

Summer 6-1999

Falcandus and Fulcaudus Epistola ad Petrum liber de Regno Sicilie Literary form and author's identity

Gwenyth Hood

Marshall University, hood@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/english_faculty

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Medieval Studies Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hood, Gwenyth E. "Falcandus and Fulcaudus, Epistola ad Petrum, Liber de Regno Sicilie: Literary Form and Author's Identity." *Studi Medievali*, June 1999 3rd Series, XL pp. 1-41.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Faculty Research by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

Falcandus and Fulcaudus, « Epistola ad Petrum, Liber de Regno Sicilie » Literary Form and Author's Identity

In Paris, in 1550, when the printing press was still relatively new, Gervais de Tournay published a medieval chronicle under the title, *Historia Hugonis Falcandi Siculi De rebus gestis in Siciliae regno iam primum typis excusa* [« The History of Hugo Falcandus the Sicilian, concerning things done in the Kingdom of Sicily, now printed for the first time »]. He had discovered this history, as he explains in his preface, in a codex placed at his disposal by Matthew Longuejume, bishop of Soissons, a codex so ravaged by time that it looked repulsive enough to poison the hand that dared to touch it ⁽¹⁾. But he was pleased to save from oblivion the admirable work contained within it. Apparently the *Historia* evoked this reaction through its literary qualities alone, since Gervais seemed to know nothing about the time or place it concerned, and in his preface, he made, as G. B. Siragusa said, a sorry mess (« una brutta confusione ») of the various dynasties which had ruled Sicily ⁽²⁾. Evidently all the information he gave about the *Historia* itself, to the extent that it was accurate, came from the codex he had before him, which is now lost. As published, his *editio princeps* began with a prefatory letter, titled « Letter to Peter, treasurer of the church of Palermo, concerning the calamity of Sicily » (*Praefatio ad Petrum Panormitanae Ecclesiae Thesaurarium de calamitate Siciliae*) and was followed by the

(1) GERVAIS DE TOURNAY *Praefatio*, p. 6, quoted in G. B. SIRAGUSA, ed., *La Historia o Liber de regno Sicilie e la Epistola ad Petrum Panormitane Ecclesie Thesaurarium di Ugo Falcando*, Rome, Istituto Storico Italiano, 1897, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia*, p. xxvi. (All quotations from the works of Falcandus are taken from this edition, unless stated otherwise).

(2) SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., p. xx.

history proper, which was titled *De Tyrannide Siculorum*. Gervais de Tournay did not know the dates of the events within the *Historia*, but later scholars supplied them. In fact, the *Historia* concerns the reigns of the two kings William of Sicily, father and son. It covers the entire reign of William I (r. 1152-1166) who is commonly known as « William the Bad » largely because of the account of him given in this very work, and it continues through the first three years of the minority of William II (r. 1166-1189), commonly called « William the Good » because of his excellent reputation elsewhere. The chronological account of the *Historia* ends shortly after the great earthquake of February 4, 1169. However, the ostensibly prefatory *Epistola ad Petrum*, from internal evidence, was written during the political crisis which followed the death of William II in 1189. At that time, a Sicilian faction rejected William's designated successor, Constance, and crowned Tancred, an illegitimate grandson of Roger II, as their king, an act which rendered inevitable the *calamitas* of the title: the invasion of Sicily by the mighty armies of Constance's husband, Henry VI of Hohenstaufen.

Superficially, then, there is a gap of some twenty years between the events of the *Historia* and those of the *Epistola*. However, the *Historia* apparently alludes to the death of Pope Alexander III when the author, describing events which happened around 1160, mentions that Alexander *then* (« tunc ») presided over the Roman Church, implying that he no longer did so at the time of the writing (p. xix, 28) ⁽³⁾. Alexander III died in 1181,

(3) H. HOFFMANN has argued that *tunc* here does not necessarily imply that Alexander III has died at the time of the writing; see his *Hugo Falcandus und Romuald von Salerno*, in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 23 (1967), pp. 117-170 (especially pp. 130-133). He argues that the passage where Falcandus asserts that Bari, destroyed in 1155, « now (*nunc*) lies transformed into heaps of stone, » is evidence for an early date of the *Historia*, since Bari was rebuilt long before Alexander III's death. However, Jamison, Fuiano, and Loud and Wiedemann point out that Falcandus is using the « historic present » in this passage, and it therefore does not imply that the city still lay in ruins as the author wrote. See E. JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius of Sicily. His Life and Work and the Authorship of the Epistola Ad Petrum and the Historia Hugonis Falcandi Siculi*, London, 1957, p. 236; M. FUIANO, *Ugo Falcando*, in *Studi di Storiografia Medioevale ed Umanistica*, Naples, 1975, pp. 105-195: p. 137); and G. LOUD and T. WIEDEMANN, tr., *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily by Hugo Falcandus' and Other Contemporary Sources for the Sicilian Kingdom 1153-69*, Manchester, 1998, pp. 41-42. LOUD and WIEDEMANN (*The History of the Tyrants of Sicily* cit., p. 39) cannot dismiss HOFFMANN's argument that *tunc*, as they paraphrase him, « could in Medieval Latin sometimes mean 'now' or 'in the very recent past' (like the modern German *jetzt*) as well as its more common classical meaning 'then' / at some time in the (more distant) past' ». However, the issue is a passage, not a single word, and for the word, the usage in the *Historia* is more

which reduces the gap between the works to about nine years. Actually, the brief but significant passages which express hostility to William II and focus friendly attention on the future king Tancred, quite out of proportion to his slight role in the events, suggest that the *Historia* was also put into its final form during Tancred's brief reign. It is easy to see how the news of William II's death (and perhaps of Tancred's crowning) might have moved the author, now living somewhere outside the kingdom of Sicily, to take up and revise a work he had written earlier and send it, along with a prefatory letter, to a friend in Sicily. These are the impressions created by the work as presented in the *editio princeps*.

But today, largely because of the influence of G. B. Siragusa's now definitive 1897 edition, which was based on an examination of the surviving manuscripts, what De Tournay published as one work is now regarded as two. The *Historia* is usually called *Liber de Regno Sicilie*, a generic title which translates literally as « The Book of the Kingdom of Sicily. » (However, Graham Loud and Thomas Wiedemann have assigned to their newly published English translation the title *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily*, echoing De Tournay's edition) ⁽⁴⁾. Meanwhile the *Epistola ad*

relevant than the evidence from charters and chronicles which Hoffmann offers to support his theory about a late Medieval meaning for *tunc*. In the *Historia*, *tunc* appears more than forty times and consistently seems to have its classical meaning, which can usually be translated with the English « then, » referring to a point in time, either in the past or within a sequence of events. Once, indeed, *tunc* refers to a time that never came to be, when the archbishop Hugh tells admiral Maio that if he should obtain custody of the king's sons as well as the treasure, « then » (*tunc*) everyone would realize that he was aiming at the throne (p. 36). More often, *tunc* is used to introduce a detail in the past which is relevant to the narrative. For example, on p. 8 Falcandus introduces the archbishop Hugh, « who then presided over the church of Palermo » (*qui tunc Panormitane preerat ecclesie*). That Hugh no longer presides over the church of Palermo as Falcandus writes is clear because on p. 49 he reports the archbishop's death. In other cases, it is less definite that the detail introduced by *tunc* no longer applies. When Nicholas the Logothete warns Maio of his danger shortly before his assassination in 1160, Falcandus mentions that Nicholas was, at that time, (*tunc*) lingering in Calabria (p. 37). Was Nicholas still lingering in Calabria as Falcandus wrote? Probably not, but of course it hardly matters. Nicholas might have departed from Calabria and returned there again a dozen times or more without its being relevant to the narrative; what matters is that he was there then (*tunc*) to warn Maio. However, the name of the reigning pope would always be relevant to most twelfth century readers of Latin chronicles, so when Falcandus thinks it necessary to mention, as background, that permission was sought from Alexander III who « then » (in 1160) governed the Roman church (*Alexandro pape, qui tunc Romane presidebat Ecclesie*), the inference is strong that some other pope was reigning by the time the passage was written, just as SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., JAMISON (*Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 236) and FUIANO (*Ugo Falcando* cit., p. 137) thought.

(4) LOUD and WIEDEMANN, tr., *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily* cit.

Petrum is perceived as a short, independent work of propaganda, intended to draw support to the newly crowned Tancred in 1190. Siragusa took his title and the order of the works from the oldest manuscript then available to him, cod. Par. Lat. 6262, which he designated **A** in his apparatus ⁽⁵⁾. (An older manuscript has since turned up, and as textual studies indicate that it was copied from the lost Longuejoue codex, it is now clear that the latter was older than any surviving manuscript) ⁽⁶⁾.

Siragusa adopted the form and title of **A** even though he perceived that the text had been deliberately tampered with by one or more scribes who frankly aimed to reverse the author's meaning (p. xxxii). Apparently it did not occur to him that the reversal of the order of the works could also be a product of this tampering. Also, though Siragusa kept the name « Hugo Falcandus » in his edition, he stressed the fact that De Tournay's source for this name was unknown and unverifiable. So, with Siragusa's new edition, the *Historia* changed its literary form and lost clear title to any author's name. Though Siragusa himself remained convinced that the *Historia* and the *Epistola* were by the same author, others were more inclined to doubt it. Hence, after Siragusa's edition even more than before it, the author's identity, as Evelyn Jamison said, became « one of the most debated questions of twelfth century Sicilian historiography » ⁽⁷⁾.

(5) SIRAGUSA also declared that De Tournay's title for the *Historia* was thematically inappropriate (*La Historia* cit., p. xvii). He retained the title of the *Epistola* from De Tournay's edition because there was no title in **A** (*ibid.*, p. 169).

(6) When SIRAGUSA created his edition, he designated the manuscripts available to him as **A**, **B**, and **C**. When the older manuscript, long kept in a monastery at Catania, was acquired by the Vatican, he designated it **D** in the appendix he then published to his edition. See *La Historia o Liber de regno Sicilie e la Epistola ad Petrum Panormitane Ecclesie Thesaurarium di Ugo Falcando. Lezione del cod. di S. Nicolò dell'Arena di Catania ora Vaticano Lat. 10690*, Rome, Istituto Storico Italiano, 1904, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*. Also see M. VATTASSO, *Del Codice Benedettino di San Nicolò dell'Arena di Catania, continente La Historia o Liber de Regno Sicilie e La Epistola ad Petrum Panormitane Ecclesie Thesaurarium di Ugo Falcando*, in *Archivio Muratoriano*, n. 2, Città di Castello, 1905. Evelyn Jamison follows Marco Vattasso in designating this Catanian codex as **V** and this serves better to remind us that this manuscript is anomalous with Siragusa's apparatus and came to light later. The manuscripts, conveniently listed on pp. 183 and 374 of JAMISON's book (*Admiral Eugenius* cit.) are as follows.

A: cod. Par. Lat. 6262 (late thirteenth century).

B: cod. Par. Lat. 14357 (fourteenth century).

C: cod. Par. Lat. 5151 (fourteenth century).

V: cod. Vat. Lat. 10690 (early thirteenth century).

P*: the lost Longuejoue Codex (early thirteenth or late twelfth century).

These manuscripts fall into two « recensions, » **P*VC** (**C** was copied from **V** which was copied from **P***) and **AB** (**B** was copied from **A**).

(7) JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 177.

To expend enormous effort simply to assign some long-dead author the honor or infamy of having written these works would, perhaps, be frivolous, but of course, the case is not so simple. The author's voice is an integral part of these works; in one or the other or both of them, he speaks in the first person, addresses a personal friend, alludes to his own past, and pronounces judgements on important questions. To his original readers, it mattered who was speaking; therefore, it matters to us. Hence, to recover the author's identity is to recover part of the work. Naturally, repeated attempts have been made to do so, before and after Siragusa's edition. Some scholars were content to speculate about the author's character and condition without proposing a specific identity. His acquaintance with palace architecture and palace intrigues suggested a position in the Sicilian government; besides this, his language was so much the language of the chancery that Enrico Besta, Charles Haskins, and C. A. Garufi all believed he had been a court notary⁽⁸⁾. His probable role in the government caused many to suppose him a layman, though Bernhard Schmeidler thought him a cleric because his depth of learning and the skill he displayed in alluding to authors such as Sallust, Eusebius, Sedulius, and Boethius, while yet adapting their words to his own contexts, showed that he had mastered ecclesiastical education of his time to the highest degree⁽⁹⁾.

