

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## Introduction

This book is written with a particular audience in mind, and seeks to introduce western medievalists, who have been trained to observe Norman kingship through predominantly Latin eyes and in the environment of north-western Europe, to what may for many be a new and disturbingly unfamiliar perspective. I have therefore chosen to set out from a much frequented point of departure, and to progress at a leisurely pace towards the Mediterranean. But, should historians of medieval Islam happen to open this book, they will find the administrative culture that it describes so familiar that they may well wonder that anyone should think so peripheral a subject worthy of such detailed attention. The following paragraphs are therefore also intended to introduce them to one of the western medieval historiographical questions underlying this book: the nature – indeed, the very existence – of what, whether it is observed in Normandy, England, Sicily or Antioch, may be recognised as an administrative policy peculiar to Norman rule.

In 1969, David C. Douglas stated the case as follows:

Before the twelfth century was far advanced, monarchies established by the Normans controlled the best organized kingdoms of Europe, and a Norman prince ruled the strongest of the Crusading states. This success was however not due merely to the facts of conquest or even to the establishment of notable rulers supported by strong feudal aristocracies. It derived also from a particular administrative policy which was everywhere adopted by the Normans. In all the states they governed, the Normans at this time were concerned to give fresh vitality to the administrative institutions which they found in the conquered lands, and to develop these constructively to their own advantage.<sup>1</sup>

The claims made by Douglas and his predecessors have since been challenged, most strongly for England. James Campbell and Wilfred Lewis Warren have suggested that the evidence for Anglo-Norman administration is open to a

<sup>1</sup> Douglas 1969, pp.181–2, writing very much in the tradition of Charles Homer Haskins who, more than a century earlier, had stressed that a ‘genius for adaptation’ had characterised Norman government in Normandy, England, Sicily and Antioch: Haskins 1911, especially pp.433–5; see also Haskins 1915.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 2 Introduction

fundamentally different interpretation.<sup>2</sup> Warren attacked ‘the myth of Norman administrative efficiency’ as follows:

Until the end of the eleventh century Anglo-Norman England was largely managed by Englishmen. A crisis in continuity emerges not at the Conquest but as the generation personally familiar with pre-Conquest practice died off and the Normans had to cope for themselves. The critical questions are how far they were able to master the Anglo-Saxon inheritance, and how far they understood it. The innovations in administrative practices are ... at least in part a response to problems which the Normans themselves had inadvertently created, and an attempt not so much to improve upon the Anglo-Saxon system as to shore it up and stop it collapsing. And the lines of development in the government of England which the Normans helped to set were determined as much if not more by their administrative failures as by their successes.<sup>3</sup>

Warren concluded on a still more provocative note.

I find myself unable to accept the view that the Normans were ‘constructive builders on solid Anglo-Saxon achievements’.<sup>4</sup> Under the Normans the Anglo-Saxon system became ramshackle. Norman government was a matter of shifts and contrivances. Nor can I see Norman administrative methods as the precursor in an evolutionary sense, of effective royal government; they had to be rethought. Nevertheless, there *is* a break in continuity, not at the Conquest itself, not on the morrow of it, but within fifty years of it. The break occurred not because the Normans did not wish to preserve the Anglo-Saxon inheritance but because they did not know how to do so. It may have been an involuntary breach, but it was nonetheless fundamental because the consequence was transition from a sophisticated form of non-modern state managed through social mechanisms to a crude form of modern state organized through administrative institutions.<sup>5</sup>

Such re-evaluation of Anglo-Norman administration has provided a considerable stimulus to this study. Recent historians of Norman Sicily have been content to claim that there was ‘no interruption of Moslem administrative practice’ and that ‘the Normans took from their Arab predecessors the centralized financial bureau of the *diwan*’. In Sicily, as in England, they have implied, the Norman rulers chose the best practices and institutions from the pre-conquest administration and incorporated them into the Norman system which their ‘genius for adaptation’ then developed into one that was more efficient and more successful than its predecessor.<sup>6</sup> And yet, there has been no re-examination of the sparse evidence for the administrative system of Muslim Sicily since Michele Amari wrote in the mid to late 19th century. Nor has a systematic study of the Arabic component of the Norman administration, throughout its history, ever been attempted by a historian familiar not just with the evidence from Sicily, but also with contemporary Islamic administrative practice.

<sup>2</sup> Campbell 1975; Warren 1984.

<sup>3</sup> Warren 1984, pp.115–16.

<sup>4</sup> Loyn 1983, p.197.

