning of the word *ludem*, emended to *actum* on the fly (because *ludus* "game" is used for a sequence of techniques, while *actus* refers to a single tempo, in this case the assumption of *krucke*). The addition of *scholaris* as the subject of *obmittit* is in the later hand B.

The technique described is an example of *Fühlen* in the bind, the priest may thrust to the belly in the (strong) bind, but the scholar has the opportunity to release the bind and strike to the head, scoring an easy double-hit. As soon as the attacker feels he is losing the bind, he has to interrupt the attack and perform the counter shown in the next image.
→ *intrare*

6v (12) §23

Image §23 is without text (and without lineation). It shows a counter against the double-hit discussed under §22. The counter is worth closer scrutiny, as it does not recur (but compare the counter in §76 as conceptually related).

Frustum 6

6v (12) §24

| ✠ *Hic iterum resumitur prima custodia videlicet sub brach[io] que obsedetur cum quodam contrario quod dicitur langort et est generalis obsessio cuius obssessionis contraria sunt ex parte regentis custodiam ligationes sub et supra, unde versus: Dum ducitur langort statim liga sub quoque supra. Sed superior ligacio semper utilior erit quam inferior.* | Here once again the first guard, viz. the one under the arm, is re-assumed, which is besieged with a certain counter that is called *langort*, and it is a siege of the common fencers, and the counters to this siege on the part of the one in the guard are the binds below and above, whence the verse: When *langort* is performed, quickly bind below or above. But the upper bind will always be more useful than the lower one. |

The sign of the cross in the margin is faded or deleted.
→ *langort*

7r (13) §25/§26

Hic erit ludus prioris custodie, scilicet ligantis et ligati unde versus: *Ligans ligati contrarii sunt et irati,* *ligatus fugit ad partes laterum peto sequi.* Johannes Herbart von Wirtzburck.	Here will follow the game of the first guard, that is, of the binder and the bound, whence the verse: Binder and bound are contrary and irate The bound flees to the side, I aim to pursue.

This page once again shows the overbind-*schiltslac* sequence; there is a change of perspective from §24. §26 has lineation but no text. On the bottom of the page, Johann Herbart (Herwart) of Würzburg, who acquired the manuscript in the 1550s, has left his name.
→ *ligans-ligati*

Frustum 7

Play #7 is a rare instance of an actively established *under*bind (followed immediately by a sword-change), the only other example of this being #22 .

7v (14) §27/§28

✠ *Custodia prima et obsessio generalis ut supra sed variatur ludus in fine frusci*	The first guard and the siege of the common [fencers, i.e. *langort*] as above, but the game is varied at the end of the play.	
¶*Superior*	¶*Inferior sed sacerdos ligavit licet sit inferior*	above	below, but the priest has established the bind, even though he is in the lower posititon.

The sign of the cross is faded or deleted. The text of plays #7 and #8 (foll. 7v to 8v) has been re-traced in darker ink, according to CS by hand C (but closely following the original ductus of hand A).

8r (15) §29/§30

¶*Hic fit mutatio gladii inferioris*	Here is the change of the sword in lower position.

The text is written between the two images, on the right side (the side of the fencer performing the technique). There is no other text (or lineation) on the page. Image §28 (the underbind) is closely reproduced in §29, the only difference in posture being the scholar's having moved his shield to his left hand side. §29 thus shows the same situation as §25 (with the role of the two fencers reversed), i.e. the overbind, which was followed in §26 by the §, but in this case, the *Vor* is held not by the fencer in the overbind, but by the fencer in the underbind, who next performs sword-change, so that the sequence §29-§30 becomes a repetition of §11-§12.

Frustum 8

⊞ ✛ *Custodia prima resumitur hic et obsedetur cum prima possessione videlicet halpschilt et habebis omnia priora.*	First guard is resumed here, and it is besieged with the first [siege], that is halpschilt, and you will have all of the things [treated] before.
versus: Dum ducitur halpschilt cade sub gladium quoque scutum.	verse: When *halpschilt* is assumed, fall under sword and shield.

There is a deleted cross patty in the margin, which has been replaced by a cross trefly.

This "play" on the final page of the first quire has no new material, but it is important as the only instance of the frequently used action of "falling under" being shown from the reverse perspective, showing the hands of the fencer in *halpschilt*.

The variant *possessio* for *obsessio* here occurs for the last time (otherwise only as *possessor* in §14, and in the late addition in §6).

The verse is written between the two images, on the right side (the side of the fencer performing the technique).

Secunda custodia (frusta #9–#11)

Frustum 9

9r (17) §33

✠ *Notandum quod hic docetur quomodo debeat secunda custodia obsedi et dico secunda custodia, Quia tertia custodia non multum differt a secunda, que habetur in humero d sinistro sed hic loquimur de secunda custodia que datur humero dextro Et de eadem custodia obsessessor ducit obsessionem que vocatur schutzen quia quelibet custodia tenet unam proteccionem i. schutzen.*	Note that here is taught how the second guard is to be besieged, and I say the second guard because the third guard, which is held on the left shoulder, is not much different from the second, but here we speak of the second guard, which is given to the right shoulder. And [against] either guard, the besieger performs a siege which is called *schutzen*, because every guard has one protection, i.e. *schutzen*.

→ *schutzen*

9r (17) §34

Hic ponit se simili modo sacerdos ad scolarem et docet quid ex hiis fiat, et sciendum quod salva doctrina sacerdotis qui prius fuit obssessus potest tria facere / *Primo potest exprimere gladium deorsum et tunc durchtreten /* *Secundo potest recipere plagam latere dextro.* *tertio potest recipere plagam latere sinistro /* *Nota quod hoc idem potest facere adversarius, licet obsessessor ad hoc prius sit paratus*	Here the priest places himself in a similar way as the scholar and teaches what may come from these things. And know, that according to the priest's sound teaching, the one who was first in besieging can do three things: First, he can push the sword downwards and then *durchtreten*. Second, he can perform a strike on the right side. Third, he can perform a strike on the left side. Note that the adversary may do the same, even though the besieger will be the first to be ready.

Hand C?

9v (18) §35

¶ *Hic scolaris instructus mediante consilio sacerdotis ducit actum quemdam qui nuncupatur durchtritt. posset tamen recipisse plagam tam sinistram que ducitur ex parte dimicatorum generalium, quam dexteram que consuevit duci ex parte sacerdotis et suorum iuvenium* *Contrarium illarum duarum viarum erit sacerdotis euntis cum gladio sub brach[io] qui tunc attingit manus nudas ducentis plagas supradictas.* *Licet contrarium istud non sit depictum in exemplum ymaginum.*	Here the scholar, instructed by the priest's counsel, performs an action which is called *durchtritt*. He could also? perform a strike on the left, which is done on the part of general fencers, and also on the right, which is usually done on the part of the priest and of his youths. Countering these two possibilities, the priest, going with the sword under the arm, who may thus reach the naked hands performing the abovementioned strikes. However, this counter is not depicted in the example of the images.

§35 is the only depiction of durchtritt. It carefully depicts the complex geometry... etc.
The text on fol. 9v is the beginning of the portion written in hand C, again interrupted by hand A on 26r to 28v.
Hands A and C are two contemporary scribes working in rotation (unlike the somewhat younger hand B responsible for interspersed additions or corrections).

9v (18) §36

¶ *Nota quod sacerdos def*==*e*==*ndit hic actum superius* ==*ductum*==*. (quia) cum scolaris vero esset in actu itineris sacerdos religando atque subpremendo gladium scolaris ligatum demonstrat* ut hic patet per exemplum. *Preterea quid sacerdotem ex hiis facere contingat si diligenter inspexeris poteris edoceri. et cetera.*	Note that the priest here defends the action performed above. As the scholar was just about to act, the priest, binding and pressing down the scholar's bound sword demonstrates as ==shown== here in the example. What the priest may arrive at doing afterwards from these things, you may learn if you look carefully, etc.

The priest's counter consists of the "sword-change" technique, and the resulting position shown in §36 is equivalent to that in §30.
quia deleted or faded?

10r (19) §37

¶ *Hic vero* ==*c*==*um esset sacerdos in actu superius ligandi informat scolarem quid sit faciendum adversus hec videlicet stichslac quod generaliter ducere consuevit, patet hic per exemplum.*	Here, just as the priest was in the ==[above?]== act of ==[over?]==binding, he instructs the scholar as to what is to be done against this, viz. *stichslac*, which he is generally accustomed to performing, as shown here in the example.

→ *stichslac*

Frustum 10

10r (19) §38

✠ **<u>*Humero dextrali datur altera*</u>**, i. custodia. Et <u>*nota*</u> quod tam rector custodie quam obsessor eiusdem sunt in eodem actu ut supra, exemplo proximo*	To the shoulder is given the second, i.e. guard. And note that both ==the one in== the guard and his besieger are in the same act as in the preceding example.

The text cites the introductory verse for the second guard and notes that the position shown in §38 is equivalent to that in §33, i.e. the first image of the preceding play #9.

10v (20) §39

¶ *Hic sacerdos obmisit omnes actus tam ligandi quam religandi et hoc in exemplum suorum scolarium ut possint dischere quid sit faciendum, scolaris vero invadendo eum et ducit illum actum qui ponitur hic in exemplum*	Here the priest omits all actions of binding ==or [actively] binding==, and he does so as an example for his scholars so that they may learn what is to be done; and the scholar stepping in performs the action which is here put in the example.

The purpose of play #10 is just to show the attack from the *schutzen* position against the second guard. Note that the use of *invadere* is paired with the explicit depiction in §39 of the scholar's right leg being forward (based on the position of the rear foot, a detail not seen since §22, and seen here for the last time in the book).
→ *invadere, ligatio, religatio*

Frustum 11

10v (20) §40

✠ ¶ *Eadem custodia (et) alia vero obsessio, et est illa que appellatur halpschilt pri[...]us tacta contra primam custodiam videlicet sub brach[io].*	The same guard but a different siege, and it is the one called *halpschilt* which we have treated before against the first guard, viz. the one under the arm.