Several specific identities have also been proposed. The first was Hugues Foucaud, or Hugo Fulcaudus, who was the abbot of Saint Denis from 1186-1197. Of this abbot's origin, nothing is known for certain, and the first clear evidence of his presence at Saint-Denis is found a charter of abbot William of Gap, dated 1183, where « Hugo Fulcaudus prior » is the first witness listed⁽¹⁰⁾. Fr. Clement, a Benedictine of Saint Maur⁽¹¹⁾, first proposed him as the author in 1770, and Heinrich C. F. Hillger, in

(8) E. BESTA, « *Il Liber de Regno Sicilie* » e la Storia del Diritto Siculo, in *Miscellanea Salinas*, Palermo, 1907, p. 262. I have not been able to see this article; Carlo Alberto Garufi provided the previous citation: See C. A. GARUFI, *Roberto di S. Giovanni, maestro notaio e il Liber de Regno Sicilie*, in *Archivio storico per la Sicilia*, 18 (1944), p. 47; and C. H. HASKINS, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, 1927, pp. 262-263.

(9) B. SCHMEIDLER in *Italienischer Geschichtsschreiber des XII. and XIII. Jahrhunderts*, Hugo Falcandus, in *Leipziger Historische Abhandlungen*, XI, Leipzig, 1909, p. 82.

(10) *Cartulaire Blanc* of Saint-Denis (Paris, Arch. Nat., LL 1157), pp. 785-786.

(11) Hugues Foucaut, *Abbé de Saint-Denis en France*, in *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. XV, Paris, 1869, pp. 274-282.

his 1878 dissertation, was the last to put forward his claims in any depth ⁽¹²⁾. Very soon after that, in 1880, the Foucaud authorship was vigorously attacked by Friedrich Schröter ⁽¹³⁾, and since then he has had no convinced advocate. Obviously, his name had been one of his strongest assets. His location, too, agreed with the foreign *provenance* of the *Epistola* and the pro-Frankish bias of the *Historia*. For in the opening of the *Historia*, the so-called Falcandus reports that Roger II, whom he presents as an ideal king, « was of Norman stock, and knew that the Frankish nation excelled all others in the glory of war »; hence he was readiest to love and honor warriors from across the Alps ⁽¹⁴⁾. Moreover, though the *Historia* recounts the actions of many Franks, not all of whom behave well or wisely, the writer never offers any insult to the *gens Francorum* as a whole or undercuts the high prestige which this passage assigns them. He is not so favorable to the other two nations who made up most of the rest of the Christian population of Sicily at the time; to the Greeks he casually attributes perfidy (p. 133), and to the « Longobards » he ascribes « ambiguous faith » (p. 77). « Longobard » here probably means « Apulian of Lombard descent, » and Falcandus is more sympathetic to the *gens Lombardorum* (p. 70) who have towns in Sicily itself. Still, he never offers them a compliment like the one he offered to the *gens Francorum*.

Besides expressing a high opinion of the *gens Francorum*, the so-called Falcandus also provides a disproportionately large amount of information about the Franco-Norman nobility of the kingdom and diplomacy involving France. He records that the Greek emperor, Manuel Comnenus, sent armies into the kingdom to help the nobles against William I (p. 13), but says almost nothing of the dispute between the rulers, focusing instead on the aims of the nobles. On the other hand, during the minority

(12) H. C. F. HILLGER, *Das Verhältniss des Hugo Falcandus zu Romuald von Salerno*, Hall a/S, 1878, pp. 11-12.

(13) F. SCHRÖTER, *Über die Heimath des Hugo Falcandus Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Unter Italiens*, Eisleben, 1880. Unfortunately, I have not been able to see a copy of Schröter's work myself and have been forced to depend on what others report, particularly JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., pp. 199-209, 221-222 and F. CHALANDON, *Histoire de la Domination Normande en Italie et en Sicilie*, I, Paris, 1907; rpt. New York, 1960, pp. LIV-LV.

(14) « Transalpinos maxime cum ab normannis originem duceret sciretque Francorum gentem belli gloria ceteris omnibus anteferri, plurimum diligendos elegerat et propensius honorandos ». SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., p. 6.

of William II, he reports a correspondence between Queen Margaret and the archbishop of Rouen (p. 109) which draws their kinsman, Stephen du Perche, to Sicily. Yet he neglects to mention negotiations which happened around the same time and are reported by his contemporary, Romuald of Salerno, concerning a match between young William II and Maria Porphyrogenita, Manuel's daughter⁽¹⁵⁾. Knowledge of these negotiations might have helped explain why, as Falcandus reports, there were fears in 1168 or 1169 that Manuel might invade Sicily, presumably with the good will of the queen-regent Margaret and the young king, to re-establish Stephen du Perche in his archbishopric after he had been expelled (p. 165). Hence, upon the whole, Falcandus tells less about Greek affairs than seems necessary to make his own narrative coherent. When his information extends beyond the royal court, it appears to follow lines of French transmission. French, as he makes clear, was an indispensable language at the royal court (p. 127), so it seems probable that « Hugo Falcandus, » as a courtier, knew it well. Thus, if he ever found it best to leave Sicily, France would be a likely destination. Once in France, he might well have been drawn to the Abbey of Saint-Denis, famous for its literary activities and its own tradition of royal chronicles, some written by Hugues Foucaud's predecessors, the abbots Suger and Odo of Deuil⁽¹⁶⁾.

Beyond this, contemporary references point to abbot Hugues. Peter of Blois, in his letter 131, addressed to his nephew Ernald, states that the current abbot of Saint-Denis as well as the current pope could bear witness to the high position he had held in Sicily as *sigillator* or keeper of the seal, when he was tutor to young William II⁽¹⁷⁾ from about 1166-1168, that is, during the years when the account of the *Historia* is most detailed. In his letter 116⁽¹⁸⁾ Peter actually addresses a certain abbot H. of Saint-Denis and proposes, as one literary man to another, that they exchange works. Peter asks in particular to see a « treatise » which H. has written about unfortunate events in Sicily:

(15) *Chronicon Romualdi II Archiepiscopi Salernitani*, VII, part. 1, ed. C. A. GARUFI, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, Raccolta degli Storici Italiani dal cinquecento al millecinquecento*, ed. L. A. MURATORI. New edition, Città di Castello 1909-1935, p. 254.

(16) See G. M. SPIEGEL, *The Chronicle Tradition of Saint-Denis*, Brookline, Mass. and Leyden, 1978.

(17) PETER OF BLOIS *Ep.* 131 (*PL*, CCVII, col. 390a).

(18) *Ibid.* (*PL*, CCVII, coll. 345-346).

Moreover, concerning that treatise in which you described your situation, or rather, your downfall, in Sicily, I entreat you that you might share it with me, if that can be, so that curtain may draw back curtain and one cherub gaze back upon another ⁽¹⁹⁾.

Certainly, there are some points of confusion in this evidence. Peter's next words indicate that abbot H. is currently embroiled in a serious dispute with his king:

I have learned of your desperate straits, I know the crosses you bear, I know of the theft of your goods, I heard the thundering of the royal threats, and also I was there on the spot when they goaded your household into uproar against you. You have been set in the smelting furnace of the Lord, but enduring patience will prove your magnanimity, which has often strengthened itself in such tight places... May He provide you with a more honorable peace who bears away the breath of princes and treads down the necks of the proud with His own strength ⁽²⁰⁾.

Much effort has been expended trying to find a precise account of this quarrel, and Schröter, in his attack on Foucaud's authorship, apparently argued that as Hugues Foucaud had good relations with Philip Augustus, the Abbot H. of this letter must be his successor, Hugh of Milan ⁽²¹⁾. When Evelyn Jamison re-

(19) « Rogo autem, quatenus tractatum, quem de statu, aut potius de casu vestro in Sicilia descripsistis, communicetis mihi, si fieri potest: ut cortina cortinam trahat, unus cherubin alterum respiciat ». The phrase « that curtain may draw curtain and one cherub gaze back upon another, » is an allusion to *Sanctus Sanctorum* (Exodus 25: 182), a fact which was called to my attention by Dr. Charles Witke, of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Witke suggests, « [i]t might signify, in a flowery way, that the recipient shouldn't keep secret what has been happening, but reveal it to his fellow denizen of the inner sanctuary ». (Private e-mail, Wednesday, June 18, 1997. Quoted by permission). Perhaps Peter hoped that the *tractatus* would reveal some mystery about the quarrel he describes later in the letter. Another confusing point about the letter is Peter's reference to abbot H.'s *casus*, supposedly described in the *tractatus*. Actually the so-called Falcandus does not directly describe whatever misfortune he may have had. However, Peter has obviously not seen the work in question, and could easily have misunderstood what he had heard about it.

(20) « Novi vestras angustias, novi cruces, novi rapinam bonorum vestrorum, audivi regia comminationis tonitruum; atque praesentialiter aderam, ubi vestros domesticos excitabat contra vos in tumultum. Positus estis in conflatorio Domini, sed magnanimitatem vestram, quae se in tam arctis rebus frequenter exercuit, finalis patientia declarabit. . . . Honestiorem pacem vobis provideat, qui aufert spiritum principum, ac sublimium colla propria virtute conculcat ».

(21) JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 201. There is evidence that Philip's relationship with Saint-Denis became somewhat strained after 1190, while Foucaud was still abbot. That year, many things happened: Philip Augustus set out on his crusade, the *Epistola ad Petrum* was dispatched to Sicily, and according to Elizabeth Charpentier, Foucaud's contemporary Rigord, chronicler of Saint-Denis, ceases to apply the epithets *Augustus* and *christianissimus*,

viewed Schröter's arguments, she found them sufficiently flawed that she preferred to brush them aside and instead exclude Hugues Foucaud with a careful analysis of dates; however, her analysis also has its flaws⁽²²⁾. When all the dust has settled, these two letters are far more likely to refer to Hugues Foucaud than to anyone else.

Further evidence accumulated after the case for Hugues Foucaud had been more or less forgotten. In 1909 Schmeidler reported that Guillaume de Nangis, writing at Saint-Denis about a hundred years after abbot Hugues (some time between 1286 and 1297, as Jamison establishes the date), apparently had Falcandus's *Historia* before him and copied a passage from it, almost word for word, into his text on the life of *Louis IX*⁽²³⁾. Jamison (p. 371) exerts herself to explain how **A** (the oldest manuscript now surviving in France) might have arrived at Saint-Denis by this time. In order to have done so, **A** would have to be slightly older than its official catalog classification, and **B**, which was

to Philip Augustus, except for one final usage of each term, in 1204 and 1205 respectively. Probably, Charpentier suggests, Rigord's first recension of his *Gesta Philipii Augusti* had been finished in 1190 and presented to Philip when he came to Saint Denis to receive the oriflamme from Abbot Hugues. After 1190, Rigord's continuations were « sur un mode beaucoup moins élogieux et parfois franchement hostile » (p. 10). See E. CHARPENTIER, *Histoire et informatique Recherchés sur le vocabulaire des biographies royales français*, in *Cahiers de Civilisation médiévale*, 25 (1982), pp. 3-30. After 1190, Philip had many reasons for quarreling with churchmen: his devices against Richard of England, his fellow crusader, his taxation of his clergy, and his marriage and repudiation of Ingeborg of Denmark. The *Historia* of « Falcandus » might itself have contributed to the quarrel, since Philip Augustus was allied with Henry VI of Hohenstaufen.

(22) Hugues Foucaud died on October 24, 1197, and JAMISON (*Admiral Eugenius* cit.) suggests that letter 116 was a letter of congratulations to his successor, translating *primitias novi fructus* (« firstlings of new fruit ») as « firstfruits of the new position » (ibid. p. 204). « Firstfruits, » however, more likely to refers to the writing which Peter sends to H., since Peter later refers to the *fructusque suavior et uberior* in his other works. As for letter 131, Jamison suggests it was written about the same time as Letter 116, in 1197 or 1198, because in 1198 Peter's nephew Ernald became abbot of Saint Laumer, but he is not assigned this title in letter 131. By this evidence, the letter cannot have been written more than a few months after the death of Hugues Foucaud. However, Peter cannot be referring to a newly elected abbot of Saint Denis in letter 131 because it is clear that there has been a stretch of time during which Ernald could (*potuisti*) know from the words of « ipsius papae, qui nunc sedet . . . et abbatis S. Dionysii » about the high honors Peter once enjoyed in Sicily. Had either pope or abbot been new in his position, Peter would, in this context, have said so. Also, though as Jamison says the Pope in question could easily have been Celestine III (rr. 1191-1198), Celestine III died on January 8, 1198, less than three months after Hugues Foucaud, and the next pope, Innocent III, (b. circa 1160), was a child in 1168 and cannot be the one Peter means. In three months Peter really did not have much time to get used to the idea of Celestine III and Hugh of Milan as contemporaries. If abbot H. is also the abbot of letter 131, he is surely Hugues Foucaud.

