

Keyifli Okumalar Dileriz

Binlerce kategoride milyonlarca PDF e-kitap, ders kitapları, dergiler ve romanlara platformumuz üzerinden ücretsiz ulaşabilirsiniz.

RESMİ WEB SİTEMİZ

<https://rantey.org>

Yedek ve Duyuru Kanallarımız

Sitemize erişim engeli gelmesi veya adres değişikliği durumunda aşağıdaki kanallardan güncel giriş adresine erişebilirsiniz:

- Telegram: <https://t.me/birkitapbir>
- WhatsApp Kanalımız : <https://whatsapp.com/channel/0029VbDHv8uE50Us4lvMoc0Y>

A COMPANION TO BYZANTIUM AND THE WEST, 900-1204



Edited by

NICOLAS DROCOURT
& SEBASTIAN KOLDITZ

A Companion to Byzantium and the West, 900–1204

Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World

Managing Editor

Wolfram Brandes

VOLUME 10

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/bcbw*

A Companion to Byzantium and the West, 900–1204

Edited by

Nicolas Drocourt
Sebastian Kolditz



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover Illustration: (The so-called) Limburger Staurothek, c. 968–985. With kind permission of the Dom- und Diözesanmuseum Limburg. ©Photo: Michael Benecke

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Drocourt, Nicolas, editor. | Kolditz, Sebastian, editor.

Title: A companion to Byzantium and the West, 900–1204 / edited by Nicolas Drocourt, Sebastian Kolditz.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, [2022] | Series: Brill's companions to the byzantine world, 2212–7429 ; vol. 10 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021042330 (print) | LCCN 2021042331 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004498792 (hardback) | ISBN 9789004499249 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Byzantine Empire—Relations—Europe, Western. | Europe, Western—Relations—Byzantine Empire. | Byzantine Empire—History—1081–1453. | Byzantine Empire—Civilization.

Classification: LCC DF547.E85 C66 2022 (print) | LCC DF547.E85 (ebook) | DDC 303.48/2495040902—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021042330>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021042331>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: “Brill”. See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 2212-7429

ISBN 978-90-04-49879-2 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-49924-9 (e-book)

Copyright 2022 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Hotei, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau Verlag and V&R Unipress.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Requests for re-use and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill nv via brill.com or copyright.com.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Preface ix

Notes on Contributors x

Introduction: Approaches to Byzantine-Western Relations in the Period
from the Late 9th Century to 1204: Some Introductory Remarks 1

Nicolas Drocourt and Sebastian Kolditz

PART 1

Perceptions and Linguistic Aspects

1 Knowledge of the West in Byzantine Sources, c.900–c.1200 31

Jonathan Shepard

2 The Image of the Greeks in Latin Sources 85

Hans-Werner Goetz

3 Linguistic Competence, Diplomacy and Diplomatics 108

Christian Gastgeber

PART 2

The Two Empires and Italy: Political and Ecclesiastical Relations

4 Byzantine-Western Relations in the Political and Ecclesiastical Spheres
in Later Carolingian Times 137

Klaus Herbers

5 Beyond Liudprand and Theophano: Aspects of Western-Byzantine
Relations in Ottonian and Salian Times 148

Sebastian Kolditz

6 Byzantium, Rome and the Papacy: A History of Ecclesiastical
Separation 192

Axel Bayer

- 7 Komnenoi and Staufer: Ambition and Confrontation 215
Leonie Exarchos
- 8 Political and Cultural Encounters between Byzantium and the Normans,
11th–12th Centuries 247
Eleni Tounta

PART 3

Byzantium and a Multifaceted Latin World

- 9 Byzantium and Scandinavia 273
Daniel Föller
- 10 Byzantium and England, c.900–1204 300
Christopher Hobbs
- 11 Byzantium and the Iberian Peninsula. From the Capture of the Balearic
Islands to the Fourth Crusade 325
Juan Signes Codoñer
- 12 Byzantium and France 357
Savvas Neocleous
- 13 Latins in Byzantium and Orthodox Christians in the Crusader States,
1096 to 1190 391
Johannes Pahlitzsch

PART 4

Agents and Objects

- 14 Travellers, Diplomats, Interpreters and Others: Agents of Political
Relations 419
Nicolas Drocourt
- 15 Monastic Travel between the Byzantine Empire and the West:
The Italo-Greek *Brokers*, 10th–13th Century 446
Annick Peters-Custot

- 16 Italian Traders in Byzantium, c.800–1204 471
David Jacoby
- 17 Jews as Cultural Brokers between Byzantium and the Latin West,
850–1200 AD 496
Saskia Dönitz
- 18 Objects of Desire: Exchange in Commodities and Gifts 513
Dominik Heher
- General Bibliography 539
- Index 555

Preface

Some books have long histories. This is also the case with the present volume, the roots of which go back to 2014 when Stefan Burkhardt, at that time researcher at the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences, developed the first draft for this volume's structure together with Sebastian Kolditz, who had just joined Heidelberg University. The first contributions arrived already in 2016: those of Juan Signes Codoñer, Dominik Heher, Hans-Werner Goetz, Daniel Föller, Nicolas Drocourt, Jonathan Shepard and Saskia Dönitz. But several changes in the group of contributors emerged over the following years and led to some major changes in the structure of the volume as a whole. We are very grateful to a number of authors who readily joined the ongoing project and wrote comprehensive articles in a relatively short period of time. Their readiness to contribute helped us keep the basic structure of the volume and even enlarge its contents in a very fortunate way. Furthermore, Stefan Burkhardt unfortunately had to abandon his participation in the editorial activities due to new professional duties in 2017, and Nicolas Drocourt kindly stepped in. It is thus due to many troubled circumstances that the manuscript of this volume could only be finished in summer 2020.

Against this background we wish to express our deep gratitude to all the contributors whose cooperation and patience during a prolonged process of editing we really appreciate, as well as to the anonymous reviewer of this volume who provided us with many helpful suggestions, to Michael Mulryan for copyediting the manuscript and to Alessandra Giliberto for her invaluable support on the publisher's part. We are particularly grateful to the series editor Wolfram Brandes for his kind advice and to our colleague Stefan Burkhardt whose conceptual ideas laid the basic foundations of this volume and the specific way it treats Byzantine-Western relations in the High Middle Ages.

Finally, we deeply regret that David Jacoby, an outstanding Byzantinist and scholar of Mediterranean history, passed away before this volume, which contains one of his last articles, could be published. It has been a great privilege for us to work together with him. We also want to commemorate the late Filippo Burgarella, a distinguished scholar of the Byzantine tradition in southern Italy, who initially had accepted our invitation to contribute but passed away before he could finish his article.

Sebastian Kolditz and Nicolas Drocourt

Heidelberg / Nantes, September 2020

Notes on Contributors

Axel Bayer

studied history and Byzantine studies in Cologne and Rome and obtained his Ph.D. in 2000. He is a historian and Byzantinist. His main field of research is the history of the schism between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. His publications include the monograph *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054*, several articles on Byzantine-Western ecclesiastical relations, such as “Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg” (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 96 (2003)), and the lemma “Schisma, 2. Orthodoxe Kirchen” (*Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* 11 (2010)).

Juan Signes Codoñer

was Professor of Greek at the University of Valladolid (1996–2020) and is currently a professor at the Universidad Complutense of Madrid (since October 2020). He is president of the Spanish Society of Byzantine Studies. He studied classical philology at the University of Salamanca and Byzantine studies at the Freie Universität in Berlin (1987–89) and spent research stays at the Universities of Vienna, Paris, Birmingham, and Oxford and at the Dumbarton Oaks Centre in Washington. He has published monographs and contributions on Byzantine history and historiography, Byzantine law, Greek grammatical tradition, Homer, the origins and diffusion of the Greek alphabet, and Hellenism in the Early Modern era.

Saskia Dönitz

is a researcher at the Institute for Judaic Studies at Goethe-University Frankfurt. She specializes in medieval Jewish history and literature, Byzantine Jewry, cultural transfer, reception history, and Jewish-Christian relations. Her relevant publications include: *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon* (2013); *Transkulturelle Verflechtungen im mittelalterlichen Jahrtausend* (as co-author, 2016); and “Jüdisch-christliche Begegnungen in verschiedenen Kulturräumen des Mittelalters: Byzanz und Ashkenaz im Vergleich” (*Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 38 (2013)).

Nicolas Drocourt

is Associate Professor of Byzantine and Medieval History at the University of Nantes (France). He published *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore. Les ambassadeurs*

étrangers dans l'Empire byzantin des années 640 à 1204 (Leuven, 2015), and numerous articles on Middle Byzantine diplomacy. He also edited or co-edited different volumes on medieval diplomacy, notably *La figure de l'ambassadeur entre mondes éloignés (XI^e–XVI^e siècle)* (Rennes, 2015) and *La diplomatie byzantine, de l'Empire romain aux confins de l'Europe (V^e–XV^e siècle)* (Leiden-Boston, 2020).

Leonie Exarchos

studied at the University of Heidelberg and at the Institut Catholique de Paris, and has held academic positions at the Department of History (Byzantine Studies) at the University of Mainz and at the University of Göttingen, where she was a member of the DFG-funded Research Group “Cultures of Expertise from the 12th to the 18th century”. In 2016, she was a visiting researcher in Oxford. She gained her Ph.D from the University of Göttingen, and is currently preparing a monograph investigating Western experts in Byzantium between 1143 and 1204. Her research interests include Western-Byzantine relations, Mediterranean history, cultural exchange, and transculturality in the Middle Ages.

Daniel Föller

is a historian working on medieval Europe, with a special interest in Viking Age Scandinavia and its relations to Byzantium. Currently, he is finishing his habilitation on Carolingian military culture at Frankfurt University.

Christian Gastgeber

is senior research associate and group leader of the research group “language, text, and script” of the division of Byzantine Research in the department for Medieval Studies of the Austrian Academy of Sciences; he is editor of several Byzantine texts (*Register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople*, *Cartulary of St Paul on Mount Latros*, *Chronicon Paschale*) and conducts research on Byzantine manuscripts, documents, and text transmission.

Hans-Werner Goetz

is Professor Emeritus of Medieval History at the University of Hamburg, where he held a chair from 1990–2012. He is specialized in the history of medieval concepts. His recent publications include *Gott und die Welt. Religiöse Vorstellungen des frühen und hohen Mittelalters* (3 vols, 2011–16) and *Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen und christlich-abendländisches Selbstverständnis* (2 vols, 2013).

Dominik Heher

is a freelance exhibition curator. Holding a Ph.D. from the University of Vienna, his main research focus is on rituals of power and punishment in Byzantium, historical geography, and material culture of the Byzantine Empire. He co-edited the exhibition catalogues *Das goldene Byzanz und der Orient* (2012) and *Byzanz und der Westen. 1000 vergessene Jahre* (2018). His further publications include the monograph *Mobiles Kaisertum: Das Zelt als Ort der Herrschaft und Repräsentation in Byzanz (10.–12. Jahrhundert)* (2021), as well as several articles on harbours and port cities in the Byzantine Empire.

Klaus Herbers

is Senior Fellow for Medieval History at the Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nuremberg as well as a full member of the Academy of Sciences and Literature in Mainz, plus a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences in Göttingen. His areas of research include papal history of the Early and High Middle Ages, pilgrimage and pilgrim reports, along with hagiography and the veneration of saints. His most recent publications are *Prognostik und Zukunft im Mittelalter. Praktiken – Kämpfe – Diskussionen* (2019), *Papsturkunden in Spanien III. Kastilien* (2020), the fourth volume of the *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (2020), and the anthology *Das Buch der Päpste: Der Liber pontificalis. Ein Schlüsseldokument europäischer Geschichte*, which he published with Matthias Simperl (2020).

Christopher Hobbs

completed his doctoral thesis in 2017, a historiographical study of the 15th-century historian Doukas. Thereafter, he was a Teaching Fellow in Byzantine and medieval History at Royal Holloway, University of London. His main research area is Byzantine historiography with a focus on identity, East-West relations, and Byzantine responses to the fall of Constantinople.

David Jacoby

(1928–2018) was Professor of Medieval History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His research covered a broad range of the central topics in Mediterranean history, among them transmediterranean trade in numerous objects, and transcultural relations in the eastern Mediterranean during the Middle Ages, landholding in Frankish Greece, and the history of traders based in the Italian maritime republics. He published extensively on these issues, and his numerous articles have been collected in several volumes, among them *Travellers, Merchants and Settlers in the Eastern Mediterranean, 11th–14th centuries* (2014), and *Medieval Trade in the Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond* (2018).

Sebastian Kolditz

has been Academic Assistant at the Chair of Medieval History at Heidelberg University since 2013. His research interests focus on diplomatic relations in the Middle Ages, Church councils and the maritime history of the Mediterranean. His publications include the monograph *Johannes VIII. Palaiologos und das Konzil von Ferrara-Florenz (1438/39). Das byzantinische Kaisertum im Dialog mit dem Westen* (2014), as well as articles on Christian-Muslim diplomacy (together with Nikolas Jaspert) and Byzantine-Western contacts. He has also written on the Carolingians and the Mediterranean, and on Byzantine-Venetian treaties in the later Middle Ages.

Savvas Neocleous

BA (University of Cyprus), MPhil and Ph.D (Trinity College Dublin), LMS (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto), is an independent researcher focusing on relations and interactions between the Byzantine Empire, Latin Christendom and the Muslim world. He is the author of *Heretics, Schismatics or Catholics? Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century* (2019). He has also published several articles in edited volumes and peer-reviewed journals, including *Crusades*, *Journal of Medieval History*, *Medioevo Greco*, *Al-Masaq*, and *Byzantion*. His papers focus on aspects such as the question of the so-called Byzantine-Muslim alliances against the Crusades, the blame game for the failure of the Second Crusade, the motives behind the diversion of the Fourth Crusade and the crusader conquest of Constantinople, the representation of Andronikos I Komnenos's tyrannical rule in 12th-century European narratives, and the image of the Latins in Byzantine accounts.

Johannes Pahlitzsch

studied medieval history, Byzantine studies, and Arabic studies and is Professor of Byzantine Studies at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (Germany). He wrote a monograph on the history of the Greek Orthodox patriarchate of Jerusalem in the crusader period, is co-editor of *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Historical Bibliography* and published the edition of the Arabic translation of the Byzantine law book *Procheiros Nomos*. He is the author of numerous articles on the situation of oriental Christians under Muslim rule in the Middle Ages, and the relations between Byzantium and the Islamic world. He was awarded fellowships at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and Dumbarton Oaks, and was Visiting Scholar at Wolfson College, Oxford. He is a member of the board of the Leibniz ScienceCampus Mainz project "Byzantium between Orient and Occident", and is spokesperson for the Research Training Group

2304 “Byzantium and the Euro-Mediterranean Cultures of War. Exchange, Differentiation and Reception”.

Annick Peters-Custot

is full Professor of Medieval History at the University of Nantes. Her research is mainly devoted to the history of southern Italy from Byzantine rule to the Swabian period (8th–13th century), and focuses in particular on the interactions and connections between the Byzantine Empire and the Western world in the religious field (monasticism, liturgy, hagiography) as well as on the notion of “imperiality” of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily. She is currently working on the circulation of the so-called *regula S. Basilii* in the Western world from the 5th to the 15th century. She led several research programmes for the École française de Rome, notably “L’héritage byzantin en Italie, VIII^e–XII^e s.” with Jean-Marie Martin and Vivien Prigent (four volumes published between 2011 and 2017), and is the main coordinator of the programme “Imperialiter” (2017–21). Her publications include the monographs: *Les Grecs de l’Italie méridionale post-byzantine. Une acculturation en douceur (IX^e–XIV^e siècles)* (2009); and *Bruno en Calabre. Histoire d’une fondation monastique dans l’Italie normande: S. Maria de Turri et S. Stefano del Bosco* (2014).

Miriam Salzmann

is Academic Assistant at the Chair of Byzantine History at Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz. Her research focuses on cultural contacts between Late Byzantium and the Latin world, the social and cultural history of Medieval Cyprus, and late Medieval translations. She has recently published her dissertation under the title *Negotiating Power and Identities. Latin, Greek and Syrian Élites in Fifteenth-Century Cyprus* (2021) and is currently working on a fifteenth-century Venetian translation of the Doukas chronicle.

Jonathan Shepard

was University Lecturer in Russian History at Cambridge. With S. Franklin he co-authored *The Emergence of Rus* (1996) and co-edited *Byzantine Diplomacy* (1992), and 12 of his studies appear in his *Emergent Elites and Byzantium* (2011). Edited volumes include *The Expansion of Orthodox Europe* (2007), *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire* (rev. ed. 2019); *Byzantium and the Viking World* (with F. Androshchuk and M. White, 2016); *Imperial Spheres and the Adriatic* (with M. Ančić and T. Vedriš, 2018); and *Viking-Age Trade: Silver, Slaves and Gotland* (with J. Gruszczyński and M. Jankowiak, 2020).

Eleni Tounta

is Associate Professor in Medieval History at the Aristotle University of Thessalonica. Her research interests focus on the history of medieval political thought, medieval historiography, identities and power relations, and social history, especially in the Holy Roman Empire and southern Italy in the High and Late Middle Ages. Her publications include the monograph *Medieval Mirrors of Power: Historians and Narratives in Norman Southern Italy* (2012) [in Greek], an article on “Conflicting Sanctities and the Construction of Collective Memories in Byzantine and Norman Italo-Greek Southern Calabria: Elias the Younger and Elias Speleotes” (*Analecta Bollandiana* 135 (2017)), and an article on “The Italo-Greek Courtiers and their Saint: Constructing the Italo-Greek Elite’s Collective Identity in the Twelfth-Century Norman Kingdom of Sicily” (*Mediterranean Studies* 28.1 (2020)).

Approaches to Byzantine-Western Relations in the Period from the Late 9th Century to 1204: Some Introductory Remarks

Nicolas Drocourt and Sebastian Kolditz

In a letter sent to the basileus John II Komnenos in 1142, the German King Conrad III stated programmatically:

Amicitiam, honorem et gloriam, ut parentes nostri, videlicet Romanorum imperatores, antecessores nostri, ad antecessores vestros, scilicet regnum et populum Grecorum, constituerunt, constituo et, sicut servaverunt, conservabo. Non est gens, regnum aut populus, qui non noverit nostrae Romanae rei publicae vestram novam Romam et dici et fore filiam, ex huius radice ramos et fructus eius processisse [...] Sint ergo res utriusque communes, utriusque amicus idem, idem inimicus, sive in terra, sive in mari, et cognoscat ac timeat matris virtutem et valentiam, qui non honoraverit filiam, sive Normannus sive Siculus sive quis alter quicumque ubicumque.¹

Conrad characterizes the relationship between his own quasi-imperial dignity as *rex Romanorum* – he would never be crowned emperor in Rome – and the Byzantine *basileia* as a long-lasting friendship, which should materialize in mutual support against common enemies. Nevertheless, in his view, this state of friendship was structured by a quasi-familial hierarchy, and he claimed parental honour and precedence for himself as representative of the elder Rome, while John Komnenos was labelled as lord of the Greek people and as

1 “I confirm the friendship, honour and glory which our parents and predecessors, the emperors of the Romans, exhibited towards your predecessors, i.e. the kingdom and people of the Greeks, and I will conserve it in the same manner as they did. There is no nation, kingdom or people which would not know that your new Rome is said, and in fact is, the daughter of our Roman *res publica*, and that its branches and fruits proceed from this very root. [...] Therefore, the concerns of both (of us) shall be our common ones, one’s friend shall be the other’s, too, one’s enemy the enemy of the other as well, on land and at sea; and the one who does not honour the daughter shall experience the mother’s virtue and power, be it a Norman or a Sicilian or whoever else wherever.” The letter is inserted into Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris* 1.25, ed. Waitz/de Simpson, pp. 37–38.

emperor of Constantinople, the new Rome. The special relationship between both rulers is thus traced back to a common Roman identity which would bind them to cooperate and subjugate their enemies.²

As is well known, Byzantine identity was indeed based in the Roman imperial tradition that had continued without interruption – though completely Hellenized – at the Bosphorus, and thus found its expression in the Byzantine self-designation as *Rhōmaioi*.³ Instead, the use of the Latin language in the ecclesiastical as well as the political sphere can be seen as the major common characteristic defining the heterogeneous plurality of Byzantium's "western" partners, who thus often appear as *Latinoi* in the Byzantine sources, though only from the later 11th century onwards.⁴ In ecclesiastical matters, this terminology generally refers to those who were subject to the Roman Papacy, but at the same time, Rome continued to be considered the highest ranking patriarchate within the Pentarchy, and thus did not only belong to the "others" but remained an essential point of reference in Byzantine ecclesiology.⁵ The Latin world, instead, usually simply referred to the people of Byzantium as Greeks according to their language.⁶

These terminological difficulties have to be taken into consideration when speaking about medieval "Byzantine-Western" relations. Such a label is, of course, completely anachronistic and at the same time seems to be rather blurred with regard to "the West". First of all, this term has a purely geographical meaning, but at the same time it risks evoking inappropriate and essentialist overtones about distinctive features of "the Occident" or a nascent "Western World" viewed in contrast with the Byzantine tradition.⁷ Instead of such generalizing ideas we shall on the one hand emphasize the diversity of the Latin

2 In his answer, the new *basileus* Manuel Komnenos, of course, changed the attributes calling himself emperor of the Romans and his addressee "*nobilissimum fratrem et amicum imperii mei*" and simply "king" (*rex*), see Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris* 1.25, ed. Waitz / de Simpson, p. 40.

3 This Roman identity has often been understood as correlated to the empire's multi-ethnic composition, see Stouraitis, "Roman Identity", pp. 176–77 (with references), but also as an expression of a national identity according to Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium*, esp. pp. 74–82. For a critical revision of these concepts see now Stouraitis, "Roman Identity", who also draws attention to social elite connotations of Roman-ness as opposed to a "Greek" populace, e.g. with Anna Komnene (Stouraitis, "Roman Identity", pp. 198–200).

4 For the connotations of the term *Latinoi* in Middle Byzantine texts, see Koder, "Latinoi", pp. 26–32; the relatively late emergence of its use has been revealed by Kazhdan, "Latins and Franks", pp. 84–89.

5 Cf. Herrin, "Pentarchy"; for Byzantine views of Rome, see Carile, "Roma e Románia".

6 Koder, "Byzanz als Mythos und Erfahrung", pp. 243–44.

7 Cf. Winkler, *Geschichte des Westens*, vol. 1, pp. 40–46, on considerations about the role Byzantium played for the "genesis of the West".

Christian sphere in the period considered here. On the other hand, it should be underlined that there were important factors of identity both “Byzantines” and “Latins” essentially had in common. These were at least twofold: on the one hand, their belonging to Christendom, more specifically to Chalcedonian Christianity once defined as the orthodox faith of the late Roman Empire and distinguished from Miaphysite doctrines influential in the East.⁸ On the other hand, both sides shared the ancient Roman imperial tradition as a common point of reference.

Against this background, Byzantine-Western relations have traditionally been understood as the relations between two empires. One of the earliest substantial studies in this field thus focused on Byzantine-Ottonian relations throughout the 10th century.⁹ In the late 1940s the German medievalist Werner Ohnsorge established an overarching paradigm to the study of relations between Byzantium and the Occident in the Middle Ages. He claimed that these relations were in fact primarily determined by the so-called “problem of two emperors” (*Zweikaiserproblem*),¹⁰ that is the structural tension between the de facto coexistence of two imperial powers in the East and the West and their ideological claim to unlimited, universal rule over Christendom. Thus, the imperial coronation of Charlemagne at St Peter’s in 800 became the natural point of origin for understanding the complex relations Byzantium entertained not only towards the later Carolingians, but towards the entire Occident, a term continuously used by Ohnsorge. Simultaneously, the history of political and diplomatic contacts became closely interwoven with the study of medieval concepts of imperial rule, and Ohnsorge himself postulated the existence of well-distinguished “ideas of empire” in the Latin West: a Frankish imperial idea of Charlemagne, a papal one, and a Roman one which substituted the Frankish idea in the reign of Otto III.¹¹

In contrast it was usually assumed that the Byzantine Empire, as heir to the universalist tradition of ancient Rome, claimed universal rule over the entire

8 Whereas Latin Christendom displays a basically homogeneous landscape in terms of doctrine – though not of rite – after the suppression of Arianism in the early medieval kingdoms, the history of early Byzantium was marked by the struggle about the Chalcedonian doctrine, see Frend, *Monophysite Movement*. Miaphysite partners continued to play a major role in the Middle Byzantine period, especially the Armenians. For an overview of Byzantine-Armenian relations, see Der Nersessian, *Armenia and the Byzantine Empire*; Garsoïan (ed.), *L’Arménie et Byzance*.

9 Mystakides, *Byzantinisch-deutsche Beziehungen*.

10 See his diachronic basic study: Ohnsorge, *Zweikaiserproblem*. Besides that, Ohnsorge also published numerous articles on specific episodes in the history of these relations.

11 Ohnsorge, “Das abendländische Kaisertum”, pp. 7–19.

oikoumenē for itself.¹² This assumption was only questioned when Telemachos Lounghis, a leading expert in the study of Early and Middle Byzantine diplomacy, coined the term “limited *oikoumenē*” in order to describe an alleged Byzantine political doctrine in the era of the Macedonian emperors.¹³ According to Lounghis, the emperors of this dynasty deliberately renounced their claim to universal suzerainty with regard to the Latin world. Although it seems questionable whether such conceptions were actually formulated in Byzantium during these centuries, they certainly describe the pragmatism of Byzantine diplomacy towards its Western partners, be they of imperial rank or not. They were never treated as subjects – as was the case with local rulers in territories which at least formally remained parts of the empire (e.g. in Caucasia, but also with the dukes of Venice or Naples)¹⁴ – but as partners on a more or less equal level. To sum up, it should not be denied that imperial self-conceptions on both sides thoroughly influenced political attitudes and political action towards the other. But today it seems clear that our understanding of the complex developments, even in the sole field of inter-imperial relations over the course of several centuries, cannot be reduced to one determining factor. Ideological antagonism could thus be revived if appropriate in order to obtain concrete political aims,¹⁵ such as with the political clashes between Frederick I Barbarossa and Manuel I Komnenos.¹⁶ But it did not prevent close cooperation and even a cordial relationship at other times.

A second traditional focus in the study of Byzantine-Western relations in the Middle-Byzantine period is the role Byzantium played in the history of the Crusades.¹⁷ Scholars have long since been aware of the importance of long-term developments in Byzantine-crusader relations. The First Crusade in particular has attracted much scholarly attention with regard to the interaction between

12 See, for example, Obolensky, “Principles and Methods”, pp. 53–56. The relevance of universalist ideas has been sharply reduced by Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium*, pp. 100–11. In fact, various notions of *oikoumenē* should be distinguished, as Koder, “Die räumlichen Vorstellungen” argues: besides the – geographically blurred and adapted – imperial notion, he recognizes, for example, a Christian concept of *oikoumenē* in contrast to the desert, eschatological notions of *oikoumenē* and *antoikoumenē*, and even rather localized subjective views.

13 See Lounghis, “Die byzantinische Ideologie”; for a critical evaluation, see Koder, “Die räumlichen Vorstellungen”, p. 29.

14 This can be seen from the famous list of addresses in the *Book of Ceremonies* from the 10th century: see Martin, “L’occident chrétien”.

15 Cf. Lilie, “Das ‘Zweikaiserproblem’”; recently also Hehl, “Zwei Kaiser –(k)ein Problem”, pp. 44–61, especially with regard to the 12th century.

16 Cf. Kresten, “Der ‘Anredestreit’”. See also the contribution by Leonie Exarchos in the present volume.

17 See Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*; most recently Kolia-Dermitzaki, “Byzantium and the Crusaders”.

the leaders of the crusading army and the *basileus*, or the attempts at defining a legal relationship between them.¹⁸ Furthermore, the growth of mutual distrust over the course of the crusade and its aftermath has been highlighted and viewed as a first step in a critical development of Western attitudes towards Byzantium throughout the 12th century.¹⁹ Finally, the fact that the Middle Byzantine Empire succumbed to the onslaught of a crusading Latin army in 1204 has long since posed a major question in this field of study. How could a military force of officially recognized *milites Christi* conquer the capital of a Christian Empire? It is obvious that a meticulous analysis of the events of 1203/04, as well as the narratives discussing these events, are indispensable in answering this question.²⁰ But again, the history of political and military events is closely interwoven with the history of ideas and perceptions, and even economic aspects have to be considered with regard to the role of Venice. The Crusades furthered the penetration of the entire eastern Mediterranean by merchants from Venice, Pisa, and Genoa including Byzantine territory and its capital. The legal foundations for their presence in Byzantium, the features of their trading activities according to the documentary evidence, and consequently their role in the development and decline of the Byzantine economy, have also attracted much scholarly attention.²¹

The third major research tradition reflected in the present volume concerns the practice of diplomacy. Traditional approaches to the history of diplomacy and foreign relations often regarded the Middle Ages as a long prehistory to the actual formation of a system of international relations based on permanent embassies and a growing professionalization during the Early Modern period.²² It was only from the 1980s onwards that interest in the medieval practice of diplomacy and negotiations between political, as well as ecclesiastical actors, grew substantially.²³ Nevertheless, long before this, aspects of Byzantine

18 See Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 45–49; Pryor, “The Oaths of the Leaders”.

19 Among the many studies analysing these attitudes, we refer to Kindlimann, *Die Eroberung Konstantinopels*; Ebels Hoving, *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen*.

20 Since long, frequent efforts have been made to further elucidate this key event; we only mention Madden (ed.), *The Fourth Crusade*; Madden, “The Venetian Version”; Angold, “A Papal Version”.

21 See Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, and the contribution by David Jacoby in this volume.

22 This is evident considering the position of the excellent and wide-ranging study by Ganshof, *Le Moyen Âge*, within the series *Histoire des relations internationales* or – even more significantly – the absence of a volume on the Middle Ages in the recent multivolume handbook *Handbuch der Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen*. See also the main assumptions of Queller, *Office of Ambassador*.

23 For an outline of research history and recent trends, see Péquignot/Moeglin, *Diplomatie et « relations internationales »*, pp. 590–617; for Byzantine diplomacy in particular, see Drocourt “Introduction”, pp. 2–5.

foreign relations were being approached systematically, such as the diplomatics of letters sent to non-Byzantine political authorities (*Auslandsschreiben*),²⁴ aspects of treaty-making and negotiations,²⁵ the internal organization of Byzantine foreign policy, and the office of the *logothetes tou dromou*.²⁶ The general strategies and intentions of Byzantine diplomacy had been discussed at the International Congress of Byzantine Studies at Ohrid in 1961,²⁷ but it was above all the symposium on Byzantine diplomacy held by the British Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, and published in 1992, which provided a major and lasting impact on this field in the last few decades. A number of recent collective volumes has further deepened our knowledge and understanding of the mechanisms of Byzantine diplomacy.²⁸ The spectrum of issues treated in depth in recent studies is indeed also broad. It includes the profile of diplomatic agents, the role of ceremonies and gift-giving, dynastic marriages and the bestowal of honorary titles on foreign rulers, communication routes, the use of languages, etc. Obviously, these questions not only concern political relations between Byzantium and the Occident, but also Byzantine relations with the Muslim world,²⁹ as well as with the Nomadic steppe peoples that settled in the regions on the northern coasts of the Black Sea,³⁰ the Slavs, and the Bulgar state, which dominated the Balkans up to the early 11th century.³¹ This plurality offers rich opportunities for comparison and contextualization of Byzantine-Western relations.³²

Besides these three main research traditions, however, efforts to illuminate the interaction between Byzantium and other parts of the Latin world have

24 Dölger/Karayannopoulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, pp. 94–105.

25 See Heinemeyer, “Verträge”; Miller, “Byzantine Treaties and Treaty-Making”.

26 Miller, “The Logothete of the Drome”.

27 The main contribution on the subject was Obolensky, “Principles and Methods”.

28 Lampakis/Leontsini/Lounghis/Vlysidou (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy*; Drocourt/Malamut (eds.), *La diplomatie byzantine*; Chrissis/Kolia-Dermitzaki/Papageorgiou (eds.), *Byzantium and the West*.

29 For an overview of Byzantine-Muslim relations up to the end of the first millennium, see Drocourt, “Christian-Muslim diplomatic relations”. Among the numerous recent studies on political and cultural relations between Byzantium and the Arab/Muslim powers in the period considered here, we only mention Beihammer, “Strategies of Diplomacy”; Holmes, “Treaties between Byzantium and the Islamic World”. The most detailed study surveying all known instances of diplomatic relations, as well as military confrontations, during the 9th and most of the 10th century, remains Vasiliev/Canard, *Byzance et les Arabes*.

30 See, for instance, Noonan, “Byzantium and the Khazars”; Huxley, “Steppe-Peoples in Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos”.

31 Cf. Browning, *Byzantium and Bulgaria*; Angelov, *Srednovekovnata bălgarska diplomacija*.

32 For such an approach, see Drocourt, “Ambassades latines et musulmanes”.

long remained a relatively “provincialized” field. Although important contributions were published some time ago on relations between Byzantium and France, England, the Low Countries,³³ Scandinavia, Poland, and Hungary,³⁴ most of these studies remain rather isolated. Already in 1973, Karl Leyser insisted that “it would be mistaken to confine Byzantine interests in the West to the horizons of Italy”.³⁵ But it was only with the publication of Krijnie Ciggaar’s fundamental monograph on Western travellers to Byzantium in the High Middle Ages³⁶ that the broad spectrum of these contacts and their local historiographical and material repercussions became entirely visible, the first time this topic had been treated in a comprehensive and coherent manner.

The present volume is dedicated only to a specific epoch in the long history of Byzantine-Western relations. To cover the whole field from Late Antiquity to the Ottoman Conquest of 1453 would far exceed any reasonable endeavour. Our choice of temporal limits almost corresponds to that taken by James Howard-Johnston for a pioneering conference dedicated to Byzantine-Western relations.³⁷ Nevertheless, the choice of the later 9th century as a beginning is not easy to justify, as it avoids a rather obvious starting point, namely the imperial coronation of Charlemagne in 800. However, this event necessarily has to be viewed in the context of prior Byzantine-Carolingian relations, which again would have extended the study into the 8th century, and the so-called Iconoclastic Controversy, and thus would have opened up discussions of the long traditions in ecclesiastical relations concerning the Ecumenical councils. Furthermore, there had been of course a long-ranging tradition of political exchange between Constantinople and the Franks since the early Merovingian epoch,³⁸ but the rulers of other “barbarian” *gentes* had also maintained diplomatic contacts with the imperial court in Constantinople.³⁹ Only when the Carolingians united most parts of the Christian West under their rule did Byzantine relations with the West in fact become Byzantine-Carolingian relations and, after 800, turn into a relationship between two empires.

33 See the studies in Ciggaar/van Aalst (eds.), *Byzantium and the Low Countries*. For England and France as well as Scandinavia, see the respective chapters in this volume.

34 For Poland, see Halecki, “La Pologne et l’Empire byzantin”; the classical study for Hungary is Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*.

35 Leyser, “The Tenth Century”, p. 41.

36 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*.

37 Howard-Johnston (ed.), *Byzantium and the West*.

38 For a detailed discussion, see Ewig, *Die Merowinger und das Imperium*.

39 The history of these missions (for the period up to the mid-8th century) within their political contexts, has been outlined in detail by Lounghis, *Ambassades*, pp. 9–139, see also the table in Lounghis, *Ambassades*, pp. 458–71.

Far from cultivating a permanent ideological competition, they repeatedly sought cooperation and alliance against the Muslims operating in southern Italy, for example during the famous campaign of the Carolingian Emperor Louis II in the late 860s.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, there was a fundamental structural difference between these two political entities. While imperial power in Byzantium was transmitted through a continuous series of rulers, the Carolingian Empire was founded on a dynastic principle comprising the partition of territories among royal heirs, which soon led to the empire's decomposition into several de facto independent kingdoms. In this new constellation the imperial title became in fact related to rulership over the Kingdom of Italy and depended on the Papacy, as only the pope was considered sufficient to crown a Roman Emperor. Soon the vulnerability of the Carolingian states became more and more evident, notably due to the Norman attacks on its western and northern coasts. The necessity of defence in turn fostered the emergence of powerful aristocratic families, some of whom became competitors with the Carolingian kings. These processes contributed to the profound transformation of the "Latin World" during the long 10th century, which saw the emergence of a characteristic plurality of independent kingdoms and other regional powers, not only within, but also beyond, the former Carolingian Empire, especially on the Iberian Peninsula, in northern and in East Central Europe. By contrast, the so-called Macedonian dynasty, founded in 867 by the usurper Basil I, not only managed to keep the Byzantine Empire united under its rule, but even to expand it significantly in the later 10th and early 11th century, in the Balkans as well as into the Near East. This structural background basically persisted over the whole period studied here.

The reason for the date of 1204 as the final endpoint for our study in this volume is certainly more obvious. With the capture of Constantinople the traditional Byzantine Empire ceased to exist, but this caesura did not bring Byzantine-Western relations to an end. The successors to the Byzantine imperial and patriarchal tradition, resident in Nicaea, remained in contact with the Papacy and its envoys: for instance, John III Vatatzes had a close relationship with the Staufen Emperor Frederick II.⁴¹ Latin-Greek contacts were further intensified under the first Palaiologan emperors who used their networks in order to prevent a new Western invasion.⁴² It seems that Byzantine diplomatic

40 For Louis' campaign, see now also Kolditz, "Gesandtschaften, Briefe und Konzilien", with further references.

41 For relations between the Papacy and Nicea, see now Exarchos "Formen des Bekenntens"; for Frederick II, see Merendino, "Federico II e Giovanni III Vatatzes".

42 See Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*; Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*.

activities towards the West finally reached their peak in the last century of Byzantium, especially during the reign of Manuel II.⁴³ The underlying conditions of these relations, however, had changed fundamentally in comparison with the Middle Byzantine period: the territorial extension of Byzantium was shrinking almost continuously; Greeks and Latins now lived close to each other within a politically fragmented *Romania*, and, above all, both groups had to cope with the growing power of Turkish tribes and the emergent Ottoman Empire. Some recent studies have deepened our understanding of these complex modes of coexistence and symbiosis as well as the permanent conflict within the lands of *Romania* between the 13th and the 15th century,⁴⁴ the structures of which were completely different from Byzantine-Western relations in Middle-Byzantine times.⁴⁵

In the Middle-Byzantine period, it was a contrast between a unitary imperial power in the Greek East and a plurality of independent rulers in the Latin West, which can be seen as a fundamental condition for Byzantine-Western relations. Their course and development can therefore not be reduced to one single chronological thread of embassies and exchanges. Instead, it is composed of a number of parallel histories, each of which focuses on the relationship of a specific part of Latin Christendom towards Byzantium. This structure will be reflected explicitly in two sections of the present volume dedicated, respectively, to the Western Empire – including the Papacy and other parts of Italy – and to other parts of the Latin West, usually less close to Byzantium, but nevertheless showing very characteristic patterns of contact. In both cases, the main focus will be on political dimensions, but economic and cultural aspects will not be excluded either. The remaining two sections of the volume reflect systematic approaches, highlighting patterns of perception, the linguistic and material aspects of diplomatic contacts, and various groups of agents.

The first section of this book deals with “Perceptions and Linguistic Aspects”. Jonathan Shepard draws attention to the knowledge “of the West” as it appears in numerous Byzantine texts from the entire period under consideration. He demonstrates how far acquaintance with the West changed over these centuries. The ruling elite, some churchmen and a few monks had a kind of monopoly of this knowledge until the 11th century. Some events such

43 Research on these activities has been flourishing over the last two decades, for example Andriopoulou, *Diplomatic Communication*.

44 This has been highlighted in recent monographs and essay collections, such as Necipoğlu, *Byzantium Between the Ottomans and the Latins*; Herrin/Saint-Guillain (eds.), *Identities and Allegiances*; Harris/Holmes/Russell (eds.), *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks*.

45 This becomes evident when comparing Shepard, “Byzantine Diplomacy”; and Oikonomides, “Byzantine Diplomacy”.

as the Norman conquests in Italy and Sicily, the development of pilgrimages to Jerusalem passing through the empire, and the upswing in trade produced changes, notably in the way Byzantine authors named the Westerners. Official orators could admittedly still use conventional terms for denoting Westerners, but the latter were now better known and understood in Byzantium, even far from the imperial court and Constantinople. During the 12th century, there were many ways and occasions for both groups to gain a better understanding of each other. Nevertheless, opposition towards the Latins and the accentuation of differences also flourished, such as the lists of the Latins' religious deviations tend to show.

In the second chapter Hans-Werner Goetz looks at "The Image of the Greeks in Latin Sources", based on a succinct overview of research positions. In Latin eyes the *Graeci* or "Greeks" could be seen as different from the Latins or Westerners by several criteria, primarily language, political belonging, culture, or ethnicity. Though one can also find a kind of admiration towards the Greeks in some sources, others seem to suggest the opposite. Goetz discusses these attitudes in their respective historical and political contexts. Furthermore, the question of the religion of the Greeks appears in some testimonies: the "Greek" is sometimes seen as a Christian whose faith was (at the very least) in danger of deviance.

The linguistic basis for Graeco-Latin relations is analysed by Christian Gastgeber with a special focus on the language of documents produced in the course of negotiations or diplomatic missions, though these documents did not survive in large numbers. Which language(s) were used in official correspondences and in those by ambassadors and diplomatic agents? A careful reading of the sources demonstrates that translators were everywhere, and at every level of official communication. Pragmatism was a key reality in the face of ideas of linguistic superiority adopted by both sides. At the same time, however, this did not exclude some kind of intentional text manipulation or even falsification in specific situations. Language thus was, above all, an instrument in politics.

In the following section, the development of political as well as ecclesiastical relations between Byzantium and its imperial counterpart in the West is addressed, with the inclusion of the Papacy. For geographical reasons, Italy is situated at the crossroads of relations between Byzantium and successive Western imperial dynasties,

The first of them, the Carolingians, still prevailed at the beginning of the period under examination, although it was past its peak after the mid-850s. In a kind of short introductory survey, Klaus Herbers characterizes the main aspects of Byzantine-Western Relations in the late 9th century. Even if a

compromise had been found in 812 with the so-called Treaty of Aachen,⁴⁶ the quarrel around the imperial title (*Zweikaiserproblem*) remained implicitly alive during the second part of the 9th century, as shown by Louis II's famous letter to Basil I in 871. The military context and the decision of the two emperors to fight against Muslims in southern Italy conditioned their mutual understanding, but Western emperors' direct contacts with Byzantium were rare after Louis II's death in 875. Two other questions provoked tensions between Constantinople and Rome in the 860s and beyond: the so-called Photian Schism and the rivalry over the conversion of the Bulgarians. It created disputes and misunderstandings, as well as numerous embassies and letters. The ecclesiastical conflict caused by the fourth marriage (tetragamy) of Leon VI led to new tensions at the beginning of the following century, including with the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The Ottonian 10th century has received a great deal of attention with regard to Byzantine-Latin relations, probably due to two major protagonists: Bishop Liudprand of Cremona and the famous Empress Theophano. Instead of focusing once more on their personalities, Sebastian Kolditz tries to give a long-term outline of political relations stretching from the pre-Ottonian Kingdom of Italy to the rule of Lothair III in the early 12th century. The diffuse contacts with Byzantium in the age of the Salian emperors (1024–1125) thus come to the fore, though they have been rather neglected in research so far. Furthermore, some general questions about the belonging of envoys and political mediators are discussed.

On the ecclesiastical level, Axel Bayer examines the development of relations between the Papacy and the Patriarchate of Constantinople, primarily during the 11th century. The date of 1054 regularly comes to mind in this respect, as it has traditionally been associated with the "Great Schism" between Rome and Constantinople. However, the events of July 1054 on the Bosphorus, treated in-depth in this contribution, were not considered to be significant in most of the sources at least until the end of the 12th century. Instead, the unity of the Churches was notably challenged by two main differences, one of a dogmatic nature (the procession of the Holy Spirit), the other concerning rites (the azyme question). In spite of discussions and courteous debates, a lasting rapprochement between the two Churches was never achieved; their separation endured. The Fourth Crusade and its consequences, including the sack of Constantinople, made the state of schism obvious for both Latins and Byzantines.

46 Aspects of the Treaty of Aachen have been studied in detail in a recent volume: Ančić/Shepard/Vedriš (eds.), *Imperial Spheres and the Adriatic*.

The 12th century is also known for the complex relations between two powerful dynasties in the Byzantine and Western empires. Leonie Exarchos studies them in her article "Komnenoi and Staufer: Ambition and Confrontation". The *Zweikaiserproblem* ("Two-Emperors problem") continued to remain an important ideological aspect of these relations. Beyond the question of the imperial title and all its consequences, reflected in some official correspondences, the rivalry between the two empires was particularly apparent in several spatial contexts, such as Hungary, the Crusader States and, most significantly, Italy. But this rivalry did not necessarily lead to enmity: from 1138 to 1152 there was even real cooperation between both sides, notably against common threats and enemies. Furthermore, a marriage alliance strengthened the cooperation and links between the two dynasties. With the election of Frederick I Barbarossa as king in 1152, tensions arose, notably after the temporary disappearance of a common enemy with Manuel I making peace with the Normans in 1158. The Byzantine Emperor also supported Western partners who were often among Frederick's enemies, but the emperor always avoided direct confrontation with the latter. Nevertheless, after some failed Byzantine campaigns in Italy and Manuel's death in 1180, the Byzantine policy of active intervention on its western front came to an end. The weakness of the empire under the last Komnenoi and the Angeloi faced the consolidation of Staufen rule in the Holy Roman Empire.

As heirs to the Byzantine, as well as other traditions in southern Italy, the Normans were major actors in the framework of Byzantine-Western relations. Eleni Tounta points the reader to their political and cultural encounters with Byzantium in the course of the 11th and 12th centuries. Their military confrontation in southern Italy and on the western Adriatic coast under Robert Guiscard and his son Bohemond are well known events, as well as other Norman assaults on the empire like that which led to the seizure of Thessalonica in 1185. But these encounters also had other implications, such as diplomatic contacts, even if peaceful relations were infrequent. Besides that, however, various facets of cultural interaction between these two neighbours are recalled and investigated in this contribution. These concern, inter alia, the integration of Norman knights into Byzantium's elite, and patterns of mutual perception. As such, the question of identity construction is examined; this had strong political implications since Norman kings exploited the heritage of Byzantine culture in order to enhance their own legitimacy.

The following section of the book is devoted to relations between Byzantium and various parts of Europe beyond Italy and Germany. Based on a relatively broad research tradition, Daniel Föller gives a concise outline of contacts between Byzantium and the northern people of Scandinavia, not without

some side-glances on the early Rus'. He thematizes aspects such as the specific source-problems related to the predominance of saga-traditions in the north, the role of trade and raids in the early relationship, and the presence of "Varangian" mercenaries in Byzantium in the 11th and 12th centuries, but also refers to occasional religious and diplomatic contacts. Furthermore, patterns of mutual perception and influences are discussed, for example with regard to the slow emergence of a differentiation between Rus' and Scandinavians in Byzantine sources, and the presence of Byzantine artefacts in Scandinavia.

The "Varangian guard" and its composition is again discussed in Christopher Hobbs' contribution, which gives a concise outline of what is known today about Byzantine contacts with Britain, primarily Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England. Actual personal contacts seem to be virtually non-existent before the 10th century, but the Anglo-Saxon traditions of pilgrimage to Italy might have played a role in establishing them. The presence of some Greek monks in England in the late 10th and early 11th century predates the first known cases of diplomatic exchange. Besides that, there are strong indications of substantial Anglo-Saxon emigration towards Byzantium after the Norman Conquest, which possibly led to their settlement in regions on the Black Sea known as "New England". The last section of this paper discusses aspects of cultural influence and material exchange.

Similar to the British Isles, the Iberian Peninsula also had a rather peripheral position with regard to Byzantium in the period treated here, though it had contained regions under Byzantine rule in Late Antiquity and again became a major player in Byzantine foreign relations in Palaiologan times. Against this background, the contribution by Juan Signes Codoñer concentrates on five aspects. The first part concerns the rather close and official Byzantine relations with al-Andalus during the Umayyad period, thus forming a contrast with the scarcity of information on contacts between the Eastern Empire and the small Christian kingdoms in the northern part of the Iberian Peninsula. Even for Mediterranean Catalonia there is very little evidence, and artistic influence is difficult to interpret. After the First Crusade, Iberian pilgrimage and travel to the eastern Mediterranean increased considerably, while cases of Byzantine pilgrimage to Santiago are difficult to trace. In the fourth part of the paper, the author analyses two major Iberian accounts of travel from the later 12th century, those of the Muslim Ibn Jubayr and the Jew Benjamin of Tudela. Finally, Signes Codoñer outlines the intensification of political and even matrimonial relations towards the Crown of Aragon in the same period.

Savvas Neocleous examines the history of relations between Byzantium and the Kingdom of France, including the County of Flanders, which developed slowly in the late 10th and throughout the 11th centuries. Besides mentioning

some situations of diplomatic contact, Neocleous characterizes pieces of information concerning Byzantium in West Frankish historiography, as well as instances of contact in the ecclesiastical and monastic spheres. However, it was only in the context of the First Crusade, whose leaders first and foremost came from northern France and the southern "Low Countries", that immediate contact between both sides, and consequently knowledge of each other, increased considerably. Similarly, the Second Crusade and the Fourth Crusade, leading to the *halosis* of 1204, are two major points of reference in the article's following sections. In parallel, Neocleous traces the development of representations of Byzantium and its emperors in French literature, which did not only consist of the well-known growing anti-Greek sentiment.

The First Crusade and its encounter with Byzantium also forms the point of departure for the contribution by Johannes Pahlitzsch, which focuses on Latin-Greek interaction during the Crusades and in the Crusader States. Pahlitzsch underlines the stereotypical and secular nature of early reproaches against the Greeks during the crusade. This contrasts with the ecclesiastical policy pursued by the Crusaders in the Holy Land, when they substituted Greek ecclesiastical institutions with Latin ones, and consequently established "a two-tier society" among Christians. As Pahlitzsch shows, the expulsion of the Orthodox patriarchs from Jerusalem and Antioch into exile in Byzantium strengthened the influence of the Patriarchate of Constantinople on Eastern patriarchal sees, their liturgy, and Church law. Byzantine influence grew further in the reign of Manuel I, who virtually assumed the role of a protector of the Crusader states, but did not succeed in improving the position of the Melkites, who ultimately favoured Saladin's rule. A concise discussion of the contemporary position of the Latins at Constantinople closes the article.

One major region of Latin influence is unfortunately missing in this volume though it had been included in our plans from the very beginning: the independent principalities or kingdoms in Bohemia, Poland, and Hungary. After their formation over the course of the 10th century, these areas of eastern and central Europe were another fundamental part of the Latin world. While the Piasts of Poland and the Bohemian Přemyslids were only occasionally in contact with Byzantium,⁴⁷ Hungary formed another major bridge between the Eastern and the Western empires, thus comparable in some ways to southern Italy. There are numerous pertinent studies on Byzantine-Hungarian relations

47 Cf. the studies: Dvornik, "Manuel Komnenos"; Halecki, "La Pologne et l'empire byzantin", pp. 41–45; Albrecht, "Böhmen und Byzanz", pp. 81–89; Salamon, "Polen und Byzanz"; Prinzing, "Byzantinische Aspekte", pp. 461–70; Wołoszyn, "Zwei Episoden"; Rostkowski, "Borys-Koloman".

and on Orthodox Christians in the Hungarian Kingdom, and we can only refer to some of them here.⁴⁸ In contrast to these polities, however, the early medieval Rus' has consciously been left out of the conception of this volume. Though undoubtedly acting as a major intermediary between Byzantium and the northern parts of Europe from the 9th century onwards, and belonging, at least regarding the ruling and most dynamic strata of early Rus' society, to the trans-European "Viking diaspora" of Norman warriors and traders,⁴⁹ they nevertheless did not become a part of Latin Europe, neither linguistically nor religiously. Instead, the Rus' adopted Greek Christianity and thus became a major part of what Dmitry Obolensky has famously termed the "Byzantine commonwealth", as did the Bulgarians and Serbs.⁵⁰ This neither precluded phases of deeply antagonist relations with Byzantium nor a depletion of contacts, as can be observed in the Rus'ian case from the later 11th century onwards, this an albeit less dramatic case than it has been assumed in earlier studies perhaps.⁵¹ This relative scarcity of information for contacts might reflect a structural similarity with Byzantine-Western relations.

The last section of the book again unites some systematic approaches to Byzantine-Western relations. It is primarily devoted to the role of specific types and groups of agents, either defined by their functional role, such as diplomats and traders, or by their religious profile, such as orthodox monks and Jews. Nicolas Drocourt profiles the various agents of diplomatic relations, especially the envoys travelling in both directions. He recalls firstly that recent studies have demonstrated that these travellers were numerous. Furthermore,

48 Moravcsik, *Byzantium and the Magyars*; Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*; among the numerous articles see, inter alia: Rostkowski, "Hungary"; Font, "Lateiner und Orthodoxe"; Font, "Emperor Manuel Comnenos"; Kiss, "Les influences de l'église orthodoxe"; and several contributions in Prinzing/Salamon (eds.), *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa*, pp. 13–95.

49 For the concept of a Viking diaspora in recent research, see Bauduin, "Des Vikings aux Normands", pp. 291–94; for research perspectives emphasizing the position of the Rus' within the Viking world, see especially Berthelot/Musin (eds.), *Russie viking*; Bauduin/Musin (eds.), *Vers l'Orient et vers l'Occident*.

50 Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*. The concept has since been applied in various studies but has also been critically revised, see Raffensperger, "Revisiting". In this context, the question of how narrow ties bound Kievan Rus' with "Western" Europe has recently been the subject of important new considerations: Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*. If we nevertheless maintain the conceptual distinction between Latin Europe and the "Byzantine Commonwealth" this explicitly does not mean to deny that the Rus' principalities were essential parts of Europe during the High Middle Ages, which strongly interacted with other European powers.

51 Bibikov, "Die alte Rus' und die russisch-byzantinischen Beziehungen", pp. 207–22, who based his reconsideration on a broad spectrum of sources, as does his three-volume collection of Greek source-material concerning the Rus': Bibikov, *Byzantinorossica*.

compared to other people on the move (pilgrims, refugees, merchants, or captives) they were certainly among those who travelled most, at least according to our documentation. Their political and social status is analysed. Be they Byzantines or of Western origins, they were part of the elite and, logically, close to the sovereign they represented abroad. The so-called official or diplomatic questions they had to deal with were of various natures; though they often had a political or military dimension, they could also be associated with economic, cultural, or intellectual aspects. Thus, the power and influence, as well as the question of the immunity of these official travellers, are under the scope in this chapter. In this perspective, agents of official relations other than envoys are also considered, such as members of the retinue, hostages, interpreters, and so on.

Annick Peters-Custot examines another important group of cultural brokers, namely Byzantine/Greek monks established in south Italy, the main zone of direct contact between the Greek and the Latin world. She first characterizes the religious landscape of this region and the sources it has produced. The later 10th century witnessed substantial migration from some of these areas to other parts of Italy, thus bringing Greek monks into contact with Latin monasticism (e.g. at Montecassino) as well. A special emphasis is duly put on the presence of Byzantine monks in Rome, which served as a continuous point of (spiritual) attraction not least because of the papal institution as a pillar of Pentarchy, as can be observed from the written "Lives" of saintly monks. These travels got a further "political" stimulus in the late 10th century due to the frequent presence of the Ottonian emperors in the Rome area, and the special relationship some protagonists of Italo-Greek monasticism, such as St. Neilos, developed towards them. Finally, Peters-Custot discusses the fields of actual cultural exchange, and some patterns of textual perceptions of the ascetism the monastic fathers displayed.

Though Liudprand of Cremona showed a certain degree of disdain for them,⁵² his works give us an impression of the central role merchants played in early diplomatic exchanges between the West and Byzantium. Complementary, David Jacoby examines the installation of Italian traders in Byzantine areas; he therefore looks back to the early 9th century when the first indications of a Venetian presence can be detected, soon followed by merchants from Amalfi in the 10th century. He discusses the role Italian traders played in the commercial distribution of agrarian goods and textiles within the empire and in the eastern Mediterranean area in the following century. Another focus

52 See Leyser, "Ends and Means", pp. 121–22.

is put on the development of Byzantine privileges for Italian traders, including those from Pisa and Genoa whose presence is widely visible in the 12th century; but also merchants from other Italian cities, such as Bari, Ancona, or Treviso, are occasionally found in the sources. In addition, Jacoby gives us an extensive in-depth discussion of the probable numbers of Italians resident in merchant communities within the Byzantine Empire, the legal conditions of their residence, and above all their geographical distribution in the Byzantine area beyond Constantinople. In this context, Italian presence on the islands of Crete and Cyprus and in Egypt is likewise outlined. The editors are very grateful to Miriam Salzmann and Johannes Pahlitzsch who kindly accepted our request to write a short addendum to this article which outlines the main research questions and debates in this field.

The role of Jews as intermediaries between the Latin and the Byzantine world is concisely outlined by Saskia Dönitz. Against a background of scarce information, especially from the Byzantine sphere, it is nearly impossible to give a general profile of Jews as cultural brokers, but a few individual cases of trans-Mediterranean contacts can be traced, such as those between Jewish communities in Apulia with Constantinople and Córdoba. Jewish migration from Italy to the early centres of Ashkenaz on the Rhine, and the transfer of literary and liturgical traditions, is another link between a Byzantine and a Latin context, exemplified, for example, in the Qalonymus family tradition, or by cross references with Byzantine Jewish scholars in Ashkenazic texts, though evidence for influence in the opposite direction is virtually absent.

A systematic approach to the functions and relevance of (precious) material objects and gifts in Byzantine-Western exchanges closes the volume's last section. Here Dominik Heher states there was a fundamental imbalance in this respect: the often-exotic gifts Byzantine envoys brought with them enjoyed a much higher prestige than those of their Western counterparts. Besides that, he also draws attention to the economic and ideological aspects of gift-giving, relic transfer and the bestowal of titles, particularly in the case of Venice. Specific items played a particularly significant role in gift exchange; besides manuscripts, that occur only seldomly, Christian relics, and above all Byzantine silk fabrics were objects of high esteem, but sometimes also of fierce criticism in the West.

Finally, we should also briefly refer to what is not contained in the present volume, which does not claim to cover each and every aspect of Byzantine-Western relations in the period addressed. One of the aspects consciously left out is the history of Byzantine Italy, i.e. those significant parts of the Italian south that were regained by Byzantine forces from the 870s onwards and were

transformed into a larger provincial unit (the Catepanate of Italy) ruled from Bari.⁵³ Although separated by the Adriatic and Ionic Seas, this substantial Byzantine territory – which bordered the Lombard principalities, and at least approached the sphere of interest of the Western Empire – existed up to the Norman conquest of Bari in 1071, and a strong Greek-Byzantine cultural influence continued to play a substantial role in larger parts of this region much longer than this.⁵⁴ Besides providing us with a plethora of fascinating phenomena of Latin-Greek symbiosis and hybridization, this zone was also the primary scene of military confrontation between Byzantines and Latins (of various origins and ethnic denominations) throughout the 10th and large parts of the 11th centuries. A profound discussion of these aspects of co-habitation and confrontation could well have formed the subject of another chapter in this book. We did, however, abstain, from a deeper penetration into this sphere here as it belongs to the subject of another volume within this Companion series.⁵⁵ Only the central role of south Italian monasticism in trans-imperial relations demands a contribution of its own in the present volume, as mentioned above.

Another subject which somehow seems missing in the present collection as a separate chapter is the development of the theological conflict between East and West. These questions are, of course, closely interwoven with the emerging rift between the two Churches, traced by Axel Bayer, yet at the same time they were also firmly anchored in the general developments of Eastern and Western theologies.⁵⁶ Approaching the field of religious contacts from a broader angle of perception, the transfer of “non-orthodox” religious ideas, especially dualist beliefs, between the Greek and Latin sphere could also be taken into account. It is thus certain that a relationship existed between the Paulician movement in 9th-century Byzantium, Slavic bogomilism emerging in 10th century Bulgaria and spreading over the southern and western Balkans, and the formation of radical religious ideas in the West from the early 11th century onwards, particularly in northern Italy and the Occitan area, where it led

53 The classical monograph on the history of these territories remains Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft*; for the structural and economic history of Apulia in particular, see Martin, *La Pouille*.

54 Cf. Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale*; Hofmann, *Papsttum und griechische Kirche*.

55 See Cosentino (ed.), *A Companion to Byzantine Italy*.

56 Among the many important contributions, we refer to: Gemeinhardt, *Die Filioque-Kontroverse*; Sicienski, *The Filioque*; Spiteris, *La Critica Bizantina del Primato Romano*; for an overview of the changes in the attribution of Latin “errors” in the period up to 1204, see Kolbaba, “Byzantine Perceptions”, pp. 119–28.

to the establishment of the Cathars. The degree of Eastern influence on occidental religious phenomena is, however, disputed.⁵⁷

Three other subjects had originally been planned as separate chapters but could not be completed due to several reasons. We have already referred to the missing of a chapter on East Central Europe in this respect. The basic geographical conditions of land- and sea-based communications between East and West and their historical developments have been analysed by Ewald Kislinger in a number of recent studies, which will serve as an excellent guide to these aspects not specifically treated in this volume.⁵⁸ Furthermore, communications are closely interwoven with economic exchange, as Michael McCormick's fundamental study on Mediterranean travel and commerce in the preceding early medieval epoch has shown.⁵⁹ A study following similar paths for the 10th to 12th century would certainly be a promising subject of inquiry,⁶⁰ but it clearly exceeds the limits of focus taken in the present volume. Nevertheless, individual aspects of material exchange and long term travel will be found, for instance, in the chapters on Scandinavia, the British Isles, and the Iberian Peninsula, but a comprehensive analysis of Mediterranean commercial relations would necessarily shift our focus onto the Islamic world and its numerous ports, which lie beyond the scope of the present volume, as well as on the role of the Rus' as an economic mediator towards other parts of continental Europe. At the same time, an analysis of trade between Byzantium and other parts of Europe essentially depends on detailed archaeological studies.⁶¹ Therefore, the present book only contains a chapter on the relatively well-documented written material telling us about the activities of Italian merchants primarily from the emerging trade centres of Venice, Pisa

57 For further discussions of these problems see, inter alia, Garsoïan, *Paulician Heresy*; Lemerle, "L'histoire des Pauliciens"; Ries, "Manichéens, Pauliciens, Bogomiles, Cathares"; Biget, "Les bons hommes".

58 See Kislinger, "Reisen und Verkehrswege in Byzanz"; Kislinger, "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz"; Kislinger, "Verkehrsrouten zur See"; see also Avramea, "Land and Sea Communications"; and the considerations made by Leyser, "The Tenth Century", pp. 29–32 and 46–47, especially with regard to the role of Venice and Hungary.

59 McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy*.

60 For a general overview of Byzantine trade in this period, see Laiou, "Exchange and Trade"; furthermore Patlagean, "Byzance et les marchés", pp. 596–627; Oikonomidès, "Le march-and byzantin", pp. 645–60. Nevertheless, long-distance trade is examined less for this period than for the preceding centuries, and other contributions on Byzantine trade history have concentrated on local exchange networks: see Morrisson (ed.), *Trade and Markets in Byzantium*.

61 This is evident from the numerous studies assembled in Mundell Mango (ed.), *Byzantine Trade*, which refer to the distribution of specific types of wares, such as wine, pottery, glass, and metalware.

and Genoa, in the Byzantine Romania. Finally, we also had to give up an article looking at the symbolic dimension of Byzantine-Western communications, as expressed – inter alia – in rituals, insignia, and depictions of rulers on objects such as seals, or the transfer of titles, etc. This is all the more regrettable as a comprehensive treatment of these subjects does not yet exist, though several studies of individual aspects can be adduced.⁶² This desideratum shows that the history of Byzantine-Western relations and transcultural influences still offers a lot of subjects to be further explored. The present volume thus hopefully will not “close” a field of study, but rather open up new perspectives for future research.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, eds. G. Waitz/B. de Simpson, *Ottonis et Rahewini Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 46), 3rd ed., Hannover 1912.

Secondary Literature

Ančić, M./Shepard, J./Vedriš, T. (eds.), *Imperial Spheres and the Adriatic. Byzantium, the Carolingians and the Treaty of Aachen*, London 2018.

Albrecht, S., “Böhmen und Byzanz und was sie voneinander wussten”, in G. Prinzing/M. Salamon/P. Stephenson (eds.), *Byzantium and East Central Europe* (Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia, 3), Cracow 2001, pp. 81–97.

Andriopoulou, S., *Diplomatic Communication between Byzantium and the West under the Late Palaiologoi (1354–1453)* (Ph.D thesis, University of Birmingham 2010), URL: <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1515/> (accessed 18/08/2020).

62 For Byzantine influence on Ottonian seals, see Keller, “Ottonische Herrschersiegel”, esp. pp. 10–20; for insignia, see Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*; Pertusi, “Insegne del potere sovrano e delegato”; for the use of Byzantine titles, see Schramm “Kaiser Otto III.”. The role of symbolic communication and rituals in the societies of Latin Christendom in the High Middle Ages has become a major trend in medievalistics over the last decades, but there have been only a few attempts so far to apply a similar approach (to rituals beyond court ceremonies) to Byzantium. One example is Grünbart, “Basileios II.”. For diplomatic ceremonial in Byzantium, see Tinnefeld, “Ceremonies for Foreign Ambassadors”; Angelidi, “Designing Receptions”; Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, vol. 2, pp. 487–583.

- Angelidi, C., "Designing Receptions in the Palace (De Cerimoniis 2.15)", in A. Beihammer/S. Constantinou/M. Parani (eds.), *Court Ceremonies and Rituals of Power in Byzantium and the Medieval Mediterranean: Comparative Perspectives*, Leiden 2013, pp. 465–86.
- Angold, M., "A Papal Version of the Fourth Crusade: The Mosaics of San Giovanni Evangelista at Ravenna", *Speculum* 94 (2019), 1006–32.
- Angelov, P., *Srednovekovnata bălgarska diplomacija*, Sofia 2011.
- Anton, H.H., "Beobachtungen zum fränkisch-byzantinischen Verhältnis in karolingischer Zeit", in R. Schieffer (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Regnum Francorum*, Sigmaringen 1990, pp. 97–119.
- Avramea, A., "Land and Sea Communications, Fourth–Fifteenth Centuries", in A.E. Laiou (ed.), *The Economic History of Byzantium. From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Washington, DC 2002, vol. 1, pp. 57–90.
- Bauduin, P., "Des Vikings aux Normands", in *Le migrazioni nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di Studio della fondazione Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 66), Spoleto 2019, vol. 1, pp. 273–302.
- Bauduin, P./Musin, A.E. (eds.), *Vers l'Orient et vers l'Occident. Regards croisés sur les dynamiques et les transferts culturels des Vikings à la Rous ancienne*, Caen 2014.
- Beihammer, A., "Strategies of Diplomacy and Ambassadors in Byzantine-Muslim Relations in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", in A. Becker/N. Drocourt (eds.), *Ambassadeurs et ambassades au coeur des relations diplomatiques. Rome-Occident médiéval-Byzance (VIII^e s. avant J.-C.–XII^e s. ap. J.-C.)*, Metz 2012, pp. 371–400.
- Berthelot, S./Musin, A.E. (eds.), *Russie viking, vers une autre Normandie? Novgorod et la Russie du Nord, des migrations scandinaves à la fin du Moyen Âge, VIII^e–XV^e siècle*, Paris 2011.
- Bibikov, M.V., "Die alte Rus' und die russisch-byzantinischen Beziehungen im Spiegel der byzantinischen Quellen (Ende 11.–13. Jahrhundert)", *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 35 (1985), 197–222.
- Bibikov, M.V., *Byzantinorossica. Svod vizantijskich svidetel'stv o Rusi*, 3 vols., Moscow 2004–18.
- Biget, J.-L., "Les bons hommes sont-ils les fils des bogomiles? Examen critique d'une idée reçue", *Slavica Occitania* 16 (2003), 133–88.
- Browning, R., *Byzantium and Bulgaria. A Comparative Study across the Early Medieval Frontier*, Berkeley 1975.
- Carile, A., "Roma e Románia dagli Isaurici ai Comneni", in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 34), Spoleto 1988, vol. 2, pp. 531–82.
- Chrissis, N.G./Kolia-Dermitzaki, A./Papageorgiou, A. (eds.), *Byzantium and the West. Perception and Reality (11th–15th c.)*, London-New York 2019.

- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden 1996.
- Ciggaar, K.N./van Aalst, V. (eds.), *Byzantium and the Low Countries in the Tenth Century. Aspects of Art and History in the Ottonian Era*, Hernen 1985.
- Cosentino, S. (ed.), *A Companion to Byzantine Italy* (Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World, 8), Leiden-Boston 2021.
- Der Nersessian, S., *Armenia and the Byzantine Empire. A Brief Study of Armenian Art and Civilization*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, Mass. 1974.
- Dölger, F./Karayannopulos, J., *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre. Abschnitt: Die Kaiserurkunden* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 12, 3.1), Munich 1968.
- Drocourt, N., "Ambassades latines et musulmanes à Byzance: Une situation contrastée (VIII^e–XI^e siècles)", *Byzantion* 74 (2004), 348–81.
- Drocourt, N., "Christian-Muslim Diplomatic Relations. An Overview of the Main Sources and Themes of Encounter (600–1000)", in D. Thomas/B. Roggema/J.P. Monferrer-Sala (eds.), *Christian Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. 1: (600–900) (History of Christian-Muslim relations, 14), Leiden 2009, pp. 29–72.
- Drocourt, N., *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore. Les ambassadeurs étrangers dans l'empire byzantin des années 640 à 1204*, 2 vols., Louvain 2015.
- Drocourt, N., "Introduction", in id./E. Malamut (eds.), *La diplomatie byzantine, de l'Empire romain aux confins de l'Europe (V^e–XV^e siècle)*, Leiden-Boston 2020, pp. 1–17.
- Drocourt, N./Malamut, E. (eds.), *La diplomatie byzantine, de l'Empire romain aux confins de l'Europe (V^e–XV^e siècle)*, Leiden-Boston 2020.
- Dvornik, F., "Manuel I. Komnenos a Vladislav II., král český", in M. Weingart/J. Dobiáš/M. Paulová (eds.), *Z dějin východní Evropy a Slovanstva: sborník věnovaný Jaroslavu Bidlovi k šedesátým narozeninám*, Prague 1928, pp. 58–70.
- Ebels Hoving, B., *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen 1096–1204*, Assen 1971.
- Ewig, E., *Die Merowinger und das Imperium* (Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge G 261), Opladen 1983.
- Exarchos, L., "»Und ihr wagt nicht, euren Glauben zu bekennen«. Formen des Bekennens im Rahmen der Unionsverhandlungen zwischen römischer und orthodoxer Kirche in Nikaia und Nymphaion 1234", in M. Grigore/F. Kühner-Wielach (eds.), *Orthodoxa confessio? Konfessionsbildung, Konfessionalisierung und ihre Folgen in der östlichen Christenheit Europas*, Göttingen 2018, pp. 139–62.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden 1967.
- Font, M., "Lateiner und Orthodoxe: Völker und ihre Gewohnheiten. Das Beispiel des mittelalterlichen Königreichs Ungarn", in M. Salamon et al. (eds.), *Rome, Constantinople and Newly Converted Europe. Archeological and Historical Evidence*, Crakow 2012, vol. 1, pp. 143–52.

- Font, M., "Emperor Manuel Comnenos and the Hungarian Kingdom", in M. Kajmakamova/M. Salamon/M. Smorag Rózycka (eds.), *Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone, from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century* (Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia, 5), Cracow 2007, pp. 223–36.
- Frend, W.H.C., *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge 1972.
- Ganshof, F.-L., *Le Moyen Âge* (Histoire des relations internationales, 1), 3rd ed., Paris 1964.
- Garsoïan, N.G., *The Paulician Heresy. A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire*, The Hague 1967.
- Garsoïan, N.G. (ed.), *L'Arménie et Byzance. Histoire et culture* (Byzantina Sorbonensia 12), Paris 1996.
- Geanakoplos, D.J., *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West 1258–1282. A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations*, Cambridge, Mass. 1959.
- Gemeinhardt, P., *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 82), Berlin-Boston 2002.
- Grünbart, M., "Basileios II. und Bardas Skleros versöhnen sich", *Millennium* 5 (2008), 213–24.
- Halecki, O., "La Pologne et l'Empire byzantin", *Byzantion* 7 (1932), 41–67.
- Harris, J./Holmes, C./Russell, E. (eds.), *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean World After 1150*, Oxford 2012.
- Hehl, E.-D., "Zwei Kaiser – (k)ein Problem? Byzanz, das westliche Kaisertum und ein missverständlicher Forschungsbegriff", in L. Körntgen et al. (eds.), *Byzanz und seine europäischen Nachbarn: Politische Interdependenzen und kulturelle Missverständnisse* (Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident, 17), Heidelberg 2020, pp. 41–77.
- Heinemeyer, W., "Die Verträge zwischen dem Oströmischen Reiche und den italienischen Städten Genua, Pisa und Venedig vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert", *Archiv für Diplomatik* 3 (1957), 79–161.
- Herrin, J., "The Pentarchy: Theory and Reality in the Ninth Century", in *Cristianità d'Occidente e cristianità d'Oriente (secoli VI–XI)* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 51), Spoleto 2004, vol. 1, pp. 591–628.
- Herrin, J./Saint-Guillain, G. (eds.), *Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean After 1204*, Farnham 2011.
- Hofmann, T., *Papsttum und griechische Kirche in Süditalien in nachnormannischer Zeit (13.–15. Jahrhundert). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Süditaliens im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter* (Phil. Diss. Würzburg 1994).
- Holmes, C., "Treaties Between Byzantium and the Islamic World", in P. de Souza/J. France (eds.), *War and Peace in Ancient and Medieval History*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 141–57.

- Howard-Johnston, J.D. (ed.), *Byzantium and the West: c.850–c.1200. Proceedings of the XVIII Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, 30 March–1 April 1984* (= Byzantinische Forschungen, 13), Amsterdam 1988.
- Huxley, G., "Steppe Peoples in Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos", *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 34 (1984), 77–89.
- Kaldellis, A., *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge 2007.
- Kazhdan, A.P., "Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century", in A. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim world*, Washington, DC 2001, pp. 83–100.
- Keller, H., "Ottonische Herrschersiegel. Beobachtungen und Fragen zu Gestalt und Aussage und zur Funktion im historischen Kontext", in K. Krimm/H. John (eds.), *Bild und Geschichte. Studien zur politischen Ikonographie. Festschrift für Hansmartin Schwarzmaier*, Sigmaringen 1997, pp. 3–51.
- Kindlimann, S., *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens im Hochmittelalter. Studien zur Entwicklung der Idee eines lateinischen Kaiserreichs in Byzanz*, Zurich 1969.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz und dem Abendland vom neunten bis in die Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts", in E. Konstantinou (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 1997, pp. 231–57.
- Kislinger, E., "Verkehrsrouten zur See im byzantinischen Raum", in E. Kislinger/J. Koder/A. Külzer (eds.), *Handels Güter und Verkehrswege. Aspekte der Warenversorgung im östlichen Mittelmeerraum (4. bis 15. Jahrhundert)*, Vienna 2010, pp. 149–74.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege in Byzanz. Realität und Mentalität, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen", in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, vol. 1: *Plenary Papers*, Sofia 2011, pp. 341–87.
- Kiss, G., "Les influences de l'Église orthodoxe en Hongrie aux X^e–XIII^e siècle", *Specimina nova. Sectio mediaevalis* 4 (2004), 51–71.
- Koder, J., "Byzanz als Mythos und Erfahrung im Zeitalter Ottos I.", in B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Ottonische Neuanfänge*, Mainz 2001, pp. 237–50.
- Koder, J., "Latinoi – The Image of the Other According to Greek Sources", in C. Maltezou/P. Schreiner (eds.), *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo). Atti del colloquio internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz O.P., Venezia, 1–2 dicembre 2000*, Venice 2002, pp. 25–39.
- Koder, J., "Die räumlichen Vorstellungen der Byzantiner von der Ökumene (4. bis 12. Jahrhundert)", *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 137/2 (2002), 15–34.
- Kolbaba, T.M., "Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious 'Errors': Themes and Changes from 850 to 1350", in A. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, DC 2001, pp. 117–43.

- Kolditz, S., "Gesandtschaften, Briefe und Konzilien in den Beziehungen Ludwigs II. von Italien zu Byzanz", in S. Roebert et al. (eds.), *Von der Ostsee zum Mittelmeer. Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte für Wolfgang Huschner* (Italia regia, 4), Leipzig 2019, pp. 289–310.
- Kolia-Dermitzaki, A., "Byzantium and the Crusades in the Komnenian Era: Perception and Reality", in N.G. Chrissis/A. Kolia-Dermitzaki/A. Papageorgiou (eds.), *Byzantium and the West. Perception and Reality (11th–15th c.)*, London 2019, pp. 59–83.
- Kresten, O., "Der 'Anrede Streit' zwischen Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach der Schlacht von Myriokephalon", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 34/35 (1992/93), 65–110.
- Laiou, A.E., *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II. 1282–1328* (Harvard historical studies, 88), Cambridge, Mass. 1972.
- Laiou, A.E., "Exchange and Trade, Seventh–Twelfth Centuries", in ead. (ed.), *The Economic History of Byzantium. From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 39), Washington, DC 2002, vol. 2, pp. 697–770.
- Lampakis, S./Leontsini, M./Lounghis, T./Vlysidou, V. (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy: A Seminar*, Athens 2007.
- Lemerle, P., "L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques", *Travaux et mémoires* 5 (1973), 1–145.
- Leyser, K., "The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships", in D. Baker (ed.), *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, Edinburgh 1973, pp. 29–63.
- Leyser, K., "Ends and Means in Liudprand of Cremona", in Howard-Johnston (ed.), *Byzantium and the West*, pp. 119–43.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)*, Amsterdam 1984.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Das 'Zweikaiserproblem' und sein Einfluss auf die Aussenpolitik der Komnenen", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985), 219–44.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, Stuttgart 2004.
- Lounghis, T.C., *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident depuis la fondation des États barbares jusqu'aux Croisades (407–1096)*, Athens 1980.
- Lounghis, T.C., "Die byzantinische Ideologie der 'begrenzten Ökumene' und die römische Frage im ausgehenden 10. Jahrhundert", *Byzantinoslavica* 56 (1995), 117–28.
- Madden, T. (ed.), *The Fourth Crusade: Event, Aftermath, and Perceptions*, Aldershot 2008.
- Madden, T., "The Venetian Version of the Fourth Crusade: Memory and the Conquest of Constantinople in Medieval Venice", *Speculum* 87 (2012), 311–44.
- Makk, F., *The Árpáds and the Comneni: Political Relations Between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th Century*, Budapest 1989.
- Martin, J.-M., *La Pouille du VI^e au XII^e siècle* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 179), Rome 1993.

- Martin, J.-M., "L'occident chrétien dans le Livre des cérémonies, II, 48", *Travaux et Mémoires* 13 (2000), 617–45.
- McCormick, M., "Diplomacy and the Carolingian Encounter with Byzantium down to the Accession of Charles the Bald", in B. McGinn (ed.), *Eriugena. East and West*, Notre Dame 1994, pp. 15–48.
- McCormick, M., *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce AD 300–900*, Cambridge 2001.
- McCormick, M., "From One Center of Power to Another: Comparing Byzantine and Carolingian Ambassadors", in C. Ehlers (ed.), *Deutsche Königspfalzen*, vol. 8: *Places of Power – Orte der Herrschaft – Lieux du pouvoir*, Göttingen 2007, pp. 45–72.
- Merendino, E., "Federico II e Giovanni III Vatatzes", in *Byzantino-Sicula II: Miscellanea di scritti in memoria di Giuseppe Rossi-Taibbi*, Palermo 1975, pp. 371–83.
- Miller, D.A., "The Logothete of the Drome in the Middle Byzantine Period", *Byzantion* 36 (1966), 438–70.
- Miller, D.A., "Byzantine Treaties and Treaty-Making: 500–1025 A.D.", *Byzantinoslavica* 32 (1971), 56–76.
- Moravcsik, G., *Byzantium and the Magyars*, Amsterdam 1970.
- Morrisson, C. (ed.), *Trade and Markets in Byzantium*, Washington, D.C. 2012.
- Mundell Mango, M. (ed.), *Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries. The Archaeology of Local, Regional and International Exchange. Papers of the Thirty-Eighth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St John's College, University of Oxford, March 2004* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications, 14), Farnham 2009.
- Mystakides, B.A., *Byzantinisch-deutsche Beziehungen zur Zeit der Ottonen*, Stuttgart 1891.
- Noonan, T.S., "Byzantium and the Khazars: A Special Relationship?" in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 109–32.
- Obolensky, D., "The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy", in *Actes du XII^e Congrès International d'Études Byzantines, Ochride, 10–16 septembre 1961*, Belgrade 1963, vol. 1, pp. 45–61.
- Obolensky, D., *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453*, London 1971.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter*, Hildesheim 1947.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Das abendländische Kaisertum", in id., *Ost-Rom und der Westen. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1983, pp. 1–36.
- Oikonomides, N., "Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 1204–1453: Means and Ends", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 73–88.
- Oikonomides, N., "Le marchand byzantin des provinces (IX^e–XI^e s.)", in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: L'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 40), Spoleto 1993, pp. 633–60.

- Necipoğlu, N., *Byzantium Between the Ottomans and the Latins. Politics and Society in the Late Empire*, Cambridge 2009.
- Patlagean, E., "Byzance et les marchés du grand commerce, vers 830–vers 1030. Entre Pirenne et Polyani", in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: L'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 40), Spoleto 1993, pp. 587–629.
- Péquignot, S./Moeglin J.-M., *Diplomatie et « relations internationales » au Moyen Âge (IX^e–XV^e siècle)*, Paris 2017.
- Pertusi, A., "Insegne del potere sovrano e delegato a Bisanzio e nei paesi di influenza bizantina", in *Simboli e simbologia nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 23), Spoleto 1976, vol. 2, pp. 481–568.
- Peters-Custot, A., *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-byzantine (IX^e–XIV^e siècle). Une acculturation en douceur* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 420), Rome 2009.
- Prinzing, G., "Byzantinische Aspekte der mittelalterlichen Geschichte Polens", *Byzantion* 64 (1994), pp. 459–84.
- Prinzing, G./Salamon, M. (eds.), *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950–1453: Beiträge zu einer table-ronde des XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Copenhagen 1996*, Wiesbaden 1999.
- Pryor, J.H., "The Oaths of the Leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexius I Comnenus: Fealty, Homage – πίστις, δουλεία", *Parergon* n.s. 2 (1984), 111–41.
- Queller, D.A., *The Office of Ambassador in the Middle Ages*, Princeton 1967.
- Raffensperger, C.A., "Revisiting the Idea of the Byzantine Commonwealth", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 28 (2004), 159–74.
- Raffensperger, C.A., *Reimagining Europe. Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World*, Cambridge, Mass. 2012.
- Ries, J., "Manichéens, Pauliciens, Bogomiles, Cathares. Transmission et fonctionnement des systèmes dualistes dans l'Europe médiévale", in C. Elsas (ed.), *Tradition und Translation. Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene. Festschrift für Carsten Colpe zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin 1994, pp. 154–64.
- Rostkowski, G., "Hungary between Byzantium, Central and Eastern Europe (ca. 1118–1135)", in G. Prinzing/M. Salamon/P. Stephenson (eds.), *Byzantium and East Central Europe* (Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia, 3), Cracow 2001, pp. 159–77.
- Rostkowski, G., "Borys-Koloman Kolomanowicz, Bizancjum i Polska w 1131–1132 roku. Przyczynek do dziejów bizantyńsko-polskich stosunków politycznych" [Borys-Koloman Kolomanowicz, Byzantium and Poland in the years 1131–1132. A Contribution to the History of Byzantine-Polish Political Relations], in T. Wasilewski (ed.), *Inter Orientem et Occidentem. Studia z dziejów Europy środkowowschodniej ofiarowane profesorowi Janowi Tyszkiewiczowi w czterdziestolecie pracy naukowej*, Warsaw 2002, pp. 65–76.

- Salamon, M., "Polen und Byzanz. Die Perspektiven des 11. und des 14. Jahrhunderts", in V. Múcska (ed.), *East Central Europe at the Turn of the 1st and 2nd Millennia*, Bratislava 2002, pp. 89–102.
- Schramm, P.E., *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom 3. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols., Stuttgart 1954–78.
- Schramm, P.E., "Kaiser Otto III. (980–1002): seine Persönlichkeit und sein 'byzantinischer Hofstaat'", in id., *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Stuttgart 1969, vol. 3, pp. 277–97.
- Shepard, J., "Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 800–1204: Means and Ends", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 41–71.
- Siecienski, A.E., *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford 2010.
- Spiteris, J., *La Critica Bizantina del Primato Romano nel secolo XII* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 208), Rome 1979.
- Stouraitis, I., "Roman Identity in Byzantium. A Critical Approach", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 107 (2014), 175–220.
- Tinnefeld, F., "Ceremonies for Foreign Ambassadors at the Court of Byzantium and their Political Background", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 19 (1993), 193–213.
- Vasiliev, A.A./Canard, M., *Byzance et les Arabes*, 3 vols., Brussels 1935–68.
- Winkler, H.A., *Geschichte des Westens. Von den Anfängen in der Antike bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Munich 2009.
- Wołoszyn, M., "Zwei Episoden aus der Geschichte der polnisch-byzantinischen Kontakte des 10. bis 12. Jahrhunderts", in M. Kajmakamova/M. Salamon/M. Smorag Rózycka (eds.), *Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone, from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century* (Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia, 5), Cracow, 2007, pp. 161–82.

PART 1

Perceptions and Linguistic Aspects



Knowledge of the West in Byzantine Sources, c.900–c.1200

Jonathan Shepard

1 Introduction

1.1 *The West Viewed in a Classical Setting (c.900–c.1050)*

Sundry terms denoting “the West” (*he Dysis/Espera*) or “the Western [parts]” (*ta Hesperia*) as a geographical entity appear in 10th- and earlier 11th-century Byzantine texts.¹ Usually, they denote anywhere beyond the Adriatic that had belonged to imperial Rome in its heyday. According to an entry in the encyclopaedia known as the *Souda*, its sway had long stretched to “the Ocean” and “Britain, too ... is now counted within the borders of the empire of the Romans”. No clear-cut distinction is drawn between Rome’s frontier when the source for this entry was composed, the 3rd century AD, and the current state of play. This finesse was characteristic of texts emanating from the metropolis, Constantinople.² Narratives, hagiographies and prescriptive texts, whether from imperial or ecclesiastical circles, are sparse and deal mainly with the Italian peninsula and nearby islands and coastal towns. They mostly identify persons or groupings by the names of islands, regions or urban centres – “Sardinians”, for instance, “Calabrians”, “Neapolitans”, “men of Benevento” or “men of Capua” – and resort to such blanket terms as “Italians” or “Lombards” more sparingly.³

1 Niketas the Paphlagonian, *Letter*, ed. Westerink, pp. 191, 195; *Vita Basilii*, chs. 52, 71, ed. and trans. Ševčenko, pp. 188–89, 244–45, 246–47; Theophanes Continuatus, ed. Bekker, pp. 453–54; *Monody for Bertha-Eudocia* (d. 949), ed. Lampros, p. 269.

2 *Suidae lexicon*, ed. Adler, vol. 4, s.v. *Rhōmaïōn archē*, p. 302, lines 13–23. The text probably took shape during the first ten years of Basil II’s reign (976–86): *ODB*, vol. 3, pp. 1930–31 (Kazhdan); Németh, “Imperial Systematisation”, p. 245.

3 Sardinians: Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De ceremoniis*, II.44, ed. Reiske, vol. 2 (= ed. in and trans. Moffatt/Tall, vol. 2), pp. 650–51; II.43, eds. and trans. Dagron et al., vol. 3, pp. 291–93. Calabrians: e.g. Theophanes Continuatus, ed. Bekker, p. 454; John Skylitzes, *Synopsis*, ed. Thurn, pp. 264, 266. Neapolitans: Theophanes Continuatus, ed. Bekker, pp. 453–54; “men of Benevento” and “of Capua”: *DAI*, ch. 29, lines 213–14, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, pp. 134–35. Italians: *DAI*, ch. 23, lines 23–24, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, pp. 100–01; John Skylitzes, *Synopsis*, ed. Thurn, p. 262. Lombards (mostly in the role of barbarian intruders into Italy): Theophanes

Far less attention is given to places or events beyond the Alps. This amounted to the Far West, and contrasted with the Near West, parts of which came within “the empire of the Romans”. Byzantine texts refer to the inhabitants by ethnic names, in so far as they mention any: “Celts”, “Gauls” and “Germans”, terms of classical pedigree, feature in the *Souda* as well as works of narrative. The “Franks”, whose name remained current among Westerners themselves, had figured in late antique texts as well-ordered and formidable warriors, yet ultimately “barbarians” of the type congenial to the north, a characterization reiterated by a treatise on tactics, c.900.⁴ The term is used occasionally in sources, of northerners engaging with Italy, especially Rome, yet unlikely to master that city for long. Diplomatic expediency might even prompt marriage alliances with leading Franks. Having seen his son Romanos married to Bertha-Eudocia, daughter of the fairly powerful Hugh of Arles, Constantine VII found justification in Constantine the Great’s supposedly Western origins and “the traditional fame and nobility of those lands and races”.⁵ The deposition of Pope John XII, “inclined to every sort of debauchery and vice”, by Otto I, “the emperor of the Franks”, is recorded by John Skylitzes, whose late 11th-century chronicle drew on earlier sources.⁶

Such attention reflects Rome’s unique and indelible significance to the Byzantines.⁷ Their imperial order sprang, ultimately, from that city’s conquests and virtues, and their Roman “brand” had connotations of hegemony, beyond any other regime’s reach. The Papacy commanded respect, too, being an ancient patriarchate. Tenth-century narratives of affairs within the Byzantine Church treat it as foremost in the Pentarchy. The *Life of Patriarch Euthymios*, for example, gives weight to the judgement of the other patriarchs, but especially Rome’s, as to whether Leo VI should receive special dispensation for his uncanonical fourth marriage.⁸ The stature of the Papacy and “the whole priestly order of the holy church of the Romans [i.e. Western Romans]” found acknowledgement in the greetings prescribed by Constantine VII’s

Continuatus, ed. Bekker, pp. 453–54; *DAI*, ch. 25, line 22, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, pp. 104–05; ch. 27, lines 30, 36, 53, 63, pp. 114–17.

4 Leo VI, *Tactica*, Constitution 18, chs. 76–92, ed. and trans. Dennis, pp. 464–71. Leo was drawing heavily on the *Strategikon* of Maurice: Haldon, *Critical Commentary*, pp. 347–50. See also Kaldellis, *Ethnography*, pp. 82, 85.

5 See *DAI*, ch. 13, lines 118–22, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, pp. 70–73; Balzaretto, “Narratives of Success”, pp. 187–92, 205–07.

6 “ὁ τῶν Φράγγων βασιλεύς”: John Skylitzes, *Synopsis*, ed. Thurn, p. 245. On Skylitzes, see below, nn. 57, 65.

7 Still of value for explaining this is Dölger, “Rom in der Gedankenwelt”, esp. pp. 74–83, 98–101.

8 *Life of Euthymios* 11, 12, 13, 15, ed. and trans. Karlin-Hayter, pp. 72–73, 78–81, 86–87, 98–101.

Book of Ceremonies for papal envoys.⁹ Such shows of respect presupposed that “Rome ... now has put away imperial power, has its own form of government and is controlled principally by some pope of the day”.¹⁰ Subsequently, from 962 onwards, the coronations of Otto I and his successors as emperors rekindled memories of the city’s imperial status but alarm bells failed to sound. Even Otto III’s involvement brought mirth rather than outrage, judging from letters written by Metropolitan Leon of Synada while leading an embassy to Otto in the mid-990s. He even claims credit for putting on the papal throne “the rogue” Philagathos, showing *Schadenfreude* over “Old Rome”’s discomposure.¹¹ Essentially, Leon shows condescension, seeing in families like the Crescentii the local powers of substance with whom deals might be struck. This is understandable, given the substantial resources and the familial networks still linking Byzantines with the city. Thus, Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos, himself of Calabrian stock, expected a clerical kinsman to lobby the pope on his behalf.¹²

Writers on Italian affairs show fellow-feeling, alongside condescension. Churchmen and monks considered Greek-speaking regions like Calabria and Sicily within their purlieu, befitting subordination to the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate.¹³ Unshaken by the Arabs’ overrunning nearly all of Sicily by 900, similar assumptions prevailed at court. Constantine VII saw Sicily as integral to his claim to “rule the sea as far as the Pillars of Hercules”.¹⁴ Making up for losses there, control resumed over Calabria and much of Apulia from the late 9th century on, while claims to overlordship further north were expressed in protocol. The leaders of maritime cities – Naples, Salerno, Amalfi, Gaeta, Venice – were “subjects” (*douloi*) and therefore received “commands” (*keleuseis*) rather than “letters” (*grammata*), according to the *Book of Ceremonies*. So

- 9 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, II.47, ed. Reiske, vol. 2 (= ed. in and trans. Moffatt/Tall, vol. 2), pp. 680–81; II.47, eds. and trans. Dagron et al., vol. 3, p. 347.
- 10 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De thematibus*, II.10, ed. Pertusi, p. 94.
- 11 Leo of Synada, *Correspondence*, nos. 8, 11, 12, ed. and trans. Vinson, pp. 10–11, 16–17, 18–23. See Kolditz, “Leon von Synada”, pp. 545, 549–53, 557–59, 562–67.
- 12 Nicholas I Mystikos, *Letters*, no. 54, eds. and trans. Jenkins/Westerink, pp. 292–93.
- 13 *Notitiae episcopatum*, ed. Darrouzès, pp. 83, 85–86, and no. 8, entry 13/14 (a list of metropolitan sees, datable to the 10th century); *ODB*, vol. 1, pp. 365–66 (Kazhdan/Hitchner); Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie*, pp. 126–30. On the question of when these regions came under Constantinopolitan jurisdiction, see Brandes, “Das Schweigen des Liber pontificalis”, esp. 177–87, 199–203.
- 14 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De thematibus*, II.10, ed. Pertusi, p. 94. Romanos I Lekapenos sent an expeditionary force to reconquer Sicily, which still had administrative staff befitting its nominal status of “theme” in the mid-10th century: Prigent, “La politique sicilienne”, pp. 73–84.

did the *archontes* of Sardinia whose inscriptions on seals and stone were, until the early 11th century, apt to state their court-titles.¹⁵

Whilst susceptible to the benefits that imperial favour could bring, these peripheral elites were self-determining. The extent of the theme of “Longibardia” (“Lombard-land”) fluctuated over time. Outside Calabria, the Salento and military bases, the number of Greek-speakers was modest, with Romance-speaking “Lombards” the majority population.¹⁶ Even inland settlements were vulnerable to Arab raiding, with native *grandees* themselves liable to rebel. So were the citizens of important towns, including Bari, headquarters of Longibardia’s governor (*katepano*). Yet the imperial order allowed for reaffirmation of property-rights and -privileges, and for dispute-resolution in line with Lombard law, and was of avail to ecclesiastical and secular landholders alike, judging by the contracts and charters authenticated under the auspices of Byzantine judges and notaries. Indeed, by the mid-11th century students in Constantinople were expected to learn Latin at the law school founded by Constantine IX.¹⁷ And eventually the *katepano* Basil Boiannes drove out the leading rebel, Melo, and in 1018 defeated the Norman adventurers he had enlisted. Boiannes consolidated the north-eastern borders, building barrier-fortresses whose names evoked antiquity: Civitate and Troia (“Troy”).¹⁸ For their part, Byzantine writers and poets would sometimes recall their empire’s glorious roots by dubbing themselves “Ausonians”, and comparing Nikephoros Phokas’ victories with Scipio Africanus’ and Julius Caesar’s.¹⁹

15 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, II.48, ed. Reiske, vol. 2 (= ed. in and trans. Moffatt/Tall, vol. 2), p. 690; II. 48, eds. and trans. Dagron et al., vol. 3, p. 371. See Martin, “L’Occident chrétien”, pp. 635–37; Cosentino, “Re-analysing Some Byzantine Bullae”; id., “Byzantine Sardinia”, pp. 349–51.

16 von Falkenhausen, “Between Two Empires”, p. 139; Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie*, pp. 32–46, 50–72.

17 See Martin, *Pouille*, pp. 52–53; von Falkenhausen, “Between Two Empires”, pp. 143–54; Prigent, “Conclusion”, pp. 221–25, 234–35; von Falkenhausen, “Amministrazione fiscale”, pp. 540–49; Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie*, pp. 119–21. For Constantine’s novel: *Jus graecoromanum*, eds. Zepos/Zepos, vol. 1, pp. 618–27, esp. pp. 620, 624; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 863. On the knowledge of Latin terms in Constantinople, see Penna “Hagiotheodorites”, pp. 420–21, 426; Stolte, “Byzantine Law of Obligations”, p. 330.

18 On Boiannes, see Holtzmann, “Der Katepan Boioannes”.

19 Theodosios the Deacon, *De Creta*, ed. Criscuolo, p. 2, lines 1–4, 11–14; John Geometres, *Poèmes*, no. 90, line 2; no. 91, line 4, ed. and trans. van Opstall, pp. 306–07, 312–13; Leo VI, *Naumachica*, ed. Dain, p. 61, lines 1, 5; Mazzucchi, “Dagli anni di Basilio Parakimomenos”, pp. 294–95, 302. The *Souda*, however, identifies the “Ausonians” as “Italians”: *Suidae lexicon*, ed. Adler, vol. 1, s.v. *Ausoniōn*, p. 417. The term did not wholly go out of use as a self-signifier in later Byzantine texts, mostly verses subject to the requirements of prosody and metre: Ganchou, “Nikolaos Notaras”, pp. 152–58.

Expeditions were launched to reconquer Sicily. The victories of Georgios Maniakes were reported in a contemporary manifesto, presupposing readers' acquaintance with battle sites: Remata, for instance, and Draginai.²⁰ The central Mediterranean landscape was viewed familiarly, as if awaiting reinvigoration of empire.

1.2 *An (Over-)Turning of the Tables, and "The Wild Beasts from the West"*
(c.1050–1204)

In 1071, barely 30 years after Byzantium's last Sicilian expedition, Bari fell to Robert Guiscard, younger brother of two Norman commanders who had quit Maniakes' heterogeneous expeditionary force and gone on the rampage on the mainland. Few in numbers and mutually competitive, the Normans nonetheless legitimized violently-gotten gains. In 1059, Guiscard was enfeoffed with Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily by Pope Nicholas II. With Bari the empire lost its key base. Hard-pressed by Turkish incursions, the imperial government came to terms, hoping to divert some of Guiscard's manpower against the Turks. Guiscard's daughter Olympias was betrothed to the Purple-born son of Michael VII, Constantine, an honour dictated by the turn of events. Writing to Guiscard on the emperor's behalf around 1072, Michael Psellos emphasized their "unanimity" (*homodoxia*) in religious confession. "Our states have a single root and origin", he averred.²¹ As in the 10th century, ancient precedents served to dignify concessions. The government's hopes for cooperation and mercenaries were not absurd. Normans and other Franks had been enlisting in their thousands since the 1040s. What happened next was unforeseeable. Exploiting Byzantine disarray before the Turks, the commander Roussel de Bailleul carved out a lordship in Asia Minor, purporting to install the emperor's uncle, Caesar John Doukas, on the throne. Then, upon Michael VII's deposition in 1078 and the detention of Olympias-Helena, Guiscard retaliated, sponsoring a Pseudo-Michael, whom he claimed to be "restoring" to power. In 1081 he led Lombards and Normans across the Adriatic, routing Alexios I Komnenos' army at Dyrrachium, and his son Bohemond advanced down the Via Egnatia. Only death in 1085 ended Guiscard's offensive. Unlike earlier Western potentates, Guiscard did not involve himself with Rome's affairs, beyond sacking it in 1084. No less unprecedented was his ability to cross the sea and seize swathes of

20 John Skylitzes, *Synopsis*, ed. Thurn, pp. 403, 405; Shepard, "Byzantium's Last Sicilian Expedition", pp. 148, 150–54.

21 Michael Psellos, *Letters*, no. 143, lines 2–3; no. 144, lines 2–3, ed. Sathas, pp. 385, 389; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, nos. 986a [989]; 986b [990].

imperial territory. Previous Franks had been landlubbers and imperial strategy reckoned the Adriatic a barrier.

Now the tables were turned – even overturned. From being an object of surveillance, Italy became a springboard for aggression. Nearly every decade after the 1080s saw attacks by land or sea, or a Crusade. Even the Venetians, so long compliant, harried Byzantium's Aegean and Adriatic possessions in 1122–26, upon the emperor's refusal to renew trading privileges. The distinction Byzantine sources had drawn between the inhabitants of Italy together with nearby regions and the peoples living beyond the Alps lost validity once north-erners were installed on the peninsula lastingly, in force. The new interchange-ability is registered by Byzantine writings' adoption of the term *Latinoi* in the mid-11th century. It was borrowed from Western usage, judging by a patriarchal edict of 1054. This incorporated the papal bull excommunicating Patriarch Michael Keroularios. The edict calls Latin "the Italian tongue"; but where the bull mentions "churches of the Latins" in Constantinople, its usage is retained in the Greek translation.²² Soon, the term was taken up by the Byzantines themselves. The term befitted newcomers like Roussel de Bailleul who, after leaving the north, fought in Sicily before heading east.²³ Around 1080, Michael Attaleiates used it of Crispin, "leader of the Latins"; Crispin denounced govern-ment troops' "impiety" for being ready "to shed the Christian blood" of his rebel force on Easter Day. "Latins" carries overtones of Christian brother-hood here.²⁴ In screeds of Byzantine churchmen, however, "Latins" gradually became a term of disparagement, supplanting "Franks".²⁵ In the early 12th century, Theophylact of Ohrid wrote a tract suggestively entitled "Conversation with a pupil concerning the complaints made against the Latins".²⁶

22 "τὰς τῶν Λατίνων ἐκκλησίας" (Edict of Michael Keroularios): *Acta et scripta*, ed. Will, p. 164, lines 11–12. Likewise with the Host of "the Latins" (τῶν Λατίνων), *ibid.*, lines 35–36. See also *ibid.*, p. 163, line 3; Grumel/Darrouzès, *Les regestes*, no. 869; *ODB*, vol. 2, p. 1187 (Kazhdan).

23 Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ch. 23.1; ch. 25.2, ed. Perez Martín, trans. Kaldellis/Krallis, pp. 332–33, 362–63.

24 Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ch. 18.2–3, ed. Perez Martín, trans. Kaldellis/Krallis, pp. 224–27.

25 In 1052/53 Leon of Ohrid's denunciation of Western practices addressed "all the archbish-ops of the Franks", besides the pope and (probably) the patriarch of Grado (*Letters*, no. 1, ed. Büttner, p. 181, lines 5–6; pp. 43–49). Keroularios tended to use "Franks" or "Romans" (*sic*) for Western Christians, although citing the papal legates' denunciation of Eastern churchmen unwilling to shave their beards "in the manner of the Latins" (Letter no. 2 to Peter of Antioch): *Acta et scripta*, ed. Will, p. 186, lines 23–25.

26 Theophylact of Ohrid, *Discours*, ed. and trans. Gautier, pp. 246–85. The tract of the mid-11th century Stoudite monk Niketas Stethatos is entitled "*Dialexis* to the Franks, that is (ἡγουν) Latins", but its text addresses them repeatedly as "Romans": Niketas Stethatos, *Dialexis*, ed. Michel.

If Byzantines now wrote of Westerners as persons, this reflects how many of them were on Byzantine soil. From 1098 onwards Westerners were ensconced in Antioch and other former imperial possessions. First-hand knowledge may, paradoxically, account for the dearth of panoramic surveys from the Komnenian era.²⁷ Among the multifarious challenges Byzantium faced, Rome still mattered, but new powers like Venice, Genoa, and Pisa did not belong in taxonomies of the *Souda*'s type. From suchlike centres the imperial government recruited individuals capable of translating documents from, and into, Latin. They also served as interpreters, even conducting embassies. One such was Theophylact, "a man of Italian origin", whom Manuel I sent in 1160 to find him a bride among top crusading families in the Levant.²⁸ Another was the Pisan Leo Tuscus, who described himself as "an interpreter of the imperial letters".²⁹

Manuel's quest for marriage ties and intensive correspondence in Latin reflected beleaguering, and fear of Western-born enemies within. At the time of his accession in 1143, the Caesar John Roger Dalassenos, a grandee of Norman origin and husband of John II's eldest daughter, plotted to seize the throne with the aid of 400 Normans, presumably mercenaries in imperial service.³⁰ The approach of German troops on the Second Crusade brought nightmares – literally – to citizens in Constantinople, with John Tzetzes reassuring a lady that the forum full of armed men seen in her dream did not bode ill.³¹ Court poets acclaimed Manuel's handling of these "wild beasts from the West",³² but fresh onrushes were feared. Manuel also had to reckon with the wealthy Norman kingdom of Sicily under Roger II. A Norman fleet even dared to sail before Constantinople's walls and sack outlying suburbs in 1149, while

²⁷ Kaldellis, *Ethnography*, pp. 49–53.

²⁸ John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, v.4, ed. Meinecke, pp. 208–09; Kresten and Seibt, "Theophylaktos Exubitos", pp. 233–38. See on Cerbano Cerbani, a translator of Venetian origin already working at the court of Alexios I and John II: Brand, "Imperial Translator", pp. 217–18; Rodriguez Suarez, "From Greek into Latin", pp. 94–97.

²⁹ Dondaine, "Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscan", pp. 81, 121–22. On Leo as an example of the employment of Westerners to translate imperial letters into Latin, especially from Manuel's reign onwards, see Gastgeber, "Lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung", pp. 109–11. See also below, n. 43 and the contribution of Christian Gastgeber to this volume. See also Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, vol. 1, pp. 169–81.

³⁰ John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, 11.4, ed. Meinecke, pp. 36–37; Nesbitt, "Some Observations", pp. 211–13.

³¹ John Tzetzes, *Epistulae*, no. 59, ed. Leone, pp. 87–88.

³² Manganeios Prodromos, *Poems*, eds. and trans. Jeffreys/Jeffreys (forthcoming); Jeffreys/Jeffreys, "The Wild Beast", pp. 102–04, 108–09, 116; Stephenson, "Anna Comnena's *Alexiad*", pp. 45–47.

court poets reviled Roger, the Sicilian “dragon”.³³ Even worse for Manuel, the new leader of the power with which he had hoped to ally against Roger proved to have his own ideas about the *imperium*. Frederick I Barbarossa (1152–90) sought to systematize his entitlement to be a Roman emperor, issuing a collection of decrees of Roman law at Roncaglia in 1158.³⁴ While wooing city-states like Genoa, to whom he issued trading privileges in 1169, and attending closely to the affairs of Hungary, a counter-balance to Venice in the Adriatic, Manuel set greatest store by the Papacy and by invocations of crusading. Exploiting papal conflict with the German emperor, he nurtured hopes of coming to terms with Pope Alexander III, raising the prospect of both Old Rome and the New coming under his imperial dominion.³⁵ A key informant about religious affairs and doctrine in the West was Hugh Eteriano, the brother of Leo Tuscus. At Manuel’s request Hugh set out, in both Latin and Greek, all the written authorities he could cite for adding the phrase *filioque* (“and from the Son”) to the Creed’s statement that the Holy Spirit “proceeded from the Father”.³⁶ Manuel’s dream of political and religious harmonization made sense, elaborating upon Constantine VII’s tableau: Old Rome would nominally be under his dominion yet left to papal oversight. Papal leadership was now, however, gaining administrative substance and legal foundations. In 1177, the Peace of Venice between Pope Alexander and Barbarossa dashed any lingering hopes of a Byzantino-papal concordat.

The previous year, Manuel’s zeal to prove his crusading credentials through fighting the Turks had ended disastrously at Myriokephalon. Many Westerners perished in the debacle, and Manuel took pains to depict his personal bravery in a letter to Henry II Plantagenet.³⁷ Manuel’s quest for Western marriage-ties persisted. The eventual outcome of Theophylact’s forementioned mission was the marriage of Manuel to Maria, the daughter of Raymond of Poitiers, Prince of Antioch. Then, in 1179, their young son Alexios wedded Louis VII of France’s daughter and, according to verses composed for Agnes’ arrival at Constantinople, female relatives and “the nobles of your land, all the magnates”

33 Theodore Prodromos, *Poems*, no. xxx, line 200, ed. Hörandner, p. 354; p. 362 (commentary).

34 Magdalino, “Phenomenon”, pp. 185–86; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 41–43, 52–53, 56–65; Körntgen, “Verhältnis der Staufer”, p. 110.

35 Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 83–92.

36 Hugh states that he is writing at Manuel’s request: Hugh Eteriano, *De sancto et immortalis Deo*, cols. 232–33; see also (for attestation by Hugh’s brother, Leo), Dondaine, “Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscus”, pp. 83–85, 98–99, 101–03; Hamilton/Hamilton (trans.), *Christian Dualist Heresies*, pp. 46, 234; below n. 43.

37 Vasiliev, “Manuel Comnenus”, pp. 236–41; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 95–100; Stouraitis, “Conceptions of War”, pp. 75–79; Chrysos, “1176”.

accompanied her.³⁸ The anonymous poem's praise for the bride, "glory of the whole West", is in key with earlier celebrations of Frankish brides. However, in comparing her beauty favourably with that of her future sister-in-law, Maria *kaisarissa*, the author took a sideswipe at the latter while casting the new marriage-tie in a favourable light.³⁹ Court rivalries erupted upon Manuel's death. Maria *kaisarissa*'s faction played upon apprehensions about the Westerners favoured by Alexios II's mother and her chief counsellor, the *proto-sebastos* Alexios Komnenos. Maria of Antioch's expulsion from the palace was followed, in 1182, by populist violence and the massacre of traders and other Latins in Constantinople. This was observed by a scholar much in favour with Manuel who had composed a speech for Agnes' arrival a few years earlier.⁴⁰ Subsequently, while Metropolitan of Thessalonica, Eustathios witnessed the Normans' sack of this city in 1185, writing his account soon afterwards. His work exemplifies a shift in literary presentations of Westerners among the Komnenian elite. Hitherto, writers had mostly refrained from lumping Latins together with "barbarians" who violated Christian norms and shrines wholesale. Eustathios now does so, intending his account to circulate.⁴¹

Eustathios' alteration in tone registers the volatile reactions of Byzantines towards the Westerners now frequenting their highways and towns. Diplomatic contacts burgeoned, entailing marriage-alliances such as that in 1192 of Isaac II's daughter Eirene to Roger the co-ruler of Sicily: within a few years, she was married to Philip of Swabia, brother of the German emperor.⁴² The everyday presence of Westerners, including churchmen, aroused mixed reaction among Byzantine monks and clerics. The distaste some Eastern priests felt had already been shown by Odo of Deuil's observation of them washing down altars where Latin priests had celebrated Communion, in Constantinople in 1147.⁴³ Yet the episode also shows a shared use of churches. Lists of Latin errors may well have circulated as protests against such cooperativeness, addressing

38 Strzygowski, "Epithalamion", p. 552 (from fol. 5^r, lines 2–3); Jeffreys, "Vernacular *eisiterioi*", pp. 102–04. See also Hilsdale, "Constructing", pp. 470, 476–77.

39 Strzygowski, "Epithalamion", p. 551 (from fols. 4^r, 4^v); Jeffreys, "Vernacular *eisiterioi*", pp. 105–06, 109–11.

40 Eustathios of Thessaloniki's speech of welcome for Agnes: *Oratio ad Agneten principem*, in *Fontes rerum Byzantinarum*, eds. Regel/Novosadskij, pp. 80–92; Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *Capture of Thessaloniki*, chs. 28, 29, ed. in and trans. Melville Jones, pp. 34–35.

41 Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *Capture of Thessaloniki*, chs. 96, 98–108, 115–18, ed. in and trans. Melville Jones, pp. 110–13, 112–23, 126–31; Holmes, "Shared Worlds", p. 34 and n. 8.

42 *ODB*, vol. 3, pp. 2009–10 (Brand).

43 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione*, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 54–55. Subsequently, Hugh Eteriano warned Manuel that this practice gave particular offence to the Western Church along with the re-baptism of Latins and the demand that any of them taking a Greek wife

“lax” churchmen and – especially – laypersons willing to fraternize, rather than the Westerners themselves. These lists receive attention below.⁴⁴

They are not, one must stress, the only texts to convey alarm at how easily layfolk were won over to Western rites and fashions. Already in the mid-1090s, according to Metropolitan Nicholas of Andida, “the simpler among the orthodox” on Rhodes preferred Communion with “azymes” (unleavened bread): this, they had heard from Latin churchmen, was more pleasing to God.⁴⁵ Similar protests were sounded by Theodore Balsamon almost a century later. He complained of “ignorant people” who, upon hearing the church bell of the Latins and eager for novelty, wanted to reduce to one the number of *semantra* used for the summons to prayer in monastic churches.⁴⁶ New-fangled devices were, he implies, catching on where Western churches were built. Indeed, bells may occasionally have been put to religious purposes by provincials, who anyway deviated from Constantinopolitan standards.⁴⁷ Wealthy Westerners as well as Byzantine traders were most probably the inspiration for poems which mention “mega-merchants” (*megalemporoi*) and describe ships laden with deluxe goods “from India and Alexandria”; and wealthy Western traders feature in saints’ *Lives*, too.⁴⁸ Their prosperity led some Constantinopolitan citizens to spurn “Roman dress” (*Rhōmaikē stolē*) and to adopt their fashions which, a 12th-century writer complained, “did not even cover your hands and knees”.⁴⁹ Thus, Western ways appealed on different planes, from the spiritual to modish materialist, generating cross-currents of imitation and revulsion throughout society. If Manuel Komnenos took up jousting, and works of art and orations even celebrated this,⁵⁰ not all members of the Byzantine establishment chose to follow suit. Resentment over Westerners’ prominence at court was exploited

“should renounce all rites of the Latins”. See the final chapter of Leo Tuscus’ *De haeresibus et praevaricationibus Graecorum*, ed. Dondaine, “Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscan”, p. 126.

44 See below, pp. 59, 64–65.

45 Darrouzès, “Nicolas d’Andida”, pp. 208 (text), 202–03 (trans. and commentary); Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 53–54, 60.

46 Theodore Balsamon, *Meditata sive responsa*, cols. 1073–76.

47 Rodríguez Suarez, *Western Presence*, pp. 192–94. On Constantinopolitan attitudes towards “the outer parts” beyond the City walls, see Magdalino, “Constantinople”, pp. 183–88; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, pp. 70–71.

48 Michael Glykas, *Στίχοι*, lines 8–15, ed. Tsolakis, p. 3; trans. Bourbouhakis, “Political Personae”, p. 64; Theodore Prodromos, *De Rhodanthes*, vi.243–53, ed. Marcovich, p. 100, trans. Jeffreys, pp. 103–04; Merianos, “Literary Allusions”, pp. 228–30, 232–35. For a saint’s *Life*, see below, n. 65.

49 Darrouzès, “Recueil épistolaire”, p. 225; Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 512–13.

50 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, pp. 108–09; Jones/Maguire, “Description of the Jousts”, esp. pp. 11–18, 137–39.

by his cousin Andronikos, and it eventually brought him the throne in 1182. In the elite circles from which our secular sources mostly stem, written evidence of one's knowledge of Westerners and their ways could have adverse consequences. The contrast with Constantine VII's sense of affinity with the West is stark, reflecting a virtual "communications revolution".

2 Communications and Travel: From "the West Over There" to "Westerners Over Here"

In the background to the above-noted changes lies an easing in communications between the eastern Mediterranean world and the West. This began around the mid-10th century, gathered pace in the early 11th and then, from around 1050 onwards, burgeoned forth.⁵¹ Explicit attestations in Byzantine sources are wanting, but the Venetians' reaffirmation in 971 of a decree of John I Tzimiskes, banning sale of military materiel to the Saracens, is suggestive.⁵² So is the foundation on Mount Athos soon afterwards of a house of Amalfitans, traders like the Venetians, along with the contacts of Athanasios and other Athonite fathers with Latin monasticism, that are implied by passages from the Benedictine Rule incorporated in the Grand Lavra's *Hypotyposis*.⁵³ And in the mid-10th century, a waterway to northern Europe developed through the land of Rus', reflecting the vitality of the Viking world. Persons and goods could be ferried even to the British Isles, and it was probably via "the Way from the Varangians to the Greeks" that a seal of the *genikos logothetes* Leon reached London's Strand. Its likeliest date is the mid- to late-990s.⁵⁴ Leon was, presumably, writing about matters similar to those prompting the *genikon's* correspondence with other elites, of the Rus' and the Hungarians: military service in Byzantium.⁵⁵ Through such communications, officials had means of gaining detailed information. Knowledge rather than whimsy may underlie Michael Psellos' complaint, probably in the early or mid-1060s, that provincial life

51 As indicated by the evidence from Western sources for this epoch, assembled by Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*, esp. pp. 2–4, 38–39. See also Kislinger, "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz", pp. 247–50, 254–56; Kislinger, "Reisen und Verkehrswege in Byzanz", pp. 374–78.

52 Tafel/Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, vol. 1, no. 13, p. 21; no. 14, pp. 26–28.

53 Leroy, "S. Athanase", pp. 117–21; *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, ed. Thomas/Hero, vol. 1, pp. 205, 216 (commentary); von Falkenhausen, "Gli Amalfitani", p. 27.

54 Cheynet, "London Byzantine Seals", pp. 146–47; *PmbZ* # 24537.

55 Cheynet, "London Byzantine Seals", pp. 155, 158; Shepard, "Trouble-Shooters", p. 713.

made him forget Greek, like a Greek exiled “among the Britons”: for in Britain, “few know Greek, and even those who do speak it incorrectly”.⁵⁶

By this time the homeland of “Varangians” (Scandinavian mercenaries) – *Varangia* – was familiar enough to be self-explanatory for denoting Harald Hardrada’s origins.⁵⁷ Meanwhile the subjugation of Bulgaria in 1018 opened up routes that pilgrims soon exploited. The “Franks” whom Patriarch Peter of Antioch observed venerating icons in his see’s churches, were probably pilgrims who travelled through Asia Minor.⁵⁸ Another sign of the times comes from a Balkan land route taken by pilgrims. Ohrid, near the Via Egnatia, was the see of Archbishop Leo. It may be no accident that polemics between Eastern and Western churchmen were launched from there in 1052/53, or that they focused on azymes and fasting, devotions readily observable among the Latins passing Leo’s see; he had the Eastern liturgy represented graphically in his church.⁵⁹ Inconclusive in themselves, such scraps make up a picture of increasing travel and mixed reactions. Not that pilgrims were the only travellers. Western – at least Venetian – traders were acquainted with Aegean ports, judging by those listed in Alexios I’s grant of trading-privileges in (most probably) 1082.⁶⁰ The phrase “journey (*taxegio*, from Greek *taxeidion*) of Thebes” had been current among Venetians heading inland for some while, judging by a notarial document’s record of a journey made in 1071.⁶¹ Such phraseology suggests a fair amount of dealings between businessmen, at least. In light of all this, a mass movement like the First Crusade is not so surprising, although Anna Komnene depicts this as a complete surprise for her father. In fact, Alexios probably used land routes to broadcast calls for aid, appeals which Anna indirectly mentions.⁶² Latin sources are more forthcoming. They corroborate what a

56 Gautier, “Quelques lettres”, pp. 144–45; Shepard, “From the Bosphorus”, p. 36, n. 73.

57 Kekaumenos, *Counsels and Tales*, ed. and trans. Litavrin, pp. 298–99. *Varangoi* first features in a Byzantine narrative with reference to an episode involving the mercenaries in 1034: John Skylitzes, *Synopsis*, ed. Thurn, p. 394. Presumably, Skylitzes was using a source composed a generation or more before his own time.

58 Peter of Antioch (Letter to Michael Keroularios): *Acta et scripta*, ed. Will, p. 202.

59 Leo of Ohrid, *Letters*, no. 1, ed. and trans. Büttner, pp. 180–89, 192–93 (text), pp. 37–42 (introduction); Nikolov, *Povest polezna za Latini*, pp. 39–41; *Reallexikon*, eds. Wessel/Restle et al., vol. 7, s.v. *Ohrid*, cols. 202–18 (esp. 216–217) (G. Fingarova), 252–75 (esp. 267–75) (B. Schellewald).

60 Pozza/Ravegnani (eds.), *I trattati*, no. 2, pp. 35–45; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1081; Kislinger, “Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz”, pp. 250–51; Angold, “Belle Epoque”, p. 625 and n. 35; Jacoby, “Venetian Commercial Expansion”, pp. 387–88.

61 *Documenti del commercio veneziano*, eds. Morozzo della Rocca/Lombardo, vol. 1, pp. 11, 12; see also Lopez/Raymond (trans.), *Medieval Trade*, p. 178.

62 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, VIII.5.1, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 245.

13th-century chronicler asserts about Alexios' knowledge of Westerners' religious concerns.⁶³ From the First Crusade onwards, visitors, along with diasporas from Italian maritime cities, would be available in enough coastal emporia to alert many Byzantines to Western ways.

3 Texts Composed (or Drawing Heavily on Source-Materials from) before c.1050

Our sources fall into three groups. Two emanate from the imperial-ecclesiastical complex, with authors either in imperial service or having some role within the Church hierarchy, and showing concern for matters of state. Our third group also comes from clerics or monks, but shows fewer signs of establishment ties and a viewpoint often far-removed from Constantinople.

3.1 *Imperial-Ecclesiastical Complex: Secular Texts*

Few narratives are to hand. The products of court circles, dealing mostly with earlier periods, mention the West passingly, as when Joseph Genesios, Theophanes Continuatus and the *Life* of Basil I depict Byzantino-Frankish joint operations that were envisaged or executed.⁶⁴ Contemporary coverage of the 10th or early 11th century is scant. Symeon the Logothete records the marriage and early death of Bertha-Eudocia, a court affair, and Skylitzes mentions Otto I's victory over the Hungarians in 955 and subsequent ousting of John XII from the papal throne, but adds little beyond rebellions by Lombards and cities like Naples.⁶⁵ Although of strategic concern, the West seldom prompted narratives. Texts written or commissioned by Constantine VII are the main signs of interest. Constantine's *De administrando imperio*, a miscellany put together for his son, Romanos, focuses on places of geopolitical significance such as

63 *Synopsis Chronikē*, ed. Sathas, pp. 184–85; Shepard, “Man-to-Man”, pp. 751–52.

64 For joint-operations envisaged in 841: Joseph Genesios, *Regum libri quattuor*, eds. Lesmüller-Werner/Thurn, p. 50; Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia Books I–IV*, 111.37, eds. and trans. Featherstone/Signes Codoñer, pp. 194–95. For an asserted collaboration culminating in the capture of Bari in 871: *Vita Basilii*, ch. 55, ed. and trans. Ševčenko, pp. 198–201.

65 Symeon the Logothete, *Chronicon*, ch. 136.78, ed. Wahlgren, pp. 337–38; Theophanes Continuatus, ed. Bekker, p. 430; John Skylitzes, *Synopsis*, ed. Thurn, pp. 239, 245, 263–64, 348. Skylitzes essentially registers preoccupations of his own time, the end of the 11th century: Holmes, *Basil II*, pp. 220–38, 363–64, 541–42. See, on Theophanes Continuatus, Treadgold, *Middle Byzantine Historians*, pp. 206–15, ascribing the entire Book VI to Symeon the Logothete and dubbing this the “second edition” of his chronicle.

Venice and the Dalmatian towns, giving up-to-date topographical data.⁶⁶ Semi-legendary tales, in contrast, serve to show how Carolingian attempts to dominate south-central Italy and Venice were, in effect, thwarted.⁶⁷ Their implication, that Frankish interventions were unlikely to last, echoes the treatment of Byzantium's relations with the 6th-century West in the *Excerpta de legationibus*. One of the 53 sets of excerpts from earlier historians commissioned by Constantine, this assemblage covers diplomatic exchanges with potentates on eastern and northern frontiers, too.⁶⁸ But a certain method is apparent in its attention to Frankish interventions in Italy. This could register Constantine's apprehensions, once Otto I began to intervene in Italian affairs and showed appetite for *imperium*.⁶⁹ While Constantine described Rome as "putting away imperial power" in *De thematibus*, Otto's activities from the late 940s onwards gave cause for concern. The precedents and stories in *De administrando imperio*, supplementing the *Excerpta*, amount to Constantine's response. Reverting to his predecessors' tactics, he allowed for recognition *ad hominem* of potent northern newcomers to Italy. Already at the end of the 8th century, Eirene had probably offered imperial status to Charlemagne.⁷⁰

Rather than reformulating relations with the West, imperial texts kept the antique geopolitical landscape green. Mounting trade could fertilize – rather than threaten – eastern imperial predominance in Italy, if merchants saw their prosperity as closely aligned with it. Governmental reckoning to this effect lies behind the concessions made to Venice in 992 in return for its commitment to transport troops across the Adriatic.⁷¹ The reckoning was sound, in that profits accruing to the empire's favoured satellites grew throughout the first half of the 11th century. Moreover, Westerners were frequenting the court and entering imperial service. If the Franks' presence was routine enough to warrant provision in Philotheos' treatise on banquets in 899, they were probably no less common a century later.⁷² A random anecdote divulges that Peter, allegedly a scion of the German ruling house, was serving under the emperor early

66 DAI, chs. 28, 29, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, pp. 116–17, lines 75–96; pp. 134–39, lines 235–95; Magdalino, "Constantine VII", pp. 32, 35–37.

67 DAI, chs. 27, 29, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, pp. 128–33, lines 117–69; pp. 120–21, lines 22–39.

68 Németh, "Imperial Systematisation", pp. 239–43, 245–47, 251–53.

69 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De legationibus*, vol. 1.1, pp. 108–11, 119–20, vol. 1.2, p. 500 (from Procopius); on Otto's mounting interest in affairs in Italy and Burgundy in the 940s, see Shepard, "Circles Overlapping".

70 Lilie, *Byzanz*, pp. 205–09; Fried, "Papst Leo III.", pp. 308–13.

71 Pozza/Ravegnani (eds.), *I trattati*, no. 1, pp. 21–25; Dölger/Müller/Beihammer, *Regesten*, no. 781; on the modest scope of these concessions, see Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", p. 375, n. 23.