The lacuna indicated as *pri[...]us* is due to the scribe breaking the line early and then deleting a few words at the beginning of the second line. The *(et)* also appears to have been deleted. Use of *tacta* for "touched upon" as in "treated" recurs below 12v, 20v, 23r, 23v, 25r, 25v, 30r, apparently used equivalently to *superius dictum*, *supradictum*, etc.

11r (21) §41/§42

Nota quod multi generales dimicatores seducuntur ista obsessione hic posita qui credunt fieri posse separacionem scuti et gladii mediante plaga illa que ducitur hic quod secus est, quia obsessor non facit moram aliquam per quam possit periclitari sed illa hic ducta depicta est in exemplum omnibus volentibus uti consilio sacerdotis	Note that many general fencers are seduced by this siege here presented, because they believe that they might separate sword and shield with this strike being performed here, but this is not so, because the besieger will not make any delay, which might [indeed] be risky, but this [separation] being performed here is depicted as an example for all who are willing to make use of the priest's counsel.
Hic vero cum sacerdos esset in actu ducendi plagam superiorem docet scolarem vertere scutum et gladium intrando cum gladio ut hic, quod is ~~qui~~ existens adversarius plagam ducere nequivit [?ne potuit] ad effectum.	Here, indeed, as the priest is in the act of delivering the strike [from/discussed] above, he teaches the scholar to turn his shield and sword, entering with the sword as shown here, because of which the adversary cannot deliver the strike effectively.

This play is an important hint as to the geometry of *halpschilt*: the position is apparently thus that it may provoke a strike aimed between the hands, easily defended by turning the weapons slightly clockwise and stepping to the right.

Invasio (frustum #12)

The purpose of play #12 is to illustrate the default attack from *halpschilt*. And as such is an addition to the group of plays #1–#8 and probably should have been included there, making its appearance here the first apparent deviation from the presentation order as originally planned.

11v (22) §43/§44

✠ *Hic resumit sacerdos custodiam primam videlicet sub brach[io], obmissis quibusdam prius non positis, ut patet infra per exemplum.*	Here the priest re-assumes the first guard, viz. the one under the arm, as some things have been omitted before, as shown below in the examples.
¶ *Posset quis dubitare quomodo scolaris invaderet sacerdotem et sciendum quod sacerdos latitando obmittit omnes suas defensiones informando scolarem, qui sicut stat non variando scutum nec gladium magis appropinquat, i. paulo plus recipiendo plagam ut hic patet per ymagines.*	Here one might wonder in what way the scholar should attack the priest, and know that the priest by delaying omits all his defenses, in order to instruct the scholar, who, as he stands, and, without moving by much either sword or shield, approaches, i.e. a little later delivers a strike, as shown here in the images.

Note the scope ambiguity of *magis*, i.e. either "*non variando magis*" or "*magis appropinquat*". From the context and the system's general philosophy, I assume that the point is that the weapons do not have to be moved *much* and not that the attack involves *greatly* advancing.

Tertia custodia (frusta #13–#16)

Frustum 13

12r (23) §45/§46

⊕ *Hic ducetur tertia custodia que per scolarem obsessa est ut hic cuius obsessionis contrarium erit ligacio \& dico ligacio quia sola superior \& non alia ut infra proximo exemplo* ¶ *Hic ligat sacerdos quod est melius \& utilius quia si quid aliud faceret quo minus gladius adversarii occuparetur in dampnum suum redundaret*	Here the third guard is assumed, which is besieged by the scholar as here, the counter against which siege will be a bind, and I say a bind but [I mean] only an upper bind and none other, as shown in the following example. Here the priest binds, which is better and more useful than anything else he might do, which would less occupy the adversary's sword and result in his ==damage==.

The sign of the cross is a later addition, CS: *fort. per man. C addit.*

12v (24) §47

¶ *Ex illa ligacione sup[er]ius proxime tacta docet sacerdos clientulum suum circumdatis brachiis adversarii recipere gladium et scutum, ut hic patet.*	From this bind just treated above, the priest teaches his pupil to ==receive== the adversary's sword and shield by enveloping the arms, as shown here.

circumdatis brachiis ablative absolute "the arms having been enclosed".

Frustum 14

12v (24) §48

✠ ¶ *Custodia tertia ducetur hic ut prius et eadem obsessio licet varietur ludus.*	The third guard is performed here as before, and the same siege, but the play is different.

13r (25) §49

¶ *Hic docet sacerdos clientulum suum qui ducit obsessionem et docet eum intrare si obmittuntur ligaciones.*	Here the priest teaches his pupil, who is performing the siege, and he teaches him to enter if the binds are omitted.

Frustum 15

13r (25) §50

✠ ¶ *Eadem custodia tertia videlicet in humero sinistro et est eadem obsessio que vocatur halpschilt ut supra.*	The same third guard, viz. on the left shoulder, and the same siege which is called *halpschilt*, as above.

In spite of what is suggested by the text, this is the first time we see the third guard against *halpschilt*.
Note that the *halpschilt* position shown is somewhat higher than in earlier instances.

13v (26) §51/§52, 14r (27) §53

¶ *Nota quod omnes actus custodie prime videlicet sub brach[io], habuntur hic usque ad proximum signum crucis.*	Note that here are the same actions of the first guard, viz. the one under the arm, until the next sign of the cross.

The text refers to the three images §51 to §53 as equivalent to §6 to §8.
Lineation but no text in the middle of 13v and at the top of 14r.

Frustum 16

14r (27) §54

⊠ ¶ *Hic resumitur eadem tertia custodia cuius obsessio erit langort quam omnes ducunt generales dimicatores* - *cuius obsessionis contraria / sunt due ligaciones quarum una est in dexteris super gladium, reliqua vero in sinistris.*	Here the same third guard is re-assumed, whose siege will be *langort*, which is performed by all common fencers, [and] the counters against which siege are two binds, of which one is on the right above the sword and the other on the left.

→ *langort*

14v (28) §55

versus ¶ *Ligans ligati contrarii sunt et irati, ligatus fugit ad partes laterum peto sequi.*	verse: Binder and bound are contrary and irate, the bound flees to the side, I aim to pursue.

→ *ligans-ligati*

Quarta custodia (frusta #17–#18)

Frustum 17

14v (28) §56

✧ ¶ *Postquam determinatum est de tertia custodia hic determinat de quarta cuius obsessio erit halpschilt que omnia prius habuisti invenies hic usque ad proximum signum crucis.*	After dealing with the third guard, here we deal with the fourth, whose siege will be halpschilt, of which all which you had before you will find here until the next sign of the cross.

The first of <mark>several</mark> problemtic single-image plays, which may indicate either a missing page or a mis-arrangement of the following pages. The next page 15r begins with a cross sign, which is however of the secondary type possibly inserted considerably later, but it also unlikely to have been intended to follow §55 (as it recommences in a guard-siege position). There is doodling on the page taking up the cross trefly and giving it an anthropomorphic appearance.

Frustum 18

15r (29) §57/58

⊕ *Hic sacerdos resumit quartam custodiam cuius custodie quarte erit obsessio custodia prima, et hoc in exemplum suorum scolarium ut hic patet per exemplum.*	Here the priest re-assumes the fourth guard, of which fourth guard the siege will be the first guard and this [he does] as an example for his scholars, as shown here in the example.
Postquam scolaris superius obsedit sacerdotem hic iterum ipse obsedit eum et hoc sub brach[ium], et notandum quod omnia ista tanguntur in prima custodia videlicet sub brach[ium], usque ad proximam signum crucis.	After the scholar has above besieged the priest, here he [the priest] again besieges him [the scholar], and this under the arm, and note that all this has been treated under the first guard, viz. the one under the arm, until the next sign of the cross.

Thee priest is explicitly stated to only show fourth guard "as an example" (i.e. imitatig common fencers) and he does not initiate any action from it against first, instead changing into first guard himself. The text then refers to the four following images §58 to §61 as equivalent to §5 to §8.

15v (30) §59/60,
16r (31) §61

Lineation but no text, repeat of the "privileged sequence" §5 to §8.
In §59, the bind was drawn incorrectly, and the mistake has been addressed by drawing the scholar's sword, which is supposed to be in front, in stronger lines.

Langort (frustum 19)

16r (31) §62

✠ ¶ *Hic resumitur custodia prima videlicet sub brach[io], cuius obsessio erit langort, et est generalis et modicum valens* ¶ *Et nota quod regens custodiam tria habet facere,* *Primo potest ligare in dextris super gladium* *Secundo potest ligare in sinistris sub gladio,* *Tertio potest comprehendere gladium manu ut infra patet exemplo proximo.*	Here the same first guard is re-assumed, viz. the one under the arm, whose siege will be langort, and it [*langort*] is a common and of limited value. And note that the one in the guard may do three things: First, he may bind on the right side above the sword, second, he may bind on the left under the sword, third, he may grasp the sword with the hand, as is shown below in the next example.

This is a belated addition to plays #6–#7 which have already treated *langort* against first guard; cf. the text on 6v.
→ *langort*

16v (32) §63/§64

Hic sacerdos deprehendit sive docet deprehendere gladium obsedentis, et nota quod gladius ipsius obsedentis non potest absolvi nisi mediante schiltsclac ubi sacerdotis manus percutietur cum scuto ut infra, exemplo proximo	Here the priest takes, or teaches to take, the sword of the besieger, and note that the sword of this besieger may not be loosened except by means of a *schiltslac*, where the priest's hand is <mark>hit</mark> with the shield as below in the next example.

16v (32) §64

Hic relevatur gladius scolaris mediante schiltslac, et caveat sacerdos ne scolaris ducat plagam capiti sive fixuram generalem quam sacerdos consuevit docere discipulos suos. Preterea scias quod si scolaris dat plagam capiti protectionem duc gladio connexoque scuto quod habetur in sinistra manu, et sic f[r]angis scutum de manibus tui adversarii ut patet infra proximo exemplo.	Here the scholar's sword is freed by means of a *schiltslac*, and the priest should take care lest the scholar deliver a strike to the head or the <mark>common</mark> thrust, as the priest is used to teaching his students. Furthermore you should know that if the scholar does a strike to the head, perform a protection with the sword and shield together held in the left hand, and so you may also wrest the shield from the hands of your adversary, as shown below in the next example.