(23) SCHMEIDLER, *Italienischer Geschichtsschreiber* cit., pp. 16-20 and 79-82. See also JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 370.

copied from it some time later in the fourteenth century, must have been copied in France, though evidence of **B**'s French *provenance* is, at best, ambiguous. But all difficulty is removed if we assume that the manuscript was there all along. It might have been abbot Hugues's own copy, perhaps the lost Longuejoux codex ⁽²⁴⁾.

Still, Hugues Foucaud has found no strong advocate since Schröter's attack. Scholars looked elsewhere. In this century Ugo Santini ⁽²⁵⁾ and C. A. Garufi proposed a certain canon Robert of Saint John (fl. 1147-1182?), a personage within the *Historia* who clearly played a role far more important than the paucity of the words devoted to him would suggest. But since Garufi established that canon Robert was dead by 1185, he was obliged to propose separate authors for the *Epistola* ⁽²⁶⁾. Canon Robert, even if he is not the author, reveals something significant about the circles in which the latter moved. Like the author, he is an enemy of the admiral Maio and a friend to the chancellor Stephen du Perche, whose rise and fall dominate the last third of the *Historia*. The very warmth of the author's approval for canon Robert suggests that he is a patron or a beloved teacher rather than the author himself ⁽²⁷⁾. Falcandus writes,

[N]o alliance of conspirators and no storm of persecution, though often it shook the whole realm, ever tore him away from that purpose of fidelity to which he always attached himself. Never did flattering fortune so transport him that he sullied his innate benignity with any pride or tyranny, and adverse Fortune never so dejected him that he allowed his faith to be traded for the favor of powerful men or for the price of any dignity (p. 66) ⁽²⁸⁾.

(24) Since **P***, the lost Longuejoux codex, by the evidence of the *editio princeps*, had the characteristic lacunae of the **P*VC** recension, (see SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., pp. XXXIII-XXXV; and JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 182), it cannot have been the original. It might, however, have been Abbot Hugues's own copy, the one he made for himself when he sent the original to Sicily. The library of Saint-Denis was sacked by Huguenots in 1567, which could explain how Abbot Hugh's copy was lost. See D. NEBBIAI - DALLA GUARDA, *La Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye de Saint-Denis*, Paris, 1985, p. 126.

(25) U. SANTINI, *Ugo Falcando? Il libro del Regno di Sicilia (Le più belle cronache del medioevo in versione italiana moderna)*, Cuneo, 1931. (To my immense regret, I have been unable to see this work).

(26) GARUFI, *Roberto di S. Giovanni* cit., pp. 115, 117.

(27) About this, Jamison remarks, « [t]he praise accorded to the canon of Palermo in the *Historia*, far from supporting his authorship, in fact excludes it, because no medieval author, with his conventional humility, would ever put on record his own merits ». See JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 211.

(28) « ... quem nulla coniuratorum unquam societas, nulla persecutionis procella, cum to-

Also, canon Robert clearly was well informed about many things:

[Roger of Tiro, the constable] and Robert of Saint John . . . had many friends, so nothing could easily happen in Palermo worthy of care which did not come to their notice. Therefore, they would tell the chancellor the devices of those who were conspiring and by what counsels they must be obstructed. If only [Stephen] had preferred their advice to the counsel of Odo Quarrel, the emerging troubles would have been easily suppressed at the beginning (p. 120).

A man who could give such good information to a chancellor could certainly inform a chronicler too.

Unconvinced by canon Robert's case, Evelyn Jamison, in 1957, published her book on *Admiral Eugenius*, arguing, among other things, that Eugenius (1130-1203) ⁽²⁹⁾, a court official of Greek origin, was the common author of the *Epistola* and the *Historia*. Chronologically, at least, he could have written both works, and since he reached the apex of his career under king Tancred, this would explain the pro-Tancredine bias of the *Historia*, though not its focus on events up until 1169. Eugenius was also a known literary figure, though Jamison admits that the *Historia* and the *Epistola* are stylistically superior to what remain of his Latin works. These were mostly translations, she says, and did not allow him to show what he could do ⁽³⁰⁾. However, apart from coincidence of time, place, and literacy, nothing else connects Eugenius closely to the *Historia*. Jamison's arguments have not been definitively refuted, but no more strong advocates have spoken for Eugenius.

Scholars since Jamison have been content with doubt, both of the authorship of each work, or of their common authorship, or both ⁽³¹⁾. Yet the case of « Hugo Falcandus » may be one where

tum sepe regnum concuteret, ab eo cui semper inheserat proposito fidelitatis avulsit. Nunquam eum blanda fortuna sic extulit, ut innate benignitati superbie quicquam aut tyrannidis admisceret; nunquam sic adversa deiecit, ut fidem suam vellet potentium virorum gratia vel cuiuslibet dignitatis pretio nundinari » (SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit.).

(29) JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 5.

(30) *Ibid.*, pp. 226-227.

(31) This includes LOUD and WIEDEMANN, in their newly published translation (*The History* cit.). They review the authorship question on pp. 28-42 and suggest that the author deliberately wished to be anonymous. They refer to him as Pseudo-Hugo, for example, on p. 39. G. M. CANTARELLA likewise regarded the name « Hugo Falcandus » as a deliberate pseudonym. See his *Ripensare Falcando*, in *Studi Medievali*, 34 (1993), pp. 823-840 (especially p. 832). In-

scholars, using informational technology of the twentieth century to work upon the accumulated knowledge the past, can produce clarity instead of confusion. If we examine the author's « voice » on the basis of what we now know, with due regard for the literary form, a clear portrait emerges which points away from canon Robert and admiral Eugenius and toward Hugues Foucaud. When the letters of Peter of Blois, the citation of Guillaume de Nangis, and stylistic evidence from Abbot Hugues' surviving documents are taken into account, there is little reason to doubt that the author of the *Historia* and its famous prefatory letter is actually the man whose Latinized name was sometimes spelled « Hugo Fulcaudus, » who grew up in Sicily and left, eventually settling in France, where he became abbot of Saint-Denis some years later. While the voice which speaks in the *Epistola* and *Historia* may in some ways resemble the voices of canon Robert and admiral Eugenius, only the voice of the émigré, Hugues Foucaud, can speak in both and bind the works together, resolving the question of identity and common authorship at the same time.

The obvious foreign location of the author of the *Epistola* is a stumbling block for anyone who interprets this work mainly as pro-Tancredine propaganda, since Tancred's warmest partisans would tend to reside in the kingdom, and if elsewhere when William's death was announced, would hurry home. But, despite many ingenious attempts to read the words some other way, the *Epistola's* author is clearly writing from outside the kingdom and intends to stay where he is. Most of this is clear from the beginning of the letter:

I was intending, dearest Peter, after the bitterness of winter was made mild by the favor of the more gentle breeze, to write something happy and jocund which I would send to you as a kind of first fruits of the re-born spring. But having heard about the death of the king of Sicily, understanding and pondering to myself how much calamity that change of things would bring with it, how much the very quiet condition of that kingdom would either be shaken by the storms of hostile invasions or overturned by a great whirlwind of civil strife, I abandoned my undertaking, suddenly dismayed in spirit... (32).

deed, if the author had published his work in Sicily before the death of William II, he would not have wished to be known.

(32) « Disponebam, Petre karissime, post yemis asperitatem clementioris aure beneficio mitigatam, letum aliquid ac iocundum scribere, quod tibi quasi quasdam renascentis veris

Obviously, the correspondent writes to Peter from some distance away; hence the need for letters. He has heard news of the death of « the king of Sicily, » not « the king, » or « our king. » He writes of dangers which face « that kingdom, » not « the kingdom » or « our native land. » Abandoning « some happy and jocund thing » he was going to write as a springtime gift for Peter, he writes « songs of lamentation » instead, and justifying his grief to anyone who might think it unseasonable, he writes,

In truth it is difficult to persuade a fosterling that he should not mourn for the death of his nurse, nor can I, I say, contain my tears, nor can I either pass over in silence or remember with dry eyes the desolation of Sicily, who having received me in her most gracious lap, benignly cherished, advanced me and raised me up ⁽³³⁾.

Had the writer been within the kingdom, either on the island or the mainland territories, not only would « the king of Sicily » have been his king, but there would have been no need to justify his anxiety or grief, which he would have shared with everyone around him. The mainland territories of the kingdom could expect, and actually did experience, the German invasion sooner than the island, and the author of the *Epistola* may have had some news of this as he finished his letter. After all, William II had died in the November of 1189, and in the *Epistola*, the author speaks of the coming of spring. Tancred was crowned on January 18, 1190; the Saracens immediately rebelled; and in the May of 1190, a German force under Henry Testa had invaded the kingdom and « occupied a good part of the Abruzzi and eastern Apulia » ⁽³⁴⁾. While the author reveals no direct knowledge of any of this, he speaks favorably of electing a king of « not doubtful virtue, » and paints a vivid picture of a German invasion which this king might possibly be able to drive back. Also, he delineates the possibilities of a Saracen rebellion exactly like the one which was already happening. Still, he writes as if these things were far

primitias dedicarem. Sed audita morte regis Sicilie, intelligens ac mecum reputans quantum hec rerum mutatio calamitatis afferet, quantum illius regni quietissimum statum, vel hostilis incursus procella concuteret vel gravis seditionem turbo subverteret, repente consternatus animo cepta deserui » (SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., pp. 169-170).

(33) « Verum quia difficile est in morte nutricis alumpno persuaderi ne lugeat, non possum, fateor, lacrimas continere, non possum desolationem Sicilie que me gratissimo sinu susceptum benigne fovit, promovit et extulit, vel preterire silentio vel siccis oculis memorare » (ibid. p. 169).

(34) JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., pp. 80-81.

away and visionary. His closing makes it clear that he means to stay where he is and get his news of Sicily from long distance: « Live long, dearest Peter, and rejoice long, and let it not be grievous to you to send me letters as your messengers, about yourself and the condition of the kingdom » (p. 186).

The author's foreign sojourn would by no means, of course, have eliminated the *Epistola's* value as propaganda. In some ways, this endorsement of the Tancredine cause, arriving unsought from someone who had nothing personal to gain or lose from the events, might have been more effective than anything Tancred's obvious partisans could say. As propaganda, though, the *Epistola* has other drawbacks. Tancred's inner circle could not have been pleased by the way the author disparages the Apulians, suggesting that their allegiance and territories cannot be held. Tancred certainly attempted to hold Apulia, and the gap between his plans and Falcandus's advice might account for what Siragusa calls the « bizarre » tampering within **AB** recension. It is easier to imagine Nicholas or Eugenius as the author of the **AB** variants than of the original *Epistola* as it is known from the other recension, **PVC**.

In the **PVC** version of the *Epistola*, the author judges that in the Apulians no kind of hope or trust is to be placed (*nichil arbitror spei aut fiducie reponendum*), while in **AB**, every kind of hope and trust is to be placed in them (*omnimodam... arbitror spei aut fiducie reponendum*) (p. xxxii, 174). Likewise, in **PVC**, when Apulians are commanded to go to war, many begin to flee (*fugere*) before the martial banners are brought, and, when commanded to guard fortresses, some betray (*produnt*) the others and introduce (*introducunt*) enemies while their allies are unaware or resisting. But in **AB**, when they are ordered to hasten to war, many Apulians begin to fight (*pugnare*) before the martial banners are brought, and when set to guard fortresses, some protect (*protegunt*) the others by slaying and killing (*trucidant et occidunt*) their enemies while their allies are unaware or resisting. Obviously the **AB** version would be more pleasing to the Apulians whom the Tancredines wished to bring into their cause. It would also make the military situation in the *Epistola* as a whole seem more hopeful.

These « bizarre » changes are not limited to the *Epistola* but extend into the *Historia*, indicating that the two works were unit-

ed in the same manuscript when the changes were made. On p. 14, Siragusa's edition reads (here representing **PVC**) that the Apulians are a most inconstant (*inconstantissima*) tribe, who desire their liberty in vain (*frustra*) and could not keep it if they gained it, who can neither help themselves much by war (*nec bello multum valeat*) nor be tranquil in peace. **AB** has it that the Apulians are a most constant (*constantissima*) people who desire their liberty, not in vain (*non frustra*) and can keep it when they have gained it; who can help themselves much by war (*ut que cum bello multum valeat*) and be tranquil in peace. Obviously these changes, too, are motivated by a desire to improve the image of the Apulians. Another set of changes points even more strikingly to this time of crisis. In the *Historia*, **PVC** describes a certain count, Geoffrey of Montescaglioso, as a man of the highest liberality, but of fickle (*mobile*) spirit and of wavering (*vacillante*) faith. In **AB**, Count Geoffrey is a man of noble (*nobile*) spirit and unwavering (*non vacillante*) faith (p. xxxiii, 15). Who was this man whose character is so thoroughly transformed with a few strokes of the pen? C. A. Garufi demonstrates that this Count Geoffrey of Montescaglioso is the same man as Count Geoffrey of Lecce⁽³⁵⁾, the brother of the lady whom Falcandus describes only as *nobilissima*, Tancred's mother (Siragusa ed., p. 23). This Geoffrey, blinded at Admiral Maio's instigation for his role in the Apulian rebellion of 1156 (Siragusa, 1897 ed., p. 22), had died, according to Garufi, in 1174⁽³⁶⁾, sixteen years before the *Epistola* was written. The so-called Hugo Falcandus may have thought he had been sufficiently tactful in referring to Tancred's mother as *nobilissima* and withholding explicit mention of Tancred's relationship with the disgraced and blinded count, but Tancred's partisans might have thought otherwise. The new king needed all the prestige he could get, and besides, he would remember his uncle Geoffrey⁽³⁷⁾.