<sup>5</sup> Warren 1984, pp.131–2. See also the discussion of the implications of the ‘break in continuity’ in Clanchy 1993, pp.65–8.

<sup>6</sup> Douglas 1969, pp.185, 186, 189–91.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

In part, this explains why extraordinary claims have been made that analogous instances of the Norman ‘genius for adaptation’ may found in England and Sicily: the De Hautevilles’ use of the Muslim *iqḷīm* or administrative district has been compared to Henry I’s use of the English hundred;<sup>7</sup> the Sicilian *jarāʿid* or tax-registers have been compared to Domesday Book;<sup>8</sup> and scholars continue to debate the relationship between the Sicilian *dīwān* and the English exchequer.<sup>9</sup> But it is not overstating the case to object that such claims would not have been made had their authors been familiar with the history of Islamic administration outside Sicily, and with the detailed history of the Norman *dīwān*.

This book has not been written with one eye on the Anglo-Norman world; from my blinkered perspective, it seems that those analogies that may meaningfully be made between the administrative history of England and Sicily are of a different order. In Sicily, as in England, in the immediate post-conquest period, the Norman rulers sought to adapt indigenous administrative practices to their own needs. In Sicily, as in England, a generation after the conquest, there was a break in continuity caused by the failure of the conquerors to preserve the administrative system inherited from the previous rulers of the island. And in Sicily, as in England, Norman rulers subsequently introduced administrative innovations to repair the damage done to the pre-conquest system; innovations which underwent rigorous selection through a process of trial and error, and rapidly developed in new directions.

But, in the two islands, the Norman conquerors were heirs to indigenous administrative systems that were fundamentally different. The progress described by Warren – ‘from a sophisticated form of non-modern state managed through social mechanisms to a crude form of modern state organized through administrative institutions’ – is peculiar to England. Muslim Sicily, like most of the Islamic world, was governed through administrative institutions before the Norman conquest, and the De Hautevilles were to struggle hard, not least against themselves and their closest supporters, to prevent the erosion of administrative government by immigrant Latin society.

Again, the manner in which the Norman rulers of the two islands sought to adapt indigenous administrative practices to their own needs was fundamentally different. In England, the Norman kings sought to perpetuate the Anglo-Saxon inheritance by employing indigenous administrators.<sup>10</sup> Until 1071, a significant group of English earls and great thegns had retained power and status in the post-conquest settlement;<sup>11</sup> and thereafter, at the level of the shire, a small but vital community of Englishmen survived – ‘by commending themselves to the incoming continental magnates, by undertaking ministerial duties, and by taking land at farm’ – and ensured ‘the continuance of English customs and traditions’.<sup>12</sup> After

<sup>7</sup> Douglas 1969, p.186, citing Chalandon 1907, vol.I, p.348.

<sup>8</sup> Genuardi 1910; Clementi 1961.

<sup>9</sup> Garufi 1901; Takayama 1993, pp.12–13, 169.

<sup>10</sup> Williams 1995, pp.98–125.

<sup>11</sup> Williams 1995, pp.24–70.

<sup>12</sup> Williams 1995, pp.71–97: quotes from p.96.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 4 Introduction

the conquest of Sicily was complete, there were no Muslim barons in Roger's *comitatus*, and no Muslim lords held land in fief. Although Sicilian Arabs must have been employed within the early Norman administration, we know the name of only one before 1130, while we can reconstruct the prosopography of an entire class of Greek Christian administrators who were imported from east Sicily and Calabria to manage and to adapt the Arabic and Islamic institutions through which the island had been administered. The immigrant Latin and indigenous Arab communities of Sicily were separated from each other by a cultural barrier which, if anything, grew less permeable with time; and the manner in which the Greek community acted as an intermediary between the Latin and the Arab may even have increased their distance from each other.

