

ALESSANDRO GARCEA – MICHELA ROSELLINI – LUIGI SILVANO (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I, Late Antiquity and Beyond* (Corpus Christianorum, *Lingua patrum* 12). Turnhout: Brepols 2019. 564 pp. – ISBN: 978-2-503-58492-8 (€ 230.00).

- PÉTER BARA, Research Centre for the Humanities, Budapest (peterbara@peterbara.com)

The editors of this thick and learned volume claim in the preface that there are huge gaps in research exploring the use of Latin in Byzantium. This statement is in accord with the remarkable phenomenon in research that more has been written about the use of Greek in the West than about the role of Latin in the Byzantine East. The present volume aims at filling in certain gaps by a multidisciplinary approach, taking into account not only different types of source material, such as literary, and non-literary texts, visual material, inscriptions, but also showing different viewpoints of researchers who are historians, philologists, or literary scholars. A look at the *Table of Contents* shows that the editors aimed at a systematic survey, as the book is distributed into thematic units. The titles of the units, however, do not always seem to be meaningful. The unit ‘The laws of language and the language of laws’ is only loosely connected to the papers included. This, nonetheless, does not detract from the contributions’ high standard. The indices allow the reader to look for personal names and locations which are helpful and are made with additional notes to avoid ambiguity. The orthography follows recent trends of English literature and the Latin viewpoint of the volume explains the application of Latinized forms of Greek names.

GUGLIELMO CAVALLO’s contribution launches the volume in lieu of an introduction. Probably, from the structural point of view, the ‘Preface’ (a little bit short to be an introduction) betrays more to the reader on the *status artis* and the problem. CAVALLO points out that the use of Latin in Byzantium is to be analysed as of the Byzantine self-consciousness of being Roman (see the notions of *romanitas* and *rhomansyne*), particularly between the 4th and 6th centuries. As CAVALLO emphasises, the phenomenon has been researched especially from the linguistic and juridical point of view. However, himself adds to this view from the cultural aspect by the examination of paratextual evidence in manuscripts. CAVALLO shows that the way

the book production was commissioned, donated and presented in a ritualised form, referred to the classical Roman tradition. After that, CAVALLO with a superb handling of manuscript evidence demonstrates the recurrent interest in classical Latin authors, such as Terence, Virgil and others. The study of – many times – fragmentary evidence is pursued until the 11th century and bolsters CAVALLO’s argument on the awareness of and interest in classical Latin in Byzantium.

The second part entitled ‘General framework’ contains two contributions. LUIGI SILVANO’s article discusses problems of definition and periodization of the gradually declining knowledge and use of Latin. His presentation is very lucid and meaningful. SILVANO sticks to the period of Constantine the Great as starting point, after that follows the sequence of events to 750 which he finds the watershed between Late Antiquity and medieval Byzantium. However, he votes for a long-durée perspective reaching until events of the Fourth Crusade, moreover, until the 14th century.

ALESSANDRO GARCEA surveys the development in the use of Latin and Greek in the Eastern Mediterranean from Constantine until the 6th century as the epoch of bilingualism and the period of unilingualism after the 6th century. Instead of promoting the model of the conflict between the two languages (the notion of *Sprachenkampf*, originating in the 19th century), GARCEA’s central idea is to distinguish in which spheres (such as administration) and groups (e. g. dominating class) Latin and Greek were used and what were the triggers behind these phenomena. It is a main virtue of GARCEA’s analysis to make a diachronic approach with emphasising that the Latinization of the East was a non-linear trend. The researcher divides the period under discussion to six different stages. During ‘imperfect bilingualism’ (after 212) documents connected with Roman citizenship were issued in Latin, furthermore, it was the language in court. In parallel with school practices for people with higher social status, many users of Latin developed only oral competences, learned the language as adults and used manuals with Latin terms written in Greek letters. In the second phase (after 330), Constantine included the official use of Latin in his political agenda and imperial correspondence. GARCEA’s term of Constantine’s linguistic ‘nationalism’ is, to some degree, awkward. Despite Constantine’s efforts, multilingualism existed (stage 3), followed by a ‘dual-lingualism’ under Theodosios II (stage 4). Under Justinian, the *Digests* were issued in Latin, whereas the original language of the *Novels*, being governmental acts, was Greek. The grammarian Priscian already worked actively on the preservation of the Latin written heritage. GARCEA calls this fifth phase ‘interlin-

guistic' (p. 64). and writes about an 'interlanguage' (p. 58). Whereas the ongoing processes are clearly presented, the very notion, in my view, is not sufficiently explained, or justified.