(35) C. A. GARUFI, *I conti di Montescaglioso. I. Goffredo di Lecce signor di Noto, Sclafani e Caltanissetta. II. Adelia di Adernò*, in *Archivio Storico per la Sicilia Orientale*, 9, Catania, 1912, pp. 324-365.

(36) *Ibid.*, pp. 339-340.

(37) Jamison suggests that the manuscript was altered for the sake of Albiria, Tancred's daughter and Geoffrey's grand niece, who was in Apulia again for a few years after 1200. She cannot suggest Tancred because she believes Eugenius did not start writing the *Historia* until after Tancred was dead and Eugenius was in a German prison. See JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., pp. 164-166, and 183, note 1.

Is the reversal of the *Epistola* and the *Historia* another aspect of the deliberate tampering in the **AB** recension? Actually, it is hard to see that Tancred's partisans had a motive for placing the *Epistola* after the *Historia*. The *Epistola* spoke more directly to the crisis of their times, and the Tancredines would surely have preferred to keep it first, where it would be read even if the reader had a short attention span. Perhaps the reversal was done by the victorious Hohenstaufens after Tancred's defeat; the *Epistola* would have been an obnoxious document to them, but they might have valued its excellent Latin style and its beautiful description of Palermo. The *Historia*, which begins with a long passage praising Roger II, would probably have been irresistible to Roger's descendants. The *Epistola*, placed at the end like an appendix, would at least not infect the entire work with its anti-Hohenstaufen tone. Perhaps Constance asked for a copy of the work with the *Epistola* moved to the end, or perhaps someone prepared it in that form for the use of the young, orphaned Frederick Roger, better known as Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, to whom it would have offered much valuable information about the immediate past.

However that may be, the **AB** variants nevertheless call our attention to the fact that the *Epistola*'s author, though friendly to Tancred's cause, was not as friendly as his warmest partisans, and not thoroughly informed of his intentions. Besides, much of *Epistola* has nothing to do with the military and political crisis of Tancred's times. One hundred and thirty-seven lines in Siragusa's edition, slightly more than half the *Epistola*, are devoted to the description and praise of Palermo. Ostensibly, as the author states near the end, this is to show how worthy Palermo is of being mourned; more directly, of course, the author means to comfort Peter with proof of his concern and sympathy, and by evoking memories of the happy past. Beyond this, the *Epistola* sets the scene for the events of *Historia*. In the vivid word-picture of the city, the author describes the structure of the palace, the Pisan tower (p. 177), the Greek tower (pp. 53, 177) and the Joharia (pp. 60, 177), the royal chapel (p. 180), and royal hall (*aula regia*) (pp. 182, 62), the gate of Saint Agatha and the house of admiral Maio (p. 182). The latter's murder at the gate of Saint Agatha is a crucial turning point in the *Historia* (pp. 41-43), but it happened on 10 November 1160, nearly thirty years before the *Epis-*

tola was written. Apparently the admiral's family was ruined and his property confiscated and given to others. Count Sylvester's house is also mentioned (p. 183), but count Sylvester had also died, according to the account of *Historia*, some time around 1162 or 3 (p. 83) and left a son, William, to inherit his property (pp. 108-109). What is the point of mentioning these long-dead men in 1190, when Tancred's crown and kingdom are at stake? The point is, of course, to prepare the reader for their appearance in the *Historia* which is attached to the *Epistola*. The author's apostrophe to Messina also recalls the events of the *Historia*, despite the difference in perspective; in the *Epistola*, the writer looks with hope upon the *crudelitate piratica*, « piratical ferocity » of Messinese (p. 171), while in the *Historia* he is hostile when he speaks of their *levitate piratica*, « piratical inconstancy » (p. 132) and *importunitatem piraticam*, « piratical insolence » (p. 151), but he nevertheless finds the same qualities in them. He would be glad if the Messinese could do to Henry VI's Germans what he deplores their having done to Stephen du Perche's French.

The *Epistola* also has an extended allusion to the earthquake of 1169 (pp. 171, 175) and the *Historia* ends with a detailed description of it (pp. 165-166). Forms of the word *calamitas* are a repeated refrain in the *Epistola*, and the *Historia* also uses the word on its last page, tying the two works together (p. 166).

The two works are thematically linked even more by the author's friendliness toward Tancred and the rebels to whom he was allied during the events of the first third of the *Historia*. Indirectly, too, the author suggests his own involvement in the events of the last third, and thus, his reasons for leaving Sicily during or after 1169. But to see this, we must examine the *Historia* as the author presented it.

Jamison points out that the two oldest surviving manuscripts of the *Historia*, as well as the *editio princeps*, suggest that the author's original manuscript of the *Historia* contained no chapter headings and no divisions except those marked by large ornamental capitals which appear in five places (the same ones) in **P** and **V**, and four of the same places in **A**. The first and shortest section (about 45 lines in Siragusa's edition) begins with the words *Rem in presenti* (pp. 4-5). Here the author explains that he will record the recent events in Sicily so that those who have be-

haved honorably will not be defrauded of their deserved praise and children might be inspired to virtue by their fathers' example. For indeed, the author declares, children are inspired chiefly by the deeds of their forefathers and the reputation of their homeland (*patrieque probitatis*). That is why the ancient Romans kept images of their ancestors in their houses, so as to have before them, « as it were, a sort of necessity to embrace virtue »⁽³⁸⁾. Clearly the author is concerned with the moral education of noble youths, a preoccupation he shares with Guillaume de Nangis, the monk of Saint-Denis later copied this passage. Within the *Historia* itself, these words will be echoed in the exhortation of a Calabrian nobleman, Roger of Marturano, when he proves to young Matthew Bonellus that he must slay William I's chief minister, admiral Maio: « Keep before your eyes what parents brought you forth and you will understand that every path of transgression is closed to you and the necessity of spurning wickedness is plain »⁽³⁹⁾. Given the violent and shocking nature of what Roger demands, only a close examination of the narrative can establish that he is no glib misuser of rhetoric but has the author's sympathy.

The second section of the *Historia* (the first narrative portion), begins with the words *Primum Igitur* and comprises about 1160 lines in Siragusa's edition. It begins with the death of the great count Roger (A.D. 1101) and the succession of his son Roger II. Falcandus describes this king Roger's character, laying stress on Roger's ready wit, his willingness to summon his advisors and hear their counsel before making decisions, his eagerness to adopt good customs wherever he finds them, his Norman descent and his preference for Frenchmen. King Roger, reports Falcandus, had promising sons, but they predeceased him, and William, who survived him, did not inherit Roger's virtues. William hated his father's ministers, imprisoning some and banishing others, and he made a disastrous choice as his own chief minister: Maio of Bari. In the first part of the *Historia*, this low-

(38) « Hinc nimirum antiquitus Romani patrum domi conservabant ymagines ut antecessorum eis acta semper occurrerent puderetque degenerem sequi lasciviam ac turpi languere desidia et amplectende virtutis quasi quamdam necessitatem haberent pre oculis » (SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., p. 4).

(39) « pre oculis habe qui te parentes genuerint, et omnem tibi delinquendi viam obstructam intelliges aspernandique sceleris necessitatem indictam » (ibid., p. 32).

born man gains such complete domination over William I that the king has no wish to listen to anyone but him and his chosen accomplice, archbishop Hugh of Palermo. Drunk with success, Maio conceives an ambition to mount the throne himself. He persuades the archbishop that the two of them will depose William I and assume the government until the king's sons come of age. However, he does not tell his accomplice « the rest of what he intends, » lest even this unscrupulous man should recoil. Indeed the archbishop does just that when he realizes that Maio has plans against the king's sons as well as the king himself (p. 36). But in the years before this happens, Maio and archbishop Hugh set out to destroy the many valiant and noble men who stand in their way. Because of this (as Falcandus tells it) there is uproar in the kingdom; rebels invite the Greek emperor to help them, and the king is at last obliged to lead armies to battle in person. William I is, however, successful; the invading Greeks are expelled, and of the rebellious nobles who do not escape into exile, many are thrown into prison, some of them beaten, blinded and mutilated. So Maio triumphs for a while, but when another baronial plot against him spreads as far as Calabria, he sends his protégé, Matthew Bonellus, who is betrothed to his young daughter, to mediate, hoping to win the nobles back to loyalty. But instead, a Calabrian noble, Roger of Marturano, in a speech some eighty lines long, lays out the reasons why Bonellus himself must kill Maio. The chief reasons are that Maio is a monster who is destroying the nobility and the king; Matthew Bonellus is the only noble left in Sicily who is yet able to act; and Bonellus's position with Maio, who thinks he has the youth thoroughly hoodwinked, gives him unparalleled opportunity to do the deed. Furthermore, the deed will bring Bonellus everlasting fame and (if he wishes) marriage to the highborn countess of Catanzaro (pp. 31-34). This last is a well-calculated appeal to Matthew's ambition, but it is also an intrinsic part of the persuasion itself, since only by such an offer could the Calabrians replace the alliance Bonellus would lose with Maio's death and guarantee that they would not make him an outcast for betraying so near a connection. Persuaded by these appeals, Bonellus makes definite arrangements with the countess and her relatives, returns to Palermo, and confides his plans in Maio's now estranged and dying accomplice, the archbishop.

Archbishop Hugh is dying because Maio had him poisoned when he tried to back out of their conspiracy. But the first dose did not quite kill him dead, and so, fearing that the archbishop might regain his health, Maio visits his bedside with a stronger poison, which he presents as medicine specially designed to cure his illness. When the archbishop protests that the very sight of medicine makes him ill, Maio gives up the attempt for the time, but continues his bedside visit:

Then he sits by his side like an intimate friend and, gently reproaching him over the matter... swears that he is as anxious for [the archbishop's] health as for his own, for if the archbishop should die, he did not know what he would do afterwards, where he would turn, where seek company, in whom place his faith. He reposed no faith and trust in anyone else ⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Clearly, if any man ever deserved to be murdered by his son-in-law, this is the one. The archbishop manages to send to Bonellus, urging him to set up his ambush to meet the admiral on his way home. Bonellus obeys, successfully cuts the admiral down, and flees the city. The common people display their hatred of Maio by insulting his body.

The next section (pp. 44-108), beginning with the words *Sequenti die*, comprises about 1550 of Siragusa's lines. It begins the day after Maio's murder. Initially the king is persuaded by the two new ministers he receives as *familiares* that Maio was a traitor who deserved his death. Bonellus is restored to favor and called to court, while Maio's family is arrested, their property confiscated. However, the king's mood soon changes, and when Bonellus sees that his enemies are getting bolder, he and his allies decide, in self-defense and for the common good, to depose the king and place his nine year old son, Roger, duke of Apulia, on the throne instead. Bonellus draws the king's nearest surviving kinsmen, including his bastard brother Simon, and Tancred, his bastard nephew (the future king), into the plot.

Tancred, in fact, had already been introduced, in the *Primum igitur* section, along with his brother William, as sons born of a

(40) « dehinc illi familiaris assidet, et blande super hoc eum redarguens, . . . seque de illius ut propria salute iurat indifferenter esse sollicitum, nam siquidem eum mori contigerit, nescire se quid deinceps sit acturus, quo se vertat, quam expetat societatem, cuius fidei se committat. Nichil enim in alio quoque spei aut fiducie sibi repositum » (ibid., pp. 40-41).