This is a convenient point to emphasise that the linguistic history of post-conquest England and Sicily was fundamentally different. Both islands have been called 'trilingual' as a result of Norman conquest. But it is as well to remember that such a concentration upon the big three languages oversimplifies the intricate linguistic puzzle that challenges the historian of both islands, and ignores, in particular, the linguistic diversity of north and west Britain, and the wide variation of Romance vernaculars in the Sicilian kingdom. It also neglects the Scandinavian communities of Britain, and the presence in southern Italy and Sicily of more than a handful of Normans who still bore Norse personal names.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, in both islands, Jews used Hebrew, Judaeo-Arabic, and occasional Aramaic words and phrases.<sup>14</sup> In Sicily, there are also traces of Berber. Nonetheless, it is to the big three that I must now return. In England, although English ('Standard Old English') was the administrative language before the conquest, Latin was already the dominant literary language, and soon after the conquest rapidly replaced English as the language of record, although English continued to be used as the unwritten language of local administration. French ('Anglo-Norman') was introduced at the conquest as the language of the victorious élite, but, except in the king's court, French-speakers were soon assimilated into English-speaking society; although French was soon established as a literary language, it was not until the mid-13th century that it was widely used as a language of record.<sup>15</sup> In pre-conquest Sicily, Arabic was the dominant language of administration at all levels, of literary culture, and of religion. Greek was confined to monastic communities and to the Greek urban societies of eastern Sicily. Even the non-Muslim minorities, Jews and Greek Christians, seem to have been predominantly Arabic-speaking. After the Norman conquest, Arabic continued to be used in some written documents for a generation, but was then dropped, and for more than fifteen years ceased to be used in documents issued by the central administration. Greek was established during the conquest as the language through which the Normans were to rule, and rapidly became the dominant language of administration throughout the whole island. By

<sup>13</sup> Ménager 1975, pp.267–96; Ménager 1981a, pp.6–10. This does not, of course, necessarily indicate that they or their fathers were Norse speakers.

<sup>14</sup> For Judaeo-Arabic in England, see Beit-Arié 1985, pp.33–56 and plates 6–7.

<sup>15</sup> Clanchy 1993, 198–223 *et passim*.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

1110–15, the almost total replacement of Arabic by Greek, and of Arab Muslims by Greek Christians, in the central administration hastened the collapse of the pre-conquest administrative system, far more than did the as yet insignificant introduction of Latin. Although the new Greek structure incorporated spolia salvaged from pre-conquest Muslim administration, it was essentially foreign and new. At the local level, Latin lords and their Arab ‘villeins’ used, respectively, Latin (or a Romance vernacular) and Arabic, while Greek Christians acted as intermediaries between the two communities.<sup>16</sup> In post-conquest England, an educated person might read and write English, French, and Latin, but in Sicily such trilingualism was exceedingly rare and, I suspect, effectively confined to the Greek Christian community. In the long term, the language of the Norman conquerors enriched English but was replaced by it, as English became the dominant language, in all registers, not just in England but throughout Britain. In Sicily, the Romance vernaculars of the conquerors had almost completely ousted Arabic by the end of the 13th century, after which date it was used only by Jews and slaves of North African origin. Medieval Sicilian contains only some three hundred words of Arabic derivation.<sup>17</sup>

But, if the Anglo-Saxon and Muslim Sicilian inheritances were fundamentally different one from the other, and if the Norman conquerors of the two islands sought to adapt those diverse inheritances in strikingly different ways, the contrast is greater still between the manner in which Henry I and Roger II each sought to make good the damage done to the pre-conquest system in his respective island. Whereas in England, Henry I replaced Anglo-Saxon social mechanisms with a series of innovations amounting to the rapid expansion of the early state and the administrative machinery through which it was thenceforth to be governed, Roger II and his officers sought to preserve and to restore the ruined edifice inherited from Muslim Sicily by importing administrative practices, institutions, and personnel wholesale from the contemporary Islamic world, so that the Arabic administration of Sicily in the mid-12th century more closely approached the classical Islamic system, as exemplified in contemporary Fāṭimid Egypt, than had the administration of the Kalbid emirs before the Norman conquest. In England, the Normans had inherited the entire Anglo-Saxon system and when, a generation after the conquest, Norman rule had brought it close to collapse, Henry I had no choice but innovation. In Sicily, the De Hautevilles had conquered a province on the periphery of the Fāṭimid empire and when, a generation after their neglect had caused the collapse of the indigenous system, Roger II sought to repair it, he turned to the imperial centre for the men and machinery with which to do so. Roger thus gave a new lease of life to previously moribund Arabic and Islamic administrative institutions and practices, restoring them to such health that they outlasted his dynasty.

<sup>16</sup> The best (and yet unsatisfactory) summary of the language situation in Norman Sicily remains Varvaro 1981, pp.125–220. For Arabic in Norman Sicily, see Metcalfe 1999, soon to be published in revised form – Metcalfe 2002 (forthcoming).

