

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

2015

“...tamquam civili causa” – The Reception of Vegetius and Frontinus in Geremia da Montagnone’s *Compendium moralium notabilium*

Aaron J. Bolarinho

Wilfrid Laurier University, aaron.bolarinho@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [European History Commons](#), [Intellectual History Commons](#), [Medieval History Commons](#), and the [Military History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bolarinho, Aaron J., “...tamquam civili causa” – The Reception of Vegetius and Frontinus in Geremia da Montagnone’s *Compendium moralium notabilium*” (2015). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 1781.

<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/1781>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

“...*tamquam civili causa*” –
The Reception of Vegetius and Frontinus in
Geremia da Montagnone’s *Compendium
moralium notabilium*

by

Aaron Bolarinho

MA Thesis

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Master of Arts in History

Tri-University Graduate Program in History

Wilfrid Laurier University

©Aaron Bolarinho 2015

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments:	2
Chapter One: Introduction	3
Chapter Two: Montagnone the Man	7
Chapter Three: The <i>Compendium Moraliu Notabilium</i>	9
Chapter Four: The <i>Compendium</i>, the <i>Strategemata</i>, and the <i>Epitoma</i>	18
Chapter Five: What is <i>Pars 5, Liber 2: De bello et hostilitate et de arte bellandi?</i>	20
Chapter Six: War with wisdom...wisdom within war?	28
Chapter Seven: Who is the audience for Montagnone’s military selections?	31
Chapter Eight: Warfare by word, by sight, and by quill	33
Chapter Nine: “...To foster their own power of conceiving...like deeds.”	43
Chapter Ten: “All arts depend on Practice...”	49
Chapter Eleven: “...tamquam civili causa”	52
Chapter Twelve: “He who pursues rashly...”	54
Chapter Thirteen: Conclusion	57
Appendix One: Transcription and Translation of Montagnone’s Preface in the <i>Compendium moraliu notabilium</i>	61
Appendix Two: Reference Guide to Vegetius and Frontinus in the <i>Compendium moraliu notabilium</i>	64
Notes and Bibliography	85

Acknowledgments

First and foremost I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Chris Nighman, for his tireless patience, firm guidance, and adventurous spirit. I became caught up in the excitement of the *Compendium* journey quite quickly after talking with him the August before I began my M.A. Certainly the most pleasant moments of this thesis were the quiet ones where we puzzled over the text – or the loud ones where we excitedly shared our observations. Critical to this project was the translation of Montagnone’s preface; the Latin was quite a struggle for me and it would have been impossible to arrive at a serviceable translation without his constant support and expertise. I am forever a better person and a better student for the wonderful opportunity I received to study under him.

I would like to also thank my other two committee members, Dr. Altay Coskun and Dr. Steven Bednarski. Not only did they serve as both my mentors and professors during my M.A, but they also nurtured far more than they criticized – constantly pushing me to do what perhaps they knew I could do and I did not.

Finally I would like to thank all of my friends and family who persevered with me during the tumultuous year of my M.A. In particular, I would like to thank Carol McClary – my love, my joy, and whose unfailing belief in me carried me entirely through the darkest moments of my M.A.

Introduction

“Scientific knowledge of warfare nurtures courage in battle. No one is afraid to do that which he has learned well.”¹

A Paduan lawyer by the name of Geremia da Montagnone compiled a medieval *florilegium* called the *Compendium moralium notabilium* in about 1310 A.D. This thesis is concerned with him, his book, and his intended audiences. Montagnone’s *Compendium* is a curious *florilegium* for a variety of reasons, the most intriguing of which is Part Five, Book Two: *De bello et hostilitate et de arte bellandi*. In 5.2 there are forty chapters where Montagnone quotes from two Roman military authors 199 times: the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* of Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus, and the *Strategemata* of Sextus Iulius Frontinus. Moreover, these two authors are quoted an additional sixty-three times in the rest of the *Compendium*. As we shall see, every other medieval *florilegium* was created by clerics – and presumably for a clerical audience.² Both Montagnone’s position as layman and his presumed target audience are as curious and atypical as his ponderously heavy use of Vegetius and Frontinus. In this project I will ask the following questions: Why did Montagnone draw on Vegetius and Frontinus so heavily, what was his purpose, and who was his audience? If he tells us in the *Compendium*, can we believe him - does the evidence emit darkness or light? In this process we will meet many characters, such as clerics and lawyers, *condottieri* and martial artists, humanists and philosophers – all will have a voice to add and a part to play.

This research is centered first and foremost upon a close textual analysis of the quotations from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*. For this reason I have transcribed each quotation of Vegetius and Frontinus from the *Compendium* and compared it to a modern critical edition. The particular critical editions I have used were selected and approved by my supervisor in continuity

with his online *Compendium Moraliū Notabiliū* project.³ Because of this focus, I have provided (as an appendix) a list of all the selections of the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*, along with a citation of their locations in the respective critical editions. Although I have not included translations for the selections cited in the appendix, I have provided translations for particular quotations within the body of this paper. The *Compendium Moraliū Notabiliū* survives in over fifty manuscripts. I have chosen to use the only printed edition of the *Compendium*: the Venice 1505 edition titled *Epitoma sapientiae*, edited by a lawyer named Peter Trecius.⁴ This printed edition is quite legible, the typeface is not overly difficult to read, and this edition is the common point of contact for most scholars who have studied the *Compendium* (the only exception being B. Ullman), as the manuscript corpus has not yet been properly surveyed to determine the most reliable witnesses to Montagnone's autograph. Based on a preliminary examination of two manuscripts that were readily available online, the text of the preface appears to be nearly identical, and at this point there is no reason to think that the preface in the Venice 1505 edition is not sufficiently indicative of Montagnone's original version. That said, due to a lack of comparison across the whole manuscript family of the *Compendium*, and because only seven of the ninety-seven authors in the Venice 1505 edition have been transcribed and assessed for the online *Compendium* project to date, the conclusions of this thesis will necessarily be tentative. I have also collaborated with my supervisor on a translation of Montagnone's preface, which is provided as an appendix.

Montagnone and the *Compendium moraliū notabiliū* have previously received some scholarly attention. There are a number of articles written in Spanish or Italian on certain authors featured in the *Compendium*: for example, P. Rajna's "Tre studi per la storia del Libro di Andrea Capellano," and Andrea Gloria's "Volgare illustre nel 1100 e proverbi volgari del 1200." I have

drawn only upon the English language works of Weiss, Wheeler, Witt, Ullman, and Moss. In 1996 Ann Moss produced the wonderful book *Printed commonplace-books and the structuring of Renaissance thought* which will feature prominently in this study. I have also drawn on the Master's Thesis of Elena Crupi, who compared selections regarding *mulier* and *coniugium* between Montagnone's *Compendium* and Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus Florum*.

Broadly speaking, I have divided this project into two parts: context and analysis. I will begin by inquiring after Montagnone – what do we know about him, what kind of a man was he? To add to what little we know of this man and his life, I will also sketch his place in Paduan humanism, as well as Padua's political climate in the 14th century. I will then proceed to assess the book itself, its place in Italy's intellectual climate and history, its nature and attributes, and the particular questions that it evokes. A number of extracts from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* that appear either inside and outside 5.2 will then be examined.

My intention in analyzing quotations from Vegetius and Frontinus both inside and outside 5.2 was to determine what purpose guided Montagnone's selectivity and editorial agency. The preface to the *Compendium* will feature prominently in this analysis. I conclude that despite what Montagnone suggests in his preface, he has not produced an epitome of the *Strategemata* or the *Epitoma* and instead has assembled a selection of quotations reflecting general wisdom on warfare.

Observing what seems to be the character of the quotations both inside and outside 5.2, I argue that there are three possible audiences for Montagnone's transmission of selections from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*. I first address military professionals such as generals and *condottieri*, and I dismiss them as an audience with some confidence. Next, considering that Montagnone wrote not only as a lawyer, but among lawyers and educated men of the law in

Padua, I suggest that his target audience may have been the spectrum of professions where legal education meets military action. An emissary, spy, *provveditore*, or even a simple scribe might have a need or use for military knowledge or tactics. I will refer to this category of men as ‘learned-warriors’, and in this way I maintain that Montagnone’s interest in these selections was for their military face value. It stands to reason that a man who draws heavily upon military tactics and strategy in a wisdom collection surely valued the selections from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* for their practical utility in military matters.

This argument, however, focuses mainly on 5.2, and there are of course sixty-three other selections that concern us. It is also possible that Montagnone was not interested in the military information in these selections at all. In keeping with the broad tradition of medieval *florilegia*, Montagnone may have been interested in simply the general wisdom that these selections present, targeting a general audience whose interest is similar.⁵ Such wisdom goes beyond the context in which it was originally uttered; wisdom that, once heard, can be applied to one's life whoever one is or whatever one does. For example, this general applicability is obvious in sayings like: “If you desire peace, prepare for war,”⁶ or “every work appears difficult before you attempt it.”⁷

After presenting arguments in both in favor of the ‘learned-warrior’ and the ‘general audience’ hypothesis, I will conclude by acknowledging that the present weight of the evidence appears to favor the ‘general audience’. I will nevertheless propose a further avenue of inquiry into the effect that the gender of the readership may have had in informing the context of the *Compendium*’s reception. I am confident that further research in this area, as well as a continued effort to assess and analyze more of the content of the *Compendium* will lead to a more confident

resolution to this question than I have been able to achieve here.

Chapter Two: Montagnone the Man

Unfortunately, little of Montagnone's life is known at this time. He does not offer much autobiographical information in the preface to the *Compendium*, and indeed we may discover that the best indicator of his character is the *Compendium* itself. Montagnone tells us himself that he is a Paduan citizen and a judge,⁸ and recent scholarship indicates that he likely compiled the *Compendium* during the first decade of the 14th century. He was both a lay person and a lawyer, and Ullman has connected Montagnone with a developing 'proto-humanist' group in Padua.⁹ Witt adds further that Montagnone may have even had direct contact with Lovato Lovati, the 'founder of Paduan humanism.'¹⁰ This is supported by Weiss and also Tiziano Dorandi, who argues that Montagnone "used a rare Latin translation of Laerzio's *Vitae Philosophorum*, likely completed by Enrico Aristippo between 1154 and 1162."¹¹ Though Laerzio is not cited in the *Compendium*, Dorandi argues that certain selections are most certainly from Laerzio's *Vitae*,¹² and therefore perhaps a sign of Montagnone's connection to Lovati. Lovato Lovati was, like Montagnone, both a local Paduan judge and civil lawyer with "a passion for classical literature."¹³ Lovati wrote works commenting on both Seneca and Livy, as well as "identifying and promoting [Padua's] legendary founder, the mythical Trojan elder Antenor."¹⁴ Weiss notes that Petrarch himself seventy years after Lovati's death would laud him as the 'greatest Latin poet of his time'.¹⁵

Weiss argues that the city of Padua itself (and not Bologna) was the "birthplace of Italian humanism."¹⁶ Both Lovati and Montagnone had access to the resources at the University of Padua, and also would have also had "access to two of the greatest repositories of Carolingian

manuscripts at the time: the Abbey Library of Pomposa, eighty kilometers south of Padua, and the Verona Chapter Library, approximately eighty kilometers west of Padua.”¹⁷ Witt explains that the early humanists were often notaries and lawyers, or teachers of rhetoric and grammar.¹⁸

Both Witt and Moss make a great deal of early humanism’s connection to rhetoric and grammar, and both suggest that rhetoric, dialectic and poetry were the central subjects at the heart of the development of early humanism.¹⁹ Witt argues that humanism developed out of broad, long-term changes in Italian political, economic, social, and cultural life; the notarial profession was central to it.²⁰ The attempt to learn, copy, and adopt classical styles of grammar and rhetoric pushed early humanists beyond mere antiquarianism,²¹ and encouraged attitudes towards learning and classical texts that to some extent informed Montagnone’s creation of the *Compendium*.

We observe that Montagnone was a learned man. He had the skills, experience, and associations one would expect of a Paduan lawyer and judge in the early 14th century, and he had access to a great repository of classical texts. He lived in a university city with a growing population of lay intellectuals that created an intellectual climate that encouraged education and personal investigation of classical works.

Of additional interest to us is Padua’s wider political context. Padua was a Guelf city and would spend much of the 14th century in open conflict with its Ghibelline neighbors. Padua would lose its sovereignty twice: the first time to the Della Scala and the second time to the Venetians. In the early 14th century the commune of Padua and its noble families were in open conflict with the Ghibelline della Scala family of Verona. In November 1310, the Holy Roman Emperor Henry VII made Cangrade and Alboino della Scala Imperial vicars, and in April 1311 the della Scala succeeded in taking Verona. After another sixteen years of fitful yet vicious war,

Cangrande would finally take Padua in 1328.²² This victory would be short-lived, however, as the Paduan Carrara family, with the backing of Venice and Florence, would retake Padua in 1337. The Carrara would rule restlessly until they could no longer resist the expansion of the Venetian *terra firma* and were incorporated into the Republic in 1405.²³ It is not clear whether Montagnone ever held a significant political position in Padua or had any grander connection to the former conflict or those unfolding elsewhere in Italy during his lifetime.

Chapter Three: The *Compendium Moraliū Notabiliū*

The *Compendium moraliū notabiliū* is most certainly a *florilegium*, and belongs to that same group of works as the *Florilegium Gallicum*, the *Florilegium Angelicum*, and the *Manipulus Florum*. It is very difficult to speak broadly of such a genre of works, whose very nature is to anthologize and represent a large corpus of other works. Therefore, while we will see that most major *florilegia* hitherto studied share a similar topical identity and are (as such) identifiable as species of wisdom literature,²⁴ I am reluctant to begin there. The attitude of the anthologizers and the information technology that they utilize will sketch the outline of the class of *florilegium*, not the topic. Richard and Mary Rouse introduce their study of the *Manipulus Florum* with a similar sentiment: “Therefore, while the *Manipulus* is by genre a *florilegium*, its originality lies in its purpose and in the structure invented to achieve that purpose.”²⁵ I will therefore consider the genre of *florilegia* broadly in terms of ‘treatment’ and ‘technology’. We will see that in order to identify a *florilegium*, any *scriptor* will have to ‘anthologize’ its sources. Further, they will have to anthologize according to general themes and flavors that fit within the larger genre of wisdom literature. In addition, we will see that the attitude of ‘anthologizing’ invites editorial agency and textual innovation. That will place the work within this particular

genre. *Florilegia* often provide examples of interesting (and sometimes even revolutionary) intellectual technology for the usage and utility of the reader. We will proceed to investigate both of these aspects of *florilegia*.

Beginning broadly with the idea of ‘treatment’, it is necessary to define what exactly constitutes this particular ‘anthologizing attitude’. Literally flower-collections, the Latin word *florilegium* (from *flos*, *floris* and *lego*, *legere*) is a direct translation from the Greek *anthology*. They are typically collections of quotations from classical authors, though some also include patristic sources, theologians and philosophers, and sometimes Scripture. Ann Moss argues that the medieval genre of *florilegia* originated in the 12th century in France, likely in Orleans,²⁶ though the driving intellectual sentiment is visible much earlier. As part of a broader genre of collections of knowledge and wisdom, *florilegia* participate in a genre of literature populated by such characters as Marcus Terentius Varro, Cicero, Seneca the Younger, and Quintilian. These men and their literary fellows devoted much attention to encyclopedias, knowledge-collections, and epitomes – expanding the concepts onto which medieval *florilegium* would be founded.

Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 B.C.), ‘*vir Romanorum eruditissimus*’, is estimated to have authored seventy-four literary works in a corpus of 620 books.²⁷ Unfortunately, only nine of his books remain and only one of those has survived complete.²⁸ This tremendous effort touched upon an astounding number of topics, including the Latin language, poetry, as well as 700 prose biographies of famous Romans and Greeks.²⁹ Further, he authored the forty-one books of the *Antiquities* divided between “Things Human” and “Things Divine”, as well as seventy-six books regarding (among others topics) philosophy and history.³⁰ Varro’s prolific writing and antiquarian passion³¹ resulted in an impressive Roman ‘knowledge-collection’ – a veritable

“reference library of *res Romanae*.”³² Peter Van Nuffelen suggests that Varro “saw wisdom as a universal possession...and thus not [exclusively] the preserve of the Greeks.”³³

His younger contemporary Cicero was also a prolific writer. Born in 106 B.C., he would author a remarkable corpus of literature, letters, and philosophical works. Much of his work would survive in whole or in part into the Middle Ages: six books on rhetoric, eight works of philosophy, fifty speeches and over 900 letters.³⁴ Commenting on what makes an ‘ideal orator’ in Book one of the *De Oratore*, Cicero explains that eloquence requires a high degree of general knowledge, as well as an aptitude in humor, history, law, performance, and memory technique.³⁵ Further, in his *De Inventione*, Cicero discourses on the four cardinal virtues: Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance.³⁶ He also uses these virtues as categories for his discourse on deliberative oratory.³⁷ We will observe that the cardinal virtues play an important role in the organization of the *Compendium*, as well how his ideal oratorical virtues became important to medieval *litterati*.

Moss argues that both Seneca the Younger (d. 65 A.D.) and Quintilian (d. 100 A.D.) express an anthologizing attitude regarding ‘wisdom gathering’ that had a significant influence on the genre of medieval *florilegia*.³⁸ In the opening preface of the *Manipulus Florum*,³⁹ Thomas of Ireland spends a significant amount of time quoting Seneca. Thomas’s references to Seneca were with regards to a particular metaphor that would help give the genre of florilegia its name. The eighty-fourth of Seneca’s *Epistulae Morales* “On Gathering Ideas” includes a passage that reads as follows:

“We should imitate the bees, as they say, which wander and pluck suitable flowers to make honey, then carry whatever they arrange and distribute through the honeycomb, just as our Virgil said:

. . . they pack close the
liquid honey and fill the storehouse
with sweet nectar. . . .

..for it is pleasing to the writers that knowledge of honey-making does not belong to the bees, but the knowledge of collecting does.” (84.5-6)⁴⁰

We see here the attitude of an anthologizer directed towards ideas themselves: selecting items of wisdom, collecting them into one place, and through a process of refinement turning that already sweet nectar into honey.⁴¹

This attitude is distinct from that of its close cousin, the epitome. At its most basic, to epitomize is to “reduce a source to its most essential matter.”⁴² While this act of literary digestion and arrangement can be seen as far back as the Hellenistic period, it was pursued with particular intensity in Imperial Rome.⁴³ Though written late in the Empire (approx. 383-450 A.D.), the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* stands out for us as a proximate example of an epitome.

