MEDIEVAL PROSOPOGRAPHY

HISTORY AND COLLECTIVE BIOGRAPHY

VOLUME 34
2019

Medieval Prosopography

History and Collective Biography

Volume 34
2019

Edited by
George T. Beech, Valerie L. Garver,
Amy Livingstone, Jonathan R. Lyon,
Alan V. Murray, and Joel T. Rosenthal

MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo

ISSN 0198-9405 (print)
ISSN 2381-8700 (online)

Medieval Institute Publications is a program of
The Medieval Institute, College of Arts and Sciences

Western Michigan University

Contents

Articles

Book Reviews

Royal *comestabuli* and Military Control in the Sicilian Kingdom: A Prosopographical Contribution to the Study of Italo-Norman Aristocracy

Hervin Fernández-Aceves
Lancaster University

Abstract: When the Sicilian monarchy was established after years of conflict, King Roger II began to consolidate his authority on the Italian peninsula. The establishment of titles for the organization and control of the continental provinces has been noted by several scholars as an instrumental feature of the kingdom's social arrangement. Yet, contemporary scholarship has dismissed the royal *comestabuli* as unimportant social agents, either as "officials" documented in the *Catalogus Baronum* or as territorial lords. As a result, several questions surrounding the issue remain unanswered: to what extent did the local, lesser aristocracy shape the kingdom's effective social, and military, control over Southern Italy, and who were the nodal characters that allow us to discern this process? Was a *comestabulia* a fixed administrative district, or rather a type of social authority? Although in this limited space a finished picture cannot be presented, this article offers the results of a recent prosopographical exploration of South Italian sources for the Norman period. By taking the *comestabuli* as a starting point, I study the intermediary position that particular barons held as both royal agents and para-comital supervisors of the military contingents levied from the kingdom's aristocracy. This article attempts not only to shed some light on this almost ignored class of functionaries, but also to further explore the social roles established amongst the Italo-Norman nobility.

IN THE WAKE OF the creation of the Sicilian monarchy, and the long conflict that extended from 1130 for almost a decade, King Roger II was ready to reorganize his peninsular dominions, especially the constitutional provinces of the duchy of Apulia and the Principality of Capua (also known as the Terra di Lavoro). According to the chronicle of Romuald of Salerno, after Roger II overcame and destroyed enemies and traitors—both rebellious barons and imperial forces—and was accepted

into the pope's grace, he "instituted chamberlains [*camerarii*] and justiciars [*iustitiarii*] throughout all the land, promulgated laws newly drafted by him, and removed evil customs from their midst, in order to preserve the peace."[1] The institution of titles for the organization and control of the peninsular province appears hence to have been an instrumental feature of the kingdom's social arrangement.[2] However, in Norman Italy, after the kingdom's creation, there was no actual discernible, fixed form of central authority that would embed the higher nobility within an established administration.

A problematic emphasis has been traditionally laid on state, state-formation, kingship, and structures of authority, as well as administrative "systems" in the Kingdom of Sicily, for instance by Jamison, Marongiu, Takayama, and Johns.[3] Likewise, the gaze of many researchers, from Cahen to Carocci, continues to be fixed on "feudalism" with its critiques of landholding, lordship, and settlement patterns.[4] For example, the so-called royal assembly of Silva Marca has become an almost undeniable fact adopted by many scholars. As suggested by Jamison and advocated by Cuozzo, this idea assumes the existence of a constitutional assembly at which King Roger gathered all the men of the realm in 1142 at Silva Marca in order to introduce a new central administrative system for the entire kingdom. Whereas Jamison has focused more on the role that these hypothetical assemblies played in the construction of a feudal language, to be implemented and enforced with the *Catalogus Baronum*, Cuozzo has

[1] *Romualdi Salernitani Chronicon*, ed. Carlo A. Garufi, RIS, 7, 2nd ed. (Città di Castello: S. Lapi, 1935), p. 226.

[2] On the arrangement of the peninsular aristocracy and the usage of the comital title after the rebellions of the 1130s, see Hervin Fernández-Aceves, "The Re-Arrangement of the Nobility Under the Hauteville Monarchy: The Creation of the South Italian Counties," *Ex Historia* 8 (2016): 58–90 (pp. 68–77).

[3] Evelyn M. Jamison, "The Norman Administration of Apulia and Capua: More Especially Under Roger II and William I, 1127–1166," *PBSR* (1913): 211–481; Antonio Marongiu, "A Model State in the Middle Ages: The Norman and Swabian Kingdom of Sicily," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 6.3 (1964): 307–20; Hiroshi Takayama, *The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993); Jeremy Johns, *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Dīwān* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[4] Claude Cahen, *Le régime féodal de l'Italie normande* (Paris: Geuthner, 1940); Sandro Carocci, *Signorie di Mezzogiorno: Società rurali, poteri aristocratici e monarchia (XII–XIII secolo)* (Rome: Viella, 2014).

emphasized that it was in the assembly of Silva Marca where the centralizing design was enforced against the counts of the kingdom, and that this design entailed the systematic creation of a new feudal structure called a county in the two continental provinces of Apulia and Capua.[5] This administrative system for the entire kingdom allegedly included the establishment of a regular military service, the creation and reorganization of counties, and the introduction of "feudalism."[6] As a result, it became commonplace in South Italian historiography to assume that the county was a deliberate and designed creation of a centralizing monarchy in 1142, without careful regard for the available evidence on the counts' presence and activities.[7] However, as I argue here, this premise raises fundamental questions about the chronology of the South Italian local military commanders, and the documented political and military role played by the aristocracy.

The diverse royal functionaries attested in the surviving documentation appear to keep mutating, and the control exercised by the royal court would only start to consolidate and be widely documented on the basis of the actual role played by the peninsular nobility and local lords. The

[5] Evelyn M. Jamison, "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo ed Archivio Muratoriano* 83 (1971): 1–63 (pp. 15–17); Errico Cuozzo, *"Quei maledetti normanni": Cavalieri e organizzazione militare nel mezzogiorno normanno* (Naples: Guida, 1989), p. 108.

[6] Jamison, "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum," p. 15; Errico Cuozzo, "'Milites' e 'testes' nella contea normanna di Principato," *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 88 (1979): 121–64 (p. 150); Errico Cuozzo, "Prosopografia di una famiglia feudale normanna: I Balvano," *ASPN* 98 (1980): 61–80 (pp. 79–81); Errico Cuozzo, "La contea di Montescaglioso nei secoli XI–XIII," *ASPN* 103 (1985): 7–37 (p. 29); Cuozzo, *Quei maledetti normanni*, pp. 105–13; Jean M. Martin, *La Pouille du VI^e^ au XII^e^ siècle*, Collection de l'École française de Rome, 179 (Rome: École française de Rome, 1993), pp. 770–95; Graham A. Loud, "Continuity and Change in Norman Italy: The Campania during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Journal of Medieval History* 22.4 (1996): 313–43 (pp. 333–37); Joanna H. Drell, *Kinship & Conquest: Family Strategies in the Principality of Salerno during the Norman Period, 1077–1194* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 44–45.

[7] For example, Dione R. Clementi, "Definition of a Norman County in Apulia and Capua," in *Catalogus Baronum: Commentario*, by Errico Cuozzo, FSI, 101.2 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984), pp. 377–84; Martin, *La Pouille*, pp. 770–93; Laurent Feller, "The Northern Frontier of Norman Italy, 1060–1140," in *The Society of Norman Italy*, ed. Alex Metcalfe and Graham A. Loud (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 47–73 (p. 68); Carocci, *Signorie di Mezzogiorno*, pp. 142–43; Drell, *Kinship & Conquest*, pp. 44–45.

"royal state," as it existed at least in the peninsular provinces, consisted of the image of a recurrently absent monarch, a scattered staff of justiciars, constables, and chamberlains, and a mobile court of the king's justice that appeared at itinerant provincial assemblies. Instead of first approaching the position of these functionaries, including the *comestabuli*, as an office bound to an assumed centralized bureaucracy, one should begin by considering how their social profile was actually built by their documented and intersecting relations and activities.[8]

To what extent did the local aristocracy shape the recently established monarchy and its effective social and military control in Southern Italy, and who were the nodal characters that allow us to discern this process? Was a *comestabulia* a fixed administrative district, or rather a type of social authority? These are ambitious questions, and whilst in this limited space I cannot present a finished picture, in this paper I offer a socio-historical blueprint, with a particular focus on the *comestabuli*. Although their importance has been disregarded by modern scholarship, the royal *comestabuli* provide a precise example of a societal group that appears to be at the center of an emerging and mutating system of military control.[9] As I shall now demonstrate, in the kingdom's contemporary aristocratic society the definitions for the Norman usage of the title *comestabulus*

[8] The survey and hypotheses constructed here attempt to map the intersections of agents of military and political control. This typology for the study of social control is based on the work of Michael Mann, who offers a historical sociology based upon a systematic insistence on the contingency and conjunctural character of history. Mann attempts to trace causal mechanisms and sequences to show how various social structures and circumstances led to specific kinds of changes in the social order. This approach can be summed up in two premises that can be applied for the study of pre-modern political organizations: 1) societies are constituted of multiple overlapping and intersecting socio-spatial networks of power, and 2) a general account of societies, their structure, and history can be most clearly understood, independently of any fixed institutional framework, in terms of the interrelations of sources of power: ideological, economic, military, and political relationships. Michael Mann, *A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760. The Sources of Social Power 1*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 1–34; *An Anatomy of Power: The Social Theory of Michael Mann*, ed. John A. Hall and Ralph Schroeder (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

[9] For example, the royal *comestabuli* are not discussed either in Takayama's important general reference work on the kingdom's administration (*The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily*), or in a recent article about the *Catalogus Baronum*. James Hill, "The Catalogus Baronum and the Recruitment and Administration of the Armies of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily: A Re-Examination," *Historical Research* 86.231 (2013): 1–14.

and the circumscription of *comestabulia* emerge as an obscure but crucial societal aspect of the monarchy's control of the nobility on the mainland. The prosopographical exploration of those connected to the title of *comestabulus* presented here will shed some light not only on this almost ignored class of royal functionaries, but also on the social roles established amongst the Italo-Norman aristocracy.

The Legal and Social Context of a Key Prosopographical Source: The *Catalogus Baronum*

Before examining the sources themselves and the information that can be extracted from them, it is necessary to first analyze their context and relevance. Alongside the charters, a key document employed in this exploration is the *Quaternus magne expeditonis*, a contemporary record present in the compendium known as the *Catalogus Baronum*. This official document has been identified as a general register of the military service owed to the central *curia* for the *auxilium magne expeditionis*.[10] The sole manuscript of the *Catalogus* was an Angevin copy that was destroyed in 1943, when the contents of the Archivio di Stato of Naples, then transferred to Nola, were burned. Capasso originally placed the composition date of its prototype, the *quaternus originalis* as it were, between 1155 and 1169.[11] Jamison subsequently corrected this time range to 1150 to 1168, based on the premise that the essential purpose of the *Quaternus* was not simply to provide a register of military service, but more importantly to organize the levy of the *auxilium magne expeditionis* that might have been summoned in 1150 and later, ca. 1167.[12] The *Quaternus* provides information concerning the provision of armed forces for military service in Apulia and the Terra di Lavoro, at least theoretically. Despite the multiple problems that this source presents—the loss of the original and only known manuscript, the apparent *lacunae*, the manuscript's tradition through Swabian and Angevin copyists, and the still debatable purpose and date of its composition—the *Quaternus* provides a rich and instructive starting

[10] Evelyn M. Jamison, "Foreword," in *Catalogus Baronum*, FSI, 11 (Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1972), 1:xv–xxiii.