<sup>17</sup> Caracausi 1983.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 6 Introduction

At the same time, however, Roger II and his successors also presided over a series of far-reaching innovations in the Greek and, especially, in the Latin branches of the administration. In this book, both because I am exclusively concerned with the island of Sicily and do not examine even Calabria let alone the other mainland provinces of the Norman kingdom, and because my main subject is the Arabic administration and the Arabic facet of Norman kingship, I have neglected such innovations in the Greek and Latin administration. They must not be forgotten, however, lest the overall effect of my argument be to exaggerate the importance of the reformed Arabic administration for the history of Norman Sicily as a whole.

I am especially conscious of this danger because I am so keenly aware that historians of Norman institutions remain almost completely uninformed about the nature of the Arabic administration of Norman Sicily. The brief review of King Roger's fiscal administration which Haskins gave in 1915 was still thought acceptable when Douglas returned to the theme in 1969 and when R.H.C. Davis began the work of deconstruction in 1976.<sup>18</sup> To this day, both the great pioneers – Erich Caspar, Ferdinand Chalandon, Haskins, and Evelyn Jamison – and such lesser figures as Carlo-Alberto Garufi, Karl Andreas Kehr, Ernst Mayer and Hans Niese, all of whom wrote before the First World War, still remain indispensable to the subject. Indeed, there are few topics for which one does not first open with profit the *Considerazioni* of Rosario Gregorio, published nearly two centuries ago. Theirs is the lead followed by the few modern scholars to have attempted original work, including Mario Caravale, Enrico Mazzaresse Fardella and Hiroshi Takayama. And yet all of these scholars show themselves to be unfamiliar with the Islamic tradition to which the Arabic administration of Kalbid and Norman Sicily belonged. It is difficult to convey the consequences of this unfamiliarity, but a rough idea may be had by imagining what would be the result were four or five generations of Arab historians, with no knowledge of Latin, to have debated amongst themselves the nature of Anglo-Norman administration taking as their yardstick of contemporary administrative practice the *Aḥkām al-sultānīya* ('The ordinances of government') by the 11th-century Iraqi jurist al-Māwardī.

A few Arabists have struggled against the tide, and have sought to introduce their Latin medievalist colleagues to the essentially Islamic context in which alone the Arabic administration of Norman Sicily can be understood. Michele Amari had the misfortune to write with imperfect knowledge of the documentary evidence from Sicily, and at a date when knowledge of medieval Islamic institutions was still in its infancy, but his 1878 study was a model for its time. Amari's friend and correspondent, Otto Hartwig, had asked him a series of penetrating questions designed to lay bare what he clearly believed to be the close relationship between the English exchequer and the Sicilian *dīwān*.<sup>19</sup> Amari replied by comparing at some length Sicilian institutions with medieval Islamic administrations described by Arab authors, including al-Māwardī, Ibn Khaldūn, al-Ya'qūbī, al-Maqrīzī,

<sup>18</sup> Haskins 1915, pp.228–9; Douglas 1969, 181–2; Davis 1976.

<sup>19</sup> This was a matter of debate well before Haskins 1911: as early as the 18th century, the consensus in Sicily was that Norman administrative institutions had been imported wholesale to the island.



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

al-Nābulusī and others. His principal conclusion was that the Sicilian *dīwān* in the mid-12th century was essentially Arabic and Islamic in character, and more closely resembled the *dīwān* of Fāṭimid Egypt than the English exchequer. I am not aware of Hartwig's response, but the reaction of most of Amari's contemporaries was to reject his conclusion out of hand. For example, Carlo-Alberto Garufi, a figure of insular stature with none of Amari's breadth and depth of scholarship, pretended to disprove Amari's argument by means of a detailed philological discussion, regardless that he knew no Arabic.<sup>20</sup> And yet it is no exaggeration to claim that Garufi and his followers have been left in possession of the field to this day. With a handful of notable exceptions, the administration of Norman Sicily has continued to be studied from an Anglo-Norman perspective, and the essentially Arabic and Islamic character of the Norman *dīwān* is simply ignored. Why this should be so is in large part explained by the fate of the Arabic documents of Norman Sicily.