Vegetius clearly expresses an epitomizing sentiment in his preface to Book Four:

To complete then, a work undertaken by command of your Majesty, I shall summarize in order from various authors the measures by which either our cities should be undertaken by command of Your Majesty, defended or the enemy’s destroyed. Nor shall I regret my labour since foundations are being laid for the benefit of all (4.praef.).⁴⁴

In the *Epitoma*, Vegetius was not overtly selecting, refining, and crafting the contents in the manner of florilegists like Thomas of Ireland or Montagnone. Ostensibly, Vegetius’ goal was to accurately summarize and transmit the most relevant information from his literary sources: Cato the Elder, Cornelius Celsus, Frontinus, and Paternus (among others). Even further, Vegetius himself admits that he is not a military man, and so is stretched to his limit by the very nature of the project. Of course, it is naive to think that the act of summarizing can be done objectively without any kind of editorial agency on the part of the epitomizer. Vegetius certainly exercised

his measure of editorial agency in composing the *Epitoma*: it has an overt political bias and was designed to address the contemporary illnesses of the Roman legion. Nevertheless, an epitome is constrained by the requirements of summarizing in a way that a *florilegium* should not be. The author of a *florilegium* may decide to direct his harvest of flowers so the result is indicative of the whole meadow. On the other hand, the anthologizer may simply select particular flowers he determines are worthy of his harvest.

Quintilian's comments on memory from his *Institutio Oratoria* expand and add more to Seneca's earlier sentiments.⁴⁵ Quintilian was convinced that the best way to remember a piece of writing was to write it down oneself and subsequently memorize it.⁴⁶ Memorizing selections of one's favorite poets or famous philosophers would not only demonstrate the comprehensive nature of one's education, it would also make those selections available should one need them when composing new texts.⁴⁷ One's production of poetry or philosophy or letters and orations would no doubt benefit from having such choice *sententiae* resident in one's memory. Further, Quintilian suggests that this method is ideal for education, such that pupils "will train their memory, form their style in imitation of the best authors...and [be] provide[d with] an abundant treasure house of vocabulary."⁴⁸

Thus, the anthologizing attitudes of Seneca and Quintilian inform those found among the creators of *florilegia*. This kind of intent facilitates efficient study and effective memorization. In the first place, the student may look to a *florilegium* – and not to the source of the quotations themselves – for the relevant selections based on the anthologizer's *schema*. This clearly saves the student time, if it is the anthologizer's *schema* he wants. For example, rather than having to sift through all of Cicero for his most interesting insights into moral philosophy, the anthologizer has done that for you. Further, for a young student not already possessed of the intellectual

ability to critique which parts of Cicero are more or less important on the subject of ethics, a *florilegium* compiled by an eminent intellectual could prove to be an invaluable resource. In the second place, the act of selecting, modifying and altering important works could assist in the act of memorization. A short and succinct quotation that summarizes an author's philosophical position on whatever subject is a valuable tool for both the novice and experienced student. We can clearly see the desire for an epitomization effort; this will of course depend on the purpose and subject of the individual *florilegium*.

These flower-metaphors clearly persisted long after Seneca and Quintilian with the proliferation of the image of a collection of flowers (or sometimes arrows) often taking a central role in the self-identification of these medieval quotation anthologies. The twelfth-century *Florilegium Gallicum* and the *Florilegium Angelicum*, as well as the fourteenth-century *Manipulus Florum* all serve as examples, along with many other similar texts such as the *Sophologium*, the *Policraticus* and *Liber Pharetrae*.⁴⁹

The survival of medieval *florilegia* and commonplace books has been irregular,⁵⁰ and their content and purpose vary to a degree. The *Sophologium* of Jacobus Magnus was divided according to sermons on the “seven virtues, the seven sins, death...and different sectors of society.”⁵¹ John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* is a tract of ethical and political philosophy,⁵² and the *Speculum maius* is an extensive four-part encyclopedia.⁵³ Again, to speak generally of such a scope of works is certainly difficult; nevertheless, it is clear that the critical character element of *florilegia* is the selectivity of the author. As Ann Moss explains,

Most marked among medieval principles for appropriating and assimilating classical texts are: selectivity...the extracts from ancient texts are cut loose from their cultural roots and implanted into a foreign matrix of allusions and verbal game playing...[into] an essentially different linguistic universe.⁵⁴

It is the author of the *florilegium* that is doing the harvesting of the extracts, according to what guidelines and intentions we are left to search for and hypothesize.

Naturally, it stands to reason that the organization and content of a *florilegium* should suit its purpose and intended audience. If these works have a preface – as in the case of the *Compendium* – their intended audience may be reflected there. However, even then we must assess the content of the *florilegium* to determine whether the author’s intentions as laid out in the preface are reliable. For example, Nighman argues quite strongly against the Rouses that the *Manipulus Florum* was intended as a study aid for clerical students rather than a sermon aid for priests.⁵⁵ Nighman explains that the character of the text is key to identifying a prospective audience, as certain chapters of the *Manipulus Florum* show.⁵⁶ For example, the *Mulier* and *Coniugium* sections of the *Manipulus Florum* are misogynist in nature, an attitude may have been useful to cultivate in prospective clerics.⁵⁷ From what was used and modified later in the severely misogynist witchhunter’s manual – the *Formicarius* – but derived from the *Manipulus Florum*, we can see that the nature of the selection can change according to what the author needs it to do.⁵⁸ Therefore, as soon as the flower is ‘harvested’ from the garden, the process of selecting, compiling, rearranging, and modifying becomes central to the basic *florilegium* project,⁵⁹ and each individual *florilegium* will thereby develop its own peculiar character. This character will develop out of the confluence of the anthologizer’s attitude, intention, and the methodology employed in the work.

This brings us to the technological identity of the genre of *florilegia*. The Rouses explain that beginning in the 13th century, unique intra-textual tools began to develop that revolutionized how these kinds of anthologies were read.⁶⁰ “These tools epitomize an effort to get at material, to gain access, to locate, and to retrieve information.”⁶¹ The *Manipulus Florum* has perhaps the

most advanced cross-textual referencing system of any extant *florilegium*, and as it is contemporary with the *Compendium*, it will serve well as a comparison.

The *Manipulus Florum* was completed by Thomas of Ireland in 1306.⁶² It was subsequently printed in over fifty editions between 1483 and 1887, and is extant in over 180 manuscripts. The *Manipulus Florum* contains approximately six thousand moral and theological selections within 266 topics, beginning with *Abstinencia* and ending with *Christus* (Xps), ordered alphabetically. Completed around 1310 by Montagnone, the *Compendium* is a collection of quotations and extracts from pagan and Christian classical authors, patristic authors, and Scripture. It also includes quotations from a number of medieval texts, including Andreas Capellanus' *Art of Love*. Montagnone even includes common vernacular sayings and proverbs,⁶³ a significant departure from the norm for a work of this kind. The *Compendium* survives in approximately fifty extant manuscripts but was only printed once, at Venice in 1505, and that copy comprises 157 folios. Both the *Manipulus Florum* and the *Compendium* begin with a preface, where the authors set out to explain their purpose for creating the work. The *Compendium* is organized into five books: the first on Religion, and the next four on the cardinal virtues of Justice, Prudence, Temperance, and Fortitude. Each book contains several major rubrics, such as the second book under Fortitude: *De bello et hostilitate et de arte bellandi*. Below each major chapter heading, there are a number of minor chapter heads further subdivided by topic. Within each sub-topic, the relevant quotations are arranged in chronological order. Thus, in *Compendium* 5.2, Rubric 4 (*De eis que prius et potius agenda sunt quam prelium*), the order of authors proceeds as follows: Terentius Varo, Valerius Maximus, Vegetius, Cassiodorus, Baldo, and Ricardus *iudex*.

We may note first that the *Compendium* is ordered based on a whole range of topics relevant to moral science, whereas the *Manipulus Florum* generally uses single noun headings, such as *Bellum* or *Blasphemia*. The *Compendium* does seem to be the first *florilegium* put together in this way,⁶⁴ and perhaps it follows given that Montagnone was a trained rhetorician and civil lawyer with humanist interests.⁶⁵ Further, we might notice some interest of Montagnone's in historical criticism. Moss suggests that he may have organized his selections in chronological order so that the reader may see where the original source and context of the quote came from.⁶⁶ This is hinted at, but not said explicitly, in this line from his preface: "*Observans in quocumque titulo auctorum ordinem prout sciencie et doctrine operam dantes precesserunt et successerunt in tempore: vt ex hoc appareat quod quisque auctorum ab alio dictum in scriptis suorum operum disseruerit: et vt quisque debitam laudem cuique auctori ex suis propriis inuentis auctoribus indubitanter attribuat*". Also, quite unlike the *Manipulus Florum*, the *Compendium* does not have a system of cross-textual referencing. It is the *Manipulus Florum*'s system of cross-textual referencing that the Rouses and others believe made it become so popular: it "was written not to be read, but to be used –that is, searched."⁶⁷ At the end of each lemma Thomas provided a list of particular quotations of similar interest from other lemmata, as well as one or more lemmata that stand as either synonyms or antonyms of that lemma.⁶⁸ In contrast to Thomas of Ireland's project of utility, the 1505 editor of the Venice copy of the *Compendium* – another lawyer, named Peter Trecius – advertised the *Compendium* as a *florilegium* useful as "a means of escaping the trials and temptations of the present age...a work of religious meditation, whose main function is to demonstrate that the words of Christian authors and pagan authors agree in the truth of the Holy Spirit."⁶⁹

We note finally that the choice of authors varies significantly. Unlike a *florilegium*

created by a theologian for an ecclesiastical audience (the *Manipulus Florum* serves as our example), the *Compendium* contains fewer patristic sources. It also includes more Greek sources than the *Manipulus Florum* – including Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle, and Theophrastus,⁷⁰ all in Latin translations. As mentioned before, the inclusion of vernacular proverbs is quite unique, and a collection of both pagan and Christian late classical writers – including much Latin poetry – is key to recognizing Montagnone’s early humanist approach.⁷¹ While Moss and Maria Pilar Cuartero Sancho disagree as to how precisely the collection of sources in the *Compendium* is atypical of a medieval *florilegium*, they do agree that it is very different from the norm.⁷² Moss suggests the source choices seem to follow from Montagnone’s expressed purpose for the work,⁷³ whereas Sancho suggests that it is more likely due to the humanist character of the contemporary intellectual environment in which Montagnone lived.⁷⁴ I agree with Elena Crupi that the latter seems to be the more likely explanation.⁷⁵

Chapter Four: The *Compendium*, the *Strategemata*, and the *Epitoma*

Having thus briefly examined Montagnone and the general character and attributes of the *Compendium* and its genre, I will now address the parts of the *Compendium* that are the focus of this study. Part Five on Fortitude, Book Two is entitled “On War and Hostility, and the Art of Warring”. It includes 199 quotations; spanning over 11 folios, it makes up 36% of Part Five and roughly 14% of the whole *Compendium*. It is arranged into forty rubrics consisting primarily of selections from the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* of Vegetius, and the *Strategemata* of Frontinus. In contrast, its contemporary the *Manipulus Florum* has only forty-four total quotations under *Bellum*, and most of those excerpts are much shorter than those selected by Montagnone. Montagnone utilizes both Vegetius and Frontinus in roughly equal measure throughout 5.2,

favouring selections from Vegetius heavily at the beginning of the section and slowly transitioning to favor Frontinus towards the end. Outside 5.2 there are sixty-three other selections (forty-six from Vegetius and seventeen from Frontinus) scattered throughout the other parts of the *Compendium* under thirty-four additional rubrics.

As the online *Compendium* project has shown, Montagnone is mostly quite accurate with his transmission, and correct in his citations. The most frequent case of mis-referencing was with Vegetius – several times Montagnone mistakes⁷⁶ the correct book (but not the chapter) that the selection is from. Twice Montagnone misattributes a quotation to Frontinus when it was from Vegetius,⁷⁷ and once Montagnone mis-attributes a quote from Cassiodorus’ Epistles to Vegetius.⁷⁸ In general, Montagnone exercises more editorial discretion with Vegetius than he does with Frontinus. We ought to expect this, however, as the *Strategemata* is well organised, and each small item from Frontinus is (on the whole) self-contained. Within 5.2, we see large selections from both Vegetius and Frontinus, whereas outside 5.2 we see a marked increase in Montagnone’s editorial agency as much smaller quotations are the rule. The comparison of these groups of quotes will allow us to take a firm position regarding their nature.

To reiterate, this project will attempt to address two questions with respect to the transmission of Vegetius and Frontinus in *Compendium* 5.2: who is it for and why? From Montagnone’s preface (“*Ita ut litteratus...studuerit*”), it appears that he may have intended *Compendium* 5.2 to function as an epitome of these two authors. We will proceed to examine whether and in what sense this is true regarding his transmission of the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* in the *Compendium*. Can we get a sense of the target audience for the *Bellum* section or even the wider-ranging usages of the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*? Why did Montagnone feel

it necessary to include a large chapter about war in a collection of notable morals, where the five major subjects are the cardinal virtues and religion?

Chapter Five: What is *Pars 5, Liber 2: De bello et hostilitate et de arte bellandi*?

“...so that a literate person would never have to pursue the notable moral in the original book.” This may prove to be the most important line in Montagnone’s preface to the *Compendium*. Not only does it seem to hint at Montagnone’s audience (which we shall return to later), but it also seems to express an ‘epitomizing’ sentiment. Regarding “the notable moral in the original book,” this refers to the list that Montagnone had just given us of things he has included in the *Compendium*:

“Under those titles I assigned, not without great labour of contemplation, notable moral authorities and examples that have been said or done and even stories chosen by me with care from many volumes of books, and furthermore I arranged notable metrical and common proverbs from outside of books wandering in diverse ordinary sayings, fitting this layout.”⁷⁹

Therefore, it seems that Montagnone is saying his *Compendium* is intended to be the last stop for a *litteratus* with respect to their study of notable morals. However, it is not clear how forceful, or rather, how wide a net is cast upon the study of notable morals by his comment that readers will “never have to pursue...” Does he mean the whole study itself, such that his book has brought the best of whole effort of studying notable morals? Or does he simply mean that he has extracted the best and most useful of whichever works he has consulted, given that he could not have consulted each and every work available? The former seems much more arrogant than the latter; and so I suspect the latter. Further, we may note his attitude from the following:

“Therefore I, Geremia da Montagnone, judge and citizen of Padua, not finding moral knowledge ordered by another according to all its parts under suitable titles, desired to digest the titles principally on the basis of my own clever thinking: and I desired to arranged those things containing all parts of moral knowledge for the *Compendium moralium notabilium* by division and ordination according to my judgment.”⁸⁰

When read together with the following text from his preface, this suggests that he is both concerned with those works that he has already examined himself and those works that he has included in his project in response to the work of others. Regardless, what is clear is that he has created the *Compendium* “not without great labour” and with a discerning eye.

It is clear from this then that Montagnone is expressing an ‘epitomizing’ attitude in his preface to the *Compendium*. In addition, *Compendium* 5.2 is far more heavily dominated by only two sources than any other book in the *Compendium*. Therefore, this case of extensive citations from only two *auctores* in a rubric given such great space – prefaced by a clearly epitomizing attitude – seems to indicate that Montagnone chose to take on the role of an epitomizer in addition to the role of a florilegist. I do not see a reason to distrust the information given in his preface; after all, he says “...the following preface [is] provided for understanding the chief purpose of the whole work.” However, I will test Montagnone’s claim and try to specify the nature of his epitome.

Through looking at the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* and the *Strategemata*, we can determine whether Montagnone attempted to produce an epitome of these texts in *Compendium* 5.2. By calling his book the *Epitoma Rei Militaris*, Vegetius made no secret of the epitomizing nature of his project. We have paid witness to this previously, and here again in the preface to Book One Vegetius articulates the nature of his work:

Yet in this opusculum neither linguistic elegance nor intellectual acumen was needed, but painstaking and faithful labour, to put into public domain for the benefit of Rome matters which lay scattered and hidden in the pages of various historians and teachers of military science (1.praef.).⁸¹

In this sentence he both expresses the openness of his project's embrace and his own simultaneous lack of experience with the subject at hand. Vegetius does not claim to be a military man, nor does he express his intention to add his own opinions to the matter. The nature of the *Epitoma* bears this intention out. Not only does it ostensibly summarize from some of the greatest Roman writers on generalship, but it is well organized, comprehensive, and above all a work of excellent quality. It is not so mysterious why there are over 266 extant Latin manuscript copies. It is a technical manual on the art of generalship; its comprehensiveness and quality are instantly visible in comparison to later Byzantine military manuals such as Emperor Maurice's *Strategikon* or Nikephoros II Phocas' *Praecepta Militaria*.⁸² Not only does it contain a wealth of general wisdom regarding the art of generalship,⁸³ it also contains much technical information that is targeted towards the artist of war.⁸⁴ Though the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* contains much general wisdom, Vegetius did not intend that to be the work's primary focus. He intended it to be a technical manual targeted logically first to those who understand and participate in war. The *Epitoma Rei Militaris* is also, of course, an epitome. We ought therefore to be naturally suspicious of Montagnone if he claims to have attempted an epitome of the *Epitoma* – does he do this? I believe the answer is a firm *sic et non*.

On the one hand, it seems highly unlikely that 5.2 qualifies as an epitome. First of all, since the *Epitoma* is a comprehensive technical manual, any true epitomizing effort ought to be similarly comprehensive and technical. It would be an odd claim indeed to say that a technical manual has been epitomized with most of the technical material left out. And in fact this is the case in the *Compendium*. By far the majority of the excerpts from the *Epitoma* transmitted by Montagnone qualify as 'general wisdom'. 19.V.1 and 19.V.2 are two of the most technical transmitted passages; so technical, in fact, that these items seem intended for a martial artist.

19.V.1 reads: “Furthermore, in the actual conflict and clash of arms the soldier coming on by a running jump makes the adversary’s eyes flinch, frightens his mind and plants a blow before the other can properly prepare himself for evasive or offensive action.”⁸⁵ 19.V.2 discusses the differences between the cut and the thrust – a more classical subject in the art of the sword there is none:

...as a cut, whatever its force, seldom kills, because the vitals are protected by both armour and bones. But a stab driven two inches in is fatal; for necessarily whatever goes in penetrates the vitals. Secondly while a cut is being delivered the right arm and flank are exposed; whereas a stab is inflicted with the body remaining covered, and the enemy is wounded before he realizes it.⁸⁶

However, these few transmitted specifics seem to be the exception that proves the rule.

At the very beginning of this study, I hypothesized that certain classes of information in Vegetius and Frontinus were far more likely to be chosen by Montagnone for transmission than others. I would have been surprised if Montagnone had focused his transmission on, for example, certain details unique to a Roman legion of Vegetius’ era, as opposed to more general details whose utility is not bound by time and place. The usefulness of certain martial content is context specific, and is predicated on the continuity (or lack thereof) between the two disparate contexts of the author and the reader. The more dissimilar the relationship, the less useful the selection – unless a general principle can be distilled from a specific example. We have already noticed that Montagnone’s selection of technical material is infrequent, and is more the exception that proves the rule. We should also notice that his selection of context-specific material is also infrequent.⁸⁷

The *Epitoma*’s subjects may be sorted topically under the following headings: tactics and strategy, training, recruitment, unit formations and movements, and the constitution of the army. Advice from Vegetius about the organization of a legionary cohort or the structure of a legion’s baggage train has obviously less immediate utility than 12.V.1: “*Qui desiderat pacem praeparet*

bellum”, or 12.V.5. “He who does not prepare grain-supplies and provisions is conquered without a blow”.⁸⁸ The selection of this aphorism seems logical because an army even one hundred years later may or may not have a group of *Triarii* to be sorted into the battle line, but the necessity of adequate food-supplies is a human fundamental that spans cultures, continents, and time. Indeed, the bulk of the transmitted text by Montagnone from Vegetius is focused on tactics, strategy, and training; all of Frontinus is tactics and strategy. Not only is Montagnone’s transmission heavily weighted towards the subject of tactics and strategy, it is also weighted towards items of ‘general wisdom’. Montagnone combed through and selected a great many items of general wisdom from the *Epitoma*, including almost one half of book 3.26: “General rules of war”. In fact, other than the few significantly technical or context-specific selections,⁸⁹ most of Montagnone’s quotations from Vegetius may be considered ‘general wisdom of war’. The universality of these selections is significant, and their utility is therefore high.