CS assume that a further illustration has been "lost", because the final techniques (blocking the strike to the head with sword and shield held in the left hand and at the same time using the right hand to wrest the shield from the opponent's hand) are not shown in spite of the promise "as shown below in the next example".
I do think the layout of the work is interrupted at this point, but not necessarily because pages are missing. The book "forgets" to include the material on the fifth guard, but the fact that this material is belatedly inserted later in the book suggests that it was never present here.

Sexta custodia (frustum #20)

17r (33) §65/§66

✣ *Hic sacerdos ducit sextam custodiam que datur pectori, et nota quod solum illa fixura est ducenda que ducetur de quinta custodia, usque ad proximum signum crucis.*	Here the priest performs the sixth guard, which is given to the breast, and note that only that thrust, which is also performed from the fifth guard, is to be performed; until the next sign of the cross.
Hic sacerdos de ista custodia sexta iam dicta ducit fixuram, que fixura etiam de quinta custodia est ducenda	Here the priest from that abovementioned sixth guard performs the thrust, which thrust is also to be performed from the fifth guard.

Image §66 is the first illustration of "that thrust" associated with the fifth guard, but its mention as if it had already been treated suggests that the original plan was to dicuss the guards in their numerical order. When performed from the fifth guard, the technique is drawn from the right side, the only image comparable to §66 is §124.
The somewhat redundant second paragraph in the middle of the page was added by the younger hand B.
→ *fixura*

17v (34) §67

Hic scolaris per religacionem resistit et defendit sacerdoti illam fixuram ~~in proximo~~ superius in proximo exemplo per ipsum factam	Here the scholar resists with an [active] bind and defends that above thrust of the priest's, which is performed by him [the priest] in the example just above.

The scribe wanted to refer to the image just above (§66), writing *in proximo [exemplo]*, but then realising that this expression is otherwise used to refer to the next image below cancels the first *in proximo* and writes the more explicit *superius in proximo exemplo*.
See also §109 (play 36).

Ligaciones (frusta #21–#27)

Frustum 21

The text appears to introduce a new section or "chapter", after treating the system of guards and sieges, the following plays (21 to 25) are dedicated to the binds. This again suggests that discussion of the fifth guard was omitted accidentally (and inserted belatedly as plays 36 to 38). Play 21 is dedicated to the "upper right" bind which has already figured several times, and the text suggests that images §68 and §70 are to be taken as equivalent to §7 and §8 (but with §69 an intermediate step not seen before is presented). Play 21 then goes a little overboard with a wrestling sequence (§70 to §73) before the topic of binds is continued in play 22.

17v (34) §68

✥ *Postquam determinatum est de omnibus custodiis supradictis hic determinat de septima custodia que nuncupatur langort, et notandum quod quatuor sunt ligaciones que respiciunt illam custodiam videlicet due liguntur de dextra parte, relique vero due de sinistra parte.* *Sed loquimur hic primo de ligatura s. super gladium quod habes totum in custodia prima usque ad quartum exemplum ubi recipitur gladius et scutum.*	After treating all the above guards, here we treat the seventh guard, which is called langort; and note that there are four binds that correspond to this guard, viz. two bind from the right side and the other two from the left side. But here we first speak of the bind above the sword, which you all have in the first guard, until the fourth example where sword and shield are taken.

18r (35) §69/§70

Notandum quod scolaris prius in exemplo inmediate precedenti fecit ligaturam super gladium sacerdotis. hic sacerdos appropinquat erigendo gladium et scutum propter proteccionem capitis *Hic scolaris recipit schiltslac et ex contrario plagam infert sacerdoti*	Note that the scholar at first, in the immediately preceding example, establishes a bind above the priest's sword; here, the priest approaches while lifting sword and shield for the protection of the head. Here the scholar performs a *schiltslac* and from the counter he inflicts a strike on the priest.

Image §69 is a valuable addition to the "privileged sequence" of overbind-plus-*schiltslac*, as it shows the reaction of the fencer being overbound.

18v (36) §71/§72

Hic recipit ligatus, i. inferior gladium et scutum superioris. *Hic dereliquit voluntarie scolaris gladium et scutum volens luctare cum sacerdote, ut infra.*	Here the bound, i.e. the one below, captures sword and shield of the one above. Here the scholar voluntarily drops sword and shield, intending to wrestle with the priest, as [shown] below.

The style of beards (horseshoe moustaches) drawn on the faces in §72 may be a clue as to the date of the "doodler": it seems likely to me that the doodling was added in the 17th century (after Gunterrodt's death but before its acquisition by the ducal library of Gotha), perhaps by a child.

19r (37) §73

Superius sacerdos deprehensus fuit per scolarem in modum luctationis quod sacerdos hic defendit ut patet per exemplum.	Above the priest was being gripped in the mode of wrestling by the scholar, which the priest here defends against, as shown in the example.

Frustum 22

19r (37) §74

✤ *Hic resumitur iterum illa custodia ultima que ducetur per scolarem Contrarium vero ducet sacerdos, et est una ligatura de illis quatuor ligaturis videlicet subligacio in sinistra parte ut hic patet per ymagines.*	Here the same final guard is again resumed, <mark>held</mark> by the scholar. The counter is held by the priest, and it is one of those four binds, viz. the under-bind on the left side, as shown here in the images.

19v (38) §75/§76

Postquam superius exemplo proximo subligatum est per sacerdotem scolaris vero recipit capud sacerdotis quia fuit superior gladius suus et nota quod quandocunque subligatur capud debet teneri in custodia ne percutiatur ut hic, unde versus, dum subligaveris caveas ne decipieris, dum subligatur c[apud] ligantis recipiatur.	After he was under-bound by the priest in the last example above, the scholar reaches the priest's head, because his sword was above, and note that whenever one under-binds, one must take care of the head lest it be hit as [seen] here, whence the verse: When you under-bind, take care lest you be deceived, When under-binding, the head of the binder may be reached.
Superius scolaris duxit plagam percutiens capud sacerdotis, quod sacerdos hic defendit, quia ducit contrarium ut patet per exemplum.	Above, the scholar delivered a strike, cutting the priest's head, which the priest here defends against because he performs a counter, as shown in the example.

§75 may stand in as a replacement for the missing depiction of "nucken", even though the implied dynamic is different ("nucken" implies a two-part movement down-up, while here the movement is just upwards).
§76 is important as a rare depiction of this type of counter; there is no explanatory text or follow-up action, but the left arm extended under the right suggests a counter-attack by stepping left with a shield-strike.

Frustum 23

20r (39) §77/§78

✤ **H**ic iterum ducitur ultima custodia que nuncupatur langort quam in hoc loco regit sacerdos, scolaris vero de hiis quatuor ligacionibus ducit unam videlicet super gladium ut patet hic per exemplum. **P**ostquam superius ligatum est super gladium sacerdotis ut supra visum est, *h*ic vero sacerdos defendit per illum actum qui vocatur sthich, ut patet hic.	Here again the final guard, which is called *langort*, is performed, in this case by the priest, while the scholar performs one of those four binds, viz. [left] above the sword, as shown here in the example. After above an upper bind is established above the priest's sword, as seen above, here the priest defends against that action which is called *stich*, as shown here.

There is some terminological confusion here between words for "above (in the text)" and "above (the sword)". After writing *superius ligatum est*, the scribe appears to become aware of the dual meaning and explicitly repeats *super gladium* as well as *supra visum*.
The text fails to specifiy which of the upper binds is being discussed (the left one); comparing the text of the preceding and succeeding plays, this is clearly an oversight on the part of the scribe.

Frustum 24

20v (40) §79/§80

+ **H**ic ultima custodia videlicet Langort ducitur hic per scolarem super quam custodiam ligat sacerdos de illis quatuor ligacionibus unam videlicet super gladium in dextris. Et nota quod quandocumque ligatum est ex parte ligantis ligatus potest fugere quocumque vult aut in sinistris aut in dextris, unde diligenter videas si fugere incipiat <mark>dum</mark> sequaris *u*nde *v*ersus, ligatus fugit ad partes later<mark>um</mark> peto sequi. **E**x illa ligatura superius tacta que ducta est per sacerdotem scolaris fugit ut supra dictum est ut patet hic, quia fugit sub brachio quod inmediate sequitur sacerdos percutiendo capud ut hic.	Here the final guard, viz. *langort*, is performed by the scholar, above which guard the priest binds with one of those four binds, viz. on the right above the sword, and note that whenever one is bound, the bound one can flee wherever he wants, either to the left or to the right, therefore you should diligently check if he begins to flee so that you may follow, whence the verse: the bound flees to the side, I aim to pursue. From the bind treated above, which is performed by the priest, the scholar flees as discussed above, as shown here, because he flees under the arm, and the priest immediately follows, hitting the head, as [shown] here.

The text contains the most detailed explanation of the *ligans-ligati* verse in the book. The second image shows a "nachreisen" technique after as of the fencers retreats from the bind.
A simple cross sign has been added in faded ink on the margin, but the text makes clear that this is the beginning of a new play, and the cross sign was apparently simply forgotten by the painter.
Play #24 concludes the discussion of the four binds to the [lower] langort; it is followed by a brief treatment of "upper langort" (#25) and of vidilpoge (#26-#27), but play #28 (23r) consists of an explicit addition to the "four binds" topic, before the next "chapter" dealing with the "priest's special guard" is started with play #29 (23v).
→ *ligans-ligati*

Frustum 25

21r (41) §81/§82

✣ *Nota quod hic est alia custodia videlicet superior Langort que ducitur hic per sacerdotem suis scolaribus in exemplum iubendo scolarem suum ducere illum actum videlicet ponendo se ad eum ut patet hic per exemplum.* *Hic sacerdos religat defendendo atque contradicendo scolari et erit una ligacio de illis quatuor ligacionibus videlicet super gladium in dextris quod habes superius totum in aliis supradictis.*	Note that here is a different guard, viz. upper langort, which is here performed by the priest, as an example for his scholars, and instructing his scholar to perform this action, viz. placing himself to him as shown here in the example. Here the priest binds, defending and answering the scholar, and it will be one bind out of those four binds, viz. above the sword on the right, which you have above, with all that has been said before.

