

CONOR WHATELY (ed.), *Military Literature in the Medieval Roman World and Beyond* (Reading Medieval Sources 8). Leiden: Brill 2024. xiii, 454 pp. – ISBN 978-90-04-69373-9

• PHILIP RANCE, Freie Universität Berlin
(rance@zedat.fu-berlin.de; philip.r.rance@gmail.com)

This volume comprises a collection of essays on a broad category of texts commonly termed ‘military manuals’, mostly late Roman and Byzantine, with some specimens of analogous literature from other cultures ‘beyond’. Once a peripheral pursuit of a few dedicated philologists, over the last four decades the study of Byzantine military treatises has been transformed as a succession of critical editions, translations and/or commentaries provided firmer textual foundations, expanded research agendas and attracted increasingly diverse scholarly attention. While these works are read primarily as historical sources by military specialists, a recent reorientation of inquiry, aligned with a more pervasive ‘literary turn’, has heightened interest in literary-cultural aspects, addressing questions of genre, intertextuality, purpose, audience and milieu. The editor of this volume, CONOR WHATELY, acknowledges (pp. vii, 1) that the Covid pandemic reshaped the project, constraining initial plans for global coverage of medieval military writing and preventing some contributors from submitting chapters (including this reviewer). Even if that were not the case, however, a more expansive collection might still have featured an outsized Byzantine component simply as a reflection of this comparatively intensive and cohesive scholarship. The absence of a contribution on Islamicate military literature is regrettable but not wholly surprising, given the much less advanced state of research, partly owing to limited scholarly engagement, but also to editorial challenges posed by complex ‘open’ textual traditions that defy western notions of a critical edition. If the ‘Medieval Roman World’ of this book’s title is initially ambiguous (at least without an ‘east/eastern’ qualifier), one can sympathise with the editor’s search for an inclusive label, especially in light of a recent fundamentalist impulse to rebrand Byzantine Studies. In any case, all the chapters concerning east Roman/medieval Greek texts prefer ‘Byzantine’, if only as the most convenient indicator of periodisation and literary culture. A list of authors and titles is reproduced at the end of this review.

WHATELY's Introduction selectively surveys medieval military writing and recent scholarly trends, and summarises the chapters. Section 1 concerns 'The Late Antique World'. MICHAEL CHARLES' essay on how best to use Vegetius' *Epitoma rei militaris* as a historical source is not so much 'methodological' as cautionary or even admonitory. While some concerns about the hazards of positivism in military historiography are valid, particularly in old-school operational reconstructions, CHARLES' quasi-philosophical excursus on ontology and epistemology seems overly pessimistic and tangential to historical method. Remarks on Vegetius' rhetorical purpose and technique are unlikely to be revelatory to readers familiar with the text and its large bibliography, though observations on the author's temporal self-awareness (pp. 40–41) are perceptive and cohere with current interest in historical temporalities. A concluding case study, which deconstructs one recent historicising interpretation of Vegetius' naval precepts, rarely extends beyond negational critique of an easy target, which is itself unrepresentative of recent research.¹

Engaging more directly with Vegetian scholarship, old and new, a second paper on the *Epitoma* by PIERRE COSME and MAXIME EMION seeks a nuanced assessment of authorial aims, capabilities and outlook through a case study of senior legionary hierarchy. Differentiating compositional strata, COSME and EMION show how Vegetius consciously distinguishes personnel, institutions and practices of his own time from those of the past, irrespective of the evident historical incoherence of his *antiqua legio*, as a means of signalling operational ideals within a reformatory discourse. Although covering some well-trodden ground, their analysis is thorough and integrates recent discoveries, notably the Edict of Anastasios I from Perge.

ŁUKASZ RÓŻYCKI examines attitudes and responses to battlefield 'bravado' – feats of heroism, impetuosity and disorderly attacks – in late Roman military treatises, with respect to morale, cohesion and tactical control, reflecting perennial tensions between the collective needs of *disciplina militaris* and the individual impulse of self-display and initiative. As a 'monomachic' ethos is documented in late antiquity across diverse martial cultures of varying organisational sophistication – Roman, Persian, Gothic, Armenian, Arab, Berber, RÓŻYCKI's inquiry addresses one facet of near-

1. Both CRAIG CALDWELL's construction of the battle of the Hellespont in 324, and CHARLES' deconstruction thereof, might have benefited from the literary analysis of DIMITRIS KRALLIS, Greek Glory, Constantinian Legend: Praxagoras' Athenian Agenda in Zosimos *New History*? *Journal of Late Antiquity* 7.1 (2014) pp. 110–130.