In the interval between the first publication of Amari's *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia* in 1854–72 and Nallino's revised second edition in 1933–9, Salvatore Cusa published *I Diplomi greci ed arabi di Sicilia*.<sup>21</sup> This transcription of most of the Arabic and bilingual (Arabic-Greek and Arabic-Latin) documents issued by the Norman rulers should have greatly facilitated the study of the Arabic administration, but the work was not without problems. In the first place, only Part One was published, in two volumes, and the second part, which was to contain critical apparatus and translations of the Greek and Arabic texts, never appeared. The Arabic documents thus remained inaccessible to those scholars most interested in the administrative history of Norman Sicily, none of whom were Arabists.<sup>22</sup> In the second place, it now seems clear that Cusa was not himself primarily responsible for the transcription of either the Arabic or the Greek documents, and that this was entrusted to his pupils, respectively Carlo Crispo Moncada and Isidoro Carini.<sup>23</sup> In fact, the detailed examination of the Arabic texts published under Cusa's name reveals so great a number of inconsistencies and such extreme linguistic unevenness as to suggest that at least two individuals were responsible for the edition. And yet, although Cusa's edition is incomplete, contains a substantial number of errors in all three languages, and lacks all critical apparatus, it is nonetheless an extraordinary achievement for its time, and no one should confront the original Arabic documents with Cusa's published texts without feeling admiration and gratitude towards whoever was actually responsible for the transcription.<sup>24</sup> The sad fact

<sup>20</sup> Garufi 1901, especially pp.234–8. See also below, pp.194–5.

<sup>21</sup> Vol.I bears the year 1868 but was not actually published until 1874; vol.II is dated 1882.

<sup>22</sup> Gaetano Trovato, self-styled 'Professor in Arabic Language and Literature', published an Italian translation of some of the Arabic documents edited by Cusa (Trovato 1949). His versions are based upon Cusa's imperfect texts, they abound with errors and unmarked lacunae, and they lack critical apparatus, philological rigour, and historical sensibility: see also De Simone 1999b, pp.95–6.

<sup>23</sup> De Simone 1984; De Simone 1999b, pp.77–81, 84–5.

<sup>24</sup> See Amari's review, now conveniently reprinted in Amari 1970, pp.207–10. ('Io, che de' codici e diplomi arabi n'ho pur maneggiati di molti e che ho visti gli originali pubblicati adesso dal professor Cusa, posso attestare che ve n'ha alcuno di quelli che a prima vista fanno gettare via lo scritto per disperazione. Ancorchè io non sia d'accordo circa qualche lezione qua e là, non posso non ammirare la somma perizia dello editore'.)

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 8 Introduction

remains, however, that any serious study of the Norman *dīwān* must be based upon the original documents, and not on the texts published in Cusa's name.

In the year of the eight-hundredth anniversary of King Roger's death Paolo Collura first proposed a new and complete critical edition of the documents of the Norman rulers of Sicily in all three administrative languages: Arabic, Greek and Latin.<sup>25</sup> Work upon the *Codex diplomaticus regni Siciliae* (CDRS) did not actually get underway until the early 1970s, and only four volumes of edited documents have so far appeared – the Latin documents of Roger II, what purports to be all the documents of William I, the documents of Tancred and William III, and the documents of Constance.<sup>26</sup> Only two of the forty-five Arabic and bilingual documents issued by the Norman administration have yet been edited, both issued by William I. Unfortunately, the Greek text of the one original bilingual document was so badly mangled by the printers as to render it unusable, and the Arabic text contains several minor errors.<sup>27</sup> The second document is a Latin transumpt of a bilingual original, which was already published in a fuller version, and which also contains several minor errors.<sup>28</sup> One Arabic and one Greek-Arabic document, also issued by the Arabic administration of William I, were not included in the volume because of the rigidly Eurocentric definition of what does or does not constitute a public document: a definition adopted by the editors against the express advice of the late Albrecht Noth, who was responsible for the edition of the Arabic texts.<sup>29</sup> What was taken to be an Arabic *deperditum*, but is nothing of the kind, is also included amongst the documents of William I.<sup>30</sup>

Although this is not an auspicious start to the edition of the Arabic documents, the CDRS has made one important contribution to the study of the Arabic administration of Norman Sicily – the late Albrecht Noth's brief review of the Arabic documents of Roger II.<sup>31</sup> In this preliminary study, made prior to his projected edition of the documents themselves, Noth made almost the first attempt since Michele Amari to examine the Arabic documents of Norman Sicily within the context of contemporary Islamic administrative practice.<sup>32</sup> This important and perceptive study has been an inspiration to me.

The historiographical imbalance which this book seeks to redress is thus a particularly heavy one. If I am thought to have over-compensated, I have done my best to make this unfamiliar, and often troublesome, material as accessible as possible to readers who have no Arabic, Greek, and Latin, and no knowledge of medieval Islamic administration, so that they can retrace my steps and follow my

<sup>25</sup> Collura 1955b.

<sup>26</sup> Respectively: Brühl 1987; Enzensberger 1996; Zielinski 1982; Kölzer 1983.