72 Philotheos, *Kletorologion*, ed. and trans. Oikonomidès, pp. 164–65, 176–77.

in Basil II's reign.⁷³ Through such visitors and their contacts home, imperial statesmen kept abreast of affairs in the West.⁷⁴ Given that the power-balance appeared to be tipping in Byzantium's favour, the air of confidence breathed even in a poem on the heroic failure of the Western-based Maniakes' rebellion, conveyed substance rather than just swashbuckling Homeric literary imagery.⁷⁵

3.2 *Imperial-Ecclesiastical Complex: Clerical Texts*

The above-mentioned greetings prescribed by Constantine VII's *Book of Ceremonies* imply that embassies from Rome arrived as often as those from Bulgaria or the Abbasid caliphate and other Muslim powers.⁷⁶ The Papacy's stature, for all the failings of individual holders of the office, made its rulings on lawful procedure impossible for powerholders to ignore. One measure of this is the letter Nicholas Mystikos wrote to Pope John X, announcing the Tome of Union between his supporters and those of his rival, Euthymios. In the collection of his letters, probably made by Nicholas himself, it is by far the longest, being nearly twice the length of the runner-up, a letter addressed to Symeon of Bulgaria.⁷⁷ And, seeking papal endorsement of his son Theophylact's installation as patriarch, Romanos Lekapenos contemplated the marriage of John XI's half-sister to another of his sons.⁷⁸ There are hints of contacts between Eastern and Western churchmen, as when views about the impending millennium since Christ's birth were pooled in the mid-10th century. Thus texts on eschatological topics by Niketas David answer questions from "the bishops in the West".⁷⁹ Liudprand of Cremona took an interest in comparable texts of prophecy while visiting Constantinople in 968.⁸⁰ Embassies like Liudprand's were occasions for exchanging spoken as well as written words,

73 Kekaumenos, *Counsels and Tales*, ed. and trans. Litavrin, pp. 296–97; on "Peter", see *PmbZ* # 26499 (sceptical as to his royal origins).

74 On the various types of information obtainable from foreign envoys as well as from other visitors, see Drocourt, "Passing on Political Information".

75 Broggin, "Il carme *Εἰς τὸν Μανιάκην*", pp. 14–17 (text), 25–29 (commentary); also Bernard, *Writing and Reading*, pp. 186, 228–29.

76 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, II.47, ed. Reiske, vol. 2 (= ed. in and trans. Moffatt/Tall, vol. 2), pp. 680–86; II. 47, eds. and trans. Dagron et al., vol. 3, pp. 346–57.

77 Nicholas I Mystikos, *Letters*, nos. 32, 9, eds. and trans. Jenkins/Westerink, pp. 214–45, 52–69; see also Evans, *Mountains*.

78 Theodore Daphnopates, *Correspondance*, eds. and trans. Darrouzès/Westerink, pp. 38–41.

79 Niketas the Paphlagonian, *Letter*, ed. Westerink, esp. pp. 191–92, 195; Brandes, "Liudprand", pp. 456–58, 462–63; Magdalino, "Year 1000", pp. 241–44, 269; Magdalino, "History of the Future", pp. 50–51, 62–63.

80 Liudprand of Cremona, *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana*, chs. 39–41, ed. Chiesa, pp. 204–05; Brandes, "Liudprand", pp. 436–42, 445–50, 453.

and such opportunities multiplied with travel.⁸¹ One sidelight on opinions arriving from the West comes from arguments over liturgical practice between Michael Keroularios and Argyrus, held in the imperial palace before the latter's assignment to southern Italy as *Doux* in 1051. Argyrus' defence of azymes led Keroularios repeatedly to deny him Communion.⁸²

3.3 *Non-establishment Texts*

This group of sources, although exiguous and concerning an avowedly separate sector of society, attests communication that was not at the bidding of Constantinopolitan elites. It was, essentially, a matter of individuals' wanderlust and curiosity, the penchant for pilgrimage common to monks of all persuasions. The holy men known by name found admirers in elite milieus where their *Lives*, composed in Greek, had a certain cachet. Thus in Rome in 990, Empress Theophano and "the men in power" attended the deathbed of the Sicilian-born Sabas the Younger; his *Life* was written soon afterwards by Patriarch Orestes of Jerusalem, apparently in Calabria.⁸³ Archbishop Sergius of Damascus and Gregory of Cassano were also known to the Western imperial court, while Otto III regarded the Calabrian Nilus as one of his spiritual fathers and, according to Nilus' *Life*, conversed and prayed with him.⁸⁴ For every one of these paragons, however, there were Grecophone monks whose presence went unrecorded yet whose ways made a lasting impression on Western brethren. This, at least, is what a study of monastic reform in the West has concluded.⁸⁵ Such was the repute of Byzantine monks that a pilgrim band went on from Jerusalem to Mount Sinai and then Athos, before returning to their own house of Monte Cassino in 998. One of them, Liutius, took what he had seen of lavra monasticism to heart, founding a dependent cell and devoting himself to asceticism and manual labour.⁸⁶ Other pilgrims saw in Byzantium a sort of asylum for penitents. One Latin bishop guilty of manslaughter was dissuaded by

81 See Drocourt, "La place de l'écrit dans les contacts diplomatiques", esp. pp. 37–42.

82 Michael Keroularios, Letter no. 1 to Peter of Antioch: *Acta et scripta*, ed. Will, p. 177, col. A, lines 30–35; p. 175, col. A, lines 9–10; von Falkenhausen, "Gli Amalfitani", pp. 22–23.

83 Orestes of Jerusalem, *Life of Sabas and Macarius*, 50, ed. Cozza-Luzi, p. 67; Burgarella, "Chiese d'Oriente", pp. 198–207; Tounta, "Saints, Rulers and Communities", pp. 442–45.

84 Bruno of Querfurt, *Vita altera Sancti Adalberti*, ch. 17, ed. Karwasińska, pp. 19–20; *Life of Nilus*, chs. 92–93, cols. 153–54; Burgarella, "Chiese d'Oriente", pp. 200–09; von Falkenhausen, "Gregor von Burtscheid", pp. 234–38; von Falkenhausen, "Between Two Empires", p. 145; Shepard, "Western Approaches", p. 552; Tounta, "Saints, Rulers and Communities", pp. 445–49.

85 Jotischky, "Monastic Reform", pp. 61–67.

86 *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, II, 12, 22, 30, ed. Hoffmann, pp. 190, 206, 221–23; Jotischky, "Monastic Reform", p. 65.

the patriarch from becoming a hermit, opting for an austere life under Symeon the New Theologian's watch, in St Mamas monastery.⁸⁷ The story presupposes Latin reverence for Byzantine monasticism. That cultural traffic could flow in the opposite direction is attested by passages to be found in the Grand Lavra's *Hypotyposis* (above, p. 41). Indeed, bands of wandering monks bound for Rome were not uncommon in Ephesus around 1010, judging by the *Life* of St Lazaros, who thought to join them.⁸⁸ Seemingly of peasant stock, he had long lived in the Holy Land: peregrinations around Eastern Christendom and to Rome were not confined to the elite.

4 Texts Composed after c.1050

The tone of texts changes, with "Latins" conveying stronger overtones of culturo-religious otherness than the older term, "Franks", had done. Suddenly and extraordinarily, Westerners looked capable of threatening Byzantium's existence. They are a looming presence in texts. But precisely because sociocultural links with Westerners were open to objections and dealings with Latins were politically charged, texts intended for circulation stuck to stereotypes or were reticent about personal contacts with Westerners. And texts written so as to impress upon ordinary Byzantines the errors of the Latins were liable to be downright misleading. In that sense, 12th-century writings about Westerners are even more of a "distorting mirror" than those of earlier centuries.⁸⁹

4.1 *Imperial-Ecclesiastical Complex: Secular Texts (Including Those Written by Churchmen on Secular Topics)*

The wider range of extant working texts offsets the distortions of literary compositions. They mention Westerners routinely, and exemption-charters listing mercenaries distinguish between peoples. Thus, a charter of 1086 exempts Athos' Grand Lavra from billeting "English", "Franks", "Varangians", or "Germans" (*Nemitzoi*) on its properties.⁹⁰ Such deeds were no longer issued in the 12th century, but imperial concessions for Italian cities survive, mostly in Latin translations done at the time: ten for Venice, three for Pisa and five

87 Niketas Stethatos, *Vie de Syméon*, ed. and trans. Hausherr, pp. 68–72.

88 Gregory the Cellarer, *Life of Lazaros*, ch. 29, p. 519; trans. Greenfield, pp. 114–15. See also Malamut, *Sur la route des saints*, esp. pp. 316–17.

89 Mango, *Byzantine Literature*.

90 *Actes de Lavra*, eds. Lemerle/Guillou/Svoronos, no. 48, p. 258.

for Genoa.⁹¹ Providing for dispute-resolution between individual Byzantines and their citizens, some allow for procedures requested by the Westerners, “the decisive oath”, for example, to circumvent impassés arising from insufficient evidence.⁹² The Roman law behind this procedure was known to Byzantium and Venice alike; but intensive trafficking fostered the former’s resuscitation of practices fallen into disuse. Such responsiveness to Italian merchants’ ways could serve imperial interests. Likewise the government was swift to harness the Westerners’ trend towards linking the rites of oath-taking with a man’s landholding rights. By 1097, Alexios I was making Bohemond his “liegeman” (*lizios*). He fused Western conceptions of tenure, conditional upon honouring oaths of fealty, with traditional expectations of imperial “servants”. This hybrid is known from the working text incorporated into Anna Komnene’s account of Bohemond’s surrender at Diabolis in 1108.⁹³ The concept of overriding personal obligation conveyed by the term *ligius* was adapted to imperial needs and applied to Genoese and Pisan citizens, besides Western warlords. This, too, emerges from functional texts. Their usage shows how familiar the term’s implications were to the Byzantines.⁹⁴ It enabled Manuel to forge ties with individuals “in every one of the Italian cities and beyond”. Illustrating this remark, Niketas Choniates recounts his emissaries’ quest for liegemen in Ancona.⁹⁵

Whether writing narratives, orations or verses, literary authors generally avoid showing familiarity with Western ways outside the military sphere. Writing at the start of our period, Attaleiates showed interest in contemporary Westerners, recounting individuals’ feats,⁹⁶ but he also looked to the Roman past. He saw in its traditions a means of restoring ancient “virtue” to the eastern empire, appreciating ancient Roman law and, at least in times past, a role

91 Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, nos. 1304, 1365, 1373, 1576, 1577, 1578, 1590, 1647 (Venice); nos. 1255, 1499 [1400], 1607 (Pisa); nos. 1488, 1497, 1498, 1609, 1616 (Genoa).

92 Pozza/Ravegnani (eds.), *I trattati*, no. 11, p. 134, lines 12–14; Penna, *Byzantine Imperial Acts*, pp. 80–83.

93 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, XIII.12.1, 4, 8, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 414, line 10; p. 415, line 44; p. 416, line 84; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1243; Penna, *Byzantine Imperial Acts*, pp. 272–73; West, *Reframing*, pp. 208–10; Shepard, “Man-to-Man”, pp. 764–65.

94 See e.g., Miklosich/Müller (eds.), *Acta et diplomata*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 1, line 3; p. 2, line 20; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1582. See Ferluga, “Ligesse”, pp. 420–22; Penna, *Byzantine Imperial Acts*, pp. 271–74. On the development of lifetime grants of landholding and other rights, conditional upon service, in this period, see Bartusis, *Land*, esp. pp. 164–70.

95 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, p. 201, lines 5–6, 10–14.

96 Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ch. 8, ed. Perez Martín, trans. Kaldellis/Krallis, pp. 82–83. Above, n. 36.

for “the people” alongside the senate in upholding the body politic.⁹⁷ John Xiphilinos (nephew and namesake of the Constantinopolitan patriarch) epitomized Cassius Dio’s *Roman History*, and remarked on its containing a “great deal of benefit for our way of life and situation”.⁹⁸ Subsequently, discussion of the West could reflect upon contemporary Komnenian regimes, amounting to *Kaiserkritik*.⁹⁹ Nikephoros Bryennios’ references to Western mercenaries are positive. Himself of distinguished army stock, he recognized the capacity of Westerners for action. His *History*’s details of Roussel’s insurrection probably derive from the man who quelled it, Alexios Komnenos. They show respect among Byzantine generals for Westerners’ talents for governance, not just warfare: Roussel had won over the townsfolk of Amaseia, protecting them from the Turks.¹⁰⁰ But Bryennios’ accounts of pitched battles redolent of ancient Rome may perhaps impugn Alexios Komnenos’ penchant for covert operations.¹⁰¹

Anna’s portrayal of her father’s reign in terms of his virtues, a “biographical genre” of historical writing, is in key with her Middle Byzantine predecessors.¹⁰² Her lengthy accounts of Alexios’ campaigns against Guiscard and Bohemond set up worthy adversaries for him to overcome, while allowing her to dilate on their military talents, which she found of inherent interest. She presupposes knowledge of their horsemanship, as in her praise for a Byzantine whose dexterity with lance and shield “gave the impression that he was not a Roman at all, but a native of Normandy”.¹⁰³ For Bohemond’s strategy in 1107/08 and siege-tactics against Dyrrachium, Anna reports what her husband Nikephoros Bryennios and other veterans had seen and heard.¹⁰⁴ And her fascination with devices and problem-solving draws her to the Normans’ ingenuity in constructing a canal and re-floating their stranded boats in 1082.¹⁰⁵ But her cov-

97 Michael Attaleiates, preface to *Ponema Nomikon*, eds. Zepos/Zepos, pp. 415–16; Krallis, *Michael Attaleiates*, pp. 52–62, 67–69, 192–99, 233–44; id., “Democratic’ Action”, pp. 41–48, 51–53. Michael Psellos showed his interest in the ancient Roman order with his “Succinct History”, starting with the “legal monarchy” of Romulus and his successors: *Historia syntomos*, chs. 1–7, ed. and trans. Aerts, pp. 2–7; Markopoulos, “From Narrative Historiography”, pp. 712–13.

98 John Xiphilinos, *Epitome*, p. 526; Mallan, “Style”, p. 611.

99 Magdalino, “Aspects”, pp. 335–40. Still of value on the unfavourable climate for criticism of policy in the Komnenian era, is Browning, “Enlightenment and Repression”.

100 Nikephoros Bryennios, *Histoire*, 11.14, 19–21, ed. and trans. Gautier, pp. 166–67, 182–87.

101 See Neville, *Heroes and Romans*, pp. 89–103, 173–78.

102 Scott, “Classical Tradition”, pp. 69–72; Markopoulos, “From Narrative Historiography”, esp. pp. 697, 713–14.

103 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, x.3.5, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 289.

104 *Ibid.*, XIII.2.2–3, 3.1–12, pp. 388–89, 389–94.

105 *Ibid.*, IV.3.3, pp. 125–26.

erage of her father's battles with Normans, wariness towards Crusaders and skilful harnessing of Westerners' energies while holding them at bay, makes him the antithesis of Manuel and conveys barbed criticism of the man on the throne during most of the *Alexiad's* composition.¹⁰⁶ If Anna never names Manuel, says little of her brother John II beyond his birth after her own, and dismisses the "stupidity" of Alexios' successors, this constitutes a well-crafted *damnatio memoriae*.¹⁰⁷ Probably for kindred reasons, Anna is coy about her sources. The closest she comes to acknowledging a Western informant for her extensive treatment of Norman campaigning is her mention of a "Latin" whom the bishop of Bari had, "he said", sent to Guiscard.¹⁰⁸

In fact, she almost certainly drew on an epic poem, commissioned by the Apulian Duke Roger Borsa to celebrate the deeds of his father. Scholars have long remarked upon the resemblances between Anna's account of the Normans' assault on the empire and that of William of Apulia's *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, in overall balance and in matters of detail. Both writers offer full accounts of Guiscard's invasion of 1081, quite sketchy treatment of operations in the Balkans after his return to Italy, and close coverage of his last campaign and death on Cephalonia. Thus the storm that struck the boat bearing Guiscard's body home features in both accounts, including the near-loss of his coffin and the eventual burial beside his brothers' tombs at a monastery in Venosa, named as the Holy Trinity by Anna.¹⁰⁹ Noting how similarly they recount Guiscard's display of a pretender, purportedly Michael VII, before the walls of Dyrrachium in 1081, and the citizens' derisive reaction, F. Wilken thought it "almost believable" that Anna drew on William's account.¹¹⁰ Subsequent scholarship has tended to favour their use of a common written source rather than direct borrowing by Anna from William.¹¹¹ However, the appraisals by the two works of Alexios

106 Magdalino, "Pen of the Aunt", pp. 23–29; Stephenson, "Anna Komnena's *Alexiad*", pp. 47–53; Shepard, "Anna Komnena".

107 E.g. Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, xiv.3.9, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 438, line 43. Anna's nearest approach to mentioning Manuel comes when she refers to "the third emperor" after Alexios, stating that she had gathered her material during his reign: Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, xiv.7.5, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, pp. 451–52. On Anna's loathing of John and loaded allusion to the birth of his twin children, see Viliimonović, "Observations", pp. 54–55; Stanković, "John II Komnenos", pp. 11–15, 18–21.

108 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, iii.12.8, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 119.

109 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, vi.1.6.3, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 180; William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, v, lines 391–404, ed. and trans. Mathieu, pp. 256–59.

110 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, iv.1.3–4, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, pp. 121–22; William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, iv, lines 260–71, ed. and trans. Mathieu, pp. 218–19; Wilken, *Rerum ab Alexio I*, p. 158. See also *ibid.*, p. xxvi, n. 75 on pp. 145–46, p. 221, n. 159 on pp. 222–23.

111 See, e.g., Chalandon, *Essai*, p. xii and n. 1; Liubarsky, "Ob istochnikakh 'Aleksiady'", pp. 113–15. Scepticism as to the use of a common source was voiced in William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, ed. and trans. Mathieu, pp. 39–45 (introduction). Mathieu concluded

and his un-military predecessors are remarkably alike,¹¹² and P. Frankopan has drawn attention to a telling phrase in their accounts of Guiscard's confrontation with the citizens. According to William, Guiscard's professed aim was that Michael VII, "undeservedly driven from the seat of his realm, be restored to his *honor*". The same line of thought occurs in the *Alexiad*, with Guiscard declaring his aim that "my son-in-law Michael, driven out of the realm, should be restored back to his position of honour".¹¹³ The Greek *timē* has the meaning of a "title, dignity" in addition to the abstract notion of "honour", while *honor* could denote a territorial holding or an office, privilege or sovereignty in medieval Latin, as well as the abstraction.¹¹⁴ Recourse to such phrasing at this point in the *Alexiad* could be deliberately conveying the ambiguousness of *honor* or, simply, a translator's uncertainty as to what sense it had in the Latin text before him. In either case, the text seems far likelier to have been William's *Gesta* than some hypothetical common source.¹¹⁵ Frankopan refutes the claim that the *Alexiad's* chronological errors and reiteration of the same episodes would not have arisen had William's orderly account been directly available to Anna: her narrative is moulded around its hero, and "it is striking that the effect of Alexios' repeated returns to Constantinople is to magnify his success against the Normans".¹¹⁶

There is, indeed, no compelling reason why the full text of William of Apulia's *Gesta* should not have been available to Anna Komnene. Her father's relations with Count Roger I of Sicily had been cordial, and Alexios took care to maintain ties with the Sicilian court after Roger's death. For example, he conferred the title of *prōtonobelissimos* on Admiral Christodoulos, the "prime minister"

from the textual similarity of one passage in the *Alexiad* to the *Gesta* that a few extracts from the latter, "mais non l'ensemble", were made available to Anna by one of her Norman informants, who could have read or reported them to her: William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, ed. and trans. Mathieu, p. 46. Doubts both as to the use of a common source and as to the availability of the *Gesta* to Anna, are expressed by Loud, "Anna Komnena", pp. 47–52.

112 Brown, "Gesta Roberti Wiscardi", esp. pp. 172–75.

113 "... regni sede repulsus/Immerito Michael ut restituaretur honori": William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, IV, lines 260–61, ed. and trans. Mathieu, p. 218; "τὸν τῆς βασιλείας ἐξωσθέντα Μιχαὴλ τὸν ἐμὸν κηδεστήν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν τιμὴν αὐθις ἀποκαταστήσαι": Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, IV.1.3, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 121, lines 35–36; Frankopan, "Turning Latin into Greek", p. 89.

114 Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, pp. 495–98 (s.v. *honor*).

115 While Frankopan sees in *timē* fewer ambiguous connotations than I do ("Turning Latin into Greek", p. 89), the chances of the Latin versifier and the Greek translator of a supposedly common Latin source independently conveying the same ambivalent turn of phrase so closely seem remote.

116 Frankopan, "Turning Latin into Greek", p. 93.

of the Regent Adelasia, in 1109.¹¹⁷ Subsequently, the mounting power and ambitions of Roger II, Adelasia's son, became cause for concern in Byzantium, and links were sought with leading figures on the mainland. A. Rhoby has made a strong case for accepting the *Liber pontificalis*' statement that William, son and heir of Roger Borsa, travelled to Constantinople with the intention (albeit unfulfilled) of wedding a Komnenian princess, an episode datable to between 1115 and 1124 and perhaps to the opening years of John II's reign.¹¹⁸ And, Rhoby suggests, it was during this period, perhaps around 1124/25, that Andronikos Komnenos, the second son of John II, married Eirene *sebastokratorissa*.¹¹⁹ This match to so prominent a Komnenos will have had heavily political overtones, at a time when the Venetians were threatening and harrying Corfu and other imperial possessions in the Adriatic.¹²⁰ The bride could very well have belonged to a potent Norman family,¹²¹ and whether or not de Hautevilles, her kinsmen would probably have been established on the mainland rather than Sicily. Courtly contacts of this sort would have helped keep open lines of communication with influential families in southern Italy from where, in the 12th century, manuscripts of the *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi* reached such Norman centres of learning as Bec or Mont Saint Michel.¹²² Down some such lines, a copy of William's epos, with its markedly positive portrayal of Alexios,¹²³ could have travelled to Constantinople and become known to – if it had not been ordered by – a Komnenian household.

Not that this was the sole pathway whereby a Latin text might have reached Constantinople and, sooner or later, become available to Anna Komnene in a

117 von Falkenhausen, "Boemondo e Bisanzio", p. 120. On Alexios' relations with Roger I, see Shepard, "Man-to-Man", pp. 759–60.

118 *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, vol. 2, p. 322; Rhoby, "Verschiedene Bemerkungen", pp. 310–12. On Roger's early signs of expansionism: Houben, *Roger II.*, pp. 35–42.

119 Rhoby, "Verschiedene Bemerkungen", pp. 308–09. On the approximate date of the marriage, see also Barzos, *Ἡ γενεαλογία*, pp. 361–62.

120 See, e.g. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, pp. 78–80.

121 A Norman origin for Eirene was deemed likely by Michael and Elizabeth Jeffreys, "Who was Eirene?", esp. 51–57. Doubts as to whether she need have been a first-generation immigrant from the West were subsequently raised by Elizabeth Jeffreys, "*Sebastokratorissa* Irene as Patron", p. 178 and n. 9. While these doubts have force, they may be allayed by considerations aired below pp. 54–55.

122 No early manuscripts of William's *Gesta* are known from Italy, but his work enjoyed some circulation in central Italy at least, being known to the author of the 12th-century *Chronicle of Carpineto*: Mathieu, "Le manuscrit 162 d'Avranches", pp. 124–27; William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, ed. and trans. Mathieu, pp. 74–75 (introduction).

123 See Brown, "*Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*", pp. 174–75, 176; Frankopan, "Turning Latin into Greek", p. 94.

Greek rendering.¹²⁴ As noted above, Western-born translators were in imperial employ, and the task of rendering William's *Gesta* into Greek would not have posed undue difficulty. One translator, at least, engaged in historical writing. Cerbano Cerbani reports that he had written two poetic compositions on the origins of the Venetians' operations against John II Komnenos.¹²⁵ Another scholar was James of Venice, who lived in Constantinople for a lengthy spell (or spells) during the 1120s and 1130s. James translated several key texts of Aristotle into Latin, and his translations were soon disseminated and commented upon in the West, including Normandy.¹²⁶ While there is no explicit evidence that James was in the emperor's service, he was of sufficient standing in Constantinople to rank prominently among the Latins in the theological debate between Anselm of Havelberg and Byzantine churchmen in 1136.¹²⁷ It is quite likely that James moved in the milieu of the scholars and thinkers who looked to Anna Komnene for encouragement, in common pursuit of studying and commenting on Aristotle's work.¹²⁸ This is not to claim that Anna ever met James face-to-face or communicated with him. But it is noteworthy that James took an interest in the recent past and, according to Cerbano Cerbani, he actually wrote a history of Venetian campaigning in Dalmatia.¹²⁹ Through James, or fellow-spirits among the Latin translators in Constantinople, a copy of William's *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi* could have become available to Anna without much ado. There was, in short, no lack of channels. The participation of a Western scholar in the Aristotelian circle she fostered would jar with the line taken towards Latins and their culture in the *Alexiad*. But such dismissiveness could have served to forestall criticism of Anna's Aristotelian studies and also, perhaps, of their appeal to Latins.

124 Anna's recoil from articulating the barbaric names of the Crusaders, and her ridicule of John Italos' pronunciation of Greek as characteristic of someone arriving from the Latins in his youth, implies her ignorance of their language, presumably unfeigned: Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, x.10.4; v.8.8, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, pp. 315, 165; Buckler, *Anna Comnena*, pp. 179, 185–86.

125 The works, which are no longer extant, are mentioned by Cerbano Cerbani in his *Translatio mirifici martyris Isidori*, ch. 2, p. 324; Pertusi, "Cultura greco-bizantina", p. 167; Brand, "Imperial Translator", p. 218; Rodriguez Suarez, "From Greek into Latin", p. 97.

126 Minio-Paluello, "Iacobus Veneticus Grecus", pp. 265–72, 281–82, 291–95; Rodriguez Suarez, "From Greek into Latin", p. 98.

127 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, II.1, col. 1163^B; trans. Criste/Neel, p. 86; trans. Sieben, p. 76; Rodriguez Suarez, "From Greek into Latin", p. 98.

128 Browning, "Unpublished Funeral Oration", pp. 398–402; Sorabji, "Ancient Commentators", pp. 20–22, 24; Ebbesen, "Philoponus, 'Alexander'", p. 450; Frankopan, "Literary, Cultural and Political Context", pp. 46–57.

129 Cerbano Cerbani, *Translatio mirifici martyris Isidori*, ch. 2, p. 324; Pertusi, "Cultura greco-bizantina", p. 167; Rodriguez Suarez, "From Greek into Latin", pp. 97, 98.

Anna Komnene was *sui generis*. But her concealment of a key Latin source, as of her family's multifarious connections with the de Hautevilles, exemplifies reticence on the part of orators and other writers in Komnenian Constantinople. In the earlier 12th century, an epitaph circulating at court might recall a man's Norman background and early feats against the empire. One such was Roger, son of Dagobert, whose prowess on horseback with his lance brought him victories in Italy and the Balkans at Byzantium's expense. Subsequently, his epitaph recalls, the lord Alexios had "opened his soul to me ... I found a sea of gold and came to glory", while also receiving the title of *sebastos* for loyal and effective service.¹³⁰ These verses of the emperor's trusty doctor, Nicholas Kallikles, reflect Alexios' own appraisal of Westerners' qualities. By means of careful handling, they could be harnessed and eventually integrated into the elite.

By the mid-1140s, however, and perhaps earlier, such confidence was open to serious doubt, and might prove damaging to anyone who voiced it. There are strong grounds for supposing that Roger was the father of the Caesar John Roger Dalassenos who had designs on the throne in 1143.¹³¹ This may well account for the veil writers draw over the origins of the fore-mentioned wife of Andronikos Komnenos, Eirene *sebastokratorissa*. That she was not raised in a Greek-speaking ambiance is shown by Theodore Prodromos' composition of a grammar, most probably with an eye to her learning of classical Greek.¹³² His dedication of this work, seemingly suitable for use in a school, to Eirene the mature woman, could have been taken amiss had she been Byzantine-born: she became, at least after the loss of her husband Andronikos in 1142, well-known for her active patronage of literary activities.¹³³ A clear allusion to Eirene's Western origins comes from the description of her father as a valiant warrior "of the race of the Aeneadae [i.e. Trojans]".¹³⁴ Furthermore, a hint not only of Norman origins but also of Eirene's continuing sense of affinity with her compatriots in southern Italy is given by two poems of Manganeios Prodromos, datable to around 1150/51. One celebrates the return of Eirene's daughter,

130 Nicholas Kallikles, *Poems*, no. 19, ed. Romano, p. 94, lines 31–34; Jeffreys/Jeffreys, "Who was Eirene?", pp. 61–62; Nesbitt, "Some Observations", pp. 209–11.

131 Nesbitt, "Some Observations", pp. 216–17; above, p. 37.

132 See Zagklas, "Byzantine Grammar Treatise", esp. pp. 84–86.

133 Jeffreys/Jeffreys, "Who was Eirene?", pp. 40–43, 50–51; Jeffreys, "*Sebastokratorissa* Irene as Patron", pp. 189–90, 193–94.

134 Lambros, "Ὁ Μαρκετιανὸς ἡρώδις", Poem 56, lines 28–33, p. 23; Jeffreys/Jeffreys, "Who was Eirene?", pp. 54–55, 56–57. To have dubbed a Norman based in Antioch a "Trojan" would have risked incurring charges of irony. Of Eirene's mother one hears from Theodore Prodromos in only the vaguest terms, concerning her beauty: *Poems*, no. 44, lines 20–25, ed. Hörandner, p. 406.

Theodora, to Constantinople from “the belly of Hades” and her “freeing from the wild beast”, her husband, the Austrian Duke Henry of Babenberg.¹³⁵ Verses from the other poem, written in Eirene’s name, recall her anguish upon seeing her daughter coupled to this “wild beast from the West”.¹³⁶ These two poems are in harsh dissonance from the tones with which Manganeios Prodromos had greeted Theodora’s wedding to Henry in the city a couple of years earlier.¹³⁷ Whether or not their disparagement of Theodora’s marriage to Henry was for public knowledge or private diversion, these verses may well imply Eirene’s resentment at her daughter’s role as a pawn in an anti-Norman alliance of Manuel Komnenos’ devising.¹³⁸ They exemplify both the mutability of relations with individual Western regimes and the “default setting” of denunciation of the barbarousness of Westerners. From the mid-1140s onwards, with the ever-looming prospect of yet another Crusade compounding the Norman problem, reticence on the part of writers about the Western origins of princesses or other habitués of the imperial court, along with disavowal of Western ways, was as politic for writers competing for patronage as it was for Anna Komnene herself.¹³⁹ Their reticence should not be mistaken for ignorance or, necessarily, for distaste.

No full historical narrative recounting his actions survives from or, apparently, was ever composed during the reign of Manuel Komnenos.¹⁴⁰ Writing soon after the death of Manuel, whose secretary and confidant he had been, John Kinnamos depicts him sympathetically. While knowledgeable about events in Italy, affairs in Old Rome and the papal penalty of interdicts, perhaps through participation in a mission there,¹⁴¹ Kinnamos describes Westerners’ martial prowess, boastfulness, and greed in tones reminiscent of Anna’s

-
- 135 Ed. and trans. of the relevant verses in Rhoby, “Verschiedene Bemerkungen”, p. 317; Manganeios Prodromos, *Poems*, eds. and trans. Jeffreys/Jeffreys (forthcoming).
 - 136 Ed. and trans. of the relevant verses in Rhoby, “Verschiedene Bemerkungen”, pp. 318–19; Manganeios Prodromos, *Poems*, eds. and trans. Jeffreys/Jeffreys (forthcoming). See also Jeffreys/Jeffreys, “The Wild Beast”, pp. 115–16 and n. 67.
 - 137 Ed. in Neumann, *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber*, pp. 65–68; Manganeios Prodromos, *Poems*, eds. Jeffreys/Jeffreys (forthcoming). See also Jeffreys/Jeffreys, “The Wild Beast”, pp. 114–15; Rhoby, “Verschiedene Bemerkungen”, pp. 313–14.
 - 138 Jeffreys/Jeffreys, “The Wild Beast”, p. 115; Rhoby, “Verschiedene Bemerkungen”, pp. 319–20.
 - 139 On orators’ uncertainty as to Manuel’s wishes and attitudes, and on their mixed loyalties during the first decade and a half of his reign, see Stanković, “Byzantine Intellectuals”, esp. pp. 211–12, 215–19, 223, 225–26. See also Karla, “Literarische Porträt Manuels I.”, pp. 678–79; above, p. 50.
 - 140 Stanković, “Byzantine Intellectuals”, pp. 209, 222, 225; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 413, 445; Treadgold, *Middle Byzantine Historians*, pp. 387–88, 402, 406.
 - 141 John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, IV.14, ed. Meinecke, pp. 170–71; trans. Brand, p. 3 (introduction); Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 60–61; Treadgold, *Middle Byzantine Historians*, pp. 407–08.

Alexiad and, indeed, earlier Byzantine ethnography.¹⁴² Kinnamos outlines their political hierarchy and records Manuel's designation of the Venetians residing in Constantinople as *bourgesioi* (from Italian *burgensis*).¹⁴³ But he does not accord them overriding significance in his narrative.

Kinnamos' younger contemporary, Niketas Choniates, is fully conversant with Old French and Italian terms for leaders and officials, and he knows that the Latins consist of "different peoples".¹⁴⁴ Having begun, while a senior administrator under Alexios III, a history of reigns since John II's, and carrying on writing until 1205, a year after the Fourth Crusaders' capture of Constantinople, he later resumed work. The eventual – unfinished – outcome was ruminative upon the City's fall, recounting events up to November 1206.¹⁴⁵ Choniates wrote of a "vast gulf between us and them": the Latins had "ever" been "designing ills for our people", for all the pretence of friendship, and craving our "paradise".¹⁴⁶ His *History* wryly notes Henry VI's aspiration to dominions matching ancient Roman emperors.¹⁴⁷ Henry's father, however, Frederick Barbarossa, receives praise for "apostolic zeal" "to suffer with the Christians of Palestine on behalf of Christ". Choniates presents the motivation of participants on the Third Crusade as understandingly as he does the Second Crusaders,¹⁴⁸ reserving condemnation for those Fourth Crusaders who, having "set out to avenge the Holy Sepulchre, raged in battle against Christ" through assaulting fellow-Christians.¹⁴⁹ Byzantium's collapse stems from emperors' mistaken policies and internal power-struggles and, indeed, from fate rather than external foes. If money had flowed out to Westerners "like rivers", this was Manuel Komnenos' fault: his wish to pre-empt their assaults is laudable, but does not excuse his over-taxation and treatment of subjects like slaves.¹⁵⁰

142 E.g., John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, II.13–14, 15–16; III.16; IV.6, 13, ed. Meinecke, pp. 70–72, 76–80, 125, 148–49, 167–69; Asdracha, "L'image", p. 35; Treadgold, *Middle Byzantine Historians*, pp. 414–15; Kaldellis, *Ethnography*, pp. 50, 176–78.

143 John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, II.12; VI.10, ed. Meinecke, pp. 68–69, 282; Asdracha, "L'image", pp. 37, 40.

144 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, p. 247, line 31. See also *ibid.*, pp. 88, 308, 359, 539, 609; Asdracha, "L'image", pp. 32 n. 7, 40.

145 The lengthier and shorter versions of Niketas' *History* are analysed, and their changing circumstances of composition demonstrated, by Simpson, *Niketas Choniates*, pp. 68–77. See also Treadgold, *Middle Byzantine Historians*, pp. 434–35.

146 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, p. 301.

147 *Ibid.*, pp. 479–80.

148 *Ibid.*, pp. 68–70, 416–17; Simpson, *Niketas Choniates*, pp. 316, 318–19.

149 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, p. 575.

150 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, pp. 203–06, 246–47; Magdalino, "Aspects", pp. 329, 338; Treadgold, *Middle Byzantine Historians*, pp. 439–40, 452–54; Simpson, *Niketas Choniates*, pp. 149–52, 156–58.

If Choniates is bitter, especially about the Venetians, this reflects a sense of betrayal by those grown rich from trading with Byzantium, and arrogant. He acknowledges that his own family survived the sack thanks to his “intimate friend and associate”, a Venetian merchant.¹⁵¹

Choniates’ grasp of crusading ideology and “Who was Who” among Western powers, owes something to his administrative experience: while governor of Philippopolis in 1189, he found himself mediating between Isaac II Angelos and the German Crusaders under Barbarossa. But Choniates’ range of Westerners goes beyond the military figures depicted by earlier writers like Kinnamos, to trade and affairs at court. The marriage-ties of Manuel and subsequent emperors meant that rival factions could have leaders of Latin origin at their head, yet exploit xenophobia. Thus Maria *kaisarissa*, herself the daughter of Bertha of Sulzbach, played on popular unease about Maria of Antioch’s ties with Westerners (above, p. 39). Yet her own husband was Renier of Montferrat, and Choniates has him address the “Latin” bodyguards under his command, along with her domestic servants, urging them to make a stand and defend St Sophia against their foes charging into it “shamelessly”.¹⁵² Here the historian idealizes Renier in contrast with factitious Byzantines. But rhetoric was a two-edged sword and *raisons d’état* could shift from month to month, as Choniates himself exemplifies in a court oration delivered at Epiphany. Here, he acclaims Isaac II’s willingness to take up arms against Barbarossa, whose army is crossing imperial territory.¹⁵³ Circumstances in January 1190 made it politic for Niketas to harp on brutish barbarian aggressiveness. In short, outsiders were ever liable to be branded with whatever negative imagery traditionally denoted their people or region; if their virtues were praised, this was often to show up the deficiencies of the Byzantines and their emperors, a form of *Kaiserkritik*.

The gyrations of policy towards outsiders, especially Westerners capable of metamorphosing into insiders and back again, are illustrated by the *Muses*, poems written as if by Alexios Komnenos for his heir’s instruction. Scholarly opinion now weighs in favour of their composition early in John II’s reign. Classifying the “Kelts” alongside other ravaging barbarians, the poems obfuscate the compromises Alexios had offered to Westerners, foreshadowing in this respect the *Alexiad*’s hard line.¹⁵⁴ Court orators played safe by striking

151 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, p. 588; Simpson, *Niketas Choniates*, p. 323.

152 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, pp. 238–39, 241.

153 Niketas Choniates, *Orationes*, no. 9, ed. van Dieten, pp. 90–100; Simpson, *Niketas Choniates*, pp. 53, 55.

154 Maas, “Musen”, e.g. Poem 1, lines 118–22, 265–98; Poem 2, lines 51–65; Mullett, “Whose *Muses*?”, pp. 197–99, 206–09; Strano, “Ideologia”, pp. 444–47, 457–59.

triumphalist notes, applauding shows of strength and Westerners subservient. For example, in an oration of 1138, Michael Italikos celebrated John II's campaigns in Cilicia and Syria, acclaiming his victories over "barbarian" Kelts and Armenians alike.¹⁵⁵ Italikos was hardly ignorant of the West, undertaking at least one embassy to Rome for which, judging by his letter to John II, he expected to need all his powers of persuasion.¹⁵⁶ But exposing oneself to accusations of softness on Westerners through acknowledging their positive traits was unwise, given the competitiveness of orators, who often wrote speculatively in hopes of their piece being deliverable at some public occasion.¹⁵⁷ For a marriage-tie a writer might still resort to traditional praises of the West, like the anonymous poet greeting the French princess Agnes in 1179, or the speech Choniates himself wrote for Isaac II's marriage to the Hungarian Margaret in 1185/86, recalling her descent from Julius Caesar and Augustus.¹⁵⁸ But prudence lay behind the hackneyed tones in which authors wishing to circulate their work usually described Westerners, even in defeat. For example, Michael Italikos, Nikephoros Basilakes, and Theodore Prodromos depict John II's entry into Antioch in 1138 in triumphalist colours, without mentioning Prince Raymond or Count Joscelin of Edessa by name.¹⁵⁹ Only William of Tyre indicates that Raymond and Joscelin played the part of *strator*, and were leading the emperor's horse like grooms. The emperor's deft adaptation of an act so laden with symbolism in Western tradition found no place as yet in court rhetoric.¹⁶⁰

Twenty years later, Manuel made an even more spectacular entry into Antioch, with its prince Reynald and other notables attending to his horse's bridle. Reynald had already prostrated himself and handed over his sword to Manuel "in front of all the legions". John Kinnamos alludes to this entry only in quite general terms, while asserting that the ceremonies followed the lines of a triumph in Constantinople.¹⁶¹ To that extent, Manuel was incorporating

155 Michael Italikos, *Lettres*, no. 43, ed. Gautier, pp. 252–53, 259–60 (text), 240, 241 (summary).

156 Michael Italikos, *Lettres*, no. 23, ed. Gautier, pp. 173–75 (text), 173 (summary); Bucossi, "Seeking a Way", p. 124.

157 Jeffreys, "Literary Trends", pp. 110–12.

158 See above, pp. 38–39; Niketas Choniates, *Orationes*, no. 5, ed. van Dieten, pp. 35–44, esp. p. 40. On his writings in general, see Simpson, *Niketas Choniates*, pp. 36–67.

159 Michael Italikos, *Lettres*, no. 43, ed. Gautier, pp. 260–61, 265–66; Nikephoros Basilakes, *Orationes*, no. 3, ed. Garzya, pp. 63, 69, 71–73; Theodore Prodromos, *Poems*, ed. Hörandner, p. 258, lines 166–67.

160 William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, 15.3, ed. Huygens, vol. 2, pp. 676–77; Vučetić, "Emperor John II's Encounters", pp. 87–89.

161 John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, vi.21, ed. Meinecke, p. 187. Fuller details are given by William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, 18.23, 25, ed. Huygens, vol. 2, pp. 845, 848. Various contemporary verses celebrated Reynald's utter humiliation, involving a rope around his neck, with vivid yet

Western rites of subjection within his style of imperial rulership. Whether this could reconcile the mass of his Greek-speaking subjects to Western ways as a whole was another matter.

4.2 *Imperial-Ecclesiastical Complex: Clerical Texts*

Upon being excommunicated by the papal legates, Michael Keroularios gave rise, directly or indirectly, to several screeds listing Latins' errors: their addition of the *filioque* clause to the Creed, deviations from correct ritual and discipline, and foul eating habits.¹⁶² Churchmen posted far from Constantinople helped fire these broadsides, not only Leon of Ohrid but also Metropolitan Ephraim of Rus'. Ephraim's catalogue of Latin errors resembles others but blames the Germans for imposing azymes and other customs on "the Romans" (i.e. the Papacy); and his criticism of Polish fasting periods in Lent sprang from what he had seen or heard in Rus', not from stereotypes made in Constantinople.¹⁶³ Churchmen with first-hand experience were the likeliest to find fault, especially once they began to experience Western rule in the Levant. For instance, John the Oxite ridiculed what he had seen of Latin liturgical practices at Antioch during the First Crusade, and Patriarch John VIII of Jerusalem wrote two tracts against azymes in the opening years of the 12th century.¹⁶⁴

However, the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate avoided pronouncements about the Latins for some time after the polemics launched by Keroularios and his sympathisers. The government was wary of highlighting points of difference. The *Armoury of Doctrine* Alexios I commissioned from the monk Euthymios Zigabenos relegates the *filioque* question to the distant past.¹⁶⁵ More or less unofficial discussions took place concerning azymes and the *filioque* clause. Several treatises emerged from the disputation under Alexios'

traditional imagery, e.g. Manganeios Prodomos in *RHC Gr.*, pp. 305–10, esp. p. 306, lines 93–102 (= no. 9 in Magdalino, *Empire*, appendix 1, p. 495). See also the other poems of Manganeios Prodomos in *RHC Gr.*, pp. 319–26 (= no. 10 in Magdalino, *Empire*, appendix 1, p. 495); *RHC Gr.*, pp. 303–05 (= no. 35 in Magdalino, *Empire*, appendix 1, p. 496); Euthymios Malakes, in Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Noctes Petropolitanae*, pp. 179–80.

162 One may note, besides the writings of Keroularios himself, and the more restrained texts of Leon of Ohrid and Niketas Stethatos, the text known as *The Things Done and Taught by the Franks Contrary to the Orthodox Faith ...* (ed. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*); Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, p. 175. See below, n. 187.

163 Čičurov, "Antilateinischer Traktat", pp. 343–45 (text), 332, 334–35, 341–43 (discussion); Cheynet, "Schisme de 1054", pp. 309–10.

164 John the Oxite, *Λόγος περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων*, ed. Leib, p. 262 and n. 84 (text); Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, p. 58, n. 186; pp. 60, 95, 111–33; Augé, *Byzantins, Arméniens*, pp. 60–64.

165 Euthymios Zigabenos, *Panoplia dogmatike*, *PG* vol. 130, col. 875C; *PG* vol. 102, cols 391–400; see also Shepard, "Hard on Heretics", pp. 771–72.

aegis between churchmen and an ex-archbishop of Milan, Pietro Grossolano. This was held in 1112, while Alexios was sounding out Paschal II as to possible Church union, and he commissioned the treatises.¹⁶⁶ Such data as survives from Alexios' reign shows that a general council was deemed by emperor and patriarch the forum for resolving differences. They seemingly knew how important general councils were to reformist popes as a means of regenerating the Church under their authority, worldwide. Given the interchangeability of "general" with "universal" councils, this bespeaks diplomatic finesse, containing papal aspirations within the traditional Eastern Christian bounds of the Pentarchy.¹⁶⁷ In a treatise playing down the Latins' errors, deeming even the *filioque* merely a reflection of their language's poverty, Theophylact of Ohrid insists that issues involving the Trinity, and thus the fundamentals of the faith, are for a universal council to determine.¹⁶⁸ In sympathy with Alexios' outlook, Theophylact may have written his treatise around the time of the disputation with Grossolano.¹⁶⁹ Equally temperate are the *Six Dialogues on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, written by Niketas, who was probably the Metropolitan of Thessalonica around 1133. Pointing out how even-handedly he represents the "Greek" and "Latin" spokesmen discussing the Trinity, A. Bucossi notes that Western views about the respective roles of Son and Spirit are deemed tenable; at the end, the speakers agree, "from the Son" and "through the Son" mean the same, although the word *filioque* must be erased from the symbol of faith.¹⁷⁰ Remarking that the Greek and Latin speakers have arguments "equivalent and equal in force", Niketas explains that each case has its merits, partly in default of determination by "a synod", presumably a universal council.¹⁷¹ Here he echoes

166 On Grossolano's visit, see, e.g. Grumel, "Autour du voyage"; Bayer, *Spaltung*, pp. 191–96; Augé, *Byzantins, Arméniens*, pp. 151–56.

167 For the imperial protocol of a ruling of the *Synodos Endēmousa* ("Standing Synod") in 1089, see ed. Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, pp. 215–22 at pp. 220–21. The Latin terminology for "general" and "universal" or "ecumenical" councils was elastic at the end of the 11th century, and the terms *synodus* and *concilium* were not sharply distinguished from one another: Gresser, *Synoden*, pp. 573–78; Somerville, *Pope Urban II*, pp. 182–85. See also Shepard, "Man-to-Man", pp. 781–83.

168 Theophylact of Ohrid, *Discours*, ed. and trans. Gautier, pp. 256–57.

169 On the composition date, see Mullett, *Theophylact*, pp. 239–40; Augé, *Byzantins, Arméniens*, p. 152. On Theophylact's position, see also Kolbaba, "Orthodoxy of the Latins", pp. 201–02, 206–08.

170 The Sixth Dialogue, ending with agreement that the speakers differ only over use of prepositions, awaits full publication: Niketas of Thessalonica, *Six Dialogues*, col. 221B; Bucossi, "Seeking a Way", p. 130.

171 Niketas of Thessalonica, *Six Dialogues*, col. 169B; Bucossi, "Seeking a Way", p. 126. See also Bucossi, "The Six Dialogues".

Theophylact and, in assigning a role for the Son in the bestowal (although not in the procession) of the Spirit, his Greek spokesman's position resembles that taken by a participant in the 1112 disputation, Niketas Seides.¹⁷² Indeed, as Bucossi notes, a similar line – involving a distinction between the “procession” of the Holy Spirit from the Father and its “bestowal” by the Son, and thus room for possible compromise – was proffered by Metropolitan Niketas of Nicomedia in his 1136 dialogue with Anselm of Havelberg.¹⁷³

The dearth of extant Greek writings in depth concerning Latin theological positions does not betoken imperviousness to goings-on in the West in the 12th century. The earlier enthusiasm for disputations owed something to Alexios I's care in furthering education among the clergy of St Sophia.¹⁷⁴ And Anselm of Havelberg's recollections of what amounts to a college of teachers and authorities in “the liberal arts and the divine scriptures” may exaggerate the degree of institutionalization.¹⁷⁵ But his sense of familiarity suggests currents underway more or less simultaneously in East and West, a predisposition towards “*disputatio*” in public as the means of gaining theological accuracy and moral enlightenment.¹⁷⁶ The nature of interaction between Western Scholasticism and Byzantine scholars' quest for precision awaits full exegesis.¹⁷⁷ But the feasibility of cross-fertilization is clear from the case of Anna Komnene (above, p. 52). In fact, Manuel Komnenos reportedly took up an interpretation of Christ's statement, “My Father is greater than I” (John 14:28) brought back by one of his envoys from the West, sparking objections from many Constantinopolitan clergymen. Manuel eventually prevailed, and a council ruled in support of his line in 1166. Although his patriarch's support was lukewarm, and the opposition had included many metropolitans, Manuel's consultations with the Paris-educated Hugh Eteriano during the controversy flagged up his interpretation's background, “une polemique occidentale, transportée

172 Niketas Seides, *De controversiis*, argument 3, section 1, ed. Gahbauer, p. 40, lines 25–30.

173 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, 11.11, 24, col. 1180A, 1204D; trans. Criste/Neel, pp. 110–11, 147–48; trans. Sieben, pp. 97, 129; Bucossi, “Seeking a Way”, pp. 132–33.

174 Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 58–60, 91–95; Magdalino, “Reform Edict”, pp. 199–207, 214–17.

175 Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, col. 1141A–B; trans. Criste/Neel, p. 45; trans. Sieben, pp. 44–45; Angold, *Church and Society*, p. 93; Novikoff, *Medieval Culture*, pp. 96–99.

176 Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 95–98; see also Cameron, *Arguing It Out*, pp. 62–65, 82–85. For the West see, e.g., Southern, “Schools of Paris”, esp. pp. 121–23, 128–32; Witt, *Two Latin Cultures*, pp. 173–74, 246–52, 259–67; Novikoff, *Medieval Culture*, pp. 35–49, 63–66, 70–82.

177 Bucossi, “Seeking a Way”, p. 134.

à Byzance".¹⁷⁸ According to Hugh, Latins were "pointed out in the streets as objects of hatred and detestation"; clerical intellectuals lampooned the new dogma.¹⁷⁹

Manuel was keenly aware of this. His discussions with representatives of the Armenian and Latin Churches showed off his theological expertise and, in the Latins' case, his understanding of the *filioque* issue and papal primacy. Through commissioning a *Sacred Arsenal*, Manuel was following in his grandfather's footsteps. But its first half is devoted to the Western Church, contains a "Dialogue" between "the emperor" and "the wisest cardinals", and focuses mainly on papal primacy and the procession of the Holy Spirit. The author was a layman, the high-ranking official Andronikos Kamateros.¹⁸⁰ Presumably – and unlike Alexios – Manuel could not count on a monk for the task. Presenting himself simultaneously as defender of the faith yet conversant with Western ways, Manuel was, in his later years, coaxing Byzantine churchmen towards a settlement with the Papacy.

However, the mixed feelings of senior churchmen are encapsulated in statements of, or attributed to, the Constantinopolitan patriarch, Michael Anchialos. Answering a letter from Pope Alexander III in 1173, he avowed zeal for reunion but held up humility as the means, alongside respect for the ancient Church order which St Peter had instituted first in Jerusalem, then in Antioch, then further afield. Implicitly, he thus invokes the Pentarchy, as senior churchmen had done in Alexios I's reign.¹⁸¹ Michael rebuffed an attempt by Manuel to relax the ban on matrimony between persons already related by marriage. In effect, he dismissed as irrelevant Manuel's parading of knowledge about "the customs of great countries" such as the Latins: they had triggered the schism, and there would be "no lack of stones to check our assailants and make them bow to truth [on the *filioque*]" once the Byzantines devised (like David) a proper sling.¹⁸² Established laws should not, in Michael's view, be upset by

178 Dondaine, "Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscan", p. 124. See John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, VI.2, ed. Meinecke, pp. 251–56; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 90–91, 287–91; Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 83–85.

179 Letter of Hugh to Peter of Vienna, ed. Dondaine, "Hugues Ethérien et le concile", pp. 480–83 at p. 481. See also Dondaine, "Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscan", pp. 82–83, 123–124; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 289–90; Angold, *Church and Society*, p. 85; Cameron, *Arguing It Out*, pp. 78–79, 146–47.

180 Andronikos Kamateros, *Sacrum Armamentarium*, ed. Bucossi, e.g. pp. xxi–xxiii, xxvi (introduction); Magdalino, *Empire*, p. 290.

181 Hofmann, "Papst und Patriarch", pp. 78–79; Angold, *Church and Society*, p. 110. See above, p. 60.

182 Darrouzès, "Questions", pp. 125–27, 137; Magdalino, *Empire*, pp. 214–16, 292; Angold, *Church and Society*, p. 107.

Latin practices. Unsurprising in itself, his outlook was overshadowed by foreboding about Westerners' power. The so-called *Dialogue* between Michael and Manuel is, in its present form, of later 13th-century date, but its author probably inferred Michael's sentiments from texts that were circulating in the 1170s. The patriarch is represented as comparing the Muslims' rule favourably with that of the "Italians" (i.e. Westerners): the former would not force their faith upon him, but living under the latter, and having to accept their formulation of the faith, he would be "separating myself from my God" – a form of "double servitude".¹⁸³ Thus, martial imagery about Western churchmen features in both Michael's internal correspondence with the emperor and public texts of the 1170s. This suggests knowledge of goings-on in Frankish-occupied lands, while brushing aside imperial attempts at realignment with Western customs.

If churchmen were wary of creeping Latinization, individuals were ready to enlist Western practices in defence of true faith. A celebrated example is Patriarch Dositheos' alleged declaration in St Sophia in 1189: convicted murderers killing 100 participants in the Crusade would wipe away their sins.¹⁸⁴ This turning of crusading notions against their originators flouts customary Byzantine reservations about bloodshed.¹⁸⁵ But the ultimate paradox lies in the fact that Dositheos was himself of Venetian stock; offering a kind of indulgence sprang from a family background in the West.¹⁸⁶ Even allowing for Venice's longstanding affiliation with Byzantium, Dositheos' rise to the patriarchate exemplifies Constantinople's openness to Westerners, clergy alongside merchants and warriors. The scant attention to his origins in Byzantine sources corresponds with their reticence about the Western connections of other prominent individuals (above, pp. 54–55). There were, then, many means for Byzantine ruling circles to learn of Western ways and ideas. And if the bids of Manuel to introduce Latin fashions and thinking underwent scrutiny from figures in the imperial-ecclesiastical complex, Western customs were adopted piecemeal at lowlier social levels. This could happen without conscious abandonment of orthodoxy, and it is the subject of our final section.

183 "Dialogue", eds. and trans. Laurent/Darrouzès, pp. 366–67; Grumel/Darrouzès, *Les registes*, nos. 1121**, 1122**; Magdalino, *Empire*, p. 292; Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 110–11; Bucossi, "New Historical Evidence", pp. 125–26.

184 The patriarch's pledge features in a letter sent by Frederick Barbarossa to his son, Henry, incorporated in *Historia de expeditione Friderici*, ed. Chroust, p. 43; Brand, *Byzantium Confronts*, pp. 181–85; Angold, *Church and Society*, p. 123.

185 On Holy Warfare in Byzantine eyes, see, e.g. Stouraitis, "Just War", pp. 243–50, and above, p. 38.

186 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. van Dieten, p. 405; Darrouzès, "Notes inédites", p. 159; Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 122–23; Magdalino, "Isaac II", pp. 100–01.

4.3 *Non-establishment Texts*

Hostility towards the religious observances and also the mores of Westerners in general found expression in writings intended to circulate widely. Their lists of errors of the Latins drew upon the works of Michael Keroularios and his contemporaries, intermingling complaints about fasting on the Sabbath and suchlike breaches of correct observance with scurrilous allegations. Thus an anonymous list, probably written not long after 1054, reprises Keroularios' charge that Latins eat "strangled ... and unclean things", adding that they do not chant the Alleluia during Lent.¹⁸⁷ Another text prefaces its list by stating that all Christians "of the West beyond the Ionian Sea", except for the Calabrians, have fallen into heresy.¹⁸⁸ Our only *terminus ante quem* for this text is c.1178, when Hugh Eteriano translated it into Latin. Other datable lists appear mostly from around the later 11th and early 12th century, or in the era of the Fourth Crusade.¹⁸⁹ However, such clustering may be illusory, given that texts remain unpublished. Moreover they could have circulated and been re-read publicly without any fresh compositions, while some texts survive only in Slavonic translation, notably "A Tale about the Latins", seemingly composed in Greek at the end of the 11th century.¹⁹⁰ If the text was soon disseminated in Bulgaria and Rus', the original's circulation in Byzantine provinces liable to be frequented by Latins is at least as probable.

That discontent rumbled on in some quarters of the Byzantine Church emerges from the complaints about the washing of altars made by well-disposed Westerners like Hugh Eteriano. And if Western styles of clothing were in vogue with those who could afford them in Constantinople, there were probably many others who could not (see above, pp. 39–41, 57). Besides, people whom Nicholas of Andida termed "the simpler among the orthodox" were apt to fall for Western ways, unaware how far they deviated from correct practices (above, p. 40). It was, most probably, to discourage social mixing and casual assimilation of customs that the lists were written and read aloud, setting observable differences alongside intimations of uncleanness and ungodliness. If the aim of these texts' authors is clear enough, their identity is murky. Those known by name, such as Michael Keroularios or John of Claudiopolis, ranked

187 Michael Keroularios (Letter no. 2 to Peter of Antioch): *Acta et scripta*, ed. Will, p. 180; *The Things Done and Taught by the Franks Contrary to the Orthodox Faith ...* (ed. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*), pp. 152–53 (paras 6, 13); Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, pp. 175, 189, 193.

188 *Concerning the Franks and other Latins*, in Hergenröther (ed.), *Monumenta graeca*, pp. 62–71 at p. 62; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, p. 178.

189 Dondaine, "Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscan", pp. 114–16; Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, pp. 16–17.

190 Popov (ed.), *Istoriko-literaturny obzor*, pp. 178–88; Nikolov, "Useful Tale", esp. pp. 111–12; new edition in Nikolov, *Povest polezna za Latini*, pp. 69–75.

high in the Church hierarchy, but the main embroiderers and circulators could well have been monks or local priests, aghast at the impression made on simple folk by the likes of Mauro, a wealthy Amalfitan who settled on the west coast of Anatolia in the later 12th century.¹⁹¹ Given the prominence, according to William of Tyre, of monks – along with priests – in urging on criminal elements in the Constantinopolitan populace to seek out and slaughter Latins who were hiding in their homes in 1182,¹⁹² one might expect their animus to have been broadcast in writing. Antipathy towards Westerners is a recurrent theme in 12th-century monastic writings about the Normans and other Western “barbarians”. St Christodoulos of Patmos put his powers to posthumous effect in fending off their attempts to seize his relics from the monastery he had founded.¹⁹³ While still on earth, Abbot Neophytos of the Kykkos monastery on Cyprus wrote copiously (though guardedly) about the errors of the Latin “heretics”, after the island came under Crusaders’ control in 1191.¹⁹⁴ Westerners were now seen as potential predators, more intent on stripping shrines than consulting Eastern holy men. Scattered across the Eastern Christian world, and only loosely affiliated with the imperial-ecclesiastical complex, monks became vocal critics of Latin ways; and if, as seems probable, they had a hand in elaborating and disseminating the lists of Latin errors, they were highlighting, when not simply inventing, culturo-religious divergences.

Such disinformation is in contrast with the stance of monks in earlier centuries. As seen above, undercurrents of persons and texts had flowed between Eastern Christian monks and their fellows in the central Mediterranean, including Romance-speaking areas. Byzantine-based monks were more cognizant with their Western counterparts’ ways than their writings’ apparent obliviousness to them might suggest. With cognizance went sympathy and, even occasional borrowings, judging by the Grand Lavra’s *Hypotyposis* (above, p. 41). It may have been the longstanding links of the Stoudios monastery with the Papacy that prompted one of its brethren to write his *Dialexis* during the stay of the papal legates in Constantinople in 1054, avowedly in response to questions “often” put to him by “various Romans [i.e. Westerners]

191 See, on the problem of attributing authorship of the lists, Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, pp. 26–28, 173–75, 177. For the trader, see *Life of Leontios*, ch. 55, ed. and trans. Tsougarakis, pp. 94–97; Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 370–71.

192 William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, 22. 13(12), ed. Huygens, vol. 2, pp. 1023–24; Brand, *Byzantium Confronts*, pp. 41–42.

193 See the summary of Theodosios’ account of the miracles of Christodoulos in Vranousi, *Τά ἀγιολογικά κείμενα*, pp. 71–75; Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 369–70.

194 Galatariotou, *Making of a Saint*, pp. 235–43; Angold, *Church and Society*, pp. 374–75.

coming here".¹⁹⁵ Niketas Stethatos' tract is mild in tone and respectful towards the Papacy, while holding out against azymes, fasting on Saturdays, and a total ban on married priests.¹⁹⁶ In striking a moderate note, Niketas was not temporizing. His *Life of Symeon the New Theologian* is sympathetic towards Western churchmen, and seems to characterize the general outlook of the Stoudios monastery in the mid-11th century.¹⁹⁷ A sense of commonality between monks persisted irrespective of their specific customs and rites of devotion. Although very seldom articulated, it is discernible in the collaboration between a former monk of Cormery, Guillaume, and the brethren of a house in Nicomedia in need of repairs after its liberation from the Turks in the mid-1090s.¹⁹⁸ Guillaume, our ultimate source for this, was acting on behalf of Alexios I but he was scarcely part of the imperial-ecclesiastical complex. The fact that he was in Alexios' employ is noteworthy in itself. Indeed, Alexios' demonstrative solicitousness towards monks and religious houses even in the Far West presupposed a sense of spiritual pursuits in common, overriding differences in liturgical rites or ideas of Church hierarchy.¹⁹⁹

Nonetheless, what had amounted to a kind of "Monastic International" was losing its momentum. Eastern Christian monks were no longer a byword for asceticism in the West, for all the imitation that some practitioners in the Frankish-occupied Holy Land may have inspired.²⁰⁰ By the later 1130s, the Latin house founded at Civetot (Kibotos) by Alexios, in commemoration of Peter the Hermit's pilgrims and symbolizing Christian fraternity, had fallen into disrepair. Alexios' bid to affiliate the monastery with Cluny by placing it under the care of its foremost priory, La Charité-sur-Loire, failed to garner lasting sympathy from the mother-house.²⁰¹ At the same time, the sheer numbers of Western monks

195 Niketas Stethatos, *Dialexis*, ed. Michel, p. 322.

196 Niketas invokes Pope Clement I and, pointedly, claims Pope Agatho's endorsement of the decrees of the Sixth Ecumenical Council: *Dialexis*, ed. Michel, pp. 355–40; Bayer, *Spaltung*, pp. 90–91. See also above, n. 60.

197 Niketas Stethatos, *Opuscles*, ed. Darrouzès, pp. 8–10 (introduction); Crostini, "Navigando per il Salterio", esp. pp. 135–44, 193–200, 205–09. See above, pp. 46–47.

198 Shepard, "How St James the Persian's Head", pp. 299–301 (text), pp. 304–06 (translation), pp. 325–28, 331–32 (commentary).

199 Guillaume's brother Gausbert, who stayed at Alexios' court in the earlier years of his reign, subsequently held a senior office at the important monastery of Marmoutier, on the Loire. He could have had a hand in Stephen of Blois' departure on Crusade in 1096: Shepard, "How St James the Persian's Head", pp. 314–17, 324 and n. 125. See also Shepard, "Emperor's 'Significant Others'".

200 Jotischky, "Monastic Reform", pp. 67–72.

201 Peter the Venerable, *Letters*, ed. Constable, vol. 1, p. 209 (text), vol. 2, pp. 148–49, 292 (commentary). On the location of Kibotos, see Lefort "Communications", p. 213 and map on p. 208. See also Shepard, "Muddy Road" of Odo Arpin, pp. 22–24.

and clerics traversing Byzantine lands rose as communications between East and West eased, while the Latins' churches multiplied.²⁰² It is no coincidence that monasteries like Patmos, lying on the route of so many Western travellers to the Holy Land, produced texts taking a virulently anti-Latin line. Amalfi, with its houses on Mount Athos and in Constantinople, long had an intermediary role between the Papacy and other Western churchmen and their Eastern counterparts. Around 1070 a clergyman named "Laycus", probably an Amalfitan, wrote a tract in defence of azymes, addressing it to the abbot of the Amalfitan monastery of St Maria of the Latins in Constantinople.²⁰³ He expected them to engage with overbearing Eastern churchmen in measured tones, much as Niketas Stethatos was doing in the Stoudios monastery around the same time. Signs of such engagement are fainter for the 12th century, and although the Amalfitan house on Mount Athos was still functioning in 1198 under the emperor's protection, it was no longer a significant channel of communication between East and West.²⁰⁴

5 Conclusion

Until well into the 11th century, close acquaintance with the West was more the preserve of the ruling elite and senior churchmen than something for ordinary Byzantines, and much of their information came from the written word, works of classical antiquity or more recent hagiographical texts and correspondence with Western clerics. This was a Mediterranean world on which intruders from the Far West – notably the Franks – might impose themselves from time to time, without bringing about total rupture from the ancient past. Indeed, the old imperial order became more tangible and ripe for revival with the consolidation of Byzantium's politico-military presence in the central Mediterranean. This state of affairs ended quite abruptly with the upswing in trade and, in the mid-11th-century, the Normans' seizure of southern Italy and Sicily, as well as Robert Guiscard's marshalling of their resources to threaten Constantinople itself. At the same time, the number of Western pilgrims passing through Byzantine lands to and from Jerusalem was on the rise, and senior churchmen were taking exception to the distinctive rites and forms of prayer

202 See Lilie, "Lateinische Kirche", pp. 203–11.

203 *Epistola missa Sergio abbati ad defendendum se de azymis contra Grecos*, ed. Michel, in *Amalfi und Jerusalem*, pp. 35–47; von Falkenhausen, "Gli Amalfitani", p. 34.

204 See *Actes de Chilandar*, eds. Živojinović et al., vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 100–03 at p. 102 (text); von Falkenhausen. "Gli Amalfitani", pp. 26–29, 43–44.

they observed among their Western counterparts. Now that northerners hailing from the Far West were intermingling with the inhabitants of the Italian peninsula, the new label of “Latins” began to denote Westerners of all stripes, while the term “Italians” came to designate the Normans in the south. This usage was all the more convenient now that so many of them were “over here” in a variety of guises. What had been a region, “the West”, replete with classical associations and longstanding ecclesiastical institutions, became a source of novelties and surprises. These ranged from sudden military threats to new styles of clothing, and offshoots began to proliferate in the Holy Land and the Levant, taking control of commercial seaways and episcopal sees, and gaining vantage-points in several Byzantine towns. In Constantinople itself, eminent members of the ruling elite were first- or second-generation Latin migrants.

Amidst all these cross-currents, the adherence of orators and Constantinopolitan *littérateurs* to conventional terms for denoting Westerners is understandable. There was an ample stock of imagery for depicting them collectively in negative terms as wayward or bellicose barbarians, while writers celebrating imperial marriage-alliances and the arrival of Western brides could still draw on notions of nobility and grandeur common to East and West in the distant past. Indeed, a sense of commonality extending to religious devotions was key to Manuel Komnenos’ personal style of leadership. But he could scarcely halt the flux, and the opaqueness of the occasional references in literary works to the origins of Eirene *sebastokratorissa* suggests how readily an individual’s Western connections or origins could become a social and political handicap. The silences and the conventionality of our literary sources about the origins of individual Westerners who had joined the imperial-ecclesiastical complex are misleading. Far more was known about them and their societies’ customs than had been known to previous generations of Byzantine writers and churchmen about “the Western parts”.

Until the 11th century, members of the imperial-ecclesiastical complex had enjoyed a virtual monopoly on face-to-face encounters with the West, with monks constituting a marginal exception. By the later 12th century, many Byzantines below the level of the imperial-ecclesiastical complex had some personal impressions of Westerners, whether from direct encounters or hearsay. These were not necessarily accurate or profound, and one should never underestimate the suspicion in rural communities, at least, towards the outsider, or the ambiguousness towards foreigners’ wealth and goods on the part of the urban poor. Nonetheless, the burgeoning lists of Latins’ deviations from true religion and other malpractices are an index of the appeal they exerted on at least some “simple folk”. Whoever the original authors may have been, the compilers and copiers of the lists, probably working at grass-roots, were

playing up ritual differences that had counted for little in an era of minimal communications, and in effect they were spreading misinformation. The Latins were, in their eyes, a form of rampant contamination, and the clerical proponents of “Old Rome” were now a threat to traditional devotions and religious order.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

CFHB	<i>Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae</i>
CSHB	<i>Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae</i>
ODB	Kazhdan, A.P. et al. (eds.), <i>Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , 3 vols., Oxford-New York 1991
PG	Migne, J.-P. (ed.), <i>Patrologia cursus completus: series graeca</i> , 161 vols., Paris 1857–66
PL	Migne, J.-P. (ed.), <i>Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina</i> , 221 vols., Paris 1841–64
PmbZ	Lilie, R.-J. et al. (eds.), <i>Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit</i> , vol. 2: (867–1025), <i>Prolegomena</i> , 7 pts. and indices, Berlin-New York 2009–13
RHC Gr.	Miller, E. (ed.), <i>Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens grecs</i> , vol. 2, Paris 1881
RHC Occ.	<i>Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux</i> , 5 vols., Paris 1844–95

Primary Sources

- Acta et scripta de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae*, ed. C. Will, Leipzig-Marburg 1861.
- Actes de Chilandar*, eds. M. Živojinović et al., *Actes de Chilandar: des origines à 1319* (Archives de l'Athos, 20), vol. 1 in 2 pts, Paris 1998.
- Actes de Lavra*, eds. P. Lemerle/A. Guillou/N. Svoronos (Archives de l'Athos, 5), vol. 1, Paris 1970.
- Andronikos Kamateros, *Sacrum Armamentarium, pars prima*, ed. A. Bucossi, Turnhout 2014.
- Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, eds. D.R. Reinsch/A. Kambylis (CFHB, 40), vol. 1, Berlin-New York 2001.
- Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, in *PL*, vol. 188, cols 1139–1248; *Anselm of Havelberg, Anticimenon: On the Unity of the Faith and the Controversies with the Greeks*, trans. A. Criste/C. Neel, Collegeville, Minn. 2010; *Anticimenon: Über die eine Kirche von Abel bis zum letzten Erwählten und von Ost bis West*, trans. H.J. Sieben, Münster 2010.

- Bruno of Querfurt, *Vita altera Sancti Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris*, ed. J. Karwasińska (Monumenta Poloniae Historica, series nova, 4.2), Warsaw 1969.
- Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, eds. J.C. Thomas/A.C. Hero, 5 vols., Washington D.C. 2000.
- Cerbanio Cerbani, *Translatio mirifici martyris Isidori a Chio insula in civitatem Venetam* (RHC Occ., vol. 5), Paris 1895, pp. 321–34.
- Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, ed. H. Hoffmann, *Die Chronik von Montecassino*, (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores, 34), Hanover 1980.
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, ed. J.J. Reiske, *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae* (CSHB), 2 vols., Bonn 1829–30; *Constantine Porphyrogenetos: The Book of Ceremonies* (Byzantina Australiensia, 18) trans. A. Moffatt/M. Tall, 2 vols., Canberra 2012; *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des cérémonies* (CFHB, 52), ed. and trans. G. Dagron et al., 6 vols., Paris 2020.
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De legationibus*, ed. C. de Boor, *Excerpta historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta*, vol. 1.1: *Excerpta de legationibus Romanorum ad gentes*, Berlin 1903, pp. 1–227; vol. 1.2: *Excerpta de legationibus gentium ad Romanos*, Berlin 1903, pp. 228–599.
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De thematibus*, ed. A. Pertusi (Studi e testi, 160), Rome 1952.
- DAI = Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, ed. G. Moravcsik, trans. R.J.H. Jenkins, (CFHB, 1), 2nd ed., Washington D.C. 1967.
- Darrouzès, J., “Un recueil épistolaire du XII^e siècle”, *Revue des études byzantines* 30 (1972), 199–229.
- “Dialogue between Patriarch Michael Anchialos and Emperor Manuel Komnenos”, ed. and French trans. in V. Laurent/J. Darrouzès, *Dossier grec de l'union de Lyon, 1273–1277*, Paris 1976, pp. 346–75.
- Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI–XIII*, eds. R. Morozzo della Rocca/A. Lombardo, 2 vols., Turin 1940.
- Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *Capture of Thessaloniki*, ed. and trans. J.R. Melville Jones, *The Capture of Thessaloniki* (Byzantina Australiensia, 8), Canberra 1988.
- Euthymios Zigabenos, *Panoplia dogmatike*, in PG vols. 128–30.
- Fontes rerum Byzantarum: rhetorum saeculi XII orationes politicae*, eds. V.E. Regel/N.I. Novosadskij, St Petersburg 1892 (repr. Leipzig 1982).
- Gregory the Cellarer, *Life of Lazaros*, in *Acta sanctorum, Novembris III*, Paris 1910, pp. 508–88; *The Life of Lazaros of Mt Galesion: An Eleventh-Century Pillar Saint*, trans. R.P.H. Greenfield, Washington D.C. 2000.
- Haldon, J., *A Critical Commentary on the Taktika of Leo VI*, Washington D.C. 2014.
- Hamilton, J./Hamilton, B. (trans.), *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c.650–c.1405: Selected Sources*, Manchester 1998.

- Hergenröther, J. (ed.), *Monumenta graeca ad Photium eiusque historiam pertinentia*, Ratisbon 1869.
- Historia de expeditione Friderici*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I.* (Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum. Nova series, 5), Berlin-Weimar 1928, pp. 1–115.
- Hugh Eteriano, *De sancto et immortali Deo* (printed in Migne under the title *Libri tres contra Graecos*), in *PL*, vol. 202, cols 231–396.
- John Geometres, *Poèmes*, ed. and trans. E.M. van Opstall, *Poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques*, Leiden 2008.
- John Kinnamos, *Epitome rerum*, ed. A. Meinecke, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum* (CSHB), Bonn 1836; *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, trans. C.M. Brand, New York 1976.
- John the Oxite, *Λόγος περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων πρὸς τὸν Ἀνδρινουπόλῃτην*, ed. B. Leib, *Deux inédits byzantins sur les azymes au début du XII^e siècle* (Orientalia Christiana, 9), Rome 1924, pp. 244–63.
- John Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. H. Thurn, *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum* (CFHB, 5), Berlin-New York 1973.
- John Tzetzes, *Epistulae*, ed. P.A.M. Leone, *Ioanne Tzetzes Epistulae*, Leipzig 1972.
- John Xiphilinos, *Epitome*, ed. U.P. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*, 5 vols., Berlin 1895–1931, vol. 3, pp. 479–730.
- Joseph Genesios, *Regum libri quattuor*, eds. A. Lesmüller-Werner/H. Thurn, *Iosephi Genesii Regum libri quattuor* (CFHB, 14), Berlin 1978.
- Ius graecoromanum*, eds. J. Zepos/P. Zepos, 8 vols., Athens 1931 (repr. Darmstadt 1962).
- Kekaumenos, *Counsels and Tales*, ed. and Russian trans. G.G. Litavrin, *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena*, 2nd ed., St Petersburg 2003.
- Leo VI, *Naumachica*, ed. A. Dain, *Naumachica*, Paris 1943.
- Leo VI, *Tactica*, ed. and trans. G.T. Dennis, *The Taktika of Leo VI*, rev. ed. (CFHB, 49), Washington D.C. 2014.
- Leo of Ohrid, *Letters*, ed. E. Büttner, *Erzbischof Leon von Ohrid. Leben und Werk*, Bamberg 2007.
- Leo of Synada, *Correspondence*, ed. and trans. M.P. Vinson, *The Correspondence of Leo, Metropolitan of Synada and Syncellus* (CFHB, 23), Washington D.C. 1985.
- Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis: texte, introduction et commentaire*, 3 vols., 2nd ed., Paris 1955–57.
- Life of Euthymios, Patriarch of Constantinople*, ed. and trans. P. Karlin-Hayter, *Vita Euthymii Patriarchae CP*, Brussels 1970.
- Life of Leontios, Patriarch of Jerusalem*, ed. and trans. D. Tsougarakis, *The Life of Leontios, Patriarch of Jerusalem: Text, Translation, Commentary/Bios tou hosiou hēmōn patros Leontiou patriarchou Hierosolymōn*, Leiden 1993.

- Life of Nilus the Younger*, in *PG*, vol. 120, cols 15–166.
- Liudprand of Cremona, *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liudprandi Cremonensis Opera omnia* (Corpus christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 156), Turnhout 1998, pp. 185–218.
- Lopez R.S./I.W. Raymond (trans.), *Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean World: Illustrative Documents*, New York 2001.
- Manganeios Prodromos, *Poems*, ed. and trans. E.M. Jeffreys/M.J. Jeffreys, Oxford forthcoming.
- Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, ed. I. Pérez Martín, trans. A. Kaldellis/D. Krallis, *The History: Michael Attaleiates*, Washington D.C. 2012.
- Michael Attaleiates, *Ponema Nomikon*, in *Jus graecoromanum*, eds. J. Zepos/P. Zepos, vol. 7, pp. 411–97.
- Michael Glykas, *Στίχοι οὓς ἔγραψε καθ' ὃν κατεσχέθη καιρόν*, ed. E.T. Tsolakis, *Μιχαήλ Γλυκά Στίχοι οὓς ἔγραψε καθ' ὃν κατεσχέθη καιρόν*, Thessaloniki 1959.
- Michael Italikos, *Lettres*, ed. P. Gautier, *Michel Italikos Lettres et discours* (Archives de l'Orient Chrétien, 14), Paris 1972.
- Michael Psellos, *Historia syntomos*, ed. and trans. W.J. Aerts, *Michaelis Pselli Historia syntomos* (CFHB, 30), Berlin 1990.
- Michael Psellos, *Letters*, ed. K.N. Sathas, *Ἱστορικοὶ λόγοι, ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ ἄλλα ἀνέκδοτα, Μεσαιωνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 5, Venice 1876.
- Miklosich, F./Müller, J. (eds.), *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana collecta*, 6 vols., Vienna 1860–90.
- Monody for Bertha-Eudocia* (d. 949), ed. S. Lampros, “Ἀνέκδοτος μονωδία Ῥωμανοῦ Β' ἐπὶ τῷ θανάτῳ τῆς πρώτης αὐτοῦ συζύγου Βέρθας”, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 2 (1878), 266–73.
- Nicholas Kallikles, *Poems*, ed. R. Romano, *Nicola Callicle Carmi*, Naples 1980.
- Nicholas I Mystikos, *Letters*, ed. and trans. R.J.H. Jenkins/L. Westerink (CFHB, 6), Washington D.C. 1973.
- Niermeyer, J.F., *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, rev. ed., Leiden 1984.
- Nikephoros Basilakes, *Orationes et Epistulae*, ed. A. Garzya, *Nicephori Basilacae Orationes et epistolae*, Leipzig 1984.
- Nikephoros Bryennios, *Histoire*, ed. and French trans. P. Gautier, *Nicéphore Bryennios Histoire* (CFHB, 9), Brussels 1975.
- Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten (CFHB, 11), vol. 1, Berlin-New York 1975.
- Niketas Choniates, *Orationes et epistulae*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten (CFHB, 3), Berlin-New York 1972.
- Niketas the Paphlagonian, *Letter to the Visiting Western Bishops*, ed. L.G. Westerink, “Nicetas the Paphlagonian on the End of the World”, in *Μελετήματα στη μνήμη*

- Βασιλείου Λαούρδα: Essays in Memory of Basil Laourdas*, Thessaloniki 1975, pp. 177–95 (text pp. 191–95).
- Niketas Seides, *De controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae*, ed. R. Gahbauer, *Gegen den Primat des Papstes: Studien zu Niketas Seides*, Munich 1975, pp. 1–78.
- Niketas Stethatos, *Dialexis*, ed. A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, 2 vols., Paderborn 1924–30, vol. 2, pp. 320–42.
- Niketas Stethatos, *Opusculs et lettres*, ed. J. Darrouzès, *Nicéas Stéthatos Opusculs et lettres*, Paris 1961.
- Niketas Stethatos, *Vie de Syméon*, ed. and trans. I. Hausherr, *Vie de Syméon le nouveau théologien (949–1022)* (Orientalia Christiana, 12), Rome 1928.
- Niketas of Thessalonica, *The Six Dialogues on the Procession of the Holy Spirit by Niketas of Maroneia*, in *PG*, vol. 139, cols 169–222.
- Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. J. Darrouzès, Paris 1981.
- Odo of Deuil, *De projectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and trans. V.G. Berry, New York 1948.
- Orestes of Jerusalem, Patriarch, *Life of Sabas and Macarius*, ed. G. Cozza-Luzi, *Historia et laudes SS. Sabae et Macarii iuniorum e Sicilia*, Rome 1893.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A., *Noctes Petropolitanae*, St Petersburg 1913 (repr. Leipzig 1976).
- Peter the Venerable, *Letters*, ed. G. Constable, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass. 1967.
- Philotheos, *Kletorogion*, ed. and French trans. N. Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles*, Paris 1972, pp. 65–235.
- Popov, A. (ed.), *Istoriko-literaturnyy obzor drevne-russkikh polemicheskikh sochinenii protiv latinian (IX–XVv.)* [Historical and Literary Review of Ancient Russian Polemical Writings against the Latins (9th–15th centuries)], Moscow 1875.
- Pozza, M./Ravegnani, G. (eds.), *I trattati con Bisanzio, 992–1198*, Venice 1993.
- Strzygowski, J., “Das Epithalamion des Paläologen Andronikos II.,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 10 (1901), 546–67.
- Suidae lexicon*, eds. A. Adler et al., 5 vols., Leipzig 1928–38 (repr. Stuttgart 1967–71); available online: www.stoa.org/sol/ (last accessed 7 August 2016).
- Symeon the Logothete, *Chronicon*, ed. S. Wahlgren (CFHB, 44), Berlin 2006.
- Synopsis Chronikē*, ed. K.N. Sathas, *Bibliotheca graeca medii aevi*, vol. 7, Paris 1894, pp. 1–556.
- Tafel, G.L.F./Thomas, G.M. (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, 3 vols., Vienna 1856–57.
- Theodore Balsamon, *Meditata sive responsa*, in *PG*, vol. 138, cols 1013–76.
- Theodore Daphnopates, *Correspondance*, ed. and French trans. J. Darrouzès/L.G. Westerink, *Théodore Daphnopatès Correspondance*, Paris 1978.

- Theodore Prodromos, *De Rhodanthes et Dosiclis amoribus libri IX*, ed. M. Marcovich, Stuttgart 2012; *Four Byzantine Novels*, trans. E.M. Jeffreys, Liverpool 2012, pp. 19–156.
- Theodore Prodromos, *Poems*, ed. W. Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos Historische Gedichte*, Vienna 1974.
- Theodosios the Deacon, *De Creta capta*, ed. H. Criscuolo, *Theodosii Diaconi De Creta capta*, Leipzig 1979.
- Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia Books I–IV*, eds. and trans. J. Featherstone/J. Signes Codoñer, *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur Libri I–IV* (CFHB, 53), Berlin-New York 2015.
- Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, ed. I. Bekker, *Theophanes Continuatus; Ioannes Cameniata; Symeon Magister; Georgius Monachus*, (CSHB), Bonn 1838.
- Theophylact of Ohrid, *Discours*, ed. and French trans. P. Gautier, *Discours, traités, poésies* (CFHB, 16.1), Thessaloniki 1980.
- The Things Done and Taught by the Franks Contrary to the Orthodox Faith ...* (Τὰ παρὰ τῶν Φράγγων παρὰ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν [καὶ] παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν συνήθειαν δοξαζόμενα καὶ τελούμενα, δι' ἃ καὶ ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀκοινωνήτως, εἰς ταῦτα), ed. A.N. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty po istorii drevnieishei greko-russkoi polemiki protiv Latinian*, St Petersburg 1878, pp. 151–57.
- Vita Basilii*, ed. and trans. I. Ševčenko, *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur liber V quo Vita Basilii imperatoris amplectitur* (CFHB, 42), Berlin-New York 2011.
- Vranousi, E.L., *Τὰ ἀγιολογικά κείμενα τοῦ ὁσίου Χριστοδοῦλου ἱδρυτοῦ τῆς ἐν Πάτμῳ Μονῆς*, Athens 1966.
- William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, ed. and French trans. M. Mathieu, *La geste de Robert Guiscard*, Palermo 1961.
- William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, 2 vols. (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 63, 63A), Turnhout 1986.

Regesta

- Dölger, F./Müller, A.E./Beihammer, A., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 1/2: *Regesten von 867–1025*, 2nd ed., Munich 2003.
- Dölger, F./Wirth, P., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 2: *Regesten von 1025–1204*, 2nd ed., Munich 1995.
- Grumel, V./Darrouzès, J., *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1: *Les actes des patriarches*, fascs. 2 and 3: *Les registres de 715 à 1206*, 2nd ed., Paris 1989.

Secondary Literature

- Angold, M., “Belle Epoque or Crisis? (1025–1118)”, in J. Shepard (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire, c.500–1492*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 583–626.

- Angold, M., *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081–1261*, Cambridge 1995.
- Asdracha, C., “L’image de l’homme occidental à Byzance: le témoignage de Kinnamos et de Choniates”, *Byzantinoslavica* 44 (1983), 31–40.
- Augé, I., *Byzantins, Arméniens et Francs au temps de la Croisade, Politique religieuse et reconquête en Orient sous la dynastie des Comnènes*, Paris 2007.
- Balzaretti, R., “Narratives of Success and Narratives of Failure: Representations of the Career of King Hugh of Italy (c.885–948)”, *Early Medieval Europe* 24 (2016), 185–208.
- Bartusis, M.C., *Land and Privilege in Byzantium: The Institution of Pronoia*, Cambridge 2013.
- Barzos, K., *Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*, 2nd ed., Thessaloniki 1984.
- Bayer, A., *Spaltung der Christenheit: das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054*, Cologne 2002.
- Becker, A., *Papst Urban II. 1088–1099*, 3 vols., Stuttgart 1964–2012.
- Bernard, F., *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry, 1025–1081*, Oxford 2014.
- Bourbouhakis, E.C., “Political’ Personae: the Poem from Prison of Michael Glykas: Byzantine Literature between Fact and Fiction”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 31 (2007), 53–75.
- Brand, C.M., *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1080–1204*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968.
- Brand, C.M., “An Imperial Translator at the Comnenian Court”, *Byzantinoslavica* 59 (1998), 217–21.
- Brandes, W., “Liudprand von Cremona (Legatio Cap. 39–41) und eine unbeachtete West-Östliche Korrespondenz über die Bedeutung des Jahres 1000 AD”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 93 (2000), 435–63.
- Brandes, W., “Das Schweigen des Liber pontificalis. Die ‘Enteignung’ der päpstlichen Patrimonien Siziliens und Unteritaliens in den 50er Jahren des 8. Jahrhunderts”, *Fontes Minores* 12 (2014), 97–203.
- Broggini, M., “Il carme *Εἰς τὸν Μανιάκην περὶ τοῦ μούλτου* attribuito al Cristoforo Mitileneo”, *Porphyra* 15 (2011), 14–34.
- Brown, P., “The *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*: a ‘Byzantine’ History?”, *Journal of Medieval History* 37 (2011), 162–79.
- Browning, R., “Enlightenment and Repression in Byzantium in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries”, *Past & Present* 69 (1975), 3–23.
- Browning, R., “An Unpublished Funeral Oration of Anna Comnena”, repr. in Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed*, pp. 393–406.
- Buckler, G., *Anna Comnena. A Study*, Oxford 1929.
- Bucossi, A., “New Historical Evidence for the Dating of the *Sacred Arsenal* by Andronikos Kamateros”, *Revue des études byzantines* 67 (2009), 111–30.
- Bucossi, A., “Seeking a Way Out of the Impasse: the *Filioque* Controversy During John’s Reign”, in Bucossi/Rodriguez Suarez (eds.), *John II Komnenos*, pp. 121–34.

- Bucossi, A., "The Six Dialogues by Niketas 'of Maroneia': a Contextualising Introduction", in A. Cameron/N. Gaul (eds.), *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, London-New York 2017, pp. 137–52.
- Bucossi, A./Rodriguez Suarez, A. (eds.), *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium. In the Shadow of Father and Son*, Abingdon 2016.
- Burgarella, P., "Chiesa d'Oriente e d'Occidente alla vigilia dell'anno mille", in G. Arnaldi/G. Cavallo (eds.), *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino*, Rome 1997, pp. 179–212.
- Cameron, A., *Arguing It Out: Discussion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium*, Budapest 2016.
- Chalandon, F., *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis I Comnène*. Paris 1900.
- Cheynet, J.-C., "Le schisme de 1054: un non-événement?", in C. Carozzi/H. Taviani-Carozzi (eds.), *Faire l'événement au Moyen Âge*, Aix-en-Provence 2007, pp. 299–311.
- Cheynet, J.-C., "The London Byzantine Seals", repr. in J.-C. Cheynet, *La société byzantine. L'apport des sceaux*, vol. 1, Paris 2008, pp. 144–59.
- Chrysos, E., "1176 – A Byzantine Crusade?", in J. Koder/I. Stouraitis (eds.), *Byzantine War Ideology between Roman Imperial Concept and Christian Religion*, Vienna 2012, pp. 81–86.
- Čičurov, I.S., "Ein antilateinischer Traktat des Kiever Metropoliten Ephraim im Codex Vaticanus Graecus 828", *Fontes Minores* 10 (1998 [1999]), 319–56.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations*, Leiden 1996.
- Cosentino, S., "Byzantine Sardinia between West and East. Features of a Regional Culture", *Millennium* 1 (2004), 329–67.
- Cosentino, S., "Re-analysing Some Byzantine Bullae from Sardinia", in C. Ludwig (ed.), *Siegel und Siegler. Akten des 8. Internationalen Symposions für Byzantinische Sigillographie*, Frankfurt am Main 2005, pp. 69–79.
- Crostini, B., "Navigando per il Salterio: riflessioni intorno all'edizione elettronica del manoscritto Londra, British Library, Addit. 19.352. Seconda parte: Il significato storico del Salterio di Teodoro", *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata* 56/57 (2002/03), 133–209.
- Darrouzès, J., "Nicolas d'Andida et les azymes", *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974), 199–210.
- Darrouzès, J., "Questions de droit matrimonial", *Revue des études byzantines* 35 (1977), 107–57.
- Darrouzès, J., "Notes inédites de transferts épiscopaux", *Revue des études byzantines* 40 (1982), 157–70.
- Dölger, F., "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 56 (1937), 1–42; repr. in id., *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt. Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze*, Darmstadt 1953, pp. 70–115.
- Dondaine, A., "Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscan", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 19 (1952), 67–134.

- Dondaine, A., "Hugues Ethérien et le concile de Constantinople de 1166", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958), 473–83.
- Drocourt, N., "La place de l'écrit dans les contacts diplomatiques du haut Moyen Âge. Le cas des relations entre Byzance et ses voisins (de la fin du VII^e siècle à 1204)", in *L'Autorité de l'écrit au Moyen Âge (Orient-Occident). Actes du XXXIX^e Congrès de la SHMESP*, Paris 2009, pp. 25–43.
- Drocourt, N., "Passing on Political Information between Major Powers: the Key Role of Ambassadors between Byzantium and its Neighbours during the Middle Byzantine Period", *Al-Masāq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean* 24 (2012), 91–112.
- Drocourt, N., *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore: Les ambassadeurs étrangers dans l'Empire byzantin des années 640 à 1204*, 2 vols., Leuven 2015.
- Ebbesen, S., "Philoponus, 'Alexander' and the Origins of Medieval Logic", in Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed*, pp. 445–61.
- Evans, N., *Mountains, Steppes and Empires: The North Caucasian Highlanders and their Neighbours*, Oxford forthcoming.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Gregor von Burtscheid und das griechische Mönchtum in Kalabrien", *Römische Quartalschrift* 93 (1998), 215–25.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Between Two Empires: Southern Italy in the Reign of Basil II", in P. Magdalino (ed.), *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, Leiden 2003, pp. 135–60.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Gli Amalfitani nell'Impero bizantino", in E.G. Farrugia (ed.), *Amalfi and Byzantium* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 287), Rome 2010, pp. 17–44.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Amministrazione fiscale nell'Italia meridionale bizantina (secoli IX–XI)", in Martin/Peters-Custot/Prigent (eds.), *L'héritage byzantin en Italie*, vol. 2, pp. 533–56.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Boemondo e Bisanzio", in C. Damiano Fonseca/P. Ieva (eds.), *"Unde boat mundus quanti fuerit Boamundus". Boemondo I di Altavilla, un normanno tra Occidente e Oriente*, Bari 2015, pp. 105–23.
- Ferluga, J., "La ligesse dans l'Empire byzantin", *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog Instituta* 7 (1961), 97–123; repr. in id., *Byzantium on the Balkans*, Amsterdam 1976, pp. 399–425.
- Frankopan, P., "The Literary, Cultural and Political Context for the Twelfth-Century Commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*", in C. Barber/D. Jenkins (eds.), *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, Leiden 2009, pp. 45–62.
- Frankopan, P., "Turning Latin into Greek: Anna Komnene and the *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*", *Journal of Medieval History* 39 (2013), 80–99.
- Fried, J., "Papst Leo III. besucht Karl den Großen in Paderborn oder Einhards Schweigen", *Historische Zeitschrift* 272 (2001), 281–326.
- Galatariotou, C., *The Making of a Saint. The Life, Times and Sanctification of Neophytos*, Cambridge 1992.
- Ganchou, T., "Nikolaos Notaras, mésengyos tôn Ausonôn, et le mésastikion à Byzance au XV^e siècle", *Bizantinistica* 14 (2012), 151–81.

- Gastgeber, C., "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei unter den Komnenen und Angeloi: Neue Ergebnisse zur Arbeit in der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei", in M. Balard/E. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur: contacts, relations, échanges*, Paris 2005, pp. 105–22.
- Gautier P., "Quelques lettres de Psellos inédites ou déjà éditées", *Revue des études byzantines* 44 (1986), 111–97.
- Gresser, G., *Die Synoden und Konzilien in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums in Deutschland und Italien von Leo IX. bis Calixt II., 1049–1123*, Paderborn 2006.
- Grumel, V., "Autour du voyage de Pierre Grossolanus archevêque de Milan, à Constantinople en 1112", *Échos d'Orient* 32 (1933), 22–33.
- Hilsdale, C.J., "Constructing a Byzantine Augusta. A Greek Book for a French Bride", *The Art Bulletin* 87 (2005), 458–83.
- Hofmann, G., "Papst und Patriarch unter Manuel I. Komnenos. Ein Briefwechsel", *Epeteris Etaireias Byzantinon Spoudon* 23 (1953), 74–82.
- Holmes, C., *Basil II and the Governance of Empire (976–1025)*, Oxford 2005.
- Holmes, C., "Shared Worlds': Religious Identities – a Question of Evidence", in J. Harris/ead./E. Russell (eds.), *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean World After 1150*, Oxford 2012, pp. 31–59.
- Holtzmann, W., "Der Katepan Boioannes und die kirchliche Organisation der Capitanata", *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (1960), no. 2, pp. 19–39.
- Houben, H., *Roger II. von Sizilien*, Darmstadt 1997.
- Jacoby, D., "Venetian Commercial Expansion in the Eastern Mediterranean, 8th–11th Centuries", in M. Mundell Mango (ed.), *Byzantine Trade (4th–12th Century)*, Aldershot 2009, pp. 371–91.
- Jeffreys, E.M., "The Sebastokratorissa Irene as Patron", *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 60/61 (2011/12) [= L. Theis et al. (eds.), *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond*, Vienna 2014], pp. 177–94.
- Jeffreys E.M., "Literary Trends in the Constantinopolitan Courts in the 1120s and 1130s", in Bucossi/Rodriguez Suarez (eds.), *John II Komnenos*, pp. 110–20.
- Jeffreys, E.M./Jeffreys, M.J. "The Wild Beast from the West': Immediate Literary Reactions in Byzantium to the Second Crusade", in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington D.C. 2001, pp. 101–16.
- Jeffreys, M.J., "The Vernacular *eisiterioi* for Agnes of France", in E.J. Jeffreys/M.J. Jeffreys/A. Moffatt (eds.), *Byzantine Papers*, Canberra 1981, pp. 101–15.
- Jeffreys, M.J./Jeffreys, E.M., "Who was Eirene the Sevastokratorissa?", *Byzantion* 64 (1994), 40–68.
- Jones, L./Maguire, H., "A Description of the Jousts of Manuel I Komnenos", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 26 (2002), 104–48.

- Jotischky, A., "Monastic Reform and the Geography of Christendom: Experience, Observation and Influence", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Sixth Series* 22 (2012), 57–74.
- Kaldellis, A., *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*, Philadelphia, Pa. 2013.
- Karla, G., "Das literarische Porträt Manuels I. Komnenos", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 101 (2008), 669–79.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz und dem Abendland vom neunten bis in die Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts", in E. Konstantinou (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 1997, pp. 231–57.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege in Byzanz. Realität und Mentalität, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen", in I. Iliev/A.N. Nikolov, E. Kostova/V. Angelov (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Sofia 2011. Plenary Papers*, Sofia 2011, pp. 341–87.
- Kolbaba, T.M., *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins*, Urbana, IL 2000.
- Kolbaba, T.M., "The Orthodoxy of the Latins in the Twelfth Century", in A. Louth/A. Casiday (eds.), *Byzantine Orthodoxies*, Aldershot 2006, pp. 199–214.
- Kolditz, S., "Leon von Synada und Liudprand von Cremona. Untersuchungen zu den Ost-West-Kontakten des 10. Jahrhunderts", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95 (2002), 509–83.
- Körntgen, L., "Das Verhältnis der Staufer zu Papst und Kirche", in A. Wiczorek/B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Die Staufer und Italien*, 2 vols., Darmstadt 2010, vol. 1, pp. 107–15.
- Krallis, D., "'Democratic' Action in Eleventh-Century Byzantium: Michael Attaleiates' 'Republicanism' in Context", *Viator* 40 (2009), 35–53.
- Krallis, D., *Michael Attaleiates and the Politics of Imperial Decline in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, Tempe, Ariz. 2012.
- Kresten, O./Seibt, W., "Theophylaktos Exubitos (kein 'italienischer Rebell des späten 10. Jahrhunderts' sondern μέγας διεργμηνευτής unter Kaiser Manuel I. Komnenos) und seine Siegel", *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 52 (2002), 231–41.
- Lambros, S., "Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς κώδιξ 524", *Neos Hellenomnemon* 8 (1911), 3–59.
- Lefort, J., "Les communications entre Constantinople et la Bithynie", in G. Dagron/C. Mango (eds.), *Constantinople and its Hinterland*, Aldershot 1995, pp. 207–18.
- Leroy, J., "S. Athanase l'Athonite et la règle de S. Benoit", *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 29 (1953), 108–22.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Die lateinische Kirche in der Romania vor dem Vierten Kreuzzug. Versuch einer Bestandaufnahme", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 82 (1989), 202–20.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz unter Eirene und Konstantin VI. (780–802)*, Frankfurt am Main 1996.
- Liubarsky, I.A., "Ob istochnikakh 'Aleksiady' Anny Komninoi", *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* 25 (1965), 110–17.

- Loud, G.A., "Anna Komnena and her Sources for the Normans of South Italy", in I. Wood/G.A. Loud (eds.), *Church and Chronicle in the Middle Ages. Essays Presented to John Taylor*, London 1991, pp. 41–57.
- Maas, P., "Die Musen des Kaisers Alexios I.", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 22 (1913), 348–69 (text on pp. 368–69).
- Magdalino, P., "Aspects of Twelfth-Century Byzantine *Kaiserkritik*", *Speculum* 58 (1983), 326–46.
- Magdalino, P., "The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 13 (1988), 171–99.
- Magdalino, P., "Constantinople and the *ἐξω χώραι* in the Time of Balsamon", in N. Oikonomides (ed.), *Byzantium in the 12th Century: Canon Law, State and Society*, Athens 1991, pp. 179–97.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993.
- Magdalino, P., "The Reform Edict of 1107", in M. Mullett/D. Smythe (eds.), *Alexios I Komnenos*, Belfast 1996, pp. 199–218.
- Magdalino, P., "The Pen of the Aunt: Echoes of the Mid-Twelfth Century in the 'Alexiad'", in T. Gouma-Peterson (ed.), *Anna Komnene and Her Times*, New York-London 2000, pp. 15–43.
- Magdalino, P., "The Year 1000 in Byzantium", in P. Magdalino (ed.), *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, Leiden 2003, pp. 233–70.
- Magdalino, P., "The History of the Future and its Uses: Prophecy, Policy and Propaganda", repr. in J. Shepard (ed.), *The Expansion of Orthodox Europe: Byzantium, the Balkans and Russia*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 29–64.
- Magdalino, P., "Isaac II, Saladin and Venice", in J. Shepard (ed.), *The Expansion of Orthodox Europe: Byzantium, the Balkans and Russia*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 93–106.
- Magdalino, P., "Constantine VII and the Historical Geography of Empire", in S. Bazzaz/Y. Batsaki/D.S. Angelov (eds.), *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space*, Washington D.C. 2013, pp. 23–42.
- Malamut, E., *Sur la route des saints byzantins*, Paris 1993.
- Mallan, C., "The Style, Method and Programme of Xiphilinus' *Epitome* of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*", *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013), 610–44.
- Mango, C., *Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered before the University of Oxford on 21 May 1974*, Oxford 1975; repr. in id., *Byzantium and its Image: History and Culture of the Byzantine Empire and its Heritage*, London 1984, no. 2.
- Markopoulos, A., "From Narrative Historiography to Historical Biography", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 102 (2010), 697–715.
- Martin, J.-M., *La Pouille du VI^e au XII^e siècle*, Rome 1993.
- Martin, J.-M., "L'Occident chrétien dans le Livre des cérémonies, II, 48", *Travaux et Mémoires* 13 (2000), 617–46.

- Martin, J.-M./Peters-Custot, A./Prigent, V. (eds.), *L'héritage byzantin en Italie (VIII^e–XII^e siècle)*, vol. 2: *Les cadres juridiques et sociaux et les institutions publiques* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 461), Rome 2012.
- Mathieu, M., "Le manuscrit 162 d'Avranches et l'édition princeps des *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi* de Guillaume d'Apulie", *Byzantion* 24 (1954), 111–30.
- Mazzucchi, C.M., "Dagli anni di Basilio Parakimomenos (Cod. Ambros. B 119 sup.)", *Aevum* 52 (1978), 267–316.
- Merianos, G., "Literary Allusions to Trade and Merchants: the 'Great Merchant' in Late Twelfth-Century Byzantium", in A. Simpson (ed.), *Byzantium 1180–1204. The Sad Quarter of a Century?*, Athens 2015, pp. 221–43.
- Michel, A., *Amalfi und Jerusalem im griechischen Kirchenstreit (1054–1090)* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 121), Rome 1939.
- Minio-Paluello, L., "Iacobus Veneticus Grecus, Canonist and Translator of Aristotle", *Traditio* 8 (1952), 265–304.
- Mullett, M., *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*, Aldershot 1997.
- Mullett, M., "Whose Muses? Two Advice Poems Attributed to Alexios I Komnenos", in P. Odorico (ed.), *La face cachée de la littérature byzantine. Le texte en tant que message immédiat*, Paris 2012, pp. 195–220.
- Németh, A., "The Imperial Systematisation of the Past in Constantinople: Constantine VII and his *Historical Excerpts*", in J. König/G. Woolf (eds.), *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 232–58.
- Nesbitt, J., "Some Observations about the Roger Family", *Nea Rhome* 1 (2004), 209–17.
- Neumann, C., *Griechische Geschichtschreiber und Geschichtsquellen im zwölften Jahrhundert*, Studien zu Anna Comnena, Theod. Prodromus, Joh. Cinnamus, Leipzig 1888.
- Neville, L., *Heroes and Romans in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: The Material for History of Nikephoros Bryennios*, Cambridge 2012.
- Nicol, D.M., *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*, Cambridge 1992.
- Nikolov, A., "A Useful Tale about the Latins: an Old Bulgarian Translation of a Lost Byzantine Anti-Latin Text of the End of the 11th–Early 12th Century", *Scripta & e-Scripta* 1 (2003), 99–119.
- Nikolov, A., *Povest polezna za Latini. Pametnik na srednovekovnata slavianska polemika sreshchu Katolitsizma*, Sofia 2011.
- Novikoff, A.J., *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice and Performance*, Philadelphia, Pa. 2013.
- Pahlitzsch, J., *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, Berlin 2001.
- Penna, D., *The Byzantine Imperial Acts to Venice, Pisa and Genoa, 10th–12th centuries: A Comparative Legal Study*, The Hague 2012.

- Penna, D., "Hagiotheodorites: the Last *Antecessor*? Some Remarks on One of the 'New' *Basilica* Scholiasts", *Subseciva Groningana* 9 (2014), 399–427.
- Pertusi, A., "Cultura greco-bizantina nel tardo medioevo nelle Venezie e suoi echi in Dante", in V. Branca/G. Padoan (eds.), *Dante e la cultura veneta*, Florence 1966, pp. 157–95.
- Peters-Custot, A., *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-byzantine (IX^e–XIV^e siècle): une acculturation en douceur* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 420), Rome 2009.
- Prigent, V., "La politique sicilienne de Romain Ier Lécapène", in D. Barthélemy/J.-C. Cheynet (eds.), *Guerre et société au Moyen Âge. Byzance – Occident (VIII^e–XIII^e siècle)*, Paris 2010, pp. 63–84.
- Prigent, V., "Conclusion de la première partie", in Martin/Peters-Custot/Prigent (eds.), *L'héritage byzantin en Italie*, pp. 221–35.
- Rhoby, A., "Verschiedene Bemerkungen zur Sebastokratorissa Eirene und zu Autoren in ihrem Umfeld", *Nea Rhômē* 6 (2009), 305–36.
- Rodriguez Suarez, A., *The Western Presence in the Byzantine Empire During the Reigns of Alexios I and John II (1081–1143)* (Ph.D. thesis, King's College London 2014).
- Rodriguez Suarez, A., "From Greek into Latin: Western Scholars and Translators in Constantinople during the Reign of John II", in Bucossi/id. (eds.), *John II Komnenos*, pp. 91–109.
- Scott, R., "The Classical Tradition in Byzantine Historiography", in M. Mullett/R. Scott (eds.), *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, Birmingham 1981, pp. 61–74.
- Shepard, J., "Byzantium's Last Sicilian Expedition: Scylitzes' Testimony", *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 14/16 (1977/79), 145–59.
- Shepard, J., "The 'Muddy Road' of Odo Arpin from Bourges to La Charité-sur-Loire", in P. Edbury/J. Phillips (eds.), *The Experience of Crusading*, vol. 2: *Defining the Crusader Kingdom*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 11–28.
- Shepard, J., "How St James the Persian's Head was Brought to Cormery': a Relic-Collector around the Time of the First Crusade", in L.M. Hoffmann/A. Monchizadeh (eds.), *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, Wiesbaden 2005, pp. 287–335.
- Shepard, J., "Western Approaches (900–1025)", in J. Shepard (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire, c.500–1492*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 527–59.
- Shepard, J., "From the Bosphorus to the British Isles: the Way from the Greeks to the Varangians", in *Drevnejshie gosudarstva vostochnoi Evropy*, Moscow 2010, pp. 15–42.
- Shepard, J., "Hard on Heretics, Light on Latins: the Balancing-Act of Alexios I Komnenos", in D. Renault (ed.), *Mélanges Cécile Morrisson* (Travaux et Mémoires, 16), Paris 2010 [2011], pp. 765–77.
- Shepard, J., "Trouble-Shooters and Men-on-the-Spot: the Emperor's Dealings with Outsiders", in *Le relazioni internazionali nell'Alto Medioevo* (Settimane di Studio

- della Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 58), Spoleto 2011, pp. 691–723.
- Shepard, J., “Man-to-Man, Dog-Eat-Dog, Cults-in-Common: the Tangled Threads of Alexios’ Dealings with the Franks”, in B. Flusin/J.-C. Cheynet (eds.), *Autour du “Premier humanisme byzantin” et des “Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle”, quarante ans après Paul Lemerle* (Travaux et Mémoires, 21/2), Paris 2017, pp. 749–88.
- Shepard, J., “Circles Overlapping in the Upper Adriatic (Introduction)”, in M. Ančić/id./T. Vedriš (eds.), *Imperial Spheres and the Adriatic: Byzantium, the Carolingians and the Treaty of Aachen (812)*, Abingdon 2018, pp. 1–21.
- Shepard, J., “The Emperor’s ‘Significant Others’. Alexios I Komnenos and his ‘Pivot to the West’”, in S. Tougher (ed.), *The Emperor in the Byzantine World. Papers from the Forty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, London 2019, pp. 135–55.
- Shepard, J., “Anna Komnena as a Source for the Crusades”, in A. Mallett (ed.), *Franks and Crusades in Medieval Eastern Christian Historiography*, Turnhout 2020, pp. 25–63.
- Simpson, A., *Niketas Choniates. A Historiographical Study*, Oxford 2013.
- Somerville, R., *Pope Urban II, the Collectio Britannica, and the Council of Melfi (1089)*, Oxford 1996.
- Sorabji, R., “The Ancient Commentators on Aristotle”, in id. (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed*, pp. 1–30.
- Sorabji, R. (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and their Influence*, London 1990.
- Southern, R.W., “The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres”, in R.L. Benson et al. (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Oxford 1982, pp. 113–37.
- Stanković, V., “Byzantine Intellectuals and the Struggle for Domination in Twelfth-Century Byzantium”, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog Instituta* 44 (2007), 209–27.
- Stanković, V., “John II Komnenos before the year 1118”, in Bucossi/Rodriguez Suarez (eds.), *John II Komnenos*, pp. 11–21.
- Stephenson, P., “Anna Comnena’s *Alexiad* as a Source for the Second Crusade?”, *Journal of Medieval History* 29 (2003), 41–54.
- Stolte, B., “The Byzantine Law of Obligations”, in T.A.J. McGinn (ed.), *Obligations in Roman Law*, Ann Arbor, Mich. 2012, pp. 320–33.
- Stouraitis, I., “Conceptions of War and Peace in Anna Comnena’s *Alexiad*”, in J. Koder/id. (eds.), *Byzantine War Ideology between Roman Imperial Concept and Christian Religion*, Vienna 2012, pp. 69–80.
- Stouraitis, I., “‘Just War’ and ‘Holy War’ in the Middle Ages. Rethinking Theory through the Byzantine Case-Study”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 62 (2012), 227–64.
- Strano, G., “Ideologia, retorica e prassi di governo nelle *Muse* di Alessio I”, in G. Vespignani (ed.), *Polidoro. Studi offerte a Antonio Carile*, vol. 1, Spoleto 2013, pp. 443–59.

- Tounta, E., "Saints, Rulers and Communities in Southern Italy: the *Vitae* of the Italo-Greek Saints (Tenth to Eleventh Centuries) and their Audiences", *Journal of Medieval History* 42 (2016), 429–55.
- Treadgold, W., *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke 2013.
- Vasiliev, A.A., "Manuel Comnenus and Henry Plantagenet", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 29 (1929/30), 233–44.
- Vilimonović, L., "Observations on the Text and Context of Anna Komnene's 'Alexiad'", *Belgrade Historical Review* 5 (2014), 43–58.
- Vučetić, M.M., "Emperor John II's Encounters with Foreign Rulers", in Bucossi/Rodriguez Suarez (eds.), *John II Komnenos*, pp. 71–90.
- Wessel K./Restle M. et al. (eds.), *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*, 7 vols. to date, Stuttgart 1966–.
- West, C., *Reframing the Feudal Revolution: Political and Social Transformation between Marne and Moselle, c.800–c.1100*, Cambridge 2013.
- Wilken, F., *Rerum ab Alexio I, Joanne, Manuele, Alexio II Comnenis Romanorum Byzantinorum imperatoribus gestarum libri quatuor*, Heidelberg 1811.
- Witt, R.G., *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge 2012.
- Zagklas, N., "A Byzantine Grammar Treatise Attributed to Theodoros Prodromos", *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 16 (2011), 77–86.

The Image of the Greeks in Latin Sources

Hans-Werner Goetz

1 State of Research and Principal Questions

Despite numerous studies on the relations between Byzantium and the Occident – with striking changes in perspective over the course of the last century with a growing emphasis on a broad spectrum of contacts in the latest decades – the state of research concerning the image of Byzantium and the Greeks in Western eyes seems remarkably poor, and pertinent contributions are generally lacking, with some exceptions though. There are hardly any studies dealing with the whole period considered in this volume. Most studies are either restricted to certain periods and/or focus on reflections on (or repercussions of) the political situation or the view of the Greek emperors rather than on the image of the Greeks, sometimes contrary to the promising title of the works. Consequently, this article cannot be more than a preliminary attempt at considering the Western image on a broader scale.

Fred Haenssler's Ph.D thesis from 1954 is concerned with the preceding epoch of our focus here, and concentrates on the political sphere by pursuing the question of the Empire's recognition in the "barbarian" kingdoms.¹ The same applies to the Ph.D thesis of Martin Arbagi from 1969² which covers exactly the whole period regarded here, but is much more interested in the problem of political recognition than in the image of the Greeks in Latin authors. Finally, another thesis, written by Herta Franz, is restricted to medieval literature/epic poetry and also lays its focus almost exclusively on the perception of the ancient Greeks. A large part of it merely consists of a list of names of persons and places mentioned in the epic poetry.³ Other relevant studies are limited to certain periods and/or certain authors, like Chris Wickham's magisterial look at the 9th century,⁴ Peter Schreiner's valuable overview of 12th-century literature,⁵ Bunna Ebels-Hoving's comprehensive analysis

¹ Haenssler, *Byzanz*.

² Arbagi, *Byzantium*.

³ Franz, *Bild Griechenlands*.

⁴ Wickham, "Ninth-Century Byzantium".

⁵ Schreiner, "Byzanz".

of the 12th-century sources related to the Crusades⁶ up to the Fourth Crusade and the establishment of the “Latin Empire” in Constantinople,⁷ and, more recently, Valentin Portnykh’s article on the First Crusade.⁸ Marc Carrier’s study on the Byzantines as the “Other Christianity” during the Crusades⁹ deals with a similar theme and period as Ebels-Hoving, and recently Savvas Neocleous has studied Latin attitudes towards the Greek religion in the 12th century.¹⁰ For earlier centuries, one should mention Laury Sarti’s article on the perception of the Byzantines in the Frankish West,¹¹ and also Clemens Gantner’s book on the construction of otherness in papal Rome during the 8th century.¹² Michael Rentschler’s study is restricted to one author, Liudprand of Cremona, but is important and provides a good deal of information.¹³ Two further articles by Michael Rentschler on the 10th and 11th centuries respectively focus on politics and culture.¹⁴ My own study is restricted to the perception of the Greek (“Orthodox”) faith.¹⁵ Consequently, a comprehensive analysis of the Western image of the Greeks is still lacking. Exceeding the scope of this article that will concentrate on the image of the Greeks as a whole, there are more specialized studies, such as on the image of Constantinople,¹⁶ on certain Byzantine emperors,¹⁷ and on particular genres, for example, French (and German) fiction from the 12th century onwards.¹⁸

6 Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*.

7 Cf. also Schieffer, “Einheit”.

8 Portnykh, “Byzantins”.

9 Carrier, *L'autre chrétien*, describing different periods than Ebels-Hoving, regarding his theme under “a cultural perspective”. Like other recent studies, Carrier is interested in the representation, particularly of the emperors, rather than the “image” of the Greeks (which is often pre-supposed) and in their “historicity” rather than the authors’ concepts (cf. the result of the first part, *ibid.* p. 201: the cultural environment does not suffice to comprehend the diplomatic relations); one of his core themes concerns attitudes towards Byzantine ceremonial as an indicator of a cultural difference (*ibid.*, pp. 113–201). Likewise, the chroniclers’ reports are assigned to the period they describe, not to their date of origin.

10 Neocleous, *Heretics*.

11 Sarti, “From Romanus to Graecus”.

12 Gantner, *Freunde Roms*.

13 Rentschler, *Liudprand*.

14 Rentschler, “Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts”; Rentschler, “Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 11. Jahrhunderts”.

15 Goetz, *Wahrnehmung*; see also Freudenberg, “*Unus grex*”; Freudenberg, “Dialog”.

16 Ducellier, “Une mythologie urbaine”; Devereaux, *Constantinople*.

17 Neocleous, “*Tyrannus Grecorum*”.

18 Devereaux, *Constantinople*; Černáková, “The Image of Byzantium”; however, Wingler, *Construire pour soumettre*, examines the representation of Byzantium and its emperors

Furthermore, most authors, and particularly within traditional research, assumed a certain medieval “anti-byzantinism”, and tried to explore its origins. Haenssler does not find clear indications of such an attitude expressed through derogatory judgements on the Eastern Empire in the period before the Langobard invasion of Italy. Instead, the earlier successor states of the Roman Empire, but also the Langobards themselves, still acknowledged the emperors’ claims on priority for Byzantium, an attitude that was not abandoned until the imperial coronation of Charlemagne.¹⁹ Until that time there was no “common aversion to the East in the Occident”,²⁰ although the idea of a continuity and unity of the Roman Empire gradually faded away in the second half of the 8th century.²¹

Arbagi finds some circumstantial evidence for “anti-byzantinism”, particularly in the correspondence of the 8th-century popes (and in the *Libri Carolini*).²² But he characterizes the Western attitudes towards Byzantium on the whole as “indifferent” rather than hostile, and postpones an “anti-byzantinism” to the end of the 12th century when the stereotyped view of “effeminate, treacherous, cowardly” Greeks became popular throughout.²³ These results seem to be confirmed by Ebels-Hoving²⁴ (who, however, does not deal with the earlier centuries). Although it is advisable to abandon one-sided perspectives, it would nevertheless be unfounded to conclude, as Ebels-Hoving does, that negative assessments had been lacking before that period. Moreover, we should distinguish between different spheres of perception and take the respective historical background into account.

2 Background

The Western image of the Greeks cannot be detached from the pertinent historical context. Several developments caused a strained relationship between Byzantium and the West, first and foremost the formation of independent “barbarian” kingdoms within the territory of the former Roman Empire in the West. A further area of ecclesiastical and political conflict arose from the papacy’s

rather than their Western image (in chronicles, pp. 43–196, and epics, pp. 199–316, where he emphasizes the role of onomastics).

19 Haenssler, *Byzanz*, p. 107.

20 Ibid., p. 108.

21 Ibid., p. 109.

22 Arbagi, *Byzantium*, pp. 124–26.

23 Thus Arbagi, *Byzantium*, pp. 234–35; Carrier, *L'autre chrétien*, pp. 77–78.

24 Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*, p. 264.

political shift from Byzantium towards the Franks since the second half of the 8th century (characterized by Arbagi as a “radical change”).²⁵ Furthermore, the papal claim to primacy (over the whole Church) and its rejection by the Eastern patriarchs was a constant cause of tension; in the 9th century, the dispute about the legitimacy of Patriarch Photios of Constantinople represents an outstanding example of this. In the same period, the missionary competition between the Roman and the Greek Orthodox Church in Slavic and Bulgarian south-eastern Europe also contributed considerably to an intensification of tension. Politically, the relations grew strained again after the imperial coronation of Charlemagne (800), which resulted in the co-existence of two emperors (*Zweikaiserproblem*), with the same problem reviving after the imperial coronation of Otto I (962). Tensions equally resulted from the claims of both empires to southern Italy up to the Norman Conquest. Moreover, an important factor for tension is to be found in the theological controversies about divergent doctrines or questions of faith,²⁶ such as iconoclasm²⁷ which, however, was restricted to some decades of the 8th and the early 9th century. Other issues had a more long-lasting impact on the relations: above all the *filioque* controversy (which evolved over the whole period considered here),²⁸ liturgical ceremonies, such as the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist (in the 11th and 12th centuries),²⁹ or ecclesiastical customs, such as celibacy in contrast to the marriage of clerics. Finally, the relations deteriorated towards 1204, when the “Latin Empire” was established in Constantinople. Although there are, of course, also different comments independent of the above-mentioned tensions, we can easily observe an intensification of demarcation and gradually worsening attitudes in the context of such strained relations.

Nevertheless, throughout the whole period, there were always contacts between East and West of greater or lesser intensity. These included: diplomatic contacts, sometimes even alliances, several marriage projects, culminating in the marriage of Otto II with the Greek princess Theophanu, but also travels³⁰ and cultural exchange,³¹ all of which had repercussions on the image of the Greeks.

25 Arbagi, *Byzantium*, p. 28.

26 See Nagel, *Karl der Große*.

27 See Noble, *Images*; Brubaker/Haldon, *Byzantium*.

28 Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*.

29 See G. Avvakumov, *Entstehung*; Smith, *And Taking Bread*.

30 See Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*; Dierkens/Sansterre (eds.), *Voyages*; for the background of the early period, cf. McCormick, *Origins*, with “A register of the Mediterranean communications” (700–900), pp. 852–972.

31 Konstantinou (ed.), *Byzanz*; Engels/Schreiner (eds.), *Begegnung*.

3 Terminology

While the Byzantines regarded themselves as “Romans” and Byzantium as the continuation of the Roman Empire, Western authors never or very seldom acknowledged this claim and avoided calling the Byzantines “Romans” (a term that was more and more restricted to Rome anyway). In the 10th century, Liudprand of Cremona even denied such a characterisation outright: the Greeks had left Rome long ago (in the times of Constantine) and changed their language, their customs, and their clothing.³² But a designation as “Byzantine” is extremely rare, too;³³ “Byzantium” refers to the city of Constantinople, not the whole realm. The common, widespread term used over the whole period is “Greeks” (*Graeci* or, even more frequent, *Greci*);³⁴ the realm and region are correspondingly called *Gr(a)ecia*. The prevailing criterion of delimitation, therefore, is language,³⁵ particularly as the term “Greeks” is frequently opposed to “Latins”, and, in fact, the insuperable difficulties in the linguistic area were well known, although we sometimes find at least a rudimentary knowledge of Greek in the West, whereas there was practically no command of Latin in the East. Nevertheless, the primarily linguistic delimitation corresponds at the same time to a distinction between peoples (“Greek” as an ethnic distinction), and is further applied with regard to the political sphere (the Empire), to culture, and even to religion, designating the Greek (“Orthodox”) faith, which still lacks a term of its own. Consequently, “Greek” has not only multiple implications (linguistic, ethnic, political, cultural, religious) and is applied to the Byzantine people, realm, army, or emperor, but it is not exclusively applied to the Byzantines either. Thus the term could exceed the political borders, for example when applied to a Greek population in Italy, at least in earlier centuries,³⁶ although even in “Greek” southern Italy the term could be applied polemically for the Byzantine rulers and army.³⁷ The early papal lives in the *Liber pontificalis* classify numerous popes (many of them

32 Liudprand, *Relatio* 51, ed. Chiesa, pp. 209–10.

33 The Patrologia Database (Migne) gives no more than 24 references; the whole Library of Latin Texts has just one reference/instance/example.

34 The Patrologia Database has 3251, the Library of Latin Texts 4730 references. Calling the Byzantines “Greeks” can be traced back to the 5th century; cf. Sarti, “From *Romanus* to *Graecus*”, p. 137.

35 Sarti, “From *Romanus* to *Graecus*”, pp. 146, 150: The Byzantines were called Greeks because they were associated with Greek language and culture, but also because the term symbolized a demarcation in order to redefine a Western identity, as a gradual process.

36 Sarti, “From *Romanus* to *Graecus*”, p. 138.

37 Peters-Custot, “L'autre est le même”.

coming from Italy) as being *natione Grecus*.³⁸ The ethnic and the political connotations of the term “Greek” were not necessarily identical. Furthermore, the term is not restricted to Byzantium and the Byzantine period, but transgresses all epochs from Early Antiquity to the (medieval) present. In fact, by using the same term, universal chronicles rather give the impression of an ethnic continuity throughout the epochs and lack any indication of the beginning of a new (“Byzantine”) Empire.

4 Ethnic, Political, and Cultural Assessment: between Admiration and Aversion

While terminology thus corresponds to linguistic distinctions, any (possibly) inherent assessment was affected by political reasons. Although Byzantium was always acknowledged as an independent realm, one may doubt whether it was still perceived as the dominant political and cultural model up until the Carolingian period, as Haenssler believed.³⁹ Politically, Merovingian and Carolingian authors no longer regarded Byzantium as a continuation of the Roman Empire⁴⁰ or called it “Roman” (as Arbagi thinks),⁴¹ let alone in later centuries. As Clemens Gantner has shown, the political detachment of the popes (Stephen II, Paul I, Hadrian I) from the imperial power in the middle of the 8th century was henceforth accompanied by using the term *Greci* as an indicator of demarcation and disparagement in papal sources. This tendency seems to be intensified in the 9th century, when Emperor Louis II, in his famous letter to Basil I,⁴² justified his imperial title with references to his succession in the Roman Empire in spite of the fact that his realm was restricted to Italy. At the same time he provides a religious interpretation of his claims: the grace of Christ had been transferred to the Franks; just as God’s elect had devolved from the Jews to the Christians, in the same way power had moved from Rome to the Franks, while the Greeks were no longer emperors of the Romans because of their cacodoxy (literally their “bad opinion”).

38 Gantner, *Freunde Roms*, pp. 91–100.

39 Haenssler, *Byzanz*; differently Goetz, “Byzanz”.

40 Thus Arbagi, *Byzantium*, p. 56.

41 Thus Arbagi, *Byzantium*, p. 19, for the period until 870. Cf. Goetz, “Unsichtbares Imperium”. The only evidence would be continuous lists of the emperors, but even here Fredegar, for example, sees a new phase beginning with Constantine. Cf. also Herbers, “Papst Nikolaus”, pp. 62–65.