The offensive possibilities from this "upper *langort*" (presumably *zwerchhau*?) are not discussed, instead the focus is on how to effectively neutralise the guard, resulting in a right overbind (the text suggests treating §82 as equivalent with §79). The overbind is assumed to be especially strong (because of the greater vertical distance it has to cover), and the following technique is comparable to a "winding" action depending on a strong bind, with a discussion of *fühlen*.

21v (42) §83/§84

Postquam superius religatum est per sacerdotem hic scolaris querit alias vias percutiendi sacerdotem, et notandum quod cum credit se sacerdos posse ligare scolaris interim percutit brachia ipsius sacerdotis supradicti. Nota hic etiam quod non solum percutuntur brachia, <sed> vis istius actus sive plage consistit in fixura que potest hic duci. *Hic sacerdos sentiens brachia sua esse lesa volens ducere plagam trahendo se seorsum demum scolaris sequitur ut hic, et cetera.*	After the priest has bound above, here the scholar seeks for other ways of hitting the priest, and note that as the priest believes that he may establish a bind, the scholar meanwhile is hitting the arms of this abovementioned priest. Note also that here not only the arms are hit, but the power of this action or strike consists in the thrust which may here be delivered. Here, the priest feeling that his arms have been injured and intending to deliver a strike, the scholar is drawing himself back and ==eventually== follows, as [shown] here, etc.

Here we have an explicit presentation of a *Nachschlag* situation (hitting the head after having been hit on the arms). The hit on the arm is performed from optimal distance, while the "powerful" thrust is omitted because it would open the attacker to a double hit, with the counter against the *Nachschlag*, still avoiding close distance, shown in §84.

Frustum 26

22r (43) §85/§86

❖ *Hic ducetur quedam custodia generalis que nuncupatur vidilpoge quam regit sacerdos, scolaris vero contrariando* <mark>*sic*</mark> *ponendo se <ad> ipsum ut patet hic per ymagines.* *Postquam scolaris posuit gladium suum super brachium sacerdotis quod habetur etiam pro ligatura ut patet superius hic sacerdos vertit manum que regit scutum recipitque gladium ipsius scolaris ut in hoc exemplo.*	Here is performed a certain common guard, which is called *vidilpoge*, by the priest, while the scholar is countering <mark>thus</mark>, placing himself <mark>towards</mark> him as shown here in the images. After the scholar places his sword on the priest's arm, which also counts as a bind, as shown above, here the priest turns the hand which holds the shield and takes the sword of this <mark>same</mark> scholar, as in this example.

→ *vidilpoge*

Frustum 27

22v (44) §87/§88

❖ *Hic iterum resumitur illa custodia videlicet vidilpoge et ducitur per sacerdotem scolaris ducit hic idem ut supra.* *Hic religat sacerdos vt supra.*	Here that guard is re-assumed, viz. *vidilpoge*, and it is performed by the priest; the scholar here does the same as above. Here the priest binds as above.

→ *vidilpoge*

23r (45) §89

❖ *Ex illa ligatura sacerdos recipit schiltslac ut supra sepius tactum est ex ligaturis supradictis*	From this bind the priest delivers a *schiltslac*, as has often been treated above, from the above-mentioned binds.

The text suggests equivalence of §88/§89 to §7/§8.

Ultima custodia (frustum #28)

23r (45) §90

✣ *Nota quod iterum hic resumitur ultima custodia videlicat Langort. Circa quod notandum est quod illa fixura ducetur hic mediante qua regens custodiam fingitur super ventrem sive penetratur gladio, et nota quod non est plus depictum de illo frusto quam ille due ymagines quod fuit vicium pictoris.*	Note that here the final guard, viz. *langort*, is again resumed, regarding which should be noted <<mark>that</mark>> this thrust here delivered, by means of which the one in the guard is pierced in the belly or penetrated by the sword, and note that no more is depicted regarding this play other than these two images, which was the painter's fault.

A "single-image play" explicitly mentioned as exceptional, apparently a technique that was intended to be presented in the context of plays 21 to 25. The sentence is strictly speaking anacoluthic, but the meaning is that this thrust to the belly delivered against *langort* was omitted above by mistake and is important enough to show here even if there was only space to draw a single position. There also seems to have been a problem in the depiction of geometry, with the priest's sword should be drawn in front, i.e. the technique is performed from "left overbind".

imaginum is still used close to its original meaning of "likeness", i.e. "two images" refers to the depiction of the two fencers in a single "exemplum".

fingitur should read *figitur*.

Custodia specificata (frusta #29–#35, #39–#40)

Frustum 29

23v (46) §91/§92

✠ *Hic ducit sacerdos suam custodiam specificatam videlicet Langort que opsedetur per scolarem cuius opsessio erit halpschilt vt patet hic per exemplum*	Here the priest performs his special guard, viz. Langort, which is besieged by the scholar, whose siege will be halpschilt, as shown hre in the example.
Hic ponit se sacerdos sub gladium scolaris quod sepius prius tactum est unde Versus Dum ducitur halpschilt cade sub gladium quoque scutum	Here the priest places himself under the scholar's sword, which has often been treated before, whence the verse: When halpshilt is assumed, fall under sword and shield.

This is the beginning of the section or "chapter" on the "priest's special guard" or "special *langort*", consisting of eight plays (29-34, 39-40). The application or advantage of the "special guard" is however not elucidated in this play, instead §92 is simply identified as equivalent with §6.
The cross trefly is here simplified to a cross crosslets.
→ *cade-sub*

24r (47) §93

Postquam sacerdos superius posuit se ad scolarem hic scolaris religat calcat volens facere quod <mark>sub</mark>sequitur et quia multas formas superius habe<mark>tis</mark> unde non est necesse plura ponere exempla, unde versus, Ligans ligati et cetera.	After the priest above has placed himself <mark>against</mark> the scholar, here the scholar binds and applies pressure, intending to do what follows, and what you had in ma y variants above, so that it is not necessary to give more examples, whence the verse The binder and bound, etc.

24r (47) §94

Nota quod ex illa religacione ex parte scolaris ducetur <mark>utilis</mark> plaga videlicet faciendo separacionem gladii et scuti sacerdotis necnon intrando ut p quod nusquam plus in libro scriptum est ut patet hic per exemplum.	Note that from this bind on the part of the scholar, a useful strike is delivered, viz. achieving a separation of the priest's sword and shield, and/<mark>while</mark> entering, on which is written nowhere else in the book, as shown here in the example.

In this play, the "special *langort*" starting position is quickly reduced to the bind as already discussed (i.e. §93 equivalent to §7), so the author decides instead of re-iterating this material he can show a technique from the bind not yet treated but topically part of the "four binds" section. It is explicitly stressed that the positon shown in §94 is unique in the entire book (but c.f. §41 for *separatio* against *halpschilt*).
→ *intrare* → *calcat* → *ligans-ligati* → *separatio*

Frustum 30

24v (48) §95/§96

✠ *Hic iterum resumitur specificata custodia sacerdotis que nuncupatur Langort ut superius visum est deinde scolaris obsedit eum ut supra quod est halpschilt sed alia exempla subsecuntur, ut patet infra.*	Here the special guard of the priest, which is called langort, is resumed, as seen above, the scholar again besieges it with halpschilt, but other examples follow, as shown below.
Hic sacerdos ponit se ad scolarem ut sepius prius visum est	Here the priest places himself towards the scholar as often seen before.

new type of cross sign with four dots. §95/§96 is said to be equivalent with §91/§92.

25r (49) §97

Notandum quod scolaris ducit hic plagam generalem quam consueverunt ducere omnes generales dimicatores ex supradictis proxime tactis videlicet quando ligans et ligatus sunt in lite tunc ligans qui est superior vadit post caput et obmittit schiltslac mediante quo subsequitur plaga, sacerdos vero intrat ut hic.	Here the scholar delivers this common strike which all common fencers are wont to deliver from what was treated just above, viz., when binder and bound are in conflict and the binder, who is above, aims to the head and omits the *schiltslac*, by means of which the strike follows; the priest then enters as [shown] here.

The image shows an attempted direct attack with the short edge from the bind and its counter. The idea seems to be that the scholar from §96 has overbound and now attempts the attack as in the "privileged sequence", but omitting the *schiltslac*. Here we have therefore a rare instance of a "common mistake" deemed worthy of a full image.
Because of misreported foliation according to which fol. 20 was considered a single folium (see appendix), I have formerly accepted as likely that a fol. 24a, the missing half of a bifolium 20-20a, had been lost between fol. 24 and fol. 25. Since we now know that fol 20 is attached to fol. 25, I do no longer think this is likely; §97 is simply a somewhat unusual conclusion of play #30.

Frustum 31

25r (49) §98

✠ *Nota quod resumitur hic specificata custodia sacerdotis apellata Langort sed est valde aliena obsessio hic depicta et valde rara et sciendum quod omnia ista reducuntur ad custodiam primam et ad obsessionem que dicitur halpschilt et cetera.*	Note that here is resumed the special guard of the priest known as *langort*, but a very strange and very rare siege is depicted here, and it should be known that all these things are reduced to the first guard and to the siege which is called *halpschilt*, etc.

cross potent with four dots.
The play seems to be a concession to "strange" positions outside of Liutger's system of guards that may be assumed by "common" fencers, with the general conclusion that slight deviations from the system may still result in the same dynamics, but also (in the next image) that deviations from the "optimal" positions may be exploited. This "strange" position is also suggestively similar to the "common strike" shown in the preceding image, even though there are noticeable differences in both the position of the sword and the shield.