Finally, it seems reasonable to expect to find that Montagnone summarized the internal subjects of the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*. Both Vegetius’ and Frontinus’ chapter and topic headings are very similar where their subjects align, but in contrast 5.2 sweeps by in a very general way. For example, Part Five, Book Two, Rubric Thirteen is entitled “On the Fortification and Protection of Places.” Siege warfare is the primary subject of *Strategemata* Book Three, and makes up the majority of Book Four in the *Epitome*. Yet, Montagnone has only three quotations under this rubric – one from Frontinus, and two from Vegetius. 13.F.1 relates how Alcibiades’ city was besieged by the Spartans. In order to stimulate the vigilance of his guards overnight, he told them to watch for a light from the citadel and signal back when they see it, lest they be harshly punished in the morning.⁹⁰ 13.V.1 advises the general to use dogs on the city walls at night, that they may smell the enemy and bark before they are seen. Vegetius also suggests using

geese, and references the famous story of the goose that saved Rome from the Gauls by honking and alerting Mallius.⁹¹ Lastly, 13.V.2 offers the sober advice of stockpiling in a city supplies proportionate to the enemy's ability to besiege it. Of all the information regarding the "...Fortification and Protection of Places" present in *Strategemata* Book Three and *Epitoma* Book Four, this is all Montagnone thought relevant in this rubric. These three quotations do not constitute an epitome of the original sources. Yet, it is clear that Montagnone has done this purposefully. He quotes an additional twenty-three times from *Strategemata* Book Three, and these quotes are found throughout 5.2's forty rubrics. This state of affairs is common throughout 5.2, and it is clear from Montagnone's placement of the text and topical schema that he had his own topics in mind. He chose not to imitate the topical organization of either Frontinus or Vegetius. Lastly, we know this because Montagnone addressed this in his preface, where he identifies his profession and explains that he has created the Compendium "according to my judgment."⁹² Evidently, this judge and lawyer from Padua applied a significant amount of his own editorial agency in the ordering and arranging of subjects from technical manuals regarding an art of which he was presumably not a practitioner.⁹³

This, therefore, cements our 'non'. It is unlikely that Montagnone attempted an epitome of the *Epitoma*, at least with respect to its technical material. It is even more unlikely that he intended an epitome of the *Strategemata* – his selections are even less representative, even less comprehensive, and chosen with even less obvious reason. His selections from Frontinus were certainly not chosen systematically enough to represent an epitome of Frontinus. However, it is from a comparison of Frontinus' *Strategemata* that we will achieve our 'sic'.

Frontinus's *Strategemata* is a very different book from Vegetius' *Epitoma*. It is completely focused on tactics and strategy (as suits its name), and further it is driven by an

incredible historiographic energy. As a brief aside, Montagnone parachutes the first selection below from Frontinus' preface into Rubrica 9 (9.F.1), the subject of which is germane to our current discussion but whose topical placement is curious:

I neither ignore nor deny the fact that historians have included in their works this feature also, nor that authors have already recorded in some fashion all famous examples. But I ought, I think, out of consideration for busy men, to have regard to brevity.... For it is a tedious business to hunt out separate examples scattered over the vast body of history; and those who have made selections of notable deeds have overwhelmed the reader by the very mass of material.⁹⁴

Frontinus is speaking the truth about his hunt, and all of his examples have been traced back to the original texts from whence they came. However, the most important part of Frontinus' preface is the following (emphasis mine):

For in this way commanders will be furnished with specimens of wisdom and foresight, *which will serve to foster their own power of conceiving and executing like deeds*. There will be the added advantage that a general will not fear the issue of his own stratagem, if he compares it with experiments already successfully made.⁹⁵

This is both exciting and extremely important. It is critical to note that Frontinus is not saying that the purpose of the *Strategemata* is to transmit strategies and ideas that generals may study and thereby learn or copy. He says that their purpose is to furnish wisdom and foresight, which commanders will use to “foster their own power of conceiving and executing like deeds”. To elucidate this element, I would like to compare Frontinus's goals with those of certain medieval martial arts manuals.

The MS Ludwig XV 13 is a manual of martial arts called the *Fior di Battaglia* created by a fighting master named Fiore dei Liberi c. 1410.⁹⁶ In it there are many pictures with accompanying text that address subjects ranging from unarmed grappling to fighting in full harness with weapons on horseback. The images are commonly referred to as ‘plays’ by modern Fiore scholars, thus “the fourth play of grappling” and so on. For those who study the art of the

sword, they know that there are a great many things that one can do to parry and attack a simple blow directed at oneself without moving into grappling, or grabbing the opponent's sword, or anything like that. However, Fiore only has one image where he addresses this entire topic of fencing: the first image on folio 20vb.⁹⁷ The *Fior di Battaglia* is not a beginners' manual; it is not intended to instruct, only to remind. Thus, a martial artist who already knows the art of the sword will see that image and think, "Oh yes, there are also all those things I can do regarding the class of free and open parries". This play then is not a specific instruction from Fiore; rather it functions much like the *Strategemata* as a "specimen[] of wisdom and foresight, which will serve to foster their own power of conceiving and executing like deeds."⁹⁸ Frontinus and Fiore's works therefore share this exciting characteristic principle of the applicability of general wisdom to various situations.

This analysis tells us two important things. First, that the 'plays' in the *Strategemata* are primarily useful for the principle that they contain, not the history they reveal. In a significant and appreciable way, the *Strategemata* could be considered a species of martial wisdom literature. Second, the *Strategemata* appears to have certain qualities typical of a *florilegium*: a wide net was cast by the author, selections from diverse authorities in other sources were consulted, and the selections were arranged according to the schema of the compiler for the use, memory and edification of the reader. We may therefore notice that the *Compendium* is much more like the *Strategemata* than the *Epitoma*. In fact, our examination of the *Epitoma* has shown that Montagnone's prevailing interest is in wisdom and general advice on war, advice that is not too context-specific and that has a high degree of general utility. We may finally return to Montagnone's preface: "*Ita ut litteratus...*". To reiterate, we have no reason not to trust Montagnone's claim that he is epitomizing – we had only to determine what it was that he claims

to be epitomizing.

In the preceding investigation, we have determined that Montagnone's subject is not technical information on war or the art of generalship, but rather general wisdom on warfare and generalship. We may therefore conclude that *Compendium 5.2* is a collection of general military wisdom. Montagnone selected the quotations he did "principally for my own benefit...with wise thought" and almost exclusively from the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* and the *Strategemata*.⁹⁹ As 5.2 is part of the *Compendium moralium notabilium* as a whole, it also shares its character and is also fully part of this *florilegium*. This, therefore, seems to be what *Compendium 5.2* is. But what about the other sixty-three selections outside of 5.2?

Chapter Six: War with wisdom...wisdom within war?

Having examined Montagnone's book on war, it remains to trace down the surreptitious *exploratores* of Vegetius and Frontinus that have invaded the rest of the *Compendium*. In the *Compendium* outside of 5.2, Vegetius and Frontinus appear sixty-three times. Four times in part one, fifteen in part two, twenty-one in part three, seventeen in part four, and six times in part five exclusive of 5.2. The nature of these selections provides a fascinating contrast to the contents of *Compendium 5.2*.

First of all, we ought to note the character of Montagnone's dispersion of these selections. There are in fact selections of Vegetius and Frontinus in every part of the *Compendium*. Only Part One "De religione" has fewer than ten excerpts; and if we add the six excerpts in Part Five that lie outside of 5.2 to those within, Part Five of the *Compendium* on Fortitude stands out with the most excerpts from Vegetius and Frontinus at 205. If there was any doubt as to whether Montagnone fit Vegetius and Frontinus into the fabric of his wisdom

collection, it is defeated by these sixty-three selections. That said, they are not dispersed evenly within the *Compendium*, nor within each of its subjects. For example, Part Two, Book Four, Rubric Five is entitled “De discordia”. Surely there are a host of selections from Frontinus or Vegetius that Montagnone could have used under this rubric. Advice on the causes, uses, or remedies of discord is abundant in both works; however Montagnone does not cite them here. He does use Frontinus twice in the last rubric of Part Two, Book Four “De causis inducentibus pacem et concordiam”. In 2.4.14.F.1, Lucius Sulla broke up the mutiny of a frenzied legion when he announced that the enemy was at hand. In 2.4.14.F.1, a Dacian chief, in order to calm his subjects’ desire for war, called them together and had them watch two dogs who had been fighting one another join forces when they saw a wolf. In this way, he urged his people not to attack the Romans when they were embroiled in civil strife. Why Montagnone chose to use these extracts in 2.4 rather than in 4.5 or somewhere else is not clear. In the absence of any discernible pattern of dispersion within the *Compendium*’s subjects, we are forced to adopt the likely premise that Montagnone simply used Vegetius and Frontinus where he thought it most relevant.

Fortunately this premise is bolstered by the content of these sixty-three selections, and it is here where Montagnone’s editorial agency really shines brightly. As a general rule, these selections are quite short, and cleanly harvested from their original texts. In a much more obvious way than in 5.2, Montagnone has reached into Vegetius and Frontinus, plucked exactly which flowers he wanted, and pruned the stems.

Most of the selections from Vegetius are extremely short, much shorter than we would expect from 5.2. Where in 5.2 a selection may have contained a neat flower of wisdom or a turn of phrase within it, outside of 5.2 Montagnone is only interested in that flower of wisdom.¹⁰⁰ This is significant, and will affect how we view the content of 5.2. There is some overlap

between items of wisdom mentioned outside of 5.2 and those within it, but not much.

Undeniably, the character of Montagnone's transmission of Vegetius has an exceptional and conspicuous level of editorial agency compared to 5.2.

In a way, this is even more true with his transmission of Frontinus. In 5.2, Montagnone always transmitted an item from Frontinus completely, and included the entire text of the entry.¹⁰¹ It is interesting then to see that a few quotations from the *Strategemata* outside of 5.2 have been harvested and pruned of 'extraneous' text. Frontinus comprises only sixteen of the sixty-three selections outside 5.2, where we saw a more balanced usage within 5.2 between Frontinus and Vegetius at eighty-three and one hundred and sixteen quotations, respectively. Also, there is no overlap in selections of the *Strategemata* between those inside and outside 5.2. The fact that Montagnone exercised editorial agency on these Frontinus selections is conspicuously significant, and is inconsistent with one of the few transmission patterns we have been able to see so far in this study.

In sum, this contrast between the quotations from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* outside 5.2 highlights Montagnone's editorial agency. We can see a stark contrast in detail between those within and without. Any selection from the *Strategemata* includes the entire entry in 5.2, where outside it may have been heavily edited. Regarding the *Epitoma*, in 5.2 Montagnone may have included whole chapters or large chunks of text. Outside of 5.2, the selections of Vegetius have been pruned down to their bare wisdom and stripped of any 'extraneous' detail. It is clear that Montagnone did not attempt to epitomize technical material in the quotations outside 5.2. The selections he takes from Vegetius outside of 5.2 are cleanly plucked from the text: 1.3.12.V.1 "Daily use makes light work if heavy equipment is worn", 3.1.5.V.1 "there is nothing that continual practice does not make easy", or 3.3.3.V.1 "who can

you find able to teach what he himself does not know?”¹⁰² Therefore the nature of the quotations outside 5.2 supports my previous analysis. It seems that Montagnone was primarily interested in the general wisdom available within the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*, and not in the technical material available in these texts. We saw that this was the case from the contents of Part 5, Book 2, and now we can see that the remaining quotations from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* support that hypothesis. Montagnone has not epitomized the *Strategemata* or the *Epitoma* in the *Compendium*; he has generated a collection of useful military wisdom.

Chapter Seven: Who is the audience for Montagnone’s military selections?

Having briefly sketched and examined the character of the content transmitted by Montagnone from the *Epitoma* and the *Strategemata*, I will now offer two hypotheses regarding Montagnone’s intended audience. We will return again to the preface of the *Compendium*, and again to the line “*Ita ut litteratus...studuerit.*” Our most explicit clue to the intended audience of the *Compendium* is his use of ‘*litteratus*’. In addition, we have the lines “*Ideo que ego Hieremias...iudicio meo disponere*” and “*Multa rennuens...edita sunt*”. From these lines I agree with both Moss and Crupi that it seems as if Montagnone explicitly intended the *Compendium* for *litterati* – among whom Montagnone presumably numbered himself.¹⁰³ However, 5.2 poses a unique problem to this otherwise reasonable thesis,¹⁰⁴ that by ‘*litteratus*’ Montagnone means his fellow lawyers and proto-humanist intellectuals in Padua. Why would a Paduan lawyer need to know about warfare? If he did, what would we expect him to want to know? Further, is Montagnone honest in his preface? Does the content of 5.2 bear his intentions out?

First, having assessed the content of the *Compendium*, we can already narrow down the scope of his meaning of *litteratus*. Our natural hypothesis for the audience of an epitome of the

art of generalship ought to be the artists themselves. It only stands to reason that the targets of a technical manual (unless explicitly stated otherwise) were those who are technicians of that craft. There were many contemporary artists of war in Montagnone's time such as the great families of the Paduan region (including the d'Este, to whom Fiore's manuscript is dedicated) and those of the Veneto. There were already learned men who were *condottieri*, antecedents of the more famous generals such as Francesco Sforza or Gattamelata or Paoli Savelli in the following centuries. We may then fairly ask: could *Compendium* 5.2 have been intended for a *litteratus* like one of them? Could it have been intended for an artist of war?

I believe this is highly unlikely, and almost certainly not the case. We have already determined that it does not seem that Montagnone attempted to create an epitome of the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*, because he was merely excerpting general military wisdom. Since he selected from these works what he considered the most important general wisdom they contained, he necessarily left out a great deal. As a book of 'plays', the *Strategemata*'s utility is already extremely broad, its subjects varied and comprehensive. The *Epitoma* has a great deal of general wisdom, but it also has extremely important technical observations to make. Books 3.7 "How to cross large rivers,"¹⁰⁵ 3.8 "How to lay out a camp"¹⁰⁶ and 3.2 "How an army's health is controlled" are all examples of technical and vital military information. In fact, it is incredible that Montagnone does not quote from 3.2, the very chapter which Vegetius may have written with some personal authority.¹⁰⁷ Montagnone clearly had his own editorial agenda, and it was concerned by and large with general wisdom of warfare. Further, his topical schema is not as ordered, efficient, or as comprehensive as either the *Strategemata* or the *Epitoma*. This begs the question: if an artist of war wanted to access a book on generalship and warfare, why would he choose the *Compendium* if it is less comprehensive and less complete than the original manuals?

Further, 5.2 comprises only eleven folios amongst 157; the *Compendium moralium notabilium* is not primarily a military manual, nor is its general subject military matters. Even further, we know that there were multiple manuscript copies of the *Epitoma* and the *Strategemata* available at the time – certainly more of an attractive source for study for any craftsman of that art. Therefore, the weight of the evidence seems to push against the thesis that Montagnone’s *litteratus* would have included learned men who were active professionals of war, such as privileged *condottieri* or nobility.

We are now pushed back towards Moss and Crupi’s shared understanding of *litteratus* – which we would expect from our understanding of the literary climate of Montagnone’s time.¹⁰⁸ We may then ask again: Why would a Paduan lawyer want to know about warfare? If he did want to know, what would we expect him to want to know? Even more importantly, what is the connection between lawyers, judges, and the art of generalship?

Chapter Eight: Warfare by word, by sight, and by quill

“Here below some pray, others fight, still others work....”¹⁰⁹

“From the beginning, mankind has been divided into three parts, among men of prayer, farmers, and men of war.”¹¹⁰

This simplistic self-characterization of medieval society provides the contemporary scholar with the opportunity to illustrate complexity. There were many individuals or groups in medieval society that either traveled, lived between, or walked away from these social categories. For example, this company of *oratores*, *bellatores*, and *laboratores* was joined by *mercatores*, those merchants and tradesmen who flourished in medieval towns and cities. Other men like the warrior-monks of the Hospitallers and the Templars also blurred these divisions, in this case between the *oratores* and the *bellatores*. As Guido Ruggiero so aptly observes,¹¹¹ “boundaries

were neither neat, nor fixed, nor particularly exact”, and they were “a complex and often contradictory set of relationships that occupied an important and changing place in human life.”¹¹² When secular education became more and more common in Europe during the later Middle Ages, there arose a class of educated secular men who were able to become lawyers, notaries, rhetoricians, grammarians, and engineers – a class of ‘those who learn’. This education afforded them the opportunity to play an administrative or mechanical role within governments and on behalf of the ruling class. This would place them in the unique position to affect and indeed help wage any warfare begun by their employers. I suggest that once we become further acquainted with these men we may find them a convenient and opportune audience for the martial content in the *Compendium moralium notabilium*. These men had a critical function in medieval warfare and government, and their role would only expand and grow alongside medieval society.

Warfare, generalship and law came together within this particular class of *litterati*. This class was comprised of figures who populated a government’s or authority’s diplomatic and domestic offices. Regarding our particular interests, these characters demonstrate scaling degrees of connection to warfare. There was the young messenger who delivers his first wartime letter from Padua to Verona, as well as the seasoned *provveditore* who is forced by sudden emergency to take command of a *condottiere*’s army. There was also the professional spy working for a foreign government, as well as the emissary who found opportunities for espionage during his routine diplomatic excursions. Ambassadors, spies, *provveditori* – or even just the scribes or notaries who worked for them; all of these men may have been involved in the business of warfare to a certain degree. While it is certainly possible for a general audience of *litterati* to have an interest in the art of warfare, these men may have had a significant professional interest in the

art of generalship without actually intending to practice it themselves. I will attempt a brief sketch of this class, and then continue to offer two examples of men who were certainly examples of these ‘learned-warriors’.

