Tools, Techniques, and Terminology: Perspectives on Spanish Influence on Filipino Martial Arts

Tim Rivera

Introduction

Due to the Philippines being a Spanish colony for three centuries, there is much speculation on the possible influence of Spanish fencing on the Filipino martial arts. Assertions range from one extreme (completely independent arts) to the other (Filipino martial arts were derived entirely from Spanish fencing), though most fall between the two, positing various degrees of influence.

The study of Spanish fencing and Filipino martial arts presents an interesting dichotomy: the Spanish methods are well-documented in treatises dating back to at least the 16th century, but the practice of it died out, and no living tradition remains; conversely, there are no known treatises of the Filipino methods written before the middle of the 20th century, though its practice is alive and well. This makes comparing and contrasting the two difficult, as the time periods covered by their technical descriptions are not contemporary.

Another difficulty in making generalizations is the breadth and variety of methods that fall within each classification. Spanish fencing (or more accurately, Iberian fencing, as the tradition includes the Portuguese as well) underwent a lot of change over the centuries, as well as spreading to the Americas and Asia. Filipino martial arts encompass many distinct, but related styles from different

ethnic groups in Luzon and the Visayas. Additionally, modern Filipino martial arts encourage innovation, leading to a proliferation of varieties of systems and styles.

These difficulties mean that it's not possible to know for certain what technical influence there was on the development of Filipino martial arts, and that assertions of influence need to be made in the context of specific styles or groups of related arts. However, examining the historical evolution of Spanish fencing along with the modern forms of Filipino martial arts can give insight into possible relationships between the two. Searching for potential avenues of influence requires an understanding of the forms that influence can take, and how it might manifest.

Types of Influence

When speaking about influence, it's important to differentiate between direct, technical influence from one art to another, and the effect of indirect, cultural influence. Direct influence would consist of a change in the techniques of one art as a result of coming into contact with another. It may involve the wholesale adoption of the weapons of the other art, or simply a change in existing weapon morphology to facilitate the use of appropriated techniques. These changes may come with terminology from the other art attached, but not necessarily. Direct influence could also be found in an art adapting its weapons or techniques in order to counter another art with which it comes into conflict.

Indirect influence comes by way of one culture interacting with another; those cultural changes can affect the development of an art without its practitioners learning the other art or struggling to overcome it. This could take the form of changes to the weapons used by the art, if such changes don't affect how the weapon is used. Aesthetic modifications, as well as new methods of forging or constructing, can be adopted without altering its method of use.

Cultural mores also have a profound effect on techniques, indicating what actions are considered brave or cowardly, what is proper or unseemly conduct, or even class-based restrictions on behavior. When these change due to contact with ideas from another culture, it can alter the development of their martial arts. For instance, a culture with a taboo against blade-to-blade contact may emphasize evasion or the use of shields; that taboo might fade away after contact with a culture that emphasizes blade contact in arts, which would open up new avenues of development without directly studying the martial arts of the other culture.

Language and pedagogy are other areas of cultural influence that can have an effect on the form a martial art takes. Much of the terminology of Filipino martial arts is derived from Spanish, which has frequently been used to justify the belief that Filipino martial arts themselves are derived from Spanish fencing, at least in part. This illustrates the importance of the distinction between the different types of influence; the presence of indirect influence through borrowed language does not necessitate or imply direct influence via the adoption of techniques. For example, one of the most well-known dishes in Filipino cuisine is *adobo*, which consists of some type of meat marinated or braised in vinegar and garlic, along with soy sauce or salt, and other spices. The word *adobo* is Spanish, referring to a marinade of vinegar, garlic, salt, and other spices; this name was also given to the native cooking method they encountered. It would be incorrect to assert that Filipino *adobo* derives from or is influenced by Spanish *adobo* simply because the Filipinos adopted the Spanish name for it.

Pitfalls

There are many other logical pitfalls that have to be avoided while analyzing possible relationships between these arts. The most common is a phenomenon known as confirmation bias, which involves seeking out data that supports a prior belief, interpreting new data in favor of the belief,

and ignoring or dismissing data that contradicts it. The best way to counter this is to not have a predetermined answer to the question of Spanish influence on Filipino martial arts, or more realistically, a fluid and nuanced perspective on the subject.

Another issue is the dismissal of the possibility of convergent evolution for similarities that occur between the two arts. Although the Philippines was a Spanish colony for three centuries, it also had thousands of years of history before the Spanish arrived. Swords were already in use there, which means that fundamental similarities common to most sword-based martial arts are almost certainly a product of convergent evolution, rather than Spanish influence. Even unconventional techniques common to the two arts do not necessarily show influence; the Philippines has had contact with nearly all of east Asia, including Mongolia, Japan, China, Vietnam, Thailand, Brunei, Malaysia, Indonesia, and India. If the techniques are also found in the martial arts of their neighbors or other cultures they were in contact with, then it cannot be assumed that Spain was the source.

It's also tempting to look to the martial arts from the cultures of the Philippines that were not influenced much (if at all) by Spain, such as the Moros of Mindanao, or various indigenous groups, to get an idea of what precolonial Filipino martial arts looked like. One problem with this approach is that it presumes that the arts and culture of the Philippines was homogeneous across the islands, and that distinctiveness of the people of the Visayas and the lowlands of Luzon is due to Spanish influence, rather than Spanish influence falling along existing cultural divisions. Another problem is that the arts of the indigenous and Moro people have not existed in a time capsule for the past four centuries – they have changed and evolved over time with the needs of the cultures that continue their practice.

Another common assumption regarding Spanish fencing influence is that Spanish military training involved training in swordsmanship, thus any Filipino who was recruited or trained in warfare by the Spanish learned fencing. This is an incorrect assumption for many reasons. For regular troops, the sword was a sidearm, and not a primary weapon. Even then, the individual weapon-fighting skill of a soldier was not nearly as important as discipline, morale, unit cohesion, maneuvers, and

communication. Fencing (along with most martial arts) more properly fits in the contexts of dueling or self-defense, where the practitioner is fighting alone, rather than as part of a unit. There are no references to compulsory sword training for soldiers until the mid-19th century; there are, however, instances of fencing treatise authors lamenting the lack of sword training in the military.

The sole Spanish military treatise published in the Philippines is from the mid-19th century and concerns the training of a regiment of lancers in Luzon.[1] Only 60 days of the nearly year-long training of recruits is spent on weapons; half of that is on firearms, and the remaining 30 is split between lance and sabre. Only the most rudimentary sabre handling is taught: two lessons on drawing and presenting it formally, and three lessons on cuts, thrusts, and parries in formation.