25v (50) §99/§100

☩ *Hic sacerdos ducit quandam fixuram prius tactam quia scolaris qui fuerat obsessor supra exemplo proximo obmittit omnes suos actos, quia si religasset fuisset subportatus ut patet infra exemplo proximo.* *Notandum quod ex hiis ista fixura superius tacta per sacerdotem erit hic quedam religacio facta per scolarem quod oportet de necessitate si volumus quod defendatur fixura superius depicta.*	Here the priest delivers a certain thrust treated above, which the scholar, who was the besieger in the example just above, omits all his actions because, had he sought the bind, he would have been pushed [aside], as shown in the next example below. Note that from this thrust by the priest treated above, there will here be a certain bind established by the scholar, which is necessary if we want that the thrust shown above should be defended against.

subportatus "conveyed, carried" is used only here. It seems to express that from the position in §98, the priest would have much more force in a bind and could just push through. Nevertheless, the scholar does manage to get into a bind against the thrust in §100, presumably by taking a step to improve the angle and to be able to turn his hand to bind with the strong edge. → *fixura* → *religatio*

[Fruscum 32]

26r (51) §101

Ligans ligati contrarii sunt et [i]rati ligatus fugit ad partes laterum peto sequi.	Binder and bound are contrary and irate, the bound flees to the side, I aim to pursue.

"play 32" is here counted merely for compatibility with CS.
It is a single image showing overbind with the *ligans-ligati* verse, but I do not necessarily think that anything is missing between §100 and §101.

Fruscum 33

26r (51) §102

✤ *Hic tertia custodia obsessa est cum specificata custodia sacerdotis que nuncupatur langort Et consulo bona fide quod is qui regit tertiam custodiam non protrahat suos actos alioquin is qui regit obsessionem, <sacerdotis> intrat cum fixura quod est in communi usu sacerdotis.*	There the third guard is besieged by the special guard of the priest which is called *langort*, and I counsel in good faith that he who is in the third guard should not delay his actions in any way, [because] he who is in the siege enters with thrust, which is in the usual habit of the priests'.

This play for the first time mentions the main strength of the "priest's special langort", i.e. the delivery of a strong thrust (supported by the shield), arguably shown twice before in illustration, §97 and §99.
We have seen the "priest's special langort" three times before,
in each instance shown by the priest. Here and in the remaining six instances, it is shown by the scholar.

26v (52) §103

Postquam sacerdos superius obsessus fuit hic scolaris schutzet sacerdos vero ducit quandam religacionem ut hic patet.	After the priest was besieged above, here the scholar *schutzet* and the priest establishes a bind as shown here.

The finite German verb *schutzet* in the Latin text, "the scholar *schutzet*" as in "the scholar performs *schutzen*".
There is more than one possible interpretation of what is going on here. The text describes accurately what is going on in the images, but there is a logical disconnect; we were just told that the one in third guard was at a disadvantage, ...

Fruscum 34

26v (52) §104

✢ **H**ic resumitur quarta custodia que est obsessa cum specificata custodia sacerdotis sacerdotis est econtra obsidere aliquin scolaris intrat ut prius et veniunt omnes actus quos prius habuisti.	Here the fourth guard is resumed, which is besieged with the priest's special guard. It is for the priest to besiege anything the scholar does, he enters as before, and all actions which you had before follow.

Apparently a single-image play, possibly by design, its point being just tick off fourth guard against special *langort*. §104 is nominally equivalent to both §117 and §122 (but note the difference in the way the shield is held in fourth guard).

Frustum 39

30r (59) §117/§118

| ✢ ¶ *Notandum quod hic resumitur quarta custodia cuius quarte custodie obsessio est specificatum langcort sacerdotis, videat autem obsessor ne regens custodiam ducet aliquam plagam, quia periculosum erit* sic diu *latiare, unde ducat primo schuzin demum fixuram non obmittat.* | Note that here the fourth guard is resumed, the siege to which fourth guard being the priest's langort, but the besieger should see that the one in the guard do not deliver any strike, because it would be perilous to tarry for long, so he should at first perform *schutzen*, and then not omit the thrust. |
| ¶ *Hic sacerdos econtrario obsedit scolarem quod puto melius esse quod potest ab aliquo edoceri quia si hoc non fiet scolaris ipsum invaderit cum fixura quod nunc suus erit sed ex hiis oritur ludus prime custodie videlicet ligantis* \& *ligati quod patet infra in exemplo proximo* | Here, on the other hand, the priest besieges the scholar, which I hold to be better, which one may learn from anyone, because if he did not do so, the priest would enter towards him with a thrust, which now would be for him to do, but from these things follows the play of the first guard, viz. Of the binder and bound, as shown below in the next example. |

30v (60) §119/§120

| ¶ *hic erunt ligaciones que superius tacte sunt sepius unde versus, Ligans ligati contraria sunt et irati et cetera.* | Here will be the binds which are often treated above, whence the verse: Binder and bound are contrary and irate, etc. |
| ¶ *Ex illis ligacionibus superius ductis scolaris ducit illam plagam per caput ducendo gladium [median]te schiltslac.* | From these binds performed above, the scholar delivers this strike (directing the sword towards the head) by means of a *schiltslac*. |

The text suggests a generic overbind, but the picture emphasizes the scholar's raised elbow leading up to the *schiltslac*.

31r (61) §121

| *Notandum quod plagam superius ductam per scolare sacerdos defendit hic in hunc modum quia scolaris gladius fuit inferior et cum esset in actu ducendi plagam ducendo gladium seorsum sacerdos vero* antequam *scolaris ducat gladium suum ad usum debitum recipit plagam ut patet hic per exemplum.* | Note that the priest here defends against the strike delivered above by the scholar in this fashion, because the scholar's sword was lower, and as he was in the act of delivering the strike, moving the sword backwards, the priest performs a strike before the scholar puts his sword to use as shown here in the example. |

An explicit *indes* technique against the *schiltslac*.

Frustum 40

31r (61) §122

✣ *Hic iterum resumitur quarta custodia cuius custodie obsessio erit specificatum langort sacerdotis, et notandum quod quandocunque sic se habet ludus ut hic tunc consulo tam regenti custodiam quam obsedenti eam, ne quisquam eorum protrahendo obmittat quod suum est, videlicet ex parte regentis custodiam obsessio, et ex parte obsidentis fixura.*	Here the fourth guard is again resumed, the siege for which fourth guard will be the priest's special langort, and note that whenever the play is such as here, I counsel that the one in the guard, and also the one besiegeing him, that neigher of them should delay what they have to do, viz. on the part of the one in the guard, the siege, and on the part of the besieger, the thrust.

31v (62) §123/§124

Superius dictum est <tam> de eo qui regit custodiam quam de eo qui eam po<b>ssedit et quia prior erit scolaris qui superius fuerat obsessessor ducit quod suum est videlicet primo schuzin ut hic et infra exemplo proximo fixuram, quia sacerdos omnes suos actus obmittit unde qui prior vadit prior erit ad faciendum dampnum suo adversario *Post quam determinatum est superius de actibus scolaris et de obmissione actuum sacerdotis, hic iterum sacerdos obmittit quod suum est donec scolaris suam perducit adessentem intracionem ut patet hic.*	Above both the one in the guard and the one besieging him were discussed, and because the scholar, who above was the besieger, will be the first [to act], he performs what is for him to do, viz. first schutzen as here, and in the next example below a thrust, because the priest omits all his actions, thus he who goes first will be the first to do damage to his adversary. After above the actions of the scholars and the omission of all actions by the priest have been discussed, here the priest again omits what would be for him [to do], and thus his scholar executes the next attack as shown here.

Frustum 35

27r (53) §105/§106

✛ *Hic iterum sumitur quinta custodia que etiam obsessa est cum specificata custodia sacerdotis que dicitur langort ut patet hic per exemplum.* *Ligans ligati <contr>arii sunt et irati* *Ligatus fugit ad partes laterum peto sequi.*	Here the fifth guard is again assumed, which is again besieged with the priest's special guard which is called langort, as shown here in the example. Binder and bound are contrary and irate The bound flees to the side, I aim to pursue.

faded or deleted Greek cross.

The text makes explicit that the fifth guard has been treated before; it was "forgotten" before (see commentary to plays 19 and 21), and it seems that after completing play 35, the authors realised the omission and present the forgotten material as plays 36 to 38 without, however, making explicit mention of the oversight.

Quinta custodia (frusta #36–#38)

Frustum 36

27v (54) §107/§108

✤ **H**ic obsedetur quinta custodia cuius obssessio erit halbschilt et nota regens \<custodiam\> solum habet due facere, primo potest ducere fixuram, secundo, potest ducere plagam dividendo scutum et gladium. **S**uperius scolaris obsessessus est, hic vero recipit fixuram ut patet per exemplum	Here the fifth guard is besieged, [and] its siege will be halpschilt, and note that the one doing the guard only has two things to do: first, he can deliver a thrust, and second, he can deliver a strike separating sword and shield. Above, the scholar is besieged, and here he <mark>delivers</mark> a thrust, as shown in the example.

§108 shows "that thrust from the fifth guard" mentioned earlier but omitted in the original presentation of the guard (compare §66, play 20).
→ *separatio* → *fixura*

28r (55) §109

Post fixuram superius ductam per scolarem, hic sacerdos defendendo schutzet et recipit plagam, hoc est generalis regula in arte sacerdotis.	After the thrust delivered by the scholar above, here the priest defending does *schutzen* and delivers a strike; this is a general rule in the priest's art.

The text suggests equivalence of *defensio* and *schutzen*; it is also interesting in expressing the intent of the author of presenting a specific system ("the priest's art" specifically, as opposed to the "art of fencing" in general, c.f. *generalis regula* with *communis usus* in §102, play 33) with specific core principles (the dynamic of *obsessio-schutzen*-counter when fencing from the *nach*). The defending action is not shown here, but the situation corresponds to that in play 20, with §67 showing the intermediate position.
→ *schutzen*

28r (55) §110

✠ *Hic iterum resumitur quinta custodia cuius contrarium erit halpschilt, ut patet hic per exemplum.* *Nota quod quandocumque ducetur halpschilt contra illam quintam custodiam vel contra secundam custodiam, tunc semper timendum est de plaga ducenda ex parte regentis custodiam, dividendo scutum et gladium cum plaga, unde consulo quod quandocumque ducis illam obsess[ionem] videlicet halpschilt intres cum fixur[a] sine m[or]a.*	Here the fifth guard is resumed, whose counter will be *halpschilt*, as shown here in the example. Note that whenever *halpschilt* is assumed against that fifth guard, or against the second guard, the strike to be delivered by the one in the guard dividing shield and sword, is always to be feared; therefore I counsel that whenever you assume this siege, viz. *halpschilt*, you should enter with a thrust without [delay].