universal behaviour that ideally requires comprehensive study. Nonetheless, his focus on institutionalised channelling or constraint of psychological stimuli, through training, discipline and habituated conduct, offers a more persuasive and broadly applicable analysis compared to some culture-specific factors or constructs often adduced as behavioural motivations (Roman *virtus/andreia*, late Roman/Christianised ‘manliness’, Homer/Homerising).²

In terms of methodological originality, the stand-out contribution to this section is CATHARINE HOF’s comparative analysis of late Roman/Byzantine military manuals and surviving urban fortifications, with Resafa-Sergiupolis as the primary example. Thoughtful consideration of broader aspects of theoretical writing, technological instruction and knowledge transfer, specifically in relation to builder-engineers, precedes detailed investigation of correspondence and divergence between written precept and built reality. Informed by this process of mutual elucidation, HOF undertakes a ‘reverse-reading’ of Resafa’s multi-stage walls, which imaginatively recreates the ‘requirements catalogue and instructions’ for this construction project, effectively rendering observable practice into prescriptive text. Her analysis of this and other Near Eastern sites shows knowledge and insight. Some aspects of intertextuality remain tricky: in comparing Philo of Byzantium and Syrianos Magister one may struggle to distinguish long-term historical continuity from direct textual dependence – of course, both can be the case; and HOF (pp. 107–108, 115) seems unaware that Maurice’s *Strategikon* is one of the sources for anonymous *De obsidione toleranda*. This paper provides much food for thought: ultimately I was left speculating whether gaps between extant literary treatises and archaeological remains were once filled by a subcategory of informal or ephemeral writings, of which no specimen survives.

Opening section 2, ‘The Medieval Roman World’, MICHAEL WHITBY provides a judicious discussion of Maurice’s *Strategikon*, as a product of its own time and place, rather than, as so often, through the filter of its Byzantine reception. He addresses questions of date and authorship, structure and sources, and authorial agenda, with extended consideration of the ethno-military case studies in book XI, perhaps the most original section of the treatise, and certainly the part that has attracted the greatest atten-

2. On related issues see now PHILIP RANCE, *Heroes, Historiography and Homer on the Late Antique Battlefield: Constructing Courage in Procopius’ Wars*. In: JENN FINN (ed.), *A Companion to Courage and Cowardice in Ancient Warfare*. Leiden – Boston 2025, pp. 480–537.

tion. Remarks on linguistic register and style (pp. 159–160) are especially interesting. WHITBY’s contribution now becomes the best single-chapter treatment of this work.

IMMACOLATA ERAMO’s study of authors and authorship of Byzantine military treatises is particularly welcome, not least because such an inclusive survey has not been attempted. ‘Authorship’ is broadly construed. Alert to the varying impact of literary convention and intended audience, ERAMO examines expressions of authorial self-awareness, motive and milieu within selected works, embracing actual identity and assumed persona. Alternatively, she considers modern attempts to identify authors of anonymous texts and to evaluate ascriptions in manuscript traditions. Here imperial attributions (Maurice, Leo VI, Nikephoros II) complicate assessment, by merging notions of authorship, authority and sponsorship, circumstances easily obscured by scholars who too loosely apply the label ‘pseudo-’. ERAMO’s argumentation is typically prudent, though identifying Syrianos Magister as a *magister officiorum*/μάγιστρος τῶν ὀφφικίων (p. 179) seems restrictive, given the proliferation of μάγιστρος as a devalued honorific in the Middle Byzantine era.³ Especially thoughtful is discussion of Leo’s *Taktika*, evidently an editorial composite, where she highlights problems in differentiating the contributions of patron, compiler-editor and/or editor-copyist, all arguably ‘authorial’, but nonetheless plausibly distinguishes Leo’s own imprint in the text. Similar issues arising from *Peri Paradromēs*, though discussed in prior scholarship, are clearly articulated. Accordingly, ERAMO has laid the groundwork for integrating military treatises into general studies of authorship in Byzantine literature.⁴

KATHARINA SCHONEVELD’s chapter on military-technological illustrations in Byzantine codices reprises selected arguments from her impressive German-language doctoral monograph, an exercise especially useful to anglophone readers.⁵ Transmitted in tenth-/eleventh-century copies of

3. One might also note that the only other Byzantine military author to bear a magistral title in a manuscript ascription is Nikephoros Ouranos, writing c.1000: see codex Istanbul, TSMK, G.İ. 36, p. 1, lines 7–8: Νικηφόρου | μαγίστρου τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ, with PHILIP RANCE, *The Last Byzantine Military Manuscript*: Istanbul, TSMK, G.İ. 36 and the *Taktika* of Nikephoros Ouranos. *Byzantina Symmeikta* 34 (2024) p. 251–291 at 282–290.