« most noble » mother to the deceased duke Roger, eldest son of Roger II. After the Apulian rebellion, these youths are confined within the walls of the palace (*inter septa palatii servabantur*) not necessarily incarcerated (*in carcere*) like the other prisoners (pp. 22-23). Whether they were in the rebellion, Falcandus does not explicitly say, but as their maternal uncle Geoffrey of Montescaglioso was a leading figure, it is easy to see how they might have been drawn in. Now, describing how Bonellus approaches king William's brother Simon (who is, evidently, at liberty) Falcandus merely notes that Simon was king Roger's son by a concubine. Simon's mother, like Tancred's, seems to have been a count's daughter⁽⁴¹⁾, but Falcandus does not call her *nobilissima*. After mentioning that King William had denied Simon the principedom of Taranto which King Roger's testament had left him, Falcandus turns quickly to Tancred. His brother William is dead by now, not without some suspicion being cast upon the king. Falcandus here remarks that William had been extremely beautiful (*pulcherrimus*) and had no equal as a knight (*neminem militum viribus sibi parem repperat*). Obviously, Tancred comes of good stock and has a very compelling motive for hating his uncle William. But Tancred himself is more outstanding for his natural abilities (*ingenio*) and energy (*industria*) than for strength of body (*corporis virtute*).

This sounds promising, but it goes beyond the immediate requirements of the narrative. King William's brother Simon, so scantily described, is obviously more important than Tancred in Bonellus's *coup*. It is to Simon that the conspirators turn when, in the absence of Bonellus, their plot is about to be revealed. It is Simon whom they follow through the palace to seize the king, because he had been brought up there and knew the intricacies of its pathways (*amfractus viarum*) (p. 55). Tancred is at Simon's side when they surprise and capture the king, but when William I is a prisoner and nine year old Roger is proclaimed king, it is with Simon that the archdeacon Walter, the child's tutor, makes an alliance, urging people to swear obedience to the authority (*imperio*) of the prince Simon (p. 73). We hear nothing more of Tancred until after the popular uprising which forces the rebels to release the king. Then Tancred, Simon and others appear at

(41) JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 291.

Bonellus's stronghold to reproach the latter for his sluggishness (*ignaviam*). Roused by this, Bonellus leads his forces toward Palermo and then, for unexplained, and Falcandus suggests, insufficient reasons, changes his mind and returns to his stronghold, while reinforcements from Messina and the interior of Sicily hurry to the king. Then, as the nobles wait in their stronghold, William I sends canon Robert of Saint John (Garufi's candidate for authorship) to negotiate.

Here the canon is introduced for the first time, and his frustrating career is reviewed. William I, in a rare display of independent judgement early in his reign, had resolved to make canon Robert chancellor, but Maio had persuaded the king to send him on an embassy to Venice first, meanwhile commanding royal officials to assign him an unseaworthy ship so that he would never come back. But canon Robert, secretly shown the admiral's letters, arranges his own transportation and comes home safe but impoverished (pp. 67-68). Clearly the canon, like Falcandus, believed Maio was a traitor who deserved to die, but still Falcandus claims he was never guilty of disloyalty. However, the idea of promoting him is never mentioned again, even after Maio's death. Why not? Falcandus does not say, but it is probably related to something else which he does not report: the fact that four bishops, including Romuald of Salerno who reports it, and Richard, the elect of Syracuse, who became a royal *familiaris* around this time, had helped stir up the popular uprising which freed the king from the rebels⁽⁴²⁾. But as Falcandus reports it, during the *coup*, the bishops either praised the rebels or else kept silent, and the popular uprising was completely spontaneous and unexpected. Yet even he cannot conceal the prominent role these bishops, especially the elect of Syracuse, play in the king's counsels, only hours after his release and for the rest of his reign.

No doubt Falcandus's suppression of the bishops' role serves his purposes in more than one way. The bishops were moral arbiters, and if not even a sense of shame induced them to speak up during the *coup*, it strengthens the inference that William I was so incompetent that few had any respect for him. But besides this, Falcandus has introduced canon Robert as a supreme-

(42) ROMUALD, *Chronicon* cit., p. 247.

ly loyal man. On hearing of his loyalty, the reader would expect that if any royal officials had tried to help the captive king, canon Robert would have done so. Canon Robert was evidently involved in no such attempt, so Falcandus cannot allow that there was any.

Of course, the very fact that canon Robert is chosen to negotiate suggests that he is trusted, to some degree, by both sides. A peaceful agreement with the rebels is finally reached, in which Bonellus (who denies knowledge of the *coup* he had organized) is pardoned for his recent aggressive actions. Most of the nobles who had actually seized the palace agree to depart from the kingdom, « safe and immune » (*salvos et indempnes*) (p. 89).

However, Tancred and an ally, Roger Sclavo, indignant at the unjust treaty, have already withdrawn from Bonellus and raised another rebellion at Butera. King William and his new *familiares* then arrest Bonellus, who is ultimately blinded and mutilated, and set out to deal with Butera.

As Simon was more important during the *coup*, Roger Sclavo seems to have been more important at Butera; the latter even chose the location because his father once ruled there and was kindly remembered by the inhabitants. It was a formidable rebellion: « The place was extremely well fortified, and with Roger Sclavo, it could not lack strength or courage (*virtute vel audacia*) or with Tancred, prudence and counsel (*prudencia consiliove*) ». Perhaps not, but Tancred displayed his *prudencia* chiefly by consulting astrologers about the best times for military actions, a strategy which the supposedly stupid William quickly learned to imitate. In the end, the nobles quarreled with the people of Butera and, fearing betrayal, decided to hand over the town to the king first, in exchange for being allowed to depart « safe and unharmed » (*salvos et incolumes*) (p. 74).

Upon the whole, the narrator's words about Tancred create expectations which are disappointed in the narrative. They must surely refer to something beyond events at hand. Probably that something is the reputation Tancred gained later, after he was recalled from exile. He led William II's armies against Constantinople in 1185⁽⁴³⁾, and of course, he became king in 1190 when the *Epistola* was dispatched to Palermo.

(43) CHALANDON, *Histoire de la Domination* cit., II, p. 426.

A more oblique compliment to Tancred's house (coupled with insults to the Williams and their house) appears in the passage ostensibly mourning the death of the nine year old Roger, who was struck by an arrow when the king's rescuers assaulted the palace.

[A]lso another loss was sustained and an irreparable one, for much time, for [the nine year old child] Duke Roger was killed . . . who now had begun to be marked most clearly beyond what his age demanded with the manners of his grandfather [Roger II] and paternal uncle [duke Roger], showing the prudence of the one and the benignity of the other with the name of both. . . . Indeed this island, so that it should never lack a tyrant, preserved this custom regarding the sons of the kings, that first she should cast the better ones in the way of death, so as to set up for herself those kings through whom the privilege of tyranny can be preserved in her. Thus formerly Roger, duke of Apulia [father of Tancred], a man of unique benignity and sweetness, suffered an early death so that William [the elder] would not lack an opportunity to reign, [William the elder] who sought after cruelty and was a slave to folly, as much as his brother had embraced prudence and gentleness. In the same way now, [young] duke Roger was taken away, and she [Sicily] spared William [the younger] so that he might reign. They [the sons of the elder William] were to follow the footsteps of those whose names they had been allotted; no one will be ignorant of this who knew them both (p. 61).

Clearly, while dispraising the Williams, father and son, Falcandus is also heaping praises on the Rogers, father and son, including the Roger who was Tancred's father. But does he seem to overpraise the name « Roger » at a time when the king's name will be Tancred? Tancred's eldest son was named Roger, and he was made co-ruler in 1192⁽⁴⁴⁾. Falcandus was looking with hope toward the next generation, something which all Tancred's allies would have been eager to do, in view of the second William's long childlessness.

After Butera, Tancred disappears from the narrative. William I spends two years pacifying his realm and returns to Palermo. He dies, after a long bout with stomach flux, in 1166, leaving his kingdom to his eldest surviving son, William, who is somewhat short of thirteen years old, with the queen Margaret to act as regent, assisted by his three chosen *familiars*, who are to remain

(44) JAMISON, *Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 97.

permanently at court. Queen Margaret frees prisoners, gives away lands and titles, abolishes the monetary penalties which William I had imposed on rebellious towns, and succeeds in making herself and her son popular. However, conditions are unsettled as her cousin Gilbert, count of Gravina, struggles to gain more power and bishops intrigue over the vacant see of Palermo. So ends Section 3.

The last section of the *Historia*, beginning with the words *Emenso itaque post mortem* ⁽⁴⁵⁾, is, year for year, also the most detailed part, being nearly as long as each of the first two parts, but covering less than the three years, from 1166 to 1169. It is the only section which lists specific dates, and it contains the only letter from the royal chancery which was copied in full into the *Historia*. The figure of Stephen du Perche dominates this section of the work, as Maio dominated the first. Stephen, a kinsman of Queen Margaret, comes to Palermo on her invitation and is persuaded to stay as chancellor. The queen then arranges his election as archbishop of Palermo, thus giving him the two positions most desired, respectively, by Matthew the notary and the elect of Syracuse (p. 109), two of the *familiares* whose continued presence at court the dying William I had stipulated. Stephen's promotion indicates that queen Margaret has decided to continue resisting some of the late king's policies and advisors, though various considerations restrain her from openly repudiating the provisions of his last will (p. 95). The disappointment of William's old *familiares*, however, offers fresh hope to canon Robert of Saint John, who, with Roger of Tiro the constable, becomes Stephen's loyal friend and gives him wise advice. Perhaps Falcandus's own position in the government dates from this time; he says that Stephen increased the number of notaries, but even so, there were not enough of them for all the letters needing to be written (p. 114).

Stephen's preeminence is short-lived. Court officials resent his preference for Frenchmen; the common people are embittered and frightened by his decision to follow French customs instead of Sicilian ones in settling their disputes with their new

(45) This is the last section common to **PVA**. It covers pp. 108-165 of SIRAGUSA's edition and contains about 1580 lines of Latin. **P** and **V** have another section or subsection which begins *Cum hanc in Sicilie partibus*. In SIRAGUSA's edition, drawn from **A**, the reading is *Dum hanc in partibus* (*La Historia* cit., p. 125). JAMISON suggests that it may only be a subsection (*Admiral Eugenius* cit., pp. 184-185).

French overlords (p. 145); and the Saracens are alarmed that he takes his duty to prosecute apostates seriously (p. 115). When he perceives that a large conspiracy is developing against him in Palermo, Stephen arranges to hold court at Messina, but plots follow him there. Their most conspicuous agent is queen Margaret's brother, count Henry, a naive wastrel who has been convinced by Stephen's wily enemies that Stephen and the queen are lovers and it is his duty as a brother to kill the chancellor. Informed on and put in prison, count Henry names so many accomplices that the chancellor's friends are dismayed. They advise Stephen to offer a general pardon and attempt conciliation rather than try to punish such a multitude. On the other hand, Stephen's ally and cousin, count Gilbert, urges vengeance, seeing this as a chance to destroy his personal enemies. Warned by his friends that his only hope lies in the extremes—he must either fully pardon or completely destroy his enemies - Stephen adopts a middle ground, allowing a few nobles to be accused, including Gilbert's personal enemy, count Richard of Molise, who bursts into tears when he learns that the chancellor, « whom he had always sought to obey, » believes him an enemy (p. 140). The evidence against Richard of Molise is not strong enough for anything more than a challenge to single combat, which the count eagerly accepts, but he is imprisoned at Taormina after a convoluted series of legal maneuvers about his title to the lands he holds and his subsequent accusation that a baronial judgement against him was biased⁽⁴⁶⁾. Others, more obviously guilty, are also imprisoned, but for the moment, nothing worse is inflicted on them and the chancellor returns to Palermo, only to find another conspiracy, headed by the notary Matthew, to murder him during the procession on Palm Sunday. These conspirators are also imprisoned. Meanwhile, the citizens of Messina rise in rebellion, release count Henry and put Stephen's right hand man, Odo Quarrel, to a grisly death. The Greeks of the city massacre all the Frenchmen (*transalpinos*) they can find until Count Henry stops them.

(46) For accusing the court of false judgment, Count Richard was placed « at the king's mercy » for « life and limb » because of King Roger's law that disputing the king's judgments was « similar to blasphemy ». See SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., p. 141, and note 2 on that page. What is not clear is whether King Roger's law was customarily applied to appeals against the baronial court.