[11] Bartolomeo Capasso, *Sul catalogo dei feudi e dei feudatarii delle provincie napoletane sotto la dominazione Normanna: Memoria* (Naples: Stamperia della Regia Università, 1870), pp. 293–371.

[12] Jamison, "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum," p. 3.

point from which to approach the organization of the kingdom's lordships during the mid-twelfth century, and the territorial changes and social distinctions introduced with the Norman presence.

The contemporary terminology reveals some of the distinctions that existed within the kingdom's aristocracy. It was not uncommon in both royal and comital charters to include an invocation that addressed the king's and the counts' own *fideles*, *bones homines*, *barones*, and *milites*. These terms covered a wide range of social groups and classes, and the exact boundaries between these categories is not always made clear. However, one must note the differentiation between nobility and lesser barons. The language in what appears to have been part of Roger II's legislation sheds some light on the matter.

The Vatican version of the collection of ordinances that contain the legislation of Roger II—better known, albeit inaccurately, as his assizes or constitutions of Ariano—includes an exposition of circumstances as a prologue, and in its first sentence Roger II called upon his *proceres* to recognize the glory and generosity of God. *Proceres* was an umbrella term that referred to the kingdom's nobility generally, and not exclusively to the members of the peninsular upper aristocracy and the comital class. King Roger's legislation employs more specific terminology to refer to the social groups to whom he directed the alleged legislation. The second ordinance, or "assize," of the same Vatican *codex* commanded the "princes, counts, barons and all our faithful subjects" ("principes, comites, barones et omnes nostri fideles") to defend and protect all the possessions of the churches—this categorization is omitted in the equivalent ordinance of the Montecassino version. The following ordinance (third in the Vatican version, second in the Montecassino *codex*) was a general admonition to treat one's subjects decently, especially in matters of taxation, and was addressed to "greater and lesser barons" as well as "princes, counts, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and all those who have subject to them citizens, burgesses, peasants, and men of any sort" ("principes, comites, barones maiores atque minores, archiepiscopos, episcopos, abbates, cunctos denique qui subditos habent cives, burgenses, rusticos, sive cuiuscumque professionis homines"). Conversely, the Montecassino version referred only to the princes, counts, barons, and all those who have men subject to them ("principes, comites et barones omnesque dominos subiectos"). The social terminology varied again in the next ordinance, which ordered the king's "princes, counts, all the barons, archbishops, bishops, and abbots" ("principes nostros, comites, barones universos, archiepiscopos, episcopos,

abbates") not to alienate, grant or sell, or diminish in whole or in part anything belonging to the *regalia*.[13] Despite all the variations, it appears that the effect of these diverse legal categorizations was to differentiate between the members of society who ruled others and those who were subservient. Indeed, overlordship is the key concept around which the legal and social terminology of the South Italian aristocracy can be understood. The fundamental difference between major and lesser lords is that the former were overlords of other barons. Using the terminology of the *Catalogus*, a major baron held demesne property (i.e., *feuda in demanio*) and was placed above barons who held *feuda* from him *in servitio*. Therefore, the subjects of this study on nobility are those identified as overlords on the mainland.

The entries in the documents of the *Catalogus* clearly differentiate between the tenancy and the actual service due for the *magna expeditio*. Almost every entry presents the details of what each baron holds as patrimonial responsibility, which I will henceforth refer to as a "tenancy unit." These tenancy units are generally presented in the form of *feuda*, territorial units valued in terms of *milites*. The accepted view is that the numerical figure indicated in the *Quaternus* for a *feudum*, sporadically referred to in the document as *feudum proprium*, was the agreed figure of service decided on enfeoffment.[14] At this point I am not interested in a discussion of the actual validity of the general historiographical models of feudal and vassalage institutions, but simply wish to demonstrate that the contemporary terminology and the unrefined structure exposed in the textual sources are more useful and straightforward concepts than the traditional vocabulary employed to categorize the so-called feudal system.[15]

Previously, military service in the Lombard principalities had been a matter of personal status, and not dependent on the tenure of property.[16]

[13] Francesco Brandileone, *Il diritto romano nelle leggi normanne e sveve del regno Sicilia* (Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1884), pp. 94, 96–97, 119–20; Gennaro M. Monti, "Il testo e la storia esterna delle assise normanne," in *Studi di storia e di diretto in onore di Carlo Calisse*, 3 vols. (Milan, 1940), 1:295–348 (pp. 309, 311–12).

[14] Jamison, "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum," pp. 6–8; Cahen, *Le régime féodal*, pp. 41–51, 67; Martin, *La Pouille*, pp. 754–62.

[15] Cf. Cahen, *Le régime féodal*, pp. 51–54.

[16] Graham A. Loud, "Norman Traditions in Southern Italy," in *Norman Tradition and Transcultural Heritage: Exchange of Cultures in the "Norman" Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, ed. Stefan Burkhardt and Thomas Foerster (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 35–56 (p. 51).

This changed with the arrival of the figure of the "knight" (*miles*) brought by the transalpine invaders, and the subsequent introduction of the *feudum*, a rather ambiguous unit of tenancy by which land holdings could be transacted, or for which a service, often non-military, could be extracted from the holder (i.e., the baron). The term *feudum* can be attested, for example, in a series of surviving South Italian charters from the late twelfth century, used to refer to small-scale agricultural holdings for which rent or some type of professional service was rendered.[17] One must note, however, that the use of this term is less evident in those dominions that had been under Byzantine rule (i.e., Adriatic Apulia), which had a stronger basis in Roman-style tax exactions. The word *vasallus* was never attested in Apulia, although the presence of *fideles* attributed to respective *domini* or *seniores* was well attested in Southern Italy since the eleventh century.[18] There were also other non-territorial units, such as villains, mills, and city houses, which although recorded in the *Quaternus*, do not attest a valued assessment in terms of *milites*. Both the tenants holding directly from the *curia* and the barons holding their units from other barons *in servitio* are recorded in the *Quaternus*, presenting thus a hierarchized distribution of tenancy units.

Apart from the detailed recorded tenancies, almost every entry in the *Quaternus* specifies the service offered by each baron in terms of number of *milites*, occasionally including an additional provision of *servientes* (i.e., foot soldiers).[19] In a handful of entries there are even *balliste* or *ballistarii* offered to the army.[20] The service figures, often recorded as objects

[17] *Chronicon Casauriense, auctore Iohanne Berardi*, ed. Lodovico A. Muratori, RIS, 2 (Milan: Societas Palatina, 1726), cols. 1010–11 (February 1165); *Codice diplomatico verginiano*, ed. Placido M. Tropeano, vol. 5, *1161–1169* (Montevergine: Edizioni Padri Benedettini, 1982), no. 406 (June 1161); *Codice diplomatico normanno di Aversa*, ed. Alfonso Gallo (Naples: Luigi Lubrano editore, 1926), nos. 113 pp. 210–11 (March 1181), 125 pp. 233–34 (January 1184), 143 pp. 270–72 (November 1191); *Le pergamene dell'archivio diocesano di Salerno (841–1193)*, ed. Anna Giordano (Salerno: Laveglia & Carlone, 2015), no. 154 pp. 355–57 (March 1170).

[18] Martin, *La Pouille*, pp. 754–62. On the matter of the documented appearance of the *milites* in Apulia after 1054, see Martin, pp. 749–54.

[19] It is important to note that the term *pedites armati* is employed as, what it seems to be, an exchangeable voice for *servientes*. *Catalogus Baronum*, ed. Evelyn M. Jamison, FSI, 11 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1972), ¶¶ 291 p. 47, 438 p. 80, 445 p. 82, 871 p. 157.

[20] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶¶ 344 pp. 57–58, 806 p. 148, 839 p. 153, 864 p. 156, 982

to the verb *offero*—seldom using verbs such as *debeo servire*, *debeo dare* in its place—indicate the military force that had to be provided in case the army needed to be mobilized *pro auxilio regni*. This figure was the result of adding up the value of the *feuda* and an additional figure referred to in the document as *augmentum*.[21] The structure of military service as reflected in the *Quaternus* seems to have rested upon a previously established structure of tiered tenancy. Against the model of the accepted view, which essentially insists on the existence of a comprehensive system of "feudal" institutions—put forward by Cahen and revised by Jamison—the *feuda* figures might represent instead the results of a preliminary land or wealth survey held by each tenant. On the other hand, the *offero* figures stand as a speculative total of the military service to be levied by the royal *curia* from the recorded barons.[22] Military services, for example, were apparently levied by the overlords themselves, as is indicated by the fact that the figures for the subtenants' military dues were included in the overlords' final total service. However, thus far, no model has convincingly clarified the existence of two distinct figures, both computed using the *milites* as units. I argue that the register therefore presents two distinct but overlapping structures in which the given figures express different types of measures for different purposes, whilst using the same unit, i.e., *miles*. Whereas the *milites* of the *feuda* appear to reflect a negotiated assessment of each unit's value, the *milites* that each baron is recorded to have offered must indicate the actual military service of men to be provided to the peninsular royal army. For example, despite the fact that numerous *feuda* on the register

p. 176. These soldiers were most likely crossbowmen; *ballista* usually translates as crossbow, and *ballistarii* as something pertaining to crossbows, or artillery. Jan F. Niermeyer and Co van de Kieft, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), p. 79.

[21] The term *augmentum* was seldom employed in other contemporary texts, but it is attested in the late eleventh century, in a document from the Abbey of St. Sophia in Benevento (June 1076–September 1091), relative to Fiorentino: *Vat. Lat.* 13491, no. 9. Enzo Matera, "Le più antiche carte del monastero di S. Sofia di Benevento. Codice Vaticano latino 13491 (aa. 784–1330). Saggio di edizione" (Ph.D. diss., Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza," 1985); *Les chartes de Troia. Édition et étude critique des plus anciens documents conservés à l'Archivio Capitolare. I (1024–1266)*, ed. Jean M. Martin, Cod. Dipl. Pugliese, 21 (Bari: Società di Storia Patria per la Puglia, 1976), p. 759n508. On this collection of documents from St. Sophia in the Vatican, see Paola Massa, "L'archivio dell'abbazia di Santa Sofia di Benevento," *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* 61 (2016): 433–66 (pp. 464–65).

[22] On this suggestion, see Hill, "The Catalogus Baronum," pp. 7–10.

are described as fractional *milites*, almost all the service figures are given in whole amounts.[23] One should differentiate between these two types of relations in order to understand both the purpose behind the *Quaternus* and the social structures that the text presents.

