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Dancing and fencing (or the “Art of Defense,” as it was referred to in English manuals of the sixteenth century) have much in common, but also much that distinguishes them. They both require disciplined study and motor control to learn movements that may seem highly unnatural to the beginning student, but which must nevertheless be performed with near perfection to satisfy the master. Each has associated with it a technical language of terms representing individual movements which are to be strung together to create movement sequences. On the other hand, there are also distinct differences between the activities: in dancing, you and your partner attempt to accommodate your movements to each other; in fencing, you and your opponent are intent on discommoding the actions of the other, or at least precluding his or her intended final action (be it cut or thrust). In many dances, including those of the Renaissance period, there is an established pattern of movements to be executed in order. In fencing, while you may learn movements in a set pattern, you must be sure not to execute them in a pattern lest your opponent be able to anticipate your actions.

Outweighing the similarities between fencing and dancing are the similarities in the challenges involved in reconstructing each of these two activities from original Renaissance sources. In each case, one is presented with a verbal description which must be interpreted as a series of physical movements, ideally the same movements intended by the author. This is especially difficult as the author was writing for a contemporary audience and could reasonably presume that his readers had seen first hand at least some of what was being described. In reconstructing these movements, we can never be sure that our reconstruction is completely true to the original author’s intentions, but we can work towards that goal by considering whether we have satisfied the details of the written description while producing a movement sequence which satisfies whatever aesthetic and practical considerations can be applied.

Given the requirement of disciplined movement common to the two activities, as well as the fact that both were expected accomplishments within the same strata of society, it should not be surprising that dancing and fencing have long been associated with each other. In many cases, a single person might serve as both dancing master and fencing master. Cesare Negri provides us with some Renaissance examples of this in his list of dancing masters given in the opening section of Le Gratie d’Amore (Milan, 1602): Gio. Ambrosio Valchiera, Milanese, was master to the son of the Duke of Savoy, “to whom he taught not only dancing (ballare) but also fencing (schermare), and in that service he always lived with much fame.” Gio. Battista Varade, Milanese, “ran a school of dancing and fencing in Milan and Rome, and was worthy master in the one and in the other profession.” Unfortunately, we have no writings by, or even other references to, either of these masters and their activities in dancing or fenc-
There are at least three areas where one might expect to gain insights from the juxtaposition of fencing manuals and dance manuals of the Renaissance era:

1. First, in interpreting technical terms that cross over from one activity to the other.
2. Second, in the identification of general styles of movement or other elements of style present in both activities that characterize a particular culture or nation.
3. Third, in gaining general insights into the conventions of the day for describing movement.

A particular aspect of this third area which I will treat below concerns the use of illustrations and pictorial notations.

The importance of juxtaposing dance and fencing manuals would be fully demonstrated if one could point to clear cases of technical terms that are common to both activities and where ambiguities in one description are explained by the other. In Joachim Meyer’s fencing manual, *Gründliche Beschreibung der ... Fechtens* (Strasburg, 1570; 2nd ed. Augsburg, 1600), Meyer uses the term “double step” (“zwifachen trit”) in his longsword, dusack and rapier sections when he requires a greater displacement of the attacker’s body than can be achieved by a single large step. In the absence of early dance experience, one might imagine that a double step is just a pair of steps. Only after several references to this “double step” does Meyer finally give the reader a clear statement of its execution:

Do a double step thus: when you have stepped with your right foot to his left, and your technique requires that you should step yet further around, then step with your left foot after the right one, outwards or past behind your right foot; then before you have scarcely set the left down, you can step forth with the right, to double the [step].

That is, a “double step” is not two steps, but rather three steps. This comes as no surprise to historical dancers who are used to the idea of a double step consisting of three steps, or three steps with a final close. Nevertheless, the strong argument for interpreting Meyer’s double step as three steps comes, not from contemporary dance sources, but from Meyer’s own treatise.

Another term that appears in both dancing and fencing treatises of the Renaissance is “Contratempo.” Salvator Fabris discusses this term in his treatise, *De Lo Schermo overo Scienza d’Arme* (Copenhaven, 1606). First, he establishes the idea of a “tempo,” which he defines as “a movement made by the adversary within distance.” This appears to correspond to what is sometimes referred to today as a unit of “fencing time,” which is the time required for a direct, or single-action, attack. If your adversary is within attacking distance and begins a movement which you perceive as exposing some part of his body, you can be assured of hitting him with a direct attack as this requires only a single *tempo*, while for him to complete his movement and also parry your attack requires more than one *tempo*. Fabris warns his reader that “there are some men who cunningly offer a time, that you may attempt a hit, and at the same time they parry and hit, which is called a hit in *contratempo*.” A hit in *contratempo* thus occurs when your opponent hits you while you are in the act of extending your weapon in an effort to hit him. That is, two actions are in contratempo when they occur during the same brief unit of time.
the other, but the difference must be distinctly less than
the time required to carry out either of the actions.