4. E.g. AGLAE PIZZONE (ed.), *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature. Modes, Functions, and Identities* (Byzantinisches Archiv 28). Berlin – Boston 2014.

5. KATHARINA SCHONEVELD, *Illustrationen zur Kriegstechnik in byzantinischen Handschriften. Transfer und Adaption antiken Wissens in Byzanz (Byzanz und die eumediterranen Kriegskulturen 2)*. Göttingen 2024, reviewed by PHILIP RANCE in *ByzRev* 7 (2025) pp. 218–234.

Hellenistic and Roman *poliorcetica* and *belopoeica*, and derivative Byzantine poliorcetic writing, these images have attracted limited discussion of authenticity, style and practicability in studies of ancient siegecraft and book illumination. SCHONEVELD's comprehensive pictorial analysis re-orients inquiry towards the 'Byzantine' contribution, substantially revising prior views of stylistic evolution and demonstrating the intentionality and didactic rationale of editor-illustrators, with implications for understanding scientific illustrative techniques, reception of classical literature, and knowledge transfer in Byzantine military culture.

In an insightful and bibliographically rich study, GEORGIOS CHATZELIS locates the ninth-/tenth-century florescence of Byzantine military writing, combining new compositions and ancient learning, in interlinked military, cultural and ideological contexts. While narrower military dimensions, notably Byzantine-Abbasid conflict, have been amply studied, CHATZELIS extends inquiry to literary-cultural and educational developments in the Middle Byzantine era, touching on authorial motives and readership. Most original is his thesis that competing claims to 'Romanness' – east Roman, Carolingian/Ottonian and Abbasid – fostered rivalry in state-sponsored literary production, which he demonstrates across diverse intellectual spheres. Even if the precise dynamics of such 'ideological rivalry' with respect to military treatises may be less obvious or compelling, this proposition opens a potentially fruitful avenue of research. Support for CHATZELIS' view on the motivational significance of *romanitas* is perhaps also to be found in the relative popularity of certain ancient military texts, which tend to be those with specific dedications to Roman emperors or overt prefatory rhetoric of Roman supremacy.⁶

Also in this section, NADYA WILLIAMS floats some ideas about classical influence in Byzantine military writing, but they are not anchored to knowledge of the Byzantine texts, their interrelationships or modern bibliography. SAVVAS KYRIAKIDIS' chapter on late Byzantine military literature largely rehearses recent scholarship, with some additional inferences of familiarity with manuals based on military narratives.

Section 3 offers specimen studies from 'Beyond the Roman World'. Although perhaps of less intrinsic interest to readers of *The Byzantine Re-*

6. See limited remarks in PHILIP RANCE, *The Ideal of the Roman General in Byzantium: the Reception of Onasander's Strategikos in Byzantine Military Literature*. In: SHAUN TOUGHER – RICHARD EVANS (eds), *Generalship in Ancient Greece, Rome and Byzantium*. Edinburgh 2022, pp. 242–263 at 262–263.

view, all three chapters are recommended for scholarly quality and comparative insight. Having already produced one of the most informed comparative studies of pre-modern eastern and western military cultures,⁷ DAVID GRAFF is adept at discussing Chinese sources unfamiliar even to other specialists in warfare. Here, with exemplary clarity, he explores how ‘medieval’ texts written c.600–1300 (essentially the Tang and Song dynasties) diverged from ‘ancient’ antecedents or ‘classics’, and why enduring changes to form and content emerged in this era. Innovations include increasingly specific, detailed and technical exposition; military encyclopaedism; and a past-oriented sensibility most evident in accumulation of historical precedents as exempla of general principles. GRAFF relates these developments to shifting intellectual attitudes to ancient literary heritage and closer conceptual connections between military historiography, theory and practice, especially under the Tang dynasty. Although similarities are not explicitly signalled, specialists in Byzantine military writing will be struck by developmental parallels beyond mere generalities.