Warfare and martial arts are as complicated as any other and have deadly consequences for failure or imperfection. Montagnone recognized this, at least to the extent that he transmitted Vegetius’ opinion on the matter in 5.V.5: “Who can doubt that the art of war comes before everything else, when it preserves our liberty and prestige, extends the provinces and saves the Empire?”¹¹³ To expand this idea further, French scholar P. Contamine produced an article tracing the reception of two late medieval military treatises:¹¹⁴ those of Robert de Balsac and Beraud Stuart, Lord of Aubigny.¹¹⁵ Contamine briefly summarizes the content of these manuals in the following way:

...[they] emphasise the underlying importance of the need for manpower and money, provisions and artillery. They propose a whole range of types of leader, some fit to lead a company, others an army...some expert at theorizing about war, others better at fighting it on the ground. Nor should the specialists be forgotten: the artillerers, the engineers, the spies, those expert in diplomacy. The prince must employ men skilled in all these activities.¹¹⁶

War by its nature is a delicate activity with high stakes, and it is a constant theme in the art of generalship to seek out every possible advantage over one’s foe and utilize every available resource.¹¹⁷ This effort naturally extends beyond the immediate battlefield into governance and politics, where diplomatic and notarial figures functioned as a critical part of any commune or *condottieri*’s war machine.¹¹⁸ As Donald E. Queller so aptly observed: “war and diplomacy were born as twins.”¹¹⁹

There were a number of Latin terms used to describe messengers and envoys in the Middle Ages, whose specific connotation sometimes depended on whether it was a secular or

ecclesiastical title. The common terms *nuncius* and *legatus* were also often used interchangeably:

A legate is, or can be called, whoever has been sent from another...from any city or province to a ruler or another...on this account a legate is called a substitute for the office of another...but also *nunci* whom foreigners send to us are called legates....¹²⁰

Though the office of the *nuncius* often had a wide and varied set of usages, we can observe some common characteristics. Legally, sending a *nuncius* or a *legatus* was tantamount to sending a letter.¹²¹ Azo explains: “A *nuncius* is he who takes the place of a letter...and he recites the words of the principle.”¹²² Though a *nuncius* may have been merely a physical letter-bearer, they may also have been given the privilege of conveying their employer’s message using their own words.¹²³ Even further, they may have been given the basic powers of an emissary who was tasked to negotiate on behalf of and in the person of their employer. There were a number of natural benefits to trusting a message to an emissary rather than a mere letter-carrier. For one thing, the *nuncius* could potentially communicate tone, intention, wording, and attitude better than a letter could.¹²⁴ They may also have added security to an important or sensitive message, as physical letters can be stolen, lost or destroyed.¹²⁵ Finally, they may have composed their own words or lines of negotiation in the presence of their employer, to be relayed at the appropriate time to their intended audience. Nevertheless, the broad distinction between *nuncii* and emissaries or official ambassadors was that the *nuncius* could not obligate their employer, nor did the *nuncius* have a diplomatic identity distinct from that of the employer’s message. As Baldo di Ubaldi suggests in his *Commentaria*, “For just as a magpie speaks through himself, and not from himself, and just as an organ does not have a sound by itself, so a *nuncius* says nothing from his own mind or by his own activity, but the principle speaks through him.”¹²⁶

In contrast there were diplomatic functionaries who – while they could potentially have any and all the responsibilities of a *nuncius* – served their employers in an expanded role. We naturally associate the term ‘ambassador’ with one who operates with both individual and diplomatic dignity whose function is to negotiate on behalf of their employer. Both Queller and La Claviere suggest that the usage of the term ‘ambassador’ was often as loose as it was with *nuncii*: “The expression has the same elasticity as the institution. In Italy the word *ambasciata* signifies any commission whatsoever.”¹²⁷ For example, the Latin terms *ambassiatores*, *oratores*, *nuncii*, *legati*, and *commisarii* were all used as synonyms by the English regarding their French ambassadors in 1488.¹²⁸ However, the use of the term ‘ambassador’ in diplomacy developed in Italy in the later Middle Ages,¹²⁹ and like with the *nuncii* there were certain characteristics that were broadly indicative of this office.

First and foremost, an ambassador was characterized by procuratorial powers. Both J. Mervyn Jones and Queller agree that “procuration came to diplomacy not directly from Roman law, but through Roman influence on canon law.” Before the revival of Roman law in the twelfth century, simple *nuncii* would have to travel back and forth (or send surrogates) in order to receive direction from their employer. Procuracy would help solve another major challenge in diplomacy – that of pursuing in a timely fashion a process of negotiation where the principles were some distance apart. Procurators were able to both negotiate and conclude diplomatic missions on their own, and thereby obligate their employer.¹³⁰

Second, an ambassador was characterized by the possibility of permanent or semi-permanent foreign residence. “At least as early as 1269, Venetian ambassadors were required to remain at their posts until granted permission to repatriate themselves, and it tended to become increasingly difficult to obtain such permission.”¹³¹ In a resident position with the authority of

their employer, an ambassador allowed for the conservation of an active diplomatic relationship between two parties. It would also give the ambassador the opportunity to carry out smaller miscellaneous tasks for their employer, including private negotiations and espionage. Indeed, information gathering became one of the primary responsibilities of ambassadors and a major element of any diplomatic commission.

There are many such examples of this aspect of the office: “Mantuan ambassadors prided themselves on being so well informed that sometimes even the Venetian ambassadors sought information from them.”¹³² Precisely because the distinction between legitimate information gathering and espionage was often so nebulous, resident ambassadors, their staff and associate functionaries were all capable of participating in effective espionage.¹³³ In a political environment where foreign powers had permanent diplomats in one’s city or capital, there naturally developed two kinds of espionage (or perhaps, two kinds of diplomacy). The first kind is that which we have already seen – ‘legitimate’ espionage. Simply by being in a certain place, an ambassador could hear – or make sure he heard – what news was relevant to his employer. The other kind of espionage was done as surreptitiously as possible by professional spies themselves.

J.R. Alban and C. Allmand observe that spies became increasingly linked with warfare in the late Middle Ages.¹³⁴ Due to their clandestine nature and the hesitance their employers often showed in recording them, the history of medieval spies is difficult to penetrate. Nevertheless, we can sometimes chart their existence through payrolls and accounting documents, as well as through contemporary commentary on the importance they played in both government and military endeavors.¹³⁵ Philippe de Mezieres claimed the use of spies “is always necessary, but especially so in time of war, both to observe the enemy and those of doubtful loyalty, and to keep

commanders fully informed of their intentions.”¹³⁶ Fidenzio de Padua, writing of his experience in the Holy Land, advised that “Christians should follow the Islamic practice of keeping themselves well informed of what was happening ‘*non solum in partibus propinquis, sed etiam in partibus remotis*’.”¹³⁷ Later medieval governments certainly employed official *exploratores*, whose job it was to work undercover in a foreign country, observe, and pass along relevant information to official delegates.¹³⁸ As we have seen, active diplomacy between two entities provided a natural cover for a spy to assume the official function of an emissary or ambassador; after all, their mandate was often to meet, confer with, and observe foreign entities. As this practice was more widely adopted in late medieval Europe,¹³⁹ the line between *nuntius* and *explorator* blurred further. Indeed, French diplomat Phillipe de Commynes¹⁴⁰ considered “...ambassadors as legalized spies; this was an opinion shared by many, if not most of his contemporaries, especially Italians.”¹⁴¹ He advised rulers to watch foreign ambassadors carefully.¹⁴² Nevertheless, *nuncii* of all sorts were sometimes only involved in intelligence gathering duties incidentally and opportunistically. Ostensibly, their main duties were to carry out their official diplomatic function. A famous example of a man who lived between the blurred lines of *nuntius* and *explorator* may be found in the person of Niccolo Machiavelli.

Born in Florence in 1469, Machiavelli personifies (to a great degree) this image of the ‘learned-warrior’. During his first fourteen years of service to Florence beginning near the end of the 15th century, the Florentine Republic was at great risk. Machiavelli’s first several missions included the French court of Louis XII, the Roman court of Pope Alexander VI, the war camps of the Pope’s son and powerful captain Cesare Borgia, and the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I.¹⁴³ Though Machiavelli’s task was merely to report the activities of the court and any future plans he could discern, he also included his own analysis and opinions in his

dispatches. His motivations for including his own analysis and observations may have been driven as much by his ambition as his sense of patriotism; messengers were often rewarded for extra information.¹⁴⁴ At first the republican politicians treated his thoughts with disdain but they grew to rely on them. Particularly, his great friend Piero Soderini (who had been voted *podesta* for life in 1494) trusted Machiavelli's political savvy and afforded him much more responsibility than Machiavelli's secretaryship suggested.¹⁴⁵ He was eventually appointed as the head of the Second Chancery of the Florentine Republic as well as secretary to the Ten of War following the expulsion of the Medici, the execution of Savonarola, and the restoration of the Republic in 1498.¹⁴⁶ Machiavelli was not alone in his position – the communes and cities of Italy from the 14th to 16th centuries had vested interests in having diplomats skilled in foreign policy negotiation. At certain parts of Florence's history it had to rely more on diplomacy than its army (or lack thereof) to solve pressing political issues. Indeed, much of Machiavelli's career was spent as one of these diplomats – begging and pawing at the feet of foreign generals for the sake of Florence's safety.

This all-too-common story is shown through Machiavelli's experience at the French court in August, 1500. At the time of Machiavelli's arrival as foreign ambassador all Italian city-states had representatives at the French court.¹⁴⁷ Machiavelli remarks of the French court "they all have more fear of this King than they do of each other." Machiavelli spent much of his time begging princes and their representatives to fulfill their military contracts with Florence, though Florence had neither the money nor the might to provide even the smallest consequence for betrayal. Princes like Louis XII knew this, and Machiavelli was called in the French court "Mr. Nothing".¹⁴⁸

Over the length of his career Machiavelli became frustrated with the constant infighting between Italian city-states, the invasion of Italy by the French, Germans, and Spanish, as well as Florence's reliance on *condottieri*. Machiavelli exudes a consistent air of criticism and despair regarding his city's diplomatic and military history in his *History of Florence*, completed for Pope Clement VI (Giulio de Medici) in 1525.¹⁴⁹ Recording the opportune death of Giovanni Galeazzo Visconti in 1402 while he was on the march to capture Florence, Machiavelli would remark: "Thus death has always been more favorable to the Florentines than any other friend and more potent to save them than their own valor."¹⁵⁰ As a consequence of these Florentine weaknesses he pushed all his life for the reform of Florence's military institutions, and made suggestions based on his extensive career involved in large military and foreign affairs. First among his suggestions for reform were the removal of Florence's reliance on *condottieri*, and the creation of a citizen militia.¹⁵¹

Though an ardent republican and fierce opponent of the Medici, Machiavelli's political career ended with the fall of Prato and the subsequent return of the Medici to Florence in September 1512. Though subsequently tortured by the Medici and sent into exile,¹⁵² he would finish writing the *Dell'Arte della Guerra* in 1520. Though Machiavelli's commented on military theory in *The Prince*, *The History of Florence* and his *Discourses on Livy*, the *Art of War* would encapsulate his military experience. It was the only major work of Machiavelli's published during his lifetime.¹⁵³ For the purposes of our present discussion, we may note that the setting of the *Art of War* is the *Orti Oricellari* – a "circle for literary, philosophical, and political discussion" among privileged *litterati*.¹⁵⁴ Further, the principal source and inspiration behind Machiavelli's military narrative was none other than Vegetius himself.¹⁵⁵ Unlike the

Compendium, the *Art of War* follows the *Epitoma*'s internal organisation quite closely and is, as it was intended: a military manual.

Machiavelli became an example of a *litteratus* and functioning *nuncius* who not only participated in the military operations of his city but had a vested and patriotic interest in their success. Though strictly not a military man, his proximity to *condottieri* and warfare during his career made it imperative that he be able to understand and accurately assess the progress of a recruitment effort, a siege, or indeed a campaign.¹⁵⁶ I find it likely that his colleagues, superiors, the lower functionaries of the Florentine government would have had a vested interest in acquiring a general knowledge of warfare and the art of generalship.

I would like to offer Jacopo Antonio Marcello as our second example of men representing the 'learned-warrior' class. Marcello is an example of a *litteratus* who was perhaps as much engaged with warfare as we might think possible for such a man. Marcello (1398 - 1464) was a Venetian nobleman.¹⁵⁷ We know of his intimate connection to Italian humanism on account of his interesting relationship with his son, as discussed by Margaret L. King in *Death of the Child Valerio Marcello*. Jacopo Marcello functioned primarily as a professional *provveditore* during his career of service to Venice, and much of that was in liaison with the famously successful *condottiere* Francesco Sforza. King observes that Venice like so many other Italian cities of the time

hired generals to war for them; they did not in their own persons lead armies on the *terraferma*. At the side of each hired general stood an official who was part supervisor, part spy, part paymaster -- the *provveditore*. It was this unglamorous position that Marcello held almost without interruption for twenty-six years.¹⁵⁸

Further:

It was rare...for individual nobles to hold offices that were predominantly military or naval throughout their active careers. Yet, a few did, functioning as genuine military

specialists, strategists, and combatants. Marcello was one of perhaps a dozen Venetian noblemen in his century whose careers belonged to that group. Still, he was no general.¹⁵⁹

King arrives at this analysis through examining the panegyrics written in praise of Marcello and his son Valerio (that Marcello himself had commissioned). These panegyrics record Marcello performing his expected duties as *provveditore*, and sometimes even going above and beyond what was perhaps traditionally expected – such as guaranteeing that the troops would be paid on time even if he had to draw on his own personal fortune.¹⁶⁰ Most importantly, the panegyrics seem to not only flatter Jacopo Marcello but play into his own self image; they paint the image of a successful and valiant *condottiere* who was credited with lifting the Siege at Brescia, taking a fleet of ships over the Alps, and liberating Verona.¹⁶¹ However, King conclusively explains that the facts of his life do not bear these exaggerations out as truth. “The representation of Marcello in these texts...is distorted from the outset: as a Venetian nobleman with provveditorial duties he would not have led armies nor won victories”.¹⁶² King identifies Marcello as a *litteratus* who will stretch the upper limit of this class of *litterati*’s involvement with warfare. Not only was Marcello a successful and extremely well respected *provveditore*,¹⁶³ but he was an actively involved one who was present on many marches and campaigns both in the field and at the siege. Further, he seemed to want – perhaps he even considered himself to be – a *condottiere* at heart rather than a glorified liaison and diplomat.¹⁶⁴ Regardless, we can take Jacopo Marcello as a case of a *litteratus* who was intensely involved with the business of war, and yet still not enough to make him a general.

Chapter Nine: “...To foster their own power of conceiving...like deeds.”

As I have argued previously, it is highly unlikely that Part Five, Book Two in the *Compendium* was intended for a military professional – and even less so for those quotations

outside of 5.2. It appears that Montagnone arbitrarily selected to include in the *Compendium* only those general pieces of wisdom that he deemed significant from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, my analysis of the sixty-three quotations found outside 5.2 has shown that there appears to be a significant difference in editorial agency between those quotations inside and outside 5.2. This suggests something unique about the level of military detail in 5.2 and perhaps indicates that its target audience had more than a mere intellectual interest in the art of war and generalship.

The level of editorial agency that Montagnone exercises on quotes outside 5.2 indicates that he is capable of the same level of agency within 5.2. Yet the quotes within 5.2 are as a rule much fuller, longer, and full of information that has been excised from the quotations outside 5.2. This seems to indicate that the detailed quotes inside 5.2 are conspicuously deliberate. If general wisdom was truly Montagnone's only interest, it is problematic that the quotations inside Part Five, Book Two are so different in character. To highlight these characteristics, we will look a group of quotations that seemed to call out to Montagnone for the kind of editorial agency he exercised outside of 5.2.¹⁶⁶

To begin, we have from the *Epitome* Book 3, Chapter 17 "On reserves, which are posted behind the line", and Book 3, Chapter 14 "How the line should be drawn up to make it invincible in battle".¹⁶⁷ Montagnone quotes the entire chapter of the former,¹⁶⁸ and nearly the entire chapter of the latter.¹⁶⁹ In 3.14, Vegetius provides a detailed description of how a typical Roman battle line would be formed, complete with all the unit names, their functions in the line, and the space they need. *Epitoma* 3.17 discusses the utility and function of reserve units, and the unit formations and strategies they are to adopt to counter enemy attempts to crack the main battle line. Vegetius explains the use of the 'wedge', 'pincer' and 'saw' formations, as well as how to

counter a flank by the enemy's reserves. This information certainly stretches the bounds of general utility. It is not clear how these details would benefit a general audience.

In Rubric 19 of Part Five, Book Two, the first two quotations from the *Epitoma* regard the Art of Arms. Again, we meet 19.V.1 and 19.V.2: “Furthermore, in the actual conflict and clash of arms the soldier coming on by a running jump makes the adversary’s eyes flinch, frightens his mind and plants a blow before the other can properly prepare himself for evasive or offensive action.”¹⁷⁰ 19.V.2 reads:

...as a cut, whatever its force, seldom kills, because the vitals are protected by both armour and bones. But a stab driven two inches in is fatal; for necessarily whatever goes in penetrates the vitals. Secondly while a cut is being delivered the right arm and flank are exposed; whereas a stab is inflicted with the body remaining covered, and the enemy is wounded before he realizes it.¹⁷¹

This topic was often addressed by fencing masters in the later Middle Ages and into the early modern period, for it is a serious subject in the Art of Arms.¹⁷² Whether one favors thrusting or cutting will change the very face of one’s martial art. Cutting and thrusting have very different martial characteristics in tempo, measure, and commitment,¹⁷³ and one’s attitude towards these techniques may determine which weapons one chooses and precisely how one trains.¹⁷⁴ In an appreciable way, it is difficult to see how such specific information on such a narrow topic could be intended for a general audience.

Finally, we have a number of selections from the *Strategemata*. As we have seen, Frontinus explicitly states in his preface: “For in this way commanders will be furnished with specimens of wisdom and foresight, which will serve to foster their own power of conceiving and executing like deeds.” However, this does not necessarily mean that Frontinus is interested in general wisdom. In fact, unlike in Montagnone’s preface, Frontinus singles out commanders as his target audience. We can therefore take it as a general rule that Frontinus has military men

as his target audience. Therefore, since Montagnone allows for the complete transmission of all quotations from the *Strategemata* in Book 5.2, these quotations retain their original character.

On the other hand, there is no reason why Montagnone could not see specimens of general wisdom in certain parts of the *Strategemata*. In fact, Montagnone may have been guided by this very principle when selecting from the *Strategemata*. For example, 3.F.1 contains three short selections from the *Strategemata* on examples of a smaller force defeating a larger force. These three items are taken from *Strategemata* Book Four Chapter Two “On the Effect of Discipline”, though Montagnone does not include their origin subject in his reference.¹⁷⁵ In Rubric 7, Montagnone selects another two examples from *Strategemata* Book Four Chapter Two. This time, they both explicitly mention discipline:

By improving discipline, Domitius Corbulo withstood the Parthians with a force of only two legions and a very few auxiliaries....¹⁷⁶ Alexander of Macedon conquered the world, in the face of innumerable forces of enemies, by means of forty thousand men long accustomed to discipline under his father Philip.”¹⁷⁷

It is clear that these selections from the *Strategemata* – as much as Frontinus may have intended them to be read by generals and military personnel – have an element of general utility. We can see that samples of smaller forces defeating larger ones could both provide encouragement to those who feel oppressed by challenges, while at the same time warn others against the overconfidence of anticipated success. Further, admonishments concerning the benefit and effect of discipline surely have a utility free of the contextual bonds of class or profession.