If we turn to the use of the term *contratempo* in
dancing, we find it used repeatedly by Cesare Negri in his treatise *Le Gra -
tie d’Amore* (1602). In the ninth section of “Trattato Secondo,” Negri
addresses the four ways of dancing the “Gagliarda.” The first way is with
five-steps in one measure of music. The second and third ways are with
four and three steps, respectively, the steps being performed more slowly.
The fourth way is with six, seven, eight or more steps; that is, with
more than one step performed within each beat of the music. Negri refers
to these last cases as being in *contratempo.* It appears that in dancing, as
in fencing, a key element to actions being in *contratempo* is that more than
one action is taken, though not necessarily completed, in
a single unit of time. Other instances of Negri’s use of
the term *contratempo* are consistent with this, but the com-
plexity of the cases where it is used suggests that there
may be additional implications to the term.

In John Essex’s 1710 trans-
lation of Feuillet’s *For the Improve-
ment of Dancing*, a symbol is given
with the legend “To walk one step
forward and stamp the ground with
the flat of the foot as in fencing.”
One can then turn to the fencing
manuals of the day to learn more
about the precise movement in-
tended, making this a fine example
of a cross benefit obtained by look-
ing at a combination of fencing
and dancing manuals. On the other
hand, this reference occurs well
after the Renaissance period. In
general, one might expect cases of
terminology crossing from fencing
to dancing in dances with explicitly martial themes, but
the two obvious cases of this, Thoinot Arbeau’s “Buf-
fons” and Cesare Negri’s “La Battaglia,” are disappoint-
ing in this regard. The terminology used by Arbeau to
describe blows, *Taille Haulte, Revers Hault, Taille Basse, Re-
vers bas, Feincte* and *Estocade* (Thrust), is consistent with pe-
riod fencing terminology; but, as with Meyer’s use of the
double step, Arbeau’s own illustrations are sufficient to
explain the intended movements, so little is to be gained
by consulting contemporary fencing manuals. Negri’s
“La Battaglia” uses no fencing termin-
ology or movements, and so fenc-
ing sources are completely irrelevant
in this case.

A more general argument for the
parallel study of fencing and danc-
ing is that in many periods, the same
gentlemen who would be learning
the one activity, would also be receiv-
ing daily instruction in the other. If
the movement styles in these two ac-
tivities were grossly different, these
gentlemen would be faced with the
huge challenge of changing the ba-
sic kinesthetic elements of how they
move. It is difficult to imagine that
the strength, sense of distance, tim-
ing, balance, overall posture and style
of movement acquired with sword in hand would not af-
fect the same gentleman’s posture and movement style
on the dance floor. The rapier was a new weapon of the
sixteenth century which, unlike the broadsword and other
traditional weapons of war, became an everyday symbol
of social status. It became an almost
indispensable adornment to gentle-
men’s dress on the street, in court
and even on the ballroom floor, as
evidenced by the illustrations in
the Dance Manuals of Caroso and
Negri (Figures 1-4). The clear
implication of these figures is that
a gentleman was expected to be so
comfortable wearing a sword that
it was not a significant impediment
to movement, presumably because
gentlemen would from habit com-
ensurate with its presence in a myr-
iad of ways of which the wearer
was probably unconscious. Caroso
gives specific advice to dancers on
the manner of handling a sword while dancing, but this
could hardly have sufficed were the wearer not already
used to wearing one.

One of the earliest manuals of the rapier is the
*Trattato di Scientia d’Arme, con un Dialogo di Filosofia* (Roma,
1553) of Camillo Agrippa. This manual includes many
illustrations of guard positions and of engagements be-
tween combatants. The former of these are each displayed in conjunction with a geometrical figure representing the angles and proportions proper to the posture (Figure 5). This concern for geometry as the means of understanding nature and perfecting art can be associated with the neoplatonic philosophy that was finding favor in the second half of the sixteenth century. The importance of philosophy to the science of arms is proclaimed not only by the title of the Agrippa's treatise, but also by the opening illustration within the text which shows a debate between a philosopher of the ancient school armed with his books and a modern philosopher wearing a sword and holding instruments of mathematical learning (Figure 6). A corresponding concern within dance for the new mathematical philosophy is to be seen in the wonderful rosette figure in Fabritio Caroso's Nobilta di Dame (Venetia, 1600) which appears with the legend, “Il Contrapasso fatto con vera mathematica” (Figure 7).