Observing that medieval engineers typically acquired know-how orally and experientially, MICHAEL FULTON revisits selected texts that variously shed light on the construction, operation and capabilities of trebuchets (counterweight and traction). Focusing on three thirteenth-/fourteenth-century western European authors, Villard de Honnecourt, Egidio Colonna and Marino Sanudo, who seemingly provide more informed expositions, and with a glance at comparative material in Islamic texts, he analyses prescribed or visualised designs, primarily in terms of stability and functionality, and assesses authorial expertise and evidential value. As modern notions of a ‘manual’ most readily apply to guidelines on construction and maintenance, FULTON’s paper more broadly exemplifies the differing expectations of medieval technical writing, in this case reflecting the relative simplicity of ballistic technology.

JOHN HOSLER offers a well-written and thorough investigation of the reception of John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus* (1159), as both an original composition and an indirect tradition of Vegetius’ *Epitoma*, up to the eighteenth century. In doing so, he shows that CHRISTOPHER ALLMAND’s study of Vegetian reception, though excellent, was not the last word.⁸ HOSLER traces or plausibly infers at least general, and often specifically military, in-

7. DAVID A. GRAFF, *The Eurasian Way of War. Military Practice in Seventh-Century China and Byzantium*. Abingdon – New York 2016.

8. CHRISTOPHER ALLMAND, *The De Re Militari of Vegetius. The Reception, Transmission and Legacy of a Roman Text in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge 2011.

terest among élite readers – rulers, commander and/or intellectuals – across western Europe, even if the actual impact of the *Policraticus* on the conduct of war cannot be established. His close engagement with textual transmission, both manuscript and printed, makes for compelling argumentation.⁹

In a final section entitled ‘Conclusion’, GEORGIOS THEOTOKIS explores common elements in the form and especially content of military texts produced primarily in Rome, Byzantium and successive Islamic polities, with a view to discerning knowledge transfer between military cultures. Partly reprising recent scholarship, his wide-ranging observations on genre, compositional context and literary convention accentuate similarities in selected military texts. Although THEOTOKIS’ familiarity with diverse periods and cultures is impressive, since the features he identifies as *topoi* specific to military treatises (e.g. authorial humility, *negligentia*, ancient authority) are routinely found also in Classical and Byzantine writing in other ‘technical’ fields – medicine, agriculture, veterinary science, technology – these traits should be understood rather as general components of Greco-Roman scientific discourse, which can assist in locating military authors in that literary-cultural milieu. Turning to content, THEOTOKIS highlights shared concerns in military texts from various regions and eras, including: choosing a general, knowing the enemy, the timing, location and conduct of battle, and responses to victory and defeat. Despite this chapter’s titular reference to ‘timeless principles of war’, these are not Clausewitzian ‘Grundsätze’, but a mixture of generic ideas and practices, mostly in universal scenarios of pre-Industrial warfare. THEOTOKIS finds significance in these commonalties, which are plausibly underpinned by a long-recognised military-cultural continuum across the Mediterranean-Black Sea zone, though inferred ‘horizontal’ diffusion, at least via textual relationships, requires more specific demonstration.

Drawing together selected conceptual threads, a brief Epilogue by JOHN HALDON remarks generally on the expanding range and shifting foci of re-

9. Some observations: p. 369 with n. 61: if John of Salisbury’s unique citation of Tacitus (*Pol.* VIII.18 788c Webb II 364.3), apparently via Orosius, has any validity, it cannot refer to *Agricola* but only to *Annales* and/or *Historiae* (cited HAVERFIELD, JRS [1916] p. 200 is confusing). P. 382 with nn. 70–71: John of Salisbury’s reference to ‘Julius Iginus’, among specifically military authorities (*Pol.* VI.19 618a Webb II 57.6), is identified as ‘probably a reference to Gaius Julius Hyginus, a contemporary of Ovid’, to whom works on mythology and astronomy are doubtfully attributed. Perhaps more likely is a confused allusion to the military tract [pseudo-Hyginus] *De munitionibus castrorum*, which, by the sixth century at the latest, was transmitted within the gromatic writings of Hyginus (Gromaticus) and thus spuriously ascribed to him.

