



SPICILEGIUM

ONLINE JOURNAL OF JAPAN SOCIETY FOR
MEDIEVAL EUROPEAN STUDIES,

VOL. I (2017)

* * *
* *
*

CONTENTS

- 1 FOREWORD TO THE FIRST ISSUE OF *SPICILEGIUM*
Hiroshi Takayama
- 2 EDITOR'S NOTICE
Shoichi Sato
- 3 CLASSIFICATION OF VILLEINS IN MEDIEVAL SICILY
Hiroshi Takayama
- 17 THE *TAKTIKA* OF LEO VI AND THE BYZANTINE EASTERN FRONTIER
DURING THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES
Kosuke Nakada
- 28 THE RAVISHMENT OF BODY AND SOUL
IN THE *FRIAR'S TALE* AND THE *SUMMONER'S TALE*
Takami Matsuda

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST ISSUE OF *SPICILEGIUM*

It is with great pleasure that I present the first issue of *Spicilegium*, an English on-line-journal of the Japan Society for Medieval European Studies (JSMES). The journal will be published once a year, and be open to contributions in all fields (history, literature, philosophy, art, music and other fields) studying Medieval Europe spanning from the fifth century to the fifteenth century.

I am extremely grateful to the members of the English journal working committee of JSMES for their five years of continuous effort to launch this journal, along with the starting editorial board members for their editorial work and review of submissions with particular note for the editor-in-chief Professor Shoichi Sato. I also gratefully acknowledge a generous donation from Mr. Isuna Hasekura and Mr. Nobuo Matsuki which made the launch of *Spicilegium* possible.

JSMES, founded on 1 April 2009, is devoted to medieval European studies in the broadest sense of the term, including Byzantine, Islamic, Late Antiquity and Early Modern studies. Its Japanese Journal *Seiyo Chusei Kenkyu (Medieval European Studies)*, edited separately from *Spicilegium* and launched in 2009, is published annually and is received by all members of the Society. Membership is open to professional researchers, postgraduate students, and non-professional researchers.

This journal offers a new platform for the growing body of work on medieval Europe. I hope *Spicilegium* will be a strong base for worldwide discussion on medieval European studies.

19 December 2017

Hiroshi Takayama

President

The Japan Society for Medieval European Studies

update record, 03. 02. 2018

EDITOR'S NOTICE

It is a great pleasure to see the launch of *Spicilegium*, the first online journal of the Japan Society for Medieval European Studies, in response not only to the wish of the members and supporters of our Society but also to a widespread demand from international sphere to see the Japanese academic arena opened to whomever interested in various aspects of European medieval society and culture. We are very happy to produce the first issue of *Spicilegium* with three good articles all of which, without exception, were submitted to meticulous and strict review.

I would like to thank here all the anonymous reviewers for their selfless task in raising the academic level of the journal, and also to Professor Shigeto Kikuchi for his service as the assistant to the editor-in-chief. Dr. Kôji Murata contributed greatly with his knowledge of classical languages for the proofreading of digitalized texts. Finally, I should like to express my gratitude again to Mr. Toshinobu Nagata for his wonderful job in constructing a superb website for *Spicilegium*.

Editor-in-chief
Shoichi Sato

CLASSIFICATION OF VILLEINS IN MEDIEVAL SICILY^[*]

Hiroshi Takayama

[*] This is a revised English version of my Japanese article "Chusei Sicilia ni okeru Nomin no Kaisokubun (Classification of Peasants in Medieval Sicily)," *Seiyo Chusei Kenkyu (Medieval European Studies)*, 6 (2014): 141-159, which is one of the results of JSPS Grant-in-aid for Scientific Research 24520826 & 15K02931, and was made based on "Classification of Villeins in Norman Sicily" presented at the 2014 Annual Meeting of Medieval Academy of America (April 10-12, 2014, UCLA, USA).

[1] Guy Fourquin, "Serfs and serfdom: Western European," Joseph R. Strayer, ed., *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, 13 vols. (New York, 1982-89), 11: 199-208. Marc Bloch, *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française* (Oslo, 1931), pp. 87-95; Georges Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris, 1953), pp. 173-286; Idem, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*, trans. by Cynthia Postan (Columbia, South Carolina, 1968; originally published in Paris, 1962), pp. 188-192; Idem, *Guerriers et paysans, VIIIe-XIIIe siècles. Premier essor de l'économie européenne* (Paris, 1973), pp. 179-300, esp. pp. 256-257; Robert Boutruche, *Seigneurie et féodalité. I. Le premier âge des liens d'homme à homme*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1968; 1st ed. 1959), pp. 124-234; Theodore Evergates, *Feudal Society in the Bailliage of Troyes under the Counts of Champagne, 1152-1284* (Baltimore/London, 1975), pp. 137-144; Setsuo Watanabe, "Ryoushu to Nomin (Lords and Peasants)," Atsushi Egawa & Yoshihisa Hattori, eds., *Seiyo Chuseishi*, 3 vols (Tokyo, 1995), 2: 194-199.

[2] Marc Bloch, *La société féodale* (Paris, 1939), pp. 366-367; Agnès Gerhards, *La société médiévale* (Paris, 1986), pp. 247-248, "Servage"; Werner Rösener, *Die Bauern in der europäischen Geschichte* (Munich, 1993), pp. 64-87.

[3] Hans Kurt Schulze, *Grundstrukturen der Verfassung im Mittelalter*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne, 1990-92), pp. 72-73.

ABSTRACT

According to a traditional view, villeins in Norman Sicily consisted of two basic classes, those who owed their lords hereditary service in person and those who owed service with respect to the terms of their tenure of land. Scholars who recently examined relevant terms in Arabic documents seem to share this view. For example, Jeremy Johns showed us a list of Latin, Greek and Arabic words categorized into two groups, a class of "registered" villeins (*hursh*) and a class of "unregistered" villeins (*mul*s), while Alex Metcalfe explains that Arabic and Greek terms to refer to villeins can be resolved into two basic categories, "registered" and "unregistered" families. In this paper, I will make it clear that *mul*s and *hursh* were not a pair of opposite Arabic terms indicating two different classes of villeins, but that *mul*s simply signify those who were not listed in the previous documents.

It has been generally understood, mainly based on studies of France, that a social class of unfree peasants subject to lords through land tenure was formed in Western Europe during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.^[1] Marc Block, a well-known French medievalist, considered that most peasants in the Middle Ages had been unfree and in the status of serfdom due to the following three points. First, they had to pay *chevage*, a kind of poll-money and a symbol of servitude. Second, they could not marry women living outside their lords' domains unless they got their lords' permission by making a large payment. Third, they had to pay *mainmorte* (death duty) to their lords when they bequeathed their property.^[2] Hans Kurt Schulze, a German scholar, defines *Bauern* (sing. *Bauer*, peasants) in medieval Europe as those who belonged to rural population (as opposed to urban population), and explains that they constituted a quite uniform class as a whole in terms of social function, management style, and lifestyle, although they consisted of various people in free, semi-free, and unfree conditions, and varied greatly in terms of land tenure.^[3]

Scholars seem to have divided medieval peasants into slaves, unfree peasants, and free peasants in terms of degree of freedom, and sub-divided unfree peasants into serfs and villeins in terms of degree of dependence on their lords, although these divisions and definitions are quite artificial. As a matter of fact, there were various words supposed to indicate peasants in medieval Europe, and some of them were sometimes ambiguous and polysemous.

It is important for us to clarify here the usage of some frequently used words, modern and medieval, for peasants of Medieval Europe. The English word "serf" ("serf" in French, "servo" in Italian) derives from the Latin word "*servus*", while the English word "villein" ("vilain" in French, "villano" in Italian) comes from the Latin

[4] Du Cange, et al., *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, 10 vols. (Niort, 1883–1887), 7: 454-455, “Servus”; Bloch, *La société féodale*, p. 363.

[5] Wolfgang Stürner, ed., *Die Konstitutionen Friedrichs II. für das Königreich Sizilien* (Hanover, 1996, MGH Const., 2, Suppl.), II 32., p. 338: “seu quicumque villanus qui in villis et casalibus habitat.” Du Cange, et al., *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, 8: 331: “Villani dicti sunt a villa, eo quod in villis commorentur, qui et rustici, a ruribus, quae excolunt, et Pagenses, etc. ...” Cf. Adalgisa de Simone, “Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia,” *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome*, 116 (2004): 481; Bloch, *La société féodale*, pp. 369-370.

[6] J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden, 1976), pp. 1103-1104, “villanus”.

[7] Cf. Ferdinand Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, 2 vols. (Paris 1907), 2: 528.

[8] Robert Fossier, *Paysans d’Occident* (Paris, 1984); Paul Freedman, *The Origins of Peasant Servitude in Medieval Catalonia* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 1-18. For studies on peasants in Medieval Sicily, see note 9 below. For recent studies and trends, see especially the works of Pietro Corrao, Giuseppe Petralia, and Sandro Carocci.

[9] Rosario Gregorio, *Considerazioni sopra la storia di Sicilia*, 4th ed. (Reprint of 3rd edition, Palermo, 1845; 1st ed., Palermo, 1810-1816); Michele Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, 1st ed., 3 vols (Florence, 1854-1872), 3: 233-250; 2nd ed., a cura di Carlo Alfonso Nallino, 3 vols. in 5 parts (Catania, 1933-39), 3: 245-257; Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande*, 2: 528-530; Ernst Mayer, *Italienisch Verfassungsgeschichte von der Gothenzeit bis zur Zunfttherrschaft*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1909), 1: 185; Carlo Alberto Garufi, “Censimento e catasto della popolazione servile. Nuovi studi e ricerche sull’ordinamento amministrativo dei Normanni in Sicilia nei secoli XI e XII,” *Archivio Storico Siciliano*, 49 (1928): 73-75; Illuminato Peri, *Il villanaggio in Sicilia* (Palermo, 1965), pp. 35-49; Idem, *Villani e cavalieri nella Sicilia medievale* (Rome, 1993), pp. 26-37; Vincenzo d’Alessandro, “Servi e liberi,” *Uomo e ambiente nel Mezzogiorno normanno-svevo* (Bari, 1987), pp. 293-317; Pietro Corrao, “Il servo,” *Condizione umana e ruoli sociali nel Mezzogiorno normanno-svevo* (Bari, 1991), pp. 61-78; Idem, “Gerarchie sociali e di potere nella Sicilia normanna (XI-XII secolo). Questioni storiografiche e interpretative,” *Señores, siervos y vasallos en la Alta Edad Media. XXVIII Semana de Estudios Medievales, Estella 16-20 julio 2001* (Pamplona, 2002), pp. 459-481; Donald Matthew, *The Norman Kingdom of Sicily* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 150-160; Jean-Marie Martin, *Italie normandes (XIe-XIIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1994),

word “villanus”.

Figure 1. Some words of Latin origin for peasants

| |
|--|
| <i>servus</i> (L) serf (E, F), servo (I) |
| <i>villanus</i> (L) villein (E), vilain (F), villano (I) |
| <i>rusticus</i> (← <i>rus</i>) (L) rustic, rural (E), rustique, rural (F), rustico, rurale (I) |

L: Latin, E: English, F: French, I: Italian

The Latin word “*servus*”, originally meaning a slave, does not appear very frequently in medieval Latin sources,^[4] but “serf” in English or French, and “servo” in Italian, are quite often used by modern scholars to indicate a medieval peasant subject to lords. On the other hand, the Latin word “*villanus*” originally meant a person in a *villa* (a village),^[5] and “villein” in English (“vilain” in French, “villano” in Italian) is also used to indicate an unfree peasant in medieval Europe. “Villein” is sometimes used almost interchangeably with “serf”. However, some historians think a villein was freer than a serf,^[6] while others regard a serf as belonging to one of the two classes of villeins, a more unfree one.^[7]

Meanwhile, recent studies seem to suggest that status and condition of peasants in Medieval Europe varied from place to place and from time to time more largely than scholars had previously thought. It is getting more and more difficult for us to consider peasants in medieval Europe as a uniform class of unfree status under lordship.^[8]

1. HISTORIOGRAPHY

The villeins in Norman Sicily have long been investigated by a number of historians, including Rosario Gregorio, Noël des Vergers, Michele Amari, Ferdinand Chalandon, Ernst Mayer, Carlo Alberto Garufi, Illuminato Peri, and Giuseppe Petralia.^[9] Scholars mentioned various words in Latin, Greek and Arabic supposed to indicate a villein, and interrelationships between them has been an issue subject to debate. For example, Chalandon, a French historian of the early twentieth century, found various words indicating a villein in the documents of Norman Sicily.^[10]

Figure 2. Words for villeins in three languages (Chalandon)

| |
|---|
| Latin <i>servi glebae, rustici, adscriptitii, inscriptitii, homines, coloni, aldi, metochii, cortisani, angararii, homines censiles</i> |
| Greek <i>πάροικοι (paroikoi), ἄνθρωποι (anthrōpoi), ἐναπόγραφοι (enapographoi), ἐξώγραφοι (exōgraphoi)</i> |
| Arabic <i>Riġiāl el Geraīd (= riġāl al-jarā'id), maks, Mehallet (= mahallāt), Ghorebā (= ghurabā')</i> |

pp.177-214; Emanuele Conte, *Servi medievali. Dinamiche del diritto comune* (Rome, 1996), pp. 219-223; Francesco Panero, *Schiavi servi e villani nell'Italia medievale* (Turin, 1999), pp. 295-304, 324-330; Idem, "Le nouveau servage et l'attache à la glèbe aux XIIe et XIIIe siècle: l'interprétation de Marc Bloch et la documentation italienne," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge*, 112 (2000): 551-561; Idem, "Signori e servi: una conflittualità permanente," *Rivolte urbane e rivolte contadine nell'Europa del Trecento. Un confronto*, ed. by M. Bourin, G. Cherubini, and G. Pinto (Florence, 2008), pp. 305-321; Giuseppe Petralia, "La «signoria» nella Sicilia," G. Rossetti, ed., *La signoria rurale in Italia nel medioevo* (Pisa, 2006), pp. 233-270; Sandro Carocci, "Le libertà dei servi. Reinterpretare il villanaggio meridionale," *Storica*, 37 (2007): 51-94; Idem, "Angararii e franci. Il villanaggio meridionale," *Studi in margine all'edizione della platea di Luca arcivescovo di Cosenza (1203-1227)*, eds. by E. Cuozzo and J.-M. Martin (Avellino, 2009), pp. 205-241.

[10] Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande*, 2: 528.

[11] Stürner, ed., *Die Konstitutionen Friedrichs II.*, III 3., p. 366: "Errores eorum, qui villanos quoslibet sine licentia dominorum ad ordinem clericatus accedere regia constitutione dicunt esse prohibitum, interpretatione benivola corrigentes, decernimus eos tantum villanos predicta constitutione intelligi fore prohibitos clericari, qui personaliter, intuitu persone sue scilicet, servire tenentur, sicut sunt ascriptitii et servi glebe et huiusmodi alii. Qui vero respectu tenimenti vel alicuius beneficii servire debent, si voluerint ad ordinem clericatus accedere, liceat eis sine voluntate etiam dominorum, prius tamen hiis, que tenent a dominis suis, in eorum manibus resignatis." Cf. James M. Powell, ed., *The Liber Augustalis, or Constitutions of Melfi promulgated by the Emperor Frederick II for the Kingdom of Sicily in 1231* (Syracuse University Press, 1971), p. 106; Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande*, 2: 528-530; Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 149.

[12] Michele Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, 2nd ed., ed. by C. A. Nallino, 3 vols. in 5 parts (Catania, 1933-39), 3: 245-250; Ernst Mayer, *Italienische Verfassungsgeschichte von der Gothenzeit bis zur Zunftherrschaft*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1909), 1: 185; Carlo Alberto Garufi, "Censimento e catasto della popolazione servile. Nuovi studi e ricerche sull'ordinamento amministrativo dei Normanni in Sicilia nei secoli XI e XII," *Archivio Storico Siciliano*, 49 (1928): 73-75.

[13] Chalandon follows Amari, who read *muls* as *maks*. Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 1st ed., 3: 243; 2nd ed., 3: 250.

[14] Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande*, 2: 529-30. Chalandon, following the edition of Salvatore Cusa (*I diplomi greci ed*

There is no agreement of opinions on which word in Arabic, Greek, or Latin documents corresponds to which word, and there has been controversy over what these words precisely meant. But many scholars seem to have concluded that the villeins consisted of two basic different groups, those who owed hereditary service in person (*intuitu personae*) and those who owed service with respect to the terms of their tenure of land (*respectu tenimenti*), based on the following law of William II.

Correcting by a benevolent interpretation the errors of those who say that without their lords' permission all villeins have been forbidden by royal constitution to enter the clergy, we decree that the villeins forbidden to become clerics by the above-mentioned constitution should be those who are held to serve personally, i.e., with respect to their own persons, like *ascriptitii*, *servi glebe*, and others of that kind. However, those who must serve by reason of a holding or other benefice, if they desire to enter clergy, they may do so even without the accord of their lords, after they previously give back what they hold from their lords into the lords' hands.^[11]

In this law, the villeins are divided into two categories: "those who are held to personal service, i.e., with respect to their own person, like *ascriptitii*, *servi glebe*, and other of that kind," and those "who owe service by reason of a holding or a benefice." The law makes clear that the villeins of the first category are forbidden to become clerics while those of the second category may do so even without the permission from their lords.

Based on these descriptions, historians have tried to arrange various words in Latin, Greek and Arabic documents into the two categories. For example, Chalandon, relying on the work of Amari,^[12] put them in the following order. In the upper group are the villeins who owe service to their landlords by reason of a holding (*respectu tenimenti*), that is, *homines censiles* in Latin, ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) and ἄνθρωποι (*anthrōpoi*) in Greek, *maks* (Amari reads *muls* as *maks*)^[13] and *maḥallāt* in Arabic. In the lower group are the villeins who owe service to their landlords with respect to their own persons (*intuitu personae*), that is, *servi* and *ascriptitii* in Latin, ἐναπόγραφοι (*enapographoi*) and πάροικοι (*paroikoi*) in Greek, and *rijāl al-jarā'id* in Arabic.^[14]

Figure 3. Classification of villeins by Chalandon

| | villeins who owe service to their lords by reason of a holding | villeins who owe service to their lords with respect to their own persons |
|--------|--|---|
| Latin | <i>homines censiles</i> | <i>servi</i> <i>ascriptitii</i> |
| Greek | ἐξώγραφοι (<i>exōgraphoi</i>) ἄνθρωποι (<i>anthrōpoi</i>) | ἐναπόγραφοι (<i>enapographoi</i>) πάροικοι (<i>paroikoi</i>), |
| Arabic | <i>maks</i> <i>maḥallāt</i> | <i>rijāl al-jarā'id</i> |

Meanwhile, Carlo A. Garufi, an Italian scholar, explains as follows. *Jarīda* (pl. *jarā'id*) included only names of villeins of large estates who owed labor service

arabi di Sicilia pubblicati nel testo originale, vol. 1 [2 parts][Palermo 1868-1882], p. 247) uses the Greek word ἐξώγραφοι (*ezōgraphoi*), but the word in the original manuscript (cf. Figure 7 below) is ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*).

[15] Carlo Alberto Garufi, "Censimento e catasto," *Archivio storico siciliano*, n.s. 49 (1928): 74-75.

[16] Cusa, pp. 134, 245-246.

[17] Petralia, "La «signoria» nella Sicilia," pp. 261-262; Carocci, "Angararii e franci," p. 24.

[18] Annliese Nef, "Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 112/2 (2000): 579-607; Idem, *Conquérir et gouverner la Sicile islamique aux XIe et XIIe siècles* (Rome, 2011); Jeremy Johns, *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily* (Cambridge, 2002); Alex Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians* (London, 2003), p. 37; Idem, *The Muslims of Medieval Italy* (Edinburgh, 2009), pp. 268-72; Adalgisa de Simone, "Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 116 (2004): 471-500.

[19] Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 151, Table 6.1. On the other hand, Nef arranges various words written in *jarā'id* of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. She lists as Latin words, *villanus*, *homo*, *rusticus*, as Greek words βελλάνος (*bellanos*), ἄνθρωπος (*anthrōpos*), ἀνέρ (*aner*), πάροικος (*paroikos*), ἐξώγραφος (*exōgraphos*), ἀγαρήνος (*agarēnos*), and Arabic words *al-rijāl* («les hommes»), *rijāl al-jarā'id* («les hommes de documents»), *al-rijāl al-muls* («les hommes doux, lisses»), *rijāl al-mahallāt* («les hommes des campements», «les hommes des villages»), *al-rijāl al-ghurabā* [= *ghurabā*] / *al-rijāl al-ghurabā* («les hommes étrangers»), *al-rijāl al-hurshī* [= *khurshī*] / *rijāl al-hursh* («les hommes rudes»). Nef, "Conquêtes et reconquêtes," pp. 586-588; Idem, *Conquérir et gouverner*, pp. 489-490.

personally with his family and sons because of their persons, while in the *platea* (Lat. pl. *plateae*; Gr. πλατεῖα, pl. πλατεῖαι) included all villeins, more precisely, both those who owed labor service because of their persons and those who owed labor service for the lands and other benefices granted to them.^[15]

Although this classification is similar to that of Chalandon, Garufi thinks that *jarīda* included only those who owed labor service personally but *platea* included both this kind of villeins and the more free villeins who owed labor service by reason of a land holding. This understanding of Garufi based on the difference between *jarīda* and *platea* cannot be accepted, however, because the Arabic word *jarīda* is written as *plateia* in Greek in Arabic-Greek bilingual documents, which suggests both are identical.^[16]

Although there is no agreement of opinion on which word in Arabic, Greek, and Latin documents relates to which category of villeins, the idea of the classification of villeins into two groups seems to have been accepted by generations of historians.^[17] Those scholars who have recently published studies relating villeins in Arabic documents, including Annliese Nef, Jeremy Johns, Alex Metcalfe, and Adalgisa de Simone, also seem to share this idea.^[18] For example, Jeremy Johns, who has examined words used for Muslim villeins in Arabic documents in detail, shows us a list of words categorized into two groups.^[19]

Figure 4. Classification of villeins by Jeremy Johns

| Registered | Unregistered |
|--|--|
| • <i>ahl</i> or <i>rijāl</i> (<i>idāfa</i> or preposition) <i>al-rah</i> / <i>al-fulānī</i> , 'the people' or 'the men of such-and-such an estate' | |
| • <i>rijāl al-mahallāt</i> , 'the men of the settlements' | • <i>al-ghurabā</i> , 'the strangers' |
| • οἱ ἐντόποι (<i>oi entopoi</i>), 'the indigenes' | • οἱ ξένοι (<i>oi xenoī</i>), 'the strangers' |
| • <i>nativi</i> , 'indigenes'; <i>servi glebae</i> , 'serfs of the land' | • <i>advenae</i> , 'newcomers'; <i>hospites</i> , 'guests' |
| • <i>rijāl al-jarā'id</i> , 'the men of the registers' | |
| • οἱ ἐναπόγραφοι (<i>oi enapografoi</i>) 'the registered' | • οἱ ἐξώγραφοι (<i>oi exōgrafoi</i>), 'the unregistered' |
| • <i>adscriptitii</i> , 'the registered' | • <i>inscriptitii</i> , 'the unregistered' |
| • <i>al-hursh</i> , <i>al-rijāl al-hursh</i> , 'the rough', 'the rough men' | • <i>al-muls</i> , <i>al-rijāl al-muls</i> , 'the smooth', 'the smooth men' |
| • <i>rustici</i> , 'rough' | • [<i>glabri</i> , 'smooth'] |
| • <i>qui personaliter, intuitu personae suae scilicet, servire tenentur</i> , 'those who are held to personal service, i.e. with respect to their own persons' | • <i>qui ... respectu tenimenti vel alicuius beneficii servire tenentur</i> , 'those who ... owe service by reason of a holding or other benefice' |

(Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 151, Table 6.1)

According to him one group is a class of "registered" villeins expressed as *hursh* (the rough men) as well as *rijāl (ahl) al-jarā'id* (the men of the registers) in Arabic documents, and the other is a class of "unregistered" villeins expressed as *muls* (the smooth men) in Arabic documents. This summary, a result of Johns' extensive examination of Arabic parchments in Norman Sicily, shows us his new interpretation and detailed information about Muslim peasants, but he preserves the tradi-

[20] Johns' book is a good scholarly work which examines Arabic documents of Norman Sicily in detail. Although I do not agree with the traditional view reinforced by Johns, it would not have been possible for me to complete this article without his work.

