do. What has to be undertaken instead is something of a “life and times” approach, blending limited biographical evidence into wider contexts, with a good dose of speculation as to the roles played by the individual. For Charlemagne, the Frankish king and emperor who ruled from 768 to 814, none of his personal writings have survived, even if some of the most important administrative and theological texts of his reign were presented as if they were the product of the ruler’s own pen, and all sources of evidence for his reign need careful interpretation.

Accepting the overall limitation does not prevent Johannes Fried, in Charlemagne, from trying to identify incidents and textual details that might reveal something of Charlemagne’s own thoughts and feelings. This is regrettable, as none of the chosen examples seem convincing, and almost all depend on lavish use of the conditional tense: “may” and “might” feature all too often and arouse in the mind of the skeptical reader the response, “or just as easily may not.” Some of Fried’s interpretations depend more on evidential claims than on mere speculation, but too frequently these are asserted rather than proved. For example, it is suggested that “we may surmise that the death of his little brother affected Charlemagne deeply” (19)—just because that death was recorded in the set of annals now known as Annales Regni Francorum (under the year 759). This interpretation depends upon the view, unsupported here, that nothing could have been included in this text without his later approval. Such attempts at psychological insights are particularly frequent in the first chapter of the book, titled “Boyhood,” a period for which the evidence is especially sparse, but can be found throughout the book, culminating in an imagined dialogue between Charlemagne, on his deathbed, and God. In general, explicit text criticism is needed but lacking, even if some of the most important administrative and other practices. Particularly good are the sections devoted to the missi (royal messengers and inspectors), the Frankish army, the manorial economy, the influence of apocalyptic expectations, the Duchy of Bavaria, and Charlemagne’s maneuvers against its duke, Tassilo III, among many others. The incorporation of so many topics into a small number of long chapters can weaken the coherence of each, and there is quite a lot of repetition, even of incidental details; but there is no doubting the value of much of what is provided in these chapters, as well as in the final two, on the lead-up to the imperial coronation and on the new emperor’s final years. An excellent epilogue explores the way Charlemagne was seen in the Nazi period.

The translation, while professionally competent and readable, suffers from anachronisms. “Earldoms” (50) are purely Anglo-Saxon administrative units and the term cannot be used of Frankish counts. Similarly, the translator’s unfamiliarity with the subject results in the same man appearing as both Dietrich von Bern (25) and “the Visigothic king Theoderic” (350 and 439), doubling the error by making him the wrong kind of Goth. Other mistakes are numerous—for example, locating Grado in Spain (415) and making Ermoldus Nigellus an Anglo-Saxon (512). To know whether these are original authorial errors or slips in translation requires consultation of the German original of 2013.
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Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition, 867–1056, is stimulating and innovative in that it is the
very first social history of Byzantine law. The great merit of Zachary Chitwood’s study is that it narrates the story of the Roman legal tradition embedded in the larger framework of Byzantine legal culture, defined by Chitwood as the complicated interplay of the Roman legal and political legacy, Orthodox Christianity, and Hellenic culture. In all this, Chitwood focuses on a hinge epoch, namely, the ruling years of the Macedonian dynasty, which saw momentous changes in the legal heritage of the old Roman empire. In his study, Chitwood uses a vast array of sources, both legal—not only taken from secular, but also from canon law—and nonlegal, always contemplating them from the perspective of Byzantine legal culture. In this, the monograph transcends the more traditional histories of the sources of Byzantine law. A solid bibliography of primary and secondary sources, and an elaborate index make Chitwood’s monograph highly accessible. An extra bonus is the very welcome English translation of Constantine IX Monomachos’s *Novella constitutio*, a key source for the final chapter.

A good introduction discussing the main theme of the book and its theoretical background—considering both the strength and some drawbacks of this particular approach—and a clear set of main conclusions frame six individual chapters. For this short review I have concentrated on chapters 1 and 6.