However, like the *Epitoma*, there are rubrics full of conspicuously specific information taken from the *Strategemata*. The two largest rubrics of selections from the *Strategemata* are found in Part Five, Book Two, Rubric 35: “*Quod hostes non sunt inducendi ad pugnandum: sed excludendi*” and Rubric 36: “*De insidiis disponendis contra hostes.*” Between these two Rubrics

there are twenty-five quotations pertaining to the generation and execution of ambushes. As an example, we can look at 35.F.6 and 36.F.5:

Iphicratense, the Athenian, being encamped on one occasion on level ground, happened to learn that the Thracians were intending to come down from the hills, over which there was a single line of descent, with the purpose of plundering his camp by night. He therefore secretly led forth his troops and posted them on both sides of the road over which the Thracians were to pass. Then when the enemy descended upon the camp, in which a large number of watch-fires were built by the hands of a few men, produced the impression that a mighty host was still there, Iphicrates was enabled to attack them on the flank and crush them.¹⁷⁸

Marhabal, sent by the Carthaginians against rebellious Africans knowing that the tribe was passionately fond of wine, mixed a large quantity of wine with mandragora, which in potency is something between a poison and a soporific. Then after an insignificant skirmish he deliberately withdrew. At dead of night, leaving in the camp some of his baggage and all the drugged wine, he feigned flight. When the barbarians captured the camp and in a frenzy of delight greedily drank the drugged wine, Marhabal returned, and either took them prisoners or slaughtered them while they lay stretched out as if dead.¹⁷⁹

We are thus confronted by the fact that near the end of his chapter on war, Montagnone included twenty-five examples of ambushes and tricks such as 35.F.6 and 36.F.5. These examples are long, quoted in full, and contain a great many specific details. There is so much detail, in fact, that it is hard to see how Montagnone would have intended these quotations for a general audience. It is also difficult to see what general wisdom might be suggested by these passages. These examples seem to function in the *Compendium* exactly as they do in the *Strategemata*. Having already assessed the *Strategemata* as well as comparing its contents to the *Fior di Battaglia*, we know that Frontinus intended to provide examples from history to facilitate the ingenuity of other commanders. 35.F.6 is a perfect example of an ambush combined with a force-multiplying ruse, while 36.F.5 is an excellent example of that class of ambushes useful against an undisciplined force. Each of the twenty-five quotations in these two rubrics functions

in a similar way. It is clear is that Montagnone included these selections exactly as he intended, given that he refused to use his editorial agency to prune these selections down.

Therefore, having assessed the class of quotations from Part Five, Book Two that contain oddly-specific military information, we are forced to allow for the possibility that Montagnone had an interest in Vegetius and Frontinus beyond the general wisdom they contained. Furthermore, we have identified an audience that would have a vested interest in the specific content of a collection of wise quotations on war and generalship. Ambassadors, *provveditori* emissaries and spies; these men needed to know and understand warfare, campaigns, and the relevant details involved. After all, it was directly relevant to their job. It was their task to liaise with the *condottieri*, allied or rival governments, or noble castellans, check and assess their progress and effectiveness, evaluate and weigh the amount of investment placed on them, and advise them if need be. In order to do this job effectively, it would be imperative that a man such as Machiavelli or Marcello have a basic grasp of the Art of Generalship. General knowledge of tactics, supply, the training and upkeep of a soldier's health and morale, and the ability to form realistic expectations concerning basic military risks would be essential. It would be impossible to accurately assess a general or an army's progress and condition otherwise. Nevertheless, since they often functioned in primarily an administrative position between the employer and employee, they did not necessarily need an intimate knowledge of all aspects of the Art of Generalship in order to do their job effectively. Therefore, perhaps the target audience of 5.2 in the *Compendium* is a *litteratus* of this sort. They may have found the *Compendium* edifying on all counts – as Petrus Trecius did¹⁸⁰ – and in addition the *Bellum* section would be directly relevant to their profession.

Chapter Ten: “All arts depend on Practice...”¹⁸¹

It is equally possible, regardless of the specific and pertinent military details included in the transmission of selections in 5.2, that the intended audience was a general class of educated *litterati*. In fact, this seems to be the notion we receive from Montagnone’s preface. He does not say that certain parts of the *Compendium* are meant for some, while other parts are meant for others. Montagnone simply states “*litteratus*”.

As we have seen, the group of quotations from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* that exist outside of 5.2 differ in character from those within 5.2. They are subject to much more editorial agency, and are generally pruned to the pure element of wisdom relevant for its given rubric. In this respect, they seem to relate much more closely in character to the selections from other authors in the *Compendium*, or Thomas of Ireland’s usages, than to those quotations in 5.2.¹⁸² It is therefore reasonable to assume that these selections of Vegetius and Frontinus do indeed share the character of the rest of the *Compendium*, and were in fact intended for a general audience of *litterati* just as Montagnone says in his preface.

However, the quotations within 5.2 are another matter entirely. As we have seen, their comparative size and complexity to those outside of 5.2 makes their detail conspicuous. Yet even here, the detail is not conspicuous enough to assure us of a target audience. Returning to Seneca’s original sentiment:

“We should imitate the bees, as they say, which wander and pluck suitable flowers to make honey, then carry whatever, they arrange and distribute through the honeycomb, just as our Virgil said:

. . . they pack close the
liquid honey and fill the storehouse
with sweet nectar. . . .

...for it is pleasing to the writers that knowledge of honey-making does not belong to the bees, but the knowledge of collecting does.”¹⁸³

The act of wisdom gathering is at the heart of the *florilegium* project. This act implies that a flower of wisdom has an innate utility to it, a utility that is not necessarily tied to its context or place of origin. Montagnone, as the anthologizer, has exercised editorial agency in his organization of the *Compendium*, drawing on whatever he deems relevant to include in any given rubric. Why should 5.2 be the exception to the rule? Rather than becoming over-focused on the subject of 5.2, it is possible that it too is a book of general wisdom, within a larger compendium of general wisdom. These quotations from Roman military manuals may have been arranged topically and transmitted according to Montagnone’s particular specifications, but nonetheless are all *moralia notabilia*.

This begs the question: Can one see general wisdom in military details? Observing the scope of quotations inside 5.2, we can see a definite scale of specificity. There are selections of clearly general wisdom such as 8.V.2: “they ought always to be doing in peacetime what is deemed necessary for battle”. As a lawyer, or a poet, or a judge, or a scribe, one could read that item and relate it to one’s life or profession. So the adage goes ‘practice makes perfect’, and ‘be prepared for challenges, even if they do not seem to be instant’ – something as true in military matters as it is in any other art, craft, or science.¹⁸⁴ There are quotations that have both an element of general wisdom as well as information that seems combat-specific, for example, 19.V.6; “He who pursues rashly with his forces in loose order is willing to give the victory that he had himself obtained”. This clearly has a specific military context: a general is advised to prosecute a route of the enemy with extra care and to avoid the temptation to consider the battle won and unit cohesion therefore unnecessary. Nevertheless it is possible to read general wisdom

from this as well. Perhaps this suggests that one should not pursue good opportunities in one's life too rashly, lest one risks too much and cannot survive a counter-attack of misfortune? Perhaps it is an adage to never let a victory drive out the memory of the struggle necessary to obtain it? The particular meaning Montagnone intended to be taken from this quotation is a mystery. What is clear is that such wisdom-digging is a central activity facilitated by *florilegia*, and it certainly is possible to do with quotations like these as well.

Finally, there are certain quotations that have such specific detail as to leave their audience clear, such as 19.V.2 on the cut or thrust. Who else could this selection be for if not a soldier? or a fencer? Again, this selection mentions elements of the classic martial paradox of the thrust and cut, which martial artists and fencing masters will be arguing vociferously about more than a thousand years later.¹⁸⁵ Yet even in this class of quotations, it may have been possible that they too are intended to represent general flowers of wisdom. Perhaps this one reads “Act as efficiently as you can to accomplish your goal” and “be careful what you risk in achieving your goals – achieve them as safely as you can.” Perhaps less generally, “in Rhetoric, make your arguments direct and your questions to the point; and never pursue a line of argument that could be turned against you.” Therefore, even with quotations from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* that are extremely specific and detailed, it still seems possible to see a principle behind them or a general adage. Depending on the quotation (like 18.V.1) wisdom-extraction may not be easy, but that may have factored into Montagnone's choice of selection. Perhaps such difficult selections encourage the reader to embrace the craft of epistemic archeology “as a means of escaping the trials and temptations of the present age.”¹⁸⁶

Therefore, the selections outside 5.2 participate fully in the ‘general wisdom’ project of the *Compendium* and the selections inside 5.2 are perfectly capable of participating. Since we

have determined that the *Compendium* is targeted towards *litterati*, it is quite possible that Montagnone's inclusion of Vegetius and Frontinus in the *Compendium*, as well as the presence of Part Five, Book Two, fits neatly into the general purpose of the *Compendium*:

A notable moral was chosen where it was discovered when investigating a certain place in the original book. Thus in order that a learned man should study never in another manner any of the aforementioned things and each notable thing in the original book.

Chapter Eleven: "...tamquam civili causa"

Finally, Montagnone has left us one piece of evidence: "So let the general be watchful, sober, and discreet. Let him call a council of war and judge between his own and his enemy's forces, as if he were to adjudicate between parties in a civil suit."¹⁸⁷ This quotation appears only once in the *Compendium*, buried within Rubric eleven of 5.2 "*De prouidencia et preconsiliatione belli*." This quote conspicuously targets men of Montagnone's own profession and yet – like so many of wisdom's flowers – he may have read it in a general way.

We could certainly read this quote as supporting the 'general audience' hypothesis. Vegetius explains here that in the Art of Generalship, it is beneficial for a general to act like a judge. While Montagnone has left much of Vegetius behind, he coincidentally included this selection. If there are times when it benefits a general to act like a judge, it also stands to reason that there are times when it benefits a judge to act like a general. 'Watchful, sober, and discreet' are ideal qualities for a judge or a lawyer. Thus, this quotation is an exact example of the kind cross-profession wisdom that we would expect a general audience to seek from Part Five, Book Two.

On the other hand, we could read this quotation as indicating the intimate relationship that military education had with legal education. 'Watchful, sober, and discreet' also describes a *provveditore*, much less a general emissary to a military ally or enemy. Those men whose job it

was to liaise with, spy on, plan, facilitate, record, and command the military activities on behalf of a commune or government would likely have had some from legal education or experience. We can see many examples of such professionals in history, not the least of which are Marcello and Machiavelli. Therefore, we may also read this quote as adding character to the peculiar nature of 5.2. It contributes force to the attractive notion that the unique character of the contents of 5.2 is not an accident, and that this part of the *Compendium* might have made it attractive to contemporary legal and political professionals in Padua. As we have seen, under growing threat from the De la Scala, Padua's turbulent military and political history in the 14th century would have left no shortage of opportunities for educated men who wished to serve their Commune. Beyond that, there is nothing to say that it would not have benefited a *litteratus* of Montagnone's time to achieve an education in both the law and in conventional wisdom in the art of generalship. I suspect that such men were highly sought after. And would not have had a shortage of potential employers.

Chapter Twelve: "He who pursues rashly..."

My hypotheses concerning the two most likely target audiences notwithstanding, there is no conclusive evidence to confirm or deny either one. First and foremost, the vast majority of the quotations in the *Compendium moralium notabilium* remain untranscribed and unexamined. The *Compendium* is a truly massive work. To really confirm or deny my hypotheses, the whole content of the 1505 edition needs to be examined, as well as compared to a sufficient number of manuscript copies of the *Compendium*. This analysis could then be re-examined in the full light

of the *Compendium*'s character. That done, the premises I have offered regarding the character of the *Compendium* may stand on a body of evidence broader than simply the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*. The best and most robust argument for Montagnone's target audience will be made with the force of the whole *Compendium* and its manuscript family behind it. It remains to address particularly odd and problematic cases of transmission. I have saved most of these cases for last because I believe they can support both of the audience hypotheses that I have argued.

First, there are three pieces of advice each repeated four separate times in the *Compendium*. Vegetius Book 3, Chapter 26, Item 5: "No plans are better than those you carry out in advance without the enemy's knowledge," Item 28: "When you discover that your plan has been betrayed to the enemy, you are advised to change your dispositions," and Item 29: "Discuss with many what you should do, but what you are going to do discuss with as few and as trustworthy as possible, or rather with yourself alone."¹⁸⁸ As a group of quotations with a related subject, they are repeated more times than any other selection of quotations, but this is not necessarily indicative of a pattern. It could just indicate that Montagnone had chosen his list of rubric headings ahead of time, and these particular quotations were widely useful in a number of rubrics. It could also indicate that this book, or 5.2, was targeted to emissaries and spies. On the other hand, it seems as if a judge or a lawyer might find those pieces of advice eminently useful. Thus, they remain an odd curiosity.

The second set of odd quotes are within 5.2 at 24.F.2, 28.F.1, 30.F.2, and 35.F.7. These selections from Frontinus seem particularly odd to place within a compendium of notable morals, and further it is even less clear than usual what general wisdom is contained therein. In 24.F.2 Philip of Macedon ordered his cavalry to the rear of his army and commanded them loudly to kill any deserters. 28.F.1 has two examples of Lucius Sulla and Arminius fastening the heads of

enemies on pikes to display to the enemy, and Domitius Corbulo beheading a captured general and launching his head over the enemy walls with a catapult. In 30.F.1 Coriolanus, for the sake of revenge and discord, prevents the destruction of the patrician lands and mercilessly ravages those of the plebeians. Finally, 35.F.7 has the Athenian general Cimon set fire to a temple of Diana and the surrounding grove, and then massacre the rescuers. These examples from Frontinus are curiously un-Christian, and their notable moral quality is dubious. There is so much of Frontinus that Montagnone does not transmit, so much that he decides not to include, and yet he includes examples like these? Why? If these quotes were all organized under a rubric entitled “What to avoid”, than perhaps we would have an easy clue. They are scattered throughout 5.2, however, and there is no reasonable explanation available at this time. We may also add to this group of un-Christian quotes the aforementioned twenty-five selections on ambushes in Rubric 36. Why allocate so much time to a military action that was frowned upon in the Catholic Church?

The third set of interesting quotes regards training and practice. They are perhaps the most abundant single subject that Montagnone transmits, scattered both outside and within 5.2.¹⁸⁹ For example, 3.1.5.V.1: “...there is nothing that continual practice does not render very easy” and 3.1.5.V.2: “...it is above all the ancient and wise opinion that all arts depend on practice.”¹⁹⁰ Indeed, these quotes on training and practice are also some of the most generally useful items that Montagnone selects for transmission. Nevertheless, despite their abundance and utility, they are as useful to a general audience as they are to a military or legal one, so they do not help choose between our two hypotheses.

Last but not least is the small group of quotes from 5.2 that have an oddly specific military character.¹⁹¹ I argued previously that these quotes do not necessarily push back against

the ‘general audience’ premise; it is possible to find general wisdom even in specialized cases. However, this group remains a problem for the general audience hypothesis, and is in fact the principal point of friction between the two competing hypotheses. In the same way, these quotations are the principal source of strength for the ‘learned-warrior’ hypothesis. It is precisely this sort of specific information that one would expect a *provveditore* or a *condottieri*’s liaison to need to know. These quotations are unhelpful precisely because they are drowned by the relatively general nature of the rest of them; there are not enough of these detailed extractions to tip the scales.

I am therefore forced to admit that I find both hypotheses plausible. On the one hand, I find the weight of the ‘general utility’ of Montagnone’s chosen selections crushing. Not having transcribed or assessed the rest of the content of the *Compendium*, I would be surprised if the weight of the remaining evidence favors the ‘learned-warrior’ hypothesis more than the ‘general audience’ hypothesis. Further, I think we are forced to give Montagnone’s own words their due weight. In the absence of any significant evidence contradicting the intentions Montagnone expressed in his preface, there is every reason to believe that the intended audience were the *litterati* of his acquaintance. Further, we have already seen how the *Compendium moralium notabilium* breaks the *florilegia* mold in a number of areas. It was compiled by a layman and judge educated in a proto-humanist environment. It also draws heavily on the Bible, poets and prose writers, common Italian proverbs, and even *The Art of Courtly Love* by Andreas Capellanus. It is also organized topically, and it is ordered to show the progress of one saying as it passed from one text to another. Perhaps it is too radical a premise to assert that, on top of all this, it also specifically targets military wisdom for practical usage by artists of war?

And yet, it is impossible to ignore character of Part Five, Book Two. Having contrasted these selections from those outside of 5.2, it seems clear that Montagnone is opposed to exercising significant editorial agency. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that as much agency went into the quotations in 5.2 as those outside of it. This indicates that the level of detail in 5.2 is deliberate. Montagnone could potentially have pruned much of 5.2 to get at the blossoms of ‘true’ wisdom just as he did outside of 5.2. That said, perhaps the wisdom he sought was manifest in the precise details he transmitted. 5.2 likely has exactly the amount of detail Montagnone thought relevant. Therefore, in 5.2 where flowers of wisdom (such as 12.V.1 “*Qui desiderat pacem praeparet bellum*”) seem surrounded by ‘extraneous’ details, we can see that those details are in fact not extraneous and are as relevant to the reader as any general wisdom to be discerned therein. Such specific military details are therefore likely purposeful, and since they bear no direct utility to a general audience, I am forced to concede that they suggest a very particular target. These selections and their details do in fact have practical military advice for one who is involved with such things. Furthermore, it is possible that Montagnone – a judge himself – and his educated circle had a hand in the government of Padua. Padua’s history at this time was turbulent at best, and perhaps the art of generalship was a common subject studied by these educated proto-humanists. Who is to say that Montagnone’s ‘general audience’ was not one that was indeed basically familiar with generalship and strategy, or at least perhaps with Vegetius or Frontinus?

Chapter Thirteen: Conclusion

“...I ought, I think, out of consideration for busy men, to have regard to brevity.”¹⁹²

This project began by targeting some of the basic epistemic challenges presented by the transmission of the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* in the *Compendium moralium notabilium*. Principally, I have attempted to ascertain Montagnone's purpose and intended audience for his selections of Vegetius and Frontinus. The main body of this project has been a textual analysis of the quotations along with an analysis of Montagnone's preface. I have supplemented this analysis by sketching the context surrounding Montagnone and Padua, humanism, and the development of *florilegia*.

Through textual analysis I have argued that *Pars 5, Liber 2* is not likely an epitome of the *Strategemata* or the *Epitoma*, and instead is a general collection of military wisdom. As a result of this analysis I dismissed with confidence the likelihood that military professionals like generals or *condottieri* were the specific target audience for this part of the *Compendium*.

I then hypothesised two possible classes of *litterati* that Montagnone may have intended as the audience for *Pars 5, Liber 2*. The first class was that of the 'learned-warriors', whose connection with warfare spanned broadly from the theoretical to the technical. I offered Niccolo Machiavelli and Jacopo Antonio Marcello as later examples of this class. It followed from the identification of this class that such men would have had a specific interest in *Pars 5, Liber 2*, and the content of this book appeared to suit these men better than a general audience in both detail and utility. These 'learned-warriors' often required a functional amount of military knowledge for their profession, and would certainly have benefited from a basic education in the art of war. The second class of *litterati* I then suggested to identify as a general educated audience, those we might expect to walk in contemporary Paduan intellectual circles and participate in the growing culture of Italian humanism. I found it also likely that the collection of

quotations from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* suited this audience. The *litterati* of Montagnone's acquaintance may have seen the *Compendium* as a book of collected wisdom. Such men would certainly have had the tools to extract general principles and useful wisdom even from detailed selections of the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma*.