Among the best organized of the early manuals on the use of the rapier is the Ragione di Adoprar Sicuramente l'Arme si da Offesa, Come da Difessa of Giacomo di Grassi (Venetia, 1570). Di Grassi begins his manual by defining a limited number of movements and positions to be used in this art (Figure 8); he then describes a variety of sequences arrived at by stringing these elements together. The parallel in structure to the dance manuals of Caroso and Negri is clear, even though the specific movements Di Grassi describes are quite different. The manual of Di Grassi is uniquely important in that here we have the original Italian manual (of 1570) and a nearly contemporary English translation: Giacomo Di Grassi His True Arte of Defence (London, 1594). This illustrates a more general issue concerning rapier instruction in different nations which parallels dance practice. In both areas, the Italians clearly led the other European nations in the quantity of works produced and in the subtlety and complexity of the activity described in those works. The English, while maintaining some traditional elements, were particularly enamoured of Italian practice and technique. The French appeared to favor a somewhat simpler style than the Italians, though we have few sources in either area on which to base such a generalization. The Germanic nations also looked to the Italians, though German fencing maintained a fondness for cutting and a willingness to grapple which the Italian school discouraged. The Spanish developed their own distinctive style which in both arts was characterized by a firm, erect posture and crisp motions. Dancers performing a choreography that is sup-

Figure 9. Gerard Thibault d’Anvers, Academie de l’Espee (Leyden, 1628), detail of Tabula III.
posed to reflect the Spanish style, “Il Canario” or “The Spanish Pavan” for instance, would do well to study the imposing, even intimidating, posture distinctive to the Spanish style of fencing (Figure 9).

The most detailed reference to swords within the major dance manuals of the late sixteenth century is in the final dance of Thoinot Arbeau’s Orchesography (Lengres; 1589), the “Bouffons” or “Mattachins.” Arbeau’s description of this dance uses the standard terms of the day (in their French forms): high and low (haute and bas), cut and reverse cut (taille and revers), feint (feicte) and thrust (estocade). As was mentioned above, each of these movements is illustrated by Arbeau and it is therefore not necessary to consult with fencing manuals to understand the intended motions (Figure 10). On the other hand, the dance is a long one, and the many blows involved are something of a challenge to one not accustomed to the handling of a sword. The costumes that Arbeau depicts for this dance are clearly quaint and old-fashioned from the point of view of a sixteenth century gentleman. It is perhaps less obvious that the style of sword depicted, the emphasis on cutting blows, the feint with the edge rather than the point, the drawing back in preparation for the thrusts, as well as the fact that there are few thrusts in the first place, all would have probably have also registered to a sixteenth century audience as rather old-fashioned.