Possible Sources

There are several possible avenues by which Spanish fencing could have been introduced to the native Filipinos (those born in the Philippines, whether indigenous, from Spanish or other origins, or mixed), and in turn influenced the development of their martial arts, directly or indirectly. Despite sword training not being required in the military for the vast majority of the Spanish colonial period, many soldiers took it upon themselves to learn fencing, especially irregular troops. It was typical for Spain to employ native conscripts in their military; this was especially true in the Philippines, being halfway around the world, under the direction of the viceroyalty of New Spain. So while native Filipinos serving in the Spanish military weren't required to learn fencing, they may have encountered the opportunity.

Affluent or well-connected Filipinos may also have had the opportunity to study with a fencing master in the Philippines. The instruction of Spanish fencing was controlled by central authorities since at least the 15th century. Each crown or viceroyalty in the Spanish empire had its senior master

1 *Prontuario para el Regimiento de Caballeria* (Manila: Imp. a cargo de Anselmo Mateo, 1855).

(*maestro mayor*) who was the ultimate authority under which masters were certified and given license to teach. While we have no records of Spanish fencing masters teaching in the Philippines, there is a record of one master in 1730 (Domingo Pérez de Aguilar) being examined and granted the authority of being the lieutenant senior master (*teniente de maestro mayor*) in Manila, under the senior master of New Spain in Mexico City.[2] Aguilar was a resident of Mexico City, but a native of Manila, and it is unknown whether he took advantage of his position to teach or establish masters in the Philippines. In the next century, a fencing treatise was published in Mexico by a Filipino named Román Punzalán Zapata.[3] He was known to teach in Mexico, but it is unknown if he ever returned to the Philippines and taught there.

Another route for civilian Filipinos to encounter Spanish fencing is by receiving instruction from Catholic clergy. The friars and priests saw it as their role to care for and educate the Filipinos, indoctrinating them into Spanish culture and religion. Many clergy were known to study the art of fencing, so it is possible that any clergy so inclined would be eager to share the art with Filipinos who show interest.

A notable example of this scenario involves the introduction of a performance commonly known in the Philippines as *moro-moro*. This was a form of the *moros y cristianos* festivals that celebrate the *reconquista* of the Iberian peninsula. These feature stylized combat between Christian and Muslim groups, and can still be found in some former Spanish colonies. It was introduced to the Philippines in the early 17th century, taking the form of a stand-alone performance, or as part of a play. Oral history from many branches of the Filipino martial arts connects them to the practice of *moro-moro*, either as a method to continue the practice of their native arts in a way approved by the Spanish, or as a path for the assimilation of Spanish fencing.

The *moro-moro* is said to have been introduced to the Philippines by Mexican friars via the Manila Galleon trade route from Acapulco. In many parts of Mexico, the *moros y cristianos*

2 Matt Galas, "Master Certificate of Domingo Pérez de Aguilar," Monumenta Historica Dimicatoria, no. 1 (2013).
3 Román Punzalán Zapata, *Prontuario de Esgrima* (Méjico, Imp. de Galván, 1833).

performances are known as *danza de los doce pares de francia* (dance of the twelve peers of France), named after the legendary 12 paladins of Charlemagne. There are several styles of Filipino martial arts named *doce pares*, with at least one directly connected to the practice of *moro-moro*.[4]

Analyzing any potential technical connections between Spanish fencing and Filipino martial arts requires an understanding of their typical characteristics. One approach to gaining this understanding is to compare and contrast three essential elements of weapon-based fighting arts: tools, techniques, and terminology. The tools are the weapons or implements that the art was created or evolved to use – in this case, the sword and its companion arms. The techniques of an art are shaped by the morphology of the tools, in addition to any cultural or tactical considerations. Finally, the terminology is the language used to describe both the tools and techniques of an art, in order to effectively communicate between practitioners.

4 For more detail on the origins of *moro-moro* and Filipino martial arts called *doce pares*, cf. Andrea Rollo, "Moro-Moro: The Missing Piece in the Filipino Martial Arts History," Doctoral Thesis (Universitat d'Alicant, 2025).

Tools of Spanish Fencing

While Spanish fencing includes a variety of weapons, the single-handed sword (*espada*) has been at the heart of these arts since at least the 16th century. A typical sword from the late 15th century has a blade around 75 - 90 cm (29.5 - 35.5 in) long, and 4 cm (1.5 in) wide, with a rhomboid or lenticular cross-section. The hilt consists of a straight cross (sometimes curved), full-length tang, wooden handle (sometimes metal or wire-wrapped), with a metal pommel. Commonly, the top of the cross will be joined to a pair of rings on either side of the blade; these rings provide protection when wrapping the index finger of the sword hand over the cross for better control. Blunted training swords were used, known as *espada negra* (black sword).

Over the centuries, the sword blade lengthened and narrowed, reaching 105 cm (41 in) or more in length, as little as 1.8 cm (0.7 in) in width, and quite flexible. The hand protection evolved a great deal over that time, with the addition of posts or rings perpendicular to the flat of the blade, and knuckle guards curving down from the cross to the pommel. These became more numerous and elaborate, with multiple rings and loops that would sweep from the top of the hilt and join the knuckle guard near the pommel. Solid metal shells were added to the guard as well, eventually becoming large enough to replace the rings and loops. Around the same time, the iconic Spanish cup hilt was also developed. This consisted of a hemispherical metal dish which entirely enclosed the rings in front of the cross. The arms of the cross were lengthened to extend well past the cup.

The sword had many companion arms, including the buckler (*broquel*), round shield (*rodela*), and cloak (*capa*), but the most notable is the dagger (*daga*). A typical dagger has a straight blade with two edges, usually around 2 cm (0.8 in) wide, and a length ranging from 24 - 55 cm (9.5 – 21.5 in), with the longer blades found in the later centuries. The form of the hilt generally followed that of swords, though simpler, eventually developing a unique style known as a sail hilt. The sail is a

triangular-shaped hand guard which is wide where it joins the cross, curving out and narrowing almost to a point as it reaches the pommel.