The third part of the book is entitled 'Latin in the Empire: texts and people' contains three contributions. JEAN-LUC FOURNET discusses the use of Latin in Late Antique Egypt. The outstanding case study supports GARCEA's above mentioned statements and shows the case of multilingualism (stage 3 in GARCEA's scheme) with the Egyptian example.

CLAUDIA RAPP focuses on the topic of multilingual monastic communities in the East. RAPP draws a picture which shows the overwhelming importance of Greek as liturgical language in Jerusalem, Betlehem, and in the Monastery of Saint Sabas. Concurrently, these monasteries were hubs of pilgrims from both East and West that resulted in high language diversity, among which Latin was only one element. The examples of Sinai and Egypt show similar patterns, modified by local traditions. RAPP's remarks on how members of monastic communities acquired their Latin knowledge, complement CODOÑER's paper (p. 143 sqq.).

GABRIEL NOCCHI MACEDO focuses on the production of Latin manuscripts in Late Antique Constantinople in a valuable overview. Based on indirect and later evidence, MACEDO traces the scribes, possible *scriptoria*, the script used and the actual books produced/ copied. His argument on behalf of the Constantinopolitan origin of the so-called BR uncial script seems tenable. At p. 110, he mentions Apuleius, Lucan, Vegetius, and Boethius whose works were copied. This list worth revisiting, taking into account MACEDO's evidence on different lexica (p. 112) and other contributions in the present volume mentioning Virgil and a number of classical Latin authors.

The fourth thematic part of the volume is entitled 'Laws of the language and language of the laws'. ANDREA PELLIZZARI's paper presents evidence about the use of Latin in Libanios' oeuvre. His description reveals the grudge of the renowned rhetorician and promoter of Greek *paideia* in the context of the increasing administrative and juridical use of Latin.

JUAN SIGNES CODOÑER's article sheds light on a crucial topic of the volume: the learning of Latin and Greek languages. The paper stands out for its subtle differentiations in the phenomenon of Latin-Greek diglossia, paying particular attention to the historical contexts which shaped it. The author's emphasis on the lack of normative Greek grammars compared to its Latin counterparts in Late Antiquity is particularly instructive.

The problem of Latin handbooks is further analysed by MICHELA ROSELLINI and ELENA SPANGENBERG YANES in their case study of Priscian's teaching. The article shows the need for further research on the availability of classical Latin texts in Constantinople, or in the Eastern Empire. Furthermore, the relationship of spoken and written Latin is to be explored further, too.

The fourth article from the pen of MARC BARATIN elucidates the political context of Priscian's oeuvre. BARATIN approaches his figure from John Lydos' viewpoint which is a scholarly novelty. Lydos in his work entitled *De magistratibus* covers with silence Priscian who was his predecessor as the main authority in the field of teaching Latin in Constantinople. BARATIN develops the arguable hypothesis that Priscian has been in contact with people of the former emperor Anastasios who became involved in the Nika revolt against Justinian.

The last contribution by THOMAS ERNST VAN BOCHOVE takes under scrutiny Justinian's *Digests*, *Institutions* and the *Code*. Despite the fact that it has been treated extensively in scholarship, VAN BOCHOVE handles previous scholarly views with versatility. VAN BOCHOVE addresses the phenomenon that Justinian had issued a legal *corpus* in Latin in a predominantly Greek speaking society. The main reason for this was that the sources of codification were mainly in Latin. As a result of this, as VAN BOCHOVE points out, mainly Greek speaking students of Roman law were taught in Greek to gain expertise in a subject whose language was Latin. Therefore, Justinian's measures brought about the naissance of a special legal language, the legal Latinogreek, displaying such forms as Gr. *DEFEN-DEUEIN* for Lat. *defendere*, or Gr. *ἡ EMPTION* for the Lat. *emptio*. It is also noteworthy that the pressure of a Greek-speaking environment forced the emperor to issue his *Novels* in Greek. This, conversely, resulted in a Latin course for Latin-speaking students. VAN BOCHOVE's fine overview focuses on legal theory and education. It may be fruitfully developed with some remarks on the everyday use of the Justinian codification in law-courts, namely how the actual judges spoke Latin after being instructed in Latinogreek.

