searches of Old Russian law to have easy access to manuscripts that include the Old Church Slavonic translation of the *Ecloga*.

As a weak point of the reviewed publication one may consider the fact that the publisher did not use a specialized font for editing texts in the Old Church Slavonic language that would make it possible to indicate all the spelling features of the Old Russian texts. It is also a pity that the author also did not have time to prepare a translation of the text of the Old Church Slavonic *Ecloga* into one of the modern languages (e.g. modern Russian). This would have significantly broadened the group of recipients of the publication and allowed its use in work with students. In its current form, however, the presented publication is very valuable for mediaevalist historians and paleoslavists, introducing to the academic community an almost unknown source – the full Old Church Slavonic translation of the Byzantine *Ecloga* (so far only the original Greek text of the *Ecloga* has been published and translated into modern languages)[12].

[12] E.g. *Ecloga. Das Gesetzbuch Leons III und Konstantinos V,* ed. L. BURGMANN, Frankfurt-am-Main 1983, pp. 282 [= FBR, 10].

http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.03.18

MICHAŁ STACHURA, *Wrogowie porządku publicznego. Studium agresji językowej w Kodeksie Teodozjusza, Nowelach Postteodozjańskich i Konstytucjach Sirmondiańskich* [*Enemies of the Public Order. The Study of Language Aggression in the Theodosius Code, Post-Theodosian Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*], Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Historia Iagellonica", Kraków 2010, pp. 262.

Michał Stachura, the historian from Cracov working in the Department of the History of Byzantium at the Institute of History of the Jagiellonian University, has recently published a series of important papers, each of which is to a great extent based on the analysis of the *Theodosius Code*. He has been particularly interested in the terminology characteristic of statutes included in the Code just mentioned and pertaining to the unorthodox, Christian population of the Roman Empire. One of the goals he set himself was to uncover ideological components inherent in statutes dealing with heretics and determining their legal position[1]. The work under review embodies a new method developed by the author with a view to studying imperial constitutions directed not only against heretics but against

[1] See among others: *Pojęcie „heretycy w ustawodawstwie Konstantyna Wielkiego i jego następców* [*The Concept „Heretics" in the Legislation of Constantine the Great and that of his Successors*], Histor 30, 2000, p. 19–52; *Zur Motivation der Häretikerverfolgung im Spiegel von Gesetztestxten der Theodosianischen Dynastie,* [in:] *Freedom and Its Limits in the Ancient World. Proceedings of a Colloquim Held at the Iagiellonian University*, ed. D. BRODKA, J. JANIK, S. SPRAWSKI, Kraków 2003, p. 249–262; *W poszukiwaniu istoty przestępstwa innowierców – studia nad terminologią ustaw wymierzonych w niekatolików (364–450/455)* [*In search of the essence of the crime committed by religious dissenters – studies of terminology used in statutes directed against non-Catholics 364–450/455*], [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia źródłoznawcze,* vol. V, ed. T. DERDA, E. WIPSZYCKA, Kraków 2004, p. 219–269; *Eunomian rights to draw testaments in the legislation of 389–399*, ZSSR.KA 92, 2006, p. 45–62; *Stadt und Peripherie in der Häretikerpolitik der frühbyzantinischen Kaiser (ca. 325 bis 455)*, P 1, 2006, p. 133–152; *Kritik der superstitio und Affirmation der Orthodoxie in den Gesetzen des Codex Theodosianus,* [in:] *Studies on Late Roman History*, ed. E. DĄBROWA, Kraków 2007, p. 33–61 [= Ele, 12]; *Pogańska ofiara i heretyckie nabożeństwo w ujęciu praw Kodeksu Teodozjusza* [*Pagan sacrifices and religious ceremonies held by heretics in the Theodosian Code*], [in:] *SKaz*, vol. VI, ed. B. IWASZKIEWICZ-WRONIKOWSKA, D. PRÓCHNIAK, Lublin 2008, p. 179–192.

all groups of Roman society who may be said to have fallen victim to the offensive and insulting language used in the imperial law. Stachura is of the opinion that it was verbal aggression, coupled with undisguised contempt, which was used for denoting those whom Roman emperors regarded as enemies of the public order.