<sup>27</sup> See Appendix 1, *Dīwānī* 36.

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix 1, *Dīwānī* 34.

<sup>29</sup> See Appendix 1, *Dīwānī* 33 and 35.

<sup>30</sup> Enzensberger 1996, *Deperditum* 3, p.102; see Appendix 1, *Dīwānī* 34.

<sup>31</sup> Noth 1978; critically reviewed by von Falkenhausen 1980b, and slightly revised for the Italian version (Noth 1983). See also Noth 1977 and Noth 1981–2.

<sup>32</sup> See especially Noth 1983, pp.208–13, and compare with Amari 1878. See also Schack 1969, pp.54–87 and De Simone 1988.



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

argument at every stage. All words and phrases in Arabic have been transliterated and translated at their first occurrence, and often elsewhere in the text. Greek words and phrases are always given in transliteration when they occur in the text, and are translated on at least their first occurrence. There is no glossary, but the first occurrence in the index of an Arabic, Greek or Sicilian term will lead the reader to a definition or translation. Only in the notes and tables, and in specialist and technical discussion, have I occasionally left Arabic or Greek words in the original. Sicilian place-names are standardised as far as possible; where no standard exists, the reader is referred to an explanatory note. In the index, all place-names in Sicily and southern Italy are followed by the standard abbreviation for the modern province in which they are located (see *Abbreviations*), and are cross-referenced to any alternative place-names used in this book. Where dates are given according to the Islamic or Byzantine calendar, Julian equivalents are given.

Arabists may care to note that, so far as possible and with the exceptions given below, I have used a system of transliteration based on that now standard in the English-speaking world. Names and short phrases, titles, *etc.* are given without case endings (*iʿrāb*) – e.g. *ṣāhib dīwān al-taḥqīq al-maʿmūr*, not *sāhibu dīwāni l-taḥqīqi l-maʿmūri*.<sup>33</sup> But I have generally given as full as possible a vocalisation for longer passages of text in order to account in detail for the reading proposed. I have occasionally suspended this practice where the text quoted is too far removed from the grammatical and syntactical conventions standard in the written language – e.g. in quotations from the 1182 Monreale estate register (*jarīdat al-ḥudūd* – ***Dīwānī* 44**) given in the notes to Chapter 7.

Whereas I have always referred back to the original in quoting from Arabic documents, this has not always been possible for the far more numerous Greek and Latin documents. Greek quotations are transliterated by a rigid system of letter-for-letter equivalents, ignoring accents and breathings; this inevitably leads to such infelicities as *kapriliggas* for *kaprilingas* but, as with Arabic, I have preferred to reproduce orthography and not pronunciation. So far as possible, when quoting from the original, the orthography of quotations from Greek documents has been reproduced, and not made to correspond to a classical model, but abbreviations and contractions have been supplied. Quotations from edited Greek documents, however, are likely to reproduce the editor's classicising corrections.

Throughout the text, references to the catalogue of *dīwānī* documents, *i.e.* of the Arabic and bilingual documents issued by the Norman administration, presented as Appendix 1, are given in the form ***Dīwānī* 1**, ***Dīwānī* 2**, *etc.* A dagger symbol preceding a number – e.g. ***Dīwānī* †9** – indicates that the document is a forgery. A new and critical edition of all the Arabic and bilingual documents from Norman Sicily is now in preparation by myself, Nadia Jamil, and Alex Metcalfe. The first volume, publishing the private – *i.e.* the non-*dīwānī* documents – will appear in the

<sup>33</sup> Note, in particular: و – *wū* (*wāw mushaddada* – *ūw* not *ww*); ي – *yī* (*yāʾ mushaddada* – *īy* not *yy*); ء – *ʾ* (*hamzat al-waṣl* is elided as shown in the example cited in the text).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-81692-2 - Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily: The Royal Diwan

Jeremy Johns

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 10 Introduction

near future. (Appendix 2, below, is a provisional catalogue of the private Arabic documents: references to it are in the form **Private 1**, **Private 2**, *etc.*) The third volume, dedicated to the three great Monreale *jarā'id* (***Dīwānī* 43–5**), will be largely the responsibility of Alex Metcalfe, whom the Arts and Humanities Research Board has granted a three-year Postdoctoral Research Fellowship at the University of Leeds to undertake the task. The second volume, in which the other *dīwānī* documents will be edited, will complete the series. An analytical study is also planned, which will compare the private and the *dīwānī* documents, not only to each other, but also to other corpora of medieval Arabic documents, in terms of diplomatic form, language, and script.