Part Five bears the title 'Latin as a *medium* at the service of the power'. FRÉDÉRIQUE BIVILLE analyses the role of Latin in acclamation ritual. The concise paper surveys occasions and forms of ritualised acclamations in Rome, afterwards focuses on its Byzantine usages. As the tenth-century *Book of Ceremonies* demonstrate, the role of Latin was only marginal. Certain Latin chants are referenced (τὰ ῥωμαστὶ ᾄδόμενα). Furthermore, Latin

words indicate the Latin roots of respective solemnities, however, those are written in Greek with certain changes and shortcomings (see pp. 260–261). The article implies that these Latin words has become part of the Byzantine acclamation ritual at some point, however, tracing its history, at least of some words, may add to the value of the contribution.

VINCENT ZARINI surveys the sixth-century Flavius Cresconius Corippus' career and works who was a Latin poet of African origin. The case study shows ZARINI's expertise in Corippus' works and demonstrates that strictly Latin poetry could play a role in sixth-century Constantinople. ZARINI's remarks about Corippus' *Iohannis* show a Latin poet who addressed an African audience and, in ZARINI's opinion, in spite of the successful Byzantine campaign in North Africa, Corippus was not a one-sided supporter of Byzantium. This view is meaningful together with Libanios' example, treated by PELLIZZARI (p. 131 sqq.). However, people can change their views over time, as ZARINI's reading of the evidence goes. Some fifteen year after the *Iohannis*, Corippus fled to Constantinople and composed eulogies in the favour of Justin II and Anastasios, a high-ranking officer. ZARINI argues that Corippus composed the two eulogies in Constantinople against the recent assumption of HEINZ HOFMANN who suggested Carthage as the place of composition. At the same time, ZARINI emphasises that the two eulogies, and especially the one praising Justin II uses Latin terminology (*atria, penates, limina, or patres, clientes, plebs*), allusions to classical Latin passages (such as *Aeneid* 6.853: *parcere subiectis* etc., or the figure of Menenius Agrippa) for promoting the Roman idea of *concordia ordinum* and applying that to unify the opposing factions after Justinian's death.

The last paper in the unit is that of ANDREAS RHOBY. The researcher surveys Latin inscriptions produced in late Antiquity. The fourth century witnessed an increase in the number of Latin inscriptions as part of the adoption of the Roman traditions in state administration. RHOBY emphasises that Latin was the hallmark of imperial control, not only then, but also in the seventh century. Simultaneously, there are more and more Latin-Greek bilingual inscriptions. The surviving evidence is very meagre after the fifth century and ceases to exist by the beginning of the sixth. However, written sources testify to the existence of Latin inscriptions in Constantinople and in other parts of the empire also in the twelfth century. In most of the cases, stones and mosaics have preserved the surviving evidence. The magical display of Latin inscriptions is a promising field of research, particularly the question of why the Latin words could have had such effect

(see interesting remarks in RHOBY, ‘Text as art? Byzantine inscriptions and their display’, pp. 30–36).