42 Louis II, *Letter*, ed. Henze, pp. 385–94. For this letter, see Arbagi, *Byzantium*, pp. 128–37; Grierson, “Carolingian Empire”, pp. 891–97.

Similar to the characterization given by Liudprand a century later – as mentioned above – Louis adds: by moving to another city (Constantinople) they had abandoned their seat, their people, and their language.⁴³ Equally, the attitude of the Ottonian and Salian rulers towards Byzantium depended widely on the quarrels about their own emperorship.⁴⁴ It is significant that a number of 12th-century German authors, including the imperial chancellery, prefer (although never exclusively) to call the Byzantine emperor *rex Grecorum*: terminologically (and ideologically), there was but one (Roman) emperor. Even Conrad III (who was never crowned emperor) called himself *Dei gratia Romanorum imperator augustus* in a letter to John II Komnenos, while he addressed John as *imperator Constantinopolitanus*. He further emphasized that the Roman emperors were his predecessors, whereas “your new Rome” was *regnum et populum Grecorum* and “a daughter of our Roman *res publica*”⁴⁵ – an obvious affront to the Byzantine self-image.

While a political estimation depends on the political situation, a cultural assessment is a consequence of obvious cultural differences, such as those examined by Michael Rentschler. He explains Liudprand's judgements as the outcome of his experience of a “cultural gradient” between East and West. Apparently, he writes, the acquaintance with a foreign culture that was centuries ahead of his own, caused irritation for Liudprand,⁴⁶ a superiority which the author would never have acknowledged.

In principle, there are three possible kinds of attitude towards others (each of them with graduations): admiration, aversion, or indifference. We find all three forms in the Western perception of the Greeks. Arbagi states a growing indifference (and ignorance) towards Byzantium after 570, which lasted until the Crusades, without any “systematically hostile sentiment”.⁴⁷ On the whole, this may be true, and, in fact, the great majority of remarks on Byzantium or “the Greeks” seem “indifferent” as far as they just “report” without a particular bias, if they report at all. It may be significant, for example, that out of 107 references to Greeks in the universal chronicle of Otto of Freising, only nine refer to the Byzantine period. Nevertheless, the evidence testifies to a clear demarcation: the Greeks are not necessarily despised or admired, but they

43 Louis II, *Letter*, ed. Henze, p. 390. Cf. Wickham, “Ninth-Century Byzantium”, pp. 253–54, who attributes the writing of the letter to Anastasius Bibliothecarius.

44 Thus Arbagi, *Byzantium*, p. 138.

45 Conrad III, *Diploma no 69 (D K III 69)*, in *Die Urkunden Konrads III. und seines Sohnes Heinrich* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser, 9), ed. F. Hausmann, Vienna 1969, p. 122 (written in 1142).

46 Rentschler, *Liudprand*, p. 80.

47 Arbagi, *Byzantium*, p. 1 (the quotation); indifference: Arbagi, *Byzantium*, pp. 5, 27–28.

are increasingly seen as being, or belonging, to the “others”, or even seen as “strangers”, an observation which is confirmed by the familiar enumeration “Greeks and Saracens”.⁴⁸ Moreover, numerous remarks are judgemental, and it depended on the context which of the three basic kinds of attitude was applicable. Rather than observing a clear temporal development, we find assessments in either direction in all centuries under discussion here. Thus, on the whole the Western perception of the Greeks can be seen as being ambiguous: as an attitude that has appropriately been characterized as oscillating between “admiration and aversion”.⁴⁹ An alternative “positive or negative image of the Greeks” falls short of the complexity of the problem.⁵⁰ Consequently, we find a pejorative assignment of negative qualities (like envy, fraud, or perfidiousness/unfaithfulness) alongside expressions of respect for the Greek language and science.⁵¹ As Rentschler observes, the spectrum stretches from a (restrained) deep respect, above all for Greek knowledge (for example in Ruotger), to a dismissal of Greece as mendacious (*mendax Graecia* in Rather of Verona).⁵² The image of the Greeks, he concludes, has more facets than has been assumed so far.⁵³ Similarly Rudolf Schieffer has stated that Western authors showed respect for Greek erudition, the imperial tradition, and cultural splendour, but they were well aware of a cultural “strangeness”.⁵⁴

Instances of admiration can be found in travellers’ reports, demonstrating that Greece continued to be culturally attractive.⁵⁵ This is clearly confirmed by translations of Greek writings into Latin: for example, the *Hierarchia caelestis* of Dionysios Areopagita, translated by Hilduin of Saint-Denis and John Scotus Eriugena in the 9th, and again by Hugh of Saint-Victor in the 12th century, or the various translations produced by the papal librarian Anastasius Bibliothecarius in Rome.⁵⁶ It remains significant, though, that these were almost exclusively translations from the Greek Fathers and not from contemporary

48 Similarly Sarti, “From *Romanus* to *Graecus*”, p. 137, who pleads for a deliberate use of the term and against any “indifference” or “negligence”.

49 Thus Schreiner, “Byzanz”, pp. 555–62.

50 Thus Rentschler, “Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts”, p. 354.

51 Wickham, “Ninth-Century Byzantium”; Carrier, *L'autre chrétien*, pp. 73–77.

52 Rentschler, “Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts”, pp. 326–32.

53 Rentschler, “Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 11. Jahrhunderts”, pp. 154–55.

54 Schieffer, “Zum lateinischen Byzanzbild”, pp. 19–20.

55 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*, pp. 78–101.

56 Wickham, “Ninth-Century Byzantium”, pp. 248–49.

authors.⁵⁷ In contrast, indications of an aversion can be seen in continuous reproaches concerning the wily cunningness and unfaithfulness of the Greeks.⁵⁸ Thietmar of Merseburg, in his comment on Theophanu, whom he credits with an extraordinarily virtuous way of life, adds the words: “which is seldom found in Greece”.⁵⁹ Elsewhere he speaks of a “habitual slyness” of the Greeks (*solita calliditate*),⁶⁰ while Hildebert of Le Mans refers to an “intriguing cunningness” (*calumniosa Graecorum versutia*),⁶¹ and Frederick I is said to have been well aware of “the ruses and frequent frauds of the Greeks”.⁶² “Where they could not win by bravery, they vanquished by ruse”, Widukind of Corvey comments on the alliance between Otto I and Nikephoros II Phokas, after the Greeks had attacked the Western military camp.⁶³ Again Widukind implicitly draws a continuous line from the ancient Greeks to the Byzantines: the character of a people is considered innate and unchanging. Rather of Verona calls the Greeks “mendacious”, Aimoin of Fleury “thoughtless”, Wipo “devious”,⁶⁴ and for Hugh of Saint-Victor they are “a mendacious and two-faced people”.⁶⁵

The ambiguity inherent in the image of the Greeks becomes particularly visible in the historiographical writings of Liudprand of Cremona in his reports on his two legations to Constantinople: the first mission, conducted on behalf of the Italian king Berengar in 949, is treated in some chapters in Liudprand’s *Antapodosis*,⁶⁶ the second embassy on behalf of Emperor Otto I in 968 is the object of the *Relatio*.⁶⁷ Whereas the *Antapodosis* reveals a “cultural

57 An exception is Anastasius’ translation of the Greek chronicle of Theophanes, which, however, had been written about half a century earlier.

58 Schreiner, “Byzanz”, p. 558; Herbers, “Papst Nikolaus”, p. 65.

59 Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle* IV 10, ed. Holtzmann, p. 142.

60 Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle* II 15, ed. Holtzmann, pp. 54, 56.

61 In Anselm of Canterbury, *Letter* 239, ed. F.S. Schmitt, *Epistolarum libri secundi pars secunda* (S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia, 5), Edinburgh 1951 (repr. Stuttgart 1968), p. 147.

62 Thus *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I.* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum nova series, 5), Berlin 1928, pp. 1–115, here p. 40: “Expertus itaque imperator dolos et frequentes fraudes Grecorum”.

63 Widukind of Corvey, *Res gestae Saxonicae* III 71, eds. H.-E. Lohmann/P. Hirsch, *Die Sächsischen Geschichte des Widukind von Korvei* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 60), Hannover 1935, p. 148: “Graeci vero ad artes paternas conversi – nam erant ab exordio fere mundi plurimarum gentium domini, et quos virtute nequibant, artibus superabant”.

64 Schieffer, “Zum lateinischen Byzanzbild”, pp. 21–22 (with references).

65 Hugh of Saint-Victor, *Adnotatiunculae elucidatoriae in Joelem prophetam*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 175, pp. 322–72, here col. 362a.

66 Liudprand, *Antapodosis* VI,4–10, ed. Chiesa, pp. 146–50.

67 Liudprand, *Relatio*, ed. Chiesa, pp. 187–218.

amazement" and admiration, this appraisal turns into complete aversion and contempt in the *Relatio*,⁶⁸ although undoubtedly influenced by the failure of his mission and the endeavour to conceal this before the Emperor. In his *Antapodosis*, Liudprand offers several humorous as well as instructive anecdotes on Byzantine emperors, such as Leon VI or Romanos I.⁶⁹ For him, Leon Porphyrogennitos was a "most pious emperor" (*piissimus imperator*), who knew how to rule his empire in peace and justice,⁷⁰ but Liudprand criticizes Romanos for designating his first-born son Christophoros *contra ius fasque* as his successor, instead of the *porphyrogennetoi* Stephanos and Konstantinos.⁷¹ When Liudprand arrived in Constantinople, he admired the architecture⁷² – the palace seemed to him the most beautiful and most powerful fortification he had ever seen,⁷³ and the imperial hall with its wonderful decoration was "a house of admirable magnitude and beauty"⁷⁴ – as well as the gastro-nomic culture,⁷⁵ and he was impressed by the acrobats⁷⁶ and the rich remuneration of the courtiers.⁷⁷ The Byzantine "strangeness" seemed moderated, because Liudprand had made inquiries about the peculiarities of ceremonial beforehand.⁷⁸

All this turned into a rejected strangeness and a defiant reaction in his second report, where Liudprand ridicules the Emperor (Nikephoros II Phokas), the ceremony, the meals, and the clothing. The picture he draws of the Emperor is a pure caricature: dwarfish with a big face, eyes like a mole, the colour of his skin like that of an Aethiopian (the most detested colour in Western eyes), hair like swine, dressed in stinking, faded clothes and speaking in the mendacious manner of a fox.⁷⁹ Liudprand calls the Greek meals greasy and disgusting,⁸⁰ the clothes extravagant and effeminate,⁸¹ and the artistic plays abominable.⁸²

68 Cf. Rentschler, *Liudprand*, pp. 9–17 and 17–20; Arbagi, *Byzantium*, pp. 147–54.

69 Cf. Liudprand, *Antapodosis* I 11–12, ed. Chiesa, pp. 10–16; *ibid.* III 25, pp. 77–79.

70 *Ibid.* I 6, ed. Chiesa, p. 8: "undique pace habita sancte et iuste Grecorum regebat imperium".

71 *Ibid.* III 37, ed. Chiesa, p. 86.

72 Rentschler, *Liudprand*, pp. 31–35.

73 Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis* V 21, ed. Chiesa, pp. 135–36.

74 Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis* VI 5, ed. Chiesa, p. 147.

75 Rentschler, *Liudprand*, pp. 36–40.

76 Liudprand, *Antapodosis* VI 9, ed. Chiesa, pp. 148–49.

77 *Ibid.* VI 10, ed. Chiesa, pp. 149–50.

78 *Ibid.* VI 5, ed. Chiesa, p. 147: "nullo sum terrore, nulla admiratione commotus, quoniam quidem ex his omnibus eos qui bene noverant fueram percontatus".

79 Liudprand, *Relatio* 3, ed. Chiesa, p. 188.

80 *Ibid.* 11, 13, ed. Chiesa p. 192, 193.

81 *Ibid.* 54–55, ed. Chiesa, pp. 211–12. Cf. Rentschler, *Liudprand*, pp. 40–42.

82 Rentschler, *Liudprand*, pp. 42–47.

His attitude may be typical in so far as his image of the Greeks, according to the context, is either black or white, but never black-and-white, and it deteriorates. The current political context clearly determines the view of Byzantium, just as it is opportune.⁸³ As Schreiner and Ebels-Hoving observe, on the whole aversion and contempt outweighed admiration.⁸⁴ However, this development did not begin in the second half of the 11th century, as Rentschler, Arbagi, and others think,⁸⁵ but is a feature that we find throughout the period considered here, nor was Byzantium up to the 11th century “the lost ideal” which from then on gave way to a kind of Eastern paradise.⁸⁶

Although the First Crusade⁸⁷ actually responded to the call for help issued by the Byzantine emperor, the crusaders and the Crusader States frequently lived in tense relations with Byzantium.⁸⁸ Albert of Aachen calls the Byzantines “false Christians”,⁸⁹ Guibert of Nogent “the most cowardly of all people”,⁹⁰ and William of Tyre develops an utterly disparaging opinion.⁹¹ The Byzantine emperors are constantly denigrated,⁹² and while the crusaders are seen as *milites Christi* and martyrs, the image of the Greeks is frequently that of bad Christians⁹³ and traitors.⁹⁴ Although there are no increasing tensions in the political relationship between East and West in the 12th century,⁹⁵ reproaches

83 Thus Rentschler, *Liudprand* p. 97, who, however, wrongly assumes that such a characterization only occurs with Gregory VII and beyond.

84 Schreiner, “Byzanz”, pp. 576–77; Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*, p. 267.

85 Rentschler, “Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 11. Jahrhunderts”, p. 154; Arbagi, *Byzantium*, pp. 82–83; also Wingler, *Construire*.

86 Thus Ducellier, “Une mythologie urbaine”.

87 For the relationship between Byzantium and the West during the Crusades, see Harris, *Byzantium*.

88 For the image of the Greeks during the Crusades and in crusader chronicles, cf. Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*; Schieffer, “Zum lateinischen Byzanzbild”; Portnykh, “Byzantins”; Carrier, *L'autre chrétien*.

89 Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana* VI 57, ed. S.B. Edgington, *Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem* (Oxford Medieval Texts), Oxford 2007, p. 480. Concerning “false Christians”, see also Ducellier, “Une mythologie urbaine”.

90 Guibert of Nogent, *Gesta Dei per Francos* II 19, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis, 127A), Turnhout 1996, p. 135.

91 Cf. Rödig, *Zur politischen Ideenwelt*, pp. 86–104; Völkl, *Muslims*, summary p. 265. Neocleous, *Heretics*, who regards derogatory statements as being minority opinions, underestimates their dissemination.

92 Portnykh, “Byzantins”, pp. 722–23.

93 Thus Portnykh, “Byzantins”, p. 726.

94 Thus, Neocleous, “The Byzantines and Saladin”, and Id., “Byzantine-Muslim Conspiracies”, tries to disprove the reproach of a Byzantine alliance with Saladin uttered by some Latin chroniclers during the Third Crusade.

95 Thus Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*, pp. 263.

augment and reach their peak prior to the Fourth Crusade.⁹⁶ Ebels-Hoving even interprets the conquest of Constantinople as a consequence of an increasing delimitation from Byzantium,⁹⁷ and Schieffer thinks that the negative image of Byzantium at least offered a legitimation (although not necessarily a motive) for the conquest.⁹⁸ This may be true. Nevertheless, a (potentially) negative image of Byzantium is much older and *not* a result of the Crusades.

5 The Literary Image of the Greeks

The literary image of the Greeks does not seem to be much different from the perspective of medieval historiography, the more so as there are fluid transitions. Notker's *Gesta Karoli*, for instance, pretend to be historiography, but consist of anecdotes, and Liudprand's report is clearly stylized. However, literature and poetry have not yet been analysed much concerning this question.⁹⁹ In Notker's *Gesta*, a Frankish envoy to Constantinople outwits "the wise Greece"; he is sentenced to death for a ludicrous *faux pas*, allegedly, against the table manners at court, he had turned over the fish on his plate. Given the opportunity of a last wish, he demanded that everybody who saw him doing so should die with him, and thus was able to rescue himself.¹⁰⁰ This is, of course, a completely fabricated anecdote, ridiculing Byzantine manners and laws, but it is significant for Notker's image of the Greeks and perhaps also that of his readers who could laugh about it. The incident is celebrated by Notker as "a victory of the wise descendent of the Franks over the vain Hellas",¹⁰¹ Byzantium is exposed as being a country of ridiculousness and vanity. Nevertheless, in another anecdote told immediately afterwards, Charlemagne admires the Greek antiphones and has them translated into Latin.¹⁰² Again, we find the same ambiguous vacillation between scorn and admiration.¹⁰³

Twelfth-century literature is still characterized by an unreal, transfigured image of Byzantium, sometimes like in a fable, or a mythical transfiguration,

96 Schieffer, "Zum lateinischen Byzanzbild", pp. 26–31.

97 Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*, p. 264.

98 Schieffer, "Zum lateinischen Byzanzbild", pp. 30–31. Completely contrary to this view, and without knowledge of Schieffer's and Carrier's studies, is Neocleous, *Heretics*.

99 For the 12th century, see, above all, Schreiner, "Byzanz"; Franz, *Bild Griechenlands*, offers no substantial observations.

100 Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli* II 6, ed. Haefele, pp. 54–55.

101 Ibid., p. 55: "Tum sapiens ille Francigena vanissima Hellade in suis sedibus exsuperata victor et sanus in patriam suam reversus est."

102 Ibid. II 7, ed. Haefele, p. 58.

103 See also Wickham, "Ninth-Century Byzantium", p. 248.

but, consequently, in this case it is not pejorative.¹⁰⁴ On the whole, however, and notably on both sides, aversion again may have prevailed over admiration,¹⁰⁵ although in German and French literature and epics of the 12th and 13th century, the image of the Greeks is not really derogative.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, the evidence in German epics consists of references to the city of *Byzantium* (Constantinople) and not to the Byzantine Empire.¹⁰⁷

6 Religious Perception: the Western Image of the Greek Church

According to Peter Schreiner, religious aspects are not present or at least not emphasized in German literature,¹⁰⁸ and Bunna Ebels-Hoving draws the same conclusion from the crusaders' chronicles before the late 12th century when reproaches of heresy multiply.¹⁰⁹ However, this actually seems to be not so much a question of development, but rather of the specific situation or context, and proves to be dependent on the "political climate". Religious and theological debates also normally had an ecclesio-political background, for example the papal claim to primacy. Whereas the popes had been subordinate to the Byzantine Emperor until the middle of the 8th century, they subsequently loosened these connections, turning towards the Frankish kingdom, and definitively severed them during the pontificates of Paul I (757–67) and particularly Hadrian I (772–95) in favour of a close bond with the Carolingian and later on the Ottonian and Salian emperors, although the popes never gave up their claim to primacy over the whole Church. Concerning Byzantium, we find a short-term escalation in the letters of Nicholas I (858–67) with regard

104 Thus Schreiner, "Byzanz", p. 574, and, deliberately, Černáková, "The Image of Byzantium": fiction does not display the same ambiguity as chronicles (ibid. p. 40).

105 Thus Schreiner, "Byzanz", pp. 576–77.

106 Deliberately in this sense for the 12th century: Černáková, "The Image of Byzantium": negative attributes of single persons need not have repercussions on the image of the whole population; for the Greeks in vernacular epics, see Winger, *Construire pour soumettre*, pp. 199–316; for the image of Constantinople as (a desirable) renewal and utopia, as a dialectical opposition and as a tension between *aemulatio* and *admiratio* in French literature, see Devereau, *Constantinople* (summarizing pp. 183–86).

107 Schreiner, "Byzanz", p. 574.

108 Schreiner, "Byzanz", p. 577.

109 Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*, p. 264. In contrast, Neocleous, *Heretics*, contests that the Greeks were regarded as heretics by the majority of Latins; they were normally seen as Christians (summarizing pp. 239 and 245–47). It is certainly true that Greeks and Latins wanted to be united rather than divided (thus Neocleous, *Heretics*, p. 97), however, often enough this wish was an unrealistic ideal.

to the quarrel over Patriarch Photios of Constantinople and missionary competition in Bulgaria, which continued under John VIII (872–82): in order to win the Bulgarians over to the Roman Church, the popes exacerbated a delimitation from Byzantium.¹¹⁰ Yet, as Klaus Herbers rightly warns us, tradition and the comprehension of the papal office have to be taken into account here too.¹¹¹ Concerning Nicholas, one may detect a development in his image of the Greeks, dependent on the ecclesio-political, dogmatic (*filioque* controversy) and also personal context, namely a shift from the image of deviants who have to be called back (until 865) to a clear delimitation after that date, marked by an increasing use of the terms “we” and “you”, of prejudices and clichés, and even of a formal exclusion of the Greeks from the Christian community between 867 and 869.¹¹² Arguing against a priority of Constantinople in the context of primacy, Pope Nicholas emphasized that the see of Constantinople was not a real patriarchate, because it had neither been founded by an apostle nor was it mentioned in the respective decrees of the synod of Nicaea.¹¹³

With regard to the Greek faith, Western attitudes seem to be ambiguous: on the one hand we find an awareness that Greeks and Latins have the same faith as they have the same origins and constitute one and the same Church. On the other hand, however, some authors discern a chain of events leading to the rift between the two Churches (in which 1054 is just one stage in a long line, which was only retrospectively perceived as a final caesura).¹¹⁴ Accordingly, we can observe two (simultaneous) tendencies. One of them acknowledges the orthodoxy of the Greek faith. Alcuin, for example, praises the Greek doctrine of the Trinity as a bulwark against heresy;¹¹⁵ and even Pope John VIII, in a letter to the Bulgarians, confirms that Greeks and Romans have the same faith, the same baptism, and the same God;¹¹⁶ and Pope Hadrian I at least speaks of a “unity divided in two parts”.¹¹⁷ Even the papal claim to primacy presumes a unity of the two Churches, although this may seem theoretical.

110 See Herbers, “Papst Nikolaus”, pp. 66–71.

111 Ibid., p. 56.

112 Thus ibid., p. 73.

113 Nicholas 99, ed. E. Perels, in *Epistolae Karolini aevi IV* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Epistolae, 6), Berlin 1925, pp. 596–97, ch. 92 (written in 866).

114 Thus Bayer, *Spaltung*; for the less unequivocal Byzantine perspective, see Cheynet, “Le schisme de 1054”.

115 Alcuin, Letter 268, ed. E. Dümmler, in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi II* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Epistolae, 4), Berlin 1895, pp. 426–27.

116 John VIII, *Register*, Letter 66, ed. Caspar, p. 59 (from 878).

117 Hadrian I, Letter 2, chapter 52, ed. K. Hampe, *Epistolae selectae pontificum Romanorum Carolo Magno et Ludowico Pio regnantibus scriptae in Epistolae Karolini Aevi III* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Epistolae, 5), Berlin 1889, p. 39 (from 791).

Nevertheless, in precarious situations, the authors often admit that this unity was endangered and use negative expressions in this context. Thus Pope Paul I, in a period of alienation and a threatening situation, in which he was afraid of a Greek attack and wished Pippin to help him, called the Byzantines “the most godless Greeks, the enemies of the holy Church of God, who are opposing God and overpower the orthodox faith”; they only wished “to destroy the orthodox faith and the holy tradition of the venerable Fathers”.¹¹⁸ In this diction, orthodoxy is exclusively ascribed to the Roman Catholics.

The dogmatic controversies that have already been mentioned above (most of them figuring as responses to Greek reproaches) became a source of corresponding quarrels. Most important is the *filioque* controversy about the Nicene Creed, namely whether the Holy Ghost emanates from the Father alone (according to the Greek doctrine, actually in conformity with the original Creed), or whether it emanates from Father *and* Son in equal relevance, according to a formula which gained increasing prominence in the whole Western Church from Carolingian times onwards. By connecting this formula with the dogmatic question of the equality of the three divine persons, the Greek belief is frequently seen as coming close to the Arian heresy, whereas some authors, such as Anastasius Bibliothecarius, John Scotus Eriugena, Anselm of Canterbury, or Peter Abelard, fully recognized that this difference merely results from linguistic distinctions, because the Greeks call “substance” what the Latins understand by “person”.¹¹⁹ Nevertheless, Rathramnus of Corbie considered the Greek formula heretical, because it seemed to him blasphemous with regard to the Holy Ghost¹²⁰ who was seen as minor to the Father and the Son,¹²¹ and thus resembled Arianism.¹²² As Klaus Herbers observes, these polemical writings (around Rathramnus, Aeneas of Paris, and the *Response* of the bishops of the Frankish synod of Worms in 864), perceive the Greeks as the “Other” and as a clearly distinct group.¹²³ Even Anselm of Canterbury still calls the Greek formula erroneous,¹²⁴ and according to Anselm of Havelberg

118 *Codex Carolinus*, Letter 30, ed. Gundlach, p. 536, from 761/66 (wishing to convince Pippin by these words to support him).

119 Goetz, *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 714–15.

120 Rathramnus of Corbie, *Contra Graecorum opposita* 1,1, col. 227a.

121 *Ibid.*, 1,3, col. 229b.

122 *Ibid.*, 2,2, col. 247ab.

123 Herbers, “Papst Nikolaus”, p. 52.

124 Anselm of Canterbury, *De processione spiritus sancti* 14, ed. F.S. Schmitt, *Opera quae archiepiscopus composuit* (S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Opera omnia, 2), Seckau 1940 (repr. Stuttgart 1968), pp. 177–219, here p. 215.

the very worst blasphemy consisted in the belief that the Holy Ghost does not emanate from the Son as well.¹²⁵

The second great dispute concerned the use of leavened (the Greeks) or unleavened (the Latins) bread in the Eucharist. It started with Humbert of Silva Candida responding to a treatise of the Greek monk Niketas Stethatos, written by order of Patriarch Michael Keroularios. While Anselm of Canterbury assumes that both modes are possible, he at least thinks that the use of unleavened bread is more appropriate. Rupert of Deutz even believes “without any doubt” that Christ himself had used unleavened bread¹²⁶ (although the Bible does not give an explicit indication), and he ridicules the Greeks with a pun that, again, implies heretical tendencies: “Greece is ‘leavened’ [that is, acidified] by so many heresies that it oddly ignores what it sacrifices in leavened (bread)”, whereas the Roman Church always remains unspoiled.¹²⁷ Nevertheless, Gerhoh of Reichersberg (who is often of a similar opinion as Rupert) emphasizes afterwards that both forms represent the same mode of sacrament so that the use of leavened bread is not an infringement.¹²⁸ Again, the opinions vary and often tend to avoid an escalation, but they still imply a religious dispute that could result in the reproach of heresy.¹²⁹ A further controversy about the marriages of priests did not reach the same level of relevance, but even the compulsory beards of Greek priests led the German bishops at the synod of Worms to the ironical remark that, if holiness is (hidden) in the beard, then there was nothing more holy than a billy goat.¹³⁰

Attempts to reconcile different customs stand side by side with (even more frequent) attempts to refute the Greek rites or at least to defend the Latin (Catholic) customs as being the better or even the only right ones. In the latter case, the Greek customs must necessarily be wrong or even heretical. Liudprand of Cremona, for instance, implies that the Greeks did not worship God properly: “For he who searches for God in appearance only, *ficte* [or: only pretends to search for God], will never deserve to find him.”¹³¹

125 Anselm of Havelberg, *Antikeimenon* 2,12, col. 1181bc.

126 Rupert of Deutz, *De sancta trinitate et operibus eius* 11. In Exodum 2,11, ed. R. Haacke, 4 vols. (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis, 21–24), Turnhout 1971–72, vol. 22, pp. 647–48.

127 Rupert of Deutz, *Liber de divinis officiis* 2,22, ed. Haacke, pp. 52–53.

128 Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Liber de simoniacis*, ed. E. Sackur (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Libelli de lite 3), Hanover 1897, pp. 239–72, here p. 260.

129 A similar controversy refers to the *zeon*, the practice of adding hot water to the wine of the Eucharist; cf. Avvakumov, *Entstehung*, pp. 161–97.

130 *Responsio contra Graecorum haeresim*, ed. Hartmann, p. 307.

131 Liudprand, *Relatio* 65, ed. Chiesa, p. 218: “Qui enim ficte Deum quaerunt, numquam invenire merentur.”

It is in these contexts that Byzantium is characterized as a hotbed of heresies and the Greek Orthodox faith itself as heresy (or at least as being heretical at times). Thus, Pope John VIII wrote to the Bulgarians that the Greeks “had fallen into diverse heresies and schisms out of habit”,¹³² and the bishops assembled at the synod of Worms opened their reply to the Roman See with a reference to the numerous treatises written by the Church Fathers against heresies!¹³³ Aeneas of Paris gives a long list of Eastern heresies, while not a single pope had ever been an “heresiarch”.¹³⁴ This method became really popular later on. While Aeneas refers only to the pope as a haven of orthodoxy, this is extended to all of Rome in a letter of Pope Gregory VII: there had never been a heresy in Rome!¹³⁵ For Gregory, the members of the Eastern Church had even renounced their faith on the initiative of the devil,¹³⁶ which, in Catholic eyes, would make the Greeks unbelievers like all non-Christians. Liudprand of Cremona asserts that the heresies in Constantinople had been eliminated by people who came from Rome,¹³⁷ and Humbert of Silva Candida compares Greek “misbelief” with various (former) heresies (Valesians, Arians, Donatists, Nicolaitans, Manichaeans, and many others), because they share certain features with each of them.¹³⁸ The reproach that there had always been many heresies in Constantinople is repeated again and again, from times as early as Fulgentius of Ruspe about 500¹³⁹ up to Rupert of Deutz¹⁴⁰ and Anselm of Havelberg in the 12th century.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, this specific manner of characterizing the Greeks as heretics at the same time seems to be an attempt to reconcile the contradiction between unity and deviance. By (a mere) comparison with other heresies, or by emphasizing that there were occasional heresies, the authors avoided calling the Greek Orthodox faith as such heretical, but only condemned particular elements.

132 John VIII, *Register*, Letter 66, ed. Caspar, p. 59.

133 *Responsio contra Graecorum haeresim*, ed. Hartmann, praef. p. 292.

134 Aeneas of Paris, *Liber adversus Graecos*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 121, cols 683–764, praef., cols 686–87.

135 Gregory VII, *Letter* 8, 1, ed. Caspar, p. 513.

136 Gregory VII, *Letter* 2,49, ed. Caspar, p. 189.

137 Liudprand of Cremona, *Relatio* 21, ed. Chiesa, p. 196.

138 Humbert of Silva Candida, *Excommunicatio qua feriuntur Michael Caerularius atque eius sectatores*, ed. C. Will, *Acta et scripta quae controversiis Ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant*, Leipzig 1861, pp. 153–54.

139 Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Dicta regis Trasamundi et contra ea responsionem liber unus*, ed. J. Fraipont, *Sancti Fulgentii episcopi Ruspensis opera* (Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina, 91), Turnhout 1968, pp. 67–185, here p. 87.

140 Rupert of Deutz, *Liber de divinis officiis* 2,22, ed. Haacke, p. 52.

141 Anselm of Havelberg, *Antikeimenon* 3,6, col. 1215–17.

This attitude corresponds to the religious classification of the Greeks as vacillating between orthodoxy and heresy. Concerning religion, there is not so much a vacillation between admiration and aversion, as in secular assessment, but rather between unity and segregation.¹⁴² A dictum of Bernard of Clairvaux may be characteristic of this ambiguity: the Greeks, he writes, “are with us and not with us at the same time: affiliated in faith, separated in peace, although in faith they also hobble away from the right paths”, to an extent, Bernard adds, that even heresy rages overtly in some of them.¹⁴³ William of Tyre claims that the Greeks “allegedly” have a Christian faith.¹⁴⁴ Corresponding to the actual relationship between the Eastern and Western churches, which was characterized by a gradual but discontinuous drifting apart in phases of increased tensions rather than an abrupt splitting up, the Greek faith, in Western perception, was neither an independent (different) religion nor an independent Christian Church, it was neither a different faith nor a truly Christian one, but according to the situation it could either be seen as (still) Catholic or as heretical.¹⁴⁵ This duality corresponds to the ambiguous consequences of papal primacy, which caused tensions, but also implied adherence to the principle of ecclesiastical unity.

7 Conclusion

The Western perception of the Greeks does not give the impression of unequivocalness, although it testifies to a clear demarcation. Where an assessment is visible – and it should be repeated that most historiographical remarks seem more or less neutral – the Greeks belong to the “others”: linguistically, politically, culturally, and not least from a religious or ecclesiastical point of view. Consequently, in spite of frequent contacts on the same political level (at least in the Western view) and also in spite of some admiration for Greek culture (although often referring to earlier periods), we find numerous indications of derogatory utterances and attitudes. Such remarks reveal an inherent aversion, but often enough they depend on the political climate. The same applies to the perception of the Greek faith, which vacillates between belonging to the

¹⁴² Similarly Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium*, p. 281.

¹⁴³ Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione ad Eugenium papam* III 4, eds. J. Leclercq/H.M. Rochais, *S. Bernardi Opera*, vol. 3, Rome 1963, pp. 393–493, here pp. 433–34.

¹⁴⁴ William of Tyre, *Chronicle* II 4, eds. R.B.C. Huygens/H.E. Mayer/G. Rösch, *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis, 63), Turnhout 1986, p. 167.

¹⁴⁵ Such a conclusion seems much more appropriate than denying religious reproaches, as Neocleous, *Heretics*, does.

same (Catholic) Church or forming a Church of its own. The idea of unification failed because of the conflicting claims of the popes and the patriarchs of Constantinople, and was not realistic anyway. A strict delimitation was emphasized whenever Catholic authors detected, or construed, the danger of heresy or interpreted the Greek rites as being heretical, although they never abandoned the illusion of a united Christian faith. While most former and recent studies that concentrate on the age of the Crusades tend to emphasize either the beginning of a new development in the history of the Western image of the Greeks or else a development within this period, they neglect the spectrum of views from earlier centuries: the image of the Greeks was, and remained, versatile.¹⁴⁶ When Carrier observes a development from cultural antagonism at the end of the 11th century¹⁴⁷ towards a “diversification” of the image of the Byzantines,¹⁴⁸ in fact, both images had long since existed one beside the other. The same is true for the development from the image of the Greek emperor to the image of the Greeks.¹⁴⁹ The period between 1155–80 may well have been a period of “*détente*”,¹⁵⁰ followed by a further deterioration during the Third and particularly towards the Fourth Crusade,¹⁵¹ but this is due to political tensions and does not signify a fundamental change of the Western image. William of Tyre and others judge the politics of the Emperor Manuel much more favourably than that of Alexios;¹⁵² nevertheless William has many reservations against the Greeks. Concrete representation and assessment depended on the current situation and the intention of the authors rather than on an either invariable or changing attitude towards “the” Greeks over time. However, in times of tension, it could adopt a definitely denigrating character.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anselm of Havelberg, *Antikeimenon (Dialogi)*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 188, cols 1139–1248.
- Codex Carolinus*, ed. W. Gundlach, in *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae, 3), Berlin 1892, pp. 469–657.

-
- 146 The same reservation holds when Devereaux, *Constantinople*, p. 34, detects a shift from a religious to a political perspective in the 12th century.
- 147 Carrier, *L'autre chrétien*, pp. 203–07.
- 148 Ibid. pp. 263–311.
- 149 Ibid., pp. 264–72.
- 150 Ibid. pp. 312–52.
- 151 Ibid. pp. 353–92.
- 152 Ibid., p. 348.

- Gregory VII, *Letters*, ed. E. Caspar, *Das Register Gregors VII.* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae selectae 2,1–2), Berlin 1920.
- John VIII, *Register*, ed. E. Caspar, *Registrum Iohannis VIII. Papae in Epistolae Karolini aevi V* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae, 7), Berlin 1928, pp. 1–272.
- Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liudprandi Cremonensis Opera omnia* (Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio mediaevalis, 156), Turnhout 1998, pp. 3–150.
- Liudprand of Cremona, *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liudprandi Cremonensis Opera omnia* (Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio mediaevalis, 156), Turnhout 1998, pp. 187–218.
- Louis II, *Letter*, ed. W. Henze, *Epistola ad Basilium I. imperatorem Constantinopolitanum missa in Epistolae Karolini aevi V* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae, 7), Berlin 1928, pp. 385–94.
- Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni imperatoris*, ed. H.F. Haefele, *Notker der Stammler. Taten Kaiser Karls des Großen* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, n.s. 12), 2nd ed., Munich 1980.
- Rathramnus of Corbie, *Contra Graecorum opposita Romanam ecclesiam infamantium libri quatuor*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 121, cols 223–346.
- Responsio contra Graecorum haeresim de fide sanctę trinitatis*, ed. W. Hartmann, in *Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 860–874* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Concilia, 4), Hannover 1998, pp. 291–307.
- Rupert of Deutz, *Liber de divinis officiis*, ed. R. Haacke, *Ruperti Tuitiensis Liber de divinis officiis* (Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio mediaevalis, 7), Turnhout 1967.
- Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle*, ed. R. Holtzmann, *Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und ihre Korveier Überarbeitung* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, n.s., 9), Berlin 1935.

Secondary Literature

- Arbagi, M.G., *Byzantium in Latin Eyes: 800–1204* (Ph.D thesis, Rutgers University, 1969), University Microfilms. Inc. 70–041.
- Avvakumov, G., *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens: Die lateinische Theologie des Hochmittelalters in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Ritus der Ostkirche* (Münchener Universitätschriften. Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Instituts zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, 47), Berlin 2002.
- Bayer, A., *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054* (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 53), Cologne 2002.
- Brubaker, L./Haldon, J., *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era c. 680–850: A History*, Cambridge 2011.
- Carrier, M., *L'Autre chrétien à l'époque des Croisades: les Byzantins vus par les chroniqueurs du monde latin (1096–1261)*, Saarbrücken 2012.

- Černáková, Z., "The Image of Byzantium in Twelfth-Century French Fiction: a Historical Perspective", in E. Egedi-Kovács (ed.), *Byzance et l'Occident II: Tradition, transmission, traduction* (Antiquitas. Byzantium. Renascentia, 16), Budapest 2015, pp. 17–45.
- Cheynet, J.-C., "Le schisme de 1054: un non-événement?", in C. Carozzi/H. Taviani-Carozzi (eds.), *Faire l'événement au Moyen Âge* (Le temps de l'histoire), Aix-en-Provence 2007, pp. 299–311.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden 1996.
- Devereaux, R., *Constantinople and the West in Medieval French Literature. Renewal and Utopia* (Gallica), Woodbridge 2012.
- Dierkens, A./Sansterre, J.-M. (eds.), *Voyages et voyageurs à Byzance et en Occident du VI^e au XI^e siècle* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettre de l'Université de Liège, 278), Geneva 2000.
- Ducellier, A., "Une mythologie urbaine : Constantinople vue de l'Occident au Moyen Âge," *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Âge*, 96/1 (1984), 405–24.
- Ebels-Hoving, B., *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen 1096–1204*, Assen 1971.
- Engels, O./Schreiner, P. (eds.), *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten. Kongreßakten des 4. Symposions des Mediävistenverbandes in Köln 1991*, Sigmaringen 1993.
- Flori, J., "Quelques aspects de la propagande anti-byzantine dans les sources occidentales de la première croisade", in D. Coulon/C. Otten-Froux/P. Pagès/D. Valérian (eds.), *Chemins d'Outre-Mer. Études d'histoire sur la Méditerranée médiévale offertes à Michel Balard* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 20), Paris 2004, vol. 1, pp. 331–43.
- Franz, H., *Das Bild Griechenlands und Italiens in den mittelhochdeutschen epischen Erzählungen vor 1250* (Philologische Studien und Quellen, 52), Berlin 1970.
- Freudenberg, B., "Dialog und Konflikt. Trennende und verbindende Elemente in der Wahrnehmung der griechischen Religion in der Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts. Das Beispiel des Anselm von Havelberg", in N. Bade/ead. (eds.), *Von Sarazenen und Juden, Heiden und Häretikern. Die christlich-abendländischen Vorstellungen von Andersgläubigen im Früh- und Hochmittelalter in vergleichender Perspektive*, Bochum 2013, pp. 153–89.
- Freudenberg, B., "Unus grex et unum ovile? The Papacy's Comprehension of the Greek-Orthodox Religion in the Eighth Century", *Millennium. Jahrbuch zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* 10 (2013), 349–72.
- Gantner, C., *Freunde Roms und Völker der Finsternis. Die päpstliche Konstruktion von Anderen im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*, Vienna 2014.
- Gemeinhardt, P., *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 82), Berlin 2002.
- Goetz, H.-W., *Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen und christlich-abendländisches Selbstverständnis im frühen und hohen Mittelalter (5.–12. Jahrhundert)*, 2 vols., Berlin 2013.

- Goetz, H.-W., "Byzanz in der Wahrnehmung fränkischer Geschichtsschreiber des 6. und 7. Jahrhunderts", in C. Föller/F. Schulz (eds.), *Osten und Westen. Kommunikation, Kooperation und Konflikt* (Roma Aeterna, 4), Stuttgart 2015, pp. 77–98.
- Goetz, H.-W., "Unsichtbares oder sichtbares Imperium Romanum? Die römische Kaiserzeit in der fränkischen Historiographie", in J. Strothmann (ed.), *Civitates, regna und Eliten. Die regna des Frühmittelalters als Teile eines 'unsichtbaren Römischen Reiches'* (Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, 124), Berlin-Boston 2021, pp. 201–26.
- Grierson, Ph., "The Carolingian Empire in the Eyes of Byzantium", in *Nascità dell'Europa ed Europa carolingia: un'equazione da verificare* (Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 27), Spoleto 1981, vol. 2, pp. 885–916.
- Haenssler, F., *Byzanz und Byzantiner. Ihr Bild im Spiegel der Überlieferung der germanischen Reiche im früheren Mittelalter* (Ph.D thesis, University of Bern 1954).
- Harris, J., *Byzantium and the Crusades* (Crusader Worlds), London-New York 2003.
- Herbers, K., "Papst Nikolaus I. und Patriarch Photios. Das Bild des byzantinischen Gegners in lateinischen Quellen", in Engels/Schreiner (eds.), *Begegnung*, pp. 51–74.
- Konstantinou, E. (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 1997.
- McCormick, M., *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce, A.D. 300–900*, Cambridge 2001.
- Nagel, H., *Karl der Große und die theologischen Herausforderungen seiner Zeit* (Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 12), Frankfurt-on-Main 1998.
- Neocleous, S., "The Byzantines and Saladin: Opponents of the Third Crusade?", *Crusades* 9 (2010), 87–106.
- Neocleous, S., "Byzantine-Muslim Conspiracies against the Crusades: History and Myth", *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010), 253–74.
- Neocleous, S., "Tyrannus Grecorum. The Image and Legend of Andronikos I Komnenos in Latin Historiography", *Medioevo greco. Rivista di storia e filologia bizantina* 12 (2012), 195–284.
- Neocleous, S., *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics? Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century* (Studies and Texts, 216), Toronto 2019.
- Noble, Th.F.X., *Images, Iconoclasm and the Carolingians*, Philadelphia 2009.
- Peters-Custot, A., "L'Autre est le même: qu'est-ce qu'être 'grec' dans les sources latines de l'Italie? (VIII^e–XI^e siècles)", in Ph. Jossierand/J. Pysiak (eds.), *À la rencontre de l'Autre au Moyen Âge. In memoriam Jacques Le Goff. Actes des premières Assises franco-polonaises d'histoire médiévale* (Centre de recherches en histoire internationale et atlantique. Enquêtes et documents, 58), Rennes 2017, pp. 53–78.
- Portnykh, V.L., "Les Byzantins vus par les chroniqueurs de la Première croisade", *Le Moyen Âge* 120 (2014), 713–26.

- Rentschler, M., "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts", *Saeculum* 29 (1978), 324–55.
- Rentschler, M., "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 11. Jahrhunderts", *Saeculum* 31 (1980), 112–56.
- Rentschler, M., *Liudprand von Cremona. Eine Studie zum ost-westlichen Kulturgefälle im Mittelalter* (Frankfurter Wissenschaftliche Beiträge. Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe, 14), Frankfurt-on-Main 1981.
- Rödig, Th., *Zur politischen Ideenwelt Wilhelms von Tyrus*, Frankfurt-on-Main 1990.
- Sarti, L., "From Romanus to Graecus. The Identity and Perceptions of the Byzantines in the Frankish West", *Journal of Medieval History* 44 (2018), 131–50.
- Schieffer, R., "Die Einheit der lateinischen Welt als politisches und kirchliches Problem (8.–13. Jahrhundert)", in E. Chrysos/P.M. Kitromilides/C. Svolopoulos (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings*, Athens 2003, vol. 1, pp. 63–72.
- Schieffer, R., "Zum lateinischen Byzan(z)bild vor 1204", in P. Piatti (ed.), *The Fourth Crusade Revisited. Atti della Conferenza Internazionale nell'ottavo centenario della IV Crociata 1204–2004, Andros (Grecia), 27–30 maggio 2004* (Pontificio comitato di scienze storiche. Atti e documenti, 25), Vatican City 2008, pp. 18–31.
- Schreiner, P., "Byzanz und der Westen. Die gegenseitige Betrachtungsweise in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts", in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa. Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 40), Sigmaringen 1992, pp. 551–80.
- Smith III, M.H., *And Taking Bread ... Cerularius and the Azyme Controversy of 1054* (Théologie historique, 47), Paris 1978.
- Völkl, W., *Muslime – Märtyrer – Militia Christi. Identität, Feindbild und Fremderfahrung während der ersten Kreuzzüge*, Stuttgart 2011.
- Wickham, C., "Ninth-Century Byzantium through Western Eyes", in L. Brubaker (ed.), *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive? Papers from the Thirtieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1996* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications, 5), Aldershot 1998, pp. 245–56.
- Wingler, C., *Construire pour soumettre. L'image du Basileus dans la littérature française et allemande des croisades* (Autour de Byzance, 4), Paris 2016.

Linguistic Competence, Diplomacy and Diplomatics

Christian Gastgeber

1 A Methodological Approach to Linguistic Competence

Research on linguistic aspects of diplomacy is confronted with two basic problems: first, to what extent can a text transmitted secondarily, i.e. in literary, narrative sources, guarantee the faithfulness to the original version of a document? Second, how can a translated text indicate whether it was originally rendered by the addressor (or rather his office) in order to be sent to the addressee, together with the Greek *prototypon* in the addressor's language, or whether the addressee (or rather his office) only received a letter in the sender's own language and had to translate it himself.

The second issue touches on a further problem which is often ignored with regard to translations: the fact that the addressor and the addressee read and interpreted different texts. Although the content might be identical on the whole, the wording is different. Semantical connotations of words and phrases cannot completely be rendered into the addressee's language, let alone deliberate manipulations of translations in order to give a different meaning to a phrase. In historical interpretation it is common to leave the feature of linguistic competence between addressor and addressee aside, or to presuppose, at least implicitly, that the addressee understood the text in the addressor's language. Even in cases where the original text *and* the translation still exist today, the textual interpretation of the document is usually based only on the original text which, of course, expresses the ideas of the addressor more precisely than any translation, but only to an audience sharing his language. This is more evident in elaborate letters composed by well-trained rhetoricians in the chancery whose translators faced the problem of appropriately rendering (and sometimes even understanding) the original. Inappropriate translations, however, seem to have contributed, to a large extent, to misunderstandings and misinterpretations, even if in personal encounters and discussions with the addressor's envoys the addressee may have requested explanations and obtained clarifications of issues outlined in the translated texts. Nevertheless, the translated versions of letters circulated and were consulted by others as

well, e. g. by court historians. In general, this problem equally concerned East and West; in Byzantium, incoming Latin letters could only be understood through translation, but the availability of translators was mainly confined to the capital. In the West, it was by chance that bilingual “experts” were available, primarily in south Italy, in areas of Greek influence. The linguistic aspect also has to be taken into account with respect to the powerful position of an addressee who received a letter directed to a broader audience but they alone had translators exclusively at their disposal (at his court or in his environment). Such a situation allowed the possibility of deliberate manipulation, as documented for instance in the case of Patriarch Michael Keroularios (see below, p. 121–123).

The first problem mentioned above refers to stylistic and contextual adaptations of documents sent to the West already in Latin translation. It generally concerns quotations and insertions in secondary transmission: Latin texts sent from Byzantium are likely to have not responded to the linguistic register of a Latin author, in so much as the Greek translator changed or adapted the wording, even when he gives the impression of quoting a passage literally. For example, the letter sent by Emperor Manuel I Komnenos to King Henry II of England in November 1176 is transmitted in two traditions: the whole letter is inserted in the chronicle of Roger of Howden, and there are excerpts in the *ymagines historiarum* of Ralph de Diceto (report on the year 1177).¹ Ralph’s version differs from Roger’s in the use of the possessive pronoun combined with an abstract term for the emperor (*imperium meum* vs. *imperium nostrum*). The term *imperium meum* literally renders the corresponding Greek term ἡ βασιλεία μου, while *imperium nostrum* is adapted to western chancery use. It is more likely that *imperium meum* (as in Ralph’s excerpts) complies with the original literal translation (created in the chancery in Constantinople). Other cases of “automatic” variations concern the adaption of Bible quotations (see below, p. 110).

It is often taken for granted that a Latin mediaeval chronicler who quotes a (translated) document, if he had access to the addressee’s chancery or was even working there, used the original version. However, the letters by Emperor Manuel I Komnenos inserted in the *chronicon* of William of Tyre – as one of many examples – confront us with the problem of literary demands of an author quoting a document within his literary framework shaped in a particular style and of the strict adherence to the original text, in our case to the

1 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1524; edition and analysis in Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 1, pp. LIII–LIV; vol. 2, pp. 152–59; vol. 3, pp. 151–58.

official translations.² These letters are by no means insertions of the original texts, but free revisions of them according to William's rhetorical demands.³

The second issue is linked to the question of the nationality of the translator; a fundamental issue, as it concerns the emperor's policy of engaging translators in his chancery. Provided that an original Greek text was translated into Latin in Constantinople and sent together with the Latin translation (a practice which came into use approximately in the 11th century), the quality of rendering and the semantics of the chosen vocabulary hint at the translator's identification. However, a poor translation can *a priori* either be attributed to a Greek who struggled with an appropriate rendering or to a Latin who did not understand the precise meaning or construction of the Greek original. The same ambiguity applies to a good translation; such a version might stem from a well-experienced Greek as well. In the analysis of the nationality issue some criteria can be drawn up that help to determine the translator's linguistic background, with the limitation that one or two of these alone are not sufficient to determine this, and that often some uncertainty still remains. The criteria are as follows:⁴

- 1) The general impression of the quality of a text on the whole (not of one sentence or phrase alone), i.e. whether the text seems to be composed in a clear and comprehensible (not necessarily rhetorical) Latin or is influenced by Greek grammar, syntax, semantics, and vocabulary.
- 2) Rhythmic ends of clauses and sentences: Latin translators were (rather) accustomed to use the three mediaeval main *cursus* (*planus*, *tardus*, *velox*) and the *trispondaiacus*.
- 3) Biblical quotation: a very elementary criterion. For a passage indicated or identified as a biblical quotation, a Latin translator would preferably have used *his* Vulgate version (*his* is emphasized, since various versions of the Old Testament differing in time and place have to be taken into consideration), at least for quotations that were known from liturgy or a theological context. In contrast, a Greek was usually not accustomed to the Latin version(s) and would base his (word by word) translation on the exact Greek wording. In a broader sense, this issue also refers to quotations of original Latin passages which were translated into Greek in Constantinople and then retranslated into Latin in the translated document. If the original wording was required and the original text was at the translator's disposal, he may not have retranslated such a passage from

2 The same applies to secondary transmission by Greek historians, see Kresten, "Auslandsschreiben" (not completely convincing for Anna Komnene).

3 Gastgeber, "Wilhelm von Tyrus".

4 Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 1, pp. XIII–XL.

Greek into Latin, but have fallen back on the original version. This is a procedure that is well-known from inserts in conciliar acts.⁵

- 4) The abstract noun(s) for the self-designation of the emperor; this criterion, already mentioned above, mainly matters from the period of the Komnenoi onwards. At that time the chancery limited the abstract phrase to just one (ἡ βασιλεία μου, variants are rare and underline particular connotations); rendered literally into Latin, it is translated as *imperium meum*. Latins (in Western chanceries), however, were not accustomed to use this expression for an emperor, but often used terms like *celsitudo*, *clementia*, *serenitas*, *sublimitas* or *tranquillitas* combined with the possessive pronoun *noster*, rather than *meus*.⁶
- 5) The translation of proper names (persons and places) can serve as an indicator if they correspond to the (usual) Latin forms instead of more or less literally rendered ones, maintaining even the Greek casus suffix.⁷ Particular cases are, here again, retranslated Latin words which already underwent some morphological changes through the adaption to the Greek language: a Latin translator would probably reconstruct the original wording. For attributive place names a Greek would rather use the genitive, while a Latin would prefer the adjective.⁸
- 6) Greek words (in the translation) reveal the translator's limited vocabulary. If he adheres to the Greek words, he is obviously not trained in the addressee's language (which rather suggests a Greek translator). In particular, lists of gifts contained in some letters require a careful analysis in this respect as they are likely to contain highly exclusive words whose mere transliteration might reflect either the lack of vocabulary knowledge or the lack of an exact meaning (which, in contrast, hints at a Latin translator).
- 7) Variations of the conjunctions: e.g. for -τε and καί a Latin could vary between *-que*, *et*, *atque*, *nec non et*, while a Greek translator would reduce this plurality to one (or two).

5 See e.g. Riedinger, "Griechische Konzilsakten", pp. 259–62.

6 See Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache*, pp. 452–454; Gastgeber, "Selbstbezeichnung".

7 For instance, a passage of the Byzantine treaty with Venice of 1147 (Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1365) reads *Cypron et Creten* (which corresponds to the reconstructed Κύπρον καὶ Κρήτην; the Greek version is not preserved); in a later treaty of February 1187 (Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1576) in which the passage of the 1147 document was inserted, a Latin translator, active at the turn of the 1180s to the 1190s in the imperial chancery, rendered the words with the Latin equivalents *Ciprum et Cretam*.

8 See e.g. the corrections in the translations of the documents of the Second Council of Lyon: Gastgeber, "Dossier", pp. 48–57.

- 8) Criterion 7 directly leads to another: the tendency of variation. If a Latin translation displays variants of the same Greek word, such a use fits with a Latin rather than a Greek translator.
- 9) The translation of concise Greek phrases (e.g. an infinitive dependent on an article). For the sake of clarity a Latin would have preferred a periphrasis with a subordinate clause.
- 10) Semantic misunderstandings of a word or a phrase in its context: a Greek understood his language, his problem was rather to find an appropriate equivalent. A misunderstanding of the original text contextually, thus points to a Latin translator.

2 The Linguistic Competence of a Westerner: Written vs Spoken Greek

To complete our image of the medieval linguistic problems of communication and diplomacy also from the Western perspective, a differentiation is necessary between the (comprehension and) translation of a – more or less rhetorical – (*koinē*) text and a spoken dialogue. The knowledge of Greek grammar and vocabulary as transmitted by Latin medieval introductions or word lists did not enable a Latin speaker to conduct a Greek dialogue in the Byzantine period, and doubt arises whether he would even have been able to translate a Greek text of high linguistic register. A further issue that complicates research is that circulating manuscripts of such introductions transmit corrupted texts.⁹ The problem was that these introductions were based on classical Greek and therefore on a pronunciation which no longer corresponded to the spoken language in Byzantium and its radical phonetic changes, as regards, inter alia, itacism.

This image of an “obsolete Greek” is further underlined by a small number of Latin manuscripts containing anonymous basic introductions to, or compilations of, Greek letters, grammar and vocabulary, stemming from classical or late antique handbooks. In particular the alphabets and the phonetic explanations of a letter indicate whether the contemporary pronunciation was at least partially respected and updated in these works or not. The small number of such basic Greek texts for Western scholars indicate that itacism and the equivalence of α and $(a)e$ are, to some extent, respected, but other vowel or consonant peculiarities of medieval Greek were unknown.¹⁰ The same holds true for

9 See e.g. the Greek grammar in London, British Library, Harley ms. 2688, 19r–22r.

10 See e.g. Vienna, Austrian National Library, codex 114 (10th c.), containing explanations of Greek words and a Greek grammar. This manuscript is prominent for its scribe and owner

the vocabulary, since the known lists mainly represent an ancient thesaurus. The knowledge of contemporary spoken (vernacular) Greek was limited to a couple of small Latin word lists,¹¹ including short phrases for conversation.¹² In summary, it was unmanageable for Westerners without contacts with contemporary Greeks to learn spoken Greek from such grammars or wordlists alone which would enable them to conduct a conversation, or even have the right pronunciation of Greek. For a Latin envoy a conversation and translation could only succeed by recruiting either a bilingual Italian or a translator in the Byzantine capital. He could also make use of a translator attributed to him by the emperor, or rather the *logothetes* of the drome (τοῦ δρόμου, *cursus*). Due to the silence of the sources, it is an open question if envoys from the West could and did recruit personal interpreters among the locally present Latins, e.g. in the Latin monasteries. This can be assumed for Western embassies dealing with the question of Church union: the engagement of a Rome-oriented Latin rather than a bilingual Greek, who may have been suspected of changing the meaning, guaranteed the correct translation. If the envoy had to rely on attributed translators, he was *a priori* in a markedly worse position as all discussions with members of the court and the Church could be controlled and manipulated (by the emperor).

3 The Translator at the Byzantine Imperial Court

The imperial chancery comprised an “office” of translators about which the sources, however, provide only scarce information. Its employees are occasionally mentioned in official documents or in chronicles. Judging from the

Froumund of Tegernsee (Krause, “Fragment”, pp. 15–16; Aerts, “Froumund’s Greek” (the shelfmark is wrong: it is codex [latinus] 114 of the Austrian National Library, not of the stock of the Greek manuscripts); id., “Knowledge”, pp. 90–91).

11 See Herren, “Evidence”, pp. 57–84. He summarizes that it was possible for a student of Greek to become confronted with some features of “vulgar Greek” and that “these features are displayed more abundantly in texts emanating from Italy – a country where Greek was still a living language in some parts”. Aerts, “Knowledge”, p. 82, points to a very poor knowledge of Greek in the 9th century (“it seems that Greek studies in general remained on a poor level, with more ‘ornamental’ than linguistic aspects”).

12 See e.g.: Monza, Biblioteca Capitolare, cod. E.14 (127), 9th/10th century (Bischoff/Beck, “Glossar”; Sabatini, “Glossario”; Parlangèli, “Glossario”; Aerts, “Vocabulary”); Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 236, f. 97v, 11th century (Aerts, “Wordlist”; Ciggaar, “Bilingual word lists”, p. 172); Auxerre, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. 212 (179), ff. 133v–134r, 12th century (Aerts, “Froumund’s Greek”; Ciggaar, “Bilingual Word List”, pp. 172–75, interprets it as containing questions of mercenaries and not of crusaders; in contrast to the teaching aid in Carolingian lists).

information we have on them and their work, their (official) title was *hermeneutes/diermeneutes*.¹³ The translators belonged (in the period this volume is focusing on) to the office of the *logothetes* of the drome. The increasing need for their work led to the establishment of a department of translators headed by the *megas diermeneutes*. The first documented *megas diermeneutes* – Theophylactus Exubitus, of Italian origin, under Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, about 1160 – is also known by his seals, *bullae* with mixed letters, both in Greek and Latin. Different presentations of Theophylactus' profile on the *bullae* (before and after his promotion) indicate that the *megas diermeneutes* wore a kind of crown and a luxurious coat or necklace.

Two sources provide evidence concerning the translators' remuneration: Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus informs us about the payment of translators;¹⁴ and a Pisan account of expenses of 1199 lists what the privileged addressee had to pay for bilingual contracts (issued by the imperial chancery). There we find expenses for writing the Greek and Latin text, for the *magnus interpres*, for the *bulia*, and for the (oriental) paper of the text.¹⁵ From this it implies that, starting from the 12th century, the accompanying translation of a treaty (in general including privileges of the Byzantine emperor) was the usual way of issuing such a document, but the employment of an imperial translator was an extra charge (needless to say that letters were free of charge).

4 The Status Quo of Language Competence under the Macedonian Dynasty

Judging from the diplomatic correspondence issued by the emperors of the Macedonian dynasty, it is evident that the chancery renewed its preceding practice of using only the Greek language in documents sent abroad. Up to that time the imperial chancery did not respect the language competence of its addressees (after the language of such documents was changed from Latin

-
- 13 Bréhier, *Monde byzantin*, vol. 2, pp. 245–46; Guiland, “Grand Interprète”; Kresten/Seibt, “Theophylaktos Exubitos” (with discussion of the corrupted name *Triphilus* in the chronicle by William of Tyre [18, 30], here described as *maximus palatinorum interpretum*); Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, vol. 2, pp. 396–98. For (Late) Antiquity see also Wiotte-Franz, *Hermeneus*, vol. 1, pp. 1–12, 60–143.
 - 14 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cer.* II 15, eds. Dagron/Feissel/Flusin/Zuckerman/Stavrou, p. 147, lines 613–14, 616; p. 149, lines 633–34 (donations to the translators of Olga of Kiev).
 - 15 See Wirth, “Herstellungskosten”; the text is edited in *Toscan Documents*, nr. 47, ed. Müller, p. 78, col. 2.

to Greek in the period from the 6th to and 7th century¹⁶) or simply supposed that the “superior language” Greek would be understood. As far as the correspondence that concerned Rome, there was obviously a “reservoir of mediators” of varying linguistic skill at the popes’ disposal, perhaps not least due to some popes’ Greek or Syriac origin and the immigration of Greeks from the East and Southern Italy.¹⁷ Understanding Greek became problematic at courts where it was not practised, or only in an artificial way in order to demonstrate universal education by using words, phrases, or stylistic elements reminiscent of Greek. A famous example is Liutprand of Cremona with his excessive quotations of Greek terms in the reports of his embassies.¹⁸ Although his knowledge of the Greek language undoubtedly surpassed that of his contemporaries in the West, he needed a translator in Constantinople for communication (*Legatio* 46 where he speaks about his *graecologos*¹⁹), but could understand some phrases even without his translator.²⁰

Undoubtedly, a Greek text which the addressee could not read risked to be altered by a consulted translator or – in the case of a translator even working at the best of his limited ability – be misunderstood. However, although Greek clerics were present in the West (Italy), we cannot take for granted that each incoming Greek letter was genuinely understood thanks to them, unless the immigrants were well-trained in literary (*koinē* and attic[ising]) Greek and were bilingual. The correct understanding and rendering of a Byzantine document was thus a case of pure luck: it depended on whether a learned Greek (or a very well trained Latin) was available at the exact time an incoming letter was received.²¹

16 For the change of language, see Gastgeber, “Byzantine Imperial Chancery”.

17 See the contribution of Annick Peters Custot in this companion and Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome*.

18 Sources are his *Antapodosis* of 958–62 (concerning the years 893–931) and his *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana*, written between 968 and 970 and referring to his embassy in 968. For the Greek vocabulary contained in his works see Koder/Weber, *Liutprand*, pp. 15–70; see also for the complementary aspect of scriptural practice, Gardthausen, “Griechische Schrift”; Schreiner, “Schrift”.

19 Liutprand of Cremona, *Legatio* 47, ed. Chiesa, p. 207, lines. 746–47.

20 Liutprand of Cremona, *Legatio* 54, ed. Chiesa, p. 211, lines. 888–90.

21 See the thematic studies: Mansion, “Disparition”; Weiss, “Studio”; Krause, “Fragment”; Aerts, “Knowledge”; Frakes, “Griechisches”; Aerts, “Latin-Greek Wordlist”; Dionisotti, “Greek Grammars”; Berschin, *Mittelalter*; Berschin, “Elements”; Kaczynski, “Greek Glosses”; Aerts, “Froumund’s Greek”; Ciggaar, “Bilingual Word Lists”; Boulhol, *Connaissance*. See also Bischoff, “Griechische Element”. For the important impact of Irish scholars, see Jauneau, “Jean Scot Erigène”; Berschin, “Griechisches”; Moran, “Pronunciation”; id., “Medieval Ireland”; id., “Greek Dialectology”.

Indeed, the choice of Greek for letters sent abroad by the imperial chancery was caused by a discourse on the superiority of the two languages as well: for the Byzantines it was out of the question that Greek was beneath Latin.²² This controversy also touched on the assumption of the barbarian origin of the “Latins”, and was a recurrent theme in Byzantine literature.²³ Based upon such stereotypes Emperor Theodore II Lascaris explained the superiority of the Greeks and emphasized the perfect natural condition of their language, in contrast to any other language: ἀπασῶν τοίνυν γλωσσῶν τὸ ἐλληνικὸν ὑπέρκειται γένος θέσει καὶ εὐκρασίᾳ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὐφυΐα καὶ ἐπιστήμη (“the Greek idiosyncrasy surpasses all other language due to its geographical location, its good temperature and thus due to shapeliness and knowledge”).²⁴

A revision of the former practice (i.e the use of Greek alone) becomes apparent in the (secondarily transmitted) correspondence with Arabic potentates, when in July 938 Emperor Romanos I Lakapenos sent a letter to Caliph ar-Rāḍi of Baghdad,²⁵ and, as documented by the literary sources at least, the imperial chancery for the first time appended an authentic Arabic translation to the Greek original. This was a translation that originated from the chancery itself, which was certainly a significant concession to the addressee, although a differentiation was underlined by the use of golden ink for the Greek text and silver ink for the Arabic translation. This linguistic concession seems to be the first (pragmatic?) experiment of respecting a linguistically different audience, and facing the reality of being understood. Some years later, in 947 or 949, a letter from the emperors Constantine VII and Romanos II to Caliph ‘Abdarrahmān III b. Muḥammad an-Nāṣir of Cordoba was written in Greek alone with golden ink,²⁶ at least according to its detailed description in Arabic sources which do not mention any accompanying translation. Silver ink was used as well on an

22 Response from Pope Nicolaus I to Emperor Michael III from 28 September 865 with quotations from the latter's letter (see Dölger/Müller/Beihammer, Reg. 464): “in tantam vero furoris habundantiam prorupistis, ut linguae Latinae iniuriam irrogaretis, hanc in epistola vestra barbaram et Scythicam appellantes ... Iam vero, si ideo linguam Latinam barbaram dicitis, quoniam illam non intelligitis, vos considerate, quia ridiculum est vos appellare Romanorum imperatores et tamen linguam non nosse Romanam ... et tamen Romanam linguam barbaram appellare non veremini”: Nicolaus I (Pope), *Letters*, nr. 88, ed. Perels, p. 459, lines 5–26). See also Dagron, “Communication”; Dagron, “Formes et Fonctions”; Oikonomides, “Unilinguisme”.

23 See e.g. Jeffreys/Jeffreys, “Wild Beast from the West”; Kolbaba, *List*.

24 Theodore Laskaris, *Sermo secundus contra Latinos de processione spiritus sancti*, 3, ed. Krikones, p. 138, lines 34–35.

25 Kresten, “Chrysographie”, pp. 157–60, esp. p. 158 n. 59.

26 Kresten, “Chrysographie”, pp. 161–67; for the early use of chrysography, see also Gastgeber, “Kaiserliche Schreiben”, pp. 100–06.

attached scroll (included in the interior part of the letter) which listed all the gifts sent by the Byzantine emperor to the caliph. In addition, these Arabic sources indicate a change of material used in the imperial chancery from papyrus (and brown ink) to purple coloured parchment (and golden as well as silver ink, differentiated by content) in the 10th century. Unfortunately, the Latin sources which deal with embassies and incoming letters from the East rarely, if ever, report on the golden ink. The period of experiments and transition from Greek to bilingual letters is further documented in the description of a letter from Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos to Caliph al-Qā'im of Baghdad, dating from late winter 1051 or 1052, according to which an interlinear Arabic translation, again in golden ink, was added.²⁷ Textual witnesses of this linguistic development are finally the first (three) original letters dating from the first half of the 12th century (all of them are sent to the pope, see below), which are preserved in the Archivio Segreto Vaticano. They are composed of a preceding Greek text and a following translation into the language of the addressee, in these cases into Latin.

5 The Presence of Latins in the East (Before the Crusades)

As for the West, for Byzantium the same question arises if Latin language competence was supported by the local presence of native speakers. It has already been pointed out that southern Italy was privileged in this regard by the presence of Greek-speaking communities there. Translators could be recruited from this area, or contact with this community could provide a first (or deeper) introduction into Greek.²⁸ The mobility of merchants between West and East contributed to an acquaintance with the Greek *lingua franca*, the *dimotiki*. For delegations to the Byzantine Emperor or the Ecumenical Patriarch, Italy could therefore be an area best suited to recruit a translator to become part of the entourage.

Latin translators were needed in Constantinople to communicate with Western envoys, since Western authorities generally wrote in Latin to the East. The process which followed the arrival of an incoming Latin letter up to its presentation in Greek translation to the emperor (or patriarch) through the

27 Kresten, "Chrysographie", pp. 170–72.

28 Drocourt, "Signes", pp. 278–84; id., "Diplomatie sans langue", pp. 52–58; see also Haskins/Lockwood, "Sicilian Translators"; Sansterre, *Les Moines*; Noble, "Declining Knowledge"; Riché, "Grec"; Leonardi, "Anastasio Bibliotecario"; Chiesa, "Scuola napoletana nel X secolo"; id., "Traduzioni"; id., "Traduzioni e traduttori".

involvement of a local translator has, however, only left a few traces in literary reports of embassies, concerning both their translators' names and origin or recruitment.²⁹ It is a fact that Latin communities existed in Constantinople, from which recruitment was feasible; these communities, grouped according to their home cities or areas, mainly consisted of merchants and monks. The latter group possessed churches and monasteries and included: Amalfitans³⁰ (who were also the founders of a monastery on Mount Athos at the end of the 10th century; this monastery existed until the 12th century³¹), Venetians,³² Pisans,³³ Genoese,³⁴ and Anconitans (documented only at the end of the 12th century³⁵). How far Western clerics acted as mediators or translators when a Western envoy arrived in the capital remains very hypothetical, but, at least for the purpose of Latin liturgy, these clerics were surely contact persons for envoys. Taking all the information we have on translators of the different languages in Constantinople together, it emerges that native speakers of the target language worked for the emperor, but surely not exclusively.³⁶ From which particular community they were recruited remains just as enigmatic as the question as to where a native Greek could learn Latin in the capital unless he stemmed from a bilingual area (like southern Italy) or family (see below, p. 125, with regard to Alamanopolus).

6 From Greek to Latin Translations: The Imperial Chancery in Contact with Foreign Countries

As far as transmitted Greek texts attest, the chancery of the emperor as well as that of the patriarch barely³⁷ adjusted the Greek linguistic register used in

29 Drocourt, "Diplomatie sans langue".

30 Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 3, pp. 570–71 (based on his study "Sanctuaires"). For the translation practice, see also Chiesa/Dolbeau, "Traduzione amalfitana".

31 See Lemerle, "Archives"; Pertusi, "Monasteri"; Balard, "Amalfi"; Falkenhausen, "Amalfitani"; Skinner, *Amalfi*, pp. 212–33. For a well-known translator from this community, see Hofmeister, "Übersetzer Johannes".

32 Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 3, pp. 571–73; Nicol, *Byzantium*; Martin, "Venetians".

33 Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 3, pp. 573–74.

34 Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 3, pp. 574–75.

35 Janin, *Géographie*, vol. 3, p. 575.

36 Oikonomides, "Unilinguisme".

37 As far as the West is concerned; regarding the Arabic world, there is a remarkable letter, written by Arethas, archbishop of Caesarea, to the emir of Damascus (?) by order of Emperor Romanos I Lacapenus (see Dölger/Müller/Beihammer, Reg. 608a, about 926/27?; edition: Arethas, *Scripta minora*, nr. 26, ed. Westerink, pp. 233–245) which,

their documents sent abroad to avoid possible misunderstandings, nor took into account that a translator was confronted with big problems if he had to translate typical Byzantine rhetorical phrases. This does not rule out the possibility that documents could (and, indeed, did) vary in stylistic shades and could represent a lower Greek register, especially if they were reduced to a technical vocabulary of formulaic phrases without any rhetorical aspiration. This includes phrases like the certification of an incoming letter to be handed over, the certification of the reception of envoys, the announcement of imperial envoys, or an occasional list of gifts. To this category also belongs the treaties between Byzantium and the maritime republics of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa with typically low register treaty articles. Some of the treaties are introduced by a proem, but in general they begin with a short explanatory narrative paragraph and then pass to the items of the privileges or the agreement. A handful of letters sent by the Angeloi emperors to the local authorities in Genoa (documents called βασιλικόν – *imperiale*) are preserved in the original (1188–99). They represent such a pragmatic, non-rhetorical linguistic register (factual, *koinē*-oriented). Assessed by these texts alone, the Angeloi documents did not meet the otherwise well-known high rhetorical level of letters (metaphoric, varying in vocabulary, rhythmic, allusive). However, the (secondarily transmitted) letters referring to the question of Church union at the end of the 12th century modify the overall image. Composed by learned officials who were well versed in rhetoric and dialectic, these texts are masterpieces of urban Greek and are therefore transmitted in collections of rhetorical exemplars or within the literary corpus of a scholar. Against this content-oriented background of documents, the level of Greek used in the chancery at this period neither deteriorated nor improved considerably.

Nevertheless, after the imperial chancery began to add translations to its foreign correspondence (in the 10th century, at least for letters to Arabic addressees),³⁸ even the scarce transmission of documents allows us reflections on the linguistic level in the chancery. As regards accompanying Latin translations of treaties, the other category of documents relevant for the West, there

expressis verbis, lowers the stylistic register in order to be understood; see Oikonomides, "Unilinguisme", pp. 13–14.

38 For this topic, see in detail Gastgeber, "Übersetzungsabteilung"; Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 1; Gastgeber, "Kaiserliche Schreiben", pp. 91–100 (with correction on the assumption of an early Latin bilingual letter sent by Emperor Basil I to Emperor Louis II in spring 871: Dölger/Müller/Beihammer Reg. 487). The chancery of the Byzantine *katepanos* in southern Italy was addressing a bilingual audience in Greek and Latin versions and was therefore developing differently from the capital: it started to issue bilingual documents earlier: Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 1, pp. 93–95.

is still doubt when exactly the imperial chancery started to append authentic translations. The earliest privileges in Latin – 927 for the monastery San Vincenzo al Volturno,³⁹ 931 for the monastery of Montecassino;⁴⁰ the Greek versions are not preserved in both cases – do not speak in favour of a clear attribution of the translation either to the addressor or to the addressee. The preserved linguistic layer apparently displays revisions with elements of a very low linguistic register and obvious emendations.⁴¹ In these particular cases another problem arises: even if the linguistic register seems to hint at a Greek native speaker, an Italian monastery, however, might have had a Greek (monk) at its own disposal. Therefore a presumed native Greek translator needs not to be localized in Constantinople, although the imperial chancery already issued bilingual documents (at least, to Arab addressees). The first privilege for Venice from 992 is transmitted in a Latin so corrupt that it is impossible to take a clear decision about the original Latin text;⁴² the overall impression speaks for a Greek (Greco-Italian?) rather than a Latin translator. A further privilege for Montecassino issued in 1076⁴³ also hints at a Latin translator.⁴⁴ To sum up, these Latin privileges do not provide sure evidence that they were already issued bilingually in Constantinople.

The first Latin translations of letters – under Emperor Alexios I Komnenos, transmitted in the register of the monastery of Montecassino – are very likely to have been translated by Greeks.⁴⁵ I am inclined to argue for a bilingual issuing of these documents in Constantinople. Due to the deplorable transmission of Byzantine original documents, the first original bilingual letter in Greek and Latin only dates from 1139,⁴⁶ the first original bilingual treaty with a Western maritime republic still later, from 1192 (for Pisa).⁴⁷ This treaty informs us about the estimation of the Greek and the Latin versions because on the *kollemata* of the backside (the overlaps where the parchment sheets were glued together) an authentication note was written by the responsible official, the *logothetes*

39 Dölger/Müller/Beihammer, Reg. 610.

40 Dölger/Müller/Beihammer, Reg. 659d (olim 555); date corrected in Kresten, "Datierung".

41 See the linguistic analysis in Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 1, pp. 95–104, 104–12.

42 See Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 1, pp. 112–17.

43 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1006.

44 See Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 1, pp. 117–22.

45 See Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 4–27 (so called Anonymus 1097/1098), 28–49 (Anonymus 1111/1112); the respective documents (all of them issued for Montecassino) are Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1207, 1208 (new edition and analysis in Gastgeber, "Addressing"), 1262, 1264. For none of them is the Greek version extant.

46 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1320a.

47 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1607.

of the drome (in this case Demetrios Tornikes).⁴⁸ It reads: “The present copy (*ison*) of the issued chrysobull, written in Latin letters and sealed together with the original (*prototypon*) with a golden seal ...” (τὸ παρὸν ἴσον τοῦ γεγονότος χρυσοβούλλου λατινικοῖς γράμμασι γραφὲν καὶ τῷ πρωτοτύπῳ τῇ χρυσῇ βούλλῃ συσφραγισθὲν ...). This note illustrates that the translation, though written on the same paper and sealed together with the Greek original, is termed a “copy” (ἴσον), not as the authentic version (*prototypon*), which is represented by the Greek text alone. This difference is further stressed by the signature of the emperor which was added only to the first part, the Greek prototypon, whereas the Latin version was not signed.

7 The Language Problem in the So-Called Schism of 1054: An Insight into the Use of Translators in Constantinople

In a broader context of political impact, language problems and manipulated understanding of the other's letters are impressively documented in the conflict between Cardinal Humbert and Patriarch Michael Keroularios.⁴⁹ This clash of two energetic opponents had a linguistic dimension as well, which this section will focus on (without repeating the socio-political complexity of the event around 1054). The controversy also sheds some light on the presence of Latins in Constantinople, since Keroularios started his campaign against them by closing the Latin churches in the capital and forcing Latin monks to accept Greek liturgical practices.⁵⁰ At the same time (late 1052/early 1053) Archbishop Leon of Ohrid (former *chartophylax* of the *Megalē Ekklēsia* in Constantinople) addressed the Italian clergy and admonished the Latins for their uncanonical liturgical practices. Rome, meanwhile, tried to win over Patriarch Peter of Antioch; Patriarch Dominicus Marango of Grado, who acted as mediator, wrote a *Greek* letter⁵¹ to Peter (spring/middle 1053), an exceptional indication of respect by using the addressee's language. In contrast to this linguistic concession, however, Peter also received a letter from Pope Leo IX responding to his *intronistica* of 1052 after a delay of about two years. In this case, Peter was facing the problem of understanding the letter which was written

48 See Otten-Froux, “Enregistrement”, p. 242, n. 4.

49 See Gastgeber, “Schism”.

50 See *Ut enim fertur, omnes Latinorum basilicas penes vos clausistis, monachis monasteria et abbatibus tulistis, donec vestris viverent institutis: Documents About the 1054 Controversy*, nr. 2 (letter from Pope Leo IX to Patriarch Michael Cerularius), chap. 29, ed. Will, pp. 80, line 36, p. 81, line 1.

51 For its stylistic level, see Bianchi, “Patriarca”, pp. 65–67.

in Latin alone. Therefore he sent a copy to Constantinople asking Keroularios to provide him with a translation. As both versions are preserved, a comparison reveals the deliberate changes made by a translator in Constantinople.⁵² When Leon of Ohrid continued to admonish the Latin Western clergy in a second letter, Rome launched a counter-attack against the patriarch with a *libellus* written by Cardinal Humbert in Latin. At this moment the Studite monk Niketas Stethatos took over the leading role in the literary attack, writing in Greek and evoking a harsh response from Cardinal Humbert, again writing in Latin. It is likely that the Latin treatises did not reach their Greek audience for linguistic reasons, therefore, after the dispute between Humbert and Niketas (24 June 1054) – which ended in favour of the former – Emperor Constantine IX ordered the translation of the Latin works against the Greeks.

After that, Humbert launched the anathema against the patriarch, written in Latin, and placed it on the altar of Hagia Sophia on 16 July 1054 with the patriarch absent, but in the presence of the patriarchal clergy and the parish. It was not understood until the patriarch received a translation by the *protospatharius* Cosmas (a Roman), Pyrrhos, and the monk John (a Spaniard).⁵³ Keroularios consequently tried to cut any possible links between Rome and Antioch, and he himself informed Peter of Antioch about the recent events as well as the anti-Greek attacks by the Latins. As a testimony to his opponent's insolence he added the "forged" papal letter he had received, naturally in Greek translation.⁵⁴ The conflict escalated after the departure of the papal envoys, for Keroularios mobilized the populace against their charges. The emperor was forced to react without evoking a political conflict with Rome. He managed the crisis by punishing the interpreters of the Latins, Paulus and his son Smaragdus, by punches and tonsure and had them handed over to the patriarch.⁵⁵

52 See Gastgeber, "Manipulative Macht". An edition of the two versions is in Leo IX (Pope), *Letter to Patriarch Peter of Antioch*, ed. Michel, pp. 458–75.

53 *Documents About the 1054 Controversy*, nr. 11 (*semeioma* of the synod session on the anathema by Cardinal Humbert; Grumel/Darrouzès, Reg. 869, after 24 July 1054), ed. Will, p. 161, lines 16–24. For the involved translators, see *Prosopography of the Byzantine Worlds, 1025–1180* (2016 version): Kosmas 133: <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Kosmas/133/>; Anonymus 719 (Pyrros, translator): <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Anonymus/719/>; Ioannes 446: <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Ioannes/446/> (accessed 5 May 2021).

54 *Documents About the 1054 Controversy*, nr. 13 (letter from Michael Keroularios to Patriarch Peter of Antioch: Grumel/Darrouzès, Reg. 866, before 18 July 1054), ed. Will, p. 177, lines 36–178, line 8.

55 *Documents About the 1064 Controversy*, nr. 8 (short report by Cardinal Humbert), ed. Will, p. 152, lines 11–14; see Gastgeber, "Manipulative Macht", pp. 38–39. See *Prosopography of the Byzantine World 1025–1180*: Paulos 125: <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Paulos/>

Among the translators whom Keroularios (?) could order to render the anathema, the *protospatharios* Cosmas belonged to the imperial court; the Spanish monk John may have been a member of his Greek clergy, and the third person is not attributable, but was a Greek. In Antioch, a Latin letter needed a Greek translation from outside. On the whole, the course of events around 1054 and the importance of translations underline the power of manipulation by controlled translators.

8 The Latinized Imperial Chancery: The Komnenoi and Angeloi Dynasty

With the concession of a (subordinate) Latin translation of undeniable Constantinopolitan origin for Western addressees, research on the linguistic quality and mastery of Latin in the capital are finally on safe ground due to the existence of original documents from the 12th century. Some products of the chancery bear witness to enormous difficulties with the Latin language, which rather suggests a Greek translator. As already outlined and certified by the 1054 episode, the imperial chancery made use of Western native speakers as well (or even primarily?⁵⁶), at least for conversation with Western envoys. It is not surprising to find them employed for *writing* the part in the addressee's language, and, due to this need, they had to be well experienced in (calligraphic) writing of Latin too. However, the involvement of Latins for the *translation itself* seems to vary under the Komnenoi and Angeloi.

Although the first preserved imperial letters to the West sent by Alexios Komnenos seem to have been translated by a Greek rather than a Latin, as outlined above,⁵⁷ a Venetian cleric and translator called Cerbanus Cerbani⁵⁸ was active at the court of both Alexios I and John II Komnenos (with the limitation that no document translated by him is preserved). Under John's rule, however, the Byzantine attitude towards the Venetians deteriorated and Cerbanus fled from Constantinople. Filippomaria Pontani argued for the involvement of Moses (del Brolo) of Bergamo as scribe *and* translator⁵⁹ under John II

125/; Smaragdus 101: <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Smaragdus/101/> (accessed 5 May 2021).

56 See Oikonomides, "Unilinguisme", pp. 14–20.

57 See above, n. 45.

58 Brand, "Imperial Translator"; Bara "Cerbanus".

59 According to Pontani ("Mosè del Brolo") he was the scribe (and translator) of the imperial letters Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1320a (1139 to Pope Innocent II) and Reg. 1348 (1146 to Pope Eugenius III); as regards the translator, I am more inclined to differentiate between the

Komnenos, whose secretary he was. He also participated as translator in the famous dispute of Western and Greek scholars in 1136. Yet, on the whole, the translations of the letters between 1139 and 1151 do not give the impression of an advanced knowledge of Latin; a Greek translator seems more likely. Under Manuel I Komnenos, Leo Tuscus worked for the emperor,⁶⁰ but like Cerbanus (and Moses?) he too is known only from literary translations, not from a definitely attributable translated chancery document. Judging by the quality of the translation, remarkably good Latin does not appear in documents earlier than 1164: in a letter from Emperor Manuel I Komnenos to King Louis VII,⁶¹ assuming that the Latin version is really the original one and not a revised version produced in the West. Some doubt seems to be justified, since the text is preserved only as copy in a letter collection.

There is the unique case of two differing translations produced at the same time for a *chrysobullos logos* for Genoa from October 1169.⁶² Their difference may be explained by continued negotiations by the Genoese about their privileges while the official translator, *interpretes imperii*, a Latin called Gilbertus, had already been sent to the West. After successful negotiations about additional privileges, the former document seems to have been translated a second time some months later. Its linguistic level is significantly inferior to the former Gilbertus version. An explanation could thus be the absence of the “good translator” Gilbertus, causing the employment of a less experienced translator in the capital.⁶³

From another (anonymous) translator who was active in the imperial chancery between 1187 and 1193, the Latin “Anonymus 1187–1193”, some originals have been preserved which display the enormous influence of the Western Latin imperial chancery on the Latin script as well, an after effect of the Crusades.⁶⁴

1139 (and 1141) translator and the so-called “translator *id est*” of the following documents (see Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 50–148); as regards the scribe, Ronconi, “Codice Parigino Suppl. gr. 388”, endorsed Pontani’s analysis by the identification of Moses’ handwriting in interlinear translations of Greek poetic works (Cod. Parisinus Suppl. gr. 388).

60 Dondaine, “Hugues Etherien et Léon Tuscan”; an overview of Hugh is also in Hamilton, “Hugh Eteriano”; for the involvement of his brother Burgundio as a literary translator, see Classen, *Burgundio*. Hugh might be the translator of a letter Emperor Manuel I Komnenos sent to King Henry II of England in November 1176, a report on the battle of Myriokephalon against Sultan Qilij Arslan II in 1176: see Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1524. The good translation speaks for a Latin. Since Hugh was present at that time at the court, he has to be taken into account as the translator.

61 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1456a.

62 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1609.

63 See Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 180–257.

64 Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 269–333.

This influence is well documented by the translator Gerardus Alamanopulus (1192)⁶⁵ who appears to be the child of a mixed marriage between a German crusader and a Greek woman. During the period of the “Anonymus 1187–1193” a further translator, the “Anonymus 1188”, can be identified in an original Greek-Latin document; he was presumably a Latin too. In 1194, the *interpretes litterarum Latinarum* Jacob is documented as envoy to Pisa in a document, preserved in the Latin translation of secondary transmission; he seems to have been responsible for the translation as well.⁶⁶ At the end of Angeleoi rule the situation changed radically: by analysing respective documents two translators have been differentiated, active in the years 1198–99 and 1199–1201, respectively.⁶⁷ Both, however, could not meet the level of their former Latin colleagues, and seem to have been native Greek speakers.

9 A Special Case: Accentuated Latin Translations (1139, 1146)

Two rare Greek-Latin originals, calligraphic masterpieces of imperial letter writing, dating from June 1139 (Emperor John II Komnenos to Pope Innocent II) and August 1146 (Manuel I Komnenos to Pope Eugenius III)⁶⁸ are unique for their use of Greek accents (acute, gravis, circumflex) in the Latin translation. The Greek accents are set according to Latin pronunciation and length of vowels.⁶⁹ In John II's letter they are used in the text, in that of Manuel I they only occur in the address on the backside of the document; in the 1139 letter the Latin translation of the address was forgotten. Between these two originals another scribe wrote the letter from Emperor John II Komnenos to Pope Innocent II (in 1141),⁷⁰ which, however, does not display any accent in the Latin version. The scribe of the two Latin versions of 1139 und 1146 is identified as Moses of Bergamo, according to Filippomaria Pontani and Filippo Ronconi.⁷¹

65 He was responsible for the documents Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1610 (1192), 1612 (1192) and a *practicum traditionis* (1192), all for Pisa; see Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 350–81.

66 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1618; see Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 382–88.

67 “Translator 1198–1199”: Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1647 (for Venice), 1648 (for Pope Innocent); “Translator 1199–1201”: Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1649 and a *practicum traditionis*, both documents for Genoa; see Gastgeber, *Übersetzungsabteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 389–408 and 409–68.

68 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1320a, 1348. New critical edition of the letter from Emperor John II Komnenos to Pope Innocent II is in *Auslandsschreiben*, nr. 4, eds. Kresten/Müller, pp. 422–29.

69 See table xvii in Kresten/Müller, “Auslandsschreiben”.

70 April 1141 (Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1320b).

71 See note 59.

A first way of interpreting this (Greek oriented) accentuation might be that it was intended to support the Byzantine envoys for public reading; in the case of the complete accentuation of the 1139 letter, this would provide a unique hint as to how a letter was presented to the addressee.⁷² Two arguments, however, contradict this interpretation. Firstly, the 1139 letter also displays a lot of typical Latin abbreviations. If a Greek, not accustomed to read Latin, had to be aided at a public reading by accentuation marks (including the differentiation of long or short vowels), it is unimaginable that he could master all the abbreviations. Secondly, this mode of presentation would contradict the way a letter was handed over to the addressee, as is recorded in some sources. A letter had to be handed over as a closed document (maybe even artificially wrapped⁷³), but if the envoy first read the letter he himself had to open it. Equally, such public reading performed by an envoy is not documented in literary sources. By pure chance, a *commonitorium* of Pope John VIII to his envoys, the bishops Paul of Ancona and Eugenius of Ostia, from August 879, is extant (in Greek). In this document⁷⁴ the pope instructs them about their first encounter with the emperor: They are not allowed to *hand over* (δοῦναι) the letter to anyone else before the official encounter with the emperor. When they approach the emperor, they have to *hand over* (παράσχετε) the letter and express some salutation phrases. If the emperor wants to be informed about the content of the letter before reading it (sc. himself), the envoys are instructed to answer: "If your Majesty orders this, take a look at the letter". If, however, he insists on being informed by the envoys themselves, they should not read the letter, but summarize the content very generally (i.e. salutations and words about the Churches' peace). From these instructions it appears that the unique accentuation of the Latin documents is an artificial ornament employed by the scribe Moses, a kind of quirk, to embellish the text and to display scholarship, and is not a reading aid for Greek envoys.

10 The Patriarchal Chancery: Evidence of Latin Translation

Due to the state of the extant sources, the focus of this linguistic analysis has been laid on the imperial chancery and its output. From the other big chancery of the capital, that of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, only one

72 This is the interpretation by Kresten/Müller, *Auslandsschreiben*, p. 423 ("Betonungshilfe").

73 See the mention of a silver casket in the letter from the emperors Constantine VII and Romanos II to Caliph 'Abdarrāḥmān III b. Muḥammad an-Nāṣir in Cordoba (about early 948, cf. Dölger/Müller/Beihammer, *Reg.* 657; Kresten, "Chrysographie", p. 166).

74 Editions: John VIII (Pope), *Commonitorium*, ed. Boöjamra, pp. 8–10; ed. Caspar, pp. 188–90 (no. 211a); see in detail Drocourt, "Place"; id., *Diplomatie*, vol. 1, pp. 293–300.

Latin translation from the last days of the Angeloi can be taken into consideration: a letter from Patriarch John x Kamateros to Pope Innocent III from February 1199.⁷⁵ Surprisingly, the linguistic analysis of this document reveals that the same translator worked in the imperial chancery at this time and that he was also responsible for a letter from Emperor Alexios III Angelos to the same pope bearing the same date.⁷⁶ This coincidence may result from a lack of translators in the patriarchal chancery, but, with regard to the emperor's monitoring of the activity in the patriarchate, it is quite reasonable to assume that the emperor wished to control the patriarch's written correspondence with the West. A patriarch at that time (Georgios II Xiphilinos) even had to accept that a letter on his behalf was drafted by the emperor's *logothetes* of the drome.⁷⁷ This example indicates that the drafting and translating of a patriarchal letter could have been, and indeed was in this case, supervised by the imperial chancery, at least in politically critical times.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alexius I Komnenos (Emperor), *Letter to Abbot Oderisius I de Marsis of Montecassino*, ed. C. Gastgeber, "The Byzantine Emperor Addressing his Addressee", pp. 100–01.
- Arethas, *Scripta minora*, ed. L.G. Westerink, *Arethae archiepiscopi Caesariensis scripta minora*, vol. 1, Leipzig 1968.
- Auslandsschreiben*, eds. O. Kresten/A.E. Müller, "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Specimen einer kritischen Ausgabe", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86/87 (1993/94 [1994]), 402–29.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, eds. G. Dagron/D. Feissel/B. Flusin/C. Zuckerman/M. Stavrou, *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des cérémonies* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 52/3), vol. 3/2, Paris 2020.
- Documents About the 1054 Controversy*, ed. C. Will, *Acta et Scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant*, Leipzig-Marburg 1861.
- John VIII (Pope), *Commonitorium*, ed. J.L. Boojamra, "The Photian Synod of 879–880 and the Papal Commonitorium (879)", *Byzantine Studies* 9 (1982), 8–10; ed. E. Caspar, "Registrum Iohannis VIII. papae" (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae, 7, Karolini aevi, 5), Berlin 1928, pp. 188–91.

75 Grumel/Darrouzès, Reg. 1194; critical edition of both versions: John X. Camaterus, *Letter to Pope Innocent III*, ed. Gastgeber, pp. 118–26; see also the commentary by Gastgeber, "Beobachtungen I"; id. "Beobachtungen II".

76 Dölger/Wirth, Reg. 1648.

77 Grumel/Darrouzès, Reg. 1183. See Gastgeber, "Good Guy".

- John x Camateros (Patriarch), *Letter to Pope Innocent III*, ed. Ch. Gastgeber, "Sprachliche und übersetzungstechnische Beobachtungen ... I", pp. 118–26.
- Leo IX (Pope), *Letter to Patriarch Peter of Antioch*, ed. A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios. Quellen und Studien zum Schisma des XI. Jahrhunderts*, Paderborn 1930, vol. 2, pp. 458–75.
- Liutprand of Cremona, *Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liutprandi Cremonensis opera omnia* (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 156), Turnhout 1998, pp. 197–218.
- Nicolaus I (Pope) *Letters*, ed. E. Perels, *Epistolae Karolini aevi* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae, 6, Karolini aevi, 4), Berlin 1925, vol. 4, pp. 257–690.
- Theodore Laskaris, *Sermo secundus contra Latinos de processione spiritus sancti* (= *sermo septimus de theologia christiana*), ed. Ch. Th. Krikones, *Θεοδώρου Β' Λασκάρεως περί χριστιανικῆς θεολογίας λόγοι* (Analekta Vlatadon, 49), Thessaloniki 1988, pp. 137–48.
- Toscan Documents*, ed. G. Müller, *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'Oriente cristiano e coi Turchi fino all'anno MDXXXI*, Florence 1879.

Secondary Literature

- Aerts, W.J., "The Monza Vocabulary", in W.F. Bakker et al. (eds.), *Studia Byzantina et Neohellenica Neerlandica* (Byzantina Neerlandica, 3), Leiden 1972, pp. 36–73.
- Aerts, W.J., "The Knowledge of Greek in Western Europe at the Time of Theophano and the Greek Grammar Fragment in ms. Vindob. 114", in V.D. van Aalst/K.N. Ciggaar (eds.), *Byzantium and the Low Countries in the Tenth Century: Aspects of Art and History in the Ottonian Era*, Hernen 1985, pp. 78–103.
- Aerts, W.J., "The Latin-Greek Wordlist in Ms 236 of the Municipal Library of Avranches, fol. 97^v", *Anglo-Norman Studies* 9 (1986), 64–69.
- Aerts, W.J., "Froumund's Greek: an Analysis of fol. 12^v of the Codex Vindobonensis Graecus 114, Followed by a Comparison with a Latin-Greek Wordlist in MS 179 Auxerre fol. 137^v ff [sic]", in A. Davids (ed.), *The Empress Theophano. Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, Cambridge 1995, pp. 194–210.
- Balard, M., "Amalfi et Byzance (X^e–XII^e ss.)", *Travaux et Mémoires* 6 (1976), 85–95.
- Bara, P., "Egy velencei a Magyar Királyságban? Cerbanus Cerbano és biográfiája", *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. acta historica* 144 (2019), 25–41, URL: <http://acta.bibl.u-szeged.hu/66963/> (accessed 5 May 2021).
- Berschin, W., "Griechisches bei den Iren", in H. Löwe (ed.), *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1982, vol. 1, pp. 501–10.
- Berschin, W., "Greek Elements in Medieval Latin Manuscripts", in Herren (ed.), *Nectar*, pp. 85–103.
- Berschin, W., *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter. Von Hieronymus zu Nikolaus von Kues*, Bern 1980; English translation by Jerold C. Frakes: *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*, Washington 1988.

- Bianchi, G., "Il patriarca di Grado Domenico Marango tra Roma e l'Oriente", *Studi Veneziani* 8 (1966), 19–125.
- Bischoff, B., "Das griechische Element in der abendländischen Bildung des Mittelalters", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 44 (1951), 27–55, repr. in id., *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, Stuttgart 1967, vol. 2, pp. 246–75.
- Bischoff, B./Beck, H.-G., "Das italienisch-griechische Glossar der Handschrift e 14 (127) der Biblioteca Capitolare in Monza", in H. Bihler/H. Rheinfelder/A. Noyer-Weidner (eds.), *Medium Aevum Romanicum, Festschrift für Hans Rheinfelder*, Munich 1963, pp. 49–62.
- Bloch, H., "Monte Cassino, Byzantium and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages (885–1112)", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 3 (1946), 163–224.
- Boulhol, P., *La Connaissance de la langue grecque dans la France médiévale (VI^e–XV^e s.)*, Aix-en-Provence 2008.
- Brand, C.M., "An Imperial Translator at the Comnenian Court", *Byzantinoslavica* 59 (1998), 217–21.
- Bréhier, L., *Le Monde byzantin*, vol. 2: *Les Institutions de l'Empire byzantin*, 2nd ed., Paris 1970.
- Chiesa, P., "Le traduzioni dal greco: l'evoluzione della scuola napoletana nel X secolo", *Mittelaltinisches Jahrbuch* 24/25 (1989/90), 67–86.
- Chiesa, P., "Le traduzioni", in G. Cavallo/C. Leonardi/E. Menestò (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo*, part 1: *Il medioevo latino*, vol. 3: *La ricezione del testo*, Rome 1995, pp. 165–96.
- Chiesa, P., "Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell'alto medioevo", in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente* (Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 49), Spoleto 2002, pp. 455–92.
- Chiesa, P./Dolbeau, F., "Una traduzione amalfitana dell'XI secolo: la Vita latina di sant'Epifanio", *Studi Medievali*, 3rd series, 30 (1989), 909–51.
- Ciggaar, K., "Bilingual Word Lists and Phrase Lists: for Teaching or for Travelling", in R. Macrides (ed.), *Travel in the Byzantine World. Papers from the Thirty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, April 2000* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Publications, 10), Aldershot 2002, pp. 165–78.
- Classen, P., *Burgundio von Pisa. Richter, Gesandter, Übersetzer* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Jg. 1974, Abh. 4), Heidelberg 1974.
- Dagron, G., "Communications et stratégies linguistiques", in N.G. Moschonas (ed.), *Ἡ ἐπικοινωνία στὸ Βυζάντιο. Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Β' Διεθνoῦς Συμποσίου τοῦ Κέντρου Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν*, Athens 1993, pp. 81–92.
- Dagron G., "Formes et fonctions du pluralisme linguistique à Byzance (IX^e–XII^e siècle)", *Travaux et Mémoires* 12 (1994), 219–40.

- Dionisotti, A.C., "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe", in Herren (ed.), *Nectar*, pp. 1–56.
- Dölger, F./Müller, A.E./Beihammer, A., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 1/2: *Regesten von 867–1025*, 2nd ed., Munich 2003 (quoted by reg.).
- Dölger, F./Wirth, P., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 2: *Regesten von 1025–1204*, 2nd ed., Munich 1995 (quoted by reg.).
- Dondaine, A., "Hugues Ethérien et Léon Toscan", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 27 (1952), 67–134.
- Drocourt, N., "Existe-t-il des signes distinctifs d'une culture d'ambassadeur dans le cas des contacts avec le monde byzantin (VIII^e–XI^e siècle)?" in F. Bougard/R. Le Jan/R. McKitterick (eds.), *La culture du haut Moyen Âge, une question d'élites ?*, Turnhout 2009, pp. 277–302.
- Drocourt, N., "La Place de l'écrit dans les contacts diplomatiques du haut Moyen Âge. Le cas des relations entre Byzance et ses voisins (de la fin du VII^e siècle à 1204)", in *L'Autorité de l'écrit au Moyen Âge (Orient-Occident). Actes du XXXIX^e Congrès de la SHMESP*, Paris 2009, pp. 25–43.
- Drocourt, N., *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore. Les ambassadeurs étrangers dans l'empire byzantin des années 640 à 1204* (Association pour la Promotion de l'Histoire et de l'Archéologie Orientales, Université de Liège, mémoires, 11), 2 vols., Louvain-Paris-Bristol 2015.
- Drocourt, N., "Une diplomatie sans langue ? La question des échanges linguistiques dans la diplomatie médio-byzantine", in D. Couto/S. Péquignot (eds.), *Les langues de la négociation. Approches historiennes*, Rennes 2017, pp. 25–61.
- Ekonomou, A.J., *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes. Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590–752*, Lanham 2007.
- Falkenhausen, von V., "Gli Amalfitani nell'Impero bizantino", in E.W. Farrugia (ed.), *Amalfi and Byzantium. Acts of the International Symposium on the Eighth Centenary of the Translation of the Relics of St Andrew the Apostle from Constantinople to Amalfi (1208–2008)*, Rome 2010, pp. 17–44.
- Frakes, J.C., "Griechisches im frühmittelalterlichen St. Gallen: ein methodologischer Beitrag zu Notker Labeos Griechischkenntnissen", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 106 (1987), 25–34.
- Gardthausen, V., "Die griechische Schrift des Mittelalters im Westen Europas", *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* 8 (1929/30), 114–35.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Sprachliche und übersetzungstechnische Beobachtungen zu dem in den Kanzleiregistern Papst Innocenz' III. überlieferten Schreiben des Patriarchen Ioannes X. Kamateros von Konstantinopel: I. Einführung. Besonderheiten der Übersetzung. Bibelzitate. Edition", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 38 (1996), 85–127.

- Gastgeber, Ch., "Sprachliche und übersetzungstechnische Beobachtungen zu dem in den Kanzleiregistern Papst Innocenz' III. überlieferten Schreiben des Patriarchen Ioannes X. Kamateros von Konstantinopel: II. Wortuntersuchung mit sieben Appendices", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 39 (1997), 83–161.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Das Schreiben Kaiser Ioannes' II. Komnenos an König Konrad III. in der Überlieferung bei Otto von Freising", in C. Scholz/G. Makris (eds.), *Πολύπλευρος Νοῦς. Miscellanea für Peter Schreiner zu seinem 60. Geburtstag* (Byzantinisches Archiv, 19), Munich-Leipzig 2000, pp. 17–36.
- Gastgeber, Ch., *Die lateinische "Übersetzungsabteilung" der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei unter den Komnenen und Angeloi* (Ph.D thesis, University of Vienna), 3 vols., Vienna 2001.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Die unpersönliche kaiserliche Selbstbezeichnung. Entwicklung und Wandlung", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 45 (2003), 117–48.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei unter den Komnenen und Angeloi", in M. Balard/E. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur*, Paris 2005, pp. 105–22.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Good Guy – Bad Guy: Zum Rollenspiel von Kaiser und Patriarch am Vorabend des 4. Kreuzzuges", *Transylvanian Review* 19, Supplement 2: *Worlds in Change II: Transforming East-Central Europe* (2010), 673–710.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Kaiserliche Schreiben des 9. Jahrhunderts in den Westen. Neue Aspekte der Übersetzungsfrage und der materiellen Ausstattung", in id. (ed.), *Quellen zur byzantinischen Rechtspraxis. Aspekte der Textüberlieferung, Paläographie und Diplomatik, Akten des internationalen Symposiums, Wien, 5.–7. 11. 2007* (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 25), Vienna 2010, pp. 89–106.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Schreiben der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei in der Kreuzzugsgeschichte des Wilhelm von Tyrus. Zur Authentizitätsfrage", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 63 (2013), 91–106.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "The Byzantine Emperor Addressing his Addressee, Variants of Closeness and Distance in Diplomatic Communication: A Letter to the Abbot of Monte Cassino", *Initial* 2 (2014), 79–105.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Die manipulative Macht der Übersetzung: Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Patriarch Michael Kerullarius und Kardinal Humbert von 1054 im Spiegel der bewussten Inhaltsverfälschung", in E. Juhász (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland II. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia* (Bibliotheca Byzantina, 2), Budapest 2014, pp. 29–44.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Das Dossier der documenta byzantina des 2. Konzils von Lyon (1274). Ein bislang unbekannter Rotulus aus dem Umfeld eines Konzilsteilnehmers, des Salzburger Erzbischofs Friedrich von Walchen", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 65 (2015), 13–66.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "The So-Called Schism of 1054 and its Impact on Byzantine Society", in B. Crostini/G. Peers (eds.), *A Book of Psalms from Eleventh-Century Byzantium: The*

- Complex of Texts and Images in Vat. gr. 752* (Studi e Testi, 504), Vatican City 2016, pp. 193–228.
- Gastgeber, Ch., “The Byzantine Imperial Chancery and its Language Policy from Justin II to Leo III (Sixth–Eighth Centuries): From Latin to Greek”, *Medieval Worlds* 11 (2020), 17–59, URL: 10.1553/medievalworlds_n011_2020s17 (accessed 5 May 2021).
- Grumel, V./Darrouzès, J., *Les registes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1: *Les actes des patriarches*, fascs 2 and 3: *Les registes de 715 à 1206*, Paris 1989 (quoted by reg.).
- Guilland, R. “Le grand interprète”, *Epeteris Hetaireias Byzantinon Spoudon* (Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν) 36 (1968), 17–26, repr. in id., *Titres et fonctions de l'empire byzantin* (Variorum collected studies, 50), London 1976, no. 20.
- Hamilton, J., “Hugh Eteriano. Life and Writing”, in B. Hamilton/J. Hamilton/S. Hamilton (eds.), *Hugh Eteriano. Contra Patarenos*, Leiden-Boston 2004, pp. 109–53.
- Haskins C.H./Lockwood, D.P., “The Sicilian Translators of the Twelfth Century and the First Latin Version of Ptolemy’s *Almagest*”, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 21 (1910), 75–102.
- Herren, M.W., “Evidence for ‘Vulgar Greek’ from Early Medieval Latin Texts and Manuscripts”, in id. (ed.), *Nectar*, pp. 57–84.
- Herren, M.W. (ed.), *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages* (King’s College London Medieval Studies, 2), London 1988.
- Hofmeister, A., “Der Übersetzer Johannes und das Geschlecht Comititis Mauronis in Amalfi”, *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* 27 (1932), 225–84, 493–508.
- Janin, R., “Les sanctuaires des colonies latines à Constantinople”, *Revue des Études Byzantines* 4 (1946), 163–77.
- Janin, R., *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, part 1: *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, vol. 3: *Les églises et les monastères*, 2nd ed., Paris 1969.
- Jeaneau E., “Jean Scot Erigène et le grec”, *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (*Bulletin Du Cange*) 41 (1977/78), 5–50.
- Jeffreys E./Jeffreys M., “The ‘Wild Beast from the West’: Immediate Literary Reactions in Byzantium to the Second Crusade”, in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington D.C. 2011, pp. 101–16.
- Kaczynski, B.M., “Greek Glosses on Jerome’s Ep. CVI. ad Sunniam et Fretelam, in E.Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, MS Phillipps 1674”, in Herren (ed.), *Nectar*, pp. 215–27.
- Koder, J./Weber, Th., *Liutprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel. Untersuchungen zum griechischen Sprachschatz und zu realienkundlichen Aussagen in seinen Werken* (Byzantina Vindobonensia, 13), Vienna 1980.

- Kolbaba, T., *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins*, Illinois 2000.
- Krause, W., "Das Fragment einer griechischen Grammatik des Cod. Vindob. 114 und das griech.-lat. Glossar der St. Pauler Handschrift XXV D/65", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 5 (1956), 7–25.
- Kresten O., "Zur Datierung des kaiserlichen Sigillion Dölger, Reg. 555, für Monte Cassino: Konstantinos VII. (951) und nicht Leon VI. (891/911)", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 31 (1989), 53–73.
- Kresten, O., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser der Komnenenzeit. Die literarische Überlieferung bei Anna Komnene und Ioannes Kinnamos. Mit einem Exkurs: Zur Chronologie der Auslandsschreiben Dölger-Wirth, Reg. 1068, 1077, 1080 und 1114", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 39 (1997), 21–59.
- Kresten, O., "Zur Chrysographie in den Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 40 (1998), 139–86.
- Kresten O./Müller A.E., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Specimen einer kritischen Ausgabe", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86/87 (1993/94 [1994]), 402–29.
- Kresten, O./Seibt, W., "Theopyhlaktos Exubitos (kein ‚italienischer Rebell des späten 10. Jahrhunderts‘, sondern *megas diermeneutes* unter Kaiser Manuel I. Komnenos) und seine Siegel", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 52 (2002), 231–41.
- Lemerle, P., "Les archives du monastère des Amalfitains au Mont Athos", *Epeteris Hetaireias Byzantinon Spoudon* (Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν) 23 (1953), 548–66.
- Leonardi, C., "Anastasio Bibliotecario e le traduzioni dal greco nella Roma altomedievale", in Herren (ed.), *Nectar*, pp. 277–96.
- Mansion, A., "Disparition graduelle des mots grecs dans les traductions médiévales d'Aristote", in *Mélanges Joseph de Ghellinck*, Louvain 1951, vol. 2, pp. 631–45.
- Martin, M.E., "The Venetians in the Byzantine Empire before 1204", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 13 (1988), 201–14.
- Moran, P., "‘A Living Speech’? The Pronunciation of Greek in Early Medieval Ireland", *Ériu* 61 (2011), 29–57.
- Moran, P., "Greek in Early Medieval Ireland", in A. Mullen/P. James (eds.), *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 172–92.
- Moran, P., "Greek Dialectology and the Irish Origin Story", in P. Moran/I. Warntjes (eds.), *Early Medieval Ireland and Europe; Chronology, Contacts, Scholarship* (Studia Traditionis Theologiae, 14), Turnhout 2015, pp. 481–512.
- Nicol, D., *Byzantium and Venice. A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relation*, Cambridge 1988.
- Noble, T.F.X., "The Declining Knowledge of Greek in Eighth- and Ninth-Century Papal Rome", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 78 (1985), 56–62.

- Oikonomides, N., "L'Unilinguisme" officiel de Constantinople byzantine (VI^e–XII^e siècle), *Symmeikta* 13 (1999), 9–22.
- Otten-Froux, C., "L'enregistrement du chrysobulle de 1192 aux Pisans", *Revue des Études Byzantines* 42 (1984), 241–48.
- Parlangeli, O., "Il glossario monzese", *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana*, n.s. 15 (1965/66), 241–69.
- Pertusi, A., "Monasteri e monachi italiani all'Athos nell'alto medioevo", in *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1963. Études et mélanges*, Chevetogne 1963, vol. 1, pp. 217–51.
- Pontani, F., "Mosè del Brolo e la sua lettera da Costantinopoli", *Aevum* 72 (1998), 143–75.
- Prosopography of the Byzantine Worlds, 1025–1180* (2016 version, by M. Jeffreys/E. Hall/C. Roueché), URL: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/> (accessed 5 May 2021).
- Riché, P., "Le grec dans les centres de culture d'Occident", in Herren (ed.), *Nectar*, pp. 143–68.
- Riedinger, R., "Griechische Konzilsakten auf dem Wege ins lateinische Mittelalter", *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 9 (1977), 253–301.
- Ronconi, F., "Il codice Parigino Suppl. gr. 388 e Mosè del Brolo da Bergamo", *Italia Medievale e Umanistica* 47 (2006), 1–27.
- Sabatini, F., "Il glossario di Monza. Il testo, la localizzazione, il compilatore", *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* 98 (1963/64), 51–84.
- Sansterre, J.-M., *Les Moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VI^es.–fin du IX^es.)*, 2 vols., Brussels 1983.
- Schreiner, P., "Zur griechischen Schrift im hochmittelalterlichen Westen: Der Kreis um Liudprand von Cremona", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 45 (2003), 305–17.
- Skinner, P., *Amalfi and its Diaspora*, Oxford 2013.
- Stotz, P., *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, vol. 4: *Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 2,5,4), Munich 1998.
- Weiss, R., "Lo studio del greco all'abbazia di San Dionigi durante il Medioevo", *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 6 (1952), 426–38; repr. in id., *Medieval and Humanist Greek*, Padua 1977, pp. 44–59.
- Wiotte-Franz, C., *Hermeneus und Interpres. Zum Dolmetscherwesen in der Antike* (Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und Alten Geschichte, 16), Saarbrücken 2001.
- Wirth, P., "Zur Frage der Herstellungskosten eines byzantinischen Chrysobulls", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 42 (1992), 209–12.

PART 2

*The Two Empires and Italy: Political and
Ecclesiastical Relations*



Byzantine-Western Relations in the Political and Ecclesiastical Spheres in Later Carolingian Times

Klaus Herbers

In the following,¹ the late Carolingian period is defined as the time from the Treaty of Verdun (843) to the last East Frankish Carolingian king, Louis the Child (900–11). On the Byzantine side, this is equivalent to the period from the rule of Michael III (842–67) to that of Leon VI (886–912). From an ecclesiastical perspective, it encompasses the pontificates of Sergius II (844–47) to Sergius III (904–11), as well as the patriarchates of Methodios I (843–47) to Euthymios I Syncellus (907–12) and the emperors Louis II (850–75), Louis the Blind (901–05), and Berengar of Friuli (915–24). Although the major themes of contact and conflict (especially with Rome) carried on late antique and early medieval traditions, multiple issues held sway: the so-called “two-emperor problem” (*Zweikaiserproblem*) created by Charlemagne’s imperial coronation, the iconoclastic controversy’s conclusion, the Photian schism, and the related dispute over Bulgaria.

1 The Two-Emperor Problem and the Iconoclastic Controversy’s Conclusion: Saracen Danger in Italy

The 8th-century controversy over icons and their worship or veneration did not reach any kind of closure until the Second Council of Nicaea (787), but

1 The most important editions concerning the councils alluded or referred to in this contribution are the following ones: *Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 843–859*, ed. W. Hartmann, (MGH Concilia, 3), Hannover 1984; *Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 860–874*, ed. W. Hartmann (MGH Concilia, 4), Hannover 1998; *Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 875–911*, ed. W. Hartmann/I. Schröder/G. Schmitz (MGH Concilia, 5), Hannover 2012. Papal letters concerning the Photian Schism have been edited by E. Perels: “Nicolai I. papae epistolae” and “Hadriani II. papae epistolae” in *Epistolae Karolini aevi IV* (MGH Epistolae, 6), Berlin 1925, pp. 257–765; see also “Epistolae ad res orientales spectantes”, ed. E. Caspar/I. Laehr, in *Epistolae Karolini Aevi V* (MGH Epistolae, 7), Berlin 1928 (reprint 1993), pp. 371–84; and *Papal Letters*, ed. Herbers/Unger. Due to the limited space I will cite the recent “Papstregesten” (*Regesta Imperii*) which contain precise indications of sources and editions.

continued to be discussed in the West in the *Libri Carolini* and at the Council of Frankfurt (794).² The repercussions of this carried over into the 9th century: an 809 council in Aachen negotiated whether the term *filioque* should be part of the Creed, and the results were subsequently discussed in Rome.³ The aftermath of these consultations can be seen, for example in Pope Leo IV's (847–55) stipulations, or the decisions made in regards to the Theopaschite Controversy of 861,⁴ which centred around whether Jesus Christ suffered as God or as Man. Other backdrops to these theological questions only contingently influenced the relationship between East and West.

The two-emperor problem remained virulent on the secular level, as uncertainties and demarcations persisted, despite the compromise that followed Charlemagne's imperial coronation in 800. Even the titles given to dignitaries reveal this. The dispute over the title *Serenissimus Augustus a deo coronatus magnus, pacificus, imperator romanum gubernans imperium, qui et per misericordiam dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum* was concluded in 812 by agreeing that Charles would forgo the addition that marked his dignity as "Emperor of the Romans", while the Byzantine ruler Michael I laid claim to the title *Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων* (*Basileus tôn Rhōmaion*), that is, "Emperor of the Romans," himself.⁵

The repercussions of this quarrel can be seen particularly clearly in the letter Louis II sent to Byzantium in 871,⁶ exacerbated by a conflict in southern Italy, where Louis II fought against the Saracens, sometimes with and sometimes without Greek support. The Saracens had repeatedly raided and conquered the Apennine peninsula since the beginning of the 9th century.⁷ The imperial letter illustrates several features: first, Louis II was attempting to improve relations between the "imperial houses" through matrimonial projects, although he ultimately failed to do so. Second, the letter is concerned with the question

2 Cf. Thümmel, *Konzilien zur Bilderfrage*, esp. pp. 215–30; Brubaker/Haldon, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era c. 680–850*; Brandes, "Byzantinischer Bilderstreit, das Papsttum und die Pippinsche Schenkung" (with bibliography). See the different contributions in Brandes/Hasse-ungeheuer/Leppin (eds.), *Konzilien und kanonisches Recht*.

3 *Council of Aachen*, ed. Willjung; Herbers, "Ost und West um das Jahr 800", pp. 48–49; Herbers, "Geistige oder geistliche Führung", esp. pp. 131–34.

4 See Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, nos. 540 and 778.

5 On the so-called "Treaty of Aachen", the question of its content and related research traditions, see now Ančić, "The Treaty of Aachen", esp. pp. 25, 30–34.

6 Böhmer/Zielinski, *Regesta Imperii* I 3, 1, no. 325; Herbers, *Europa: Christen und Muslime*, pp. 46, 49. The letter only survives inserted in the Chronicle of Salerno, see *Chonicon Salernitanum*, ed. U. Westerbergh (Studia Latina Stockholmensia, 3), Stockholm 1956, pp. 107–21.

7 See the contributions in Wolf/Herbers (eds.), *Southern Italy*, esp. Di Branco, "Strategie di penetrazione islamica".

of the Saracen danger threatening southern and mid-Italy, which affected both sides. Related to this was Byzantium and the “Western Roman Empire’s” position in the Italian sphere. The letter was presumably written or stylized by Anastasius, the Roman Church’s librarian.⁸ He was one of the dwindling number of people in Rome and Italy with knowledge of the Greek language, who thereby became bridge-builders and the constructors of diplomatic contacts for both the emperors and the popes.

As Louis II mainly operated in Italy, people such as Archbishop Hincmar of Reims in his *Annales Bertiniani* called him “*imperator Italiae*.”⁹ Louis’s Carolingian successors who bore the title of *imperator* from Charles the Bald (emperor from 875 to his death in 877) up to the East-Frankish ruler Arnulf (887–99, crowned emperor in 896) held sovereignty over Italy merely in addition to their duties north of the Alps. Overall, the emperors’ direct contacts with Byzantium were rather restricted after Louis II’s death in 875.¹⁰ Yet the Saracen danger and the defence against it¹¹ also heavily concerned Byzantine interests in southern Italy. The reconquest of Bari (871) was not the only milestone; various letters from as early as the time of Pope Leo III (795–816) were already reporting on this danger.¹² The mentioned imperial letter of Louis II offers a partisan snapshot, but one that perhaps approximates the images of south-Italian historiographers writing in Latin, for they too sometimes turned their pens against Saracens and Greeks alike, as Erchempert’s history of the Langobards or the Chronicle of Salerno make clear. Both sources mention killings, captures, pillaging, and depopulation in Calabria, Benevento, and Salerno.¹³

The historiographical sources offer similar reports of Bari’s conquest, as can for example be seen in the writings of Erchempert from the monastery of Montecassino. He spoke negatively of Saracens and Greeks alike. Just how much he had his own social structures in mind can be seen by the fact that he repeatedly referred to the leader of the Saracen forces, or emirates, as *rex*.¹⁴ The judgements in the *Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis* do not

8 Concerning Greek influences in the papal administration from 680 to 830, see Winterhager, *Migranten und Stadtgesellschaft im frühmittelalterlichen Rom*.

9 See Zimmermann, “*Imperatores Italiae*”.

10 Hiestand, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum*, pp. 19–82.

11 Cf. Böhmer/Zielinski, *Regesta Imperii* I 3, 1, esp. no. 46; Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, nos. 59, 60. Concerning Bari, see Di Branco, “Strategie di penetrazione islamica”; see also the other contributions in Wolf/Herbers, *Southern Italy*.

12 *Papal Letters*, ed. Herbers/Unger, nos. 1–4, pp. 42–61.

13 Herbers, *Europa: Christen und Muslime*, pp. 49–50 with precise references.

14 *Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis*, ed. G. Waitz (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum), Hannover 1878, cap. 18, p. 477; cf. Herbers, *Europa: Christen und Muslime*, p. 50, n. 183.

differ significantly. A direct insight into Sicily's situation after the warlike alterations is provided by the, admittedly fragmentary, letter of a certain monk Theodosius (*monachus*).¹⁵ His testimony, preserved only in a Latin version, conveys a viewpoint that at least appears to have been formed under the immediate impression of the events surrounding the conquest of Syracuse in Sicily, in 878. The writer draws clear Old-Testament parallels as he relates as to the siege's hardship: he himself, he writes, had been praying with the bishops in the cathedral, but they had been cornered at the holy altar. The conqueror came from a noble family and had even given his name, but all of the ecclesiastical treasures were plundered: precious metals weighing in at 5000 pounds. The writer continues with descriptions of imprisonment and their transport to Palermo, where a religious dialogue supposedly took place between the emir and the bishop, but one which ultimately – because the conquerors followed false teachings – led to renewed imprisonment. During his imprisonment, he met Christians from other lands; Theodosius names Ethiopians, Tarsians, Jews, and Lombards as well as “our Christians” from various areas. The letter concludes with comments on the Paschal feast and a prayer of supplication for an end to the imprisonment.

Although older research has taken certain polemic statements in this and comparable testimonies very literally, we can only be certain that the political *mélange* in southern Italy by no means evidences solid front lines. At any rate, Byzantium was continuously involved in these conflicts, sometimes through independent territories, such as Capua, Salerno, and Naples.

2 The Photian Schism and the Conflict over Bulgaria

The so-called Photian Schism also played into the relationships of the secular powers. A political shift in 856 in Byzantium brought Bardas, an uncle of Emperor Michael III (842–67) to power. Patriarch Ignatios (847–58/61 and 867–77), a member of the rigorist monastic party who previously had enjoyed political favour at court, resigned after several clashes with Bardas. The learned Photios (858–67, 877–86)¹⁶ took his place, but he was raised from layman to patriarch in defiance of canonically prescribed regulations. From 860 onwards, when Byzantine envoys appeared in Rome with Photios's *synodica*, this led to

15 See my interpretation in Herbers, *Europa: Christen und Muslime*, pp. 50–52.

16 On him, see Hergenröther, *Photius. Patriarch von Konstantinopel*; Stratoudaki White, *Patriarch Photios of Constantinople*. His letters have been published in Photios, *Epistolae et Amphilochia*, eds. B. Laourdas/L.G. Westerink, 3 vols, Leipzig 1983–85.

a long-lasting conflict with Pope Nicholas I (858–67) whose position was later upheld by Hadrian II (867–72).¹⁷ Supporters of the Ignatian party may have influenced Nicholas I's decision to strip Patriarch Photios of all his ecclesiastical dignities at a synod in 863 and to confirm Ignatios as patriarch. Emperor Michael sent a sharply worded, polemical letter to the pope rejecting these Roman decisions.¹⁸

The conflict between Rome and Byzantium surrounding the mission in Bulgaria heightened existing tensions. The Bulgarian ruler Boris was baptized in Constantinople in 864, and Greek missionaries were active in his realm. Against this background, Boris asked for a Roman missionary delegation in 866, possibly to free himself from his reliance on Byzantium. Nicholas wrote a missive in which he answered the Bulgarian's questions and also commented on Greek customs. This 106-chapter encyclical is particularly interesting because it responds to a letter with corresponding inquiries and thus offers an insight into the theological and liturgical practices common to the Greek-Byzantine church.¹⁹ But the negotiations were also accompanied by questions about the ecclesiastical structure, as Boris was presumably envisioning an autocephalous ecclesiastical structure. However, Pope Nicholas denied the request that he deploy one of the acting missionaries, Bishop Formosus of Porto (864–76, 883–91), to serve as archbishop in Bulgaria, as Formosus was already acting as a bishop and the episcopal translation proscription prohibited him from taking on this office.²⁰

Almost simultaneously, in the autumn of 867, after he had heard of the Greeks' complaints about Roman customs in Bulgaria, Nicholas called for a council of the Western Church, and he also invited the Frankish clergy to compose theological dispute/defence writings. This probably contributed to Photios's decision to depose and excommunicate Pope Nicholas I at a synod held in Constantinople in the late summer of 867.²¹ The subsequent murder of Emperor Michael III and transition of power to Basil I (867–86), however, deprived Photios of his chief backer and caused his immediate deposition and

17 See the complete documentation with further literature in Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*. Cf. the classical study by Dvornik, *Photian Schism*.

18 Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, esp. nos. 616 and 762; Dölger/Müller, *Regesten*, no. 464.

19 Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, no. 822.

20 See Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, nos. 833, 892 and 957, 968, 1014.

21 For the reception in Rome, see Herbers, "Rom und Byzanz im Konflikt", pp. 60–61.; Id., "Agir et écrire", pp. 115–16, 118–19; *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta*, vol. 2: *The General Councils of Latin Christendom*, part 1: *From Constantinople IV to Pavia-Siena (869–1424)*, eds. G. Alberigo/A. Melloni, Turnhout 2013, II,1 6, p. 250; Unger, "Der *Liber pontificalis* in Kanzlei und Archiv der Päpste", p. 319. Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, no. 950 (bibliography).

the restitution of Ignatios. But Nicholas died at about the same time and thus did not learn about the victory of his position.