The rebels proceed to rescue Count Richard as well, and the narrative here offers one of the more striking examples of the difference in *aesthetics* between the first and last sections of the *Historia*. The castellan at Taormina proves unusually steadfast, and even when his brother-in-law comes to tell him that the Messinese will kill his wife and children unless he cooperates, he refuses, declaring that he will lose wife, children and his own life as well, rather than accept this stain upon his honor. Giving up on the castellan, his brother-in-law seeks out a lower official, the *gavarretus* ⁽⁴⁷⁾ and strikes a deal. Then as Falcandus relates:

On a certain day, when Matthew the castellan was sleeping, the *gavarretus*, as he had promised, released Count Richard from his chains and led him out. Presently, as he was hastening by a straight path toward the castellan, the latter was startled from sleep by the sound of feet. Seeing the count, he snatched up his sword in sudden terror. He would easily have turned back the ambush prepared for himself upon the other's head, except that the traitor (by whose work this had been accomplished) seized the unready man in an embrace, broke the force of the deadly blow, and, with a knife he was holding, pierced him through the upper part of his back between his shoulders. However, the count's hand was wounded as he stretched it out toward the upraised sword. Thus Matthew was pierced with many wounds, and the happy Messinese gained the castle of Taormina along with the count himself ⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Few combats in the *Historia* receive longer descriptions than this, but the use of the word « traitor » here is especially striking. Forms of *proditor*, it is true, are used some forty times in the *Historia*, but most of them are in quotations or indirect utterances, for example, a paraphrase from Maio's letter of exhortation to loyal cities (pp. 15, 30), Bonellus's words when slaying Maio (p. 42), the words of the king (p. 63) or of a royal messen-

(47) An official called the *gavarretus* appears twice in the *Historia*, once in connection with the palace « coup » (pp. 53, 55, etc) and once in this passage. Both times, the *gavarretus* is apparently the castellan's second-in-command, and seems to have charge of the prisoners. Siragusa and the other commentators were not able to provide any more information than these contexts suggest.

(48) « Quadam ergo die, dormiente Matheo castellano, gavarretus, ut sponderat, Richardum comitem a vinculis expeditum eduxit. Cumque mox ad castellanum itinere recto contenderet, ille ad strepitum pedum excusso sompno, cum vidisset comitem, repente perterritus ensen arripuit, et sibi paratas insidias in capud illius facile retorsisset, nisi proditor, cuius id opera patratum fuerat, amplexus improvidum, ferientis conatum eluderet, et illi cultro quem tenebat superiorem dorsi partem inter humeros transfixisset, manu tamen comitis quam ensi sublato pretenderat vulnerata. Ita Matheo multis confosso vulneribus, Messanenses Tauromenii castellum ipsumque comitem alacres receperunt » (ibid., p. 154).

ger (p. 64) or the threat of a crowd (p. 59). Depending on the person being quoted, directly or indirectly, we may suspect that Falcandus agrees or disagrees with the designation. But only five times in the entire work does he use the word *proditor* when giving no one's view but his own. The first time he is explaining Roger II's need for severity (p. 6), the second, he is speaking of Maio (p. 23), the third, he describes Caïd Peter leading the Sicilian fleet in a deliberate flight from the Almohads (p. 26), avoiding a battle which Falcandus says he could easily have won and which might have saved the remnants of Roger II's African empire. The fourth time, he uses it in this scene, when the *gavarretus* kills the castellan to prevent him from killing the unarmed, probably innocent, prisoner whose escape he is managing⁽⁴⁹⁾.

(49) That, at least, is the plain sense of the Latin, *manu tamen comitis quam ensi sublato pretenderat*, since *pr(a)etendere* regularly takes an accusative for the thing stretched out (*quam*, referring to the hand) and a dative for the thing stretched toward (the sword). The reading, *ensi*, (the dative for *ensis*) is, if Siragusa is correct, found in the *editio princeps* and all the manuscripts, including V, since Siragusa lists no variants for this passage either in his 1897 edition or in his appendix, (see above, n. 48). It is true that two translations, that of Bruto Fabricatore and now Loud and Wiedemann, put swords into Richard of Mandra's hands in this passage, having him stretch out his hand *with* an upraised sword rather than *toward* the castellan's uplifted sword. Bruto Fabricatore was translating from the Del Re edition, where the reading is *ense sublato*, *ense* being the usual ablative form. See *Cronisti e scrittori sincroni napoletani editi ed inediti*, I, ed. G. DEL RE, Naples, 1845, p. 384). Perhaps Loud and Wiedemann also take *ensi* to be ablative; however *ense* also appears in the *Historia*, clearly with the ablative sense (*ense stricto*, p. 135) and Siragusa lists no variants for that passage either. *Pretenderat* is a strange word to use to convey the idea that Richard was lunging or parrying, and even if *ensi* is ablative, it is more likely to be construed with *vulnerata* than with *pretenderat* and the passage would thus mean, « the count's hand, which he had stretched out, was wounded by the upraised sword ». It is true that some impressions created in the passage tempt the reader to imagine a sword in Richard's hand. *Contenderet* implies that Richard is approaching the castellan deliberately, presumably to capture or kill him, and this in turn implies that he is properly armed for such an encounter. What combination of desperation and haste could have impelled him to ambush the armed (though sleeping) castellan without a sword? We are not told. Yet the dative *ensi* is not the only thing in the passage which suggests Richard was unarmed; if he, a seasoned warrior, had been attacking with a sword, why would Falcandus say that the startled castellan would « easily » have avenged his attempt except for the attack of the knife-wielding *gavarretus*? For that matter, it is not altogether clear that the *proditor* is in fact the *gavarretus*; since *contenderet* is clearly singular; could the *proditor* be the castellan's brother-in-law? Also, Matthew is « pierced by many wounds, » though Falcandus only describes one blow, which seems lethal enough. Do we to assume that Richard and his ally continue to stab the fallen Matthew repeatedly, or do we imagine additional companions who have rushed forward and finished the job in frenzied haste? Evidently Falcandus expects us to infer many details which he does not state specifically, and we lack the knowledge which he assumed his readers would have. Probably he is also reticent for thematic reasons; he wishes to keep the focus on the steadfast, unfortunate castellan rather than on Richard of Mandra's desperate and daring escape. However, passages like this, where the Latin creates conflicting impressions not easily harmonized with the information at hand, are not unique to the last section of the *Historia*. Another prominent example is the scene in the *Sequenti die* section where the king is captured by the conspirators (p. 56). The difficulties with this passage alone could fill a book, but, to give but

Unlike Maio and Caïd Peter, this *gavarretus* was never mentioned before and will not be mentioned again. The narrator of the first three sections did not use the word « traitor » in his own voice against such a minor actor in such a messy situation. (The fifth time Falcandus uses *proditor* in his own voice, on p. 155, he is declaring that the Lombard towns who offer to help Stephen du Perche are moved by righteous indignation against the traitors. Yet all through the first sections he had avoided applying the word « traitor, » in his own voice, to the rebels who included Bonellus and the future King Tancred).

On the other hand, this celebration of the steadfast, unfortunate castellan Matthew is very much in harmony with the purpose announced at the beginning of the *Historia*: to record the deeds of « those few whose memorable faith shone out, among such and so many wicked deeds of the worst people »⁽⁵⁰⁾. For though Falcandus offers praise in the first section, for example to count Evrard of Squillace and count Simon of Policastro (p.

one example, the Latin indicates clearly that the king is first captured by a group headed by his half-brother Simon and his nephew Tancred, who, while mentioning his « tyranny » (*tyrannide*) and « folly » (*insaniam*), speak to him « quite gently » (*blandius*), and in « words not so very harsh » (*verbisque minus asperis*), thereby reducing his fear that will be slaughtered on the spot. Then, presently (*mox*), « when he saw William the Count of Lesina, a most savage man, and Robert of Bova, no less renowned for ferocity, coming with drawn swords, he [began] entreating those by whom he had been captured (*rogabat eos a quibus captus fuerat*) not to allow him to be killed by them, since he was eager to abdicate the kingdom spontaneously. He was thinking (*arbitrabatur*) that he would never escape such cruel enemy hands, nor would this expectation have been vain, except that Richard of Mandra beat back the charge of certain ones who were lunging at him and forbade the slaughter of the king. » By using the pluperfect (*a quibus captus fuerat*) Falcandus makes it clear that the captors to whom the king appeals for protection are a distinct group from those now approaching with drawn swords. Also, although only the names of Lesina and Bova are mentioned, it is not they but others, « certain ones » (*quorundam*), who are lunging at the king when Richard of Mandra drives them back, indicating that they do not attack alone but at the head of a larger group. Clearly, though Richard of Mandra is formidable, he cannot possibly have beaten back this charge by himself; some other members of the group (to whom the king is appealing) must have helped. Aid and comfort for those who interpret the passage this way is given by the unknown Cistercian chronicler of S. Maria Ferraria, who, in an otherwise hilariously vague account of the *coup*, says: « [T]he king was sent into custody, and when he was being threatened with death, he was delivered from the freed prisoners by certain ones [who had been] among the fettered ones, namely by Richard of Mandra, who was afterwards made constable of the palace and count, and by three others. » (« Sed rex in custodia missus, cum minaretur occidi, ab asolutis vinctis liberatur a quibusdam compeditorum, scilicet a Riccardo de Mandra, qui postea factus est palatii comestabilis et comes, et ab aliis tribus »). (See *Ignoti Monachi Cisterciensis S. Mariae de Ferraria Chronica et Ryccardi de Sancto Germano Chronica Priora*, ed. A. GAUDENZI, Naples, 1888, p. 30). Jamison does not doubt that here the *Chronica* « preserves . . . precise information, found nowhere else » (*Admiral Eugenius* cit., p. 291), but she does not speculate as to whether Falcandus expected his readers to deduce something of the sort.

(50) « pauci, quorum inter tot ac tanta pessimorum flagitia memorabilis fides enituit » (SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., p. 3).

8), their deeds did not require vivid descriptions, and the most active character, Matthew Bonellus, receives a mixed assessment, his beauty, generosity and physical prowess being balanced against his irresolution and his tardiness in keeping his promises (p. 31). In the last section, there is more celebration of brave, vain deeds, such as the castellan's long resistance at Taormina, and later, the long struggle of the French soldiers to defend Stephen's house (pp. 157-158). Very likely, that part of proem and the last section of the *Historia* were written first, shortly after 1169, to record the virtue and courage of those on the losing side, whom the victors would happily forget. Perhaps, too, Falcandus was conscious of a need to correct the record and see that some justice was done to his side, not foreseeing that his own *Historia* would be the most vivid and detailed account which survived. A hint of what the adverse party was doing with the same material is suggested in the chronicle of the unknown Cistercian monk of S. Maria Ferrarria, which summarizes events of the last third of the *Historia* in these few sentences:

Stephen the Spaniard, who had been made chancellor and master of the kingdom of Sicily and Apulia by the mother of King William, who was still a boy, wickedly desired to usurp the throne and meant to kill the boy-king himself and his tiny little brother, born of the same mother. Hence, he treacherously captured Richard of Mandra, the count, and certain other officials of the palace who might, he thought, be able to resist him, and sent certain of them to a castle, where he ordered his [the count's] eyes to be torn out. But with the permission of God, when the same count was being sought for blinding, he was set free, and after the man who had intended to blind him had been killed, he returned to the palace. Then, in concert with those who had saved the king from death, he expelled the chancellor from the realm⁽⁵¹⁾.

In any case, within the *Historia*, when the chancellor Stephen learns that his prisoners are freed and his companions slaugh-

(51) « Stephanus yspanus a regina matre regis Gulielmi adhuc pueri cancellarius et magister regni Sicilie atque Apulie factus, cupiens nequiter usurpare regnum, voluit occidere ipsum regem puerum et fratrem uterinum minimum. Unde insidiose Riccardum de Mandra comitem et quosdam alios magistros palatii, quos putabat sibi posse resistere, capiens et in castrum quosdam in captionem mictens, oculos ei erui precepit. Sed nutu Dei cum idem comes ad cecandum peteretur deliberatur: et interfecto eo qui sibi oculos eruere volebat, revertitur ad palatium, et coniunctus cum hiis qui eripuerant regem de morte, eiecit eundem cancellarium de regno » (*Ignoti Monachi Cisterciensis S. Mariae de Ferraria Chronica* cit., p. 31).

tered, he is « greatly disturbed by this sudden misfortune, » and « now at last sought out the counsel of his friends, which he had neglected to do for a long time » (52). They do their best for him, but he still prefers the advice of Frenchmen, and in any case it is too late. When Stephen and a handful of friends (whose names Falcandus carefully records) have been besieged in a bell tower for a day, his enemies offer him terms and he capitulates. In return for a galley to sail away in and promises of good treatment for his various categories of allies, Stephen agrees to renounce the kingdom. The next day, as he is being conducted to the port in accordance with the agreement, canons from the cathedral, assisted by a menacing crowd and angry *familiaries*, compel him to release them from their oath of loyalty so that they can elect a new archbishop. So Stephen sails away, and then excited crowds induce the canons of the cathedral to elect the young king's tutor, Walter, as their archbishop. The queen's efforts to get the election declared illegal are vain; pope Alexander III not only ratifies it but even grants Walter the special privilege of being consecrated in his own see instead of traveling to the papal court. Then on February 4 a terrible earthquake strikes, and Falcandus describes in detail the destruction it wreaks in Reggio, Catania, and the neighborhood of Syracuse. This earthquake is seen as an omen that a great calamity will strike Sicily, and some fear that the emperor of Constantinople will invade Sicily on Stephen's behalf. Instead, news comes that Stephen du Perche has died. The queen and Stephen's other friends lose all hope. « And, » writes the author, « [Walter] bound the king to him with such suspect familiarity (*eatenus suspecta satis familiaritate*) that he seemed to rule not so much the court as the king himself, » (p. 165). With these ominous words, the *Historia* ends.