According to how this investigation has proceeded so far, I find the 'general audience' hypothesis more likely for two major reasons. The first is simply that Montagnone seems to have singled them out in his Preface. He says "*Ita ut litteratus...*" with no further context, except of course to indicate that the *Compendium* is also for – indeed – "principally" for his own benefit. Montagnone does not provide us any more evidence than that; and so to read that text as referring to 'learned-warriors' would be to step beyond the bounds of the current available evidence. The second reason is that the selections from *Epitoma* and the *Strategemata* that qualify as general wisdom far outweigh those that are too specific. Though there are enough detailed military-specific quotes that the learned-warrior hypothesis cannot be dismissed and must be taken seriously, I do not feel that there are enough of them to change the ultimate character of the text which is, on a whole, focused on general wisdom rather than specific military details. However perhaps, as I suggested in my introduction, pursuing research on gender, and more effort on sketching the character of a 'general audience' of *litterati* will lead to a more confident resolution to this question than I have been hitherto able to achieve.

I suspect that there is a strong argument to be made regarding the notion of warfare as a metaphor for 'challenge'. This argument ought to include a gender analysis of how medieval Italian men experienced and understood war and conflict, and how this influenced the medieval Italian man's perspective of life's obstacles and opportunities. Regarding the later Middle Ages, Ruth Mazo Karras writes: "Young men who came to the university were initiated into an

alternative masculine subculture based on ideas of rationality and moderation, but they not infrequently chose rather to imitate the aristocracy from whose ranks many of them came.”¹⁹³ I suspect that there was a culture-wide association of war with ‘challenge’ in late medieval Italy, perhaps similar to how it is today. For example, the war on drugs, the war on terror, the war on Christmas, and the war on women represent the loudest and broadest war metaphors in modern American culture. Indeed, if I had narrated this project with an endless series of war metaphors, I might have been guilty of a boring and tiresome literary trope – and perhaps this is the point. Such a trope is not new, nor do I suspect it was new for Montagnone or his fellow *litterati*. If this was true, then that would mean that Montagnone’s audience would have been naturally disposed to view the selections from the *Strategemata* and the *Epitoma* in a general way. As a result, in order to continue to make the argument that his audience may have been specific and professionally interested in the military content of the extracts, I would have to show some conscious distinctions by Montagnone. This study of a portion of the *Compendium moralium notabilium* has not found any such specific distinctions; on the contrary, the only distinction found was a general one: “*Ita ut literatus...*” Therefore, I shall conclude this investigation as it began – with the quotation that perhaps best exemplifies the metaphor of warfare as ‘challenge’: “So let the general be watchful, sober, and discrete. Let him call a council of war and judge between his own and his enemy’s forces, as if he were to adjudicate between parties in a civil suit.”¹⁹⁴

Appendix 1*The Compendium Moraliū Notabilium*

Venice Printing 1505 A.D.

Preface Translation and Transcription by Aaron Bolarinho

Transcription

Incipit compendium moraliū notabilium compositum per Hieremiam iudicem de montagnone ciuem Paduanum: premissis infrascriptis prohemiiis ad presciendum summariam intentionem totius huius operis. Rubrica. Utilimum et quasi necessarium fore existimandum est ad moraliū notabilium scientiam atque memoriam facilius habendam: atque completius ipsa moralia notabilia sub compendio collecta et disposita ordinatim habere sub congruentibus titulis. Ideoque ego Hieremias iudex de montagnone ciuis paduanus non reperiens moralem scientiam secundum omnes partes eius: ab aliquo sub congruis titulis ordinatam ad profectum mei ipsius principaliter ex cogitatione solerti edere studui titulos: omnes partes moraliū scientiæ continentis eosque ad compendium moraliū notabilium diuisione atque ordinatione congrua iudicio meo disponere. Cuius studii opera meo ingenio hebeti facilis visa non fuit. Sub quibus titulis morales auctoritates notabiles et dicta ac facta exemplaria atque etiam fabulas electa per me curiose de multis librorum voluminibus ac etiam notabilia prouerbia metrica et vulgaria extra libros in diuersis consuetudinariis locutionibus vagantia: non sine magno labore meditationis conuenienti dispositione apposui. Cum indagatione certi loci illius libri originalis vbi reperiatur electum morale notabile. Ita vt litteratus quisque ipsorum quodque notabile in originali libro nunquam aliquo modo studuerit. Ponendo sub pluribus titulis idem notabile quod contineat multiplicem materiam titulorum secundum exigentiam multiplicis materiarum illius notabilis. Observans

in quocumque titulo auctorum ordinem prout sciencie et doctrine operam dantes precesserunt et successerunt in tempore: vt ex hoc appareat quod quisque auctorum ab alio dictum in scriptis suorum operum disseruerit: et vt quisque debitam laudem cuique auctori ex suis propriis inuentis auctoribus indubitanter attribuat. Multa rennuens et abiiciens ab hoc opere quae aliquibus etiam sapientibus notabilia prima facie viderentur: sed indagacione examinis redargutionem inherenti vitio patiuntur: aut quia falsa sunt aut quia vana existentia ad stateram vtilitatis nullum vel minimum pondus habent: aut quia superflua sint ex eo maxime quod ab aliis auctoribus in opere scripture auctentice prius edita sunt.

Translation

Here begins the Compendium Moraliū Notabilium composed by Geremia da Montagnone citizen of Padua: the following preface has been set out in the below text in order to reveal the chief intention of the whole work. It should be considered most useful and as it were necessary to have more easily the knowledge and memory of notable morals: and in order to have more completely these same notable morals, they have been collected and arranged within this compendium under their appropriate titles. Therefore I, Geremia da Montagnone, judge and citizen of Padua, not finding moral knowledge ordered by another according to all its parts under suitable titles, I desired to digest the titles principally on the basis of my own clever thinking: and I desired to arranged those things containing all parts of moral knowledge for the Compendium moraliū notabilium by division and ordination according to my judgment. The work of my zeal did not seem easy to my languid talent. Under those titles I assigned, not without great labour of contemplation, notable moral authorities and examples that have been said or done and even stories were chosen by me with care from many volumes of books and furthermore I arranged

notable metrical and common proverbs from outside of books wandering in diverse ordinary sayings, fitting this layout. A notable moral was chosen where it was discovered when investigating a certain place in the original book. Thus in order that a learned man should study never in another manner any of the aforementioned things or each notable thing in the original book. Placing under many titles this same notable thing which contains many material layers of titles following the urgency of the multiplicity of the materials of this notable thing. Observing in whatever title the succession of authors just as those given the work of knowledge and doctrine proceeded and succeeded in time as it might appear from this because each of the authors plants a saying of another in the writings of his own works, with the result that each attributes without a doubt to authors praise owed to each author on the basis of their own inventions. Refusing and throwing away many things from this work which seemed to be notable at first glance to other wise men, but in the investigation with respect to the refutation of my examination, they suffer from inherent vice: either because they are false, or because by their vain existence they have nothing or the smallest weight on the scales of usefulness or because they may be superfluous especially from the rest because they were put forth earlier by other authors in their original work of writing.

Appendix 2

The Selections of Vegetius and Frontinus in the *Compendium moralium notabilium*

The following pages contain every selection Montagnone included from Vegetius' *Epitoma Rei Militaris* and Frontinus *Strategemata*. The following list corresponds precisely to the rubrics in the *Compendium*, but not to Montagnone's own demarcations of each set of quotes. Montagnone often combines selections that follow each other, some large and some small, sometimes with large gulfs of text between them. Therefore, I have separated and identified each individual quote, and included the line references to the critical editions being used to compare the transmission of the text in the Online *Compendium moralium notabilium* Project at <http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/CMN/index.html>. The full documents for both Vegetius and Frontinus from the Online project will be available on the website. Lastly, I have added a reference system to increase the ease and convenience of the reader. In the previous paper, quotes will refer to the reference system of part - book - rubric - author - numerical order. Thus, 1.3.6.V.1 indicates Part One, Book Three, Rubric six, Vegetius, quote one (of one). Since the vast majority of the quotations are found in Part Five, Book Two - the part and book numbers will be omitted if the quote is found within Part Five, Book Two. Thus: 10.V.2 indicates Part Five, Book Two, Rubric 10, Vegetius, quote two (of three).

Pars 1, Liber 3: De naturalitate et moralitate: et pertinentibus ad eas

Rubrica 6: De naturali errore circa se et alium (fol.20vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

1.3.6.V.1 - 3.6.7 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.75, ll.18-19).

Rubrica 7: De diuersitate moralitatum et naturalitatum diuersorum hominum

(fol.21ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

1.3.7.V.1 - 2.21.4-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.55, ll.23-24).

Rubrica 12: De facilitate et difficultate (fol.22rb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

1.3.12.V.1 - 1.20.8-9 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.23, ll.6-7).

1.3.12.V.2 - 2.18.7 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.52, ll.21-22).

Pars 2, Liber 1: De iustitia et pertinentibus ad eam et de contrariis

Rubrica 6: De licita defensione (fol.27vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

2.1.6.V.1 - 3.3.4 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.69, ll.10-11).

2.1.6.V.2 - 4.8.7 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.129, ll.17-18).

Pars 2, Liber 2: De veritate et falsitate et connexis vtrique vel alterutri

Rubrica 2: De fide seu fidelitate et infidelitate seu perfidia (fol.31vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

2.2.2.V.1 - 3.9.10 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.86, ll.12-14).

Rubrica 4: De proditione exprobanda (fol.32rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*:

2.2.4.F.1 - 4.4.1-2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.101, ll.247-257).

Rubrica 5: De simulatione et dissimulatione (fol.33rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*:

2.2.5.F.1 - Sextus Iulius Frontinus, *Strategemata*, 1.9.10 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.22, ll.550-555).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

2.2.5.V.1 - 3.3.12 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.70, ll.14-15).

Rubrica 10: De confidentia: credulitate et credulis atque incredulis (fol.35ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

2.2.10.V.1 - 3.3.12 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.70, ll.14-15).

Pars 2, Liber 3: De dilectione et amicitia

Rubrica 2: De pietate (fol.36vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*:

2.3.2.F.1 - 1.7.7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.19, ll.476-479).

Pars 2, Liber 4: De odio: discordia: et pace

Rubrica 10: De seditionibus ciuium (fol.45vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

2.4.10.V.1 - 3.10.12 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.90, ll.4-8).

Rubrica 14: De causis inducentibus pacem et concordiam (fol.46vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

2.4.14.F.1 - 1.9.2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.22, ll.546-549).

2.4.14.F.2 - 1.10.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.24, ll.584-589).

Pars 2, Liber 5: De beneficiis

Rubrica 10: De mercede premio et retributione (fol.51va):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

2.5.10.V.1 - 3.26.30 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.18-19).

Pars 2, Liber 6: De politicis moribus

Rubrica 3: De principibus: ducibus et regibus (fol.54va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

2.6.3.F.1 - 4.7.3 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.107, ll.376-377).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

2.6.3.V.1 - 1.1.1-2 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.4, ll.21-23).

2.6.3.V.2 - 2.5.3-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.39, ll.6-12).

Pars 3, Liber 1: De intelligentia et scientia: consideratione morali

Rubrica 5: De meditatione (fol.62ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.1.5.V.1 - 1.19.2 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.21, ll.22-23).

3.1.5.V.2 - 2.24.4 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.59, ll.25-26).

Pars 3, Liber 2: De prudentia et pertinentibus ad eam et de contrariis

Rubrica 1: De prudentia et sapientia (fol.51va):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.2.1.V.1 - 1.2.5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.7, ll.10-12).

Rubrica 4: De consilio (fol.67ra unmarked, sig. DD iii):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.2.4.V.1 - 3.26.5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.117, ll.15-16).

3.2.4.V.2 - 3.26.28 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.13-14).

3.2.4.V.3 - 3.26.29 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.15-17).

Rubrica 12: De cautione: securitate et periculo (fol.70rb unmarked, sig. DD iv):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

3.2.12.F.1 - 2.11.3 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.65, ll.913-918).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.2.12.V.1 - 3.22.10-11 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.110, ll.16-17).

3.2.12.V.2 - 3.25.12-13 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.116, ll.11-12).

Pars 3, Liber 3: De philosophica doctrina ac disciplina et his connexis

Rubrica 3: De doctrina et doctoribus seu magistris (fol.65va):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.3.3.V.1 - 1.8.7 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.12, ll.24-25).

Rubrica 8: De etate acceptabili discipline (fol.70ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.3.8.V.1 - 1.4.2 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.9, ll.1-2).

Pars 3, Liber 4: De prudentia operandi: et his que pertinent ad eam

Rubrica 5: De artibus et artificiis (fol.72ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.4.5.V.1 - 2.24.4 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.59, ll.25-26).

Rubrica 6: De exercitio et vsu exercitii (fol.72va):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.4.6.V.1 - 1.20.8-9 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.23, ll.6-7).

3.4.6.V.2 - 2.23.14 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.59, ll.7-8).

3.4.6.V.3 - 3.10.1 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.88, ll.5-6).

Rubrica 7: De cura et intentione animi et negligentia (fol.72vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.4.7.V.1 - 4.38.3 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.150, ll.3-4).

Rubrica 8: De labore operatio et corpore seu mollitie vel ocio (fol.74ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.4.8.V.1 - 2.14.8-9 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.48, ll.22-23).

Pars 3, Liber 5: De prudentia taciturnitatis et locutionis

Rubrica 8: De tacendis et celandis propriis et alienis criminibus (fol.77ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.4.8.V.1 - 3.26.5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.117, ll.15-16).

3.4.8.V.2 - 3.26.28 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.13-14).

3.4.8.V.3 - 3.26.29 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.15-17).

Rubrica 19: De scomatibus id calidus dictis conuiciis que vulgo in italia dicuntur moti (fol.83vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

3.5.19.F.1 - 4.5.13 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.104, ll.319-320).

Pars 4, Liber 1: De temperantia et intemperantia et pertinentibus ad eam

Rubrica 4: De paucitatis acceptabilitate et reprobatione multitudinis (fol.87ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

4.1.4.V.1 - 1.1.8 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.6, ll.11-14).

4.1.4.V.2 - 3.1.5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.65, ll.20-21).

Rubrica 5: De paulatinorum potentia (fol.87rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

4.1.4.F.1 - 1.10.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.23, ll.562-571).

Pars 4, Liber 2: De diuitiis et paupertate: et pertinentibus ad eas

Rubrica 12: De exemplis acceptate paupertatis illustrium virorum (fol.93va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

4.2.12.F.1 - 4.3.3 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.100, ll.210-211).

4.2.12.F.2 - 4.3.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.100, ll.214-216).

4.2.12.F.3 - 4.3.12 (R.I. Ireland ed., pp.100-101, ll.231-233).

4.2.12.F.4 - 4.3.15 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.101, ll.243-245).

Rubrica 14: De auaritia et cupiditate pecunie (fol.94va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

4.2.14.F.1 - 4.5.20 (R.I. Ireland ed., pp.105-106, ll.343-345).

Rubrica 16: De parsimonia seu parcitate: largitate: et prodigalitate id est de modo expensarum (fol.95vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

4.2.16.V.1 - 2.20.2 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.54, ll.9-11).

4.2.16.V.2 - 3.3.8-9 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.70, ll.1-2).

4.2.16.V.3 - 4.7.8-10 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.128, ll.14-20).

*Pars 4, Liber 3: De potentia et honoribus et contrariis et pertinentibus ad
hec*

Rubrica 3: De humilitate seu mititate superbia: elatione et fastu (fol.97vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

4.3.3.V.1 - 3.25.12-13 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.116, ll.11-12).

Rubrica 4: De arrogantia: insolentia: iactantia et vanagloria (fol.98va):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

4.3.4.V.1 - 3.6.7 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.75, ll.18-19).

Pars 4, Liber 4: De delectationibus et delectabilibus et pertinentibus ad ea

Rubrica 13: De continentia et incontinentia cupiditatum et voluptatum

(fol.108ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

4.4.13.F.1 - 1.5.7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.19, ll.476-479).

Rubrica 15: De fame et siti seu ieiunio morali consideratione (fol.108rb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

4.4.15.V.1 - 3.3.2 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.68, l.23).

4.4.15.V.2 - 3.9.8 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.86, ll.3-4).

4.4.15.V.3 - 4.30.5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.145, ll.12-13).

Pars 5, Liber 1: De fortitudine animi et pertinentibus ad eam

Rubrica 4: De animi constantia seu perseuerantia: leuitate: pertinacia et mutabilitate (fol.119va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

5.1.4.F.1 - 4.5.16 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.105, ll.329-333).

Rubrica 7: De mansuetudine: ira et furore (fol.123ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

5.1.7.F.1 - 2.11.5 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.66, ll.926-931).

Rubrica 10: De timore (fol.124rb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

5.1.10.V.1 - 1.1.7-8 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.6, ll.10-11).

5.1.10.V.2 - 1.3.5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.8, ll.18-19).

Pars 5, Liber 3: De aduersitatibus et prosperitatibus et pertinentibus ad eas

Rubrica 1: De aduersitate et prosperitate (fol.137ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

5.3.1.V.1 - 3.9.10 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.86, ll.12-14).

Rubrica 5: De pressura temporis (fol.139vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

5.3.5.V.1 - 3.10.17 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.90, ll.22-23).

Pars 5, Liber 2: De bello et hostilitate et de arte bellandi

Rubrica 3: De bello et hostilitate et de arte bellandi, De belli pressura periculo et euentu (fol.125va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

3.F.1 - 4.2.5-7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.99, ll.193-199).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

3.V.1 - 3.9.3 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.85, ll.5-10).

3.V.2 - 3.16.3-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.99, ll.7-12).

3.V.3 - 3.26.4-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.117, ll.12-17).

Rubrica 4: De eis que prius et potius agenda sunt quam bellum (fol.125vb - fol.126ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

4.V.1 - 3.9.2-3 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.85, ll.3-10).

4.V.2 - 3.26.4 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.117, ll.12-14).

4.V.3 - 3.26.31-32 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.20-21).

Rubrica 5 : De militia et officio et laudibus militum et sacramento eorum (fol.126ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

5.V.1 - 2.5.5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.39, ll.12-15).

5.V.2 - 2.19.5-6 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.53, ll.19-23).

5.V.3 - 2.24.3-4 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.59, ll.21-26).

5.V.4 - 3.3.4-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.69, ll.10-11).

5.V.5 - 3.10.2-3 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.88, ll.7-10).

5.C.1 - Aurelius Cassiodorus, *Variarum libri XII.*, 2.31 (CCSL 96, A.J. Fridh ed., p.79 , ll.2-5).

Rubrica 6 : De eligendis ad militiam seu officium bellicum (fol.126rb-126va):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

6.V.1 - 1.8.3-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.12, ll.19-21).

6.V.2 - 1.2.2-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., pp.6-7, ll.18-23, 1-12).