The usage of the sword began to die off in the 18th century, following the introduction of the popular French small sword, known in Spanish as *espadín*. Small swords became widespread in Spain in the 18th century with the ascendance of the house of Bourbon to the throne. Many of them were imported directly from France. The blades of these swords are both shorter and more narrow than the typical sword blades in Spain at the time, and the guards on the hilts tend to be much smaller. The practice version of the small sword is known as the *florete*, although that name was also sometimes used for lighter, smaller versions of the small sword that were effectively unable to cut.

Although the small sword doesn't have a specific size, the typical blade had a length between 75 and 85 cm (29.5 – 33.5 in) and a width of 1 - 2.2 cm (0.4 - 0.9 in), with later swords usually having narrower blades than earlier ones. The hilts tend to be much simpler than those from previous centuries; some have a guard that consists only of a small cross, others have a small, round disc which is slightly dished, and others have two slightly dished oval lobes that are joined around the blade. The hilt may also incorporate a knuckle guard, although it is generally less rounded than swords of previous centuries, following the line of the grip more closely.

The sabre (*sable*) was introduced in the 18th century (along with the small sword), where it caught on with the military, becoming standard with many units in the following century. Although curved swords have been in the Iberian peninsula since before the 15th century, they were referred to as *alfanje* or *cimitarra* and always regarded as foreign, never associated with Spanish swordsmanship.

Typical sabre blade length ranges from 70 - 90 cm (27.5 - 35.5 in) and width from 2 - 3.7 cm (0.8 - 1.5 in), with varying degrees of curvature, although the blades tended to narrow as time passed. Usually, the guard consists of a slightly dished metal cup that narrows into a knuckle guard which connects directly to a cap at the bottom of the grip; the sabre differs from the sword in that it doesn't have a pommel separate from the grip. Some guards mimic the style of older sword guards with

multiple loops that branch out of the top of the hilt and curve down to merge with the knuckle guard. Some have a simple cross which turns into a knuckle guard, and a few have no knuckle guard at all. The bottom of a sabre hilt usually curves slightly forward toward the edge; this curve tends to be exaggerated when the knuckle guard is absent. Blunted practice sabres were used for training, though some practitioners would use sticks instead. Others believed that sticks were not a good substitute, as they lacked the curve of the sabre.

Tools of Filipino Martial Arts

Filipino martial arts also encompass a variety of weapons, but for our purpose, the focus will be on the sword (and the stick, which was a surrogate for the sword since at least the early 17th century).[5] The most commonly-known swords of the Philippines (*kris*, *barung*, *kampilan*) traditionally belong to the Moros of Mindanao, whose arts are distinct enough to be categorized separately from the arts of Luzon and Visayas that are referred to as Filipino martial arts.

There is a wide variety in the forms and names of swords in the Philippines that are used in the areas where Filipino martial arts are practiced. Any particular blade may have different names in different areas, or even multiple names in the same area. The terms *sundang* and *bolo* are widely used to refer to a sword of any type, although sometimes the word *espada* is used as well. The less common but older term *kalis* has also come into recent use. Some local names are general, others refer to the shape of the blade or the hilt. The following is a small sampling of the more common local names of different swords: *dahon palay, ginunting, golok*, *itak*, *pinuti*, *sanduko*, *tabak, talibong*, *tenegre.*

A typical Filipino sword has a single-edged blade with a length between 45 and 65 cm (18 - 25 in) and a width varying from 3 - 4.5 cm (1.2 - 1.8 in). Usually, the spine has a thickness of around 4 - 10 mm (0.16 – 0.4 in) at the hilt and narrows gradually narrows toward the tip. Many have a pronounced false edge that results from a sudden narrowing of the spine, creating bevels on the back edge near the tip; occasionally, the false edge near the tip is sharpened. Double-edged blades exist, but are rare. Depending on region, edge geometries are usually semi-lenticular in cross section, also known as a convex grind, or beveled on only one side, also known as a chisel grind.

There is an immense variety of blade profiles, even within the same region; straight edges exist, but most have a curve, especially at the end. Some will even recurve, with a slight concave bend near the hilt, turning into a larger convex curve approaching the tip. A few blades even maintain a concave

5 Pedro de San Buena Ventura, *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala* (Pila, Laguna, 1613).

shape for the entire length of the edge. The wavy-bladed style commonly associated with the *kris* can also be found in the central and northern islands. The spines of single-edged blades have the same variety in shape. Some are straight from hilt to tip or follow the curves of the edge to maintain a uniform blade width until nearing the point. Others will deviate to provide a wide belly for cutting, narrowing at the hilt (sometimes to an extreme), either by making a less extreme curve, or even being convex and giving the blade a leaf shape. The styles of points are just as diverse, with some blades gradually narrowing and others ending more abruptly. Straight-back points, clip points, drop points, spear points, trailing points, sheepsfoot points, and talon points of various degrees can be found, as well as other, less-common designs.

Hand guards take a few different forms, if present at all. Sometimes it's a small disk, a rectangular block with short quillons, a wide rear quillon angling toward the point with a forward quillon angling toward the pommel or forming a partial or full knuckle guard (often called an S-guard or D-guard, depending on the length of the knuckle guard and whether it connects to the bottom of the hilt). Many swords that lack a guard have a protrusion at the base of the blade on the same side as the edge, which serves as a stop for anything sliding down the blade (or a hand sliding up from the hilt). It can be more squared off to catch, or curved to serve as a ramp away from the grip.

Hilts are commonly made of wood or buffalo horn, without a pommel, but frequently widening or curving at the end. They are usually offset from the line of the blade, angling toward the edge to various degrees (sometimes up to 30 degrees or more), giving the blade a forward cant when held. Depending on region, the hilts are attached with a blind tang, or a full-length tangs that is peened over a metal plate or cap at the end of a hilt. Some hilts have carved finger grooves, but many are carved into various designs at the end, past the grip. Depending on the region and ethnic group, these carvings range from simple shapes such as knobs or horse hooves, to human heads or fists, to the head of a deity or monster.

Filipino sword blades are short and wide relative to Spanish sword blades; being single-edged, they would typically be classified as *machetes* rather than swords, or at best, *terciados* (swords with blades that are one-third shorter than expected sword blade length). Though some have similar styles of hand protection to the simpler forms of Spanish hilts, possibly influenced by Spanish sword design, Filipino swords didn't develop the comprehensive hand protection that the Spanish swords did. The offset hilt design gives the same benefit that the Spanish found by wrapping one or two fingers over the cross, so more hand protection beyond the hilt is unnecessary. There are several possible reasons, both practical and cultural, why Filipino swords would maintain only minimal hand protection in their swords after being exposed to the style of elaborate hand protection of Spanish swords, but for our purposes, it's only important to note that it did not occur, nor did Spanish swords replace Filipino swords.