Although it was drawn from the pre-existing tenancy structure made up of the aristocratic strata in Apulia and the Terra di Lavoro, this special military levy for the *magna expeditio* stood alongside it as a distinct structure of social power. The registers in the *Catalogus* were a record not of pre-existing obligations but of a mandatory service on the basis of negotiated appraisal for each of the baron's *feuda*.[24] The document shows the names of the barons and the amount of military service due from their tenure to the king. The *Quaternus*, therefore, presents the numbers of the military contingents that each of the recorded entities owed to the king's army in the mainland provinces. Some entries even explicitly refer to the military service owed *pro auxilio magne expeditionis*, mostly when recording the personal service owed by individuals with no recorded tenancy.[25] A similar, more elementary system of conditional tenancy appears to have been in use before 1150. Alexander of Telese provides some examples of this. First, in 1129, Robert of Grandmesnil reportedly pleaded with Roger II to be allowed to return home across the Alps from the campaign in Apulia because his *feudum* was too small to sustain the burden of military service laid upon it. Since Roger II did not endow him with a richer *feudum*, Robert deserted the host. Also, we are told that in 1131 Richard (of Rupecanina), Count Rainulf's brother, claimed proudly that he held the city of Avellino and the *castrum* of Mercogliano as a freehold, in that he rendered no service for this lordship to the king or any overlord.[26]

[23] Only three entries of the entire record express military service in fractional figures. *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶¶ 224–25 p. 37, 240 p. 39. Such a minuscule anomaly might have been, most likely, the result of a transmission or scribal mistake, and not necessarily the proof of a fiscal system or a "fractional" military service. Cf. Cahen, *Le régime féodal*, pp. 71–73.

[24] Cf. Donald J. Matthew, *The Norman Kingdom of Sicily* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 145–46. See also Loud, "Norman Traditions in Southern Italy," pp. 52–53.

[25] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶¶ 282–90 pp. 46–47, 408 p. 73, 490–91 p. 93, 505 p. 95, 516 p. 96, 546 p. 101, 691–92 p. 122, 823 p. 150.

[26] *Alexandri Telesini abbatis Ystoria Rogerii regis Sicilie, Calabrie atque Apulie*, ed. Ludovica De Nava, FSI, 112 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1991), bks. 1 chap. 17 p. 16, 2 chap. 13 p. 30.

The language of the *Quaternus* suggests that the kingdom's institutional organization required that the tenants of the *feuda* render to the king's army a certain agreed number of "knights" (*milites*) or "auxiliary infantry" (*servientes/pedites armatos*). This figure was proportional to the value of the tenancy unit as assessed by the royal court officials (e.g., *camerarii*), and agreed between the baron and the royal court. This case-by-case assessment was universally expressed in numbers of *milites*. The *augmentum*, on the other hand, was a figure used to translate the value of the held *feuda* into an actual figure of *milites* and, if the amassed lordships were rich enough, of *servientes* that ought to be levied for the king's army. The *augmentum* was not always clearly recorded, and, on many occasions, it was simply omitted. Conversely, the final number of soldiers that the baron "offered" or "presented" (*obtulit*) was expressed after the expression *cum augmentum*. It appears that the military service essentially consisted of doubling the value of the barons' tenure in *milites*, and in instances when foot soldiers were also offered, a fixed number of *servientes* was added to the final yield. Thus, in the vast majority of the entries in which the *augmentum* was explicitly recorded, this figure was a duplicate of the *feuda*'s value in *milites*.

Although the different barons would have been the overlords and masters of these military units, their command must have been a privilege exclusive to the king. Perhaps the territorial lords were not only in charge of summoning and providing the contingents that made up the great army of the king; they must also have been responsible for ensuring the *milites*' readiness and inspecting the weaponry and equipment.[27] Even though the recorded barons must have led their own contingent of knights into the peninsular army, they would have been under the direct command of either a royal *comestabulus* or their immediate overlord. In turn, the regional *comestabuli* and major overlords (i.e., the counts) must have been commanded by a royal general, such as the chancellor or the *magnus capitaneus/comestabulus*, and, naturally, the king himself.

This could have also been an ad hoc solution for the kingdom's military control, constructed upon both the old Lombard concept of personal armed obligation and the newly introduced concept of *feudum*. It does not signify by any means that the South Italian *feuda* were units of military service; rather, the *feudum* was a unit of institutional and conditional

[27] Jamison, "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum," pp. 3–23; Cuozzo, "Balvano," pp. 80–81; Cuozzo, "Montescaglioso," p. 29.

tenancy, the building block of an economic structure that allowed for both the delimitation of the object held (e.g., a piece of land, a town, or a mill) and its use in individual transactions and military administration. The structure of the *Quaternus magne expeditionis* reveals two overlapping systems: a military layer above an economic one. Just as *feudum* provided a basic reference to the royal court for the computing and demand of the military levy, other social actors employed these tenancy units for different economic and political activities.

The *Quaternus magne expeditionis* records use of the title "constable" (*comestabulus*) and a territorial circumscription named "constabulary" (*comestabulia*). Even if the title was well known in medieval Europe, the possible duties of a *comestabulus* varied considerably, from those of a commander-in-chief to those of a person responsible for maintaining stables and armaments. Scandone, for example, defined the royal *comestabulus* in Norman Italy as simply a "cavalry general" (*generale di cavalleria*).[28] These concepts, however, can be misleading if read under assumptions drawn from distinct temporal and spatial contexts, such as the contemporary duchy of Normandy or the Carolingian Empire. The use of this title in the *Quaternus*, and the social activities of its bearers, suggest that the royal *comestabuli* in the continental territories of the Sicilian kingdom were employed in a more specific way.

Having examined the context and terminology of the *Catalogus Baronum*, I now turn to the usage and application of the title *comestabulus* and the construction of the idea of the *comestabulia*, both obscure but crucial societal aspects of the court's control over the nobility on the mainland.

The Usage of the Title of *comestabulus* in Norman Italy

The reorganization of the mainland provinces during and after the civil war brought with it the need to forge new relationships between the royal court and the territorial nobility who held positions of authority in the mainland provinces. A royal commander in charge of maintaining direct communication with forces that were spread out across the provinces, and which were thus not under direct royal authority, could therefore improve the king's capacity for military control. In the early 1130s, Roger II started to reorganize the military command to help defend the peninsular domin-

[28] Francesco Scandone, *L'alta valle del Calore. II. Il feudo e il municipio di Montella dal dominio dei Normanni a quello della Casa d'Aragona* (Palermo, 1916), pp. 28–29.

ions of the newly created kingdom. However, the lack of any contemporary explicit indication of a plan suggests that, in order to face the shifting challenges of the first turbulent decade, the reorganization consisted of a series of contingent innovations and modifications, installing as a result positions with ambiguous definitions. One of the first cases of this process is found in Falco of Benevento's *Chronicon.* According to the Beneventan notary, Roger II appointed in 1132 a *comestabulus* at Montefusco in order to strike fear into the city, and ultimately protect the royal interests from the urban party in favor of Pope Innocent II.[29] The earliest known diplomatic evidence for the royal *comestabuli* of Montefusco is found in a donation of 1137, in which a certain individual named Pagan *filius Andree* calls himself *comestabulus domini regis Montisfusculis.*[30] These functionaries are further mentioned at intervals in documents throughout the period.[31]

This is a convenient moment to elaborate on the fact that one of the earliest uses of the title *comestabulus* in contemporary sources for Norman Italy is found in Falco's *Chronicon*, years before the creation of the Sicilian kingdom: when Pope Paschal II appointed Landulf de Greca as *comestabulus Beneventanorum*,[32] in order to make the city "safe and kept so much in the future from the disorders which often menaced it and from the frequent conspiracies fomented against the lord pope."[33] Falco, furthermore, refers multiple times to a position called the *honor comestabiliae*, or simply the *comestabilia*, as a sort of a "constableship" appointed by either the pope or the archbishop of Benevento.[34] This same Landulf is subsequently presented in 1119 as the *comestabulus* of Montefusco, although there is no clear explanation of how he acquired such an honor.[35] However, Falco

[29] *Falcone di Benevento. Chronicon Beneventanum: Città e feudi nell'Italia dei normanni*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998), p. 146.

[30] *Codice diplomatico verginiano*, ed. Placido M. Tropeano, vol. 2, *1103–1131* (Montevergine: Edizioni Padri Benedettini, 1978), no. 243 pp. 179–82.

[31] Jamison, "Norman Administration," p. 250n4.

[32] Loud has identified him as the Landulf de Greca mentioned by Cuozzo as the father of the baron Tadeus of Greca, who formerly held a *feudum* precisely at Montefusco. *Roger II and the Creation of the Kingdom of Sicily*, ed. Graham A. Loud (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 134; *Catalogus Baronum: Commentario*, ed. Errico Cuozzo, FSI, 101.2 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984), p. 115.

[33] *Falco*, pp. 6–7; Loud, *Creation of the Kingdom*, p. 134.

[34] *Falco*, pp. 16–31.

[35] *Falco*, pp. 44–45.

does state later that in 1120 some friends of Landulf de Greca requested that the pope allow him, by then a former *comestabulus*, the right to live in the city of Benevento, for Landulf had been living in Montefusco for the previous three years.[36] Throughout Falco's narrative, Landulf is presented as struggling against the Norman threat, the archbishop of Benevento, and the city itself, in order to secure the privileged position within the city's military command he had through the constableship granted originally by the pope. Cardinal priest Gerard granted the same position in 1132, conceived on this occasion as both *honor* and *potestas*, to Rolpoto of St. Eustasius, commander of the city's knights.[37] This appointment was made in order to counter the king's *comestabulus* of Montefusco mentioned earlier. Although the example of the *comestabulus* of Benevento sheds some light on the use of the royal *comestabulus* and *comestabulia* on the peninsula before the arrival of Roger II, it must be considered carefully as an honor within the context of urban military organization in Benevento, rather than an immediate model for the later royal functionary.

Apart from these urban constables, there is another usage of the title *comestabulus* outside of the royal context that also merits attention: the ducal constables in Apulia. The earliest ducal constable identified is Rainulf Brito, baron of St. Agatha, attested as *celeste opitulante grata ducalis comestabulus* in documents from 1086,[38] 1092,[39] and 1095.[40] In all of these documents, Rainulf is recorded together with his son Joel, who in turn is later attested as a ducal constable in a donation he made to Cava in July 1121.[41] Joel's will is recorded the following month, and in this docu-

[36] *Falco*, p. 56.

[37] *Falco*, p. 146.

[38] Cava, *Arm. Mag.* C.7, ed. in Martino Martini, *Feudalità e monachesimo cavense in Puglia, I: Terra di Capitanata (S. Agata di Puglia)* (Martina Franca: Casa Ed. Apulia, 1915), no. 1 pp. 39–41; *Recueil des actes des ducs normands d'Italie (1046–1127). I: Les premiers ducs (1046–1087)*, ed. Léon R. Ménager (Bari: Grafica Bigiemme, 1980), no. 55 pp. 187–91. This charter has been identified as "suspect," and a forgery, at least in its present form. Carmine Carlone, *Falsificazioni e falsari cavensi e verginiani del secolo XIII* (Altavilla Silentina: Edizioni studi storici meridionali, 1984), p. 10; Giovanni Vitolo, *Insediamenti cavensi in Puglia* (Galatina: Congedo, 1984), pp. 83–84.

[39] Gallo, *Cod. Dipl. Aversa*, no. 6 pp. 10–11.

[40] Cava, *Arm. Mag.* D.6, ed. in Martini, no. 4 pp. 43–45.