Part six bears the title ‘Latin texts as sources’. BRUNO ROCHETTE’s contributions gives an overview about translations from Latin to Greek, between the 4th and 6th centuries. The article shows that from among the pagan Latin authors Virgil, Cicero and Eutropius has been subject of translations. In addition to these, Dositheus’ *Ars grammatica* has been converted to Greek, too. The translations made from Christian text display a great diversity from official documents to council decisions, histories, theological pieces and hagiography. Translations were made literally (*verbum e verbo*), or more freely (*sensum e sensu*), by and large the former was more frequent. In the case of pagan authors sometimes the content has been Christianised. ROCHETTE explains that the triggers behind translations were pedagogical and stemmed from literary interest in fewer cases. The papyri examples from lexica concerning Virgil and Cicero at p. 300 are instructive. The paper itself is a valuable overview and might be the stepping stone for further analysis about the audience and reception of the texts translated. ROCHETTE’s points insinuate the view about the Eastern Roman/early Byzantine society as Greek speaking, self-sufficient and showing little interest in Latin *paideia*. This may be distorting, taking into account only the number of Western refugees in late antique Constantinople and in the East.

The second paper by GIANFRANCO AGOSTI brings this question further. He deals with the topic whether poets, writing in Greek between the third and sixth centuries, imitated classical Latin poets, such as Virgil and Ovid. AGOSTI, in his sensible analysis, comes to two important conclusions. First, the knowledge of Latin language and literature should be distinguished from the imitation of Latin authors. Second, AGOSTI returns to the previously accepted theory which contends that assumed allusions to Latin poets go back to lost Hellenic models.

CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER traces the use of Latin in the *Chronicon Paschale*. The study is thoroughly documented, Latin forms appearing in the text are classified, listed and analysed. GASTGEBER carefully explains the history of the text and the Latin words’ examination is closely connected to the presentation of the manuscript tradition. On the whole, the *Chronicon* is a patchwork of multiple authors which was put together after 628. The first and best copy dates to the tenth century. The work is written in strict annalistic structure and heavily relies on its sources, particularly the chronicle of John Malalas. Latin technical terms appear especially regarding the

emperors Phokas and Heraclius. The *Chronicon* is presumably based on Latin-based sources, too, but those are used via Greek translations. Only one phrase is written with Latin characters which is arguably taken from Malalas.¹ The misreading of Latin words by the very author and/or the scribe demonstrates their weak Latin knowledge.

UMBERTO ROBERTO provides an early seventh-century case study on the knowledge of, and interest in Latin and classical Roman *paideia*, furthermore, the history of Roman republic. ROBERTO surveys the *Historia Chronike*, and its author John of Antioch. The paper is well structured, the introduction concisely discusses the period of Maurice and Heraclius from the aspect of Western emigres and the administrative elite who used Latin in the Eastern capital. After that ROBERTO examines the *Historia Chronike* and presents John of Antioch as member of the administrative elite. John liked Latin expressions and paid particular attention to the history and institutions of the Roman republic and later monarchy. He quoted a number of Latin authors, such as Livy, Virgil, Sallust and Suetonius. ROBERTO argues that John used manuals and florilegia for this purpose, what is more, he does not exclude that John used also Latin sources. The latter argument is probable, however, difficult to prove, at least on the basis of the evidence quoted by ROBERTO. For instance, John's use of the *Breviarium* of Eutropius only reflects its content without evident textual parallels.

LAURA MECELLA's article examines the life and works of Peter the Patrician who was Justinian's *magister officiorum*. MECELLA surveys Peter's *Περὶ πολιτικῆς καταστάσεως* and his *ἱστορία* which survive as fragments embedded in the tenth-century *De ceremoniis* and in the *Excerpta historica Constantiniana*. The former contains a number of Latin technical expressions from the bureaucratic and military sphere. These are partly transliterated, partly written with Latin characters. MECELLA claims that the *Περὶ πολιτικῆς* was composed to train imperial officers which brought about that Latin expressions have been inserted. Compared to the *Περὶ πολιτικῆς*, in the *ἱστορία* Latin phrases are avoided, however, it shows the influence of Latin authors, such as Virgil and Tacitus. MECELLA assumes that Tacitus' passage reached Peter via a mediating source which is not known today. The parallel passages between Tacitus and Peter that Mecella brings at p. 371 are convincing. Furthermore, MECELLA emphasises that Peter the Patrician used fourth-, and fifth-century historical works (based largely on the results of previous scholarship).