[21] Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians*, p. 37; Idem, *The Muslims of Medieval Italy*, pp. 268-72. Brian Catlos accepted their idea in his latest book. Brian Catlos, *Muslims of Medieval Latin Christendom, c.1050–1614* (Cambridge, 2014), p. 116.

[22] Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, 1st ed., 3: 243; 2nd ed., 3: 250. This interpretation of Amari was accepted by Nef. See Nef, "Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales," p. 600; Idem, *Conquérir et gouverner*, p. 501.

[23] De Simone, "Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia," p. 489.

[24] Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 147.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

[27] Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians*, p. 37; Idem, *The Muslims of Medieval Italy*, pp. 268-72.

[28] Nef seems to have accepted Johns' opinion in her book published in 2011, although she showed an interpretation different from Johns' about *muls* in her article of 2000. Nef, "Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales," pp. 588-589, 600-606; Idem, *Conquérir et gouverner*, pp. 506: "Que le terme *hursh* «rude» s'oppose à celui de *muls* («dous», «lisse») paraît peu contestable. Il est donc probable que le premier désigne le *rijāl al-jarā'id*."

tional idea of the classification of the villeins into two groups.^[20]

Johns' understanding of Muslim villeins has been accepted overall by Alex Metcalfe. According to Metcalfe, many terms were used synonymously across three languages to refer to villeins, and those in Arabic and Greek can be resolved into two basic categories: families who were "registered" and those who were "unregistered". Following Johns' idea, he explains that those who were "registered" were called *hursh* ("rough men"), or *rijāl (ahl) al-jarā'id* in Arabic, and *enapographoi* (ἐναπόγραφοι) in Greek, while those who were "unregistered" were called *muls* ("smooth men") in Arabic, and *exōgraphoi* (ἐξώγραφοι) in Greek.^[21]

This categorization of the words of three languages is highly elaborative. However, it should be noted that many of the listed words have been categorized into the two groups, not based on the usage in the documents of Norman Sicily, but on analogy of the meanings of words, or by analogy with East Roman law and usages outside Norman Sicily. In addition, there is a possibility that such words do not correspond one-to-one contrary to the presupposition that words (concepts) indicating peasants correspond one-to-one between Arabic, Greek, and Latin.

Furthermore, the interpretation of Amari and Nef that *exōgraphoi*, a Greek word correspondent to the Arabic word *muls*, originally meant "those written outside (the lists) (*que' fuori scritto/ écrites à l'extérieur (des listes)*),"^[22] and the opinion of De Simone that *exōgraphoi* means "those added (to the lists),"^[23] call the understandings of Johns and Metcalfe into question.

In this article, I will focus on *muls* and *hursh* which Johns and Metcalfe have regarded as a pair of opposite words indicating "unregistered" and "registered" villeins, and have given "the smooth men" and "the rough men" as their English translations. I think a new interpretation of *muls* and *hursh*, as well as *rijāl (ahl) al-jarā'id*, in Arabic documents will reveal to us a different aspect of the reality of Norman Sicily.

2. MULS AND HURSH: A PAIR OF OPPOSITE TERMS?

What is Arabic word *muls*, then? "Another group of villeins, *al-muls*," explains Jeremy Johns, "first appear in contraposition to the *rijāl al-jarā'id* in the *jarāida* renewed for San Giorgio di Triocala in November 1141. After the lists of the *rijāl al-jarā'id* of Triocala and Raḥl al-Başal comes a third list of the names of the *muls*. *Muls* is the plural of *amlas*, meaning 'smooth', 'soft', 'sleek', et cetera. ... In the Sicilian documents, however, the word is always used in the plural."^[24]

According to Johns, *muls* is antithesis to *hursh*. "The *muls* appear in antithesis to the *hursh*," continues his explanation, "in the two Chùrchuro documents of 1149 and 1154. Of the five households of Muslim *rijāl* granted to Chùrchuro, two are *hursh*, and three are *muls*. The word *hursh* is the plural of the adjectival form *ahrash*, meaning 'rough', 'harsh', or 'coarse'... As with *muls*, only the plural form *hursh* is used for the Muslim villeins of Norman Sicily."^[25]

"The two terms," concludes Johns, "clearly form a pair of contrasted opposites, the *hursh* and the *muls*, the 'rough' and the 'smooth'. Neither term, to the best of my knowledge, is employed in this sense anywhere in the Arabic-speaking world, except Sicily."^[26] This understanding of Johns has been accepted by Metcalfe^[27] and Nef.^[28]

The idea of contraposition of *muls* and *hursh* had already been shown in the nineteenth century by Reinhart Dozy, who had explained "The *muls* formed in Sicily a certain class of serfs, while another class had the name of *al-hursh*" without

[29] Reinhart Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1877–1881), 2: 620, ملس (*muls*), املس (*amlasu*): “Les ملس (*muls*) formaient en Sicile une certaine classe de serfs, tandis qu’une autre portait le nom de الحرش (*al-hursh*).” Already in the eighteenth century, Rosario Gregorio edited an Arabic document of 1149 (see Figure 5 below), which includes *muls* and *hursh*, and discussed what these two words meant. See Rosario Gregorio, *De supputandis apud Arabes Siculos temporibus* (Palermo, 1786), pp. 36–37. Noël des Vergers also stated that the word *muls* was written always as ἐξὼγραφοί (*exōgraphoi*) in Greek, and that this Greek word corresponded to *ascriptitii* in Latin documents. See Noël des Vergers, “Lettre à M. Caussin de Perceval sur les diplômes arabes conservés dans les archives de la Sicile,” *Journal Asiatique*, ser.4, 6 (1845): 20–24.

[30] Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 2nd ed., p. 246, note 1.

[31] Palermo, Arch. Dioc. (Archivio Diocesano), Fondo Primo, no. 14 (Edition: Cusa, pp. 28–30; Jeremy Johns and Alex Metcalfe, “The Mystery of Chürchuro: Conspiracy or Incompetence in Twelfth-Century Sicily,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 62 (1999): 242–248).

[32] Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 16 (Edition: Cusa, pp. 34–36; Johns and Metcalfe, “The Mystery of Chürchuro,” pp. 248–253).

[33] De Simone, “Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia,” p. 488. Cf. Ibn Manẓūr (630–711 A.H.), *Lisān al-‘arab*, 18 vols. (Beirut, Dār Ṣādir, 2004), 14: 121–122 ملس (*m/l/s*).

[34] Gregorio, *De supputandis*, p. 37; Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 1st ed., 3: 244; Idem, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 2nd ed., 3: 252; Nef, “Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales,” pp. 588, 604; Idem, *Conquérir et gouverner*, pp. 490, 506–507; Johns, *Arabic Administration*, pp. 148–150; Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians*, p. 37; Idem, *The Muslims of Medieval Italy*, pp. 269–72; De Simone, “Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia,” pp. 486–489, 499.

[35] Gregorio, *De supputandis*, p. 36; des Vergers, “Lettre à M. Caussin de Perceval,” pp. 20–23; Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, 2: 620; Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 2nd ed., 3: 246, note 1; Nef, “Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales,” pp. 588–589, 600–606; Idem, *Conquérir et gouverner*, pp. 506; Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 147; Metcalfe, *Muslims and Christians*, p. 37; Idem, *The Muslims of Medieval Italy*, pp. 268–72; De Simone, “Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia,” pp. 485–499.

giving any French translation in his *Supplement to the Arabic Dictionaries* published in 1877–1881.^[29]

Dozy’s idea was thereafter accepted by Carlo Alfonso Nallino, an editor and annotator of the second edition of Michele Amari’s *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia* published in 1933–39. In a footnote of this book, Nallino states that “*hursh* (plural of *aḥrash*), which means rough (*ruvidi*), is the contrary of the class of the aforesaid *muls* (smooth [*lisci*]). Examination of the diplomas leads us to the equivalence of *hursh* to *rijāl* (*ahl*) *al-jarā’id* (people [inscribed] in the *platea*), that is, *villani*, *ascriptitii*, and *rustici*.”^[30]

Johns’ understanding of *hursh* and *muls* is basically based on these scholars’ ideas. The supporting sources of their ideas are the two Arabic documents of 1149^[31] and 1154^[32], which are two copies of a lost document of 1149. These copies have the same content except the part describing the granted land and the sentence added to the document of 1154 to explain why the copy was made again. The word *muls* appears only once in these documents. “The total is five men (*rijāl*) from the district of Iato, among whom two are *hursh* and three *muls*.”

Figure 5. Sentence referring to *hursh* and *muls*
(Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, nos. 14, 16)

no. 14 (1149), line 6; no. 16 (1154), lines 5–6

“The total is five men (*rijāl*) from the district of Iato, among whom two are *hursh* and three *muls*.”

الجملة خمسة رجال من إقليم جاتو منهم/ اثنين حرش وثلاثة ملس

Based on this information, Dozy, Nallino, Johns, and Metcalfe assumed that *hursh* and *muls* were a pair of opposites. If *hursh* and *muls* were in fact a pair of opposites, I might have been led to the same conclusion. But, this sentence does not include any detailed information about *hursh* and *muls*, although they were written side by side. There are no solid grounds to regard these words as a pair of opposites. We should set aside the contraposition of *hursh* and *muls*, and reexamine what these words really indicated.

3. WHAT IS *MULS*?

If *hursh* and *muls* are not a pair of opposites, how should we understand *muls*? *Muls* (sing. *amlas*) is certainly a word meaning “smoothed (*laevis*)”, “smooth (*glaber*)”, “soft (*mollis*)”, etc., but it is a very ambiguous and polysemous word signifying “mixed (*mixtus fuit*)”, “escaped (*evasit*)”, “freed (*liberatus fuit*)”, “robbed (*ereptus fuit*)”, etc.^[33] Thus, scholars have speculated about its meaning from its apposition with *ghurabā’* (*ghurbā’*)^[34] or its contrast to *hursh* (*hurash*).^[35] We have only five sources referring to *muls*.

Figure 6. Sources including *muls*

1141: Toledo, ADM, Mesina, no. 1119

• *muls*

1149: Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 14

(1st copy of a document of 1149)

• *muls* & *hursh*

1154: Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 16

(2nd copy of a document of 1149)

• *muls* & *hursh*

1169: Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 25

• *hursh*

• *ghurabā'* & *muls*

1183: Palermo, BCRS, no. 45

• *muls* = ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*)

[36] Toledo, ADM (Archivo General de la Fundación Casa Ducal de Medinaceli), Mesina, no. 1119. Facsimile: *Messina il ritorno della memoria* (Palermo, 1994), p. 162. Edition: M. Eugenia Gálvez, "Noticia sobre los documentos árabes de Sicilia del Archivo Ducal de Medinaceli," Biancamaria Scarcia Amoretti, ed., *Del nuovo sulla Sicilia musulmana* (Roma, 3 maggio 1993) (Rome, 1995), pp. 171-181.

[37] Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, nos. 14, 16.

[38] Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 25. Edition: Cusa, pp. 37-39. This document includes not only *muls* but also *hursh* and *ghurabā'*.

[39] Palermo, BCRS (Biblioteca Centrale della Regione Siciliana), Fondo Monreale, no. 45. Edition: Cusa, pp. 245-286. In this document *muls* and ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) appear repeatedly.

[40] Amari states that the Greek word *exōgraphoi* would mean "what was written outside", which becomes clear by comparison with *enapographoi* (ἐναπόγραφοι, registered [trascritti]), *adscriptitii*, that is, *villani*, true serfs of the glebe (veri servi della gleba). See Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 1st ed., vol. 3, p. 243; 2nd ed., vol. 3, pp. 250-251.

In her article of 2000, Nef, following Amari's view, explains that ἐξώγραφοι originally meant "written out of [the lists]" or "out of the *al-jarā'id*" (Nef, "Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales," p. 600), and "was invented as an antonym of *rijāl al-jarā'id* and as a synonym of *muls*" (*Ibid.*, 606). In her book published in 2011 too, she states "the original meaning of this Greek word is 'written outside of [the lists]" (Nef, *Conquérir et gouverner*, p. 51).

On the other hand, De Simone ("Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia," pp. 489-490) explains that ἐξώγραφοι meant "registered from the outside", that is, "those added [to the lists]". According to her, *muls*/ ἐξώγραφοι added to the lists were distinguished from those already registered in the lists at the beginning at least, but gradually came to be much the same thing as ἔντοποι (*hoi entopoi*, "born in the land"). She also states that the word *adscripticius* possibly corresponded to ἐξώγραφος, and both meant "added to the list" or "registered lately".

The earliest of them is an Arabic document issued in 1141 and now preserved in an archive in Toledo.^[36] The word *muls* appears twice in this document. The second and third earliest are the Arabic documents of 1149 and 1154, which are the two copies of a lost document of 1149 I have already mentioned. Both are now preserved in an archive in Palermo. The words *muls* and *hursh* appear once in each of these documents.^[37] The fourth earliest is an Arabic-Greek document issued in 1169, now preserved in the same archive in Palermo.^[38] This document includes the words *hursh*, *ghurabā'*, and *muls*.

The last of the five sources is a long Arabic-Greek bilingual document issued in 1183, and now preserved in another archive in Palermo.^[39] It is this Arabic-Greek bilingual document of 1183 that gives us a hint to figure out what the word *muls* meant. In this document, the Arabic word *muls* is written as ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) in Greek. The words *muls* and ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) appear repeatedly in this document.

Both *muls* and ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) are quite ambiguous words, and it would be difficult to know what a writer intends to indicate by these words in a monolingual document. However, if we can find an overlapping meanings of the Arabic word *muls* and the Greek word ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*), it would be possible to figure out what the writer intended to mean. The Greek word ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) has such meanings as "the written outside", "outside the written", and "the unwritten" as Amari, Nef, and De Simone suggest,^[40] while the Arabic *muls* has meanings like "smooth", "slippery", and "slipped".

It would be plausible to assume that by these words, the writer of the document intended to indicate "slipped", that is, "slipped from the former document or name-list", "those slipped from the former document or name-list", or "those newly added" as De Simone suggests. This hypothesis seems to be supported by the composition of the document of 1183.

Figure 7. Structure of the Document of 1183
(Palermo, BCRS, Fondo Monreale, no. 45; Cusa, pp. 245-253)

lines 1-13: Introduction in Arabic

[1-a]

line 14: "Names of the people of the *maḥallāt* at Ghār al-Širfī"

(اسما أهل المحلات بغار الصرفي)

lines 15-18: **14 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 17: "These out of the *challet*, in all, 14 names" (οὔτοι [Cusa, οὔτοι] εκ τῶν χαλλέτ ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα ιδ')

line 18: "The total from the *maḥallāt* is 14 names" (الجملة من المحلات اربع عشر اسما)

[1-b]

line 19: "The *exōgraphoi* of the estate Siriphē" (οἱ ἐξώγραφοι [Cusa, ἐξώγραφοι] τοῦ χωρίου σίριφη)

line 20: "And from the *muls* at Ghār al-Sīrfī" (ومن الملس بغار الصرفي)

lines 21-30: **40 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 31: "In all 40 names" (ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα μ')

line 32: "The total is 40 names" (الجملة عربيعين اسما)

[2-a]

line 31: "And from the *machallet* Dartze" (καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μαχαλλέτ δάρτζε)

line 32: "And from the *maḥallāt* at Darja" (ومن المحلات بالدرجة)

lines 32-34: **10 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 33: "In all 10 names" (ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα ι')

line 34: "The total is 10 names" (الجملة عشرة اسما)

[2-b]

line 35: "The *exōgraphoi* of Dartze" (οἱ ἐξώγραφοι τῆς δάρτζε)

line 36: "And from the *muls* at Darja" (ومن الملس بالدرجة)

lines 37-38: **3 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 37: "In all 3 names" (ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα τρία)

line 38: "The total is 3 names" (الجملة ثلاثة اسما)

[3-a]

line 39: "And from the *machallet* Tzatine" (καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μαχαλλέτ τζατίνε)

line 40: "And from the *maḥallāt* at Jaḥīna" (ومن المحلات بجطينة)

lines 41-46: **24 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 45: "In all 24 names" (ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα κδ')

line 46: "The total is 24 names" (الجملة اربعة وعشرين اسما)

[3-b]

line 47: "The *exōgraphoi* of Tzatine" (οἱ ἐξώγραφοι τζατίνε)

line 48: "And from the *muls* at Jaḥīna" (ومن الملس بجطينة)

lines 49-56: **30 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 55: "In all 30 names" (ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα τριακοντα)

line 56: "The total is 30 names" (الجملة ثلاثون اسما)

[4-a]

line 57: "And from the *machallet* Minzēl Abderrhachmen and Koumait" (καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν μαχαλλέτ μίνζηλ ἄβδεράχμιεν καὶ κουμάιτ)

line 58: "And from the *maḥallāt* in the estate (*manzil*) of 'Abd al-Rahmān and al-Qumayṭ" (ومن المحلات بمنزل عبد الرحمن والقميط)

lines 59-60: **3 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 59: "In all 3 names" (ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα τρία)

line 60: "The total is 3 names" (الجملة ثلاثة اسما)