search on Byzantine military texts in recent decades. He dwells especially on the ‘dark-age’ hiatus in literary culture c.650–800 and the re-emergence of military writing in the later ninth/tenth centuries, with a renewed ethos, milieu and function. Beyond strictly military contexts, he also stresses the many facets of literature, culture and society that are variously illuminated by these texts. HALDON’s concluding remarks prompt two thoughts of relevance to several chapters. First, was the ‘Dark Age’ quite so ‘dark’ for military writing? It is not clear to me why the demise of traditional high-brow secular genres of antiquity should have necessarily disrupted the copying, editing and modification of non-literary, low-register technical treatises – as is traceable, for example, in the majuscule transmission of the *Strategikon*, c.600–800. More generally, the apparent ‘dark-age’ scarcity of military writing harbours a certain circularity of argument, insofar as many undated/undatable adaptations, excerpts and redactions, which could quite plausibly originate in this period, have been assigned a vague ‘late antique’ date (pre-c.600) solely on the presumption that they could not possibly be products of the ‘Dark Age’, thus reinforcing and perpetuating its gloominess.¹⁰ Second, whatever one’s view on the date of Syrianos Magister’s compendium, the significance of moving it from the sixth century to the ninth goes far beyond issues of content, sources and historical utility, and crucially affects our understanding of the development of this genre. If Syrianos is extracted from his former setting in the sixth century, then the whole notion of a sixth-century ‘corpus’ unravels; far from being a body of military writing reflective of contemporary or ‘Justinianic’ warfare, we are left with two unrelated and entirely different texts, Urbicius’ opuscula and Maurice’s *Strategikon*, at either extreme of the century. Correspondingly, if we locate Syrianos in the ninth century, then not only is the ‘dark-age’ gap substantially narrowed (and one might place the *Apparatus bellicus* later in the same century), but also the still popular yet flimsy assumption that Leo VI single-handedly revived military writing must be modified or discarded. Although the tenth century will ever remain a ‘Golden Age’, the long-term trajectory of Byzantine military literature is beginning to look more evenly spread and less like periodic feast or famine.

Although this volume does not set out to survey the current state of research, it mirrors prevailing activity and concerns. As WHATELY observes (p. 22), the content of treatises remains a priority, not only as evidence

10. See further PHILIP RANCE, The Reception of Aineias’ *Poliorketika* in Byzantine Military Literature. In: MARIA PRETZLER – NICK BARLEY (eds), *Brills Companion to Aineias Tacticus*. Leiden 2018, pp. 290–374 at 291–292 esp. n. 3, 296–297.

for military-historical research, but also, I would suggest, more fundamentally as the main criteria for evaluating originality, development and significance. The ‘literary turn’ is evident in several chapters (notably ERAMO and CHATZELIS). There is little on language (WHITBY, ERAMO), still less on the materiality of books (SCHONEVELD). The relative dearth of philological interest may signal future lines of inquiry: in particular, a greater proportion of Byzantine military texts are purely linguistic adaptations, with little or no changes to content, exemplified by the many sequential versions of Leo’s *Taktika* or Polyainos’ *Strategemata*, which alternately ‘upgrade’ or ‘downgrade’ the linguistic register. Clearly the aims and processes of redaction, paraphrase and metaphrasis were crucial dynamics in the transmission and reception of this genre and a major factor governing its readership. They also offer another area where military texts could be integrated into wider Byzantine literary scholarship.¹¹ One should also bear in mind that the conventional stemmatic method of a critical edition, by seeking to reconstitute the earliest or ‘authentic’ text of the authorial archetype, rejects all of these subsequent textual interventions, which can be distinguished only by carefully scrutinising the apparatus criticus, assuming it is both accurate and comprehensive (which is not always the case). Consequently, while these editorial principles, inherited from classical philology, are understandable and justified in their own terms, the text printed on the pages of a modern edition – notably of Maurice’s *Strategikon* or Leo’s *Taktika* – is not the version that most Byzantine readers would have read.¹² Finally, at least for the tenth/eleventh centuries, more attentiveness to codicology and textual transmission, especially court-sponsored composition and palace-centred book production, might constrain some of the more optimistic assumptions about access to and circulation of these works.

The pioneering editorial endeavour of preceding decades ensured that there are now critical texts of all of the more important Byzantine treatises, excepting a full edition of Nikephoros Ouranos’ *Taktika*,¹³ while most are furnished with one or more translations, and several with commentaries.

11. See recently e.g. ANNE P. ALWIS – MARTIN HINTERBERGER – ELISABETH SCHIFFER (eds), *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature* (Byzantios 17). Turnhout 2021, with remarks on integrating military texts in the review by PHILIP RANCE, *ByzRev* 5 (2023) pp. 129–137 at 136.

12. See remarks on the challenges of editing multi-recension texts in RANCE, *The Last Byzantine Military Manuscript* (above n. 3), pp. 271–273.