The two paragraphs are written side to side.
contrarium: CS *contraria* this poorly written word is here used instead of the expected *obsessio.*
The second paragraph runs on for seven lines beyond the lineated space, squeezed on the right margin, with some letters cut off, presumably at a later date when the pages were cut down (the priest's rear foot is also, exceptionally, cut off by the page margin); the final word, read as *misericordia* by Forgeng and CS, is abbreviated to *mia* for lack of space. I find the use of emotional or "moral" vocabulary like *misericordia* a little out of character; the context is that any delay should be avoided due to the threat (c.f. §102, play 33), whence my tentative reading of *minuta*
But if he wanted to write "without delay", why not just sine mora, which would have fit on the line?
Also, it may as soon be inia, ima. The warning against the vulnerability of *halpschilt* against the thrust from fifth or second guard is reasonable, indeed this attack across the center line to the opponent's sword side is at the core of the system, but the counsel to "enter with a thrust without [delay]" seems to advise a direct, straight thrust from long distance, as opposed "that thrust" from the fifth guard, which sounds more like a description of what a "common fencer" might do, and it is not explicitly shown in later images. → *separatio*

28v (56) §111/§112

Hic scolaris ducit stich quia sacerdos obmittit suam defensionem ut patet hic per exemplum *Hic sacerdos defendit illum actum superius ductum ut patet hic per sacerdotem*	Here the scholar delivers a *stich*, because the priest omits his defense, as shown here in the example. Here the priest defends against that action delivered above, as shown here in the [example]

sacerdotem clearly written instead of *exemplum* by mistake (so also CS).

29r (57) §113

¶ *Prius quam superius in tertio exemplo ymaginarum fixura quedam ducta est per scolarem eandem vero fixuram sacerdos hic defendit recipiendo scilslac schiltslac ut patet hic per exemplum*	Before, in the third example of images above, a thrust is delivered by the scholar, but here the priest defends against this thrust, performing a *schiltslac*, as shown here in the example.

The second scribe (hand C) takes over again, in the middle of an ongoing play, but establishes the continuity between foll. 28 and 29 by referring to §111 above (counting inclusively of the image described here).

29r (57) §114

✤ ¶ *Hic iterum s̲e̲ resumitur quinta custodia de qua superius dictum est sepius et est notandum, quod sacerdos obsedit scolarem obsessione qua[n]dam rara et valde bona in exem[plum] suorum discipulorum, et sciatur quod, si scolaris ducet fixuram que duci consueuit de consuetudine, sacerdos debet etiam ducere fixuram contra fixuram scolaris quia sua magis valet, intrando cum sinistro pede, si autem intrare nequiverit cedat cum dextro pede, nichillominus non obmittatur quin etiam ipsa fixura perficiatur. Si autem scolaris obsedit eum econtrario mediante halpscilt, sacerdos cadat sub gladio et scutum, et tunc superveniunt ea que prius visa sunt in custodia prima, unde versus, Dum ducitur halpscilt cade sub gladium quoque scutum.*	Here the fifth guard is again resumed, of which much has been said above, and it should be noted that the priest besieges the scholar with a certain rare and very good [siege], as an example for his pupils, and know that if the scholar should deliver a thrust, as is the habitual use of the priest's, he should also deliver a thrust against the scholar's thrust, because his will be more effective, entering with the left foot, or if he does not want to enter, he should retreat with the right foot, nevertheless he should not omit this or he will himself be hit by the thrust. If, however, the scholar besieges him by means of halpschilt, the priest should fall under sword and shield, and thus there will follow all things that have been seen before with the first guard, whence the verse: If he is in *halpschilt*, fall under sword and shield.

→ *fixura* → *cade-sub*
This "obsessio rara" seems to be a further optimised position to deliver "that thrust" preferred by the priest. It seems to combine advantages of the fifth and the "special langort" guards, both of which are already designed as starting positions for "that thrust".

29v (58) §115/§116

¶ *hic* scolaris perfecit suam fixuram, sacerdos vero obmittit omnes suos actus.	Here the scholar completes his thrust, while the priest omits all his actions.
¶ *hic nota, quod sacerdos defendit hic fixuram scolaris.*	Here note that the priest defends against the scholar's thrust.

☞   foll. 30-31, plays #39–#40 have been inserted following play #34.

Walpurgis (frustum #41)

32r (63) §125/§126

⊠ *Notandum est quod hic resumitur custodia prima, videlicet sub brach[io], cuius obsessio erit specificata custodia secunda sacerdotis locata in humero dextro. Et nota quod regentis custodiam statim erit schuzin nulla mora interposita alioquin ex parte adversarii ducetur halpschilt quod erit regenti custodiam valde perniciosum, et ex hiis generantur omnia que habuntur de prima custodia de quibus habetur in primo quaterno.*	Note that here the first guard is resumed, viz. under the arm, the siege for which will be the priest's special second guard, located at the right shoulder. And note that the one in the guard should immediately do *schutzen*, without the slightest delay; on the part of the adversary, halpschilt is assumed, which will be very pernicious to the one in the guard, and from this will follow all the things about the first guard, which were treated in the first <mark>quire</mark>.
Hic sacerdos qui regebat custodiam ducit schutzin quod erit pro[pter]eo quia prior erit paratus et est bene[?] consulendum quod obsidens statim ligat super gladium ipsius regentis custodiam quod hic obmittitur ut patet per exemplum.	Here the priest, who is in the guard, performs *schutzen*, because he was the first to be ready, and it is good counsel that the besieger should bind immediately above the sword of the one in the guard, which is omitted here, as shown in the example.

32v (64) §127/§128

Hic e[runt] ligationes superius et inferiores que [? sepius] ducte sun[t] […] unde versus Ligans ligati et c[etera]	Here will follow the binds above and below which [have often been treated], whence the verse, Binder and bound, etc.
Ex hiis superioribus allegacionibus sacerdos <walpurgis> recipit schiltslac quia erat superior et prius parata.	From these <mark>above</mark> binds, Walpurgis delivers a *schiltslac*, because she was above, and the first to be ready.

The name *Walpurgis* is inserted above the line (by the same hand), but the participle *parata* is feminine, independently of the personal name confirming that the second fencer is now a woman. *Walpurgis* is strictly speaking a genitive, the nominative being *Walpurga*, but the form *Waltpurgis* is already used as a nominative in Othlo's *Vita s. Bonifati* (11th c.) Compare §127/§128 to §119/§120: the first image is practically equivalent, and the second image shows *shiltslac*, but in §119 performed by the bound, and in §128 by the binder. It is a pretty detail that the losing binder in §119 is distracted, looking at the bind, while the winning binder in §127 (Walpurgis) is much more relaxed, looking at the opponent; at the same time, the winning fencer in §119 has a controlled stance, raising his shield not more than is necessary, while the losing fencer in §127 is raising his shield too much, awkwardly obstructing his own line of sight. This kind of attention to minute detail, even in seemingly "equivalent" images, is found throughout the book.

Glossary

German technical terms

***durchtreten**, durchtrit* (modernised *Durchtritt*)
***halbschilt**, halpschilt* "half-shield" (modernised *Halbschild*)
krucke "crutch" (modernised *Krücke*)
langort "long-point"
stichslac "thrust-strike" (modernised *Stichschlag*)
schiltslac "shield-strike" (modernised *Schildschlag*); *stich* and *schild* are *fixura* and *scutum*, respectively, and *slac* corresponds to *plaga* (*slac* is the normal MHG term for strikes or blows dealt in battle; but note that *slac* was replaced by *houw*, *hau* the Liechtenauerian terminology).
stich "thrust" (3v, 4r, 20r, 28v), apparently used interchangeably with *fixura*
nucken "nod" or "push, poke" (CS translate *basculer*); the word is related to modern German *nicken* ("to nod"); MHG *nicken* has the transitive meaning of "to bend downward, to suppress"; *nucken* or *nücken* seems to have been a Middle German dialectal variant of *nicken* already im MHG; if so, this is the only trace of a regional dialect in the text. *nücken* was specifically also used in the sense of "to balk, shy (of horses)". In modern Middle German dialects (Rhenish-Palatine), *nucken* also means "to shove, push, poke".
***schutzen**, schutzin, schuzet* "protection", "protects" (modernised *Schützen; schützt*), apparently(?) used interchangeably with *protectio*.

Latin verses

There are ten "verses" in the text. Of these, eight occur only once, while the other two describe core techniques and are referenced throughout the book, recurring nine and five times, respectively. These two verses are given entries under *ligans-ligati* and *cade-sub* in the glossary below.

Two verses belong to the introductory material in the first folium:
 1r *Septem custodie sunt etc.* a mnemonic listing of the seven guards on the first page (also invoked, for the second guard, in play #10, fol. 10r)
 1v *Tres sunt que preeunt etc.*, a verse apparently introducing the core principles, discussed in the appendix below ("Clerus Lutegerus").

Further four verses are part of the detailed treatment of the first play in fol. 2:
 2r *Custodia prima retinet contraria bina etc.*, a verse introducing *halbschilt* and *langort*.
 2r *Dum ducitur halbschilt etc.*, the first part of this verse recurs four more times (→ *cade-sub*).
 2v *Hic religat calcat etc.*, a verse introducing the overbind (→ *religat, calcat*), *schiltslac* and grappling.
 2v *Hec tria sunt cleri etc.*, a verse introducing *durchtreten*, *mutatio gladii* and grappling.

Most of remaining verses follow over the next few pages, with a single exception found only in the second half of the book:
 3v *Clerici sic nucken etc.*
 4v *Ligans ligati etc.*, recurring eight further times (→ *ligans-ligati*)
 6v *Dum ducitur langort etc.*
 19v *Dum subligaveris etc.*

The presence of such "verses" is an important testimony for the background of the mnemonic *Zettel* of the Liechtenauerian tradition. Neither the "verses" in our manuscript nor those attributed to Liechtenauer are in any way candidates for "poetic" qualities of any kind; they are purely mnemonic. Liechtenauer's verses do, however, make a visible effort at rhyming even in cases where there is no metrical structure to speak of. Of our ten verses, some make an apparent effort at rhyming, while others would not be recognisable as "verse" if they were not explicitly labelled as such. This may be due to their being translations from German: While *Dum ducitur halpschilt / cade sub gladium quoque scutum* makes no pretence of rhyming, if *scutum* renders German *schilt*, there might have been at least an identical rhyme in the original. By contrast, *Ligans ligati / contrarii sunt et irati* makes an obvious effort at coming up with a rhyme, even at the cost of breaking Latin syntax.