We come now to the third theme alluded to above: the representation of movement in fencing and dancing manuals. Particularly intriguing in this regard is the manual of Henry de Saint Didier, Traicte Contenant les Secrets du Premier Livre sur l’Espee Seule (Paris, 1573). Several of Didier’s illustrations include outlines of feet laid out on the ground with numbers showing the steps to be taken in executing a particular passage of arms. For instance, in Figure 11, the Lieutenant on the left attacks, keeping his left foot on “1” while moving his right to “2,” while the Prevost defends himself by deflecting the thrust of the Lieutenant while drawing the left foot back from “1” to “3,” keeping his right foot at “2.” I have described this use of feet outlines as intriguing rather than important as it does not appear to have influenced notation of either fencing or dancing. It is, of course, all too familiar to us today as the prevalent notation system for teaching twentieth century ballroom dances at the introductory level, but I have found no systematic use of the system in dance manuals earlier than the late nineteenth century or in fencing manuals of any period. There are, however, some minor examples of its use in Spanish manuals of the Renaissance: a single illustration showing the movement of the left foot during the gentleman’s Reverence in Navarro’s Discursos Sobre el Arte del Danzado (Seville, 1642; Figure 12), and an illustration of the position of the feet with reference to the circle of combat in Narvaez’s Libro de las
A more subtle device for showing foot placement is introduced in the fencing manual of Achille Marozzo, *Opera Nova* (Mutinae, 1536). This consists of depicting the floor as a grid shown in perspective. By noting the position of each foot relative to the lines, the position of the feet relative to each other, as well as to the feet of the opposing fencer, can be discerned precisely (Figure 14). This device is adopted by many of the most important fencing manuals of the next hundred years, including those by Vincentio Saviolo, Joachim Meyer, Salvator Fabris and Nicoletto Giganti (Figures 15–18). Turning to the dance manuals of Caroso and Negri, we note that they employ a similar gridwork in nearly all of their illustrations. In the case of Caroso’s *Il Ballarino* (Venice, 1581; Figure 1) and *Nobilta di Dame* (Venice, 1600; Figure 2), the grid is unadorned. Negri has made his tiles less uniform and more ornate in many of the illustrations in *Le Gratie d’Amore* (Milan, 1602), but the outlines of the tiles nevertheless present a clear gridwork (Figures 3, 4). The significant function of this gridwork within fencing manuals of the period raises the question of whether it is intended to have a corresponding function within these dance manuals. The brief answer is probably not. These manuals do not rely upon the illustrations to define details of foot placement and orientation as one steps through a complicated sequence. Nevertheless, the choice of this floor design may be more than just an aesthetic device or a simple representation of the tiled floors common to great halls. Whether Caroso and Negri intended to have foot positions and body orientations represented by this device, or were merely conforming to a practice which others (such as authors of fencing manuals) had found to be effective in instructional manuals, the result is the same – positions and orientations are clarified. As with all the other issues raised above, this is an area where research has just begun, and there will likely be many more questions to be asked before answers are forthcoming.

**NOTES**

1 This association continued into the twentieth century. In the 1920s, the British journal *The Dancing Times* included a regular column on fencing by “Septimus”. When the column was introduced in October of 1919, reference is made to the recent hiatus in fencing activities during the war and expresses confidence that the sport will soon return to its prior level of popularity. This rise in popularity presumably took place as the journal announced, in 1922, a prize cup for competition in fencing among those dancing schools which included that activity in their curricula. (*The Dancing Times*, Nov. 1922, N.S. #146.)

2 Cesare Negri. *Le Gratie d’Amore* (Milan, 1602), p. 4; Gustavia Yvonne
Figure 16. Joachim Meyer. *Gründliche Beschreibung der Freyen, Ritterlichen und Adelichen Kunst des Fechtns* (Augsburg, 1600), 2: 19(verso).

Figure 17. Salvator Fabris. *De Lo Schermo overo Scienzi d’Arme* (Copenhaven, 1606), plate 31, p. 59.

Figure 18. Nicoletto Giganti. *Escrime Nouvelle ou . . . Diverses Manières de Parer et de Fraper d’Espée* (Frankfurt, 1619), fig. 29.

1 Ibid.


Quotation is from an unpublished translation by Jeffrey Forgeng, Curator at the Higgins Armory Museum, Worcester, Massachussetts. The word “step” in brackets at the end bears the translator’s note: “Schnitt; read Tritt.”

Salvator Fabris. De Lo Schermo overo Science d’Arme (Copenhagen, 1606), chapter 10, p. 13: “Tempo si dimanda quel moto che l’[[animico fa dentro della distanza.” This work was translated but never published by A. F. Johnson. An as unpublished version of this translation was edited by Joshua Pendragon as part of an undergraduate project for Marlboro College in 1996. The passages quoted above draw heavily upon this translation, modified by reference to the original Italian.

7 Salvator Fabris. De Lo Schermo overo Science d’Arme (Copenhagen, 1606), chapter 10, p. 14: “Ma in questo luogo si deve auertire, che alcuna volta si trouano alcuni, iquali astutamente fanno tempo accio si uada a ferire, & nel medesimo tempo, che si ua essi hanno parato, & ferito, questo si chiamà ferire di contratempo.”

Fabris notes that this can frequently result in both parties being hit, which occurs because the person initiating the attack in contra-tempo has mistimed matters, has misestimated distance, or has made his motion too large and hence too slow. (Salvator Fabris. De Lo Schermo, p. 14.)


10 Cesare Negri. Le Gratie d’Amore (Milan, 1602), pp. 31, 32, 58, to name a few. These references were brought to my attention by Julia Sutton in private communication.