[41] Cava, *Arm. Mag.* F.19, ed. in Martini, no. 9 pp. 47–48. Carlone has identified the charter as a forgery, but no further explanation is provided. Carlone, *Falsificazioni e falsari*, panel 35.

ment he is again referred to as a *comestabulus*.[42] It is known that Joel was dead by 1127, for his son Richard made a donation to Cava for the memory of his father in 1127, in which he is attested as *celesti largita gratia ducalis comestabulus*.[43] This is the same Richard, son of Rohel (Joel), who later in 1133, after the accession of King Roger, handed the town of St. Agatha over to whomsoever Roger II wished.[44] In addition to this apparent dynasty of ducal constables, there is also the case of Briennus/Brittinus *comestabulus*, who witnessed a series of charters issued by Duke Roger Borsa: one in favor of Venosa (1088), another in favor of Montecassino (1090), and two donations to the bishopric of Melfi (1094 and 1097).[45] Briennus was dead by September 1112, when his widow, daughter of Count Tasso, made a donation to her *vicecomes*.[46]

However, these early examples are still far from the type of royal constables under whom lesser tenants were ordered in the *Quaternus*. During the kingdom's first decade, a time of constant rebellion and foreign threat, Roger II established temporary military leaders who were entrusted with the defense of the mainland territories.[47] According to Jamison, a system was created through the appointment of such commanders, mostly during the time when the king faced the third noble uprising and the imperial-papal league against him. She claimed that the existence of "special officers" at the head of the local forces in Apulia could be traced to the time Robert of Selby retreated to Salerno in 1137.[48] Jamison further-

[42] Cava, *Arm. Mag.* F.20, ed. in Martini, no. 10 pp. 48–50.

[43] Cava, *Arm. Mag.* F.43, ed. in Martini, no. 14 pp. 52–53.

[44] De Nava, *Al. Tel.*, bk. 2 chap. 51 pp. 47–48.

[45] Hubert Houben, *Die Abtei Venosa und das Mönchtum im normannisch-staufischen Süditalien* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995), no. 54 pp. 284–87; Tommaso Leccisotti, *Le colonie cassinesi in Capitanata, IV: Troia* (Montecassino: Vallecchi, 1957), no. 15 pp. 69–71; *Italia sacra sive de Episcopis Italiae*, ed. Ferdinando Ughelli and Nicolò Coleti, 2nd ed., 10 vols. (Venice: Sebastian Coleti, 1721), vol. 7, cols. 923–24.

[46] *Codice diplomatico verginiano*, vol. 2, no. 122 pp. 93–96.

[47] Jamison, "Norman Administration," pp. 250–54.

[48] Robert of Selby had succeeded the late Guarin at the chancery and, thus, as commander in charge of the defense in Capua in 1137. The papal and imperial army dislodged the royal forces, forcing Robert's retreat. For a relevant discussion, see Jamison, "Norman Administration," pp. 252, 257, 271–72. On Robert of Selby, see Erich Caspar, *Roger II (1101–1154) und die Gründung der normannisch-sicilischen Monarchie* (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1904), pp. 302–3; Charles H. Haskins, "England and Sicily in the Twelfth Century," *The English Historical Review* 26.103–4 (1911): 433–47, 641–65 (p. 437); Mario

more suggested that this was followed by the consolidation of a system in which the peninsular territories—at least in Apulia—were divided into "districts," namely, the *comestabulie*, and that the barons in each district were grouped under the command of an appointed constable.[49] Although neither Jamison nor those who have subsequently used her claim provide direct evidence for the existence of those special officers in 1137, they infer the inauguration of the *comestabuli* plan from an incident attested in the Montecassino *Chronica*.[50] The abbot-elect of Montecassino, at the time of the imperial German invasion, narrowly escaped when passing through the Terra Beneventana on his way to meet the German emperor at Lagopesole, being delivered by the inhabitants of Guardia Lombardi into the hands of Robbertus de Morra and the aforementioned *comestabulus* Gilbert de Balvano, "who was in charge of King Roger's army" ("qui exercitui Rogerii regis preerant").[51] Though neither of these commanders is described as *comestabulus* in the chronicle, both are attested in the *Quaternus* as tenants of the region.[52]

Use of the title of *comestabulus* is not subsequently evidenced until the first drafts of the *Quaternus* in 1150. By tracing the social interactions of the *comestabuli* identified earlier, one can note the absence of activities conducted under that title in the decades before and after 1150. These barons are mostly recorded in private documents, such as donations and other transactions during this time. This may indicate a shift in the mechanisms employed by the royal *curia*, mostly after the accession of King William I.

The invasion in the years 1155–1156, together with the concerted action of rebellious barons, provoked a period of unrest that may have forced King William I to rearrange his organization of the peninsula.

Caravale, *Il regno normanno di Sicilia* (Rome: Giuffrè, 1966), p. 149; Horst Enzensberger, *Beiträge zum Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen der normannischen Herrscher Unteritaliens und Siziliens*, Münchener Historische Studien. Abteilung geschichtliche Hilfswissenschaften, 9 (Kallmünz: M. Lassleben, 1971), p. 75; Carlrichard Brühl, *Urkunden und Kanzlei König Rogers II. von Sizilien* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1978), pp. 45–52.

[49] Jamison, "Norman Administration," p. 252.

[50] For example, Takayama, *The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily*, p. 64n84.

[51] *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, ed. Hartmut Hoffmann, MGH SS, 34 (Hanover: Hahn, 1980), bk. 4 p. 571.

[52] Robert of Morra was a lesser tenant than Gilbert of Balvano, having held a *feudum* of two *milites* in Castellione, near the present-day town of Morra de Sanctis, located in the province of Avellino, 55 km SE of Benevento. *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶ 696 p. 123.

According to Pseudo-Falcandus, Count Simon of Policastro was placed in command of a large army in Apulia, together with Chancellor Asclettin.[53] This Simon bore precisely the title of *comestabulus*, as is indicated further on in the same text, in that we are told that Count Simon was called back to Palermo on suspicion of conspiracy, and in his place another *comestabulus* was appointed.[54] It may not be safe to assume that Simon was actually the "master constable" (*magister comestabulus*) in charge of the army of all Apulia and the Terra di Lavoro, rather than simply the constable in charge of the royal household's armed forces.

Although Simon was soon replaced as *comestabulus*, as indicated above, the use of the title in Southern Italy seems to have continued. Gilbert de Balvano was regarded as "royal master constable" (*regius magister comestabulus*), in a judicial confirmation in favor of the monastery of All the Saints at Cuti (just outside of Bari), which was issued on 5 April 1155 by the royal justiciars William of Tivilla and Robert the seneschal.[55] Cuozzo has suggested that the *magister comestabulus* was a new office instituted by William I's government in order to coordinate the command of the army in the region.[56] However, given that Gilbert of Balvano died in 1156, his inclusion in the *Quaternus* can be dated to the composition

[53] *De rebus circa regni Siciliae curiam gestis Epistola ad Petrum de desolatione Siciliae*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo (Florence: Sismel, 2014), pp. 62–65. One of the most important narrative sources for the Norman Kingdom of Sicily is the history attributed to the so-called "Hugo Falcandus" (henceforth Pseudo-Falcandus), which provides a vivid and detailed account of the political machinations and rebellions under William I and the first years of William II (1154–1169). Although the identity of this author remains a mystery, Pseudo-Falcandus's testimony has become, for better or worse, a pillar for the understanding of the Kingdom of Sicily's court affairs and nobility in the second half of the twelfth century. See Graham A. Loud and Thomas Wiedemann, introduction to *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily by "Hugo Falcandus," 1154–69* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), pp. 1–53; Edoardo D'Angelo, "Intellettuali tra Normandia e Sicilia (per un identikit letterario del cosiddetto Ugo Falcando)," in *Cultura cittadina e documentazione. Formazione e circolazione di modelli*, ed. Anna L. Trombetti Budriesi (Bologna: CLUEB, 2009), pp. 325–59; Hervin Fernández-Aceves, "A Relational View of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily and Its Royal Court: The Social Space Constructed by 'Hugo Falcandus'" (MA thesis, Central European University, 2013); Graham A. Loud, "The Image of the Tyrant in the Work of 'Hugo Falcandus,'" *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 57 (2013): 1–20.

[54] *Falcandus*, p. 68.

[55] *Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari. Periodo normanno (1075–1194)*, ed. Francesco Nitti di Vito, Cod. Dipl. Barese, 5 (Bari: V. Vecchi, 1900), no. 112 pp. 190–92.

[56] Cuozzo, "Balvano," p. 65.

of the first draft in 1150.[57] It could be assumed, therefore, that a similar administrative responsibility existed for the command of the levied forces on the peninsula during the latter days of Roger II. Gilbert de Balvano had previously been in command of the royal forces in Apulia in 1137,[58] and soon thereafter his services to the crown were extended through his service as a justiciar (*iustitiarius*), together with Chancellor Robert of Selby, at a court held in Melfi in 1149.[59] Gilbert of Balvano appears to have held *feuda* totaling twenty *milites* and located around the towns of Rocchetta Sant'Antonio, Lacedonia, and Monteverde, east of the Irpina mountainous region, and Valle di Vitalba, 30 km south of Melfi.[60] Gilbert's tenancy area is thus located at the center of Apulia. Although the person recorded as the tenant of these *feuda* is his son, Richard of Balvano, in all likelihood Gilbert was the former tenant, most likely replaced in the 1168 revision. Gilbert's epithetical town and his influential family's place of origin, although not far from this region (40 km south of Valle di Vitalba), was actually in a different area, much closer to the territories of the historical principality of Salerno. His *comestabulia*, instead, was located east of his lands, in the Irpina, and it contained, amongst those of other lesser barons, the dominions of Count Philip of Balvano (Gilbert's nephew), Elias of Gesualdo, and the Conza lordships of the count of Carinola.[61] The seemingly prolific activities of this character may serve as an example of how the royal court was able to implement its military and political agenda in the mainland territories aside from the tenancy structure, where the counts would have been the intermediaries between the Palermitan

[57] *Necrologio del Liber confratrum di S. Matteo di Salerno*, ed. Carlo A. Garufi, FSI, 56 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1922), p. 108.

[58] Giovan B. Prignano, "Historia delle famiglie di Salerno normande" (Cod. 276–77, Biblioteca Angelica, Rome), fol. 108v (a. 1149).

[59] *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, bk. 4 p. 571. Hartmut Hoffmann, "Chronik und Urkunden in Montecassino," *QFIAB* 51 (1971): 93–206.

[60] Cava, *Arm. Mag.* H.10, edited in Carmine Carlone, *Documenti cavensi per la storia di Rocchetta S. Antonio* (Altavilla Silentina: Edizioni Studi Storici Meridionali, 1987), pp. 137–38. *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶ 433 p. 78.

[61] On the origins of the Conza lordship and its attachment to the count of Carinola, see Hervin Fernández-Aceves, "Political Manoeuvring in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily: Civitate and Carinola in the Development of the South-Italian County," *White Rose College of the Arts & Humanities Journal* 2 (2016): 63–73.

curia and the lesser tenants. Gilbert was, nevertheless, soon succeeded by Maio of Bari's brother-in-law, Simon.[62]

Although it previously overlapped with the title of simple *comestabulus* held by Gilbert de Balvano, by the end of William I's reign the figure of *magister comestabulus* seems to have acquired a very distinct meaning from the *comestabulus* as understood in the *Quaternus*. After Gilbert de Gravina, who had been appointed *magister capitaneus totius Apulie et principatus Capue*, was expelled from the realm, the subsequent royal generals on the mainland bore the title of "great constable" (*magnus comestabulus*). It seems clear that the title of master or great constable carried different functions and responsibilities from those of the *comestabulus* of the *Quaternus*. Whereas the *magnus comestabulus* implied a joint command of the armed forces of Apulia and Capua, the royal *comestabulus* seems to have been related to heterogeneous contingent units of barons spread across the land.