[4-b]

line 61: "And the *exōgraphoi* of the same" (καὶ οἱ ἐξώγραφοι ἀπ' αὐτῆς)

line 62: "And out of the *muls* there" (ومن الملس بها)

lines 63-68: **25 names** in Greek and Arabic

line 67: "In all 25 names" (ὁμοῦ ὀνόματα κε')

line 68: "The total is 25 names" (الجملة خمسة وعشرون اسما)

~~~~~

[52-b]

In this document, as a matter of principle, the same contents are usually written in Arabic and Greek alternately line by line, and a subhead, a list of names, and a total number of the names constitute one unit. In many cases a unit of people of *maḥallāt* of a certain place (for example, Ghār al-Širfī, lines 14-18) and a unit of *muls* of the same place (for example, Ghār al-Širfī, lines 19-32) make a pair, although for some places there is only one of the two kinds of unit. The Arabic word *maḥallāt*, which appears repeatedly in the subheads of the former units of the pairs, is a general word to indicate a settlement, and the people of the *maḥallāt* at Ghār al-Širfī simply indicate the people of the settlement of Ghār al-Širfī.

The Greek word corresponding to *maḥallāt* is usually μαχαλλέτ (*machallet*), a transliteration of *maḥallāt*, and it is also expressed as οἱ ἄνθρωποι μαχαλλέτ (*hoi anthrōpoi machallet*, people of *maḥallāt*).<sup>[41]</sup> In some cases, the word οἱ ἔντοποι (*hoi entōpoi*),<sup>[42]</sup> which means “born in the land”, or the word οἱ ἐντόπειοι (*hoi entōpeioi*), which means “people of the land”, are added.<sup>[43]</sup> There is no word to suggest a class of villeins in the subheads. If *muls* means a class of villeins, why do none of the subheads of the other units of the pairs have words indicating a class of villeins?

If *muls* and ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) simply indicate those who were not written in former documents/name-lists, or those who were newly added, however, it is understandable that the subheads of the pairs of units are asymmetric, and that very general expressions like “men” and “people” are used. The document of 1141, the earliest source including *muls*, also seems to support this hypothesis.

#### Figure 8. Structure of the document of 1141

(Toledo, ADM, Mesina, no. 1119; Gálvez, pp. 173-176)

lines 1-2: "A *jarīda* attesting to names of men (*rijāl*) of Triocala /written on the date of Month November of the year 536 [=1141 A.D.]."

(جريدة تشهد علي أسماء رجال طرقلش /كتبت بتاريخ شهر نومبره من سنة ست وثلاثين وخمسماية)

lines 3-11: **50 names**

line 11: "The names of men (*rijāl*) of Raḥl al-Baṣal" (أسماء رجال رحل البصل)

lines 12-20: **50 names**

line 20: "The total is one hundred men (*rijāl*)." (الجملة مائة رجال)

line 21-22: "Then, when it was the date of Month July and Indiction IV [1141 A.D.], you asked us, — we were in Agrigento, may God protect it —, concerning these names which are written (Johns, p. 107: "registered") in this document (*sigill*; *sigillum* in Latin; σιγίλλιον in Greek) / who were found in your possession but *muls* (slipped from or out of the former list; Johns, p. 107: "as newly commended villeins"). And so we granted them to you on the condition that if any of them is in our *jarā'id* or in the *jarā'id* of our landholders, he shall be taken from you."

ثم لما كان بتاريخ شهر اسطربير (أسطربير Gálvez) بالانديقتس الرابع (الرابع Gálvez)

سالتنا ونحن بكركنت حماها الله في ها ولا الاسما الذين يثبتوا في هذا السجل /

الذين وجدوا عندك (عبدك Gálvez) ملسا فسلمناهم لك على شريطة انه متى ما ظهر

منهم في جرابينا وجرابيد ترارابتنا (قرايبينا Gálvez) احدا يوخذ (يوخذ Johns, Duana, p.107 n 51) منك

line 23: "These are their names." (وهذه اسماءهم)

line 24-25: **15 names.**

line 26: "The total is fifteen *muls* men." (الجملة خمسة عشر رجلا ملس)

line 27: Roger II's signature in Greek "Ρογέρτος ἐν Χριστῷ Θεῷ εὐσεβῆς κραταιὸς  
Ρῆξ καὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν βοηθός."

[41] Palermo, BCRS, Fondo Monreale, no. 45, lines 2 and 16 from the last; Cusa, pp. 284, 286.

[42] Palermo, BCRS, Fondo Monreale, no. 45, lines 836; Cusa, p. 255.

[43] Palermo, BCRS, Fondo Monreale, no. 45, lines 250, 256; Cusa, pp. 276, 277. Cf. Johns, *Arabic Administration*, pp. 148-149; Nef, "Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales," pp. 602; De Simone, "Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia," p. 489.

This document includes three name-lists. The first one is the “names of men (*rijāl*) of Triocala”, the second one the “names of men (*rijāl*) of Raḥl al-Baṣal”, and the third one the “names written in this document who were found in your possession and *muls*”. There is no word suggesting a class of villeins in this document either. The word *muls* appears twice in this document, and could be interpreted as “those slipped from the former lists/documents” as in the case of the document of 1183. The name-lists include names of inhabitants, usually, heads of households.

Already in the eleventh century, Count Roger I of Sicily made use of these name-lists when he granted lands to vassals, churches or monasteries. For example, his Greek-Arabic bilingual document issued in 1095 to grant land to St. Mary Church of Palermo includes name-lists in Greek and name-lists in Arabic<sup>[44]</sup>, and his Greek-Arabic bilingual document issued in the same year to grant land to the bishop of Catania includes a name-list of the people (*ahl*) of Aci (Aci, *Liyāj*, Γιάκην) and a name-list of widows (*arāmil*) in Arabic.<sup>[45]</sup> Thus, the Norman rulers’ privileges of donation of land often included name-lists of inhabitants (heads of households) living there to confirm that the listed inhabitants should belong to a new lord.

Some of these documents have additional lists of inhabitants, who were not included in the preceding older name-lists, as shown in the documents of 1141 (Figure 8)<sup>[46]</sup> and 1145 (King Roger II’s approval and renewal of Roger I’s grant of land to his vassal Roger for Walter son of Roger).<sup>[47]</sup>

This shows that a revision of *jarīda* was made, not using a method that a completely new name-list was made by rearranging all names based on new information, but by simply putting a new name-list below the old ones. This method of revision seems to support the idea that the words *muls* and ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) in the subheads of the name-lists in the document of 1183 were used to indicate the following name-lists were additional. It does not mean that there were different classes of villeins expressed by different words, which were written in different columns. Various words were employed to indicate inhabitants, but most words are generally ones meaning “people” or “inhabitants”. *Muls* and ἐξώγραφοι (*exōgraphoi*) are not words indicating different classes of villeins, but documental words meaning “slipped away from” (or “not written”) in former *jarīda*. This word indicates that they refer to newly added information.

In Arabic documents of Norman Sicily we also see the phrase *rijāl al-jarā’id*, namely, “men of *jarā’id*”. Some scholars have regarded it as another antithesis to the *muls*. For example, Johns explains as follows: “Another group of villeins, *al-muls*, first appear in contraposition to the *rijāl al-jarā’id* in the *jarīda* renewed for San Giorgio di Triocala in November 1141. After the lists of the *rijāl al-jarā’id* of Triocala and Raḥl al-Baṣal comes a third list of the names of the *muls*.”<sup>[48]</sup>

However, *al-muls* is not in contraposition to the *rijāl al-jarā’id* in this document. As we have examined before, there is no phrase of *rijāl al-jarā’id* here. We find only “*rijāl* of Triocala” and “*rijāl* of Raḥl al-Baṣal”,<sup>[49]</sup> which Johns probably interpreted as *rijāl al-jarā’id*.

Johns and other scholars have regarded *rijāl al-jarā’id* as a lower class of villeins, and *rijāl al-muls* as an upper class of villeins. I do not agree to this, because there are no sources showing that the phrase *rijāl al-jarā’id* indicated a class of villeins. The word *muls* appears repeatedly in the subheads of the name-lists in the document of 1183, but neither *hursh* nor *rijāl al-jarā’id* appears in subheads of the name-lists in the documents of Norman Sicily. The phrase *rijāl al-jarā’id* did not indicate a particular class of villeins, but meant literally “men of documents”, that

[44] Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 5. Edition: Cusa, pp. 1-3.

[45] Catania, Archivio Capitolare della Cattedrale di Catania, Pergmene greco-arabe e greche, no. 1; Edition: Cusa, pp. 541-549. Cf. Hiroshi Takayama, *The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily* (Leiden/ New York/ Köln, 1993), pp. 39-40.

[46] Toledo, ADM, Mesina, no. 1119. Facsimile: *Messina il ritorno*, p. 162. Edition: Gálvez, “Noticia sobre los documentos árabes de Sicilia,” pp. 171-181.

[47] Palermo, BCRS, Fondo Monreale, no. 4. Edition: Cusa, pp. 127-129. Cf. Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 307, doc. no. 25.

[48] Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p.147.

[49] Toledo, ADM, Mesina, no. 1119, lines 1-2, 11. Facsimile: *Messina il ritorno*, p. 162. Edition: Gálvez, “Noticia sobre los documentos árabes de Sicilia,” pp. 171-181. See Figure 8.

is, “men written in documents”.

Documents of grant in Norman Sicily often include a conditional clause that if a person whose name is listed in the present document was already listed in another privilege or document, he should be excluded from this donation. For example, a Greek document issued in 1095 has the following sentence: “If someone of the Hagarenes written in this *plateia* donated to the bishop of Catania is found in my *plateiai* or the *plateiai* of my vassals, he should be returned without exception,”<sup>[50]</sup> and the document of 1141 we have already examined includes the following clause: “If someone of them is included in our *jarā'id* or the *jarā'id* of our vassals, he should be taken from you.”<sup>[51]</sup>

What most matters here is in whose *jarīda* a peasant is written and to whom he belongs. Classes of villeins do not matter. Making clear and sure to which landlord a peasant belonged was the main purpose of including a name-list of peasants in these documents.<sup>[52]</sup>

Meanwhile, based on the existence of the two classes of villeins, scholars have posed two interesting questions. The first question is “Who were *muls*?” For example, Johns assumed that *muls* were new immigrants. According to his research, fourteen names out of fifteen *muls* written in a document of Triocala issued in 1141 have *nisbas* indicating their origin of North Africa. Thus, he infers that “they were new immigrants to the lands upon which they were registered.” And this supposition is, he thinks, supported by the document of 1169 in which *muls* are paired with *ghurabā'* (foreigners).<sup>[53]</sup> Metcalfe made a slight modification to this view, insisting that we should not regard *muls* as the first generation of immigrants to Sicily. According to Metcalfe, most of them came from other towns and villages, and received tolerant conditions to hold land, such as reduction of taxes and extension of its payment.<sup>[54]</sup>

The second question is “Does the legal status of *muls* change to that of *rijāl al-jarā'id* in due course of time?” According to Nef, *muls* were not members of the community in charge of paying tax, but changed to registered *rijāl al-jarā'id* after they joined the community.<sup>[55]</sup> On the other hand, Johns assumes that *muls* were unregistered “strangers” at the beginning, but changed to registered *rijāl al-jarā'id* after they settled in the land.<sup>[56]</sup> Metcalfe explains that after the next census, *muls* ceased to be “unregistered” and were written in a name-list as “men of registers”. Thus, he thinks the class of villeins changed by a census.<sup>[57]</sup> Needless to say, however, *muls*, which these scholars regarded as an upper class of villeins, were not a class of villeins, but simply those not written in former documents/ name-lists.

Johns, Metcalfe, and Nef were obliged to explain the change of class from “unregistered men” to “men of registers” based on the existence of the two classes of villeins, but in fact this simply indicates that names omitted or unwritten in former documents/name-lists were added in new documents.

#### 4. WHAT IS *HURSH*?

If the Arabic word *muls* is not in contraposition to *hursh*, but simply means omission or those who were not written in former lists, then, what does the Arabic word *hursh* indicate? As of now, no Greek word is known to correspond to the Arabic word *hursh*, and there has been controversy concerning the meaning of *hursh*. Some scholars believed that *hursh* has a relationship with a Latin word *rusticus*.<sup>[58]</sup> However, as Amari already pointed out, the conventional idea that *hursh* was an Arabic translation of Latin *rusticus* is not based on reliable grounds.<sup>[59]</sup>

[50] Cusa, pp. 548-549: “καὶ διὰ τοῦτω προστάττομεν ὅτι ἐάν τις εὐρέθῃ ἐχ τὰς ἐμὰς πλατείας ἢτε ἐχ τὰς πλατείας τῶν τερρερίων μου ἐκ τοῦς ἀγαρινούς τοῦς ὄντας γεγραμμένους ἐχ τὴν τοιαύτην πλατεῖαν ἵνα ἀντιστρέφῃ αὐτοῦς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἄνευ πάσης προφάσεως.” Cf. Takayama, *The Administration*, p. 39.

[51] Toledo, ADM, Messina, no. 1119, lines 21-22. Facsimile: *Messina il ritorno*, p. 162. Edition: Gálvez, “Noticia sobre los documentos árabes de Sicilia,” pp. 171-181. See Figure 8.

[52] Takayama, *The Administration*, pp. 38-40, 86-87; Idem, “The Financial and Administrative Organization of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily,” *Viator*, 16 (1985): 145-149.

[53] Johns, *Arabic Administration*, pp. 147-148.

[54] Metcalfe, *The Muslims of Medieval Italy*, p. 270.

[55] Nef, “Conquêtes et reconquêtes médiévales,” p. 600; Nef, *Conquérir et gouverner*, p. 501.

[56] Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 149.

[57] Metcalfe, *The Muslims of Medieval Italy*, p. 269.

[58] De Simone, “Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia,” p. 487.

[59] Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 1st ed., 3: 239, note 1; 2nd ed., 3: 246, note 1. However, Amari’s reading of this Arabic word as *h/r/s* [=kh/r/sh], not as *h/r/s* [=h/r/sh], is not acceptable. This word is always written as *h/r/sh* in the manuscripts.

Nallino explains that *hursh*, meaning rough (*ruvidi*), is an antithesis to *muls*, and that examination of sources leads us to the conclusion that it is the same as *rijāl* (*ahl al-jarā'id* (men written in *plateiai*), that is, *villani*, *adscripticii*, and *rustici*).<sup>[60]</sup> Based on this understanding of Nallino, Johns explains that the “word *hursh* is the plural of the adjectival form *ahrash*, meaning “rough”, “harsh”, or “coarse”. ... As with *muls*, only the plural form *hursh* is used for the Muslim villeins in Norman Sicily.”<sup>[61]</sup>

[60] Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani*, 2nd ed., 3: 246, note 1.

[61] Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p. 147.

De Simone reads this word *h/r/sh*, not as *hursh*, plural form of *ahrash*, but as *hurash*, which she thinks the Arabic scribe writing the Arabic documents used as an Arabic translation of the Greek phrase *ho/hoi ek tēs khōras* (ὁ/οἱ ἐκ τῆς χώρας) meaning natives, former inhabitants, or old inhabitants. Thus, De Simone proposed a new interpretation that *hurash* and *muls* indicate old settlers (*indigeni*) and new settlers (*sopraggiunti*).<sup>[62]</sup>

[62] De Simone, “Ancora sui «villani» di Sicilia,” p. 487.

There are only three sources that include *hursh*, all of which I have already mentioned as the documents including *muls*.

### Figure 9. Sources including *hursh*

|                                                                                                                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1149: Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 14.<br>(1st copy of a document of 1149)<br>• <i>muls</i> & <i>hursh</i> |
| 1154: Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 16.<br>(2nd copy of a document of 1149)<br>• <i>muls</i> & <i>hursh</i> |
| 1169: Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 25.<br>• <i>hursh</i><br>• <i>ghurabā'</i> & <i>muls</i>                |

The earliest two documents of 1149 and 1154 are the copies of a lost document of 1149, and have almost the same content. Both have the following sentence as I have already shown in Figure 5: “The total is five men (*rijāl*) from the district of Iato, among whom two are *hursh* and three *muls*.” The third source is the Arabic-Greek document of 1169 which includes the words, *hursh*, *ghurabā'* and *muls*, and gives us more detailed information.<sup>[63]</sup>

[63] Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 25. Edition: Cusa, pp. 37-39.

The introductory Arabic text of this document informs us that an order of King William II was issued to write this document which includes what he grants to a hospital at Khandaq al-Qayruz, that is, a village (*rahl*) known as ‘Ayn al-Liyān in the district of Termini with all its rights, and ends with the phrase “and in it from *al-rijāl al-hursh*”.

### Figure 10. Structure of the document of 1169 (Palermo, Arch. Dioc., Fondo Primo, no. 25; Cusa, pp. 37-39)

|                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| line 1: hoc est privilegium ...                                                                       |
| line 2: † Τὸ κατόνομα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ χωρίου ἀν λιαν τῶν δοθέντων εἰς τὸ σπιταλον τοῦ Κάμπο Γράσσου. |
| line 3: بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم                                                                        |

lines 4-10: "When it was the date of Month July and Indiction II ....." (a royal order of William II was issued to write this document which includes what he grants to a hospital at Khandaq al-Qayruz, that is, a village (*rahl*) known as 'Ayn al-Liyān in the district of Termini with all its rights.)

line 10:" and in it from *al-rijāl al-ḥursh*" (وفيه من الرجال الحرش)

line 9-12: **6 names**

line 13: "In all 6 names" (ὅμου ὀνόματα ζ' .)

line 14: "The total is 6 names" ( الجملة ستة اسما )

line 14: "And from the foreign (*ghurabā*) and *muls* men dwelling on the above-mentioned estate (*rahl*)" (ومن الرجال الغربا والملس الساكنين بالرحل المذكور)

lines 16-18: **8 names**

line 17: "In all 8 names" (ὅμου ὀνόματα η' .)

line 18: "The total is 8 names" ( الجملة ثمانية اسما )

line 17: "In all, the two combined, 14 names" (ὅμου αὶ β' ὀμάδες ὀνόματα ιδ' )

line 18: "The total of the two totals is 14 names" ( جملة الجملتين اربعة عشر اسما )

line 18-22: "He has bestowed all things that are written here upon the above-mentioned hospital (*isbtāl*, "*hospitale*" in Latin), on condition that the people of Termini who live in 'Ayn al-Liyān Village, have their fields in it, and have reclaimed them for themselves or through their fathers, would keep their fields but go on paying to the hospital what they have been requested to pay to the 'ummāl (official) hitherto. So, this village, which was under the jurisdiction (*hukm*) of the *dīwān al-na 'mūr*, shall never burden them with any increase, and the sailors (*al-baḥrīyūn*) and other inhabitants of this village shall follow their practice (*āda*) with the 'ummāl (officials) in all affairs as before. And he put the well-known seal confirming it and proving it at the date written at the head. God is enough for us, and what an excellent *wakīl* He is!"

انعم على الاسبital المذكور بجميع ما ذكر على ان اهل ثرمة السكان بها وعندهم رباعا في عين اللبان فتحوها هم او ابواهم او اجدادهم تبقى بايديهم على حالها يودون عنها من الاعطية الى الاسبital ما كانوا يودونهم الى العمال فالرحل المذكور في حكم الديوان المعمور من غير زيادة عليهم وباقى سكان الرحل من البحرين وغيرهم من ... يجرون في جميع امورهم على عادتهم مع العمال و ختم بالطابع المسهور تاكيده له ودليلا عليه بالتاريخ المتقدم وحسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل.

This Arabic text is followed by a list of six names in Greek and Arabic, a phrase "In all six names" in Greek, and an almost same phrase "The total is six names" in Arabic. Then, comes a subhead in Arabic "And from the foreign (*ghurabā*) and *muls* men dwelling on the above-mentioned village (*rahl*)", which is followed by a list of eight names in Greek and Arabic. The Arabic *ghurabā*' is a plural form of *gharīb* meaning "foreign". In the last sentence lines 18-22 of the document, the king's order that he shall give all these people to the above-mentioned hospital is described in detail.<sup>[64]</sup>

As I have already stated, many scholars have regarded *hursh* as a class of vil-  
leins in contrast to *muls*. Johns and Metcalfe gave it an English translation "rough men", while others think it was used as a translation of the Latin word *rusticus*. On the other hand, it is possible that *hursh* meant "forest" in the documents.<sup>[65]</sup> In any case, our information on *hursh* is too limited to get a plausible answer. Further conjecture should not be made.

[64] For the content of the ending clause of this document, see Takayama, *The Administration*, pp. 86-87.

[65] Johns, *Arabic Administration*, p.170, note 1. For various meanings of the word, see Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-ʿArab*, 4: 85-86, حرش (*h/r/sh*).

## CONCLUSION

My conclusion drawn from the examination of sources about the Arabic words *muls* and *hursh* is that they were not a pair of opposite terms indicating two different classes of villeins. Thus, it would not be proper to translate them as “smooth men” and “rough men” in English. *Muls* is a word employed to indicate those who were omitted or not written in former documents/name-lists, and a term necessitated in document creation.

This conclusion is rather different from previous scholars’ understandings. At first glance, my view of *muls* might appear to be similar to the concept of “unregistered” villeins opposite to “registered” villeins, but, in fact, they are based on totally different perceptions. *Muls* as a word to indicate those who were omitted or not written in older name-lists reflects the reality of document creation, as well as the Norman governance of land and inhabitants by means of written documents made based on Arabic name-lists, but it is not relevant to classes of villeins at all.

On the other hand, the idea of “registered and unregistered” as two classes of villeins is derived from the analogy to the Roman or East Roman laws. It is certainly possible that terms and concepts of a certain society’s legal system are transmitted to another society, but the existence of such terms and concepts does not mean that the legal system of the original society functioned in the recipient society. Without examining the difference of the controlling power and method of governance by Norman rulers and territorial lords who make the legal system function, we would not be able to discuss a uniform system covering various territories.

As a matter of fact, it is difficult to assume the existence of two classes of villeins with legal status applied uniformly in Norman Sicily. Even if the Norman rulers restored order to a certain degree in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, their power was not strong enough to enforce legal status of villeins uniformly across the boundaries of seignorial domains. Despite the law of William II, actual conditions of villeins seem to have varied according to the relationship with their landlords.

The reason why listing names of inhabitants in documents was so important for landlords is because it offered them assurance that these inhabitants belonged to them. It seems to suggest a reality contrary to existence of a uniform legal system and a large-scale census which some scholars have presumed. Landlords’ control of inhabitants in their domains probably continued to function as a basic framework of Norman governance, although Norman rulers tried to centralize their administration.

*The University of Tokyo*  
*Tokyo, Japan*

update record, 03. 02. 2018

# THE *TAKTIKA* OF LEO VI AND THE BYZANTINE EASTERN FRONTIER DURING THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES<sup>[\*]</sup>

Kosuke Nakada

[\*] I should like to thank the editors and anonymous reviewers of *Spicilegium* for commenting on an earlier draft of this article. I should also like to thank Dr Koji Murata for revising my draft.