The first chapter deals with the Macedonian codification effort, the so-called “Cleansing of the Ancient Laws,” that is, the legislation of the emperor Justinian (527–565), which started during the reigns of the emperors Basil I (867–886) and Leo VI (886–912). Chitwood regards this Macedonian codification effort “as the reappropriation of *Romanitas* [the Roman legal past]” driven by “the need for dynastic, ecumenical and political legitimation in the face of new powers which challenged the Byzantine Empire’s claim to the legacy of Roman imperial authority” (44). In his treatment of the sources relating to this purification of Justinian’s legislation—the prefaces to the *Prochiron*, the *Eisagoge*, the “Sixty Books,” and the *Epitome legum*, together with the Novels of Leo V—Chitwood also comes up with a clear account of the disputed datings of the *Prochiron* and the *Eisagoge* (25–26, with note 41). If one is to criticize the first chapter at all, it would concern the use of the term “Sixty Books” in order to designate the large compilation of laws issued by Leo VI (32–35): in my view, it would be better to refer to this compilation with the traditional phrase “*Basilica*,” as Leo’s compilation was issued in sixty books altogether, but not provided with the name “Sixty Books.”

The sixth chapter deals with legal education, and the establishment of the law school of Constantinople in the year 1047, through the *Novella constitutio* of Constantine IX Monomachos. In Chitwood’s view, the foundation of this law school—headed by the *nomophylax didaskalos* John Xiphilinos—epitomizes a revival in the study of secular law, while from the perspective of Byzantine legal culture, this foundation “represented a final rapprochement with the Roman political legacy” (183). Xiphilinos and future heads of the law school were supposed to know Latin, even though the last remnants of Latin were being Hellenized and expunged from the legal manuscripts. Before dealing with the law school proper, Chitwood presents a vivid and detailed account of the history of legal education from the days of Justinian up to the eleventh century while sketching the Hellenization of Roman law: the gradual process of exhellenismos (the substitution of Latin legal termini technici by Greek equivalents) (152–167). In his subsequent narrative of the activity of the law school (167–178), Chitwood argues that jurists still added exclusively so-called old scholia (marginal notes and comments dating from the sixth and early seventh centuries) to the text of the *Basilica* during the eleventh century, and possibly later (177–178). In this, he appears to have based his work on my own study (“Tenth Century Constantinople: Centre of Legal Learning? Second Thoughts Concerning the Addition of the Older Scholia to the Basilica Text,” *Fontes Minores* 12 [2014]: 69–96). However, in this study, I have argued that it is quite possible that the addition of the old scholia took place from the mid-twelfth century onward. There is, indeed, no direct, hard evidence for this, but the possibility of a tenth-century addition remains: it cannot be summarily ignored or disqualified, as Chitwood seems to do (177 n. 140). There is every chance that the addition of the old scholia is not so much an eleventh-century expression of Byzantine legal culture, but rather a tenth-century manifestation of the typically Byzantine phenomenon of encyclopedism, or better, the “cultura della sylloge,” a phrase coined by Paolo Odorico.

Finally, it should be observed that Chitwood’s monograph contains some curious slipups that may quite well be the result of rushed work during the final stages of writing or editing. Just a few examples. First, page 31 refers to three emperors mentioned in the rubric of the *Eisagoge*: “Basil, Constantine and Leo.” This must be Basil, Leo, and Alexander. The first set of three emperors occurs in the rubric of the *Prochiron*. Second, page 34 note 81 mentions an article by Berger published in 1954, which was refuted by Scheltema in 1942. Scheltema’s study was published in 1955. Third, page 153 omits any mention of Justinian’s *Institutiones* as part of the first year of that emperor’s legal curriculum. Fourth, page 154 describes the *Authenticum* as a Latin translation of the Greek Novels. Originally, however, the *Authenticum* was a kata podas rendering, intended as an auxiliary for Latin-speaking students. Fifth, page 171 depicts Tribonian as one of Justinian’s *antecessores* (professors of law). In reality, however, Tribonian was the emperor’s *quaestor sacri palatii*. Despite the above inaccuracies, Chitwood’s study is on balance an accessible and generally sound narrative, well worth reading for nonspecialists also.

THOMAS ERNST VAN BOCHOVE
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In *The Clergy in the Medieval World*, Julia Barrow provides an immensely valuable social history of the secular