The Recorded Presence of the Royal *comestabuli*

The barons explicitly mentioned in the *Quaternus* as *comestabuli* or in charge of a *comestabulia* who are not also counts are: Fragalius of Bitricto, Angoth of Arcis, Guimundus of Montellari, Alfanus the chamberlain, Lampus of Fasanella, Gilbert of Balvano, Rogerius Bursellus, William Scalfonus, Richard son of Richard, and Robert of Quallecta.[63] There are two instances in which a *comestabulus* is also attested as a count: Count Roger of Tricarico, and, in the Abruzzo, Count Bohemund of Manopello. The case of the latter should be understood within the context of the organization of the Abruzzo as an annexed province.[64] These barons comprise the

[62] We are told by Pseudo-Falcandus that the great admiral's power was consolidated during the apparent peace that followed Count Robert's rebellion. Maio of Bari's brother Stephen had risen to the rank of admiral, and his brother-in-law, Simon the seneschal, was appointed "master captain" (*magister capitaneus*) for Apulia and the Terra di Lavoro. *Falcandus*, pp. 88–89.

[63] For the counts that can be documented ca. 1150, see Fernández-Aceves, "The Re-Arrangement of the Nobility," pp. 72–81.

[64] The Abruzzese register of *feuda* and military service in the *Catalogus Baronum* actually constituted a different *quaternion*, with a particular and distinct structure, whose recorded barons appear to have been placed originally under the authority of Bohemund of Tarsia, count of Manopello. No inclusive geographical designation appears in the *Catalogus*, and the name *Aprutium* applied not to the entire province but to a single county and

first identifiable group of *comestabuli* who served as intermediaries between the royal *curia* and the other barons during the mid-twelfth century.

The case of Count Roger of Tricarico is remarkably different from the rest. Although the entry in the *Quaternus* reads "of the constabulary of the county of Tricarico" (*De comestabilia comitatus Tricarici*), Jamison believed that a copyist substituted the words *comitis* and "R"—the initial letter of the name Roger—for *comitatus*.[65] Furthermore, a subsequent addition to this entry indicated that this "comital constabulary" belonged to the so-called principality of Taranto. It seems, hence, that the original *quaternion* grouped the barons of this area under Count Roger I of Tricarico, and not Roger II, son of Robert of Lauro who, by 1150, must have also been appointed royal *comestabulus* by King Roger II. A certain Count Roger held Tricarico from some point after 1143, when Count Geoffrey of Tricarico was attested for the last time, until the last peninsular insurgency against William I's regime, in which he appears to have been involved as a rebel nobleman.[66] It is unclear why Roger II's court would have entrusted the count of Tricarico with the duties of a peninsular *comestabulus*, a situation that the monarch avoided in every other instance.

It should be considered, however, that in 1150 the area around the valleys of the gulf of Taranto (modern Basilicata) mostly comprised scattered lordships: the county of Gravina had not yet been created, Count Geoffrey of Tricarico appears to have either been removed or died, and the count of Montescaglioso had been recently appointed. Perhaps it was not that Count Roger of Tricarico was made a constable, but that the constable in charge of overseeing the region was given the county of Tricarico. Despite the lack of evidence for the early counts of Tricarico, this would explain the origin of Count Roger I of Tricarico. A loyal local baron would have been thus rewarded with comital rank and given a privileged position with which to exercise his royal appointment as regional

diocese. However, the record for all the Abruzzese lands brings out the unity of a region secured under the supervision of the new count of Manopello. According to Jamison, the modern editor of the *Catalogus*, a third scribe took up his pen with the section "on the jurisdiction of Count Bohemund" (*De Justitia Comitis Boamundi …*), with different handwriting and different spelling, and a new and separate *quaternion* began there. *Catalogus Baronum*, p. 183.

[65] *Catalogus Baronum*, p. 18 n. d.

[66] *Rogerii II. Regis Diplomata Latina*, ed. Carlrichard Brühl, Codex Diplomaticus Regni Siciliae, 2 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987), nos. 59 pp. 166–69, 60 pp. 170–72.

military commander. By 1168, the situation in the Basilicata was very different, with the presence of Count Gilbert of Gravina and Count Roger II of Tricarico, son of Robert of Lauro, count of Caserta. Nonetheless, it changed even more after 1169: Tancred of Lecce was given the county of Montescaglioso, together with some additional lordships that would later be known as the county of Lecce. The reference to the principality of Taranto must have been appended to some of the entries in the *Quaternus* when the register was subsequently copied as a territorial indicator of the extent of Tancred of Lecce's county and authority.[67] By the end of the Norman period, Count Tancred of Lecce had become not only the most prominent noble in southern Apulia, but a count and *magnus comestabulus* closely tied to the Sicilian royal court. As such, he must have taken over the regional military duties that Roger of Tricarico once exercised as *comestabulus*.[68]

There are two lesser tenants in the *Quaternus* who are also recorded as *comestabuli*, but without any reference to their overseeing or engagement with the other barons. These tenants are Berengarius of Giso, who has been identified as Peregrinus of Gisay, and Peter Cacapice. Peregrinus/Berengarius "acquired" Viggiano, a *feudum* valued at four *milites* and located in southern Apulia, between the Cilento region and the valleys of what is known today as Basilicata.[69] A subsequent entry in the *Quaternus* attests Berengarius/Peregrinus of Gisay, "constable" (*comestabulus*), as lord of "Sarconem" and "Pertecaram," each one a *feudum* of two *milites*.[70] It is uncertain exactly where these two places were located, but Jamison has suggested that "Sarconem" might be modern Sarconi, and "Pertecaram" the now ruined Torre di Perticara; neither is far from Viggiano, the *feudum*, and both are located in the Agri valley (south of modern Basilicata). Viggiano was also recorded as part of the so-called principality of Taranto, meaning that it was part of the lordships that were originally held directly from the king and subsequently placed under the authority of Count Tancred of Lecce.[71] This same Berengarius was present as a *comestabulus* when the royal

[67] Jamison, "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum," pp. 54–55.

[68] Palumbo has offered an extensive and comprehensive study on Tancred and the county of Lecce. Pier F. Palumbo, *Tancredi conte di Lecce e re di Sicilia e il tramonto dell'età normanna* (Lecce: Edizioni del Lavoro, 1991), pp. 57–110.

[69] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶ 108 p. 20.

[70] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶ 483 p. 91.

[71] The so-called principality of Taranto must have been a territorial indicator rather

court permuted the holdings of John *male conuencionis*.[72] It is clear that he was a commander of the royal military household, and not a baron involved in the recruitment of the peninsular aristocracy. Peter Cacapice, on the other hand, held only two *feuda* of two *milites*, and the *Quaternus* records him explicitly as *comestabulus de Neapoli*, an urban responsibility that definitely does not place its bearer in the same position in the *Quaternus* as the other *comestabuli*.[73] Hence, it seems clear that neither of these barons had a responsibility to the royal *curia* with respect to the deployment and mobilization of the military aristocracy in the peninsular provinces.

The same barons bearing the title of *comestabulus* also held other administrative positions. Jamison, in her assumption that the country was subdivided into equivalent judicial circuits and constabularies, pointed out that the "office" of a royal *comestabulus* and that of a royal justiciar (*iustitiarius regius*) were frequently held by the same person.[74] This is inaccurate; only three out of the eleven *comestabuli* or heads of the *Quaternus*'s constabularies are attested to have held the title of *iustitiarius*: Gilbert of Balvano,[75] Guimundus of Montellari,[76] and Lampus of Fasanella.[77]

The comparison of the indications contained in the available records where these eleven individuals were present in their capacity as consta-

than a judicial entity, and much less a separate administrative province. It was originally a princely title, tied to the royal family, which was subsequently used to refer to the southern Apulian dominions of Count Tancred of Lecce. There is evidence of neither the lands held *in demanio* of the principality nor of any actual royal official whose office was dedicated exclusively to administer the principality. Therefore, this principality must have started as a regional grouping of tenants that would later be tied to the actual comital dominions Tancred of Lecce held after 1169. Cf. Jamison, "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum," pp. 53–55; Hubert Houben, "Le origini del principato di Taranto," *Archivio Storico Pugliese* 61.I–IV (2008): 7–24 (pp. 19–21).

[72] Carlo A. Garufi, *Catalogo illustrato del tabulario di S. Maria Nuova in Monreale*, Documenti per servire alla storia di Sicilia: Diplomatica, 19 (Palermo: Era nova, 1902), App., no. 1 pp. 161–63.

[73] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶¶ 833 pp. 151–52, 904 p. 161.

[74] Jamison, "Norman Administration," p. 338.

[75] Prignano, "Historia delle famiglie di Salerno normande," fol. 108v (a. 1149).

[76] Cava, *Arca* xxvii.117 (a.1151); Montecassino, *Ex Chartis Civ. Troie* caps. cxvo.i.1 (a. 1155–1156), ed. in Jamison, "Norman Administration," App., nos. 8 pp. 463–64, 11 pp. 468–70. Guimundus, and his son after him, held Castellucium (modern Castelluccio Valmaggiore, west of Foggia) a *feudum* of two *milites. Catalogus Baronum*, ¶ 396 p. 71.

[77] See below, on page 29.

bles, as depicted by the titles employed, confirms that the overlapping of functions performed as justiciars was far less common than previously believed. A similar comparison from the point of view of the *iustitiarii*, which emphasized the geographical indications in the records of suits, has conversely suggested that a justiciar exercised a double role as constable in the same geographical area.[78] Jamison hence concluded that a *comestabulia* formed at the same time a well-defined judicial circuit. However, the surviving charters do not provide any overt indication of the alleged military duties these justiciars could have exercised as dual functionaries carrying the title of *comestabulus*. Although this apparent coincidence is of course incomplete and relies on the assumed existence of a homogenous and fixed administrative grid over the territory (namely, judicial circuits and constabularies), it does reveal a fundamental feature of the social organization within the kingdom's administration: the fluid overlapping of functions and responsibilities.

When recorded in documents of private transactions, the individuals identified as *comestabuli* do not bear that title. I have not found, so far, a recorded instance in which a royal *comestabulus* is presented as such. In the few instances where Guimund of Montellari, Lampus of Fasanella, and Gilbert of Balvano appear as participants of a *curia*, they are presented solely as justiciars. If these people presided over provincial courts, or issued orders to local royal chamberlains, they did so in a judicial capacity, which does not appear to correlate with their functions in the military service structure. The apparent overlapping of the titles of *comestabulus* and *iustitiarius* is presented, hence, as the result of the close ties that these barons already had with the royal court, and not necessarily as a constituent feature of the office of royal justiciar. As both local barons and functionaries of the crown, the king's justiciars on the mainland must have been seen as a convenient alternative to the noblemen that held the counties of the mainland for assisting with the logistics behind the *magna expeditio* and the king's peninsular army. Hence, before focusing on the specific cases of those barons that can be documented as both *comestabuli* and *iustitiarii*, it is fundamental to understand first the relationship between the royal military levy and the "jurisdictions" of the *comestabuli*.

[78] Jamison, "Norman Administration," p. 338.