Ligans ligati etc. 4v, 7r, 14v, 20v, 24r, 26r, 27r, 30v, 32v
Dum ducitur halbschilt, etc. 2r, 3r, 8v, 23v, 29r

Latin technical terms

calcare "press" (2r, 2v, 24r); CS translate *piaffer* "stamp (one's feet)" (p. 20, *entraînant son adversaire dans un tiraillement*, i.e. they assume the instruction is literally to stamp with the foot in order to startle the opponent). The primary meaning of the Latin word is indeed "to tread upon, stamp" (e.g. of grapes), but also "to tread across, over" when traversing an object in space, and finally also "to press close together, to press in". I assume it is this last sense that is being invoked here: "to stamp" is meaningless in the context and "to step in" is already covered by *intrare*, while the verb *calcare* is used together with *religare*, in combination expressing the active formation of a strong bind, and, in my interrpretation, the application of lateral pressure to create an advantageous geometry.

contraria, defensio [to be added]

custodia "guard" doubtlessly renders MHG *hut,* and indeed it retains pretty much the same meaning as a technical term in Liechtenauer's system.

dimicator, ars dimicatoria; dimicatio is classical Latin for `a fight, combat' (*dimico* `to fight, attack'), but here seems to be used already in a technical sense later taken by *fechten*. But the question is if the German term behind the Latin is already *fechten*, or perhaps still *schirmen*. The presence of *dimicator* would seem to favour *fechten*, as this has the agent noun *fechter*, while an agent noun **schirmer* is unattested(?)

ducere `execute' *führen* (not as in `lead', but as in `perform, execute', *einen streich führen*? I did choose not to translate this verb consistently, as its meaning may pale to simply "to do", and to give "execute" in the translated text every time would have been too awkward; so translation varies between "perform", "deliver" and simple "do" (or even omission of any verb, as in "the one in the guard").

fixura "thrust", the Latin word properly means "a fastening, driving in [of a nail]", from *figo* "fasten, fix; transfix, pierce", but the text uses the term for the attack, even if it is deflected, so the term is equivalent to *stich* "thrust, stab", the mode of attack contrasting with *plaga* (*hau*) "blow, strike". The equivalence is made explicit in play #37, where the same action is referred to as *stich* in 28v but as *fixura* in 29r. The term may refer to any thrust (c.f. 21v as an example of *fixura* referring to a straight thrust to the belly), but it is most frequently used of the specific technique repeatedly referred to as a

favourite of the priest's, but it is given no specific name, instead it is variously called *fixura generalis que sacerdos consuevit docere discipulos suos (*16v)*, fixura que ducetur de quinta custodia* (17r)*, quedam fixura prius tacta* (25v)*, fixura quod est in communi usu sacerdotis* (26r), or even *fixura que duci consuevit de consuetudine* (29r). This is so awkward that one must wonder why the author stopped short of simply calling it "the priest's thrust" (*fixura sacerdotis*), or even "the priest special thrust" (*specificata fixura sacerdotis*); apparently he did not want to claim it as his own invention, or even as a very advanced technique, but simply as a comparatively "common" technique which he was nevertheless very fond of.

 #19, #20, #25, #28, #31-40.
16v, 17rv, 21v, 23r, 25v, 26r, 27v, 28r, 29rv, 30r, 31rv

intrare, invadere 　　　[to be added]

plaga `strike' (*hau*?) *recipere plagam*

obsessio "siege", one of the system's core concepts, variously *obsidere, obsidens; obsedere, obsedens; obsessor, obsessus*; 2r, 4r, 8v also *possessio, possessor*, also occasionally (9r, 27v, 31v) *obsessessus, obsessessor, possessessor, possessessio* (CS p. XCII: "*stupefiant*"). The literal translation of *ob-sedere* is "to sit against"; the intended meaning is "to obstruct; to sit in the way; to besiege", a meaning also carried by MHG *versetzen*, properly "to obstruct, be in the way" (a meaning even found in Old English, *forsettan* "to obstruct"; the modern German *belagern*, earlier *belegern*, arises only at the end of the medieval period). I therefore think it is not unlikely that the Latin term renders MHG *versetzen, versatz* etc. This same word is also an important concept in Liechtenauerian fencing, but here it has a different meaning, implying blade contact, i.e. where Liutger's *obsessio* "obstructs" a *potential* attack, the Liechtenauerian Versatz "obstructs" an *actual* attack. It might be best to leave this technical term untranslated in English, but because of the general principle of rendering all Latin text in English, I opted to translate it as "siege", "to besiege", etc., but I might revisit this choice in the future.

ligatio, *ligat, ligans, ligatus* "bind", "binds", "binder", "bound" ; only once *allegacio* (32v). Clearly corresponds to German *Band*, *(an)binden* as still used in Liechtenauerian fencing, i.e. any prolongued blade contact.

religatio, *religare* "strong bind", "to bind fast": *religatio* is clearly used in contrast to simple *ligatio*, once in explicit contrasst (*tam ligandi quam religandi*, 10v); while *ligatio* neutrally refers to any blade contact, *religatio* is an actively, strongly established bind, hence *religat et calcat* ("binds fast and applies pressure"), *religando atque subpremendo* ("binding and pressing down", 9v). Medieval authors derived the word *religio* from *religo* (e.g. Guillaume de Saint-Thierry (d. 1148), *De natura et dignitate amoris,* 14.44: *a religando religio dicitur).*

subligatio, *subligare* "underbind", only in play #19, otherwise *inferior ligacio* "lower bind" for the equivalent position, but *subligare* seems to be used for the (rare) case where a lower bind is actively established.

*cade-sub
ligans-ligati*

preeunt / fugiunt 1v could be related to *vor / nach*?

oppositum / medium 1v `the opposite / middle'

Appendices

Stygius Pluto (1r)

The distichon given at the top of fol. 1r was apparently added in the 15th century, when the manuscript was still kept in a monastery library. It seems to express a disparaging view of "armed clerics" and clearly also refers to the depiction of a female fencer on the last folium. This verse is attested in print in the 16th century, and there attributed to Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II, 1405–64), as follows:

Andreas Gärtner, *Proverbialia dicteria* (1574): "*Non audet Stygius Pluto tentare, quod audet Effrenis monachus plenaque fraudis anus*" (cited after Wilhelm Binder, *Novus Thesaurus Adagiorum Latinorum,* 1861 who offers the German paraphrase "Wo der Teufel nicht selbst hin will, schickt er entweder einen Pfaffen, oder ein altes Weib.")

Holinshed's Chronicles (1577): "Æneas Sylvius (and before him many more driving upon the like argument) dooth saie in this distichon: *Non audet Stygius Pluto tentare, quod audent / Effrænis monachus, plenaque fraudis illa*. Meaning *Mulier*, a woman."

A longer variant is given by Richard Gough, *Human Nature Displayed in the History of Myddle* (1824): "I remember what Eneas Sylvius said: *Non audet Stygius Pluto tentare, quod audet / Effrenis monachus, plenaque fraudis anus. / Vix adfert Stygius Pluto tot damna quot audet / Credo bibax ebrius, plenaque fraudis anus*. Not Stygian Pluto ever durst pursue, What a rogue monk, and treacherous hag can do. The Stygian fiend can scarce such mischief do man, as This drunken cobler and dissembling woman has."

I have not been able to locate the verse in Aeneas Sylvius' works directly; in any case, the presence of the verse (with *dolis* for *fraudis*) in a 15th-century hand in our manuscript (more or less conteporary with Aeneas Sylvius, and certainly predating any printed edition of his works) would seem to suggest that he is not its original author.

Clerus Lutegerus (1v)

It is suggestive that the author (if we accept the instructor in the verses and in the manual as the same person) is called *cler[ic]us* "the cleric" (or "the clerk") three times in these verses, but never in the text; conversely, the text consistently calls him *sacerdos*, and never *clericus* (Middle Latin use of *clerus* for *clericus* is noted in Du Cange's *Glossarium*). It is almost as if he had composed the verses as a mnenomic orally at an earlier time, before envisaging the project of creating this manual, when he was younger and not yet ordinated as a priest. Latin *clericus* renders MHG *pfaffe*, which may could to either a priest, a deacon or a member of the minor orders. Note that it is not unusual to find the designation *pfaffe* associated with fencing masters of the late medieval tradition, so Hanko Döbringer (still in the 14th century) and Hans Leküchner (in the later 15th century).

The interpretation of the name Lutegerus in the verse on fol. 1v depends on the interpretation of the verse of which it forms a part. This verse is very difficult to interpret in a number of ways. In fact, nothing about it is entirely clear to me.

Tres sunt que preeunt relique tunc fugiunt / Hee septem partes ducuntur per generales / Oppositum clerus mediumque tenet lutegerus.

Are we to understand that the seven guards are the same as the "seven parts", and of these three "precede" (or "go forward" as antonym to *fugiunt*?) and the remaining (i.e. four) "flee" or "go backward" in some way? CS translate *Il y en a trois qui avancent, tandis que les autres replient.* But "reply" isn't really what a *custodia* does, the system has the separate term *obsessio* just for that, and there is nothing in the subsequent material that would somehow suggest that some of the guards have a function of replying or reacting to the others. It is also anyone's guess how the guards are to be grouped. One reasonable assumption would be the the first four, shown on 1r, as opposed to the final three, shown on 1v. There is, in fact, a conceptual difference between the groups, guards 1-4 as described in the manual initiate a strike, while 5 and 6 initiate a thrust, and 7 is a special case, inviting a bind instead of posing a direct threat.