This ending seemed abrupt to Jamison, who declared that the work was unfinished. She believed, of course, that Eugenius meant to recount the rest of William II's reign, and Tancred's too. But Michele Fuiano rightly insists that the ending was thematically appropriate. He points out that this passage correlates with the one which declares that the young William will be as bad as his father, which in turn relates to several which describe

(52) « Hec ubi cancellario nunciata sunt, tanto repente turbatus infortunio, consilium amicorum quod diu neglexerat, tum demum expetiit » (SIRAGUSA, *La Historia* cit., p. 154).

how the elder William allowed himself to be completely dominated by Maio⁽⁵³⁾. Still, there is more to it than that; though obviously Falcandus prefers kings who ruled over their *familiares* instead of the reverse, the fact that a fifteen-year-old king whose realms have been torn by chaos should rely excessively upon his tutor does not yet spell certain doom. Falcandus must mean that Walter, like Maio before him, gave disastrous advice to the king. What can he have in mind? There is not a great deal to choose from, since the time of William II was afterwards looked upon as a sort of golden age; hence, Dante assigns the younger William a place among the just rulers in *Paradiso*, (Canto 20, lines 61-66).

But one widely criticized choice which the younger William made is generally attributed to the advice of archbishop Walter. As the chronicler Richard of San Germano reports it:

Now, the king had a certain paternal aunt (amita) in the palace at Palermo, and the king, by the counsel of the said archbishop [Walter of Palermo], gave her in marriage to Henry, king of the Germans, son of Frederick, the emperor of the Romans. He [Walter] also brought it about that by the command of the king, all the counts of the realm offered an oath that if the king should die without children, they, as the faithful of the realm, would be bound to this aunt of his and to the aforesaid king of the Germans, her husband⁽⁵⁴⁾.

This is what led to the crisis of 1189 when William died childless and Henry of Hohenstaufen claimed the throne in Constance's right. Thus the author brings the reader in a full circle, from the *Epistola* to the *Historia*, and from the end of the *Historia* to the *Epistola* again. The *Historia*, indeed, was finished.

This conclusion also makes the author's reasons for leaving Sicily obvious. Canon Robert had remained loyal to Stephen du Perche until the end, and when Stephen was driven from power, the government was seized by men who had rebelled against Stephen, some of whom had been his prisoners. The new archbishop Walter had never, it is true, been named as a rebel, but once he took power, he chose as his colleagues two men whom Stephen had imprisoned, the bishop Gentile of Agrigento and the notary Matthew. What happened to canon Robert then? Accord-

(53) FUIANO, *Ugo Falcando* cit., p. 133.

(54) In *Ryccardi de Sancto Germano Chronica Priora*, in *Ignoti Monachi Cisterciensis S. Mariae de Ferrara Chronica* cit., pp. 63-64.

ing to Garufi, the last extant document he wrote for the Sicilian government was dated on the May of 1169, which is around the time the *Historia* ends⁽⁵⁵⁾. Garufi speculates that he retired from court at this point, which seems logical. However, he lived on until at least 1182, when he drew up a document through which he surrendered his possessions to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Cefalù. The context does not explain why he does this; it is not a pious donation. By 1185, he was dead⁽⁵⁶⁾.

If the so-called Falcandus hoped for advancement in the royal court after 1169, he would have needed a new patron. But the hostility he expresses toward archbishop Walter, toward Matthew the notary, and toward bishop Gentile make it doubtful that he either desired or could gain this. Maybe at this point, as the *Histoire Littéraire* says, he « left the world in disgust and retired to the abbey of Saint-Denis, where he made his profession »⁽⁵⁷⁾. Or perhaps he simply went traveling and never came back. It might have taken him some years to find his way to Saint-Denis.

Can abbot Hugh's own documents add anything to the case for his identity with the chronicler Hugo Falcandus? Since some still argue whether the *Historia* and its prefatory letter, the *Epistola ad Petrum*, are by the same author, it might seem absurd to hope that anything could be learned by a comparison between these works and the few brief charters which survive under the name of the abbot. For though the *Epistola* and the *Historia* are of unequal length and of different genres, at least both works give ample scope for the author's style. The legal charters which survive under abbot Hugh's name are brief and constrained by their genre to deal with particular circumstances and precise legal points. Ordinarily they would allow little scope for the author's individual style, except in their brief preambles⁽⁵⁸⁾. Be-

(55) GARUFI, *Roberto di S. Giovanni* cit., p. 47.

(56) *Ibid.*, pp. 126-127.

(57) *Histoire Littéraire* cit., p. 276.

(58) I am indebted to Steven M. Wight for indispensable help with this project. Among other things, he gave me invaluable assistance in transcribing and interpreting Foucaud's *Testament*, pointed out the allusion to 2 *Timothy* with its echo in the *Historia*, called to my attention the fact that *itidem* and *perquirere* are unusual words, and alerted me to the stylistic importance of the *arenga* or preamble in a charter. Likewise, I am also indebted to Dr. Gabrielle Spiegel for invaluable help in transcribing the *Testament* and identifying proper names. Of course, all the mistakes in interpreting and presenting this evidence are my own.

sides which, the mitred abbot of Saint-Denis might well have left many of his documents to clerks or notaries. On the other hand, a careful administrator, especially one with a literary flair who had once been a notary himself, would surely attend personally to his more important documents. In fact, abbot Hugh has left two fairly important charters⁽⁵⁹⁾ which have some stylistic similarities with the works of Hugo Falcandus.

One of these, dated 1186 (the year Hugh was elected abbot) is published in the *Gallia Christiana* collection, where it is titled, *Hugo Abbas Sancti Dionysii oppidanis tributa quaedam dimittit*⁽⁶⁰⁾. It also appears in Volume 1 of the *Cartulaire Blanc* of Saint-Denis (p. 95), titled *Carta Abbatis Hugonis super tolta et tallia huius ville*. In this document, the abbot explains that he has granted the entreaties of the burgers of Saint Denis, who have often come to him asking to be freed from, « taxes, levies, and exactions »⁽⁶¹⁾. As the preamble states,

In accordance with the law of fraternal charity we ought freely to grant the just requests of anyone at all; still more, however, are we bound cheerfully and speedily to hear favorably the prayers of those whose bodies and souls we have received into our governance. We also judge that it is in our interest to seek especially the well-being of those whose profit, we do not doubt, will greatly increase our prosperity⁽⁶²⁾.

The abbot, then, with the consent of the chapter, grants the burgers of Saint-Denis freedom from all *tallia et tolta, necnon et omni rapina*, in exchange for certain fixed sums, to be paid several times a year. The document carefully provides mechanisms for the resolution of any disputes which may arise from it.

(59) There are several other charters in the *Cartulaire Blanc* which clearly belong to Hugues Foucaud, and some undated ones that may be his; however, of the ones that are clearly his, the two discussed in this article are the only ones with preambles, thus allowing the most scope for his individual style.

(60) *Gallia Christiana novissima. Histoire des Archeveches, éveches & abbayes de France, accompagnée des documents authentiques recueillis dans les registres du Vatican et les Archives locales, par. J[oseph]. H[yacinthe] Albanés*, VII, 2, Montbéliard, 1899-1920 (*Instrumenta*), C 75-76.

(61) This translation for « tallia et tolta, necnon et omni rapina » was suggested to me by Dr. Lynn Nelson, who also gave me valuable help in interpreting this charter. Private e-mail, Wed, 20 Aug 1997. Of course, all the errors in interpretation are mine.

(62) « In nomine sancte et individue Trinitatis, amen. Hugo Dei gratia B. Dionysii abbas, totusque eiusdem ecclesie conventus. Cum iustis quorumlibet postulationibus iuxta legem fraterne karitatis libenter annuere debeamus, eorum tamen preces, quorum corpora simul et animas regendas suscepimus, alacrius et celerius exaudire tenemur. Nostra quoque plurimum interesse decernimus, ut eorum precipue profectibus intendamus, de quorum commodis et augmentis proventus nostros multipliciter augeri non dubitamus ».

The other important document is as yet unpublished. It appears in the *Cartulaire Blanc* of Saint-Denis (pp. 60-61) and is dated 1196, the year before Abbot Hugues' death. Here the abbot arranges for his anniversary to be celebrated after his death⁽⁶³⁾, explaining his reasons in his preamble:

Seeing that all of us, established in this valley of misery, offend greatly as long as we inhabit the land of our pilgrimage and are not able to expunge the infection of the old leaven completely, it is necessary for us to look to those who come after for the health of our souls. In this way, after we have laid down the burden of the flesh, we may obtain pardon for those faults which in the present life we did not yet correct with suitable amends, through the prayers of religious men and the offering of the saving Host. Taking care for this, then, we have decreed that our anniversary shall be remembered after our death each year, in the church of Saint-Denis by our brothers, and in the church of Saint Paul by the canons serving God in the same place. Also we have taken care to seek out and assign with resourceful diligence revenues sufficient for the refreshment both of our brothers and the canons of Saint Paul on that same anniversary day⁽⁶⁴⁾.

The revenues are to come from a new village which Abbot Hugh himself established, and which « not without great difficulty and expense, » he had extricated from the control of local noblemen, so that now it owed dues to no one but him. Alluding to *2 Timothy 2:6*, Abbot Hugues declares, « [I]t is fitting that a farm worker should receive something of the fruits of his labors » (*ius-tum est de laboribus suis agricolam fructum percipere*), and thus it is appropriate that some revenues from this village should be devoted to his anniversary celebration.

Though the brevity of these two documents does not give extensive room for development, they have several points in common with the works attributed to Falcandus. Both combine lofty

(63) « Super Hoc Quod Hugo Abbas Fecit Anniversarium Suum Fieri in Ecclesiis Beati Dionysii et Sancti Pauli ».

(64) « Quoniam in hac valle miserie constituti quamdiu peregrinationis nostre terram incolimus, multis offendimus omnes et veteris fermenti contagium penitus expurgare non sufficimus, expedit nobis in posterum saluti nostre consulere et sollicite providere, ut delictorum veniam, que necdum in presenti vita digna satisfactione correximus, deposito carnis onere, religiosorum orationibus virorum et hostie salutaris oblatione obtinere possimus. Hoc igitur attendentes, anniversarium nostrum in ecclesia beati Dionysii a fratribus nostris et in ecclesia sancti Pauli a canonicis ibidem Deo servientibus post obitum nostrum fieri singulis annis decrevimus et redditus, qui eiusdem anniversarii die ad refectionem tam fratrum nostrorum quam canonicorum sancti Pauli sufficiant, sollerti diligentia perquirere et assignare curavimus ».

sentiments and pragmatic concerns almost seamlessly. Both deal with taxes and dues which villages owe to their overlords, a matter of such interest to Falcandus that he criticizes Stephen du Perche more sharply than usual for failing to respect Sicilian customs in such matters, thus giving his enemies to chance to assert with some evidence that « [Stephen] intended to force all the Sicilians to pay annual revenues and exactions according to the custom of France, which had no free citizens » (p. 145).

Besides this, each charter contains a *litotes* (a rhetorical figure Falcandus uses often) and both *litotes* involve phrases reminiscent of Falcandus. In his *Testament*, the Abbot says that he freed the village from other claims *non sine multo difficultate et magnis sumptibus*, while in the *Historia*, Falcandus twice uses *magnis sumptibus* in a similar *litotes*: *nec sine magnis sumptibus* (p. 36) and *non sine magnis sumptibus* (p. 87). Similarly, in the preamble to the 1186 charter, abbot Hugh writes, « we do not doubt » (*non dubitamus*), when expressing his conviction that the abbey's well-being would be increased by the townspeople's prosperity. Falcandus, in the *Epistola* and *Historia*, uses *litotes* with forms of *dubius* a total of eleven times, including the reference to the king of *non dubie virtutis* (p. 173) whom the Sicilians may elect. Once, also, he uses a *litotes* with a form of *dubitare*, asserting that the reader shall not doubt (*non dubites*) that the prosperity of a realm depends on the virtue of its ruler (p. 6).

Apart from the *litotes*, each charter shares another distinctive phrase with the *Historia*. Each also shares some fairly uncommon words with the works of Hugo Falcandus.