At the outset, I would like to mention that I have already published another article on the *Taktika* in Japanese (“The *Taktika* of Leo VI and the Byzantine Eastern Frontier in his Reign,” *Mediterraneanus: Annual Report of the Collegium Mediterranistarum* 36 [2013], pp. 3–24), in which my focus was on the nature of the whole text as a military treatise, and the meaning of the chapter on the Arabs. This paper can therefore be seen to a certain extent as a revised English version of my previous article. However, recent scholarship, especially the critical commentary by Prof. John Haldon, has given further insight into the disposition of the treatise and the context in which the *Taktika* was composed. Therefore, in the present paper, taking the chapter on the Arabs as an example, I would like to study the relationship between the treatise, Leo VI as the commissioner and the actual situation of the Empire’s frontier more fully, and reveal the nature of the *Taktika* as the projection of Leo VI’s thoughts.

[1] I used the new edition by George T. Dennis, *The Taktika of Leo VI, Text Translation, and Commentary*, ed. and trans. George T. Dennis (Washington D. C. 2010), revised ed. by John F. Haldon (2014).

[2] On this classical view on Leo VI, see Georg Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des Byzantinischen Staates* (Munich 1940, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1963), Japanese translation by Hiroshi Wada, 2001, p. 327; Steven Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire* (London 1930), p. 126; Alexander A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, 3 vols, French edition by Henri Grégoire and Marius Canard (Brussels 1935–68), vol. 2/1, p. 219. See also the summary of previous scholarship on this issue in Shaun Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI: Politics and People*, *The Medieval Mediterranean*, 15 (Leiden 1997), pp. 164–165.

[3] Gilbert Dagron and Haralambie Mihăescu, *Le traité sur la guérilla de l’empereur Nicéphore Phocas (963–969)* (Paris 1986), pp. 9, 145, 152; Alphonse Dain, “Les Stratégistes byzantins,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967), pp. 317–392 (pp. 354–356); Albert Vogt, “La jeunesse

## ABSTRACT

Recent studies on the political and military history in the reign of Leo VI (r. 886–912) tend to emphasise his role as a central authoritative figure. However, close scrutiny on the emperor’s military treatise called the *Taktika* and collation with the actual situation offers a different picture concerning his view on the warfare in the eastern frontier. In chapter XVIII of the *Taktika* on the manoeuvres against the raiding Arabs, Leo emphasises the importance of autonomous regional defence undertaken by local forces. When understood collectively with other sources, this can be an attestation of Leo’s willingness to delegate power to potentates in order to resist the incessant raids more effectively, despite the possible centrifugal effects. This sort of interaction between the central government and the frontier can be comprehended within a broader context of the long-term continuity of the Byzantine flexible frontier policy from the ninth to the eleventh centuries.

---

## INTRODUCTION: THE *TAKTIKA* AND THE REIGN OF LEO VI

The Byzantine military treatise known as the *Taktika* of Leo VI the Wise (r. 886–912) has a peculiar character.<sup>[1]</sup> Written by one of the most scholarly emperors, the majority of the work’s contents are nonetheless derived from earlier materials. These especially encompass classical writings, including the *Stratēgikon* by the sixth-century Emperor Maurice, which heavily influenced the style of the *Taktika*. Nevertheless, Leo VI still introduces some fresh contemporary elements, such as the second-hand information gleaned from his entourage, and updated the contents in accordance with his own time.

Scholars hitherto have debated the nature of the treatise, and have especially discussed the subtle character of the whole text. It has retrospectively been evaluated as a mere accumulation of impractical theories, perhaps partly because Leo VI was regarded as a weak figure due to his lack of military training and experience.<sup>[2]</sup> Alphonse Dain noted this “armchair character” in his exhaustive bibliographical study on Byzantine strategists, although he appreciated that this treatise led to the revival of the neglected genre of military science in Byzantium. Albert Vogt even insisted that Leo VI only investigated historical military forces in the *Taktika*. Gilbert Dagron also concludes that Leo VI was mediocre as a strategist, and points to his work’s omission of information on Bulgaria, which was one of the greatest threats to Byzantium at that time.<sup>[3]</sup>

However, during the latter half of the last century, scholars began reviewing assessments of Leo VI, especially regarding military and diplomatic matters. Romilly Jenkins and Patricia Karlin-Hayter argue that sources such as the *Chronicon*

de Léon le sage," *Revue historique* 174 (1934), pp. 389–428 (p. 408).

[4] Romilly J. H. Jenkins, *Byzantium: The Imperial Centuries AD610–1071* (London 1966), pp. 198–211; Patricia Karlin-Hayter, "When Military Affairs were in Leo's Hands: A note on Byzantine Foreign Policy (886–912)," *Traditio* 24 (1967), pp. 15–40.

[5] Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI*, pp. 166–168, 203–218; Idem, "The Imperial Thought-World of Leo VI: the non-Campaigning Emperor of the Ninth Century," in *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?*, ed. Lesile Brubaker (Aldershot 1998), pp. 51–60.

[6] Karlin-Hayter, "Military Affairs," pp. 21–22; Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI*, pp. 167–172. Tougher cites Grosdidier de Maton's emphasis upon the prescriptive nature of the *Taktika*. See José Grosdidier de Matons, "Trois études sur Léon VI," *Travaux et Mémoires* 5 (1973), pp. 181–242 (p. 229).

[7] See Eric McGeer, "Military Texts," in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, ed. Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, John F. Haldon and Robin Cormack (Oxford 2008), pp. 907–914; Denis F. Sullivan, "Byzantine Military Manuals: Prescriptions, Practice and Paedagogy," in *Byzantine World*, ed. Paul Stephenson (New York 2010), pp. 149–161.

[8] Catherine Holmes, "Political-Historical Survey, 800–1204," in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, pp. 264–279 (p. 267); Paul Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantine: notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle* (Paris 1971), pp. 121–346.

[9] Cf. Dain, "Les stratégistes," p. 354; Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI*, p. 168.

[10] John F. Haldon, *A Critical Commentary on the Taktika of Leo VI*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies*, 44 (Washington D.C. 2014), pp. 9–38; Meredith Riedel, "The Sacrality of a Sovereign: Leo VI and Politics in Middle Byzantium," in *Zwei Sonnen am Goldenen Horn?*, ed. Michael Grünbart, Lutz Rickelt and Martin M. Vučetić (Berlin 2011), Band 3/1, pp. 127–135.

[11] Haldon, *Commentary*, esp. pp. 9–38; Riedel, "Sacrality." In addition, Catherine Holmes ("Byzantine Political Culture and Compilation Literature in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Some Preliminary Inquiries," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 64 (2010), pp. 55–80) argues that granting of ancient wisdom could also indicate imperial authority in the Byzantine world.

[12] In this respect, the *Taktika* is comparable with other legislative activities of the same emperor. See Haldon, *Commentary*, pp. 37–38; Paul Magdalino, "The Non-Judicial Legislation of the Emperor Leo VI," in *Analecta Athenensia*

of Symeon the Logothete are harshly biased against Leo VI and cannot be taken at face value. They use a longer-term perspective to re-evaluate his reign, and argue that "failures" in his time, such as the fall of Taormina and the plunder of Thessaloniki, which had been emphasised in the previous historiography, had only a temporary effect.<sup>[4]</sup> Regarding Leo VI's lack of involvement in military campaigns, it was emphasised that Leo chose not to do so as he tried to act as a central authoritative figure. Karlin-Hayter explains that Leo VI acted as "his own Minister for War" while Shaun Tougher, who more recently published an elaborate monograph on Leo VI's reign, further claims that this "non-campaigning" emperor tried to be like Justinian and was happy to entrust military campaigns to reliable generals, especially to magnates from the lineage of the military aristocracy, while he remained in Constantinople and effectively gave orders.<sup>[5]</sup> The significance of the *Taktika* also seems to have been reconsidered based on these opinions on Leo himself. Within this literature, Karlin-Hayter and Tougher consider the *Taktika* to be an attestation to Leo VI's concern with contemporary military problems and external politics. Focusing on newly introduced elements and the prescriptive style of the text, they both emphasise the practical utility of the treatise. Karlin-Hayter stresses that the *Taktika* is the Byzantine version of "Standing Orders" and the "King's Regulations," while Tougher, who associates the text with the aforementioned "non-campaigning" style of Leo VI's reign, concludes that it represents his intention to deliver knowledge to his generals in the field.<sup>[6]</sup>

However, it must be noted that such conclusions with regard to the practicality of the *Taktika* are based only upon a limited part of the treatise. The *Taktika's* aims must be judged by considering it as compiled in its entirety; contemporary elements in the treatise are quite limited, and even if they reflect the actual circumstances, the "reality" they reflect is debatable. The regulative fashion might also be only superficial one, which is possible due to the traditional pedagogic and scholarly nature of military texts in the Byzantine world.<sup>[7]</sup> Moreover, contemporary Byzantine cultural activities focused on accumulating ancient wisdom and compiling it into works, which Paul Lemerle labels "encyclopédisme." Leo is often considered to be one of the propagators and patrons of this movement, and he himself also created other related works.<sup>[8]</sup> Amongst these, in the text *Problemata* he answers questions by citing the *Stratēgikon* of the Emperor Maurice – the model of the *Taktika*, as mentioned above – explicitly indicating his scholarly interest in military knowledge from the past; therefore, the *Taktika* might be placed within this extended context.<sup>[9]</sup> Thus, it is uncertain whether the *Taktika* as a whole includes "practical" intentions in terms of military affairs, as Karlin-Hayter and Tougher argue.

When considering this point, John Haldon's recent critical commentary and Meredith Riedel's article reach convincing conclusions.<sup>[10]</sup> They plausibly argue that Leo VI's chief intention was to provide his generals with Christian moral guidance for conducting warfare. Leo stressed the importance of the role of God's favour elsewhere in the text, and gave advice on how to fight in accordance with the faith.<sup>[11]</sup> Although not being directly applicable to the contemporary battlefield, the text was undoubtedly motivated by his consciousness of being a ruling emperor, and can be regarded as useful instruction in this sense.<sup>[12]</sup> On the other hand, from a purely military aspect, most of the information can be evaluated as having been impractical, as it would have been obsolete or visionary. Haldon also suggests that the generals did not need to rely on the emperor's admonition as they could have had greater experience and superior techniques.<sup>[13]</sup>

*ad ius Byzantium Spectantia, Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte, Athener Reihe* ed. Spyros Troianos (Athens 1998), pp. 169–182; Sullivan, “Byzantine Military Manuals,” p. 152.

[13] Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 25. However, even though the *Taktika* might have been impractical for mature commanders for such reason, it is still possible that the text is used for the education of junior members of military aristocracy. Cf. Eric McGeer, *Sowing the Dragon's Teeth: Byzantine Warfare in the Tenth Century*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies* 33, (Washington D.C. 1995), pp. 191–195; Sullivan, “Byzantine Military Manuals,” p. 160.

[14] On the nature of the military information of foreign peoples in the *Taktika*, see Anthony Kaldellis, *Ethnography After Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature* (Philadelphia 2013), chapter 4.

[15] It has also attracted scholarly attention as a source for analysing Byzantine-Arab relations. See John F. Haldon and Hugh Kennedy, “The Arab-Byzantine Frontier in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries,” *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta* 19 (1980), pp. 79–116.

[16] Tougher, “Non-Campaigning,” p. 58.

[17] On this point, Gilbert Dagron argues that the warfare between the two had been “tamed”, as it had become the normal state in the borderlands. According to his article, although Byzantium and Arabs were incessantly at war, there were close connections between the two sides and interactions across the Arab-Byzantine frontier. See Dagron, “Apprivoiser la guerre: Byzantins et Arabes ennemis intimes,” in *To Εμπόλεμο Βυζάντιο (9<sup>ος</sup>–12<sup>ος</sup> αι.)*, ed. Kostas Tsiknakis (Athens 1997), pp. 37–49. See also Idem, “Les arabes, ennemis intimes (Xe siècle)” in Idem, *Idées Byzantines* (Paris 2012), pp. 353–386. This can be reconciled with the conclusion of the archaeological research by Alexander Asa Eger. See Alexander Asa Eger, *The Islamic-Byzantine Frontier: Interaction and Exchange among Muslim and Christian Communities* (London and New York 2015).

[18] See Gilbert Dagron, “Byzantine et le modèle islamique au Xe siècle. A propos des Constitutions Tactiques de l'empereur Léon VI,” *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 122<sup>e</sup> année, n. 2 (1983), pp. 219–243, revised version in Idem, *Idées Byzantines*, pp. 329–352; Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, pp. 145–149.

[19] As for the chapter titles in the *Taktika*, I cite Dennis' translation.

[20] See Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI*, pp. 183–193.

Nevertheless, the fact that the *Taktika* contains contemporary military information, especially concerning warfare with foreign peoples, cannot be overlooked, even though such content exists only to a restricted extent.<sup>[14]</sup> The discussion of warfare against the Arabs in the eastern borderland in chapter XVIII is especially noteworthy, as it includes detailed descriptions of tactics, equipment and the nature of the people and the frontier. It can therefore be considered a key source for gaining insight into the emperor's concerns, from which one can at least understand his grasp of the actual situation and what kind of practices he intended to apply in order to address it.<sup>[15]</sup>

Concerning this point, although the works re-evaluating Leo's reign tend to emphasise the centralised character of his policy as mentioned above, close examination of this text offers a slightly different picture of the emperor's perception of frontier affairs. This is not to deny the centralised tendency of Leo's reign or his active role as a military leader. In the military sphere, this might be especially the case when it comes to large-scale military campaigns in hostile territories.<sup>[16]</sup> For the continual warfare with Arabs in the eastern borderland, however, a different approach was more suitable due to the nature of warfare at that time, and Emperor Leo VI seems to have been well aware of this.<sup>[17]</sup>

To investigate this, a close comparison of the tactics in the *Taktika* and warfare as depicted in other sources from Leo VI's time is required, as previous efforts to do so have been insufficient. Of course, much research on the Arabs as depicted in the *Taktika* has already been undertaken by Byzantinists, with Gilbert Dagron perhaps the most notable among them. However, while their studies address the Byzantine attitude towards the Islamic religion and their view on frontier society in detail, as indicated in the *Taktika*, there is, in my view, still a lot more to explore in terms of discussions of actual military manoeuvres, as well as how these complement other research on Leo VI's reign.<sup>[18]</sup> Therefore, this paper reconsiders Leo VI's comprehension of and intentions towards contemporary circumstances on the eastern frontier. It does so by comparing the *Taktika's* description of his Arab-Islamic opponents to the actual historical situation on the borderlands during the ninth and tenth centuries.

## 1. CHAPTER XVIII OF THE *TAKTIKA* AND THE BYZANTINE EASTERN FRONTIER

The accounts of Arabs in the *Taktika* are placed in constitution XVIII, entitled “About the Practices of Various Peoples and of the Romans in Their Battle Formations,” and consisting of forty-eight paragraphs.<sup>[19]</sup> The discussion of Arabs and other recently included elements can also be found elsewhere in the text. For example, novel institutional nomenclatures are mentioned in chapter IV “About the Division of the Army and the Appointment of Officers,” and Arabs are obviously the hypothetical enemy discussed in chapter XIX “About Naval Warfare,” perhaps as their piracy in the Aegean Sea was one of the most immediate threats at that time.<sup>[20]</sup> Nevertheless, chapter XVIII remains the most remarkable section for information on the Arabs, as its description is the most concentrated, the best organised and also the longest.

As the title implies, the chapter is dedicated to an ethnographical account of the empire's neighbouring nations, and knowledge of peoples besides the Arabs (Saracens) depends heavily upon a sixth-century military treatise, the aforementioned *Stratēgikon* of Emperor Maurice.<sup>[21]</sup> The entry on the Arabs occupies a significant portion of this chapter (48 paragraphs out of 150) and, of course, has no

[21] Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 333.

[22] On this classification, see Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 332.

[23] Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 332. The title of the sections is: "Λέοντος ἐν Χριστῷ βασιλεῖ αἰωνίῳ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων πῶς δεῖ Σαρακηνοῖς μάχεσθαι."

[24] Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 332.

[25] *Taktika*, XVIII. 119, pp. 480–483: "Χαίροντες οὖν ταῖς εὐδαίαις καὶ ταῖς θερμότεραις ὥραις τότε συλλέγονται, καὶ μάλιστα θέρος, καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ταρσὸν τῆς Κιλικίας τοῖς ἐγγυφίοις ἐνούμενοι τὴν ἐκστρατείαν ποιοῦνται. τοὺς δ' ἄλλους καιροὺς μόνον οἱ ἐκ Ταρσοῦ καὶ Ἀδάνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῆς Κιλικίας πολισιμάτων τὰς κατὰ Ῥωμαίων ποιοῦνται καταδρομὰς." The author's translation, based upon a partial consultation of Dennis' translation (henceforth the same, whenever the *Taktika* is cited).

[26] See p. 18 above.

[27] *Taktika*, XVIII. 120, pp. 482–483: "Χρὴ οὖν αὐτοῖς τότε προσβάλλειν, καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ τὸν χειμῶνα ἐπὶ πραιῖδαν ἐξερχομένους..."

[28] *Taktika*, XVIII. 128, pp. 484–485: "Δεῖ δὲ σε, εἴ ποτε καὶ ληστείας χάριν καταδράμωσι τοῦ Ταύρου ἐντός, ἐπιτηδεύειν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐν ταῖς στεναῖς τοῦ ὄρους τούτου διεξόδοις, ὅτ' ἂν ὑποστρέφωσι μάλιστα κεκοπωμένοι, ἴσως καὶ παιδαῖς τινὰς ζῶων ἢ πραγμάτων ἐπιφερόμενοι."

[29] Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, p. 147; Haldon, *Commentary*, pp. 362–366.

[30] I will discuss more details on *thema* (pl. *themata*) in chapter 3 below. Note that the passages on the Arabs in the *Taktika*, XVIII do not presuppose large-scale expeditions in enemy territory, while *Taktika*, IX, which depends on the *Stratēgikon*, assumes such circumstances.

[31] For *tagmata* (sg. *tagma*), see John F. Haldon, *Byzantine Praetorians* (Bonn 1984), pp. 228–256; Idem, *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World, 565–1204* (London 1999), p. 78. Wherever the Greek term *tagma* is used in the *Taktika*, it does not stand for imperial regiments, but small army divisions consisting of 200–400 soldiers. See Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society*, p. 114.

[32] Haldon, *Commentary*, pp. 382–383 argues that the section is an addition to the composition on the Arabs, which originally ended in XVIII. 135. He also emphasises that no specific enemy is mentioned here, but these paragraphs are apparently composed with the Arabs in mind. In the end of XVIII. 135, Leo remarks that the following battle formations (i.e. XVIII. 136–149) can be employed "against this barbaric people (κατὰ τοῦ τοιούτου βαρβαρικοῦ ἔθνους, i.e. Arabs)." Moreover, the

precedent in the *Stratēgikon*, which was compiled before the rise of Islam. According to Haldon, the entry's composition can be divided into several parts as follows: (1) a general account of the Arabs (103–125), including a brief explanation of their history (103–104), religion (105) and practices in warfare (106–112). (2) A more detailed description of warfare, specifically regarding the eastern frontier along the Taurus and Anti-Taurus Mountains (126–135). (3) A particular recommendation of manoeuvres against Arabs, based on the *Stratēgikon* of Maurice.<sup>[22]</sup> Amongst these, (1) exists independently, as its linguistic tone and, more remarkably, the unique title of the sections given by a copyist in the manuscript signify.<sup>[23]</sup> Haldon claims that (1) addresses a general depiction of the Arabs not specified geographically, while (2) refers to a more particular location in the east.<sup>[24]</sup> However, place names on the Cilician plain, such as Adana and Tarsus, from which *razzias* (raids) were launched, clearly appear in XVIII. 119, in (1):

"Then being happy with good weather and warm seasons, especially in summer, they gather together and unite themselves with the local people of Cilician Tarsus to make expeditions. In other time, only those from Tarsus, Adana and other Cilician cities make pillages against Roman territory."<sup>[25]</sup>

Moreover the stratagem indicated in (3) is mainly applicable to situations in the east, as will be argued below. Thus, it could be said that Leo VI's particular concern when describing the Arabs in chapter XVIII of the *Taktika* was the frontier in the Eastern Anatolia, or *al-Thughūr*, although Byzantium confronted Muslims in other areas as well (e.g. Crete and southern Italy).

The concreteness of tactics is one of the most notable features of this passage, and it apparently represents the actual circumstance of the eastern borderland. Although the forgoing research underlines the initiative of central government and the emperor in the reign of Leo, as mentioned above,<sup>[26]</sup> the descriptions of these tactics allows us a slightly different interpretation of the emperor's understanding of the frontier, as can be seen in the passages from the *Taktika* cited below:

"Therefore it is necessary to attack them when they are on expeditions for booty, especially in winter..."<sup>[27]</sup>

"If they plunder inside the Taurus range you must deal with them in the narrow mountain path, when they are turning back and are the most fatigued, and are probably carrying some plunder, consisting of animals and materials."<sup>[28]</sup>

As evident in the text, these lines represent strategies for guerrilla counterattacks, and are written under the assumption that the Arabs make expeditions seeking plunder.<sup>[29]</sup> One can further explore the nature of Byzantine military actions depicted here, especially concerning those carrying out these tactics. The interceptions described here were presumably made by local commanders with the troops at their disposal, since their actions required prompt responses. This assumption is supported by the fact that only a *stratēgos* and his *thema*, i.e. local commanders and their locally based armies, appear in these sections, whereas the quote does not allude to the intervention of central government;<sup>[30]</sup> nor does it refer to the impe-

tactics depicted here are particularly suitable for frontier conflicts (although they may be applicable in other fields), as we shall see below.

[33] *Taktika*, XVIII. 148, pp. 498–499: “κατὰ ἐν θέμα ἐκτάξας τρεῖς ποιήσεις παρατάξεις ἀνά χιλιάδων τεσσάρων...”

One might suppose that a unit consisting of 4,000 soldiers is fairly large, but the number presupposed here is far inferior to the paper strength of a *thema*. See *Taktika* IV, which is based on *Stratēgikon*. Cf. Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society*, pp. 102–103, 110. Leo VI also concerns himself about the availability of small numbers of soldiers in his own days, along with their lack of training, *Taktika*, XVIII, 149, pp. 500–501. Dagron also remarks that this number is moderate (see Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, p. 147). This can also be confirmed from another source: the tenth-century treatise *De Velitatione Bellica*, which presupposes a *thema* consisting of a similar number of soldiers, also considers that they fought guerrilla warfare “with only a small fighting force (μετ’ὀλίγου μαχίμου λαοῦ).” *De Velitatione Bellica*, in Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, Pr. 3, pp. 32–35 [I have utilised Dagron and Mihăescu’s edition, but have also partly consulted “Skirmishing,” in *Three Byzantine Military Treatises, Text, Translation and Notes*, ed. and trans. George T. Dennis (Washington D.C. 1985), pp. 144–244]. I will return to this source in detail in chapter 3 below.