13 Cesare Negri. Le Gratie d’Amore (Milan, 1602), pp. 256-263. This has been translated by Gustavia Yvonne Kendall as part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Musical Arts from Stanford University in 1985.


16 The most extreme dependence on geometrical constructions as a foundation for the science of arms arises in the Spanish school. This is discussed in a recent article by the fencing master and fencing historian Ramon Martinez. Martinez gives examples of the movimientos, or movement segments, of the Spanish school. He refers briefly to the Spanish dance manual of Esquivel Navarro, Discursos sobre el arte del dançado (Seville, 1642), and its reliance on the concept of movimientos developed within the Spanish science of arms, but without providing detailed examples. (Martinez, Ramon. “Spanish Fencing from the 16th to 18th Centuries”, Hammerz Press, August 1999, 5 (2, 3).


20 In general, the Spanish manuals were not well illustrated. The major exception to this is the manual on the Spanish style written in French by Gerard Thibault d’Anvers, Académie de l’Espee (Leyden, 1628). Thibault’s manual is a large folio with plates that fill the double opening. Note in Figure 9, the many geometrical lines on the plate that define the space between a fencer and his opponent. A translation of this manual into English is in progress, with “Part One: Philosophe and Practice” available at this time: Gerard Thibault d’Anvers, Academy of the sword, A Renaissance Manual of Hermetic Swordsmanship (Seattle, WA: Fir Mountain Press, 1998).


23 The anonymous Dick’s Quadrille Call-Book and Ball-Room Prompter. New edition. (New York, 1895) uses figures with successive feet outlines in its instructions for the Waltz, Polka, and some other dances. The original edition of 1878 of this manual does not use this device. The approximately contemporary Manuel du Maintien et de la Danse by Henri de Soria, fils, also uses feet outlines. This Paris manual is undated, and or may not antecede the 1895 version of Dick’s manual. 24 Esquivel Navarro. Discursos sobre el Arte del Dançado (Seville, 1642), p. 22r.

25 Don Luis Pacheo de Navarze. Libro de las Grandezas de la Espada (Madrid, 1599-1600). Illustration printed in: Arthur Wise. The Art and History of Personal Combat (Greenevich, Conn.: New York Graphic Society, Ltd., 1972), p.49. I have not been able to see a copy of this full work, which is purported to have many illustrations, and I therefore do not know if there are additional illustrations involving feet outlines.

26 Achille Marozzo, Opera Nova (Mutina, 1536)

27 Vincentio Saviolo. His Practise, In Two Books, The First Intreating of the Use of the Rapier and Dagger, The Second of Honor and Honorable Quarrels (London, 1595); Joachim Meyer. Gründliche Beschreibung der Freyen, Ritterlichen und Adelichen Kunst des Fechtens (Augsburg, 1600) (I have not been able to inspect a copy of the Strasbourg edition of 1570, but I presume that this edition uses this device as well); Salvator Fabris. De Lo Schermo overo Science d’Arme (Copenhagen,1606); Nicoletto Giganti. Escrime Nouvelle ou . . . Diverses Manieres de Parer et de Fraper d’Espee (Frankfurt,1619). On the other hand, this device is not used in: Camillo Agrippa. Trattato di Scientia d’Arme (Rome,1553); Henry de St. Didier. Traicte... sur l’Espee Seule (Paris,1573); G. A. Lovino.

In the case of Figure 17 (Fabris, Plate 31), the fencer on the left has attacked, bringing his weapon to the inside line (i.e. nearer the reader) of the fencer on the right. Instead of simply parrying (bringing the opponents weapon closer to the reader), the fencer on the right performs a contracavatione (“counter-disengage” or circular parry), but does not actually push the opponent’s weapon to his outside line, but rather uses it to keep the opponents weapon from following him as he turns his body, shifting it to the side while bringing his right foot across his left. In this way, his own weapon stays in line with his opponent’s body and he is thereby able to hit his opponent as the opponent continues his attack. (Salvator Fabris, *De Lo Schermo overo Scienza d’Arme* (Copenhaven, 1606), p. 58. Salvator Fabris. *Fencing: On the Science of Arms*. Trans. A. F. Johnson. Ed. J. Pendragon (Marlboro, MA: 1996), p. 77.)

The illustrations from Caroso’s two works (Figures 1 and 2) both show gentlemen performing a Riverenze or bow. The short length of step and orientation of each gentleman relative to his partner is easier to discern with the gridwork present than it would be on an unmarked surface.