Spanish Techniques

To understand Spanish fencing as a whole, it's helpful to think of three broad categories: the older traditional style of *esgrima*, the newer mathematical-based style calling itself *la verdadera destreza* (the true skill), and the later foreign-influenced style of *esgrima* that came along with the small sword and sabre. There was significant overlap between these categories, and diversity within them, but they represent the major influences that shaped the development of fencing in Spain.

The usual posture of traditional Spanish fencing is upright, with the feet placed a normal walking pace apart. Typically, the sword is kept with the point at the opponent, but a common tactic is to point the sword away in order to invite the opponent to attack the opening, so that the attack can be countered. Footwork against a single opponent involves a natural walking step, or shuffling with the right foot always in front of the left. Against multiple opponents, pivoting footwork is used with widely-arcing cuts.

The old school of fencing is based on learning guidelines called rules, such as how to draw, how to step, how to cut, or how to cut against many opponents in a wide street. Rules typically involve a prescribed pattern of stepping, cutting, and thrusting, though some are more basic. The two most fundamental rules are that an attack on the outside (the right side of a right-handed swordsman) is to be defended with the fingernails of the sword hand turned down; conversely, an attack on the inside is to be defended with the fingernails up. These postures of nails-down and nails-up are a defining characteristic of old-style methods of swordplay; all thrusts are given either nails-down or nails-up.

Thrusts are also used to counter an opponent's attack by following these rules; the opponent's thrust is forced off the line of attack by the counter thrust sliding down its edge. A cut is countered either during the lifting of the sword to prepare the cut, or by catching the cut in the strong part of the blade and quillons while delivering the thrust. Attacks are also avoided by stepping back or to the side,

or ducking, while thrusting or cutting to an opening, including the arm. Thrusts are also parried with the empty hand or sword; one common defense involves deflecting a thrust with the blade by lifting the sword hilt quickly, which allows for a strong downward cut to follow.

Controlling the opponent's sword with the strong or middle of the blade is the primary means of attacking and counterattacking safely, either by moving it off the center line directly or in a downward circular motion. A more cautious method is to press the weak of the blade (the third closest to the point) against the weak of the opponent's blade to feel their reaction and attack into the opening they present.

The common companion arms to the sword are the round shield, buckler (a small, hand-held shield), dagger, and cloak. The use of the sword remains largely unchanged by the addition of these arms, although attacks tend to be more commonly given to the lower part of the body than against the sword alone. The dagger is used defensively, parrying or trapping the opponent's sword while countering with the sword. Although the dagger is also used to wound if the opponent does not have their own dagger.

The Spanish method of using a sword in each hand goes back to the 15th century,[6] taught in contextual rules, based on the environment (narrow or wide street, or intersection), distribution of the opponents (opponents on one side, in front and back, or surrounded), or specific goals (guarding a lady, separating a fight). These rules are given as a sequence of steps, cuts, and thrusts, frequently involving turns and changes in direction. The use of the two-handed sword is also taught in this manner.

The newer school of fencing calling itself the true *destreza* began in the late 16th century and gradually replaced the older tradition, though many hybrid styles developed. This true *destreza* was based on classical Greek philosophy and geometry, trying to approach swordplay scientifically, rather than by following the rules of traditional fencing. The posture is upright, with the right foot in front of the left at a distance of only one foot. The arm is held fully extended at shoulder level, with the sword

6 Luis Pacheco de Narváez, *Nueva Ciencia* (Madrid: Melchor Sanchez, 1672), 499.

pointed at the opponent, so that the sword and the arm make a horizontal line. This right-angle posture is favored as it is shown to reach farther than other angles.

The preferred sword-hand position is fingernails inside (to the left), in which the sword is held with the edges facing up and down. This position allows for the most force to be applied by the sword in a downward direction, which is favored because it is viewed as the natural motion for the sword. For the same reason, only cuts with a downward motion, to the head or face, are used in this method. Sword actions are analyzed and countered by breaking them down into three opposing pairs of movements, rather than by technique. Footwork is described geometrically, in reference to a common circle that touches the front foot of each fencer. Steps are not just given along the circumference, but also inside the circle on various degrees (commonly 45) from the diameter, and outside the circle on the tangent line, directly away, or backward and to the side. All steps are done by moving both feet, so that the feet do not remain disproportionately spaced.

Much emphasis is placed on being safe by either being offline and behind one's sword in right angle, or gaining control over the opponent's sword with linear or circular blade actions. One of the most praised outcomes is being able to gain control over the opponent's sword with the left hand, which is the only time the left foot is permitted to pass ahead of the right. This allows a fight to end without killing, as the method is deeply rooted in the Catholic faith in which taking a life should be avoided if possible. The sword alone against a single opponent is the basis on which the principles of the system were founded, so the dagger, buckler, shield, and cloak were usually relegated to a passive role. The principles were meant to be universal, so some authors dealt with the use of different weapons, such as the dagger alone against the sword, the use of the two-handed sword, and even a two-handed flail.

Although there were many variations and evolutions over the years, lighter and faster blades, as well as facing new styles out of southern Italy in the late 17th century, forced innovations that involved fencing without blade contact, and even a slightly wider, unevenly-weighted stance. French and Italian

styles of fencing began to gain popularity in Spain in the 18th century along with the use of small swords and sabres. Hybrids of Spanish and foreign methods quickly developed, but by the late 19th century, all that remained of *destreza* was some appropriated technical terminology. The old-style sword continued in use, though with a shorter blade closer to that of the sabre. The newer swords and their variations were not always well-received; some treated them the same, others taught only thrusting with the sword or *florete* and only cutting with the sabre, and some thought the *florete* was useful only in a fencing school.

The typical position of these new styles is with two to two-and-a-half feet of distance between the feet, the feet on a line to the opponent, with the right foot in front pointed forward, and the left at 90 degrees. The torso is upright and profiled, with the legs bent and weight centered, sword arm forward with the sword pointed forward and the left arm is held behind. For small sword and *florete*, the weapon hand is usually positioned fingernails-inside (left) or nails-up, with the left hand behind the head above the shoulder or elbow. For sabre, the weapon hand is usually positioned nails-inside or nails-down, with the left hand behind the lower back or on the left hip.