Byzantine embassies sent to Rome sought the collaboration of his successor, Hadrian II, in the condemnation of Photios, which was first proclaimed at a Roman Synod and afterwards at an Ecumenical Council held in the Byzantine capital in 869/70 in the presence of papal legates.²² Anastasius Bibliothecarius († 879) was also present at the deliberations and later succeeded in transporting the documents to Italy, under hazardous conditions. The West's efforts to win Bulgaria for the Latin Church likewise came to an end on this occasion.²³ The return of the dispatched Roman missionaries and the respective letters were motivated by the Constantinople decision, as the entry on Hadrian in the *Liber Pontificalis* makes evident.²⁴

After Ignatios's death in 877, Photios became patriarch once more. In 879/80, another synod in Constantinople (Constantinople v) grappled with Photios's legitimacy and also rejected adding the *filioque* to the *Symbolum*. Pope John VIII (872–82) gave in to these decisions with great hesitations.²⁵ It was not until Basil's successor, Leon VI came to the throne, that Photios was forced to step down in 886; yet Ignatios's and Photios's followers continued to engage in disputes via polemic papers that Rome and individual popes also supplemented with various annotations.

The simultaneous dispute over Bulgaria, which had begun in 864 and was ultimately resolved at the Fourth Council of Constantinople in 869/70 in favour of Byzantium, led to numerous legations to Bulgaria and the Bosphorus. The Carolingians were also indirectly involved in this conflict over Bulgaria, and the activities of the missionaries Constantine-Cyril († 869) and Methodius († 885), originally sent from Byzantium and then acting in Rome and later the Great Moravian kingdom on the pope's behalf, fuelled the tensions. Because they for a time allowed the use of the Slavic language for liturgical purposes, and thereby contributed to the development of the respective alphabet (Glagolica), their influence particularly shaped Pannonian missionary activities.²⁶

However, contacts with Byzantium often lacked the necessary linguistic competency and produced (intentional or unintentional) falsifications of the written records. We possess a translation by the above-mentioned Anastasius

22 For the acts (a translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius), see: *Gesta Octavae Synodi Anastasio Bibliothecario interprete*; cf. Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, nos. 951 and 958 (bibliography).

23 Herbers, *Rom und Byzanz*.

24 *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, vol. 2, p. 185; see also Herbers, "Verlust".

25 Böhmer/Unger, *Papstregesten*, nos. 550–55.

26 Könighaus, *Bohemia pontificia*, nos. *5–42 and pp. 8–9.

Bibliothecarius of the records of the Fourth Council of Constantinople (869). The proceedings of this synod can serve as a lesson as to what happens to diplomatic intercourse when linguistic incompetency and misinterpretation come into play.²⁷

3 The Translations

The disputes over the correct texts in this conflict had lasting repercussions. Anastasius Bibliothecarius was not just responsible for translating the council records of 869, but also translated numerous other works, especially hagiographical ones, from Greek into Latin. This translation activity, which other individuals such as the Deacon John Hymonides (c.879) participated in (above all within his famous *Vita Gregorii Magni*),²⁸ reached a new peak around the turn of the 10th century, and Rome served as a focal point alongside Naples.²⁹ The translated literature dealt with many subjects, particularly hagiography. Already between 858 and 876, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who also rendered the chronicles of Georgios Synkellos, Theophanes, and Nikephoros the Patriarch into Latin in the framework of his *Chronographia tripertita*, translated various biographical texts, such as the *Life of Saint John the Almsgiver* (dedicated to Pope Nicholas) and the *Passio* of Saint Dionysius (dedicated to Charles the Bald). These activities clearly show that the acquisition of Greek learning also formed a part of diplomatic exchange.³⁰

4 The Tetragamy Conflict

The tetragamy conflict between Emperor Leon VI, Patriarch Nicholas I Mystikos of Constantinople (901–25), and the popes Sergius III (904–11) and Anastasius III (911–13) played out in the Late Carolingian period. It dealt with the illegitimate fourth marriage that Emperor Leon VI (886–911) wanted to

27 See *Gesta Octavae Synodi Anastasio Bibliothecario interprete*, pp. 7–25; Böhmer/Herbers, *Papstregesten*, no. 1039.

28 Bougard assumes that he is also the author of the *Vita Nicolai* in the *Liber pontificalis*: Bougard, “Anastase le Bibliothécaire ou Jean Diacre?”; Bon/Bougard, “Le *Liber pontificalis* et ses auteurs”.

29 See Düchting, *Heiligenverehrung in Süditalien*, esp. pp. 259–69.

30 Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil*, vol. 2, pp. 167–68, vol. 3, p. 387; Neil, *Seventh-Century Popes and Martyrs* (cf. critically W. Brandes, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 102 (2009), 798–807); Düchting, *Heiligenverehrung in Süditalien*.

enter into in 906, as the deaths of his three wives had left him with no heirs. In contrast to the patriarch of Constantinople, a Byzantine synod and Pope Sergius III approved of his plans, so the emperor stripped Nicholas I of his rank as patriarch; Euthymios I (907–12) quickly took his place. Yet the conflict continued. After Leon's death in 912, his last wishes restored Nicholas to his old rank; Nicholas then ordered Pope Anastasius III to revise Sergius III's judgement and to punish the still-living culprits.³¹ In 920, a Byzantine synod condemned tetragamy and proclaimed the Tomos of Union that restored unity and consensus in the Byzantine Church. Sending a missive to Pope John X (914–28), the Byzantine ecclesiastical authorities demanded a corresponding revision of the Roman position; a second delegation in early 921 and another missive in 922 renewed this demand and reminded the pope of the issue,³² which Patriarch Nicholas apparently believed to threaten the unity of the Church.³³ It remains difficult to judge in what respect these acts complicated the relationship between both Churches in the short term.

But the different paths of contact and conflict described roughly in this chapter influenced their further evolution in several respects. In later times, after 1204, different forms of historiography characterized the Photian Schism and the discussions on the *filioque* in their specific way. The 9th-century past became, above all, from the 13th century onwards, a weapon in different historical situations. Yet, the dispute and decision on Bulgaria, resolved in 870, would have a long-lasting effect as it fixed the border between Eastern and Western Christendom up to the present day.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Council of Aachen*, ed. H. Willjung, *Das Konzil von Aachen 809* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Concilia 2, Suppl. 2), Hannover 1998.
- Gesta Sanctae ac Universalis Octavae Synodi quae Constantinopoli congregata est Anastasio Bibliothecario interprete*, eds. C. Leonardi/A. Placanica (Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini d'Italia, Serie 1,16), Florence 2012.
- Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*, 3 vols., Paris 1886–92, 1957.

31 Böhmer/Zimmermann, *Papstregesten*, nos. 8, 9. See also Oikonomidès, “La dernière volonté”; and Karlin-Hayter, “Le synode à Constantinople”.

32 Böhmer/Zimmermann, *Papstregesten*, nos. 50, 51, 52, 58, 63.

33 Nicholas Mystikos, *Letters*, eds. Jenkins/Westerink, p. 330.

- Nicholas Mystikos, *Letters*, eds. R.J.H. Jenkins/L.G. Westerink, *Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 6), Washington 1973.
- Papal Letters*, eds. K. Herbers/V. Unger, *Papstbriefe des neunten Jahrhunderts* (Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters. Freiherr vom Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe, 51), Darmstadt 2019.

Regesta

- Böhmer, J.F./Herbers, K., *Regesta Imperii I: Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern 751–918* (926/962), vol. 4: *Papstregesten 800–911*, part 2: 844–872, 3 vols., Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1999, 2012, 2021.
- Böhmer, J.F./Unger, V., *Regesta Imperii I: Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern 751–918* (987), vol. 4: *Papstregesten 800–911*, part 3: 872–882 (*Johannes VIII.*), Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 2013.
- Böhmer, J.F./Zielinski, H., *Regesta Imperii I: Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter den Karolingern 751–918* (926), vol. 3: *Die Regesten des Regnum Italiae und der burgundischen Regna*, part 1: *Die Karolinger im Regnum Italiae 840–887* (888), Cologne-Vienna 1991.
- Böhmer, J.F./Zimmermann, H., *Regesta Imperii II: Sächsisches Haus 919–1024*, vol. 5: *Papstregesten 911–1024*, Cologne-Vienna-Graz 1969, 2nd ed. 1998.
- Dölger, F./Müller, A.E., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 1/1: *Regesten von 565–867* (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit, Series A, Sec. 1), 2nd ed., Munich 2008.
- Könighaus, W. (ed.), *Bohemia-Moravia Pontificia vel etiam Germania Pontificia*, vol. 5/3: *Provincia Maguntinensis*, part 7: *Dioceses Pragensis et Olomucensis*, Göttingen 2011.

Secondary Literature

- Ančić, M., “The Treaty of Aachen. How Many Empires?”, in id./J. Shepard/T. Vedriš (eds.), *Imperial Spheres and the Adriatic. Byzantium, the Carolingians and the Treaty of Aachen* (812), Abingdon 2018, pp. 25–42.
- Berschin, W., *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, vols. 2–3, Stuttgart 1988–91.
- Bon, B./Bougard, F., “Le *Liber pontificalis* et ses auteurs au IX^e siècle: enquête stylistométrique”, in Herbers / Simperl (eds.), *Das Buch der Päpste*, pp. 286–303.
- Bougard, F., “Anastase le Bibliothécaire ou Jean Diacre? Qui a récrit la Vie de Nicolas Ier et pourquoi?”, in J.-M. Martin/B. Martin-Hisard/A. Paravicini Bagliani (eds.), *Vaticana et medievalia. Études en l’honneur de Louis Duval-Arnould* (Millennio medievale. Strumenti e studi n.s., 16), Florence 2008, pp. 27–40.
- Brandes, W., “Byzantinischer Bilderstreit, das Papsttum und die Pippinsche Schenkung. Neue Forschungen zum Ost-West-Verhältnis im 8. Jahrhundert”, in F. Daim et al. (eds.), *Menschen, Bilder, Sprache, Dinge. Wege der Kommunikation zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen*, vol. 2: *Menschen und Worte*, Mainz 2018, pp. 63–79.

- Brandes, W./Hasse-Ungeheuer, A./Leppin, H. (eds.), *Konzilien und kanonisches Recht in Spätantike und frühem Mittelalter. Aspekte konziliarer Entscheidungsfindung* (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte n.s., 2) Berlin-Boston 2020.
- Brubaker, L./Haldon, J., *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era c. 680–850. A History*, Cambridge 2011.
- Di Branco, M., "Strategie di penetrazione islamica in Italia meridionale. Il caso dell'Emirato di Bari", in Wolf / Herbers, *Southern Italy*, pp. 149–64.
- Düchting, L., *Heiligenverehrung in Südtalien. Studien zum Kult in der Zeit des 8. bis beginnenden 11. Jahrhunderts* (Beiträge zur Hagiographie, 18), Stuttgart 2016.
- Herbers, K., "Rom und Byzanz im Konflikt", in W. Hartmann/K. Herbers (eds.), *Die Faszination der Papstgeschichte. Neue Zugänge zum frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 28), Cologne 2008, pp. 55–69.
- Herbers, K., "Agir et écrire: les actes des papes du IX^e siècle et le Liber pontificalis", in F. Bougard/M. Sot (eds.), *Liber, Gesta, histoire. Écrire l'histoire des évêques et des papes, de l'Antiquité au XXI^e siècle*, Turnhout 2009, pp. 109–26.
- Herbers, K., "Ost und West um das Jahr 800. Das Konzil von Aachen 809 in seinem historischen Kontext", in M. Böhnke/A.E. Kattan/B. Oberdorfer (eds.), *Die Filioque-Kontroverse. Historische, ökumenische und dogmatische Perspektiven 1200 Jahre nach der Aachener Synode* (Quaestiones disputatae, 245), Freiburg 2011, pp. 30–70.
- Herbers, K., *Europa: Christen und Muslime in Kontakt und Konfrontation. Italien und Spanien im langen 9. Jahrhundert* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, 2016/2), Stuttgart 2016.
- Herbers, K., "Verlust – Veränderung – Ersatz: Beispiele der Briefpraxis im 9. Jahrhundert", in T. Deswarte/K. Herbers/C. Scherer (eds.), *Frühmittelalterliche Briefe. Übermittlung und Überlieferung (4.–11. Jahrhundert)/La lettre au Haut Moyen Âge. Transmission et tradition épistolaires (IV^e–XI^e siècles)* (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 84), Cologne 2018, pp. 131–37.
- Herbers, K., "Geistige oder geistliche Führung? Karl der Große und das Papsttum", in J. Fried (ed.), *Karl der Große. Wissenschaft und Kunst als Herausforderung*, Stuttgart 2018, pp. 121–36.
- Herbers, K./Simperl, M. (eds.), *Das Buch der Päpste – Liber pontificalis. Ein Schlüsseldokument europäischer Geschichte* (Römische Quartalschrift Supplementbände, 67), Rome-Freiburg-Vienna 2020.
- Hergenröther, J., *Photius. Patriarch von Konstantinopel. Sein Leben, seine Schriften und das griechische Schisma. Nach handschriftlichen und gedruckten Quellen*, 3 vols., Regensburg 1867–69 (repr. Darmstadt 1966).
- Hiestand, R., *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum im 10. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur ideologischen und machtpolitischen Auseinandersetzung zwischen Osten und Westen*, Zürich 1964.

- Karlin-Hayter, P., "Le synode à Constantinople de 886 à 912 et le rôle de Nicolas le Mystique dans l'affaire de la tétragamie", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 19 (1970), 59–101.
- Neil, B., *Seventh-Century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, Turnhout 2006.
- Oikonomidès, N., "La dernière volonté de Léon VI au sujet de la tétragamie", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 56 (1963), 46–52.
- Schreiner, P., "Diplomatische Geschenke zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen ca. 800–1200: Eine Analyse der Texte mit Quellenanhang", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 251–82.
- Stratoudaki White, D., *Patriarch Photios of Constantinople: His Life, Scholarly Contributions and Correspondence. Together With a Translation of 52 of His Letters*, Brookline, Mass. 1981.
- Thümmel, H.G., *Die Konzilien zur Bilderfrage im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert. Das 7. Ökumenische Konzil in Nikaia 787* (Konziliengeschichte), Paderborn 2005.
- Unger, V., "Der *Liber pontificalis* in Kanzlei und Archiv der Päpste. Zur Abfassung, Verwendung und Aufbewahrung des *Liber pontificalis* im neunten Jahrhundert", in Herbers/Simperl (eds.), *Das Buch der Päpste*, pp. 304–23.
- Winterhager, P., *Migranten und Stadtgesellschaft im frühmittelalterlichen Rom. Griechischsprachige Einwanderer und ihre Nachkommen im diachronen Vergleich* (Europa im Mittelalter, 35), Berlin-Boston 2020.
- Wolf, K./Herbers, K. (eds.), *Southern Italy as Contact Area and Border Region during the Early Middle Ages. Religious-Cultural Heterogeneity and Competing Powers in Local, Transregional and Universal Dimensions* (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 80), Cologne 2017.
- Zimmermann, H., "Imperatores Italiae", in H. Beumann (ed.), *Historische Forschungen für Walter Schlesinger*, Cologne 1974, pp. 400–19.

Beyond Liudprand and Theophano: Aspects of Western-Byzantine Relations in Ottonian and Salian Times

Sebastian Kolditz

1 Two Well-Known Protagonists

One week after Easter, on 14 April 972, the city of Rome witnessed an event of extraordinary splendour. Pope John XIII celebrated the marriage of Otto II, co-emperor and heir to the aged Emperor Otto I, and a young lady named Theophano who had just come across the sea from the imperial city of Constantinople, sent by John Tzimiskes, the ruling *basileus*.¹ John had obtained his throne during a bloody usurpation assassinating the previous *basileus* Nikephoros II Phokas. Like his successor, Nikephoros did not belong to the ruling Macedonian dynasty, which at that time was only represented by the two infant sons of Romanos II, Basil and Constantine. In contrast to them, Theophano, whose father Constantine Skleros belonged to the highest echelon of Byzantine aristocracy and was a brother-in-law to John Tzimiskes,² could not claim to be a *porphyrogennetos*, a princess born in the porphyry chamber of the Imperial Palace and thus of immediate imperial descent. Her adversaries among the secular and ecclesiastical elite of the Western Empire did not fail to use this as an argument against her in later years, especially in the troublesome time after her husband's death in 983.³ In 972, however, Theophano was very welcome to the Western imperial family. She received a rich dower from her husband, laid down in a sumptuous charter written in golden letters on purple parchment.⁴ In fact, the marriage implied a kind of official recognition of Ottonian imperial status by the Roman Empire in the East, and thus

1 See Engels, "Theophano", pp. 32–33.

2 For a precise study of Theophano's ancestry, see Kresten, "Byzantinische Epilegomena", who also refers to the long previous debates on this subject.

3 For opposition to, and negative judgments on, Theophano, see Ciggaar, "Theophano: an empress reconsidered", pp. 52–56.

4 The document as well as another famous charter with similar external features, the *Ottonianum* issued by Otto I to the pope on the occasion of his imperial coronation, have been thoroughly studied by Georgi, "Ottonianum und Heiratsurkunde 962/972", for the dower, see

crowned the achievements of Otto I in founding an Empire that united the East Frankish realm and large parts of Italy and exercised its authority even beyond. Numerous foreign embassies, among them also legates of the Greeks, were received at an imperial diet at Quedlinburg⁵ early in 973, only some weeks before the aged emperor died.

Otto's relationship towards Byzantium had not always been cordial, however. Soon after the opening of a diplomatic exchange between the two empires in 967, which should have led to a military as well as a dynastic marriage alliance,⁶ suspicions must have been growing on both sides and open hostilities broke out early in 968 when Otto besieged Bari, the capital of the Byzantine administration in southern Italy, though without success. Against this backdrop, it is quite natural that Otto's close advisor Bishop Liudprand of Cremona⁷ was given a rather cold reception at the court of Nikephoros II in the same year, when he was sent there to renegotiate the dynastic marriage project. Liudprand was forced to spend a number of months in the Byzantine capital before returning without tangible results. But above all, Liudprand was a prolific writer who did not hesitate to put down a long and venomous report on his embassy which he addressed to his imperial masters: the famous *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana*. It is an extraordinary source for the history of diplomatic relations in the 10th century.⁸ At the same time, the *Relatio* is a strongly biased text, be it written either to justify Liudprand's diplomatic

p. 149; Ciggaar, K., "The Empress Theophano (972–991)", pp. 38–40, and, in a comparative perspective, Macrides, "Dynastic Marriages", pp. 277–79.

5 The diet is recorded, without explicit mention of the embassies, by Widukind, *Deeds of the Saxons*, III 75, eds. Waitz/Kehr, p. 152, and with enumeration by Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle*, II 31, ed. Holtzmann, p. 76; for an analysis, see Gulya, "Der Hoftag in Quedlinburg".

6 The Byzantine envoys received by Otto in Ravenna in April 967 requested peace and friendship (*pacem vel amiciciam*): see *Continuatio Reginonis*, ed. F. Kurze, *Reginonis abbatiss Prumiensis Chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 50), Hannover 1890, p. 178 (ad ann. 967). Their presence coincides with a synod held by Pope John XIII and Otto at Ravenna, see *Die Konzilien 916–1001*, ed. Hehl, pp. 261–78; Wolter, *Die Synoden im Reichsgebiet und in Reichsitalien*, pp. 91–97. Otto's envoy to Constantinople, in turn, should have negotiated a dynastic marriage. For Byzantium's limited means on Italian soil and the limited value of an alliance with Otto, see Shepard, "Aspects of Byzantine Attitudes", pp. 72–76, 87–92.

7 For Liudprand's role at Otto's court, see Huschner, *Transalpine Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, vol. 2, pp. 510–623.

8 On the *Relatio* as a text, see Sutherland, "The Mission", pp. 75–81. It should be borne in mind that the only manuscript of the *Relatio*, once preserved at Trier, has long since been lost. Therefore, the first printed edition of the text published in 1600 constitutes the unique testimony; this makes a critical treatment of Liudprand's partisan account nearly impossible.

failure⁹ or to instruct the Lombard princes of Capua, Benevento, and Salerno, Otto's main allies in southern Italy, about the *basileus's* "bad intentions" towards them.¹⁰ The report contains numerous exaggerations and perhaps even some fictitious elements,¹¹ and it contrasts strongly with the admiring, colourful picture of Byzantine court life Liudprand himself had conveyed earlier in the unfinished sixth book of the *Antapodosis*.¹² This historiographical *opus magnum*, written during Liudprand's exile at the Ottonian Court beyond the Alps and motivated by a desire for retribution, is distinguished by its broad geographical horizon which includes the recent Byzantine past as well.¹³

Liudprand's texts have long since attracted much scholarly attention and continue to do so.¹⁴ For the whole Middle Byzantine period there is no other piece of narrative giving such deep and lively insight into crucial episodes of Latin-Byzantine relations from a protagonist's perspective. The detailed description of receptions at court, banquets and processions,¹⁵ the comments on the ambassador's housing and his restricted freedom of movement, the references to diplomatic gifts and Liudprand's understanding of Byzantine strategy,¹⁶ can be used as a mine of information, not only with regard to his

- 9 Negative judgements on Liudprand's diplomatic abilities have repeatedly been delivered: see Schummer, "Liudprand of Cremona – a diplomat?", pp. 200–01; others are quoted by Hoffmann, "Diplomatie in der Krise", pp. 114–15; see also Koder, "Erfolglos als Diplomat, erfolgreich als Erzähler?", p. 137.
- 10 This view on Liudprand's *causa scribendi* has been exposed by Mayr-Harting, "Liudprand of Cremona's Account", particularly pp. 546–50; for a similar interpretation, which even denies the relevance of the marriage project, see Simpson, "Liudprand of Cremona", esp. pp. 48–50; instead, Leyser, "Ends and Means", p. 137, considered these aspects secondary; for earlier views, see Karageorgos, *Λιουτπράνδος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Κρεμύνης*, pp. 60–64.
- 11 See Koder, "Subjektivität und Fälschung".
- 12 Liudprand, *Antapodosis* VI, 4–10, ed. Chiesa, pp. 146–50. This narrative refers to Liudprand's stay at the Byzantine court in 949 at the head of an embassy sent by the regent of the *regnum Italiae*, Berengar of Ivrea.
- 13 For the genesis, dating, and structure of the *Antapodosis*, see Karageorgos, *Λιουτπράνδος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Κρεμύνης*, pp. 51–58; Karpf, *Herrscherlegitimation*, pp. 5–12; Leyser, "Ends and Means", pp. 127–32 (emphasizing the European horizon). The relevance of Liudprand's encounter with Bishop Recemundo, representative of the caliph of Córdoba, for the structure of the *Antapodosis* is discussed in detail by Drocourt, "Al-Andalus". On Liudprand's theory of revenge and divine justice, see Sutherland, "The Idea of Revenge", pp. 400–07, 409.
- 14 It is impossible to give a representative, let alone complete overview of the relevant bibliography; instead we refer to the bibliographic lists in Karageorgos, *Λιουτπράνδος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Κρεμύνης*, pp. 15–30; Koder, "Erfolglos als Diplomat, erfolgreich als Erzähler?", pp. 139–40, and to further works cited by Hoffmann, "Diplomatie in der Krise".
- 15 For the interpretation of these features, see Hoffmann, "Diplomatie in der Krise", pp. 125–37, 147–65 with further references; for eating and drinking see Hoffmann, "Diplomatie in der Krise", pp. 175–77; Weber, "Essen und Trinken".
- 16 See Shepard, "Information, Disinformation and Delay", pp. 244–47.

personal experience at the Byzantine court but also on structural aspects of current diplomatic practice and general features of Byzantine society. Liudprand's attitudes and political ideas have been analysed in detail against the background of the author's biography as far as it can be reconstructed from various sources.¹⁷ Distortions have been revealed and individual episodes or elements of knowledge¹⁸ contained in Liudprand's texts have been analysed, sometimes in a comparative perspective.¹⁹

Similarly to Liudprand, Theophano can also be seen as an emblematic figure in the history of Byzantine-Western relations. Numerous studies have been dedicated to various aspects of her life and times. In comparison to the case of Liudprand, however, this is a more recent development in research, which favourably coincides with a general upsurge of interest in female rulership throughout the Middle Ages.²⁰ Nevertheless, Theophano holds a place of honour among the many queens and empresses of medieval Germany. On the one hand, this is due to her energetic action as regent of the Empire during the minority of her son Otto III (from 985 to her premature death in 991), on the other hand, the many facets of "Byzantine influence" ascribed either to her or to her entourage also constitute a factor which promotes her popularity. The published proceedings of several colloquia²¹ held in or around 1991 in commemoration of the 1000th anniversary of her demise, reflect a clear preference for the cultural and intercultural contexts of Theophano's times. This large quantity of scientific publications, however, stands in marked contrast to the scarcity of information contemporary sources provide on her activities and personality,²² and it also contrasts with the modest degree of interest researchers had so far

17 For Liudprand's biography, see Sutherland, *Liudprand*, esp. pp. 3–11, 77–85, 94–101; Karageorgos, *Λιουτπράνδος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Κρεμῶνης*, pp. 35–50. Liudprand's attitude towards Rome and the Romans in his various writings is discussed by Arnaldi, "Liutprando di Cremona: un detrattore di Roma o dei Romani?"; cf. Karageorgos, *Λιουτπράνδος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Κρεμῶνης*, pp. 195–237; for a comparative view on Liudprand and Leon of Synada with regard to the "idea of Rome", see Kolditz, "Leon von Synada", pp. 554–59.

18 Thus some eschatological motifs are discussed in detail by Brandes, "Liudprand von Cremona"; cf. Shepard, "Past and Future in Middle Byzantine Diplomacy", pp. 171–73.

19 For a comparative approach to *Relatio* and *Antapodosis*, see Koder, "Die Sicht des 'Anderen' in Gesandtschaftsberichten", pp. 120–29.

20 See for instance, Erkens, "Die Frau als Herrscherin"; Bange, "The Image of Women".

21 Davids (ed.), *The Empress Theophano*; von Euw/Schreiner (eds.), *Kaiserin Theophanu*. The volume Engels/Schreiner (eds.), *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten* likewise goes back to a conference held on this occasion, though its contributions cover a much broader range of topics. For a comprehensive study of Theophano's rule and regency, see Eickhoff, *Theophanu und der König*, esp. pp. 15–120, 191–406.

22 See Engels, "Theophano", esp. pp. 33–41; Leyser, "Theophanu divina gratia imperatrix augusta", pp. 20–27.

in her husband's political action.²³ Against this background it cannot easily be ascertained whether Theophano actually influenced Ottonian policy towards Byzantium. Surprisingly, her years as an empress seem to be characterized by a nearly total absence of embassies between the Ottonian court and the Bosphorus.²⁴

Following the paths of research it would be tempting to rethink the experiences Liudprand made at the Bosphorus and their written traces or to re-evaluate Theophano's actual or possible influence on Ottonian government and on the political concepts her son possibly developed.²⁵ Instead, this contribution rather aims at "provincializing" these emblematic figures in the history of the relationship between the two empires in favour of a perspective of *longue durée*. This starts with the establishment of contacts between Byzantium and the East Frankish kingdom at the end of the 9th century and continues throughout the Ottonian as well as the Salian century in the West until the times of Lothair III, the former duke of Saxony, whose reign (1125–37) forms a kind of *intermezzo* between the Salian "Henrys" and the establishment of their Swabian (Staufen) successors. We will first succinctly discuss some general patterns of research, and then give an outline of the development of these relations over the course of these centuries.

2 The 10th and the 11th Centuries in Byzantine-Western Relations: Patterns of Research Interest – and Disinterest

The eminent British historian Karl Leyser opened his seminal article on the place of the 10th century in the history of Byzantine-Western relations, with a view on "physical conditions", i.e. on the routes of communication.²⁶ In this

23 Otto II is certainly the least examined Ottonian ruler, his ten-year reign is often considered a mere appendix to his father's glorious achievements. This perspective has rightly been questioned by Seibert, "Eines großen Vaters glückloser Sohn".

24 Thus, Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 303, records only one legation between 973 and 995, an embassy sent from Byzantium to Otto II, which is poorly documented. Theophano's personal influence on political relations between the two empires during her husband's reign and later on in the time of her regency, is nearly untraceable in the sources. It can, however, safely be assumed that her presence at the Ottonian court neither led to an intensification of contacts with Byzantium nor to a fundamental change of their ambiguous character, cf. Keller, "Das ottonische Kirchenreich", p. 274, 281, who adduces the dynastic change in Constantinople as an explanation.

25 See *infra*, note 29. Strong arguments in favour of Theophano's influence on Otto's opinions are adduced by Shepard, "Marriages Towards the Millennium", pp. 21–24.

26 Leyser, "The Tenth Century", pp. 29–30.

perspective, the emergence of the powerful Magyar polity marked a fundamental change at the onset of the 10th century, as it blocked the overland routes between the Frankish Kingdoms and Byzantium and led to the increasing importance of Venice as a maritime intermediary between the two empires. By focusing on these essential conditions of communications,²⁷ Leyser's perspective gave a new foundation to a field of study which had long been flourishing, particularly but not exclusively in Germany,²⁸ under the primacy of "conceptual history". Thus, Percy Ernst Schramm stressed the Byzantine roots of Otto III's alleged programme of a *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum*,²⁹ and Franz Dölger shaped the Byzantine view of the outside world into a coherent "family of kings" (based on his analysis of chapter II 48 of *De Cerimoniis*).³⁰ Influenced by these lines of thought, the historian and archivist Werner Ohnsorge (1904–85) formed probably the most sophisticated and coherent perspective on the long-term development of these relations, the dynamics of which he traced back to a fundamental opposition between the factual existence of two Christian Roman Empires in contrast to their respective universal aspirations, inherent in the very idea of imperial rule. This paradigmatic "problem of two emperors" (*Zweikaiserproblem*) should help to explain the occasional eruptions of open conflict and even warfare between Byzantine and Western emperors which emerged for the first time after the imperial coronation of Charlemagne on Christmas Day 800, and showed up again after Otto I had obtained imperial rank in February 962. Besides tracing this general explanatory line and focusing on various ideological nuances of the *Kaiseridee*

-
- 27 This aspect has meanwhile been treated in a number of thorough studies: Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*, pp. 21–44; Kislinger, "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz und dem Abendland", *passim*; id. "Reisen und Verkehrswege in Byzanz", esp. pp. 351–61; see also McCormick, "Byzantium on the Move", pp. 26–28. The conditions of travel beyond and within the Byzantine empire are now treated comprehensively by Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, vol. 2, pp. 335–466.
- 28 The first substantial treatment of our subject for the Ottonian period, which is still worth reading, was written by a Greek: Mystakides, *Byzantinisch-deutsche Beziehungen*.
- 29 This interpretation is based on the legend of Otto's imperial bull, see Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom and Renovatio*, pp. 116–35. Schramm's assumptions have been questioned by Görich, *Otto III.*, pp. 187–209. Recently, an alternative understanding of the legend has been proposed by Marzochi, "*Renovatio imperii Romanorum*", esp. pp. 197–207; but see also the interpretation outlined by Keller, "Identità romana", pp. 264–71.
- 30 Dölger, "Die 'Familie der Könige' im Mittelalter", pp. 36–42, 51–53; cf. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*. II 48, eds. Dagron/Feissel/Flusin/Zuckerman/Stavrou, vol. 3, pp. 358–75. Dölger's conception and its intellectual roots have been severely criticized by Brandes, "Die 'Familie der Könige im Mittelalter'. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag"; for a partial revision of the debate, see Prinzing, "Byzanz, Altrussland und die sogenannte 'Familie der Könige'", esp. pp. 51–55.

in the West,³¹ Ohnsorge published many detailed studies, in which he meticulously analysed specific constellations of the inter-imperial relationship, using even minimal pieces of evidence in order to reconstruct actual and possible moments of diplomatic communication.³² His numerous contributions undoubtedly had an important impact on the study of Byzantine-Western relations, but some of his assumptions and theses have since been revised. In contrast to Ohnsorge, Paolo Lamma emphasized the preponderance of regional power interests both sides had with regard to southern Italy over the ideological disputes that only resulted from these clashes of interest.³³ It is perhaps no coincidence that these conceptions were formulated and debated during the period of the Cold War between “East” and “West” in the 20th century, and that their very conceptual foundations have been subjected to critical revisions with good reason since the 1980s.³⁴

Nevertheless, the role of ideological concepts has again been stressed in a more recent interpretation of Byzantine-Western relations. According to Telemachos C. Lounghis, the emperors of the so-called Macedonian dynasty followed the paradigm of a “limited *oikoumene*” in their foreign politics, i.e. a deliberate restriction of the scope of universal authority claimed by the Byzantine Emperor which enabled a peaceful cohabitation with the Western imperial institution.³⁵ This alleged doctrine was temporarily abandoned under Nikephoros II Phokas whose more demanding attitude towards the West, however, did not prevail.³⁶ Besides this overarching conception, Lounghis made a fundamental contribution to the field by tracing the history of embassies from Byzantium to the West from Late Antiquity down to the time of the

31 Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter*; for a short outline of his main ideas see also id., “Byzanz und das abendländische Kaisertum”. The influence of Ohnsorge’s theory is visible when Leyser, “The Tenth Century”, pp. 33–34 discusses “the heart and substance of Byzantine-western relationships” primarily in ideological terms.

32 These contributions have been collected in three volumes of studies: Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz* (containing articles published between 1931 and 1958), id., *Konstantinopel und der Okzident* (articles between 1958 and 1965) and id., *Ost-Rom und der Westen* (articles between 1966 and 1981).

33 Lamma, “Il problema dei due imperi”, pp. 334–37, concluding his meticulous analysis of sources from the 9th and the first half of the 10th century up to Liudprand.

34 See Lilie, “Zweikaiserproblem” (focusing on the Komnenian era), and recently Kolia-Dermitzaki, “Byzantium and the West – the West and Byzantium”, esp. 375–80, who bases her argument on the use of titles in the Ottonian charters, as well as Hehl, “Zwei Kaiser – (k)ein Problem”, esp. pp. 41–42 and 67–69. The structural differences between the two empires have been considered by Hehl, “Zwei christliche Kaiser”, esp. pp. 283–95.

35 For a basic outline of this interpretation, see Lounghis, “Die byzantinische Ideologie”.

36 Lounghis, “Die byzantinische Ideologie”, pp. 122–23; see also id., “Der Verfall des Papsttums”, esp. p. 221; id., “Byzantine Diplomacy”, pp. 46–54.

First Crusade.³⁷ In this way, the diplomatic exchanges between the empires during the 10th and 11th centuries are integrated both into a long term perspective and into a broader spectrum of political partners of Byzantium in the Occident, which transcends the focus on the imperial counterpart. Rudolf Hiestand highlighted the continuous importance of Italy for Byzantine foreign politics at the turn of the 10th century,³⁸ instead of an anachronistic focus on the East-Frankish kingdom. More recent research on our subject obviously shows the influence of the various cultural turns in the historical sciences by privileging systematic approaches to the history of Byzantine-Western relations against the analysis of individual situations. Topics include the modes of mutual perception,³⁹ the ceremonies and rituals of (diplomatic) encounters,⁴⁰ practices such as negotiating⁴¹ or gift giving,⁴² as well as the uses of literacy, oaths, and oral communications in diplomatic encounters.⁴³

Although the dominant research perspectives have thus undergone considerable change over the course of time, one disequilibrium seems to be strikingly constant. In comparison to the flourishing research on the Ottonian epoch – and afterwards on that of the Komnenoi and the Staufen Emperors – the 11th and early 12th centuries are considerably underrepresented in scientific publications on our subject. Though some particular moments in the history of this period have been dealt with in depth⁴⁴ we do not have any comprehensive study which outlines the dynamics of Byzantine-Salian relations in the long run.⁴⁵ Instead, the First Crusade is usually considered a major turning point in the history of Byzantium, particularly with regard to its relations with the West. The emphasis on interaction with the crusaders, however, further marginalizes

37 See Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident*, containing a table of all traceable embassies, see pp. 476–87 for the 10th and 11th centuries.

38 Hiestand, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum*.

39 For these aspects, see the article by Hans-Werner Goetz in this volume.

40 See Tinnefeld, “Ceremonies for Foreign Ambassadors”; Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 150–62; Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, vol. 2, pp. 487–571.

41 Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 175–87, following the models for the conclusion of treaties that have been described by Heinemeyer, “Studien zur Diplomatie”, esp. pp. 400–13.

42 For these subjects we refer to Dominik Heher’s contribution to the present volume.

43 See Drocourt, “La place de l’écrit dans les contacts diplomatiques”, esp. pp. 34–35, 39–42.

44 Inter alia, Wolfram, “Die Gesandtschaft Konrads II.”; Jäckel, “Heinrich III. und eine Brautschau in Byzanz”; Ohnsorge, “Das nach Goslar gelangte Auslandsschreiben”; Bayer, “Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg”; Sansterre, “Byzance et son souverain”.

45 The embassies sent from Byzantium up to the First Crusade are listed in Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident*, pp. 478–81, but there is no comprehensive list of legations going in the opposite direction after 1002, since the useful “both-sided” conspectus given by Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 247–305, stops at that date.

political exchange with the Salian emperors who were not involved in this expedition.

From the Medievalist point of view, research on the Salian epoch, which particularly flourished in the 1990s,⁴⁶ has privileged the interior power structures of the Empire and its *Reichskirche*, which help us to understand the background of the fundamental antagonism between *regnum* and *sacerdotium* usually referred to as the “Investiture Contest”. The external dimension of Salian politics has rather been neglected, and the one volume of studies dedicated to this field does not contain a contribution with regard to Byzantium.⁴⁷ Furthermore, the parallel dynamics of crisis, that characterized both the Western Empire and Byzantium in the second half of the 11th century, have not yet been treated in a thorough comparative study.⁴⁸

The wide range of recent approaches in research reflects the diversity of sources that contribute to our knowledge of Byzantine-Western relations, particularly for the 10th century. Besides historiographic sources, the *Book of Ceremonies* offers some pieces of information from the actual practice of foreign policy at the Byzantine Court in the first half of the 10th century, above all through a long list of addressees of imperial letters (in chapter 2 48).⁴⁹ The detailed descriptions of diplomatic receptions at the Palace in Constantinople in the same source unfortunately do not concern embassies coming either from Italy or the German kingdom.⁵⁰ Some Ottonian charters issued during the south Italian campaigns of Otto I and Otto II contain short but revealing

46 The three-volume collection of studies Weinfurter (ed.), *Die Salier und das Reich*, certainly constitute the most important output of these research efforts.

47 Some references to Byzantium can be found throughout this volume, particularly in Boshof, “Das Salierreich und der europäische Osten”, pp. 176–81.

48 A notable exception is Borgolte, *Europa entdeckt seine Vielfalt*, pp. 27–75 (though comprising the 12th and earlier 13th centuries).

49 For the Italian addressees mentioned in this framework, see Martin, “L’occident chrétien”, pp. 617–37. The most enigmatic entries in this list concern the four kings of Saxony (*Sazônia*), Bavaria (*Baiourê*) or land of the Nemitzoi, Gallia, and Germania, and – at another place in the list – the king of *Frangia*: see Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*. II 48, eds. Dagron/Feissel/Flusin/Zuckerman/Stavrou, vol. 3, pp. 368–69 and 374–75. A sophisticated interpretation of these entries as references to specific Frankish rulers that were in contact with Byzantium at the end of the 9th and earlier 10th centuries (Otto I, Emperor Arnulf, Emperor Louis III and Konrad I respectively) has been proposed by Ohnsorge, “Drei Deperdita der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei”, pp. 237–54. It has been modified by Martin, “L’occident chrétien”, pp. 639–43, who attributes the list to the 920s. Both agree that the king of *Frangia* should be identified with Otto I, but recently Komatina, “The ‘King of Francia’ in *De cerimoniis* II, 48”, pp. 160–68, has conclusively proposed King Hugh of Italy for this position in the list.

50 A detailed discussion of the receptions contained in *De Cerimoniis* II 15 and their dating to 946 has been provided by Kresten, “*Staatsempfänge*” im Kaiserpalast von Konstantinopel.

passages on political and military aspirations directed against Byzantine rule in Apulia or Calabria.⁵¹ Letters and pieces of political correspondence play a less prominent role for this period as compared to the history of the 9th century, but some of them contain singular background information, such as a letter drafted by Theodore Daphnopates in the name of Romanos I, and sent to the pope to secure Roman support for Romanos' son Theophylaktos, who had been installed as patriarch of Constantinople.⁵² An even more intriguing insight is offered by a number of passages in the letter collection of Leon, Metropolitan of Synada, which reflect several stages of the latter's mission to Rome and to the court of Otto III between 996 and 998.⁵³ For the 11th and early 12th century, information on political relations between the two empires is often scarce and fragmentary, and almost exclusively contained in historiographic sources. Pieces of political correspondence inserted in Benzo of Alba's chronicle (though certainly adapted), in Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*, and in the *Registrum Petri Diaconi* from Montecassino, only indirectly concern this subject, while no single official letter destined from one imperial court to the other has been preserved.⁵⁴ Material sources, such as seals or artistic objects, have therefore also been taken into account, especially by Ohnsorge, though conclusions drawn exclusively from them tend to be hypothetical.

3 A Multilateral Game: Byzantine Diplomatic Relations to Italy and the Western Empire in the 10th Century

Looking back from the middle of the 10th century, relations between Constantinople and the East Frankish Kingdom developed slowly and the few existing pieces of information on them remain shadowy, especially with regard to the negotiated subjects. The reception of two Byzantine missions at the court of the East Frankish King Arnulf, at Regensburg in 894 and 896, is well attested.⁵⁵ This suggests a short phase of mutual ambassadorial exchange probably as a background to Arnulf's military intervention in Italy, which led to his

51 See Loud, "Southern Italy and the Eastern and Western Empires", pp. 8–9.

52 Theodore Daphnopates, *Letters*, no. 1, eds. Darrouzès/Westerink, pp. 31–41.

53 Leon of Synada, *Letters*, nos. 1–13, ed. Vinson, pp. 2–22; on Leon, see Kolditz, "Leon von Synada", pp. 536–44; PmbZ #24416, and recently Andriollo, *Constantinople et les provinces d'Asie Mineure*, pp. 185–92.

54 Jäckel, "Heinrich III. und eine Brautschau in Byzanz", p. 189. For the letters transmitted by Benzo and Peter the Deacon, see below, pp. 167–68 and 176–77; for the function of letters in the *Alexiad*, see Mullett, "The Language of Diplomacy", pp. 205–10.

55 See *Annales Fuldenses*, ed. F. Kurze (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 7), Hannover 1891, pp. 125 (ad ann. 894), 130 (ad ann. 896).

imperial coronation.⁵⁶ The appearance of the warlike Magyars on the scene in Eastern Europe at that time might also have caused the intensified exchange. After that there is a gap of nearly 50 years,⁵⁷ until we come across the next ascertained situation of contact between the Eastern Franks and Byzantium in 945, when a legate sent by Constantine VII was received by Otto I.⁵⁸ This obviously was the starting point for a number of further exchanges, some protagonists of which are known by name, such as the Byzantine *koitonites* Salomon arriving at then Ottonian court at Easter 949, or the merchant Liudfred from Mainz.⁵⁹ In the course of these exchanges a first marriage arrangement between the two dynasties was seemingly discussed and prepared,⁶⁰ but it did not materialize in the end. A Byzantine legation sent to Otto after his victory over the Magyars in 955 is mentioned in the triumphant and biased account given by Widukind

56 Both Ohnsorge, "Drei Deperdita der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei", pp. 231–32; and Hiestand, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum*, pp. 70, 75–76 explained Leon VI's contacts with Arnulf with Byzantine enmity towards the Italian emperors Wido and Lambert.

57 A further instance of contact in the time of Conrad I (911–18) has been supposed by Ohnsorge, "Drei Deperdita der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei", pp. 227–28, 233–33, though his argument based on the statement that once "Greek letters" were read to Conrad is highly speculative. The gap in contacts is duly highlighted by Leyser, "The Tenth Century", pp. 40–41.

58 This embassy is briefly mentioned in several annalistic compositions of the East Frankish kingdom, all of them going back to the lost *Annals of Hersfeld*; see for instance Lampert of Hersfeld, *Annals*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Lamperti monachi Hersfeldensis opera* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 38), Hannover 1894, p. 36 (ad ann. 945); Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle*, II 34, ed. Holtzmann, p. 82 (referring to the two missions in 945 and in 949); cf. Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident*, pp. 201–02.

59 On Salomon, whose name is only known from Liudprand's account, see PmbZ #26971; on Liudfred PmbZ #24749.

60 This project concerning Hadwig (PmbZ #22539), the daughter of Duke Henry of Bavaria and later wife of Duke Burchard II of Swabia (954–73), is only mentioned in a rather fabulous account by Ekkehard IV of Sankt Gallen: *Casus Sancti Galli*, ch. 90, trans. H. Haefele, *St. Galler Klostergeschichten* (Freiherr-vom-Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe, 10), Darmstadt 1980, p. 184, who claims that Hadwig in her youth had been betrothed to *Constantino greco regi* but had herself opposed this marriage. This undated piece of information is usually placed in the early 950s and thought to refer to the Byzantine Prince Romanos II instead of Constantine VII, see e.g. Shepard, "Information, Disinformation and Delay", p. 283. Nevertheless, a marriage alliance still pursued by Romanos I for his son and co-emperor Constantine Lakapenos cannot be excluded either, if the latter's wife Theophano (PmbZ #28123), daughter of Mamas, was no longer alive. Her date of death is not known. In this case the negotiations would refer to the years before 945 (when Hadwig was still very young) and the project would necessarily have been abandoned after Constantine's demise early in 945.

of Corvey; this might explain the notable (though indirect) mention of this victory in Skylitzes' *History*.⁶¹

Thus, Byzantine interest in the West was not focused on the Ottonian kingdom over the first decades of the 10th century. Instead, the late- and post-Carolingian *regnum Italiae*, some rulers of which also bore the imperial title after their Roman coronation, certainly received more attention at the Bosphorus. Emperor Leon VI (886–912) temporarily aimed at establishing a marriage alliance with Louis, King of Provence,⁶² who was crowned emperor (Louis III) in 900, but was soon expelled from Italian soil by his powerful rival Berengar I. When Louis later tried his comeback, he was again defeated, blinded and obliged to leave Italy perpetually in 905. Shortly thereafter Leon sought contact with Pope Sergius III in order to obtain papal permission for his intended fourth marriage, which was firmly opposed by Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos of Constantinople in accordance with the rules of Byzantine canon law. The Tetragamy controversy thus led to a reintensification of Byzantine contacts with the Papacy and the city of Rome where the senator Theophylactus and his family had established their supremacy over the Apostolic See. This development made Rome exempt from the sphere of intervention of Italian kings and turned the ancient capital into an independent partner of the *basileus*. In 915, Byzantine military forces supported Pope John X and Duke Alberic of Spoleto in a successful battle against the Muslim community settling at the Garigliano.⁶³ The same pope also re-established ecclesiastical communion with Nicholas Mystikos, Patriarch of Constantinople. The Byzantine Emperor Romanos I Lakapenos later tried to win the Papacy as a guarantor of his own son's patriarchal position.⁶⁴ According to a cryptic allusion made

61 See Widukind, *Deeds of the Saxons*, 111 56, eds. Waitz/Kehr, p. 135: "unde plurimos legatos suscipit, Romanorum scilicet et Graecorum Sarracenorumque"; John Skylitzes, *History*, ed. Thurn, p. 39, l. 74–76.

62 Kresten, "Zur angeblichen Heirat Annas" showed that the project was never accomplished. Louis' intended fiancée Anna died at a young age in Constantinople. For a list of attempted marriage alliances concerning Byzantium, see Schreiner, "Die kaiserliche Familie", pp. 763–71.

63 On this battle and the coalition behind it, see Hiestand, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum*, pp. 126–28; Fedele, "La battaglia del Garigliano", esp. pp. 185–99; Arnaldi, "La fase preparatoria", esp. pp. 123–25; most recently Di Branco, 915. *La battaglia del Garigliano*, pp. 11–20, 138–39.

64 Romanos' letter, drafted by Theodoros Daphnopates, refers to the opposition within the Permanent Synod of Constantinople against the elevation of the emperor's son to the patriarchal throne, but it cautiously avoids conceding any right of intervention to the See of Rome: Theodore Daphnopates, *Letters*, no. 1, eds. Darrouzès/Westerink, pp. 33–35.

by Liudprand of Cremona,⁶⁵ this patriarch possibly received a permanent papal concession to wear the *pallium* due to the pressure exercised by *princeps* Alberic of Rome. This information certainly refers to another contact between Rome and Byzantium after the exchange of envoys between Pope John XI and Romanos I.⁶⁶ Alberic is also mentioned as prince of Rome (*pringkips Rhômês*) in the address list in *De Cerimoniis* and was thus acknowledged as a political actor of his own by the court of Constantinople.⁶⁷

At about the same time, the Kingdom of (Northern) Italy, ruled by Hugh of Provence, entered a phase of dense diplomatic contacts with Byzantium. In 935, the *protospatharios* Epiphanius was sent to King Hugh in order to form an alliance against the Lombard principalities in southern Italy,⁶⁸ and in the early 940s, Hugh and Emperor Romanos I concluded a military alliance against the Muslim stronghold of Fraxinetum in Provence, an alliance which was further confirmed by a marital link, negotiated during a sequence of diplomatic missions between 940 and 944. In the end, Hugh's (illegitimate) daughter Berta was sent to Constantinople⁶⁹ as a fiancée to Romanos II, the son of the Byzantine co-emperor Constantine VII and grandson of Romanos I. This alliance was soon effectively questioned by changes of regime on both sides: a palace coup in December 944 led to the demise of the Lakapenoi and the reign of Constantine VII as sole *basileus* (945–59), while Margrave Berengar II of Ivrea,

65 Liudprand, *Relatio*, ch. 62, ed. Chiesa, p. 215.

66 While Liudprand clearly names Alberic, Romanos' above-mentioned letter to Pope John XI alludes to a marriage proposed by the pope's mother, the powerful Roman *senatrix* Marozia: Theodore Daphnopates, *Letters*, no. 1, eds. Darrouzès/Westerink, p. 41. It was thus based on a previous diplomatic mission sent by the Roman authorities before Marozia was ousted by her son Alberic (in the second half of 932 or early in 933). As Romanos' letter implies (p. 31), this mission had already acknowledged Theophylaktos Lakapenos as patriarch of Constantinople. Alberic continued his mother's policy.

67 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis* II 48, eds. Dagron/Feissel/Flusin/Zuckerman/Stavrou, vol. 3, p. 369.

68 This mission is only known from Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis* II 44, eds. Dagron/Feissel/Flusin/Zuckerman/Stavrou, vol. 3, pp. 31–13, where both the composition of the fleet sent with Epiphanius (PmbZ #21710) and the gifts he brought with him are listed. Hugh's first diplomatic contact with Constantinople in 926/27 had probably failed: Hiestand, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum*, pp. 154–55.

69 The main source for these successive missions is Liudprand, *Antapodosis*, v 14, ed. Chiesa, p. 130. Berta's voyage to Constantinople is also mentioned in Theophanes Continuatus, ed. I. Bekker, *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus* (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn 1838, p. 431 (Romanos Lakapenos, ch. 46) and further Byzantine historiographical works, cf. Komatina, "The 'King of Francia' in *De cerimoniis* II, 48", p. 160. On the relations between Hugh and Byzantium, see Hiestand, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum*, pp. 181–87; on Berta's stay at the Byzantine court, see Shepard, "Marriages Towards the Millennium", pp. 7–9.

succeeded in ousting Hugh from Italy and seizing effective power in the name of Hugh's son Lothair. This was the background constellation of Liudprand's first mission to the Bosphorus in 949 on behalf of Berengar, the objectives of which can only hypothetically be reconstructed.⁷⁰ In any case, the contacts between Italy and Constantinople were probably interrupted afterwards, even beyond the annexation of the kingdom by Otto I.

Summing up what has been outlined: Byzantine contacts towards the former Frankish Empire in the decades between the end of the 9th century and about 965 were characterized by a permanent focus on Italian affairs, which resulted in phases of dense diplomatic exchange with the post-Carolingian kings but also with the semi-official rulers of Rome and the Papacy. The objectives of these relations, however, did not remain constant; among them ecclesiastical matters feature as well as projects of military cooperation against local Saracen forces or negotiations about dynastic marriage alliances. Besides these rather oscillating relations, there are few instances of contact between Byzantium and the kingdom of the Eastern Franks, which only reach a higher frequency during the earlier reign of Otto I.

Otto's imperial coronation in 962 seemingly did not provoke an immediate Byzantine reaction,⁷¹ although it not only implied the rebirth of Western emperors after nearly 40 years of vacancy but also confirmed the factual union between the two kingdoms of East Francia (Germany) and (Northern) Italy. Furthermore, Otto's vigorous interventions in the affairs of the Roman See and even in southern Italy during the following years, necessarily induced tensions with Byzantium.⁷² The Eastern Empire ruled over large territories in Apulia and Calabria and regarded the neighbouring Lombard principalities and the small maritime polities (Naples, Amalfi and Gaeta) as its zone of influence. Furthermore, Pope John XII sought support in Constantinople against

70 Recently a new interpretation of this embassy's – possibly murderous – intentions has been proposed by Prinzing, "Emperor Constantine VII and Margrave Berengar II of Ivrea", esp. pp. 199–207. Small, "Constantinopolitan Connections", pp. 89–90, suggests an educational purpose. On Liudprand's probable source of knowledge on the downfall of the Lakapenoi, the legate Sigefrid of Parma, see Drocourt, "Passing on Political Information", p. 106.

71 Ohnsorge's assumption, that Romanos II acknowledged Otto's new imperial status (Ohnsorge, "Die Anerkennung des Kaisertums Ottos I.", pp. 178–80) is highly speculative. As Ohnsorge perfectly knew, John Skylitzes, *History*, ed. Thurn, p. 245, does not refer to the imperial coronation, he simply calls Otto the "*basileus* of the Franks" when he refers to the deposition of Pope John XII in December 963; see also Lounghis, "Der Verfall des Papsttums", pp. 224–27.

72 Cf. Keller, "Das ottonische Kirchenreich", pp. 268–73.

Otto.⁷³ The exchange of various embassies between Otto I and the powerful *basileus* Nikephoros Phokas, from 967 to 969, among them Liudprand's mission, did not result in *pax et amicitia* between the two empires. Instead, it was accompanied by open military confrontation in southern Italy. According to Liudprand, Nikephoros gave naval support to Berengar II's son Adalbert when the latter planned to reconquer his former kingdom in 968.⁷⁴ Besides that, the *basileus* seemingly transposed the conflict to the ecclesiastical sphere by establishing a new metropolis at Otranto, and thus extending the sphere of ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in southern Italy.⁷⁵ The subsequent elevation of the see of Benevento to the rank of an archbishopric, decreed at a Roman synod in Otto's presence in May 969, has been interpreted as the Roman reply to this measure, but it might be traced back to regional factors as well.⁷⁶

The open confrontation between the two empires only ceased, when, in 970, the new *basileus* John Tzimiskes released Otto's main ally, the Lombard prince Pandulf of Capua, from captivity⁷⁷ and reopened the marriage negotiations. A high-ranking Western delegation led by Archbishop Gero of Cologne finally brought the Greek bride over to Italy.

We have already stated that Theophano's presence in the Western Empire nevertheless did not cause an intensification in contacts towards Byzantium. Instead, the state of mutual relations seems to be characterized rather by

73 The pope's secret embassy to Constantinople went there *ob iniuriam nostram* in the eyes of Otto I: see Liudprand, *Historia Ottonis*, ch. 6, ed. Chiesa, p. 172, l. 124; see also Böhmer/Zimmermann, *Papstregesten*, no. 315, pp. 96–97.

74 See Liudprand, *Relatio*, chs. 29–31, ed. Chiesa, pp. 199–200. Previously, Adalbert had sent Grimizo as his envoy to Constantinople in order to carry a Byzantine fleet to Italy. During the military operations, Adalbert himself was to remain as a hostage at Bari (Liudprand, *Relatio*, ch. 30). It is not clear whether these preparations actually led to military operations on Italian soil against the combined troops of Otto and the Lombard prince Pandulf “Ironhead” of Capua and Benevento.

75 Liudprand, *Relatio*, ch. 62, ed. Chiesa, p. 215, ll. 1025–39. This measure, as well as an alleged prohibition on celebrating the liturgy in the Latin language in Apulia and Calabria, is not mentioned in any other source.

76 For this synod, see *Die Konzilien 916–1001*, ed. Hehl, pp. 306–14; Wolter, *Die Synoden im Reichsgebiet und in Reichsitalien*, pp. 101–04. The interpretation of this event as a strong reply to the measures taken by Nikephoros II, has been discussed with due circumspection by Huschner, “Benevent, Magdeburg Salerno”, pp. 96–99. The role of regional hierarchies in the Lombard principalities, however, should not be underestimated, see Kolditz, “Von Ravenna bis Otranto”.

77 On Pandulf's captivity and transfer to Constantinople, see the *Chronicle of Salerno*, ch. 172, ed. Westerbergh, p. 175. On his release, which caused Otto I to retire from Byzantine Apulia, see *Chronicle of Salerno*, ch. 174, ed. Westerbergh, p. 177. The release of the captives is also alluded to in Widukind, *Deeds of the Saxons*, III 73, eds. Waitz/Kehr, p. 149.

potential conflict in the following years, when the ruthless usurper Boniface VII, who had his predecessor Pope Benedict VI (973–74) killed in prison, found asylum in Byzantium, from where he returned in 984 and once again occupied the *cathedra Petri*.⁷⁸ Otto II started to use the title *Romanorum imperator augustus*, cautiously avoided by his predecessors, precisely at the time of his campaign against the Saracens in southern Italy, which was also directed against the Greek presence there.⁷⁹ The Byzantine provincial fleet played an ambiguous role in rescuing Otto's life after his unfortunate battle against the Sicilian Muslims at Crotona in 982, perhaps with the intention to carry him off to Constantinople.⁸⁰ After Otto II's death in Rome (December 983), Theophano did not immediately claim the regency for herself,⁸¹ but later she followed the call of Archbishop Willigis of Mainz and finally prevailed over the bold pretensions of Duke Henry (the "Wrangler") of Bavaria, whose claims to royal status were ironically ridiculed by his adversaries with a reference to Byzantine custom: *more Grecorum conregnantem instituere vultis?*⁸²

Otto III, the son of Theophano, has repeatedly been credited with introducing Byzantine habits and autocratic manners into the Western Empire during his later imperial years, such as the use of Byzantine titles at his court or the secluded position of his table at banquets.⁸³ Furthermore the reign of Otto III, as well as the regency of his mother, undoubtedly represent a phase of close

78 On him, see Delogu, "Bonifacio VII".

79 See Seibert, "Eines großen Vaters glückloser Sohn", pp. 310–12; Ohnsorge, "Basileus, Kaiser und Sarazenen", pp. 179–80, who links the changing title to a new self-conception of Otto as fighter against the Saracens, allegedly promoted by Theophano.

80 Various versions of this event, the outcome of which could either be seen as a victory or a crushing defeat of the Ottonian forces, exist in a number of contemporary as well as later sources; for an outline, see Clauss, *Kriegsniederlagen im Mittelalter*, pp. 281–86. The role of the Greeks in particular could be construed differently in this respect. Thus, the Muslims were sometimes even considered mercenaries defending Greek territories against Otto: see Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicle*, ed. G.H. Pertz, *Herimanni Augiensis Chronicon* in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, vol. 5, Hannover 1844, pp. 67–133, here p. 117 (ad ann. 982). On the event, see also Seibert, "Eines großen Vaters glückloser Sohn", p. 311, n. 81; Alvermann, "La battaglia di Ottone II"; Eickhoff, *Theophanu und der König*, pp. 63–79; Ohnsorge, "Basileus, Kaiser und Sarazenen", pp. 181–89; Keller, "Das ottonische Kirchenreich", pp. 277–80. For a detailed discussion of the narrative constructions, see Banaszkiewicz, "Ein Ritter flieht", esp. pp. 148–60.

81 See Erkens, "... more Grecorum", pp. 274–75. On the other hand, Ciggaar, "The Empress Theophano (972–991)", pp. 51–54, assumes an influence of Byzantine models on Western institutions of co-rulership and regency in Theophano's age.

82 For an outline of this controversy, see Eickhoff, *Theophanu und der König*, pp. 99–120. On Henry's aspirations, see Erkens, "... more Grecorum", pp. 280–89.

83 The latter innovation is cautiously criticized by Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle*, IV 47, ed. Holtzmann, p. 184, who interprets these measures as a renewal of the "customs of the

relations between the Ottonian elite and Greek monasticism in Italy,⁸⁴ which might have influenced the characteristic traits of Otto's personal devotion and humility as a christomimetic ruler. Political contacts towards Byzantium, however, did not intensify until shortly before Otto's imperial coronation in 996 when he sent his mother's former counsellor John Philagathos, Archbishop of Piacenza,⁸⁵ to the court of Basil II in order to negotiate a Byzantine marriage for Otto himself. Having returned to Italy, Philagathos was installed as anti-pope (John XVI) by Crescentius, the head of the Roman opposition, who also instrumentalized the Byzantine legate Leon, Metropolitan of Synada, for his political aims, before Leon went to Otto's court in 997.⁸⁶ The Roman crisis, suppressed by Otto's rigid personal intervention in 998, again shows the ambivalence inherent in Byzantine-Western relations during this phase, oscillating between exceptional closeness and potential rivalry. The negotiations between the two empires continued, however, and it seems that a marriage between Otto and one of the daughters of the Byzantine co-emperor Constantine VIII was about to be concluded⁸⁷ when Otto's premature death early in 1002 prevented its accomplishment.

4 Distant Courts: Contacts in the Decades between 1000 and the 1070s

What follows can be described as a constellation of two distant empires for about 70 years, between 1002 and the year 1071, when Byzantium lost Bari, the capital of its south Italian possessions to the Normans under Robert Guiscard.

ancient Romans"; see also Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, pp. 110–11; Hehl, "Zwei Kaiser – (k)ein Problem", pp. 61–62.

84 See the contribution by Annick Peters-Custot to this volume.

85 For Philagathos' career, see Chrestos, "Ἰωάννης Φιλάγαθος", esp. pp. 217–26; Huschner, "Giovanni XVI"; id., "Piacenza-Como-Mainz-Bamberg", pp. 19–30.

86 Leon nevertheless boasted of having made Philagathos pope: Leon of Synada, *Letters*, no. 6, ed. Vinson, pp. 8–10; on the course of this mission, see Schramm, "Zwölf Briefe des byzantinischen Gesandten Leon", pp. 251–54; id., "Kaiser, Basileus und Papst", pp. 220–36; Kolditz, "Leon von Synada", pp. 509–10 and 544–53; Moulet, "Le personnel ecclésiastique", pp. 344–47; Holmes, *Basil II*, pp. 508–09.

87 In the course of another embassy led by Archbishop Arnulf of Milan. He is said to have accompanied the imperial bride to Bari early 1002, from where she returned when Otto's death was announced. The only account of these events, in Landulf the Elder's fabulous *History of Milan*, ed. A. Cutolo, *Landulphi Senioris Mediolanensis Historia* (Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, 2nd ed., vol. IV/2), Bologna 1942, ch. II 18, p. 53, deserves a critical treatment, see Kolditz, "Leon von Synada", pp. 578–79; cf. Hoffmann, "Von verlorenen Hufeisen", pp. 233–35.

In the course of these decades political contacts between the empires petered out in frequency and significance. We are not informed about any official exchange between the two sides during the reign of Henry II (1002–24).⁸⁸ But this emperor later received the Apulian rebel Meles/Melus at his court, whom he finally acknowledged as Duke of Apulia in April 1020, some days before the latter's death.⁸⁹ Pope Benedict VIII also favoured a military intervention by the Western Emperor against the consolidation of Byzantine power in southern Italy. Consequently, Henry did not avoid direct interference in the Byzantine sphere of interest on his third Italian campaign in 1022, when he laid siege to the Apulian stronghold of Troia. But besides that, his intervention focused on the (temporary) extinction of Byzantine influence on the Lombard territories in the region by deposing the philo-Greek prince Pandulf IV of Capua and installing a new abbot at Montecassino.⁹⁰ In the long run, the results of Henry's intervention proved to be of little durability, but the Byzantines similarly did not obtain any consolidated supremacy over southern Italy. Although Basil II planned a large campaign in order to reconquer the island of Sicily from Muslim rule during the last years of his reign, the operations of a Byzantine army there ultimately failed during the reign of Constantine VIII (1025–28).⁹¹

This emperor again received envoys from the Western Empire at the Bosphorus. After the splendid imperial coronation in Rome in 1027, the first Salian Emperor Conrad II (1025–39) sent Bishop Werner of Strasbourg to Constantinople in 1027. Though the contemporary sources do not mention the purpose of this mission, it has often been assumed that Conrad aimed at obtaining a Byzantine bride for his son Henry III. If so, this would have been a quite illusionary objective as the fading Macedonian dynasty did not have

88 Ohnsorge, "Die Legation des Kaisers Basileios II.", pp. 304–09, claimed that a Byzantine embassy was received by Henry at Christmas 1002, some months after his accession to the throne. Though this is based on rather weak evidence – Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle*, v 27, ed. Holtzmann, p. 251, only mentions "many embassies" – it has generally been accepted, see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, p. 242; Shepard, "Storm Clouds and a Thunderclap", pp. 134–35, who characterizes Henry's position towards Byzantium as "informed wariness".

89 On Meles, see Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, pp. 242–44; PmbZ #25033; Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft*, pp. 53–58; ead., "Between Two Empires: Southern Italy in the Reign of Basil II", pp. 146–48 and 153–55; Loud, "The German Emperors and Southern Italy", pp. 596–97.

90 See Weinfurter, *Heinrich II.*, pp. 245–48; Loud, "The German Emperors and Southern Italy", pp. 598–601; Falkenhausen, "Montecassino e Bisanzio", pp. 79–80.

91 For this campaign led by the *koitonites* Orestes, see John Skylitzes, *History*, ed. Thurn, p. 368 and 383–84; Holmes, *Basil II*, p. 506; Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft*, p. 53.

a suitable princess to be sent into the West at that time.⁹² Nevertheless, an imperial letter written with gold ink reached Conrad's court probably in 1029,⁹³ and in the year before an unnamed Greek bishop was present at a German synod held at Pöhlde.⁹⁴ These contacts remained isolated episodes as probably did another Byzantine legation sent by Constantine IX Monomachos and received by Henry III in the course of a general synod celebrated at Mainz in October 1049.⁹⁵ In his reply Henry emphasized – according to Adam of Bremen – his alleged descent from the Empress Theophano and claimed that he therefore held the Greeks in high esteem and struggled to imitate their habits and customs.⁹⁶

Meanwhile the political context in southern Italy, the main zone of encounter between the two empires, had changed considerably: Byzantine rule over Apulia and Calabria was destabilized by successive revolts, particularly that of the powerful general Georgios Maniakes in 1042.⁹⁷ On the other hand, Prince Pandulf IV of Capua had continued his troublesome activities until Conrad II's intervention, and then temporarily escaped to Constantinople in 1039.⁹⁸

92 See Wolfram, "Die Gesandtschaft Konrads II.," pp. 162–70. Recently, the fragmentary source evidence for this legation has been revised by Jäckel, "Heinrich III. und eine Brautschau in Byzanz," pp. 184–99, who rightly questions the established assumption that a marriage alliance was envisaged; Jäckel (pp. 190–91) also rejects the dating of the embassy to 1028 proposed by Wolf, "Zur richtigen Datierung".

93 See Wipo, *Deeds of Conrad*, ch. 22, ed. H. Bresslau, *Die Werke Wipos* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 61), 3rd ed., Hannover 1915, p. 42: "Legationis tamen causam postea imperator Graecorum aureis literis imperatori Chuonrado rescripsit."

94 Mentioned at the end of the participants' list in Wolthere's *Vita Godehardi prior*, ch. 35, besides a likewise unnamed Roman bishop: "et unus Romanus, alius Grecus in sinodo consederunt": *Die Konzilien 1023–1059*, ed. Jasper, p. 119.

95 See Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 896, p. 27; a detailed analysis of the sources for this mission has been undertaken by Ohnsorge, "Das nach Goslar gelangte Auslandsschreiben", esp. pp. 317–21; see also Kresten, "Correctiunculae", pp. 144–48. On the synod and its proceedings, see *Die Konzilien 1023–1059*, ed. Jasper, pp. 251–66; Gresser, *Synoden und Konzilien in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums*, pp. 21–22.

96 Adam of Bremen, III 32, ed B. Schmeidler, *Adam von Bremen, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte*, 3rd ed. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 2), Hannover 1917, p. 174: "Tunc ille Constantinopolitano rescribens iactavit se inter alia descendere a Grecorum prosapia, Theophanu et fortissimo Ottone sui generis auctoribus. Ideoque nec mirum esse, si Grecos diligeret, quos vellet etiam habitu et moribus imitari; quod et fecit."

97 On this rebellion, and a previous accusation against Maniakes, see Cheynet, *Pouvoir et contestations*, pp. 48–49, 57–58; for Maniakes' military activities before, see also Shepard, "Byzantium's last Sicilian expedition", esp. pp. 148–54.

98 See the certainly very biased account given by the *Chronicle of Montecassino*, II 63, ed. Hoffmann, pp. 288–93. The related account by Amatus of Montecassino, *History of the*

Against this backdrop the Norman warriors that served the regional power-holders as welcome auxiliary forces could easily establish themselves as an independent political entity. Conrad II contributed to their ascent when he accepted the creation of the Norman county of Aversa in 1038 at the request of Prince Guaimar IV of Salerno.⁹⁹ In 1053, a campaign against the Normans led by Pope Leo IX failed disastrously at Civitate (near Foggia) and the pope was at least *de facto* forced to recognize the Norman leader Humphrey de Hauteville as Count of Apulia and Calabria. The emergence of this dynamic regional power rival brought the two empires into closer political contact as both probably felt their respective interests threatened. In 1055, Henry III sent Bishop Otto of Novara to Constantinople. The legate returned accompanied by Byzantine envoys sent by the Empress Theodora, and the state of mutual friendship (*amicitiam pactumque*) between the two empires was corroborated.¹⁰⁰ Besides that, however, nothing concrete seems to have resulted from these contacts in the long run, probably due to the troubled internal situation in both empires in the following years.

It was only around 1062/63 that the *Patricius* Pantaleon of Amalfi again tried to form a military alliance between the two empires against the Normans. He himself offered to mobilize the *basileus* Constantine X Doukas, while Bishop Benzo of Alba, whose writings are the sole source on this project, was allegedly meant to do the same with regard to the young Henry IV.¹⁰¹ Benzo further refers to two letters sent by the Byzantine Emperor to the Roman (anti-) Pope Honorius II (Cadalus). In the first of them Constantine X tried to exhort Honorius to promote an inter-imperial alliance against the Normans in the

Normans, II 12, ed. V. de Bartholomaeis, *Storia de' Normanni di Amato di Montecassino* (Fonti per la storia d'Italia, 76), Rome 1935, p. 70, adds that the emperor sent him "into exile".

99 See Loud, "The German Emperors and Southern Italy", pp. 602–03. For the consequences of Norman warfare and conquest on the local population, see *id.*, "Byzantine Italy and the Normans", pp. 220–23.

100 The two legations are briefly mentioned in Berthold, *Chronicle*, ed. Robinson, pp. 176–77. Ohnsorge, "Eine Rotulus-Bulle", pp. 337–41, assumed that the new *basileus* Michael VI in turn sent a mission back to the German court, which was headed by the *protospatharios* Nikephoros, arrived only after the death of Henry III and was received by the infant king Henry IV at Cologne in December 1056. Such a reconstruction seemed to be justified by the gold bulla of a Byzantine emperor Michael once applied to the lost shrine of Saints Marsus and Lutrudis at Essen. The bulla, however, should not be attributed to Michael VI but probably belongs to Michael Komnenos Doukas, the ruler of Epeiros in the 13th century, as Kresten, "Correctiunculae", pp. 148–53 has shown.

101 Benzo of Alba, *Seven Books*, II 7, ed. Seyffert, pp. 212–14; cf. Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 248, vol. 1, p. 102; for further activities of Pantaleon, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 126 and 128.

West, which could open the way for a common action of the two emperors to liberate the Holy Sepulchre.¹⁰² The second letter – transmitted by Pantaleon of Amalfi – suggests that Henry should undertake a military campaign to Apulia and Calabria supported by a large Byzantine naval operation.¹⁰³ In this perspective, a military intervention from Germany in southern Italy would no longer have been feared but desired by the Byzantines. However, the initiative did not bear fruit.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, Benzo's chronicle is far from entirely trustworthy, and since his letters bear indubitable traces of manipulation by Benzo himself, a safe reconstruction of the exchange he testifies is not possible.¹⁰⁵

At about the same time German bishops were repeatedly present on the Bosphorus: Archbishop Gebhard of Salzburg (1060–88) travelled to Constantinople on behalf of Henry IV. Neither the date nor the aim of his mission are mentioned in the short note contained in a relatively late *Life* of Gebhard, whose author is primarily interested in the fate of a precious *rationale* Gebhard had brought with him from there and given to the monastery of Admont.¹⁰⁶ Probably this mission should be dated to the end of 1060, but

¹⁰² Benzo of Alba, *Seven Books*, II 12, ed. Seyffert, pp. 224–28. Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 126–29, corrects the date assumed by Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 952, p. 48 (early 1063) to spring 1062; cf. Sansterre, “Byzance et son souverain”, pp. 95–96, 98.

¹⁰³ Benzo of Alba, *Seven Books*, III 3, ed. Seyffert, pp. 276–78, esp. p. 278, ll. 1–8. The Latin translation of Constantine's letter is inserted into a probably fictive letter Benzo claims to have written to Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, and the affair seems to be linked to Cadalus' second attack on Rome in 1063; see Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 306, vol. 1, p. 134; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 953, p. 48; Sansterre, “Byzance et son souverain”, pp. 96–97.

¹⁰⁴ Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem*, p. 83, suggests that Adalbert of Bremen thwarted the Byzantine efforts; contra Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 130. Sansterre, “Byzance et son souverain”, pp. 99–100, draws attention to a parallel exchange of letters between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and Pope Alexander II, which could indicate a change in the Byzantine position in 1063 when Cadalus had lost most of his supporters.

¹⁰⁵ Benzo furthermore claims that he himself handed the *basileus'* message over to Henry IV at Quedlinburg, but such an encounter in 1065, when Henry had come of age and Cadalus had already definitely lost his support, is difficult to imagine: see Benzo of Alba, *Seven Books*, III 13–14, ed. Seyffert, pp. 306–14, with a critical assessment (pp. 306–07, n. 210). A probable date for this mission is 1065; see Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 355, vol. 1, p. 158, but Struve regards Benzo's speech as “*offensichtlich fingiert*”.

¹⁰⁶ *Vita Gebehardi*, ed. G.H. Pertz, *Vita Gebehardi, Thiemonis, Chunradi*, [...] *archiepiscoporum cum Chronico Admuntensi in Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, vol. 11, Hannover 1854, pp. 33–51, here ch. 8, p. 39: “Inter cetera preciosa [...] rationale unum ex auro et gemmis preciosissimis intextum [...] quod imperator Graeciae fundatori nostro Gebehardo archiepiscopo, dum legatione cesari illo functus filium eius baptizasset, pro munere donaverat.” Ohnsorge, “Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg”, pp. 348–51, interpreted the term *rationale* as a Byzantine imperial *lóros*.

even the year 1074 has been taken into consideration.¹⁰⁷ Bishop Gunther of Bamberg together with further high-ranking German pilgrims stayed at the Byzantine capital on their way to the Holy Land in 1064.¹⁰⁸ Besides the rise of the Normans, increased religious communications thus also bridged the distance between East and West in the second half of the 11th century.

5 In the Shadow of the Normans: Inter-imperial Relations from the 1080s to the Death of Lothar III

When Robert Guiscard finally took Bari after a long siege in 1071, Byzantine territorial rule in southern Italy de facto came to an end. Michael VII Doukas, who at about the same time assumed power after the defeat Romanos IV Diogenes had suffered at Mantzikert, sought a rapprochement with Guiscard. Negotiations about a marriage between one of Robert's daughters and a member of the Byzantine imperial family – first Michael's brother Konstantios, then Michael's son Constantine – came to a successful end.¹⁰⁹ Abbot Desiderius of Montecassino might have played a role in this context, since in 1076 Michael

¹⁰⁷ The date 1062, proposed by Ohnsorge, "Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg", pp. 351–59, links this mission to the diplomatic activities mentioned by Benzo (see also Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 250, vol. 1, p. 103). It has been rejected by Bayer, "Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg", pp. 517–19, in favour of the year 1060 when the baptism of Prince Konstantios Doukas mentioned in the *Vita* should have taken place. For a discussion of the date 1074 proposed by W. Erben, see Bayer, "Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg", pp. 519–20.

¹⁰⁸ The stay at Constantinople is mentioned in the *Annales Altahenses maiores*, ed. E. Oefele (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 4), 2nd ed., Hannover 1891, p. 67 (ad ann. 1065), which state stereotypically: "Illic ergo tam honorifice se agebant in cunctis, ut ipsa graeca et imperialis arrogantia nimium miraretur super his". For this famous pilgrimage, see Joranson, "The Great German Pilgrimage"; Jacoby, "Bishop Gunther of Bamberg", esp. pp. 274–79. The Greeks are said to have believed that Gunther of Bamberg in fact was King Henry travelling incognito; a precious silken cloth he received from the emperor ended up in his grave at Bamberg; see Prinzing, "Das Bamberger Gunthertuch". The growth of Latin pilgrimage in the 11th century due to the opening of the Hungarian land route is said to have opened an "age of mass contact": Leyser, "The Tenth Century", p. 46; see also Kislinger, "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz und dem Abendland", pp. 254–57; Shepard, "Storm Clouds and a Thunderclap", pp. 129–32.

¹⁰⁹ Constantine was betrothed to Robert's daughter Olympias who came to Constantinople in 1076, but due to Constantine's infant age and Michael's demise in 1078 the marriage was never completed: see Falkenhausen, "Olympias", pp. 65–68, 72; see also the contribution by Eleni Tounta to this volume.

issued a chrysobull that fixed an exceptionally high annual Byzantine payment (*solemnion*) of 24 pounds of gold together with 4 *pallia* to this prestigious and influential monastery.¹¹⁰ In the same period, Michael VII also entered into contact with Pope Gregory VII, which probably resulted in discussions about the restoration of ecclesiastical union, held with Patriarch Dominicus IV of Grado as papal representative.¹¹¹ Instead, the Western Empire and its royal head Henry IV, whose relationship with Gregory had gravely deteriorated, seem to be completely absent from Byzantium's foreign contacts in the time of Michael VII. The constellation changed, however, when Nikephoros Botaneiates dethroned Michael early in 1078: Olympias, Guiscard's daughter, was confined to a monastery in the Byzantine capital, and Gregory VII immediately excommunicated the new *basileus* at a Roman synod in November.¹¹² This council was also attended by the representatives of Rudolf of Rheinfelden, who, meanwhile, had been elected king against Henry by a faction among the German princes. Against this background, it would be natural to assume that both Nikephoros and Henry were inclined towards a mutual rapprochement, but there is no evidence for any such effort. Only one charter among the famous forgeries instigated by Bishop Benno II of Osnabrück (1068–88) might give a hint as to growing attention towards Byzantium at that time. The forged diploma, allegedly issued by Charlemagne, conceded complete freedom from royal service to the church of Osnabrück, except in the case where a marriage union between the *imperator Romanorum* and the *rex Grecorum* was negotiated. In this case, the Bishop of Osnabrück should assume the honour of being legate, and therefore a school should permanently exist at the bishop's see where

110 The hypothesis of Desiderius' involvement in Byzantine-Norman negotiations is proposed by Falkenhausen, "Montecassino e Bisanzio dal IX al XII secolo", pp. 92–98, in a meticulous discussion of Michael's *chrysobullon sigillion* (Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1006, p. 67); see also Loud, "Montecassino and Byzantium", pp. 47–49. *Chronicle of Montecassino*, III 39, ed. Hoffmann, pp. 415–16.

111 Michael's initiative is known thanks to the pope's reply contained in the *Register of Gregory VII*, ed. E. Caspar, *Registrum Gregorii VII* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae selectae, 2), vol. 1, Berlin 1920, no. 1 18, pp. 29–30 (9 July 1073), where the two Greek monks Nicholas and Thomas are mentioned. See Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 988, p. 60; Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII*, pp. 483–84; Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 139–41; for the identification of Dominicus of Grado, see Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, vol. 1, p. 112, n. 492. Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 996b, p. 62, suggests that the philosopher John Italos was the Byzantine representative in the ensuing disputations with Dominicus, based on a note in Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, v 8,5, ed. Reinsch, p. 163, which, however, does not clearly refer to discussions with a papal representative.

112 For this synod, see Gresser, *Synoden und Konzilien in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums*, pp. 177–86, esp. p. 181; for Gregory's position towards Byzantium and the Normans at this time, see Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII*, pp. 432–33, 485–86.

the Greek language should be taught.¹¹³ Looking at this forgery in the political context of the time, this clause could indicate that Benno, an influential partisan of Henry IV against the Papacy, sought to obtain a monopolistic position for his bishopric in future relations with Constantinople. Nevertheless, there is no trace of Osnabrück's further role in inter-imperial relations in the time of Henry IV or its aftermath.

Guiscard, however, used the Constantinopolitan usurpations as a pretext for his own invasion of Byzantine territory in the western Balkans. Consequently, the new Byzantine Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) vigorously built new alliances. He sent his envoys to Gregory VII, but also to Henry IV and the Venetians in 1081.¹¹⁴ A phase of diplomatic exchange with the Salian court followed. First, it was Alexios who had much interest in winning Henry as an ally against the aggressive policy Robert Guiscard initiated beyond the Adriatic Sea. Thus, a second Byzantine legate, the Bishop of Methymna, reached Henry's camp in Italy and urged him again to intervene in 1082.¹¹⁵ Henry answered the Byzantine initiative by sending the count Burchard – probably the later Bishop of Münster – and his *fidelis* Albert as envoys to the Bosphorus.¹¹⁶ After a certain period of time, probably in spring 1083 according to the chronicler Frutolf,¹¹⁷ he received the Byzantine ambassador Constantine Choirospaktes in Italy, who brought with him – besides a letter from Alexios – rich gifts, among them an enormous amount of money and precious relics.¹¹⁸ It has

-
- 113 *Die Urkunden der Karolinger*, ed. E. Mühlbacher, *Die Urkunden Pippins, Karlmanns und Karls des Großen* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Diplomata Karolinorum, 1), Hannover 1906, no. 273, pp. 403–05, here p. 405, ll. 7–14. See also Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*, p. 222; Drocourt, “La question des échanges linguistiques”, p. 57. For Benno's forgeries, see Vogtherr, “Die Fälschungen”, pp. 218–19.
- 114 Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, nos 1067, 1068 and 1070, p. 87; based on Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, III 10, 1–2 and IV 2, 2, ed. Reinsch, pp. 112–14 and 122–23. See Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident*, pp. 245–47; Kresten, “Die Auslandsschreiben”, pp. 46, 54. For the mission to Venice, see Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 330–31.
- 115 This mission left Byzantium before Guiscard went back to Italy in May 1082. It is only attested by Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, v 3,1, ed. Reinsch, p. 146. Cf. Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 1081, p. 224; Kresten, “Die Auslandsschreiben”, pp. 48, 54, who modifies the sequence of embassies with due reason: this mission is to be dated before that of Choirospaktes.
- 116 Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 1043, vol. 3, pp. 202–03; Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany*, pp. 214–15; for the date of this mission, probably in 1082 instead of 1081, see Kresten, “Die Auslandsschreiben”, p. 54.
- 117 *Frutolfi Chronica*, ed. Schmale, in Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronicle*, p. 96. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany*, pp. 222–23, consequently takes 1083 as the date of Choirospaktes' embassy.
- 118 The main source for this mission (Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 1077, vol. 3, pp. 221–22) is Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, III, 10, 2–8, ed. Reinsch, pp. 112–14, where Alexios' letter to Henry is inserted. The letter's text seems to be original, not

often been assumed that Henry received another embassy from Alexios early in 1084, which again offered rich gifts if Henry would attack Robert Guiscard.¹¹⁹ Since the content of these two embassies is very similar, they might in fact be one and the same, as Lounghis and Kresten believe.¹²⁰ Nevertheless, the possibility of a separate mission, arriving shortly before Henry entered Rome in March 1084 and was crowned emperor by “his” Pope Clement III, cannot be excluded either. Anyhow, Henry IV subsequently returned to the north and did nothing to prevent Robert Guiscard from again crossing the Adriatic. The rapprochement towards its Western imperial counterpart thus proved ineffectual for Byzantium and the idea of an inter-imperial alliance faded away.¹²¹

In the following years the Papacy, represented by Urban II (1088–99), again became the main Western partner for Alexios Komnenos. Negotiations for Church union were held in 1089.¹²² Byzantine envoys sent to the curia tried to obtain military aid against the Pechenegs in 1091 and later against the Seljuks in 1095. As is well known, the second of these embassies played a crucial role in the genesis of the First Crusade.¹²³ The misunderstandings that came about in the course of the crusade necessitated further communications with the Apostolic See before and after 1100.¹²⁴ Besides that, a Byzantine embassy

adapted by Anna, as Kresten, “Die Auslandsschreiben”, pp. 27–34, has argued; he furthermore shows convincingly (pp. 49–54) that Choroosphaktes’ mission should be identified with that mentioned by Frutolf (previous note) and hence dated to 1083, instead of 1082 as traditionally assumed (inter alia in the *regesta*). Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany*, pp. 222–23 also opts for 1083. It is not clear whether this mission or (as Kresten proposes) already the first one in 1081, is alluded to by Benzo of Alba, *Seven Books*, I 17, ed. Seyffert, p. 152, who focuses on relics sent to Henry, and also alluded to by the *Vita Heinrich IV*, ch. 1, ed. W. Eberhard (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 58), 3rd ed., Hannover 1899, p. 12, ll. 18–25, which mentions a Golden altarpiece sent by the *rex Graeciae* and given to Speyer Cathedral.

119 The sole source is Bernold, *Chronicle*, ed. Robinson, p. 439: Bernold emphasizes that Henry took the money offered but spent it *ad conciliandum sibi vulgus Romanum*, against the *basileus*’ intentions. See Böhmer/Struve/Lubich, *Regesta Imperii Heinrich IV.*, no. 1131, vol. 3, p. 249; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten* no. 1114, p. 103, both of which distinguish this legation from that of Choroosphaktes.

120 See Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident*, pp. 246–48; Kresten, “Die Auslandsschreiben”, pp. 52–53, n. 101, and pp. 54–55.

121 Holtzmann, “Unionsverhandlungen”, p. 51; Kresten, “Die Auslandsschreiben”, pp. 56–58 (“gigantische Fehlinvestition”).

122 For these contacts, see Holtzmann, “Unionsverhandlungen”, pp. 38–50; Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 154–62; Drocourt, “La question des échanges linguistiques”, p. 58.

123 Both of these embassies are mentioned in Bernold, *Chronicle*, ed. Robinson, pp. 483, 520; see Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1156, p. 128; no. 1176, pp. 138–39.

124 As Shepard, “Hard on Heretics”, pp. 772–76, suggests, the persecution of Bogomil heretics in Byzantium at that time might also have been intended as a message confirming

was sent to the major maritime power within the Kingdom of Italy, Pisa, whose ships had been involved in predatory attacks against Byzantine territories in the years before. The *comune* gave security to the *basileus* and in turn received its first trading privilege in October 1111.¹²⁵ In the same year the papal legate Cuno of Praeneste proclaimed the excommunication of the Western Emperor Henry V in Greece, because Henry had seized Pope Paschal II after his own imperial coronation in Rome.¹²⁶

It was only in 1117, shortly before the death of Alexios I, that contacts between the two empires were again resumed. Bishop Burchard of Münster went to Constantinople where he died in the following year.¹²⁷ The motive of this seemingly isolated mission is unknown, as is that of an embassy sent by Alexios I to Pope Paschal II (1099–1118) at about the same time.¹²⁸

Byzantine orthodoxy to the Latin world against the accusations of heresy fostered by Bohemund.

- 125 For these developments and the resulting treaty, see Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 69–76, 355–62; and Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1255, p. 174, with further references.
- 126 This is mentioned in a report given by Cuno to the Lateran Synod in 1116, which is inserted in Ekkehard of Aura's *Chronicle*: Ekkehard, *Chronicle*, rec. III, ed. Schmale, p. 322, l. 28–p. 324, l. 3. The note states that Cuno confirmed the sentence of excommunication originally proclaimed at Jerusalem “in Grecia, Ungaria, Saxonia, Lotharingia et Francia, in v conciliis.” Hiestand, “Legat, Kaiser und Basileus”, pp. 148–151, assumed that the sentence was read at the Permanent Synod of Constantinople and that the Byzantine Church excommunicated Henry V, but he does not adduce any evidence for this problematic assumption, which is also disapproved by Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 188, n. 64.
- 127 The legation is mentioned in the reconstructed *Annals of Paderborn*, ed. Scheffer-Boichorst, p. 135, and in Ekkehard of Aura's *Chronicle*, rec. IV, ed. Schmale, p. 346, ll. 21–23 (ad ann. 1121); cf. Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, VII, pp. 86–87, n. 52. For an overview of Henry V's contacts towards east-central and eastern Europe in general, see Ziemann, “Im Osten was Neues”, who, however, does not discuss Burchard's mission.
- 128 The embassy, which was received by Paschal II at Palaestrina in winter 1117/18, is briefly mentioned in the pope's *Life* by Petrus Pisanus, see Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1274, p. 180; Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher*, VII, p. 50. Koder, “Die letzte Gesandtschaft”, p. 134, argues that this mission should promote, besides Church union, an official recognition of Byzantine emperorship by the Papacy. In any case, it was not the first instance of contact between Alexios and Paschal. According to Albert of Aachen, the emperor had commissioned the Latin bishop of “Barzenona”, sent to him by King Baldwin of Jerusalem, to explain his behaviour towards the crusaders to the pope: see Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1218, p. 155. The identification of this prelate is very questionable, see Darrouzès, “Les documents byzantins”, pp. 53–54. Another Byzantine mission to Paschal II at the end of 1112 concerned Church union. It was headed by the *kuropalates* Basil Mesemerios as can be inferred from Paschal's reply: Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1263, p. 176; Classen, “Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens”, p. 209; Servatius, *Paschalis II.*, pp. 303–04; the theological discussions that had taken place earlier that year in Constantinople are outlined by Darrouzès, “Les documents byzantins”, pp. 51–59; Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 191–96; see also Koder, “Die letzte Gesandtschaft”, pp. 131–33.

The last cluster of contacts to be mentioned in this succinct outline is situated in the final years of the reign of Lothair III (1125–37). At an imperial diet assembled at Merseburg in August 1135, Lothair received a Byzantine mission consisting of a bishop and a lay dignitary. The envoys brought exotic gifts with them (e.g. *aromata multa nimis et in hac terra hactenus incognita*), and they induced the emperor to organise a campaign against Roger II, the new king of Sicily and southern Italy, who is considered a tyrant (*Ruokerus tirannus*) in the *Magdeburg Annals*.¹²⁹ While still planning his Italian campaign, Lothair in turn sent the erudite Bishop Anselm of Havelberg at the head of an embassy to Byzantium.¹³⁰ Anselm stayed at the Pisan quarter in Constantinople, where he held the first part of his public disputation with Metropolitan Niketas of Nikomedeia on the differences between the Greek and Latin churches in April 1136.¹³¹ The Pisans strongly approved of an alliance between the two empires against Roger, and in 1136 John II Komnenos sent his envoys to Pisa, offering rich gifts.¹³² Pisa supported the coalition of Roger II's enemies on the southern Italian mainland, and the *comune* also backed

- 129 See the relatively detailed account in a chronicle written at Erfurt: *S. Petri Erpeshfurtensis Continuatio Chronici Ekkehardi*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Monumenta Erpeshfurtensia* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 42), Hannover 1899, p. 42, ll. 4–23. (ad ann. 1135). Shorter notes are contained in the *Annals of Magdeburg*, ed. Pertz, p. 185, ll. 39–41 (ad ann. 1135) and in the *Continuatio Cosmae Chronici Bohemorum*, ed. R. Köpke in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, vol. 9, Hannover 1851, p. 141 (ad ann. 1135); cf. Böhmer/Petke, *Regesta Imperii Lothar III.*, no. 453, p. 288; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1309, pp. 191–92; Papageorgiou, “The Political Ideology”, p. 39. The terminology of the sources is discussed by Tounta, *To δυτικὸν sacrum imperium*, pp. 33–35.
- 130 The mission is briefly mentioned in the *Annals of Magdeburg*, ed. Pertz, p. 185, ll. 41–43 (ad ann. 1135); it might be identified with the mission to the Greeks in which the provost Eilbert of Goslar took part and witnessed a miracle worked by Godehard during the maritime passage: see *Translatio Godehardi episcopi Hildesheimensis*, ed. G.H. Pertz, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, vol. 12, Hannover 1856, pp. 639–50, here p. 649, ll. 1–13. Though the sources never mention Anselm and Eilbert together, the identification of the two missions is taken for granted by Böhmer/Petke, *Regesta Imperii Lothar III.*, no. 453, pp. 287–88.
- 131 The contents of this disputation are referred to in Anselm's *Anticimenon*: Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 188, cols 1140–41 and 1163. The second and third book of the treatise (cols. 1163–1248) in fact constitute a record of the disputation, certainly reworked by Anselm. On Anselm's mission, see Darrouzès, “Les documents byzantins”, pp. 59–65; Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg*, pp. 42–47; on his career and relationship to Lothair III, see Petke, *Kanzlei, Kapelle und königliche Kurie*, pp. 323–31; Lees, *Anselm of Havelberg*, pp. 40–42, 48–57.
- 132 This mission is mentioned in a somehow distorted passage in the *Annals of Pisa*, ed. M.L. Gentile, *Gli Annales Pisani di Bernardo Maragone* (Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, 2nd ed., VI/2), Bologna 1936, p. 10 (ad ann. 1137). Its aim is not mentioned. According to Lilie,

Lothair's dynamic campaign there in 1137. In July of this year, Eastern legates arrived at Lothair's camp and transmitted John's congratulations on Lothair's victory over Roger II. Once again, a religious disputation was held at this occasion: between a Greek *philosophus*, who fiercely criticized the Roman Church, and Petrus Diaconus. The results of this dialogue were sent to the emperor and the patriarch in Constantinople.¹³³ A growing awareness of a deep religious rift between Greeks and Latins thus started to influence the political dialogue, but the desire for close military cooperation between Byzantium and the Western Empire clearly prevailed in their mutual relationship at the dawn of the Staufan age.

Looking back at the general developments that characterized these relations during the Salian century, discontinuity is certainly one of the main characteristics. Occasionally, contacts could reach a relatively high frequency, but they did not develop into a regular exchange. Instead, it seems that over long phases (especially between 1084 and 1117, but also during the whole reign of Henry II) communications ceased completely. If the Papacy and the Norman principalities are included, however, the second half of the 11th century can clearly be seen as a period of dense interaction between Byzantium and its Italian "Near West". These dynamics cannot be explained in terms of fixed ideological orientations adopted by individual rulers on either side. They rather testify to Byzantium's flexible adaptation to the changing power constellations in Italy and the Western Empire.

6 Belonging and Betweenness

From the viewpoint of diplomatic history, envoys play a crucial role for political contacts: their personal attitudes and manners of behaviour, their social status and intellectual aspirations clearly influenced the course of negotiations, as Liudprand's case perfectly illustrates. Most Western envoys – or rather

Handel und Politik, pp. 378–81, the emperor was primarily interested in securing Pisan support for his planned campaign into Syria.

¹³³ This is reported in some detail by *Chronicle of Montecassino*, IV 115–16, ed. Hoffmann, pp. 590–91. According to this source Petrus Diaconus was consequently appointed *logotheta* and *a secretis* of the Roman Empire. Lothair III thus adapted two Byzantine titles for him. Böhmer/Petke, *Regesta Imperii Lothar III.*, no. 602, p. 382, casts doubt on these circumstances of the disputation, though not conclusively. Its historicity is accepted by Bucossi, "Seeking a Way Out", pp. 124–25. See also the reconstructed *Annals of Paderborn*, ed. Scheffer-Boichorst, p. 164 (ad ann. 1137); Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1313, p. 193; Tounta, *Το δυνάσθε sacrum imperium*, pp. 36–37.

heads of diplomatic missions – belonged to the ecclesiastical elite, such as the archbishops of Milan in 1001 and Salzburg in 1062, the bishops of Würzburg (995), Strasbourg (1027), Novara (1055), Münster (1082, 1117) and Havelberg (in 1135).¹³⁴ Besides them, counts and other nobles also appear among the envoys, but the complete absence of the Western aristocracy's highest echelon, the dukes, margraves and counts palatine, and the almost complete absence of German archbishops (especially Mainz) is striking. Consequently, detailed information on at least some diplomatic missions to Byzantium is to be found in the local historiography of bishoprics and monasteries, which privileges the role of the Western ambassadors. Their Byzantine counterparts often remain unknown to us beyond their names and titles, but it is clearly discernible that they likewise usually belonged to the middle stratum of court dignitaries (patricians or *protospatharioi*) and the episcopate.¹³⁵

As representatives and negotiators on behalf of their respective sovereigns, most of these diplomatic agents clearly belonged to one of the two sides and only temporarily came into contact with the other. Some other agents in the history of these relations, however, seem to show a higher degree of “betweenness”, since they stood in closer relations towards both the Latin and the Byzantine spheres. Although the Benedictine monastery of Montecassino clearly belonged to the Latin part of southern Italy, it occasionally benefitted from privileges issued by Byzantine emperors, for the first time by Constantine VII in 951.¹³⁶ In 1054, Constantine IX bestowed an annual payment of two pounds of gold to the abbey, probably as a means to strengthen the anti-Norman alliance with both Henry III and the Papacy.¹³⁷ But it was only during the reign of Alexios I Komnenos, after the establishment of Norman rule in southern Italy, that the Abbot and Cardinal Oderisius (1087–1105) and his successors de facto assumed the position of influential mediators between the *basileus* and the Roman curia, but also the western emperor and the crusaders in the years after 1097.¹³⁸ In his letter sent early in 1112, Alexios alluded

134 On the role of bishops as ambassadors to Byzantium, see Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, vol. 1, pp. 92–96, and for the criteria determining the choice of ambassadors see pp. 139–203.

135 See also the contribution by Nicolas Drocourt to the present volume.

136 The exact dating of this document, which is only partially preserved in a poor Latin translation inserted into the *Registrum* of Peter the Deacon, and wrongly attributed to Leon VI, has been established by Kresten, “Zur Datierung des Kaiserlichen Sigillion Dölger, Reg. 555”; cf. Falkenhausen, “Montecassino e Bisanzio dal IX al XII secolo”, pp. 73–74.

137 Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 915, pp. 32–33; cf. Bloch, “Monte Cassino, Byzantium and the West”, p. 191; Falkenhausen, “Montecassino e Bisanzio dal IX al XII secolo”, pp. 88–89; Loud, “Montecassino and Byzantium”, p. 45.

138 Four letters sent by Alexios I to Montecassino in 1097, 1098, and 1112 are preserved inserted in Peter the Deacon's *Registrum*, and another exchange dated 1106 is mentioned

to the recent imperial coronation and violent intervention of Henry V in Rome, but it was only the fanciful interpretation of this document, given by Peter the Deacon in the *Chronicle of Montecassino*, which turned this into an initiative of Alexios to have his son John Komnenos crowned by the pope in Rome, as Peter Classen has demonstrated.¹³⁹

Before the establishment of Norman rule, the local princes of southern Italy can probably be characterized by a similar kind of betweenness, due to their geographical situation at a trans-imperial periphery. Naples and Amalfi, but also the Lombard princes of Capua, Benevento, and Salerno repeatedly had to adapt to changes in the power-balance between the two empires. Some of them, like Pandulf “Ironhead” of Capua in the 960s, or Pandulf IV in the early 11th century, chose a clear position on one side; others, like Gisulf I of Salerno (952–77), seem to have preferred an attitude of distance and neutrality towards both imperial centres. Nonetheless, the Lombard princes do not usually appear as diplomatic agents in these relations, with the possible exception of Pandulf “Ironhead”, whose release from a short captivity in Constantinople by John Tzimiskes in fact opened the way to Theophano’s marriage. The Duchy of Naples formally remained a loyal subject of Constantinople throughout its existence and developed some curious forms of Latin-Greek cultural symbiosis,¹⁴⁰ but seems to have remained completely uninvolved in inter-imperial relations. In contrast, the position of Amalfi – likewise formally a part of Byzantium – is primarily characterized by the wide-ranging presence of its citizens as traders throughout the Mediterranean and particularly in the Byzantine Empire. Some Amalfitan protagonists thus also appear as political negotiators and intermediaries.¹⁴¹

Finally, some members of the Roman aristocracy, particularly throughout the 10th century, likewise preferred an orientation towards far-away Byzantium to the critical – though in the long run ephemeral – presence of the German

in the monastery’s chronicle: Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, nos. 1207, 1208, 1229, 1262, and 1264, pp. 148–49, 162, 175–76. The first two letters have been edited and commented on by Kresten/Müller, “Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser”, pp. 417–22, nos. 2 and 3. For the content and context of this correspondence, see Bloch, “Monte Cassino, Byzantium and the West”, pp. 222–23; Falkenhausen, “Montecassino e Bisanzio dal IX al XII secolo”, pp. 99–106.

139 Classen, “Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens”, pp. 207–12; Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1261, p. 175. For the context of the letter sent in 1112, see Loud, “Montecassino and Byzantium”, pp. 53–54.

140 For instance in the external appearance of the ducal as well as private charters: Martin, “Hellénisme politique”, pp. 73–76; id., “Les documents de Naples, Amalfi, Gaète”, pp. 54–55, 64–67.

141 For a detailed analysis of these questions, see Falkenhausen, “Gli Amalfitani nell’Impero bizantino”, esp. pp. 21–23, 30–31, 40–43.

kings and emperors in the *urbs*. As far as we can see in the fragmentary evidence, Byzantium avoided interfering openly in Roman affairs. Even when the Greek John Philagathos ascended the *cathedra Petri* in 997, the Byzantine government most likely did not back this course of events.

The range of people whose biographies contained parts that related to both empires is larger still. It comprises the well-known charismatic Greek monks from southern Italy that were venerated for their piety and ascetism, particularly in late Ottonian times,¹⁴² but also some elusive and mysterious people, such as a Peter, a “nephew of the Frankish king” (*adelphopais tu basileos Frangias*) who is said to have held offices in the Byzantine provincial administration in the early years of Basil II.¹⁴³ It also includes the Greek monk Simeon who finally ended his long circum-Mediterranean travels at the monastery of Reichenau and brought a precious relic with him.¹⁴⁴

In conclusion, the relations between the Eastern and Western Empires over the long course of time between the early 10th and the early 12th century cannot be reduced to a steady state of ideological antagonism between two monarchical institutions holding aspirations of universal rule. Instead, the complex relationship is made up of a long sequence of individual situations of contact and exchange, as well as long periods of interruption in between. The two power blocs were probably much less focused on each other than on their respective neighbours: the Ottonians and Salians above all on the eastern periphery of their German realm, but temporarily also on the West-Frankish kingdom and Burgundy; Byzantium in turn on the southern Balkans and on its Muslim neighbours in the East. They only had one common sphere of interest: the territories in the southern Apennine peninsula, where their interventions occasionally clashed in the later 10th and earlier 11th centuries, before the ascent of the Normans induced the imperial protagonists to adopt more cooperative attitudes. Besides that, Byzantium and the Western Empires were in fact two distant powers.

142 For their role see the contribution by Annick Peters-Custot to this volume.

143 Kekaumenos, *Counsels*, ed. G.G. Litavrin, *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena. Sočinenie vizantijskogo polkovodca XI veka*, Moscow 1972, pp. 280–82 (ch. 81), and see the commentary on pp. 584–86; Schramm, “Kaiser, Basileus und Papst”, pp. 243–45; Cheynet, “Le rôle des Occidentaux dans l’armée byzantine”, p. 113; PmbZ #26499 with further references to the debate on his identity.

144 On him, see Bayer, “Griechen im Westen”, pp. 337–39; Koder, “Byzanz als Mythos und Erfahrung”, pp. 237–38. For further glimpses of a Greek presence in Germany, see Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*, pp. 208–09.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, eds. D.R. Reinsch/A. Kambylis, *Annae Comnenae Alexias* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 40), 2 vols., Berlin-New York 2002.
- Annals of Magdeburg*, ed. G.H. Pertz, *Annales Magdeburgenses*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, vol. 16, Hannover 1859, pp. 105–96.
- Annals of Paderborn*, ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *Annales Patherbrunnenses. Eine verlorene Quellenschrift des 12. Jahrhunderts aus Bruchstücken wiederhergestellt*, Innsbruck 1870.
- Benzo of Alba, *Seven Books*, ed. H. Seyffert, *Benzo von Alba, Sieben Bücher an Kaiser Heinrich IV.* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 65), Hannover 1996.
- Bernold, *Chronicle*, ed. I.S. Robinson, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz 1054–1100* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum n.s., 14), Hannover 2003, pp. 383–540.
- Berthold, *Chronicle*, ed. I.S. Robinson, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz 1054–1100* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum n.s., 14), Hannover 2003, pp. 161–381.
- Chronicle of Montecassino*, ed. H. Hoffmann, *Die Chronik von Montecassino* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores, 34), Hannover 1980.
- Chronicle of Salerno*, ed. U. Westerbergh, *Chronicon Salernitanum* (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 3), Stockholm 1956.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, eds. G. Dagron/D. Feissel/B. Flusin/C. Zuckerman/M. Stavrou, *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des cérémonies* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 52), 6 vols., Paris 2020.
- Ekkehard of Aura, *Chronicle*, eds. F.-J. Schmale/I. Schmale-Ott, *Frutolfs und Ekkehard's Chroniken und die anonyme Kaiserchronik* (Freiherr-vom-Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe, 15), Darmstadt 1972.
- Die Konzilien Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens 916–1001*, ed. E.-D. Hehl (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Concilia, 6), Hannover 1987–2007.
- Die Konzilien Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens 1023–1059*, ed. D. Jasper (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Concilia, 8), Hannover 2010.
- Leon of Synada, *Letters*, ed. M.P. Vinson, *The Correspondence of Leo, Metropolitan of Synada and Syncellus* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 23), Washington 1985.
- Liudprand, *Antapodosis, Relatio, Historia Ottonis*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liudprandi Cremonensis Opera Omnia* (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 156), Turnholt 1998.
- John Skylitzes, *History*, ed. H. Thurn, *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 5), Berlin-New York 1973.

- Theodore Daphnopates, *Letters*, eds. J. Darrouzès/L. Westerink, *Théodore Daphnopatès Correspondance* (Le monde byzantin), Paris 1978.
- Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicle*, ed. R. Holtzmann, *Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und ihre Korveier Überarbeitung* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum n.s., 9), Berlin 1935.
- Widukind, *Deeds of the Saxons*, eds. G. Waitz/K. Kehr, *Widukindi Rerum Gestarum Saxoniarum libri tres* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 60), 5th ed., Hannover 1935.

Regesta

- Böhmer, J.F./Petke, W., *Regesta Imperii IV*, vol. 1: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Lothar III. und Konrad III.*, part 1: *Lothar III.*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1994.
- Böhmer, J.F./Struve, T./Lubich, G., *Regesta Imperii III: Salisches Haus*, part 3: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich IV. 1056(1050)–1106*, 5 vols., Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1984–2018.
- Böhmer, J.F./Zimmermann, H., *Regesta Imperii II: Sächsisches Haus*, vol. 5: *Papstregesten 911–1024*, 2nd ed., Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1998.
- Dölger, F./Wirth, P., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 2: *Regesten von 1025–1204*, 2nd ed., Munich 1995.

Secondary Literature

- Alvermann, D., “La battaglia di Ottone II contro i Saraceni nel 982”, *Archivio Storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 62 (1995), 115–30.
- Andriollo, L., *Constantinople et les provinces d'Asie Mineure, IX^e–XI^e siècle. Administration impériale, sociétés locales et rôle de l'aristocratie* (Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, Monographies, 52), Leuven-Paris-Bristol 2017.
- Arnaldi, G., “La fase preparatoria della battaglia del Garigliano dal 915”, *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia della Università di Napoli* 4 (1954), 123–44.
- Arnaldi, G., “Liutprando di Cremona: un detrattore di Roma o dei Romani?”, *Studi Romani* 53 (2005), 12–50.
- Banaszkiewicz, J., “Ein Ritter flieht oder wie Kaiser Otto II. sich vom Schlachtfeld bei Cotrone rettete”, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40 (2006), 145–65.
- Bange, P., “The Image of Women of the Nobility in the German Chronicles of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries”, in Davids (ed.), *The Empress Theophano*, pp. 150–68.
- Bayer, A., “Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 96 (2003), 515–20.
- Bayer, A., “Griechen im Westen im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Simeon von Trier und Simeon von Reichenau” in von Euw/Schreiner (eds.), *Kaiserin Theophanu*, vol. 1, pp. 335–42.
- Bayer, A., *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054* (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 53), Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 2002.

- Bloch, H., "Monte Cassino, Byzantium and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 3 (1946), 163–224.
- Borgolte, M., *Europa entdeckt seine Vielfalt, 1050–1250* (Handbuch der Geschichte Europas, 3), Stuttgart 2002.
- Boshof, E., "Das Salierreich und der europäische Osten", in F. Staab (ed.), *Auslandsbeziehungen unter den salischen Kaisern. Geistige Auseinandersetzung und Politik*, Speyer 1994, pp. 167–92.
- Brandes, W., "Liudprand von Cremona (Legatio Cap. 39–41) und eine bisher unbeachtete west-östliche Korrespondenz über die Bedeutung des Jahres 1000 AD", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 93 (2000), 435–63.
- Brandes, W., "Die 'Familie der Könige im Mittelalter'. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zur Kritik eines vermeintlichen Erkenntnismodells", *Rechtsgeschichte/Legal History* 21 (2013), 262–84.
- Bucossi, A., "Seeking a Way Out of the Impasse: the *Filioque* Controversy During John's Reign", in A. Bucossi/A. Rodriguez Suarez (eds.), *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium: In the Shadow of the Father and Son* (Centre for Hellenic Studies, Publications, 17), London 2016, pp. 121–34.
- Cheyne, J.-C., *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 9), Paris 1990.
- Cheyne, J.-C., "Le rôle des Occidentaux dans l'armée byzantine avant la Première Croisade", in E. Konstantinou (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1997, pp. 111–28.
- Chrestos, K., "Ιωάννης Φιλάργατος. Η σταδιοδρομία ενός "Ελληνα κληρικού στη Δύση", *Byzantina* 18 (1995/96), 205–55.
- Ciggaar, K., "The Empress Theophano (972–991): Political and Cultural Implications of Her Presence in Western Europe, in Particular for the County of Holland", in ead./V. van Aalst (eds.), *Byzantium and the Low Countries in the Tenth Century. Aspects of Art and History in the Ottonian Era*, Hernen 1985, pp. 33–76.
- Ciggaar, K., "Theophano: an Empress Reconsidered" in Davids (ed.), *The Empress Theophano*, pp. 49–63.
- Ciggaar, K., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden 1996.
- Classen, P., "Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens", *Journal of Medieval History* 3 (1977), 207–24.
- Clauss, M., *Kriegsniederlagen im Mittelalter. Darstellung – Deutung – Bewältigung* (Krieg in der Geschichte, 54), Paderborn 2010.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., *Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085*, Oxford 1998.
- Darrouzès, "Les documents byzantins du XII^e siècle sur la primauté romaine", *Revue des Études Byzantines* 23 (1965), 42–88.

- Davids, A. (ed.), *The Empress Theophano. Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, Cambridge 1995.
- Delogu, P., "Bonifacio VII antipapa", in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, vol. 2, Rome 2000, pp. 93–96.
- Di Branco, M., 915. *La battaglia del Garigliano. Cristiani e musulmani nell'Italia medievale*, Bologna 2019.
- Dölger, F., "Die 'Familie der Könige' im Mittelalter", in id., *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, Ettal 1953, pp. 34–69.
- Drocourt, N., "Al-Andalus, l'Occident chrétien et Byzance. Liens et réseaux de personnes autour des évêques Recemundo et Liutprand de Crémone : quelques hypothèses", in P. Sénac (ed.), *Le Maghreb, al-Andalus et la Méditerranée occidentale (VIII^e–XIII^e siècle)*, Toulouse 2007, pp. 57–79.
- Drocourt, N., "La place de l'écrit dans les contacts diplomatiques du haut Moyen Âge. Le cas des relations entre Byzance et ses voisins (de la fin du VII^e siècle à 1204)", in *L'autorité de l'écrit au Moyen Âge (Orient – Occident) (XXXIX^e congrès de la SHMESP)*, Paris 2009, pp. 25–44.
- Drocourt, N., "Passing on Political Information between Major Powers: the Key Role of Ambassadors between Byzantium and its Neighbours during the Middle Byzantine Period", *Al-Masāq* 24 (2012), 91–112.
- Drocourt, N., *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore. Les ambassadeurs étrangers dans l'empire byzantin des années 640 à 1204*, 2 vols., Louvain 2015.
- Drocourt, N., "« Une diplomatie sans langue? » La question des échanges linguistiques dans la diplomatie médio-byzantine", in D. Couto/S. Péquignot (eds.), *Les langues de la négociation. Approches historiennes*, Rennes 2017, pp. 25–61.
- Eickhoff, E., *Theophanu und der König. Otto III. und seine Welt*. 2nd ed., Stuttgart 1997.
- Engels, O., "Theophano, the Western Empress from the East", in Davids (ed.), *The Empress Theophano*, pp. 28–48.
- Engels O./Schreiner, P. (eds.), *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten. Kongreßakten des 4. Symposiums des Mediävistenverbandes in Köln 1991 aus Anlaß des 1000. Todesjahres der Kaiserin Theophanu*, Sigmaringen 1993.
- Erkens, F.-R., "Die Frau als Herrscherin in ottonisch-frühsalischer Zeit", in von Euw/Schreiner (eds.), *Kaiserin Theophanu*, vol. 2, pp. 245–59.
- Erkens, F.-R., "... more Grecorum conregnantem instituere vultis? Zur Legitimation der Regentschaft Heinrichs des Zänkers im Thronstreit von 984", *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 27 (1993), 273–89.
- von Euw, A./Schreiner, P. (eds.), *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrtausends. Gedenkschrift des Kölner Schnütgen-Museums zum 1000. Todesjahr der Kaiserin*, 2 vols., Cologne 1991.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert* (Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa, 1), Wiesbaden 1967.

- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Olympias, eine normannische Prinzessin in Konstantinopel", in *Bisanzio e l'Italia. Raccolta di studi in memoria di Agostino Pertusi*, Milan 1982, pp. 56–72.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Montecassino e Bisanzio dal IX al XII secolo", in F. Avagliano (ed.), *L'età dell'abate Desiderio III, 1: Storia arte e cultura. Atti del IV Convegno di Studi sul Medioevo Meridionale* (Miscellanea Cassinese, 67), Montecassino 1994, pp. 69–107.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Between Two Empires: Southern Italy in the Reign of Basil II", in P. Magdalino (ed.), *Byzantinum in the Year 1000* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 45) Leiden 2003, pp. 135–60.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Gli Amalfitani nell'Impero bizantino", in E.G. Farrugia (ed.), *Amalfi and Byzantium. Acts of the International Symposium on the Eighth Centenary of the Translation of the Relics of St Andrew the Apostle from Constantinople to Amalfi (1208–2008)* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 287), Rome 2010, pp. 17–44.
- Fedele, P., "La battaglia del Garigliano dell'anno 915 ed i monumenti che la ricordano", *Archivio della R. Società Romana di storia patria* 22 (1899), 181–211.
- Georgi, W., "Ottonianum und Heiratsurkunde 962/972" in von Euw/Schreiner (eds.), *Kaiserin Theophanu*, vol. 2, pp. 135–60.
- Görich, K., *Otto III. Romanus Saxonicus et Italicus. Kaiserliche Rompolitik und sächsische Historiographie* (Historische Forschungen, 18), Sigmaringen 1993.
- Gresser, G., *Die Synoden und Konzilien in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums in Deutschland und Italien von Leo IX. bis Calixt II. 1049–1123* (Konziliengeschichte A), Paderborn 2006.
- Gulya, J., "Der Hoftag in Quedlinburg 973", in A. Ranft (ed.), *Der Hoftag in Quedlinburg 973. Von den historischen Wurzeln zum Neuen Europa*, Berlin 2006, pp. 19–27.
- Hehl, E.-D., "Zwei christliche Kaiser im mittelalterlichen Europa. Eine problematische Geschichte", in H. Leppin/B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Kaisertum im ersten Jahrtausend*, Regensburg 2012, pp. 271–95.
- Hehl, E.-D., "Zwei Kaiser – (k)ein Problem? Byzanz, das westliche Kaisertum und ein missverständlicher Forschungsbegriff", in L. Körntgen et al. (eds.), *Byzanz und seine europäischen Nachbarn: Politische Interdependenzen und kulturelle Missverständnisse* (Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident, 17), Heidelberg 2020, pp. 41–77.
- Heinemeyer, W., "Studien zur Diplomatik mittelalterlicher Verträge vornehmlich des 13. Jahrhunderts", *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* 14 (1936), 321–413.
- Hiestand, R., *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum im 10. Jahrhundert* (Geist und Werk der Zeiten, 9), Zurich 1964.
- Hiestand, R., "Legat, Kaiser und Basileus. Bischof Kuno von Praeneste und die Krise des Papsttums von 1111/1112", in H. Fuhrmann/H.E. Mayer/K. Wriedt (eds.), *Aus Reichsgeschichte und Nordischer Geschichte* (Kieler Historische Studien, 16), Stuttgart 1972, pp. 141–52.

- Hoffmann, T., "Diplomatie in der Krise. Liutprand von Cremona am Hofe Nikephoros II. Phokas", *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 43 (2009), 113–78.
- Hoffmann, T., "Von verlorenen Hufeisen und brennenden Nüssen – Über Konflikte im Rahmen des 'diplomatischen' Zeremoniells des byzantinischen Kaiserhofes", in C. Scholl/T. Gebhardt/J. Clauss (eds.), *Transcultural Approaches to the Concept of Imperial Rule in the Middle Ages*, Frankfurt 2017, pp. 221–44.
- Holmes, C., *Basil II and the Governance of Empire (976–1025)*, Oxford 2005.
- Holtzmann, W., "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 28 (1928), 38–67.
- Huschner, W., "Giovanni XVI, antipapa", in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, vol. 2, Rome 2000, pp. 112–16.
- Huschner, W., "Piacenza-Como-Mainz-Bamberg. Die Erzkänzler für Italien in den Regierungszeiten Ottos III. und Heinrichs II. (983–1024)", *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento* 26 (2000), 15–52.
- Huschner, W., *Transalpine Kommunikation im Mittelalter. Diplomatische, kulturelle und politische Wechselwirkungen zwischen Italien und dem nordalpinen Reich (9.–11. Jahrhundert)* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Schriften, 52), 3 vols., Hannover 2003.
- Huschner, W., "Benevent, Magdeburg, Salerno. Das Papsttum und die neuen Erzbistümer in ottonischer Zeit", in K. Herbers/J. Johrendt (eds.), *Das Papsttum und das vielgestaltige Italien. Hundert Jahre Italia Pontificia* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, n.s. 5), Berlin 2009, pp. 87–108.
- Jacoby, D., "Bishop Gunther of Bamberg, Byzantium and Christian Pilgrimage to the Holy Land in the Eleventh Century", in L. Hoffmann/A. Monchizadeh (eds.), *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur* (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik, 7), Wiesbaden 2005, pp. 267–85.
- Jäckel, D., "Heinrich III. und eine Brautschau in Byzanz. Zugleich ein Einblick in die Werkstatt von Regestenmachern", in G. Lubich/D. Jäckel (eds.), *Heinrich III. Dynastie – Region – Europa*, (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 43), Vienna-Cologne-Weimar 2018, pp. 181–206.
- Joranson, E., "The Great German Pilgrimage of 1064–65", in L.J. Paetow (ed.), *The Crusades and Other Historical Essays Presented to Dana C. Munro by his Former Students*, New York 1928, pp. 3–43.
- Karageorgos, B., *Λιουτπράνδος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Κρεμῶνης ὡς ἱστορικός καὶ διπλωμάτης* (Bibliothēkē Sophias N. Saripolu, 38), Athens 1978.
- Karpf, E., *Herrscherlegitimation und Reichsbegriff in der ottonischen Geschichtsschreibung des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Historische Forschungen, 10), Stuttgart 1985.

- Keller, H., "Das ottonische Kirchenreich und Byzanz", in *Cristianità d'Occidente e cristianità d'Oriente, secoli VI–XI* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 51), Spoleto 2004, vol. 1, pp. 249–88.
- Keller, H., "Identità romana e l'idea dell'*Imperium Romanorum* nel X e nel primo XI secolo", in V. West-Harling (ed.), *Three Empires, Three Cities: Identity, Material Culture and Legitimacy in Venice, Ravenna and Rome, 750–1000*, Turnhout 2015, pp. 255–76.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz und dem Abendland vom neunten bis in die Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts", in E. Konstantinou (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1997, pp. 231–57.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege in Byzanz. Realität und Mentalität, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen", in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, vol. 1: *Plenary Papers*, Sofia 2011, pp. 341–87.
- Koder, J., "Die Sicht des 'Anderen' in Gesandtenberichten" in Engels/Schreiner (eds.), *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten*, pp. 113–29.
- Koder, J., "Subjektivität und Fälschung in der byzantinischen Geschichte. Liutprand von Cremona als 'Historiograph' und als Objekt der Historiographie", *Byzantiaka* 15 (1995), 107–32.
- Koder, J., "Byzanz als Mythos und Erfahrung im Zeitalter Ottos I.", in B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Ottomische Neuanfänge*, Mainz 2001, pp. 237–50.
- Koder, J., "Die letzte Gesandtschaft Alexios' I. Komnenos bei Paschalis II", in E.-D. Hehl et al. (eds.), *Das Papsttum in der Welt des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Mittelalter-Forschungen, 6), Stuttgart 2002, pp. 127–35.
- Koder, J., "Erfolglos als Diplomat, erfolgreich als Erzähler? Liudprand von Cremona als Gesandter am byzantinischen Kaiserhof", in F. Daim (ed.), *Menschen, Bilder, Sprache, Dinge. Wege der Kommunikation zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen*, vol. 2: *Menschen und Worte* (Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident, 9/2), Mainz 2018, pp. 127–40.
- Kolditz, S., "Leon von Synada und Liudprand von Cremona. Untersuchungen zu den Ost-West-Kontakten des 10. Jahrhunderts", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95 (2002), pp. 509–83.
- Kolditz, S., "Von Ravenna bis Otranto: Ottonisch-byzantinische und süditalienische Kontexte der Erzbistumserrichtungen in Benevent und Magdeburg", in E. Bünz/W. Huschner (eds.), *1050 Jahre Erzbistum Magdeburg (968–2018). Die Errichtung und Etablierung des Erzbistums im europäischen und regionalen Kontext (10.–12. Jahrhundert)* (forthcoming).
- Kolia-Dermizaki, A., "Byzantium and the West – the West and Byzantium (Ninth–Twelfth Centuries): Focusing on Zweikaiserproblem. An Outline of Ideas and Practices", in T. Kolia/K. Pitsakis (eds.), *Aureus. Τόμος αφιερόμενος στον καθηγητή Ευάγγελο Κ. Χρυσό*, Athens 2014, pp. 357–80.

- Komatina, P., "The 'King of Francia' in *De cerimoniis* II, 48", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 108 (2015), 157–68.
- Kresten, O., "Zur Datierung des Kaiserlichen Sigillion Dölger, Reg. 555, für Monte Cassino: Konstantinos VII. (951) und nicht Leon VI. (891/911)", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 31 (1989), 53–73.
- Kresten, O., "Byzantinische Epilegomena zur Frage: Wer war Theophanu?" in von Euw/Schreiner (eds.), *Kaiserin Theophanu*, vol. 2, pp. 403–10.
- Kresten, O., "Correctiunculae zu Auslandsschreiben byzantinischer Kaiser des 11. Jahrhunderts", in P. Ludwig (ed.), *Festschrift für Hermann Fillitz zum 70. Geburtstag* (= *Aachener Kunstblätter*, 60), Cologne 1994, pp. 143–62.
- Kresten, O., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser der Komnenenzeit: Die literarische Überlieferung bei Anna Komnene und Ioannes Kinnamos. Mit einem Exkurs: Zur Chronologie der Auslandsschreiben Dölger-Wirth, Reg. 1068, 1077, 1080 und 1114", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 39 (1997), 21–59.
- Kresten, O., "Staatsempfänge" im Kaiserpalast von Konstantinopel um die Mitte des 10. Jahrhunderts. Beobachtungen zu Kapitel II 15 des sogenannten "Zeremonienbuches" (Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 670), Vienna 2000.
- Kresten, O., "Zur angeblichen Heirat Annas, der Tochter Kaiser Leons VI., mit Ludwig III. 'dem Blinden'", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 42 (2000), 171–211.
- Kresten, O./Müller, A.E., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Specimen einer kritischen Ausgabe", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86–87 (1993/94), 402–29.
- Lamma, P., "Il problema dei due imperi e dell'Italia meridionale nel giudizio delle fonti letterarie dei secoli IX e X", in id., *Oriente e occidente nell'alto medioevo. Studi storici sulle due civiltà*, Padua 1968, pp. 231–337.
- Lees, J.T., *Anselm of Havelberg. Deeds into Words in the Twelfth Century* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 79), Leiden-New York-Cologne 1998.
- Leyser, K., "The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships", in D. Baker (ed.), *Relations Between East and West in the Middle Ages*, Edinburgh 1973, pp. 29–63.
- Leyser, K., "Ends and Means in Liudprand of Cremona", in J.D. Howard-Johnston (ed.), *Byzantium and the West: c.850–c.1200. Proceedings of the XVIII Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, 30 March–1 April 1984* (= *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 13), Amsterdam 1988, pp. 119–43.
- Leyser, K., "Theophanu divina gratia imperatrix augusta: Western and Eastern Emperors in the Later Tenth Century", in Davids (ed.), *The empress Theophano*, pp. 1–27.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeli* (1081–1204), Amsterdam 1984.