In the first part of his book the author defined the subject of his study – the language of invective, the term which he explains needs to be understood as *involving all means of expression used for creating such a language, deeply embedded in the ancient tradition of producing utterances of this kind*[2]. Stachura traces back this tradition to the Greek rhetoric of classical period which saw the emergence of two genres – called *psogos* and *koinos topos* – whose distinguishing mark was verbal attack. In late antiquity language aggression began to thrive again following the spread of panegyrics (praiseworthy qualities of one person being "enhanced" by comparison with character flaws of the other) and the outburst of religious controversies (fueled by theological disputes within the Church and the state`s growing hostility towards pagans and Jews). Stachura argues that abusive language was a tool used for expressing the idea of the emperor striving to protect his subjects, to ensure state security, and to uphold doctrinal correctness in matters of religion. "The brutality" of the language apparent in imperial statutes dealt with here was a dark side of the very same propaganda which made emperors exhibit their *clementia*. Except for the analysis of fully preserved documents offering examples of the invective language in its complete form, the author also examined partially preserved constitutions containing only single offensive words or phrases.

The case made in the second part of the work is that there is clearly a pattern to be detected in both the arrangement of the invective language in the imperial legislation and in the function it was supposed to exercise. It is for this reason that for the elucidation of the structure of the abusive language, the author relies on 10 examples derived from the *Theodosius Code* and *post-Theodosian Novels*. Since the latter are well-preserved, Stachura has been able to grasp key characteristics of the language of invective (repetitions, metaphors, enumerations etc.), isolating the main social circles considered hostile to the public order: 1) heretics and religious dissenters, 2) the dishonest – corrupted officials, and 3) various criminals committing such crimes as mugging, theft, or kidnappings. In the task of carrying out a rhetorical analysis of the statutes, the author usually begins by reciting at length their original versions and then turns to commenting on their content. The next step he takes consists in analyzing particular words which he organizes according to various criteria.

He isolates terms which, on his interpretation, were designed to denote the relation of hostility between the Roman community and its enemies; motives which informed the latter`s conduct; the nature of all acts hostile to the Roman order; and the wrong or erroneous religious stance.

Goals pursued by the author in the second part of his book left him with the necessity of carrying out an essentially philological analysis. And it is the study of language that allowed him to isolate – in the third and concluding part of the book – various classes of enemies (according to charges laid against them) and build their hierarchical portrait.

The first category of enemies involves those who committed a crime of sacrilege. The last term was usually taken to indicate non-compliance with imperial laws or simply disregard for imperial authority, which could manifest itself in a destruction or desecration of the Emperor`s effigies (also by counterfeiting imperial coins), or in a tax evasion. Stachura emphasizes the fact that the Roman authorities were not as much concerned about the protection of the legal order as they were about the protection of the law itself which was granted a special immunity and was surrounded by an aura of sanctity embedded in the sacrosanct character of the imperial power itself (p. 184).

Enemies of the state made up the second category of those who brought upon themselves the language of invective. In the first place this group included barbarians. They were re-

[2] *…obejmując tym pojęciem wszelkie środki wyrazu służące do stworzenia inwektywy, zakorzenione w antycznej tradycji tworzenia tego typu deprecjonujących wypowiedzi* – p. 29.

garded as invaders and robbers impelled by cruelty which in the Greco-Roman tradition was thought of as destroying the ancient value *humanitas*. It is interesting to note that – as opposed to a variety of ancient texts – there are no other charges laid against barbarians in the documents examined by the author. The image of the barbarian to be created on the basis of those documents is not so much a traditional one as it is reduced to the very essence of this tradition. The barbarian is a dangerous invader, actuated only by cruelty which remains so foreign to the Greco-Roman tradition. It is also the so-called internal enemies that were ranked among enemies of the state. That group consisted of usurpers and criminals who had a record of assault and mugging. The imperial legislation allows one to combine the latter crime with desertion. It also assists the notion that some areas of the Roman Empire were stricken with banditry.

Enemies of the state also included enemies of the Orthodox Church which was supported by the state machinery. And it is, of course, heretics and – to a lesser degree – Jews and pagans that were ranked among this group. However, under the imperial law it was only heretics that counted as criminals; where pagans were concerned, it took making an offering to a pagan deity to commit a crime. One did not commit a crime simply by being a pagan. Judaism was considered a deviation from the true religion. Nevertheless, it enjoyed a relative tolerance which Roman emperors were inclined to display for quite a long time. The invective language was thus applied to all three groups, with laws directed against heretics, however, standing out by its impetuosity. The very term *hereticus*, says M. Stachura, was regarded as an invective.

