

University of Groningen

Zachary Chitwood, Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition, 867–1056.
 Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017. ISBN: 978-1-107-18256-1

Stolte, Bernard H.

Published in:
 Speculum-A journal of medieval studies

DOI:
 [10.1086/704909](https://doi.org/10.1086/704909)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
 Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
 2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Stolte, B. H. (2019). Zachary Chitwood, Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition, 867–1056. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017. ISBN: 978-1-107-18256-1. *Speculum-A journal of medieval studies*, 94(4), 1139-1140. <https://doi.org/10.1086/704909>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Byzantine princess Theophano, who was herself related to Emperor John Tzimiskes. Otto III was well acquainted with Greek culture and had as tutor John Philagathos (of Rossano), who, moved by ambition, was appointed pope over Gregory V, the legitimate pope and a cousin of Otto III (he, too, was a disciple of Philagathos). Saint Neilos, who came to Rome from his seat at Serperi, near Gaeta, asked that Philagathos, who had been imprisoned and was horribly mutilated, be delivered to him, but Otto III and Gregory V refused his request. (See Agostino Chiesa Alciator, *Le pape au nez coupé: Jean XVI entre deux empires, de Rossano à Liège (930–1013)* [2006].)

This review, however cursory, lets us understand the fundamental role Neilos had in contemporary historical events, as well as the mediating role that holy monks often played in their society. Saint Neilos acted like other Italo-Greek saints before and after him: throughout the Byzantine Empire it was very common for them to move away from their monasteries and their hermitages to defend the flocks of faithful entrusted to them against both external and internal enemies, even at the cost of conflict with secular or ecclesiastical powers.

This *bios* truly represents the most beautiful example of historical Italo-Greek hagiography: thus, the present edition, despite some inaccuracies, will allow a modern, international audience to gain a more in-depth understanding of that work and of its holy protagonist.

GIOACCHINO STRANO, University of Calabria

ZACHARY CHITWOOD, *Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition, 867–1056*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017. Pp. xii, 236. \$99.99. ISBN: 978-1-107-18256-1. doi:10.1086/704909

This is a most welcome book. Zachary Chitwood uses the notion of “Byzantine legal culture” as “a shorthand way of collectively referring to different aspects of the interaction between Byzantine law and society” (7). It is conveniently vague enough to enable him to go into a great number of sources and subjects, while indicating his focus on the social history of Byzantine law. In this legal culture, Chitwood distinguishes three strands: the Roman political legacy, Orthodox Christianity, and Hellenic culture. The study covers the years 867–1056, the almost two centuries of the Macedonian dynasty, which Chitwood loosely terms the Middle Byzantine period, and describes the gradual transformation of Justinian’s mainly Latin legacy towards a Hellenic, less secular legal culture; Chitwood even goes as far as speaking of “The End of Secular Law in Byzantium?” (184–92). Chitwood illustrates his argument with many examples, which make for an attractive and often convincing story. There is much to applaud, and this book provides a substantial contribution to the social history of Byzantine law in the period indicated in his title; Chitwood provides an interesting context for the Byzantine legal sources it discusses. A special bonus is the English translation of “the so-called *Novella constitutio*, which announced the creation of the new position of *nomophylax didaskalos* along with the founding of a law school in the capital,” printed as an appendix at 193–203 and discussed at 168–73. (The present reviewer is mildly surprised by the prominent title. *Novella constitutio* is a generic indication of imperial legislation: every imperial *constitutio* is *novella* as opposed to the existing legislation.) The qualification “so-called” probably bears on the fact that it is a draft, not the actual constitution, which has not been transmitted. Since *Novella constitutio* is not the genuine title, why not devise a more eloquent one?