Moreover, this number seems to be compatible with the number of Islamic side. According to John Haldon and Hugh Kennedy, a garrison of one single city in the Islamic frontier consisted of about 4,000 soldiers. See Haldon and Kennedy, “The Arab-Byzantine Frontier,” p. 109.

[34] Haldon, *Commentary*, pp. 384–385.

[35] Walter Kaegi also makes this assumption. Walter E. Kaegi, “Confronting Islam: Emperors and Caliphs (641–c. 850),” in *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire, c. 500–1492*, ed. Jonathan Shepard (Cambridge 2008) pp. 365–394 (p. 393). This view is supported by Haldon’s interpretation of the *Taktika* as Christian moral guidance and an accumulation of knowledge, rather than as a practical prescription.

[36] For the history of the development of the *Thughūr*, see *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. Hamilton A. R. Gibb, et al., second edition, 12 vols (1964–2004), vol. 10, pp. 446–449, entry al-*Thughūr*; Fukuzo Amabe, *State-Building and Autonomy in ‘Abbāsīd Frontiers: Ifriqiya, Thughūr, Mosul, Ṭabaristan and Sijistān*, (Tokyo 2005), pp. 156–77; Michael Bonner, “Some Observations Concerning the Early Development of Jihad on the Arab-Byzantine Frontier,” *Studia Islamica* 75 (1992), pp. 5–31; Clifford E. Bosworth, “The City of Tarsus and the Arab-Byzantine Frontiers in Early and Middle

rial *tagmata*, or mobile central regiments, which are more suitable for massive expeditions.<sup>[31]</sup>

Furthermore, in sections 136–149 Leo VI indicates the deployment he believes to be most profitable for waging warfare against Arabs.<sup>[32]</sup> This involves a local commander and a relatively moderate number of soldiers (4,000), as the words “deploy one *thema* and make up battle formations of up to four thousand” plainly attests.<sup>[33]</sup> As Haldon points out, this depends on Chapter XII of the same treatise, which is based on the *Stratēgikon* of Maurice, but undoubtedly synthesises this earlier source with new information derived from field commanders.<sup>[34]</sup> Moreover, it must be noted that these paragraphs represent Leo VI’s opinion on what is to be done on the eastern front, and here he has apparently attached greater importance to local autonomy in the defence of the Anatolian borderlands against raiding Arabs. In such a case it is also questionable whether he finds it necessary to direct these arrangements, as one might reasonably presume that such plans had been crafted during the continual conflicts with Muslims.<sup>[35]</sup> In other words, the *Taktika* might include an aspect of the ratification of the status quo of the autonomous defence in the eastern frontier, and this could be located within the wider historical context. This must be confirmed via comparison with the actual situation at the frontier, as extracted from other sources.

## 2. MUSLIM INCURSIONS INTO BYZANTINE TERRITORY IN THE NINTH CENTURY

The first thing that must be addressed is the situation of the Muslims during this period. Islamic power emerged in the seventh century, and thereafter rapidly expanded into the entire Mediterranean world. It occupied parts of the most important Byzantine provinces, including Syria and Egypt. The caliphs held considerable influence over the vast Islamic world well into the first half of the ninth century under the rule of the ‘Abbāsīd dynasty, and exercised a large degree of control over the warfare, or *jihād*, waged against Byzantium. Even the caliph himself occasionally campaigned with his army. However, after the latter half of the ninth century, these large-scale campaigns and attempts to attain a new permanent domain essentially came to an end, due to the decline of caliphal power and the fragmentation of the Islamic state. The last attempt to gain new territory was made by the Caliph al-Ma‘mūn in 833, when he sought to establish a foothold in the Cappadocian city of Tyana. However, his successor and brother al-Mu‘taṣim abruptly decided to retreat for unclear reasons, and never returned again. The last massive expedition by a caliph was conducted by this al-Mu‘taṣim himself in 838 against Amorion, and there were no subsequent equivalents. Thereafter, warfare became deadlocked, and a frontier zone, referred to as al-*Thughūr* in Arabic, developed remarkably along the frontier with Byzantium. A local garrison stationed there and volunteers from other parts of the Muslim territory conducted *jihād* into Asia Minor, although virtually independently. Tarsus in the *Thughūr* of Syria and Malatya in the *Thughūr* of al-Jazīra in the upper Euphrates played especially prominent roles during this period.<sup>[36]</sup> They led campaigns more frequently during the summer than the winter and spring, and primarily intended to capture prisoners and plunder and enhance their religious prestige, rather than capture or take possession of new territory.<sup>[37]</sup> Accordingly, a relatively moderate number of soldiers were involved in these single campaigns.<sup>[38]</sup> These frontiersmen demonstrated their independence by exploiting the sensitive balance between the central government and the local powers, including the Tulunids.<sup>[39]</sup> Thus, the conditions pre-

‘Abbāsīd Times,’ *Oriens* 33 (1992), pp. 268–286; Haldon and Kennedy, “The Arab-Byzantine Frontier” pp. 106–116; Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, vol. 2/1, pp. 91–187.

[37] See Qudāma b. Ja’far, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, ed. and trans. Michail J. Goeje in, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, 6 (Leiden 1889), 199–200, 259; Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, pp. 177–181; Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 363; Haldon and Kennedy, “The Arab-Byzantine Frontier,” pp. 115f; Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, vol. 1, p. 97.

[38] See Haldon and Kennedy, “The Arab Byzantine Frontier,” p. 109.

[39] See Amabe, *State-Building and Autonomy*, pp. 173–177.

[40] On the relation between Byzantines and Paulicians, see Paul Lemerle, “L’histoire des Pauliciens d’Asie Mineure d’après les sources grecques,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 5 (1973), pp. 1–145.

[41] Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja’far Muḥammad b. Jarīr, *Ta’riḫ al-rusul wa’l Mulūk*, ed. Michail J. Goeje, et al., 15 vols (Leiden 1879–1901), III. 1414, 1419–20, 1434–36, 1447–1449. I have consulted the translation by Yar-Shater, et al., *The History of al-Ṭabarī: an Annotated Translation* (Albany NY 1989–2007).

[42] *Theophanes Continuatus*, ed. I. Bekker, (Bonn 1838), p. 166: “ἀνθαδῶς τῆ τῶν Ῥωμαίων γῆ λυμαινόμενοι.”

[43] See Amabe, *State-Building and Autonomy*, p. 173. The campaign of Bughā al-Kabīr in 858/9 (Ṭabarī, III. 1436) and Waṣīf (Ṭabarī, III. 1480) was dispatched by the central government. ‘Umar and ‘Alī made a large-scale campaign in 861/2, which provoked a massive Byzantine counter-offensive campaign in the following year, but this was an exceptional case, as it had permission from the central authority. See Ṭabarī, III. 1508–9.

[44] On the Paulician war of Basil I, see Norman Tobias, *Basil I: Founder of the Macedonian Dynasty. A Study of the Political and Military History of the Byzantine Empire in the Ninth Century* (Lampeter 2007), pp. 78–114; Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, vol. 2/1, pp. 32–42.

[45] *Chronographiae quae Theophanis continuati nomine fertur liber quo Vita Basilii Imperatoris amplectitur*, ed. Ihor Ševčenko, (Berlin and New York 2011), 37, pp. 136–137: “σφόδρα παρελπίει τὰς <ὕπό> Ῥωμαίους χώρας καὶ τοὺς λαοὺς καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἀγροίκων καθ’ ἐκάστην αἰχμαλώτους...” Here I quote Ševčenko’s translation.

[46] Al-Ya’qūbī, *Ta’riḫ al-Ya’qūbī*, ed. Martijn Th. Houtsma, 2 vols, (Leiden 1883), 624.

supposed in the *Taktika* (i.e. a local army in the *Thughūr* conducting frequent, small-scale campaigns for pillaging, and mainly during the warm season) can indeed be clearly seen in the historical records.

More specifically, during the 850s and 860s, that is, the last years of the Byzantine Amorion dynasty, Tarsus, Malatya and their allies, the heretical Paulicians based at Thephrike, repeated these incursions into Byzantine territory.<sup>[40]</sup> The history of al-Ṭabarī reports such campaigns during almost every year: 851/2 (summer campaign led by ‘Alī b. Yahya al-Armanī, the Amīr of Tarsus); 852/3 (summer campaign by the same ‘Alī); 853/4 (summer campaign by the same ‘Alī); 856/7 (two campaigns, including a summer campaign led by ‘Alī and a winter campaign led by ‘Umar b. ‘Abdillāh al-Aqṭa’, Amīr of Malatya); and 859/60 (summer campaign led by ‘Alī).<sup>[41]</sup> The continuator of Theophanes also remarks that “they inflicted upon Roman territory persistently,” suggesting a continual series of raids.<sup>[42]</sup> Although a central authority sometimes conducted these campaigns in 860s, or at least granted them permission, such activities were usually autonomous.<sup>[43]</sup>

This trend continued into the 870s, when Byzantine rule was transferred to the Macedonian dynasty. The Paulicians, now led by Chrysocheir, constantly raided Byzantine land until the 870s, when Basil I managed to suppress them by means of large military operations, including his campaigning in person.<sup>[44]</sup> The Paulicians occasionally threatened the Byzantines with extensive campaigns deep into Anatolia, but smaller and more frequent incursions along the frontier, seeking only plunder and prisoners, were likely of more paramount importance. One Byzantine chronicler remarks that Chrysocheir was “sorely harassing Roman territory and its inhabitants, and leading many of the countryfolk into captivity daily.”<sup>[45]</sup> Historian al-Ya’qūbī also records the summer raid led by Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Yahyā al-Armanī in 872.<sup>[46]</sup>

A short respite from these raids occurred in the East until c. 878, following the subjugation of the Paulicians. This was partly due to internal disturbances within the caliphates, including political relations between Caliph al-Mu’tamid (870–892) and his brother al-Muwaffaq, the de facto independence of Aḥmad b. Ṭulūn in Egypt under the nominal hegemony of the caliph and, finally, the revolt of Zanj.<sup>[47]</sup> However, the Muslim frontier soon became active once again, even though the war consisted of nothing more than skirmishes along the frontier. A Byzantine source also reports that “Roman Borderlands were constantly [infringed upon?],”<sup>[48]</sup> implying incessant small-scale warfare. From the Muslim perspective, Tarsus held a leading role during this series of actions, notwithstanding that the city at that time was under the suzerainty of Ṭulūnids established by Aḥmad b. Ṭulūn, a general of Turkish origin. This was because the caliph was forced to entrust the *Thughūr* to such a potentate in 878, after the city disobeyed the central authority. Al-Ṭabarī records three expeditions into the Byzantine territory under the influence of Ṭulūnids: 878 (by ‘Abd Allāh Rashīd b. Kā’ūs, Ṭulūnid Amīr of Tarsus); 879/80 (by Sīmā, dispatched by Aḥmad b. Ṭulūn); and 881/2 (by Khalaf al-Farghānī, Ṭulūnid Amīr).<sup>[49]</sup> In 882, Tarsiotēs deposed the Ṭulūnid governor Khalaf al-Farghānī, and a eunuch named Yāzamān took advantage of the situation to gain political power. He explicitly defied Ṭulūnid authority by refusing to mention the name of Ṭulūnid amīr during prayer. Thereafter, incursions into Byzantine territory occurred autonomously.<sup>[50]</sup> Al-Ṭabarī refers to expeditions led by Yāzamān in 885/6, 888 and 888/9.<sup>[51]</sup> Although Ṭulūnids recovered suzerainty in the *Thughūr* in 890, frontier garrisons made continual raids into Byzantine territory. Under Ṭulūnid influence,

[47] Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, vol. 2/1, pp. 65–70.

[48] *Vita Basilii*, 50, pp. 178–179: “καὶ πάλιν ἀπὸ τούτων αἱ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν ὁρίων ἐσχατιαὶ συνεχῶς \*\*\* το.” Although Ševčenko leaves the last word “\*\*\* το” i.e. as illegible, de Boor’s “<ἐλυμαίνον>το” or “<ἐπιέζον>το” seem plausible, based upon the context.

[49] Tabarī, III, 1916–1917, 1942, 2026.

[50] Yāzamān (or Yāzmān) is said to have been loyal to the Caliphate. See *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 10, pp. 306–307, entry Ṭarsūs. However, as Amabe (*State-Building and Autonomy*, p. 175) argues, Tarsus seems to have been self-reliant for the raids into Byzantine territory.

[51] Tabarī, III, 2111, 2113, 2114. Among these, 889 was a naval expedition.

[52] See Tabarī, III, 2130, 2138, 2140 and 2143. Yāzamān was killed during the campaign of 891.

[53] Tabarī, III, 2148, 2185, 2186, 2193, 2205, 2221, 2223.

[54] See p. 18 above.

[55] In addition to the expedition of Eustathios Argyros of 904, a naval expedition against Syria in 908 and a failed attempt to recapture Crete in 911 were conducted by the central government. There are also campaigns recorded in *De Administrando Imperio* and the *Taktika*. See Karlin-Hayter, “Military Affairs,” p. 30. During the preceding reigns of Michael III and Basil I, large campaigns were also conducted against the east, sometimes led by the emperors themselves, but these campaigns seem to have mainly aimed at stabilising the borderland. See Jonathan Shepard’s recent argument that Byzantine military actions up to the mid-tenth century were undertaken in a rather defensive manner (Jonathan Shepard, “Constantine VII, Caucasian Openings and the Road to Aleppo,” in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, ed. Antony Eastmond (Aldershot 2001), pp. 19–40; Idem, *Emperors and Expansionism: from Rome to Middle Byzantium*, in *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices*, ed. David Abulafia and Nora Berend (Aldershot 2002), pp. 55–82. Considering Leo VI’s recommendation of passive practices in the *Taktika*, it might be best to interpret his reign within the same context.

[56] Leo also shows an extremely reluctant attitude towards pitched battles. e.g. *Taktika*, XVIII, 59, pp. 458–459. Cf. Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 366; Karlin-Hayter, “Military Affairs,” p. 19.

Walter Kaegi points out that limited resources and fear of a military coup caused Byzantine emperors to refrain from aggressively expanding into Muslim territory. Kaegi, “Con-

these forces conducted razzias in 891, 893, 894 and 895.<sup>[52]</sup> Changes in the political climate in 897 again brought the frontier under ‘Abbāsid hegemony, but the caliph gained only nominal control, and the *jihād* initiatives against Byzantium came from frontiersmen. By the time the *Taktika* was composed circa 900, at least seven examples of these raids exist in the accounts of al-Ṭabarī: 897 (against Cappadocia), 898 (a naval expedition), 898/9, 899/900 (three expeditions), 900/1, 901/2 and 903.<sup>[53]</sup> Based on this review of historical accounts, it can be verified that small-scale and frequent raids into Byzantine territory were a predominant element of the military activity of the *Thughūr* from the latter half of the ninth century to the reign of Leo VI, and evidently correspond to the accounts in the *Taktika*. Therefore, we must consider how the Byzantines addressed and reacted to these incursions.

### 3. BYZANTINE REACTIONS TO MUSLIM RAIDS DURING THE TIME OF LEO VI

As mentioned above, scholarship has stressed the central control over military policy by Leo VI, who stayed at Constantinople.<sup>[54]</sup> However, as shown in the previous chapter, the situation in the east at that time seems to have needed a quite autonomous system for a long time, and this is likely to be what chapter XVIII of the *Taktika* actually reflects. Of course, large-scale raids into Muslim-controlled regions are occasionally recorded,<sup>[55]</sup> but these were an exceptional occurrence. This may be partly because Byzantine resources were engaged against other opponents, such as the Bulgarians, leaving little remaining to dedicate to the east. Moreover, *Taktika* XVIII does not mention any military actions of such an aggressive nature, as explained above.<sup>[56]</sup> Rather, under circumstances where opponents made continual attacks on a moderate scale in a remote area far from the centre, one can assume that prompt reactions by locally based troops were probably more effective. In fact, some information implies that these autonomous defensive operations were actually carried out by the military aristocracy, by an army of *thema*, or even by quasi-independent Armenian frontiersmen on the Byzantine eastern frontier, as discussed below. In addition, although it might not be easy to conclusively substantiate this from sources, military institutions also seem to have been arranged in order to adjust to these situations.

During the middle Byzantine period, the state was divided into military-administrative units called *themata* (sg. *thema*). Within these organisational units, a governor (*stratēgos*) supervised both civil administration and the army corps, which obviously differs from the late Roman principle of separating civil and military authority.<sup>[57]</sup> The eastern borderland was not an exception to this. However, in addition to the *themata*, autonomous and independent small districts called *kleisourai* (sg. *kleisoura*, originally meaning “mountain path”) protected the frontier from Muslim incursions. The emergence of *themata* has elicited controversy among scholars, but a recent consensus among Byzantinists indicates that the *themata* were gradually developed from the late Roman system, and in response to continual Muslim incursions after the mid-seventh century. This occurred after the mobile forces (*comitatenses*) under the command of each *magister militum* in Armenia, Oriens, Thrace and the praesental armies retreated to Anatolia after being defeated by Muslims, and were given jurisdictions there in order to meet their logistical needs.<sup>[58]</sup>

Around the ninth century, noticeable changes occurred in the east, as armies of *themata* and *kleisourai* directly opposed the Muslim forces there. In response to

fronting Islam," p. 394.

[57] However, this was not without precedent in the late Roman period. Civil and military authorities were combined in some exceptional regions, including Egypt and southern Asia Minor. The unification of military and civil authorities can also be seen in the Exarchates of Ravenna and Carthage created in the sixth century. See Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society*, pp. 67, 70–71.

[58] Regarding recent explanations for the development of *themata*, see Lesile Brubaker and John F. Haldon, *Byzantium and the Iconoclast Era (c. 680–850), a History*, (Cambridge and New York 2011) pp. 723–771; Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: the Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge 1990, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1995), pp. 208–232; Idem, *Warfare State and Society*, pp. 71–74; Ralph-Johannes Lilie, "Araber und Themen. Zum Einfluss der arabischen Expansion auf die byzantinische Militärorganisation," in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East III, States, Resources and Armies*, ed. A. Cameron (Princeton 1995), pp. 425–460. On the Byzantine administration in the East during the ninth and tenth centuries, see Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, pp. 239–257; Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society*, 77–79; Nicholas Oikonomides, "L'organisation de la frontière de Byzance aux Xe–XIe siècles et le Taktikon de l'Escorial," *Actes du XIVe Congrès international des études byzantines I* (1974), pp. 285–302.

However, for the emergence of *thema*, Constantin Zuckerman offers an alternative explanation based on sigillographic sources. He proposes that *themata* were created after the eighth century, rather than the generally accepted view of their creation after the mid-seventh century. Constantin Zuckerman, "Learning from the Enemy and More: Studies in 'Dark Centuries' Byzantium," *Millennium 2* (2005), pp. 79–135 (pp. 125–135).

[59] Although Byzantine-Arab frontier was described as no-man's land or deserted place in the sense of political vacuum, recent archaeological researches reveal that there are traces of the activities of local community, and exchange among them. See Asa Eger, *The Islamic-Byzantine Frontier*.

On the creation of new *themata* and other units, see Brubaker and Haldon, *Iconoclast Era*, pp. 759–760; Haldon *Warfare, State and Society*, pp. 74–94. Regarding *kleisourai*, see also Hélène Ahrweiler, "Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IXe–XIe siècles," *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 84 (1960), pp. 1–111 (pp. 81f). All the *kleisourai* were placed in the eastern frontier, with the exception of Strymon in the west.

[60] For more details, see Telemachos Lounghis, "The Decline of the Opsikian Domesticates and the Rise of the Domesticate of the Scholae," *Byzantina Symmeikta* 10 (1996), pp. 27–36.

the "regionalisation" of raids coming from Islamic territory, specific small *themata* or semi-independent subdivisions were created from larger *themata*, or were newly established in what was formerly a "no-man's-land".<sup>[59]</sup> Some of this segmentation can certainly be perceived as an intensification of central government control, as the force of larger *themata* was thereby reduced. For instance, one typical case was the division of the Opsikian *thema* after its revolt in the middle of the eighth century.<sup>[60]</sup> However, Haldon remarks plausibly that such small units were created and then implemented in order to increase the frontier's autonomy, especially due to the flexibility required to repulse continual raids swiftly.<sup>[61]</sup>

Within this context, and regarding the actual function of this administrative system, one cannot overlook the role of military aristocracy as officers, who arose during the period in question.<sup>[62]</sup> Generals such as Nikephoros Phokas, Eustathios Argyros and Andronikos Doukas were active on the eastern frontier during Leo VI's reign, and all of them came from influential military aristocratic families in Asia Minor.<sup>[63]</sup> Of course, each had strong personal connections to their emperors, as they had served in the imperial entourage early in their lives, and later played important roles in the central government by leading imperial campaigns on behalf of the emperor, sometimes as *domestikos tōn scholōn* (i.e. supreme commander).<sup>[64]</sup> However, one must also consider their functions on the frontier while they served as officers. During this period on the eastern frontier, such magnates primarily occupied official positions in *themata*. For example, the Phokas family was based in eastern *themata*, such as Cappadocia, Seleucia and Anatolikon, while Nikephoros was the *stratēgos* of the *thema* of Chalsianon before he was sent to southern Italy.<sup>[65]</sup> The Doukas family was based in Paphlagonia but had also held strong influence in the East. Andronikos' son Constantine Doukas was the *stratēgos* of Charsianon before his promotion to the position of domestic of the *domestikos tōn scholōn*.<sup>[66]</sup> As for the Argyros family, the continuator of Theophanes recounts the activities of Eustathios and his father Leo Argyros when they were local commanders in eastern *themata*. The former was likely the *tourmarches* of the *thema* of Charsianon (the commander of the subdivision of *thema*, although here described as *hyprostratēgos*, that is, sub-commander) while the latter held the same position in the *thema* of Anatolikon.<sup>[67]</sup>

"He [Leo Argyros] was such a man that no other soldiers of his value could be found during the reign of Michael [III], to such a point that he fought with the Arabs in Tephrike many times, along with his fellow men, and made them retreat, giving death and destruction, and [they] crouched and trembled when his name was called."<sup>[68]</sup>

"The Emperor had patrician Eustathios Argyros as sub-commander of the *thema* of Anatolikon; he was famed after his origin from the admirable and distinguished family of Argyros. He fought and repulsed sons of Ismael (i.e. Arabs) not once but many times, and he was revered for strength, firmness, sagacity, brevity, wisdom, discretion and justice. [The emperor] also had Andronikos, son of Doukas."<sup>[69]</sup>