The distinctive phrase in the 1186 charter is *prestito iureiurando*, « having offered an oath »⁽⁶⁵⁾. *Iusiurandum* is itself an unusual word, evoked, no doubt, partly by Falcandus's liking for compound expressions. A synonym, *iuramentum*, is much more common, at least according to the evidence of the *Patrologia Latina* database⁽⁶⁶⁾. Falcandus, on the other hand, evidently

(65) « Si vero de terris burgensium controversia mota fuerit, quod post datam libertatem eas quomodolibet adquisierint, iuramento decem proborum virorum ante datam libertatem sui iuris eas fuisse probabunt, et sic in eadem libertate manebunt: pretaxatus autem census hoc modo colligetur. Abbas, qui protempore fuerit, consilio prefatorum burgensium decem viros eliget boni testimonii, qui prestito iureiurando predicti census assisiam fideliter facient, qui si forte constitutis terminis solutus non fuerit, pro emendatione sexaginta solidos nobis persolvent, ni pro defectu nostro pretaxatam pecuniam habere nequiverint ».

(66) Unless otherwise stated, all searches of the *PLD* were done for medieval authors only,

prefers *iusiurandum*, using it a total of 22 times in the *Historia*, while he does not use *iuramentum* at all. Not only does Falcandus use *iusiurandum* often, but (displaying his love of variation) he uses it in all its cases, even the dative *iuriiando* (p. 46), a distinction he shares, among the Medieval authors in the *PLD*, only with Alcuin, who uses the dative in explaining the proper way to spell the case forms for compound words⁽⁶⁷⁾. Falcandus sometimes links *iusiurandum* in phrases with other words, such as *as-tringere* and *religio*. Five times he joins forms of *iusiurandum* with forms of *prestare* (*praestare*) and two of those times the form is *iureiurando prestito*, the very words used in the charter, though transposed. This linking of *prestare* (*praestare*) with *iusiurandum* (*jusjurandum*) is unusual. The combination occurs only 31 times in the *PLD*, though *iuramentum* (*juramentum*) is linked to *prestare* (*praestare*) 649 times⁽⁶⁸⁾.

The phrase which Abbot Hugh's testament shares with the *Historia* is derived from the second Pauline Epistle to Timothy: *Laborantem agricolam oportet primum de fructibus percipere*, which the Douay-Rheims translation renders, « The farmer who toils must be the first to partake of the fruits » (2 Timothy 2: 6). Echoing this, Abbot Hugues writes in his testament, *Ergo iustum est de laboribus suis agricolam fructum percipere*. But at the beginning of the *Historia* Hugo Falcandus states that he will write about recent events in Sicily so that strong men will receive the just fruits of their labors: *Hinc enim accidit... viros fortes meritum laboris fructum percipere* (p. 3)⁽⁶⁹⁾.

apparatus excluded. With these exclusions, a search of the Patrologia Latina database revealed that all case forms of *iusiurandum* (*jusjurandum*) are used collectively only 1652 times in the *PLD*. This includes all instances of *jusjurandum* and its case variations (1635), *iusiurandum* and its case variations (15), *jus jurandum* and its variations (12) and *ius iurandum* with its variations (1). Forms of *iuramentum* (*juramentum*) appear 5154 times.

(67) ALCUIN, *Opera Omnia* (PL, CI, col. 868c).

(68) A search for *praest-* near *jurament-* yields 636 hits, 88 matches; *prest-* near *iurament-* yields 13 hits and 6 matches. As it happens, searches for *praest-* near *iurament-* and *prest-* near *jurament-* yield nothing; *praest-* near *jusjurandum* yields 20 hits, 17 matches; *praest-* near *jurisjurandi* yields 3 hits, 3 matches, and *praest-* near *jurejurando* yields 8 hits, 8 matches. As it happens, *prest-* near *jusjurandum* and its case variations yield nothing, nor does *praest-* near *iusiurandum* and its variations. Neither *praest-* nor *prest-* is found in a phrase with forms of either *jus jurandum* or *ius iurandum* written as separate words.

(69) The forms which are common between Falcandus and Fulcaudus, *labor* with *fructum percipere*, do not often appear together in the *Patrologia Latina database*. A search for *labor-* near *fructum percipere* yields only 6 matches, of which five are from commentaries on the letters of Saint Paul.

Several of the other unusual words common to Falcandus and Foucaud can be linked to the chronicler's style. The same impulse which leads Falcandus to use *iusiurandum* in all its cases also leads him experiment with variations of familiar root words, altered by prefixes and suffixes. Since the ear is pleased with the variations in familiar sounds, sometimes with contrasted meanings, and the mind is pleased with subtle changes in nuance, this *aesthetic* could appeal simultaneously to the artist and the legalist in Falcandus. In the *Historia*, this tendency leads Falcandus to use some quite unusual forms, such as the adverb *favillatim* (p. 4), which does not appear at all in the *PLD*, and *trivialtim* (p. 29), which gains only five « hits » there. Charters offer little scope for such exuberance; however, if many compound forms generated by this taste were already in the author's vocabulary, they would sometimes recommend themselves to him as the clearest and most precise expressions for the matter at hand. Both charters of Abbot Hugues contain compound forms which can be associated with patterns in Falcandus.

For example, *itidem*, meaning « likewise, in the same way, » is analogous to *ibidem*, « in the same place, » which Falcandus also uses and which also appears in the testament. But while *ibidem* appears in the *PLD* 10899 times in 1761 texts (medieval authors only, apparatus excluded) and is, besides, common enough to have become a scholarly abbreviation, *itidem* (same exclusions), appears only 1331 times in 564 texts. That is an average of somewhat less than seven times in each of the *PLD*'s 217 textual volumes searched. However, the word appears 5 times in the *Historia* alone and once in Abbot Hugues's *Testament*. What made this unusual word appeal to Hugues Foucaud? It is not obvious that he was influenced by some model close at hand. Though *itidem* is in Abbot Suger's vocabulary, Suger uses it only 3 times in all his 7 works in the *PLD*. Suger's successor, Odo of Deuil does not use the word in his works as given in the *PLD*.

Perquirere is another unusual word common to Falcandus and the *Testament* of Abbot Hugues. Forms of *perquirere* appear in the *PLD* (usual exclusions), 1688 times, that is an average of about 7.8 times per volume. Hugo Falcandus, by these standards, has an unusual liking for this word as well, since he uses forms of it once in the *Epistola* (p. 176) and 7 times in the *Historia* (pp. 29, 35, 39, 84, 92, 119, 126). Foucaud's predecessor, Suger, likes

the word somewhat better than he likes *itidem*, using it 6 times in all, always in his *Epistolae* (not in his histories or his testament). Falcandus's taste for *perquirere*, however, is unlike Suger's, being linked to his taste for the prefix « per », which he uses as an intensifier to enhance the force of several common root words. Thus, he uses *querere* as well as *perquirere*, *utilis* as well as *perutilis*, and *timere* and *pertimere*, *necessarius* and *pernecessarius*, *sentire* and *persentire*, and so forth. An experiment can establish that this is tendency is not universal, even among highly literate authors. A boolean search of the *PLD* (no exclusions) for documents containing forms of *quaerere* returns 4236 matches, for *perquirere* returns 969 matches. A search for documents containing both returns 879 matches. A search for forms of *utilis* returns 3950 matches, for *perutilis*, 166 matches and for both together, 148 matches. However, a search for documents containing, all at once, forms of *quaerere*, *perquirere*, *utilis*, *perutilis*, *temptare*, *pertemptare*, *sentire* and *persentire* (Falcandus uses all these words) returns only one match⁽⁷⁰⁾.

Of course, Falcandus does not confine himself to variations produced by the prefix « per ». Besides forms of *perquirere*, and *querere* (*quaerere*) (pp. 16, 35, 106) he also uses forms of *adquirere* (p. 47) *disquirere* (p. 99) and *inquirere* (p. 6). Similarly, he uses forms of *fugere* many times, and forms of many compounds of it, including *aufugere* (p. 42) *effugere* (p. 56), *perfugere* (p. 26) *subterfugere* (p. 50). However, his most common variations are *confugere*, « to take refuge, » (pp. 56, 64, 68, 70, 83 etc.), and *transfugere*, « to flee » (pp. 19, 22, 61, 77, 78). In the *Tolta et tallia* charter, both *confugere* and *transfugere* appear: *Erat enim memorata consuetudo praefatis burgensibus molesta nimis et odiosa, eo quod semper in timore positi res suas exponere non audent, minus lucri intenderent, eatenus ut non solum forenses ad hanc villam confugere formidarent, verum etiam indigenae ad alias transfugere cogentur*. *Confugere* is not uncommon in the *PLD*; a search for *confug-* yields 3692 hits and 1161 matches. *Transfugere*, however, is fairly rare; a search for *transfug-* yields only 320 hits and 167 matches. Of the 167 documents containing forms of *transfugere*, only 111 also contain a form of *confugere*.

(70) That match is LEO MARSICANUS, *Leonis Marsicani et Petri Diaconi Chronica Monasterii Casinensis* (*PL*, CLXXIII, coll. 440-990).

Hugo Falcandus also uses many compound words with *libet* as an element. Besides most variations on *quilibet* (« anyone you please, anything you please ») he uses forms of *quantuslibet* (« however much you like ») and *uterlibet* (« whichever of the two you like ») and once, *quomodolibet* (p. 3) (« in whatever way you like, any whatever way at all. ») Two compounds of *libet* appear in the 1186 document, one of them, *quorumlibet* in the preamble. The other compound, *quomodolibet*, which appears later in the charter, is quite unusual. In the entire *PLD*, *quomodolibet* appears only 297 times, in a total 130 documents. The abbots Suger and Odo of Deuil are not among the authors who use it. (Gratian, on the other hand, uses it twice, and Pope Alexander III seems positively fond of it, using it twenty-six times. In fact, papal documents must contribute a large share of the usages in the *PLD*).

Falcandus also uses a variety of compounds formed from *tenus*, « length » or « extent. » The more common forms include *hactenus* (« to that extent »), *nullatenus* (« to no extent, by no means »), *quatenus* (« to what extent »), *aliquatenus* (« to some extent, to any extent »). The most unusual form *eatenus*, (« to that point, to that extent ») appears 7 times in the *Historia* and once in the *Tolta et Tallia* charter of 1186. Yet, among Medieval authors in the *PLD*, *eatenus* appears only 886 times in 396 documents. Gratian uses it 8 times but failed to popularize the word, since pope Alexander III uses it only once. Suger and Odo of Deuil do not use the word in their texts as presented in the *PLD*.

Considering the brevity of these two charters, this is a rather impressive body of distinctive expressions for them to share with the works of Falcandus. How many other twelfth century authors would use one, or two, or more of them in the same literary work, let alone in brief charters such as these? Indeed, it can become an amusing game to do boolean searches in the *PLD* database for various combinations, to see how many ways there are to shrink the number of matches to zero ⁽⁷¹⁾. But perhaps

(71) Obviously no matches will be found with searches for documents containing all the words and phrases common to these Hugues Foucaud documents and the works of Hugo Falcandus. Also, all matches can be eliminated with searches for combinations of words and phrases in common between Falcandus and each of the documents, though not necessarily of the most unusual words. For example, if we confine ourselves to forms from the *Testament*, a search for « *itidem* and *perquir-* and *magnis sumptibus* and *fructum percipere* » yields

common sense is enough to suggest that some great coincidence is necessary to explain why all these distinctive words and phrases are found both in the works of the Hugo Falcandus and the charters of Hugo Fulcaudus. Probably it is the coincidence that they were the same person.

Many things indicate that Hugo Falcandus with Hugues Foucaud were the same man. Falcandus, the pro-Frankish author of the *Epistola* and the *Historia*, states that he grew up in Sicily and left, and the narrative of *Historia* suggests that he had motives to leave shortly after 1169, when history ends. Hence, we would expect to find him outside Sicily, very likely in France. The names « Hugo Falcandus » and « Hugo Fulcaudus », are remarkably similar and a slight error could easily change one into the other. The letters of Peter of Blois imply that his correspondent, Abbot H. (almost certainly Hugues Foucaud), lived in Sicily when Peter was there, *circa* 1166-69. The citation by Guillaume de Nangis shows that a copy of Falcandus's work was at Saint-Denis in the late thirteenth century, and somehow, too, Gervais de Tournay, in the Paris of 1550, had access to a manuscript which was older and more accurate than any which now survives. Finally, the common stylistic elements between the charters of Hugues Foucaud and the works of Hugo Falcandus can only strengthen the case. That Hugo Falcandus was Abbot Hugues is a surprising yet definite fact. Realizing this will help us gain deeper insights in the *Epistola* and the *Historia* as well as the relationship between twelfth century France and Sicily.

GWENYTH E. HOOD

no matches. Confining ourselves to forms in common between the *Historia* and the *Tolta et Tallia* document, a search for « *eatenus* and *quomodolibet* and *transfug-* and *exaud-* and *praest-* near *jurejurando* » produces no matches. When *jurisjurandi* and *jusjurandum*, respectively, are substituted for *jurejurando*, the exclusion still holds.