

of a certain debate to someone else; p. 156 on strong drinks sometimes being helpful to the student of Virgil). There are also many interesting assessments of other scholars' work (but at places also of the author's own, cf. 80 n. 3; 125 n. 64), sometimes positive (e.g., p. 33 n. 8 on Solin; 128 n. 77 on Granger; 138 n. 18 on Polverini; 147 n. 14 on Edwards), but perhaps more often censorious (e.g., p. viii on the *Virgil Encyclopedia*, cf. 47 n. 13; 3 n. 5 on Erren; 47 n. 8 on Vanotti; 63 n. 14 on Zetzel; 77 n. 68 on Clausen; 102 n. 38 on Mazzocchi – not “Mazzochini” –, “by no means a good book”; 104 n. 52 on Panoussi; 140 n. 27 on Saunders and Wickert); cf. also, e.g., 24 n. 40 on M. L. West (“below his best”), to be contrasted with p. 25 n. 47 (“much better”). Taking into account this, and the fact that, although there will probably be no one who agrees with everything H. says (I myself am a bit skeptical about a number of H.'s assertions), the book does contain a wealth of information on Virgil and his methods by a scholar who must know about everything about Virgil and Virgilian studies, and will thus be of great use to those interested in one way or another in the *Aeneid*, I must conclude with a positive evaluation of the book.

Olli Salomies  
University of Helsinki

ADDENDUM. Dr. Horsfall has unfortunately passed away on January 1, 2019.

*Prisciani: De accentibus*. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di CLAUDIO GIAMMONA. *Collectanea grammatica Latina* 12. Weidmann, Hildesheim 2012. ISBN 978-3-515-00404-5. ISSN 0940-2136. 218 pp. EUR 49.80.

The short elementary treatise, entitled *De accentibus* (henceforth *DA*), edited by Claudio Giammona, was highly popular in the Middle Ages, being preserved in some 120 manuscripts from the eleventh to the sixteenth century. Its popularity was based on its false attribution to Priscian (c. 500 AD), and although doubt was cast on its authenticity by several medieval authors, including for instance Alexander Neckam (1157–1217) and Peter Helias (fl. c. 1140), it continued to be attributed to Priscian until the nineteenth century. This short textbook deals with letters, sounds and accents, that is, issues discussed in the first part of Donatus's more advanced grammar, the *Ars maior*. These topics are absent from the *Ars minor*, the most popular elementary textbook in the Middle Ages. Thus, the *DA* would seem to have provided guidelines for pronunciation for elementary grammar teaching based on the *Ars minor*. Focussing on the final syllables, it treats each part of speech in turn, quoting a large number of examples.

Many uncertainties surround this text. The treatise bears the name *De accentibus*, although only the second part deals with prosodic features. This would seem to reflect its composite nature. As regards its authorship, Giammona assumes that it was originally anonymous (p. xxii) and that the attribution to Priscian is based on a false interpretation of a passage in Book XVII of the *Institutiones grammaticae*, where Priscian refers to his *liber de accentibus*. Heinrich Keil (*Grammatici latini III*, 1860) regarded the *DA* as inauthentic, attributing it to the eighth century (p. xxiv). Schoell (*De accentu linguae latinae veterum grammaticorum testimonia*, 1876) and Luscher (*De Prisciani studiis*

*Graecis*, 1910) continued to regard it as authentic but as being contaminated with other texts. Regarding its place of origin, several scholars have searched its origin in Visigothic Spain, and it was dated as early as the sixth and seventh centuries, that is before Isidore's (560–636) *Etymologiae*, by Fontaine (*Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, 1959). More recently, the discovery of similarities between the *DA* and the *Ars* of Giuliano of Toledo composed between 680 and 685 has reinforced the importance of the Visigothic argument (Passalacqua, *Testo e tradizione*, 2009). According to Gammona's dating, the *DA* was composed after Giuliano's *Ars* and possibly in northern rather than in southern Spain (pp. xxviii–xxix).

Soon after Giuliano had composed his works, the Arabs invaded southern Spain, and many scholars and monks fled to northern Spain or to the Continent, taking books with them. This is reflected in the transmission of Giuliano's *Ars*; no copies survive from contemporary Toledo whereas shortly after the work was available in other parts of Europe (pp. xxx–xxxii). The *DA* follows the same pattern of transmission, Gammona argues, but it is worthy of note that the witnesses of the *DA* are much later than those of Giuliano's *Ars*. The latter was used until the mid-ninth century, whereas the earliest manuscripts of the *DA* are from the eleventh century.

The present critical edition is based on all early manuscripts, that is those datable between the eleventh and the twelfth centuries; the later witnesses are excluded as being more contaminated. All the manuscripts have been collated, and since they share a certain number of errors, it has been possible to establish one archetype, and a comparison of alternative readings has permitted to posit three distinct branches of transmission (pp. xxxviii–xxxix). Significant alternative readings are given in the critical apparatus and less significant in a separate appendix.