The primary footwork is linear, stepping forward or backward, maintaining the same position and distance between the feet. Lateral steps are rare. Attacking with a lunge is common, in which the left foot stays planted and the right moves forward, accompanied by the body weight shifting over the right foot and the left arm extending backward. During a defensive action, the right foot is sometimes momentarily brought backward, close to the left, or passing slightly behind with only the ball of the foot touching the ground. Less extreme changes of distance are also done by simply shifting the weight forward or back by extending the opposite leg.

These foot positions are usually referred to as first, second, etc., which follows the tendency to number everything, including sword position, thrusts, cuts, and parries. There is no consistent method of numbering. The number of different guards range from two to eight; some follow the French method of numbering, some use a portion of it, and some explicitly reject it and create their own. For

some, the numbering of guards also equates to the numbering of the thrusts, or the numbering of the parries. For others, the numbering of parries equates to the numbering of thrusts or cuts. Still others have no correlation at all.

Most thrusts are delivered either nails-up or nails-down. Styles of small sword and *florete* have from six to nine or more different thrusts that depend on target or relative position of the opponent's sword. Sabre styles tend to have only one to three, differentiated by hand position, and make use of a thrust in the nails-outside (edge and elbow upward) hand position. While *floretes* couldn't cut, sword and sabre systems typically had between five and ten numbered cuts, with numbered parries to match. With few exceptions, forehand cuts are given odd numbers, and backhand cuts are given even numbers. Two cutting patterns are most common; one begins with descending diagonal cuts, then ascending diagonal, then horizontal (and possibly a vertical cut at the end). The other starts with the vertical cuts, then descending diagonal, then horizontal, and finally ascending diagonal cuts. There were also other cutting methods with the sabre that were not numbered, such as the full-circle cut with the wrist called *molinete*, or the upward back-edge cut to the forearm called *contrafilo*.

Blade contact is important; attacking while maintaining contact with the opponent's sword is known as opposition. Thrusts are often delivered in a circular manner by pressing the blade on the opponent's blade to control it momentarily, or beating it away. Avoiding blade contact is sometimes preferable, which can be accomplished through feinting attacks or stomping the lead foot to draw a reaction from the opponent. Disarms or grabbing the opponent's sword hand is taught, but opinions are divided – some find it useful, but others think it should only be taught so one can learn to punish any attempts to do so.

The sword and dagger combination was also used by some in the new style, either keeping the dagger in front to guard the body, or behind the head with the point up. Either way, the dagger arm was still thrown backward during the lunge. The dagger was used to parry thrusts, but also to wound with a thrust or cut when the sword could be used to defend and the opponent was sufficiently close. The

dagger was also used as a primary weapon against a sword on occasion, and could also be accompanied by whatever implement was handy, which could be a cloak, a hat, or even a lantern.

For sabre, some believed it was best to fence with sticks or wooden swords of proper weight, with leather or steel guards. Others believed it should always be with real sabres, either because sticks or wooden sabres are too light or lack the proper curvature, or because the student won't learn to find the edge or get accustomed to feeling steel on steel. Sometimes stick fencing is done for its own sake, and is very similar to sabre fencing, but the front leg is withdrawn while defending, and attacks are made on the lunge. It's also frequently used by gripping both ends of the stick (thumbs facing each other), held near the thigh. Parries are made by lifting the stick, and all strikes are forehand, done with either hand, though thrusts are done with two hands.

Filipino Techniques

There are a diverse array of arts that fall under the category of Filipino martial arts; this analysis will confine itself to those that are typically called *arnis*, *eskrima*, or *kali*, which are those that are commonly speculated to have a relationship with Spanish fencing. While some styles focus only on one particular weapon, others use a variety of weapons (sticks, swords, knives, two-handed sticks, spears/staves, and more, or even empty hands) with the philosophy that the skill of using one weapon translates to others. The most common primary training tool is a stick, usually made of rattan, with a length of 70 cm (28 in), held in one hand. Some styles use a much shorter or longer stick, carved wooden sword simulators, or blunt metal swords. Not every style that trains with a stick treats it as a surrogate sword; many train with a stick and treat it as such.

Strikes with the weapon are usually numbered, but sometimes they are named or have no identifiers. The numbering systems vary wildly, with 5 and 12 being the most common number of strikes, which includes both cuts and thrusts. Regardless of the nomenclature, the use of cuts vastly outweighs the use of thrusts. Thrusts can be delivered straight or in a hooking motion. Sometimes the spine or flat of the blade, or the equivalent side of the stick, is also used to strike the opponent or their weapon. Using the butt of the weapon to strike is common as well.

There are no common postures across the various styles; some stand upright with the feet fairly narrowly spaced, others keep the legs slightly bent with the shoulders rolled forward, or lower fully into a squatting position. Some prefer wider spacing between the feet, either with the weight balanced to help spring forward or back, or with the weight shifted over one leg, sometimes to the extent that they lower themselves to the floor. Many prefer to keep in constant motion, while others like to remain still between movements. Similarly, there are no common weapon positions. When the weapon is kept in front of the body, it remains close due to the vulnerability of the hand, with many styles keeping the

weapon in constant motion in crossing or circling patterns at a distance. Positions with the hand alongside or behind the body are often described as either open or closed, based on whether the weapon (or weapon arm) crosses the center line imagined from a practitioner to their opponent. Some styles will favor one position, remaining open or closed, but most transition between them when striking. A few even have multiple distinct weapon and body positions that they transition through or guard themselves with.

One common theory in Filipino martial arts is dividing the distance between opponents into three ranges, typically called long, middle or medium, and short or close (*largo*, *medio*, *corto*). The divisions can vary slightly, but generally, long range is defined as the distance at which the head or body can't be reached with the weapon without stepping or making an extreme lean forward. Close range is defined as being able to reach the head or body with the non-weapon hand, or with the butt of the weapon. Everything in between those two is middle range. Many styles specialize in fighting in a single range, and others try to cover all three, though they may focus more on one.