- Lilie, R.-J., "Das 'Zweikaiserproblem' und sein Einfluss auf die Aussenpolitik der Komnenen", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985), 219–44.
- Loud, G.A., "Byzantine Italy and the Normans", in J.D. Howard-Johnston (ed.), *Byzantium and the West: c.850–c.1200. Proceedings of the XVIII Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, 30 March–1 April 1984* (= *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 13), Amsterdam 1988, pp. 215–33.
- Loud, G.A., "Montecassino and Byzantium in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", in M. Mullett/A. Kirby (eds.), *The Theotokos Evergetis and Eleventh-Century Monasticism*, Belfast 1994, pp. 30–58 (reprinted in id., *Montecassino and Benevento in the Middle Ages*, Aldershot 2000, no. 11).
- Loud, G.A., "Southern Italy and the Eastern and Western Empires, c.900–1050", *Journal of Medieval History* 38 (2012), 1–19.
- Loud, G.A., "The German Emperors and Southern Italy during the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", in J.-M. Martin/R. Alaggio (eds.), *Quei maledetti Normanni. Studi offerti a Errico Cuzzo*, Naples 2016, vol. 1, pp. 583–605.
- Lounghis, T.C., *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident. Depuis la fondation des états barbares jusqu'aux croisades (407–1096)*, Athens 1980.
- Lounghis, T.C., "Der Verfall des Papsttums im X. Jahrhundert als Ergebnis der deutsch-byzantinischen Annäherung", *Byzantiaka* 14 (1994), 217–35.
- Lounghis, T.C., "Die byzantinische Ideologie der 'begrenzten Ökumene' und die römische Frage im ausgehenden 10. Jahrhundert", *Byzantinoslavica* 56 (1995), 117–28.
- Lounghis, T.C., "Byzantine Diplomacy", in S. Lampakis/M. Leontsini/T. Lounghis/V. Vlysidou, *Byzantine Diplomacy: A Seminar*, Athens 2007, pp. 15–82.
- Macrides, R., "Dynastic Marriages and Political Kinship", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications, 1), Aldershot 1992, pp. 263–80.
- Martin, J.-M., "L'occident chrétien dans le Livre des cérémonies, II, 48", *Travaux et Mémoires* 13 (2000), 617–45.
- Martin, J.-M., "Hellénisme politique, hellénisme religieux et pseudo-hellénisme à Naples (VII^e–XII^e siècle)", *Nea Rhome* 2 (2005), 59–77.
- Martin, J.-M., "Les documents de Naples, Amalfi, Gaète (IX^e–XII^e siècle). Écriture, diplomatique, notariat", in id./A. Peters-Custot/V. Prigent (eds.), *L'héritage byzantin en Italie (VIII^e–XII^e siècle)*, vol. 1: *La fabrique documentaire* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 449), Rome 2011, pp. 51–85.
- Marzochi, S., "*Renovatio imperii Romanorum: quando Crescentius decollatus suspensus fuit*. An Analysis of the Meaning of Otto III's First Lead Bulla", *Journal of Medieval History* 43 (2017), 193–211.
- Mayr-Harting, H., "Liudprand of Cremona's Account of his Legation to Constantinople (968) and Ottonian Imperial Strategy", *English Historical Review* 116 (2001), 539–56.

- McCormick, M., "Byzantium on the Move: Imagining a Communications History", in R. Macrides (ed.), *Travel in the Byzantine World* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications, 10), Aldershot 2002, pp. 3–29.
- Meyer von Knonau, G., *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V.*, 7 vols., Leipzig 1890–1909.
- Moulet, B., "Le personnel ecclésiastique au service de la diplomatie mésobyzantine", in A. Becker/N. Drocourt (eds.), *Ambassadeurs et ambassades au coeur des relations diplomatiques. Rome – Occident Médiéval – Byzance (VIII^e s. avant J.-C. – XII^e s. après J.-C.)*, Metz 2012, pp. 333–49.
- Mullett, M., "The Language of Diplomacy", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications, 1) Aldershot 1992, pp. 203–16.
- Mystakides, B.A., *Byzantinisch-deutsche Beziehungen zur Zeit der Ottonen*, Stuttgart 1891.
- Nerlich, D., *Diplomatische Gesandtschaften zwischen Ost- und Westkaisern, 756–1002* (Geist und Werk der Zeiten, 92), Bern 1999.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter*, Hildesheim 1947.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Abendland und Byzanz. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1958.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Das nach Goslar gelangte Auslandsschreiben des Konstantinos IX. Monomachos für Kaiser Heinrich III. von 1049", in id., *Abendland und Byzanz*, pp. 317–32.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Die Byzanzreise des Erzbischofs Gebhard von Salzburg und das päpstliche Schisma im Jahre 1062", in id., *Abendland und Byzanz*, pp. 342–63.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Die Legation des Kaisers Basileios II. an Heinrich II.", in id., *Abendland und Byzanz*, pp. 300–16.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Drei Deperdita der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei und die Frankendressen im Zeremonienbuch des Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos", in id., *Abendland und Byzanz*, pp. 227–54.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Eine Rotulus-Bulle des Kaisers Michael VI. Stratiotikos von 1056", in id., *Abendland und Byzanz*, pp. 333–41.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Konstantinopel und der Okzident. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1966.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Byzanz und das abendländische Kaisertum", in id., *Konstantinopel und der Okzident*, pp. 294–300.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Die Anerkennung des Kaisertums Ottos I. durch Byzanz", in id., *Konstantinopel und der Okzident*, pp. 176–207.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Ost-Rom und der Westen. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1983.

- Ohnsorge, W., "Basileus, Kaiser und Sarazenen im Jahre 981/2", in id., *Ost-Rom und der Westen*, pp. 173–201.
- Papageorgiou, A., "The Political Ideology of John II Komnenos", in A. Bucossi/A. Rodriguez Suarez (eds.), *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium: In the Shadow of the Father and Son* (Centre for Hellenic Studies, Publications, 17), London 2016, pp. 37–52.
- Petke, W., *Kanzlei, Kapelle und königliche Kurie unter Lothar III. (1125–1137)* (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 5), Cologne-Vienna 1985.
- PmbZ: Lilie, R.-J. et al. (eds.), *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, vol. 2: (867–1025), *Prolegomena*, 7 pts. and indices, Berlin – New York 2009–13.
- Prinzing, G., "Das Bamberger Gunthertuch in neuer Sicht", *Byzantinoslavica* 54 (1993), 218–31.
- Prinzing, G., "Byzanz, Altrussland und die sogenannte 'Familie der Könige'", in M. Thomsen (ed.), *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zum östlichen Europa. Festschrift für Ludwig Steindorff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa, 85), Stuttgart 2017, pp. 43–56.
- Prinzing, G., "Emperor Constantine VII and Margrave Berengar II of Ivrea under Suspicion of Murder. Circumstantial Evidence of a Plot against Berta-Eudokia and Lothair (Lothar), the Children of King Hugh of Italy", in N. Gaul/V. Menze/Cs. Bálint (eds.), *Center, Province and Periphery in the Age of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos. From De Cerimoniis to De Administrando Imperio* (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik, 15), Wiesbaden 2018, pp. 192–210.
- Robinson, I.S., *Henry IV of Germany 1056–1106*, Cambridge 1999.
- Sansterre, J.-M., "Byzance et son souverain dans les *Libri ad Heinricum IV Imperatorem de Benzo d'Alba*", *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata* n.s. 51 (1997), 93–111.
- Schramm, P.E., "Kaiser, Basileus und Papst in der Zeit der Ottonen", in id., *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 3, Stuttgart 1969, pp. 200–45.
- Schramm, P.E., "Zwölf Briefe des byzantinischen Gesandten Leon von seiner Reise zu Otto III. aus den Jahren 997–998", in id., *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 3, Stuttgart 1969, pp. 246–76.
- Schramm, P.E., *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Erneuerungsgedankens vom Ende des karolingischen Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit*, 4th ed., Darmstadt 1984.
- Schreiner, P., "Die kaiserliche Familie: Ideologie und Praxis im Rahmen der internationalen Beziehungen in Byzanz", in *Le relazioni internazionali nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 58), Spoleto 2011, pp. 735–73.
- Schummer, C., "Liudprand of Cremona – a Diplomat?", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications, 1), Aldershot 1992, pp. 197–201.

- Seibert, "Eines großen Vaters glückloser Sohn? Die neue Politik Ottos II.", in B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Ottonische Neuanfänge*, Mainz 2001, pp. 293–320.
- Servatius, C., *Paschalis II. (1099–1118). Studien zu seiner Person und seiner Politik* (Päpste und Papsttum, 14), Stuttgart 1979.
- Shepard, J., "Byzantium's last Sicilian expedition: Scylitzes' testimony", *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* n.s. 14–16 (1977/79), 145–59.
- Shepard, J., "Information, Disinformation and Delay in Byzantine Diplomacy", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 10 (1985), 233–93.
- Shepard, J., "Aspects of Byzantine Attitudes and Policy Towards the West in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 13 (1988), 67–118.
- Shepard, J., "Marriages Towards the Millennium", in P. Magdalino (ed.), *Byzantium in the Year 1000* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 45), Leiden 2003, pp. 1–33.
- Shepard, J., "Past and Future in Middle Byzantine Diplomacy: Some Preliminary Observations", in M. Balard/E. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur. Contacts, relations, échanges* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 21), Paris 2005, pp. 171–91.
- Shepard, J., "Hard on Heretics, Light on Latins: The Balancing-Act of Alexios I Komnenos", in *Mélanges Cécile Morrisson* (Travaux et Mémoires, 16), Paris 2010, pp. 765–77.
- Shepard, J., "Storm Clouds and a Thunderclap. East-West Tensions Towards the Mid-Eleventh Century", in M. Lauxtermann/M. Whittow (eds.), *Byzantium in the Eleventh Century. Being in Between* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications, 19), Abingdon 2017, pp. 127–53.
- Simpson, A.J., "Liutprand of Cremona, Nikephoros Phokas, and the Italian question" *Mesogeios* 12 (2001), 43–54.
- Small, A., "Constantinopolitan Connections: Liudprand of Cremona and Byzantium", in N. Matheou/T. Kampaniaki/L. Bondioli (eds.), *From Constantinople to the Frontier. The City and the Cities* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 106), Leiden 2016, pp. 84–97.
- Sutherland, J.N., "The Idea of Revenge in Lombard Society in the Eighth and Tenth Centuries: The Cases of Paul the Deacon and Liudprand of Cremona", *Speculum* 50 (1975), 391–410.
- Sutherland, J.N., "The Mission to Constantinople in 968 and Liudprand of Cremona", *Traditio* 31 (1975), 55–81.
- Sutherland, J.N., *Liudprand of Cremona: Bishop, Diplomat, Historian. Studies on the Man and his Age* (Biblioteca degli Studi Medievali, 14), Spoleto 1988.
- Tinnefeld, F., "Ceremonies for Foreign Ambassadors at the Court of Byzantium and their Political Background", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 29 (1993), 193–213.
- Tounta, E., *Το δυτικό sacrum imperium και η βυζαντινή αυτοκρατορία. Ιδεολογικές τριβές και αλληλοεπιδράσεις στην ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική σκηνή του 12ου αιώνα (1135–1177)*, Athens 2008.
- Vogtherr, T., "Die Fälschungen der Osnabrücker Herrscherurkunden. Anlass, Wirkung und weitere Verwendung im Mittelalter", in N. D'Acunto/S. Roebert/W. Huschner

- (eds.), *Originale – Fälschungen – Kopien. Kaiser- und Königsurkunden für Empfänger in "Deutschland" und "Italien" (9.–11. Jahrhundert) und ihre Nachwirkungen im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter (bis ca. 1500)* (Italia Regia, 3), Leipzig 2017, pp. 217–28.
- Weber, T., "Essen und Trinken im Konstantinopel des 10. Jahrhunderts nach den Berichten Liutprands von Cremona", in J. Koder/T. Weber, *Liutprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel. Untersuchungen zum griechischen Sprachschatz und zu realienkundlichen Aussagen in seinen Werken*, Vienna 1980, pp. 71–99.
- Weinfurter, S. (ed.), *Die Salier und das Reich*, 3 vols., Sigmaringen 1992.
- Weinfurter, S., *Heinrich II. (1002–1024). Herrscher am Ende der Zeiten*, Regensburg 1999.
- Wolf, G., "Zur richtigen Datierung der Brautwerbung Kaiser Konrads II. für seinen Sohn Heinrich (III.) (RI 116b)", *Archiv für Diplomatik* 42 (1996), 1–5.
- Wolfram, H., "Die Gesandtschaft Konrads II. nach Konstantinopel (1027/29)", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 100 (1992), 161–74.
- Wolter, H., *Die Synoden im Reichsgebiet und in Reichsitalien von 916 bis 1056* (Konziliengeschichte A), Paderborn 1988.
- Ziemann, D., "Im Osten was Neues: Byzanz, Osteuropa und das Reich (ca. 1100–1125)", in G. Lubich (ed.), *Heinrich V. in seiner Zeit: Herrschen in einem europäischen Reich des Hochmittelalters* (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 34), Vienna 2013, pp. 271–87.

Byzantium, Rome and the Papacy: A History of Ecclesiastical Separation

Axel Bayer

On 7 December 1965, simultaneously at the last public session of the Second Vatican Council and in St. George's Church in Istanbul, a common declaration by Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople was read out. By virtue of this document both sides solemnly announced that the bull of excommunication issued by the See of Rome in 1054, as well as the reciprocal excommunication authorized by the Patriarch Michael Keroularios of Constantinople should be erased from the memory of the Church and consigned to oblivion. This was the first step towards a restoration of eucharistic *communio* between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. In the preceding discussions at the Phanar, the see of the Patriarch of Constantinople, both sides had come to the conclusion that in 1054 only specific persons and their followers had been excommunicated. But due to their repercussions the decrees of excommunication had led to the destruction of ecclesiastical *communio*, that is to schism.¹ Both Churches thus considered the events of 1054 the decisive factor which had created the long-lasting schism between East and West.

As is well known, the conflict of 1054 is often regarded as the decisive turning point for the split between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople in research.² However, in 1924 the German Church historian, Anton Michel, placed the break of ecclesiastical unity already in the time of Pope Sergius IV (1009–12),³ and likewise in 1924 the French Byzantinist scholar Bernard Leib, considered the First Crusade (1096–99) the first turning point for the estrangement between the Roman and the Greek Churches, without discussing the events of 1054.⁴ Apart from the First Crusade, a considerably later event,

1 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 1. On the event's reception see Oeldemann, *Die Wiederentdeckung*.

2 Evidence is given in Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 2; among more recent titles see Gemeinhardt, "Das Schisma von 1054"; Hausamann, *Der andere Weg der orthodoxen Kirchen im Osten*, p. 5; Bremer/Gazer/Lange, *Die orthodoxen Kirchen der byzantinischen Tradition*, p. 12.

3 Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, vol. 1, pp. 30–32, 39, see also *ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 22–40.

4 Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance*, particularly pp. 319–21.

the conquest and looting of Constantinople by the crusaders on the Fourth Crusade in 1204, also serves as a common point of reference for the origins of the state of schism between Rome and Constantinople.⁵ Finally, the dispute between the two sees over the legitimacy of Patriarch Photios in the 9th century is also often cited in this respect.

However, a state of schism between Rome and Constantinople did not yet come about during the Photian controversy, although Josef Hergenröther, the later cardinal, attempted to demonstrate that in 1869. Hergenröther supported his case with source material from the Late Byzantine period which explicitly links the outbreak of the schism with Photios,⁶ and he referred to the fact that under Photios the differences in theology, rite, ecclesiology, and Church policy, that had already been latent for a longer period, became manifest in concentrated form. This view has also been shared by Henry Chadwick.⁷ But a continuous state of schism did not result from this conflict as Photios sought and achieved reconciliation with Rome afterwards, a fact Hergenröther did not yet know. In addition, after the council of understanding held in 879/80,⁸ peace prevailed nearly continuously between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople for about 130 years. With regard to papal primacy, however, the Church of Constantinople, in conformity with its synodal vision of ecclesiastical structures, only acknowledged a primacy of honour to the See of Rome, demanding similar rights for itself according to Canon 3 of the Second Ecumenical Council (Constantinople 381).⁹

Contrary to another opinion repeatedly advocated by researchers, the existence of a Western and an Eastern emperor did not provoke schism either. Since Pope Leo III had crowned Charlemagne emperor, according to Byzantine interpretations, the pope had not only separated from the empire, but also from the imperial Church.¹⁰ But it was only shortly after the subsequent armed conflict between Byzantium and the Franks over Venice and

5 This caesura is suggested by Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church*, p. 275; and Dagron, in Boshof, *Die Geschichte des Christentums*, vol. 4, pp. 357–58.

6 See Hergenröther, *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel*, vol. 3, pp. 843–76, esp. pp. 843, 875–76; see also Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft mit Konstantinopel*, pp. 150, 295, 313.

7 Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church*, pp. 106–63.

8 See Meijer, *Successful Council of Union*.

9 Cf. Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 9–11. For Byzantine theologians' interpretations of Roman primacy, see Pinggéra, "Altes und Neues Rom. Der päpstliche Primat aus östlich-orthodoxer Sicht", pp. 188–95.

10 The first author who demonstrably regarded Charlemagne's imperial coronation as the origin of ecclesiastical dissent between Rome and Constantinople, was the Metropolitan Niketas of Nikomedeia during the theological debate he held with Anselm of Havelberg in 1136: see Anselm of Havelberg, *Anticimenon* 111 14, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 188, p. 1231 ll. 1–14 (German trans. Sieben, *Anticimenon*, p. 165).

Dalmatia, which was brought to an end in 812 through a peace treaty, that Pope Leo III received the still to come announcement of the election of Patriarch Nikephoros I of Constantinople.¹¹ One hundred and fifty years later, Otto I was crowned emperor by Pope John XII. The Byzantine historian John Skylitzes, who had close links with the court in Constantinople at the end of the 11th century, did not take notice of the event. On the contrary, he praised Otto I for having made sure that order was restored in Rome again.¹² Byzantium's preparedness to accept a Western empire in practice is to be explained by the fact that for the *basileus* no other emperor could be of equal rank. The Byzantine emperor considered himself the father of all peoples, at the very top of a hierarchy of rulers, and, from the Byzantine point of view, no Western emperor could claim equal standing.¹³ In addition, it has to be taken into account that the main focus of Byzantium's interests no longer lay in Italy, but on the eastern border of the empire and in the Balkans. Therefore, Byzantium was more likely to accept compromises with regard to Italy, and, if the prevailing political situation made sense, it accepted the Western emperors' co-operation with the popes, which continued under Otto I's successors.¹⁴

The following section deals with the conflict that arose under Pope Sergius IV. As already mentioned, Michel considered this rift the definitive break between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, which persists to this day.¹⁵

Combining various pieces of information found solely in Byzantine sources, all of which are admittedly not contemporary, the following picture of the course of events can be obtained. In 1009, Pope Sergius IV announced his election to the papal see to Patriarch Sergios II of Constantinople: the profession of faith transmitted on that occasion contained the *filioque*, i.e. the Latin doctrine claiming the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son.¹⁶ As this profession of faith thus no longer agreed with the *Symbolum*

11 See Classen, *Karl der Große, das Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 87, 96–97. For the conflict between Charlemagne and Byzantium over a western emperorship, see also Weinfurter, *Karl der Große. Der heilige Barbar*, pp. 238–40.

12 John Skylitzes, ed. Thurn, p. 245, ll. 16–20. As Chrysos, "Otto der Große aus byzantinischer Sicht", p. 487, has emphasized, this notice cannot serve as evidence for the assumption that Skylitzes was ready to recognize a more extensive interpretation of Roman primacy.

13 The relevance of the so-called *Zweikaiserproblem* should not be overestimated: see Engels, "Die europäische Geisteslage vor 1000 Jahren – ein Rundblick", p. 20; and Kolditz, "Leon von Synada und Liudprand von Cremona", pp. 554–59, 572–74, 583.

14 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 34–35 and note 101.

15 See above, note 3.

16 The Greek Church taught that the Holy Spirit proceeds uniquely from the Father, while it was the doctrine of the Latin Church that he proceeds from the Father and the Son

Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum, a synod assembled which denied communion to the new incumbent of the See of Rome. Including a pope's name in the diptychs had always been the visible sign that the Bishop of Rome, as Patriarch of the West, shared liturgical commemoration with the Patriarch of Constantinople.¹⁷ Therefore, the removal of the pope's name from the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople expressed the breaking of communion with the Church of Rome from the Greek point of view.¹⁸

However, the question arises whether attention was only given to the papal letter when the break with the Church of Rome was already definitive for Byzantium. Without doubt, such a decision could be more easily justified if a theological difference served as a pretext. Consequently, tensions regarding ecclesiastical structures in southern Italy, the old area of conflict between the Papacy and Byzantium, might have been the true cause for dissent.¹⁹

A legation sent to Pope John XIX by the *basileus* Basil II and the Patriarch of Constantinople Eustathios in 1024 or 1025, which is recorded by the Burgundian historian Rudolf Glaber,²⁰ obviously had the function of re-establishing ecclesiastical concord between Rome and Constantinople.²¹ A rapprochement on the issue of Rome's ecclesiastical influence in Apulia, that had remained Latin, but was now under Byzantine rule, probably goes back to this resumption of contacts.²² Although the Constantinopolitan Church continued to accept the pope's honorary precedence among the five patriarchs, the pope's

(*filioque*). On this major issue of theological controversy between Greeks and Latins, see now Siecienski, *The Filioque, History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, esp. pp. 112–13.

17 On the relevance of inter patriarchal notifications of accession (*Synodika* or *Systatika*) – always containing a profession of faith in a free version – as well as the diptychs as formal signs of communion, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 11–13.

18 On the “schism of the two Sergii”, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 36–41; for the main source on this event, the report written by the *Chartophylax* Niketas, see Stephenson, “The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer”, pp. 122–25.

19 Probably in the mid 8th century, Byzantium had transferred the episcopal sees of Sicily and the Byzantine part of southern Italy from Roman obedience to that of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate. At the onset of the 11th century, Calabria and the southern part of the Salentin peninsula were thus subject to Constantinople while northern and central Apulia, though likewise under Byzantine rule, remained in the ecclesiastical sphere of Rome. For a more detailed outline of the ecclesiastical structures in southern Italy see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 18, 25–28, 30, and pp. 42–43 for a possible conflict there in the time of Pope Sergius IV.

20 Rudolf Glaber, *Historiae* IV 1, 2–4, eds. G. Cavallo/G. Orlandi, 2nd ed. Milan 1989, pp. 196–202, ll. 1–63.

21 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 46–49.

22 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 49–50.

name was still erased from the diptychs of Constantinople. In the mid-11th century, the Churches of Rome and Constantinople faced each other without closer contact.²³

Thus, the question arises why a still widely held scholarly opinion continues to attach great importance to the conflict of 1054, regarding it as the beginning of the Eastern Schism. Did the course of the dispute of 1053/54 possibly itself have a share in this? An exact reconstruction of the conflict is necessary for discussing this issue.

Many factors had contributed to the estrangement of the two Churches.²⁴ The Constantinopolitan Church had been able to considerably expand its area of obedience since the second half of the 10th century. In 988, the Kievan Rus' with its vast territory had become subject to the obedience of Constantinople, and in 996, the right to consecrate the Patriarch of Antioch had been conferred to Constantinople by the Antiochene Church authorities.²⁵ Constantinople's endeavours to subordinate the Church of Antioch to itself can also be discerned in the gradual replacement of the traditional liturgy of the Melkite Patriarchate by the liturgical order of Constantinople. Throughout the 11th century the Constantinopolitan Church enhanced its authority by means of enforcing liturgical conformity. Thus, the Greek Leon acted as Archbishop of Ohrid since 1036/37 with the task of bringing about a change from Old Slavonic to Greek as the liturgical language in conquered Bulgaria.²⁶ After the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem had also come under the influence of Byzantium, probably at the beginning of the 1040s,²⁷ the Patriarch of Constantinople finally attained, to the detriment of the concept of pentarchy, a quasi-papal supremacy in the Orthodox East, which stood in the way of the acceptance of a

23 Vlyssidou, "Les relations entre l'ancienne et la nouvelle Rome sous Basile II" pp. 308–10, argued that Emperor Basil II pursued the installation of Alexios I Stoudites on the patriarchal throne at Constantinople in 1025 in order to continue his policy of rapprochement towards the Papacy. This assumption, however, does not meet with sufficient support in the sources. As the evidence adduced by Vlyssidou herself clearly shows (*ibid.*, p. 297, note 19), the traditional philo-Roman attitude of the Stoudios Monastery is furthermore no longer attested for the 11th century.

24 For what follows, concerning the process of ecclesiastical concentration in the Byzantine Church, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 47–48, 66, 68–69, 204–05.

25 For the situation in the Melkite Patriarchate of Antioch, see now Todt, "Zwischen Kaiser und ökumenischem Patriarchen", pp. 156–57, 174–76.

26 For other examples of Byzantine endeavours to promote ecclesiastical unity (with regard to the Armenians and monophysite Syriac Christianity), see Büttner, *Erzbischof Leon von Ohrid (1037–1056). Leben und Werk*, pp. 220–22.

27 For developments in the Melkite Patriarchate of Jerusalem, see Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, pp. 41–43; the date is discussed by Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 48 and note 15.

primacy for Rome. The ecclesiastical reform movement of the 11th century had its first repercussion in Rome in 1049 at the onset of Leo IX's pontificate.²⁸ The new pope emphasized the papal claim to primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church.²⁹ Thus, the question arose whether, from the Greek point of view, Rome or Constantinople was entitled to hold the position of the first ecclesiastical see.

This leads us to the famous events of 1053/54. With regard to them, a look has first to be taken at the old area of conflict in southern Italy where, in the second quarter of the 11th century, the Normans had developed into a new force between Byzantium, the pope, and the Lombard principalities. By 1050, they had conquered extensive parts of Byzantine Apulia and were pushing forward into the territory of the Lombard Principality of Benevento.³⁰ In accordance with the aims of the reform papacy Pope Leo IX increasingly sought to assert papal claims in southern Italy. Therefore, in April 1051, he accepted the offer made by the hard-pressed residents of Benevento to place the principality under Rome's political sovereignty.³¹ As the further expansion of the Normans now represented a direct threat both to the pope and to Byzantine rule in southern Italy, an anti-Norman alliance between the Papacy and Byzantium naturally emerged.³² However, Michael Keroularios, the politically ambitious Patriarch of Constantinople, vigorously opposed the endeavours of Pope Leo IX to bring about military cooperation with the rather irresolute Byzantine Emperor Constantine IX, which should commence at the beginning of spring 1053 at the latest. Keroularios, who had not failed to notice the changes taking place in Rome under Pope Leo IX, was on bad terms personally with Argyros, the Latin governor of Byzantine southern Italy. He feared, probably rightly, the loss of the Constantinopolitan sphere of obedience in parts of southern Italy that had once belonged to Rome. In an arbitrary step, Keroularios had the Latin churches in Constantinople closed under the pretext that the

28 The breakthrough of reform at the Roman curia only dates to the pontificate of Leo IX, not to the time of his predecessors Clement II and Damasus II: see Stroll, *Popes and Antipopes*, pp. 24–35, esp. p. 33.

29 On several aspects of Leo IX's thought on papal primacy, see D'Agostino, *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054)*, pp. 249–325; and further Harris, "The 'Schism' of 1054 and the First Crusade", pp. 13–16.

30 See Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard, Southern Italy and the Norman conquest*, pp. 100–02, 109, 112.

31 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 54–57; Taviani-Carozzi, "Leon IX et les Normands d'Italie du Sud", pp. 321–22.

32 For what follows, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 59–60, 63–72; and id., "Das sogenannte Schisma von 1054", pp. 31–32 and note 27; see also recently Gastgeber, "The So-Called Schism of 1054", pp. 195–96, 207.

celebration of the liturgy there was not in accordance with the regulations.³³ He furthermore induced the Greek Archbishop Leon of Ohrid – whose autocephalous archbishopric lay nearly completely in the region formerly known as Eastern Illyricum³⁴ – to draft a polemical treatise.³⁵ This text was primarily sent to Patriarch Dominicus of Grado and – contrary to previous research – not only to Latin southern Italy.³⁶ Instead, Dominicus was supposed to make this letter known to the pope and all the bishops of the West.³⁷ In the treatise, Leon denied the validity of the Latins' Eucharist because they celebrated the divine service with unleavened bread (azymes) instead of leavened bread as the Greeks did.³⁸ He also objected to further disciplinary and liturgical habits of the Latin Church.³⁹

With these actions, Michael Keroularios tried to thwart the policy of the *basileus*. In fact, the patriarch ignored the traditional allocation of roles between the emperor and the Church in Byzantium. This reflects the long-term development of the Church in Byzantium into an increasingly independent power factor since the end of the iconoclastic controversy in 843. The old unity of Church and emperor in Byzantium only partially continued to exist in the

-
- 33 While Kolbaba, "On the Closing of the Churches and the Rebaptism of Latins", pp. 39–42, argues that the closing of Latin Churches is not well-attested, Ryder, "Changing Perspectives on 1054", pp. 20–25, 29–37 rightly insists on the reliability of these Latin reproaches, as the Roman legation sent by Pope Leo IX to Constantinople in 1054 was in a position to observe the situation in the Byzantine capital and could thus have retracted improper recriminations, see Ryder, "Changing Perspectives on 1054", p. 22. Although Kolbaba renewed her argument, answering Ryder's article (Kolbaba, "1054 Revisited: Response to Ryder"), she did not adduce new evidence.
- 34 Recently, Brandes, "Das Schweigen des Liber pontificalis", pp. 187–203, has argued, that the transfer of the bishoprics of eastern Illyricum into the obedience of the Patriarchate of Constantinople should probably be dated to Justinian I's first reign, before the Quinisext Council in 691/92, while the traditionally established dates, either at the outbreak of the Iconoclast controversy or at the time of the papal alliance with the Franks (c.752), are less convincing.
- 35 On Leon of Ohrid, see the detailed biography by Büttner, *Erzbischof Leon von Ohrid (1037–1056). Leben und Werk*, containing the first critical edition of Leon's treatise (with commentary and German translation): Büttner, *Erzbischof*, pp. 162–201. See also Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 64–68, 70.
- 36 See Büttner, *Erzbischof*, pp. 42–49, 194–96.
- 37 Leon von Ohrid, *Letter*, ed. Büttner, *Erzbischof*, p. 180, ll. 4–6; p. 192, ll. 130–33.
- 38 Leon von Ohrid, *Letter*, ed. Büttner, *Erzbischof*, pp. 180–86, 192. Leon's arguments against the Latin use of azymes, including those which gained prominence in the conflict of 1053/54, have been treated by Avvakumov, *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens*, pp. 103–11; and Büttner, *Erzbischof*, pp. 38–40, 53–55, 262–74, 281.
- 39 Leon of Ohrid, *Letter*, ed. Büttner, *Erzbischof*, pp. 188–92.

middle of the 11th century, particularly on account of the weakness of the emperors in this period.⁴⁰

It is not surprising that Michael Keroularios put the Latins' consecration of unleavened bread at the centre of his attacks, because in the mid-11th century the azymes were an important theological problem for the Byzantine Church.⁴¹ In the course of his attempts at liturgical standardisation in Byzantium, the patriarch became aware of the Armenians' custom, who likewise used unleavened sacrificial bread. Keroularios condemned this custom as a relapse into Judaism.⁴²

For the reform Papacy, however, any criticism of the Roman Church order equalled heresy, according to Rome's new understanding of the fundamental significance of Roman liturgy.⁴³ To accept the patriarch's attacks would have been incompatible with the reform Papacy's intensified conception of primacy.⁴⁴ In order to call Michael Keroularios to account, and nevertheless bring about the anti-Norman alliance, Leo IX sent a legation of three, led by Cardinal Bishop Humbert of Silva Candida, to Constantinople between January and mid-March, 1054.⁴⁵ The legation was to deliver Pope Leo's sharply worded reply to Michael Keroularios. In this letter the pope even threatened the patriarch with excommunication if the latter were not to offer an apology.⁴⁶

40 The subtleties inherent in Church-state-relations in Byzantium have been underlined by Grünbart, "Epilog", and in Bayer, "Review Zwei Sonnen". On Michael Keroularios, see Cheynet, "Patriarches et empereurs: de l'opposition à la révolte ouverte", pp. 4–8, 18, and Stanković, "The Path toward Michael Keroularios", pp. 137–38, 151–54.

41 See Whalen, "Rethinking the Schism of 1054: Authority, Heresy and the Latin Rite", pp. 2–4, who, however, ignores studies in the German language (Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 219, Avvakumov, *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens*, pp. 377–78) likewise arguing that the nature of the consecration matter was of great theological importance for the Greek side.

42 Kolbaba, "Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious Errors", pp. 122–23.

43 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 73–74; Whalen, "Rethinking the Schism of 1054: Authority, Heresy and the Latin Rite", pp. 4–7. For the amplification of the meaning of "heresy" in the eyes of the adherents of Church reform in the 11th century, see Goetz, "Wandel des Häresiebegriffs im Zeitalter der Kirchenreform?", p. 136.

44 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 83–84, 89.

45 On the legation's commission, see Cheynet, "La politique byzantine de Léon IX", pp. 268–71; on its dating, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 86–87.

46 This letter of Leo IX, is published in Will (ed.), *Acta et scripta*, pp. 89–92, here p. 92. On this letter, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 82–84; D'Agostino, *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054)*, pp. 202–06, whose observations suggest the necessity of a new edition.

In Constantinople the *basileus* received the legates honourably. The subsequent encounter with Michael Keroularios ended, however, in open confrontation, because the latter refused to accept any precedence of the legates.⁴⁷ Thereafter the patriarch refused to meet the legates again, by which he also gave expression to the fact that he was not prepared to accept various divergences in the Latins' religious ecclesiastical discipline either. The Roman legates for their part now objected – in accordance with their sincere conviction – to Greek rites and ecclesiastical customs. As both the Greek and the Roman Churches thus conveyed exclusive validity to their own respective ecclesiastical practice, which they regarded as binding for all in the mid 11th century,⁴⁸ the Latins' action unleashed a fierce dispute. This dispute, however, was not conducted by the patriarch himself on the Greek side, but by the Stoudite monk Niketas Stethatos. Apart from various minor points of controversy,⁴⁹ the argument centred on the question of the right material for consecration, the different positions on the marriage of the clergy,⁵⁰ and finally also on the *filioque*.

As Michael Keroularios continued to deny the legates any possibility of calling him to account, they, finally, laid a bull of excommunication on the altar of Hagia Sophia on 16 July 1054,⁵¹ in accordance with the pope's commission.⁵² The document pronounced the anathema against Michael Keroularios, Leon of Ohrid, and their followers;⁵³ however, the *basileus* and, as it explicitly states,

47 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 87, and for what follows pp. 88–89.

48 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 68–69, 74–75, 207; and also Whalen, "Rethinking the Schism of 1054: Authority, Heresy and the Latin Rite", p. 5.

49 On the controversial issues that arose after the delegation's arrival at Constantinople, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 88–93; Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church*, pp. 207–10. More specifically on the procession of the Holy Spirit, see Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 351–53, 359–67, 378–91.

50 On the general development of celibacy in the Greek and Latin Churches up to the 11th century, see Denzler, *Geschichte des Zölibats*, pp. 24–35. The different regulations in both Churches regarding celibacy first occurred as an issue of controversy in the Photian conflict (the Latin terms were stricter): see Goetz, *Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen und christlich-abendländisches Selbstverständnis im frühen und hohen Mittelalter (5.–12. Jahrhundert)*, vol. 2, pp. 740–42 (Latin position), and Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 39–40 (Greek position).

51 The document had been issued in Latin and was translated into Greek at the patriarch's order after it had been delivered to Keroularios: see Gastgeber, "Die manipulative Macht der Übersetzung", pp. 37–38.

52 On the Roman sentence of excommunication and its intention, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 96–98; Gemeinhardt, "Das Schisma von 1054", p. 64; D'Agostino, *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054)*, pp. 228–31.

53 From the Roman perspective in the 11th century, *anathema* implied the complete exclusion from the community of the faithful: see Jaser, *Ecclesia maledicens*, pp. 42–44; Hainthaler, "Réflexions sur la levée des anathèmes historiques", pp. 228–29.

the “respected people of Constantinople” were considered orthodox. It was the legates’ intention to make it possible for Emperor Constantine IX to show his solidarity with their action. On the basis of this judgement of the Apostolic See, the emperor intended to take advantage of the new situation to depose the patriarch who was no longer tolerable for him either. However, this strategy failed due to the political weakness of Constantine IX and Keroularios’ ability to mobilise popular unrest in order to force the *basileus* to change his policy after the legates had departed without result. Constantine IX finally empowered the patriarch to convoke a synod in order to respond to the anathema.⁵⁴

At the synod, which met on 21 July, the patriarch consciously left Pope Leo IX out of the discussion, as he already knew of the latter’s death which had occurred on 19 April. He rather imposed a counter anathema on his personal enemy Argyros – whom he made out to be the motivator of the legates’ mission – as well as on the legates themselves, and on Argyros’s closest supporters at the imperial court. However, the patriarch did not name the excommunicated persons by name. The fact that Michael Keroularios reinterpreted the quarrel with Rome as a personal conflict with the Latin Argyros, not only arose from his animosity towards the governor of Byzantine southern Italy. His intention was rather to bring about the downfall of Argyros and his supporters at the imperial court.

The two sentences of excommunication were both directed only at a defined group of persons and not at the other part of Christendom in each case. A schism between the two Churches was not intended.⁵⁵ Consequently, it is absolutely consistent that, in the Middle Ages, none of the successors of Pope Leo IX associated the split between the Roman and Constantinopolitan Churches with the year 1054.⁵⁶ However, the criticism of various rites and ecclesiastical customs that had been occasioned by the dispute of 1053/54 did give both sides enough reason to become convinced of a state of mutual separation.⁵⁷ In contrast to Gilbert Dagron’s opinion,⁵⁸ the events that escalated in the mutual sentences of excommunication should not be regarded as a

54 On the patriarch’s excommunication, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 96–98; Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 355–58; D’Agostino, *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054)*, pp. 234–36; and recently, Gastgeber, “The So-Called Schism of 1054”, pp. 196–97, 213–18.

55 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 104–05.

56 Papal assertions concerning relations towards the Church of Constantinople up to the 15th century, have been collected by Denzler, “Das Morgenländische Kirchenschema”.

57 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 105; see furthermore Gemeinhardt, “Das Schisma von 1054”, pp. 64–65.

58 In Boshof, *Die Geschichte des Christentums*, vol. 4, p. 357.

conflict limited to the pope and the patriarch; in fact, both Churches were involved in the dispute.

How did the contemporaries see the events of 1053/54? Among the three eastern patriarchs, only the reaction of Peter III of Antioch is known. He did not declare his solidarity with Michael Keroularios, but appealed to him in a letter not to let the rift that had emerged become even deeper.⁵⁹ On the Roman side, the successors to Leo IX did not repeat the anathema against the patriarch. It may however be firmly assumed that the sentence would have been repeated by the subsequent popes if the excommunication pronounced by Leo IX had indeed become part of the legal tradition of the Roman Church at that time.⁶⁰ Many of Leo's successors had notorious difficulties in asserting themselves at Rome, and were hardly in a position to conduct a consistent policy towards Byzantium. A merely nominal recognition of these popes in Byzantium would have already been a success for them. Contemporary reports of the quarrel of 1054 that have a source value of their own – for example Lampert of Hersfeld in the West and Michael Psellos in his memorial address for Michael Keroularios in Byzantium – acclaim the conflict's outcome as a triumphal victory over the heresy of the other side, respectively, without, admittedly, intimating what consequences would result from that for the future.⁶¹ In any case, religious ill-feeling continued to exist between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople after 1054. This explains why, already in the 1060s, efforts were made for a rapprochement.⁶² In addition though, the discord of 1054 was the starting-point for a never-ending debate on the various theological differences between the Latin and Greek Church.⁶³

The long-term significance of 1054 could be diminished on account of the opinion, often held in modern research, that the Roman excommunication of the 16 July 1054 had become ineffective at Leo IX's death on the preceding

59 Peter's Letter has been published by Will (ed.), *Acta et scripta*, pp. 189–204, here esp. p. 202, chapter 21. See also Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 107–09; Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church*, pp. 213–15; D'Agostino, *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054)*, pp. 243–46.

60 On the “repetition” of papal decisions at synods and its significance, see Gresser, *Die Synoden und Konzilien*, pp. 531–32, 543–44.

61 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 113–16; on Psellos see also Cheynet, “Le schisme de 1054: un non-événement?”, p. 306.

62 For these attempts at rapprochement, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 131–37.

63 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 112; and Gemeinhardt, “Das Schisma von 1054”, p. 65. On the Greek side the various reproaches against the Latins were collected in lists of Latin errors. For these collections up to the 13th century, see Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 32–87.

19 April.⁶⁴ But as regards the legal validity of the Roman excommunication, it has to be pointed out that in the early days of the reform papacy, when the Roman institution of legates was still in its infancy, a legation could still continue after the death of the pope who had originally appointed it.⁶⁵

In the final part of this paper I shall discuss the question whether the First Crusade can be held responsible for a decisive increment in ecclesiastical tensions.

Despite the unprecedented vehemence with which the conflict of 1053/54 had been conducted, the Churches still saw themselves as being fundamentally in ecclesiastical communion. Only shortly before the beginning of the First Crusade, in 1089, Pope Urban II requested that his name be entered in the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople. The “permanent” synod (*synodos endemusa*) in Constantinople, just like the pope already beforehand, established that a state of schism between Rome and the Constantinopolitan Church could not be proved canonically. The synod thereupon only pronounced one condition to the pope, namely that he should send, in accordance with an earlier established custom, an announcement of his election with a profession of faith of pure, genuine content.⁶⁶

In the mind of Urban II, the First Crusade (1096–99) was firmly linked to the intention of coming to the oriental Christians’ aid against the Turks, who had advanced as far as western Asia Minor. Admittedly, the *basileus* Alexios I (1081–1118) was not prepared to deal with the crusader armies,⁶⁷ and besides that the idea of a crusade was alien to the Byzantines.⁶⁸ Having arrived in Byzantine territory, disappointed at the Byzantines’ limited preparedness for

64 Cf. Gemeinhardt, “Das Schisma von 1054”, p. 64 and note 19; Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 99, where preceding research discussions have been summarized.

65 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 99–100. Further arguments for the validity of the sentence of excommunication have been adduced by Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 99–101; and by D’Agostino, *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054)*, pp. 231–34. Instead, the partially inaccurate study by Hergehelegiu, “Kirchenrechtliche Konsequenzen” provides no new results with regard to the legal validity of the Roman sentence.

66 For the failure of Urban II’s policy of rapprochement, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 154–64. For the relevance of the diptychs and interpatristic letters for the communion between the Churches, see above pp. 194–95.

67 Byzantine influence on the formation of the First Crusade has been discussed by Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 33–36; and Preiser-Kapeller, “Die ich rief die Geister ...”, p. 89.

68 This has convincingly been demonstrated by Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 24–29. Whether the idea of “Holy War” existed in Byzantium, albeit rudimentarily, is still a matter of debate: see Kolias-Dermitzaki, “Holy War’ in Byzantium Twenty Years Later”.

co-operation, the crusaders therefore raised the accusation of betrayal.⁶⁹ At first, the crusaders' leaders still co-operated with the Melkite Patriarchs John v of Antioch and Simeon II of Jerusalem. However, after the death of the papal legate Adhémar of Le Puy on 1 August 1098,⁷⁰ the Byzantinophobe mood gained the upper hand among the leading crusaders, something also due to their own ambitions for power. Soon after the establishment of the crusader dominions in Jerusalem and Antioch, both patriarchs were replaced by Latins (in 1099 and 1100 respectively).⁷¹

Faced with the loss of the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, the Byzantine imperial Church displayed unconcealed hostility towards the Latins,⁷² and, since it did not abandon its claim to these patriarchal sees, two rival lines of patriarchs came into being in exile in Constantinople at the beginning of the 12th century.⁷³ The Constantinopolitan Church, probably as a consequence of the deteriorated ecclesiastical climate, now explicitly rejected Rome's claim to primacy,⁷⁴ whereupon Urban II's successor, Paschal II, for the first time declared that a state of schism existed between the Roman and Constantinopolitan Church in 1112.⁷⁵ The relations between Latins and Greeks, that had become closer over the course of Latin expansion into the eastern Mediterranean, also made the mutual positions in controversial religious questions known to wider circles. For example, in 1104, the German Bishop Walram of Naumburg, who probably had dealings with a mission from Alexios I at

69 For the growing tensions between the crusaders and Byzantium, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 167, 170–71; Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, pp. 73–79.

70 For the role Adhémar of Le Puy played during the Crusade, see Haas, *Geistliche als Kreuzfahrer*, esp. pp. 155–56, 281–83.

71 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 174–78. The replacement of the See of Jerusalem has been analysed in detail by Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, pp. 89–100. For the Patriarchate of Antioch, see Todt, "Griechisch-orthodoxe (melkitische) Christen", pp. 55–56; MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, pp. 111–12.

72 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 196–99 (Pope Paschal II's letter to Emperor Alexios I, in 1112).

73 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 208–09. On Byzantine efforts to reinstall a Melkite Patriarch in Antioch, see Todt, "Griechisch-orthodoxe (melkitische) Christen", pp. 56–57; the Melkite Patriarchs of Jerusalem have been extensively treated by Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit*, pp. 101–81.

74 The first extensive Byzantine argument against papal primacy was expressed by the rhetorician Niketas Seides in 1112: see Gahbauer, *Byzantinische Dogmengeschichte*, pp. 80–81; and Pinggéra, "Altes und Neues Rom. Der päpstliche Primat aus östlich-orthodoxer Sicht", pp. 192–93.

75 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 196–99 (Paschal II's letter to Emperor Alexios I).

the court of Emperor Henry IV, requested the renowned Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury to give him information about various points of controversy between Latins and Greeks.⁷⁶ In 1112 the differences in the conception of the Trinity became apparent to a full extent in a disputation in Constantinople between the *prōtos* of the monasteries on Mount Ganos, John Phournes, the Metropolitan Eustratios of Nicaea, and the rhetorician Niketas Seides, with the former Archbishop of Milan, Pietro Grossolano.⁷⁷ Remarkably enough, at about the same time – according to the testimony of Archbishop Theophylaktos of Ohrid – the opinion prevailed in the Greek Church that the Latins were schismatics on account of their differences in ecclesiastical discipline.⁷⁸

At that time, greater attention was occasionally paid again to the events of 1053/54. In the West, in 1106, the monk Sigebert of Gembloux was the first author of a universal chronicle who mentioned the excommunication of Patriarch Michael Keroularios.⁷⁹ In Byzantium an interpolation in the Chronicle of John Skylitzes⁸⁰ made before 1143 claimed – admittedly wrongly – that Michael Keroularios had erased the pope's name from the diptychs of the Byzantine Church. The reason for this was said to have been the use of azymes in the divine service.

Further developments after the First Crusade were marked by a gradually deepening rift between the Papacy and Byzantium. In 1138, Pope Innocent II called the Byzantine emperor a schismatic for the first time,⁸¹ as the pope suspected that the *basileus* would again install a Greek patriarch after conquering Antioch.⁸² Nevertheless, both the pope and the emperor basically still favoured the restoration of a mutual understanding between the Churches.

76 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 184–85, 200–01.

77 For this disputation see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 191–96. The different stances towards the *filioque* (procession of the Holy Spirit) have been outlined by Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 512–18. The position of Shepard, “Hard on Heretics”, pp. 776–77, that the *basileus* Alexios I generally spared the Latins from criticism in religious matters so as to avoid endangering his political collaboration with them, is not convincing. In fact, Alexios I himself intervened in the debates of 1112, arguing against the Latin *filioque* doctrine.

78 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 201–02; Theophylaktos of Ohrid, *Treatise on the Errors of the Latins*, ed. Gautier, p. 247, ll. 5–8.

79 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 113, 210 with note 53.

80 John Skylitzes, ed. Thurn, pp. 433–34, ll. 40–43; cf. Bayer, “Das sogenannte Schisma von 1054”, p. 37 and note 66.

81 *Papsturkunden für Kirchen im Heiligen Lande*, ed. R. Hiestand, *Vorarbeiten zum Oriens pontificius*, vol. 3 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 3. Folge, Nr. 136), Göttingen 1985, no. 49, p. 169, l. 12.

82 On Emperor John II's campaign against Antioch, see Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 76–79.

The enforcement of Roman primacy within the Byzantine Church was an essential condition for the Papacy, and the emperors John 11 (1118–43) and Manuel 1 (1143–80), similar to their predecessors since the mid 11th century, were interested in cooperating with the Roman See in order to prevent the Normans in southern Italy from attacking Byzantine territory.⁸³

To put the Second Crusade (1147/49) into effect, the Papacy was again dependent on Byzantine support, as it had been during the First Crusade. The pope thus avoided allusions to ecclesiastical differences in this context which might have endangered the main aim of this undertaking: to repel Muslim power. Nevertheless, the difficulties that arose when the crusaders crossed Byzantine territories – similar to the First Crusade – as well as the Latins' defeats on their way to the Holy Land,⁸⁴ resulted in negative perceptions of the Byzantines as enemies of the Roman Church in the eyes of many crusaders. In this context of deteriorating Latin perceptions, the accusation of heresy against the Greek Church flourished, once again similar to the context of the First Crusade.⁸⁵ Growing tensions overshadowed the mutual perceptions, for instance Bernard of Clairvaux, the spiritually leading figure in the Occident, considered Greek Christianity as only partially belonging to the same church as the Latins.⁸⁶

In the eyes of Pope Hadrian IV (1154–59), the recognition of papal primacy remained an indispensable condition for the restoration of ecclesiastical unity as it had already been for Paschal II in 1112.⁸⁷ On the other hand, Patriarch Michael III Anchialou of Constantinople (1170–78) successfully thwarted⁸⁸ Manuel I's offer to Pope Alexander III to subordinate the Byzantine Church to

83 For the Byzantine policy towards the Normans from the mid 11th century to the death of Alexios I in 1118, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, ch. 3b, 4, 6–8, 9c and 11b. For the development of relations under John II and Manuel I, see the contributions of Eleni Tounta and Leonie Exarchos in this volume.

84 Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 86–101; Kindlimann, *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens*, pp. 151–55.

85 See Kindlimann, *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens*, p. 156; for the First Crusade, see Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 170–73, 182–84, 200–01.

86 Kindlimann, *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens*, p. 180; Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, p. 70.

87 Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 531–33; for Paschal II see also Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 196–97. In 1155, Hadrian IV probably negotiated with the Byzantines to eliminate schism: see Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 529–31.

88 The main source is the *Dialogos*, a conversation between Emperor Manuel I and Patriarch Michael III. This anti-unionist work, however, only seems to originate from the time after the Council of Lyon (1274) and contains numerous polemical accusations. For a discussion of its credibility as a source, see Prinzing, "Das Papsttum und der orthodox geprägte Südosten", pp. 137–38, note 2. The text is published in *Dossier Grec de l'Union de Lyon*

the Roman See in return for being acknowledged as sole emperor in Rome.⁸⁹ The patriarch naturally refused a subordination to Rome. The former harmony between state and Church in Byzantium yielded to dissent among the two powers during the 11th and 12th centuries with regard to an understanding with Rome.⁹⁰

As one of the main controversial points, papal primacy became the subject of an extensive theological treatment for the first time in 12th-century Byzantium.⁹¹ At the same time, the controversy over the right consecration matter (azyme question) continued, and both sides insisted on their respective standpoints without developing new lines of argument.⁹² With regard to the *filioque* question, however, the disputation held in Constantinople in 1136 between Bishop Anselm of Havelberg and Niketas, the Metropolitan of Nikomedeia, might have led to some sort of compromise,⁹³ and consequently this controversy seems to have lost its former sharpness over the following decades.⁹⁴

However, the ecclesiastical tensions between Rome and Constantinople did not have any fundamental influence, before the last quarter of the 12th century, on the popular idea of a single, undivided Christendom. Political, religious, and commercial relations found clear expressions, for example, in matrimonial and monastic links, in pilgrimages with “unhesitatingly *communicatio in sacris*” on both sides, and in the veneration of common saints.⁹⁵ An irreconcilable

(1273–1277), eds. V. Laurent/J. Darrouzès (Archives de l'Orient Chrétien, 16), Paris 1976, pp. 346–75.

89 Cf. Harris/Tolstoy, “Alexander III and Byzantium”, pp. 311–12; for Manuel's Roman policy, see also the contribution of Leonie Exarchos in this volume.

90 Supra note 40.

91 For the Byzantine position, see especially Spiteris, *La critica bizantina del primato Romano nel secolo XII*.

92 See the arguments analysed by Avvakumov, *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens*, pp. 87–159 *passim*.

93 Kapriev, *Lateinische Rivalen in Konstantinopel*, pp. 137–58; Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, pp. 518–28; Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 71–74. It is not absolutely certain whether Niketas of Nikomedeia indeed was the interlocutor of Anselm: see Kapriev, *Lateinische Rivalen in Konstantinopel*, pp. 71–72.

94 See Gemeinhardt, *Filioque-Kontroverse*, p. 528 (rather sceptical about the success of the disputation); and Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 74–5 (who rather argues for a convergence).

95 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 5–6. Besides the literature mentioned there, see now also Balard, “Voyageurs Italiens à Byzance (VI^e–XI^e siècles)”, pp. 255–72; and Shepard, “Storm Clouds”, pp. 128–34. It is remarkable that the Greek anonymous writer who composed the report on the martyrdom of 13 Greek monks at Kantara (Cyprus) in 1231, regarded the increasing Latin military activities against Byzantium in the time of Emperor Manuel I (1143–80) as the very origin of the religious tensions. This text, written

gulf between Greek and Latin Christendom only came into being with the conquest and looting of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204, but above all due to the imposed change in rite enforced by the Latin occupiers after this in many places of the former Byzantine Empire. All endeavours aiming at an understanding with the Greek ecclesiastical authorities now encountered the bitter resistance of large parts of the Greek population.⁹⁶

It was only at that point, when schism had further hardened, that the conflict of 1053/54 aroused greater interest in Latin Christendom. Thus, at the time of Latin rule in Constantinople (1204–61) the French historians Hélinand of Froidmont and Alberic of Troisfontaines borrowed the account of the events of 1053/54 from the widely known *Chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux*.⁹⁷ An anonymous Dominican friar, living in Constantinople, even put the beginning of the schism with the Greek Church at the excommunication of Patriarch Michael Keroularios in his treatise “*Contra Graecos*”, written in 1252.⁹⁸

In Byzantium, it was in connection with the Second Council of Lyon, that, for the first time, voices were raised – by the monk Job Jasites, the Patriarch John Bekkos, as well as his pupil Georgios Metochites – which dated the separation between Rome and Constantinople to the quarrel of 1054.⁹⁹ This should be emphasized against Tia Kolbaba's claims that the Byzantine Church scarcely referred to Michael Keroularios in the 13th century.¹⁰⁰ Fundamental significance, however, was attached to the dispute in Byzantium only after the unionist policy of Emperor Michael VIII had triggered intensive studies on the relationship with the Roman Church. The search for a handy starting point for the state of schism, as well as the fact that the deterioration in the religious climate after the First Crusade was no longer tangible in the Byzantine sources,

probably between 1254 and 1261, has been edited by Beihammer/Schabel, “Two Small Texts”, pp. 77–81, here p. 78, ll. 54–64, see also pp. 71–72.

96 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 210; see also Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 173, 196–98. Pope Innocent III considered the Latin rite superior to the Greek one, and therefore aimed at substituting the latter for the former wherever possible: see Andrea, “Innocent III and the Byzantine Rite”, pp. 111–22, and for developments in areas conquered by the Latins in 1204, see pp. 118–21.

97 Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, pp. 210–11.

98 This treatise is edited in *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 140, pp. 483–574, here p. 518 (new edition by Beihammer/Schabel, “Two Small Texts”, pp. 74–75) and pp. 572–74. Up to the 15th century, this text constituted an important reference for theological debate with the Greeks. For an extensive study of the text and its arguments, see Dondaine, “*Contra Graecos*”, esp. pp. 320–50, 372, 384–428; see furthermore Beihammer/Schabel, “Two Small Texts”, pp. 70–73.

99 See Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*, p. 111.

100 See Kolbaba, “The Legacy of Humbert and Cerularius”.

helped the conflict of 1053/54 gain the character of a profound turning point for Byzantium in the last quarter of the 13th century.

Looking back at the events of the so-called “Schism of 1054”, the well-known confrontation between the papal legates and Patriarch Michael Keroularios was just an episode, albeit an important one, in a gradual process of alienation between the Eastern and the Western Church.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anselm von Havelberg, *Anticimenon*, transl. H.J. Sieben, *Anticimenon. Über die eine Kirche von Abel bis zum letzten Erwählten und von Ost bis West* (Archa Verbi. Jahrbuch der internationalen Gesellschaft für theologische Mediävistik, Subsidia, 7), Münster 2010.
- John Skylitzes, ed. H. Thurn, *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 5), Berlin 1973.
- Theophylaktos of Ohrid, *Treatise on the Errors of the Latins*, ed. P. Gautier, *Théophylacte d'Achrida, Discours, Traités, Poésies* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 16/1), Thessaloniki 1980, vol. 1, pp. 247–85.
- Will, C. (ed.), *Acta et Scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae saeculo XI conscripta extant*, Leipzig 1861 (repr. Frankfurt 1963).

Secondary Literature

- Andrea, A.J., “Innocent III and the Byzantine Rite, 1198–1216”, in A. Laiou (ed.), *Urbs capta. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences* (Réalités Byzantines, 10), Paris 2005, pp. 111–22.
- Avvakumov, G., *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens. Die lateinische Theologie des Hochmittelalters in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Ritus der Ostkirche* (Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, 47), Berlin 2002.
- Balard, M., “Voyageurs Italiens à Byzance (VI^e–XI^e siècles)”, in A. Dierkens/J.-M. Sansterre (eds.), *Voyages et Voyageurs à Byzance et en Occident du VI^e au XI^e siècle. Actes du colloque international de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles en collaboration avec l'Université de Liège (5–7 mai 1994)*, Geneva 2000, pp. 255–72.
- Bayer, A., *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054* (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 53), 2nd ed., Cologne 2004.
- Bayer, A., “Das sogenannte Schisma von 1054”, in P. Bruns/G. Gresser (eds.), *Vom Schisma zu den Kreuzzügen 1054–1204*, Paderborn 2005, pp. 27–39.

- Bayer, A., "Review on Grünbart, M./Rickelt, L./Vučetić, M.M. (eds.), *Zwei Sonnen am Goldenen Horn?, Kaiserliche und patriarchale Macht im byzantinischen Mittelalter. Akten der internationalen Tagung vom 3. bis 5. November 2010* (Byzantinische Studien und Texte, 3/4), 2 vols., Berlin 2011–13," in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 109 (2016), 977–79.
- Beihammer, A.D./Schabel, C.D., "Two Small Texts on the Wider Context of the Martyrdom of the Thirteen Monks of Kantara in Cyprus, 1231", in E. Motos Guirao/M. Morfakidis Filactós (eds.), *Polyptychon. Homenaje a Joannis Hassiotis*, Granada 2008, pp. 69–81.
- Bischoff, G./Tock, B.-M. (eds.), *Léon IX et son temps. Actes du colloque international organisé par l'Institut d'Histoire Médiévale de l'Université Marc-Bloch, Strasbourg-Eguisheim, 20–22 juin 2002* (ARTEM, 8), Turnhout 2006.
- Boshof, E., (ed.), *Die Geschichte des Christentums*, vol. 4: *Bischöfe, Mönche und Kaiser (642–1054)*, Freiburg 1994 (orig. ed. in French: Dagron, G./Riché, P./Vauchez, A. (eds.), *Histoire du Christianisme des Origines à nos jours*, vol. 4, Paris 1993).
- Brandes, W., "Das Schweigen des Liber pontificalis. Die „Enteignung“ der päpstlichen Patrimonien Siziliens und Unteritaliens in den 50er Jahren des 8. Jahrhunderts", in W. Brandes/L.M. Hoffmann/K. Maksimovic (eds.), *Fontes Minores XII*, Frankfurt 2014, pp. 97–203.
- Bremer, T./Gazer, H.R./Lange, C. (eds.), *Die orthodoxen Kirchen der byzantinischen Tradition*, Darmstadt 2013.
- Büttner, E., *Erzbischof Leon von Ohrid (1037–1056). Leben und Werk (mit den Texten seiner bisher unedierten asketischen Schrift und seiner drei Briefe an den Papst)*, Bamberg 2007.
- Chadwick, H., *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church. From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence*, Oxford 2003.
- Cheyne, J.-C., "La politique byzantine de Léon IX", in Bischoff/Tock (eds.), *Léon IX et son temps*, pp. 259–72.
- Cheyne, J.-C., "Le schisme de 1054: un non-événement?", in C. Carozzi/H. Taviani-Carozzi (eds.), *Faire l'événement au Moyen Âge*, Aix-en-Provence 2007, pp. 299–312.
- Cheyne, J.-C., "Patriarches et empereurs: de l'opposition à la révolte ouverte", in Grünbart/Rickelt/Vučetić (eds.), *Zwei Sonnen am Goldenen Horn?*, vol. 2, pp. 1–18.
- Chrysos, E., "Otto der Große aus byzantinischer Sicht", in M. Puhle (ed.), *Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa*, vol. 1: *Essays*, Mainz 2001, pp. 481–88.
- Classen, P., *Karl der Große, das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Begründung des karolingischen Kaisertums* (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters, 9), Sigmaringen 1985.
- D'Agostino, M.G., *Il Primato della Sede di Roma in Leone IX (1049–1054). Studio dei testi latini nella controversia greco-romana nel periodo pregregoriano*, Milan 2008.
- Denzler, G., "Das Morgenländische Kirchenschema im Verständnis von Päpsten und Ökumenischen Konzilien des Mittelalters", *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 20 (1969), 104–17.

- Denzler, G., *Die Geschichte des Zölibats*, Freiburg (Breisgau) 1993.
- Dondaine, A., "Contra Graecos. Premiers écrits polémiques des dominicains d'Orient", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 21 (1951), 320–446.
- Engels, O., "Die europäische Geisteslage vor 1000 Jahren – ein Rundblick", in H.H. Henrix (ed.), *Adalbert von Prag – Brückenbauer zwischen dem Osten und Westen Europas*, Baden-Baden 1997, pp. 17–48.
- Gahbauer, F.R., *Byzantinische Dogmengeschichte. Vom Ausgang des Ikonoklasmus bis zum Untergang Konstantinopels (1453)*, Heiligenkreuz 2010.
- Gastgeber, C., "Die manipulative Macht der Übersetzung: Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Patriarch Michael Kerullarius und Kardinal Humbert von 1054 im Spiegel der bewussten Inhaltsverfälschung", in E. Juhász (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland II. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*, Budapest 2014, pp. 29–43.
- Gastgeber, C., "The So-Called Schism of 1054 and its Impact on Byzantine Society", in B. Crostini Lappin/G. Peers (eds.), *A Book of Psalms from Eleventh-Century Byzantium: The Complex of Texts and Images in Vat. Gr. 752* (Studi e Testi, 504), Vatican City 2016, pp. 193–225.
- Gemeinhardt, P., *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 82), Berlin 2002.
- Gemeinhardt, P., "Das Schisma von 1054 – seine gesellschaftliche und ökumenische Bedeutung", *Materialdienst des Konfessionskundlichen Instituts Bensheim* 55 (2004), 63–69.
- Goetz, H.-W., "Wandel des Häresiebegriffs im Zeitalter der Kirchenreform? Eine Betrachtung der Streitschriften Humberts von Silva Candida und Gottfrieds von Vendôme", in N. Bade/B. Freudenberg (eds.), *Von Sarazenen und Juden, Heiden und Häretikern. Die christlich-abendländischen Vorstellungen von Andersgläubigen im Früh- und Hochmittelalter in vergleichender Perspektive*, Bochum 2013, pp. 131–52.
- Goetz, H.-W., *Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen und christlich-abendländisches Selbstverständnis im frühen und hohen Mittelalter (5.–12. Jahrhundert)*, vol. 2, Berlin 2013.
- Gresser, G., *Die Synoden und Konzilien in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums in Deutschland und Italien von Leo IX. bis Calixt II. 1049–1123* (Konziliengeschichte. Reihe A: Darstellungen), Paderborn 2006.
- Grünbart, M., "Epilog", in Grünbart/Rickelt/ Vučetić (eds.), *Zwei Sonnen am Goldenen Horn?*, vol. 2, pp. 155–61.
- Grünbart, M./Rickelt, L./Vučetić, M.M. (eds.), *Zwei Sonnen am Goldenen Horn? Kaiserliche und patriarchale Macht im byzantinischen Mittelalter. Akten der internationalen Tagung vom 3. bis 5. November 2010* (Byzantinische Studien und Texte, 3/4), 2 vols., Berlin 2011–13.
- Haas, T., *Geistliche als Kreuzfahrer. Der Klerus im Konflikt zwischen Orient und Okzident 1095–1221*, Heidelberg 2012.

- Hainthaler, T., "Réflexions sur la levée des anathèmes historiques", *Istina* 43 (1998), 221–36.
- Harris, J., "The 'Schism' of 1054 and the First Crusade", *Crusades* 13 (2014), 1–20.
- Harris, J./Tolstoy, D., "Alexander III and Byzantium", in P.D. Clarke/A.J. Duggan (eds.), *Pope Alexander III (1159–1181). The Art of Survival*, Farnham 2012, pp. 301–13.
- Hausamann, S., *Der andere Weg der orthodoxen Kirchen im Osten. Zur Geschichte und Theologie vom 10. bis 15. Jahrhundert*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2005.
- Hergenröther, J., *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel. Sein Leben, seine Schriften und das griechische Schisma*, 3 vols., Regensburg 1867–69.
- Herghelegiu, M., "Kirchenrechtliche Konsequenzen des so genannten 'Morgenländischen Schismas' von 1054 und ihrer Aufhebung durch den 'Dialog der Liebe' im Jahre 1065 [sic]", in K. Breitsching/W. Rees (eds.), *Recht – Bürge der Freiheit. Festschrift für Johannes Mühlsteiger SJ zum 80. Geburtstag* (Kanonistische Studien und Texte, 51), Berlin 2006, pp. 337–50.
- Jaser, C., *Ecclesia maledicens. Rituelle und zeremonielle Exkommunikationsformen im Mittelalter*, Tübingen 2013.
- Kapriev, G., *Lateinische Rivalen in Konstantinopel: Anselm von Havelberg und Hugo Eterianus* (Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales: Bibliotheca, 15), Leuven 2018.
- Kindlimann, S., *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens im Hochmittelalter* (Geist und Werk der Zeiten, 20), Zurich 1969.
- Kolbaba, T.M., *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins*, Urbana 2000.
- Kolbaba, T.M., "Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious Errors: Themes and Changes from 850 to 1360", in A. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington 2001, pp. 117–43.
- Kolbaba, T.M., "The Legacy of Humbert and Cerularius: The Tradition of the 'Schism of 1054' in Byzantine Texts and Manuscripts of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries", in C. Dendrinos/J. Harris/E. Harvalia-Crook/J. Herrin (eds.), *Porphyrogenita, Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of J. Chrysostomides*, Aldershot 2003, pp. 47–61.
- Kolbaba, T., "On the Closing of the Churches and the Rebaptism of Latins: Greek Perfidy or Latin Slander?", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 29 (2005), 39–51.
- Kolbaba, T., "1054 revisited: response to Ryder", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 35 (2011), 38–44.
- Kolditz, S., "Leon von Synada und Liudprand von Cremona. Untersuchungen zu den Ost-West-Kontakten des 10. Jahrhunderts", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95 (2002), 509–83.
- Kolia-Dermitzaki, A., "'Holy War' in Byzantium Twenty Years Later: A Question of Term Definition and Interpretation", in J. Koder/I. Stouraitis (eds.), *Byzantine War Ideology*

- between Roman Imperial Concept and Christian Religion. Akten des internationalen Symposiums (Vienna, 19.–21. Mai 2011).* (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 30), Vienna 2012, pp. 121–32.
- Leib, B., *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle*, Paris 1924.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, Stuttgart 2004.
- Loud, G.A., *The Age of Robert Guiscard, Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest*, Harlow 2000.
- MacEvitt, C., *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East. Rough Tolerance*, Philadelphia 2008.
- Meijer, J., *A Successful Council of Union. A Theological Analysis of the Photian Synod of 879–880* (Analekta Blatadōn, 23), Thessaloniki 1975.
- Michel, A., *Humbert und Kerullarios*, 2 vols., Paderborn 1924, 1930.
- Neocleous, S., *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics? Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century* (Studies and Texts, 216), Toronto 2019.
- Oeldemann, J. (ed.), *Die Wiederentdeckung der Communio. Der orthodox-katholische Dialog*, Würzburg 2006.
- Pahlitzsch, J., *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit. Beiträge und Quellen zur Geschichte des griechisch-orthodoxen Patriarchats von Jerusalem* (Berliner Historische Studien, 33), Berlin 2001.
- Pinggéra, K., “Altes und Neues Rom. Der päpstliche Primat aus östlich-orthodoxer Sicht”, in S. Weinfurter/V. Leppin/C. Strohm/H. Wolf/A. Wicczorek (eds.), *Die Päpste und ihr Amt zwischen Einheit und Vielfalt der Kirche. Theologische Fragen in historischer Perspektive* (Die Päpste, 4), Regensburg 2017, pp. 185–98.
- Preiser-Kapeller, J., “Die ich rief die Geister ...’. Das Byzantinische Reich im späten 11. Jahrhundert und der Erste Kreuzzug”, in P.A. Sutner/S. Köhler/A. Obenaus (eds.), *Gott will es. Der erste Kreuzzug – Akteure und Aspekte* (Globalhistorische Skizzen, 29), Vienna 2016, pp. 79–97.
- Prinzing, G., “Das Papsttum und der orthodox geprägte Südosten Europas 1180–1216”, in E.-D. Hehl/I.H. Ringel/H. Seibert (eds.), *Das Papsttum in der Welt des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Mittelalter-Forschungen, 6), Stuttgart 2002, pp. 137–84.
- Riebe, A., *Rom in Gemeinschaft mit Konstantinopel. Patriarch Johannes XI. Bekkos als Verteidiger der Kirchenunion von Lyon (1274)* (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik, 8), Wiesbaden 2005.
- Ryder, J.R., “Changing Perspectives on 1054”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 35 (2011), 20–37.
- Shepard, J., “Hard on Heretics, Light on Latins: The Balancing Act of Alexios I Komnenos”, in *Mélanges Cécile Morrisson* (Travaux et Mémoires, 16), Paris 2010, pp. 765–77.
- Shepard, J., “Storm Clouds and a Thunderclap. East-West Tensions towards the Mid-Eleventh Century”, in M.D. Lauxtermann/M. Whittow (eds.), *Byzantium in the*

- Eleventh Century. Being in Between. Papers from the 45th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, Oxford, 24–26 March 2012*, London 2017, pp. 127–53.
- Siecienski, A.E., *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford 2010.
- Spiteris, J., *La critica bizantina del primato Romano nel secolo XII* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 208), Rome 1979.
- Stanković, V., “The Path toward Michael Keroularios: The Power, Self-presentation and Propaganda of the Patriarchs of Constantinople in the Late 10th and Early 11th Century”, in Grünbart/Rickelt/Vučetić (eds.), *Zwei Sonnen am Goldenen Horn?*, vol. 2, pp. 137–54.
- Stephenson, P., “The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 24 (2000), 102–32.
- Stroll, M., *Popes and Antipopes. The Politics of Eleventh Century Church Reform* (Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, 159), Leiden 2012.
- Taviani-Carozzi, H., “Leon IX et les Normands d’Italie du Sud”, in Bischoff/Tock (eds.), *Léon IX et son temps*, pp. 299–329.
- Todt, K.-P., “Griechisch-orthodoxe (melkitische) Christen im zentralen und südlichen Syrien. Die Periode von der arabischen Eroberung bis zur Verlegung der Patriarchenresidenz nach Damaskus (635–1365)”, *Le Muséon* 119 (2006), 33–88.
- Todt, K.-P., “Zwischen Kaiser und ökumenischem Patriarchen: Die Rolle der griechisch-orthodoxen Patriarchen von Antiocheia in den politischen und kirchlichen Auseinandersetzungen des 11.–13. Jh. in Byzanz”, in Grünbart/Rickelt/Vučetić (eds.), *Zwei Sonnen am Goldenen Horn?*, vol. 1, pp. 137–76.
- Vlyssidou, V.N., “Les relations entre l’ancienne et la nouvelle Rome sous Basile II et l’intronisation d’Alexis Stoudite”, *Byzantina Symmeikta* 24 (2014), 293–311.
- Weinfurter, S., *Karl der Große. Der heilige Barbar*, Munich-Berlin 2013.
- Whalen, B., “Rethinking the Schism of 1054: Authority, Heresy and the Latin Rite”, *Traditio* 62 (2007), 1–24.

Komnenoi and Staufer: Ambition and Confrontation

Leonie Exarchos

1 Byzantine-Western Relations and Contact Zones in the 12th Century

The 12th century is characterized by the remarkable intensity of contact and mutual exchanges between Byzantium and the West in political, economic, cultural, and religious matters.¹ This can be understood as a consequence of several developments. Both the increasing Latin influence in the eastern Mediterranean in the form of the Crusades beginning in the late 11th century, and the growing number of predominantly Italian merchants in the Byzantine Empire, ushered in a period of increased contact with the West.² At the same time, the Byzantines shifted their attention to their provinces in the West after much of Asia Minor was lost to the Seljuqs in the 11th century.³ As the European provinces of the Byzantines became more important, the Latin world – and particularly neighbouring areas like Italy or Hungary – became an essential focus of Byzantine foreign policy.

One can broadly distinguish between three different spaces that were disputed between Byzantium and the West during the 12th century: Hungary, the Crusader States in the Near East, and Italy, in particular southern Italy. These

-
- 1 For an overview of Western-Byzantine relations in the 12th century, see Laiou, “Byzantium and the Crusades in the Twelfth Century”, pp. 17–40; Lilie, “Byzanz – Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft”, pp. 10–42; Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks in Byzantium”, pp. 83–100; on economic aspects, see, e.g. Lilie, *Handel und Politik*; Penna, *The Byzantine Imperial Acts*; on cultural aspects, see, e.g. Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*; Kazhdan/Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, pp. 167–96; on religious and ecclesiastical aspects, see, e.g. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, pp. 58–159; Harris/Tolstoy, “Alexander III and Byzantium”, pp. 301–13; Prinzing, “Das Papsttum und der orthodox geprägte Südosten Europas”, pp. 137–83; Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*.
 - 2 Lilie, “Byzanz – Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft”, esp. pp. 17–19 and pp. 27–9; id., *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 181–99; id., *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096–1204*.
 - 3 Lilie, “Byzanz – Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft”, p. 16; id., “Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa”, p. 160; Angold, “The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1118”, pp. 217–53.

areas were not only potential zones of conflict but, at the same time, were also zones of socio-political contact between Byzantium and the Western world.⁴

The interactions between the Staufen kings and emperors on the one hand and the Komnenoi and Angeloi on the other have long been subject to intense historical investigation.⁵ The Staufer and Komnenoi both boasted long traditions of rule.⁶ Older, predominantly German scholarship on this subject approached relations between the Staufen rulers and the Komnenoi using the framework of the so-called *Zweikaiserproblem* ("Two-Emperors problem"). The German research term describes the phenomenon of two co-existing Christian empires and invokes the related question of whether this was compatible with ideas about one universal, Christian emperor which existed both in the Byzantine and the Western Empire. Since both imperial powers shared similar spheres of interest and influence, particularly in the years between 1138 and 1180, there was considerable scope for cooperation and conflict. As a result, this period has proved crucial in discussions of the *Zweikaiserproblem*.⁷

Hungary was one sphere of influence that was disputed between Staufen and Byzantine rulers. Both powers sought to exercise influence in the region

4 On southern Italy, see, e.g. Loud, "Byzantium and Southern Italy", pp. 560–82; Tounta, "Süditalien als Konflikt-und Kontaktzone zwischen Stauern und Byzanz", pp. 432–45; von Falkenhausen, "La presenza dei Greci nella Sicilia normanna", pp. 31–72; on Hungary, see, e.g. Stephenson, "Manuel I Comnenus, the Hungarian Crown and the 'Feudal Subjection' of Hungary, 1162–1167", pp. 33–59; Ferluga, "La Dalmazia fra Bisanzio, Venezia e l'Ungheria ai tempi di Manuele Comneno", pp. 63–83; on the relations between Byzantium and the Crusader States, see Asbridge, "The 'Crusader' Community at Antioch", pp. 305–25; Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*.

5 See, among others: Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer*; Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz*; Tinnfeld, "Byzanz und die Herrscher des Hauses Hohenstaufen (1138–1259)", pp. 105–27; see also the volume *Die Staufer und Byzanz*.

6 For an overview of the Staufen rulers, see Görich, *Die Staufer*; on the early Staufen rulers, see Seibert, "Die frühen ›Staufer‹", pp. 1–39; see also: Engels, *Die Staufer*. The Komnenoi family was able to establish itself as the ruling family in Byzantium in 1081. They were replaced by the Angeloi, a related branch of the family, in 1185. The first Komnenian emperor was Isaac I Komnenos (1057–59), but it was only his nephew Alexios who succeeded in establishing the hereditary rule of the Komnenian dynasty, see: Brand/Cutler, "Isaac I Komnenos", pp. 101–12; Schreiner, "Isaak I. Komnenos", cols. 665–66. On the rule of the Komnenos family, see Magdalino, "The Empire of the Komnenoi (1118–1204)", pp. 627–63.

7 Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter*, pp. 89–121 and particularly pp. 125–28; Classen, "Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens", pp. 207–24; Kahl, "Römische Krönungspläne im Komnenenhaus?", pp. 259–320. Recent studies have qualified the relevance of the *Zweikaiserproblem*: Hehl, "Zwei christliche Kaiser im mittelalterlichen Europa", pp. 271–95; Lilie, "Das 'Zweikaiserproblem' und sein Einfluss auf die Aussenpolitik der Komnenen", pp. 219–43.

and, consequently, often came into conflict with each other. This is particularly noticeable in their support for different candidates during the disputes for the Hungarian throne.⁸ Both empires aimed to integrate the region, which lay at the geographical and cultural crossroads between Latin and Greek Christianity, into their respective spheres of imperial influence, while simultaneously preventing their rival power from becoming too powerful.⁹ In the Crusader States, the Byzantines also attempted to expand their influence. Since predominantly French and Norman noble families exercised rule in this contact zone, this did not have a significant bearing on Byzantine-German relations. Conrad III, Frederick Barbarossa and later Frederick II, however, personally intervened in these regions as crusaders and, as a result, were politically active in the eastern Mediterranean.¹⁰

The most significant contact zone between Byzantium and the Western Empire, and the main focus of the present article, was undoubtedly Italy. The general political situation in 12th-century Italy was complex. Various and divergent interests led to different – and sometimes contradictory – constellations of political actors, depending on the prevailing situation. In accordance with their self-understanding as the Roman Empire, the Byzantines asserted their claims with regard to Italy, particularly on the southern parts.¹¹ In the 11th century, however, Byzantium had lost control of its remaining Italian territories to the Normans.¹² Furthermore, Italy not only had a high symbolic value for Byzantium; it was also of great strategic importance. The ruling powers in the area, particularly the Normans, were able to threaten central Byzantine territories, thus, Byzantine interventions were intended to protect the empire's own

8 On relations between Byzantium and Hungary, see: Stephenson, "Manuel I Comnenus, the Hungarian Crown and the 'Feudal Subjection' of Hungary, 1162–1167", pp. 33–59; Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*; Dölger, "Ungarn in der byzantinischen Reichspolitik", pp. 315–42.

9 Stephenson, "Manuel I Comnenus, the Hungarian Crown and the 'Feudal Subjection' of Hungary, 1162–1167", pp. 40–43; see also: Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, pp. 96–112.

10 On the crusade of Frederick Barbarossa, see Loud, *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*. On Conrad III, see, inter alia, the volume *Konrad III. (1138–1152)*; and on Frederick Barbarossa, see the following biographies: Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa*; Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa*; Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*.

11 Stouraitis, *Krieg und Frieden*, pp. 201–04; Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, pp. 384–85; Loud, "Byzantium and Southern Italy", pp. 560–82. On the Roman identity of Byzantine society, see Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium*, pp. 42–74; and on the relevance of Greek identities in Byzantium, see Koder, "Griechische Identitäten im Mittelalter", pp. 297–319.

12 Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, pp. 92–144.

sovereignty.¹³ While the Komnenian Emperor John II adopted a defensive strategy in Italy, Emperor Manuel Komnenos pursued a much more active policy in the second half of the 12th century.¹⁴ The Western Emperors also had a special interest in Italy. Since the time of Charlemagne, the Western Emperor was considered the protector of the Roman Church and his presence in Italy, therefore, primarily served to safeguard ecclesiastical interests. This status encouraged further secular claims on Italy, including territories in southern Italy, even though the Western Emperors had not actively intervened there since the beginning of the 11th century.¹⁵ Under the Staufen rulers, however, this attitude evolved over the course of the 12th century into active interventionism.

The two empires were by no means the only powers that had interests in Italy. Italian city-states in the north resisted imperial claims to power and the Staufen rulers' attempts to influence their autonomy. In 1167, a league of cities, the *Lega Lombarda*, was founded, which took a firm stance against the incursions of the Western Empire in the region.¹⁶ The Italian maritime republics of Venice, Pisa, and Genoa also grew powerful over the course of the 12th century. In addition to safeguarding their independence, they focused on monitoring their trade interests in the eastern Mediterranean territories. Byzantium granted all three cities special trade privileges, and they were, in turn, obliged to offer up their assistance to the Byzantine Empire, for example, in the event of war. Despite these close commercial contacts, the relations of the Italian republics with the Byzantines were not without tension and mutual mistrust.¹⁷ The Normans had consolidated their rule in the region over the course of the 11th and early 12th centuries, culminating in Roger II's acquisition of the status of king in 1130. Byzantium not only lost its last remaining Italian territories

13 The Normans ruled not only southern Italy, but also Antioch. The danger was, therefore, even more acute, because Byzantium was threatened by the Normans from the West and the East: Lilie, "Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa", p. 160; Loud, "Byzantine Italy and the Normans", pp. 215–33.

14 Magdalino, "The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos", pp. 182–84; Lilie, "Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa", p. 160. On Manuel Komnenos and his rule, see Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*.

15 Dendorfer, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", pp. 60–61. On the relations between Charlemagne and Byzantium, see Classen, *Karl der Große, das Papsttum und Byzanz*.

16 Raccagni, *The Lombard League*, pp. 24–53; on Frederick Barbarossa's conflict with the Italian cities, see, e.g. Görich, "Konflikt und Kompromiss", pp. 79–97.

17 Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, particularly pp. 1–115, which provides an analysis of the different privileges and a summary on pp. 103–15; Penna, *The Byzantine Imperial Acts*, pp. 199–275. On relations between Byzantium and the maritime powers, see also the article by David Jacoby in this volume. On conflicts among Italian merchants in Byzantium, see Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West 1180–1204*, pp. 195–221.

to the Norman conquerors, but it was also threatened by Norman territorial expansion into the eastern Mediterranean, especially in the Principality of Antioch. Over the course of several decades, a bitter rivalry, heightened by a number of military conflicts, had developed between Byzantium and the Normans.¹⁸ The Byzantines were not the only power hostile to the Normans; the Papacy usually considered them a danger, because of its own strong interest in securing its secular dominions over other actors in Italy.¹⁹

One major difficulty in investigating relations between the Staufen and Byzantine rulers lies in the source material. Although both Byzantine and Latin sources document the activities and interactions between the two ruling houses – including records of their political activities – controversial, ambiguous, and unclear statements in our 12th-century accounts have repeatedly led to heated interpretations and discussions in scholarship on the subject. This was above all a result of the intricate political situation in Italy in the 12th century.

2 Interaction, Cooperation, and Confrontation: The Political Dimension

2.1 “Your Enemies Are Mine”: The Staufen-Byzantine Alliance (1138–1152)

The Byzantine Empire's political attitude toward King Conrad III (1138–52) was ostensibly characterized by collaboration between the two powers in Italy. The Byzantine Emperor John II Komnenos probably sent envoys to the Roman-German King only three years after Conrad's accession to power in order to establish a treaty of alliance and friendship.²⁰ The *Gesta Frederici* provide us with an account of the negotiations, in which the chronicler Otto of Freising inserted some letters relating to the negotiations of 1141. These letters give insight into the apparent aims of the treaty, including the agreement that any enemy that would endanger either empire would become the enemy of

18 The Normans were a permanent threat to Byzantine territories. For example, Roger II occupied Corfu and sacked the Byzantine territories around Corinth and Thebes in 1147. In 1185, the Normans conquered and sacked Thessalonica: Magdalino, “The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos”, p. 184; id., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 51; Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, p. 427; and see also the article by Eleni Tounta in this volume.

19 On the Papacy and its relationship with the Norman rulers, see, e.g.: Loud, *The Latin Church in Norman Italy*, pp. 135–80; Deér, *Papsttum und Normannen*.

20 Dendorfer, “Konrad III. und Byzanz”, p. 63; Böhmer/Niederkorn/Hruza, *Regesta Imperii IV 1*, 2, no. 206, pp. 87–88; Niederkorn, “Die Bündnisverhandlungen König Konrads III. mit Johannes II. Komnenos”, p. 195. For an earlier dating of the mission in 1139/1140, see Weller, *Die Heiratspolitik des deutschen Hochadels im 12. Jahrhundert*, p. 59.

both.²¹ It is important to note, however, that the Normans and Sicilians are explicitly mentioned in the agreement. The cooperation of the two empires was therefore based primarily on their mutual antagonism toward a common enemy: the Normans in southern Italy. In order further to strengthen their alliance, the two sides agreed to a marriage: a girl of royal blood (*aliqua regalis sanguinis puella*) was betrothed to Manuel, the youngest son of the Byzantine Emperor John II.²² For Conrad III, the planned marriage alliance with the Komnenian dynasty promised not only political advantages and gains in prestige through familial affiliation with the Byzantine dynasty, but also the recognition of his own authority from the Byzantines at the outset of his rule. Conrad chose Bertha of Sulzbach, the sister of his wife Gertrude, to marry Manuel Komnenos.²³

The events that followed the marriage negotiations have been much discussed in modern historical writing. Two years later, in 1143, when Bertha's groom Manuel Komnenos unexpectedly acceded to the imperial throne, the Byzantines seized upon this new situation to renegotiate. In a letter addressed to Manuel Komnenos, which is also preserved in the *Gesta Friderici*, Conrad reports that the Byzantine envoy Nikephoros, who had been sent to Conrad in 1145, had used hard words of the kind that had never before been heard.²⁴ Scholars have disputed what could have been meant by "hard words" (*verba dura*). Some have argued that Nikephoros' seemingly arrogant behaviour can be explained by the fact that he refused to address Conrad, who was only a king, as emperor. Others have argued that the Byzantine envoy must have threatened to send Bertha back to Germany, which would have amounted to

21 Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, I, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 38, ll. 7–12: "Sint ergo res utriusque communes, utriusque amicus idem, idem inimicus, sive in terra sive in mari, et cognoscat ac timeat matris virtutem et valentiam, qui non honoraverit filiam, sive Normannus sive Siculus sive quis alter quicumque ubicumque."

22 Ibid., I, 24, p. 37, ll. 9–15: "Circa idem tempus Iohannis regiae urbis imperatoris apocriarii, viri clarissimi, Romanorum principem adeunt, tam confederationis vinculum ob Rogerii Siculi insolentiam inter duo imperia, Hesperiae videlicet et Orientis, renovare cupientes quam in huius rei argumentum aliquam regalis sanguinis puellam filio suo Manuel in uxorem dandam postulantes."

23 Ibid., I, 25, p. 38. On Bertha of Sulzbach, see, e.g.: Irmscher, "Bertha von Sulzbach, Gemahlin Manuels I.", pp. 279–90; Niederkorn, "Die Mitgift der Kaiserin Irene", pp. 125–39; Todt, "Bertha-Eirene von Sulzbach", pp. 113–47; Dendorfer, *Adelige Gruppenbildung*.

24 Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, I, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 41, ll. 7–13: "Sed auditis a Nikoforo, tuae dilectionis prudenti apocriuario, preter illa quae in litteris continebantur, quibusdam verbis duris et, ut verum fateamur, ab omni retro tempore inauditis et nostrae maiestatis, ultra quam lingua explorare valeat, perturbata est mansuetudo, et est ammirata universa imperii nostri latitudo."

a political and personal insult.²⁵ In the same letter, Conrad for the first time referred to Bertha of Sulzbach as his daughter, which has led to the assumption that Conrad adopted his sister-in-law in order to enhance her status, perhaps also as a reaction to Manuel's ascension.²⁶

Historians have also disputed the implications of the dowry that Conrad promised for Bertha. In 1147–49, Conrad took part in the Second Crusade, and spent some time in the Byzantine Empire. The Second Crusade caused the postponement of Staufen-Byzantine plans to capture southern Italy, which may have compelled Manuel Komnenos to remind Conrad of his earlier promises during the latter's stay in Byzantium. In 1148, Conrad and his nephew Frederick Barbarossa, who was accompanying the king during the Second Crusade, met with Manuel Komnenos in Thessalonica.²⁷ The Byzantine chronicler John Kinnamos provides the following report of their meeting:

The emperor [Manuel Komnenos] reminded him of what had been previously agreed; this was, that Italy [i.e., Apulia and Calabria] should be restored to the empress [Bertha-]Eirene for her marriage-gift, as she was his [Conrad's] relative and he had betrothed her to the emperor. After he and Frederick had pledged their agreements with additional oaths, they departed from the Romans' land.²⁸

- 25 For this research discussion, see: Böhmer/Niederkorn/Hruza, *Regesta Imperii* IV 1, 2, no. 332, pp. 143–44. A thorough analysis of the refusal to address Conrad III as emperor, and how it became a source of conflict, is provided in: Ohnsorge, "Kaiser' Konrad III.," pp. 374–76; and Görich, "Wahrung des *honor*", p. 283. On the conflict over the Byzantine threat to send the bride back to Germany, see: Chalandon, *Les Comnène*, vol. 2, pp. 259–61; Dendorfer, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", pp. 65–66; Lilie, "Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa", p. 161; Vollrath, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", p. 343.
- 26 Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, I, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 41, ll. 25–27: "Et quoniam ita nunc est et esse debet, quod tu, amicorum amicissime, uxorem accipies dilectissimam filiam nostram, sororem videlicet nobilissimae contextalis nostrae ..."; Niederkorn, "Die Mitgift der Kaiserin Irene", p. 129; Dendorfer, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", p. 66.
- 27 On the Second Crusade and Byzantium, see Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 46–53. On the meeting between Conrad III and Manuel Komnenos, see Vučetić, *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern*, no. 100, p. 118.
- 28 English translation as cited here is John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, II, 19, trans. Brand, p. 72; Greek text in John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, II, 19, ed. Meineke, p. 87, ll. 6–11: "ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν πάλαι προομολογηθέντων ἀνεμίμησεν αὐτῷ· ἦσαν δὲ ταῦτα, ὅπως Ἰταλίαν εἰς ἔθνον τῇ βασιλίδι ἀνασώσαιο Εἰρήνην, ἣν καὶ αὐτὸς ξυγγενὴ οὖσαν τῷ βασιλεὶ κατηγγύησεν. ὁρκίοις οὖν δευτέροις αὐτὸς τε καὶ Φρεδερίκος τὰ σφίσι δεδογμένα πιστῶσαντες τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀπαλλάττονται γῆς."

In this passage, John Kinnamos mentions the confirmation of an already concluded agreement between the Byzantines and the Staufen ruler. Conrad had allegedly promised parts of southern Italy that had still not been conquered in 1148 to Bertha as her dowry.²⁹ This was why it was necessary for both Conrad and Frederick Barbarossa – as John Kinnamos explicitly states – to adapt their intentions. Indeed, there is some evidence which indicates that Conrad III was preparing a military campaign against the Normans in southern Italy after his return from the Crusade. At the diet of Würzburg in 1151, the assembled nobles swore an oath to support Conrad's planned trip to Italy, during which he hoped to be crowned emperor in Rome, and to conduct a military campaign against the Normans in Apulia and Sicily.³⁰ Furthermore, the Staufen ruler and the Byzantines considered another marriage alliance, firstly considering Conrad's son Henry as a suitable candidate, and after Henry's death, Conrad himself. The king's death in 1152, however, put an abrupt end to these plans.³¹

2.2 *Manuel I Komnenos and Frederick I Barbarossa: From Ambitions to Rivalry (1152–60)*

After Conrad III's death, his nephew Frederick Barbarossa, Duke of Swabia, was elected king. Manuel Komnenos and Frederick Barbarossa stood as two rulers who would remain at the helm of the destinies of their respective empires for almost 30 years. Both relentlessly pursued the expansion of their own political power, and were convinced of the uniqueness of their respective empire. It was only a question of time until their antagonistic positions and claims would clash. Frederick Barbarossa initially seemed to continue his predecessor's policy of rapprochement. Though admittedly declaring he would refuse to cede to "the King of the Greeks any land on this side of the sea" (i.e. Italy) in the Treaty of Constance,³² agreed with Pope Eugenius III in 1153, Barbarossa still

29 Vollrath, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", pp. 344–45; Tounta, "Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157)", p. 168; Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 399–402; Niederkorn, "Thessalonike – Konstanz – Ancona", pp. 213–44.

30 Böhmer/Niederkorn/Hruza, *Regesta Imperii* IV 1, 2, no. 754, pp. 322–23; Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 317 (addressed to Manuel Komnenos), ed. Hartmann, pp. 670–73.

31 Dendorfer, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", pp. 68–69; Niederkorn, "Die Mitgift der Kaiserin Irene", p. 139; Hiestand, "*Neptis tua und fastus Graecorum*", pp. 514–30.

32 Treaty of Constance, *Die Urkunden Friedrichs I.*, eds. Appelt et al., no. 52, pp. 87–89, here p. 89, line 8: "Grecorum quoque regi nullam terram ex ista parte maris concedet."

attempted to implement a marriage alliance with Byzantium.³³ As a result, the Byzantines found it difficult to assess his political aims.³⁴

An apparent break in political relations between the Staufer and Komnenoi occurred in 1156/57. In 1155, Manuel Komnenos sent envoys to Frederick Barbarossa with the aim of promoting a joint action against King William I in Sicily. The planned alliance, however, proved unsuccessful because Frederick Barbarossa's retinue refused to participate, even though the Emperor himself was not opposed toward a move to Apulia.³⁵ Both John Kinnamos and Otto of Freising provide reports of the meeting between the Byzantine envoys and Frederick Barbarossa. John Kinnamos mentions that those envoys who carried large amounts of money were instructed to prepare themselves for the eventuality that Frederick would refuse to participate in the campaign, and that if he did so, they should claim Italy for Byzantium. Kinnamos states that it was precisely this that happened.³⁶ Otto of Freising depicts the capture of the southern Italian territories in a similar manner, albeit retrospectively observing that the Byzantine envoys had acquired from Frederick Barbarossa sealed letters, which they used to persuade the Apulians to take their side.³⁷ Ralph-Johannes Lilie interprets this passage as a sign that Frederick Barbarossa's politics had not yet become confrontational by 1155. What the chronicler Otto of Freising describes as letters purloined by the Byzantines were actually documents intended to support the Byzantines, because Frederick Barbarossa was

33 See, for example, Frederick Barbarossa's letter to Manuel Komnenos dated September 1153, that is, some time after the Treaty of Constance of March 1153, in Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 386 (addressed to Manuel Komnenos), ed. Hartmann, pp. 814–16; John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, IV, 1, ed. Meineke, pp. 134–35; Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, p. 12.

34 Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, pp. 398–99.

35 Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1398a, p. 223; Magdalino, "The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos", p. 184; Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, p. 401; John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, IV, 1, ed. Meineke, pp. 135–36. Otto of Freising reports that Frederick wanted to launch an expedition to Apulia at this time, but could not persuade the princes of the Western Empire to support his campaign: Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, II, 35 and 36, eds. Waitz/de Simson, pp. 144–45; see also Barbarossa's letter addressed to Otto of Freising: *ibid.*, pp. 1–5, here p. 4.

36 John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, IV, 1, ed. Meineke, pp. 135–36.

37 Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, II, 49, eds. Waitz/de Simson, pp. 156–57, ll. 30–35: "Cum ab eo circa Anconam recessissent, litteras quasdam sigillo suo clausas per surreptionem acceperant. Igitur redeunte ad Transalpina principe, Greci Campaniam simul et Apuliam ingrediuntur ostensisque imperialibus litteris maritima sibi a principe concessa fuisse loca mentiuntur, sicque indigenas quosque non solum auctoritate imperatoris terrendo, sed et auro corrumpendo, totam provinciam ad suam ditionem inclinant."

unable to persuade his army to participate in the military campaign against the Normans.³⁸ The Byzantines were indeed able swiftly to conquer the coastal regions between Ancona and Taranto with the help of recruited mercenaries.³⁹ Although the Normans were an enemy of both empires by 1156, the Western Emperor regarded this surprisingly successful Byzantine action as a threat to his own ambitions in southern Italy. For this reason, he decided to take military action against the Byzantines, and he made the nobility of his realm swear to take part in an expedition against the newly-conquered Byzantine territory in southern Italy.⁴⁰ His planned expedition was, however, no longer necessary when the Sicilian King William defeated the Byzantines in May 1156 and reclaimed the lost territories from them.⁴¹

The years after 1155 were characterized by a distinct political reorientation. Despite long negotiations over a marriage between Frederick Barbarossa and a Byzantine bride, the emperor married Beatrice of Burgundy in 1156, to the surprise of the Byzantines.⁴² A shift in attitudes toward politics in Hungary also became noticeable when Manuel Komnenos made peace with the Hungarians, immediately after Frederick Barbarossa's rejection of a mutual German-Byzantine campaign against the Hungarians.⁴³ A clear break with established Komnenian policies occurred in 1158. Byzantium made peace with the Normans in southern Italy, who had, until that point, been fierce enemies. The Papacy had already performed a similarly remarkable turnabout, when, in 1156, it reached a settlement with the Normans in the form of the Treaty of Benevento.⁴⁴ Without the unifying force of a common enemy – the Normans –

-
- 38 Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 430–44; id., *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, pp. 401–03; id., “Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa”, pp. 162–63; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 59. On Frederick Barbarossa's strategy in 1155/56 and for an analysis of Lilie's arguments, see Zeillinger, “Friedrich Barbarossa, Manuel I. Komnenos und Süditalien in den Jahren 1155/56”, pp. 53–83.
- 39 Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, pp. 384–85; Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, p. 444.
- 40 Böhmer/Oppl, *Regesta Imperii* IV 2, 1, no. 398, pp. 118–19; Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, II, 49, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 157.
- 41 Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 60–61; Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, p. 385.
- 42 Böhmer/Oppl, *Regesta Imperii* IV 2, 1, no. 398, pp. 118–19; Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, II, 48 and 53, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 155 and pp. 159–60.
- 43 Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, II, 53, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 160; Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, p. 26; Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni*, pp. 58–62. On relations between Byzantium and Hungary in the reign of Manuel Komnenos, see Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 78–83; Stephenson, “Manuel I Comnenus, the Hungarian Crown and the ‘Feudal Subjection’ of Hungary, 1162–1167”, pp. 33–59.
- 44 Dölger/Wirth, *Regesten*, no. 1420, pp. 230–31; Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 444–47; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 63.

Byzantium and Frederick grew increasingly alienated. Moreover, the death in 1160 of the Byzantine Empress Bertha-Eirene, who was a relative of the Staufen dynasty, widened the rupture with the Western Empire.⁴⁵

As Paul Magdalino correctly observes, the political relationship between Frederick Barbarossa and Manuel Komnenos seems to have been characterized by the Western emperor's action and his Byzantine counterpart's reaction: "At every stage, he [Frederick Barbarossa] acted and Manuel reacted."⁴⁶ It certainly seems true that in the 1150s Frederick Barbarossa was always the one to change his mind, and decide on a politically confrontational course of action against the Byzantines, while Manuel was able only to react and reframe his political strategy in response.

2.3 1160–80: *The Making and Breaking of Alliances*

Between 1160 and 1170, Byzantium's policy toward the West was primarily directed toward strengthening Frederick Barbarossa's enemies without risking direct military intervention.⁴⁷ Byzantium was able to construct an effective political network in Italy against Frederick Barbarossa during this period. The first opportunity arose when the papal schism broke out in 1159. Manuel Komnenos deftly took advantage of this development, recognizing Alexander III as the rightful pope instead of Frederick Barbarossa's own candidate Victor IV.⁴⁸ This secured a number of advantages for the Byzantine Emperor. Firstly, most Italian cities and other powers, including France, recognized Alexander III as pope, which opened up for Byzantium the potential of new alliances. Secondly, the alliance between the *basileus* and the pope became an effective means of weakening Frederick Barbarossa both politically and ideologically. Manuel Komnenos offered financial and military support to Alexander III, and held out the prospect of a union between the Byzantine and Roman Churches. Boso reports in his *Vita Alexandri III* that in return Manuel asked that the *Romani*

45 Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 65. There were other marriage alliances between the Western and Byzantine Empire; Theodora, a niece of Manuel Komnenos, was married to Henry Jasomirgott (a member of the House of Babenberg) in 1148: Böhmer/Niederkorn/Hruza, *Regesta Imperii* IV 1, 2, no. 575, pp. 244–45; Dendorfer, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", p. 68; Hiestand, "*Neptis tua und fastus Graecorum*", p. 502.

46 Magdalino, "The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos", p. 185.

47 Byzantium needed military forces elsewhere at this time, for example in its conflicts with Hungary and Serbia: Stephenson, "Manuel I Komnenus, the Hungarian Crown and the 'Feudal Subjection' of Hungary, 1162–1167", pp. 43–57; Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, p. 408; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 78–83.

48 Harris/Tolstoy, "Alexander III and Byzantium", p. 301; Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, pp. 56–57. On the conflict between Pope Alexander III and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, see, e.g.: Laudage, *Alexander III. und Friedrich Barbarossa*; Johrendt, "The Empire and the Schism", pp. 99–126.

corona imperii, the crown of the Roman Empire, be returned to him.⁴⁹ He thus seems to have sought recognition as the rightful and sole Roman Emperor, thus cancelling out Frederick Barbarossa's own claims to that title. Although this plan came to nothing, the discussions nevertheless posed a threat to Frederick Barbarossa and his empire, a development which was closely observed in the Western Empire.⁵⁰

The Byzantine Emperor was not the only figure to rally around Alexander III: for instance, he also gained the support of the kings of France and Sicily, as well as the backing of the northern Italian cities; this served to counter Frederick Barbarossa and his planned expansion into Italy.⁵¹ The chronicler Niketas Choniates reports that Manuel Komnenos bolstered Italian resistance:

Time and again he [Manuel Komnenos] armed the Italians against Frederick, the king of Germany. The latter demanded that they should submit and turn their affairs over to him, while the emperor [Manuel Komnenos] dispatched envoys who emboldened the Italians, enjoining them to prevail against Frederick and to beware of the king's crafty ways.⁵²

It was thus the strategy of the Byzantines to incite Italian cities to hinder Frederick Barbarossa's advances into southern Italy, thereby avoiding the need

49 Boso, *Vita Alexandri III*, ed. Duchesne, p. 415, ll. 9–11. On this issue, see: Kahl, "Römische Krönungspläne im Komnenenhaus?", pp. 259–320; Classen, "Corona Imperii", pp. 503–14; Laudage, *Alexander III. und Friedrich Barbarossa*, pp. 175–80.

50 For example, in the year 1172, the *Chronica regia Coloniensis* states that one of the reasons for Frederick's expedition to Italy was that Alexander and his supporters wanted to crown the *basileus* as Roman Emperor ("quod coronam Romani imperii Greco imponere vellent"): *Chronica regia Coloniensis*, ed. G. Waitz, *Chronica regia Coloniensis (Annales maximi Coloniensis) cum continuationibus in monasterio S. Pantaleonis scriptis aliisque historiae Coloniensis monumentis* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 18), Hannover 1880, ad ann. 1172, p. 121. Interestingly, the *Chronica regia Coloniensis* uses the same terminology previously employed by Boso: "corona Romani imperii" (crown of the Roman Empire): Boso, *Vita Alexandri III*, ed. Duchesne, p. 415, l. 10.

51 Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, pp. 52–59; on relations between Alexander and the Lombards, see, e.g.: Coleman, "A City to be Built for the Glory of God, St Peter, and the Whole of Lombardy", pp. 127–52. On relations between Frederick Barbarossa and the Italian cities, see: Tabacco, "Northern and Central Italy in the Twelfth Century", pp. 428–37; Görich, "Unausweichliche Konflikte?", pp. 195–213.

52 English translation: Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, VII, trans. Magoulias, p. 113; the Greek text: Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, VII, ed. van Dielen, p. 200, ll. 66–69: "Ἰταλιώτας οὖν πλειστάκις κατὰ τοῦ ῥηγὸς Ἀλαμανίας τοῦ Φρεδερίχου | ἀνθώπλισεν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὑποκλιθῆναι οἱ καὶ τὰ καθ' αὐτοὺς ἐπιτρέψειν ἐκείνῳ διὰ πλείστου ἐτίθετο· ὁ δὲ πέμπων ἐνίσχυε καὶ κραταιοῦσθαι ὑπετίθει καὶ τὰς τοῦ ῥηγὸς δολοφροσύνας ἐνήγε φυλάττεσθαι."

for Byzantium to intervene directly. When Frederick I destroyed Milan in 1162, Emperor Manuel assisted in the reconstruction of the city walls.⁵³ Moreover, the Byzantines supported the Lombard League with financial aid.⁵⁴ The chief problem for Byzantium's actions in Italy was, however, that the Italian cities were rightly suspicious of Byzantine efforts in the region. As soon as the danger of a German advance disappeared, the primary objective of collaboration between the Byzantines and Italians became obsolete. This was the case in 1167 when Frederick Barbarossa's advance in Italy came to an abrupt end due to an epidemic that decimated his forces.⁵⁵

The traditionally close relations between Byzantium and the Italian maritime cities, especially Venice, changed in the years around 1170. While Manuel Komnenos continued to make deals with Genoa and Pisa in 1169 and 1170, his relations with Venice deteriorated considerably, in no small part due to conflicts of interest in Dalmatia.⁵⁶ In 1171, Manuel Komnenos detained all Venetians living in Byzantium. This prompted Venetian ships to attack the Byzantine coast, an assault which the Byzantines were unable to resist.⁵⁷ The tense situation further weakened the position of Byzantium in Italy.

In the early 1170s, new ideas began to shape Byzantine foreign policy. In 1170, Archbishop Christian of Mainz travelled to Byzantium on behalf of Frederick Barbarossa and, shortly after, further marriage negotiations between Byzantium and the Western Empire took place.⁵⁸ Manuel Komnenos arranged a number of Byzantine-Western marriages among the high nobility. His greatest success, however, was the betrothal of Agnes, the daughter of the French king, to the emperor's son Alexios in 1180.⁵⁹ Admittedly, the marriage projects of this era – especially those of the 1170s – suggest that the Byzantines had few other means at their disposal in order to advance their political strategy in

53 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, VII, ed. van Dieten, p. 200; Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, p. 455. On relations between Milan and Byzantium, see Classen, "Mailands Treueid für Manuel Komnenos", pp. 147–53.

54 Raccagni, *The Lombard League*, p. 58; Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, pp. 180–81.

55 Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, p. 409; Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 343–48.

56 Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, pp. 187–94; Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 480–89.

57 Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, pp. 205–06.

58 Böhmer/Oppl, *Regesta Imperii* IV 2, 3, no. 1891, p. 36; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 92–93.

59 On Manuel's marriage politics, see: Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 100 and pp. 209–17; id., "The phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos", p. 190. On marriage politics from the 6th to the 12th centuries, see Panagopulu, *Οι διπλωματικοί γάμοι στο Βυζάντιο (6ος–12ος αιώνας)*.

the West. In 1173, Byzantium made its last attempt to gain a foothold in Italy, sending troops to Ancona. Supported by the Venetians, Christian of Mainz laid siege to Ancona, and finally expelled the Byzantines. As a result, the Byzantine military schemes in Italy failed.⁶⁰ The attack on Ancona witnessed a rare direct military confrontation between the two empires. From a political perspective, Byzantium found itself in a difficult position vis-à-vis the West.

Byzantium's political significance and its reputation declined in the West due to its failed campaigns in Italy and, not least, due to its defeat by the Seljuqs at Myriokephalon in 1176. The empire's weakened position became evident in 1177, with the conclusion of the Peace of Venice. After Frederick Barbarossa had lost the battle at Legnano against the Lombard League in 1176, he pursued a policy of compromise towards his Italian enemies. Together with the Lombard League, Pope Alexander III, and the King of Sicily, the Western Emperor agreed on a peace treaty that excluded Byzantium.⁶¹ The isolation of the Byzantine Empire in Italy became increasingly apparent. The death of Emperor Manuel in 1180 signalled the end of the Byzantine policy of active intervention on its western front.

2.4 *The Staufen Rulers and the Angeloi*

In Byzantium, the years between 1180 and the conquest of Constantinople in 1204 are marked by internal political instability, as well as growing problems that affected, weakened, and ultimately almost paralyzed its foreign policy. In fact, the empire's internal state dictated the emperor's interactions with the West. In 1185, after almost 40 years of Manuel Komnenos' rule and then the short reigns of Alexios II Komnenos and Andronikos I Komnenos, Isaac II Angelos came to power. Conspiracies, rebellions, coups, and assassinations of members of the imperial family characterize the period that spanned from 1180 until 1204, which had the effect of weakening the Byzantine Empire and hindering efforts to consolidate internal politics.⁶²

60 Carile, "Federico Barbarossa, i Veneziani e l'assedio di Ancona del 1173", pp. 3–31; Abulafia, "Ancona, Byzantium and the Adriatic, 1155–1173", pp. 195–216; Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, p. 496; id., "Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa", pp. 167–68.

61 Madden, "Alexander and Venice", pp. 315–39; Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, p. 420; Georgi, *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte*, p. 321; Kölzer, "Venedig, Friede v.", col. 1471. On Manuel's defeat at Myriokephalon and its aftermath, see: Lilie, "Die Schlacht von Myriokephalon (1176)", pp. 257–75; Kresten, "Der 'Anredestreit' zwischen Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach der Schlacht von Myriokephalon", pp. 65–110.

62 For an overview of this period, see, e.g.: Magdalino, "The Empire of the Komnenoi (1118–1204)", pp. 627–63; Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, pp. 423–35; Simpson, *Byzantium*,

At the same time, Staufen rule was further consolidated in the Western Empire. After the Peace of Venice in 1177, Barbarossa succeeded in entrenching and strengthening his position. Through the marriage of his son Henry VI with the Sicilian king's daughter Constance, the Kingdom of Sicily also fell to the Staufer. The Byzantines' long feared scenario of German domination in southern Italy became a reality.⁶³ Although internal disputes in the late 12th century weakened the Western Empire, Byzantium was forced to assume a much more defensive, protective position vis-à-vis its western counterpart.⁶⁴ The Third Crusade, a major expedition in which Emperor Frederick Barbarossa participated, marks a key point at which Staufen and Byzantine interests converged. Since Frederick Barbarossa had chosen the land route for his well-prepared crusade, he necessarily had to negotiate the passage of his army with different rulers, including the Byzantine Emperor Isaac Angelos.⁶⁵ However, conflicts developed between the Byzantines and Barbarossa's army during the passage, and the Byzantine Emperor took the envoys Frederick had sent to him hostage.⁶⁶ As a result, Frederick I Barbarossa seems to have anticipated the worst-case scenario. He wrote to his son Henry:

... we urgently request your prudent and noble royal person to send suitable envoys from your serene majesty to Genoa, Venice, Ancona, Pisa and other places to obtain a squadron of galleys and other vessels, to meet us at Constantinople around the middle of March, so that they may attack the city by sea while we do so by land.⁶⁷

1180–1204. From an economic point of view, see Herrin, "The Collapse of the Byzantine Empire", pp. 188–203.

63 Kölzer, "Byzanz in der Politik Kaiser Heinrichs VI.", pp. 86–109.

64 For more on the struggle for the Western imperial throne, see for instance: Boshof, "Innozenz III. und der deutsche Thronstreit", pp. 51–67; Csendes, "Die Doppelwahl von 1198 und ihre europäischen Dimensionen", pp. 157–71.

65 Görich, "Friedrich Barbarossa und Byzanz", pp. 75–76; for more on Frederick Barbarossa and the Third Crusade, see, e.g.: Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa*, pp. 483–515; Loud, *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa*.

66 Görich, "Friedrich Barbarossa und Byzanz", pp. 78–79.

67 English translation: *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, trans. G.A. Loud, *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts* (Crusade Texts in Translation, 19), Farnham 2010, pp. 33–134, here p. 71; Latin text: *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I.* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum Nova Series, 5), Berlin 1928, pp. 1–115, here p. 42, ll. 16–20: "... regię nobilitatis tuę commonentes rogamus prudentiam, quatenus idoneos serenitatis tuę legatos Ianuam, Venetias, Anchonam atque Pisam et ad alia loca pro galearum atque vascellorum

Frederick Barbarossa clearly feared an imminent military confrontation. Although this ultimately did not occur, the episode clearly shows that the presence of crusaders in Byzantium increased tensions between Latins and Byzantines.

3 Ideological Rivalry and Cultural Exchanges between the Staufen and Byzantine Rulers

For centuries, the Byzantine Empire and its culture held a special fascination for the West. Byzantium was not only seen as the centre of the production of knowledge and culture; its resplendent capital Constantinople and the long Roman tradition of the Byzantine Empire signified what it meant to be a Roman Emperor.⁶⁸ Byzantium was able to serve as a reference point for the West, particularly for the Western Emperor. Both empires invoked a Roman legacy, though they did so in different ways.⁶⁹ For the Western Empire, thus, it was possible to use Byzantium as an example, while the simultaneous adoption and emphasis of Roman elements provided fertile ground for rivalry and conflict when it came to contesting the title of Roman Emperor. This raises the question of whether the simultaneous co-existence of two Christian emperors posed a real problem.

While older scholarship on this subject tended to interpret the confrontations and political interactions between the empires in the context of rivalry over the title of emperor, recent studies have placed less emphasis on the effects the *Zweikaiserproblem* might have had on the empires.⁷⁰ Although scholarly

transmittas presidio, ut Constantinopolim circa medium martium nobis occurrentes ipsi per mare, nos vero per terram civitatem oppugnemus."

68 On the perception of Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade, see, e.g.: France, "Byzantium in Western Chronicles before the First Crusade", pp. 3–16; Schieffer, "Byzanzbilder des Abendlandes vor 1204", pp. 43–57, particularly pp. 44–45; Magdalino, "Wie das Bild des Basileus in Westeuropa genutzt wurde", pp. 179–89; Konstantinou, *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*; Schreiner, "Byzanz und der Westen", pp. 551–80; Tounta, "Byzanz als Vorbild Friedrich Barbarossas", pp. 159–74; Koch, *Auf dem Wege zum Sacrum Imperium*, pp. 215–30.

69 One crucial difference is the pope's role at the imperial coronation. Whereas the pope crowned the Western Emperor, the coronation of the Byzantine Emperor by the patriarch was not considered a constitutive act: Tounta, "Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157)", p. 170; Dagron, *Emperor and Priest*, pp. 54–83; Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell*, pp. 7–31.

70 For the classical view of the impact of the *Zweikaiserproblem* on the politics of both empires, see, e.g.: Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter*, esp. pp. 7–15 and pp. 121–33; Kahl, "Römische Krönungspläne im Komnenenhaus?", esp. pp. 316–20.

discussion of this issue has focused on different periods of Western-Byzantine relations since the time of Charlemagne, for a number of reasons, the period of the Komnenian and Staufen rulers has been regarded as particularly well-suited for an investigation of the *Zweikaiserproblem*. Firstly, both empires fashioned an imperial self-awareness that drew heavily from Roman imperial traditions. Thus, both emperors conceived of themselves as Roman emperors, and they placed particular emphasis on this “identity” when they were in direct contact with each other. Secondly, there was an explicit clash of interests between Byzantium and the Western Empire in Italy, which even gave rise to military confrontation in 1173. And, thirdly, some sources – particularly the correspondence between the two emperors – contain explicit reference to their ideological rivalry.

One area in which contacts between Byzantium and the Western Empire proved to be mutually fertile relates to their respective conceptualizations of rule. The early Staufen imperial idea seized on various ideals and impulses which can be traced back to earlier Western traditions, conceptualizations from late Roman antiquity, and the Byzantine Empire. It is noteworthy that new elements in the conceptualization of the Western Emperor and the Empire began to develop precisely when diplomatic relations with Byzantium intensified. Alongside the various political activities of the rulers, their use of certain self-designations and titles in official documents and letters yields revealing insight into their self-conception as rulers.⁷¹

Many studies have pointed to the innovative impulses that formed the cornerstone of the reigns of Conrad III and Frederick I Barbarossa; several of these can be partially traced back to the Byzantine Empire.⁷² Though he was formally only a king, having not yet been crowned emperor by the pope,

This view has been nuanced by Lilie, “Das ‘Zweikaiserproblem’ und sein Einfluss auf die Aussenpolitik der Komnenen”, pp. 219–43, esp. pp. 240–41; and Hehl, “Zwei christliche Kaiser im mittelalterlichen Europa”, pp. 271–95, esp. pp. 284–95; see also Hehl, “Zwei Kaiser”, pp. 41–77.

71 On the correspondence between Staufen and Byzantine rulers, see: Kresten/Müller, “Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts”, pp. 402–29; Kresten, “Der ‘Anredestreit’ zwischen Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach der Schlacht von Myriokephalon”, esp. pp. 80–109. Some letters exchanged between the Byzantine and Staufen Court have survived in the collected letters of Abbot Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letters 202, 212, 216, 217, 218, 219, 316, 317, 386, 387, 411, 412.

72 Studies on the Byzantine impact of the *Kaiseridee* on Conrad III and Frederick I Barbarossa include: Koch, *Auf dem Wege zum Sacrum Imperium*, pp. 215–30; Ohnsorge, “Kaiser’ Konrad III.”, pp. 364–86; Tounta, *Το δυνικό sacrum imperium και η βυζαντινή Αυτοκρατορία* (with a summary in English on pages 499–510); ead., “Byzanz als Vorbild Friedrich Barbarossas”, pp. 159–74; ead., “Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157)”, pp. 167–214.

Conrad III appropriated the title of emperor vis-à-vis the Byzantine court.⁷³ This was reminiscent of a prevailing belief in Byzantium, i.e. that an emperor did not necessarily need to be crowned by a religious authority. The Byzantine Emperor was actually placed in a sacral sphere: he did not depend on any other authority, be that the pope or any other ecclesiastical figure, who could act as a mediator between God and the ruler. It is possible that this notion made its way from Byzantium to the Western Empire, although Conrad's use of the imperial title vis-à-vis Byzantium was primarily a means of attempting to express equal status with the Byzantine ruler.⁷⁴

Frederick Barbarossa's long reign resorted to the innovative impulses that had prevailed under his predecessor's rule. Together with his close counselors, he enhanced these notions further and strengthened his imperial power claim, in particular vis-à-vis the Papacy.⁷⁵ The notion of *sacrum imperium* (Holy Empire), which was expressed in official documents, has been much discussed. It can be understood as a sign of the empowerment of the imperial idea in opposition to the Church, expressing the notion that the empire is *per se* holy.⁷⁶ It is striking that even before Frederick Barbarossa officially applied the term *sacrum imperium* to the Western Empire, terms like *sacratissimum imperium*, *sanctum imperium* and *sanctissimum imperium* had been used by Abbot Wibald of Stablo in two letters addressed to the Byzantine Emperor, but notably as a designation for Byzantium. This occurred once in 1153 and again in 1153/54.⁷⁷ By contrast, the term was first employed to refer to the Western

73 The imperial title was also used by subordinated Nordic people in their correspondence with King Conrad: Ohnsorge, "Kaiser' Konrad III.," p. 365; Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letters 314 and 315, ed. Hartmann, pp. 665–67 and pp. 667–68. For more on the idea of imperial rule that was independent from the Papacy, see Koch, *Auf dem Wege zum Sacrum Imperium*, pp. 215–30. On the usage of the imperial title vis-à-vis Byzantium, see the following letters recorded by Ottos of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, I, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 37, ll. 30–31 and p. 41, ll. 1–2; and the letters collected by Wibald of Stablo: Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 202, 212, 216, ed. Hartmann, pp. 427, 448, 456. Conrad's use of the imperial title *Romanorum imperator* was also reflected in Conrad's son Henry's letters addressed to Manuel Komnenos and Empress Bertha-Eirene: Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letters 217 and 218, ed. Hartmann, pp. 461–62, 463–64.

74 Koch, *Auf dem Wege zum Sacrum Imperium*, p. 230; Tounta, "Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157)," pp. 170–71.

75 Weinfurter, "Wie das Reich heilig wurde," pp. 361–83; Stürner, "Kaiser und Papst zur Stauferzeit," pp. 221–33, esp. pp. 224–26; Appelt, *Die Kaiseridee Friedrich Barbarossas*, pp. 11–39. On the idea of the *Renovatio Imperii Romani* in the 12th century, see Benson, "Political *Renovatio*," pp. 359–84.

76 Weinfurter, "Wie das Reich heilig wurde," pp. 362, 373–74, 382–83; Sprenger, "Die Heiligkeit von Kaiser und Reich," pp. 175–204.

77 Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letters 387 and 412, ed. Hartmann, pp. 817, 859; Weinfurter, "Wie das Reich heilig wurde," pp. 374–77.

Empire in 1157, and its use seems to have been linked directly with the imperial claims to Italy.⁷⁸ The phrase is thus used in this context to unite those belonging to the Western Empire against their common enemies in Italy – a group that included the Byzantines with pretensions to those territories. *Sacrum Imperium* must thus be understood simultaneously as an expression of equal status with Byzantium, and as a consequence of the rivalry with the Byzantine Empire.⁷⁹ The extent to which Byzantium actually served as an example or a model for the Staufen rulers is difficult to determine, because different impulses influenced the imperial idea to varying extents.⁸⁰ Ancient Roman imperial traditions and ideas doubtlessly lived on in Byzantium, where they continued to make themselves felt. Both Conrad III and Frederick Barbarossa were exposed to these ideas during their sojourns in Byzantium; they were both eyewitnesses of the imperial ideology of the *basileus* that was exemplified in ceremonies at the Byzantine court.⁸¹

The 12th century was also characterized by mutual exchanges between Byzantium and the West. Western culture had a considerable impact on the Byzantine court in the 12th century. According to Byzantine and Western sources, Emperor Manuel Komnenos purportedly showed a special affinity to Latin culture. He is said to have participated in knights' tournaments, modelled on Western examples, and favoured Westerners at his court, appointing many to serve as translators or counsellors.⁸² We can further observe the invocation of Late Roman and Early Byzantine traditions. This applies not only to

78 The earliest usage of the term *sacrum imperium* under Frederick Barbarossa that referred to the Western Empire dates to the end of March 1157: *Die Urkunden Friedrichs I.*, eds. Appelt et al., no. 163, pp. 279–80; Weinfurter, “Wie das Reich heilig wurde”, pp. 361–62. On the term *sacrum imperium* and *sacratissimum imperium*, see Schwarz, *Herrscher- und Reichstitel bei Kaisertum und Papsttum im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, pp. 86–96.

79 Weinfurter, “Wie das Reich heilig wurde”, p. 382. A strong connection between the usage of the term *sacrum imperium* and Frederick Barbarossa's politics towards Byzantium is drawn by Tounta, “Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157)”, pp. 201–12, 214.

80 Koch, *Auf dem Wege zum Sacrum Imperium*, pp. 178–245; Weinfurter, “Wie das Reich heilig wurde”, pp. 361–83.

81 Dagron, *Emperor and Priest*, esp. pp. 84–124; Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell*, esp. pp. 158–233.

82 Nevertheless, the Western influence was limited to the imperial family and their milieu: Kazhdan/Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, pp. 180–81; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 13. On the Latins at the Byzantine court and the Latinophilia of Manuel Komnenos, see, as source references: Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, VII, ed. van Dieten, pp. 204–05; William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, XXII, 11, ed. Huygens, pp. 1020–21; Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks in Byzantium”, pp. 83–100; Schreiner, “Ritterspiele in Byzanz”, esp. pp. 228–32; for examples of Latins at the Byzantine court, see Dondaine, “Hugues Éthérien et Léon Toscan”, pp. 67–134; see also Exarchos, *Lateiner am Kaiserhof in Konstantinopel*.

the conciliar edict of 1166, but also to imperial letters sent to foreign officials.⁸³ One possible reason for this invocation of Late Roman and Early Byzantine traditions could be found in the diplomatic relations with the Staufen court. For instance, the reintroduction of the title *semper augustus* (in Greek αἰ ἀὐγούστος) found in those letters can perhaps be best explained by contact with the Staufen court, which also used this title in Latin.⁸⁴

The relations between the Staufen and Komnenian rulers were characterized by an exchange of productive impulses in both directions. The ideological rivalry between the two empires revealed itself in disputes concerning address and rank. Each side emphasized its own right to the title “Emperor of the Romans” – in Latin *imperator Romanorum* and in Greek αὐτοκράτωρ Ῥωμαίων – and declined to accept the other side’s claims to Roman legitimacy. In the case of Conrad III, this is best illustrated in the correspondence he exchanged with the Byzantine Emperors. Conrad avoided addressing the Byzantines with the title “Emperor of the Romans”, using instead formulations like *Constantinopolitanus imperator* (Emperor of Constantinople), *rex Grecorum* (King of the Greeks), or *imperator Grecorum* (Emperor of the Greeks).⁸⁵ In his letter to John Komnenos in 1142, Conrad emphasized that his own predecessors were the Roman Emperors (*Romanorum imperatores, antecessores nostri*).⁸⁶ And he likewise used the metaphor of mother and daughter, claiming that his own empire represents the mother (the Roman Empire), and Byzantium represents the daughter (the new Rome; *nova Roma*).⁸⁷ The

83 The conciliar edict of 1166 recalls the Emperors Constantine and Justinian in aspects of style and content: Mango, “The Conciliar Edict of 1166”, pp. 317–30; Classen, “Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens”, pp. 214–19. On Manuel Komnenos and his imperial idea, see Magdalino, “The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos”, pp. 178–80.