One of the characteristics of Byzantine legal language is the presence of Latin words in an otherwise Greek environment. In the chapter on “Legal Education,” Chitwood discusses among other things the difficulties raised by this Latin legal terminology for the Greek-speaking population. As a first example, at 157, Chitwood presents a fragment from the *Paraphrasis Institutionum* of Theophilos, 1.18. It contains in a few lines no less than six Latin technical

Speculum 94/4 (October 2019)

terms, which are not easy to avoid in a translation. Instead of Murison's translation, which accompanies the latest edition, he gives his own, in which "granted freedom" is not entirely correct (J. H. A. Lokin, R. Meijering, B. H. Stolte, and N. van der Wal, eds., *Theophili antecessoris Paraphrasis Institutionum*, trans. A. F. Murison [2010]); if you want to avoid technical terms, it is clearer than Murison's "emancipated," but why not use "released from paternal power"? Moreover, it is curious to add to the enumeration of the technical terms a note only pointing out that *legitimo* is "a Hellenized form of *legitimi*." Similarly Hellenized, in other words, Latin roots provided with Greek endings, are also the other terms *emancipatus* (acc. plur.), *testamentarium* (acc. sing.), *adgnaton* (acc. sing.), *adgnastica* (nom. plur.), and *emancipationi* (dat. sing.; the nominative would have been *emancipation*, not *-io*). From Chitwood's point of view it would have been worth noting that these Latin terms apparently have been able to maintain themselves in the manuscript tradition of Theophilus's *Paraphrasis*—an introduction to the law!—until at least the eleventh century.

At 158, Chitwood gives an example of how the Byzantines overcame the difficulty of "making sense of the Codex." The *Basilica* (c. 900) contain Greek summaries of the original, mostly Latin text of Justinian's codification. These summaries were often difficult to understand without having recourse to the Latin originals, an additional barrier being the often complicated Latin of Justinian's *Codex* (534). In the sixth century, the *antecessor* Thalelaios had taught the Code by providing a *kata podas* translation into Greek, as well as a Greek commentary on the substance of the text. When the *Basilica* were compiled using summaries, Thalelaios's teaching proved a useful tool for understanding that summary without having to turn to Justinian's Latin text. Most *Basilica* manuscripts contain so-called old scholia in which these antecessorial texts were copied in the margins in order to clarify the summaries. Chitwood argues that this was the way in which the Byzantines tried to circumnavigate the necessity for the reader to consult the Latin originals, who in such a case would be sufficiently informed by Thalelaios. The passage chosen to illustrate this procedure (*Bas.* 29.5.31, a summary of *CJust.* 5.14.1, with a scholion containing both Thalelaios's *kata podas* translation and his interpretation) is a good example, but Chitwood's translation suggests that he has not fully understood the legal substance of the text and of Thalelaios's commentary. A full explanation would far surpass the scope of this review, and I hope to offer it elsewhere, but it does bring me to a final observation.

Legal sources are not the easiest texts to use for nonlawyers. My observations on the two texts discussed on 157–59 do not diminish my positive appreciation of Chitwood's book, which I consider to be a successful integration of social and legal history. The boundaries between social and legal history are fading away, but both specialties still have to learn a lot from each other.

BERNARD H. STOLTE, University of Groningen

JOSHUA DAVIES, *Visions and Ruins: Cultural Memory and the Untimely Middle Ages*. (Manchester Medieval Literature and Culture.) Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018. Pp. ix, 224; 20 black-and-white figures and 1 map. £75. ISBN: 978-1-5261-2593-4. doi:10.1086/705207

In spite of its title, Joshua Davies's new book, *Visions and Ruins: Cultural Memory and the Untimely Middle Ages*, is a timely contribution to current debates about the relevance of the Middle Ages to contemporary political discourse. It is a thoughtful and meditative rumination on the various ways that the idea of medievalism functions within modernity, ranging from the dark underbelly of right-wing nationalism, which co-opts the medieval as a singular site of originary ethnicity, to the hopeful, almost utopian work of contemporary artists, who

Speculum 94/4 (October 2019)