Naturally, we must consider that this source is critical of Michael III and favourable to Macedonian emperors, and that the description on the reign of Michael III might be an exaggeration, but nonetheless these two citations both indicate that Leo and Eustathios dealt with frequent raids by Muslim or their allies on the east-

[61] Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society*, pp. 78–79. Mark Whittow also explains that *themata* became more profitable for territorial defence and degraded in quality, and the *Taktika* also reflects this inefficiency. Mark Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025* (Berkeley and LA 1996), pp. 171–173.

[62] For general accounts concerning military aristocracy, see Jean-Claude Cheynet, *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)* (Paris 1990), esp. pp. 213–221; Idem, *The Byzantine Aristocracy and Its Military Function* (Aldershot 2006); Mark Herlong, “Kinship and Social Mobility in Byzantium, 717–959,” [Ph.D. Thesis, The Catholic University of America], 1986; Spyros Stavarakas, “The Byzantine Provincial Elite: A Study in Social Relationship during the Ninth and Tenth Centuries,” [Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Chicago], 1978; Friedhelm Winkelmann, *Quellenstudien zur herrschenden Klassen von Byzanz im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert* in, *Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten*, Bd. 54 (Berlin 1987); Luisa Andriollo, *Constantinople et les provinces d’Asie mineure, IXe-XIe siècle: administration impériale, sociétés locales et rôle de l’aristocratie* (Leuven, Paris and Bristol, CT 2017).

[63] See Ralph-Johannes Lilie, et al. (eds), *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinische Zeit*, Abt. I (641–867), *Prolegomena*, 5 vols and list of abbreviations, 1998–2002; Abt. II, *Prolegomena*, 7 vols, list of abbreviations and index, 2002–2013 (henceforth *PmbZ*), Andronikos #20405, Eustathios Argyros #21828, Nikephoros Phokas #25545; Jean-Claude Cheynet, “Les Phocas,” in Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, pp. 289–317 (291–296); Idem, *Pouvoir et contestations*, pp. 213–221; Demetrios Polemis, *The Doukai: A Contribution to Byzantine Prosopography* (London 1968), pp. 16–21; Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI*, pp. 204–218.

[64] Tougher, *The Reign of Leo VI*, p. 218.

[65] Cheynet, “Les Phocas,” pp. 289–301.

[66] Polemis, *Doukai*, pp. 1–12, 22–23.

[67] On Leo Argyros, see *PmbZ*, Leon Argyros #4506.

[68] *Theoph. Cont.* p. 374: “καὶ γὰρ τοιοῦτος ἦν ὁ ἀνὴρ οἷος ἕτερος ἐπὶ Μιχαὴλ βασιλέως οὐχ εὐρέθη στρατιώτης, ὡς πολλάκις τοῖς Λαγαρηνοῖς τῆς Τεφρικῆς μετὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους αὐτοῦ μινύμενον εἰς τροπὴν καὶ φοροῦδον καὶ ἀπώλειαν παρέχειν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ φημιζόμενον καταπτῆσαι καὶ τρέμειν.” Stavarakas translated ‘τοὺς ἀνθρώπους αὐτοῦ’ as ‘armed-retainer’. Stavarakas, “The Byzantine Provincial Elite,” p. 47. Here it must also be noted that when Andronikos Doukas was suspected of rebellion in 906, he fled to his fortification in Kaballa near Ikonion “with his kinsmen and servants (ἅμα συγγενεῖσι καὶ δούλοις αὐτοῦ).” This may imply that such figures possessed armed forces loyal

ern frontier. It also explains that the two men had forces at their disposal and perhaps had the authority to make decisions independently. This is reinforced by Leo VI’s own recommendation in the *Taktika*, IV. 3 to appoint local influential men as officers under a *thema*’s commander. He seems to have recognised the value of connecting such powerful local men with the provincial military structure, and that this might be a more significant factor on the frontier, where regionalised protection was essential.<sup>[70]</sup>

This seems to have been well practised after the reign of Leo VI. The so-called *De Velitatione Bellica (On Skirmishing)*, commissioned by the soldier emperor Nicephoros II Phokas (r. 963–969) and completed after his death, attests to similar autonomous manoeuvres. One of the aims of this treatise was to recall the previous warfare in the eastern frontier, including the time of Leo VI, undertaken by the local commanders in the east, especially by those from the Phokas family.<sup>[71]</sup> It is particularly worth noting here that the treatise indicates such military actions were undertaken by a commander “with only a unit of *thema* at his disposal (σὺν μόνῳ τῷ ὑπ’αὐτὸν θέματος λαῶ).”<sup>[72]</sup> Nikephoros, who was also from one of the military aristocratic families, seems to have been aware of the autonomous nature of commanders from his lineage along with others in the east.

In addition to military aristocracy, similar duties could potentially be fulfilled by others, such as Armenian potentates. The creation of a *thema* in Lykandos can be regarded as a typical process. According to Constantine VII’s *De Administrando Imperio*, Leo VI accepted offers from Armenians who had deserted to Melitene, including famous Melias the Great. He then created several frontier districts in the south-eastern borderland around 908, and under the regency of the fourth wife of Leo VI, Zoe Karbonopsina (914–919) they were later integrated into the *thema* of Lykandos governed by Melias, now promoted to *stratēgos*.<sup>[73]</sup> The Arab geographer Qudāma b. Ja’far reports that he and the Armenians following him settled there, constructed strong fortifications and thereby played a significant role in frontier defence by causing significant damage to the Muslim raiders.<sup>[74]</sup> This was another situation in which Leo VI evidently entrusted local potentates with autonomous regional defence.<sup>[75]</sup>

In summary, after the latter half of the ninth century the Byzantine eastern frontier included an army assembled to allow local commanders of the military district, or its equivalent, to intercept continual Muslim incursions by acting at their own discretion with the forces at their disposal.<sup>[76]</sup> The stratagem to be used against the Arabs described in the *Taktika* also appears to reflect and approve this autonomous defensive disposition and practice, formed over a long period, rather than military operations controlled by the central government.

## CONCLUSION: LEO VI’S PERSPECTIVE ON THE EASTERN FRONTIER REFLECTED IN THE *TAKTIKA*

It is uncertain to what degree the *Taktika* is practically applicable to the actual field, and it is doubtful that it functioned as a utilitarian instruction from the centralised authoritative emperor to the field commanders. The paramount aim of *Taktika* was to compile an up-to-date volume of wisdom, which included the military science of the Roman past as well as Christian moral guidance for warfare, all of which was motivated by Leo VI’s consciousness of himself as a ruler chosen by God.<sup>[77]</sup> The recently introduced elements in this source can also be appropriately grasped as projections of Leo VI’s perspective on the current status of the empire, the environ-

to them and acting at their disposal. See *Theoph. Cont.*, p. 372; Polemis, *Doukai*, p. 18.

[69] *Theoph. Cont.* pp. 368–369: “Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶχε τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν ὑποστράτηγον Εὐστάθιον πατρίκιον, ὃς ἐκ τῆς καλλιστῆς καὶ ἀγαθῆς γενεᾶς τῶν Ἀργυρῶν ἐκπεφώνηται. ὃς τοῖς Ἰσλαμῆταις κατεστράτει καὶ ἔτρεπεν οὐχ ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις, ῥώμῃ καὶ ἰσχύϊ καὶ συνέσει καὶ ἀνδρίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει καὶ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τετιμημένος καὶ ἐπειλημμένος, ἔχων καὶ Ἀνδρόνικον τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Δουκός.” I have consulted the translation in Karlin-Hayter, “Military Affairs,” p. 36.

[70] *Taktika*, IV. 3, pp. 46–49; Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 146.

[71] *De Velitatione Bellica*, Pr., pp. 32–37. For the relationship between the *Taktika* and this text, see Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, pp. 149–160; Haldon, *Commentary*, pp. 363–365.

[72] See *De Velitatione Bellica*, Pr. 3, pp. 32–35. See also *Ibid.*, XVI. 4, pp. 92–95, XVII. 2, pp. 96–97. See also Dagron and Mihăescu, *Traité sur la guérilla*, pp. 161–165.

[73] For this event's details, see Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Gyila Moravcsik, trans. Romilly J. H. Jenkins, revised edition (Washington D.C.), 50. 133–166, pp. 238–241; *De Thematibus*, ed. Agostino Pertusi (Vatican 1952), XII, pp. 75–76; Gérard Dédéyan, “Mleh le Grand, Stratège de Lykandos,” *Revue des études arméniennes* 15 (1981), pp. 73–102 (pp. 87–93); *Idem*, “Les Arméniens sur la frontière sud-orientale de Byzance, fin IXe–fin XIe siècles,” *Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient* 21 (1993), pp. 67–85 (pp. 70f); *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio: a Commentary*, ed. Romilly J. H. Jenkins (Washington D.C. 1962) (henceforth *DAI, Commentary*), pp. 190–191; Whittow, *The Making*, p. 315. See also *PmbZ*, Melias #25041. Leo VI also created a *thema* in Mesopotamia between 899 and 911. In this case, Leo VI received the Armenian potentate Manuel by bestowing a golden bull upon him, and placed another person there in the position of *stratēgos*. See *DAI*. 50. 111–117, pp. 238–239; *De Thematibus*, IX, p. 73; *DAI, Commentary*, p. 189.

[74] Qudāma b. Ja'far, 254; Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, vol. 2/1, p. 42.

[75] Runciman undertook this part of the commentary of *DAI*, and places this event within the context of a “planned expansion,” which paved the way for continued aggressive advances in the future. See *DAI, Commentary*, p. 188. However, this seems like a rather defensive practice. See n. 55 above.

[76] Thus somewhat similar situations seem to have existed on both sides. This is the very

ment surrounding his state and his idea of suitable methods for addressing them. The present study demonstrates that the new lines in the *Taktika* describing manoeuvres against raiding Arabs on the eastern frontier depict autonomous regional defence undertaken by local forces. This argument differs from previous research which emphasises the context of rule by the central government. The guerrilla strategies of these military deployments existed long before the reign of Leo VI, and sources indicate that these tactics also continued after him.<sup>[78]</sup> The description of Leo VI can therefore be interpreted as meaning that he simply ratified the existing form of flexible response by local forces led by potentates, established over a long period of time. This indicates that Leo recognised it was both effective and indispensable to delegate power to these potentates in order to resist the incessant Arab razzias, despite the possible centrifugal effects on political and military power.

In the meantime, it is undeniable that he tried to emulate the reign of Justinian and rule as a centralised, authoritative ruler in other spheres. For the relationship between Leo and the commanders, Tougher remarks that their ties were based on friendship.<sup>[79]</sup> But concessions to their own interests may also have been necessary to build such a relationship. It may also be true that Leo deliberately chose not to campaign in person, but in the east, this was also partly because there was no need to do so, due to the nature of the warfare. Leo seems to have appreciated the system that functioned without the presence of the emperor in person, in order to respond promptly to the existing conditions and defend the frontier without consuming much resources. The re-organisations and creations of *themata* and *kleisourai* undertaken in his reign can clearly be understood in this context.

This sort of interaction between the central government and the frontier can be reconciled with the discussion on flexible frontier practices of the empire in the tenth and eleventh centuries during the expansion, as argued most notably by Catherine Holmes.<sup>[80]</sup> It is noted that the empire tended to entrust newly conquered territory to local potentates or reliable personnel with a large measure of authority. Thus the empire succeeded in governing the frontier with minimal resources, but this was accompanied by the risk of vulnerability to the possible rebellious attitudes of those entrusted with command of the frontier.<sup>[81]</sup> There seems to have been a concept not unlike that of the description of the eastern frontier in the *Taktika* behind such practices. Thus, Leo VI's perspective of the east in the *Taktika* may be comprehended within the broader context of the long-term continuity of the Byzantine flexible frontier policy during the ninth to the eleventh centuries.<sup>[82]</sup> Moreover, the *Taktika* can also be an indication that the imperial government was well aware of the importance of such practices.

University of St. Andrews  
St. Andrews, Scotland, UK

situation reflected in the epic of *Digenis Akritis* (to be precise, the first half of the epic, *The Song of the Emir* about Digenis' father, which illustrates the situation around the end of the ninth century). It depicts a Muslim emir who raids into Byzantine territory and the *stratēgos* and his family who are in charge of dealing with the situation. See *Digenis Akritis*, ed. and trans. Elisabeth Jeffreys (Cambridge 1998), G. I. 270-275, 295-300, G. II. 60-69; G. III. 66-72. Cf. Nicholas Oikonomidēs, "L'épopée de Digénis et la frontière orientale de Byzance aux Xe et XIe siècles," *Travaux et Mémoires* 7 (1979), pp. 375-397 (pp. 382-383). See also the discussions on the interactions across the frontier between the two sides in n. 17 above.

[77] See Haldon, *Commentary*, pp. 25, 37-38.

[78] Dagron and Haldon suggest that it is debatable to what extent Leo VI produces new stratagems, or whether he simply traces pre-existing approaches, but the significant part of the tactics for the Arabs are apparently the latter, as he included second-hand information from experienced generals. Dagron, "Byzance et le modèle islamique"; Idem, *Traité sur la guérilla*, pp. 145-149; Haldon, *Commentary*, p. 334. On the emergence of the guerrilla tactics, see Kaegi, "Confronting Islam," pp. 393; Haldon, *Commentary*, pp. 364-5. Although some indication of such a stratagem can be observed since the eighth century, Haldon speculates that it was regularised in the ninth century, when the creation of *kleisurai* became fully practiced. This also seems to have continued after his reign, as can be seen in *De Velitatione Bellica* mentioned above.

[79] Tougher, "Non-Campaigning"; Idem, *The Reign of Leo VI*, pp. 203-218.

[80] Catherine Holmes, *Basil II and the Governance of Empire (976-1025)* (Oxford and New York 2005), pp. 299-391; Eadem, "How the East Was Won' in the Reign of Basil II," in *Eastern Approaches to Byzantium*, pp. 41-56; Eadem, "Treaties between Byzantium and Islamic World," in *War and Peace in Ancient and Medieval History*, ed. Philip de Souza (Cambridge 2008), pp. 141-157.

[81] This seems to have been actually the case during the collapse of the Byzantine rule in Anatolia. Recent work by Alexander Beihammer argues that the interactions with local societies were a significant factor during the Seljuk expansion into Anatolia in the eleventh century. See Alexander D. Beihammer, *Byzantium and the Emergence of Muslim-Turkish Anatolia, ca. 1040-1130* (Oxford and New York 2017).

[82] Of course, *De Velitatione Bellica* can also be placed in this context. See n. 71 above. Similar cases can also be found in *De Administrando Imperio* and *De Thematibus* concerning the reigns of Romanus I and Constantine VII. I am also preparing another paper on this.

# THE RAVISHMENT OF BODY AND SOUL IN THE *FRIAR'S TALE* AND THE *SUMMONER'S TALE*

Takami Matsuda

## ABSTRACT

Both the *Friar's Tale* and the *Summoner's Tale* allude consistently to the danger of being ravished in "body and soul" to hell when they are seen in this context of the late medieval vision of the afterlife. In the case of the summoner in the *Friar's Tale*, it is suggested that he is to undergo corporeal pain fully with his possibly somatomorphic body, as in *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*. In the *Summoner's Tale*, Friar John who claims to have witnessed a dead child borne to heaven in a "revelacioun", is in fact in the danger of being ravished himself "body and soul" to hell, as in *Visio Lazari*. The two tales tell how one is constantly in the dangerous liminal situation between damnation and salvation, between being physically ravished to hell by the devil and being carried to heaven by angels in mystical ravishment.

---

The *Friar's Tale* of a corrupt summoner in the *Canterbury Tales* is apparently an exemplary tale about avarice and careless swearing. Analogues, in which a covetous man is carried off to hell by the devil, are found in various collections of exempla such as *Dialogus miraculorum* and the fragmentary *Libri miraculorum* by the thirteenth-century Cistercian prior, Caesarius of Heisterbach.<sup>[1]</sup> In response, the Summoner tells an anti-fraternal satire, also centered around the sin of avarice, after the short but scathing vision of a friar who tours hell guided by an angel. With regard to these two tales, John Fleming has argued that they "form a kind of grotesque literary diptych on the subject of the orders of justice and mercy. In the first God's justice is prostituted by a corrupt and impenitent minister of justice; in the second his mercy is wrenched in the rude hands of a venal and wrathful minister of mercy."<sup>[2]</sup> In that case the *Summoner's Prologue*, in which a friar is literally "ravished" (III.1676)<sup>[3]</sup> to hell in a vision, can be regarded as a hinge of the diptych that holds the two wings together because this episode is actually flanked by two other cases of ravishment; it is preceded by the devil's seizure of the summoner at the end of the *Friar's Tale* and in turn followed in the *Summoner's Tale* by a vision of the soul of a dead child borne to heaven which Friar John falsely claims to have witnessed in ravishment with fellow friars. This paper argues that the two tales, despite their apparent preoccupation with this-worldly self-interest, allude quite vividly and consistently to what awaits the deceitful summoner and friar in hell, and shows that not only the summoner but also Friar John is in grave danger of being ravished in "body and soul" to hell. In fact, the *Summoner's Prologue* functions as a central panel of a triptych, rather than a diptych, providing a narrative context that firmly links the two tales together. If we pay attention to various connotations of "ravished", contextualizing them particularly by medieval *exempla* narratives and visions of the afterlife, where analogues to these tales are often

[1] See *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales*, ed. Robert M. Correale and Mary Hamel (Cambridge, UK, 2002, 2005), 1:88–89.

[2] John V. Fleming, "The Summoner's Prologue: An Iconographic Adjustment," *The Chaucer Review* 2 (1967): 95–107 (p. 106).

[3] *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd ed., gen. ed. Larry D. Benson (Oxford, 2008). All quotations from and references to Chaucer are from this edition and will be cited in parentheses within the text.

[4] See, for example, Wiesje F. Nijenhuis, *The Vision of Edmund Leversedge: A Fifteenth-century Account of a Visit to the Otherworld* edited from BL MS Additional 14193 (Nijmegen, 1991), p. 83, line 36: "And my spyrit was raveschyd and departyd fro my body..."; *The Revelation of the Monk of Eynsham*, ed. Robert Easting, EETS OS 318 (Oxford, 2002), pp. 41–43, lines 624–29: "Sothly, this was fro myd-night of Shere Thursday, the whiche endith in the mornynge of Good Fredaye, in whiche time Y was rauyshte in spirite as Y laye in the chap-tur-hows...."

[5] For a more or less comprehensive survey of medieval visions of the afterlife, see Peter Dinzelbacher, *Vision und Visionsliteratur im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1981); Alison Morgan, *Dante and the Medieval Other World* (Cambridge, 1990); Peter Dinzelbacher, *Revelationes*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge Occidental, 57, A–VI D.3 (Turnhout, 1991); Eileen Gardiner, *Medieval Visions of Heaven and Hell: A Sourcebook* (New York, 1993); Claude Carozzi, *Le Voyage de l'âme dans l'au-delà d'après la littérature latine (Ve–XIIIe siècle)* (Rome, 1994); Robert Easting, *Visions of the Other World in Middle English*, Annotated Bibliographies of Old and Middle English Literature, 3 (Cambridge, UK, 1997); Takami Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory in Middle English Didactic Poetry* (Cambridge, UK, 1997); Fabienne Pomel, *Les Voies de l'au-delà et l'essor de l'allégorie au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 2001).

[6] Cf. "And as an angel ladde hym up and down, / To shewen hym the peynes that ther were, / ... And unto Sathanas he ladde hym down." (III. 1678–79, 1686; my emphasis). See Takami Matsuda, "The Summoner's Prologue and the Tradition of the Vision of the Afterlife," *Poetica* 55 (2001): 75–82.

[7] *Peter of Cornwall's Book of Revelations*, ed. Robert Easting and Richard Sharpe (Toronto, 2013), pp.336–39.

[8] See the illustration in *The Iconography of Hell*, ed. Clifford Davidson and Thomas H. Seiler, Early Drama, Art and Music Monograph Series, 17 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1992), pl. 14.

[9] *St Patrick's Purgatory: Two Versions of Owayne Miles and the Vision of William of Stranton, together with the long text of the Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*, ed. Robert Easting, EETS OS 298 (Oxford, 1991), pp. 14–15, stanzas 76–78. See, for other examples, Mabel A. Stanford, "The Sumner's Tale and St Patrick's Purgatory," *JEGP* 19 (1920): 377–81.

sought, we can unveil a thematic strand that runs through the two tales. Ravishment to hell is actually the veiled but sustained theme throughout the Friar-Summoner sequence, which is revealed either in advance or in retrospect, with the one tale providing a context for interpretation for the other.

## I

In the *Summoner's Prologue*, "ravished" has the specific meaning of being transported to the other world in a vision (*MED*, ravishen 2(d)). In Middle English visions of the afterlife, the word is often used in this specific sense.<sup>[4]</sup> The popularity of the vision of the afterlife reached its zenith in the twelfth century with the full-scale Latin visions of hell, purgatorial regions and the earthly Paradise, notably *Visio Tnugdali* (1149), *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii* (c. 1180–84) and *Visio Monachi de Eynsham* (1196), all of which were also known in later Middle English versions.<sup>[5]</sup> As I have argued elsewhere, in view of the two-stage descent of the friar to the bottom of hell where Satan resides, the short vision in the *Prologue* can be contextualized specifically as a burlesque of such popular visions as *Visio Tnugdali* or *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*, in which the visit to regions of purgatorial torments is followed by that to hell situated further below.<sup>[6]</sup> In addition, while Purgatory and hell are often compartmentalized according to which of seven deadly sins the dead person is guilty of or in which sinful profession he was engaged while alive, the idea of the place specially reserved for the elect is also a motif in visions of the afterlife. In *Liber Revelationum*, compiled probably at the beginning of the thirteenth century by Peter of Cornwall, the Austin canon in London, a certain brother who specially loved Augustine begs God, by assiduous prayers and frequent sobbing, to reveal to him what reward Augustine enjoys in heaven. His wish being granted, he is taken by an angel to the court of heaven, but he does not find Augustine among the elect. He is then told by the angel that Augustine resides in the specially appointed place closer to the brightness of divinity.<sup>[7]</sup> Such an episode can also be regarded as an inverted analogue to the *Summoner's Prologue*, another testimony to its dependence on the tradition of the vision of the afterlife.