84 Kresten, “Der ‘Anrede Streit’ zwischen Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach der Schlacht von Myriokephalon”, pp. 88–89, particularly note 81; Ohnsorge, “Kaiser Konrad III.”, pp. 369–71. On the use of *semper augustus* in the West, see Schwarz, *Herrscher- und Reichstitel bei Kaisertum und Papsttum im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, pp. 83–85. On *semper augustus*, see Rösch, *Onoma Basileias*, pp. 34–35.

85 For example, the letters recorded by Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, I, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 37, ll. 31–32 (*Constantinopolitanus imperator*) and p. 41, l. 3 (*rex Grecorum*); and letters recorded by Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 202, ed. Hartmann, p. 427, l. 17 (*imperator Grecorum*).

86 The letter is recorded by Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, I, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 37, ll. 32–36: “Amicitiam, honorem et gloriam, ut parentes nostri, videlicet Romanorum imperatores, antecessores nostri, ad antecessores vestros, scilicet regnum et populum Grecorum, constituerunt, constituo et, sicut servaverunt, conservabo.”

87 Recorded by Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, I, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, pp. 37–38, ll. 36–12; on the importance of this passage to the concept of *Translatio Imperii*, see Tounta, *Τὸ θεϊκὸν sacrum imperium καὶ ἡ βυζαντινὴ Αυτοκρατορία*, p. 500.

metaphor entrenched the notion of a kinship between the two empires that produced certain (familial) responsibilities for both sides, although it is unmistakably clear that in Conrad's vision, it was the Western king or emperor who ruled the original *Imperium Romanum*. In his reply, John Komnenos refers to himself as Roman Emperor, while addressing Conrad twice as king, which he *de facto* was.⁸⁸ Such disputes about rank did not necessarily have an impact on the realpolitik of both empires. This correspondence is a prime example of how an ideological rivalry did not translate directly into the domain of realpolitik, since this correspondence also reveals discussion of friendship, treaties of alliance, and joint action.⁸⁹

The Staufer, Komnenoi, and Angeloi were not only political actors who stood in opposition to each other, they were also linked by dynastic ties. Just as with the Komnenoi, the Staufen rulers began cultivating familial political relations with the Angeloi from 1197 onward. Phillip of Swabia, the son of Frederick Barbarossa, married the daughter of Isaac Angelos, Eirene.⁹⁰ In rare cases the two rulers met face to face, such as when Conrad III and Frederick Barbarossa met Manuel Komnenos while participating in the Second Crusade.⁹¹ In a letter to Abbot Wibald of Stablo, King Conrad III describes how distressed Manuel was to learn that Conrad had fallen ill during the crusade. Manuel is said to have even come to see Conrad personally, together with his wife, Conrad's adopted daughter, Bertha-Eirene, and brought his own doctors to treat Conrad.⁹² One of Conrad's subsequent letters to the emperor (written in 1150) even states that Manuel attended to Conrad personally.⁹³ This was not an isolated case. Manuel Komnenos similarly took care of King Baldwin III of Jerusalem, who was married to Manuel's niece, and therefore also a relative

88 Recorded by Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, 1, 25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, p. 40, ll. 5–6 and 33–34: "Nobilissime et dilecte amice imperii mei, rex. [...] Vale, nobilissime amice imperii mei, rex." On this letter of John II Komnenos, see Gastgeber, "Das Schreiben Kaiser Ioannes' II. Komnenos an König Konrad III. in der Überlieferung bei Otto von Freising", pp. 17–36.

89 Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, 1, 24–25, eds. Waitz/de Simson, pp. 37–40.

90 Csendes, *Philipp von Schwaben*, pp. 28–29; on Philipp's relationship with Byzantium, see Maleczek, "Philipp von Schwaben und die Eroberung von Konstantinopel 1203/04", pp. 110–40.

91 Vučetić, *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern (395–1204)*, no. 99 and no. 100, pp. 116–19.

92 Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 74, ed. Hartmann, pp. 127–29, here p. 129, ll. 4–10. In the same letter Conrad reports that none of his predecessors had ever been honoured like he had been in Constantinople: ll. 9–10: "... tantum illic nobis honoris exhibens, quantum nulli umquam predecessori nostro exhibitum esse audivimus."

93 In a letter from Conrad III to Manuel Komnenos recorded by Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 212, ed. Hartmann, pp. 447–50, here p. 448, ll. 6–13.

of the emperor.⁹⁴ The emperor personally treated his relatives as a doctor and healer, a sign of familiarity that created a certain degree of intimacy and trust.⁹⁵ In the 1150 letter to Manuel, Conrad appreciatively speaks of Manuel's kindness to him, hinting at how impressed he must have been to have received treatment from Manuel.⁹⁶ The correspondence of Conrad and his son Henry with the Byzantine ruling couple Manuel Komnenos and Bertha-Eirene generally intensified after Conrad's sojourn in Byzantium. In those letters, they discussed contemporary affairs and reflected on an alliance. These letters, addressed to Emperor Manuel and Empress Bertha-Eirene, are extraordinarily friendly in tone.⁹⁷ The Empress, who was related to the Staufen dynasty, seems to have acted as a kind of mediator between the two empires, even in political matters. This personal contact and the private relations between the dynasties should not be underestimated, even if their influence on political decisions must be analysed with caution.

4 Conclusion

Staufen-Byzantine relations between 1138 and 1204 have proved complex and sometimes difficult to interpret. The period is characterized by different phases of cooperation and confrontation. Familial relations between the two realms, as well as personal meetings, promoted intense and at times fruitful contacts between the two empires. At some points, however, these relations turned into conflict and were marked by rivalry. This occurred in the context of official relations between the two emperors, but it seems to have been a more general feature of the relationship between Byzantium and the West in the 12th century.⁹⁸

Political ambitions and claims to regions like Italy, Hungary, and the Crusader States brought about rivalry and struggles over influence in, and domination of, these territories. Italy played a significant role as a zone of both

94 John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, IV, 21, ed. Meineke, p. 190; William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, XVIII, 25, ed. Huygens, p. 848; Anca, *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation und kaiserliches Selbstverständnis*, pp. 120–22.

95 On Manuel's role as doctor: Anca, *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation und kaiserliches Selbstverständnis*, pp. 114–24.

96 Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 212, ed. Hartmann, pp. 447–50.

97 Dendorfer, "Konrad III. und Byzanz", p. 68. Letters to Manuel Komnenos: Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, Letter 202, 212, 217, ed. Hartmann, pp. 427, 447–50, 461–63; letters to Empress Bertha-Eirene: *ibid.*, Letter 216, 218, ed. Hartmann, pp. 455–61, 463–65.

98 Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West 1180–1204*; Laiou, "Byzantium and the Crusades in the Twelfth Century", pp. 17–40; Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*.

contact and conflict. For both rulers, Italy represented a territory upon which they had territorial claims, and to which they had ideological connections. For Byzantium, in particular, there were many political considerations, including the aim of defending against Norman aggression, which made conquest of this region attractive beyond imperial claims. But rivalry was also fostered by the personalities who ruled the two empires between 1152 and 1180. The reigns of Frederick Barbarossa and Manuel Komnenos were marked not only by a relatively stable period of rule, but also by both rulers' forceful insistence on the uniqueness and the rights of their respective empires. Contact between the two empires, and the situation of ideological competition between them, led to a strengthening of imperial notions on both sides. It is open to debate whether the policies of each empire vis-à-vis the other were influenced by these notions, and whether ideological claims or pragmatic decisions played a more decisive role in shaping their respective policy towards each other.

This article has discussed the ways in which relations between the two empires were influenced both by internal circumstances and other foreign political developments and actors. Although the information contained in contemporary sources about the exact motives and sequence of events is often vague and imprecise, by adopting a long-term perspective, the significance of both domestic politics and foreign political dynamics in relations between the two empires becomes apparent. In 1155, it was impossible for Frederick Barbarossa to plan a campaign against southern Italy, even though he personally advocated this move, because the princes of the Western Empire opposed these plans.⁹⁹ Manuel Komnenos, who endorsed a relatively offensive strategy compared to his predecessors and successors, also lacked the means and capacities for a successful military action in Italy, not least because he had obligations in other regions.¹⁰⁰

During these decades, the Byzantine Emperor was more reactive than active; he was generally forced to adapt his politics to the actions of the Western Emperor and others.¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, Frederick Barbarossa's attitude towards Italy also demonstrates that he took Byzantine ambitions in that region seriously and, on occasions including 1155 and 1173, conducted military efforts to

99 Böhmer/Opll, *Regesta Imperii* IV 2, 1, no. 341, p. 102; Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, II, 35 and 36, eds. Waitz/de Simson, pp. 144–45; see also Frederick Barbarossa's letter addressed to Otto of Freising: *ibid.*, pp. 1–5, here p. 4.

100 Lilie, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, pp. 407–08; *id.*, "Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa", p. 160. On Manuel's engagement in Hungary, see, e.g.: Stephenson, "Manuel I Komnenos, the Hungarian Crown and the 'Feudal Subjection' of Hungary, 1162–1167", pp. 33–59.

101 Magdalino, "The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos", p. 185.

counter Byzantine activities. On one level, then, both empires demonstrated a keen awareness of the threat posed by the other. However, looking at the evidence more closely, it is also clear that the two imperial powers were tied together by a range of reciprocal influences and familial connections. As a result, both empires were able to exert a cultural and ideological impact on the other.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Boso, *Vita Alexandri III*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, Introduction et Commentaire*, 2 vols., Paris 1886–92 (repr. Paris 1955), vol. 2, pp. 397–446.
- John Kinnamos, *Historia*, ed. A. Meineke, *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum* (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 23), Bonn 1836.
- John Kinnamos, *Historia*, trans. C.M. Brand, *The Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, New York 1976.
- Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J.L. van Dieten, *Nicetae Choniatae Historia* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 11, 1), Berlin 1975.
- Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, trans. H.J. Magoulias, *O City of Byzantium. Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Detroit 1984.
- Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris*, eds. G. Waitz/B. de Simson, *Ottonis et Rahewini Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 46), 3rd ed., Hannover 1912.
- Die Urkunden Friedrichs I. (1152–1158)*, eds. H. Appelt/R.M. Herkenrath/W. Koch/J. Riedmann/W. Stelzer/K. Zeillinger (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser, 10, 1), Hannover 1975.
- Wibald of Stablo, *Codex epistularis*, ed. M. Hartmann, *Das Briefbuch Abt Wibalds von Stablo und Corvey*, 3 vols. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit, 9), Hannover 2012.
- William of Tyre, *Chronicon*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, vol. 2 (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 63A), Turnhout 1986.

Regesta

- Böhmer, J.F./Niederkorn, J.P./Hruza, K., *Regesta Imperii IV*, vol. 1: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Lothar III. und Konrad III.*, part 2: *Konrad III. (1138 (1093/94)–1152)*, Vienna 2008.

- Böhmer, J.F./Oppl, F./May, H., *Regesta Imperii IV*, vol. 2: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Friedrich I. 1152 (1122)–1190*, part 1: 1152 (1122)–1158, Vienna 1980.
- Böhmer, J.F./Oppl, F., *Regesta Imperii IV*, vol. 2: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Friedrich I. 1152 (1122)–1190*, part 3: 1168–1180, Vienna 2001.
- Dölger, F./Wirth, P., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 2: *Regesten von 1025–1204*, 2nd ed., Munich 1995.

Secondary Literature

- Abulafia, D., "Ancona, Byzantium and the Adriatic, 1155–1173", in id., *Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean, 1100–1400* (Collected Studies Series, 250), London 1987, pp. 195–216.
- Anca, A.S., *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation und kaiserliches Selbstverständnis. Berührung der westlichen mit der byzantinischen Welt in der Zeit der ersten Kreuzzüge* (Symbolische Kommunikation und gesellschaftliche Wertesysteme, 31), Munich 2010.
- Angold, M., "The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1118", in D. Luscombe/J. Riley-Smith (eds.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV, 1024–1198*, Cambridge 2004, part 2, pp. 217–53.
- Appelt, H., *Die Kaiseridee Friedrich Barbarossas* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 252, 4), Graz 1967.
- Asbridge, T.S., "The 'Crusader' Community at Antioch: The Impact of Interaction with Byzantium and Islam", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 9 (1999), 305–25.
- Benson, R.L., "Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity", in R.L. Benson/G. Constable/C.D. Lanham (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Oxford 1982, pp. 339–86.
- Boshof, E., "Innozenz III. und der deutschen Thronstreit", in T. Frenz (ed.), *Papst Innozenz III. Weichensteller der Geschichte Europas*, Stuttgart 2000, pp. 51–67.
- Brand, C.M., *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968 (repr. Aldershot 1992).
- Brand, C.M./Cutler, A., "Isaac I Komnenos", in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, New York 1991, vol. 2, pp. 1011–12.
- Carile, A., "Federico Barbarossa, i Veneziani e l'assedio di Ancona del 1173. Contributo alla storia politica e sociale della città nel secolo XII.", *Studi Veneziani* 16 (1974), 3–31.
- Chalandon, F., *Les Comnène. Études sur l'empire byzantin au XI^e et XII^e siècle*, 2 vols., Paris 1912.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962–1204. Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden 1996.
- Classen, P., "Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens", *Journal of Medieval History* 3 (1977), 207–24.
- Classen, P., "Corona Imperii. Die Krone als Inbegriff des römisch-deutschen Reiches im 12. Jahrhundert", in J. Fleckenstein (ed.), *Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Peter Classen*, Sigmaringen 1983, pp. 503–14.

- Classen, P., "Mailands Treueid für Manuel Komnenos", in J. Fleckenstein (ed.), *Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Peter Classen*, Sigmaringen 1983, pp. 147–53.
- Classen, P., *Karl der Große, das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Begründung des karolingischen Kaisertums* (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters, 9), 2nd ed., Sigmaringen 1988.
- Coleman, E., "A City to be Built for the Glory of God, St Peter, and the Whole of Lombardy': Alexander III, Alessandria and the Lombard League in Contemporary Sources", in P.D. Clarke/A. J. Duggan (eds.), *Pope Alexander III (1159–1181). The Art of Survival*, Farnham 2012, pp. 127–52.
- Csendes, P., *Philipp von Schwaben: Ein Staufer im Kampf um die Macht*, Darmstadt 2003.
- Csendes, P., "Die Doppelwahl von 1198 und ihre europäischen Dimensionen", in W. Hechberger/F. Schuller (eds.), *Staufer und Welfen. Zwei rivalisierende Dynastien im Hochmittelalter*, Regensburg 2009, pp. 157–71.
- Dagron, G., *Emperor and Priest. The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. J. Birrell, Cambridge 2003.
- Deér, J., *Papsttum und Normannen. Untersuchungen zu ihren lehnsrechtlichen und kirchenpolitischen Beziehungen* (Studien und Quellen zur Welt Kaiser Friedrichs II., 1), Cologne 1972.
- Dendorfer, J., *Adelige Gruppenbildung und Königsherrschaft. Die Grafen von Sulzbach und ihr Beziehungsgeflecht im 12. Jahrhundert* (Studien zur bayerischen Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte, 23), Munich 2004.
- Dendorfer, J., "Konrad III. und Byzanz", in *Die Staufer und Byzanz*, pp. 58–73.
- Dölger, F., "Ungarn in der byzantinischen Reichspolitik", *Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis* 8 (1942), 315–42.
- Dondaine, A., "Hugues Éthérien et Léon Toscan", *Archives d'Histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 19 (1952), 67–134.
- Engels, O., *Die Staufer*, 9th ed., Stuttgart 2010.
- Exarchos, L., *Lateiner am Kaiserhof in Konstantinopel. Expertise und Loyalitäten zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen (1143–1204)* (Mittelmeerstudien, 22), Paderborn (forthcoming).
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "La presenza dei Greci nella Sicilia normanna. L'apporto della documentazione archivistica in lingua greca", in R.M. Carra Bonacasa (ed.), *Byzantino-sicula IV: Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia della Sicilia Bizantina (Corleone, 28 luglio–2 agosto 1998)*, Palermo 2003, pp. 31–72.
- Ferluga, J., "La Dalmazia fra Bisanzio, Venezia e l'Ungheria ai tempi di Manuele Comneno", *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 63–83.
- France, J., "Byzantium in Western Chronicles Before the First Crusade", in N. Housley (ed.), *Knighthoods of Christ. Essays on the History of the Crusades and the Knights Templar. Presented to Malcolm Barber*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 3–16.

- Freed, J.B., *Frederick Barbarossa. The Prince and the Myth*, New Haven 2016.
- Gastgeber, C., "Das Schreiben Kaiser Ioannes' II. Komnenos an König Konrad III. in der Überlieferung bei Otto von Freising", in C. Scholz/G. Makris (eds.), *Polypheuros nous. Miscellanea für Peter Schreiner zu seinem 60. Geburtstag* (Byzantinisches Archiv, 19), Munich 2000, pp. 17–36.
- Georgi, W., *Friedrich Barbarossa und die auswärtigen Mächte. Studien zur Außenpolitik 1159–1180* (Europäische Hochschulschriften 111, 442), Frankfurt am Main 1990.
- Görich, K., "Wahrung des honor: Ein Grundsatz im politischen Handeln König Konrads III.", in H. Seibert/J. Dendorfer (eds.), *Grafen, Herzöge, Könige: Der Aufstieg der frühen Staufer und das Reich (1079–1152)*, Ostfildern 2005, pp. 267–98.
- Görich, K., "Unausweichliche Konflikte? Friedrich Barbarossa, Friedrich II. und der lombardische Städtebund", in O. Auge/F. Biermann/M. Müller/D. Schultze (eds.), *Bereit zum Konflikt. Strategien und Medien der Konflikterzeugung und Konfliktbewältigung im europäischen Mittelalter*, Ostfildern 2008, pp. 195–213.
- Görich, K., *Die Staufer. Herrscher und Reich*, 2nd ed., Munich 2008.
- Görich, K., "Konflikt und Kompromiss: Friedrich Barbarossa in Italien", in W. Hechberger/F. Schuller (eds.), *Staufer und Welfen. Zwei rivalisierende Dynastien im Hochmittelalter*, Regensburg 2009, pp. 79–97.
- Görich, K., *Friedrich Barbarossa. Eine Biographie*, Munich 2011.
- Görich, K., "Friedrich Barbarossa und Byzanz", in *Die Staufer und Byzanz*, pp. 74–85.
- Harris, J., *Byzantium and the Crusades*, London 2014.
- Harris, J./Tolstoy, D., "Alexander III and Byzantium", in P.D. Clarke/A.J. Duggan (eds.), *Pope Alexander III (1159–1181). The Art of Survival*, Farnham 2012, pp. 301–13.
- Hehl, E.-D., "Zwei christliche Kaiser im mittelalterlichen Europa. Eine problematische Geschichte", in H. Leppin/B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Kaisertum im ersten Jahrtausend. Wissenschaftlicher Begleitband zur Landesausstellung "Otto der Große und das Römische Reich. Kaisertum von der Antike zum Mittelalter"*, Regensburg 2012, pp. 271–95.
- Hehl, E.-D., "Zwei Kaiser – (k)ein Problem? Byzanz, das westliche Kaisertum und ein missverständlicher Forschungsbegriff", in L. Körntgen/J. Kusber/J. Pahlitzsch/F. Carlà-Uhink (eds.), *Byzanz und seine europäischen Nachbarn. Politische Interdependenzen und kulturelle Missverständnisse* (Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident, 17), Mainz 2020, pp. 41–77.
- Herrin, J., "The Collapse of the Byzantine Empire in the Twelfth Century: a Study of a Medieval Economy", *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 12 (1969/70), pp. 188–203.
- Hiestand, R., "Neptis tua und fastus Graecorum. Zu den deutsch-byzantinischen Verhandlungen um 1150", *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 49 (1993), 501–55.

- Irmscher, J., "Bertha von Sulzbach, Gemahlin Manuels I.", in *Byzance et l'Europe. 6e Symposion Byzantinon l'automne 1992* (Byzantinische Forschungen, 22), Amsterdam 1996, pp. 279–90.
- Johrendt, J., "The Empire and the Schism", in P.D. Clarke/A.J. Duggan (eds.), *Pope Alexander III (1159–1181). The Art of Survival*, Farnham 2012, pp. 99–126.
- Kahl, H.-D., "Römische Krönungspläne im Komnenenhouse? Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Zweikaiserproblems im 12. Jahrhundert", *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 59 (1977), 259–320.
- Kaldellis, A., *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, 3rd ed., Cambridge 2009.
- Kazhdan, A., "Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century", in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, D.C. 2001, pp. 83–100.
- Kazhdan, A.P./Epstein, A.W., *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 7), Berkeley 1985.
- Koch, G., *Auf dem Wege zum Sacrum Imperium. Studien zur ideologischen Herrschaftsbegründung der deutschen Zentralgewalt im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 20), Vienna 1972.
- Koder, J., "Griechische Identitäten im Mittelalter. Aspekte einer Entwicklung", in A. Avramea/A.E. Laiou/E. Chrysos (eds.), *Byzantium State and Society. In Memory of Nikos Oikonomides*, Athens 2003, pp. 297–319.
- Kölzer, T., "Venedig, Friede v.", in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Stuttgart 1999, vol. 8, col. 1471.
- Kölzer, T., "Byzanz in der Politik Kaiser Heinrichs VI.", in *Die Staufer und Byzanz*, pp. 86–109.
- Kolbaba, T.M., *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins*, Urbana 2000.
- Konrad III. (1138–1152): *Herrscher und Reich* (Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst, 30), Göppingen 2011.
- Konstantinou, E. (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne 1997.
- Kresten, O., "Der 'Anredestreit' zwischen Manuell Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach der Schlacht von Myriokephalon", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 34/35 (1992/93), 65–110.
- Kresten, O./Müller, A.E., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Specimen einer kritischen Ausgabe", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86/87 (1993/94), 402–29.
- Laiou, A.E., "Byzantium and the Crusades in the Twelfth Century: Why Was the Fourth Crusade Late in Coming?", in A.E. Laiou (ed.), *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences* (Réalités Byzantines, 10), Paris 2005, pp. 17–40.

- Lamma, P., *Comneni e Staufer. Ricerche sui rapporti fra Bisanzio e l'Occidente nel secolo XII*, 2 vols., Rome 1955–57.
- Laudage, J., *Alexander III. und Friedrich Barbarossa* (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 16), Cologne 1997.
- Lilie, R.-J., “Die Schlacht von Myriokephalon (1176). Auswirkungen auf das byzantinische Reich im ausgehenden 12. Jahrhundert”, *Revue des études byzantines* 35 (1977), 257–75.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloï (1081–1204)*, Amsterdam 1984.
- Lilie, R.-J., “Das ‘Zweikaiserproblem’ und sein Einfluss auf die Aussenpolitik der Komnenen”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985), 219–44.
- Lilie, R.-J., “Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa. Die deutsche und die byzantinische Italienpolitik während der zweiten Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts in der neueren Literatur”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 42 (1992), 157–70.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096–1204*, trans. J.C. Morris/J.E. Ridings, Oxford 1993.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*, Berlin 2003.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge* (Urban-Taschenbücher, 595), Stuttgart 2004.
- Lilie, R.-J., “Byzanz – Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im 12. Jahrhundert”, in *Die Staufer und Byzanz*, pp. 10–42.
- Loud, G.A., “Byzantine Italy and the Normans”, in J.D. Howard-Johnston (ed.), *Byzantium and the West, c. 850–1200: Proceedings of the XVIIIth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford 30 March–1 April 1984* (Byzantinische Forschungen, 13), Amsterdam 1988, pp. 215–33.
- Loud, G.A., *The Age of Robert Guiscard: Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest*, London 2000.
- Loud, G.A., *The Latin Church in Norman Italy*, Cambridge 2007.
- Loud, G.A., “Byzantium and Southern Italy (876–1000)”, in J. Shepard (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c. 500–1492*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 560–82.
- Loud, G.A., *The Crusade of Frederick Barbarossa: The History of the Expedition of the Emperor Frederick and Related Texts* (Crusade Texts in Translation, 19), Farnham 2010.
- Madden, T.F., “Alexander III and Venice”, in P.D. Clarke/A.J. Duggan (eds.), *Pope Alexander III (1159–1181). The Art of Survival*, Farnham 2012, pp. 315–39.
- Magdalino, P., “The Phenomenon of Manuel I Komnenos”, in J.D. Howard-Johnston (ed.), *Byzantium and the West, c. 850–1200. Proceedings of the XVIIIth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford 30 March–1 April 1984* (Byzantinische Forschungen, 13), Amsterdam 1988, pp. 171–99.

- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993 (repr. Cambridge 2002).
- Magdalino, P., "Wie das Bild des Basileus in Westeuropa genutzt wurde", in B. Jussen (ed.), *Die Macht des Königs. Herrschaft in Europa vom Frühmittelalter bis in die Neuzeit*, Munich 2005, pp. 179–89.
- Magdalino, P., "The Empire of the Komnenoi (1118–1204)", in J. Shepard (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c. 500–1492*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 627–63.
- Makk, F., *The Árpáds and the Comneni. Political Relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th Century*, Budapest 1989.
- Maleczek, W., "Philipp von Schwaben und die Eroberung von Konstantinopel 1203/1204", in *Die Staufer und Byzanz*, pp. 110–40.
- Mango, C., "The Conciliar Edict of 1166", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17 (1963), 317–30.
- Munz, P., *Frederick Barbarossa: a Study in Medieval Politics*, London 1969.
- Niederkorn, J.P., "Die Mitgift der Kaiserin Irene. Anmerkungen zur byzantinischen Politik König Konrads III.", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 28 (1986), 125–39.
- Niederkorn, J.P., "Thessalonike – Konstanz – Ancona. Kontinuität und Wandel in der staufischen Außenpolitik 1148 bis 1155", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 42 (2000), 213–44.
- Niederkorn, J.P., "Die Bündnisverhandlungen König Konrads III. mit Johannes II. Komnenos", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 51 (2001), 189–98.
- Norden, W., *Das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Trennung der beiden Mächte und das Problem ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergange des byzantinischen Reichs (1453)*, Berlin 1903.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter. Die Bedeutung des byzantinischen Reiches für die Entwicklung der Staatsidee in Europa*, Hildesheim 1947.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Abendland und Byzanz. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1958.
- Ohnsorge, W., "Kaiser Konrad III. Zur Geschichte des staufischen Staatsgedankens", in id., *Abendland und Byzanz*, pp. 364–86.
- Ostrogorsky, G., *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. Hussey, Oxford 1980.
- Panagopoulou, A., *Οι διπλωματικοί γάμοι στο Βυζάντιο (6ος–12ος αιώνας)*, Athens 2006.
- Penna, D., *The Byzantine Imperial Acts to Venice, Pisa and Genoa, 10th–12th Centuries: A Comparative Legal Study*, The Hague 2012.
- Prinzing, G., "Das Papsttum und der orthodox geprägte Südosten Europas 1180–1216", in E.-D. Hehl/I.H. Ringel/H. Seibert (eds.), *Das Papsttum in der Welt des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Mittelalter-Forschungen, 6), Stuttgart 2002, pp. 137–83.
- Raccagni, G., *The Lombard League: 1167–1225*, Oxford 2010.
- Rösch, G., *Onoma Basileias. Studien zum offiziellen Gebrauch der Kaisertitel in spätantiker und frühbyzantinischer Zeit* (Byzantina Vindobonensia, 10), Vienna 1978.

- Schieffer, R., "Byzanzbilder des Abendlandes vor 1204", in *Die Staufer und Byzanz*, pp. 43–57.
- Schreiner, P., "Byzanz und der Westen: Die gegenseitige Betrachtungsweise in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts", in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa. Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 40), Sigmaringen 1992, pp. 551–80.
- Schreiner, P., "Ritterspiele in Byzanz", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 46 (1996), 227–41.
- Schreiner, P., "Isaak I. Komnenos", in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Stuttgart 1999, vol. 5, cols. 665–66.
- Schwarz, J., *Herrscher- und Reichstitel bei Kaisertum und Papsttum im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 22), Cologne 2003.
- Seibert, H., "Die frühen ›Staufer‹: Forschungsstand und offene Fragen", in H. Seibert/J. Dendorfer (eds.), *Grafen, Herzöge, Könige: der Aufstieg der frühen Staufer und das Reich (1079–1152)* (Mittelalter-Forschungen, 18), Ostfildern 2005, pp. 1–39.
- Simpson, A. (ed.), *Byzantium, 1180–1204. 'The Sad Quarter of a Century?'* (International Symposium/National Hellenic Research Foundation Institute of Historical Research/Section of Byzantine Research, 22), Athens 2015.
- Die Staufer und Byzanz* (Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst, 33), Göppingen 2013.
- Stephenson, P., "Manuel I Comnenus, the Hungarian Crown and the 'Feudal Subjection' of Hungary, 1162–1167", *Byzantinoslavica* 57 (1996), 33–59.
- Stouraitis, I., *Krieg und Frieden in der politischen und ideologischen Wahrnehmung in Byzanz (7.–11. Jahrhundert)* (Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber, Ergänzungsband, 5), Vienna 2009.
- Stürner, W., "Kaiser und Papst zur Stauferzeit", *Rottenburger Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte* 22 (2003), 221–33.
- Tabacco, G., "Northern and Central Italy in the Twelfth Century", in D. Luscombe/J. Riley-Smith (eds.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV, 1024–1198*, Cambridge 2004, part 2, pp. 422–41.
- Tinnefeld, F., "Byzanz und die Herrscher des Hauses Hohenstaufen (1138–1259)", *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* 41 (1995), 105–27.
- Todt, K.-P., "Bertha-Eirene von Sulzbach. Eine Deutsche auf dem byzantinischen Kaiserthron", *Hellenika. Jahrbuch für die Freunde Griechenlands* (1988), 113–48.
- Tounta, E., *Το δυτικό sacrum imperium και η βυζαντινή Αυτοκρατορία: ιδεολογικές τριβές και αλληλεπιδράσεις στην ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική σκηνή του 12ου αιώνα (1135–1177)*, Athens 2008.
- Tounta, E., "Byzanz als Vorbild Friedrich Barbarossas", in S. Burkhardt/R. Metz/B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Staufisches Kaisertum im 12. Jahrhundert. Konzepte – Netzwerke – Politische Praxis*, Regensburg 2010, pp. 159–74.

- Tounta, E., "Süditalien als Konflikt-und Kontaktzone zwischen Staufern und Byzanz", in B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter/A. Wiczorek (eds.), *Verwandlungen des Staufferreichs. Drei Innovationsregionen im mittelalterlichen Europa*, Darmstadt 2010, pp. 432–45.
- Tounta, E., "Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157): Die staufisch-byzantinischen Beziehungen und die "Heiligkeit" des staufischen Reiches", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 131 (2011), 167–214.
- Treitinger, O., *Die oströmische Kaiser-und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell*, Jena 1938 (repr. Darmstadt 1956).
- Vollrath, H., "Konrad III. und Byzanz", *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 59 (1977), 321–65.
- Vučetić, M., *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern (395–1204). Vorbereitung, Gestaltung, Funktionen* (Ph.D thesis, University of Münster 2013).
- Weinfurter, S., "Wie das Reich heilig wurde", in H. Kluger/H. Seibert/W. Bomm (eds.), *Gelebte Ordnung – Gedachte Ordnung. Ausgewählte Beiträge zu König, Kirche und Reich aus Anlaß des 60. Geburtstages*, Ostfildern 2005, pp. 361–83.
- Weller, T., *Die Heiratspolitik des deutschen Hochadels im 12. Jahrhundert* (Rheinisches Archiv, 149), Cologne 2004.
- Zeillinger, K., "Friedrich I. Barbarossa, Manuel I. Komnenos und Süditalien in den Jahren 1155/1156", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 27 (1985), 53–83.

Political and Cultural Encounters between Byzantium and the Normans, 11th–12th Centuries

Eleni Tounta

When in the battle of Cannae in 1018, Basil Boiannes, the *katepano* of Italy, defeated the army of the Apulian Lombard Melus, who had rebelled against Byzantine rule, no one probably anticipated the far-reaching repercussions that rebellion, albeit unsuccessful, would have for the Byzantine dominions in southern Italy. Melus had recruited about 250 Norman mercenaries who, after the defeat at Cannae, remained in the *Mezzogiorno* and earned their living fighting mainly for the Lombard principalities in Campania.¹ Two decades later, when the Byzantines organized an expedition to reconquer Sicily from the Muslims and solicited help from the Prince of Salerno, Guaimar IV (1027–52), they were offered a contingent of Norman mercenaries. Not only did the Byzantine general Georgios Maniakes win a victory that was short-lived and failed to change Sicily's political status (1038–42), but he also unwittingly imperilled Byzantine authority in southern Italy. Owing to a disagreement over the distribution of booty or the payment of wages, the Norman mercenaries abandoned the expedition, crossed the Strait and began to conquer southern Italian territories. In 1041 they settled in Melfi, and in the following year one of their compatriots, William the “Iron Arm”, a member of the Norman Hauteville family, was elected their leader.² His election was to determine the fate of the *Mezzogiorno*, which was to remain under his family's rule until the end of the 12th century.

The Norman conquest of the *Mezzogiorno* took place in a relatively swift manner. By 1042 two Norman counties had been formed, one in Melfi and another one in Aversa, in Campania, under Rainulf Drengot. Both of them nominally depended on the overlordship of Guaimar IV of Salerno. In Melfi the count's office evolved into a family business; in 1047, after William's death, it was his brother Drogo who became the leader of the Apulian Normans, and,

¹ Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, pp. 67–77.

² Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, pp. 77–97. For Maniakes's expedition, see Shepard, “Byzantium's Last Sicilian Expedition”, pp. 145–59; and Savvides, *Γεώργιος Μανιάκης*, pp. 43–50. See also Lauritzen, “Achilles at the Battle of Ostrovo”, pp. 171–87.

after his assassination in 1051, he was succeeded by his brother Humphrey. During this time, the Holy See, worried about the Norman expansion, made a vain attempt to expel them from southern Italy. On 18 June 1053, in the Battle of Civitate, the army of Pope Leo IX (1049–54), which consisted of Lombard, Italian, and German forces, was crushed by a united force of Apulian and Campanian Normans, and the pope himself was taken prisoner. The victory consolidated the Norman presence in the *Mezzogiorno* and brought to the fore another Hauteville brother, Robert Guiscard, who had arrived there in 1046 and ravaged several Calabrian territories. After Humphrey's death in 1057, Robert became count and soon displayed his hegemonic ambitions; a year later he dissolved his marriage to his Norman wife in order to marry Guaimar IV's daughter, Sikelgaita, in an evident attempt to acquire influence over the Lombard principalities. In the same year, the Count of Aversa, Richard I (1058–78), conquered the principality of Capua. In August 1059 at the Synod of Melfi, Pope Nicholas II (1059–61) invested Robert Guiscard with the Duchy of Apulia, the county of Calabria, and Sicily, thus profiting from the Norman conquests in order to declare the Roman Church's overlordship in southern Italy and Sicily. The duke continued the conquests together with his brother Roger, who had arrived in the *Mezzogiorno* by the time Humphrey was dead. By 1060, the two brothers had completed the conquest of Calabria, the southern territories of which were granted to Roger; in 1071 Bari, the last bastion of Byzantine rule in southern Italy, fell into Robert's hands after a three-year siege; in 1072 the two brothers entered Palermo and Roger became Count of Sicily, possessing half of the island as well as southern Calabria. In December 1076 Robert finally conquered the Principality of Salerno.³

In the present chapter I will not confine myself to outline the armed confrontations and diplomatic relations between the Byzantines and the Normans, which will only be referred to in order to provide a chronological framework for this essay. Rather, I will examine the encounters between the two sides, as far as the sparseness of documentation allows, from a cultural perspective. This is the angle from which modern research tends to investigate the subject, adopting a fresh approach to the relevant medieval texts using the tools of narrativity and textuality and thus coming up with fruitful arguments about the ways in which the two cultures “conversed” with each other. The forms of “perception of the Other”, which are closely connected to the narrative process of identity construction, together with modes of integration into an alien society and of intercultural influences, constitute research strategies that have broadened our understanding of the past, especially when they concern “frontier

3 Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, pp. 97–139, 146–85.

societies",⁴ such as those of southern Italy and perhaps other Byzantine provinces remote from the imperial capital as well. Out of the coexistence or close contact between different cultures, and the mutable nature of borders, these societies not only developed certain characteristics of their own, very different from those prevailing in the "centres", but they also emerged as meeting-points of different mental horizons, beliefs, and practices, thus serving as channels of communication and exchange.

The Byzantines proved incapable of defending their remote western provinces in an era when they had to face the Seljuk Turks' invasions in the eastern parts of the empire and important political crises marked by violent conflicts over the throne.⁵ How much did they know about their western enemy? The Byzantine court could not have been unaware of the Duchy of Normandy and the cultural conditions prevailing there, since prominent members of Norman society had visited Byzantium, independently of their compatriots who were conquering southern Italy.⁶ One significant example of these sorts of encounters can illustrate both the importance of the contacts between the two cultures and the limitations of modern research imposed by the lack of evidence. I am referring to the sojourn in Constantinople of Odo II Stigand and his brother Robert.⁷ In the *Chronicle* of the abbey of Sainte-Barbe-en-Auge written in the 12th century, we are informed that Odo II Stigand (1036–62), son of Odo I Stigand who belonged to the upper Norman nobility, spent three years (1057–60 or 1058–61) at the Byzantine court frequenting the close circle around the emperor. During his time there, he had been granted the titles of *protospatharios* and *tagmatophylax*,⁸ which entailed military functions in the Byzantine army. According to the anonymous author of the *Chronicle*, whilst in Byzantium, Odo II also learned Greek and acquired or improved his medical and veterinary knowledge. The reasons for his journey to Constantinople

4 For this concept, see, among others, Abulafia and Berend, *Medieval Frontiers*.

5 Vlyssidou, *The Empire in Crisis*; Lauxtermann/Whittow, *Byzantium in the Eleventh Century*.

6 Van Houts, "Normandy and Byzantium", pp. 544–59. An important merit of this work is the way in which it proves through textual analysis that the Duke of Normandy, Robert the Magnificent (1027–35), never visited Constantinople on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem (1035). This visit, which is often repeated in modern studies, is an historical anecdote probably constructed in the 1070s. Cf. Ciggaar, "Byzantine Marginalia", p. 44, who insists on Robert's visit without putting forward any new arguments. Recently, Wierzbński, "Normans and other Franks", pp. 277–88, gives an overview of the subject based on previous research and repeats the aforementioned historical inaccuracy.

7 Ciggaar, "Byzantine Marginalia", pp. 48–55.

8 Amsellem, "Les Stigand", p. 286, recapitulates Ciggaar but correctly argues that the second office granted to Odo II was that of *tagmatophylax* and not *thalamepolos*, as Ciggaar, "Byzantine Marginalia", 51, read the word *thamatephilatus* in the *Chronicle*.

remain unknown. He probably sought to enhance his social status either by increasing his reputation or by improving his military skills.⁹ After his return to Normandy, his brother Robert also travelled to Constantinople. According to the *Chronicle*, which probably used these voyages to construct a glorious founding myth for the abbey, when Robert came back to his *patria*, he brought with him the relics of St Barbara, which were used to consecrate the homonymous monastery.

Nevertheless, the most significant channel of communication between the Byzantine court and the southern Italian Normans consisted of mercenaries of Norman descent who decided to cross the Adriatic Sea in order to join the Byzantine army.¹⁰ In this respect Loud is not wrong in suggesting that Robert Guiscard started the siege of Bari in 1068 after having been informed by Norman mercenaries of the dangers that the Byzantine Empire faced at that time on its eastern frontiers. The first of these mercenaries served the empire during the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55), defending it against the Seljuk raids. Their leadership was assumed by compatriots of theirs who had been granted military functions, titles, castles, and lands in order to identify their own interests with the prosperity of the empire.¹¹ Hervé, Robert Crispin, and Roussel de Bailleul were the chieftains who, after a short career in southern Italy, came to Byzantium and assumed the leadership of the contingent of the “Franks”, as Westerners were labelled by the Byzantines.¹² Yet, they left their imprint on the Byzantine historical narratives because they were not satisfied with their socio-political status and rebelled in order to acquire more privileges.¹³ Of these, the case of Roussel de Bailleul is the most interesting, since his rebellion lasted for three years (1073–76), in which he succeeded in creating an autonomous political entity in the geopolitically important Armeniakon theme in north-eastern Asia Minor, enjoying the support of the local elites and significant political influence. It is, however, difficult

9 Amsellem, “Les Stigand”, p. 286. Ciggaar, “Byzantine Marginalia”, pp. 53–54, proposes the hypothesis that Odo II had been sent to Constantinople by Duke William I (1035–87), the future conqueror of the English royal throne, who wanted to become familiar with Byzantine imperial culture in order to acquire the necessary political skills. This assumption cannot be verified.

10 Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, p. 135.

11 Shepard, “The Uses of the Franks”, pp. 285–88.

12 Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks”, pp. 84–91.

13 Shepard, “The Uses of the Franks”, pp. 296–302. See also the more detailed study by Simpson, “Three Sources of Military Unrest”, pp. 181–207. A recent study traces Hervé’s career up until the Battle of Mantzikert (1071): Seibt, “Übernahm der Französische Normanne Hervé”, pp. 89–96. Roussel de Bailleul has been the subject of a monograph which examines his rebellion in the context of contemporary Byzantine politics, correcting inaccuracies of previous research: Leveniotis, *Το στασιαστικό κίνημα*.

to ascertain to what extent his close bonds with the local population were due to his adoption of Byzantine cultural elements, his favourable policy towards the local elites notwithstanding.¹⁴

The Janus-faced nature of the Norman mercenaries, who on the one hand constituted a crucial military force and on the other represented a considerable threat to the political stability of the empire, should have fazed the Byzantines in their efforts to find ways of assimilating the Norman war leaders into Byzantine elite society. In a recent article, Alexander Olson argues that the 11th century Byzantine historian Michael Attaleiates (c.1022–80) consciously chose to label the Normans as “Latins” – the use of this ethnic term was still unusual in the 11th century – instead of using the common definition “Franks”, in an effort to facilitate their integration into elite Byzantine circles. Drawing on ancient Roman histories, the Byzantine author’s aim was to remind his contemporaries of the ancient Latins, the inhabitants of central Italy, who, after having fought against Aeneas and his companions, finally formed an alliance with him. The alliance was consolidated through Aeneas’ marriage to a Latin woman, Lavinia, from whom a new ethnic group, that of the Romans, originated. In this way Attaleiates constructs a vague common ancestry for both Normans and Byzantines, implying that their assimilation would be honourable. He goes even so far as to present the southern Italian Normans as being indigenous, instead of foreign invaders, and to justify Robert Guiscard’s Balkan campaign by the inadequate behaviour of the Byzantines.¹⁵ Attaleiates’s efforts become more understandable if one assumes that he might have had in mind not only the Norman mercenaries fighting on the frontiers of the empire but also the Norman dissidents who frequented the imperial palace. They had rebelled against Robert Guiscard’s rule in an attempt to gain more fiefs and privileges, and they had been financially supported by the Byzantine emperors, who found an opportunity to weaken the power of their great adversary. The first of these revolts took place in 1064–67 and was finally suppressed by Robert Guiscard. Those who managed to escape from his clutches fled to the imperial court. One of them, Joscelin of Molfetta, was sent back to southern Italy at the beginning of 1071 as commander of a fleet to lift Robert Guiscard’s siege of Bari.¹⁶

14 Shepard, “The Uses of the Franks”, p. 300, speaks of a possible assimilation since Roussel had the Mother of God in Byzantine style depicted on his seal. Cf. the different view of Hoffmann, *Rudimente von Territorialstaaten*, pp. 80–82; and Leveniotis, *Το στασιαστικό κίνημα*, pp. 90–92.

15 Olson, “Working with the Roman History”, pp. 1–14.

16 Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, pp. 133–36. On this point it is worth noting that up until the 1150s Constantinople was the privileged place of exile for barons that had rebelled against Hauteville rule.

Even so, the Byzantine emperors did not burn their bridges with the new authorities of the *Mezzogiorno*. There was an immediate need to prevent the Duke of Apulia from expanding his conquests into other Byzantine provinces and, apart from that, in their minds, Robert Guiscard might prove to be an important ally in their response to the Seljuk threat. In 1071, Romanos IV Diogenes proposed a marriage alliance to Robert, the details of which remain unknown, since the emperor was soon overthrown by Michael VII Doukas.¹⁷ The new emperor repeated his proposal in 1073, and this time a treaty was concluded (1074), recorded in an imperial chrysobull. The two letters Michael VII sent to the duke inviting him to enter into an alliance, together with the text of the treaty, all composed by the Byzantine intellectual Michael Psellos, are revealing of the Byzantine mental horizons as far as the perception of the Other is concerned. In the letters, a common faith and noble lineage are presented as the motives which prompted Michael VII to accept the alliance. They reveal both the integrative power of religion and the Byzantine aristocratic ideal, which could match the knightly ethos that was constructed at about the same time in western Europe. Nevertheless, the common cultural traits could not outweigh the imperial ideal and therefore, Michael VII argued, the bond with Byzantium could enhance the prestige of the allied rulers.¹⁸ It is for this reason that the treaty, which was to be ratified by the marriage of Michael VII's son Constantine to Robert Guiscard's daughter Olympias, regards the Duke of Apulia as a ruler that was quasi-independent from the Byzantine emperor. In return for his peaceful conduct towards the empire and his support against its enemies, Robert Guiscard was granted the high court rank of *novelissimos*, together with a commensurate salary. Additionally, he received another 43

17 Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, p. 211.

18 The letters are edited by Konstantinos Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 5 vols., Venice/Paris 1876, vol. 5, nos. 143 and 144, pp. 385–92. Their similarities have raised questions about their date of composition and whether there had been two embassies sent to Robert Guiscard, with the second taking place after the duke's refusal of the first proposal. For the relevant discussion, see Kolia-Dermizaki, "Michael VII Doukas", pp. 251–68, who supports the view that for reasons of prestige only one letter had been dispatched: letter no. 143, written, according to her, in the autumn of 1073. Tinnefeld, "Ein byzantinisch-normannisches Heiratsbündnis", pp. 231–35, without touching on the subject of the embassies, dates letter no. 143 before June 1072 and letter no. 144 to the first half of July 1072, and argues that they were not dispatched in the form in which they have come down to us, since it does not match the usual form of imperial correspondence. The original letters had been revised by Psellos in order to give them a more elegant and rhetorical style to fit in with his collection.

court titles, together with their respective emoluments, to distribute them among his companions.¹⁹

The treaty's validity did not survive Michael VII's overthrow by Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–81). In fact, the fate of the emperor, which determined that of his daughter, gave Robert Guiscard the ideal pretext to fulfil his own ambition by invading the empire's Balkan provinces (1081–85). Today it is accepted that the reason behind this expedition was not the duke's aspiration to the imperial throne, as previous research had established following the worldview of the Byzantine authors, but his aim to conquer new lands for his first-born son Bohemond, who had been excluded from the paternal heritage to the benefit of his step-brother Roger Borsa, offspring of Robert Guiscard and the Lombard princess Sikelgaita. Additionally, the campaign would provide Robert Guiscard with considerable booty to distribute to his vassals and knights.²⁰ The military events are too well-known to be narrated here in detail. I will therefore confine myself to a brief description of the expedition in order to go on to discuss some important aspects of the cultural encounters between the two peoples.

After settling his disputes (June 1080) with his overlord Pope Gregory VII (1073–85), Robert Guiscard immediately began his military preparations. The appearance at his court in Salerno of a monk pretending to be the deposed Michael VII and seeking the duke's help to regain his imperial dignity, legitimized the expedition by making the emperor's restoration to the throne one of its prime aims.²¹ In May 1081, the Norman fleet sailed from Otranto; in the meantime Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) had successfully rebelled against Nikephoros III Botaneiates and ascended to the throne (February 1081). Within less than one year Robert Guiscard and his son Bohemond managed to conquer a vast swathe of the empire's north-western Balkan territories, inflicting

-
- 19 Michael Psellos, *Public Orations*, ed. G.T. Dennis, *Michaelis Pselli Orationes Forenses et Acta* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 1667), Leipzig 1994, pp. 176–81. Tinnefeld, "Ein byzantinisch-normannisches Heiratsbündnis", pp. 224–29, argues that the treaty's text, as it has come down to us, had also been revised by Psellos.
- 20 McQueen, "Relations between the Normans and Byzantium", pp. 438–42. More recently Smith, "Nobilissimus' and Warleader", pp. 507–26, underpins McQueen's argument by examining Robert Guiscard's policy in the cultural context of Norman military society.
- 21 William of Apulia, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, ed. Mathieu, iv, 162–70; Anna Komnene, *Alexias*, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, vol. 1, 1.12.vi–viii and iv.1.iii–iv. Even Pope Gregory VII appealed to southern Italian bishops (25 July 1080) to support Robert Guiscard in his effort to restore the deposed Michael VII to the throne. See *Gregorii VII Registrum*, ed. E. Caspar, *Das Register Gregors VII*, part 2 (books v–ix) (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae Selectae, 11.2), Berlin 1923, here viii.6, pp. 523–24.

a crushing defeat on Alexios I at the Battle of Dyrrachium (18 October 1081).²² Events took a different turn in the spring of 1082 when Robert Guiscard was compelled to return to Italy in order to defend Gregory VII against the German king Henry IV (1056–1105), who was marching towards Rome to assert his authority over the Holy See. In addition, the Duke of Apulia had to suppress another revolt by his vassals which then broke out, probably instigated by the Byzantine court. Bohemond remained the sole leader of the expedition, and despite his initial successes in expanding his conquests into Epirus, Macedonia, and Thessaly, he was finally defeated by Alexios I at Larissa (summer of 1083) and forced to retreat to Aulon in Albania.²³ When Robert Guiscard came back in the autumn of 1084 it was too late for the situation to be reversed; his unexpected death on 17 July 1085 in Cephalonia put an end to the Norman expansion in the Balkans.²⁴

Nevertheless, Bohemond's ambitions – after his father's death and his conflicts with the next Duke of Apulia, his half-brother Roger Borsa, he was obliged to be content with the principality of Taranto – brought him into a renewed confrontation with Alexios I. During the First Crusade (1095–99) Bohemond played a decisive role in the conquest of Antioch and managed to take over the rule of the city with the crusaders' consent, thus becoming the first prince of the homonymous principality (March 1099). The military pressure exerted on him both by the Byzantines and the Turks, who incidentally had kept him imprisoned for nearly three years (1101–04), compelled Bohemond to leave his nephew Tancred in his post and return to Europe (early in 1105) to raise support for his *outremer* dominion. In October 1107 he landed at Aulon, in an attempt to take over control of Balkan lands; however, he was soon forced to capitulate and sign the Treaty of Devol (September 1108) with Alexios, according to which he became the emperor's *homo ligius* invested with the territory of Antioch. Nevertheless, his immediate return to Italy, his death in 1111, and Tancred's insistence on his rule over the principality *de facto*, nullified the treaty.²⁵

An aspect of Robert Guiscard's invasion of Byzantium, which is closely connected with the question of cultural transmission in the medieval Mediterranean world, concerns the narrative representations of his campaign in

22 Savvides, *Byzantino-Normannica*, pp. 45–57; Theotokis, *The Norman Campaigns*, pp. 142–67, who deals mainly with the military aspects of the campaign. For a brief description of the whole expedition, see Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, pp. 214–20.

23 Savvides, *Byzantino-Normannica*, pp. 57–62; Theotokis, *The Norman Campaigns*, pp. 167–77.

24 Savvides, *Byzantino-Normannica*, pp. 63–70; Theotokis, *The Norman Campaigns*, pp. 177–84.

25 Savvides, *Byzantino-Normannica*, pp. 71–81; Theotokis, *The Norman Campaigns*, pp. 200–14. For Bohemond's effort to solicit help from the French Kingdom and the development of his anti-Byzantine propaganda, see Russo, "Il viaggio di Boemondo", pp. 3–42.

the historical work of Anna Komnene, the *Alexias*. Anna Komnene's accurate knowledge of Robert Guiscard's campaign, southern Italian politics, and even the legends that had been constructed around the Norman conquest of the *Mezzogiorno*, has not escaped the attention of researchers. The acquisition of such knowledge can be easily explained by the continuous movement of people between the two coasts of the Adriatic Sea. Besides, Anna herself includes among her personal informants an unnamed Latin, envoy of the Bishop of Bari to Robert Guiscard during his campaign.²⁶ What is, however, difficult to clarify are the remarkable similarities some passages of her work bear with sections of the history of William of Apulia, which presuppose the Byzantine author's direct access to the Latin text. William of Apulia narrated Robert Guiscard's deeds and composed his work in c.1099.²⁷ The author is a representative case of the multicultural character of southern Italy. As has been recently argued, he probably was of Greek-Lombard descent, or of Greek-speaking Lombard parents, and able to speak both languages. In his work he not only depicts the Byzantines in a positive light, but he is also very well informed on contemporary Byzantine politics, probably drawing directly on Byzantine written sources, including the histories of Michael Attaleiates and John Skylitzes or their sources.²⁸

Graham Loud, who has extensively discussed both Anna Komnene's familiarity with the political situation in the *Mezzogiorno* and the similarities between her account and that of William of Apulia, admitted the difficulty we encounter when trying to reach a conclusion about how William of Apulia's work had passed down to Anna Komnene, since it was not widely disseminated in the West and Anna did not have any knowledge of Latin.²⁹ More recently, Peter Frankopan reopened the case by providing additional textual evidence on the similarities between the two works. Taking cue from William of Apulia's pro-Byzantine stance, he argued that his work echoes the rapprochement between the Roman and the Byzantine Churches which led to the convocation of the Council of Bari in 1098. Frankopan put forward the speculative hypothesis that the unnamed Latin cited by Anna Komnene was William of Apulia himself, who had travelled to Byzantium not during Robert Guiscard's campaign but a decade later as an envoy of the Bishop of Bari to prepare for the Council of Bari; Anna did not meet him personally but she read a translation of his work, now lost.³⁰

26 Anna Komnene, *Alexias*, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, vol. 1, III.12.viii.

27 William of Apulia, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard*.

28 Brown, "The *Gesta Roberti Wiscardī*", pp. 162–79.

29 Loud, "Anna Komnena and her Sources", pp. 41–57.

30 Frankopan, "Turning Latin into Greek", pp. 80–99.

Anna Komnene's *Alexias*, almost an encomium of her father's deeds, constitutes for modern historians an important source for examining the Byzantine perceptions of the Normans, which wavered between their stereotypical labelling as "barbarians", people on the borderline of the civilized and civilizing Roman Empire, and admiration of their military prowess. Anna wrote in the light of Robert Guiscard's Balkan campaign and the empire's experience of the First and Second Crusades. To reaffirm the imperial superiority which had been challenged by Westerners, a clear demarcation of the boundaries separating the Byzantine community from the Others was required. The Normans, like any other Western people, were endowed with negative qualities, such as cultural inferiority, arrogance, and greed, which justified their characterization as "barbarians". Because of their conquests they were also regarded as tyrants, namely usurpers of the imperial power. Due to the political circumstances in which the *Alexias* was composed, even Michael VII was accused by Anna Komnene of having negotiated a "barbarian marriage" which was not in keeping with Byzantine custom.³¹

In a similar way, William of Apulia, his overall positive attitude towards the Byzantines notwithstanding, set clear boundaries between the Byzantine army and the Norman one when his narrative dealt with the first Norman struggles to settle in southern Italy. Identity is a situational representation of the "self" and the "other" discursively constructed to provide cohesion for the community and meaning to its enterprise. Byzantines were therefore labelled as cowards,³² as an effeminate people weakened by drunkenness and debauchery, who often retreated in front of a small enemy force, and whose heavy clothing did not allow them to fight.³³ This dismissive and gendered labelling comes as no surprise, given that the stereotypes shaping "otherness" are culturally defined. Whereas the Byzantines filtered the Normans through their notion of imperial ecumenicity, the Normans viewed them through the prism of their feudal society and its main value: military prowess.³⁴ It was in the same cultural framework that Geoffrey Malaterra (a Norman monk in Sicily who at the end of the 11th century narrated Roger's and Robert Guiscard's deeds) "explained" – in an effort to legitimize Robert Guiscard's Balkan expedition – why the Byzantines did not want the marriage union between Michael VII's and the Duke's families.

31 The issue of the Byzantine perceptions of the Latin Other has been thoroughly examined. See, among the most recent studies, Kazhdan, "Latins and Franks", pp. 83–100; Koder, "Latinoi", pp. 25–39; and Jeffreys/Jeffreys, "The 'Wild Beast from the West'", pp. 101–116. For Michael VII's accusation, see Anna Komnene, *Alexias*, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, vol. 1, 1.10.ii.

32 William of Apulia, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, ed. Mathieu, I, 77–79.

33 William of Apulia, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, ed. Mathieu, I, 225–28.

34 Tounta, "Norman Conquerors", pp. 141–43.

It was because they were afraid that the heirs born in the palace would give the Normans the opportunity to prevail at the imperial court, since the Byzantines, *ex more* given to pleasure and not the study of war, would finally be overcome by the strength of the Normans.³⁵ Geoffrey Malaterra's narrative is revealing of the way in which medieval people perceived themselves and others: a community's special features are not innate but shaped by the cultivation of *mores*.³⁶

Beyond the narrative construction of identities, the Byzantine court displayed a significant assimilating capacity. This assertion leads us to see an additional cultural implication in Robert Guiscard's campaign. During his inglorious expedition, Norman adventurer knights deserted their camp to continue their lives in Byzantium. The aristocratic-military ideal that these Westerners conveyed must have been attractive to the Komnenian court, which had undergone analogous social transformations.³⁷ Nevertheless, because of their rapid assimilation it is difficult to discern how their *normannitas* contributed to their reception at the court.³⁸ In any case, their swift integration into elite Byzantine society through the two most appropriate ways, marriage to aristocratic families and adoption of the Greek language and the Orthodox faith, proves the porous and liquid character of medieval political frontiers, and challenges us to read the written sources in a different light.

Three of these knights created families which endured until the Late Byzantine centuries.³⁹ Roger, son of Dagobert, went over to Alexios I's camp at the beginning of the duke's Balkan expedition in 1081. He was granted the rank of *sebastos* and assumed diplomatic missions to Latin courts. When he passed away, early in the 12th century, an epitaph was written for him by the Byzantine poet Nicholas Kallikles, which reveals the process of integration Roger had undergone by gaining the emperor's favour, being granted a court rank, and then being married to an aristocratic family.⁴⁰ His descendants were

35 Geoffrey Malaterra, *The Deeds of Count Roger*, ed. E. Pontieri, *Gaufrido Malaterra De rebus gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae comitis et Roberti Guiscardi ducis fratris eius* (Rerum Italicorum Scriptores, 5.1), Bologna 1925–28, III, 13, p. 64.

36 Tounta, *Μεσαιωνικά χάρτρες*, pp. 121–22.

37 McQueen, "Relations between the Normans and Byzantium", p. 428. For the social transformations in the Komnenian era, see Kazhdan/Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, pp. 99–119. In this regard, it is useful to recall that Manuel I Komnenos had formed an entourage of Westerners, including a few dissident Norman barons, who served him on diplomatic missions or as interpreters, although their influence in decision-making is not to be exaggerated: see Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 222–23.

38 Kaldellis, *Hellenism*, p. 294.

39 Nicol, "Symbiosis and Integration", pp. 122–35.

40 Nicholas Callikles, *Poems*, ed. R. Romano, *Nicola Callicle Carmi* (Byzantina et Neo-hellenica Neapolitana. Collana di Studi e Testi, 8), Naples 1980, poem 19, pp. 93–95.

included among the members of the high Byzantine aristocracy and even had family relations with the imperial family of the Komnenoi, such as his son John Roger-Dalassenos who married Maria, the daughter of John II Komnenos (1118–43). If the Rogerios family can no longer be traced in the sources after the 12th century, this is due to the male members' decision to adopt the apparently more prestigious surnames of their mothers.⁴¹ Roger's brother Raoul changed sides at about the same time as his brother and served the emperor as a diplomat. The members of the Raoul family also belonged to the Byzantine aristocracy and retained their Latin surname until the 14th century, and occasionally even beyond.⁴² The third Norman-Byzantine family, that of Petraliphas, was created by the Norman knight Peter of Alife, who offered his allegiance to Alexios I after Robert Guiscard's death in 1085. Peter assumed important administrative offices and diplomatic missions, and his family acquired significant portions of land in Thrace and Thessaly. After the middle of the 13th century it seems that its members, like those of the Rogerios family, took a Byzantine surname and that of Petraliphas disappeared from the sources.

The new Duke of Apulia, Roger Borsa (1085–1111), as well as his son and successor William I (1111–27), were too preoccupied with revolts by their barons to be interested in events on the other side of the Adriatic Sea. Those who gained most from these internal Apulian conflicts were the counts of Sicily, Roger I (1071–1101) and his son and successor Roger II (1105–54), who provided the dukes with military support in exchange for Calabrian and Sicilian territories which belonged to the Duchy.⁴³ As a result, the county's power increased and fuelled Roger II's political ambitions. In 1127, after the childless death of Duke William I, the count annexed the Duchy of Apulia to his county, and in 1130 he was proclaimed king by the contested Pope Anacletus II (1130–38), despite the furious reactions of the Apulian barons and the rival Pope Innocent II. Both the Byzantine and the German empires regarded their sovereign rights in the *Mezzogiorno* as having been infringed by a tyrant, a usurper of their authority, and they concluded a fragile alliance which actually never seriously threatened the Kingdom of Sicily.⁴⁴

Against this backdrop, Roger II strove for the recognition of his royal authority. Therefore, he suggested a marriage between a Byzantine princess

41 For a fuller study of Roger's descendants, see Nesbitt, "Some Observations", pp. 209–17.

42 Fassoulakis, *The Byzantine Family of Raoul-Ral(l)es*. For a member of this family who still used the surname Raoul in the 15th century, see Kolditz, "Mailand und das Despotat Morea", pp. 385–88, 400.

43 Loud, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, pp. 246–60.

44 Houben, *Roger of Sicily*, pp. 41–78; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 38–43; Tounta, "Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157)", pp. 167–214.

and one of his sons (1143–44). His proposal had been rejected by Manuel I. Furthermore Roger II failed to persuade the participants in the Second Crusade in 1147 – especially the French king Louis VII since the German king Conrad II had formed an alliance with the Byzantine emperor against the Sicilian Kingdom – to take the sea route to Jerusalem via Sicily. Thus, he decided to demonstrate his power by attacking Byzantine territories. In 1147, a Norman fleet conquered Corfu (reconquered by Manuel I in 1149), and then, sailing round the Peloponnese, burnt and ravaged many important cities, like Methone, Nauplion, Corinth, Athens, Thebes, and Chalcis. From Thebes the Normans captured women silk workers who were transferred to the palace silk workshop in Palermo, thus improving the quality of the island's silk production with their skills. The defeat of the Norman fleet by combined Byzantine and Venetian forces in the spring of 1148 did not dissuade Roger from sending another fleet in the following year, which audaciously entered the harbour of Constantinople and burnt some of the city's suburbs, thus inflicting a severe blow on Byzantine self-confidence.⁴⁵ These events triggered Byzantine polemic against the Normans, which was defined by the Byzantine idea of a civilized Roman world encountering uncultivated savages at its periphery. Roger II was seen as a tyrant, and metaphorically presented as a “sea dragon” emerging from the Adriatic Sea.⁴⁶

Thus the Adriatic – actually a channel of communication between the two cultures – was regarded rather as a frontier separating the Byzantine from the Norman dominions. A similar perception of the Adriatic can be detected in a legendary event narrated by William of Apulia. Just after the conquest of Bari (1071) a fish of a size never seen before appeared off the Adriatic coast. Robert Guiscard managed to kill it and the Normans, Apulians, and Calabrians feasted on its flesh for a long time. This fish should be understood as a metaphor for Byzantine rule, which was overthrown by Robert Guiscard. The Adriatic therefore becomes the frontier between the new political entity and the external world, while the inhabitants, regardless of the cultural group to which they belong, live peacefully side by side under a ruler who cares for his subjects. The legend perfectly reflects the Norman rulers' effort to dissolve the internal borders between the various ethnic groups in the area, and to construct external ones in order to define their territory of power and eliminate any possible external intervention.⁴⁷

45 Houben, *Roger II of Sicily*, pp. 84–90, 163.

46 Strano, “La campagna antinormanna”, pp. 81–87.

47 Tounta, *Μεσαιωνικά κάτοπτρα*, p. 111; William of Apulia, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, ed. Mathieu, III, 167–81.

A discussion of Byzantine-Norman encounters cannot overlook the fruitful research topic of the cross-cultural conditions prevailing at the Palermitan court, which had been influenced by Byzantine culture.⁴⁸ In this case the relevant channels of communication were mainly represented by the Italo-Greek subjects of the Norman rulers who, especially during the reign of Roger II, played a significant role in running the kingdom's administration. It is not fortuitous that the majority of the charters issued, either public or private, in the county of Calabria and Sicily, and more than half of those produced by the royal chancery during Roger II's reign, were written in Greek,⁴⁹ and royal seals and coins carried the figure of Roger II depicted in Byzantine style.⁵⁰ The appropriation of Byzantine cultural elements was not only intended to elicit the allegiance of the Italo-Greek communities. The Byzantine political culture, alongside the other cultures of the kingdom, played a significant role in shaping the Norman rulers' political imagery conveying concepts of imperial rule, and thus ideologically underpinned the prerogatives they claimed to have over their rebellious barons and their nominal overlord, the Roman Church.⁵¹ Before reference is made to royal imagery, it is worth mentioning a practical aspect of Roger II's administration that had been influenced by Byzantine culture, although it is difficult to determine whether there was a direct intervention on the part of his Italo-Greek subjects in this case. It concerns his legal code (1142), the so-called "Assizes of Ariano", which drew extensively on Justinian's *Corpus Iuris Civilis* that had been partially rediscovered in the monastery of Montecassino at the end of the 11th century. The code endowed Roger II with

48 Since Byzantine culture prevailed in the kingdom alongside Arab and Latin cultures, modern research focuses, despite the sparseness of the documentation, on aspects of transculturality, i.e. possible intermingling of the three cultures which would have generated new cultural forms. These hybrid forms are more likely to be detected at the royal court, as Houben, "Between Occidental and Oriental Cultures", pp. 19–33, has observed. In this regard, Mallette, *The Kingdom of Sicily*, pp. 32–36, argues that the *taris*, the coins minted by the Sicilian kings, were marked by a high degree of cultural hybridization. On the obverse the kings' name and honorific title according to Islamic formulas, along with the name of the mint and the date in the year of the Hegira, appear in Arabic. The reverse side contains the Christian symbol of the cross and the abbreviated form of the phrase "Jesus Christ will conquer" in Greek. Besides, Britt, "Roger II of Sicily: Rex, Basileus and Khalif?", pp. 21–45, argues for a distinct Sicilian religious architecture, an amalgam of Byzantine and Islamic forms.

49 Falkenhausen, "I diploma dei re normanni in lingua greca", pp. 253–308; Becker, "Charters and Chancery", pp. 79–95; Falkenhausen, "The Graeco-Byzantine Heritage", pp. 57–77.

50 Houben, *Roger II of Sicily*, pp. 119–22.

51 For a recent article discussing the limits of the influence of Byzantine imperial culture at the royal court, see Peters-Custot, "«Byzantine» versus »Imperial«", pp. 235–48.

imperial privileges, since it established the king as the sole source of law who, thanks to his special relation to God, was permitted to legislate on his own.⁵²

As far as political imagery is concerned, this is impressively visualized in the Cappella Palatina, the very heart of the palace complex in Palermo, which was consecrated in 1140 and decorated with Byzantine-style mosaics.⁵³ Another private chapel, the church of Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio, today Santa Maria della Martorana, houses the famous Byzantine mosaic depicting Roger II as *basileus* crowned by Christ himself, whose face bears a strong resemblance to that of the king.⁵⁴ In this regard, it is significant that Italo-Greek intellectuals who frequented the court, like the preacher Philagathos of Cerami (12th century), the anonymous poet who belonged to George of Antioch's circle, and Eugenius of Sicily (c.1130–1202), praised the Norman kings by using the language and specific motifs of Byzantine court poetry and referring to them as *basileis*.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, there is insubstantial evidence to determine whether, and to what extent, the royal ceremonial was influenced by the imperial one. Nevertheless, a Sicilian coronation *ordo* dating from the 12th century, which was probably compiled during Roger II's reign, contains a Byzantine *proskynesis*, the ritual kissing of the king's feet by his magnates, and the recitation of *laudes regis* first in Latin and then in Greek.⁵⁶

Moreover, the Palermitan court, especially under Roger II and his son and successor William I (1154–66), was a centre of philosophy and natural science studies which were supported by important translation activity, where philosophical and scientific texts were rendered from Greek into Latin. The contacts with the Byzantine Empire surely enhanced these intellectual quests, thus pointing to the additional intercultural function of political encounters. For instance, Henry Aristippus, an important scholar, Archdeacon of Catania and Chancellor of the Kingdom (d. 1162), went on an embassy to Constantinople in 1158–60 and brought back Greek manuscripts, including Ptolemy's *Almagest*, which had been donated to him by Manuel I. The Archdeacon had translated Plato's *Meno* and *Phaidon* from Greek into

52 Pennington, "The Normans in Palermo", pp. 140–67; Houben, *Roger II of Sicily*, pp. 135–47.

53 Tronzo, *Cultures of His Kingdom*; see also Borsook, *Messages in Mosaic*.

54 For the church, see, among others, Di Liberto, "Norman Palermo", pp. 149–53; for the mosaics, see Kitzinger, *The Mosaics of St Mary's of the Admiral*, pp. 189–97; Bacile, "Stimulating Perceptions of Kingship", pp. 17–52. The church was founded in 1143 by George of Antioch (d. 1151), a Syrian Christian who, after a career under the Tunisian Zirids, acquired important administrative and military functions at Roger II's court.

55 See, respectively, Houben, *Roger II of Sicily*, pp. 101–2; Puccia, "L'anonimo Carme di Supplica", pp. 231–62; Tounta, "Admiral Eugenius of Sicily", pp. 171–83.

56 Elze, "Tre ordines per l'incoronazione", pp. 442–43, 454–45; Houben, *Roger II of Sicily*, p. 124.

Latin, and it is probable that the Byzantine court poet John Tzetzes (12th century) alluded to these translations when praising the Norman kings for their interest in Plato's work.⁵⁷

Apart from translations, Roger II encouraged the production of original texts, including some belonging to the sphere of Byzantine culture, which is another facet of the interaction between the two courts. In 1143–44, Neilos Doxopatres, a Greek-speaking monk probably in the Italo-Greek monastery of the Holy Saviour in Messina, wrote the ecclesiastical treatise *Order of the Patriarchal Thrones* in which he firmly supported the primacy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople against the analogous claims of the Holy See.⁵⁸ Neilos should probably be identified with Nicholas Doxopatres, a high-ranking official of the Patriarchate of Constantinople during the reign of John II Komnenos, experienced in Canon Law, who fled to Sicily to escape from his enemies. The king's conflicts with the Papacy notwithstanding, it is difficult to ascertain whether Roger II intentionally commissioned this treatise, since Neilos himself introduces his work merely as an answer to relevant questions posed to him by the king. Nevertheless, the author's familiarity with contemporary Byzantine Canon Law, as revealed in the *Order*, corroborates the hypothesis for this identification.⁵⁹ Moreover, Neilos's case highlights Roger II's willingness to engage in "dialogue" with Byzantine culture, which he probably regarded as an important source for guidance in political matters.

If we accept Elena Boeck's intriguing hypothesis, this "dialogue" generated the lavishly illuminated Madrid Skylitzes manuscript, which was produced at the Palermitan court during Roger II's reign.⁶⁰ According to the art historian, the illuminations shape an additional historical narrative which reveals how the Byzantine history of the 11th century was manipulated by the Norman king in order to assert the legitimacy of his power. The plot of this visual narrative is defined by the concept of political violence: the Byzantine imperial court is denuded of its sacral aura and is cast as a bloody battlefield in which emperors elected by God are overthrown by usurpers who

57 Berschin, *Griechisch-Lateinisches Mittelalter*, pp. 272–73; Rhoby/Zagklas, "Zu einer möglichen Deutung", pp. 175–76; John Tzetzes, *Histories*, ed. P.L. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Naples 1968, 10.872–75.

58 Neilos Doxopatres, *Order of the Patriarchal Thrones*, ed. G. Parthey, *Hieroclis Synecdemus et Notitiae Graecae episcopatum; accedunt Nili Doxapatris Notitia patriarchatum et locorum nomina immutata*, Berlin 1866, pp. 265–308.

59 Morton, "A Byzantine Canon Law Scholar in Norman Sicily", pp. 724–54.

60 Boeck, *Imagining the Byzantine Past*, pp. 35–42, 69–77, 96–105, 112–15, 119, 129, 182–207, 227–38.

legitimately hold the imperial sceptre thereafter, thus blurring the distinction between kingship and tyranny. In this way, Boeck argues, the king strove to nullify the accusation of tyranny which had been made against him by both empires.⁶¹

After Roger II's death and the failure of the negotiations between the two empires over an invasion of the Kingdom of Sicily, Manuel I decided to launch a campaign in Apulia using his own forces and the support of dissident Norman barons (1155–56). This joint force proved to be ineffective and, despite its initial success in conquering Apulian coastal towns, the possession of which would have protected Byzantium's Balkan territories from Norman raids, the Byzantine army was defeated by that of William I. Manuel remained undaunted, and in the next two years he sought to create a strong base in Italy for a new Apulian expedition. He finally considered an alliance with William I more profitable, and in 1158 he signed with him the peace treaty of Benevento, which put a definitive end to Byzantine aspirations of a *Reconquista* of southern Italy, though not to the emperor's western policy.⁶² Manuel I intervened in the conflict between the German emperor Frederick I (1152–90) and Pope Alexander III (1159–81), to the latter's advantage, in an effort to obtain recognition as the sole Roman Emperor from the Roman Church.⁶³ Early in 1170, however, when Manuel I realized that his policy had not been as fruitful as he had planned, he turned to William II (1166–89), William I's son and successor, and proposed that he should enter the imperial family by marrying his daughter Maria. The Norman king accepted the proposal, and although this union would have provided Manuel I with important influence in western affairs, Maria was never sent to Italy, probably because Frederick I deceived the Byzantine Emperor by making him an ostensibly better offer.⁶⁴

William II's humiliating treatment was presented by contemporary sources as one of the motives behind the king's decision to invade the Byzantine Empire's Balkan territories and conquer Thessalonica in August 1185.⁶⁵ The

61 In my opinion, there is no substantial evidence to prove the king's personal involvement in the manuscript's production. Nevertheless, Boeck's argument remains important, even if we suggest that it was one of his Italo-Greek subjects who commissioned the work.

62 Magdalino, *The Empire*, pp. 57–61. For an overview of the events that occurred between the defeat of 1156 and the Treaty of Benevento in 1158, see Gentile Messina, "Manuele Comneno", pp. 461–92.

63 Magdalino, *The Empire*, pp. 62–66, 83–92.

64 Magdalino, *The Empire*, pp. 92–93.

65 For a comparative view of Byzantine and Western medieval sources on William II's Balkan expedition, see Gentile Messina, "I rapporti tra Sicilia e Bisanzio", pp. 57–61; for the events, see Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande*, pp. 401–15.

sack of the second most important imperial city was described by its Archbishop Eustathios (c.1115–95/96), an eyewitness of the events.⁶⁶ The archbishop endows the conflict between Byzantines and Normans with religious overtones, and presents the doctrinal differences as being responsible for the invaders' appalling atrocities. In this way he constructed solid identities which portrayed the Normans as a threat, and forced the community to gather under the guidance of its spiritual leader in order to find protection. As Catherine Holmes has pointed out, Eustathios subtly manipulated the different cultural traits of the two peoples in order to legitimize his own authority, since he had not only proved himself incompetent in handling the crisis, but he had even collaborated with the Normans.⁶⁷

Nor did these events change the framework of relations between the two powers. It was a diplomatic marriage that marked the transition of the Sicilian Kingdom to its Norman-Swabian era. The childless death of William II left the kingdom in a state of disarray. He had previously arranged the marriage of his aunt Constance, Roger II's daughter and last legitimate descendant of the Hauteville family, to Frederick's son and successor Henry VI (1190–97), and when the latter claimed the Sicilian throne *iure haereditario*, an internal conflict broke out. The anti-German faction proclaimed Tancred of Lecce (1189–94) king, an illegitimate grandson of Roger II, who died a few months before Henry VI entered Palermo. Nevertheless, in his efforts to enhance his position, Tancred had solicited help from the Byzantine Empire; in 1193 he had married his son and co-king Roger III (1192–93) to Eirene, the daughter of Emperor Isaac II Angelos (1185–95), who in 1197 was remarried to Henry VI's brother and future Roman king Philip of Swabia (1198–1208).⁶⁸

To conclude: Byzantine-Norman encounters began in the 11th century – a turbulent one for the Byzantine Empire – endured throughout the 12th century under the splendour of the Komnenian dynasty, and were influenced and shaped by factors such as Byzantium's internal political situation, the cultural traits of the Normans, and the specific character of the southern Italian conquest. Despite the predominant focus contemporary sources lay on military confrontation and official embassies, the contacts between the two sides were not confined to the spheres of war and diplomacy. The analytical tools of cultural history can therefore shed light on their interaction and broaden our

66 Eustazio di Tessalonica, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica*, ed. S. Kyriakides (Istituto siciliano di studi bizantini e neoellenici. Testi e monumenti. Testi, 5) Palermo 1961.

67 Holmes, "Shared Worlds': Religious Identities – A Question of Evidence", pp. 34–35, 39–40, 42–43.

68 Reisinger, *Tancred von Lecce*, pp. 131–60.

understanding of medieval cross-cultural communication. The Adriatic Sea became the porous frontier which permitted contact between the Byzantines and the Normans, and allowed a continuous flow of people, ideas, knowledge, and objects. Norman knights integrated themselves into Byzantine elite society and soon became completely assimilated into the new culture, thus highlighting the fact that stereotypes, as constructed by medieval authors, are manipulated to shape communities in critical situations, and thus conceal from us the fluidity of medieval identities. On the other side of the Adriatic, Byzantine culture was of great importance to a newly created kingdom that had to face internal strife, its hostile overlord the Roman Church, and the two medieval empires both of which regarded it as a product of usurpation. The Norman kings, basing themselves on their Italo-Greek subjects and the Byzantine influence in the *Mezzogiorno*, exploited imperial political imagery to endow their own power with authority, legitimacy and prestige.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anna Komnene, *Alexias*, eds. D.R. Reinsch/A. Kambylis, *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, 2 vols. (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 40.1–2), Berlin 2001.
- William of Apulia, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, ed. M. Mathieu, *Guillaume de Pouille, La Geste de Robert Guiscard* (Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici. Testi e monumenti. Testi, 4), Palermo 1961.

Secondary Literature

- Abulafia, D./Berend, N. (eds.), *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices*, Aldershot 2002.
- Amsellem, E., “Les Stigand: des Normands à Constantinople”, *Revue des études byzantines* 57 (1999), 283–88.
- Bacile, R., “Stimulating Perceptions of Kingship: Royal Imagery in the Cathedral of Monreale and in the Church of Santa Maria dell’Ammiraglio in Palermo”, *Al-Masaq* 16 (2004), 17–52.
- Becker, J., “Charters and Chancery under Roger I and Roger II”, in S. Burkhardt/T. Foerster (eds.), *Norman Tradition and Transcultural Heritage. Exchange of Cultures in the ‘Norman’ Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, Farnham 2013, pp. 79–95.
- Berschin, W., *Griechisch-Lateinisches Mittelalter. Von Hieronymus zu Nikolaus von Kues*, Bern 1980.
- Boeck, E.N., *Imagining the Byzantine Past: The Perception of History in the Illustrated Manuscripts of Skylitzes and Manasses*, New York 2015.

- Borsook, E., *Messages in Mosaic. The Royal Programmes of Norman Sicily (1130–1187)*, Oxford 1990.
- Britt, K.C., "Roger II of Sicily: Rex, Basileus, and Khalif? Identity, Politics, and Propaganda in the Cappella Palatina", *Mediterranean Studies* 16 (2007), 21–45.
- Brown, P., "The *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*: A 'Byzantine' History?", *Journal of Medieval History* 37 (2011), 162–79.
- Chalandon, F., *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, vol. 2, Paris 1907.
- Ciggaar, K., "Byzantine Marginalia to the Norman Conquest", *Anglo-Norman Studies* 9 (1986), 43–63.
- Di Liberto, R., "Norman Palermo: Architecture between the 11th and 12th century", in A. Nef (ed.), *A Companion to Medieval Palermo. The History of a Mediterranean City from 600 to 1500* (Brill's Companions to European History, 5), Leiden 2013, pp. 139–94.
- Elze, R., "Tre ordines per l'incoronazione di un re e di una regina del regno normanno di Sicilia", in *Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi sulla Sicilia Normanna, Palermo 4–8 dicembre 1972*, Palermo 1973, pp. 438–59.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "I diploma dei re normanni in lingua greca", in G. De Gregorio/O. Kresten (eds.), *Documenti medievali greci e latini: studi comparativi*, Spoleto 1998, pp. 253–308.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "The Graeco-Byzantine Heritage in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily", in S. Burkhardt/T. Foerster (eds.), *Norman Tradition and Transcultural Heritage. Exchange of Cultures in the 'Norman' Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, Farnham 2013, pp. 57–77.
- Fassoulakis, S., *The Byzantine Family of Raoul-Ral(l)es*, Athens 1973.
- Frankopan, P., "Turning Latin into Greek: Anna Komnene and the *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*", *Journal of Medieval History* 39 (2013), 80–99.
- Gentile Messina, R., "Manuele Comneno e l'Italia (1157–1158)", in G. Vespignani (ed.), *Polidoro. Studi offerti ad Antonio Carile*, Spoleto 2013, pp. 461–92.
- Gentile Messina, R., "I rapporti tra Sicilia e Bisanzio (sec. XII) nelle fonti bizantine e occidentali", in R. Lavagnini/C. Rognoni (eds.), *La Sicilia e Bisanzio nei secoli XI e XII* (Byzantino-Sicula, 6), Palermo 2014, pp. 51–61.
- Hoffmann, J., *Rudimente von Territorialstaaten im byzantinischen Reich (1071–1210). Untersuchungen über Unabhängigkeitsbestrebungen und ihr Verhältnis zu Kaiser und Reich*, Munich 1974.
- Holmes, C., "Shared Worlds': Religious Identities – A Question of Evidence", in J. Harris/C. Holmes/E. Russel (eds.), *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean World after 1150*, Oxford 2012, pp. 31–59.
- Houben, H., *Roger II of Sicily. A Ruler between East and West*, trans. G.A. Loud/D. Milburn, Cambridge 2002.
- Houben, H., "Between Occidental and Oriental Cultures: Norman Sicily as a 'Third Space'?", in S. Burkhardt/T. Foerster (eds.), *Norman Tradition and Transcultural*

- Heritage. Exchange of Cultures in the 'Norman' Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, Farnham 2013, pp. 19–33.
- Jeffreys, E./Jeffreys, M., “‘The Wild Beast from the West’: Immediate Literary Reactions in Byzantium to the Second Crusade”, in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, D.C. 2001, pp. 101–16.
- Kaldellis, A., *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge 2007.
- Kazhdan, A., “Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century”, in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, D.C. 2001, pp. 83–100.
- Kazhdan, A.P./Wharton Epstein, A., *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 7), Berkeley 1985.
- Kitzinger, E., *The Mosaics of St Mary's of the Admiral in Palermo*, Washington D.C., 1990.
- Koder, J., “Latinoi – The Image of the Other According to Greek Sources”, in C.A. Maltezou/P. Schreiner (eds.), *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo). Atti del colloquio internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, Venezia, 1–2 dicembre 2000*, Venice 2002, pp. 25–39.
- Kolditz, S., “Mailand und das Despotat Morea nach dem Fall von Konstantinopel”, in S. Kolditz/R.C. Müller (eds.), *Geschehenes und Geschriebenes. Studien zu Ehren von Günther S. Henrich und Klaus-Peter Matschke*, Leipzig 2005, pp. 368–407.
- Kolia-Dermitzaki, A., “Michael VII Doukas, Robert Guiscard and the Byzantine-Norman Marriage Negotiations”, *Byzantinoslavica* 58 (1997), 251–68.
- Lauritzen, F., “Achilles at the Battle of Ostrovo: George Maniakes and the Perception of the Iliad”, *Byzantinoslavica* 72 (2014), 171–87.
- Lauxtermann, M.D./Whittow, M. (eds.), *Byzantium in the Eleventh Century. Being in Between. Papers from the 45th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, Oxford, 24–6 March 2012*, London 2017.
- Leveniotis, G., *Το στασιαστικό κίνημα του Νορμανδού Ουρσελίου (Ursel de Bailleul) στην Μικρά Ασία (1073–1076)*, Thessaloniki 2004.
- Loud, G.A., “Anna Komnena and Her Sources for the Normans in Southern Italy”, in I. Wood/G. Loud (eds.), *Church and Chronicle in the Middle Ages. Essays Presented to John Taylor*, London 1991, pp. 41–57.
- Loud, G.A., *The Age of Robert Guiscard. Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest*, Harlow 2000.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993.
- McQueen, W.B., “Relations between the Normans and Byzantium 1071–1112”, *Byzantion* 56 (1986), 427–76.
- Mallette, K., *The Kingdom of Sicily, 1100–1250. A Literary History*, Philadelphia 2005.

- Morton, J., "A Byzantine Canon Law Scholar in Norman Sicily: Revisiting Neilos Doxopatres's *Order of the Patriarchal Thrones*", *Speculum* 92 (2017), 724–54.
- Nesbitt, J., "Some Observations about the Roger Family", *Nea Rhome* 1 (2004), 209–17.
- Nicol, D.M., "Symbiosis and Integration. Some Greco-Latin Families in Byzantium in the 11th to 13th Centuries", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 7 (1979), 113–35.
- Olson, A., "Working with Roman History: Attaleiates' Portrayal of the Normans", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41 (2017), 1–14.
- Pennington, K., "The Normans in Palermo: King Roger II's Legislation", *Haskins Society Journal* 18 (2006), 140–67.
- Peters-Custot, A., "«Byzantine» versus «Imperial» Kingdom. How «Byzantine» was the Hauteville King of Sicily?", in F. Daim/C. Gastgeber/D. Heher/C. Rapp (eds.), *Menschen, Bilder, Sprache, Dinge. Wege der Kommunikation zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen*, vol. 2: *Menschen und Worte*, Mainz 2018, pp. 235–48.
- Puccia, M., "L'anonimo Carme di Supplica a Giorgio di Antiochia e l'elaborazione dell'idea imperiale alla corte di Ruggero II", in M. Re/C. Rognoni (eds.), *Giorgio di Antiochia. L'arte della politica in Sicilia nel XII secolo tra Bisanzio e l'Islam* (Byzantino-Sicula, 5), Palermo 2009, pp. 231–62.
- Reisinger, C., *Tankred von Lecce: normannischer König von Sizilien 1190–1194* (Kölner Historische Abhandlungen, 38), Cologne 1992.
- Rhoby, A./Zagklas, N., "Zu einer möglichen Deutung von Πανιώτης", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 61 (2011), 171–77.
- Russo, L., "Il viaggio di Boemondo di Altavilla in Francia (1106): un riesame", *Archivio Storico Italiano* 603 (2005), 3–42.
- Savvides, A.G.C., *Γεώργιος Μανιάκης. Κατακτήσεις και υπονόμευση στο Βυζάντιο του ενδέκατου αιώνα (1030–1043)*, Athens 2004.
- Savvides, A.G.C., *Byzantino-Normannica. The Norman Capture of Italy (to A.D. 1081) and the First Two Norman Invasions in Byzantium (A.D. 1081–1085 and 1107–1108)* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 165), Leuven 2007.
- Seibt, W., "Übernahm der Französische Normanne Hervé (Erbebios Phrangopoulos) nach der Katastrophe von Mantzikert das Kommando über die verblieben Ostarmee?", *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 10 (2010), 89–96.
- Shepard, J., "Byzantium's Last Sicilian Expedition: Skylitzes' Testimony", *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 14–16 (1977–79), 145–59.
- Shepard, J., "The Uses of the Franks in Eleventh-Century Byzantium", *Anglo-Norman Studies* 15 (1993), 275–305.
- Simpson, A.J., "Three Sources of Military Unrest in Eleventh Century Asia Minor: the Norman Chieftains Hervé Frankopoulos, Robert Crispin and Roussel de Bailleul", *Mésogeios/Mediterranée* 9–10 (2000), 181–207.
- Smith Jr., R.U., "«Nobilissimus» and Warleader. The Opportunity and the Necessity Behind Robert Guiscard's Balkan Expeditions", *Byzantion* 70 (2000), 507–26.

- Strano, G., "La campagna antinormanna per la riconquista di Corfù (1149): Schemi ideologici e contingenza storica nelle fonti letterarie bizantine", in R. Lavagnini/C. Rognoni (eds.), *La Sicilia e Bisanzio nei secoli XI e XII* (Byzantino-Sicula, 6), Palermo 2014, pp. 76–94.
- Theotokis, G., *The Norman Campaigns in the Balkans, 1081–1108* (Warfare in History), Woodbridge 2014.
- Tinnefeld, F., "Ein byzantinisch-normannisches Heiratsbündnis im Jahr 1074", in H. Seibert/G. Thoma (eds.), *Von Sachsen bis Jerusalem. Menschen und Institutionen im Wandel der Zeit. Festschrift für Wolfgang Giese zum 65. Geburtstag*, Munich 2004, pp. 221–36.
- Tounta, E., "Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157). Die deutsch-byzantinischen Beziehungen und die 'Heiligkeit' des staufischen Reiches", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 131 (2011), 167–214.
- Tounta, E., *Μεσαιωνικά κάτοπτρα εξουσίας. Ιστορικοί και αφηγήματα στο νορμανδικό ιταλικό Νότο*, Athens 2012.
- Tounta, E., "The Norman Conquerors between *Epos* and *Chanson de Geste*: The Perception of Identities in Cultural Flows", in S. Burkhardt/T. Foerster (eds.), *Norman Tradition and Transcultural Heritage. Exchange of Cultures in the 'Norman' Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, Farnham 2013, pp. 125–47.
- Tounta, E., "Admiral Eugenius of Sicily (12th c.): Court Poetry and Political Propaganda in a Cross-Cultural Environment", in N. Chrissis/A. Kolia-Dermitzaki/A. Papageorgiou (eds.), *Byzantium and the West: Perception and Reality*, London 2019, pp. 171–83.
- Tronzo, W., *The Cultures of His Kingdom. Roger II and the Capella Palatina in Palermo*, Princeton 1997.
- Van Houts, E.M.C., "Normandy and Byzantium in the Eleventh Century", *Byzantion* 55 (1985), 544–59.
- Vlyssidou, V.N. (ed.), *The Empire in Crisis (?). Byzantium in the 11th Century (1025–1081)*, Athens 2003.
- Wierzbinski, S., "Normans and Other Franks in 11th Century Byzantium: the Careers of the Adventurers before the Rule of Alexius I Comnenus", *Studia Ceranea* 4 (2014), 277–88.

PART 3

Byzantium and a Multifaceted Latin World



Byzantium and Scandinavia

Daniel Föller

1 Introduction: The Myth of the Varangians¹

When entering the tranquility of the Swedish History Museum from the busy streets of Stockholm, there is an unexpected encounter in the entrance hall: a huge Hellenistic sitting lion, more than 3 m in height. How can we explain a full-scale plaster copy of a sculpture from 4th-century BC. Piraeus in a museum dedicated to objects “excavated and found in what is now called Sweden”?² An answer is provided on the lion’s sides, where traces of three runic graffiti are rendered visible by red paint. The largest of these inscriptions is arranged within an ornamental snake, a characteristic feature of 11th-century runestones from Sweden, especially from the region around Lake Mälaren. The runes reveal that Viking-Age Swedes must have been present in Piraeus at a time when the harbour – like the rest of Greece – was controlled by the Byzantine Empire.³ The presence of this foreign artefact in the heart of Swedish national identity shows that medieval relations with Byzantium are conceived as an integral part of pre-modern Swedish history, and still meaningful today.

In Scandinavia (not only Sweden), contacts between the medieval North and Byzantium are part of the narrative about “Viking” ancestors, who are now seen as mobile traders, technical innovators, and cosmopolitan cultural brokers rather than as conquerors and colonists, the latter being earlier attributions which are largely overwritten today.⁴ Also in Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine, the presence of early-medieval Scandinavians on their way to Byzantium is significant for national identity, since the earliest historiographical text in the Old

1 This publication is part of the DFG-funded Cluster of Excellence “The Formation of Normative Orders” and the LOEWE-funded research cluster “Prehistoric Conflict Research”, both at Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main.

2 This mission of the Swedish History Museum is described on its home page: <http://www.historiska.se> (accessed 14/09/2021). For a recent survey of the plaster copy, see Zetterström Geschwind, “A Majestic Copycat in Motion”.

3 After the original sculpture (at the *Arsenale* in Venice since 1688) had been cleaned in 2008, the runologist Thorgunn Snædal reexamined the inscriptions and proposed a new reading: Snædal, “Runes from Byzantium”.

4 For one of the few surveys on the subject, see Svanberg, *Decolonizing the Viking Age* 1, pp. 36–99.

East Slavonic language – the so-called *Primary Chronicle* or *Tale of the Bygone Years* (c.1116) – stated that Scandinavians (“Varangians” in the text) founded and ruled the first polities of the Rus’, the ancestors of Russia.⁵ The scientific discovery of this chronicle in the 18th century led to the “Normanist controversy”, a debate about Slavic and Scandinavian contributions to the emergence of the Rus’ as an ethnic and political entity. This debate still lingers on, at least in political discourse.⁶

These nationalist genealogies are in stark contrast to the fluid identities visible in the medieval material, at least when considering Scandinavia. While “Byzantium” for the period in question could be described perspicuously as the empire of the *Rhōmaioi* and its cultural surroundings, things are much more complicated in 10th- to 12th-century Northern Europe. Before c.1100, when major ethnic groups such as Danes, Swedes, Norwegians, Icelanders, Orcadians, or Manx had emerged, and with them corresponding political communities, the self-designations found in Scandinavian texts were both ambiguous and unstable, often being customized for specific social or cultural purposes and contexts.⁷ Things are no clearer when considering non-Scandinavian texts describing Northerners. For example, in Byzantine texts a myriad of names and denominations for Northern barbarians can be found which conform with known Scandinavian self-designations on irritatingly few occasions, although some were directly transferred from Old Norse into Greek.⁸ This means that any collective name for Scandinavians must be an analytical anachronism. For the purpose of not reproducing the nationalist narratives sketched above, it seems useful to turn to the Old Norse sources and their definition of supra-regional collectives. The only overall designations that medieval Scandinavians actually used for themselves (at the latest from c.1000/1015 onwards) are the “Danish tongue” (i.e. Old Norse) on the one hand, and the “Northern lands” on the other.⁹ The former definition shall be borrowed for this article; “Scandinavians” – which is as an anachronistic term as “Byzantium” – will mean persons or groups speaking Old Norse

5 For the text see *Povest' Vremennykh Let*, trans. Cross/Sherbowitz-Wetzor, pp. 59–60.

6 The literature discussing these problems is so vast that the debate itself has become a topic of research. The most extensive surveys are: Scholz, *Von der Chronistik zur modernen Geschichtswissenschaft*; Latvakangas, *Riksgrundarna*; and Klejn, *Soviet Archaeology*.

7 As shown by Christiansen, *The Norsemen in the Viking Age*, pp. 64–86 and 112–32.

8 A concise discussion of the Byzantine denominations is lacking so far, although extensive studies on singular terms exist. The (incomplete) list includes: *Barangoi*, *Bretannikoi*, *Dromitai*, *Enklinoi/Inglinoi*, *Germanoi*, *Keltai*, *Koulpingoi*, *Pelekēphoroi/ Pelekypchoroi*, *Rhōs*, *Skythai*, *Tauroskeythai*.

9 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 47–48 for references.

dialects or – in archaeological contexts – bearing cultural traits chiefly found in regions inhabited by Old Norse-speakers. This means that the Rus' are only understood as (partly) Scandinavian as long as they speak an Old Norse dialect and Scandinavian traits within their material culture are considerable. Both aspects were changing during the second half of the 10th century, as a distinct Rus' culture emerged, which is why Rus'-Byzantine relations from the later 10th century are only treated incidentally in this paper.

To provide a multifaceted picture of Byzantine-Scandinavian relations from c.900 to 1204, it will be necessary to proceed in four steps: firstly, the sources and materials available to explore this topic have to be introduced, together with the main research problems resulting from the nature of this evidence. Secondly, a short survey of face-to-face-encounters between Byzantines and Scandinavians is to be sketched; in the third part it will be shown how Byzantines and Scandinavians perceived and described each other during these centuries. The fourth and last step before concluding will offer an investigation of cultural transfer and patterns of influence between Byzantium and Scandinavia (and vice versa).

2 The Preeminence of the Saga: Sources and Their Problems

When looking at the evidence for Byzantine-Scandinavian relations from the 10th century to 1204, a disequilibrium is to be noted. For the first two centuries of the period, the sources available to us are very sparse and scattered. Apart from a few dozen references in Byzantine texts, and even fewer in Latin, Arabic, and Caucasian documents,¹⁰ the most important contemporary materials are the finds and records of archaeological excavations.¹¹ Scandinavian and Rus' communities were predominantly oral cultures. They did not produce books before the middle of the 11th century, despite the fact that they had been Christianized since the middle of the 10th, and that a script system existed in

10 For the Arabic material, see the handbook-chapters by Mikkelsen, "The Vikings and Islam"; and Montgomery, "Arabic Sources on the Vikings", with further references. Neither the Latin nor the Caucasian (i.e. Georgian and Armenian) sources are treated separately, but only in conjunction with other material.

11 Much of the archaeological material on the Scandinavians in eastern Europe is assembled by Duczko, *Viking Rus*. For finds of Byzantine objects on the Scandinavian peninsula, see Androshchuk, "What does Material Evidence"; Duczko, "Viking Sweden and Byzantium"; id., "Byzantine Presence in Viking Age Sweden"; Müller-Wille, "Relations between Byzantium and the North in the Light of Archaeology"; Roslund, "Brosamen vom Tisch der Reichen".

Scandinavia: the runes of the Younger Futhark. The most ancient texts from the North reflecting contacts with Byzantium are therefore some runestones erected for commemoration, and short fragments of orally transmitted court poetry, so-called Skaldic stanzas, both dated to the 11th century.¹²

From the end of the 11th century, the number of texts dealing with Byzantine-Scandinavian relations increases dramatically, in Byzantium as well as in Rus' and – most significantly – also in Scandinavia. The most important genres are historiography, scholarly texts, and literature, especially dozens of Old Norse sagas.¹³ While this development is linked to the process of Christianization in Rus' and Scandinavia (during which stable ecclesiastical communities emerged and began to produce books), and to the need to reassure the identity of the new Christian polities, the rising level of attention for Scandinavians in Byzantine texts is a result of their growing presence in Constantinople during the Komnenian period. Many of these texts from all three areas not only describe contemporaneous contacts, but also speak of past relations. As a consequence, older narratives were overwritten and complemented, partly by rearranging their information to fit them into current structures, and partly by projecting recent observations into the past and thereby creating new information.¹⁴

These narratives of the 12th and 13th centuries – bold Vikings sailing to Byzantium, becoming the most trusted and loyal mercenaries of the emperors in the “Varangian guard” until those glorious days were ended by the Crusades – have often been reproduced by modern historians until recently, and have shaped the image of the “Varangians”, as Scandinavians in the East are customarily termed in research and public discourse. Three reasons for this can be identified: firstly, the sources of the 12th and 13th centuries offer much more (though often dubious) information than the earlier fragments, and moreover, they structure it in easily recognisable narrative patterns. Secondly, the oral traditions which many of these sources processed were for a long time believed to be very stable and reliable, granting direct access to much

12 See the survey in Jesch, *Ships and Men in the Late Viking Age*, pp. 89–107. Fuller bibliographic references are offered by Lilie et al., *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung. Prolegomena*, pp. 274–82 (runes); and Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 50, 309–19, 1181–94 (Skaldic stanzas). The latest study is Källström, “Byzantium Reflected in the Runic Inscriptions of Scandinavia”.

13 The whole corpus of Byzantine and Scandinavian texts from c.1060 onwards is collected by Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 81–1171 as an appendix, and thoroughly analysed in the main chapters; bibliographical references there are exhaustive. The latest contributions are: Litvina/Uspenskij, “Contempt for Byzantine Gold”; and Jakobsson, “The Varangian Legend”.

14 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 171–89, 293–373.

older knowledge; thirdly, the standard work on the subject by Sigfús Blöndal, published in 1954 in Icelandic and 1978, heavily revised in English, is based on the two former premises, and until now no scholarly synthesis on the subject has been written to replace this old historiographical narrative.¹⁵ A number of smaller studies challenged some aspects of it, but most of them aligned their results to its overarching structure.¹⁶ Nonetheless, this powerful narrative, deeply rooted in the historiographical tradition of various European nations, has recently been challenged, if not utterly deconstructed.

In 2015, the German medievalist Roland Scheel published a comprehensive study in two volumes, titled *Scandinavia and Byzantium. Conditions and Consequences of Medieval Cultural Relations*.¹⁷ He applies up-to-date source-critical arguments and methods to the material on Byzantine-Scandinavian relations, especially texts and objects attributed to the 12th and 13th centuries, interpreting them within the historical context in which they were produced. In doing so, he shows that the period between c.1080 and 1210 was indeed the climax of Scandinavian-Byzantine encounters, not its decline, resulting in elaborate discourses about the other in both cultures, which proved to be so strong that they even survived the severance of direct contacts following the catastrophe of 1204. Although Scheel's study is aiming primarily at those discourses, the history of actual encounters of Byzantines and Scandinavians in the 12th and 13th centuries, as well as many aspects of earlier relations and sources, are extensively discussed and reinterpreted, turning the book into an indispensable reference on the subject. Since he convincingly argues that semantics and perceptions of both Byzantines and Scandinavians with regard to the other changed drastically over the course of centuries, it is beyond dispute that the earlier material (with which he only partially deals) also needs to be reassessed in a similar way. A new book on the subject was published in October 2020 by

15 The original book, published posthumously after his death in 1945 is Blöndal, *Væringjasaga*; the revised version is id., *The Varangians of Byzantium*. The more popular books Ellis Davidson, *The Viking Road to Byzantium*; and Larsson, *Väringar* are reproducing the aforementioned patterns.

16 The scholarly literature on the topic is vast and widely scattered. Nonetheless, a number of collections have appeared over the last decades (from 1970 to 2016): Hannestad (ed.), *Varangian Problems*; Zeitler (ed.), *Les pays du Nord et Byzance*; Piltz (ed.), *Bysans och Norden*; Andersen/Hägg (eds), *Hellas og Norge*; Fledelius/Schreiner (eds), *Byzantium*; Müller-Wille (ed.), *Rom und Byzanz im Norden*; Piltz (ed.), *Byzantium and Islam in Scandinavia*; Janson (ed.), *Från Bysans till Norden*; Garipzanov/Tolochko (eds), *Early Christianity on the Way from the Varangians to the Greeks*; Bjerg/Lind/Sindbæk (eds), *From Goths to Varangians*; Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds), *Byzantium and the Viking World*.

17 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*; significant parts of his argument are tightly outlined in id., "Concepts of Cultural Transfer between Byzantium and the North".

the Icelandic historian Sverrir Jakobsson.¹⁸ Unfortunately, it appeared too late to evaluate it thoroughly and include its findings in this paper.

3 On the “Eastern Way” and Beyond: Contacts between Scandinavia and Byzantium

During the whole period from c.900 to 1204, Scandinavians travelled to Byzantium on a more or less regular basis.¹⁹ This mobility was clearly asymmetrical, since the earliest report about a contemporary Byzantine traveller to Scandinavia is to be found in a text from c.1440.²⁰ Three phases of these contacts can be distinguished, each of them characterized by specific constellations. During the first phase (9th–later 10th century), Scandinavians were part of multi-ethnic groups of warrior-traders designated as “Rus”, who reached Byzantium by travelling from the Baltic Sea by land and rivers or lakes to the Black Sea. In later sources this route was called the “Eastern Way” (*austrvegr*) in Old Norse, and “trade route from the Varangians to the Greek” (*put’ iz Vareg’ v Greki*) in Old East Slavonic.²¹ In the second phase (later 10th century–c.1100), the Rus’ emerged as a distinct ethnic group in eastern Europe, Christianized by the Greek Church and largely slavized, while in Scandinavia, likewise, major ethnic groups and polities arose, Christianized by Latin missionaries. Rus’ and Scandinavians were no longer the same.²² Scandinavians still travelled to

18 Jakobsson, *The Varangians*.

19 Scandinavian travellers to Byzantium are included in several prosopographical works, but none of them is comprehensive: Korpela, *Beiträge zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte* has a nearly comprehensive list until c.1125, but the single articles are very short and are hardly referencing previous research; Waßenhoven, *Skandinavier unterwegs in Europa* begins c.1000, evaluates few Byzantine texts, and does not list anonymous travellers; Lilie et al., *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung* is comprehensive, but covers only the period up to the first half of the 11th century; Jeffreys et al., *Prosopography of the Byzantine World* is covering the rest of the Middle Byzantine period until 1204, but the database is not yet finished (and possibly may never be). A useful survey is the chapter in Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 102–28.

20 Most researchers consider this report to be factual, e.g. Harris, “When did Laskaris Kananos Travel in the Baltic Lands?”; but Makris, “Beschreibung der Nordlandreise” argues convincingly that it was compiled completely from Italian sources from the 14th and 15th centuries.

21 For the early occurrences of the Old Norse term, see Jesch, *Ships and Men in the Late Viking Age*, pp. 89–90; for the later ones, see Zilmer, “*He Drowned in Holmr’s Sea*”, pp. 291–93. The East Slavonic derives mainly from *Povest’ Vremennykh Let*, trans. Cross/Sherbowitz-Wetzor, p. 53.

22 For this process, see Melnikova/Petrukhin, “The Origin and Evolution of the Name *Rus*”. Nonetheless, this transformation was gradual, as some Scandinavian elements remained a part of Rus’ian culture, and contacts with Scandinavia were close.

Byzantium on the established “Eastern Way”, but not as a regular part of the Rus’ anymore, who now acted as intermediaries. The third phase (later 11th century–1204) saw massive changes: the “Eastern Way” came out of use – most probably because of menacing steppe-peoples – while the Scandinavians participated in the Western crusading movement and travelled to Byzantium via the Mediterranean Sea.²³ The integration of the Scandinavians into Latin Europe (which lessened the cultural distance to Byzantium), direct access without the Rus’ intermediating, and new opportunities due to the changes that occurred in Byzantium after the Komnenians had seized power, pushed the contacts to a new level.

Following these preliminary remarks, the five principal forms of direct Byzantine-Scandinavian encounters shall be introduced: trade, military conflict, mercenarism, religion, and diplomacy. Each of them has its own logic, but is at the same time discussed within the frame of the three-phase model sketched above.

Already before the 10th century, objects produced in, or traded across, the eastern Mediterranean or the Black Sea region found their way to Scandinavia, indicating the existence of networks of long-distance-exchange.²⁴ But only from the 10th century onwards can more details be learned from written sources. Around 950, a text written by, or for, the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, later called *De administrando imperio*, described the economic activities of Rus’ warrior-traders who extorted tributes in eastern Europe during the winter and transported those goods to Constantinople in the summer.²⁵ In the 12th-century *Russian Primary Chronicle*, three treaties between princes of the Rus’ and Byzantine Emperors from c.911, 944, and 971 have been inserted into the narrative, the first two of them regulating details of trade activities and sea transport.²⁶ The Pilgårds runestone from late 10th-century Gotland – a major trading centre in the Baltic region – erected by sailors in memory of a comrade who drowned in the Dnieper-rapids, shows that

23 See Franklin/Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus’*, p. 204 for steppe peoples threatening the trade routes. The most comprehensive study on Scandinavian crusaders was already written in the 1860s and has not yet been replaced; it is to be used with caution: Riant, *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des croisades*. See also the prosopographical record by Waßenhoven, *Skandinavien unterwegs in Europa*.

24 See Ljungkvist, “Influences from the Empire”.

25 See Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, *De administrando imperio*, ch. 9, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, vol. 1, pp. 56–63 (text), vol. 2, pp. 16–61 (commentary). A full account of the text’s dealings with the Rus’ can be found in Mel’nikova, “*Rhosia* and the Rus in Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos’ *De administrando imperio*”.

26 *Povest’ Vremennykh Let*, trans. Cross/Sherbowitz-Wetzor, pp. 65–69, 73–77. The original texts are separately edited and annotated: Carile/Sacharov (eds), *I trattati dell’ Antica Russia con l’impero Romano d’Oriente*.

travellers to Byzantium came from Scandinavia itself along the “Eastern Way” and also returned there.²⁷ The latest evidence for this direct trade is another Gotlandic runestone, raised c.1100 by a Scandinavian traveller commemorating his business partner at Berezan’, an island situated in the Black Sea close to the Dnieper mouth.²⁸ The volume of this trade to Byzantium is uncertain. While the written evidence implies it was large scale, only few Byzantine objects were excavated in Scandinavia, and the number of Byzantine coins found in hoards from Scandinavian contexts is humble when compared to the masses of silver from Muslim or Western European sources.²⁹ Research has not yet found an explanation for this discrepancy.

The other activity of the Rus’ warrior-traders was raiding, and they exercised it also in the Byzantine sphere of influence. Since the 9th century, Scandinavians raided Byzantine-controlled territory as part of Rus’ groups time and again, and even Constantinople itself was attacked several times (860, 907, 941), but never taken.³⁰ When compared to the Viking incursions in western Europe, these attacks were far less frequent and devastating. Byzantium never had a serious “Viking problem”, presumably because of its effective and well-organized military and navy. Since the middle of the 10th century, when the Rus’ became a significant regional power, the character of conflicts with Byzantium changed, and two wars (970–71 and 987) were fought on the periphery of the empire as the Rus’ tried to expand their sphere of influence. In both cases, Scandinavians fought as mercenaries in the service of the Rus’ princes.³¹ Whether Scandinavians also took part in the raid of the Rus’ warlord Chrysocheir in the Aegean (c.1024), and the last Rus’ attack on Constantinople (1043) is uncertain but very likely when taking into consideration the intense relations of Rus’ and Scandinavians at the time.³²

27 The standard edition of the inscription with an exhaustive bibliography and review of the research so far, is Helmersson, “Boge socken”, pp. 24–70 (no. 280).

28 The inscription is edited in Arne, “Den svenska runstenen från ön Berezanj”; recent literature is listed within the prosopographical records in Lilie et al., *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung*, vol. 2, pp. 545–46 (Grani, no. 22320), vol. 3, pp. 483–84 (Karl, no. 23677).

29 See Jankowiak, “Byzantine Coins in Viking-Age Northern Lands” for a recent survey.

30 See Franklin/Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus’*, pp. 50–70. Treadgold, “Three Byzantine Provinces” argues that the first attack on Byzantine territory happened c.818/19.

31 Franklin/Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus’*, pp. 139–69 give an overview of Rus’ politics in this period. Lübke, *Fremde im östlichen Europa*, pp. 298–325 sketches the role of foreign mercenaries within eastern European communities.

32 For Chrysocheir see Lilie et al., *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung*, vol. 2, p. 23 (Chrysocheir, no. 21341); for the attack of 1043, see Shepard, “Why did the Russians Attack Byzantium in 1043?”; and Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 321–30.

Scandinavian warriors not only fought against the Byzantines, but also for them. According to lists of payments to soldiers and mercenaries, Rus' groups of several hundred warriors were hired occasionally from at least 902.³³ Based on 12th- and 13th-century texts, modern Scandinavian historians invented the narrative of a special Scandinavian regiment within the Byzantine army, the so-called "Varangian guard", thought to be founded in 988 after the Rus' prince Vladimir is said to have sent 6000 Scandinavian fighters to Emperor Basil II.³⁴ In fact, no traces of such a unit can be found in contemporary sources until the 12th century.³⁵ Nonetheless, Scandinavian mercenaries served in Byzantium time and again, the most prominent of them being the future Norwegian king Harald Hardrada c.1034–44.³⁶ After Alexios I Komnenos had seized power in 1081 and reorganized the military, Scandinavian mercenaries, denominated as *Barangoi*, became increasingly important, especially in the capital and at court. During the 12th century, when Scandinavian crusaders visited Constantinople regularly as a part of their journey, many of them took service with the Byzantines.³⁷ In 1204, they were present during the capture of Constantinople, but contrary to the popular imagination of brave Norsemen fighting until the end, the *Barangoi* (professional mercenaries as they were) refused to engage in a lost battle.³⁸ Many Scandinavian mercenaries returned to their northern homelands after having finished their term of service, but some apparently stayed in Byzantium. The few Scandinavian immigrants who can be shown to have been integrated into Byzantine (high) society seem to have come originally as mercenaries.

Apart from these economic and military relations, religious contacts occurred. As early as 867, only seven years after the first Rus' siege of Constantinople, Patriarch Photios reported in a letter that the pagan Rus' had been

33 See Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae* II 44, ed. and trans. Dagron et al, vol. 3, pp. 295–311, trans. Moffatt/Tall, vol. 2, pp. 651–61; and Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 95–96, 132–36 for the context.

34 The classical reference for this is Blöndal, *The Varangians of Byzantium*, pp. 45–53. The relevant literature is listed in Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 27–28 and shows the persistence of this narrative.

35 See the extensive argument by Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 77–164, 259–71, emphasizing the racist undertone of the old narrative. The existence of a distinct Scandinavian unit within the Byzantine military of the 10th and 11th century was already doubted by Kühn, *Die byzantinische Armee im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, pp. 31–33, 123–28.

36 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 126–38, 293–339 for Harald and his time in Byzantium, including the complicated source problems.

37 The indispensable reference is again Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 164–271.

38 Niketas Choniates, *History*, ed. van Dieten, p. 572, trans. Magoulas, p. 314. For the context, see Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 248–56.

converted to the Christian faith, and requested a bishop.³⁹ His elation came too early, since the aforementioned treaty of 911 neatly divided (pagan) Rus' from "Christians", that is Byzantines.⁴⁰ But there must have been some missionary effort towards the Rus'. In the treaty of 944, some Rus' are said to "have adopted the Christian faith", and in 946 or 957, Ol'ga/Helga of Kiev – the widow of the Kievan prince and regent for her infant son at the time – was baptised in Constantinople, her godparents being Emperor Constantine VII and his wife.⁴¹ Nonetheless, this was no final victory for the Church of Constantinople: in 962, Ol'ga/Helga negotiated with Ottonian emperor Otto I about integrating the Rus' into the Roman Church, and she was not able to persuade her son, Svyatoslav (prince c.963–72) to adopt Christianity.⁴² Only in 988 was her grandson Vladimir, by now ruling Kiev himself, baptised, married a Byzantine princess, installed Greek clergy, and began to actively promote the conversion of the Rus'.⁴³ Whether Byzantine missionaries ever reached Scandinavia and competed with Western clerics in converting the Norse is uncertain, but nonetheless features of Byzantine Christianity were present in 10th- and 11th-century Scandinavia, implying that at least some of the travellers to Byzantium adopted the Christian faith there.⁴⁴

From the mid-11th century onwards, a new type of Scandinavian traveller reached the Byzantine world: the pilgrim.⁴⁵ After humble beginnings, the crusader movement boosted the number of Scandinavians going on pilgrimage to the Holy Land (both armed and unarmed), and also to Constantinople from 1096, which itself became a major destination for the pilgrims.⁴⁶

Diplomatic relations between Scandinavians and the Byzantine Emperors can be observed from the 9th century, and they accompanied the

39 Photius, *Letters*, no 2, eds. Laourdas/Westerink, vol. 1, pp. 49–50.

40 *Povest' Vremennykh Let*, trans. Cross/Sherbowitz-Wetzor, pp. 66–68. The use of the treaties as a source for the history of Christianization, is discussed by Lind, "Christianity on the Move", pp. 412–21.

41 *Povest' Vremennykh Let*, trans. Cross/Sherbowitz-Wetzor, p. 74. For the scholarly debates concerning Ol'ga/Helga, see Tinnefeld, "Zum Stand der Olga-Diskussion"; Butler, "Olga's Conversion and the Construction of Chronicle Narrative"; Prasad, *Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, pp. 240–45. Ol'ga is the Slavonic form of the name, Helga the Nordic one.

42 The complete sources for this initiative are listed in Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii II*, vol. 1, p. 136 (no. 274b), 145 (no. 299a), 160 (no. 338a).

43 Recent surveys are Shepard, "The Coming of Christianity to the Rus'"; and id. "Rus".

44 A brilliant summary of the phenomenon, its problems and the available sources is conveyed by Garipzanov, "Early Christian Scandinavia and the Problem of Eastern Influences".

45 For Scandinavian pilgrims before the Crusades, see Föller, "Wikinger als Pilger".

46 Again, the outdated but unreplaced standard work is Riant, *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des croisades*. Constantinople as a destination was treated in several Old Norse guidebooks for pilgrims: Hill, "From Rome to Jerusalem"; Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 599–603, the texts on pp. 941–45.

aforementioned military conflicts and economic activities alike.⁴⁷ Much is known about the reception of Ol'ga/Helga of Kiev in 946/57 because of its meticulous documentation in the court manual of Emperor Constantine VII, *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*.⁴⁸ Byzantine diplomatic initiatives to the North were focused on the Rus' as direct neighbours, and comparable contacts with far-away Scandinavia can only be deduced from fragmentary evidence, such as the brief comment on Harald Hardrada by Kekaumenos, who stated that the former mercenary stayed on good terms with the Byzantines after having returned to Norway in the 1040s.⁴⁹

The beginning of the Crusades also marked a new stage for diplomatic contacts, since the most prominent Scandinavian pilgrims who visited Byzantium were of royal or princely descent, all in all seven Scandinavian rulers (or very close relatives). Their receptions were exhaustively described in Scandinavian historiography, but, surprisingly, not a single reference to these diplomatic events can be found in Byzantine texts.⁵⁰ But the emperors also took the initiative: in 1195, Alexios III Angelos sent several of his Scandinavian mercenaries as envoys with *chrysoboulla* to Nordic royal courts, pursuing the aim to hire more troops. This legation was the last of its kind, but maybe not the first: in the middle of the 11th century something akin to a Byzantine recruitment office seems to have existed in Anglo-Danish London.⁵¹

4 *Grikkiax and Barangoi: Describing and Perceiving Each Other*

When Scandinavians reached Byzantium in the 9th century they were part of the Rus', culturally hybrid groups – comprising Norse, Slavonic, Baltic, and steppe-elements – of warrior-traders operating in the regions between

47 For diplomatic contacts in the 9th century, see Shepard, "The Rhos Guests of Louis the Pious"; and Duczko, *Viking Rus*, pp. 10–59. For the later 9th to mid-10th century and the regional context, see Prasad, *Diplomacy and Foreign Policy*, pp. 206–50.

48 See Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae* II 15, ed. and trans. Dagron et al., vol. 3, pp. 143–49, trans. Moffatt/Tall, vol. 2, pp. 594–98.

49 See Kekaumenos, *Strategikon*, v § 81, ed. Litavrin, pp. 298–300, trans. Rouëché, p. 97 for Harald; cf. Shepard, "Byzantine Diplomacy, AD 800–1204"; and Haldon, "Blood and Ink" on Byzantine diplomacy with the Rus'.

50 See Scheel, *Byzanz und Skandinavien*, pp. 423–28, 608–52; and Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 111–12. The reception of foreign rulers in the Komnenian period is studied in general by Anca, *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation und kaiserliches Selbstverständnis*, pp. 53–126.

51 For Alexios's envoys, see Jakobsson, "Emperors and Vassals"; Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 196, 249, 615, the texts are on pp. 965–66, 985–87; the "recruitment office" is investigated by Egan, "Byzantium in London?".

the Baltic and the Black Sea. Therefore, Byzantine writers did not link them with their geographical knowledge about Northern Europe from Classical and Christian Antiquity.⁵² Although noted as “new” barbarians, the *Rhōs* could also be described in classicizing terms such as “Crimean Scyths” (*Tauroskythai*), which often included cultural attributions.⁵³ Another pattern placed them in the Christian tradition and associated them with a pagan people from an eschatological passage of the Bible, bearing a similar name (*Rōs*) and being prophesized to attack Israel from the north during the Apocalypse: Rus’ian raids were understood as an omen for the end of the world, soon to come.⁵⁴ Interestingly, c.950, the author(s) of *De administrando imperio* distinguished between a “Slavonic” and a “Rhōsian” language spoken north of the Black Sea, the latter being a creolic dialect of Old Norse.⁵⁵

Although Rus’ and Scandinavians began to grow apart in the mid-10th century, Byzantine authors distinguished them only from the 1060s, denominating Scandinavians as *Barangoi*, a term borrowed from Old Norse *væringr* which roughly meant “sworn comrade”. This (non-ethnic) group designation was used as an ethnonym for Scandinavians, a standard procedure for interpreting barbarian self-denominations inherited from classical ethnography.⁵⁶ Nonetheless, older terms did not fall into disuse completely, which makes it difficult to distinguish Scandinavians from other northern barbarians in the sources; even worse, *Barangoi* could be also used for Anglo-Saxon fugitives after 1066.⁵⁷ Byzantine authors quickly realized that the *Barangoi* came from further north than the Rus’, and recent information about Scandinavians was by now integrated into the classicizing Byzantine conceptions of Northern Europe.⁵⁸ During the Crusades, Scandinavians were perceived as Latin Christians, but were judged more positively than other Latins, with whom Byzantine relations were mostly tense.⁵⁹

52 See Bibikov, “Byzantine Sources for the History of Balticum and Scandinavia”.

53 For these overlying strata, see Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 79–88.

54 This eschatological view is only poorly researched. For now, the main source is Photius, *Homilies* 3–4, ed. Laourdas, pp. 29–52, trans. Mango, pp. 82–112; see also Brandes, “Anastasios *ho dikoros*”, p. 36.

55 See Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, *De administrando imperio*, ch. 9, eds. Moravcsik/Jenkins, vol. 1, pp. 58–61 (text), vol. 2, pp. 45–52 (commentary); and Melin, “The Names of the Dnieper Rapids”.

56 The designation is extensively discussed by Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 100–64 for the time up to c.1081, and pp. 164–271 for the period from 1081 to 1204.

57 See Shepard, “From the Bosphorus to the British Isles”; and Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 129–60 for surveys on British contacts with the Byzantine world.

58 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 190–200.

59 Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 171–259, esp. pp. 205–16 on the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnene.

Byzantine society not only continued the antique dichotomy of cultivated *Rhōmaioi* and the barbarian (or non-orthodox) rest, but also inherited its pragmatism in dealing with strangers. Specialized Byzantine officials were administrating foreigners, which included of course Scandinavian travellers. Apparently, some of these officials were even specifically created for contacts with Scandinavians, one of them himself bearing the Norse name Sphenis (Sveinn).⁶⁰ Moreover, Byzantine society was used to integrate immigrants. The price for this was cultural assimilation: immigrants usually took Greek names and, as a consequence, few Scandinavian immigrants can be identified in the sources. Some of them reached high positions such as *metropolitēs* or senator.⁶¹ However, careers like these were highly controversial because of the aforementioned Byzantine chauvinism. It is ironic that we know so much about the service of Harald Hardrada precisely because an advisory text used him as an example of a barbarian who did not rise beyond modest court-ranks, and was content with that.⁶²

Scandinavian perceptions of the Byzantine world first become visible in 11th-century Norse texts. Runic inscriptions describe the lands along the “Eastern Way” – and most notably that of the “Greeks” (*Grikkjar*) – as a source of wealth and an arena of adventures. A characteristic runic verse reads: “They valiantly travelled far for gold, and eastwards gave [food] to the eagle (i.e. slew their opponents in battle), died southwards in the land of the Saracens (*Særkland*).”⁶³ Skaldic stanzas drew a similar picture, most notably at the court of Norwegian king Harald Hardrada, whose poets glorified his period of service in Byzantium.⁶⁴ Such narratives proved immensely successful, and during the later 11th and 12th centuries an entire cycle of fantastic stories about Harald’s Byzantine adventures circulated in the Norse world (and well beyond).⁶⁵ This

60 The most recent contributions to this ill-researched field are Shandrovskaja, “The Seal of Michael, Grand Interpreter of the Varangians”; and Sode, “Reaching Beyond the Borders”. A list of such officials, bearing the title *epi tōn barbarōn* (“above the barbarians”), can be found in Lilie et al., *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung*, vol. 8, p. 339. For Sphenis, see Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 201–02, 827.

61 See Mango, “Eudocia Ingerina, the Normans, and the Macedonian Dynasty”; and Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 201–04.

62 For the full narrative, see Kekaumenos, *Strategikon*, v § 81, ed. Litavrin, pp. 294–300, trans. Rouëché, pp. 95–97. Kekaumenos’s attitude towards barbarians is treated by Rouëché, “Defining the Foreign in Kekaumenos”.

63 The normalized text in Old East Norse is: “Pæir fóru drængila fiarri at gulli ok austarla ærni gāfu, dōu sunnarla ā Særklandi.” The inscription is edited in Brate/Wessén (eds), *Södermanlands runinskrifter*, pp. 153–56 (no. 179).

64 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 309–21 for a complete list of the c.25 stanzas and a thorough discussion of their context and problems.

65 Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 293–309, 330–73; and Jakobsson, “Araltes”. For the Old Norse tradition, see also Krag, “Harald Hardrådes ungdomsår og kongesagaene”.

tradition, additionally fuelled by reports of contemporary mercenaries and crusaders, became a popular topic in high-medieval Scandinavian literature. The Icelandic sagas in particular constructed a colourful Byzantine “otherworld”, and they customized it according to their various genres: either as part of grim realistic stories about Viking-age ancestors in the *Íslendingasögur* (“sagas of Icelanders”); as chivalric fantasy in the *Riddarasögur* (“sagas of knights”); and as an exotic addition to the traditional pagan storyworld of Norse prehistory in the *Fornaldarsögur* (“legendary sagas”).⁶⁶

A second Scandinavian idea of Byzantium is somehow interconnected with this. Medieval Scandinavia had a strong understanding of itself as peripheral, as expressed in the self-designation “the Northern lands” (*Norðrlönd*), and therefore a further aspect of Byzantine otherness was its centrality. As the legitimate successor of the Roman Empire, Byzantium was perceived as a superior power, in terms of political and religious prestige as well as cultural sophistication. Again, first traces come from 11th-century runic inscriptions and Skaldic poetry, but there is also other evidence, like imitations of Byzantine coin-design or Greek titles for Scandinavian rulers.⁶⁷ In the 12th and 13th centuries, affiliating with Byzantium became a frequent practice for Scandinavian elites to raise their political and religious standing, both against internal competitors and rival neighbours, like the Holy Roman Empire of the Staufens. Three main strategies can be observed: firstly, to emphasize recent ties to Byzantium in historical or poetical texts and by exhibiting prestigious Byzantine objects; secondly, to enhance one’s origin or ancestry by “Byzantinizing” it in historical narratives; and thirdly, to connect with Eastern Christianity by adding episodes in Byzantium or Palestine to hagiographical texts or by “Byzantinizing” religious practice and sacral architecture.⁶⁸ Knowing this, it is not surprising that the schism of 1054 was ignored in Scandinavia until the end of the 13th century.⁶⁹

66 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 735–98. For the sagas of the Icelanders, see also Jakobsson, “The Varangian Legend”, pp. 353–57; for the sagas of knights, see also Barnes, “Byzantium in the Riddarasögur”.