1. See the remarks of UMBERTO ROBERTO and OLIVIER GENGLERAND on Malalas' Latin at pp. 351–352 and 377 sqq.

OLIVIER GENGLER surveys John Malalas *Chronicle* from the viewpoint of its authors' Latin knowledge. GENGLER challenges the previous scholarly view that Malalas' expertise in Latin was quasi non-existent. Instead, he argues that Malalas might have known some Latin and was familiar with Latin literature to some degree. The examples of n. 12 in p. 379 could be inserted into main text as they improve GENGLER's hypothesis. The chronicler referred to thirteen different Latin authors (the chart is welcome at p. 381) and quotes Virgil and two inscriptions. GENGLER contends that Malalas did not read himself directly every author he referred to, nevertheless, he deemed it important to include them into his work. This approach mirrors the *usus* of the 6th century.

ALESSANDRO CAPONE brings a fascinating case study from the field of translation literature, focusing on sixth-century Latin versions of Gregory of Nazianzos' works in *Laur. S. Marco* 584. The article adds to our present knowledge, contained in inventories such as Loewe's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. CAPONE discusses the Greek and Latin vocabulary used in Gregory's *Epistula* 101, and 102, *Oratio* 45, 19 and *Carmen* 1, 2, and 3. The article brings lemmas for the letter α . Further investigation could explain reasons behind interpreting some words with different corresponding forms, such as ἀπαίδευτος is rendered as *indisciplinatus* and also *ineruditus*; or ἄνοος – *sine intellectu, sine mente*. The article would benefit from a little longer discussion of the manuscript under view.

The volume's last section is entitled 'Latin vocabulary transmitted across space and time'. JOSÉ-DOMINGO RODRÍGUEZ MARTÍN offers the survey how Latin legal terminology in the Byzantine legal treatise *De actionibus* was handled. The study stands out with its conciseness and precision. The study provides a clear classification of the use of Latin terms: some words were retained in its Latin form with Latin characters; some are embedded in Latin forms but applied according to Greek grammar; some are written with Greek characters; some were translated; finally in some cases, new Greek technical terms are coined. RODRÍGUEZ MARTÍN also points to misunderstandings of the Latin terminology. I am wondering whether more could be said about the use and audience of the text which is difficult to decide, as RODRÍGUEZ MARTÍN emphasises at p. 416.

MASSIMO MIGLIETTA studies the influence of Justinian's *Institutions* on the later Byzantine juridical tradition. MIGLIETTA's starting point is the Latin text and its Greek paraphrase by the *antecessor* Theophilos. It is praiseworthy that the investigation of the topic is a new endeavour, despite the vast literature on Justinianic legislation. MIGLIETTA convinc-

ingly shows that the Institutions were an authoritative text for the Greek-speaking *antecessores* and a normative source for lawyers. The article show's MIGLIETTA's expertise, however, its train of thought is difficult to follow which is due, in all likelihood, to the preliminary nature of his research, as the author emphasises at the beginning.

PETER SCHREINER demonstrates in a meticulously documented contribution that despite the Roman element in the Byzantine self-representation was central, the knowledge of the Latin language came almost to nought after the 6th century. SCHREINER bases his argument on the following remarks: Latin legal sources were translated into Greek; Latin-Greek glossaries were compiled for legal experts in which Latin words were transliterated; such manuals contained a number of errors; the shape of Latin characters which has been retained in the texts, remained in their sixth-century form; finally, it was only the chancery that from time to time made use of Latin in official documents. There were attempts at revitalizing Latin in the 13th century as part of negotiations to promote union between the Roman and Greek churches.

JOHANNES NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS closes the volume with analysing the use of Latin in Modern Greek. The author focuses on loanwords of vulgar or spoken Latin that came to be used in some modern Greek dialects. Despite that manuals are missing, or only partly present on historical geography and comparative history of the Greek language, NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS shows that these words had been applied in Byzantine Greek before became part of modern Greek dialects. The starting examples of *papilio* and *cubiculum*, taken from the Roman military language are not only amusing, but bolster the author's argument. The subsequent instances of *diarium*, *signum*, *siligo* and *peculium* are also instructive.