The King's Military Levy and the *comestabulia*

It must have been when the *quaterniones* were revised and put together into the surviving version of the *Quaternus* (ca. 1168) that the headings containing the circumscription titles of *comitatus* and *comestabulia*[79] were included. The headings are usually followed by their respective place names and subsequent entries belonging to the circumscriptions, and are not solely under the name of an overlord or an indication of an accountable functionary.[80] The meaning and implication of *comestabulus* and *comestabulia* can be revealed by first understanding the social position of those who bore them within the structures sketched in the *Quaternus*, and then expanding that position through the distinct perspectives offered in surviving documentation. The value held by the *Quaternus* for the study of social organization lies precisely in its subdivision of the mainland nobility into the aforementioned circumscriptions. Instead of framing the object of study as an "office," my exploration rejects the assumption that the constabulary was a stable and impersonal position, and instead renders it a dynamic social position of a functionary, determined by the common social role shared amongst those who bore the title.

Under this organization the counts were a pivotal component, because as the major overlords of the lands, they were able to mobilize a vast number of soldiers. Instead of appealing directly to hundreds of unsubordinated lords (namely, those who held their *feuda* directly from the crown, *in capite Rege*), the royal court needed to rely on social brokers able to operate the logistics of putting an army together. The counts were the natural option for controlling the lower strata of the landholding aristocracy; by controlling a handful of nobles the royal court would have access to hundreds of knights, without having to send orders to each of them individually. Another advantage of having a rich upper aristocracy with the economic resources that extensive *feuda* provided was that the magnates were also able to render considerable numbers of infantry. The only barons responsible for providing armed foot soldiers in the *Quaternus* were the ones able to afford them: the counts and major landholders. The unsubordinated lords, by contrast, were only recorded as responsible for providing knights for the army.

[79] With an alternative spelling: *comestabilia*. *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶ 100 p. 18.

[80] *Catalogus Baronum*, pp. xvii–xviii.

An April 1162 charter from Sicily sheds some light on the question of the military service lesser barons owed to the king. A certain John *male conuencionis*, son of the late Geoffrey, declared that he held the *castellum* of Calatrasi (in Sicily) directly from the crown ("ex sola gratia et misericordia Regie munificiencie"), as a *feudum* for which he owed a service to the royal court ("feudi assuetum et statutum servicium curie"). John also declared himself unable to provide his *feudum*'s established service of eleven knights (*milites*), meant "for the destruction of the king's traitors and enemies" ("ad destruendos proditores et inimicis suos [Regis]"), alleging that his *feudum* could only provide three. In the presence of Matthew of Partinico, John's brother Robert, and the "royal constables" (*regii comestabuli*) Richard of Mandra and Berengerius of Gisay, the royal court heard John's plea and agreed to take the *castellum* of Calatrasi and all its holdings from him, in exchange for other *feuda* in Sicily. For this, he would only owe the king three knights. The other holdings of the *castellum* were the casale of Lacumuca, a *feudum* of two knights, and the casale of Cellario, a *feudum* of one knight.[81] It is perfectly clear that the service hereby owed was the military levy for the king's armed forces. At this stage, by April 1162, almost all the peninsular provinces were in open rebellion, and William I needed to assemble an army in Sicily. With this, the king would cross the Straits of Messina and defeat the rebels later that year. It is also worth noting that John *male convencionis* was allowed to provide a smaller contingent of knights only after he surrendered his original *castellum* in exchange for *feuda* whose official value corresponded to the number of knights he claimed to be able to provide. Apparently, the court, although lenient, was not entirely convinced that his original *feudum* of Calatrasi was not valuable enough to provide the service of eleven knights previously agreed. Moreover, the "royal constables" attested in this transaction were not actually the same type of constables recorded in the *Quaternus*. Both Richard of Mandra and Berengerius of Gisay subscribed this charter as *comestabuli*, and only Richard was recorded with the full title of *regius comestabulus*, but their presence in the royal court was a result of the role they played as commanders of the king's guard in Palermo, not as local royal functionaries in charge of the mainland's military levy. In Sicily there were no counties or major overlords, so most of the landholding and military administration must have been conducted by the Sicilian court

[81] Garufi, *Tabulario di Monreale*, App., no. 1 pp. 161–63.

directly. However, cases like the one illustrated in this charter must have been resolved in a similar manner, but without the direct intervention of the royal court and its employees. If lesser barons on the mainland could not attend a court in Palermo easily, and if the royal court could not personally hear and resolve this type of issue outside of the island, the royal administration must have relied on a body of local functionaries in charge of the king's military service.

The real extent to which the titles of "great constable" and "master captain" differ is unclear. Both Jamison and Takayama agree that there was no practical difference between these two titles; Jamison suggests that "captain and constable were titles equally applicable to the new governor [of the mainland]," and Takayama simply assumes that the master captains, constables, and justiciars were part of the same institution of two general governors, originally established under Maio's administration and subsequently consolidated as the "viceroys" overseeing Apulia and Capua.[82] These assumptions present a neat image of the royal administration and an understanding of a designed central office; nonetheless, the terminology and context of the surviving evidence presents a less elegant and more contingent institutional development. The case of the count of Gravina illustrates precisely this. It not only serves as an example of the difference between the titles of "great constable" and "master captain" and their possible distinct military and administrative functions, but also as an example of the political environment in which the royal court revived the office of "master captain of the whole of Apulia and the Terra di Lavoro." This title was last documented before Maio of Bari was assassinated and his brother-in-law, Simon the seneschal, the original *magister capitaneus*, disappeared from the political arena. Gilbert of Gravina seems thus to have taken advantage of the confusion following William I's death, by aspiring to the gubernatorial office created under Admiral Maio's administration, and then merging it with both his military rank as peninsular commander-in-chief and his socio-economic position as a member of the kingdom's nobility. Such an ambitious agenda must have been the reason behind Gilbert's presence in Sicily, and Qaid Peter's concern and caution.

Following Pseudo-Falcandus's account, there were two Apulian noblemen advising Qaid Peter at the time: Hugh, son of Atto, and Richard of Mandra, who was regarded as the "master constable [of the royal guard]"

[82] Jamison, "Norman Administration," pp. 290–91; Takayama, *The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily*, pp. 106–9.

(*magister comestabulus*). While the former was described as both sensible and a good warrior, who was put in charge of the Qaid's knights, Richard of Mandra is remembered as an experienced soldier, who had fought together with Robert of Loritello, and had plenty of courage but not so much wisdom.[83] It is not clear whether the title of *magister comestabulus* was officially given to Richard of Mandra, or if it was simply a testimony of his military responsibilities in the royal court. However, it is highly unlikely that he functioned as a commander on the mainland; he is not recorded in any other surviving document, and neither Jamison nor Takayama list him amongst the "great constables/master captains" of the kingdom. Nonetheless, Richard is subsequently regarded by Pseudo-Falcandus as the "constable" (*comestabulus*) of the "salaried knights" (*milites stipendiari*), which confirms both the real extent of his title and the role he played in the royal court as the commander of the king's household soldiers. As a man of the rebel count of Loritello, Richard of Mandra was part of the 1155–1156 rebellion until he was captured and sent in chains to Palermo. Richard's luck, however, suddenly changed when he was released from prison during the attempted coup d'état and defended William against the attacks of the other freed rebels. Although there is no evidence of what exactly happened to Richard of Mandra after that, he must have earned the king's favor and become part of the court's entourage.

The counts, as both overlords and magnates, were powerful enough to have played a crucial role in the kingdom's social organization. However, this social power was as useful to the king's government as it was a threat to the Sicilian centralizing institutions. The opposition to the incipient monarchy, and the subsequent rebellions and insurrections that followed Roger II's reign serve to support the argument that the kingdom's nobility had the capacity to challenge the king's rule over the mainland. The Sicilian king, nonetheless, needed that capacity in order to control the peninsular society; the counts were nodal points in the kingdom's economic and military power, and as such were ultimately incorporated into its organization.

In the midst of this dilemma, a middle ground between complete centralization and baronial autonomy was reached in the figure of the *Quaternus*'s constables. Appointing lesser and local barons as royal commanders allowed the royal court to rely on a structure parallel to the eco-

[83] *Falcandus*, pp. 210–11.

nomic hierarchy. The royal *comestabuli* attested in the *Quaternus* did not have the social prestige nor the economic resources of counts; they were not lords of other barons and did not hold any special social rank (e.g. the comital title). However, these functionaries became commanders by extension of the king's privilege to demand a military levy, whilst at the same time remaining local barons whose economic power was no greater than that of the people they were supposed to mobilize and command when the great army was to be summoned. Neither a substitution nor a conflicting power, the structure of royal *comestabuli* functioned as an overlapping layer which adapted to the regional variations in Apulia and the Terra di Lavoro.

These variations of supra-comital territorial arrangement can be grouped into three types:

1. in areas without major overlords or counties (most of the southern Adriatic coast, part of the Terra di Bari, and the more populated areas of the former principality of Salerno, outside the counties of Principato and Marsico), the royal *comestabuli* would have been responsible for mobilization and inspection;
2. in regions where the counties were more dispersed and less extensive (such as the counties of Fondi, Caserta, Alife, and Carinola, and the lordships of the counts of Avellino and Buonalbergo in the Terra di Lavoro; the counties of Lesina, Civitate, and the shrunken, vacant Loritello in the Capitanata; the overlordship of Gesualdo, the Conza lordships of the count of Carinola, and the small county of Philip of Balvano in Irpina; and the counties of Gravina, Montescaglioso, and Tricarico, and the holdings *in demanio* of the count of Andria in the Basilicata), the *comestabuli* would have assisted in the grouping and coordination of the diverse military contingents;
3. where counties had been left vacant (Principato and Molise), the *comestabuli* would have taken over the logistical void, without becoming members of the comital rank.

Furthermore, despite the somewhat chaotic arrangement of the surviving version of the *Quaternus*, it is apparent that the recorded constabularies were not all equally important. The recorded sections under the heading *comestabulia* contain different numbers of total *milites* and *servientes* offered to the crown. Moreover, two constabularies are subordinated under other *comestabulia*, suggesting the existence of a hierarchy amongst

the holders of the apparently same function. These are the *comestabulia* of Robert of Quallecta, which is "of the same constabulary of Lampus of Fasanella" ("que est de eadem comestabulia Lampi de Fasanella"), and "under the *comestabulia* of [late] Lampus, of the custody of Alfanus the chamberlain" ("que est subtus comestabulia Lampi de Fasanella, de baiulatione Alfani Camerarii"); and the *comestabulia* of Richard son of Richard, "under the constabulary of Guimund of Montellari" ("sub comestabulia Guimundi de Montellari").[84]

If, then, the title of *comestabulus* marks a social role rather than the existence of a regionally fixed office, a closer examination of the position and activities of those functionaries who appear as such in the *Quaternus* and have other attested activities would seem to be the logical next step.

Social Differences Between a Royal *comestabulus* and a *iustitiarius*. The Case of Lampus of Fasanella

Having delimited the social function of the title of royal constable, a crucial question arises: would a contemporary baron refer to a *comestabulus* as such, in a context not directly related to military activity? By contrast with the social relevance of a *iustitiarius* as judicial warrantor and organizer of local *curie*, the people in charge of the military levy and the local command of armed forces appear to be of secondary importance to private transactions. The available evidence for the transactions of those identified as both royal *comestabulii* and *iustitiarii* is scant. However, one case study provides a partial answer to this question: that of Lampus of Fasanella.