6.V.3 - 1.3.1 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.7, ll.17-23).

6.V.4 - 1.5.1-2 (M.D. Reeve ed., pp.9-10, ll.22-24, 1).

6.V.5 - 1.6.4-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., pp.10-11, ll.21-24, 1-4).

6.V.6 - 1.7.1-9 (M.D. Reeve ed., pp.11-12, ll.9-24, 1-12).

6.V.7 - 1.8.3-5 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.12, ll.19-21).

Rubrica 7: De peritia atque imperitia bellice operationis (fol.125va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

7.F.1 - 4.2.3-4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.99, ll.188-192).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

7.V.1 - 1.prol. (M.D. Reeve ed., p.2, ll.3-5).

7.V.2 - 1.1.7-8 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.6, ll.9-14).

7.V.3 - 1.4.5-6 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.9, ll.8-10).

7.V.4 - 1.13.5-8 (M.D. Reeve ed., pp.17-18, ll.19-23, 1-6).

7.V.5 - 1.28.10 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.31, ll.6-7).

7.V.6 - 2.23.14 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.59, ll.7-10).

7.V.7 - 3.prol.8 (M.D. Reeve ed., pp.64-65, ll.26, 1-2).

7.V.8 - 3.4.6 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.71, ll.24-25).

7.V.9 - 3.6.7 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.75, ll.15-19).

7.V.10 - 3.26.12 (M.D. Reeve ed., p.118, ll.2-3).

Rubrica 8 : De experientia et vsu bellici exercitii (fol.126vb - 127ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

8.V.1 - 1.1.1-3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.5, ll.20-24).

8.V.2 - 2.22.5-6 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.56, ll.19-24).x

8.V.3 - 2.23.1-4 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.57, ll.4-20). x

8.V.4 - 2.23.13-14 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.59, ll. 5-10).

Rubrica 9: De velocitate atque pigritia bellatorum (fol.127ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

9.F.1 - 1.Preface.2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.1, ll.9-12).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

9.V.1 - 1.4.2-4 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.9, ll. 2-5).

9.V.1 - 2.23.4 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.57, ll.14-20).x

9.V.3 - 4.31.6 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.146, ll.13-15).

Rubrica 10: De peritia atque imperitia bellice operationis (fol.127rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

10.F.1 - 4.3.9-11 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.100, ll.226-230).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

10.V.1 - 2.1.6 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.35, ll.7-9).

10.V.2 - 3.9.14 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.87, ll.5-6).

10.V.3 - 3.26.13 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.118, ll.4).

Rubrica 11 : De prouidencia et preconuiliatione belli (fol. 127rb - 127va):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

11.V.1 - 3.9.11-13, (M.D. Reeve ed. p.86, ll.15-23).

11.V.2 - 3.9.19-20 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.87, ll. 22-27).

11.V.3 - 3.12.1-3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.93, ll.5-10).

Rubrica 12 : De preparatione necessariorum belli (fol. 127va - 127vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

12.V.1 - 3.prol.8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.64, ll.26).

12.V.2 - 3.3.1-4 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.68-69, ll.22-26, 1-8). x

12.V.3 - 3.11.3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.92, ll.3-5).

12.V.4 - 3.18.11 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.101-102, ll.29, 1-9).

12.V.5 - 3.26.17 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.118, ll.10-11).

Rubrica 13: De munitione et custodia locorum (fol.127vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

13.F.1 - 3.12.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.84, ll.353-358).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

13.V.1 - 4.26.4-6 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.142, ll.12-20).

13.V.2 - 4.30.5-6 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.145, ll.9-16).

Rubrica 14: De experientia dubia fide suorum (fol. 128ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

14.F.1 - 4.1.8 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.93, ll.45-51).

14.F.2 - 4.7.23 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.110, ll.455-457).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

14.V.1 - 3.26.3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.117, ll.10-11).

Rubrica 15 : De explorationibus et exploratoribus (fol. 128ra -128rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

15.F.1 - 1.2.1, 3-4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.6-7, ll.138-143, 150-159).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

15.V.1 - 3.26.9 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.117, ll.23-24).

15.V.2 - 3.26.27 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.119 ll. 8-10).

Rubrica 16 : De occultandis consiliis initis contra hostes (fol. 128rb -128va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

16.F.1 - 1.1.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.3, ll.53-59).

16.F.2 - 1.1.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.4, ll.68-73).

16.F.3 - 1.1.13 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.6, ll.135-136).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

16.V.1 - 3.6.8-10 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.75, ll.20-27).x

16.V.2 - 3.26.5 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.117, ll.15-16).

16.V.3 - 3.26.28-29 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.119, ll.13-17).

16.V.4 - 3.26.33 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.119, ll. 11-12).

Rubrica 17 : De modo quantitatis exercitus habendo (fol. 128va - 128vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

17.F.1 - 2.1.14 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.33, ll.86-89).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

17.V.1 - 1.8.5 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.12, ll.22-23).

17.V.2 - 3.1.3-12 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.65-67, ll.13-28, 1-25, 1-2).x

17.V.3 - 3.26.10 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.117, ll.25).

Rubrica 18 : De aciebus et ordinibus exercitus disponendis (fol. 128vb - 129ra):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

18.V.1 - 1.26.1-8 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.28-29, ll.12-27, 1-8).

18.V.2 - 3.14.4-17 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.95-97, ll.7-24, 1-26, 1-11).

18.V.3 - 3.15.8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.98, ll.15-18).

18.V.4 - 3.17.1-9 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.99-100, ll.24-26, 1-25).

18.V.5 - 3.19.10-11 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.103-104, ll.23-25, 1-2).

18.V.6 - 3.26.8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.117, ll.21-22, 8).

18.V.7 - 3.26.16 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.118, ll. 8-9).

Rubrica 19 : De modis artificiosis preliandi (fol. 129va - 129vb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

19.V.1 - 1.9.7-8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.14, ll.17-21).

19.V.2 - 1.12.1-4 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.16, ll.15-23).

19.V.3 - 3.14.6-8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.95, ll.15-23). x

19.V.4 - 3.15.8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.98, ll.15-18).

19.V.5 - 3.18.9-10 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.101, ll.24-28).

19.V.6 - 3.26.16 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.118, ll.8-9).

Rubrica 20: De audacia: timore: spe et desperatione et magnanimitate

bellatorum (fol. 130ra - 130rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

20.F.1 - 4.5.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.102, ll.272-276).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

- 20.V.1** - 1.1.7-8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.6, ll.9-11).
20.V.2 - 1.3.5 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.8, ll.17-19).
20.V.3 - 1.20.25 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.25, ll.2-4).
20.V.4 - 3.prol.1 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.65, ll.2-4).
20.V.5 - 3.9.11-14 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.86-87, ll.15-28, 1-2). x
20.V.6 - 3.10.9-10 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.89, ll.19-22).
20.V.7 - 3.10.24 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.91, ll.15-16).
20.V.8 - 3.12.1-3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.93, ll.5-10).
20.V.9 - 3.12.5-7 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.93-94, ll.18-25, 1-2).
20.V.10 - 3.22.2 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.109, ll.12-15).
20.V.11 - 3.25.9-10 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.116, ll.3-5).
20.V.12 - 3.26.14 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.118, ll.5-6).
20.V.13 - 4.25.2-6 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.141, ll.12-19). x
20.V.14 - 4.31.3-4 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.146, ll.2-4).

Rubrica 21: De aduersis occultandis hostibus (fol. 130rb - 130va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

- 21.F.1** - 2.7.5-6 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.59, ll.761-768).
21.F.2 - 2.7.13 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.60, ll.794-797).

Rubrica 22: De exhoratione et incitatione suorum ad bellum (fol. 130va - 130vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

- 22.F.1** - 1.11.2-6 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.24-25, ll.595-623).
22.F.2 - 1.11.21 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.27, ll.679-681).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

- 22.V.1** - 3.9.13-14 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.86, ll.23-28).
22.V.2 - 3.12.3-4 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.93, ll.10-17).

Rubrica 23: De remouendo timore a suo exercitu (fol. 130vb - 131ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

- 23.F.1** - 1.12.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.28, ll.684-687).
23.F.2 - 1.12.7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.28, ll. 704-706).

Rubrica 24: De suis cohercendis ad pugnam (fol. 131ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

24.F.1 - 2.8.11 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.61-62, ll.828-830).

24.F.2 - 2.8.14 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.62, ll.838-842).

Rubrica 25: De suis infidelibus seu criminosis caute emittendis vel puniendis

(fol. 131rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

25.F.1 - 3.16.5 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.88, ll.466-469).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

25.V.1 - 3.4.7-10 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.71-72, ll.26-27, 1-17).

Rubrica 26: De infidelitate suorum eminentium dissimulanda et caute corrigenda (fol. 131va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

26.F.1 - 3.16.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.87-88, ll.434-441).

26.F.2 - 4.7.36 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.112, ll.511-516).

Rubrica 27: De temerario furore suorum eminentium caute mitigandum vel remouendum (fol. 131va-131vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

27.F.1 - 1.8.1-2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.20, ll.481-487).

27.F.2 - 1.8.7-8 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.21, ll.511-522).

27.F.3 - 3.6.7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.77, ll.190-195).

27.F.4 - 3.16.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.88, ll.460-465).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

27.V.1 - 3.10.11-12 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.90, ll.3-4).

Rubrica 28: De cautelis inducendi suspitiones malignas inter hostes (fol. 132ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

28.F.1 - 2.9.3-5 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.63, ll.853-862).

28.F.2 - 3.5.1-2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.75-76, ll.144-153).

28.F.3 - 3.6.5 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.77, ll.179-182).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

28.V.1 - 3.18.11-14 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.101-102, ll.29, 1-9).

Rubrica 29: De cautelis tollendi vel minuendi hostibus animositatem dimicandi (fol. 132va):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

29.F.1 - 2.4.5-9 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.43-44, ll.359-381).

29.F.2 - 2.5.45 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.56, ll.689-692).

29.F.3 - 2.7.14 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.60, ll.798-803).

29.F.4 - 4.7.26 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.111, ll.468-472).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

29.V.1 - 2.14.8-9 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.48, ll.20-23).

29.V.2 - 3.6.17-19 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.76-77, ll.23-26, 1-5).x

29.V.3 - 3.26.15 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.118, ll.7).

Rubrica 30: De cautelis fligendi hostes vano terrore (fol. 132va - 32vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

30.F.1 - 1.3.8 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.9, ll.201-203).

30.F.2 - 1.8.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.20, ll.494-498).

30.F.3 - 3.6.2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.76, ll.165-167).

Rubrica 31: De cautelis inferendi hostibus dantibus veras occasiones recedendi ab oppressione (fol. 132va - 32vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

31.F.1 - 2.4.12 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.44, ll.389-392).

31.F.2 - 2.4.15-17 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.45, ll.396-404).

31.F.3 - 4.7.10-11 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.108, ll.405-407).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

31.V.1 - 3.18.14 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.102, ll.8-9).

Rubrica 32: De turbandis hostibus (fol. 133ra - 133rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

32.F.1 - 2.1.8-9 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.32, ll.62-70).

32.F.2 - 2.2.8 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.35, ll.134-138).

32.F.3 - 2.2.14 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.36, ll.164-173).

32.F.4 - 2.5.25-26 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.50, ll.545-556).

32.F.5 - 2.9.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.62, ll.845-848).

32.F.6 - 3.17.2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.89, ll.475-478).

Rubrica 33: De fatigandis seu inquietandis hostibus ante conflictum (fol. 133vb - 134ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

33.F.1 - 2.1.1-2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.30, ll.22-30).

33.F.2 - 2.1.7-14 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.32-33, ll.59-90).

33.F.3 - 3.17.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.89, ll.481-486).

33.F.4 - 4.7.30 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.111, ll.486-490).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

33.V.1 - 3.11.3 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.92, ll.3-5).

33.V.2 - 3.11.7-9 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.92-93, ll.19-25, 1-2).x

33.V.3 - 3.13.1-3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.94, ll.5-12).

33.V.4 - 3.14.1-2 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.94, ll.21-25).

33.V.5 - 3.19.1 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.102, ll.12-22).

33.V.6 - 3.19.10-11 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.103-104, ll.23-25, 1-2).x

33.V.7 - 3.22.11-13 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.110, ll.17-22).

33.V.8 - 3.26.11 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.118, ll.1).

Rubrica 34: De eligenda commodiori suppetentia incitandi hostes et preliandi

contra eos (fol. 134rb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

34.F.1 - 2.6.3-10 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.57-58, ll.714-741).

34.F.2 - 3.11.2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.83, ll.335-338).

34.F.3 - 4.7.16 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.109, ll.423-424).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

34.V.1 - 3.21.1-6 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.108-109, ll.15-26, 1-7).

34.V.2 - 3.21.6 (M.D. Reeve ed. p109, ll.8).

Rubrica 35: Quod hostes non sunt inducendi ad pugnandum: sed excludendi

(fol. 134vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

35.F.1 - 2.5.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.45, ll.415-417).

35.F.2 - 2.5.7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.47, ll.443-446).

35.F.3 - 2.5.10 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.47, ll.457-461).

35.F.4 - 2.5.15 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.48, ll.482-484).

35.F.5 - 2.5.29 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.51, ll.564-569).

35.F.6 - 2.12.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.67, ll.959-964).

35.F.7 - 3.2.5 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.72, ll.56-58).

35.F.8 - 3.9.7-10 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.80-81, ll.269-284).

35.F.9 - 3.10.6-7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.82, ll.311-327).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

35.V.1 - 3.9.20 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.87-88, ll.26-27, 1-2).

Rubrica 36: De insidiis disponendis contra hostes (fol. 135vb):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

36.F.1 - 1.1.5-6 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.4-5, ll.74-94).

36.F.2 - 1.4.3 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.10, ll.222-224).

36.F.3 - 1.8.5-6 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.20-21, ll.499-510).

36.F.3 - 1.8.12 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.22, ll.536-540).

36.F.4 - 2.5.12 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.47-48, ll.466-472).

- 36.F.5** - 2.5.28 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.51, ll.561-563).
36.F.6 - 2.5.41 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.55, ll.669-673).
36.F.7 - 2.5.46 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.56, ll.693-697).
36.F.8 - 2.12.3 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.67, ll.953-958).
36.F.9 - 3.2.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.71, ll.38-44).
36.F.10 - 3.2.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.71, ll.50-53).
36.F.11 - 3.3.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.73, ll.100-104).
36.F.12 - 1.8.11 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.21, ll.530-535).
36.F.13 - 3.11.1 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.83, ll.328-334).
36.F.14 - 3.17.1-3 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.89, ll.471-480).
36.F.15 - 2.9.10 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.64, ll.885-889).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

- 36.V.1** - 3.3.12 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.70, ll.12-15).

Rubrica 37: De simulationibus habendis ad decipiendum hostes (fol. 135vb-136ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

- 37.F.1** - 1.4.2-3 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.9-10, ll.218-224).
37.F.2 - 1.5.4 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.13, ll.311-313).
37.F.3 - 1.5.8 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.13-14, ll.332-334).

Rubrica 38: De cautelis educendi exercitum de locis periculosus (fol. 135ra):

Frontinus, *Strategemata*,

- 38.F.1** - 1.1.7 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.5, ll.95-99).
38.F.2 - 2.13.2 (R.I. Ireland ed., p.68, ll.969-971).

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

- 38.V.1** - 3.22.3-4 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.109, ll.18-23).

Rubrica 39: De cautelis tute recedendi ab hostibus sine conflictu et diuersis documentis artis bellice (fol. 136ra - 136rb):

Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris*,

39.V.1 - 1.9.1-2 (M.D. Reeve ed. pp.13-14, ll.21-25, 1).

39.V.2 - 2.9.6-7 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.36, ll.8-9).

39.V.3 - 3.5.1 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.72, ll.21-22).

39.V.4 - 3.6.2-3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.74, ll.20-26).

39.V.5 - 3.6.21 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.77 ll. 15-18).

39.V.6 - 3.9.7-8 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.85-86, ll.24-25, 1-4).

39.V.7 - 3.11.3 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.92 ll.3-5).

39.V.8 - 3.26.7 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.117, ll.18-20).

39.V.9 - 3.26.25-26 (M.D. Reeve ed. p.119, ll.4-7).

Bibliography

Armstrong, Lawrin and Julius Kirshner, eds. *The Politics of Law in Late Medieval and Renaissance Italy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011

Alban, J.R., and Allmand C.T., "Spies and Spying in the Fourteenth Century," in *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976.

Bejczy, Istvan. *The Cardinal Virtues in the Middle Ages*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2011.

Cuartero Sancho, Maria Pilar, "Las collecciones de Sententiae en la literature latina del Renacimiento," in *Homenaje al Profesor Antonio Fontan*, ed. Jose Maria Maestre et. al. (Alaniz: Institutio de Estudios Humanisticos, 2002.

Crupi, Elena. "Women and Marriage in Two Late Medieval Florilegia," Masters of Arts Major Research Paper, Wilfrid Laurier University, 2008.

Dube, Georges. *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Fantham, Elaine. *Roman Literary Culture*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Frontinus, Sextus Julius. *The Stratagems, The Aqueducts of Rome*. Charles E. Bennet trans., Mary B. McElwain ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Frontinus, Sextus Julius. *Strategemata*. R.I. Ireland ed. Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1990.

Grendler, Paul F. *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Hooper, Davis. *Marcus Porcius Cato on Agriculture, Marcus Terentius Varro on Agriculture*. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1934.

Hale, J.R. *Machiavelli in Renaissance Italy*. London: English Universities Press, 1961.

Kaufmann, Wanda Ostrowska. *The Anthropology of Wisdom Liturature*. Westport: Bergen and Garvey, 1996.

- King, Margaret L. *The Death of the Child Valerio Marcello*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Kohl, Benjamin G. *Padua under the Carrara, 1318-1405*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Konig, Jason and Whitmarsh, Tim. *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. ed. Harvey C. Mansfield. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Art of War*. ed. Neal Wood. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. 1965.
- Mallet, Michael E., and J.R. Hale. *The Military Organization of a Renaissance State: Venice c. 1400-1617*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern History. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Mankin, David. *Cicero, De Oratore*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Manuwald, Gesine. *Cicero*. London and New York: I.B.Taurus & Co Ltd, 2015.
- Moss, Anne. *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Nighman, Chris. "The *Manipulus Florum*, Johannes Nider's *Formicarius*, and late medieval misogyny in the construction of witches prior to the *Malleus maleficarum*," *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 24 (2014), 171-184.
- Rouse, Richard H. and Mary A. *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus Florum of Thomas of Ireland*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Selected Letters*. E. Fantham (trans.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ullman, B.L. "Classical Authors in Certain Mediaeval Florilegia," *Classical Philology* 27.1 (January, 1932). Accessed at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/265243>

Ullman, B.L. "Hieremias De Montagnone and his Citations from Catullus." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 5, No. 1. (January, 1910). Accessed at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/261889>

Van Nuffelen, Peter. *Rethinking the Gods: Philosophical Readings of Religion in the Post-Hellenic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Vegetius. *Epitome of Military Science*. trans. N.P. Milner. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011.

Vegetius. *Epitoma Rei Militaris*. M.D. Reeve ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.