The brief description of hell in the *Prologue* is apparently carried over to the beginning of the *Summoner's Tale* itself where we meet an equally brief reference to "infernalized" tortures in Purgatory, with the mention of flesh-hooks and awls: "Ful hard it is with flesshook or with oules / To been yclawed, or to brenne or bake." (III. 1730–31). The flesh-hook by which "a soul is impaled in hell or purgatory" (*MED* hōk, 5(b)), is one of the typical implements used by demons in hell to torture souls.<sup>[8]</sup> *Owayne Miles*, a Middle English version of *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*, provides a graphic description of the use of such implements, both iron hooks and a furnace.<sup>[9]</sup> This is a rather specialized usage of the word "hōk," which is more commonly used to denote a fishhook (*MED* hōk, 2(a)). The word is in fact used first in this sense at the beginning of the *Friar's Tale*, where it draws out a series of associations with regard to catching with a hook:

But certes, lecchours dide he grettest wo;  
They sholde syngen if that they were hent;  
...  
For smale tithes and for smal offrynge  
He made the peple pitously to synge,

For er the bishop caught hem with his hook  
 They weren in the erchedeknes book. (III. 1310–11,  
 1315–18)

The hook, used here as a metaphor for the bishop's staff, suggests a fishhook, which goes back to Matthew 4:19 where Christ promises to make the apostles (and subsequently the clergy) "piscatores hominum". A fishhook is also a traditional image of "Christ's defeat of the Devil in the scheme of redemption" as it is used in the *Legenda aurea*, or in the Middle English *Stanzaic Life of Christ* that is based on it, where Christ sets a hidden hook to catch the devil.<sup>[10]</sup> This positive image of the triumph over sin and the devil, however, turns ambiguous when we realize that "syngen", here meaning "to lament" or "to cry out in pain" (*MED* *singen* 1(d)), is also used to describe the damned souls being punished by demons in hell, as in *Owayne Miles* where backbiters cry out in pain.<sup>[11]</sup> The archdeacon serves the bishop as a severe punisher of crimes and misdemeanors, especially of sexual nature, just as does the summoner in his service, who blackmails the accused with the promise of erasing scandalous names from his book (III. 1363–66). They both resemble the petty Titivillus who assiduously writes down venial sins in the Book of Life,<sup>[12]</sup> and by this association help to build up the narrative for the entrance of the devil himself.

If the summoner himself already presents some devilish features and is figuratively a devil in disguise, the devil himself, who is in disguise, does the same. It is suggested that his appearance as the yeoman dressed in green carrying a bow and arrow and his dwelling far in the north point to his devilish nature well before he identifies himself as such.<sup>[13]</sup> It is then significant that he explains at some length that the devil is a shape-shifter when he reveals his identity. The disguise is a chief device demons use to tempt man, as Augustine warns in the Book 12 of *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, which is a *locus classicus* for the discussion of *discretio spirituum*. The discernment of the spirits "is certainly a most difficult task when the evil spirit acts in a seemingly peaceful manner and, without tormenting the body, possesses a man's spirit".<sup>[14]</sup> There are a number of exempla in which the devil appears in seemingly benevolent guises, including an angel and the Virgin Mary.<sup>[15]</sup> The summoner tries to show that he is not intimidated, switching back from *you* to *thou* in addressing him (III. 1504–6, 1520–29),<sup>[16]</sup> and claims that the devil is his peer and brother. The devil readily concedes, casually pointing out that they will be together a long time if the summoner so wishes; the summoner, on the other hand, does not realize that this friendliness may be another disguise to tempt him to act sinfully, so that he himself becomes the target of ravishment to hell.

We then come to potential cases of ravishment with the two corresponding episodes of the encounter with a carter and the visit to a widow. In the case of the cursing carter, it was possible for the devil to seize his prize then and there, just as the summoner urged. In that case, the episode would have become one of the exemplary anecdotes against rash swearing. For example, a child was seized by the devil and lost his arm because his parents cursed him, as is narrated in the popular conduct book of Geoffrey de la Tour Landry.<sup>[17]</sup> In another exemplum, a sorceress who commended herself to the devil is instantly seized by the devil and carried off.<sup>[18]</sup> But in the *Friar's Tale*, the devil respects the true intention behind the carter's curse, and taking the circumstance of sin into consideration, leaves him unharmed.

The devil also respects the intention of the swearer in the case of the widow they visit next, but with a different outcome. When the summoner swore "the

[10] C. W. Marx, *The Devil's Rights and the Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England* (Cambridge, UK, 1995), pp. 45–46; *A Stanzaic Life of Christ*, ed. Frances A. Foster, EETS OS 166 (Oxford, 1926), lines 6345–52.

[11] Easting, *St Patrick's Purgatory*, p.15, stanza 81.

[12] See, for example, *the Early English Versions of the Gesta Romanorum*, ed. Sidney J. H. Herrtage, EETS ES 33 (Oxford, 1879; repr. 1962), p. 392, no. 73; *The Towneley Plays*, ed. Martin Stevens and A. C. Cawley, EETS SS 13 (Oxford, 1994), 1: 409–16, lines 300ff.

[13] See explanatory notes to III. 1380–83 in *Riverside Chaucer* (p. 875); Clarence H. Miller, "The Devil's Bow and Arrows: Another Clue to the Identity of the Yeoman in Chaucer's *Friar's Tale*," *The Chaucer Review* 30 (1995): 211–14 (p. 211).

[14] XII. 13. 28; St. Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, trans. John Hammond Taylor, *Ancient Christian Writers*, 42 (New York, 1982), p. 196.

[15] Cf. *Index Exemplorum: A Handbook of Medieval Religious Tales*, ed. F. C. Tubach (Helsinki, 1969), nos. 1529–73.

[16] Martha Powell Harley, "Chaucer's *Friar's Tale*," *Explicator* 46.2 (1988): 4–5.

[17] *The Book of the Knight of La Tour-Landry*, ed. Thomas Wright, EETS OS 33 (Oxford, 1906; repr. 1969), p. 108. The woodcut depicting the scene in Geoffrey de la Tour Landry, *Ritter von Turn* (Basel, 1493) is reproduced in V. A. Kolve, *Telling Images: Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative II* (Stanford, CA, 2009), p. 69.

[18] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, XI.60, in *Caesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi Ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, 1851), 2: 311–12.

[19] It may be significant that it is by the word of the helpless widow that the empowered summoner is “ravished”, in contrast to the ravishment or *raptus* of a maid by a knight in the preceding *Wife of Bath’s Tale* (III. 873–81). In this respect, the *Wife of Bath’s Tale* also prepares the reader for a series of ravishments to follow in the Summoner-Friar sequence, with a pointed remark about lecherous “limitours” who replace an elf. For the thematically linked reading of the two tales, see also Penn R. Szitty, “The Green Yeoman as Loathly Lady: The Friar’s Parody of the Wife of Bath’s Tale,” *PMLA* 90 (1975): 386–94.

[20] *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), p.494 (V.12); *John Mirk’s Festial Edited from British Library MS Cotton Claudius A. II*, 2 vols., ed. Susan Powell, EETS OS 334, 335 (Oxford, 2009, 2011), 1: 6–7, lines 121–45.

[21] *Die Vision des Bauern Thurkill*, ed. P. G. Schmidt (Weinheim, 1987), p. 22; Nijenhuis, *The Vision of Edmund Leversedge*, p. 83, lines 23–25.

[22] Johannes Herolt, *Promptuarium exemplorum*: “Ac rapuit eum in ipsa hora diabolus”, in *The Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales*, ed. W. F. Bryan and G. Dempster (London, 1941), p. 271; Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Libri VIII miraculorum*, II.17: “Et rapuit eum diabolus in ipsa hora”, in *Die Fragmente der Libri VIII Miraculorum des Caesarius von Heisterbach*, ed. Aloys Meister (Rome, 1901), p. 91.

[23] “Qualiter quidam monachus, cum raptus esset ante tribunal Domini, et de eo dixisset Dominus ut deleteretur de libro uite, per beatam Mariam redditus est corpori.... Affuit et multitudo maxima tam bonorum quam malorum angelorum undique in circuitu meo, illi uidelicet ut me defenderent, isti autem ut raperent.... Demonibus autem ad hanc uocem me rapere paratis, ego miser oculis lacrimosis ad misericordie matrem respexi.... (How a certain monk, when he was rapt (“raptus esset”) before the tribunal of the Lord, and the Lord had said of him that he would be deleted from the book of life, was restored to the body by Blessed Mary. ... And a huge crowd of both good and evil angels was everywhere in a circle about me, the former to defend me, the latter that they might seize me (“ut raperent”).... With the demons ready at this word to seize me (“me rapere”), I looked back, in my misery, with tearful eyes at the Mother of mercy....)” Easting and Sharpe, *Peter of Cornwall’s Book of Revelations*, pp. 294–96.

[24] Jean-Claude Schmitt, “Les revenants dans la société féodale,” *Le Temps de la réflexion* 3 (1982): 285–306 (p. 293).

[25] Jean-Claude Schmitt, “Le spectre de Samuel et la sorcière d’En Dor. Avatars historiques

foule feend me fecche / If I th’excuse” (III. 1610–11), this was also intended simply as an oath but it is then countersigned by the widow’s curse that gives his body and her precious pan to the devil (III. 1622–23). When the devil confirms the intention of the widow and the summoner flatly denies his intention to repent, the widow’s curse takes effect and the ravishment by the devil really occurs.<sup>[19]</sup> What follows, however, is not just the ironic reversal of the previous episode of the carter but forebodes the nature of ravishment in a specific way. The passage here deserves attention on two accounts: the summoner will visit hell with the devil “tonight” and he is ravished by the devil in both body and soul:

Thy body and this panne been mine by right.  
 Thou shalt with me to helle yet tonight,  
 Where thou shalt knowen of oure privetee  
 Moore than a maister of dyvynytee.”  
 And with that word this foule feend hym hente;  
 Body and soule he with the devel wente  
 Where as that somonours han hir heritage. (III. 1635–41)

“Thou shalt with me to helle yet tonight” actually sounds like an address of the guide to a visionary in visions of the afterlife even though, unlike the friar in the *Summoner’s Prologue*, the summoner probably has no chance of coming back. Such visions are typically experienced at night. A visit to Saint Patrick’s Purgatory requires the pilgrim to remain overnight in the cave that leads to Purgatory. In *Visio Thurkilli* (1206), a visionary is visited by the guide, St. Julian, in the evening. Other visions, from the *Vision of Drythelm*, originally recorded by Bede but also cited in the late fourteenth-century *Festial* by John Mirk,<sup>[20]</sup> to the fifteenth-century *Vision of Edmund Leversedge* in Middle English, also take place mostly at night while one is in bed.<sup>[21]</sup> The verb “hente” is used here, possibly to underline the apparent parallel with the case of the carter (III.1553), but in Latin analogues to this episode, “rapere” is used to convey a sense of ravishment.<sup>[22]</sup> One of the visions in *Liber Revelationum* also uses *rapere* in senses both of ravishment to the other world and of physical seizure by the devil; a certain monk is rapt before the tribunal of the Lord, being transported there in a vision, where he faces the danger of being seized by bad angels.<sup>[23]</sup>

While these details suggest the ravishment to hell as in a vision, it is also stated that the summoner will go to hell “body and soul” together. The devil seems to be quite specific about this point because he raised the issue of the dichotomy of body and soul in a person quite consciously earlier in the tale. The devil dwells at length on how sometimes he has permission to afflict the body only, or both body and soul, or the soul only (III. 1489–1500). While he cites Job as the example of the first case, he gives no examples of the latter two, but implies that he afflicts the soul by assuming a disguise. This includes such cases as when man is tempted by some *phantasma* which is diabolic in origin;<sup>[24]</sup> the case of the prophet Samuel raised from the dead by a sorceress, to which the devil refers soon after (III. 1507–12), may be regarded as one such example. Just as the devil says so himself, the case of Samuel was a subject of theological controversy not unrelated to the dichotomy of body and soul, as to whether the ghost is the soul returning from Purgatory to this world, or the revived flesh without the soul, or the trick of the devil. In the late Middle Ages, it was usually regarded as a diabolic illusion.<sup>[25]</sup>

Another case in which only the soul is afflicted, is actually the vision of the

d'un récit biblique: I Rois 28," *Études rurales*, 105–106 (1987): 37–64; *Les Revenants: les vivants et les morts dans la société médiévale/i* (Paris, 1994), p. 30.

[26] "Sunt quidam," inquit, "qui dicunt quod aulam intrantes primo fiunt in extasi et hec omnia in spiritu uidere. Quod omnino sibi miles ita contigisse contradicit, sed corporeis oculis se uidisse et corporis oculis se uidisse et corporaliter hec pertulisse constantissime testatur." (Easting, *St Patrick's Purgatory*, p. 150, lines 1103–4); "There are people who say that when they enter the hall at the beginning they fall into ecstasy and they see all these things in their minds. But the knight denied adamantly that this had happened in his case; on the contrary, he testified very consistently that he had seen these things with his own bodily eyes and that he had endured the torments in the flesh." (Picard, and Pontfarcy, *Saint Patrick's Purgatory*, p. 73).

[27] Easting, *St Patrick's Purgatory*, pp. 150–51, lines 1106–27.

[28] *Jacob's Well, an English Treatise on the Cleansing of Man's Conscience*, ed. Arthur Brandeis, EETS OS 115 (Oxford, 1900; repr. 1975), pp. 186–87.

[29] Easting and Sharpe, *Peter of Cornwall's Book of Revelations*, pp. 334–36.

[30] Ronald B. Herzman, "The Friar's Tale: Chaucer, Dante and the *Translatio Studii*," in *Acta Vol. IX: The Early Renaissance: Virgil and the Classical Tradition* (Binghamton, NY, 1984), pp. 1–17 (p. 8). David Raybin also notes that the devil takes the summoner "on a journey reserved even by Dante for only the most heinous of sinners": "Goddess Instrumentz': Devils and Free Will in the *Friar's* and *Summoner's Tales*," *The Chaucer Review* 46 (2011): 93–110 (p. 100). The case of the corpse of the wicked man possessed by the devil, looking as if alive, is recorded in Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, XII. 3 (Strange, 2: 317).

afterlife as in the *Summoner's Prologue*. In most cases, while the soul leaves the body to tour regions of the afterlife led by a guide, the body lies rigid in a sort of coma though not lifeless. If, on the other hand, the summoner is literally ravished to hell in body and soul as the devil claims, this may be taken as an example of the case in which both body and soul are afflicted. Such cases of ravishment do exist in visions of the afterlife. In *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*, demons themselves drag the knight Owein around various regions of torture, threatening to take him to the bottom of hell, though Owein defends himself by invoking the name of Jesus and returns unharmed to this world. When Owein narrates his journey, the corporeality of the experience is emphasized. When one in the audience suggested that the knight fell into ecstasy and saw everything in mind, the knight "testified very consistently that he had seen these things with his own bodily eyes and that he had endured the torments in the flesh."<sup>[26]</sup> This claim is immediately followed by another anecdote that seems to be inserted to underline the physical rather than virtual nature of the experience which body and soul underwent together. Demons physically bore away ("corporaliter tulerunt") a certain monk from his bed and tortured him for three days before he was returned horribly wounded. The monk lived for fifteen years but wounds never healed during that period.<sup>[27]</sup> Although this monk was put to bodily torture because demons resented his holiness, similar cases of ravishment are reserved for hardened sinners who consciously refused to repent. *Jacob's Well* includes an exemplum of the witch whose body was ravished by demons to hell because she died refusing confession.<sup>[28]</sup> Peter of Cornwall narrates a terrible incident that took place in the district of Canterbury. A certain young man, who refused confession and was excommunicated, was seized alive by two demons while asleep, who led him out of the house in chains (leaving only his nightcap behind) as far as to Tilbury and forced some sailors to ferry him across the Thames.<sup>[29]</sup> The summoner is presumably in the same category. By explicitly refusing to repent (III. 1630–31), the summoner gave himself to the devil of his own will and joined the group of the hardened unrepentant who were ravished "body and soul" to hell.

What awaits the summoner in hell is already implied by the devil earlier in the tale:

"Thou wolt algates wite how we been shape;  
Thou shalt hereafterward, my brother deere,  
Come there thee nedeth nat of me to leere,  
For thou shalt, by thyn owene experience,  
Konne in a chayer rede of this sentence  
Bet than Virgile, while he was on lyve,  
Or Dant also." (III. 1514–20).

While the references to Dante and Virgil (who descended to the underworld in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*) also imply the journey to hell, critics have been led to look for a more specific Dantean echo here, especially the fate of Frate Alberigo in *Inferno*, XXIII, 118–38, who feigned hospitality and murdered the guests.<sup>[30]</sup> His soul was sent immediately to the frozen Ptolomea, the third division of the ninth circle of hell, even while his body still roamed in this world, possessed by the devil. However, in this episode only the soul is actually ravished to hell. The case of Frate Alberigo emphasizes immediacy of damnation for a heinous crime, that the ravishment of the soul to hell does not wait for bodily death. Rather, what the above

[31] Augustine, *The City of God*, XI. 13; Saint Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans*, trans. David Wiesen, 7 vols., Loeb Classical Library (London, 1968), 3: 518–19.

[32] Hugh of St Victor, *De Sacramentis Christiane Fidei*, II. xvi. 5 (PL. 176: 589): “Gehenna, ... corporeus ignis erit, et cruciabit corpora damnatorum et hominum et daemonum; solida hominum, aëria daemonum, aut tantum hominum corpora cum spiritibus”. The translation is from *Hugh of Saint Victor on the Sacraments of the Christian Faith (De Sacramentis)*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Cambridge, MA, 1951), p. 443. Also cf. Augustine, *The City of God*, XXI. 10.

[33] Manuele Gragnolati, *Experiencing the Afterlife: Soul and Body in Dante and Medieval Culture* (Notre Dame, ID, 2005), p. 40.

[34] Carol Zaleski, *Otherworld Journeys: Accounts of Near-Death Experience in Medieval and Modern Times* (New York, 1987), p. 51. On corporeality of the soul, see Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336* (New York, 1995), pp. 290–96; Peter Dinzelbacher, “Il corpo nelle visioni dell’aldilà,” *Micrologus* 1 (1993): 301–26.

[35] See Gragnolati, p. 55; Bynum, pp. 279–305.

[36] “Quod et beatus Augustinus et beatus Gregorius incorporeos spiritus dicunt pena corporalibus ignis posse cruciari, ista uidentur etiam affirmari narratione.” (Easting, *St Patrick’s Purgatory*, p. 122, lines 60–62); *Saint Patrick’s Purgatory*, trans. Jean-Michel Picard, with introd. by Y. de Pontfarcy (Dublin, 1985), p. 45. Sources are Gregory’s *Dialogues*, IV. 30 and Augustine, *The City of God*, XXI. 10 respectively; see Easting, *St Patrick’s Purgatory*, p. 237 (note to lines 60–61).

[37] “hec omnia... non in rei ueritate corporaliter set ymaginarie spiritualiter ei contingant” (Sharpe and Easting, pp. 132–33). Hugh of St Victor also points to the virtual nature of pain as he explains that in the case of the vision of the afterlife, “certain signs similar to the corporeal are presented for the demonstration of the spiritual” (“signa quaedam corporalibus similia ad demonstrationem spiritualium”) so that the soul returned to the body can describe the experience. (Hugh of St Victor, *De Sacramentis Christiane Fidei*, II. xvi. 2 (PL. 176: 584); Deferrari, *Hugh of Saint Victor on the Sacraments of the Christian Faith*, p. 437.)

[38] Easting, *St Patrick’s Purgatory*, p. lxxx; Robert Easting, “The English Tradition,” in *The Medieval Pilgrimage to St Patrick’s Purgatory, Lough Derg and the European Tradition*, ed. Michael Haren and Yolande de Pontfarcy (Enniskillen, 1988), p. 68.

[39] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Libri VIII mirac-*

passage refers to seems to be the nature of the experience body and soul undergo together in hell. The first line —“Thou wolt algates wite how we been shape”— points to the true shape of the devil without disguise, which according to Augustine, has the aerial body capable of feeling pain,<sup>[31]</sup> and consequently to the corporeal nature of pains of hell to be experienced by those sent there. Hugh of St Victor states, on the authority of Augustine, that “[h]ell... will be corporeal fire and will torment the bodies of the damned, both of men and of demons, the solid bodies of men, the airy bodies of demons, or only the bodies of men along with their spirits.”<sup>[32]</sup> The corporeality of the soul in hell, which the passage thus seems to underline, was a controversial issue among theologians, but the idea that the soul cannot be tormented by material fire was condemned in Paris in 1277.<sup>[33]</sup> The soul is assumed to have what Carol Zaleski calls the “somatomorphic” body, capable of experiencing physical pain.<sup>[34]</sup> Dante also dwells at length on this issue, offering his own explanation, so that there is certainly a specific Dantean echo here that includes the reference to Virgil who is Dante’s guide. In *Purgatorio* XXV, 79–108, Dante has Statius explain at length the concept of the aerial body the soul assumes, which he calls “ombra”, that is capable of feeling pain.<sup>[35]</sup>

The corporeality of the soul was an issue with visions of the afterlife as well. Significantly, there is a difference of opinion as to the nature of the ordeal among several versions of the visit to St. Patrick’s Purgatory. The Latin *Tractatus* mentioned above confirms the physical nature of the experience; it says in the introductory part that “blessed Augustine and blessed Gregory say that immaterial spirits can be tortured by the torment of a material fire. Again, our account seems to confirm these facts.”<sup>[36]</sup> On the other hand, in Peter of Cornwall’s account of the visit which is more or less contemporary with the *Tractatus*, the visitor is exposed to savage torments by demons and is totally debilitated, but it is stated that these torments “do not happen to him bodily but spiritually in the imagination.”<sup>[37]</sup> The English prose account of the visit known as the *Vision of William of Staunton*, which supposedly occurred in 1406 or 1409, describes a series of pains of Purgatory in detail but at the same time leaves a hint that the whole experience was a dream, thus implying that a physical experience of hell itself, even if a virtual one, is unlikely.<sup>[38]</sup> However, most of the visions assume the corporeality of experience. Bodily pain can be an effective weapon of fear to make one attrite, so that it was stressed without theological scruples that pain could be felt physically rather than virtually in imagination. The pain of the soul can actually begin with the separation from the body. In one of the visions recorded by Caesarius of Heisterbach, the devil slowly wrenches the soul of the damned out of the body by a trident.<sup>[39]</sup> A popular twelfth-century Latin debate poem, *Dialogus inter Corpus et Animam*, also known in several Middle English versions, ends with the scene in which the separated soul is led to hell by demons in a series of tortures, while the body lies in the grave, harassed by worms.<sup>[40]</sup> A visionary is not necessarily immune from pain even when accompanied by a benevolent guide; often, the guide temporarily abandons the soul to infernal tortures as in *Visio Tnugdali*, to teach him a lesson.<sup>[41]</sup>

It is in this context of the vision of the afterlife that we can interpret what the devil says to the summoner. The *Friar’s Tale* itself provides little actual description of the infernal region; the narrator instead uses rhetorical *occupatio*, stressing that it takes a thousand winters to describe “[t]he peynes of thilke cursed hous of helle” (III. 1652). However, the vision literature provides enough allusions to guess what they might be like. For our summoner, whose guide is the devil himself, no ordinary tour of hell such as glimpsed in the *Summoner’s Prologue* is in store for him;