67 For the imitation of Byzantine coins, see Jankowiak, “Byzantine Coins in Viking-Age Northern Lands”, pp. 134–35; for the perception of Byzantium as the centre of Christianity in 11th-century Scandinavian material, see Föller, “Der byzantinische Blick”, pp. 69–70.

68 See, extensively, Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 373–733. A sketch on Denmark around 1200 is offered by Ciggaar, “Denmark and Byzantium from 1184 to 1212”.

69 See Jakobsson, “The Schism That Never Was”.

5 Northern Byzantinisms and Constantinopolitan Barbarians: Notions of Influence

The idea of a highly sophisticated Byzantine civilization emanating into the archaic cultures of Latin Europe is one of the key concepts of research on Byzantine-Western relations, and research on links with Scandinavia is no exception to this. Before the 11th century, Byzantine influence in the North can only be traced by material objects. From the 10th century onwards, Scandinavian craftsmen produced various types of objects – jewellery, coins, wood carvings, stonemasonry, wall paintings etc. – sharing stylistic features with contemporary Byzantine artefacts. But without additional information about the making and usage of these objects, it is impossible to determine how Scandinavians understood Byzantine artefacts and their own “imitations”.⁷⁰ For example, looking at a small series of cross-pendants from 11th-century Scandinavia, their form and ornament resemble a certain type of Byzantine *enkolpia*, but due to some iconographic differences the theological concept of the latter was derogated. It is impossible to say whether the Scandinavian craftsmen simply did not know or care about the ideas behind the *enkolpion*, or whether they substituted them deliberately for others.⁷¹ Nonetheless, archaeological evidence was, and is, often used for highly speculative assertions, for instance when deducing from such cross-pendants that Byzantine missionaries had been active in Scandinavia.⁷²

From the 11th century onwards, Norse texts reveal further contexts of Byzantine-looking Scandinavian objects, or even cultural transfers beyond material culture. The former can be shown by the example of royal Danish coinage produced in the name of Svend Estridsen (1047–74), whose silver pennies imitated various types of contemporary Byzantine coins. Apparently, this was a political decision and not an aesthetic accident, since all of his political rivals also incorporated Byzantine elements into their political representation.⁷³ But it is misleading to interpret every Scandinavian Byzantinism as a direct

70 See the critical thoughts by Horn Fuglesang, “A Critical Survey on Theories on Byzantine Influence in Scandinavia”; and Cutler, “Byzantine Art and the North”.

71 The example and its methodological implications are discussed by Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 358–61; and id., “Concepts of Cultural Transfer Between Byzantium and the North”, pp. 59–64, with full references.

72 Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 35–37 (with n. 70) lists the major references and shows the modern historiographical context of such extrapolations.

73 See Grierson, “Harold Hardrada and Byzantine Coin Types in Denmark”; and Steen Jensen/Kromann, “Fra Byzans til Svend Estridens Lund”.

influence. The Anglo-Danish king Cnut the Great (1016–35), for instance, used the Greek-style title “*Basileus of the English*” in his charters; yet in doing so, he did not import Byzantine ideology to enhance his political standing, but was joining Anglo-Saxon royal tradition by picking up a long-practised custom of his overthrown predecessors.⁷⁴ Furthermore, 11th-century Scandinavian evidence is very limited. For example, many Byzantine influences are ascribed to the reign of the former Byzantine mercenary and Norwegian king Harald Hardrada, but none of them can so far be proven to be more than a fascinating yet improbable theory.⁷⁵ Apart from politics, Byzantine influence can be observed in other fields of 11th-century Scandinavian culture, namely religious practice, geographical knowledge, and maybe even literature.⁷⁶

In the 12th century, Byzantine influence in Scandinavia reached its peak. This is not only a consequence of more source-material being available, but of at least two other factors: Byzantine-Scandinavian contacts were at their zenith; and the Christianization and Europeanization of the North had rendered its culture more similar to that of Byzantium, thereby facilitating processes of cultural adoption.⁷⁷ Significant Byzantine features are found in sacral art, especially in Gotland and Denmark. Yet, they differ in style and context: in Gotland, Byzantine elements were secondarily taken over from the Rus', an important trading partner.⁷⁸ In Denmark, Byzantinisms were part of a concerted political programme developed by several magnates, flanked by historiographical writing and crusading activity, with concepts and rare materials like *lapis lazuli* pigment directly imported from Byzantium.⁷⁹ Literary borrowings are not only found in narratives about the Byzantine world, but could also occur allusively, as the character of the giant sorceress Menia in Eddic mythology shows, whose origins can be traced back to Greek hagiography without

74 For the title, see Kleinschmidt, “Die Titulaturen englischer Könige im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert”, pp. 89–98.

75 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 350–73 for a survey of these theories.

76 Religious practice: Hallencreutz, “What do the Runic Stones and Adam Tell us about Byzantine Influences?”; geographical knowledge: Föller, “Der byzantinische Blick”; literary motifs: Stender-Petersen, *Die varägersage als quelle der altrussischen chronistik*, and id., *Varangica*, but see Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 416–23 for an incisive critique.

77 A concise summary of how this phenomenon shaped Byzantine-Scandinavian relations is Scheel, “Concepts of Cultural Transfer between Byzantium and the North”.

78 For Byzantinizing stone sculpture on Gotland, see Cutler, “The Sculpture and Sources of ‘Byzantios’”; for paintings in Byzantinizing style the standard work is Lagerlöf, *Gotland och Bysans*.

79 Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 447–588 contains a whole chapter on this; see, for a shorter version, id., “Concepts of Cultural Transfer between Byzantium and the North”, pp. 71–81; and Ciggaar, “Denmark and Byzantium from 1184 to 1212”, pp. 137–40.

any known interstages.⁸⁰ Yet, even though in multiple fields of Scandinavian culture Byzantine influence can be felt, again many theories remain mere speculation.⁸¹ At the present stage, no synthetical study on the subject exists, so it is impossible to determine the general significance of Byzantine influence on medieval Scandinavian cultures.

Influences in the opposite direction are hardly ever investigated, a consequence of the dichotomy mentioned in the beginning of this section. For most researchers it seems improbable that Byzantium, having a highly civilized as well as deeply chauvinistic culture, could have borrowed anything from northern barbarians. Even hybrid subcultures can barely be observed, since Scandinavian immigrants assimilated almost completely into Byzantine society and culture. Nonetheless, some Scandinavian features seem to have been retained by northern immigrants, such as legal practices or the veneration of Scandinavian saints like St Olaf.⁸² But the most enduring Scandinavian contribution to Byzantine culture is to be found in the ceremonies of the imperial court. From the late 11th century, the emperor was ritually accompanied by *Barangoi* on many occasions, and the gear and behaviour expected from these *Pelekphoroi* ("axe-bearers") shows that they had to represent "the barbarian" tamed by Byzantine imperial power.⁸³ They were so important for displaying the universal and civilizing rulership of the *basileis* that even when direct contacts ceased in the 13th century, *Barangoi* bodyguards had to be present at court, even if they were no longer of Scandinavian origin.⁸⁴ This exoticism was at the core of imperial Byzantine ideology, and its main representative was Scandinavia from the rise of the Komnenians to the end of the empire.

6 Conclusion: A Special Relationship

When Scandinavian groups first reached Byzantium in the early 9th century, the two did not share a common history or have a clear-cut image of the other, in contrast to most of the other Western European communities. In addition,

80 See Brandes, "Das Gold der Menia".

81 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 711–22 for further examples and their problems.

82 Scandinavian legal practices are present in the treaties of 911 and 944, as is supposed by Stein-Wilkeshuis, "Scandinavian Law in a Tenth-century Rus'-Greek Commercial Treaty?". A specific law of the *Barangoi* is mentioned in John Skylitzes, *Synopsis of Histories*, ed. Thurn, p. 394, trans. Wortley, p. 372; see also Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 172–73, 827–28, with an accurate discussion of the transmission and its context. For churches in Constantinople dedicated to Scandinavian saints, see Ciggaar, "St Thorlac's in Constantinople".

83 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 259–61, 269–71, 281–84, 287–91.

84 Again Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, pp. 276–81, 284–87.

Scandinavia was at that time not yet a part of Latin Christianity. Because of this, Byzantium and Scandinavia could develop a special relationship out of their economic, military, political, and religious contacts, which by themselves may not have been unique. But Scandinavians could easily accept Byzantine claims of superiority, because their homelands were never in danger of actually being conquered or otherwise dominated by the *Rhōmaioi*, and the Byzantines in turn could see Scandinavians as both useful barbarians (importing exotic goods and fighting for a fistful of *nomismata*) and some kind of archetypal savage.

An exception to this were the Rus', who were more or less direct neighbours of the Byzantine Empire. Therefore, both cultures interacted much more intensely with each other, with the Rus' becoming part of the "Byzantine commonwealth" at least from their Christianization in the second half of the 10th century, at the same time as Scandinavian influence in Rus' culture was decreasing.

Since a direct connection between Scandinavia and Byzantium was maintained using the "Eastern Way" for hundreds of years, their relationship grew strong enough to persist even during the massive changes brought about due to the Crusades, which aggravated Byzantine relations with most of Latin Europe. From the 1080s onwards, Byzantine-Scandinavian relations intensified, with the *Barangoi* mercenaries being its most important manifestation. How close this entanglement actually was by the end of the 12th century is indicated by an event in Palestine during the Third Crusade, as reported in a contemporary Danish *historia*. When Danish crusaders reached Acre in 1193, they were believed to be "Greeks" by English crusaders, who immediately attacked and tried to rob them. Even if this story might be made up, it reveals that the Scandinavians perceived their relationship with Byzantium to be a very special one.⁸⁵

For both sides, this relationship became a vital part of their political identity in the long 12th century from the 1080s to 1204, especially during the last two decades. Connections with Byzantium proved to be an effective reference to enhance political status in very different Scandinavian regions and contexts, when fighting internal competitors or trying to emancipate from an external hegemon, like the Holy Roman Empire. This positive attitude towards Byzantium was a result of "the classical concept of Byzantine soft power which means to liaise with *barbaroi* and their military resources by giving them an edge against their peers with material and immaterial tokens of friendship",

85 For the Latin text, see *Historia de profectione Danorum in Hierosolymam*, ed. Gertz, pp. 489–90.

as Roland Scheel has put it.⁸⁶ For the Byzantines, this relationship not only reinforced their military potential, but allowed them to maintain an imperial ideology in times of waning political power by showing befriended and domesticated barbarians surrounding the emperor in his palace. Both narratives were so meaningful that they were continued even after actual contacts had ceased during the 13th century. Indeed, that Byzantine soft power is still working today, in the 21st century, and can be seen in Stockholm when meeting the lion of Piraeus in the Swedish History Museum.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Arne, T.J., "Den svenska runstenen från ön Berezan utanför Dnjepermynningen" [The Swedish runestone from the island of Berezan' offshore the mouth of the Dnieper], *Fornvännen* 9 (1914), 44–48.
- Brate, E./Wessén, E. (eds.), *Södermanlands runinskrifter* [The runic inscriptions of Södermanland] (Sveriges runinskrifter, 3), Stockholm 1924–36.
- Carile, A./Sacharov, A.N. (eds.), *I trattati dell' Antica Russia con l'impero Romano d'Oriente* (Da Roma alla terza Roma. Documenti, 2), Rome 2010.
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, *De administrando imperio*, eds. G. Moravcsik/R.J.H. Jenkins, 2 vols., Budapest 1949 (text) and London 1962 (commentary).
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, eds. G. Dagron/B. Flusin/M. Stavrou, *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des cérémonies*, 6 vols. (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Parisiensis, 52), Paris 2020; trans. A. Moffatt/M. Tall, *Constantine Porphyrogenetos, The Book of Ceremonies. With the Greek Edition of the Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* (Bonn, 1829), 2 vols. (Byzantina Australiensia, 18), Canberra 2012.
- Helmerson, G., "Boge socken", in id./Snædal, Th. (eds.), *Gotlands runinskrifter* 3 [The runic inscriptions of Gotland], Stockholm 2004, URL: <http://www.raa.se/kultur/arvet/arkeologi-fornlamningar-och-fynd/runstenar/digitala-sveriges-runinskrifter/gotlands-runinskrifter-3> (accessed 14/09/2021).
- Historia de projectione Danorum in Hierosolymam*, ed. M.C. Gertz, *Scriptores minores historiae Danicae medii aevi*, 2 vols., Copenhagen 1917–22, vol. 2, pp. 443–92.
- John Skylitzes, *Synopsis of Histories*, ed. H. Thurn, *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinesis, 5), Berlin 1973; trans. J. Wortley, *John Skylitzes, A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, Cambridge 2010.

86 See Scheel, *Skandinavien und Byzanz*, p. 803.

- Kekaumenos, *Strategikon*, ed. G. Litavrin, *Kekavmen, Sovety i rasskazy* [Advices and stories], St Petersburg 2003; trans. C. Rouëché, *Kekaumenos, Consilia et Narrationes*, URL: <http://www.ancientwisdoms.ac.uk/library/kekaumenos-consilia-et-narrationes/> (accessed 14/09/2021).
- Niketas Choniates, *History*, ed. J.L. van Dieten, *Nicetae Choniatae Historia* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis, 11), 2 vols., Berlin 1975; trans. H.J. Magoulias, *O City of Byzantium. Annals of Niketas Choniates* (Byzantine Texts in Translation), Detroit 1984.
- Photius, *Homilies*, ed. B. Laourdas, *Phōtiou Homiliai* (Hellēnika, 12), Thessalonica 1959; trans. C. Mango, *The Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople*, Cambridge, Mass. 1958.
- Photius, *Letters*, eds. B. Laourdas/L.G. Westerink, *Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana), 6 vols., Leipzig 1983–89.
- Povest' Vremennykh Let*, trans. S.H. Cross/O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Text*, Cambridge, Mass. 1953.

Secondary Literature

- Anca, A.S., *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation und kaiserliches Selbstverständnis. Berührung der westlichen mit der byzantinischen Welt in der Zeit der ersten Kreuzzüge* (Symbolische Kommunikation und gesellschaftliche Wertesysteme, 31), Münster 2010.
- Andersen, Ø./Hägg, T. (eds.), *Hellas og Norge. Kontakt, komparasjon, kontrast. En artikkelsamling* [Hellas and Norway. Contact, comparison, contrast. A collection of articles], Bergen 1990.
- Androshchuk, F., "What Does Material Evidence Tell us about Contacts between Byzantium and the Viking World?", in id./Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 91–116.
- Androshchuk, F./Shepard, J./White, M. (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World* (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia, 16), Uppsala 2016.
- Barnes, G., "Byzantium in the Riddarasögur", in A. Ney/H. Williams/F. Charpentier Ljungqvist (eds.), *Á austrvega. Saga and East Scandinavia. Preprint Papers of The 14th International Saga Conference, Uppsala, 9th–15th August 2009* (Papers from the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, 14), Gävle 2009, vol. 1, pp. 92–98.
- Bibikov, M., "Byzantine Sources for the History of Balticum and Scandinavia", in I. Volt/J. Päll (eds.), *Byzantino-Nordica 2004. Papers Presented at the International Symposium of Byzantine Studies Held on 7–11 May 2004 in Tartu, Estonia* (Acta Societatis Morgensternianae, 2), Tartu 2005, pp. 12–28.
- Bjerg, L./Lind, J.H./Sindbæk, S.M. (eds.), *From Goths to Varangians. Communication and Cultural Exchange between the Baltic and the Black Sea* (Black Sea Studies, 15), Aarhus 2013.

- Blöndal, S., *Væringjasaga. Saga norræna, rússneskra og enskra hersveita í þjónustu Miklagarðskeisara á miðöldum* [History of the Varangians. History of Scandinavian, Russian and English mercenaries in the service of Byzantine emperors in the Middle Ages], Reykjavík 1954.
- Blöndal, S., *The Varangians of Byzantium. An Aspect of Byzantine Military History* (Translated, Revised and Rewritten by Benedikt S. Benediktz), Cambridge 1978.
- Böhmer, J.F., *Regesta Imperii II: Sächsisches Haus 919–1024*, vol. 1: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Heinrich I. und Otto I. 919–973* (Edited by E. von Ottenthal, with an Addendum by H.H. Kaminsky), Hildesheim 1967.
- Brandes, W., “Anastasios *ho dikoros*. Endzeiterwartung und Kaiserkritik in Byzanz um 500 n. Chr.”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 90 (1997), 24–63.
- Brandes, W., “Das Gold der Menia. Ein Beispiel transkulturellen Wissenstransfers”, *Millennium* 2 (2005), 175–227.
- Brink, S./Price, N. (eds.), *The Viking World* (The Routledge Worlds), Oxford-New York 2008.
- Butler, F., “Olga’s Conversion and the Construction of Chronicle Narrative”, *The Russian Review* 67 (2008), 230–42.
- Christiansen, E., *The Norsemen in the Viking Age* (Peoples of Europe), Oxford 2002.
- Ciggaar, K.N., “St Thorlac’s in Constantinople, Built by a Flemish Emperor”, *Byzantion* 49 (1979), 428–46.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962–1204. Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden 1996.
- Ciggaar, K.N., “Denmark and Byzantium from 1184 to 1212. Queen Dagmar’s Cross, a Chrysobull of Alexius III and an ‘Ultramarine’ Connection”, *Medieval Scandinavia* 13 (2000), 118–43.
- Cutler, A., “The Sculpture and Sources of ‘Byzantios’”, in G. Róza (ed.), *Evolution générale et développements régionaux en histoire de l’art. Actes du XXII^e Congrès International d’Histoire de l’Art, Budapest 1969*, Budapest 1979, vol. 1, pp. 191–203.
- Cutler, A., “Byzantine Art and the North. Meditations on the Notion of Influence”, in Fledelius/Schreiner (eds.), *Byzantium. Identity, Image, Influence*, pp. 169–82.
- Duczko, W., “Viking Sweden and Byzantium. An Archaeologist’s Version”, in Fledelius/Schreiner (eds.), *Byzantium. Identity, Image, Influence*, pp. 193–200.
- Duczko, W., “Byzantine Presence in Viking Age Sweden. Archaeological Finds and Their Interpretation”, in Müller-Wille (ed.), *Rom und Byzanz im Norden*, vol. 1, pp. 291–311.
- Duczko, W., *Viking Rus. Studies on the Presence of Scandinavians in Eastern Europe* (The Northern World, 12), Leiden 2004.
- Egan, G., “Byzantium in London? New Archaeological Evidence for 11th Century Links Between England and the Byzantine World”, in M. Grünbart/E. Kislinger/A. Muthesius/D.Ch. Stathakopoulos (eds.), *Material Culture and Well-Being in*

- Byzantium (400–1453). Proceedings of the International Conference (Cambridge, 8–10 September 2001)* (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 11), Vienna 2007, pp. 11–18.
- Ellis Davidson, H.R., *The Viking Road to Byzantium*, London 1976.
- Fledelius, K./Schreiner, P. (eds.), *Byzantium. Identity, Image, Influence. XIXth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, University of Copenhagen, 18–24 August 1996. Major Papers*, Copenhagen 1996.
- Föller, D., “Wikinger als Pilger. Drei norwegische Könige, zwei Runensteine und der Wiederaufbau der Grabeskirche”, in T. Pratsch (ed.), *Konflikt und Bewältigung. Die Zerstörung der Grabeskirche zu Jerusalem im Jahre 1009* (Millennium Studies, 32), Berlin 2011, pp. 281–99.
- Föller, D., “Der byzantinische Blick. Wissenstransfer von Byzanz ins wikingerzeitliche Skandinavien”, *Nordeuropaforum* 2014, 58–83.
- Franklin, S./Shepard, J., *The Emergence of Rus’ 750–1200*, London 1996.
- Garipzanov, I., “Early Christian Scandinavia and the Problem of Eastern Influences”, in id./Tolochko (eds.), *Early Christianity on the Way from the Varangians to the Greeks*, pp. 17–32.
- Garipzanov, I./Tolochko, O. (eds.), *Early Christianity on the Way from the Varangians to the Greeks* (Ruthenica. Supplementum, 4), Kiev 2011.
- Grierson, P., “Harold Hardrada and Byzantine Coin Types in Denmark”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 1 (1966), 124–38.
- Haldon, J.F., “Blood and Ink. Some Observations on Byzantine Attitudes Towards Warfare and Diplomacy”, in Shepard/Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy*, pp. 281–94.
- Hallencreutz, C.F., “What do the Runic Stones and Adam Tell us about Byzantine Influences?”, in Müller-Wille (ed.), *Rom und Byzanz im Norden*, vol. 1, pp. 331–40.
- Hannestad, K. (ed.), *Varangian Problems. Report on the 1st International Symposium on the Theme “The Eastern Connections of the Nordic Peoples in the Viking Period and the Early Middle Ages”* (Scando-Slavica. Supplementum, 1), Copenhagen 1970.
- Harris, J., “When did Laskaris Kananos Travel in the Baltic Lands?”, *Byzantion* 80 (2010), 173–87.
- Hill, J., “From Rome to Jerusalem. An Icelandic Itinerary of the Mid-Twelfth Century”, *Harvard Theological Review* 76 (1983), 175–203.
- Horn Fuglesang, S., “A Critical Survey on Theories on Byzantine Influence in Scandinavia”, in Fledelius/Schreiner (eds.), *Byzantium. Identity, Image, Influence*, pp. 137–52.
- Jakobsson, S., “The Schism That Never Was. Old Norse Views on Byzantium and Russia”, *Byzantinoslavica* 66 (2008), 173–89.
- Jakobsson, S., “The Varangian Legend”, in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 345–62.

- Jakobsson, S., "Emperors and Vassals. Scandinavian Kings and the Byzantine Emperor", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 110 (2017), 649–72.
- Jakobsson, S., "Araltes. The Evolution of a Varangian Stereotype", *VTU Review* 4 (2020), 55–67.
- Jakobsson, S., *The Varangians. In God's Holy Fire* (New Approaches to Byzantine History and Culture), Cham 2020.
- Jankowiak, M., "Byzantine Coins in Viking-Age Northern Lands", in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 117–39.
- Janson, H. (ed.), *Från Bysans till Norden. Östliga kyrkoinfluenser under vikingatid och tidig medeltid* [From Byzantium to the North. Eastern Church-influences in the Viking Age and the Early Middle Ages], Malmö 2005.
- Jeffreys, M./Karagiorgou, O./Papacostas, T./Ryder, J./Whitby, M./Osti, L./Soravia, B./Andrews, T./Karafotia, E./Munt, H., *Prosopography of the Byzantine World. 2011 Edition*, London 2011, URL: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk> (accessed 14/09/2021).
- Jesch, J., *Ships and Men in the Late Viking Age. The Vocabulary of Runic Inscriptions and Skaldic Verse*, Woodbridge 2001.
- Källström, M., "Byzantium Reflected in the Runic Inscriptions of Scandinavia", in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 169–86.
- Kleinschmidt, H., "Die Titulaturen englischer Könige im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert", in H. Wolfram/A. Scharer (eds.), *Intitulatio III. Lateinische Herrschertitel und Herrschertitulaturen vom 7. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband, 29), Vienna 1988, pp. 75–130.
- Klejn, L.S., *Soviet Archaeology. Trends, Schools, and History*, trans. R. Ireland/K. Windle, Oxford 2012.
- Korpela, J., *Beiträge zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte und Prosopographie der Kiever Rus' bis zum Tode von Vladimir Monomach* (Studia historica Jyväskyläensia, 54), Jyväskylä 1995.
- Krag, C., "Harald Hardrådes ungdomsår og kongesagaene. Forholdet mellem sagaproza, skaldekvad og muntlig tradisjon" [Harald Hardrada's younger years and the Kings' sagas. The relation between saga-prose, skaldic poetry and oral tradition], *Collegium Medievale* 11 (1998), 9–31.
- Kühn, H.-J., *Die byzantinische Armee im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Studien zur Organisation der Tagmata* (Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber. Ergänzungsbände, 2), Vienna 1991.
- Lagerlöf, E., *Gotland och Bysans. Bysantinskt inflytande på den gotländska kyrkokonsten under medeltiden* [Gotland and Byzantium. Byzantine influence on Gotlandic church art in the Middle Ages], Visby 1999.
- Larsson, M.G., *Värningar. Nordbor hos kejsaren i Miklagård* [Varangians. Northerners with the emperor in Miklagard (i.e. Constantinople)], Stockholm 1991.
- Latvakangas, A., *Riksgrundarna. Varjagproblemet i Sverige från runinskrifter till enhetlig historisk tolkning* [Founders of realms. The Varangian problem in Sweden from the

- runic inscriptions to consistent historical interpretation] (Turun Yliopiston julkaisuja B, 21), Turku 1995.
- Lilie, R.-J./Ludwig, C./Pratsch, T./Zielke, B./Bichlmeier, H./Krönung, B./Föller, D./Beihammer, A.D./Prinzing, G., *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung* (867–1025), 9 vols., Berlin 2009–13.
- Lind, J.H., “Christianity on the Move. The Role of the Varangians in Rus and Scandinavia”, in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 409–40.
- Litvina, A./Uspenskij, F., “Contempt for Byzantine Gold. Common Plot Elements in Rus Chronicles and Scandinavian Sagas”, in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 337–44.
- Ljungkvist, J., “Influences from the Empire. Byzantine-Related Objects in Sweden and Scandinavia, 560/570–750/800 AD”, in F. Daim/J. Drauschke (eds.), *Byzanz – das Römerreich im Mittelalter. Byzantium – the Roman Empire in the Middle Ages*, vol. 3: *Peripherie und Nachbarschaft. Periphery and Vicinity*, Mainz 2010, pp. 419–41.
- Lübke, C., *Fremde im östlichen Europa. Von Gesellschaften ohne Staat zu verstaatlichten Gesellschaften* (9.–11. Jahrhundert) (Ostmitteleuropa in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, 23), Cologne 2001.
- Makris, G., “Die Beschreibung der Nordlandreise des Laskaris Kananos (Codex Vindob. Histor. gr. 113)”, in V. Lica/D. Nedu (eds.), *Historiae diversitas. Festschrift für Vladimir Iliescu zum 80. Geburtstag am 8. August 2006 von seinen Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen dargebracht* (Historia Antiqua Galatiensis, 1), Galați 2006, pp. 179–214.
- Mango, C., “Eudocia Ingerina, the Normans, and the Macedonian Dynasty”, *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta* 14–15 (1973), 17–27.
- Melin, E., “The Names of the Dnieper Rapids in Chapter 9 of Constantine Porphyrogenitus’ *De administrando imperio*”, *Scando-Slavica* 49 (2003), 35–62.
- Melnikova, E.A./Petrukhin, V.J., “The Origin and Evolution of the Name *Rus*’. The Scandinavians in Eastern-European Ethno-Political Processes Before the 11th Century”, *Tor* 23 (1990), 203–34.
- Mel’nikova, E.A., “*Rhosia* and the Rus in Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos’ *De administrando imperio*”, in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 315–36.
- Mikkelsen, E., “The Vikings and Islam”, in Brink/Price (eds.), *The Viking World*, pp. 543–49.
- Montgomery, J.E., “Arabic Sources on the Vikings”, in Brink/Price (eds.), *The Viking World*, pp. 550–61.
- Müller-Wille, M. (ed.), *Rom und Byzanz im Norden. Mission und Glaubenswechsel im Ostseeraum während des 8.–14. Jahrhunderts. Internationale Fachkonferenz der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Verbindung mit der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Kiel, 18.–25. September 1994* (Akademie der

- Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. 1997, 3, 1–2), 2 vols., Stuttgart 1997–98.
- Müller-Wille, M., "Relations Between Byzantium and the North in the Light of Archaeology. Some Concluding Remarks", in id. (ed.), *Rom und Byzanz im Norden*, vol. 1, pp. 405–22.
- Piltz, E. (ed.), *Byzans och Norden. Akta för Nordiska forskarkursen i bysantinsk konstvetenskap* [Byzantium and the North. Acts from the Nordic research seminar in Byzantine art history], Uppsala 1989.
- Piltz, E. (ed.), *Byzantium and Islam in Scandinavia. Acts of a Symposium at Uppsala University, June 15–16, 1996* (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, 126), Jonsered 1998.
- Prasad, P., *Diplomacy and Foreign Policy in the Personal Reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (945–959)* (Ph.D thesis, University of Oxford 2015).
- Riant, P., *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des croisades*, Paris 1865.
- Roslund, M., "Brosamen vom Tisch der Reichen. Byzantinische Funde aus Lund und Sigtuna (ca. 980–1250)", in Müller-Wille (ed.), *Rom und Byzanz im Norden*, vol. 1, pp. 325–88.
- Rouëché, C., "Defining the Foreign in Kekaumenos", in D.C. Smythe (ed.), *Strangers to Themselves. The Byzantine Outsider. Papers from the Thirty-Second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications, 8), Aldershot 2000, pp. 203–14.
- Scheel, R., *Skandinavien und Byzanz. Bedingungen und Konsequenzen mittelalterlicher Kulturbeziehungen* (Historische Semantik, 23), 2 vols., Göttingen 2015.
- Scheel, R., "Concepts of Cultural Transfer between Byzantium and the North", in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 53–87.
- Scholz, B., *Von der Chronistik zur modernen Geschichtswissenschaft. Die Warägerfrage in der russischen, deutschen, und schwedischen Historiographie* (Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Instituts München. Reihe Forschungen zum Ostseeraum, 5), Wiesbaden 2000.
- Shandrovskaia, V.S., "The Seal of Michael, Grand Interpreter of the Varangians", in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 305–12.
- Shepard, J., "Why did the Russians Attack Byzantium in 1043?", *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* 22 (1978–79), 147–212.
- Shepard, J., "Byzantine Diplomacy, AD 800–1204. Means and Ends", in id./S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. Cambridge, March 1990* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications, 1), Aldershot 1992, pp. 41–71.
- Shepard, J., "The Rhos Guests of Louis the Pious. Whence and Wherefore?", *Early Medieval Europe* 4 (1995), 41–60.

- Shepard, J., "Rus", in N. Berend (ed.), *Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy. Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus' c.900–1200*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 369–416.
- Shepard, J., "The Coming of Christianity to the Rus. Authorized and Unauthorized Versions", in C.B. Kendall/O. Nicolson/W.D. Philipps, Jr./M. Ragnow (eds.), *Conversion to Christianity from Late Antiquity to the Modern Age. Considering the Process in Europe, Asia, and the Americas* (Minnesota Studies in Early Modern History, 1), Minneapolis 2009, pp. 185–222.
- Shepard, J., "From the Bosphorus to the British Isles. The Way From the Greeks to the Varangians", in T.N. Jackson (ed.), *Transkontinental'nye i lokal'nye puti kak so-tsiokul'turnyi fenomen. Pamiati Igoria Sergeevicha Chichurova* [Transcontinental and local routes as sociocultural phenomena. In memory of I.S. Chichurov] (Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy 2009), Moscow 2010, pp. 15–42.
- Snædal, Th., "Runes from Byzantium: Reconsidering the Piraeus Lion", in Androshchuk/Shepard/White (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World*, pp. 187–214.
- Sode, C., "Reaching Beyond the Borders of the Byzantine Empire. The Seals of the *epi ton barbaron*", in S. Günther/Li Qiang/C. Sode/St. Wahlgren/Zhang Qiang (eds.), *Byzantium in China. Studies in Honour of Professor Xu Jialing on the Occasion of her Seventieth Birthday* (Supplements to the Journal of Ancient Civilizations, 6), Changchun 2019, pp. 173–93.
- Steen Jensen, J./Kromann, A., "Fra Byzans til Svend Estridens Lund. Hvordan kejser Michaels guldmønt blev kopieret i Norden" [From Byzantium to Svend Estridsen's Lund. How Emperor Michael's gold coins came to be copied in the North], *Nationalmuseets Arbejdsmark* 1995, 54–61.
- Stein-Wilkeshuis, M., "Scandinavian Law in a Tenth-century Rus'-Greek Commercial Treaty?", in J. Hill/M. Swan (eds.), *The Community, the Family and the Saint. Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe. Selected Proceedings of the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 4–7 July 1994, 10–13 July 1995* (International Medieval Research, 4), Turnhout 1998, pp. 311–22.
- Stender-Petersen, A., *Die varägersage als quelle der altrussischen chronistik* (Acta Jutlandica, 6), Aarhus 1934.
- Stender-Petersen, A., *Varangica*, Aarhus 1953.
- Svanberg, F., *Decolonizing the Viking Age 1* (Acta Archaeologica Lundensia Series in 8°, 43), Lund 2003.
- Tinnefeld, F., "Zum Stand der Olga-Diskussion", in L. Hoffmann/A. Monchizadeh (eds.), *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, Wiesbaden 2005, pp. 531–69.
- Treadgold, W., "Three Byzantine Provinces and the First Byzantine Contacts with the Rus", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988/89), 132–44.
- Waßenhoven, D., *Skandinavien unterwegs in Europa (1000–1250). Untersuchungen zu Mobilität und Kulturtransfer auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Europa im Mittelalter, 8), Berlin 2006.

- Zeitler, R. (ed.), *Les pays du Nord et Byzance (Scandinavie et Byzance). Actes du colloque nordique et international de Byzantinologie. Tenu à Upsal 20–22 avril 1979*, Uppsala 1981.
- Zetterström Geschwind, B., “A Majestic Copycat in Motion”, in A. Källén (ed.), *Making Cultural History. New Perspectives on Western Heritage*, Lund 2013, pp. 27–37.
- Zilmer, K., “He Drowned in Holmr’s Sea – His Cargo-Ship Drifted to the Sea-Bottom, Only Three Came Out Alive”. *Records and Representations of Baltic Traffic in the Viking Age and Early Middle Ages in Early Nordic Sources* (Nordistica Tartuensia, 12), Tartu 2005.

Byzantium and England, c.900–1204

Christopher Hobbs

In the High Middle Ages, Byzantium and England both faced invasion and conquest. After years of Viking raids, Anglo-Saxon England was conquered by the Normans in 1066 leading to the uprooting of the Anglo-Saxon nobility. Byzantium suffered the loss of Asia Minor in the late 11th century, which was followed by the disruption of the crusading era and, finally, the dismemberment of the empire by the Fourth Crusade in 1204. In short, a Norman seized the Anglo-Saxon throne, a Latin the Byzantine.

The Anglo-Saxons had achieved a degree of dominance in Britain. The century and a half before the Norman Conquest witnessed the rise of the West Saxon hegemony over other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, the Danelaw and, at times, the submission of Scottish and Welsh rulers.¹ The Anglo-Saxons, and later Anglo-Normans, were not of course the only peoples occupying the British Isles at this time. In the 8th century, Bede listed four peoples corresponding with the major languages: British, English, Pictish, and Scottish.² From the 9th century, Norse could be added to this list and Anglo-Norman from the 11th. The majority of surviving evidence, and therefore secondary scholarship, relates primarily to England rather than Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.

Evidence of interaction between England and Byzantium is typically discrete, often surviving in individual finds of material culture or brief references in written works, which makes the task of reconstructing the form and extent of exchange uncertain. Moreover, the relationship between different forms of evidence is ambiguous. For instance, the discovery of Byzantine artefacts has been interpreted, by many scholars, as relating to, or corroborating, claims of diplomatic contact in written sources. Artefacts are not, however, necessarily witnesses to direct interaction between the two regions. Prior to the period in question, the large amount of ceramic evidence from the “Dark Ages” suggests that western Britain was, in fact, more closely linked to the eastern Mediterranean than some areas of continental Europe.³ Yet, such trade is

1 For an overview, see Keynes, “England, 900–1016”, pp. 456–84.

2 Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, eds Colgrave/Mynors, pp. 16–17, 230–1 (i.1, iii.6). By “Scots”, Bede is referring to the peoples of Ireland.

3 Harris, *Byzantium, Britain & the West*, pp. 190–1. So significant were earlier medieval contacts that following the fall of the western Roman Empire, it has been argued, the new states in western Europe (during the fifth to seventh centuries), “depended, to a great extent, on

hardly evidence of greater direct political contact, especially when considered in the light of limited contemporary knowledge and critical misunderstandings in the source material. Procopius seriously confused the geography of the British Isles, having assumed for instance that the island of Great Britain was in fact two islands, *Brettania and Brittia*. He associated the latter with a mysterious isle of the dead where ghosts were ferried.⁴

1 Envoys, Mercenaries and Pilgrims

This section will examine the direct contacts of travellers between England and Byzantium. The period in question, especially the mid-10th century, is widely held to have witnessed a growth in the number of contacts between England and Byzantium, representing a return to an era of closer relations after an extended hiatus dating from the 7th-century Arab invasions.⁵ Contacts during the 8th and 9th centuries have been described as “almost non-existent”.⁶ For context, it is worth examining this earlier period.

In the 8th century, Bede synchronised his chronicle with Byzantine regnal years: “a kind of community of imagination preserved lingering and mental links where real ones had lapsed”.⁷ At this time, the Archbishopric of Canterbury was held by a Byzantine, Theodore of Tarsus (c.602–90). “The English Churches”, according to Bede, “made more spiritual progress while he was archbishop than ever before”.⁸ Indeed, Bede claims that several clergy and monks were proficient in Greek as well as in Latin: a number of Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Adrian’s students, at the time of composition, knew (c.731), “Latin and Greek just as well as their native tongue”.⁹ The reign of Alfred

contemporary contacts with the Byzantine Empire in order to function as stable entities” (Harris, p. 189).

4 Procopius, *Wars*, ed. H.B. Dewing, *History of the Wars*, 5 vols., Cambridge M.A., 1914–1928, vol. 5, pp. 267–71 (viii. 20.47–58); Thompson, “Procopius on Brittia and Britannia”; Burn, “Procopius and the Island of Ghosts”.

5 Shepard, “From the Bosphorus to the British Isles”, p. 22; Harris, “Wars and Rumours of Wars”, pp. 29–46; Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 182; Talbot Rice, “Britain and the Byzantine World in the Middle Ages”, pp. 24–26; Lopez, “Le problème des relations anglo-byzantines”, pp. 139–62.

6 Harris, “Wars and Rumours of Wars”, p. 30.

7 McCormick, “Byzantium and the West, 700–900”, p. 349.

8 Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, eds. Colgrave/Mynors, p. 475 (v.8)). See also Lapidge, “The Career of Archbishop Theodore”; Lopez, “Le problème”, pp. 147–49.

9 Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, eds. Colgrave/Mynors, pp. 332–7 (quotation at p. 335), 530–3, 552–5 (iv.2, v.20, v.22). Adrian (or Hadrian), abbot of the monastery of St Peter’s and St Paul’s, Canterbury.

the Great (871–99) suggests, in the written record at least, a rebirth of outreach to the continental and Byzantine worlds. First, Alfred himself had been on pilgrimages to Rome, which had, as recently as the previous century, lain under direct Byzantine influence. Second, Alfred and his secretaries inserted references to Bulgaria and the Byzantine Balkans into their version of the *History* of Orosius.¹⁰ Third, Alfred's biographer, Asser, claims to have seen gifts and read letters from "Patriarch Elias" of Jerusalem, which constituted part of Alfred's supposed regular involvement with states ranging from Ireland to the Mediterranean.¹¹ Asser's claim has proven contentious however. He sought to underscore, and perhaps exaggerate, the cultural achievements of Alfred's reign. Read in this light, the claim of relations with the patriarch of Jerusalem, and the prestige this could bring, might simply represent an embellishment.¹² Jonathan Harris, however, suggests that the letter was probably a circular to which Alfred may have responded by sending alms. While Jerusalem had not been part of the Byzantine Empire since the mid-7th century, the patriarch still looked to the emperor as the leader of Christendom.¹³ Around a century earlier, direct connections are documented during the reign of Charlemagne (768–814) with the Greek-speaking church of Jerusalem, and even with the Abbasids.¹⁴ In this context, a degree of contact between England and the see of Jerusalem at that time is certainly plausible.

Alfred's pilgrimages to Rome, including two as a boy, are representative of significant contact between the British Isles and Italy, which fostered intermediate connections with Byzantium itself. Not only was Rome under Byzantine sway up to the middle of the 8th century, but a direct Byzantine presence remained in parts of Italy until the loss of Bari to the Normans in 1071. There was an Anglo-Saxon quarter in Rome (today the Borgo Santo Spirito) and Leo IV erected a church and hostel following a fire in c.850. Around that time, a group of Irish pilgrims ventured to Italy and made notes on a Greek Gospel cycle which thereafter they deposited at St Gall.¹⁵ In this period, Byzantine influence remained extensive. In 807, papal distributions to monasteries

10 Shepard, "From the Bosphorus to the British Isles", p. 22; *The Old English Orosius*, ed. J. Bately, Oxford 1980, pp. 12–18.

11 Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, ed. W.H. Stevenson, *Life of King Alfred, Together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser*, Oxford 1957, p. 77.

12 Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, p. 208.

13 Harris, "Wars and Rumours of Wars", pp. 37–39.

14 McCormick, "Byzantium and the West", p. 376; Borgolte, *Der Gesandtenaustausch*, pp. 45–61, 77–83. For Charlemagne's envoys to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and their report of the year 810, see McCormick, *Charlemagne's Survey of the Holy Land*.

15 McCormick, "Byzantium and the West", p. 378; Harris, "Wars and Rumours of Wars", p. 40.

indicate that six of the most important monasteries, and one convent, were Greek; in 870, several churches were Greek.¹⁶ Pilgrimage was not limited to Rome. As early as the 8th century, pilgrimage to Jerusalem was growing in popularity; for instance, in 719–29 Willibald, future Bishop of Eichstätt, travelled to Rome and Jerusalem from England.¹⁷ Likewise in 698, Abbot Adomnán presented to the king of Northumbria, Aldfrith (685–704), an account – ostensibly the pilgrimage of Arculf (a bishop from Gaul) – of the Holy Land and Near East.¹⁸

1.1 *The Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*

In this period, a number of clergy, crusaders, envoys, missionaries, mercenaries, and monks travelled, or emigrated, between England and Byzantium. According to the *Liber Eliensis*, a Greek “bishop” was attached to the court of King Edgar (959–75).¹⁹ Between 964 and 1030 at New Minster, Winchester, one of the monks, Andrew “the Greek” (*Andreas Grecus*), seems to have emigrated from Byzantium.²⁰ According to William of Malmesbury, a Greek monk named Constantine spent a number of years in the early 11th century at Malmesbury Abbey where he planted a vineyard.²¹ That the presence of Byzantines in England was considered noteworthy for inclusion in chronicles does in itself, however, suggest that it was unusual.

Constantinople was the entrepôt of important trade routes. Accordingly, the presence of individual pilgrims or envoys from distant “barbarian” lands, especially during the crusading era, was less likely to capture a Byzantine chronicler’s attention. It is, therefore, in Anglo-Saxon sources that we find English

-
- 16 McCormick, “Byzantium and the West”, pp. 362–63. See Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne*.
 - 17 Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 182; Limor, “Willibald in the Holy Places”, pp. 230–44; Aist, *The Christian Topography of Early Islamic Jerusalem*.
 - 18 Adomnán, *De locis sanctis*, ed. D. Meehan, *Adomnán’s De Locis Sanctis*, Dublin 1958; Hoyland and Waidler, “Adomnán’s *De Locis Sanctis* and the Seventh-Century Near East”, pp. 787–807; Woods, “Arculf’s Luggage: the Sources for Adomnán’s ‘*De locis Sanctis*’”, pp. 25–52.
 - 19 Lapidge, “Byzantium, Rome and England”, pp. 386–90; Harris, “Wars and Rumours of Wars”, p. 33; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 130–31; Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 182. His role, however, remains unclear.
 - 20 Shepard, “From the Bosphorus to the British Isles”, p. 26; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 130; *The Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester*, ed. S. Keynes, Copenhagen, 1996, p. 90; *Liber Vitae*, ed. W. Gray Birch, *Register and Martyrology of New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester*, Winchester 1892, p. 33.
 - 21 Shepard, “From the Bosphorus to the British Isles”, p. 26; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 131; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom, *The History of the English Bishops*, 2 vols., Oxford 2007, here vol. 1, pp. 620–21.

travellers in Byzantium. In the biographies of Edward the Confessor (1042–66), a story is told of an English embassy to Constantinople sent by the king after he had a vision of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus.²² The story of the dream follows the typical embellishment found in hagiography, but it has been noted that if the account is accurate, it would be the earliest attested embassy from England to Constantinople.²³ Indeed, while the dream is typical of hagiography, it may simply represent a framing device for a genuine mission to Constantinople and so it is by no means implausible that an Anglo-Saxon could have travelled to foreign courts as far afield as Constantinople.

William the Conqueror's father, Robert, had visited Constantinople *en route* to Jerusalem. He died in Nicaea (1035) on his return journey.²⁴ Around 1090 a monk, Joseph of Canterbury, is recorded as having visited Constantinople on pilgrimage where he was gratified to meet compatriots. He departed with a relic of St Andrew.²⁵ While the majority of pilgrimages are not recorded, the overland route to the Holy Land took pilgrims via Constantinople.²⁶ Several English crusaders participated in the First Crusade and were permitted in small groups to enter Constantinople to venerate relics.²⁷ An English fleet is recorded as sailing in the eastern Mediterranean in March 1098 when it supported the crusaders at Saint Symeon in Syria.²⁸ Finally, it has been suggested that the Norman Conquest, especially in terms of the logistics of transporting large numbers of horses, was influenced by Byzantine military technology.²⁹

1.2 *The Anglo-Saxon Migration*

The late 11th century witnessed a large migration of Anglo-Saxons to Byzantium, apparently fleeing the Norman Conquest.³⁰ The movement of peoples on this

22 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 136; Nicol, "Byzantium and England", p. 183; *Vita Edwardi Regis*, ed. and trans. F. Barlow, *The Life of King Edward who Rests at Westminster Attributed to a Monk of St. Bertin*, London 1962, pp. 67–71.

23 Head, "Alexios Komnenos and the English", pp. 186–88.

24 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 138–39.

25 Head, "Alexios Komnenos and the English", p. 194; Nicol, "Byzantium and England", p. 188; Vasiliev, "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration", pp. 62–64; Haskins, "A Canterbury Monk at Constantinople", pp. 293–95; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 144.

26 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 130.

27 Ciggaar, "L'Émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066", p. 316.

28 Shepard, "The English and Byzantium", p. 83, n. 184. Steven Runciman suggests this fleet was made up of English mercenaries who left following the Norman conquest: Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, p. 228, n. 1.

29 Ciggaar, "Byzantine Marginalia to the Norman Conquest", pp. 43–69.

30 For a survey of early studies on the migration, see Vasiliev, "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration", pp. 41–51. The attractions of the Near East were, in Vasiliev's

scale may be indicative of earlier diplomatic contacts and wider interactions. When examined in this context, the claim that Edward, or other Anglo-Saxon kings, sent envoys to Byzantium seems not only plausible but an essential foundation enabling the later migration to take place. According to Alexander Vasiliev, “the very fact of the emigration to Byzantium” suggests some pre-existing knowledge in England before 1066.³¹ He suggests that the exploits of Harald Hardrada (1015–66, Norway) must have been widely known.³² In short, Harald’s deeds may have informed a cultural awareness which opened the prospect of Byzantium to potential migrants.

Accounts of the migration in the primary sources are frequently brief and open to contradictory interpretations. Historians have disagreed, in particular, over when the Anglo-Saxons arrived in Byzantium, in what numbers and, once there, at what point the Varangian Guard transitioned from a Russian and Scandinavian corps to a predominantly English force.

The Norman monk Orderic Vitalis claims that many Anglo-Saxons fled England after the death of King Harold at the battle of Hastings.³³ The Anglo-Saxons sought either freedom from the Normans or foreign military support, “the English groaned aloud for their lost liberty and plotted ceaselessly to find some way of shaking off a yoke that was so intolerable and unaccustomed”.³⁴ In terms of the timeframe, Orderic adds, “Some of them who were still in the flower of youth travelled into remote lands and bravely offered their arms to Alexios [I Komnenos]”.³⁵ In fact, Alexios (1081–1118) seized the throne some 15 years after the Battle of Hastings. Orderic, who is writing five or six decades (around 1114–25) after the events he narrates in books III and IV, has clearly confused the chronology.³⁶ Jonathan Shepard argues that Orderic’s own, unidentified, source referenced the English at Byzantium under Alexios but made no mention of when the English emigrated. Orderic, clearly unsure of when Alexios had reigned, made the assumption that the migrants must have left

colourful phrase, “great for young, energetic, and enterprising men” (at p. 41). See also Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 140–41; Ciggaar, “L’Émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066”, pp. 301–42; Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, pp. 53–92.

31 Vasiliev, “The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration”, p. 54.

32 Kekaumenos, for instance, also recounts Harald’s time in imperial service, emphasising his fidelity to the Byzantines: Shepard, “From the Bosphorus to the British Isles”, pp. 38–39.

33 Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 2, pp. 202–205 (iv); vol. 4, pp. 16–17 (vii.5); Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 185; Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 54; Head, “Alexios Komnenos and the English”, p. 191.

34 Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 2, pp. 202–03 (iv).

35 Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 2, pp. 202–03 (iv).

36 Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 185; Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 53.

in the wake of 1066.³⁷ This delayed departure has been explained by William's increasingly harsh treatment of his conquered land.³⁸

Primary sources are largely silent on the routes taken by the migrants to Byzantium. Shepard identifies potential paths: some migrants may have travelled over the Alps via Italy following established pilgrimage and trade routes, some followed the routes taken by pilgrims along the Danube, and some migrated via Scandinavia and Russia.³⁹ Tracing the route the migrants followed could shed light on the nature and extent of correspondence between the two regions and the location of, and role played by, intermediate contacts. Resolving this question, unfortunately, requires much speculation on the basis of scanty evidence. Naturally, different migrants may have taken different routes at different times.

Goscelin (died c.1100), English monk and author of the *Life of Saint Augustine of Canterbury*, provides another reference to the Anglo-Saxon migration. Many nobles, he claims, were exiled from their homeland under William I to Byzantium, and that one nobleman was given command by the emperor over troops, that he married a noblewoman, and built a basilica dedicated to the Blessed Nicholas and St Augustine.⁴⁰ It may be inferred, therefore, that the English had their own church in Constantinople. Donald Nicol suggests that English clergy would have presided in this church.⁴¹ A very late narrative source, the Icelandic saga of Edward the Confessor, *Saga Játvarðar konungs hins helga*, also discusses the Anglo-Saxon migration.⁴² The saga was compiled, albeit from earlier sources, in the 14th century. The extent to which this account provides a factual foundation, or chiefly embellishes and creates fictive narratives, is unclear.⁴³ To shed light on the migrations, Christine Fell argues that while the Icelandic

37 Shepard, "The English and Byzantium", p. 54.

38 This is beyond the immediate scope of this chapter. See Shepard, "The English and Byzantium", pp. 55–60. Vasiliev argues that the migrants left when their hopes of defeating the Normans were dashed by the failed invasion of Sweyn II and Edgar Atheling in 1069: Vasiliev, "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration", p. 54).

39 Shepard, "The English and Byzantium", pp. 57–60.

40 "An honourable man [...] along with many noble exiles from the fatherland, migrated to Constantinople; he obtained such favour with the Emperor and Empress as well as with other powerful men as to receive command over prominent troops and over a great number of companions": *Miracula Sancti Augustini Episcopi Cantuariensis*, in *Acta Sanctorum, Maius*, VI (Paris, 1866), translated in Vasiliev, "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration", pp. 60–61; Haskins, "A Canterbury Monk at Constantinople", p. 294.

41 Nicol, "Byzantium and England", p. 190.

42 Fell, "The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: The Hagiographic Sources".

43 Shepard, "The English and Byzantium", pp. 79–84; Shepard, "Another New England?", pp. 18–39.

sagas are not consistent in every detail they can still be used by scholars with caution.⁴⁴ Constance Head suggests that the saga may supply evidence for the English arriving in Byzantium in 1081.⁴⁵ According to the saga, “Sigurd, Earl of Gloucester” was the foremost nobleman in a group who decided to migrate when it was clear that no help was forthcoming from the Danes against the Normans. He left with a fleet of 350 ships.⁴⁶ The embellishments here are obvious; most notably, there was no Earl of Gloucester called Sigurd (or Siward, the English equivalent). Shepard, however, has identified a Siward Barn in the Domesday Book who held valuable estates in Gloucestershire.⁴⁷ Siward notwithstanding, unless events narrated in the saga are corroborated elsewhere, it seems hazardous to employ the saga as a source for the 11th and 12th century migrations, given the ubiquitous fantastical elements. For instance, the author opens the account of the migration by claiming that Harold Godwinson survived the Battle of Hastings and lived out his days as a monk.

1.3 *The English in Byzantine Sources*

Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* is the key Byzantine narrative source for the early phase of the migration. Anna, it has been argued, provides evidence for English mercenaries defending Constantinople as early as April 1081 in the service of Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–81) against Alexios I in the latter's successful usurpation. Her reference to the English is, however, potentially ambiguous. She neither employs the term Ἰγγλῖνοι (the “English”) nor Βρετάννοι (“Britons”) but refers instead to τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Θούλης Βαράγγους (“the Varangians from Thule”) in which “Thule” has been interpreted by some scholars to refer to Britain.⁴⁸ For the sake of classical mimesis, Anna avoided contemporary terms for peoples who had been unknown in the ancient world. Thus, the Normans could be Kelts, the Pechenegs Scythians and Italians Latins; she could deploy terms interchangeably for crusaders, such as Kelts or Latins, regardless of their nationality. This is further complicated by the close connections between England and Scandinavia. For instance, it has been suggested that as early as the reign of Michael IV (1034–41), Anglo-Danes may have joined the Varangian

44 Fell, “The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: its Version of the Anglo-Saxon Emigration to Byzantium”, p. 196.

45 Head, “Alexios Komnenos and the English”, pp. 195–97.

46 *Edwardsaga*, trans. Dasent, pp. 424–28, repr. Ciggar, pp. 340–42; Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, pp. 80–81.

47 Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 82, n. 178; Shepard, “Another New England?”, p. 19.

48 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, ed. Leib, vol. 1, p. 92 (ii.9). See also Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, pp. 187–89.

Guard following the death of King Cnut (1035).⁴⁹ Some Byzantines may have conflated the Danes and the English as one axe-bearing people, and hence Anna may not have intended, or may have been unable, to single out the English as separate from the Scandinavians.

In short, Anna tended to generalise non-Byzantines as “barbarians”; her use of the term Thule may, therefore, have reflected a literary choice to indicate a far-flung land rather than a specific people. Accordingly, some scholars have questioned whether Thule refers to Britain or to a part of Scandinavia such as Thy in Jutland.⁵⁰ Sigfús Blöndal argues that she uses the term Thule for Scandinavia and that she would have used the term “Brettania” or the like for Britain.⁵¹ Indeed, even if she were referring to Britain, she may have been mistaken in so doing because she was writing several decades after the events she narrates, perhaps in the 1140s, and may well have assumed that the Varangian Guard had the same national composition in the 1080s as it did in the mid-12th century.

In contrast, a number of scholars have argued strongly in favour of interpreting Thule as Britain and, therefore, in favour of an earlier date for the Varangian Guard evolving into a primarily English corps. Head observes that elsewhere in the *Alexiad*, Anna remarks that Thule had once been part of the imperial domain.⁵² This statement suggests that Anna cannot mean Scandinavia when she refers to Thule, which in contrast to Britannia had never been part of the Roman Empire. Shepard demonstrates convincingly that Anna’s account is plausible and that she employed the term Thule in reference to Britain.⁵³ First, he observes that other Byzantines sometimes used the term Thule for Britain, such as the classicising Michael Psellos who used “Thule” to refer to the land of the Britons with the phrase, τῶν Βρεταννίων ἡ Θούλη, in a letter from the mid-11th century.⁵⁴ Second, in Anna’s account of Bohemond’s 1107–08 campaign against Byzantium, she lists Kelts, Franks, and Germans as having taken part, in addition to men from the island of Thule, who, she claims, joined Bohemond on this occasion but usually fought for the Byzantines.⁵⁵ Shepard argues that

49 Head, “Alexios Komnenos and the English”, p. 188; Vasiliev, “The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration”, p. 45.

50 Blöndal, “Nabites the Varangian”, pp. 145–67; F. Dölger, Note in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 38 (1938), pp. 235–6.

51 Blöndal, “Nabites the Varangian”, p. 146.

52 Head, “Alexios Komnenos and the English”, pp. 190–91; Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, ed. Leib, vol. 2, p. 73 (vi.11).

53 Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, pp. 64–74.

54 Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 66, n. 73.

55 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, ed. Leib, vol. 3, pp. 81–5 (xii.9).

while “no Scandinavian contingent is known to have served Bohemond”, participants from the British Isles are mentioned by Orderic Vitalis.⁵⁶

1.4 *Composition of the Varangian Guard*

There is surviving documentary evidence which may shed light on when the Varangian Guard began to evolve into a chiefly Anglo-Saxon force. This depends on how Byzantine exemption-charters are read.⁵⁷ These charters suggest that the English arrived in significant numbers c.1080.⁵⁸ Around this time, the emperor was advised by Kekaumenos to bestow fewer honours on the Englishmen in his service.⁵⁹ This suggests that Alexios already relied on the English mercenaries as an important contingent. Interpreting these texts, in part, rests on the term “Varangian”. Dölger, rejecting Vasiliev, argued that “Varangian” referred to Scandinavian, only applying to the English in the 12th century, and that the Anglo-Saxons were not a significant part of the Byzantine mercenary force in the late 11th century.⁶⁰ Shepard, however, argues that the “peak-period” of migrations was likely the beginning of the reign of Alexios I, that Englishmen continued to arrive in the early 1080s, and that there seems to have been a wave in 1091.⁶¹ Scholars have also interpreted Anna Komnene’s account of the Battle of Dyrrachium (October 1081) as indicating that the English were a significant component in the Byzantine forces.⁶² Moreover, some scholars claim that Geoffrey Malaterra, a Sicilian Norman, not only

56 Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 66, n. 74 and 75.

57 Namely charters which granted favours to subjects, or exempted subjects from certain taxes.

58 See Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 188; Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 64. Shepard acknowledges that the earliest reference specifically to the Ἕγγλινοι (English) dates from 1080, but argues that few charters from the 1060s and 1070s have been published and those that do survive tend to come from the Aegean. This region only faced a significant military threat after the invasion of Anatolia following the 1071 defeat at Manzikert. It was only subsequent to this that it became important for the monasteries to establish the military charges from which they were exempt: Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, pp. 63–64.

59 Kekaumenos, *Νουθετικός πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα*, eds. V. Vasilievsky/V. Jernstedt, *Cecaumeni Strategicon et incerti scriptoris de officiis regis libelli*, St Petersburg 1896, p. 95. Note that some scholars, including P. Lemerle and A.P. Kazhdan, have rejected the interpretation of this passage referring to the English, see Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 64.

60 Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, p. 60.

61 Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, pp. 60–64. Similarly, Vasiliev argues that it was in the 1080s that the English-Varangians replaced the Russian-Varangians: Vasiliev, “The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration”, pp. 58–60. See also, Benediktz, “The Evolution of the Varangian Regiment in the Byzantine Army”, pp. 20–25.

62 Shepard, “The English and Byzantium”, pp. 74–79; Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 188.

verifies Anna's account but also confirms that the Varangians were indeed English. Furthermore, Malaterra stated that the English briefly garrisoned Alexios's fortress on the Gulf of Nikomedia (Izmit).⁶³ This claim also appears in Orderic's account: "The Emperor Alexios laid the foundations of a town called Civitot for the English, at some distance from Byzantium; but later when the Norman threat became too great he brought them back to the imperial city and set them to guard his chief palace and royal treasures".⁶⁴ In terms of the Varangian Guard, the preponderance of surviving evidence seems to suggest that the English played a leading role in the Varangian Guard by the 1080s. To argue that the Scandinavians continued to play a significant role at that time necessitates rejecting a range of source material without being able to call on an equivalent body of tentative evidence for the contrary. Most importantly, it seems difficult to reconcile the primary sources citing the Norman Conquest under William I as the catalyst for the Anglo-Saxon migration with the notion that the English were not recruited in significant numbers until the 12th century. Had the English mercenaries spent decades elsewhere one would expect some greater indication in the source material.

1.5 *Diplomacy and "New England"*

The 11th-century "change in the nationality of the Varangian Guard from Scandinavian to English", Nicol argues, "must have made the Byzantines more aware of the existence of England".⁶⁵ In the 12th century, the Byzantine emperors sent a number of embassies to England.⁶⁶ Around 1100–18, Alexios sent envoys to Henry I (1100–35). He sent an Englishman from Norfolk, Ulfric, with a view to securing further military recruitment, and the 1170 embassy brought a proposal of marriage.⁶⁷ Manuel I (1143–80) dispatched several embassies to

63 Geoffrey Malaterra, *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae Comitis*, iii.27–29, ed. E. Pontieri, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, series 2, vol. 5.1, Bologna 1928, pp. 73–5; Nicol, "Byzantium and England", p. 188; Fell, "The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: its Version of the Anglo-Saxon Emigration to Byzantium", p. 195; Shepard, "The English and Byzantium", pp. 72–76; Vasiliev, "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration", pp. 56–58.

64 Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 2, pp. 202–03 (iv).

65 Nicol, "Byzantium and England", p. 192.

66 See Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 152–53; Ciggaar, "L'Émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066", pp. 316–20; Head, "Alexios Komnenos and the English", p. 194; Nicol, "Byzantium and England", pp. 192–93; Vasiliev, "Manuel Comnenus and Henry Plantagenet", pp. 233–44.

67 *Chronicle of Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon* (Rolls Series 2), London 1858, p. 46; Shepard, "The English and Byzantium", p. 79; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 131, 146–47.

Henry II (1154–89) in the 1170s.⁶⁸ Henry II had amassed extensive continental possessions, and thus France was also a locus of interaction between England and Byzantium. For instance, the envoys of 1170 arrived in Angers. Italy too remained a locus of contact: in 1177, Henry married his daughter Joan to the Norman king of Sicily, William II.⁶⁹ In addition to the exchange of envoys, there were friendly exchanges between Manuel and Henry. In the November following his decisive defeat at Myriokephalon (September 1176), Manuel sent Henry, via ambassadors, an account of the battle. Manuel concludes, “some of the chief men of your nobility were with us, and they will inform you on all the circumstances in the order in which they happened [...] we have still deemed it advisable to inform you upon all the events that have happened, as being our dearly beloved friend, and as being closely united with our imperial majesty by the ties of blood that exist between our children”.⁷⁰ It is noteworthy that Anglo-Norman nobles were present at the battle and that Manuel underscores their family ties.⁷¹ It is also an important reminder that our evidence for interaction survives from the highest echelons and that there is a myriad of lost exchanges, including the presumably verbal reports from the nobles to which Manuel is alluding. In turn Henry wrote Manuel an account of the island and people of Britain.⁷² Three reciprocal embassies during Henry II’s reign are also known. In 1176, an English knight was sent to Constantinople to send the king’s respects; Henry sent a pack of bloodhounds to Manuel and, finally, several years after the emperor’s death (1185), a nobleman is recorded as travelling to Constantinople in the king’s service.⁷³ Henry’s son and successor, Richard I

68 In 1170, 1176, and 1177: Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, pp. 192–93; Vasiliev, “Manuel Comnenus and Henry Plantagenet”, pp. 241–43 (esp. p. 242, n. 1); *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the twenty-third year of the reign of King Henry the Second, A.D. 1176–1177* (Publications of the Pipe Roll Society, 26), London 1905, p. 187.

69 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 151–52; Haskins, “England and Sicily in the Twelfth Century”, pp. 641–65.

70 Manuel I Komnenos, *Letter to Henry II of England*, trans. A.A. Vasiliev, “Manuel Comnenus and Henry Plantagenet”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 29 (1929–30), 237–40, here pp. 239–40; Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica Magistri*, ed. W. Stubbs, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, 4 vols. (Rolls Series 51), London 1869, here vol. 2, pp. 102–04.

71 Manuel’s children by his second wife, Mary of Antioch, were second cousins to the children of Henry’s queen, Eleanor of Aquitaine. It has also been suggested that there were English units at the Battle of Manzikert (1071) owing to an allusion in Matthew of Edessa to participants from remote lands: Ciggaar, “England and Byzantium on the Eve of the Norman Conquest”, pp. 87–88.

72 Gerald of Wales, *Descriptio Kambriae*, I 8, ed. J.F. Dimock, *Giraldi Cambrensis Descriptio Kambriae*, London 1868, pp. 181–82; Vasiliev, “Manuel Comnenus and Henry Plantagenet”, p. 244.

73 Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 193.

(1189–99), travelled to the East on crusade and conquered Cyprus in 1191 from Isaac Komnenos.

One important, if questionable, claim in the primary sources is that significant numbers of Anglo-Saxons were settled on the Black Sea at “Nova Anglia”.⁷⁴ According to the Icelandic saga, the English Varangians desired a land of their own and refused Alexios’ request to remain as his bodyguard. Accordingly, the emperor offered them a formerly Byzantine territory on the Black Sea, provided they could reconquer the territory for themselves. While some chose to remain in his bodyguard, the majority settled there, rechristened towns with English names, such as London and York, and built new towns. “This land”, the saga claims, “lies six days’ and nights’ sail across the sea to the east and north-east of Micklegarth [Constantinople]; and there is the best of land there; and that folk has abode there ever since”.⁷⁵ “New England” is also mentioned in a Latin chronicle.⁷⁶ Some details differ, such as the number of ships which left England (235, versus 350 in the saga) and when the English arrived (1075 according to the chronicle). It also provides additional details, including a name – Domapia – for the land on the Black Sea and the number of Englishmen who stayed in Constantinople (4,350). Strikingly, the chronicle does confirm some specific details, including a claim that the “Oriental Angli” (namely the English émigrés) refused Greek clergy preferring Latin counterparts from Hungary, and that New England was six days’ sailing from Constantinople.⁷⁷ Shepard argues that “the tale has a basis in fact: Englishmen really did play a part in the restoration of Byzantine influence over cities on the Crimea and round the Sea of Azov, and on the East coast of the Black Sea. Their numbers were small, and their settlement very scattered”.⁷⁸ He gives three main reasons, acknowledging that none is conclusive alone but arguing that together they carry cumulative weight: topography, English-derived place names, and that some of the saga’s information also appears in Byzantine sources.⁷⁹ It by no means seems implausible that some Anglo-Saxons could have left Constantinople in order to settle on the Black Sea. It is difficult, however, to determine its size and significance given the limited source material.

74 Head, “Alexios Komnenos and the English”, p. 197; Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, pp. 186–87; Fell, “The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: its Version of the Anglo-Saxon Emigration to Byzantium”, pp. 181, 194–96.

75 *Edwardsaga*, trans. Dasent, pp. 424–28, repr. Ciggaar, pp. 340–42; Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 186.

76 Ciggar, “L’Émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066”, pp. 301–42; Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 186.

77 Nicol, “Byzantium and England”, p. 187.

78 Shepard, “Another New England?”, p. 20.

79 Shepard, “Another New England?”, pp. 20–39.

2 Cultural Exchange

The Ottonian court may have acted as a locus of intermediate cultural exchange between Byzantium and England. Greek embassies visited Otto I in 945 and 949.⁸⁰ The Ottonians and the House of Wessex were connected through marriage: Edward the Elder's (899–924) daughter, Edith (Eadgyth) was the first wife of Otto I, whose son and successor (by his second marriage), Otto II, married Theophano, niece to John I Tzimiskes (969–76). Shepard argues that Scandinavia too was effectively a rival theatre of interaction between Byzantium and the British Isles via the Dnieper, an East-West way.⁸¹

2.1 *Artefacts and Material Culture*

The presence of Byzantine artefacts in the British Isles, and individual Byzantine persons, raises the question of whether there was significant cultural exchange and influence between these far-flung lands. Byzantine monks, for instance, spread Byzantine religion and culture beyond the borders of the empire when acting as ambassadors and missionaries.⁸² In the 10th and 11th centuries, written sources record a Byzantine paten, shrine, and ewers in England.⁸³ King Edmund (939–46) is said to have wrapped the body of St Cuthbert in *pallia graeca* in 944.⁸⁴ Fragments of silk have been found at Lincoln, London, and York dating from the mid- to late 10th century. These fabrics could be Byzantine in origin.⁸⁵ Given the distance between the British Isles and Byzantium, most interactions were indirect. Byzantine silk was imported, and gifted, via Italy: Byzantine silks were sold in Rome and in Pavia.⁸⁶ Some scholars have argued that Edward the Confessor was likely buried with a Byzantine silk alongside a gold Byzantine cross.⁸⁷ This determination is based on the detailed summary

80 Shepard, J., "Byzantium and the West", pp. 610–15.

81 "It is therefore worth emphasising that the various circuits making up the Way from the Varangians to the Greeks overlapped with one another; so although most participants, animate and inanimate, probably circulated across adjoining circuits, the infrastructure existed for more ambitious voyages and shipments, and such voyages were far from uncommon": Shepard, "Another New England?", pp. 33–35 (quotation at p. 29).

82 Harris, "Wars and Rumours of Wars", p. 33.

83 Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, p. 159.

84 *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, ed. T. Arnold, *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia I* (Rolls Series 75), London 1882, pp. 196–214, here pp. 211–12; Shepard, "From the Bosphorus to the British Isles", p. 23.

85 Shepard, "Another New England?", p. 24.

86 Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, pp. 149–53, 156–57, 159; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 156.

87 Shepard, "From the Bosphorus to the British Isles", p. 36; Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, pp. 162–64.

of the contents in Edward's tomb as described after its accidental opening in 1685.⁸⁸ This source is, however, questionable given the many disturbances endured by Edward's tomb after he had been laid to rest.⁸⁹ Three fragments of silk are preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum which are said to have come from the 17th-century intrusion of the tomb.⁹⁰ With the exception of Russia, which fell within the Byzantine sphere of cultural and religious influence, archaeologists have seldom uncovered Byzantine lead seals beyond the borders of the Byzantine Empire, yet a surprising number of seals have been discovered in Britain.⁹¹ In 1962, a *protospatharios*' seal (issued 1060–80) was found in Winchester; in 1963, a seal (issued c.1059–64) of the patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronios II, was also found in Winchester; a 13th-century seal of the patriarch of Antioch, Euthymios, was found in Portsmouth; from 1989 onwards, nine seals have been discovered in the City of London; and, in 1994, a seal of Alexios I was unearthed near Torksey, Lincolnshire.⁹² A number of coins have also been discovered in England. Four bronze coins, including two 11th-century *folleis*, were discovered alongside the City of London lead seals.⁹³ A number of other Byzantine coins have also been discovered in London.⁹⁴ The

88 See H. Keepe, *A True and Perfect Narrative of the Strange and Unexpected Finding the Crucifix & Gold-Chain of that Pious Prince, St. Edward, the King and Confessor which was Found after 620 years Interment and Presented to His Most Sacred Majesty, King James the Second* [under the pseudonym of Charles Taylour], London 1688.

89 The tomb was opened and the coffin transferred twice in the Middle Ages only to be desecrated in the 16th century in the reign of Henry VIII. Mary I subsequently had the coffin returned to its shrine and supplied with new jewels to replace those which had been looted. Accordingly, the cross and shroud may have been gifted to Edward no earlier than 1557. See Crook, *English Medieval Shrines*, pp. 157–60, 303.

90 Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, pp. 162–65. Dodwell argues that the museum silks likely derive either from Edward's first entombment or the 1163 translation.

91 Cheynet, "Les sceaux byzantins de Londres", pp. 85–86.

92 Cheynet, "Les sceaux byzantins de Londres", pp. 85–100; Biddle, "Excavations at Winchester 1962–3", p. 195. For the finds, see Laurent, "Byzance et l'Angleterre au lendemain de la conquête normande", pp. 93–96; Laurent, "Un sceau inédit du patriarche de Jérusalem Sophrone II trouvé à Winchester", pp. 49–50; Bendall, "A Thirteenth Century Byzantine Seal Found in England", pp. 356–57; Egan, "Byzantium in London?", pp. 111–17; De Jersey, "An Imperial Byzantine Seal from Lincolnshire", pp. 349–51.

93 A *folleis* of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55); a *folleis* issued 1065–70; a provincial copy of an Alexios I's *tetarteron* (1092–1118); and a "barbarous copy of a *tetarteron*": see Egan, "Byzantium in London?", pp. 111–12.

94 A copper-alloy half *tetarteron* (Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–80) from the Thames waterfront; a silver *miliaresion* (John I Tzimiskes, 969–76) from a c.1075 hoard at Walbrook; a coin purportedly found at the Royal Exchange (Romanos I Lekapenos, 919–44); and "an unidentified piece assigned to the eleventh century, allegedly found at Tower Bridge Road": Egan, "Byzantium in London?", p. 115.

survival of these seals and coins suggest a more extensive exchange between England and Byzantium than that indicated by the written record alone. It has been observed that the City of London finds were located in soil conditions which allowed the metalwork to remain legible while elsewhere in London this would not be possible. Hence, these witnesses likely reflect a small portion of the full record.⁹⁵ For further context, note that nine hoards and around 70 single finds have unearthed 173 gold and silver Islamic coins (hammered pre-1100). These have chiefly been found in the former Danelaw and reveal Scandinavian usage, often having being nicked, cut, or divided.⁹⁶ Byzantine and Islamic finds, therefore, differ in nature. The relatively low numbers of the former imply the individual and direct contact of travellers, the latter high numbers imply Viking influence, or dominance, because dirhams circulated in Scandinavia and Russia.

2.2 *Artistic Forms and Influence*

Many scholars have argued that Byzantine coins influenced the designs of their Anglo-Saxon counterparts. For instance, Alfred's coins were "clearly modelled on Byzantine originals" with the king's obverse bust, "executed in a very Byzantine style".⁹⁷ Comparisons have been drawn between the sword-type penny of William the Conqueror and coins of Isaac I Komnenos (1057–59).⁹⁸ Others argue that such conclusions were too subjective. Whitting argues that it is the differences, not the similarities, that are most outstanding.⁹⁹ Assessing similarities in coinage is not only subjective but it is also difficult to pinpoint the provenance of influence; in many cases, English craftsmen may have been influenced by the Ottonians, who in turn may have been influenced by the Byzantines.

Similarities have also been drawn between Anglo-Saxon and Byzantine manuscripts. For instance, two manuscripts from Winchester in the reign of Edgar (959–75), it is argued, are illustrated according to Byzantine motifs

95 Egan, "Byzantium in London?", p. 114: "It would be unwise to take the currently attested distributions as even beginning to define the full extent of the capital's buried links with Byzantium". Placed in a broad context, these suggest "the presence of persons coming from the Byzantine world with workaday Byzantine currency in their purses" with London as the port of entry: Shepard, "Another New England?", pp. 36–37.

96 Naismith, "Islamic Coins from Early Medieval England", pp. 193–4, 208–10.

97 Talbot Rice, *English Art*, p. 34. See also Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 132.

98 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 141–42.

99 Whitting, "The Byzantine Empire and the Coinage of the Anglo-Saxons", p. 36: "The ghost of the Roman Empire was still a power in the northern lands, but Byzantium was not quite the same thing. It is this position that appears to be accurately reflected in the Anglo-Saxon coinage".

and iconography.¹⁰⁰ Byzantine styles have been detected in the 12th-century Winchester Psalter, where influence may have flowed via Italy.¹⁰¹ It has been suggested that the margins of the Bayeux Tapestry, which depict animals and birds, reflect Byzantine silks (especially the idiosyncrasy of animals biting their own tails).¹⁰² Finally, it has been argued that surviving English vestments were influenced by Byzantine silks.¹⁰³ In terms of ceremonial, Greek litanies were known in England, and Byzantine features have been suggested for William the Conqueror's coronation.¹⁰⁴ Krijnie Ciggaar argues that, in the 11th century, Marian feasts migrated to England from Byzantium via southern Italy.¹⁰⁵ By its nature, ceremonial is somewhat intangible, which makes it difficult to determine the extent of influence and, similar to coinage, the provenance of any influence. Again, the Conqueror's emulation of imperial trappings, on coins as well as in ceremonial, may have derived from earlier Ottonian influence.

2.3 *Language and Culture*

Anglo-Saxon writers were aware of, and deployed, Greek vocabulary in their works. Michael Lapidge observed Greek terms in the Latin version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle composed in 978–88 by Aethelweard. In particular, Aethelweard employs Greek naval terms: for instance, the Greek *dromon* for Old English *ceol* or *scip* (ship).¹⁰⁶ Shepard argues that Aethelweard is more likely to have learned these terms directly from “informants capable of spelling them out” rather than from literary sources.¹⁰⁷ Alternatively, this use of Greek vocabulary may constitute the legacy of an earlier linguistic interest. As aforementioned, Bede celebrates the level of Greek proficiency in the 7th and 8th centuries following the efforts of Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Adrian.

When considered alongside a remark by the Byzantine statesman and man of letters Michael Psellos, such use of Greek vocabulary may be reflective of broadly contemporary exchange. Psellos complains in a letter (mid-1060s) that he is forgetting his Greek while living among provincials; he claims it is

100 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 132–33, 137, 153; Talbot Rice, *English Art*, p. 184. See also, Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, pp. 157–58.

101 Wormald, *The Winchester Psalter*, pp. 87–91; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 155–56.

102 Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, p. 169.

103 Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, pp. 149–53, 156–57, 159; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 156.

104 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 133, 139.

105 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 135–36; Clayton, “Feasts of the Virgin in the Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church”.

106 Lapidge, “Byzantium, Rome, and England in the Early Middle Ages”, p. 395.

107 Shepard, “Another New England?”, p. 28.

like living “among the Britons” where “few know Greek, and even those who do speak it incorrectly”.¹⁰⁸ Framed within the context of archaeological finds, such as Byzantine seals, Shepard argues that Psellos is referring to contemporary rather than ancient Britons, and that Psellos presupposes an awareness on the recipient’s part that some Britons tried to speak Greek.¹⁰⁹ Could this statement be taken as evidence that learned individuals in the British Isles attempted to study and speak Greek? It is unlikely that Psellos was a reliable witness for the languages spoken in Britain or the scholarly pursuits of the inhabitants. Furthermore, his phrase can be read as ironic: Byzantine provincials speak Greek as badly as those who cannot speak it at all.

The surviving Anglo-Saxon works of literature suggest a keen interest in the East, perhaps driven by the Christianisation of the Anglo-Saxon world. Such translations include Cynewulf’s *Elene* (on Saint Helena), *The Wonders of the East*, a *Letter from Alexander to Aristotle* and the story of *Apollonius of Tyre*. Exploring legendary or historical themes, such works did not address the contemporary East, but they must nonetheless have shaped contemporary attitudes to the East. Interest in the East seems to have persisted into the Norman period. In the early 12th century, a Greek description of Constantinople was translated potentially by an Englishman, and later a compatriot may well have composed another account of the imperial city.¹¹⁰ England’s only Latin epic was composed by Joseph of Exeter in the 1180s as an account of the Trojan War. In works such as Geoffrey of Monmouth’s history, the legendary founder of the Britons was Brutus, a survivor of the fall of Troy.

Given how remote each “nation” was to the other, a number of mutual misunderstandings and hostility arose. William of Malmesbury strongly criticised Alexios: “More noted for craftiness and guile than for probity, and contriving much harm against the crusaders, he left his son John as his heir; however, acknowledging the loyalty of the English, he made them his principal attendants in his family and bequeathed to his son love for them”.¹¹¹ Such hostility was no doubt reflective of the animosities sown in the crusading era. Others, however, praised Alexios, including the Norman Orderic Vitalis, who described him as “a man of great wisdom and nobility”.¹¹² The 12th-century clerk, Walter

108 Shepard, “From the Bosphorus to the British Isles”, p. 36; Gautier, “Quelques lettres de Psellos inédites ou déjà éditées”, pp. 144–45.

109 Shepard, “Another New England?”, p. 36.

110 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 148–49.

111 Vasiliev, “The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration”, p. 68.

112 Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 2, pp. 202–03 (iv).

Map, noted that the “Greeks” are “*molles et femineos, loquaces et dolosos*”.¹¹³ Some English writers seem, therefore, to have accepted the western European stereotypes about Byzantines. For their part, the Byzantines habitually referred to the English as “barbarians”, a term indiscriminately applied to all foreigners. Although there is some controversy over primary source references to English mercenaries in Byzantium, they seem to have been considered loyal to the emperor. Beyond this fidelity, it is not clear that Byzantines differentiated the English from the other “Latins” who came to suffer their opprobrium in the crusading era.

2.4 Political Ideology

The Byzantine title *basileus*, which referred to the emperor, appears in charters as a title for Anglo-Saxon kings from the 10th century.¹¹⁴ It did not, however, feature on Anglo-Saxon coins.¹¹⁵ *Basileus* emerges as the preferred Byzantine title for the emperor in the early 7th century and seems to have been used in England first by King Æthelstan (924–39) in 935.¹¹⁶ Æthelstan is widely regarded as the first king of England: when his brother-in-law, King Sihtric of the Northumbrians, died in 927, Æthelstan added his throne to his own kingdom.¹¹⁷ This event was celebrated in contemporary poems. Initially he was styled as King of the Anglo-Saxons but later became *rex Anglorum* on his charters, and even *rex totius Britanniae* on his coins (“King of the English” and “King of the whole of Britain”, respectively).¹¹⁸ In short, Æthelstan’s (less frequent) use of the term *basileus* reinforces an ideology of a unified kingdom and his position as a king “above the status of a normal king”.¹¹⁹ *Basileus* was, therefore, only one title among others, and never appeared on Æthelstan’s coins.

113 Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. and trans. M.R. James et al., *Courtiers’ Trifles*, Oxford 1983, p. 174.

114 See Snook, *The Anglo-Saxon Chancery*, pp. 74–76, 156, 164, 189–91; Gebhardt, “From Bretwalda to Basileus”, pp. 157–84 (for a list of the relevant charters, see pp. 157–58, n. 4); Gray Birch, “Index of the Styles and Titles of English Sovereigns”, p. 52.

115 Whitting, “The Byzantine Empire and the Coinage of the Anglo-Saxons”, p. 34.

116 Note that there has been lively historiographical discussion over whether Æthelstan was responsible for his own title or whether it was chosen independently: see Gebhardt, “From Bretwalda to Basileus”, pp. 163–64, esp. nn. 21–23. Resolution of this controversy could shed light on why *basileus* was used on charters but not on coins.

117 See Dumville, “Between Alfred the Great and Edgar the Peacemaker: Æthelstan, First King of England”, pp. 141–71.

118 Keynes, “England, 900–1016”, pp. 468–69; Blunt, “The Coinage of Athelstan, King of England 924–39”, pp. 47–48; Molyneux, “Why were some Tenth-Century English Kings Presented as Rulers of Britain?”, pp. 59–61.

119 Gebhardt, “From Bretwalda to Basileus”, pp. 162, 181–82.

It is difficult to determine whether this title amounted to anything other than a loan word as a way to express suzerainty over former kingdoms. There is no surviving evidence to suggest that it was invested with any of the connotations of the term as used in Byzantium. Indeed, *basileus* had been used by other rulers, including the Persian shah *before* the title was commonly used for Byzantine emperors.¹²⁰ Similarly, Charlemagne notoriously won the right to be referred to as *basileus* by the Byzantines, who subsequently employed the term *basileus Rhomaiōn* (Emperor of the Romans) on their own coins to distinguish their superior imperial claims from those of the Carolingians.¹²¹ It seems unlikely, albeit possible, that Æthelstan copied *basileus* from a Byzantine *solidus* given that he did not use the term on his coinage. Accordingly, the Anglo-Saxon usage may reflect Frankish influence and western medieval imperial claims, without any conscious knowledge of the Byzantine origins of the term. King Offa of Mercia (757–96), in particular, maintained connections with Charlemagne's court, such as an exchange of letters, and the secondment of the deacon Alcuin for many years at the court of Charlemagne.¹²² Anglo-Saxon kings may have employed the title *basileus* for its religious, rather than political, connotations: in the Greek New Testament, *basileus* is the term for king.¹²³ Finally, it has been suggested that employing terms such as *basileus* (or *imperator*) were “attempts to exhibit erudition through obscure vocabulary” rather than ideological statements.¹²⁴ Shepard, however, argues that the use of the appellation by the House of Wessex is “the outstanding mark of Anglo-Saxon awareness of contemporary Byzantium”.¹²⁵ For instance, he notes that Edward the Confessor's seals contain the first known western use of the term *basileus* and significantly were double-sided: western seals, unlike their Byzantine counterparts, were customarily single-sided.¹²⁶ This is not altogether convincing in itself. After all, papal seals were also double-sided, and by the reign of Edward the title *basileus* had been used by English kings for over a century. Besides the use of the term *basileus*, there is little to suggest that the

120 Chrysos, “The Title *Βασιλεὺς* in Early Byzantine International Relations”.

121 Classen, *Karl der Große, das Papsttum und Byzanz*, p. 94.

122 See Wormald, “The Age of Offa and Alcuin”.

123 For instance, Matt. 2:2, John 1:49; 1 Tim. 6:15. Likewise in the Septuagint, Solomon and David were naturally both termed *basileus*: see Gebhardt, “From Bretwalda to Basileus”, pp. 166–67, n. 33.

124 Molyneaux, “Why were some Tenth-Century English Kings Presented as Rulers of Britain?”, p. 63.

125 Shepard, “Another New England?”, p. 23.

126 Shepard, “Another New England?”, p. 36; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 135–36; Ciggaar, “England and Byzantium on the Eve of the Norman Conquest”, pp. 78–96.

Anglo-Saxons were influenced by Byzantine political ideology, nor even that they were aware of it. This suggests the usage may be similar to the celebrated King Offa “dinar”, which was copied so closely from an original of the Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr (754–75) that it inadvertently replicated the Arabic inscription that Allah alone is God.¹²⁷ Indeed, had the Byzantines been aware of the Anglo-Saxon usage of the term *basileus* they would have strongly discouraged it, as they had initially with Charlemagne.

Æthelstan’s successors were also termed *basileus* on charters, including those of Edmund, Eadred, Eadwig, Edgar (the Peaceful), Æthelred II (the Unready), Cnut, and Edward the Confessor; William I also occasionally used the title.¹²⁸ The only Scandinavian ruler to employ the term *basileus* was Cnut who, in eight of his charters, styled himself *basileus* or *basileus Anglorum*.¹²⁹ Rather than evoking an imperial majesty or underscoring the extent of his kingdoms, Cnut is likely to have been making a claim of legitimacy to the English throne emphasising continuity, considering that his English predecessors had frequently used the term.¹³⁰ The use of the title by Æthelstan’s other successors probably reflected Cnut’s motivation, in that the title had become an established style, perhaps with no awareness of any other connotations. In short, even if the title did originally reflect Byzantine influence during the reign of Æthelstan, the title had become a traditional style and likely no longer possessed its earlier connotations (Byzantine or otherwise) for his successors.

3 Conclusion

From the mid-10th century, there is increasing evidence of cultural exchange between England and Byzantium, which contrasts with the relatively sparse preceding three centuries.¹³¹ Closer cultural exchange should be viewed within the context of growing connections between England and continental Europe more generally.¹³² This exchange would continue beyond the period under discussion. Notably, following the fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusade,

127 Naismith, “Islamic Coins from Early Medieval England”, pp. 196–97; Allan, “Offa’s Imitation of an Arab Dinar”, pp. 77–89.

128 Scheel, “Byzantium – Rome – Denmark – Iceland”, p. 246, n. 6; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 141.

129 Scheel, “Byzantium – Rome – Denmark – Iceland”, p. 245.

130 Scheel, “Byzantium – Rome – Denmark – Iceland”, p. 246.

131 Shepard, “Another New England?”, p. 22.

132 For example, this exchange manifested itself in terms of religious learning, art, and imported manuscripts: Keynes, “England, 900–1016”, p. 456.

many Byzantine relics and objects were looted and taken west, including a relic of the true cross brought to England around 1205–23.¹³³

In spite of the geographical, and perhaps cultural, divide between these two regions, there was substantial mutual interest. Envoys and clergy travelled in both directions; soldiers and objects, however, travelled asymmetrically, with the former heading east and the latter west. Frequently, witnesses to cultural exchange in England reflect the importance of other cultural centres, notably Italy and the Ottonian court, which had more direct connections with Byzantium. Finally, while it is plausible that contemporary Byzantine ideas, through vocabulary and political ideology, travelled as far as England, there are other more plausible explanations for the use of Greek terms such as *basileus*.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anna Komnene, *Alexiad*, ed. B. Leib, *Alexiade: Règne de l'Empereur Alexis I Comnène* (1081–1118), 3 vols., Paris 1967 (second edition).
- Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, eds. B. Colgrave/R.A.B. Mynors, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Oxford 1969.
- Edwardsaga*, trans. G.W. Dasent, in *Icelandic Sagas and Other Historical Documents Relating to the Settlements and Descents of the Northmen on the British Isles*, vol. 3 (Rolls Series 88.3), London 1894, pp. 424–28, repr. K.N. Ciggar, “L'Émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066: un nouveau texte en latin sur les Varangues à Constantinople”, *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974), 301–42 (pp. 340–42).
- Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, 6 vols., Oxford 1968–80.

Secondary Literature

- Aist, R., *The Christian Topography of Early Islamic Jerusalem: the Evidence of Willibald of Eichstätt (700–787 CE)*, Turnhout 2009.
- Allan, J., “Offa's Imitation of an Arab Dinar”, *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 4th series, 14 (1914), 77–89.
- Bendall, S., “A Thirteenth Century Byzantine Seal Found in England”, *The Numismatic Circular* 102 (1994), 356–57.
- Benediktz, B.S., “The Evolution of the Varangian Regiment in the Byzantine Army”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 62 (1969), 20–25.
- Biddle, M., “Excavations at Winchester 1962–3”, *Antiquaries Journal* 44 (1964), 188–219.

¹³³ For the later history of the relic in England, see Wormald, “The Rood of Bromholm”.

- Blöndal, S., "Nabites the Varangian", *Classica et Mediaevalia* 2 (1939), 145–67.
- Blunt, C.E., "The Coinage of Athelstan, King of England 924–39", *British Numismatic Journal* 42 (1974), 35–160.
- Borgolte, M., *Der Gesandtenaustausch der Karolinger mit den Abbasiden und mit den Patriarchen von Jerusalem*, Munich 1976.
- Buckton, D. (ed.), *Byzantium: Treasures of Byzantine Art and Culture from British Collections*, London 1994.
- Burn, A.R., "Procopius and the Island of Ghosts", *English Historical Review* 70 (1955), 258–61.
- Cheyne, J.-C., "Les sceaux byzantins de Londres", *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 8 (2003), 85–100.
- Chrysos, E.K., "The Title βασιλεύς in Early Byzantine International Relations", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 32 (1978), 29–75.
- Ciggaar, K.N., "L'Émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066: un nouveau texte en latin sur les Varangues à Constantinople", *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974), 301–42.
- Ciggaar, K.N., "England and Byzantium on the Eve of the Norman Conquest (The Reign of Edward the Confessor)", *Anglo-Norman Studies* 5 (1982), 78–96.
- Ciggaar, K.N., "Byzantine Marginalia to the Norman Conquest", *Anglo-Norman Studies* 9 (1986), 43–69.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople, the West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations*, Leiden-New York 1996.
- Classen, P., *Karl der Große, das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Begründung des karolingischen Kaisertums*, Düsseldorf 1968.
- Clayton, M., "Feasts of the Virgin in the Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church", *Anglo-Saxon England* 13 (1984), 209–33.
- Crook, J., *English Medieval Shrines*, Woodbridge 2011.
- De Gray Birch, W., "Index of the Styles and Titles of English Sovereigns", in *Report of the First Annual Meeting of the Index Society*, London 1879, pp. 49–72.
- De Jersey, P., "An Imperial Byzantine Seal from Lincolnshire", *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 15 (1996), 349–51.
- Dodwell, C.R., *Anglo-Saxon Art: A New Perspective*, Manchester 1982.
- Dumville, D.N., "Between Alfred the Great and Edgar the Peacemaker: Æthelstan, First King of England", in D.N. Dumville (ed.), *Wessex and England from Alfred to Edgar: Six Essays on Political, Cultural, and Ecclesiastical Revival*, Woodbridge 1992, pp. 141–71.
- Egan, G., "Byzantium in London? New Archaeological Evidence for 11th Century Links between England and the Byzantine World", in M. Grünbart et al. (eds.), *Material Culture and Well-Being in Byzantium, 400–1453*, Vienna 2007, pp. 111–17.
- Fell, C., "The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: The Hagiographic Sources", *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972), 247–58.

- Fell, C., "The Icelandic Saga of Edward the Confessor: its Version of the Anglo-Saxon Emigration to Byzantium", *Anglo-Saxon England* 3 (1974), 179–96.
- Gautier, P., "Quelques lettres de Psellos inédites ou déjà éditées", *Revue des études byzantines* 44 (1986), 111–97.
- Gebhardt, T., "From Bretwalda to Basileus: Imperial Concepts in Late Anglo-Saxon England?", in J. Clauss/T. Gebhardt/C. Scholl (eds.), *Transcultural Approaches to the Concept of Imperial Rule in the Middle Ages*, Frankfurt 2017, pp. 157–84.
- Harris, A., *Byzantium, Britain and the West: The Archaeology of Cultural Identity AD 400–650*, Stroud 2003.
- Harris, J., "Wars and Rumours of Wars: England and the Byzantine World in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 14 (1999), 29–46.
- Haskins, C.H., "A Canterbury Monk at Constantinople, c.1090", *The English Historical Review* 25 (1910), 293–95.
- Haskins, C.H., "England and Sicily in the Twelfth Century", *The English Historical Review* 26 (1911), 641–65.
- Head, C., "Alexios Komnenos and the English", *Byzantion* 47 (1977), 186–98.
- Hoyland, R.G./Waidler, S., "Adomnán's *De Locis Sanctis* and the Seventh-Century Near East", *The English Historical Review* 129 (2014), 787–807.
- Keynes, S., "England, 900–1016", in T. Reuter (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 3: c.900–c.1024, Cambridge 1999, pp. 456–84.
- Lapidge, M., "The Career of Archbishop Theodore", in id. (ed.), *Archbishop Theodore: Commemorative Studies on His Life and Influence*, Cambridge 1995, pp. 1–29.
- Lapidge, M., "Byzantium, Rome, and England in the Early Middle Ages", in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 49), Spoleto 2002, vol. 1, pp. 363–400.
- Laurent, V., "Byzance et l'Angleterre au lendemain de la conquête normande. A propos d'un sceau byzantin trouvé à Winchester", *The Numismatic Circular* 71 (1963), 93–96.
- Laurent, V., "Un sceau inédit du patriarche de Jérusalem Sophrone II trouvé à Winchester", *The Numismatic Circular* 72 (1964), 49–50.
- Limor, O., "Willibald in the Holy Places", in S. Esders et al. (eds.), *East and West in the Early Middle Ages: the Merovingian Kingdoms in Mediterranean Perspective*, Cambridge 2019, pp. 230–44.
- Lopez, R.S., "Le problème des relations anglo-byzantines du septième au dixième siècle", *Byzantion* 18 (1948), 139–62.
- McCormick, M., "Byzantium and the West, 700–900", in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 2: c.700–c.900, Cambridge 1995, pp. 349–80.
- McCormick, M., *Charlemagne's Survey of the Holy Land: Wealth, Personnel, and Buildings of a Mediterranean Church between Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Washington, D.C., 2011.

- Molyneux, G., "Why were some Tenth-Century English Kings Presented as Rulers of Britain?", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 21 (2011), 59–91.
- Naismith, R., "Islamic Coins from Early Medieval England", *The Numismatic Chronicle* 165 (2005), 193–222.
- Nicol, D.M., "Byzantium and England", *Balkan Studies* 15 (1974), 173–203.
- Runciman, S., *History of the Crusades*, 3 vols., Harmondsworth 1965.
- Sansterre, J.-M., *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne*, 2 vols., Brussels 1982.
- Scheel, R., "Byzantium – Rome – Denmark – Iceland: Dealing with Imperial Concepts in the North", in J. Clauss/T. Gebhardt/C. Scholl (eds.), *Transcultural Approaches to the Concept of Imperial Rule in the Middle Ages*, Frankfurt 2017, pp. 245–94.
- Shepard, J., "The English and Byzantium: a Study of their Role in the Byzantine Army in the Later Eleventh Century", *Traditio* 29 (1973), 53–92.
- Shepard, J., "Another New England? Anglo-Saxon Settlement on the Black Sea", *Byzantine Studies* 1 (1974), 18–39.
- Shepard, J., "Byzantium and the West", in T. Reuter (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 3: c. 900–c. 1024, Cambridge 2000, pp. 605–23.
- Shepard, J., "From the Bosphorus to the British Isles: the Way from the Greeks to the Varangians", in *Drevnejšie Gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy*, 2009, Moscow 2010, pp. 15–42.
- Smyth, A.P., *King Alfred the Great*, Oxford 1995.
- Snook, B., *The Anglo-Saxon Chancery: the History, Language and Production of Anglo-Saxon Charters from Alfred to Edgar*, Woodbridge 2015.
- Talbot Rice, D., *English Art 871–1100*, Oxford 1952.
- Talbot Rice, D., "Britain and the Byzantine World in the Middle Ages", in *Byzantine Art: a European Art*, Athens 1966, pp. 21–42.
- Thompson, E.A., "Procopius on Brittia and Britannia", *The Classical Quarterly* 30 (1980), 498–507.
- Vasiliev, A.A., "Manuel Comnenus and Henry Plantagenet", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 29 (1929–30), 233–44.
- Vasiliev, A.A., "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration to Byzantium in the Eleventh Century", *Annales de l'Institut Kondakov* 9 (1937), 39–70.
- Whitting, P.D., "The Byzantine Empire and the Coinage of the Anglo-Saxons", in R.H.M. Dolley (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Coins*, London 1961, pp. 23–38.
- Woods, D., "Arculf's Luggage: the Sources for Adomnán's *'De locis Sanctis'*", *Ériu* 52 (2002), 25–52.
- Wormald, F., "The Rood of Bromholm", *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 1 (1937), 31–45.
- Wormald, F., *The Winchester Psalter*, London 1973.
- Wormald, P., "The Age of Offa and Alcuin", in J. Campbell (ed.), *The Anglo-Saxons*, London 1991, pp. 101–31.

Byzantium and the Iberian Peninsula.

From the Capture of the Balearic Islands to the Fourth Crusade

Juan Signes Codoñer

1 Al-Andalus and Byzantium in the 9th–10th Centuries

After the Arab conquest of the Visigothic kingdom in 711, the Balearic Islands remained under Byzantine control. Recent discoveries have shown that they were governed by Byzantine *archontes* during the 8th century. However, for the 9th century, the absence of significant finds or mentions in the sources makes our understanding of the islands' political link to the empire much more problematic. Be that as it may, the *Baleares* were not conquered by the Muslims until the very end of the 9th century or the first years of the 10th. It is likely that a Byzantine garrison resisted in the castle of Alaró in the northern part of Mallorca for some time, before the island was finally taken over by Arab invaders sent from Córdoba.¹ The resistance of the cities of Taormina and Rometta in the north-eastern corner of Sicily for almost 100 years after the capture of Syracuse by the Arabs in 876, provides a telling parallel case of fortified Byzantine enclaves in the western Mediterranean resisting against the expansionism of Islam.²

The conquest of the Balearic Islands put the entire Spanish Mediterranean coast under the control of the Caliphate of Córdoba and of its successor Muslim states (the so-called Taifa kingdoms of the 11th century), for the next two centuries. This does not imply, however, a total interruption of exchanges between Constantinople and al-Andalus after the beginning of the 10th century. In fact, in 839, when the Balearic Islands were still under Byzantine suzerainty (most probably exercised from Sardinia), the Byzantine Emperor Theophilos sent an embassy to the Cordovan Emir 'Abd al-Rahmān II. We are informed about the purpose of the embassy through the emir's answer, preserved in

1 For an overview, see Signes Codoñer, "Bizancio y las Baleares"; and id., "Las islas Baleares y su relación con Bizancio".

2 Falkenhausen, *La dominazione bizantina*, pp. 28–31, 104; and Zapata Rodríguez, *Italia bizantina*, pp. 101–19.

Ibn Ḥayyān's *History*, which replies to each point raised by the emperor.³ The problems cumulated for the Byzantines in these years: in the year before (838), the Abbasids had captured the important Anatolian city of Amorion, thus dealing a severe blow to the prestige of the Amorion dynasty. Even earlier, in 822, pirates from al-Andalus had landed on the island of Crete, wresting it from Byzantine hands;⁴ and in 827, western Sicily had been invaded by the Aghlabids, most likely with the aid of Muslim contingents from al-Andalus.⁵ The Byzantines' control of the Mediterranean Sea was at stake and an alliance with the Spanish Umayyads would be useful in order to stop Muslim attacks on Sicily and Crete, and enable a Byzantine offensive at the eastern Anatolian frontier instead. As the Abbasids had taken the caliphate in 750 from the Umayyads, who established themselves in Spain, the Byzantines tried to take advantage of the rivalry between these two Islamic powers by recognizing the legitimacy of the Umayyads. However, the proposed alliance came to nothing. 'Abd al-Raḥmān II's polite answer abounds in insults against the Abbasids, but it lacks any concrete measure. It was perhaps not for religious reasons that the Spanish Umayyads did not support the Byzantines against the Abbasids, but primarily due to the distance between the two powers.

However, the suggested alliance was not as unrealistic as it might seem. The expansion of the Shiite Fatimid caliphate, founded in 909 in Tunis, not only affected the Spanish Umayyads' possessions in North Africa, but also its legitimacy as a Muslim power rival to the Abbasids, a claim made more difficult due to the Fatimids' control of Sicily.⁶ This explains the proclamation of 'Abd al-Raḥmān III as caliph in 929 and the resumption of contacts with the Byzantines during the last period of the reign of Constantine VII (945–59), who sent several embassies to Córdoba of which we have direct information mainly through Arabic sources. I have dealt extensively with the intricate chronology of these embassies in a previous publication,⁷ and it is not my purpose here to repeat my arguments, but rather to explore some relevant aspects of these diplomatic relations.

First, it must be kept in mind that Byzantium apparently played on both sides. Although we are best informed about the embassies to Córdoba, the increasing power of the Fatimids in the central Mediterranean could not be

3 For the embassy, see Lévi-Provençal, "Un échange", Signes Codoñer, "Diplomatie und Propaganda"; and id., "Bizancio y al-Ándalus", pp. 199–208.

4 See Signes Codoñer, "Bizancio y al-Ándalus", pp. 186–99; and now id., *The Emperor Theophilos*, pp. 200–08.

5 Talbi, *L'émirat Aghlabide*, pp. 431–33.

6 For the Fatimids in general, see Halm, *Das Reich des Mahdi*.

7 Signes Codoñer, "Bizancio y al-Ándalus", pp. 212–44.

ignored by the emperor for they lay closer to Byzantium. In fact, after the Fatimid takeover in Egypt and the foundation of Cairo in 969, we have no further information about embassies between Constantinople and Córdoba, except for one brief mention of a formal exchange in 972 between the reigning Emperor John Tzimiskes and al-Ḥakam II, the dating of which is controversial.⁸ Eleven embassies between Constantinople and the Fatimid caliph are attested between 924 and 969, six of which are dated to the sole reign of Constantine VII after 945.⁹ Certainly, not all of them indicate peaceful relations, for direct conflicts between the two powers were frequent around Sicily. The *Book of the Audiences and Travels*, written by the Fatimid judge an-Nu'mān, states, for instance, that the Byzantines made an alliance with the caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III against the Fatimids in 956. However, this ended with a double defeat of the Byzantine fleet in the waters of Sicily, perhaps under the command of the *domestikos* Marianos Argyros.¹⁰

In contrast, Byzantine relations with the distant al-Andalus seem to have been more peaceful, as there was apparently no conflict in the 10th century between the two powers, but rather a common interest in keeping the influence of the Fatimids in check. In fact, the embassies are not known for political dealings, but for cultural exchange. An embassy to Córdoba, dated 949–50, brought two books to the Caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III: Orosius' *Adversus paganos*¹¹ and Dioscorides' *De materia medica*. The sources also inform us that a Byzantine monk called Nicholas arrived in Córdoba in 951–52. He was sent by the emperor to translate the work of Dioscorides for there was no knowledge of Greek at the Umayyad court. Other texts were surely also sent from Constantinople, since an Arabic translation of a Greek letter sent by Constantine VII to al-Ḥakam (when still a prince during the last years of the reign of his father 'Abd al-Raḥmān III)¹² has been preserved, accompanying a translation of the *Book of the Causes* attributed to Apollonios of Tyana. In this letter, the sending of additional books to the prince is mentioned.¹³

8 Signes Codoñer, "Bizancio y al-Ándalus", pp. 239–40.

9 Lienhard, "Marianos Argyros", pp. 116–17, n. 23.

10 Signes Codoñer, "Bizancio y al-Ándalus", pp. 237–39; and Lienhard, "Marianos Argyros", pp. 119–22.

11 For the arrival of Orosius' text before this date and the person responsible for its Arabic translation, see Molina, "Orosio", pp. 66–71, Penelas, "A Possible Author"; and Penelas, M., *Kitāb Hurusiyyus (Traducción árabe de las Historiae adversus paganos de Orosio)*, Madrid 2001, pp. 27–42.

12 Edited by Stern, "A Letter". For the dating, see Krönung, "Ein Schreiben". Al-Ḥakam was later to be known as a patron of knowledge throughout the Arabic world.

13 Matesanz Gascón, "Desde Bizancio hasta Córdoba", and id., *Omeyas, bizantinos y mozárabes*, conjectures that the *Rhomaika* of Apian could have been sent from Constantinople

The giving of books as a gift, what I have called the “diplomacy of the book”,¹⁴ was very common for Byzantine embassies. It was used as a way to promote alliances. Apparently, the famous Jewish scholar and physician, Ḥasday ibn Shaprūt, who served as a minister and ambassador to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III on several occasions, was not only involved in translating the Dioscorides, but used his personal contacts with the Byzantine envoys to send letters to the (Jewish) kings of distant Khazaria through the mediation of Empress Helena, the wife of Constantine VII. We know this because part of Ibn Shaprūt’s correspondence in Hebrew has been preserved.¹⁵ We also know the names of some Christians acting as ambassadors for Caliph ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III, such as the bishops of Córdoba, Hishām ibn Kulayb c.948 and Rabī’ ibn Zayd (Recemund) c.956–59, but there is no further information about their possible role in conveying Greek books to al-Andalus.¹⁶

The contacts between Córdoba and Constantinople were not limited to the exchange of books, but also included the sending of pieces of art for the palace ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III was building outside of Córdoba at Madīnat az-Zahrā.¹⁷ Most importantly, Byzantine mosaicists arrived in Córdoba and helped to decorate the miḥrab of the mosque, still preserved today.¹⁸

With the end of the caliphate of Córdoba in 1031, direct contacts with Byzantium seem to have definitely ceased. It is revealing that when the famous Andalusian writer, Ibn Ḥazm, wrote a polemic letter against the Byzantines some time before 1064, it was in reply to a text written on behalf of Emperor Nikephoros in 966, almost a century earlier: Byzantine matters belonged to the past in 11th century al-Andalus.¹⁹

in this period, for the work was used as a source by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Rāzī (887–955) for his *Chronicle*, written during the reign of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān III.

14 Signes Codoñer, “La diplomacia del libro”.

15 For the correspondence, see Golb N./Pritsak O. (eds.), *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*, Ithaca 1982. For the role played by Ibn Shaprūt, see Signes Codoñer, “Bizancio y al-Ándalus”, pp. 224–30, 243. For a possible connection between contacts with the Khazars and their conversion to Judaism, see Signes Codoñer, *The Emperor Theophilos*, pp. 355–62.

16 For Recemund, see Monferrer-Sala, “Rabī’ ibn Zayd”.

17 Signes Codoñer, “Bizancio y al-Ándalus”, pp. 231–34. For the use of Classical models and antique spolia in Madīnat az-Zahrā, see Calvo Capilla, “The Reuse”.

18 Stern, *Les mosaïques*.

19 Thomas, “Refutation”.

2 The Christian Kingdoms in Northern Spain in the 10th and 11th Centuries

In Byzantine sources, the Christian kingdoms in the north of the Iberian Peninsula are not mentioned in the 10th–11th centuries, except for references in passing, such as the one found in Theophanes Continuatus (a history written in the middle decades of the 10th century) in the context of a narrative of the Muslim conquest of Crete c.823.²⁰ This comes as no surprise, as most of these kingdoms were isolated in the north of Spain, mostly without access to the Mediterranean and only connected to northern Europe.

The sole exception were the counties of Catalonia, which were under the control of the counts of Barcelona after the reign of Wilfred the Hairy (878–97), although they paid obedience, albeit nominally, to the Franks. After Barcelona was sacked in 985 by the Muslims, the Count of Barcelona, Borrell II (948–93), acted as an independent ruler, but connections with the south-eastern territories of France continued. This explains the close connections between the Catalan and the Occitan languages (the latter is still spoken in Vall d'Aran in Catalonia). It was thus through its Mediterranean façade and links with southern France that the Catalan territories were exposed to Eastern influences.

Unfortunately, the evidence is not easy to ascertain, for the presence of Eastern Christian or Greek patterns in the period under consideration was not always due to direct contacts with the empire. In a significant number of cases, we have to do with late antique survivals, such as the cult of the Greek saint Isidoros of Chios, originally established in the monastery of Isidoro de Dueñas (Palencia) and later expanded to other areas in the Christian realms of northern Spain. Contrary to what was thought previously,²¹ the possibility that the cult was brought by Eastern nuns coming from Africa on the eve of the Islamic expansion has recently been taken into consideration.²²

In the same sense, the evidence about the diffusion of Greek culture in Catalonia between the 9th and 11th centuries collected by Michel Zimmermann does not amount to direct links with the East.²³ According to him, the presence of Greek anthroponyms, some of whose bearers held prominent positions (a

20 *Theophanes Continuatus*, II.21, eds. M. Featherstone/J. Signes Codoñer, *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur libri I–IV* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 53) Berlin 2015, p. 108.

21 Cigaar, *Western Travellers*, pp. 314, 315, and 317.

22 López Serra, “San Isidoro de Quíos”.

23 Zimmermann, “La connaissance du grec”; and id., *Écrire et lire en Catalogne*, vol. 2, pp. 695–723.

judge: Calapodius, a priest: Graphyolo, a deacon: Cristofore), might simply have been snobbery of the upper classes (who occasionally signed Latin documents with Greek letters),²⁴ or, alternatively, point to the Greek origins of some of them. On the other hand, some of the persons referred to as “*Graeci*” could simply have been Italian merchants who displayed their knowledge of Greek in front of their Catalan clients, as Zimmermann has argued.²⁵ A particular case is represented by the judge Aurici, who has been considered a dealer in gold²⁶ and who referred to himself as a Greek (“*ego Aurutio Greco, qui et iudice*”) in one exchange of lands dated to 1008.²⁷ This led the editors to assume that he may have acquired a direct knowledge of Justinian’s compilation in the East, an assumption that seems rather improbable to me.²⁸

Greek texts seem to have been completely absent in the famous libraries of Ripoll, Vic, and Urgell, which had a limited amount of Latin classics (much inferior in number to renowned libraries at the time such as Saint Gall and Bobbio), and were heirs to Visigothic ecclesiastical traditions. A limited knowledge of Greek is certainly attested among the Catalan clergy (Zimmermann speaks of a “*hellénisation élémentaire et incomplète*”), but even in the most prominent cases, such as Miró Bonfill, Bishop of Gerona in 971–84 and Count of Besalú in 965–84, that knowledge stemmed from a learned use of grammars and glossaries.²⁹

The same problem arises when assessing the influence of Byzantine iconography in the illumination of the so-called Ripoll Bibles (Vat. lat. 5729 and Paris. Lat. 6) commissioned by Abbot Oliba c.1020.³⁰ Manuel Castiñeiras showed how some Genesis scenes in the two Bibles depended on Italo-Byzantine models, and more particularly from Montecassino.³¹ The most probable explanation

24 See, for instance, Junyent i Sobirà, *Diplomatari*, p. 122, where the deacon Seniofred signs a document dating to 1023 first with Greek capital letters (“*CHNIΩΦPHΔVΣ levita*”) and then again, immediately after, in Latin (“*Seniofredus, suprascriptus levita*”). The name is a survival of the Gothic past (see the Visigothic king Suniefredus, 692–93).

25 See also Baucells i Reig, *Diplomatari*, vol. 1, p. 137, and vol. 5, p. 2767 s.v. “*Grecus*”.

26 Cigaar, *Western Travellers*, p. 307; and Bonnaire, “*Une famille*”, p. 283. See, however, Baucells i Reig, J. et al., *Diplomatari*, pp. 157–58 for names of professions used only as second names.

27 Baucells i Reig, *Diplomatari*, vol. 1, pp. 386–86 (no. 100)

28 Baucells i Reig, *Diplomatari*, vol. 1, p. 116.

29 This includes the two famous glossaries of Ripoll from the 10th and 11th century preserved in the *Archivo de la Corona de Aragón* (mss. Ripoll 59 and 74). See Zimmermann, *Écrire et lire en Catalogne*, pp. 710–14; and Cigaar, *Western Travellers*, pp. 308–09.

30 For a detailed study of the texts, see Mundó, *Les Bibles de Ripoll*, who ascertained their common origin.

31 Castiñeiras, “*From Chaos to Cosmos*”.

advanced so far is that local artists copied them directly from Byzantine illuminated bibles, which were perhaps brought to Ripoll by Oliba after one of his travels to Rome, two of which, in 1011 and 1016–17, are well documented.³² During his second stay, Oliba visited the Benedictine Abbey of Montecassino, where his father, Count Oliba Cabreta, had died in 990.³³ More recently, Ana Belén Muñoz Martínez tied New Testament illustrations in Vat. lat. 5729 to Byzantine models.³⁴

Another interesting case from the artistic point of view is Byzantine silk. At least six Byzantine silk tapestries, dating from the 9th to the early 12th centuries, have been identified as bought by the Cathedral of La Seu d'Urgell in Catalonia, a prominent market city at the entrance of one of the most important mountain passes in the Pyrenees.³⁵ However, the bulk of extant textiles found in the peninsula (particularly in Castile) were woven in al-Andalus, either in Córdoba or, after the end of the caliphate, in 11th century Almería.³⁶ The provenance of single pieces is not easy to ascertain, not least because of imitation and falsification.³⁷ However, we have some information about the Church authorities who bought the pieces, but we cannot identify the merchants (maybe Genoese) that sold them.

The same uncertainty applies to ivories. The central ivory panel of a Byzantine crucifixion, made in a Constantinopolitan workshop at the end of the 10th century, was reused to form a diptych for the Aragonese Queen Felicia

32 Junyent i Sobirà, "La figure de l'abbé Oliba". See also the introduction by A.M. Mundó in Junyent i Sobirà, *Diplomatari*, xi–xx.

33 Castiñeiras, "From Chaos to Cosmos", p. 36.

34 Muñoz Martínez, "Influencia bizantina".

35 Monge Simeón, "Els teixits".

36 Almería was captured in 1147 by Alfonso VII of Castile and Ramon Berenguer IV of Barcelona, with the aid of a combined Genoese and Pisan fleet. At the time, Almería lay far away from the Christian zone, whose southern frontier was still the river Ebro, so that its capture was due to economic reasons. In this sense, one should remember that Genoa had at the time great interest in the trade (and contraband) of Byzantine silk into the West (see Jacoby, "Genoa"). Almería was retaken by the Almohads in 1157 but never recovered from the destruction wrought by the Christian armies. For a description of its silk industry, see the report of al-Idrisi, translated in Constable, *Medieval Iberia*, pp. 232–33.

37 Feliciano, "Medieval Textiles", reflects on this problem. One instance of the problems posed by the provenance of the silks can be exemplified by the so-called "witches pallium" from the Romanesque monastery of Sant Joan de les Abadesses (Girona), now preserved in the Museum of Vic. The textile is usually considered an Andalusian fabric of the Taifa period (thus Feliciano, p. 59), but its dating has recently been reconsidered by Pérez Pena, "El drap de les Bruixes", who dates it to the 9th–10th centuries and now proposes a manufacture in Egypt by Christian workers.

of Roucy (1060–1123) in order to commemorate the death of her husband Sancho Ramírez in 1094.³⁸ But we do not know how it was brought to Spain.

In any case, the 11th century witnessed the introduction of Romanesque art in the peninsula derived from European models through the agency of the kings of Aragon and the Catalan counts, who were more open to Carolingian and Mediterranean influences and decisively contributed to the abandonment – also in the Christian kingdoms in the western part of the Iberian peninsula – of the local (so-called “Mozarabic”) traditions that drew inspiration from Visigothic models and the Islamic south. The adoption of the Roman liturgy by the King of Aragon, Sancho Ramírez (in 1071), and the King of Galicia, León and Castile, Alfonso VI (in 1080), marks this shift. The change occurred along with the revival of the title *imperator* (already used by the kings of León and Castile since the 9th century) by Alfonso VI, who styled himself “*imperator totius Hispaniae*”.³⁹

The existence of Greek pilgrims at the sanctuary of Santiago de Compostela before the First Crusade is occasionally attested in the sources,⁴⁰ but it cannot be proven in any instance that they came from Byzantium. This was the case of Symeon of Armenia, who came to Santiago from Jerusalem in 983–84 and is one of the first attested pilgrims at the Spanish shrine. There, according to his *Life*, Symeon is said to have freed from demons the possessed daughter of the Spanish king, who may possibly have been Bermudo II, King of Galicia.⁴¹ The *Historia silensis*, written at the beginning of the 12th century, also mentions another pilgrim from Jerusalem, probably a Greek (“*venerat a Ierosolymis peregrinus quidam graeculus, ut credo*”), who, while sleeping at the portico of the basilica, was informed by St James in a dream that Coimbra would be taken on the morrow at the third hour by King Ferdinand I of León.⁴²

Inversely, we know of only a few Spaniards who travelled to Byzantium in this period, although, wherever a reference appears, nothing specific can be concluded about them. For example, a Spanish monk John is mentioned by Patriarch Keroularios in his *Edictum synodale* among the translators of the Bull of Excommunication given to him by the papal envoy, Cardinal

38 The ivory, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, was preserved for many centuries in the monastery of Santa María de Santa Cruz de la Serós, destined for the burial of the women of the Aragonese royal house: Abenza Soria, “El díptico de Jaca”.

39 Sirantoine, *Imperator Hispaniae*.

40 See Cigaar, *Western Travellers*, p. 301.

41 *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. 32: *Julii*, part 6, Antwerp 1729, pp. 325–35, here p. 331.

42 *Historia silensis*, eds. J. Pérez de Urbel/A. González Ruiz-Zorrilla, *Historia silense* (Escuela de estudios medievales. Textos, 30), Madrid 1959, pp. 191–93.

Humbert, but we know nothing about the circumstances that brought him to Constantinople.⁴³ There were also few Spanish pilgrims who set off to Jerusalem before the First Crusade, but one of these was Count Sancho Ramírez, the bastard son of King Ramiro I of Aragon in 1092. Considering that the Seljuk Turks had controlled Anatolia since 1071, it was probably not via Byzantine territory that he reached the Holy Land.

On the other hand, Byzantium was not unaware of the alliances that the Normans of Sicily were establishing with the counts of Barcelona. As Ernest Marcos Hierro rightly remarked,⁴⁴ this is the reason why, in the *Alexiad*, Anna Komnene mentioned the marriage of Mafalda of Apulia, the daughter of Robert Guiscard, to Count Ramon Berenguer II of Barcelona in 1078,⁴⁵ for this meant the count's alliance with powers hostile to Constantinople. Certainly, the count's assassination in 1082 and the ensuing turbulence of his succession kept the counts away from meddling in Norman affairs. But from this time onwards, the Mediterranean policy remained on the main agenda of the counts, who relied on the support of the Italian powers in their campaigns against the Muslims in the Iberian Peninsula.

3 The First Crusade and Its Aftermath: Cultural and Economic Exchanges between the Iberian Peninsula and Byzantium in the 12th Century

In the 11th century, the Spanish Reconquista had advanced as far as Coimbra close to the Atlantic coast (taken in 1064) and Toledo (taken in 1085), which is situated south of the central mountain range that crosses the middle of Spain, and which for some time was an effective frontier between Christians and Muslims. However, the Christians' advance progressed more slowly in the east, and it was only in 1118 that Zaragoza, at the Ebro river, was taken by Aragon. Tarragona, the ancient capital of the *Tarraconensis*, was captured in 1117 by the counts of Barcelona. Thirty years later, between 1148–49, Tortosa, still at the Ebro river and close to the delta, and Lérida, much more to the north, were conquered by Ramon Berenguer IV, who united the kingdom of Aragon with

43 Michael Keroularios, *Edictum synodale*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 120, col. 741B: “ἡ μετριότης ἡμῶν [Keroularios speaks here]... εἶτα τὼν τὴν Ἰταλίδα γλώτταν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μεταβάλλειν εἰδόντων προσκαλεσασμένη τινάς, ἤγουν τὸν πρωτοσπαθάριον Κοσμᾶν, τὸν Ῥωμαῖον τὸν Πυρὸν καὶ τὸν μοναχὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν Ἰσπανόν.”

44 Marcos Hierro, “El catalans i l'imperi bizantí”, pp. 24–25.

45 Anna Komnene, *Alexias* 1.12.11, eds. Kambylis/Reinsch: “τούτων δὲ τὴν μὲν [i.e. θυγατέρα] Ῥαϊμόντῳ τῷ υἱῷ κόμητος Βραχενῶνος κατηγγύησατο.”

the county of Barcelona in 1137. His son and heir, Alfonso II (1164–96), ruled both territories and expanded further south into the inland province of Teruel. But the frontier at the coast did not move south of the Ebro River, except for a small fringe of land, until the Battle of Navas de Tolosa in 1212. A significant change in the Mediterranean policy of the crown of Aragon came only with the successive conquest of the Balearic Islands, starting with the conquest of Mallorca in 1229–32 and ending with that of Menorca in 1287.

These Christian advances at the eastern frontier coincided with an increasing interest in the eastern Mediterranean triggered by the First Crusade (1096–99), which brought many Westerners not only into direct contact with the Muslim East and the Holy Land, but also with Byzantium. The Spanish kingdoms' participation in this crusade was certainly of secondary importance, and we can only mention some names. Thus, Elvira, daughter of Alfonso VI of León, took part in the crusade as the wife of Raymond of Toulouse, but apart from unfounded speculations about her friendship with Anna Komnene during her stay in Constantinople in 1096,⁴⁶ we do not know that she had any further contact with the Byzantine court or Byzantine culture upon her return to León in 1118. More important was the participation of Girard of Rosselló, who took part in the sieges of Antioch (1098) and Jerusalem (1099) according to William of Tyre,⁴⁷ and assumed the title of Count of Rosselló (1102–13) upon his return to Catalonia. The participation of Count Berenguer Ramon II of Barcelona in the First Crusade, instead, seems to be rather obscure, for, although we know that he set out for the Holy Land, we are not informed about the circumstances.⁴⁸ Other minor figures from Catalan countries are mentioned in *La Gran conquesta de ultramar*, a romantic narration of the events of the First Crusade written at the end of the 13th century and based on William of Tyre's chronicle.⁴⁹

It was only in the first decades of the 12th century, in the aftermath of the First Crusade, that the number of travellers to the East increased significantly,

46 Quintana Prieto, "La infanta Doña Elvira".

47 Referred as "Guirardus de Rosellon" in William of Tyre, *Chronicle*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon* (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievals, 63–63A), Turnhout 1986, 1.17.22–23, 2.17.6, 6.17.33, and 8.18.38.

48 *Gesta Comitum Barcinonensium*, eds. Ll. Barrau-Dihigo/J. Massó Torrents (Cròniques Catalanes, 2), Barcelona 1925, p. 7, and on p. 11, the death of William II Jordan, Count of Berga and Cerdania, and grandson of Ramon Berenguer I of Barcelona during the siege of Tripoli in 1109, is also mentioned. For detailed biographies of the Catalan counts and barons during this period, see still the classic studies of Sobrequés, *Els Barons de Catalunya*, and Sobrequés, *Els Grans Comtes de Barcelona*.

49 Cooper, *Gran Conquesta de Ultramar*. The indications of the text are closely followed by Fernández de Navarrete, "Españoles en las Cruzadas".

and not as crusaders, but as pilgrims. Many of the supposed Navarrese and Aragonese nobles who took part in the crusade were, in fact, pilgrims to the Holy Land who travelled to the East in the first decades of the 12th century.⁵⁰ We have little information about the stay of Henry, Count of Portugal, in the Holy Land c.1102–05.⁵¹ Some canons of the cathedral of Santiago de Compostela also travelled to Jerusalem c.1118.⁵² Several testaments or economic settlements made by Catalan pilgrims before leaving for Jerusalem in the first decades of the 12th century have also been preserved.⁵³ Some were made by prominent persons, such as St Olegario/Oleguer, Bishop of Barcelona (1116–37) and first Archbishop of Tarragona,⁵⁴ and his successor Arnaldo/Arnau Ermengol (1137–46). A certain Peter, native of Barcelona, was elected Bishop of Tyre, where he died in 1164.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, at best we have some details about these pilgrims' stays in the Crusader States, but not about their possible travels through Byzantine territory. In fact, the land route through Anatolia was not safe enough, as the Turks controlled the inland areas.