Corrupted officials were also condemned as enemies of the Roman order. They failed to protect it, even though it was the task they were called upon to perform. Imperial legislation charged palace officials and provincial governors with all sorts of abuses, ascribing them vile motives. Palace officials were accused of exceeding their public service remit and of abusing power while acting as tax collectors. Audacity, avarice, or obstinate refusal to obey the Emperor`s orders were among the invectives with which they were referred to. The terms were also supposed to reveal their base motives. Provincial governors were often charged with negligence of duty in administering justice (they are blamed for failing to dispense justice impartially, or for denying the right of appeal). Their contemptible conduct was motivated by greed, laziness, (characterized by different terms), audacity (*audacia*), insolence (*insolentia*), and madness (*furor*). Officials that came under the authority of a governor were accused of making decisions that violated existing laws, or of using their position as governor`s agents for deriving illegal profits. Stachura has created a long list of offenses committed by different officials, stressing the fact, however, that some of their abuses – for example, corruption – need to be treated as purely theoretical. In all probability, this corruption was hypothetical only and should not be assumed to have existed in reality. Referring to it was a way of demonstrating the imperial power and its commitment to *never surrender control over the administrative apparatus* (p. 69).

The fifth category of enemies consisted of those whose offences, although punishable, were not regarded as stemming directly from the hostility towards either the state or the Church. Witchcraft, grave looting, homosexualism, adultery, incest, abduction of women (especially abduction of consecrated virgins), and the use of violence (especially taking possession of a disputed area by the use of force, while the area still remained the subject of a legal tussle) were among the heaviest crimes to be found in this group. Perpetrators of such acts were usually charged with audacity (*audacia*).

Approaching the problem from a purely statistical angle, it is heretics that were considered to be the worst enemies of the Roman order. The invective language, in its most extensive form, was leveled against them. Those who were found guilty of a variety of violent offences such as robbery and assault, grave looting, adultery, pimping, sorcery, abduction of women ranked second in this category. The third group of enemies was composed of officials who abused their power.

Raising both legal and historical issues *Enemies of Roman Order* is as much a book on the history of Roman law as it is on the history of Roman society and Roman administration in late antiquity. Stachura has succeeded in

demonstrating to how great an extent imperial legislation regulated social and religious norms in the epoch under consideration. He has thrown into relief the fact that emperors took it as one of their most important goals to make both their subjects and their administrative apparatus abide by the existing law. Specifying words and terms which were meant to convey an offensive and disdainful meaning, he has compiled a dictionary of invective, indicating expressions and terms which can actually be looked at as an ideological justification for penal sanctions to be applied against members of social groups mentioned in the above. He has offered a hierarchy of Roman society – seen from the perspective of the emperors – with Orthodox Christians on top of it and heretics at the bottom. *If we take a closer look at the hierarchy, then we shall see that it is not the state but the Church that was regarded as the key value which deserved protection in the first place*[3].

It is not only historians of Roman law, Roman society, and Roman administration, but also classical philologists and experts on the history of religion that are likely to find the analysis of the language of imperial constitutions carried out in the book under review interesting. Stachura clarified the meaning of many terms, devoting a separate chapter to those which identified all sorts of religious errors. His focus was not only on elucidating the difference in their meaning – sometimes very subtle – but also on revealing their origin. In pursuing his analyses, he often drew on the Greek philosophy of classical period and the Laws of the Twelve Tables.

Stachura has provided the reader with an original dissertation which offers much insight into many aspects of Roman history in late antiquity. Although his book deserves praise and is an important scholarly achievement, the author could sometimes be more accurate in presenting his ideas. He, for example, appears to be too casual in applying quotation marks to words such as enemy/enemies or invective/invective language. The overuse of quotation marks often leaves the reader in a quandary over the way in which a given word or phrase is to be understood. And since the exact meaning of some key terms is of crucial importance for the line of reasoning presented in the book, the reader should be left with no doubt as to how to understand them.

I am convinced that the work of Stachura is going to serve as an important point of reference for all students of Roman history, especially those who are interested in different aspects of social order of the Roman Empire (Roman administration, the authorities` response to social disturbances etc). Offering some information upon normative sources of late antiquity, it is also likely to attract the attention of those scholars for whom the *Theodosius Code* remains the main *instrumentum studiorum*.

Translated by Artur Mękarski
Paweł Filipczak (Łódź)

[3] *Jeśli przyjrzymy się naszej hierarchii, szczególnie chronioną wartością okazuje się nie państwo, lecz wspierany przezeń Kościół i jego prawowierność* – p. 206.

Świat rzymski w V wieku [*Le monde romain au v^e^ siècle*], red. Rafał Kosiński i Kamilla Twardowska, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Historia Jagellonica", Kraków 2010, pp. 464.

Le monde romain au v^e^ siècle est une synthèse d'un siècle dans l'histoire de l'Empire romain tardif, l'image panoramique de l'État et de la société de cette époque, la première présentation de Rome du v^e^ siècle de ce type en langue polonaise. Dans un seul volume on a abordé différents aspects de la civilisation romaine tradive, complexes et divergeants – le fait incontestable et digne d'être mentionné.

La première partie du livre, consacrée à l'histoire politique, comprend des chapîtres suivants : *Rzymski Zachód w latach 395–493*