13. See *status quaestionis* and editorial scheme in RANCE, *The Last Byzantine Military Manuscript* (above n. 3), pp. 267–277.

Although some text-critical work remains to be done, the coverage and nature of this volume suggest that we have entered a period of consolidation, primarily characterised by review, reappraisal, reconfiguration and, in some cases, recycling, but nonetheless capable of providing new insights, especially at points of intersection with wider scholarship. In contrast, in the three sample contributions from ‘beyond’ (GRAFF, FULTON, HOSLER), one may glimpse much wider vistas of still unexplored territory open to researchers in those respective fields. In my opinion, the chapters that most enhance our general understanding of Roman/Byzantine military literature are those that look outwards and engage with adjacent spheres (HOF on building, CHATZELIS on literary-intellectual currents) or examine generic aspects of book culture (ERAMO on authorship, SCHONEVELD on illustration). Posited cross-cultural interaction at a textual level, particularly with Arabic treatises (CHATZELIS, THEOTOKIS), is undoubtedly tantalising, but must await collaborative investigation by qualified philologists, a (very) long-standing desideratum. Regarding production quality, the volume contains many typos. Some chapters by non-native anglophones would have benefited from editorial assistance. Standard Neo-Latin titles and terms are semi-‘Hellenised’ into faux Greek or hybrid Greek-Latin forms that have no historical, textual or linguistic basis (e.g. *Sylloge Taktikorum*, *De Re Strategika*, Aeneas Taktikos). Factual errors or slips are rare and minor.¹⁴ Ultimately, although this collection is most likely to be read selectively, it should cater to the interests of diverse readers, some of whom will discover a gem or two.

Keywords

military literature; *tactica*

14. P. 4: ‘Leo the VI’s excerpts of Polyaeus’ *Stratagems*’ = an obsolete misnomer for *Sylloge tacticorum* chs. 76–102; p. 4: ‘the *Naumachiae* in the tenth century’ > ninth?; 71: ‘Caratacus in Brittany’ > Britain; p. 310: ‘preserved in three codices’ > four (add to Dain’s conspectus Vienna, ÖNB, phil. gr. 120 + 112, formerly one codex); p. 379: Tommaso Laureti’s fresco *Il Trionfo della Cristianità* (1585) does not depict Pope Gregory I burning profane writings; p. 381: ‘in Cheapside’ > on Bankside; p. 408: ‘addressed to the Emperor Hadrian’ > Trajan (despite the manuscript reading); p. 414 n. 53: ‘Carl Zuckerman’ > Constantin.

Table of Contents

Introduction: CONOR WHATELY

PART 1 The Late Antique World

1 Using Vegetius' *Epitoma Rei Militaris* as a Source for Late Antiquity
Some Reflections on Methodology: MICHAEL B. CHARLES

2 Tribunes and Prefects of Legions according to Vegetius: PIERRE COSME
and MAXIME EMION

3 Building in and by Military Manuals in Late Antiquity: Reverse-Reading
Traditional and Innovative Features from City Walls in the Roman East:
CATHARINE HOF

4 Bravado on the Battlefield. A Study of Late Antique Roman Military
Treatises: ŁUKASZ RÓŻYCKI

PART 2 The Medieval Roman World

5 The *Strategikon* of Maurice: MICHAEL WHITBY

6 Authorship in Byzantine Military Literature: IMMACOLATA ERAMO

7 Manuscript Illuminations in Military Manuals: KATHARINA SCHON-
EVELD

8 Dwarfs Fighting on the Shoulders of Giants: The Legacy of Greek and
Roman Military Manuals in the Byzantine Empire: NADYA WILLIAMS

9 Wars and Cultural Wars: The Military, Cultural and Ideological Back-
ground to the Emergence of Byzantine Military Treatises (c. 800–1100):
GEORGIOS CHATZELIS

10 The Reading of Military Manuals in Byzantium from the Eleventh to
the Fourteenth Centuries: SAVVAS KYRIAKIDIS

PART 3 Beyond the Roman World

11 Medieval Contributions to Chinese Military Thought: DAVID A. GRAFF

12 Medieval Mechanical Artillery 'Treatises': MICHAEL S. FULTON

13 Writing and Warfighting II: John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* to the Eigh-
teenth Century: JOHN D. HOSLER

PART 4 Conclusion

14 Timeless Principles of War and the Vertical Transmission of Military
Knowledge through the *Taktika*: GEORGIOS THEOTOKIS

Epilogue: JOHN HALDON