Lampus of Fasanella appears to have been an active social actor in the region of Salerno. Starting as a *fidelis* of Count Nicolas of Principato, he became a royal official in the former principality of Salerno. Cuozzo has inferred that, in a March 1141 document from Salerno concerning the land boundaries of the church of St. Peter of Toro, Lampus of Fasanella may have acted under the king's authority as a result of his titles as *iustitiarius* and *comestabulus*.[85] The charter, nevertheless, recorded him only as "Lampus, lord of Fasanella" (*Lampus domno de Fasanella*).[86] Later, in 1143, when attending the court of William, archbishop of Salerno, Lampus is

[84] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶¶ 396* p. 71, 463* p. 86, 604* p. 110.

[85] Cuozzo, "Milites e testes," p. 146.

[86] *Pergamene di Salerno*, no. 103 pp. 199–201, at 201.

recorded solely as *iustificator regie justice*.[87] In 1146, Lampus witnessed, together with Archbishop William, Bishop Johannes of Paestum, Royal Chancellor Robbertus, Chamberlain Adenulf, Simon of Tivilla, and Fulco of Divilla, amongst other barons, a donation made by his wife Emma to the monastery of Cava.[88] In 1150 and 1151, he is recorded as *dominus de Fasanella* and *iustitiarius*, together with his colleague Florius de Camerota.[89]

Although he appears to have received the office of *comestabulus* ca. 1150, in that he is recorded in the *Quaternus* as such, his documented social activities after that year do not refer to him as bearing that title. There are no entries in the *Quaternus* that directly record Lampus as a baron. However, some entries attest Lampus as the former tenant of a series of *feuda*, which may suggest the scope of Lampus's tenancy in 1150, having subsequently lost it before the time of the second revision (1167–1168). Lampus's original tenure can be geographically grouped into two general areas of Salerno: in the region of Cilento (Corneto, Trentinara, Magliano Vetere, and Selefone) he held *feuda* of five *milites*; whereas in the region around the Monti Alburni, from which he derived his epithet (Sant'Angelo a Fasanella, Pantoliano, Castelcivita, and Sicignano degli Alburni), he held *feuda* of eight *milites*.[90]

Lampus's last recorded appearance is found in an April 1152 charter by which he, together with his son Robert, sold two pieces of land with a vineyard and orchard at Felline to the Abbey of Cava. Interestingly enough, Lampus is recorded in this transaction only as "lord of Fasanella" (*dominus de Fasanella*), without any overt mention of any other title or

[87] Cava, *Arca* xxv.3, 38, 40. In Haskins, "England and Sicily," p. 643n112; Jamison, "Norman Administration," Calendar no. 13, p. 415. The title *iustificator regis* is equivalent to that of *iustitiarius*; Jamison, "Norman Administration," p. 281.

[88] Cava, *Arca* xxvi.45. Simon of Tivilla was the third husband of Sarracena, mother of Count Robert of Caserta through her previous relationship with Robert I of Lauro. Sarracena must have married Robert Capumaza before 1141. In 1159, Sarracena made a donation to Cava for the souls of her late husbands Robert Capumaza and Simon of Tivilla; apparently the memory of her first husband Robert of Lauro had ceased to be fresh in her mind by then. Cava, *Arm. Mag.* H.35.

[89] *Roger II Diplomata*, App. 2, no. 7 pp. 274–76; *Pergamene di Salerno*, no. 123 pp. 269–71. Cf. Jamison, who also edited the same document but appears to have confused the location of the original document. Jamison, "Norman Administration," App., no. 9 pp. 464–66.

[90] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶¶ 442 p. 81, 487–89 pp. 92–93.

royal office, and the payment received for this sale was declared to have been used to pay the debt Lampus and his son owed to the royal court.[91] The origin and motive of the debt that the lord of Fasanella appears to have owed to the royal court is uncertain. It could be argued that he was indebted to the crown as a consequence of losing the king's favor; Cuozzo has suggested that he might have joined the hypothetical rebellion of the count of Principato, having identified Lampus as a "loyal man" (*fidelis*) of counts Nicholas and William (III).[92]

Entries in the *Quaternus* suggest that some of Lampus's lands were taken from him, or that at least his son Robert was not allowed to inherit them.[93] However, there is no evidence to suggest that Lampus was either hostile to the monarchy or acted in insubordination, and much less that he participated in a rebellion. He would have already been in debt in 1152, four years before the first open rebellion after the end of the civil war in 1139. In any case, it is clear that Lampus of Fasanella had ceased to be the *comestabulus* in the Salernitan region by 1167, and he was no longer active as a lord of Fasanella after 1152; he was either removed by the royal court or, most likely, died ca. 1153.

The case of Florius of Camerota, who, together with Lampus of Fasanella, attended a provincial court in 1150 and 1151 as a justiciar, sheds further light on the question of the *iustitiarius-comestabulus* overlap. Florius served as a *iustitiarius* in Capua in 1158,[94] and in Aversa in 1162.[95] According to a letter of Pope Alexander III, he was sent into exile

[91] "Quas videlicet uncias auri ipsipater et filius ut dictum est se sescepisse dixerunt pro solvendo debito quod ab eis curie debetur." The payment consisted of 50 ounces of gold in "Sarracen" tarì ("quinquaginta uncias auri tarenorum saracenorum monete"). Cava, *Arca* xxviii.37.

[92] Cuozzo, "Milites e testes," pp. 126–27.

[93] *Catalogus Baronum*, ¶¶ 442 p. 81, 487–89 pp. 92–93.

[94] Graham A. Loud, "New Evidence for the Workings of the Royal Administration in Mainland Southern Italy in the later Twelfth Century," in *Puer Apuliae: Mélanges offerts à Jean-Marie Martin*, ed. Errico Cuozzo and others, Monographies, 30 (Paris: Association des amis du centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2008), pp. 395–417, no. 1 pp. 407–8. The original document (*Pergamene Aldobrandini*, Cartolario II, no. 13) was examined in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana by Graham A. Loud before the collection was returned to the Aldobrandini family.

[95] Gallo, *Cod. Dipl. Aversa*, no. 70 pp. 120–21. Loud's suggested date for this document is 1161–1162, against the suggestion of 1158 offered by Gallo and unchallenged by Enzensberger and Cuozzo. Cf. Enzensberger, *Beiträge*, p. 100; Cuozzo, *Commentario*, p. 133.

in Jerusalem.[96] Florius must have then been pardoned and welcomed back into the kingdom and the king's court, for he was amongst the officials in the royal *curia* held in Messina when Richard of Mandra, count of Molise, was judged and sentenced.[97] Florius subsequently resumed his activities as *iustitiarius* in Salerno, as he is attested in 1172[98] and 1174.[99] Despite Florius of Camerota's documented prolific social activities and long career as a royal functionary, it was Lampus who held the title of *comestabulus* for their common region and social circle.

Although the case of Lampus of Fasanella—and to a lesser extent also that of Florius of Camerota—has helped to clarify the actual documented role played by the royal constables in their own local setting, the question of the title's usage remains open. However, based on these examples, it can at least be suggested that the royal *comestabuli* did not utilize this title in a military way, and were not referred to as such, when involved in judicial processes or local transactions. Lampus's and Florius's role as royal justiciars must have given them an additional source of social control, of a political nature, which they exercised amongst other barons outside their immediate local social circle and independently of their military appointments.

Equivalent Social Relations in the Mainland's Military Organization

The great diversity of social profiles of royal *comestabuli* recorded in the *Quaternus* does not allow for an easy or homogenous conception of this class of royal functionaries. From figures as influential as the *magister*

[96] "Epistolae et Privilegia. Alexander III," in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. Jacques P. Migne, 200 (Paris, 1855), cols. 69–1320 (no. 303 cols. 332–33).

[97] "Iussi sunt itaque proceres omnes, preter curie familiares, in partem secedere, super hiis que adversus comitem dicta fuerant iudicialem sententiam prolaturi. Erant autem hii qui ad iudicium faciendum surrexerant: Boamundus Monopolis comes, Robertus de Lauro comes Casertinus, Rogerius eius filius Tricarici comes, Rogerius comes Avellini, Symon comes Sangrensis, Rogerius comes Giracii, Rogerius Tironensis magister comestabulus, Florius Camerotensis, iudex quoque Tarentinus et Abdenago Hannibalis filius, qui magistri erant iusticiarii." *Falcandus*, pp. 280–81.

[98] *Codice diplomatico del regno di Carlo I. e II. d'Angiò*, ed. Giuseppe Del Giudice (Naples: Stamperia della Regia Università, 1869), App. 1, no. 27 pp. liii–lviii, at lv.

[99] Cava, *Arca* xxxiv.91, ed. in Loud, "New Evidence," pp. 408–10.

Gilbert of Balvano, to lesser tenants such as Angoth of Arcis, the scope of the title and its potential field of action vary greatly. Consequently, it seems rather unlikely that such disparate social actors, having thus non-equivalent social positions, would have shared the same administrative position. The overlapping of different social functions for the same individual does not necessarily imply an institutional correspondence. Hence, I have argued here that distinguishing a *iustitiarius* from a *comestabulus*, and a *comestabulia* from any sort of defined or fixed circuit offers a more adequate way of defining these concepts. Instead of approaching the *Quaternus*'s constables as holders of a pre-established office bound to the administration of justice, one should describe the office based on the attested activities of the title's bearers: a specific military function for social and contingent mobilization, exercised by local barons by direct appointment from the royal administration.

Just as the idea of contrasting social positions argues against the idea of a common and defined social class from which these functionaries might have been drawn, it also suggests the existence, at least, of an equivalent social linkage. In their capacity as leaders of armed and equipped soldiers, both the counts and the lesser barons who acted as royal officials were mediating commanders who played a role in the organization of the kingdom's armed forces scattered across the mainland. As military commanders, the royal *comestabuli* appear to have acted as social brokers who responded to the different local arrangements of their communities. In this way, the border regions such as the northern territories of the Terra di Lavoro and the Capitanata would have required an entirely different network for drafting the military levy than the local tenants in the Terra di Bari and the former principality of Salerno, although the function would have been the same. Therefore, the royal *comestabulia* must have referred not to the military counterpart of the judicial circuits, but to the different social groupings from which the information for the record of the general levy originated, without deliberate and vertical planning of territorial divisions. To conclude, the royal constables were an alternative to the deployment and mobilization of the continental armed forces, in that their military position extrapolated the social brokerage of the counts, without creating more territorial overlords and without expanding the comital rank of the kingdom's aristocracy.