Watson, George Ronald. *The Roman Soldier*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Accessed at:

https://books.google.ca/books?id=PAmtuOh6K0C&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Weiss, Roberto. *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969.

Wheatly, Chloe. *Epic, Epitome, and the Early Modern Historical Imagination*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2011.

Witt, Ronald G. 'In the Footsteps of the Ancients' *The Origins of Humanism From Lovato to Bruni*. Ed. Heiko A. Oberman et al. vol.71 of *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Witt, Ronald G. "The Origins of Italian Humanism: Padua and Florence." *The Centennial Review*, Vol 34, No. 1 (Winter 1990).

Accessed at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23738952>

Some Online Resources:

Regarding Fiore dei Liberi:

http://wiktenauer.com/wiki/Fior_di_Battaglia_%28MS_Ludwig_XV_13%29

<http://www.getty.edu/art/collection/objects/1443/unknown-fiore-furlan-dei-liberi-da-premariacco-il-fior-di-battaglia-italian-about-1410/>

http://wiktenauer.com/wiki/Page:MS_Ludwig_XV_13_20v.jpg

Machiavelli's History of Florence:

<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/2464/2464-h/2464-h.htm>

Notes and References

¹ Vegetius. *Epitome of Military Science*. trans. N.P. Milner. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011. p 3, 20.V.1

² Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus Florum* was a both famous and contemporary *florilegium* to the *Compendium*. We will compare them later in the paper.

³ <http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/CMN/index.html>

⁴ It is available online here:

https://books.google.ca/books?id=cEA8AAAACAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&hl=en#v=onepage&q&f=false

⁵ *Compendium moralium notabilium* 1505 Venice edition, sig. iii recto a-b, preface "Ita ut litteratus..."

⁶ 12.V.1

⁷ 1.3.12.V.2

⁸ See Appendix 1.

⁹ Anne Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1996. p.35.

¹⁰ Elena Crupi, "Women and Marriage in Two Late Medieval Florilegia," Masters of Arts Major Research Paper, Wilfrid Laurier University, 2008, p.14.

¹¹ Crupi, p.15.

¹² Crupi, p.15.

¹³ Roberto Weiss, *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969, p. 18

¹⁴ Weiss, p.18

¹⁵ Weiss p.18

¹⁶ Crupi, p.12

¹⁷ Crupi, p.13

¹⁸ Ronald G. Witt, 'In the Footsteps of the Ancients' *The Origins of Humanism From Lovato to Bruni*. Ed. Heiko A. Oberman et al. vol.71 of *Studies in Medieval and reformation Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 2000, p.6.

¹⁹ Witt, p.6; Moss, p.11.

²⁰ Crupi, p.13.

²¹ Witt, p.23.

²² Benjamin G. Kohl, *Padua under the Carrara, 1318-1405*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998. p.17.

²³ Paul F. Grendler, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. p.22.

²⁴ For example, there are as yet no known *florilegium* that concern physical crafts like architecture, seamanship, or martial arts; most *florilegia* have theological or philosophical topics.

²⁵ Richard H. and Mary A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus Florum of Thomas of Ireland*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979, p.3.

²⁶ Moss, p.25.

- ²⁷ Davis Hooper, *Marcus Porcius Cato on Agriculture, Marcus Terentius Varro on Agriculture*. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1934, p.xvi.
- ²⁸ Hooper, p.xvi.
- ²⁹ titled *Imagines*
- ³⁰ Hooper, p. xvi.
- ³¹ Elaine Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996, p.52. This is of course not to suggest that Varro's motivations were simple. Fantham suggests that Varro and his work are more than merely antiquaria, and this seems right.
- ³² Fantham, p.52.
- ³³ Peter Van Nuffelen, *Rethinking the Gods: Philosophical Readings of Religion in the Post-Hellenic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, p.36.
- ³⁴ Gesine Manuall, *Cicero*. London and New York: I.B.Taurus & Co Ltd, 2015, p.189.
- ³⁵ David Mankin, *Cicero, De Oratore*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, p.5.
- ³⁶ Istvan Bejczy, *The Cardinal Virtues in the Middle Ages*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2011, p.26.
- ³⁷ Moss, p.7.
- ³⁸ Moss, p.30.
- ³⁹ As we will see shortly, it was far and away the most prolifically read, used, and copied medieval *florilegium*.
- ⁴⁰ Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *Selected letters*. E. Fantham trans. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p.154.
- ⁴¹ Moss, p.12.
- ⁴² Wheatly Chloe. *Epic, Epitome, and the Early Modern Historical Imagination*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2011.
- ⁴³ Jason König and Tim Whitmarsh, *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007, p.29.
- ⁴⁴ Vegetius. *Epitoma Rei Militaris*. M.D. Reeve ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004, p.124, ll.16-20, also see Milner, p.121.
- ⁴⁵ Moss, p.11.
- ⁴⁶ Moss, p.11.
- ⁴⁷ Moss, p.11.
- ⁴⁸ Moss, p.11.
- ⁴⁹ Moss, pp.25, 29, 31, 33.
- ⁵⁰ Moss, p.24.
- ⁵¹ Moss, p.31.
- ⁵² Moss, p.19.
- ⁵³ Moss, p.28.
- ⁵⁴ Moss, p.20.
- ⁵⁵ Rouse and Rouse, p.188
- ⁵⁶ Chris Nighman, "The *Manipulus Florum*, Johannes Nider's *Formicarius*, and Late Medieval Misogyny in the Construction of Witches Prior to the *Malleus maleficarum*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 24, 2014, pp.171-84.
- ⁵⁷ Nighman, p.180.
- ⁵⁸ Nighman, p.184.
- ⁵⁹ Moss, p.40.
- ⁶⁰ Rouse and Rouse, p.4.
- ⁶¹ Rouse and Rouse, p.4.
- ⁶² Rouse and Rouse, p.95.
- ⁶³ *Compendium moralium notabilium* 1505 Venice edition, sig. iii recto a-b, preface: "...furthermore I arranged notable metrical and common proverbs from outside of books wandering in diverse ordinary sayings, fitting this layout."
- ⁶⁴ Moss, p.36.
- ⁶⁵ Crupi, p.10.
- ⁶⁶ Moss, p. 36.
- ⁶⁷ Rouse and Rouse, p.3.
- ⁶⁸ Rouse and Rouse, pp.120-1.
- ⁶⁹ Moss, p. 37.

⁷⁰ Crupi, p.11.

⁷¹ Crupi, p.11.

⁷² Crupi, p.12.

⁷³ See Appendix 1.

⁷⁴ Maria Pilar Cuartero Sancho, “*Las colecciones de Sententiarum en la literatura latina del Renacimiento*,” in *Homenaje al Profesor Antonio Fontan*, J.M. Maestre et. al. (eds.), Institutio de Estudios Humanisticos, 2002, p.1574.

⁷⁵ Crupi, p.12.

⁷⁶ Mistakes; that is - unless he is using a faulty or incomplete copy, of course.

⁷⁷ 13.V.1 and 13.V.2.

⁷⁸ 5.C.1.

⁷⁹ See Appendix 1.

⁸⁰ See Appendix 1.

⁸¹ Reeve, p.5, ll.6-11; see also Milner, pp.1-2.

⁸² Not that later Byzantine military manuals are of less quality - but noting that after the fall of the Western Roman Empire, state structures remain more or less intact in what becomes Byzantium. This includes institutions of scholarship and education - as well as the professional study of the Art of Generalship and the Art of Arms. We ought to expect professional, concise, and effective military manuals from the Byzantine Empire; and indeed we have many examples. A good number of these were even authored by actual military men who had real campaign and fighting experience (i.e. Phocas, and the author of the *Strategikon*). The *Epitome* is consistent with them in breadth of subject and quality - therefore we are forced to admit that Vegetius *Epitome* does seem to be a quality manual as well.

⁸³ Vegetius 3.26 – Milner pp.116-19. ex. 3.V.1, 20.V.1, 12.V.1 - the list goes on.

⁸⁴ 19.V.1 is an incredible oddity; 18.V.1 and 18.V.4 are also oddly specific to be included in the *Compendium*.

⁸⁵ Milner, p.11.

⁸⁶ Milner, p.13.

⁸⁷ As examples, see 6.V.4-5, 18.V.2, 18.V.4, 19.V.3, 39.V.2.

⁸⁸ Milner, p.117.

⁸⁹ Such as 18.V.1-4 and 19.V.1-4.

⁹⁰ Sextus Iulius Frontinus. *Stratagems, Aqueducts of Rome*. Charles E. Bennet, Mary B. McElwain (trans.), Harvard, Harvard University Press, 1925, p.161.

⁹¹ Milner p.137.

⁹² See Appendix 1.

⁹³ As far as we know. It is far more controversial to suggest that he had a military career in addition to his comfortable (and presumably more safe) job as an employed *litteratus*.

⁹⁴ Bennet and McElwain, p.3, preface to Book One.

⁹⁵ Bennet and McElwain, p.3, preface to Book One.

⁹⁶ http://wiktenauer.com/wiki/Fior_di_Battaglia_%28MS_Ludwig_XV_13%29;

<http://www.getty.edu/art/collection/objects/1443/unknown-fiore-furlan-dei-liberi-da-premariacco-il-fior-di-battaglia-italian-about-1410/>

⁹⁷ http://wiktenauer.com/wiki/Page:MS_Ludwig_XV_13_20v.jpg

⁹⁸ Bennet and McElwain, p.3, preface to Book One.

⁹⁹ Among other authors of course – we have already established that Vegetius and Frontinus are main players in 5.2

¹⁰⁰ 3.3.3.V.1 “Who can you find able to teach what he himself has not learned? or 3.3.8.V.1 “For things are taught not only more quickly but even more completely which are learned from boyhood”.

¹⁰¹ Other than 8.F.1 where Montagnone quotes from Frontinus’ preface.

¹⁰² 1.3.12.V.1, 3.1.5.V.1, and 3.3.3.V.1 respectively.

¹⁰³ Moss, p.37, Crupi, p.10.

¹⁰⁴ Both assumed by Moss and Crupi.

¹⁰⁵ Milner, p.78.

¹⁰⁶ Milner, p.79.

¹⁰⁷ 3.2 is titled “How the army’s health controlled”. From his *Digesta Artis Mulomedicinae*, and his frequent use of health metaphors in the *Epitome*, we can suspect that he had a vest interest in the study of medicine.

¹⁰⁸ As we discussed in the *florilegia* section and in the introduction to Montagnone and his *compendium*.

¹⁰⁹ Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. p.13.

¹¹⁰ Duby, p.13. These lines are quoted respectively from Bishop Adalbert of Laon and Bishop Gerard of Cambrai. Both men lived in the 11th century.

¹¹¹ While it is true that Ruggiero makes these observations about medieval sexual boundaries and not social ones, his observations here are not so much a direct comment on medieval sexuality as they are about medieval categories.

¹¹² Guido Ruggiero, *The Boundaries of Eros*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1989, p.4.

¹¹³ Milner, p.86.

¹¹⁴ P. Contamine, *The War Literature of the Late Middle Ages*. War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976. Contamine reveals that Balsac's treatise was written between 1492 and 1502 (p.111), and Stuart's treatise (which was partially based on Balsac's) before his death in 1508 (p.117).

¹¹⁵ Contamine, p.119.

¹¹⁶ Contamine, p.199.

¹¹⁷ 3.V.1, Milner, pp.83-84: "That being so, every expedient must be thought of previously, tried out in advance and implemented before matters come to this final pass. For good generals do not attack in open battle where the danger is mutual, but do it always from a hidden position, so as to kill or at least terrorize the enemy while their own men are unharmed as far as possible...."

¹¹⁸ My brief survey of diplomats and message bearers will not take into account the specific connotations of these offices in the Catholic Church; I will be focusing on secular offices.

¹¹⁹ Donald Queller, *The Office of Ambassador in the Middle Ages*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967, p.3.

¹²⁰ Queller, p.6.

¹²¹ Queller, p.6.

¹²² Queller, p.7.

¹²³ Queller, p.7: "...certain other things concerning our business touching the king of France we place in the mouth of our aforesaid *nuncii* for the purpose of explaining to you..." Chaplais, Treaty Rolls, 1, 18, no. 42.

¹²⁴ Queller, p.7.

¹²⁵ Queller, p.7.

¹²⁶ Queller, p.9: *Commentaria*, ad C. 4, *Si quis alteri vel sibi*, 4, 17.

¹²⁷ Queller, p.61.

¹²⁸ Queller, p.65.

¹²⁹ Queller p.61. Queller characterizes scholarly consensus on this premise this way; however the history of medieval diplomacy is beyond the scope of this paper. I have the sense that it is not so simple – and this is partly why I am choosing to speak in broad terms about these offices.

¹³⁰ Queller, p.26.

¹³¹ Queller, p.83.

¹³² Queller, p.89.

¹³³ Queller, p.90.

¹³⁴ J.R. Alban and C.T. Allmand, "Spies and Spying in the Fourteenth Century", *War, Literature and Politics in the Late Middle Ages*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976, p.74.

¹³⁵ Alban and Allmand, p.74: "English accounting documents.... contain references to payments made to messengers and other persons sent 'in negociis regis secretis'."

¹³⁶ Mezieres c. 1327-1405; Alban and Allmand, p.73.

¹³⁷ Fidenzio de Padua d. 1291, authored the *Liber recuperationis Terre Sancte*; Alban and Allmand, p.73.

¹³⁸ Alban and Allmand, p.79.

¹³⁹ Not that Europeans did not practice espionage before the crusades; Friossart and Geoffrey le Baker often recount how "many military decisions had been based on information obtained by persons who were, quite evidently, spies": Alban and Allmand, p.74.

¹⁴⁰ b.1447- d.1511.

¹⁴¹ Alban and Allmand, p.78.

¹⁴² Alban and Allmand, p.79.

¹⁴³ J.R. Hale, *Machiavelli in Renaissance Italy*, London, English Universities Press, 1961, p.47.

¹⁴⁴ Alban and Allmand, p.76.

¹⁴⁵ Hale, p.52.

¹⁴⁶ Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, H.C. Mansfield (ed.). Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1998, p.29.

¹⁴⁷ Hale, p.38.

- ¹⁴⁸ Hale, p.40.
- ¹⁴⁹ Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Art of War*, N. Wood (ed.), New York, Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1965, p.xv.
- ¹⁵⁰ Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The History of Florence*. Available at the Gutenberg project: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/2464/2464-h/2464-h.htm>.
- ¹⁵¹ Machiavelli, *The Art of War*, p.21.
- ¹⁵² Machiavelli, *The Art of War*, p.xv; he was unjustly accused of participating in a criminal conspiracy against the Medici in early 1513.
- ¹⁵³ Machiavelli, *The Art of War*, p.xviii.
- ¹⁵⁴ Machiavelli, *The Art of War*, p.xix.
- ¹⁵⁵ Machiavelli, *The Art of War*, p.xx.
- ¹⁵⁶ All of which he was involved in during his career.
- ¹⁵⁷ Margaret L. King, *The Death of the Child Valerio Marcello*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994, p.117.
- ¹⁵⁸ King, p.80.
- ¹⁵⁹ King, p.80.
- ¹⁶⁰ King, p.74.
- ¹⁶¹ King, pp.76, 81.
- ¹⁶² King, p.80.
- ¹⁶³ King, pp.111-12.
- ¹⁶⁴ As evidenced from the nature of the panegyrics.
- ¹⁶⁵ Again, Montagnone says as much in his Preface.
- ¹⁶⁶ 18.V.1-6, 19.V.1-5, as well as many quotations from the *Strategemata*.
- ¹⁶⁷ Milner, p.99.
- ¹⁶⁸ A full 28 lines in Reeve, 18.V.4.
- ¹⁶⁹ A full 59 lines in Reeve, 18.V.2.
- ¹⁷⁰ Milner, p.11.
- ¹⁷¹ Milner, p.13.
- ¹⁷² See chapter 7 of George Silver's *Paradoxes of Defense* (an english fencing treatise), published 1599: "Of striking and thrusting both together".
- ¹⁷³ Roughly: Tempo - the pace of the fight, the duration of one's actions. Measure - How one disposes himself towards the enemy, including the distance they attempt to keep and the positions of their weapons. Commitment - The degree of certainty which one has given an action is directly proportionate to one's ability to alter or change that action while it is being performed. Fighting actions must often be abandoned to respond to the actions of an enemy.
- ¹⁷⁴ In fact, Vegetius is suggesting specific technique. To cut so that one's hand remains covered by one's shield is a difficult technique to learn - however it is also a principle of fencing that we see survive into the Middle Ages. The earliest extant martial manuscript in Europe (Royal Armouries Ms. I.33) is a sword and buckler manuscript founded on this principle.
- ¹⁷⁵ Which is curious, as he places them in Rubric 3 and not Rubric 7, 8, or 20... all of which seem to be more appropriate rubrics regarding subjects of discipline or its effects.
- ¹⁷⁶ Bennet and McElwain, p.189.
- ¹⁷⁷ Bennet and McElwain, p.189.
- ¹⁷⁸ Bennet and McElwain pp.125-6; 35.F.6.
- ¹⁷⁹ Bennet and McElwain pp.90-1; 36.F.5.
- ¹⁸⁰ Moss, p.37: "a means of escaping the trials and temptations of the present age...a work of religious meditation, whose main function is to demonstrate that the words of Christian authors and pagan authors agree in the truth of the Holy Spirit" - Trecius' preface to the 1505 printing of the *Compendium*.
- ¹⁸¹ Milner, p.59.
- ¹⁸² Such as Seneca and Quintillian, available here <http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/CMN/page3.html>.
- ¹⁸³ Seneca, *Selected Letters*, p.154.
- ¹⁸⁴ Montagnone has no shortage of commentary on the utility of practice and preparation. See 5.V.3, 7.V.1, 7.V.6, 8.V.4, 20.V.1 - not to mention 1.3.12.V.1-2 and 3.1.5.V.2. There are many more, not the least of which is 12.V.1: "Qui desiderat pacem praeparet bellum."
- ¹⁸⁵ Indeed, we still do. It is a hot topic among Western Martial Artists.
- ¹⁸⁶ Moss, p.37.

¹⁸⁷ 11.V.2.

¹⁸⁸ Milner pp.116, 118. (M.D. Reeve ed., p.117, ll.15-16), (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.13-14), (M.D. Reeve ed., p.119, ll.15-17) respectively.

¹⁸⁹ 1.3.6.V.1, 1.3.12.V.1-2, 3.1.5.V.1-2, 3.3.3.V.1, 3.3.8.V.1, 3.4.6.V.1-3, 4.1.4.V.1, 5.1.10.V.1, 5.3.5.V.1, 5.V.3, 7.V.2-7, 7.V.10, 8.V.1-4, 9.V.1-2, 10.V.1-3, 14.V.1, 20.V.7.

¹⁹⁰ Milner pp.18, 59.

¹⁹¹ Again: 18.V.1-6, 19.V.1-5, as well as many selections from the *Strategemata*.

¹⁹² Bennet and McElwain p.3; 9.F.1.

¹⁹³ Ruth Mazo Karas, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003, p.1.

¹⁹⁴ Milner, p.86; 11.V.2.