Its Visigothic origin is probable. The parallels with Isidore of Seville and Giuliano of Toledo are significant, and a number of place names quoted in the text support this thesis. However, the sources used by the *DA* include two works which were not used by the two Spanish authors, namely the *Ars* of Diomedes and Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*. Moreover, Priscian's work plays an essential role in the *DA*, being often quoted *verbatim*. Priscianic influence can be seen in the order of the parts of speech followed in the *DA*, and it is probably from Diomedes and Priscian that the anonymous compiler adopted the clear distinction between the terms *littera* and *elementum*, which, as is pointed out by Priscian, is often confused in grammatical manuals. Both Diomedes's *Ars* and Priscian's *Institutiones* were among the grammars newly rediscovered in the Carolingian reform. The *Institutiones* was launched into circulation by Alcuin, and a copy of Diomedes's *Ars* was prepared by Adam, abbot of the monastery of Masmünster, at Charlemagne's request in 780 (*MGH, Poetae Aevi Carolini* 1. E. Dümmler (ed.), Berlin, 1881, p. 93). Since the *DA* is generally regarded as being a composite work, it is possible that the Visigothic compilation, supposedly taken to northern Spain by the intellectuals fleeing from the south, was reworked not only in northern Spain but also later on the Continent, after the Carolingian reform.

The large number of manuscripts attests to the importance of this short treatise, which therefore deserved to be edited. Gammona's edition is based on a very sober method, and the commentary is highly professional. The nature of letters, sounds and accents was a popular theme in the early Middle Ages, being discussed both at elementary and advanced levels of education. The nine elementary texts on letters and sounds from the early Middle Ages edited by Luigi Munzi (*Littera legitima. Testi grammaticali latini dell'Alto Medioevo*, 2012) differ from the *DA* in that the latter does

not seek deeper religious meanings in linguistic phenomena. Of all these treatises, the *DA* proved the most successful. One of the keys to its success could be that it had cast the essentials of Priscian's theory of letters, sounds and accents in a more digestible form, which better suited school teaching.

Anneli Luhtala  
University of Helsinki

*A Tenth-Century Byzantine Military Manual: The Sylloge Tacticorum.* Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Studies. Translated by GEORGIOS CHATZELIS – JONATHAN HARRIS. Routledge, New York 2017. ISBN 978-1-4724-7028-7 (hbk); 978-1-315-56531-6 (ebk). 170 pp. GBP 120. USD 149.95.

The present work is the first complete English translation of the Byzantine military manual known as *Sylloge Tacticorum*. It is indeed only a translation, based on Alphonse Dain's edition *Sylloge Tacticorum, quae olim "Inedita Leonis Tactica" Dicebatur* (Paris 1938). The Greek text is not included. There can be numerous reasons for this, but it would have been helpful for scholarly purposes if the original text had been running alongside, particularly as the edition of Dain is not the easiest to access. There are, for example, no copies of it in the Finnish university libraries, although there is one at the Finnish Institute in Rome. The present translation nevertheless frequently includes the original terminology in the text, notes, and glossary, which helps to verify the interpretations.

The first translator, Georgios Chatzelis, wrote a PhD dissertation about *Sylloge Tacticorum* at Royal Holloway University of London in 2017. The other, Jonathan Harris, is one of the professors of the institution. Now, Routledge has published the analysis of Chatzelis as a monograph, *Byzantine Military Manuals as Literary Works and Practical Handbooks. The Case of the Tenth-Century Sylloge Tacticorum* (New York 2019), but it was not at my disposal when writing this review. The introductory part of the translation of *Sylloge Tacticorum* summarizes the main issues in it.

The genre of Greek military manuals emerged at the latest in fourth century BC and continued to Byzantine times, and numerous works were produced in the tenth century. This was the era of the so-called Macedonian renaissance when the Byzantine empire underwent a cultural renewal and took back several lost regions. The opening of the surviving text of *Sylloge Tacticorum* gives the date of composition as the year 6412 (903/904) under emperor Leo (VI, r. 886–912). There have, however, been doubts regarding this claim as *Sylloge Tacticorum* differs markedly from Leo's *Taktika*.

The translators adopt Gilbert Dagron's method of determining the dates of military manuals based on military innovations, enemy tactics, and administrative and socio-political context. However, a large part of the information we have about these matters is derived from the manuals themselves and risks circular argument. For example, Ilkka Syväne has defended the view that differences between *Sylloge Tacticorum* and *Taktika* do not justify dismissing the authorship of Leo. ["The New Cavalry Formations of the Sylloge Tacticorum, AD 904", [https://www.academia.edu/39251194/The\\_New\\_Cavalry\\_Formations\\_of\\_the\\_Sylloge\\_Tacticorum\\_AD\\_904](https://www.academia.edu/39251194/The_New_Cavalry_Formations_of_the_Sylloge_Tacticorum_AD_904). The original article was published in *Saga Newsletter* 112, 2008 (p.36ff.) and republished in *Slingshot* (November–December 2013, pp. 7–13). The comments on the translation of Chatzelis (and Harris) are added to the beginning of the version on academia.edu.]