Abbreviations

Al. Tel.	*Alexandri Telesini abbatis Ystoria Rogerii regis Sicilie, Calabrie atque Apulie*, ed. Ludovico De Nava, FSI, 112 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1991)
ASPN	Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane
Cava	Archivio della badia della Santissima Trinità, Cava dei Tirreni
Falcandus	*De rebus circa regni Siciliae curiam gestis Epistola ad Petrum de desolatione Siciliae*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo (Florence: Sismel, 2014)
Falco	*Falcone di Benevento. Chronicon Beneventanum: Città e feudi nell'Italia dei normanni*, ed. Edoardo D'Angelo (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998)
FSI	Fonti per la storia d'Italia
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica, following the usual conventions, e.g. SS = Scriptores
PBSR	*Papers of the British School at Rome*
RIS	Rerum Italicarum Scriptores
Roger II Diplomata	*Rogerii II. Regis Diplomata Latina*, ed. Carlrichard Brühl, Codex Diplomaticus Regni Siciliae, 2 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987)
Romuald	*Romualdi Salernitani Chronicon*, ed. Carlo A. Garufi, 2nd ed., RIS, 7 (Città di Castello: S. Lapi, 1935)

Bibliography

Manuscript sources

Cava de' Tirreni, Archivio della Abbazia di S. Trinità:
Armaria Magna C.7; D.6; F.19, 20, 43; H.10, 35
Arcae xxv.3, 38, 40; xxvi.45; xxvii.117; xxviii.37; xxxiv.91
Rome, Biblioteca Angelica: Cod. 276–77 (Prignano, Giovan B. "Historia delle famiglie di Salerno normande")

Printed primary sources

Brühl, Carlrichard, ed. *Rogerii II. Regis Diplomata Latina*. Codex Diplomaticus Regni Siciliae 2. Cologne: Böhlau, 1987

D'Angelo, Edoardo, ed. *De rebus circa regni Siciliae curiam gestis Epistola ad Petrum de desolatione Siciliae*. Florence: Sismel, 2014. [Translated as] *The History of the Tyrants of Sicily by "Hugo Falcandus," 1154–69*, trans. Graham A. Loud and Thomas Wiedemann. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998

De Nava, Ludovica, ed. *Alexandri Telesini abbatis Ystoria Rogerii regis Sicilie, Calabrie atque Apulie*. FSI 112. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1991

Del Giudice, Giuseppe, ed. *Codice diplomatico del regno di Carlo I. e II. d'Angiò*. Naples: Stamperia della Regia Università, 1869

Gallo, Alfonso, ed. *Codice diplomatico normanno di Aversa*. Naples: Luigi Lubrano editore, 1926

Garufi, Carlo A., *Catalogo illustrato del tabulario di S. Maria Nuova in Monreale*. Documenti per servire alla storia di Sicilia: Diplomatica 19. Palermo: Era nova, 1902

——. ed. *Necrologio del Liber confratrum di S. Matteo di Salerno*. FSI 56. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1922

——. ed. *Romualdi Salernitani Chronicon*. RIS 7, 2nd ed. Città di Castello: S. Lapi, 1935

Giordano, Anna, ed. *Le pergamene dell'archivio diocesano di Salerno (841–1193)*. Salerno: Laveglia & Carlone, 2015

Hoffmann, Hartmut, ed. *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*. MGH SS, 34. Hanover: Hahn, 1980

Jamison, Evelyn M., ed. *Catalogus Baronum*. FSI 11. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1972

Martin, Jean M., ed. *Les chartes de Troia. Édition et étude critique des plus anciens documents conservés à l'Archivio Capitolare. I (1024–1266)*. Cod. Dipl. Pugliese 21. Bari: Società di Storia Patria per la Puglia, 1976

Ménager, Léon R., ed. *Recueil des actes des ducs normands d'Italie (1046–1127). I: Les premiers ducs (1046–1087)*. Bari: Grafica Bigiemme, 1980

Migne, Jacques P., ed. "Epistolae et Privilegia. Alexander III." In *Patrologia Latina*, 200. Paris, 1855. Cols. 69–1320

Muratori, Lodovico A., ed. *Chronicon Casauriense, auctore Iohanne Berardi*. RIS, 2. Milan: Societas Palatina, 1726

Niermeyer, Jan F., and Co van de Kieft. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden: Brill, 1976

Nitti di Vito, Francesco, ed. *Le pergamene di S. Nicola di Bari. Periodo normanno (1075–1194)*. Cod. Dipl. Barese, 5. Bari: V. Vecchi, 1900

Prignano, Giovan B. "Historia delle famiglie di Salerno normande." Cod. 276–77. Biblioteca Angelica, Rome

Tropeano, Placido M., ed. *Codice diplomatico verginiano*, vol. 2, *1103–1131*. Montevergine: Edizioni Padri Benedettini, 1978

——. ed. *Codice diplomatico verginiano*, vol. 5, *1161–1169*. Montevergine: Edizioni Padri Benedettini, 1982

Ughelli, Ferdinando, and Nicolò Coleti, eds. *Italia sacra sive de Episcopis Italiae*. 2nd ed. 10 vols. Venice: Sebastian Coleti, 1721

Secondary sources

[Asterisked items also contain editions of source material]

*Brandileone, Francesco. *Il diritto romano nelle leggi normanne e sveve del regno Sicilia*. Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1884

Brühl, Carlrichard. *Urkunden und Kanzlei König Rogers II. von Sizilien*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1978

Cahen, Claude. *Le régime féodal de l'Italie normande*. Paris: Geuthner, 1940

Capasso, Bartolomeo. *Sul catalogo dei feudi e dei feudatarii delle provincie napoletane sotto la dominazione Normanna: Memoria*. Naples: Stamperia della Regia Università, 1870

Caravale, Mario. *Il regno normanno di Sicilia*. Rome: Giuffrè, 1966

*Carlone, Carmine. *Documenti cavensi per la storia di Rocchetta S. Antonio*. Altavilla Silentina: Edizioni Studi Storici Meridionali, 1987

——. *Falsificazioni e falsari cavensi e verginiani del secolo XIII*. Altavilla Silentina: Edizioni studi storici meridionali, 1984

Carocci, Sandro. *Signorie di Mezzogiorno: Società rurali, poteri aristocratici e monarchia (XII–XIII secolo)*. Rome: Viella, 2014

Caspar, Erich. *Roger II (1101–1154) und die Gründung der normannisch-sicilischen Monarchie*. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1904

Clementi, Dione R. "Definition of a Norman County in Apulia and Capua, " in *Catalogus Baronum: Commentario*, by Errico Cuozzo, FSI, 101.2. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984. pp. 377–84

*Cuozzo, Errico, ed. *Catalogus Baronum: Commentario*. FSI 101.2. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984

——. "La contea di Montescaglioso nei secoli XI–XIII." *ASPN* 103 (1985): 7–37

——. "'Milites' e 'testes' nella contea normanna di Principato." *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 88 (1979): 121–64

——. "Prosopografia di una famiglia feudale normanna: I Balvano." *ASPN* 98 (1980): 61–80

——. *"Quei maledetti normanni": Cavalieri e organizzazione militare nel mezzogiorno normanno*. Naples: Guida, 1989

D'Angelo, Edoardo. "Intellettuali tra Normandia e Sicilia (per un identikit letterario del cosiddetto Ugo Falcando." In *Cultura cittadina e documentazione. Formazione e circolazione di modelli*, ed. Anna L. Trombetti Budriesi. Bologna: CLUEB, 2009. pp. 325–59

Drell, Joanna H. *Kinship & Conquest: Family Strategies in the Principality of Salerno during the Norman Period, 1077–1194*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002

Enzensberger, Horst. *Beiträge zum Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen der normannischen Herrscher Unteritaliens und Siziliens*. Münchener Historische Studien. Abteilung geschichtliche Hilfswissenschaften, 9. Kallmünz: M. Lassleben, 1971

Feller, Laurent. "The Northern Frontier of Norman Italy, 1060–1140." In *The Society of Norman Italy*, ed. Alex Metcalfe and Graham A. Loud. Leiden: Brill, 2002. pp. 47–73

Fernández-Aceves, Hervin, "A Relational View of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily and Its Royal Court: The Social Space Constructed by 'Hugo Falcandus'." MA thesis, Central European University, 2013

——. "Political Manoeuvring in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily: Civitate and Carinola in the Development of the South-Italian County." *White Rose College of the Arts & Humanities Journal* 2 (2016): 63–73

——. "The Re-Arrangement of the Nobility Under the Hauteville Monarchy: The Creation of the South Italian Counties." *Ex Historia* 8 (2016): 58–90

Hall, John A., and Ralph Schroeder, eds. *An Anatomy of Power: The Social Theory of Michael Mann*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006

*Haskins, Charles H. "England and Sicily in the Twelfth Century." *The English Historical Review* 26 (1911): 433–47, 641–65

Hill, James. "The Catalogus Baronum and the Recruitment and Administration of the Armies of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily: A Re-Examination." *Historical Research* 86 (2013): 1–14

Hoffmann, Hartmut. "Chronik und Urkunden in Montecassino." *QFIAB* 51 (1971): 93–206

*Houben, Hubert. *Die Abtei Venosa und das Mönchtum im normannisch-staufischen Süditalien*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995

——. "Le origini del principato di Taranto." *Archivio Storico Pugliese* 61 (2008): 7–24

Jamison, Evelyn M. "Additional Work on the Catalogus Baronum." *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo ed Archivio Muratoriano* 83 (1971): 1–63

——. "Foreword." In *Catalogus Baronum*. Vol. 1. FSI 11. Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1972.

——. "The Norman Administration of Apulia and Capua: More Especially Under Roger II and William I, 1127–1166." *PBSR* (1913): 211–481

Johns, Jeremy. *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Dīwān*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002

Leccisotti, Tommaso. *Le colonie cassinesi in Capitanata, IV: Troia*. Montecassino: Vallecchi, 1957

*Loud, Graham A. "New Evidence for the Workings of the Royal Administration in Mainland Southern Italy in the later Twelfth Century." In *Puer Apuliae: Mélanges offerts à Jean-Marie Martin*, ed. Errico Cuozzo, Vincent Déroche, Annick Peters-Custot, and Vivien Prigent. Monographies 30. Paris: Association des amis du centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2008. pp. 395–417

——. "Norman Traditions in Southern Italy." In *Norman Tradition and Transcultural Heritage: Exchange of Cultures in the "Norman" Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, ed. Stefan Burkhardt and Thomas Foerster. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. pp. 35–56

*——. ed. *Roger II and the Creation of the Kingdom of Sicily*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012

——. "The Image of the Tyrant in the Work of 'Hugo Falcandus.'" *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 57 (2013): 1–20

Mann, Michael. *A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760*, vol. 1, *The Sources of Social Power*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012

Marongiu, Antonio. "A Model State in the Middle Ages: The Norman and Swabian Kingdom of Sicily." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 6 (1964): 307–20

Martin, Jean M. *La Pouille du VI^e^ au XII^e^ siècle*. Collection de l'École française de Rome 179. Rome: École française de Rome, 1993

Martini, Martino. *Feudalità e monachesimo cavense in Puglia, I: Terra di Capitanata (S. Agata di Puglia)*. Martina Franca: Casa Ed. Apulia, 1915

Massa, Paola. "L'archivio dell'abbazia di Santa Sofia di Benevento." *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* 61 (2016): 433–66

Matera, Enzo. "Le più antiche carte del monastero di S. Sofia di Benevento. Codice Vaticano latino 13491 (aa. 784–1330). Saggio di edizione." PhD dissertation, Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza, " 1985

Matthew, Donald J. *The Norman Kingdom of Sicily*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992

*Monti, Gennaro M. "Il testo e la storia esterna delle assise normanne." In *Studi di storia e di diritto in onore di Carlo Calisse*. 3 vols. Milan: Giuffré, 1940. 1:295–348

Palumbo, Pier F. *Tancredi conte di Lecce e re di Sicilia e il tramonto dell'età normanna*. Lecce: Edizioni del Lavoro, 1991

*Scandone, Francesco. *L'alta valle del Calore. II. Il feudo e il municipio di Montella dal dominio dei Normanni a quello della Casa d'Aragona*. Palermo, 1916

Takayama, Hiroshi. *The Administration of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993

Vitolo, Giovanni. *Insediamenti cavensi in Puglia.* Galatina: Congedo, 1984