Different preferred ranges can result in very distinct systems. Those that prefer long range rely on defense through evasion, frequently attacking or counterattacking the opponent's weapon arm and hand. Footwork and distance management is critical for staying out of middle range and exploiting openings in the opponent's defense. Weapon-on-weapon contact is infrequent because it's unnecessary for defense at long range, it's used to set up counterattacks or as emergency defense when failing to evade an attack. Styles that specialize in close range rely on control with the non-weapon hand and the weapon itself for defense, seeking to inhibit the opponent's ability to land an attack. This is done through various means, such as grabbing, pressing, pulling, off-balancing, or disarming the opponent while attacking. Another strategy at close range is to simply overwhelm the opponent with strikes to discourage a counterattack. Middle range is too close for evasion and too far to control the opponent, so styles that focus on this range have to rely on the weapon to defend themselves, redirecting or blocking the opponent's attacks to create a momentary opening in which to counterattack, which

usually results in a give-and-take style of alternating defenses and attacks. Another approach is to make the striking and defending motions so similar in execution that cuts can easily serve as blocks or deflections when the opponent attacks, enabling the practitioner to continuously attack and simply adapt the movement to the opponent's position.

Footwork in the Filipino martial arts is generally represented through the use of geometric shapes, most commonly triangles. The layout and use of these triangles varies widely; sometimes they are used alone, or touching another to form a diamond, X, or hourglass shape. They can be tessellated to illustrate zigzag paths or a variety of specific shapes. The points of the triangles usually represent foot placement, with the sides indicating moving a foot from one position to another, but the sides can also represent paths for the movement of the whole body, with the points representing particular destinations. Long-range footwork uses triangles to show ways to evade the opponent's line of attack, and also the creation of new lines of attack and counterattack. Some styles accomplish this by stepping from one spot to another with both feet, others by just moving one foot and using weight shifting and body positioning. Middle- and close-range footwork also need these constructs as they attempt to reposition or safely enter into range on an angle using quick direction changes. These triangles are also used in middle or close range to visualize how foot positioning affects body structure for control or defense.

The use of two swords or sticks is found in many Filipino martial arts. This typically involves training specific striking patterns to coordinate the use of both weapons, commonly called *sinawali*. The second most common weapon used in Filipino arts is the knife or dagger. This is used alone or in combination with the sword or stick and called *espada y daga*. For stick-based arts, the dagger is viewed as delivering the lethal blow, so the stick is used to set up the opening to insert a thrust with the dagger. For sword-based arts, the dagger takes a back seat, being used opportunistically to thrust when the opponent is occupied with the sword, or to assist in detaining the opponent's sword in medium and close range.

Comparing Spanish and Filipino Techniques

The most obvious point of comparison is the numbering of strikes that exists in both Filipino martial arts and later Spanish fencing with the sword or sabre. The Spanish use of it came through the British; the first known treatise with sabre cuts being numbered based on their angle is from 1796 in Britain,[7] and the same cuts appear in a Spanish cavalry treatise in 1813.[8] Because numbering cuts is uncommon in the areas around the Philippines, it's possible that the Filipino martial arts adopted the practice from the Spanish. However, it could just as easily have been adopted from American sabre or cutlass fencing in the early 20th century; it's impossible to know without earlier documentation of the historical state of Filipino martial arts.

The use of geometric shapes and patterns to describe footwork in the true *destreza* is another area of similarity. The similarity is superficial, though; the Spanish use of geometry for footwork is centered around the idea of proportions and means between extremes. The common circle that both combatants touch with their foot is defined at the mean of proportion – a distance close enough to begin an attack, but far enough away to have time to defend. The paths to either side of the circle's diameter show the ways to arrive to a proportionate mean (the proper place, no closer than necessary) for a cut or thrust, which is done either through controlling the opponent's sword (to the left) or by getting to an angle where their body isn't behind their sword (to the right). The use of geometry to describe footwork was not present in the later small sword and sabre styles, whose footwork was almost completely linear. The common circle, which is the hallmark of true *destreza* and the point of reference for its footwork, is not present in Filipino depictions of footwork. While it's possible that the idea of using a geometric pattern to represent footwork in Filipino martial arts was inspired by 17th and 18th

7 John Gaspard Le Marchant, *Rules and Regulations for the Sword Exercise of the Cavalry* (London, 1796).
8 *Instrucción Táctica para que los Regimientos de Caballería* (Alicante: Ramón Puchol, 1813).

century Spanish fencing, the use of triangles and circles by the Filipinos could have easily developed independently.

Both the old style of Spanish fencing and the Filipino martial arts have methods for fighting with a sword in each hand. The origin of the Spanish method is documented and predates contact with the Philippines, so the only possible direction of influence would be from the Spanish. Only the oldest treatises look on it favorably, as authors from the 17th century onward considered it impractical if it was mentioned at all. The Spanish method of use is primarily concerned with multiple opponents, consisting of sweeping cuts and turning, organized by the location, disposition of attackers, or goal (such as defending a person or object, or separating a fight). The Filipino method doesn't explicitly account for things like multiple opponents, obstacles such as walls or buildings, or how to guard a person or object while using two swords; it also uses quicker and more elaborate cutting patterns, which are possible given the shorter weapons. While it's possible that an inclination for using two swords was influenced by old Spanish fencing, or through *moro-moro* plays, the use of two swords is not uncommon in other southeast Asian martial arts.

Sword and dagger is an aspect of Filipino martial arts that is not common in other arts, but prevalent in Spanish fencing. However, the use differs between the two, which is to be expected due to their respective sword morphology – Spanish swords have long blades and elaborate hand protection, and the daggers follow suit, which makes the dagger suitable as a secondary defense or a tool to trap the weak end of a long blade. Filipino swords have short blades with minimal or no hand protection, which enables the dagger to take a more active role, both offensively because the opponent is closer, and also defensively to protect the exposed sword hand. Whether the Filipino techniques were inspired by or adapted from Spanish techniques (or both, or neither) cannot be known in absence of historical documentation.

One of the defining characteristics of Spanish fencing is utilizing the guard of the hilt and the strong of the blade to protect the head and body. Having the hand well-protected, the sword arm can be

held extended in front of the fencer, which enables small positional changes of the sword to cover a large portion of the body. As a result, a fencer finds safety in keeping the body behind the hilt and strong of the sword, favoring a profiled body and making thrusting faster and more direct than cutting. This can be seen in the nails-up or -down position of traditional Spanish fencing, as well as the right angle posture of the true *destreza*, and the numbered guards of small sword, *florete*, and sabre fencing. In contrast, Filipino martial arts relies on evasion to stay safe at long range, and so more emphasis is placed on mobility and cutting.