Now, the verse goes on to say "these seven (parts, guards) are done by the common fencers", followed by "the cleric holds the opposite, and Luitger holds the middle". This may be interpreted in a number of ways. It is important to note that neither *medium* nor *oppositum* is used in any technical sense anywhere in the manual outside of this verse.

CS have *Le clerc est a l'opposé et Luitger à mi-chemin* "the cleric is opposite, and Luitger is at half-way", i.e. they here treat "the cleric" as a different person from Luitger. In the reading of Ukert, Lutegerus is a reference by name to a notable "common fencer", so that the cleric holding "the opposite" would presumably be preferable to the "common fencer" Luitger who holds merely "the middle".

It does seem more probable to me, however, that the entire line refers to a single person, *clerus Lutegerus*, who holds "both the opposite and the middle" and that this statement, as a whole, contrasts with the "common fencers" mentioned in the preceding line. Note that this would mean that the author here employs *hyperbaton* (the separation of the two associated nominatives), in apparent aspiration to a "poetic" mode of speech entirely absent from the rest of the "verses".

I am unsure whether the terms *oppositum* and *medium* should be interpreted in a figurative way, as it were "he is in possession of the counter and the means", or in a strictly spatial sense, as it were "he holds *against* (his opponent)" and at the same time "he holds or occupies the *center*" between the fencers. This latter interpretation strikes me as a useful description of the "conflict of binder and bound" referenced throughout the manual, but it must be admitted that a discussion in the terms used in the verse is not repeated anywhere in the following text. It nevertheless remains my preferred reading, against both CS and Ukert, that "clerus Lutegerus" here refers to a single person, and most likely the manual's author himself (compare the discussion of *de Alkersleiben* below).

De Alkersleiben (2r)

Gunterrodt (1579) read this name as *Albenslaiben* recognising it as the name of the "ancient stem and most famous family" (*vetustissima prosapia et clarissima familia*) of Alvensleben. Ukert, on the other hand, reads *Alkersleiben*. Both Gunterrodt and Ukert recognised the word as a personal name (while a reading *albersleiben* is due to Forgeng, who identified the word as a fencing term, a "proto-Liechtenauerian" version of *Alber*). *Alkersleiben* is clearly more consistent with the manuscript, and Gunterrodt's reading should perhaps be considered an emendation, inserting the more familiar name of Alvensleben, a prominent noble family of Brandenburg in Gunterrodt's time (which also had held extensive possessions already in the 1300s). For Gunterrodt, it was obvious that the author of the manuscript must have been a nobleman who had retired to a monastery in his old age, and he took his reading as a confirmation of the association with nobility without positively identifying the name as referencing the manual's author.

Howerver, reading *de Alkersleiben* (with Ukert) we have a reference to the Thuringian village of Alkersleben (recorded in the 13th century as *Alkesleibin*), at the time of merely local importance as the site of a manor and a deanery. Alkersleben is some 200 km to the north of the parts of Franconia affected by the Second Margravian War, the presumed area of production of our manuscript. Ukert interprets both *Lutegerus* and *de Alkersleiben* as the names of "common fencers" (*generales dimicatores*, "gemeine Fechtmeister"). This depends entirely on the context we give to the occurrence of the names, in the case of *de Alkersleiben*: N*on ducat aliquam plagam quod probat de Alkersleiben* "He should not deliver any strike, as recommended by *de Alkersleiben*" – are we to understand that this is a counsel against the recommendation to "deliver a strike" attributed to a notable "common fencer" known as *de Alkersleiben*, or are we much rather to understand that the counsel not to deliver a strike is attributed to the highly proficient fencer known by this name, which would amount to nothing less than yet another reference by the author to himself in the third person? If we are ready to interpret *Lutegerus* in this way, I see no obstacle to adopt the same position here, which would give us an author *Clericus Lutegerus de Alkersleiben*, or, in German, *Pfaffe Luitger von Alkersleben*. Incidentally, the term *nucken* happens to be more consistent with a Thuringian rather than a Franconian origin of whoever is responsible for coining it.

Foliation

The manuscript's 32 folia have an irregular arrangement. The pagination has been reported both by Cinato and Surprenant (2009) and by Hester (2012). Only its first quarter, foll. 1-8 form a regular quire of four bifolia, 1-8, 2-7, 3-6 and 4-5, followed by a quire (or *ternion*) of three bifolia, 9-14, 10-13 and 11-12. For the remainder of the manuscript, unfortunately, the two accounts are at odds with one another, and more unfortunately, while Hester (2012) reports that Cinato and Surprenant have "suggested that it has been rebound out of order", he does not remark on the fact that these authors give an account of foliation which happens to be in conflict with his own.

Cinato and Surprenant (2009), Dalewicz-Kitto (2012)	Hester (2012)
1-8, 2-7, 3-6, 4-5	1-8, 2-7, 3-6, 4-5
9-14, 10-13, 11-12	[8a-14a], 9-14, 10-13, 11-12
15-18, 16-17	[14b-17c], [14c-17c], 15-[17a], 16-17
19, 20-25, 21-24, 22-23	18-[25a], 19-25, 20-[24a], 21-24, 22-23
26, 27-32, 28-31, 29-30	26-32, 27-[31a], 28-31, 29-30

In summary, there are three contradictions:
- CS claim foll. 15-18 form a bifolium while Hester identifies 15 and 18 each as as single folia.
- CS have a single folium 19 and a bifolium 20-25, while Hester has a single folium 20 and a bifolium 19-25.
- CS have a single folium 26 and a bifolium 27-32, while Hester has a single folium 27 and a bifolium 26-32.

Howerver, the conservation report by Dalewicz-Kitto (2012) reports foliation in agreement with Surprenant and Cinato. I will therefore assume that their variant is in agreement with reality and that Hester made a mistake.

Hester concludes that there "may well be at least ten folios missing", indicated as foll. 8a, 14a, 14b, 14c, 17a, 17b, 17c, 24a, 25a, 31a above. This is not tenable in my opinion. Hester errs much on the side of "perte" to the complete disregard of "inachèvement". I used to be ready to accept a likely missing fol. 24a based on Hester's foliation, but based on foliation as reported by Dalewicz-Kitto (2012) I do not think even this is probably. Similarly, the "exciting" possibility of a missing fol. 31a also becomes unlikely seeing that foll. 27 and 32 form a bifolium.

Index of images

"things from the first guard" (overbind-*schiltslac*, §§5-8):

frustum:	#1	#2	#11	#15f.	#18	#8	(#7, #20, #21)	#27	#29	(#30ff, #35ff.)	#39	#41
1ª *c. – halbsc.*	**§5**	§9	§43		§58	§31 (obv.)						
cade sub gla.	**§6**	§10		§51	§59	§32 (obv.)			§92	§96		
overbind	**§7**	§11	§46	§52 §55	§60		§25 (§28f.) §67f.	§88	§93	§100? §101 §106	§119?	§127
schiltslac	**§8**			§53	§61		§26 §70	§89		§113	§120	§128

custodia vs. obsessio (*Zufechten*)

obsessio vs.:	1a custodia	2a custodia	3a cust.	4a custodia	5a custodia	6a cust.	spec. *langort*
halbschilt	(see above §5)	§40	§50		§107, §110		§91, §95, §118
langort	§24, §27, §62	§39	§54	§56		§65	
special / *rarae*			§102	§104, §78, §111, §117, §122	§105 *valde bona* §114		*aliena:* §98
schutzen		§33, §38 (var.) §126		(elbow) §123			
krucke / "schrankhut"	§14, §18, §20		§45, §48				
1a custodia		(var.) §125		§57			

bind

cade-sub: see above **§6**
right overbind: see above. **§7**, §15 (bind to *krucke*), §68-§69 (*schutzen*), §79=§82
left overbind / *mutatio gladii* §12, §30; §36, §77, §103 (c.f. §90 thrust to the belly)
underbind: §§28-29, §74
krucke-krucke: §21, *schutzen-schutzen*: §34, upper *langort*: §81, *vidilpoge*: §85=§87

contact

schiltslac: see above **§8**, vs. krucke: §17, *durchtreten*: §35, *stichslac*: §37
thrust vs. *halpschilt* §66, (obv.) §108=§111 (counter §112); vs. special *langort*: §115 (counter §116); vs. 4th guard: §124; thrusts from the bind: to the belly: §83, §90, to the head: §78
defendit (counter) variants: §23, §76, §112, §116
intrat variants: §19, §22, §44=§80, §49, §75, §83-84, §97, §99, §109, §121
separatio: §94, §§41-42 (*vertere*) , §13 (from *nucken*)

grappling (*deprehensio*)

left arm: §16=§47 (from *krucke*), right arm: §§71-73 counter *luctatio*, disarm: from *langort*: §§63-64, from *vidilpoge*: §86

References

editions:

[CS] Franck Cinato, André Surprenant, *Le Livre de l'Art du Combat (Liber de arte dimicatoria)*, CNRS Éditions (2009).

[Forgeng] Jeffrey L. Forgeng, *The Medieval Art of Swordsmanship: A Facsimile & Translation of Europe's Oldest Personal Combat Treatise, Royal Armouries MS I.33*, Union City (2003).

other works cited:

Bruns, Paul Jakob, *Beyträge zu den deutschen Rechten des Mittelalters*, Helmstädt (1799), 315f.

Dalewicz-Kitto, Suzanne, *Conservation Documentation* 247-11, The Leather Conservaton Centre, Northhampton (2012).

Gunterrodt, Henricus à, *De Veris Principiis Artis Dimicatoriae tractatus brevis*, Wittenberg (1579).

Hester, James, 'A Few Leaves Short of a Quire: Is the ``Tower Fechtbuch'' Incomplete?', in: *Arms & Armour*, Vol. 9, No. 1, Maney Publishing, Leeds (2012), 20–24.

Hils, Hans-Peter, *Meister Johann Liechtenauers Kunst des langen Schwertes* (1985).

Singman (Forgeng), Jeffrey L., "The medieval swordsman: a 13th century German fencing manuscript", in *Royal Armouries Yearbook 2* (1997), 129-136.

Ukert, Friedrich August, *Beiträge zur ältern Litteratur* (1838), 138-141.