ulorum, 2: 37 (Meister, *Die Fragmente der Libri VIII Miraculorum*, p. 116).

[40] *The Latin Poems Commonly Attributed to Walter Mapes*, ed. Thomas Wright, Camden Society o.s. 16 (London, 1841; repr. 1968), pp. 95–106. For Middle English versions, see *Desputisoun bitwen þe Bodi and þe Soule* (IMEV 351) in *Middle English Debate Poetry: A Critical Anthology*, ed. John W. Conlee (East Lansing, MI, 1991), pp. 20–49, as well as the so-called Porkington 10 Debate (IMEV 3330) in *Early English Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*, ed. J. O. Halliwell (London, 1855), pp. 12–40.

[41] On the topos of the abandonment of the visionary, see Morgan, pp. 97–100.

[42] See explanatory notes to III. 1657–58 in *Riverside Chaucer* (p.876).

[43] *The Prymer or Lay Folks' Prayer Book*, ed. H. Littlehales, EETS OS 105, 109 (London, 1895, 1897; 1998), p. 58.

[44] Cf. *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. Félix Lecoy, CFMA 95 (Paris, 1973), 2: 119, line 12134.

[45] The analogue is found in another passage from *Le Roman de la Rose*, a long anti-fraternal sermon by "Faux-Semblant": *Le Roman de la Rose*, lines 11007–19; *The Romaunt of the Rose*, lines 6171–83. Cf. John Finlayson, "Chaucer's Summoner's Tale: Flatulence, Blasphemy, and the Emperor's Clothes," *Studies in Philology* 104 (2007): 458–59.

[46] Cf. note to III. 2126–28 in the *Riverside Chaucer* (p. 878) that points out the Wycliffite criticism of such letters of fraternity that "were but another deceptive way of obtaining money".

[47] Jay Ruud pointed out that Friar John "speaks continually of the Franciscan ideal" which "challenged friars to live lives emulating the first apostles after they had received the Holy Spirit at the Pentecost" and that his claim

it is the ravishment of both body and soul with no hope of return and the soul undergoes corporeal pain fully because it is still with the body even if a somatomorphic one.

The idea of physical ravishment can also be seen in the final moralization admonishing the fellow summoners to repent:

"The leoun sit in his await alway  
To sle the innocent, if that he may.  
Disposeth ay youre hertes to withstonde  
The feend, that yow wolde make thral and bonde. (III. 1657–60)

The reference to a lion here is to Psalm 9:29–30 (AV, 10:8–9) which is also partially quoted in Latin in the margin of Ellesmere MS,<sup>[42]</sup> but there is another reference to Psalm 7:3 (AV 7:2), "rapiat ut leo animam meam", which is about the ravishing of the soul by the devil. In the *Lay Folks' Prayer Book*, this is translated into Middle English as "he, as a lioun, rauysche my soule"<sup>[43]</sup>. The lines that follow counsel spiritual prudence and faith in God because God sees that the devil will not tempt one beyond his capacity. The *Friar's Tale* ends by widening the scope and urging repentance to summoners in general -- "repente / Of hir mysdedes, er that the feend hem hente" (III. 1663–64) -- otherwise, one may incur a real danger of being ravished "body and soul" to hell.

## II

After the context of vision literature is developed in farcical details in the *Summoner's Prologue*, the Summoner begins his tale with the visit of a corrupt religious to a sick person, as if to parallel the summoner's visit of the sick widow. Also in his characterization, deliberate correspondence with details in the *Friar's Tale* is notable. The image of a hook that appeared at the beginning of the *Friar's Tale*, is repeated: "I walke and fische cristen mennes soules / To yelden Jhesu Crist his propre rente;" (III. 1820–21) It has been suggested that the first line comes from the sermon by Dame Abstinence in *Le Roman de la Rose*, which is rendered "To fyssh-en synful men we go" in Chaucer's *Romaunt of the Rose* (7490).<sup>[44]</sup> If so, the irony is more pointed, since Abstinence is introduced as a figure in false disguise and Friar John himself, who preaches against gluttony, which he says is the original sin that led to the expulsion from the Paradise (III. 1915–17), is actually steeped in this deadly sin, as is obvious from his order for a sumptuous dinner.<sup>[45]</sup> The reference to rent also echoes the one by the devil in the *Friar's Tale* (III.1451), while the act of erasing the names of donors from his wax tablet recalls the similar gesture of the deceitful summoner. Friar John is presented as possessing in himself all devilish features shared by characters in the previous tale.

Friar John visits Thomas, one of the members of the lay confraternity attached to his convent,<sup>[46]</sup> whom he rebukes for being impatient and angry. He is at the bedside of Thomas because visiting the sick is one of the Seven Corporal Works of Mercy, the task also imposed on the Apostles (Luke 10:9).<sup>[47]</sup> Canon 22 of the Fourth Lateran Council (*Cum infirmitas* [or *Quum infirmitas*]) imposed confession on the sick before medical treatment could take place. Here Friar John claims that he is the physician of the soul -- "a perfit leche" (III. 1956) as he calls himself --, and urges Thomas by his tedious sermon to appease anger and make a full confession before death (III. 2089–93).<sup>[48]</sup> One Middle English version of the *visitatio*

not only echoes "Christ's promise to his first disciples to make them 'fishers of men...' but they also suggest that he has inherited the privilege of hearing confession and imposing penance as granted to the apostles": Jay Ruud, "My spirit hath his forsteryng in the Bible': the *Summoner's Tale* and the Holy Spirit," in *Rebels and Rivals: the Contestive Spirit in The Canterbury Tales*, ed. Susanna Greer Fein, David Raybin, and Peter C. Braeger (Kalamazoo, MI, 1991), pp. 126–29.

[48] Carl Phelpstead, "Th'ende is every tales strengthe': Contextualizing Chaucerian Perspectives on Death and Judgement," in *Chaucer and Religion*, ed. Helen Phillips (Cambridge, UK, 2010), p. 102. Patrick J. Gallacher points out how Friar John, in eliciting self-scrutiny of the sick by his sermon, goes against the medical tradition that warned against "serious reflection and sorrow": "The *Summoner's Tale* and Medieval Attitudes towards Sickness," *The Chaucer Review* 21 (1986): 200–12.

[49] *Yorkshire Writers*, ed. C. Horstman, 2 vols. (London, 1895–96), 2: 450–1. Amy Appleford argues that this version, composed between 1400 and 1425 (Version E in Robert R. Raymo, "Works of Religious and Philosophical Instruction," in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1500*, ed. Albert E. Hartung (New Haven, CT, 1986), 7: 2360), expands on the earlier version (Version A) to emphasize the need of self-awareness for a sick person while indirectly criticizing the lack of good priests. See Amy Appleford, *Learning to Die in London, 1380–1540* (Philadelphia, 2015), pp. 40–43. A version of the Middle English "craft of dying" in BL MS Harley 1706 also notes that patience in sickness can make satisfaction for all venial sins and a part of deadly sins; see David William Atkinson, *The English ars moriendi* (New York, 1992), pp. 6, 8.

[50] See, for example, *The Ars Moriendi (Editio Princeps, circa 1450): A Reproduction of the Copy in the British Museum*, ed. W. H. Rylands (London, 1881); *Ars Moriendi (1492) ou l'art de bien mourir*, ed. P. Girard-Augry (Paris, 1986), pp. 64–65; *Ars moriendi, das ist Die Kunst des heilsamen Sterbens: das deutschsprachige Blockbuch der Donaueschinger Hofbibliothek*, introd. Nigel F. Palmer (Rotthalmünster, 1995).

[51] Easting and Sharpe, *Peter of Cornwall's Book of Revelations*, p. 46.

[52] Gregory, *Dialogorum Libri IV*, IV. 8: Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, trans. O. J. Zimmerman (Washington, D.C., 1959), pp. 200–201. Also cf. Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, XI.8 (Strange, 2: 243).

*infirmorum*, which has a section on "How a man schulde comferte a nother þat he grucche not whanne he is seeke", advises the sick man not to be angry and suffer all pains patiently because "alle bodiliche anoyes suffrid meekliche in this lyf maketh þe sowle fayre and stronge and rightliche to passe from purgatorie to heuene".<sup>[49]</sup> Thomas, however, is not convinced, and as he lies in bed "ful of anger and of ire, / With which the devel set youre herte afire" (III. 1981–82), chiding his wife, the scene seems to convey another allusion to the ravishment by the devil. There is a visual analogy with the *ars moriendi* tract. In both blockbook and printed editions, the illustration for impatience, the fourth temptation of the dying man by the devil, shows an angry sick man kicking an attendant in frustration while a devil lurks beside him in triumph.<sup>[50]</sup> Just as devils swarm at the bedside in the *ars moriendi* tract, references to devils are repeated throughout the tale, with Friar John stressing more than once that anger only pleases the devil (III. 1833–34, 1981–84, 2089–92).

Before Friar John embarks on his sermon on anger, Thomas's wife mentions the recent death of her child:

"Now, sire," quod she, "but o word er I go.  
My child is deed withinne this wykes two,  
Soone after that ye wente out of this toun."  
"His deeth saugh I by revelacioun,"  
Seide this frere, "at hoom in oure dortour.  
I dar wel seyn that, er that half an hour  
After his deeth, I saugh hym born to blisse  
In myn avision, so God me wisse!  
So dide oure sexteyn and oure fermerer,  
That han been trewe freres fifty yeer;  
They may now — God be thanked of his loone! —  
Maken hir jubilee and walke allone.  
And up I roos, and al oure covent eke,  
With many a teere trillyng on my cheke,  
Withouten noyse or claterynge of belles;  
Te Deum was oure song, and nothyng elles,  
Save that to Crist I seyde an orison,  
Thankyng hym of his revelacion. (III. 1851–68)

This episode may carry an ironic echo of Christ's visit to Martha and Mary after the death of Lazarus; instead of the miracle of resurrection from the dead, Friar John rather opportunistically claims to have witnessed the child's departure in a "revelacioun" and uses it as an occasion to advertise the merit of his convent. This can in fact be regarded as another, quite different case of ravishment, the experience of being ravished into beholding a vision of the dead innocent child borne to heaven. Revelation and vision are often used interchangeably, but because the former is more elevated and restricted in meaning,<sup>[51]</sup> the choice of the word may be intended to add a weight to the experience of witnessing the release of the soul of someone from distance. Gregory's *Dialogues* records several instances of such visions, including the case of St Benedict, who witnessed from afar the soul of the bishop of Capua being carried by angels to heaven while he was still miles away from Capua.<sup>[52]</sup>

Mystics provide a context to regard this kind of experience as ravishment. In

the Middle English version of Richard Rolle's *Incendium amoris* translated by the Carmelite prior, Richard Misyn, "ravished" is used to translate the original "raptus" or "rapitur". Here Rolle speaks of what Misyn describes as the "dobyllle rauschyn-gis":

¶ But rauschyng is als it is schewyd, in-t[w]o wys is vnderstande:  
 ¶ O maner forsoþ in qwhilk sum man is rauschid oute of fleschly felynge, for þe tyme of hys rauschyng þatt playnly he feyll not in flesche, ne qwhatt ner qwhat is done of his flesch, & zit he is not dede bot qwhikk, for zit þe saule to þe body gifys lyfe— And on þis maner sayntis sum tyme ar rauschyd to þer profett & oþer mens lernyng, als paul, rauschyd to þe þird hevyn; And on þis maner synnar also in visyon sumtyme ar rauyshyd, þat þai may se Ioys off sayntis & paynes of dampnede for þer correccion, And oþer als we rede of many. ¶ An oþer maner of rauschyng þer is þat is lyfting of mynde in-to god be contemplacion; And þis maner of rausching is in all þat ar parfyte lufars of god, & in none bot in þame þat lufys god. / & well þis is cald a rauschyng als þe todyr, ffor with a violens it is doyne & als wer agayns kynde, & truly it is abowne kynde þat, of a fowle synnar, may be a child fulfyld with gostly Ioy in to god borne. Þis maner of rauschyng is to be desiryd & to be lufyd.<sup>[53]</sup>

[53] Richard Rolle, *The Fire of Love, and the Mending of Life or the Rule of Living*, ed. Ralph Harvey, EETS OS 106 (London, 1896), pp. 85–86.

[54] Cf. "Uno quidem modo quo quis extra sensum carnis ita rapitur, ut penitus tempore raptus non sentiat quicquid in carne uel de carne agatur"; *The Incendium Amoris of Richard Rolle of Hampole*, ed. Margaret Deanesly (Manchester, 1915), p. 254.

[55] Christ, John and Paul are mentioned as authorities that can describe hell (III. 1647). These references have been tentatively identified as referring to "crying and gnashing of teeth" in Matthew, the Last Judgement in the Apocalypse, and the *Visio Sancti Pauli*. See Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Friar's, Summoner's and Pardoner's Tales from The Canterbury Tales*, ed. N. R. Havely (New York, 1976), p. 134. However, they can also be regarded as the list of those who had intellectual visions, not only of hell but of something more profound. In the fourteenth-century Middle English version of the Apocalypse, the cases of Paul and John are explained, after Augustine, as examples of the intellectual sight, the third vision that comes after physical and spiritual sights. Cf. *An English Fourteenth Century Apocalypse Version with a Prose Commentary*, ed. Elis Fridner (Lund, 1961), p. 3. As one does not know whether Paul was taken up to the third heaven in body or in spirit (2 Cor. 12: 2–3), Paul qualifies as the example of both types of ravishment.

[56] "and after whanne he is visitid and is taken up from alle ertheli and fleisschli affeccionnes, from veyn thoughtis and veyn ymaginacions of alle bodili thynges, and as it were mykil ravysschid out of the bodili wittes and thanne bi the grace of the Holi Gost is illumyned for to see bi undirstoondyng soothfastnesse, whiche is God, and also goostli thynges, with a soft swete brennande love in hym, so perfightli that bi ravysschyng of this love the soule is ooned for the tyme and conformyd to the ymage of the Trinité"; Walter Hilton, *The Scale of Perfection*, ed. Thomas H. Bestul (Kalamazoo, MI, 2000), p. 38 (I. 8); The passage is also discussed in Mary Dzon, "Margery Kempe's Ravishment into the Childhood of Christ," *Mediaevalia* 27 (2006): 27–57 (p. 28).

The first type of ravishment is when a person is ravished ("rapitur") out of bodily senses so that while he is rapt ("raptus"), he does not feel anything in the flesh, nor can anything be done by the flesh.<sup>[54]</sup> This ravishment, which can happen to the sinner as well, applies to the vision of the afterlife in which the soul temporarily leaves the body. Paul, who is ravished to the third heaven where the earthly Paradise was thought to be relocated after the Expulsion from Eden (2 Cor. 12:2–3), is given as an example. This seems most appropriate because Paul was ravished not only to the third heaven but also to hell in *Visio Santi Pauli*, as is mentioned in the *Friar's Tale*.<sup>[55]</sup> The second type of ravishment is "lyfting of mynde in-to god be contemplacion" ("eleuacione mentis ad Deum per contemplacionem") which is granted only to perfect lovers of God. Walter Hilton describes it as the third part of contemplation, by which one is enlightened to see spiritual things, as if ravished out of bodily senses.<sup>[56]</sup> In both Rolle and Hilton, ravishment is used here as a metaphor for contemplation, rather than literally as the experience of being transported out of bodily senses. It is this privileged experience of contemplating the divine, of being granted a spiritual vision in this world, that Friar John claims he and some of his brothers experienced in tears.

Friar John further asserts that he and his brothers were awarded this vision for a life of prayer and fasting. They live as Lazarus, not as Dives, emulating the Apostles, and merited this elevated experience by abstinence, just as did Moses and Elias (III. 1885–93) who, like Paul, were both ravished to the third heaven. Elias was in fasting and contemplation before he was ravished in body "by a whirlwind into heaven" (2 Kings 2:11). Elias is mentioned again as the origin of the mendicant order (III. 2116–17). By claiming the descent, Friar John protests the special quality of his vision as ravishment, as is granted only to the followers of the prophet.

However, when Friar John does embark on the exposition on anger, the examples he uses are rather misguided. The three illustrative cases of angry men are all probably taken from *Communiloquium sive summa collationum*, a preaching hand-

[57] Correale and Hamel, *Sources and Analogues of the Canterbury Tales*, 2: 458–61; Robert A. Pratt, “Chaucer and the Hand that Fed Him,” *Speculum* 41 (1966): 619–42 (pp. 627–31).

[58] Edward J. Gallagher, “The *Visio Lazari*, the Cult, and the Old French Life of Saint Lazarus: Overview,” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 90 (1989): 331–39.

[59] “¶ Thyrdly sayd Lazarus. I haue seen in hell a grete caue tenebrous and obscure full of tables lyke bochers stalles or a grete bochery where as yreful men and women were throwe perced with trenchyng and sharpe glayues and groueden knyues wherwith the most horryble and ferefull bochers of hell hewed and detrenched them impyteuously without ceasyng. [F4v]” Quotations are from *The Kalendar of Shepherdes* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1516). STC judges that this edition (STC 22409) is presumably the second edition published in 1516 although the colophon erroneously copied that of the now lost, first edition of 1508.

[60] Penn R. Szittyta, *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton, NJ, 1986), p. 236. On the Pentecost theme in the *Friar’s Tale*, see especially Alan Levitan, “The Parody of Pentecost in Chaucer’s *Summoner’s Tale*,” *University of Toronto Quarterly* 3 (1971): 236–46; Bernard S. Levy, “Biblical Parody in the *Summoner’s Tale*,” *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 11 (1966): 45–60; Penn R. Szittyta, “The Friar as False Apostle: Antifraternal Exegesis and the *Summoner’s Tale*,” *Studies in Philology* 71 (1974): 19–46; V. A. Kolve, “Chaucer’s Wheel of False Religion: Theology and Obscenity in The *Summoner’s Tale*,” in *The Centre and its Compass: Studies in Medieval Literature in Honor of Professor John Leyerle*, ed. Robert A. Taylor, et al. (Kalamazoo, MI, 1993), pp. 265–96; Glending Olson, “The End of *The Summoner’s Tale* and the Uses of Pentecost,” *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 21 (1999): 209–45; John V. Fleming, “The Pentecosts of Four Poets,” in *Speaking Images: Essays in Honor of V. A. Kolve*, ed. R. F. Yeager and Charlotte C. Morse (Asheville, NC, 2001), pp. 111–41; Finlayson, “Chaucer’s *Summoner’s Tale*,” pp. 455–70; Glending Olson, “Measuring the Immeasurable: Farting, Geometry, and Theology in the *Summoner’s Tale*,” *The Chaucer Review* 43 (2009): 414–27.

[61] Raybin, “Goddess Instrumentz,” p. 105.

book by the thirteenth-century Franciscan John of Wales, where they appear in the original context as exempla that warn rather pragmatically against the danger of meddling with an irascible man.<sup>[57]</sup> Inappropriate examples as well as barely concealed self-interest only fuel Thomas’s anger more, so that this meddling friar acting like a devil in disguise, nearly succeeds in ravishing him to hell. Once again what would await him in hell can be inferred from visions of the afterlife, in this case in the fourteenth-century French *Visio Lazari*, which is based on *Elucidarium* often attributed to Honorius Augustodunensis.<sup>[58]</sup> A Middle English version of this vision is included in the early printed editions of the *Kalendar of Shepherdes*, where the punishment for wrath is carried out in a great butchery and it is stated that “[t]he wrathfull man is semblable and lyke vnto a demonacle, the whiche hath the deuyl within hym” [F5r].<sup>[59]</sup> Thomas, who is later referred to as a demoniac (III. 2240), is indeed in danger of becoming one, that is, being ravished in body by the devil, as he “wax wel ny wood for ire” (III. 2121) and willfully commits an act of blasphemy somewhat more serious than cursing one’s horse.

The blasphemous gift of Thomas can also be regarded as another instance of ravishment. While the parody of the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost at the end of the *Summoner’s Tale* has been much discussed, Penn Szittyta, demonstrating that the allusions to Pentecost extend to Moses and Elias, who were both regarded as Pentecostal figures, points out that “Thomas’s mock ‘yifte’ of wind is a parodic reversal of the gift bestowed by God at Pentecost, which also appeared in a wind”.<sup>[60]</sup> With regard to this gift, we may refer to a passage in the *Prologue to Prioress’s Tale*:

O mooder Mayde, O mayde Mooder free!  
O bussh unbrent, brennyng in Moyses sighte,  
That ravyshest down fro the Deitee,  
Thurgh thyn humblesse, the Goost that in th’alighte,  
Of whos vertu, whan he thyn herte lighte,  
Conceyved was the Fadres sapience,  
Help me to telle it in thy reverence! (VII. 467–73)

The Virgin Mary “ravished” down the Holy Spirit from God by her humility, so that Christ, the Wisdom of God, may be conceived. In a similar manner, the gift of wind is here ravished down from the angry Thomas not by humility but by the pride and hypocrisy of Friar John.

While Thomas probably let out his anger to some extent by the hilarious revenge, the windy gift in turn makes Friar John almost bestial for anger, as “a wood leon” (III. 2152) or “a wilde boor” (III. 2159). The lion is a recurring image that first appeared at the moralizing end of the *Friar’s Tale* signifying the devil, and in the *Summoner’s Tale* it was used by Friar John himself to warn against anger and tyranny: “Withinne thyn hous ne be thou ne leon” (III. 1989). As Raybin indicates, “Friar John’s inability to gain control over his debilitating anger conforms to the idea of diabolic influence”.<sup>[61]</sup> Unlike Thomas, Friar John has no opportunity to assuage his anger, because the lord and the lady to whom he speaks about the outrage are intrigued by the episode and are less disposed to share his anger. Because his wrath remains contained in himself, we may say Friar John is in danger of behaving worse than a demoniac, as *Visio Lazari* says:

the wrathfull man is tourmented by wrathe / and dooth often tymes

worse than the domynyacle / for without pacyence they bete the one with the other sayenge Iniuryes / reproches / velanyes / and gyue themselfe to the deuyll body and soule / and say and do many unlawfull and domageable thynges by wrathe. [F5r-v; my emphasis]

The *Summoner's Tale* closes with our realization that it is Friar John himself who is in the greatest danger of being ravished by the devil in body and soul, more so than the bedridden Thomas and at least just as much as the summoner was earlier. There is a systematic build-up to this final scene by a series of references to ravishment --from the *ars moriendi* iconography of an angry sick man, the ravishing vision of a dead child, and to the Pentecostal gift ravished down to the friar-- that culminate in the possibility of the angry Friar John being ravished body and soul to hell.

The *Summoner's Tale* stands as a wing of a triptych that is opened, facing the other wing which is the *Friar's Tale*, with the *Summoner's Prologue* as the central panel. The *Prologue* provides a brief but concrete example of the vision of hell that functions as a key narrative to allow the closely interrelated reading of the two tales as dealing with the immanent danger of ravishment in body and soul to hell. There is a constant presence of a devilish figure throughout the two tales; he has been there as dishonest servants of religion, the disguised devil who is also a guide to hell, the irritating friar at the bedside, and even as the angry sick man who pushes Friar John's wrath to the very limit by a hilarious trick. At the same time, every major character is faced with the inherent danger of being ravished; while some of them are actually ravished to hell, the others make a narrow escape without their knowledge. Though not dealing with the afterlife in descriptive details as did Dante or the popular genre of the vision of the afterlife, both tales tell how one is constantly in the dangerous liminal situation between damnation and salvation, between being physically ravished to hell by the devil and being carried to heaven by angels in mystical ravishment.

Keio University  
Tokyo, Japan