Another key characteristic of Spanish fencing is controlling the opponent's sword in order to attack safely. This is done by using the middle and strong of the fencer's blade to move the opponent's blade from the center, clearing a path for an attack. A thrust can be made with continuous blade contact because the guard of the hilt not only protects the hand, it helps to trap and control the opponent's blade. The ability to do this is also a function of blade length – if the blade is not significantly longer than the length of the opponent's arm, the attack can fail to reach if the opponent's arm is extended. Even the shortest Spanish sword blades exceed that threshold, but the longest Filipino sword blades do not reach it. Outside of close range, Filipino styles are instead confined to momentary or no blade contact at all, attacking into an opening and immediately seeking safety through blade and body positioning.

Filipino martial arts that deal with close range have developed detailed systems of counters and re-counters for fighting in close. Conversely, Spanish fencing is comparatively simple in that range, teaching only a control or two, and possibly a couple disarms, if at all. For the most part, the fight is considered finished when one fencer gains control of the other's sword arm. This may be due to a cultural prohibition against grappling in a fencing match, but it also ties into blade length as well. Swords of the length found in Spanish fencing are unwieldy within arm's reach, whereas a sword of the length used in Filipino martial arts can be easily maneuvered.

Terminology

Filipino martial arts use terms from many different languages in different amounts, including the local languages where they developed (such as Tagalog, Kapampagan, Cebuano, Hiligaynon, etc.), English, and Spanish. Many of the Spanish-derived words have changed pronunciation or orthography to fit the local way of speaking. A few of these terms carry the same meaning as they do in Spanish fencing, and some others are technical terms in both arts, but have very different meanings. However, the majority of the technical terms are distinct between the arts.

The Spanish word *esgrima* (fencing) is the root for *eskrima* (or *escrima*), which is one of the names for the Filipino martial arts. The term *esgrima* was only used for the old traditional fencing, and the new imported fencing; the authors of the true *destreza* style were dismissive of *esgrima*, instead referring to their art as *la verdadera destreza de las armas* (the true skill at arms). The term *destreza* is not found in Filipino martial arts. Another common name, *arnis*, is derived from the Spanish word *arnés*. *Arnés* can refer to many things, such as harness, armor, or a piece of equipment. This word rarely appears in fencing treatises, though when it does, it is used to refer to diverse fencing equipment held in the hands (such as sword, dagger, shield, and cloak) and is commonly used in the plural form *arneses*.[9] *Arnis* is the shortened form of *arnis de mano*, which specifies that it is related to the hand, rather than a harness or armor worn on the body. *Arnés* is a broadly inclusive term, so attempting to determine exactly what *arnis* refers to would distort its meaning.

Regarding weapon terminology, there are a few terms in common. *Espada y daga* refers to fighting with the combination of sword and dagger in both Filipino martial arts and in Spanish fencing.

---

9 Diogo Gomes de Figueiredo, "Oplosophia e Verdadeira Destreza das Armas" (Unpublished manuscript, B. Academia Ciencia Lisboa, MS Vermelho 91, 1628);
Luis Díaz de Viedma, *Método de Enseñanza de Maestros* (Barcelona: Sebastian y Iame Matevad, 1639);
Miguel Pérez de Mendoza y Quijada, *Resumen de la Verdadera Destreza de las Armas* (Madrid: Francisco Sanz, 1675);
Pedro Texedo Sicilia de Teruel, *Escuela de Principiantes* (Naples: Juan Francisco Paz, 1678);
Francisco Lorenz de Rada, *Crisol de la Verdadera Destreza* (Cádiz: Cristóbol de Requena, 1695);
Francisco Lorenz de Rada, *Nobleza de la Espada* (Madrid: Imp. Real, 1705).

It's also common in Filipino martial arts to call the butt of the stick *punyo*, which comes from the Spanish word *puño*, which means both the grip of a sword, and a fist. However, the terminology for the parts of a sword are not the same. Some of the terms that are common have a completely different meaning. *Sable* (sabre) is used as the name of at least one Filipino style, although a sabre is not used, and the movements do not resemble sabre fencing. *Broquel* (buckler) is the probable the origin for the word *brokil*, which refers to a carved wooden sword used for training Filipino martial arts. The term *florete* exists in many Filipino styles, but rather than a blunted small sword, it refers to a technique. In some styles, it's a cut that makes a circle around the wrist during the arc of the cut, such that the tip follows a looping path. In others, it's a parry and redirection followed by a thrust.

Some Filipino styles have a footwork term in common with the later style of fencing: *retirada* (retreat). However, the other later Spanish terms for footwork are absent, such as *marcha* (march), *avanza* (advance), or *cuarteo* (quartering). Other fencing terminology for footwork is also missing, including *meter*/*sacar el pie* (putting in/taking out the foot) and *pie de rueda* (wheeling step) from the traditional fencing, and the *compases* of the true *destreza* (*extraño/recto/curvo/trepidación/transversal*). When Spanish words are used to describe stepping in Filipino martial arts, it's typically *avante* and *atras* (forward and back), or simply *paso* (step).

Additionally, the Spanish fencing terms for positioning (*afirmarse*, *guardia*, *planta*, *desplante*) are absent from Filipino martial arts, whether using the traditional description of the position of the fingernails (*uñas arriba/abajo*) or the new numbered system (*guardia prima/segunda/tercia/cuarta*). The fundamental terminology from the true *destreza* is also not found, such as defining angles as *agudo*, *recto*, and *obtuso* (acute, right, and obtuse) or labeling the possible weapon movements (*natural*, *violento*, *remiso*, *de reducción*, *accidental*, *extraño*). True *destreza* talks about distance and location as a mean between extremes (*medio de proporción/proporcionado/proporcional/propincuo*), whereas Filipino arts refer to ranges as *corto*, *medio*, and *largo* (also *largo mano*). Sometimes close range is referred to as *serrada* (from *cerrada*, meaning shut or closed); sometimes *serrada* and *abierta*

(open) are used to refer to weapon position. The term *lastiko* or *elastiko* is used in some Filipino styles to refer to the motion of shifting the weight between the front and back foot, to move the body closer in order to strike and farther away in order to evade, which is not a term in Spanish fencing.

One term associated with cutting in both arts is *rompido*, which is a non-standard form of the word that means broken. In old Spanish fencing, *tajo rompido* or *romper de tajo* is a forceful downward cut after an upward or sideward deflection of the opponent's sword. In some Filipino styles, the term *rompida* refers to repeated upward and downward cuts. However, the rest of the terminology related to cutting or striking is different. The general term in Spanish fencing for a cut is *cuchillada* or *corte*, but cuts have always been divided into forehand and backhand, which were known *tajo* and *revés*. Later styles sometimes used *corte* in place of *tajo*, and some stick fencing arts used the term *golpe* (blow or strike) instead.