On the basis of what has been so far the volume is very welcome, it contains papers of high academic standard, fills gaps in scholarship and shows promising new ways for further research. It is a *sine qua non* on the shelves of people interested in Byzantium or late Antiquity, let them be historians, philologists, or literary scholars.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface (pp. 7–9)

GUGLIELMO CAVALLO, “Rhomaika: Una introduzione” (pp. 11–26)

General Framework

LUIGI SILVANO, “Desuetudine longa... subeunt verba latina”: The Transition From Late Antique to Medieval Byzantium and the Fall of Latin (pp. 27–42)

ALESSANDRO GARCEA, Latin in Byzantium: Different Forms of Linguistic Contact (pp. 43–72)

Latin in the Empire: Texts and People

JEAN-LUC FOURNET, La pratique du latin dans l’Égypte de l’Antiquité tardive (pp. 73–92)

CLAUDIA RAPP, The Use of Latin in the Context of Multilingual Monastic Communities in the East (pp. 93–108)

GABRIEL NOCCHI MACEDO, Writing Latin in Late Antique Constantinople (pp. 109–130)

The Laws of the Language and the Language of the Laws

ANDREA PELLIZZARI, La lingua degli Ἴταλοί. Conoscenza e uso del latino nell’Oriente greco di iv secolo attraverso l’opera di Libanio (pp. 131–142)

JUAN SIGNES CODOÑER, Asymmetric Exchange: Latin Speakers Learning Greek and Greek Speakers Learning Latin in Late Antiquity. On the Evidence of Grammars and Bilingual Texts (pp. 143–162)

MICHELA ROSELLINI – ELENA SPANGENBERG YANES, L’insegnamento di Prisciano (pp. 163–182)

MARC BARATIN, Sur un silence de Jean le Lydien (pp. 183–198)

THOMAS ERNST VAN BOCHOVE, Justinianus Latinograecus. Language and Law during the Reign of Justinian (pp. 199–246)

Latin as a Medium at the Service of the Power

FRÉDÉRIQUE BIVILLE, Le rituel des acclamations: de Rome à ‘Byzance’ (pp. 247–264)

VINCENT ZARINI, L'univers grec et latin d'un poète africain : Corippe et Byzance (pp. 265–274)

ANDREAS RHOBY, Latin Inscriptions in (Early) Byzantium (pp. 275–297)

Latin Texts as Sources

BRUNO ROCHETTE, La traduction du latin en grec à Byzance: un aperçu général (pp. 297–312)

GIANFRANCO AGOSTI, Modelli latini per poemi greci? Sulla possibile influenza di autori latini sulla poesia epica tardoantica (pp. 313–332)

CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER, Latin and the Chronicon Paschale (pp. 333–348)

UMBERTO ROBERTO, Sulla conoscenza del latino nell'Oriente romano nel periodo tra Maurizio ed Eraclio (582–641): il caso degli storici-funzionari e di Giovanni di Antiochia (pp. 349–360)

LAURA MECELLA, Latinismi e cultura letteraria nei frammenti di Pietro Patrizio: per un'indagine sul De cerimoniis e sugli Excerpta Historica Constantiniana (pp. 361–376)

OLIVIER GENGLER, Latin Literature in Johannes Malalas's Chronicle (pp. 377–394)

ALESSANDRO CAPONE, Appunti per un lessico grecolatino tardoantico: la traduzione latina di Gregorio di Nazianzo trasmessa dal Laur. S. Marco 584 (pp. 395–414)

Latin Vocabulary Transmitted across Space and Time

JOSÉ-DOMINGO RODRÍGUEZ MARTÍN, On the Use of Latin Legal Terminology in the Byzantine Legal Treatise De actionibus (pp. 415–430)

MASSIMO MIGLIETTA, Per lo studio dei rapporti tra Istituzioni di giustiniano e Libri basilici (pp. 431–446)

PETER SCHREINER, Latinité cachée à Constantinople (VIe – moitié XIIIe siècles) (pp. 447–464)

JOHANNES NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS, I latinismi nella lingua greca moderna (pp. 465–474)

Keywords

Byzantine empire; Latin