There are many different Spanish-derived terms for cutting or striking in Filipino martial arts that are not found in Spanish fencing, such as *abaniko* (fan), *banda y banda* (side to side) or *planchada* (flattened or pressed), *doblete* (doubled strikes), *ekis* (X strikes), and *seguidas* (follow-up striking). Even similar cuts are named differently: a cut with the wrist that makes a full circle is called *redondo* (round) or *arco* (arc), but in Spanish fencing, it's called a *molinete*. A common term for cuts or strikes in Filipino arts is *teros*, derived from the Spanish word *tiros* (shots or hits); one of the more common Filipino style or system names is *cinco teros*, meaning five strikes. *Tiro* is not used in Spanish fencing, except to refer to the Italian method of throwing thrusts.[10] The Spanish word for a thrust is *estocada*, which is sometimes used in Filipino arts to name a thrust, but it is also occasionally used as a name in place of the name *arnis* or *eskrima*. In some styles, the word *estoka* is paired with the word *parada* to name a strategy or set of counters. The word *parada* is used as the term for a parry in some later styles of fencing, though the more common terms for parry – *reparo* and *quite* – are not present in Filipino arts.

10 Nicolás Tamariz, *Cartilla y Luz de la Verdadera Destreza* (Sevilla: Herederos de Tomás López de Haro, 1696); Lorenz de Rada, 1705.

Using contra to mean a counter to a technique is common to both Filipino martial arts and Spanish fencing, as is the term *engaño* (spelled *enganyo* by Filipinos) to mean a deception or fake. However, other terms for feinting or drawing attacks or defenses in Spanish fencing are not common, such as *acometimiento*, *amago* (threat), *finta* (feint), *incitar* (incite), *llamada* (invite or call), or *treta* (trick). Also, there are a whole host of other commonly-used Spanish fencing terms that refer to actions with the sword that are not found in Filipino martial arts, such as *atajo*, *batamiento* (beating), *desviar* (deflecting), *diversión*, *estrechar* (narrowing), *flaqueza debajo/encima de la fuerza* (weak below/above the strong), *ganar* (gaining), *garatusa*, *ligar* (binding), *linea en cruz* (line in cross), *movimiento de conclusión*, *sujetar* (subjecting), *tentar* (testing or probing), and *zambullida* (dive). Likewise, there are many Spanish-derived terms in Filipino martial arts that are not found in fencing, such as *cadena* or *de cadena* (chain), *crosada* or *cruzada* (crossed), *de cuerdas* (strings or cords), *estrella* (star), *pluma* (pen), and *sombrada* or *sumbrada* (shaded).

Conclusions

It bears repeating that, in absence of any historical description of the technical details of Filipino martial arts, we cannot know what role Spanish fencing played in the development of those arts. Understanding the general characteristics of both arts helps to gain a broad picture in order to recognize their distinguishing features, which is critical for any comparison or analysis of possible influence.

Regarding the hypothesis that Filipino martial arts as a whole descended from Spanish fencing, the differences in tools, techniques, and terminology that are used would have required a drastic evolution to take place. Because the Filipinos had swords before Spanish contact, they would either have had no methods of swordsmanship, or decided to abandon any they did have in order to adopt the Spanish method. In doing so, they would have also had to reject the use of the Spanish swords that the fencing was designed for and use their own native swords. Then, they would have had to completely change the method from one optimized for long blades with well-developed guards, to shorter and wider blades with minimal or no guards. In addition, the original Spanish terminology would have to have been abandoned and replaced, including new Spanish terminology that is not used in fencing.

Another possibility for this hypothesis is that there is a lost style of Spanish machete fighting that has similar techniques and terminology to Filipino martial arts. This method of fighting would have to have been unknown or unremarkable to every Spanish fencing author from the 16th to 19th century, and have only caught on in the Philippines (in addition to Filipinos also having had no native swordsmanship tradition, or having abandoned it to take the Spanish method). The likelihood of either of these scenarios, and thus Filipino martial arts descending from Spanish fencing, is very low.

However, the Filipino martial arts are diverse and don't necessarily share a common ancestor art, so there could possibly be arts in the Philippines that descend from Spanish fencing. Such an art

would be recognizable particularly by the weapons that it uses, as weapon morphology is intimately tied to use – the positions and techniques of fencing are centered around a long blade, with sufficient hand protection to control the opponent's blade and still reach to wound. The shorter Filipino blades are unsuitable for this task. Some evolution or mixing of later fencing traditions, or native Filipino martial arts techniques or pedagogy, would also be possible in such a situation.

Two of the largest and most certain Spanish influences on Filipino martial arts are language and religion. Most styles use Spanish terminology, and some incorporate religious symbolism into their techniques or pedagogy. These are both indirect cultural influences from Spain, however, rather than influence from the fencing itself. One likely form of influence from Spanish fencing is the numbering system for strikes from sabre fencing. There is no common numbering system in Filipino martial arts, and neither does Spanish sabre fencing have one common to all. It's possible that a numbering system was copied directly, and evolved over time, which would also influence other Filipino arts. It's also possible that the numbering of cuts and thrusts was inspired by sabre cut numbers, rather than copied. Given the diversity of Filipino arts, either could be true for any given system that uses numbered strikes.

Sword and dagger fighting is another likely area of influence from Spanish fencing. Given the difference in techniques, however, it's most likely that this was simply inspired by the Spanish use of the sword and dagger. This could have multiple possible avenues of entry, whether through direct observation of fencing with sword and dagger, stories of such, or *moro-moro* plays, depending on the style. It is also likely to have spread by having been adopted from or inspired by other Filipino martial arts that had developed sword and dagger technique.

Positive assertions of direct technical influence from Spanish fencing need to be made on a style-by-style basis, which requires more focused research. In addition, more research needs to be done in the area of cultural influence on the various styles of Filipino martial arts. This requires deep historical work that would involve not only the history of the Philippines, but also the other cultures

that made an impact on the Filipinos, including more than just the Spanish. The perspectives presented in this paper should give researchers not only an idea of some of the possible avenues of influence, but also the technical distinctions between the arts, in order to make future research more productive.