On the contrary, Italy was visited by all the pilgrims before embarking to the East, via Bari. This circumstance explains the attested cultural exchanges between the Italian city and the distant see of Santiago of Compostela, where a chapel dedicated to St Nicholas was consecrated at the cathedral as early as 1107. Moreover, iconographic similarities between sculptures in the Santiago cathedral and monuments in Bari have been found.⁵⁶ Along the Way of St James, churches and chapels dedicated to St Nicholas were founded starting in the first years of the 12th century, for instance in Pamplona (c.1100) and Jaca (1105), but also at a small rural place in Burgos (today the monastery of San Juan de Ortega). This church was built by Juan de Quintanaortuño upon his return from Jerusalem in 1112 to thank the saint for having rescued him from a sea storm.⁵⁷ Sculptures representing episodes from the life of St Nicholas appeared throughout the entire century in Spain, culminating in the cycle sculpted in the capitals of the cloister of Tarragona Cathedral in the early 13th century.⁵⁸ However, since the former Byzantine city of Bari had already been conquered

50 Ubierto Arteta, "La participación navarro-aragonesa".

51 For him and other Portuguese noblemen in the Holy Land, see Fernández de Navarrete, "Españoles en las Cruzadas", pp. 53–57.

52 Castiñeiras, "San Nicola", p. 129.

53 See already Fernández de Navarrete, "Españoles en las Cruzadas", pp. 43–44.

54 Gonzalvo i Bou, *Sant Oleguer*.

55 Fernández de Navarrete, "Españoles en las Cruzadas", p. 45.

56 For the evidence, see Castiñeiras, "Compostela, Bari and Jerusalem".

57 Castiñeiras, "San Nicola", pp. 127–29. For St Juan de Ortega, see also Gallego Vázquez, "Juan de Ortega".

58 See Serrano Coll, "San Nicolás polifacético", for a detailed historical background.

by the Normans in 1071, and its blossoming as a pilgrimage centre began only after the relics of St Nicholas had come to the town in 1087, this proves again nothing about possible links between Santiago and Constantinople.

The only contrary indication is found in the life of St Meletios the Younger of Myoupolis (Cappadocia). Meletios was a monastic reformer of the early Komnenian period (c.1035–c.1110)⁵⁹ who supposedly visited Santiago after Jerusalem and Rome according to Theodore Prodromos, who wrote his *Life* c.1140: “and from there proceeding to St James of Gaul and paying tribute to the Apostle’s body” (καὶ κεῖθεν πρὸς τὰς Ἰακώβου Γαλλίας ἀπάρας καὶ τῷ ἀποστολικῷ τὸ σέβας ἀποδόμενος σκῆνῃ).⁶⁰ However, the pilgrimage to Santiago is not mentioned in an earlier *Life* of the saint written by Nicholas of Methone, who only mentions the saint’s stay in Rome and Jerusalem. According to Charis Messis, who compared both versions of the *Life*, Prodromos’s text was written as a fictional and rhetorical text serving political aims, such as criticism of the pro-Western policy of Manuel I Komnenos, of whom the other hagiographer, Nicholas, was a fervent partisan.

Besides, if we surmise that Prodromos’s text was written in a humorous tone, one could possibly conclude that Meletios probably did not visit Santiago, but that his alleged stay there served to parody the new trends in Byzantine spirituality at the Komnenian court.⁶¹ Therefore, this reference does not provide any evidence for the existence of a (regular?) Byzantine pilgrimage to Santiago, but it perhaps attests to the distrust towards the West on the part of an important intellectual at the Byzantine court, namely Prodromos, who was in contact with Eleanor of Aquitaine and was not wholly unaware of what was happening in the distant west, as he is even connected with the emergence of the novel in Provence.⁶² Consequently, with regard to literary sources one has to pay adequate attention to their context and to the literary codes in which they are embedded, which is not always done.

A similar problem is posed by the exact nature of Byzantine influence on Spanish art in this century, particularly on wood and fresco paintings executed around the year 1200.⁶³ Some scholars argue for an “indirect” Byzantine or

59 Messis, “Deux versions”, p. 314.

60 Theodore Prodromos, *Life of Saint Meletios*, ed. Ch.A. Papadopoulou, *Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ μοναχικοῦ βίου ἐν Ἑλλάδι*, vol. 1: *Ὁ ὁσιος Μελέτιος ὁ Νεός* (περ. 1035–1105), Athens 1935, p. 72 (§6).

61 Messis, “Deux versions”, pp. 321–25.

62 Martínez Manzano, “La novela de época comnena”.

63 Overview in Castiñeiras, “El románico catalán”, pp. 62–69. The debate on the “art of 1200” was triggered by the exhibition *The Year 1200* held in the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York in 1970 (Hoffmann, *The Year 1200*). A detailed catalogue of works of art in Spain

Eastern influence coming to Spain via England, which is particularly evident in the case of Castile through the marriage of Eleanor of England (daughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine) to Alfonso VIII of Castile in 1174. For example, there are the frescoes from what was probably a treasure room or palatine chamber in the Benedictine Monastery of San Pedro of Arlanza in Burgos (now in the “Cloisters” of the Metropolitan Museum),⁶⁴ or some sculptures of the Monastery of Santo Domingo of Silos in Soria.⁶⁵ The cycle of Romanesque paintings of the chapter room of the Monastery of Santa María of Sigüenza in Huesca, which has been lost to a great extent, is also usually explained as the work of English artists who worked in Spain and were associated with the masters of the Winchester Bible.⁶⁶

However, recent research has argued for a “direct” influence of Byzantine art on altarpieces and paintings of Pyrenean churches following the capture of Jerusalem by the Ayyubid Sultan Saladin in 1187 and the failure of the Third Crusade (1189–92), which brought Eastern artists and artefacts to Spanish lands. Thus, the frescoes of Sigüenza – whose close similarity to Komnenian art or to the Sicilian mosaics of the Palatine Chapel in Palermo and the Monreale Cathedral was noted long ago – are now explained through the sponsoring of Constanza, daughter of Alfonso II, who resided there between 1205–10 before her marriage to King Frederick II of Sicily, and who continued to favour the monastery after this date. Moreover, Manuel Castiñeiras has convincingly demonstrated that a series of altarpieces painted by the “*magister Alexander*” between 1195 and 1210 – those of Sant Andreu de Baltarga (Low Cerdaña), now in the MNAC of Barcelona, and of Santa Maria d’Orellà (Conflent) – reveal the direct influence of Byzantine patterns and point to the eastern Mediterranean, probably Cypriot, provenance of the artist.⁶⁷ At the same time, there were Western artists, such as the painter of the altar frontal from Avià (county of Berguedà, today in the MNAC of Barcelona), who was probably exposed to

influenced by Byzantine models is found in Ciggaar, *Western Travellers*, pp. 309–21, which despite recent research, is still the only general overview of the topic and a reference work.

64 Cahn, “The Frescoes of San Pedro de Arlanza”, points, however, to similarities with the so-called “Stanza di Ruggiero” in the Norman palace at Palermo, whose mosaics are now associated with the reign of King William I of Sicily (1154–66). William was the son of Elvira of Castile, who had married his father Roger in 1117 and remained Queen of Sicily until her death in 1135.

65 Ocón Alonso, “Alfonso VIII”.

66 Oakeshott, *Sigüenza*.

67 Castiñeiras, “Bizanci, el Mediterrani i l’art de 1200”, pp. 13–18.

Eastern influences after a stay in the Crusader States in the context of the Third Crusade.⁶⁸

It is also significant that during the 12th century several pieces of the *lignum crucis* came directly from Jerusalem to Santiago and other Spanish regions (for instance to the barony of Anglesola in Catalonia), following the miraculous “discovery” of the True Cross in Jerusalem in 1099.⁶⁹ Yet, there is no information about pieces of the cross from Constantinople before the Fourth Crusade of 1204. Moreover, the dating of the arrival of Byzantine *encolpia* serving as reliquaries in the Iberian Peninsula is problematic, as they could have appeared after the period under consideration here. This is the case with the Byzantine *encolpion* of the Cathedral of Tortosa, made in Constantinople at the end of the 11th or beginning of the 12th century, but acquired in Mallorca only in the 13th century.⁷⁰ In other cases, we have no information about the circumstances of the arrival of the pieces, which may have come to Spain in modern times through the art market.⁷¹ This problem also applies to the reuse of other Byzantine *spolia* mainly in the Mediterranean area.

We can conclude that Byzantine influences on Spanish Romanesque could have come directly from the East, but also occasionally through the Norman court in Palermo; and that either the stay of Westerners in the Holy Land or the migration of Eastern artisans to the West could also explain the influence of Byzantine models on the flourishing Romanesque in the peninsula. Cultural exchanges, however, did not take place through official contacts with the imperial court at Constantinople.

Finally, a few instances should be considered in which Byzantine sources mention the presence of “Spaniards” in the East during the same period, although the archaizing terminology used by the authors does not allow for firm conclusions. For example, Anna Komnene mentions the participation of “Celtiberian” soldiers (probably mercenaries from the Spanish Christian kingdoms) in Bohemund’s campaign against Avlona in 1107.⁷² The Lucianesque dialogue *Timarion*, written in the first half of the 12th century (and attributed to Prodromos by some scholars), mentions “Iberians, Lusitans and Celts” among

68 Castiñeiras, “Bizanci, el Mediterrani i l’art de 1200”, pp. 18–22. For the problem of itinerant painters, see Gudíol Ricart, “Les peintres itinérants”.

69 See Castiñeiras, “Compostela, Bari and Jerusalem”, pp. 48–50 for the *lignum crucis* of Santiago and its dating; cf. Jaspert, “La vera creu”; and Español Bertran, *La Vera Creu d’Anglesola*, for the Argensola cross, dating to c.1170.

70 Grimaldi, “L’encolpi esmaltat”.

71 See Vidal, “Los *encolpia* bizantinos”; and id., “Tres piezas bizantinas”.

72 Anna Komnene, *Alexias* XII.9.2, eds. Kambylis/Reinsch: “πλείους τοῦ γερμανικοῦ γένους καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Κελτιβήρων.”

the merchants who came to Thessalonica for the fair of St Demetrios.⁷³ But it is doubtful whether Christian merchants were actually referred to, for further below the text refers to many foreign ships which brought the best clothes and fabrics to the city. Among their places of origin “Hispania” is mentioned, alongside the “Columns of Hercules” and “Phoenicia and Egypt”, thus giving the impression that Muslim merchants of al-Andalus could also be meant.⁷⁴ If only we had more specific information about what exactly were the ἐπιπλά or “goods” they brought!


4 Two Spanish Travellers to the East: Benjamin of Tudela and Ibn Jubayr

As we have seen, there are reasons to suppose that travelling from the Iberian peninsula into the eastern Mediterranean, or vice versa, was anything but exceptional. But what was the goal of these travels? Many of the Spanish travellers seem to have been Christian and Muslim pilgrims proceeding to the east (Jerusalem or Medina and Mecca). In the case of the Muslims, we know that the economic contacts with Egypt and Syria were also frequent, but for the Christians there are no traces in this period of some kind of regular exchange with Byzantine territory. The Christian pilgrims’ destination was the Crusader States, and even after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187, the remaining crusader ports (Tortosa, Tripoli, or Tyre) served as safe harbours before proceeding inland to the holy places. However, the Italian maritime republics, mainly Genoa and Pisa, which had strong commercial interests in the Byzantine east, developed a growing interest in the Spanish market. Their presence is attested everywhere, not only in Provence and Catalonia. An agreement between Pisa (which had been granted suzerainty over the Balearic Islands in 1085 by Gregory VII) and the Count of Barcelona in 1113, enabled the capture of Mallorca and Menorca in the following year. The independent Muslim *taifa* ruler was taken to Pisa as a captive and the islands were freed from piracy. It was “Catalonia’s first known involvement in a major international (extra-Iberian) military alliance”.⁷⁵ The Genoese, as we have seen above, also played a fundamental role in the capture of Almería (1147–57).

73 *Timarion*, ed. R. Romano, ll. 119–20: “Καμπανῶν Ἰταλῶν Ἰβήρων Λυσιτανῶν καὶ Κελτῶν τῶν ἐπέκεινα Ἀλπεων.”

74 *Timarion*, ed. Romano, ll. 151–53: “ἀλλὰ καὶ Φοινίκη πολλὰ συνεισφέρει καὶ Αἴγυπτος, Ἰσπανία καὶ Ἡράκλειοι στῆλαι ἰστουργοῦσαι τῶν ἐπίπλων τὰ κάλλιστα.”

75 Parker, “Pisa, Catalonia”, p. 78.



MAP 11.1 The Travels of Benjamin of Tudela (ca. 1160) and Ibn Jubayr (1183)
© JUAN SIGNES CODONER

I would thus surmise that the presence of Greeks in the Spanish peninsula, either as migrants or merchants, was brought about through the mediation of Pisa and Genoa, but we have no sources or reports corroborating this point. However, at least two reports by inhabitants of the peninsula are available, one of them a Jew, the other a Muslim, both of whom travelled to the East via Byzantine territory. Let us consider these texts in more detail, for they shed some light on this question.

The Jewish traveller is Benjamin of Tudela, who left his native town in the kingdom of Navarra c.1160 for a long trip to the eastern Mediterranean, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Egypt, which ended with his return to Spain in 1172/73.⁷⁶ His report in Hebrew is not a literary narrative, but an enumeration of the stations on his route and the distances between them, with cursory notes on the Jewish communities he met and on the economic activities of the places he visited. Only exceptionally he enters into detail about monuments and rulers, particularly in his description of big cities, such as Rome, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Damascus, Baghdad, or Cairo. More importantly, Benjamin says almost nothing about the routes he took from one place to another, either by land or by sea. While this circumstance alone makes it very difficult to identify the exact route he followed (see the map *supra* for a hypothetical reconstruction of his trip until Cyprus), we must also take into account that the text we have is not his autograph and does not even reproduce his original account. The “serious inconsistencies and gaps in his itinerary”, as pointed out by David Jacoby, probably arise from his text being shortened and edited by another person in the late 12th or early 13th century.⁷⁷ Martin Jacobs even speaks of “several redactions” and a “multilayered text”, while simultaneously stressing that the text “was open to additions and emendations by later generations”.⁷⁸ Finally, a good critical edition is lacking and most of the existing translations are to a great extent interpretative, making any assessment of the text provisory. For my purposes here, I will limit myself to some general considerations, for Benjamin does not provide first-hand information about many Byzantine cities and places concerning us here,⁷⁹ but rather suggests possible connections between Byzantium and Spain through certain remarks he makes at different points of his text.

To begin with, we do not know why he set out from Spain on such a long and private journey, without being sent on a mission by any ruler. Pilgrimage

76 For the dating of his travels, see Jacoby, “Benjamin of Tudela in Byzantium”.

77 Jacoby, “Benjamin of Tudela in Byzantium”, pp. 136–38.

78 Jacobs, *Reorienting the East*, pp. 28–35.

79 A detailed overview is in Ochoa, “El imperio bizantino”.

would be the most obvious reason, but after visiting Jerusalem, he travelled further to the east (Baghdad, Basra) and visited the Arabian peninsula. If he wanted to visit Jerusalem, “he would have sailed directly from Italy to the Holy Land and avoided a long and costly detour via Constantinople”.⁸⁰ Moreover, his descriptions of Mesopotamia are lengthier than those of Jerusalem proper. Other Jewish pilgrims to the East, such as Petahyah of Regensburg, travelled from Prague to Palestine via Kiev, Crimea, the Caucasus, Mesopotamia, and Syria, thus avoiding Constantinople.⁸¹ On the other hand, although most of the indications Benjamin gives about the cities he visited are limited to references to the Jewish communities, he did not travel on behalf of a Jewish community, for he refrained from visiting many important Jewish centres on his route.⁸² His repeated remarks about economic activities deserve attention, but they generally do not show specific economic interests. Nevertheless, considering that both pilgrimage and trade were the main reasons motivating the travels of Jews at that time, I would surmise that both aspects surely motivated his travels to some extent.⁸³

It would be interesting to know whether Benjamin's route was followed by other Spanish travellers to the East. In this sense, it is revealing that when Benjamin visited Barcelona, he noted that: “merchants come thither from all quarters with their wares, from Greece, from Pisa, Genoa, Sicily, Alexandria in Egypt, Palestine, Africa and all its coasts”.⁸⁴ More or less the same is said about Montpellier,⁸⁵ closely connected with the counts of Barcelona. Significantly, when Benjamin arrived at Constantinople he mentions merchants coming from Babylon, Persia, Media, Egypt, Canaan, Russia, Hungary, Patzinakia, Khazaria, “and the land of Lombardy and Sepharad”, that is, inhabitants of the Iberian peninsula.⁸⁶ Unfortunately, this statement does not specify whether these merchants came from Muslim al-Andalus or the Christian kingdoms of northern Spain.⁸⁷ It does provide, however, solid evidence for commercial

80 Jacoby, “Benjamin of Tudela and his ‘Book of Travels’”, p. 162.

81 Jacobs, *Reorienting the East*, pp. 35–37.

82 Jacoby, “Benjamin of Tudela and his ‘Book of Travels’”, p. 161.

83 Jacobs, *Reorienting the East*, pp. 50–63.

84 Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. Adler, p. 2. I refer to Adler's English translation of the text, the corresponding pages of the Hebrew original being indicated in the margins of the translation.

85 Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. Adler, p. 3.

86 Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. Adler, p. 12.

87 Jacoby, “Benjamin of Tudela in Byzantium”, pp. 182–83 considers that there is good reason to believe that a Spanish quarter in Constantinople “was established as a result of the negotiations between King James I of Aragon and Manuel I in the years 1176–1180”. Leaving aside the confusion of James I with Alfonso II, there is no solid evidence supporting this

exchanges between Spain and Byzantium at the time, although it can be surmised that the Greeks used the ships of the Italian maritime republics for their trade with Spain. Benjamin's interest in silk manufacturing (for instance when he visited Thebes, Thessalonica, and Constantinople)⁸⁸ is, however, remarkable and could perhaps explain some of the detours on his route (see below).

It is also interesting to note that, contrary to the contacts Ḥasday Ibn Shaprūt had with Byzantine and Khazar Jews in the 10th century, Benjamin, who came from a Christian land (Tudela had been conquered by Navarra in 1119), initially followed a land route to Constantinople passing through southern France and Italy. The reason was obviously that the Balearic Islands were controlled by Arabs at the time, so it may have been too dangerous for him to embark on a ship from Catalonia to Sardinia and Sicily. It is, however, strange that Benjamin did not embark in Brindisi to land in Dyrrachium if he wished to proceed to Constantinople, for the Via Egnatia was the most expedient way to reach the capital. Instead, Benjamin embarked in Otranto and landed in Corfu and Arta, and then proceeded southwards by land to the mouth of the Achelous river. There, he appears to have embarked on a ship for Patras in the Peloponnese. From this city he apparently crossed the Gulf of Corinth again and landed in Naupaktos, and then proceeded by land to Corinth, but without stopping at Thebes, a city he visited only after leaving the Isthmus and marching to the north. After passing through Thessaly, he finally joined the Via Egnatia at Thessalonica: a large detour that remains unexplained. He later left for Constantinople, partly by land and partly by sea, which is easily explained by the importance of the city, but has no justification if his goal was to reach Jerusalem, for he returned afterwards to the Hellespont in order to continue his travels along the Aegean coast towards Rhodes and Cyprus.

As we see, this random itinerary makes no sense for a pilgrim or a merchant, but appears rather to be the result of a traveller's curiosity. Therefore, from his travels it is inappropriate to conclude anything about the usual routes connecting Byzantium to the Iberian peninsula. The return trip from the East (not drawn on the map) appears to be more logical, for Benjamin embarked in the Nile Delta on a ship heading directly to Sicily. The trip lasted 20 days and was surely more convenient for a hurried traveller than the zigzag route he had

assertion. See the section "Diplomatic Contacts Between Byzantium and the Kingdom of Aragon at the End of the 12th Century", below.

88 Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. Adler, pp. 10, 11, 13–14. Richness is associated with silk in Benjamin's account, for instance when he says that "the Greek inhabitants [of Constantinople] are very rich in gold and precious stones, and they go clothed in garments of silk with gold embroidery, and they ride horses, and look like princes".

followed when proceeding to the East.⁸⁹ However, Benjamin did not travel from Italy to southern France and then directly to Spain, but stayed first in the northern Germanic lands, unless we are not dealing here with a later amplification of his lost original text.⁹⁰

To end, just a few words about Benjamin's opinion about the Byzantines. He is mostly positive, but there are some characteristic exceptions. For instance, he repeatedly notes the wealth of the Byzantines when visiting Constantinople and he concedes that there are "also men learned in all the books of Greeks" in the city. He appears to side with the Greeks against the Vlachs of the mountains who "despoil and ravage the land of Greece",⁹¹ although he concedes that the Greeks are "not warlike, but are as women who have no strength to fight", so that they are forced to hire mercenaries. He further refers to the humiliation of Jewish silk craftsmen living in Pera, who were the object of hatred by their Byzantine neighbours, the tanners. In sum, Benjamin's opinions seem to be balanced and not partisan, as one would expect from a distant traveller speaking on a distant culture.

In contrast to Benjamin, our second traveller, the Muslim Ibn Jubayr (born in Valencia in 1145) followed the southern Mediterranean sea route. His travel report in Arabic (*Rihla*) has been compared with that of Benjamin, for both were contemporaries and parted from Spain to the East in a time span of c.25 years.⁹² There are, however, important differences between them. Ibn Jubayr was a wealthy Muslim living in the Almohad Empire who carried out his duties as a pilgrim to Mecca, whereas Benjamin belonged to a Jewish minority living in Christian Navarra. Moreover, the careful literary prose of Ibn Jubayr stands in stark contrast to the enumerative nature of Benjamin's text. Finally, and contrary to Benjamin, Ibn Jubayr paid careful attention to the chronology of his travels, which started in February 1183 and ended two years later in May 1185 upon his return to Granada.

Interestingly, Ibn Jubayr, who lived in Granada, was forced to make a detour through Jaén and Cádiz in order to embark in Ceuta, where he found a Genoese ship that took the risk of carrying a group of Muslim pilgrims to the eastern Mediterranean. Curiously enough, the ship called only at Denia, Mallorca, and Menorca, but from this point on, except for a forced anchoring in the Oristano

89 Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. Adler, p. 78.

90 Jacoby, "Benjamin of Tudela and his 'Book of Travels'", pp. 138–40.

91 Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. Adler, p. 11.

92 See Weber, "Construction of Identity". Guglielmi, "Miradas de viajeros", compares Ibn Jubayr with the later traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa.

Bay (south of Cape San Marco in Sardinia), it proceeded straight to the East bordering the southern coast of the islands of Sicily and Crete without dropping anchor there. This long sea journey was repeated on the route back to Spain (not drawn on the map): Ibn Jubayr departed from the Palestinian port of Acre, again using the service of a Genoese ship that carried Muslim and Christian pilgrims, and again proceeded directly to Sicily. Unfortunately, violent sea storms, especially when they had almost passed Crete, delayed the voyage and caused much damage to the ship, which finally shipwrecked in front of Messina. He and the other Muslims were rescued thanks to the intervention of King William II, who happened to be there. Ibn Jubayr took the occasion to visit the northern coast of Sicily, including the capital, Palermo, before embarking from Trapani for al-Andalus. This ship also avoided the main islands and made just two stops (forced by the contrary winds) at the islands of Favignana (Monk Island, in front of Trapani) and Gabita (to the north of Tabarka) before arriving at Ibiza and finally Denia.⁹³ The continuous dangers of this long sea route are vividly emphasized by Ibn Jubayr. The impression one has is that Muslim pilgrims faced greater difficulties at the time in order to travel to the East, for they had to avoid Christian ports in the main islands of Sardinia, Sicily, and Crete. The contrast with the 10th century, when Muslims controlled Sicily and Crete (until the Byzantine conquest in 961), cannot be more evident, so I would surmise that contacts with the eastern Mediterranean or the Byzantine Empire were extremely rare for Muslims living in 12th-century al-Andalus.

Contrary to Benjamin, Ibn Jubayr did not visit Byzantine territory. On his way back to Spain, two sea storms forced his Genoese ship to approach the islands of the Aegean both before coming to and after passing Crete. On the first occasion, Ibn Jubayr only noted that there were c.350 islands "under the governance of the ruler of Constantinople" and that "the Romans are wary of the inhabitants of these islands as they are of the Muslim". On the second occasion, he briefly expressed his fears of being driven by the storm to a desert island and forced to winter there.⁹⁴ In a third accident, the wind drove the ship "despite ourselves" to the harbour of Zante.⁹⁵

There is only one exception to Ibn Jubayr's general lack of interest in Byzantium: when he arrives in Sicily and finds King William II preparing an expedition against Constantinople. The massacre of the Latin residents of Constantinople by Andronikos I in 1182, which was followed by the death of

93 Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, eds. Wright/de Goeje, pp. 345–47 = Broadhurst, *The Travels*, pp. 361–63.

94 Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, eds. Wright/de Goeje, pp. 314–15 = Broadhurst, *The Travels*, pp. 329–30.

95 Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, eds. Wright/de Goeje, p. 317 = Broadhurst, *The Travels*, p. 332.

the Regent Maria (widow of Manuel I Komnenos) and her ten-year-old son Alexios II, had caused alarm on the island. The king took advantage of the troubles in Byzantium and decided to attack the empire. Ibn Jubayr mentions the presence of a grandnephew of the late Manuel I (also called Alexios) at the Norman court, and deals at length with the different rumours concerning the events in Constantinople that reached Palermo during his stay. Among them, he pays credit to one story that says that the Emir Mas'ūd (meaning Qilij Arslān ibn Mas'ūd, Seljuk Sultan of Rūm, 1156–92)⁹⁶ had conquered Constantinople with the connivance of Andronikos I. This supposed Muslim takeover of the city earned a remark by the author: “This conquest, if it be true, is one of the greatest portents of the Day of Judgement”. He further adds, after praying for the failure of William's expedition, that “this news from Constantinople – God grant that it be true – is one of the greatest miracles and awaited manifestations of the world”. Ibn Jubayr's detachment from Byzantium cannot be better expressed.⁹⁷

We may wish that other learned Spanish travellers of the period had kept diaries of their itineraries, but unfortunately Benjamin's and Ibn Jubayr's are the only ones to have been preserved. One regrets, for instance, that the famous geographer al-Idrīsī, a native of Septem (Ceuta) but educated at Córdoba, did not leave any record of his numerous travels around the Mediterranean. As is well-known, when al-Idrīsī stayed at the court of Roger II of Sicily, the Norman king commissioned him to write a description of the world in 1138. In 1154, he finished the so-called *Tabula Rogeriana*, one of the most famous maps of the world. The map was accompanied by a detailed commentary, the *Book of Pleasant Journeys into Faraway Lands*, or simply, the *Book of Roger*, which contained a small world map and 70 sectional maps according to the climates (seven) and the sections (ten for each climate) of the world, based on the Ptolemy School. It has plenty of information on Byzantium (mostly found in climates IV and V under sections four and five) but most of it was probably collected in Sicily and has nothing to do with the subject of the present article.⁹⁸

96 Qilij Arslān II was known by his father's name, so simply as Mas'ūd, as was said by Ibn Jubayr in a previous passage: Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, eds. Wright/de Goeje, p. 231. Benjamin of Tudela also refers to him as the most important threat to Byzantine power: Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. Adler, p. 13.

97 Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, eds. Wright/de Goeje, pp. 337–40 = Broadhurst, *The Travels*, pp. 353–56, and see the commentary in Broadhurst, *The Travels*, pp. 387–89.

98 An overview is in Ahmad, “Cartography”. The oldest manuscript of the *Book of Roger*, copied c.1325, is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (ms. Arabe 2221). For a French translation, see Jaubert, *Géographie d'Édrisi*.

5 Diplomatic Contacts between Byzantium and the Kingdom of Aragon at the End of the 12th Century

The conflict between Frederick I Barbarossa (King of Germany since 1152 and King of Italy and Holy Roman Emperor since 1155, titles which he held until his death in 1190) and Manuel Komnenos, the reigning Byzantine *basileus* (1143–80), determined political alliances among the European powers between 1152 and 1180. It is not the place here to enter into the details of this conflict, which was centred in Italy; here I will simply briefly discuss how during the reign of Alfonso II the Chaste (1164–96), the crown of Aragon became involved in the diplomatic constellation woven around Byzantium in order to counterbalance the Holy Roman Empire's increasing influence in the Mediterranean.⁹⁹

The starting point is a series of three consecutive treaties signed in January and February of 1177 in the cities of Tarascó (Provence), Montpellier, and Nice among the representatives of Pisa and the lords of these territories, respectively the counts of Provence, the lord of Montpellier, and the consuls of Nice. Through these three treaties, an alliance of all these powers was made against the counts of Toulouse, Genoa and, most importantly, the Holy Roman Empire. The first of these treaties is of interest here, for the Count of Provence at the time was Ramon Berenguer IV, the brother of Alfonso II the Chaste of Aragon who, for the first time, had united in a single person the titles of Count of Barcelona (inherited from his father Count Ramon Berenguer IV at his death in 1162) and King of Aragon (inherited from his mother Queen Petronilla, who resigned the title in his favour in 1164). Moreover, in 1166, Alfonso II had acquired the rights to the county of Provence from Countess Douce II, daughter of his cousin, Ramon Berenguer III of Provence. This last acquisition was an important move to prevent Provence from passing into the hands of the counts of Toulouse, for Countess Douce had been promised in marriage to the son of the reigning count Raymond V. At stake was control over the territories in south-eastern France, disputed by the Tolosans, subjects of the kings of France, and the counts of Provence, whose territory belonged to the Kingdom of Arelat within the Holy Roman Empire and whose family was related to the crown of Aragon, now in the hands of the ancient counts of Barcelona. Pisa, whose economic interests were opposed to those of Genoa, interfered in this conflict and gave Alfonso II the opportunity to gain new allies against his rivals.

99 For an overview, see Marcos Hierro, *Die byzantinisch-katalanischen Beziehungen*, pp. 3–180; and Marcos Hierro, *La dama de Bizanci*, whom I follow here closely. Detailed references to the sources are found in his studies. See also Marcos Hierro, "Bizancio en el imaginario político", pp. 307–12.

It is not a coincidence that, scarcely a few months later, in October 1177, Alfonso II's envoys were in Pisa borrowing money and preparing for an embassy to Byzantium. The main Catalan ambassador, Ramon de Moncada, Seneschal of Alfonso II, arrived in Constantinople in the spring of 1178. Together with Emperor Manuel Komnenos, he arranged the marriage of the emperor's niece, Eudokia (daughter of his brother Isaac), to Count Ramon Berenguer IV of Provence. We have no details about the negotiations leading to this alliance, but Moncada must have stayed some months in Constantinople, for he asked a Pisan resident in the imperial city to make a Latin translation of the liturgy ascribed to St John Chrysostomos.¹⁰⁰ In any case, after Moncada's return to Italy in 1178, another legation followed carrying the bride Eudokia and sailing towards France.

The proposed marriage was convenient for both sides. At that time, Emperor Manuel was trying to establish new alliances in the West through marriages of members of his family. Probably in the same convoy together with Eudokia, he sent an embassy (led by a certain Alexios Komnenos) to pick up the young princess Agnes, daughter of Louis VII of France, whose marriage to Manuel's son, the future Emperor Alexios II, had been arranged. The marriage took place in Constantinople in March 1180. The same embassy probably also dealt with the marriage of Manuel's daughter Maria to Renier of Montferrat, who was appointed *Kaisar* and married his imperial bride in Constantinople in February 1180. Moreover, already in 1178, a prominent Pisan nobleman, Hormanno Paganello, had married his son to another Byzantine princess of the Komnenian family, also named Eudokia, who had recently become widowed from a previous marriage to a Roman Guelph.¹⁰¹

However, when the bride Eudokia arrived in France, the political situation had changed completely. Frederick Barbarossa, who was informed of the projected marriages and alliances of the Byzantine *basileus*, had not only visited the city of Pisa early in 1178, but also the capital of the county of Provence, Arles, where he was crowned as King of Burgundy on 30 July. Many notables attended this coronation, except for the Count of Provence himself, Ramon Berenguer IV who, along with his brother Alfonso II, the King of Aragon, had

100 See Strittmatter, "Notes"; and Jacob, "La traduction". Ciggaar, "Une description", p. 119 suggests a possible connection between the embassy of Moncada and an anonymous Latin description of Constantinople (probably written by a northern pilgrim towards the end of the 11th century), which was copied at the end of the 12th century in the monastery of Santes Creus, 30 km north of Tarragona.

101 For these marriages, see Magdalino, *Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 100–02; Marcos Hierro, *Die byzantinisch-katalanischen Beziehungen*, pp. 161–68; and Marcos Hierro, *La dama de Bizanci*, pp. 161–64.

built the new alliance with the Byzantines aimed directly against the Holy Roman Emperor. The Catalans did not dare provoke Frederick further with the celebration of the planned marriage and therefore, probably in connivance with the Pisans, decided to marry the Byzantine princess not to the Count of Provence but to William VIII, Lord of Montpellier, a close ally of Catalan interests in the area, although undoubtedly a less prominent bridegroom. The pair had only one daughter, Maria of Montpellier, and William VIII then separated from his wife, who was held in the monastery of Aniane until her death in 1203.¹⁰² Eudokia died the year before the marriage of her daughter Maria to the new King of Aragon, Peter II, in 1204. However, according to Peter's son and heir (born in 1208), King James I the Conqueror, the marriage of his father to Maria did not only bring Byzantine imperial blood to the House of Aragon, but was also a kind of compensation for the failed marriage of Eudokia to the count of Provence. In fact, James slightly distorted the facts in his *Llibre dels feits*, where he introduced Eudokia as the daughter (and not the niece) of Manuel Komnenos, whom he addresses as the "*millor home entre els cristians*". He also claimed that it was his grandfather Alfonso II who had been initially chosen as Eudokia's bridegroom, but that he had changed his mind and instead married Sancha of Castile, daughter of King Alfonso VII of León.¹⁰³ The dates do not support this explanation, for Sancha had married Alfonso II of Aragon in 1174, but, in any case, the beginning of the 13th century and the long reign of James I the Conqueror (1213–76) saw not only the great expansion of the crown of Aragon in Spain (the conquest of the Balearic Islands and Valencia) but also the start of an ambitious Mediterranean policy which put Spain in direct contact with Byzantium. This period, marked by the impact on Byzantium of the Fourth Crusade of 1204, witnessed a lively exchange, not only of goods, but also of cultural influences, both artistic, religious and literary,¹⁰⁴ that somehow culminated in the vast and pioneering project of translating Greek classics into Aragonese by Juan Fernández de Heredia, Great Master of the Knights of the

102 For the stay of Eudokia in Montpellier, see Marcos Hierro, *La dama de Bizanci*, pp. 171–241.

103 James I, *Book of Deeds*, ed. F. Soldevila, *Les quatre grans Cròniques*, vol. 1: *Llibre dels feits del rei En Jaume*, Barcelona 2007, p. 55 (§7): "E esguardat, aquells qui veurets aquesta escriptura, si aquesta cosa és miraculosa, que nostre avi, lo rei Don Amfós, promès que seria sa muller filla de l'emperador, e depuis pres la reina Dona Sanxa. E nostre Senyor volc que per aquella promesa que el rei havia feta primerament, ço és a saber, que seria sa muller la filla de l'emperador Manuel, que aquella tornàs en son lloc. E par-ho en açò, que la neta de l'emperador Manuel fo puis muller de nostre pare, on nós venim. E per açò és obra de Déu que aquella covinença que no es complí en aquell temps se complí depuis, quan nostre pare pres per muller la neta de l'emperador".

104 See, among other recent contributions, Duran Duelt, "Icons and Minor Arts"; Castiñeiras, "Paliachora"; Castiñeiras, "Crossing Cultural Boundaries"; and Castiñeiras, *Latin Perceptions*.

Hospital between 1377–96.¹⁰⁵ Research has approached this new period mostly from the point of view of political and military events,¹⁰⁶ but has also taken into account the rich documentation preserved in Spanish and Italian archives about economic activities and trade.¹⁰⁷ However, it goes beyond the scope of the present contribution, for it exceeds the chronological limits of the volume.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anna Komnene, *Alexias*, eds A. Kambylis/D.R. Reinsch, *Annae Comnenae Alexias* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis, 40), Berlin 2001.
- Baucells i Reig, J. et al., *Diplomatari de l'Arxiu capitular de la catedral de Barcelona. Segle XI* (Diplomatariis, 37–41), 5 vols., Barcelona 2006.
- Benjamin of Tudela, *Book of Travels*, ed. M.N. Adler, *Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela. Critical Text, Translation and Commentary*, London 1907.
- Junyent i Sobirà, E., *Diplomatari i escrits literaris de l'abat i bisbe Oliba (en llatí y català)*, Barcelona 1992.
- Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, eds W. Wright/M.J. de Goeje, *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, Leyden-London 1907.
- Timarion*, ed. R. Romano, *Pseudo-Luciano, Timarione* (Byzantina et neo-hellenica neapolitana, 2) Naples 1974.

Secondary Literature

- Abenza Soria, V.C., "El díptic de Jaca i la reina Felícia de Roucy", *Síntesi. Quaderns dels Seminaris de Besalú* 2 (2014), 27–54.
- Ahmad, S.M., "Cartography of al-Sharīf al-Idrīsī", in J.B. Harley/D. Woodward (eds.), *The History of Cartography*, vol. 2.1: *Cartography in the Traditional Islamic and South Asian Societies*, Chicago 1992, pp. 156–74.
- Bonnaire, P., "Une famille de la campagne barcelonaise et ses activités économiques aux alentours de l'an Mil", *Annales du Midi* 76 (1964), 261–303.
- Broadhurst, R.J.C., *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, London 1952.
- Cahn, W., "The Frescoes of San Pedro de Arlanza", in E. Parker (ed.), *The Cloisters. Studies in Honor of the Fiftieth Anniversary*, New York 1992, pp. 86–109.

105 For his historical relevance as sponsor of this vast translation project, see now Signes Codoñer, "Reading and Translating", with previous bibliography.

106 See also, besides the other publications of Ernest Marcos Hierro referred to above, Marcos Hierro, *La croada catalana*.

107 Daniel Duran Duelt is one of the best specialists in the field: Duran Duelt, "Los ducados de Atenas ... I" (with bibliography in nn. 2 and 3); and id. "Los ducados de Atenas ... II".

- Calvo Capilla, S., "The Reuse of Classical Antiquity in the Palace of Madinat al-Zahra' and its Role in the Construction of Caliphal Legitimacy", *Muqarnas* 31 (2014), 1–33.
- Castiñeiras, M., "From Chaos to Cosmos: The Creation Iconography in the Catalan Romanesque Bibles", *Arte medievale* 1 (2002), 35–50.
- Castiñeiras, M., "San Nicola attraverso e al di là del Cammino di Santiago", in M. Bacci (ed.), *San Nicola. Splendori d'arte d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, Milan 2006, pp. 127–36.
- Castiñeiras, M., "Compostela, Bari and Jerusalem: in Search of the Footsteps of a Figurative Culture on the Roads of Pilgrimage", *Ad limina* 1 (2010), 17–53.
- Castiñeiras, M., "El románico catalán en el contexto hispánico de la Edad Media. Aportaciones, encuentros y divergencias", in J. Camps/G. Ylla-Català (eds.), *El esplendor del románico. Obras maestras del Museu Nacional d'art de Catalunya*, Madrid 2011, pp. 46–69.
- Castiñeiras, M., "Bizanci, el Mediterrani i l'art de 1200 a Catalunya", *Síntesi. Quaderns dels Seminaris de Besalú* 2 (2014), 9–25.
- Castiñeiras, M., "Paliachora (Egina), el Sinaí y Cataluña a finales del siglo XIV: hibridación artística, política y peregrinación en el Mediterráneo oriental", in C. Varela Fernandes (ed.), *Imagens e Liturgia na Idade Media* (Bens Culturais da Igreja, 5), Lisbon 2016, pp. 9–56.
- Castiñeiras, M., "Crossing Cultural Boundaries: Saint George in the Eastern Mediterranean under the Latinokratia (13th–14th c.) and his Mythification in the Crown of Aragon", *Arts/Open Access Journal* 9.3, 95 (2020).
- Castiñeiras, M., *Latin Perceptions of the Byzantine East: Art and Identities in Flux during the Catalan Expansion across the Late Medieval Mediterranean* (forthcoming).
- Ciggaar, K.N., "Une description de Constantinople dans le Tarragonensis 55", *Revue des Études Byzantines* 53 (1995), 117–40.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium. 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden-New York-Cologne 1996.
- Constable, O.R. (ed.), *Medieval Iberia: Readings from Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Sources*, Philadelphia 1997.
- Cooper, L., *Text and Concordance of the Gran Conquista de Ultramar*, Biblioteca Nacional ms. 1187, Madison 1979.
- Duran Duelt, D., "Icons and Minor Arts: a Neglected Aspect of Trade Between Romania and the Crown of Aragon", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 105 (2012), 29–52.
- Duran Duelt, D., "Los ducados de Atenas y Neopatria en el comercio regional e internacional durante la dominación catalana (siglo XIV) I: el comercio regional a través del observatorio de Candía", *Estudios Bizantinos* 6 (2018), 111–46.
- Duran Duelt, D., "Los ducados de Atenas y Neopatria en el comercio regional e internacional durante la dominación catalana (siglo XIV) II: el comercio de larga distancia a través del observatorio de Barcelona y Mallorca", *Estudios Bizantinos* 7 (2019), 85–118.

- Español Bertran, F., *La Vera Creu d'Anglesola i els pelegrinatges a Terra Santa*, Solsona 2015.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, *La dominazione bizantina nell'Italia meridionale dal IX all'XI secolo*, Bari 1978.
- Feliciano, M.J., "Medieval Textiles in Iberia: Studies for a New Approach", in D.J. Roxburgh (ed.), *Envisioning Islamic Art and Architecture: Essays in Honor of Renata Holod*, Leiden 2014, pp. 46–65.
- Fernández de Navarrete, M., "Disertación histórica sobre la parte que tuvieron los españoles en las guerras de Ultramar o de las cruzadas y cómo influyeron estas expediciones desde el siglo XI hasta el XV en la extensión del comercio marítimo y en los progresos del arte de navegar", in *Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia*, vol. 5, Madrid 1817, pp. 37–204.
- Gallego Vázquez, F., "Juan de Ortega, San", in *Diccionario biográfico español*, vol. 39, Madrid 2012, pp. 298–99.
- Gonzalvo i Bou, G., *Sant Oleguer (1060–1137): Església i Poder a la Catalunya naixent*, Barcelona 1998.
- Grimaldi, M., "Un 'estoig d'argent amb relíquies a manera de cera en quatre partides': l'encolpi esmaltat de la catedral de Tortosa", *Síntesi. Quaderns dels Seminaris de Besalú* 2 (2014), 95–116.
- Gudiol Ricart, J., "Les peintres itinérants de l'époque romane", *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 1 (1958), 191–94.
- Guglielmi, N., "Miradas de viajeros sobre oriente (siglos XII–XIV)", in D. Coulon/C. Otten-Froux/D. Pagès/D. Valérian (eds.), *Chemins d'outre mer. Études sur la Méditerranée médiévale offertes à Michel Balard* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 20), Paris 2004, vol. 2, pp. 425–37.
- Halm, H., *Das Reich des Mahdi. Der Aufstieg der Fatimiden (875–973)*, Munich 1991 (Bonner, M. (trans.), *The Empire of the Mahdi. The Rise of the Fatimids*, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1996).
- Hoffmann, K. (ed.), *The Year 1200: A Centennial Exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York 1970.
- Jacob, A., "La traduction de la Liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome par Léon Toscan: Édition critique", *Orientalia christiana periodica* 32 (1966), 111–62.
- Jacobs, M., *Reorienting the East. Jewish Travelers to the Medieval Muslim World*, Philadelphia 2014.
- Jacoby, D., "Genoa, Silk Trade and Silk Manufacture in the Mediterranean Region (ca. 1100–1300)", in A.R. Calderoni-Masetti et al. (eds.), *Tessuti,oreficerie, miniature in Liguria, XIII–XV secolo*, Bordighera 1999, pp. 11–40.
- Jacoby, D., "Benjamin of Tudela in Byzantium", in P. Schreiner/O. Strakhov (eds.), *Essays Presented to Ihor Sevcenko on his Eightieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Palaeoslavica, 10), Cambridge, Mass. 2002, pp. 180–85.

- Jacoby, D., "Benjamin of Tudela and his «Book of Travels»", in K. Herbers/F. Schmieder (eds.), *Venezia incrocio di culture. Percezioni di viaggiatori europei e non europei a confronto*, Rome 2008, pp. 135–64.
- Jaspert, N., "Un vestigio desconocido de Tierra Santa: la Vera Creu d'Anglesola", *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 25 (1999), 447–75.
- Jaubert, P.A., *Géographie d'Édrisi*, 2 vols., Paris 1836–40.
- Junyent i Sobirà, E., "La figure de l'abbé Oliba: esquisse biographique", *Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa* 3 (1972), 9–18.
- Krönung, B., "Ein Schreiben des Konstantinos VII. Porphyrogennetos an den umayyadischen Prinzen al Ḥakam in Cordoba", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 105 (2012), 1–7.
- Lévi-Provençal, E., "Un échange d'ambassades entre Cordoue et Byzance au IX^e siècle", *Byzantion* 12 (1937), 1–24.
- Lienhard, B., "Marianos Argyros reist nach Afrika. Über die Vermittlungsversuche eines kaiserlichen Würdenträgers im byzantinisch-fätimidischen Konflikt im 10. Jh.", in M. Popović/J. Preiser-Kapeller (eds.), *Junge Römer – Neue Griechen. Eine byzantinische Melange aus Wien*, Vienna 2008, pp. 11–27.
- López Serra, J., "San Isidoro de Quíos, mártir titular del Monasterio de San Isidro de Dueñas", *Publicaciones de la Institución Tello Téllez de Meneses* 80 (2009), 405–53.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993.
- Marcos Hierro, E., *Die byzantinisch-katalanischen Beziehungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Chronik Jakobs I. von Katalonien-Aragon* (Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, 37), Munich 1996.
- Marcos Hierro, E., "El catalans i l'imperi bizantí", in M.T. Ferrer i Mallol (ed.), *Els catalans a la Mediterrània oriental a l'edat mitjana. Jornades científiques de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans. Secció històrico-arqueològica* (Sèrie Jornades Científiques, 11), Barcelona 2003, pp. 23–78.
- Marcos Hierro, E., "Bizancio en el imaginario político de la corona de Aragón", in P. Bádenas de la Peña/I. Pérez Martín (eds.), *Bizancio y la península ibérica. De la Antigüedad tardía a la Edad Moderna* (Nueva Roma, 24), Madrid 2004, pp. 303–21.
- Marcos Hierro, E., *La croada catalana*, Barcelona 2006.
- Marcos Hierro, E., *La dama de Bizanci. Un enigma en la nissaga de Jaume I*, Barcelona 2013.
- Martínez Manzano, T., "La novela de época comnena a la luz de la investigación contemporánea: el caso de *Rodante y Dosicles*", *Erytheia* 24 (2003), 77–92.
- Matesanz Gascón, R., "Desde Bizancio hasta Córdoba: Orosio, Apiano y *La Crónica del Moro Rasis*", *Edad Media, Revista de Historia* 6 (2003–04), 209–24.
- Matesanz Gascón, R., *Omeyas, bizantinos y mozárabes en torno a la Prehistoria fabulosa de España de Ahmad Al-Razi*, Valladolid 2004.
- Messis, Ch., "Deux versions de la même « vérité »: les deux vies d'hosios Mélétios au XII^e siècle", in P. Odorico/P.A. Agapitos (eds.), *Les vies des saints à Byzance. Genre*

- littéraire ou biographie historique? Actes du II^e colloque international philologique « EPMHNEIA », Paris, 6–7–8 juin 2002* (Dossiers Byzantins, 4), Paris 2004, pp. 303–45.
- Molina, L., “Orosio y los geógrafos hispanomusulmanes”, *Al-Qantara* 5 (1984), 63–92.
- Monferrer-Sala, J.P., “Rabī ibn Zayd”, in Thomas, D./Mallett, A. (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: a Bibliographical History*, vol. 2: 900–1050 (The History of Christian-Muslim Relations, 14), Leiden 2010, pp. 347–50.
- Monge Simeón, L., “Els teixits produïts i comercialitzats al Mediterrani. Els casos de teixits bizantins a la Seu d’Urgell”, *Síntesi. Quaderns dels Seminaris de Besalú* 2 (2014), 55–74.
- Mundó, A.M., *Les Bibles de Ripoll: estudi dels mss. Vaticà, Lat. 5729 i París, BNF Lat. 6* (Studi e testi, 408), Vatican 2002.
- Muñoz Martínez, A.B., “Influencia bizantina en la iconografía del Nuevo Testamento de la Biblia de Ripoll”, in M. Cabañas Bravo (ed.), *El arte foráneo en España. Presencia e influencia* (Biblioteca de Historia del Arte, 9), Madrid 2005, pp. 215–25.
- Oakeshott, W.F., *Sigena: Romanesque Paintings in Spain and the Winchester Bible Artists*, London 1972.
- Ochoa, J.A., “El imperio bizantino en el viaje de Benjamín de Tudela”, in G. Busi (ed.), *Viaggiatori ebrei. Berichte jüdischer Reisender vom Mittelalter bis in die Gegenwart*, Bologna 1992, pp. 81–98.
- Ocón Alonso, D.M., “Alfonso VIII, la llegada de las corrientes artísticas de la corte inglesa y el bizantinismo de la escultura hispánica a finales del siglo XII”, in *Alfonso VIII y su época*, Madrid 1992, pp. 307–20.
- Parker, M.E., “Pisa, Catalonia, and Muslim Pirates: Intercultural Exchanges in the Balearic Crusade of 1113–1115”, *Viator* 45/2 (2014), 77–100.
- Penelas, M., “A Possible Author of the Arabic Translation of Orosius’ *Historiae*”, *Al-Masāq* 13 (2001), 113–35.
- Pérez Pena, L., “El drap de les Bruixes: Al-Ándalus, Sicília o Síría?”, *Síntesi. Quaderns dels Seminaris de Besalú* 2 (2014), 75–92.
- Quintana Prieto, A., “La infanta Doña Elvira, hija de Alfonso VI y de Jimena Muñiz”, *Temas Bercianos* 3 (1984), 277–416.
- Serrano Coll, M., “San Nicolás polifacético: el ciclo del santo obispo en el claustro catedralicio de Tarragona”, *Codex Aquilarensis* 30 (2014), 225–58.
- Signes Codoñer, J., “La diplomacia del libro en Bizancio”, *Scrittura e civiltà* 20 (1996), 9–43.
- Signes Codoñer, J., “Diplomatie und Propaganda im 9. Jahrhundert. Die Gesandtschaft des Al-Ghazal nach Konstantinopel”, in Cl. Sode/S. Takács (eds.), *Novum Millenium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck, 19 December 1999*, Aldershot 2001, pp. 379–92.
- Signes Codoñer, J., “Bizancio y al-Ándalus en los siglos IX y X”, in I. Pérez Martín/P. Bádenas de la Peña (eds.), *Bizancio y la península ibérica. De la Antigüedad tardía a la Edad Moderna* (Nueva Roma, 24), Madrid 2004, pp. 177–245.

- Signes Codoñer, J., "Bizancio y las Baleares en los siglos VIII–IX", in R. Durán Tapia (ed.), *Bizancio y las Baleares*, Palma de Mallorca 2005, pp. 45–101.
- Signes Codoñer, J., *The Emperor Theophilos and the East (829–842). Court and Frontier in Byzantium During the Last Phase of Iconoclasm* (Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Studies, 13), Aldershot 2014.
- Signes Codoñer, J., "Las islas Baleares y su relación con Bizancio en los siglos VIII y IX: una propuesta de periodización", in M.A. Cau (ed.), *Las islas Baleares durante la Antigüedad tardía (siglos III–X)*, Oxford 2021 (forthcoming).
- Signes Codoñer, J., "Reading and Translating Greek Literature in Medieval Spain from Leander of Seville to Juan Fernández de Heredia", in I. Salvo García/R.M. Rodríguez Porto (eds.), *Canon Hispánico: Classical and Late Antique Authors in Medieval Iberian Literature* (Textes et Études du Moyen Âge), Turnhout 2021 (forthcoming).
- Sirantoine, H., *Imperator Hispaniae. Les idéologies impériales dans le Royaume de León (IX–XII^e siècles)* (Bibliothèque de la Casa de Velázquez, 58), Madrid 2012.
- Sobrequés, S., *Els Grans Comtes de Barcelona*, Barcelona 1961.
- Sobrequés, S., *Els Barons de Catalunya*, Barcelona 1980 (1st ed. 1957).
- Stern, H., *Les mosaïques de la Grande Mosquée de Cordoue* (Madrider Forschungen, 11), Berlin 1976.
- Stern, S.M., "A Letter of the Byzantine Emperor to the Court of the Spanish Umayyad Caliph al-Hakam", *Al-Andalus* 26 (1969), 37–42.
- Strittmatter, A., "Notes on Leo Tuscus' Translation of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom", in S. Prete (ed.), *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda, Prefect of the Vatican Library*, New York 1961, pp. 409–24.
- Talbi, M., *L'émirat Aghlabide (184–296/800–900). Histoire politique*, Paris 1966.
- Thomas, D., "Refutation of the Byzantine Emperor's Letter", in D. Thomas/A. Mallett (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations: a Bibliographical History*, vol. 3: 1050–1200 (The History of Christian-Muslim Relations, 15), Leiden 2011, pp. 143–45.
- Ubieto Arteta, A., "La participación navarro-aragonesa en la primera cruzada", *Príncipe de Viana* 28 (1947), 357–83.
- Vidal, S., "Los *enkolpia* bizantinos de bronce en relieve del levante peninsular: Sant Pere de Rodes y Sant Cugat del Vallès", in J.M. Gurt/N. Tena (eds.), *V reunió d'Arqueologia cristiana hispànica, Cartagena 16–19 d'abril de 1998*, Barcelona 2000, pp. 551–70.
- Vidal, S., "Tres piezas bizantinas con funciones apotropaicas conservadas en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional: dos *enkolpia* y un 'sello' bivalvo inédito", *Estudios bizantinos* 2 (2014), 87–124.
- Weber, E., "Construction of Identity in Twelfth-Century Andalusia: the Case of Travel Writing", *The Journal of North African Studies* 5 (2000), 1–8 (repr. in I.R. Netton (ed.), *Islamic and Middle Eastern Geographers and Travellers*, vol. 2: *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, London 2008, pp. 256–64).
- Zapata Rodríguez, R., *Italia bizantina. Historia de la segunda dominación bizantina en Italia, 867–1071*, Madrid 2006.

Zimmermann, M., "La connaissance du grec en Catalogne du IX^e au XI^e siècle", in M. Sot (ed.), *Haut Moyen Âge: culture, éducation et société. Études offertes à Pierre Riché*, Paris 1990, pp. 493–515.

Zimmermann, M., *Écrire et lire en Catalogne: IX^e–XII^e siècle* (Bibliothèque de la Casa de Velázquez, 23), 2 vols., Madrid 2003.

Byzantium and France

Savvas Neocleous

The year 843 was an important one for both the Byzantine and Carolingian empires. In the Byzantine Empire, the Empress Theodora, widow of the late Emperor Theophilos (829–42) and mother of the last Amorian emperor, Michael III (842–67), once and for all restored the veneration of icons, thus ending the century and a half of iconoclastic debate that shook the Byzantine Empire. In western Europe, the Treaty of Verdun ended the three-year Carolingian civil war and divided the Carolingian Empire into three kingdoms: the West Frankish kingdom, the Middle kingdom, and the East Frankish kingdom.¹ The western realm, or “West Francia” – a term coined by modern scholars – was to form the basis of the Kingdom of France. West Francia roughly corresponded to the territory of modern France. In fact, it extended further south than modern France, but not as far east, encompassing the territory between Flanders in the north and the Pyrenees in the south, between the Atlantic coast in the west and Burgundy in the east.² Within these ill-defined and fluid boundaries rather than precise or fixed borders, the emergence of powerful duchies and counties clearly prevented the West Frankish kings from regularly exercising their authority within these principalities.³

Between the late 9th century and the crusaders’ conquest of Constantinople in 1204, the West Frankish realm was a state with a decentralized government, a conglomeration of principalities, including a royal principality, rather than a unified kingdom. While the Byzantine *basileus* was a powerful monarch, the divinely appointed viceroy of God on Earth, who presided over a centralized government and had absolute authority over the state and unlimited administrative control over the Church, the West Frankish kings, by contrast, often struggled to impose themselves on the powerful princes of the realm and to make them pay homage and recognize the king as their lord. Even though Philip Augustus (1180–1223), the last king of the period under investigation,

1 Auzépy, “State of Emergency”, pp. 287–91; Nelson, “The Frankish Kingdoms”, pp. 119–22.

2 Dunbabin, “West Francia”, pp. 372–74.

3 Dunbabin, “West Francia”, p. 374; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 161.

increased French royal power dramatically, his vassal, the King of England, still controlled Normandy, Maine, Touraine, Anjou, and Saintonge until 1204.⁴

1 Franco-Byzantine Relations in the 10th and 11th Centuries

During the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries diplomatic relations between Byzantium and France seem to have been limited. Indeed, Byzantine diplomatic outreach primarily involved the middle and east successor-realms to the Carolingian Empire, i.e. the Kingdom of Italy and the German Ottonian Kingdom, since these were nearer to the Byzantine Empire and, more importantly, their interests in the Italian peninsula overlapped or clashed with those of the imperial government in Constantinople. Yet, although diplomatic relations, intercultural exchanges and other contacts between the Byzantine Empire and the Kingdom of France were initially infrequent, they were not non-existent, and were to increase dramatically as time progressed from the late 9th to the late 12th century. Byzantine Greeks visited France and Franks visited the Byzantine Empire. Visitors included royalty, nobles, official ambassadors, prelates, ecclesiastics, monks, mercenaries, merchants, pilgrims, and many others. The length of their stay varied from short-term visits to longer-term or permanent migration.⁵ For the Franks, the Byzantines were the Greeks (*Graeci*), while their empire, Hellenized since the 7th century, was the *imperium Graecorum* or *imperium Constantinopolitanum*.

In 987, the Robertine Hugh Capet (987–96) was elected King of France. Hugh's election marked the end of the long-standing rivalry between the Carolingians and the Robertines for the west Frankish throne; the Capetian dynasty founded by Hugh would reign in unbroken succession up to 1328. In his bid for the throne, Hugh Capet was supported by the Byzantine Theophano, empress-dowager of his maternal first cousin the German ruler Otto II (973–83) and regent (985–91) for the minor Otto III (983–1002). In 968, Hugh's maternal uncle Otto I (936–73), inaugurator of the German imperial age, had turned to Constantinople for a Byzantine princess to be betrothed to his son Otto II. The negotiations had eventually resulted in the marriage of Otto II and Theophano, the niece of the emperor John Tzimiskes (969–76), celebrated at St Peter's in Rome in 972. Once Hugh gained the crown, following the precedent of Otto I, he considered securing a Byzantine princess for his oldest

4 Dunbabin, "West Francia", p. 376; Sayers, "Review of *Le Pape Innocent III et la France*", p. 106; Geanakoplos, "Church and State in the Byzantine Empire", pp. 387–88, 397–98.

5 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 163–64, 189–90, 195–96.

son Robert, the future Robert II (996–1031).⁶ A marriage alliance between the Capetians and the highly esteemed *basileus Romaion* would ensure enormous status and legitimacy upon the newly established Frankish dynasty, and would be a shattering blow to the Carolingian claimant to the French throne, Charles duke of Lower Lorraine, and his supporters, who challenged Hugh's legality by accusing him of usurpation.⁷

Hugh's letter to the Byzantine emperors Basil II (976–1025) and Constantine VIII (976–1028) dates to early 988, and was drafted by the scholar and future pope Gerbert of Aurillac. In the letter the Byzantine rulers are described as "orthodox emperors", whose "most sacred friendship and most suitable alliance" the new French king was seeking; the Byzantine Empire is acknowledged as both "Roman" and "Holy Empire".⁸ At a time when the *Zweikaiserproblem* acutely came to the fore in Europe following the revival of the imperial office in the West under the Ottonians, the acknowledgment of the Byzantine Empire as *Romanum* and *sanctum imperium* by the king of France and his distinguished counsellor Gerbert would have been greeted with satisfaction in the Byzantine imperial capital. Overall, the tone of the epistle, which portrayed the Byzantine rulers as the guardians of the orthodox faith, their imperial office as sacred, and their empire as holy, testifies to the awe and respect that the empire on the Bosphorus inspired at the Frankish court.

In return for a bride of imperial stock, Hugh assured the Byzantine emperors that neither Gauls – an archaic ethnonym for the Franks – nor Germans would attack the borders of the Byzantine Empire.⁹ In other words, the new Frankish king not only excluded a French attack on the empire, which was not even a remote possibility in any case, but even pledged his support for Constantinople in the event of Ottonian aggression. A Franco-Byzantine alliance, which would have acted as a deterrent against the Ottonians, would have been welcome to the Byzantine court. For unclear reasons, however, a marriage alliance between the Capetians and the ruling house of Byzantium did not actually take place. The royal letter was probably never sent to Constantinople. At about the time the missive was compiled, Count Arnulf II of Flanders (965–87) died and Hugh arranged for his heir to marry the count's elderly widow

6 Müller-Mertens, "The Ottonians as Kings and Emperors", p. 256; Dunbabin, "West Francia", pp. 389–90; Davids, "Marriage Negotiations Between Byzantium and the West", p. 109; Leyser, "The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships", pp. 41–42; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 168; Vasiliev, "Hugh Capet of France and Byzantium", pp. 229–32.

7 Duby, *France in the Middle Age*, p. 19; Hallam and Everard, *Capetian France*, pp. 27–30.

8 Gerbert of Aurillac, *Epistolae* III, ed. Weigle, pp. 139–40.

9 Gerbert of Aurillac, *Epistolae* III, ed. Weigle, p. 139.

Rozela, a marriage which would secure for the Capetians territorial gains in northernmost France.¹⁰

In spite of the cancellation of the plans for a Franco-Byzantine marriage alliance, relations between the Capetian and Macedonian dynasties remained amicable. Sometime between 1025 and 1028, Robert II commissioned Bishop Ulric of Orleans, who was to visit Constantinople during his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, to present the Emperor Constantine VIII with “a sword with a golden hilt and a reliquary of gold set with precious gems”. In return the emperor sent the Frankish king “a great many silken hangings” and “a substantial portion of the Holy Cross”, which reflected the imperial capital’s renown as the relic depository of Christendom.¹¹ This episode notwithstanding, evidence of substantial contacts between the government of Constantinople and the French royal court or magnates of the French Kingdom is largely absent during the greater part of the 11th century.

Despite the lack of extensive contacts between the Byzantine and French courts, there was still a good deal of French interest in Byzantine history.¹² Since the Byzantine Empire was an integral part of the Christian world, the most important political developments in this part of Christendom were recorded by French annalists and chroniclers such as the Norman William of Poitiers (d. c.1090), the Aquitanian Ademar of Chabannes (d. 1034), and the Burgundian Rodulfus Glaber (d. c.1046). Some of the snippets of Byzantine history found in these chroniclers conflate history with fiction, such as Glaber’s story of the devil appearing to a dying man and boasting that he had placed Conrad II (1024–39) on the German throne and Michael IV (1034–41) on the Byzantine throne, following Michael’s poisoning of his predecessor, who is wrongly identified by Glaber as Basil II instead of Romanos III (1028–34).¹³ Other entries of Byzantine history are more historically accurate, even though they sometimes contain a number of factual or chronological errors, such as Ademar’s claim that the death of Nikephoros Phokas (963–69) by assassination and not natural causes remained secret until his tomb was later opened and his cadaver was found stabbed, or the chronicler’s assertion that Basil II became a monk at the end of his life.¹⁴

10 Dunbabin, “West Francia”, p. 390; Vasiliev, “Hugh Capet of France and Byzantium”, pp. 233–34; Nicholas, *Medieval Flanders*, p. 46.

11 Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque* 4.19, ed. and trans. France, pp. 202–03.

12 France, “Byzantium in Western Chronicles before the First Crusade”, pp. 3–16; Angold, “Knowledge of Byzantine History in the West”, pp. 19–33.

13 Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque* 4.5, ed. and trans. France, pp. 178–81.

14 Adémar de Chabannes, *Chronicon* 3.22, 3.32, trans. Chauvin/Pon, pp. 225–26, 242.

While the material on the Byzantine Empire found in French chronicles is relatively scarce in comparison to narratives coming from Germany or Italy, the chronicles still testify to the prestige Byzantium enjoyed in French consciousness. William of Poitiers claims that Count Baldwin V of Flanders (1035–67) traced his ancestry not only to “the Flemings, ... [and] the kings of Gaul and Germany” but also to “a line of the nobility of Constantinople.”¹⁵ Elsewhere in the Norman chronicler’s work, the imperial capital is exalted as “the noble and vast city of Constantinople, which rules over many kings.”¹⁶ Glaber describes the Byzantine Empire as the “holy empire of Constantinople” (*sanctum imperium Constantinopolitanum*).¹⁷ Notably, the Burgundian chronicler is our only source for the overtures allegedly made in 1024 by the Emperor Basil II and the Patriarch Eustathios of Constantinople (1019–25) to Pope John XIX (1024–32) calling for the recognition of the Church of Constantinople “as universal in its own sphere”, a reference to the title “Ecumenical Patriarch,” *Οἰκουµενικὸς Πατριάρχης*, enjoyed by the Patriarch of Constantinople since the 6th century.¹⁸ While Glaber rejected the demand as improper since it compromised the universal authority of the Papacy and the unity of the Church, he did not hesitate to admit that “the Greeks ... have always kept the Church’s observance scrupulously.”¹⁹

The Byzantines, who were obviously regarded as members of the universal Christian Church by Glaber, were unequivocally described as “Greek Christians” by Ademar in spite of the bickering between the Roman and Constantinopolitan Churches.²⁰ Indeed, the 10th and first half of the 11th centuries represent the peak of the presence, and often settlement, of Greek monks in France.²¹ Glaber records that Greek monks of St Catherine at Mount Sinai came to the ducal court of Richard II of Normandy (996–1026) in Rouen every year “and took back with them many presents of gold and silver for their communities.”²² In 1027, the Sicilian-born Greek ascetic Symeon Pentaglottos (d. 1035) – who was educated in Constantinople and eventually served as a monk at Mount Sinai – and some of his fellow monks, travelled to southern

15 William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi* 1.22, eds. and trans. Davis/Chibnall, pp. 30–31.

16 William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi* 1.59, eds. and trans. Davis/Chibnall, pp. 96–97.

17 Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque* 3.2, ed. and trans. France, pp. 96–97.

18 Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque* 4.2–4, ed. and trans. France, pp. 172–77.

19 Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque* 4.2–4, 5.7, ed. and trans. France, pp. 172–77, 224–25.

20 Adémar de Chabannes, *Chronicon* 3.22, trans. Chauvin/Pon, pp. 225.

21 Hamilton/McNulty, “*Orientalis Lumen et Magistra Latinitatis*”, pp. 181–216; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 163–64, 189–90, 195–96.

22 Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque* 1.21, ed. and trans. France, pp. 36–37.

France where they were cordially received by Count William IV of Poitiers (1029–38) and made new acquaintances among the French clergy of Angoulême.²³ One of them was the French monk and chronicler Ademar of Chabannes, who praised the Greek monks as “upright in character, abounding in catholic doctrine, distinguished in life in all respects ... [and] perfectly learned in Greek and Latin letters”.²⁴

Archbishop Makarios of Antioch (d. 1012) arrived in 1011 in Ghent where he settled into the life of the Benedictine community of Saint-Bertin without difficulty and was greatly revered by his fellow monks for his nobility and sanctity.²⁵ In his brethren's understanding, Makarios, by his prayers and tears, saved the people of Ghent from the plague, to which he eventually offered himself as a sacrificial lamb, and of which he died in 1012; he was immediately venerated as a saint and miracles were reported at his tomb. Makarios's description as *miraculis plurimis chouscans* (“shining forth in very many miracles”) by the annalist of Ghent is rather rare in the monastic literature of the time.²⁶ Another Greek bishop, Barnabas, became a monk at Saint-Bénigne, Dijon, at the time of Abbot William of Volpiano (d. 1031), while the Greek-speaking monk Anastasios, who came from Venice, settled in Cluny.²⁷ According to the author of Anastasios's *vita*, the monk's brethren held him dear for his great charity and humility, and for directing them to the service of God through the example of his life.²⁸ The ease with which Greek Christians settled into the life of Latin cenobitic communities is a testament to the fact that Greek and Latin monks “were perfectly at home with each other's traditions and ways of life”, to use the words of a modern historian.²⁹ Even though the settlement of Greek monks in France, and the West in general, declined after the second half of the 11th century, the Greek ascetic tradition and spirituality would continue to enjoy profound respect in western Europe.³⁰

23 Hamilton/McNulty, “*Oriente Lumen et Magistra Latinitatis*”, pp. 197–98; Callahan, *Jerusalem and the Cross*, pp. 10, 33–34. Symeon Pentaglottos, known as “of Trier”, was canonized by Pope Benedict IX (1032–44, 1045, 1047–48).

24 *Acta concilii lemovicensis*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 142, cols. 1353–1400, here col. 1363.

25 Hamilton/McNulty, “*Oriente Lumen et Magistra Latinitatis*”, pp. 200, 204, 215.

26 *Annales S. Bavonis Gandenses 693–937*, ed. G.H. Pertz, in *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores*, vol. 2, Leipzig 1828, pp. 185–91, here p. 189. Makarios of Antioch was canonized in 1067.

27 Hamilton/McNulty, “*Oriente Lumen et Magistra Latinitatis*”, pp. 199, 205; Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 195.

28 *Vita S. Anastasii*, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 149, cols. 423–34, here col. 428.

29 Hamilton/McNulty, “*Oriente Lumen et Magistra Latinitatis*”, p. 200.

30 Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 79, 84–85, 127–28, 190–91.

2 Pre-Crusade Plans, France and the *christianum imperium* of Constantinople

In the last quarter of the 11th century, the flood of raids in Asia Minor unleashed by the Seljuk Turks following the Byzantine defeat at the Battle of Mantzikert in 1071 resulted in more awareness of Eastern Christians in western Europe, including France. In his letter of 22 January 1075 to Abbot Hugh of Cluny, Pope Gregory VII (1073–85) enumerated the misfortunes of Christendom which greatly distressed him. What, above everything else, caused the pope's "immeasurable grief and universal sorrow" was the slaughter of Christians by the Seljuks in the East.³¹ Between 1071 and 1081 the Seljuks had succeeded in establishing themselves in significant numbers over large areas of Anatolia. Reports about the ravages of the Turkish invasions of Asia Minor were soon spread in western Europe.³² The pope was determined not to remain inactive in the face of the Turkish threat. He was much taken with the idea of mobilising a military force for the defence of the Byzantine Empire; thus he could project himself as a protector of all Christians and mend fences with both Constantinople and the Eastern Churches.³³

Over the course of 1074, Gregory sent several letters to princes in France as well as other areas of western Europe endeavouring to drum up support for an expedition to assist the Eastern Christians against the Turks. The recipient of one of Gregory's letter, dated 2 February 1074, was Count William I of Burgundy (1057–87). Gregory called upon the count to support the "Christians [i.e. the Byzantines] who are grievously afflicted by the most frequent ravaging of the Saracens and who are avidly imploring us [the Western Christians] to extend them our helping hand".³⁴ Another prominent recipient was William VI of Poitiers (1058–86), who expressed his eagerness to hasten to "the service of Saint Peter".³⁵

In addition to the letters addressed to individual Western princes, Gregory issued two general summonses to Latin Christianity in March and December 1074. Having "learnt ... that a race of pagans ... strongly prevailed against the

31 Gregory VII, *Registrum* 2.49, ed. Caspar, vol. 1, p. 189, trans. Cowdrey, p. 139.

32 Angold, *The Byzantine Empire*, pp. 117–20.

33 Gregory VII's response was elicited by reports transmitted to the West by common people, rather than diplomatic exchanges with the Byzantine government. See Cowdrey, "Pope Gregory VII's 'Crusading' Plans of 1074", pp. 30–31, 34–35; id., "The Gregorian Papacy, Byzantium, and the First Crusade", pp. 154–55; id., *Pope Gregory VII*, p. 484; Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, pp. 97–98; Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 6–7.

34 Gregory VII, *Registrum* 1.46, ed. Caspar, vol. 1, pp. 70–71, trans. Cowdrey, p. 51.

35 Gregory VII, *Registrum* 2.3, ed. Caspar, vol. 1, p. 128, trans. Cowdrey, p. 95.

Christian empire (*christianum imperium*, i.e., the Byzantine Empire),” the pope invited the Christians of the West to “deeply grieve for the pitiable plight of so great an empire and for so great a carnage of Christians [i.e. Byzantines].”³⁶ The pontiff went even further and admonished the Westerners to “lay down our lives for the liberation of our brothers [i.e. the Byzantines] [...] who live across the sea in the Constantinopolitan Empire [i.e. the Byzantine Empire].”³⁷

Through Gregory’s letters and general summons, the Franks – and Western Christians in general – became more aware of the situation of Byzantium and the Seljuk threat. Gregory’s plan for an expedition to the East seems to have had a considerable appeal among Westerners. By the end of the year the pope seems to have had enough evidence to “believe that many knights support us in such a task”³⁸ Notwithstanding Gregory’s efforts, however, his “crusading” plans eventually fell through, since the situation as it developed in western Europe with the outbreak of the Investiture Contest in 1075 did not favour their realisation. Nonetheless, the ground had been prepared and the seed sown: Gregory’s project was to be brought to fruition by his successor’s successor, the French Pope Urban II (1088–99).

3 The First Crusade: a French Enterprise for the Liberation of Eastern Christianity

In 1089 and 1091 Urban II may already have been contemplating summoning the French to fight for the Byzantines.³⁹ A few years later, on 17 March 1095, an embassy of the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I (1081–1118) arrived at Urban’s council in Piacenza to appeal for military help.⁴⁰ As contemporary material testifies, this was not the first time Alexios had turned to the pope for assistance.⁴¹ The information that the Byzantine ruler pleaded for papal help is also repeated by the authoritative Fleming cleric Gilbert of Mons (c.1150–1225), who, although composing his *Chronicon Hanoniense* a century later, i.e. during the years 1195 and 1196, drew on earlier materials. More importantly,

36 Gregory VII, *Registrum* 1.49, ed. Caspar, vol. 1, p. 75, trans. Cowdrey, p. 55.

37 Gregory VII, *Registrum* 1.49, 2.37, ed. Caspar, vol. 1, pp. 75, 173, trans. Cowdrey, pp. 55, 127–28.

38 Gregory VII, *Epistolae vagantes* 5, ed. and trans. H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The ‘Epistolae vagantes’ of Pope Gregory VII*, Oxford 1972, pp. 12–13

39 Riley-Smith, “The Crusades”, p. 534.

40 Bernold of Constance, *Chronicon*, ed. Robinson, p. 520.

41 Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolomyta* 5, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. 5, Paris 1895, pp. 1–40, here p. 15.

Gilbert adds that Alexios also “sent envoys to France with letters to stir up the princes so that they would come to the aid of desolate Jerusalem and imperilled Greece”.⁴² Gilbert was right to note that one of these letters was sent to Robert the Frisian, count of Flanders (1071–93).

Alexios's letter to Robert the Frisian, purporting to date from 1091, does not survive in its original form but in a heavily reworked version of the end of the 11th century or the first decade of the 12th century.⁴³ What we can say with certainty is that in the original letter Alexios highlighted the Turkish threat to the East and made an appeal to Count Robert and his nobles to rally to the support of the Byzantine Empire, or “the most holy Greek Christian empire (*sanctissimum imperium Christianorum Graecorum*)” as is described in the reworked version of the letter, against its non-Christian invaders.⁴⁴ Already in the late 1080s Robert, who had travelled to Jerusalem, seems to have stopped in Constantinople on the way home. According to Emperor Alexios's daughter Anna Komnene, the Byzantine ruler, who met with Robert at Beroë, asked for Fleming mercenaries. Robert promised that upon his arrival in Flanders he would dispatch horsemen to Constantinople. The count kept his promise, duly sending Alexios 500 knights who served as mercenaries in the Byzantine army.⁴⁵

Alexios's appeals for military aid, coupled with reports of pilgrims and travellers who had journeyed to the Byzantine Empire and Syria at the end of the 11th century, prompted Pope Urban to action. Whereas the Italian Pope Gregory VII had tried to enlist French nobles in his expedition to the East but his main

42 Gilbert of Mons, *Chronicon Hanoniense* 23, trans. L. Napran, *Chronicle of Hainaut*, Woodbridge 2005, p. 25.

43 For an edition of the letter, see *Epistulae et chartae* 1, ed. Hagenmeyer, pp. 129–36. For a translation and discussion of the letter, see Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, trans. Sweetenham, Appendix: 215–22. The authenticity of the letter has been the subject of much debate. A number of scholars saw it as an authentic original while others dismissed it as an outright forgery. The truth must lie in-between: the letter seems to be a reworked version of a genuine, now lost original. The fact that the Byzantine Empire is described as “empire of the Greek Christians” and the Byzantines as “Greek Christians” is enough to question the authenticity of the letter: the Byzantine imperial chancery would have never used such terms. Cf. Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, pp. 60, 88–89, 94–95.

44 *Epistulae et chartae* 1, ed. Hagenmeyer, pp. 130–31; Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 9–11, 16. See also Orderic Vitalis (d. 1142), the half-French, half-English monk and historian at the monastery of Saint-Évroul in Normandy, who describes the Byzantine Empire as “holy empire” (*imperium sanctum*) four times in his work: Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 7.5, 10.20, 11.24, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 4, pp. 14–15, vol. 5, pp. 332–33, vol. 6, 102–03.

45 Anna Komnene, *Alexias* 7.6.1, 7.7.4, 8.3.5, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, pp. 218, 221–22, 242, trans. Sewter, pp. 229, 232, 252; Ciggaar, “Flemish Counts and Emperors”, pp. 35–36; Shepard, “Father” or “Scorpion?”, p. 103.

efforts were directed towards Italy and Germany, the French Urban II focused on France. In November 1095 at the Council of Clermont, Urban preached the expedition which was to become known as the First Crusade. It was basically a French enterprise, preached on French soil by a French pope. The liberation and protection of the Eastern Christians against the Muslims was one of the two primary objectives of the First Crusade, the second goal being the recovery of the land where Christ had trod.⁴⁶ In his carefully staged sermon at Clermont, Urban II heavily drew upon the language used by his great predecessor Gregory VII. In the six versions of Urban's preaching of the First Crusade, the need to aid the fellow Christians in the East was stressed.⁴⁷ According to the redaction of Urban's speech by the possible eyewitness Baldric, abbot of Bourgueil and later archbishop of Dol-en-Bretagne (d. 1130), the pope described the Eastern Christians to his audience as "your own blood-brothers (*germani fratres vestri*), your companions (*contubernales vestri*), your associates (*couterini vestri*)", explaining that they were both "sons (*filii*) of the same Christ and the same Church (*eadem Ecclesia*)" and avowing that "it is charity to risk your life for your brothers (*pro fratribus*)".⁴⁸

Urban's cry for military assistance for the Eastern Christians and for the liberation of the churches of the East was propagated by bishops, priests, and preachers across Europe. However, the main burden of promoting the crusade fell on the pope himself.⁴⁹ Urban remained in France in 1095 and 1096, moving from town to town, addressing the faithful and, according to the record of a grant to the Cluniac priory of Marcigny, exhorting "the army of Christians to subdue the ferocity of the eastern pagans".⁵⁰ As recorded by Count Fulk le Réchin (1060–1109), in Anjou where Urban was in the spring of 1096, he "urged our people to go to Jerusalem and attack the race of the pagans who had occupied this city and all the lands of the Christians as far as Constantinople".⁵¹

46 Munro, "The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont", pp. 236–37, 240, 242; Cowdrey, "Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade", pp. 186–88; Daly, "Christian Fraternity", p. 49.

47 Scholars traditionally tend to treat five versions of Pope Urban II's preaching as eyewitness; these are found in the accounts of Fulcher of Chartres, Robert the Monk, Baldric of Dol, Guibert of Nogent, and William of Malmesbury. Chibnall drew attention to the version preserved in Orderic Vitalis's work: Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 9.2, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 5, pp. 14–17.

48 Baldric of Bourgueil, *Historia Ierosolimitana* 1, ed. S. Biddlecombe, *The Historia Ierosolimitana of Baldric of Bourgueil*, Woodbridge 2014, p. 9, trans. Krey, p. 19.

49 Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, p. 104.

50 *Le cartulaire de Marcigny-sur-Loire*, 119, ed. J. Richard, *Le cartulaire de Marcigny-sur-Loire, 1045–1144: Essai de reconstitution d'un manuscrit disparu* (Analecta Burgundica, 4), Dijon 1957, p. 89.

51 *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise*, eds. L. Halphen/R. Poupardin, Paris 1913, pp. 237–38.

Urban himself, in his letter of late December 1095 to “all the faithful” in Flanders, recorded that “grieving with pious concern at this calamity [i.e. the destruction of the churches in the East], we visited the regions of France and greatly urged the princes of the land and their subjects to seek the liberation of the churches of the East”.⁵² While in the 10th century and up to the third quarter of the 11th century knowledge about the Byzantine Empire, its capital, and its people seems to have been relatively limited in France, in the last quarter of the 11th century the French became more acquainted, at least theoretically, with the Eastern Christian Empire of Byzantium and their Eastern Christian brothers.⁵³ In his letter of late December 1095 to the people of Flanders, Urban took it almost for granted that the Flemings were already well acquainted with the situation in the East: “we believe that your brotherhood has long since learned from many reports that a barbaric fury has deplorably afflicted and laid waste the churches of God and the regions of the Orient.”⁵⁴

The fervour with which Urban preached his crusade led thousands all across Europe, but particularly in France, to take the cross. The crusading troops were to begin their eastward journey after harvest time in 1096 and to gather in Constantinople. In July 1096 two contingents led by Walter, lord of Boissy-sans-Avoir in the Île-de-France and the charismatic Picard preacher Peter the Hermit arrived in the imperial capital. The ill-disciplined contingents were annihilated by the Turks in September–October 1096 after crossing the Bosphorus into Asia Minor.⁵⁵ Behind them came six large armies between November 1096 and mid-May 1097. With the exception of the expeditionary force of Bohemond of Taranto, which set off from southern Italy, the rest of the armies came from France: northern France, Lorraine, Flanders, Normandy, and Provence. They were commanded by Raymond IV of Toulouse (1093–1105), Godfrey of Bouillon (1087–1100), Robert Curthose of Normandy (1087–1106), Robert II of Flanders (1093–1111), Stephen of Blois (1089–1102), and Hugh of Vermandois (1085–1101), brother of the French king. Even Bohemond of Taranto was in fact a Norman prince, and member of the Hauteville family.

Upon arrival in the imperial capital the Frankish nobles were persuaded or forced to swear an oath of fealty to the Byzantine Emperor and pledge themselves to hand over to him any captured territory which had formerly belonged to the Byzantine Empire. In return, Alexios was to supply the crusaders with

52 *Epistulae et chartae* 2, ed. Hagenmeyer, p. 136.

53 France, “Byzantium in Western Chronicles before the First Crusade”, pp. 11–15; Angold, “Knowledge of Byzantine History in the West”, pp. 31–32.

54 *Epistulae et chartae* 2, ed. Hagenmeyer, p. 136.

55 Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, pp. 100–03; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 94–100.

provisions and war equipment.⁵⁶ With the help of the Frankish crusaders, the Byzantine Emperor succeeded in re-establishing Byzantine control in western Asia Minor. Nicaea, the capital of the Seljuk sultanate of Rum, hard pressed by the crusaders, was the first to surrender to the Byzantine ruler.⁵⁷ Although the middle-rank French crusaders resented the fact that they were not allowed to plunder the city and felt overlooked by Alexios's *munificentia*, the knights and princes, in contrast, received "what was more precious from the spoils of the city of Nicaea" and were enriched from the emperor's treasury.⁵⁸ After the capture of Nicaea on 19 June 1097, Stephen of Blois, writing to his wife Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror (1066–87), enthusiastically recorded that "the emperor, verily, received me with dignity and honour and with the greatest affection, as if I were his own son, and he loaded me with most bountiful and precious gifts". The count assured his wife that "in truth, ... there is no man today like him [Alexios] under heaven, for he is enriching all our princes most bountifully, is relieving all our knights with gifts and refreshing all the poor with feasts.... In our times ... there has not been a prince so distinguished for general integrity of character".⁵⁹

The second important city that the Byzantines had also recently lost to the Muslims and the crusaders regained in the course of the First Crusade, was Antioch. Despite pressure from Bohemond of Taranto to surrender Antioch to him, the French crusaders, respecting their oaths to Alexios, dispatched Hugh of Vermandois to Constantinople in July 1098 to invite the emperor to come and receive the city. However, Alexios's delay in proceeding to accept the surrender of Antioch enabled Bohemond to snatch the city for himself when the opportunity arose. Despite subsequent Byzantine protestations, Antioch became a Frankish principality under Bohemond.⁶⁰ For the next several decades it would be a thorn in the relations between Byzantium and the Frankish east as well as France (and the Papacy).

A new wave of French troops led by William IX of Aquitaine (1086–1126), William II of Nevers (1098–1148), the deserter Stephen of Blois, and noblemen

56 For detailed discussions of the oath to the emperor, see Ganshof, "Recherches sur le lien juridique qui unissait les chefs de la première Croisade à l'empereur byzantin", pp. 49–63; Pryor, "The Oaths of the Leaders of the First Crusade to the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus", pp. 111–41; Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 18–28; France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 115–18; Shepard, "'Father' or 'Scorpion'?", pp. 105–08.

57 Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, pp. 118–31.

58 Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos* 3.10, ed. Huygens, p. 153; Stephen of Blois, *Epistolae*, p. 887, trans. Krey, pp. 100–01.

59 Stephen of Blois, *Epistolae*, pp. 885–86, trans. Krey, pp. 100–01.

60 Asbridge, *The First Crusade*, pp. 242–46; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 189–96.

from Burgundy marched to the Holy Land via Constantinople in the aftermath of the First Crusade. The so-called Crusade of 1101 ended in failure.⁶¹ Rumours of a conspiracy between the Byzantine ruler and the “infidels” against the crusaders soon developed and spread in the West, creating their own version of events. These allegations of Byzantine-Muslim collusion mainly evolved and flourished among the rank and file of the crusader armies, attracted to tales of conspiracy in looking for a powerful actor, able to dictate the course of events, to blame for their failure. The conspiracy scenarios eventually found their way into the chronicles, having become more outlandish in transmission, despite the fact that French nobles protested that Alexios “was not to be blamed for this crime at all.”⁶² The destruction of the Crusade of 1101 by the Seljuks was followed by the defeat of the crusaders by a Fatimid army at the Battle of Ramla on 17 May 1102, which resulted in a number of crusading leaders and many knights being taken captive and led to Cairo. Three years later they were set free through Alexios’s intervention; among them was Viscount Odo Arpin of Bourges, a French knight and later monk of Cluny and prior of La Charité-sur-Loire.⁶³

4 The Frankish Principality of Antioch: a Thorn in Franco-Byzantine Relations

Alexios’s pressure on Bohemond for the return of Antioch led the Norman prince to leave his nephew Tancred in charge of the city in August 1104 and sail for western Europe to prepare a diversionary attack on the western provinces of the Byzantine Empire. He travelled as far as Flanders and the south-western part of France. During his journey to France in 1106 Bohemond was accompanied by a Greek pretender to the Byzantine throne, allegedly a son of the Byzantine Emperor Romanos IV (1068–71), and other eminent Byzantines. The Norman prince launched a propaganda campaign against Alexios, accusing him of usurpation and for the ill-treatment of pilgrims who passed through his empire on their journey to Jerusalem. The Norman’s propaganda was intended to marshal an army, the ostensible aim of which was to topple the “illegitimate”

61 Cate, “The Crusade of 1101”, pp. 343–67; Lock, *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, pp. 142–44; Tyerman, *God’s War*, pp. 170–75.

62 Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana* 8.46, ed. and trans. Edgington, pp. 634–37; Neocleous, “Byzantine-Muslim Conspiracies Against the Crusades”, pp. 257–59.

63 Anna Komnene, *Alexias* 12.1.3–4, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, pp. 360–61, trans. Sewter, pp. 370–71; Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 10.23, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 5, pp. 350–53. On the Battle of Ramla, see Tyerman, *God’s War*, p. 175.

Alexios and place the “legitimate” son of Romanos IV on the Byzantine throne as a first step towards a crusade to the Holy Land. A number of French chroniclers were taken in by Bohemond’s propaganda. Others, however, denounced the Norman and his subsequent attack on the Byzantine Empire in 1107–08, which would finally fail spectacularly.⁶⁴

Bohemond may well have been a skilled propagandist, but he found his match in Alexios who, moreover, had the money to fund a propaganda machine unparalleled in medieval European history. Upon hearing of the Norman leader’s accusations against him, the emperor presented costly gifts to the crusading knights, who, having been released from Egyptian captivity through his intervention, were lavishly entertained in Constantinople, and sent them back to the West. On arrival home, these crusaders “furnished undeniable evidence against Bohemond. They stigmatized him as a charlatan, incapable of telling the truth.... On many occasions they convicted him to his face and in every quarter denounced him, bringing forward witnesses worthy of credence – themselves.”⁶⁵ In general, French opinion was divided in its view of Alexios and this is evident and reflected in contemporary French chronicles. Attitudes ranged from outright hostility – decrying the Byzantine ruler as “malicious” (*iniquus*), “most wicked” (*nequissimus*), “perfidious” (*perfidus*), and even as an “insolent tyrant” (*tyrannus insolens*) – to profound admiration, praising him as “great” (*magnus*), “magnificent” (*magnificus*), “most renowned” (*nominatissimus*), “glorious” (*gloriosus*), “venerable” (*venerabilis*), “pious” (*pius*), “Christian” (*Christianus*), and even “most Christian” (*Christianissimus*) emperor.⁶⁶

64 For Bohemond’s “crusade”, see Yewdale, *Bohemond I*, pp. 106–34; Rowe, “Paschal II, Bohemund of Antioch and the Byzantine Empire”, pp. 165–202; McQueen, “Relations between the Normans and Byzantium”, pp. 458–67; Tyerman, *God’s War*, pp. 261–63; Whalen, “God’s Will or Not?”, pp. 111–26; Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 39–44.

65 Anna Komnene, *Alexias* 12.1.6, eds. Reinsch/Kambylis, p. 361, trans. Sewter, p. 371.

66 Stephen of Blois, *Epistolae*, p. 887; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana* 1.13, 15, 2.16, 4.40, 8.3, ed. and trans. Edgington, pp. 28, 30, 84, 310, 588; *Gesta episcoporum Tullensium* 48, ed. G. Waitz, in *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores*, vol. 8, Hannover 1848, pp. 631–48, here p. 647; *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* 1.3, ed. and trans. R. Hill, *The Deeds of the Franks and the Other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*, London 1962, p. 6; Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana* 1.13, eds. Kempf/Bull, p. 12; Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos* 2.11, 3.5, ed. Huygens, pp. 128, 143. Orderic Vitalis’s *Historia ecclesiastica* epitomizes the contradictory French opinion about Alexios. The Byzantine ruler is labelled in Orderic’s Book IX as “wily and smooth-spoken, a prolific and ingenious master of the art of deception”, and in Book X as “the worst of traitors”, whereas he is lauded in Book VII as “a man of great wisdom, merciful to the poor, a brave and illustrious warrior who was genial to his soldiers, open-handed in giving, and a most diligent servant of the

In the Kingdom of France, awareness of the Greeks and their empire was to increase following the marriage between Constance, heiress of Prince Bohemond II of Antioch (1111–30), and Raymond of Poitiers in 1136. Raymond was the uncle of Eleanor, Duchess of Aquitaine and Countess of Poitiers in her own right, and Queen of France after her marriage to King Louis VII (1137–80) in 1137. The first decade of Raymond's and Constance's joint rule was marked by conflicts with the Byzantine Empire. In 1137, 1142, and 1144, the military campaigns of Emperor John II (1118–43) and his successor Manuel (1143–80) against Antioch forced Prince Raymond to declare himself a vassal of the Byzantine Emperor and agree to install a Greek patriarch in the city.⁶⁷

The installation of a Greek patriarch and other Greek prelates in the Principality of Antioch was resented by its Frankish settlers not so much on religious grounds but primarily on ethnic ones. The Franks of *Outremer* naturally desired their spiritual leaders to be elected from their own people. The Greek bishops were not only separated from them ethnically, but they were also seen as agents of the expansionist Byzantine Empire which threatened their independence. The Komnenian emperors' aggressive policy towards Antioch in the late 1130s and the first half of the 1140s must have logically resulted in the cultivation of anti-Byzantine sentiment among the Frankish settlers of the principality. Due to the close ethnic affinity between the Franks of Antioch and of the Kingdom of France, as well as the existence of close ties of kinship between Raymond of Poitiers-Antioch and the French Queen Eleanor, reports on Byzantine aggression toward Antioch must have soon begun filtering through from the Latin East to the Kingdom of France. What is more, the Antiochene embassy to France in 1145–46 must have reported on Byzantine attempts for expansionism at the expense of the principality.⁶⁸ Unsurprisingly, this led to the formation of an anti-Byzantine party in France which would try to foment anti-Greek sentiment during the march of the French expedition of the upcoming Second Crusade through the Byzantine Empire.

divine law"; as he was "a man defended and cherished by God", he "reigned with firmness and dignity ... for thirty years". Orderic obviously drew on both hostile and sympathetic sources towards Alexios, and this resulted in the creation of a dichotomous image of the Byzantine Emperor in the *Historia ecclesiastica*: Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4.3, 7.5, 9.6, 10.20, ed. and trans. Chibnall, vol. 4, pp. 14–17, vol. 5, pp. 46–47, 334–35. See also Laiou, "Byzantium and the Crusades in the Twelfth Century", pp. 25–27.

67 Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 144–45, 155 n. 52; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 42.

68 Phillips, "Odo of Deuil's *De profectione Ludovici*", pp. 85–86; Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 51–53.

5 The French Expedition of the Second Crusade and the Byzantines

Following the Muslim capture of Edessa on 24 December 1144, Pope Eugenius III (1145–53) called for a fresh crusade on 1 December 1145. The pope succeeded in enrolling two eminent western monarchs, Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany (1138–52), for his upcoming expedition. On 16 February 1147, the French crusaders met at Étampes to decide whether they would accept the proposal of Roger II (1130–54), King of Sicily, to transport the French crusading army by water or whether the crusaders would follow the overland route marching through the Byzantine Empire.⁶⁹ Among the French, the emerging anti-Byzantine party favoured the Norman proposal, distrusting the Byzantines. This faction was headed by Bishop Godfrey of Langres, a man whom the 12th-century humanist John of Salisbury (d. 1180) described as “impulsive”, recording that “few if any have brought more harm on the Christian army and whole community” than him.⁷⁰ In his eyewitness *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, Odo of Deuil, a monk of the monastery of Saint-Denis who accompanied Louis VII on the Second Crusade as a royal chaplain, recounts that the members of the anti-Byzantine faction supported their stance by arguing “that the Greeks, as they had learned either by reading or by experience, were deceitful”.⁷¹ Despite all attempts, however, to convince the French assembly with its arguments, the French anti-Byzantine party failed miserably in its objective. Louis VII and the majority of the French magnates turned down the Norman offer and decided to follow the overland route to Jerusalem.⁷²

It has been argued that the French anti-Byzantine faction's aggressive stance toward the Greeks may well have been due to their having read accounts of the First Crusade. We know, for example, that Odo, an adherent of the party, had studied chronicles of the expedition.⁷³ The sources of the First Crusade, however, do not express any anti-Byzantine sentiment, but their venom is exclusively directed against Alexios.⁷⁴ Alexios had died in 1118. The reason for the French anti-Byzantine party's hostility towards the Greeks lay elsewhere;

69 Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, pp. 115–19; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 289–92.

70 John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis* 24, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, Oxford 1986, p. 55.

71 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 1, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 12–13.

72 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 1, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 12–13.

73 Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, p. 185.

74 Neocleous, “Contemporary Latin Historiography of the First Crusade”, pp. 27–49. Significantly, in 2009, Neocleous and Whalen independently used the term “anti-Alexian” to describe the historiography of the First Crusade: Neocleous, “Contemporary Latin Historiography of the First Crusade”, pp. 28, 34, 49; Whalen, *Dominion of God*, p. 60.

it was undoubtedly due to the Byzantine emperors' recent attempts to impose their protectorate over Frankish Antioch. Already by the second decade of the 12th century, the friction and conflicts between Constantinople and Antioch had led to negative attitudes of the Antiochenes towards the Greeks, insofar as these are reflected in the *Gesta Tancredi*, composed between 1112 and 1118 by Ralph of Caen, a cleric from Normandy in the service of Tancred, regent of the principality.⁷⁵

While the French crusading expedition was still in the Byzantine Empire, the anti-Greek party among the army advocated three times an attack on the imperial capital, using various pretexts such as a truce between Manuel and Mas'ūd I (1116–56) (the Seljuk sultan of Iconium), Byzantine expansionism against Frankish Antioch, the substitution of Latin prelates with Greek “heretical” bishops in the principality, and Manuel's demand for homage from the French barons of the Second Crusade. All three attempts of the anti-Greek party, however, were in vain, and their arguments were rejected by the majority of the French army. First, the majority party took the view that it would be wrong to interfere in the dispute between Constantinople and Antioch since the emperor “could have had justifiable reasons” (*causas iustitiae*) for his war against the Antiochenes. Second, as the majority faction argued, in France it was a custom (*consuetudo*) for homage to be paid in some circumstances to several lords, but first and foremost the vassals observed loyalty (*fides*) to the French king. The majority added, with a hint of sarcasm, “if we think this shameful, let us destroy the custom”, thus exposing the hollowness of the militant faction's argument.⁷⁶

The majority party of the French crusading expedition shrewdly suggested refusing to pay homage to the Byzantine sovereign only “if it is dishonourable to do for the emperor what we do for lesser lords”, a powerful statement testifying to Manuel being held in high esteem as a Christian monarch by the majority of the French nobility. Urging their fellow crusaders to observe their custom and take the oath of loyalty to Manuel, those of the majority faction stated that this “neither injures the king nor disgraces us”. In response to the militant party's accusation of heresy against the Byzantines, the majority of the French replied that “about their faith we are not able to judge, being ignorant of the law”. The majority party's main counter-argument against an attack on Constantinople

75 Ralph of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana* 2, 4, 11, 17, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. 3, Paris 1866, pp. 587–716, here pp. 606, 607–608, 612, 618; trans. B.S. Bachrach/D.S. Bachrach, *Gesta Tancredi: A History of the Normans on the First Crusade*, Aldershot 2005, pp. 23, 25–26, 32–33, 40–41; Neocleous, “Contemporary Latin Historiography of the First Crusade”, pp. 42–43, 45–46.

76 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 3, 4, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 54–59, 68–71, 78–81.

was that the Byzantines were fellow Christians. The majority of the French rhetorically challenged the militant minority to assail the Greeks and their imperial capital, “the richest city of the Christians (*urbs Christianorum ditissima*)”, only “if slaughtering Christians (*caedes Christianorum*) wipes out our sins”. As the majority faction concluded, “we are marching against the pagans (*contra paganos*); with Christians (*Christiani*) let us be at peace”.⁷⁷

Louis VII was doubtless flattered by the fact that while marching through the Byzantine Empire, “the congregations of the churches and the entire clergy always received him with due reverence and honour issuing forth from their cities with icons and other Greek paraphernalia”.⁷⁸ During his stay in Constantinople, the French king was lodged at the suburban palace of Philopatium, near the land walls of Constantinople. He was conducted by Manuel around the palaces, churches, and shrines of the capital, and was entertained at a banquet conducted with all due pomp and ceremony at the imperial palace at Blachernae. As Odo of Deuil admitted, the “banquet afforded pleasure to the ear, mouth, and eye with pomp as marvelous, viands as delicate, and pastimes as pleasant as the guests were illustrious”.⁷⁹ On 9 October 1147, on the Feast of St Dionysios (Saint-Denis), celebrated by Greeks as well as Latins, Manuel sent over to Louis a group of his clergy.⁸⁰ The emperor must have sought not only to please and impress his distinguished guest and his retinue but also to stress the religious affinity between Greeks and French. Odo conceded that the Byzantine clergy, “although differed from ours as to the words and organ, ... made a favourable impression because of their sweet chanting; for the mingling of voices ... softened the hearts of the Franks. Also, they gave the onlookers pleasure by their graceful bearing and gentle clapping of hands and genuflections.”⁸¹ The Greek clergy had succeeded in impressing the French crusaders.

The anti-Byzantine sentiment shared by Godfrey of Langres and Odo of Deuil was out of line with, and not representative of, the majority of the French crusaders. The Bishop of Langres repeatedly failed to convince his fellow countrymen of the validity of his arguments, while Odo's anti-Greek *De profectione Ludovici* not only never enjoyed much popularity, but was hardly known in

77 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 4, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 70–71, 80–81. See also Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, p. 25.

78 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 3, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 44–45.

79 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 4, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 66–67.

80 For the Feast of Saint-Denis and the liturgical relationship between the monastery of Saint-Denis in Paris and the Byzantine world, see Mayr-Harting, “Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the Monastery of Saint-Denis”, pp. 238–40.

81 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 4, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 68–69.

the Middle Ages. Odo's original Latin text survives only in a single manuscript: Montpellier, College of Medicine, MS 39. The manuscript dates to the late 12th or early 13th century and contains a collection of historical items which significantly, with the exception of Odo's work, were often copied.⁸²

Between 1210 and 1230, an anonymous author in Île-de-France composed the *Chronique des Rois de France*, a history of the kings of France from the (alleged) Trojan origins of the Franks to Philip II Augustus. This early vernacular prose history represents the earliest example of royal historiography in Old French, and its author translated texts lodged in the Parisian Abbey of Saint-Germain des-Prés and at the Abbey of Saint-Denis, one of them being Odo's *De profectione Ludovici*.⁸³ Although the *Chronique des Rois de France* survives in two manuscripts – Vatican Library, Vat. lat. 624, dating from the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century, and Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 869, dating from the last quarter of the 15th century – the Old French translation of Odo's work was jettisoned from the Vatican version.⁸⁴ What is more, in the middle of the 13th century, when the monks of Saint-Denis gathered together in a manuscript (today known as Paris, BnF, lat. 5925) all the Latin chronicles treating the history of France, Odo's work was excluded.⁸⁵ This neglect of Odo's history testifies to its low popularity and the failure of its author's declared purpose to instruct "posterity about the Greeks' treacherous actions".⁸⁶

Following the debacle of the Second Crusade, the French anti-Byzantine faction, attributing all the blame for the failure of the expedition on Manuel and the Greeks, seems to have tried to organize an attack on the Byzantine Empire. Since the party's earlier exhortations to Louis and the French nobles to lead an attack on the Byzantine Empire fell on deaf ears, the faction turned to Byzantium's sworn enemy, Roger II of Sicily.⁸⁷ Peter the Venerable, abbot of the Benedictine abbey of Cluny, who had once addressed Manuel's father

82 Berry, "Introduction", p. xxxii.

83 Spiegel, *The Past As Text*, pp. 188, 197, 202–03, 267–68 n. 7, 273 n. 6.

84 Spiegel, *The Past As Text*, pp. 267–68 n. 7, 273 n. 6; Spiegel, *Romancing the Past*, pp. 274–275, 284; Labory, "Essai d'une histoire nationale au XIII^e siècle", pp. 349–50. The text of the Old French translation of Odo of Deuil's *De profectione Ludovici* is found in Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 869, fols 304r–327r.

85 Spiegel, *The Chronicle Tradition of Saint-Denis*, pp. 55, 68, 71.

86 Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici* 5, ed. and trans. Berry, pp. 98–99.

87 Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, p. 64. For the crusading project of 1150, see also Mayr-Harting, "Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the Monastery of Saint-Denis", pp. 230–38; Phillips, *Defenders of the Holy Land*, pp. 100–18; id., *The Second Crusade*, pp. 274–76; Laiou, "Byzantium and the Crusades in the Twelfth Century", pp. 33–34; Constable, "The Crusading Project of 1150", pp. 67–75; Reuter, "The 'Non-Crusade' of 1149–50", pp. 150–63.

John II as “glorious and magnificent emperor of the city of Constantinople”, basked in “the glory and name of the great *Romanum imperium*”, and “exalted.... over all the princes of Christendom”, now seems to have fallen into line with the French anti-Greek party.⁸⁸ He therefore sent a letter to the Sicilian King in late 1149 or early 1150 inciting him to attack the Byzantine Empire and exact revenge for “the wicked, unheard of, and disgraceful betrayal by the Greeks and their wicked king of our pilgrims, that is, those in the army of God”.⁸⁹ Peter undoubtedly considered that a proposal for an undertaking against Byzantium would appeal to Roger given his open hostility towards the Byzantine Empire and his recent struggles with Manuel. The abbot of Cluny’s suggestion, however, did not come to fruition.⁹⁰

6 The Thawing of Relations Between the Komnenian and Capetian Courts

Despite some tensions between the Byzantine ruler and the French during the Second Crusade, the last three decades of Manuel’s reign saw the thawing of relations between Constantinople and France. During the struggle between Pope Alexander III (1159–81) and the German Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (1155–90), which lasted from 1160 to 1177, Manuel and Louis found themselves in the same camp, that of the pope. Writing to Manuel in 1169, Louis addressed the Byzantine ruler as “venerable brother and dearest friend” and acknowledged him as “illustrious and glorious emperor of the Romans” (*illustris et gloriosus Romanorum imperator*), the title which the Byzantine rulers always went to great pains to defend as their own but was denied to them by their German counterparts. Louis further assured the Byzantine Emperor that “the honour that you showed to our pilgrims in God near you [when the French crusaders were in Constantinople] ... has never been erased from our memory”.⁹¹ Ten years later, Louis VII’s daughter Agnes journeyed to Constantinople to become the wife of the Byzantine ruler’s son and heir, Alexios II (1180–83). Indeed, during Manuel’s reign the policy of intermarriages between the Byzantine imperial family and Latin royal houses reached a peak. Another Franco-Byzantine marriage alliance that took place in the last years of Manuel’s rule was between

88 Peter the Venerable, *Epistolae* 75, ed. Constable, vol. 1, p. 208. See also Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 64–65.

89 Peter the Venerable, *Epistolae* 162, ed. Constable, vol. 1, p. 395, trans. Loud, pp. 1300–01.

90 Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, p. 65.

91 *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, eds. M. Bouquet et al., 24 vols., new ed., Paris 1869–1904, here vol. 16, pp. 149–50.

the emperor's niece, Eudokia, and Lord William VIII of Montpellier (1172–1202) in 1178.⁹²

The marriage alliances between members of the Byzantine imperial house and Latin princes or princesses exerted such a romantic appeal to western Europeans that they eventually became a motif in medieval French literature. In the *chanson de geste* *Doon de la Roche*, dating to the late 12th century, the western hero, Landri, nephew of King Pepin of France, enters the service of the “good” (*bons*), “rich” (*riche*), and “valiant” (*vaillant, ber*) Emperor Alexander of Constantinople and eventually marries his daughter, who is extolled as “the most beautiful woman in Christendom” (*la plus bele fame de la crestienté*).⁹³

In the *chanson de geste* *Girart de Roussillon*, Drogon, a vassal of the Frankish King Charles Martel, arranges a marriage alliance between his son Girart and King Charles and the two daughters of the Byzantine emperor.⁹⁴ Interestingly, the date of *Girart de Roussillon*'s composition, soon after 1180, strongly suggests that a possible inspiration for the figure of the Byzantine ruler in the text might be Emperor Manuel, whom the author of the *chanson* seems to have seen during a visit to Constantinople soon before the emperor's death in 1180 at the age of 62. The author celebrates the emperor's extravagant munificence and hospitality to the French knights and declares in a personal note unusual in the French *chansons de geste*: “the emperor has a hoary head. I have never seen nor will ever see such a handsome old man. He has sense, generosity and pleasant manner”. The emperor's eldest daughter is presented as being not only of immense beauty and gentle speech but also learned in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew so that “none could find her equal in the world”, while her younger sister had “a lovely and virginal body and so dignified a presence that the wisest remained silent, marvelling at her beauty”.⁹⁵

In the romance *Cligès* of Chrétien de Troyes, which has been ascribed to the period 1176–77, “the handsome and valiant” (*li biax, li preuz*) Alexander, a “Christian” (*reçui crestianté*) prince, son of “the powerful in richness and honour” (*puissant de richesce et d'enor*) Byzantine emperor and his “very noble”

92 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, pp. 165–66; Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 66–67; see also the contribution of Juan Signes Codoñer to this volume.

93 *Doon de la Roche* 56, 59, 86, 120, 127, eds. P. Meyer/G. Huet, *Doon de la Roche: Chanson de geste*, Paris 1921, pp. 55, 72, 105, 107, 108, 155, 164; trans. N. Reniers-Cossart, *Doon de la Roche: Chanson de geste de la fin du XII^e siècle*, Paris 2011, pp. 63, 78, 103, 143, 150.

94 *La chanson de Girart de Roussillon*, eds. and trans. Combarieu du Grès/Gouiran; Devereaux, *Constantinople and the West in Medieval French Literature*, pp. 71–72, 75–86.

95 *La chanson de Girart de Roussillon* 16–17, 21, eds. and trans. Combarieu du Grès/Gouiran, pp. 58–61, 62–63; *La chanson de Girart de Roussillon*, trans. Meyer, p. 10 with n. 2. See also Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 67–68.

(*molt noble*) empress, travels to the court of King Arthur in Britain where he defends the king against a rebellious vassal and wins as his bride Arthur's niece, Soredamors.⁹⁶ Alexander's brother, the Byzantine Emperor Alis, sends an embassy to the German court requesting the hand of the German emperor's daughter. The German ruler "... could not have been happier / Agreeing at once to give them [the Greek ambassadors] / His daughter, for this was a noble / Match that enhanced his prestige."⁹⁷

This passage from *Cligès* evokes a similar passage from the vernacular chronicle of the Fourth Crusade composed by Robert of Clari (d. after 1216), a lesser knight from Picardy who participated in the same expedition. Robert, who included a wealth of information on the Byzantine Emperor Manuel in his account, relates that when this "good emperor" (*li boins empereres*) dispatched an embassy to the French court in 1178 to negotiate a marriage alliance with Louis VII, the French barons advised their king to send his daughter "to a man who was so powerful (*si rike*) and so high-ranking (*si haut homme*) as the emperor was."⁹⁸ A marriage alliance with the Christian empire of Constantinople was considered enormously prestigious by Latin rulers.⁹⁹

Emperor Manuel, adopting the policies of his grandfather Alexios, intervened with Muslim rulers for the release of a large number of Frankish prisoners. Among those freed from captivity through Manuel's good services was Henry I of Champagne (1152–81), who had been seized by the Turks while passing through Asia Minor on his way from Jerusalem to western Europe. After his death in 1180, Manuel, perhaps the most eulogized ruler in 12th-century Christendom, was highly lauded by, among others, French chroniclers. In his *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, a history of King Philip II of France dating from the 1200s, Rigord (d. c.1209), a monk of Saint-Denis, praised Manuel as "the most holy emperor" (*imperator sanctissimus*).¹⁰⁰ The French chronicler Guido de

96 Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, eds. Gregory/Luttrell, pp. 1–5, 12–13, trans. Raffel, pp. 2–5, 12–13.

97 Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, eds. Gregory/Luttrell, pp. 94–95, trans. Raffel, pp. 84–85.

98 Robert of Clari, *La conquête* 19, 92, ed. and trans. Noble, pp. 24–25, 110–11. The impressive embassy sent by Manuel to the Capetian court in 1178 was perceived and remembered by Clari's informants, i.e. Frankish residents in Constantinople, as a testament to the Byzantine ruler's power and status. Clari remarks that the envoys "were very high-ranking men and they went in great state; never did anyone see people going in greater or more noble state than they did, so that the king of France and his people marvelled at the great splendour which the messengers displayed": Robert of Clari, *La conquête* 19, ed. and trans. Noble, pp. 24–25. On the Komnenian-Capetian marriage alliance, see also Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 100–02.

99 Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 68–69.

100 Rigord of Saint-Denis, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, eds. and trans. E. Charpentier/G. Pon/Y. Chauvin, *Gesta Philippi Augusti/Histoire de Philippe Auguste*, Paris 2006, pp. 376–77.

Bazoches (d. 1203), a scion of a noble Champenois family who accompanied Henry II of Champagne (1181–97) on the Third Crusade to Palestine, extolled the Byzantine ruler as “the most noble emperor” (*nobilissimus imperator*).¹⁰¹

The chronicler of the Fourth Crusade, Robert of Clari, who obtained his information on Manuel from Frankish residents in Constantinople, exalted the Byzantine ruler as “a very worthy man and the most powerful of all the Christians (*de tous les crestiens*) there ever were and the most generous”.¹⁰² The Picard chronicler “heard this emperor loved the Franks very much and trusted them greatly”.¹⁰³ In issues of major political significance, such as the marriage of his son Alexios, Manuel is presented by Clari as deciding “on the advice of the Franks who were around him”.¹⁰⁴ The ruler’s alleged preference and fondness for the French over his own people even gave rise to fanciful anecdotes among the Frankish inhabitants of Constantinople. According to an unhistorical story recorded by Clari, Manuel’s officials and counsellors “criticised him very much, indeed they had blamed him for this many times, because he was so generous and he loved the Franks so much”.¹⁰⁵ To silence these complaints, the emperor pretended to dismiss all the French in his retinue and staff. At the same time, in collusion with the French, who had been secretly ordered by him to refuse to depart from the empire, Manuel staged a clash between French and Greeks; when the French made a great show of attacking the Greeks, the latter took flight abandoning their emperor.¹⁰⁶ The anecdote, a parable of Manuel’s generosity and affection for the French, and of French military prowess, ends with the Byzantine ruler summoning his men and declaring in a didactic tone:

Lords, now it can be seen clearly in whom I should put my trust ... I command you that not one of you be so daring or so bold ever again that he speaks of my generosity nor of the fact that I favour the Franks, for I like them and put more trust in them than in you; and therefore I will give them more than I have given them.¹⁰⁷

This anecdotal episode of Manuel reputedly favouring the French, much to the resentment of his own people, has an element of truth, although not only

101 Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, *Chronicon*, ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst, in *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores*, vol. 23, Hannover 1874, pp. 631–950, here p. 848.

102 Robert of Clari, *La conquête* 18, ed. and trans. Noble, pp. 20–21.

103 *Ibid.*, pp. 20–21.

104 Robert of Clari, *La conquête* 19, ed. and trans. Noble, pp. 22–23.

105 Robert of Clari, *La conquête* 18, ed. and trans. Noble, pp. 20–21.

106 *Ibid.*, pp. 20–23.

107 *Ibid.*, pp. 22–23.

French, but also other foreigners found favour with the emperor.¹⁰⁸ As the Byzantine historian and imperial official Niketas Choniates (d. 1215/16), relates with a touch of bitterness, the emperor attracted to his court people from diverse “foreign-language nations” and willingly granted them “their every request”, to the extent that “to some of these the means of livelihood flowed so profusely that they swam in rivers of money”. Since Manuel was “fully confident in these men as his most loyal and devoted servants, he not only entrusted them with the highest offices but also appointed them judges”.¹⁰⁹

It is important to stress in this context that in the 12th century and particularly during Manuel's reign, French clerics and theologians with an interest in Greek patristic made their way to Constantinople in search of Greek texts. In 1167, the scholar and theologian William Medicus of Gap, the future abbot of Saint-Denis (1173–86), visited the imperial capital and “brought back Greek books”, among them the *Vita* of Secundus the Philosopher, which he himself translated from Greek into Latin, and a manuscript containing Michael Synkellos's 9th-century encomium of St Dionysios the Areopagite, who was misidentified with his namesake St Dionysios (Saint-Denis), first bishop of Paris.¹¹⁰ Between 1169 and 1172 the encomium was translated into Latin by another monk of Saint-Denis, also called William – the secretary and biographer of Abbot Suger (1122–51) – and was dedicated to Abbot Ivo II (1162–72), while at around the same time Greek prayers were introduced in the liturgy of the monastery of Saint-Denis.¹¹¹ In the last decade of the 12th century, the French Cistercian Everard of Ypres (d. c.1200) fully acknowledged the Greek *auctoritates* as a source of learning for the Latins. In a dialogue Everard constructed between himself and a fictitious Greek who had come from Athens to France,

108 Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 107–08, 221; Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks in Byzantium”, p. 95.

109 Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 11), Berlin 1975, pp. 204–05; trans. H.J. Magoulias, *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Detroit 1984, p. 116.

110 Delisle, “Traductions de textes grecs”, pp. 726–30. See also Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, p. 97; Berschin, *Ελληνικά γράμματα*, pp. 365–66; Mayr-Harting, “Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the Monastery of Saint-Denis”, p. 239. On St Dionysios the Areopagite's misidentification with St Dionysios of Paris, see von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern*, vol. 2, pp. 98–99; Bogdanović, “Rethinking the Dionysian Legacy in Medieval Architecture”, p. 116.

111 Delisle, “Traductions de textes grecs”, p. 730; Berschin, *Ελληνικά γράμματα*, p. 366; Mayr-Harting, “Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the Monastery of Saint-Denis”, p. 239; Weiss, “Lo studio del greco all'abbazia di San Dionigi”, pp. 426–438; Brennan, *Guide des études érigéniennes*, p. 19

he has his Greek interlocutor remark that the Latins “are little rivers [flowing] from the Greek fountainhead” (*Latini ... sint rivuli fontis Graecorum*).¹¹²

7 The Fourth Crusade and French Involvement in the Expedition

It would take half a century after the debacle of the Second Crusade before French crusaders would again appear outside the walls of Constantinople. On 23 June 1203 when the French crusaders beheld Constantinople, they were stunned at its sight. The glamorous image of the Byzantine imperial capital had never failed to impress the French. The French cleric and chronicler of the First Crusade, Fulcher of Chartres, who had arrived in Constantinople in 1097, had recorded:

Oh what a noble and beautiful city.... How many monasteries and palaces it contains, constructed with wonderful skill! How many remarkable things may be seen in the principal avenues and even in the lesser streets! It would be very tedious to enumerate the wealth that is there of every kind, of gold, of silver, or robes of many kinds, and of holy relics.¹¹³

As in the case of Fulcher, both Geoffrey of Villehardouin and Robert of Clari, our main eyewitness chroniclers of the Fourth Crusade, were deeply impressed by the imperial capital and continually refer to its size and wealth, its walls and towers, its palaces and churches. Villehardouin notes that he:

can assure you that all those who had never seen Constantinople before gazed very intently at the city, having never imagined there could be so fine a place in all the world. They noted the high walls and lofty towers encircling it, and its rich palaces and tall churches, of which there were so many that no one would have believed it to be true if he had not seen it with his own eyes, and viewed the length and breadth of that city which reigns supreme over all others.¹¹⁴

¹¹² Häring, “A Latin Dialogue on the Doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers”, p. 248.

¹¹³ Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 1.9, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. 3, Paris 1866, pp. 311–485, here p. 331; trans. F.R. Ryan, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem 1095–1127*, Knoxville 1960, p. 79.

¹¹⁴ Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête* 128, ed. and trans. Dufournet, pp. 102–03.

How the Fourth Crusade eventually ended up ruining the Byzantine Empire is a question that has intrigued scholars for well over a century. Upon his accession to the throne of St Peter in February 1198, Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) preached a new crusade. His call was answered by a group of powerful northern French barons. The first to take the cross were the Counts Theobald III of Champagne (1197–1201) and Louis I of Blois (1191–1205), in November 1198. Many of their vassals followed their example. In February 1200, Count Baldwin IX of Flanders (1194–1205) and many of his vassals also vowed to crusade. In June, a meeting between the principal leaders at Compiègne decided to take the sea route to the east, and to attack and conquer Egypt and use it as a base to recapture Jerusalem. Therefore, six plenipotentiary envoys were appointed to negotiate the crusaders' transport with Venice. In April 1201, the six crusading delegates finalized arrangements with the doge, Enrico Dandolo (1192–1205), for the transport of the crusading army to Egypt. The Treaty of Venice stipulated an optimistically large number of crusaders, for whom the commensurately inflated sum of 85,000 Cologne marks was to be paid by April 1202, once the crusaders had assembled in Venice. The crusaders' departure was planned for 29 June 1202. In the meantime, Count Theobald of Champagne died in May 1201, and the command of the whole crusading army was offered to the Italian Marquis Boniface of Montferrat, who accepted the cross at Soissons in the late summer of 1201.¹¹⁵

The French crusaders began arriving at Venice in the middle of the summer of 1202. However, when only one-third of the expected 33,500 crusaders finally assembled there, these were left owing the Venetians 34,000 silver marks. At this stage, the doge exploited the Frankish crusaders' outstanding debt to the advantage of Venice, suggesting that the French barons could postpone their payment if they helped the Venetians recapture the town of Zara on the Dalmatian coast from King Emeric of Hungary (1196–1204). The proposal for an attack on Zara aroused much disagreement among the crusading army. Many crusaders, of all stations, abandoned the expedition. However, those Frankish leaders who were bound by the earlier Treaty of Venice, together with their vassals, comrades, and armies, had no other choice but to accept Doge Dandolo's proposal and attack Zara, which was captured and sacked on 24 November 1202.¹¹⁶

115 Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp. 39–101; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 501–21.

116 Queller and Madden, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp. 40–82; Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp. 102–26; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 524–32; Neocleous, "Financial, Chivalric or Religious?", pp. 186–91, 204–06.

In late December, while the crusaders were wintering at Zara, they were approached by envoys from the German King Philip of Swabia (1198–1208). The envoys delivered a proposal made jointly by Philip and Prince Alexios, brother-in-law of the German king and son of the former Byzantine Emperor Isaac II (1185–95, 1203–04): Isaac had been deposed by his brother Alexios III (1195–1203) in 1195. The Byzantine prince promised, among other things, to pay the crusaders 200,000 silver marks if the crusade on its way to the east were to restore him and his father to the throne of Byzantium. Philip, Prince Alexios, and Philip's cousin and vassal (and agent in the crusade) Boniface of Montferrat had already tried in vain to persuade Pope Innocent to endorse a diversion to Constantinople. Since they had met with a flat refusal from the pope, Philip and Prince Alexios, with Boniface's connivance, decided to approach the crusaders directly with their proposal, determined to exploit the dire straits of the debt-laden French barons.¹¹⁷

Philip's and Alexios's proposition caused new dissension within the crusading host. The ideal of Christian fraternity between Greeks and Latins came to the fore when Abbot Guy of Vaux-de-Cernay, the spokesperson of the party which opposed the diversion to Constantinople, stood up to those favouring the detour and "declared they would never give their consent [to the plan], since it would mean marching against Christians".¹¹⁸ Despite the general opposition to the proposal for the diversion to Constantinople, the majority of the leading barons – namely Boniface of Montferrat as well as the debt-ridden French leaders bound by the earlier Treaty of Venice, together with their vassals and comrades – finally accepted Prince Alexios's terms and signed the Treaty of Zara with him.¹¹⁹ Although the treaty was confirmed, the opposition to the detour to Constantinople remained stubbornly strong. Hundreds left the crusade either to make their own way to Palestine or to return home. On 23 June 1203 the crusading fleet eventually entered the Bosphorus and in the night of 17–18 July, Alexios III fled from Constantinople. Isaac was brought back to the imperial palace and restored to the throne. He reluctantly ratified the treaty between his son and the crusaders, and on 1 August 1203 Prince Alexios was crowned his co-emperor as Alexios IV (1203–04).¹²⁰

Relations between Greeks and crusaders normalized following the enthronement of Alexios IV. Villehardouin records that "the Greeks and the French were

117 Queller and Madden, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp. 82–100; Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp. 127–41; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 532–43; Neocleous, "Financial, Chivalric or Religious?", pp. 186–91, 204–06.

118 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête* 95, ed. and trans. Dufournet, p. 86.

119 Neocleous, "Financial, Chivalric or Religious?", pp. 186–91, 204–06.

120 Madden, *The New Concise History of the Crusades*, pp. 106, 110.

on very friendly terms with each other in all things”.¹²¹ This entente, however, did not last long due to the ongoing menacing presence of the Venetian-French army and fleet outside Constantinople, the heavy taxation imposed by Alexios IV to acquire the necessary sums of money he owed his allies for placing him on the throne, the despoilment of churches and monasteries to the same end, and eventually the destructive fire of 19–20 August, which left around 40,000 Constantinopolitans homeless.¹²² “Thus was there discord between the Franks and the Greeks, who were never again on such friendly terms as they had been before”, records Villehardouin.¹²³

Anti-crusader sentiment reached a peak in January 1204. In late January, Isaac and Alexios IV were overthrown and imprisoned by Alexios Mourtzouphlos who proclaimed himself emperor as Alexios V (1204). Although the crusaders were ready to receive peacefully their outstanding payment from Alexios V and withdraw from the Byzantine Empire, thus avoiding a war against Constantinople, the new Byzantine ruler refused to pay any money and threatened the crusaders with destruction. In a conference held shortly after Alexios IV’s assassination on the night of 8–9 February, the French leaders and prelates and the doge of Venice reached the decision to stay and capture Constantinople.¹²⁴ There was, however, a major obstacle: how could the conquest of a Christian city by a crusading army be justified?

After some examination of the situation, the French clergy in the retinue of the French barons ruled that the war against the Byzantines was “lawful and just” (*droite et juste*) for two reasons. Alexios V was guilty of Alexios IV’s murder and “the Greeks had removed themselves from obedience to Rome”. The crusading clergy reassured the leaders that “if you have the right intention of conquering this land [Constantinople] and placing it in the obedience of Rome, all those of you who die after confession will have the indulgence (*pardon*) which the pope has granted you”.¹²⁵ This was completely at odds with Innocent’s intention. The pope had not only never offered an indulgence for an attack on the Greeks and Constantinople, but had expressly forbidden an assault on the Byzantine capital. In June 1203 he had even explicitly warned

121 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête* 192, ed. and trans. Dufournet, p. 138: “... furent moult quemun li Grieu et li François de toutes choses.”

122 Neocleous, “Greeks and Italians in Twelfth-Century Constantinople”, pp. 245–48.

123 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête* 205, ed. and trans. Dufournet, p. 146: “Einsint furent desacointiez li Franc et li Grieu, qu’il ne furent mie si communal comme il avoient esté devant.”

124 Neocleous, “Financial, Chivalric or Religious?”, pp. 200–02; Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade*, pp. 224–25, 234; Tyerman, *God’s War*, p. 549; Angold, *The Fourth Crusade*, p. 98.

125 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête* 224–225, ed. and trans. Dufournet, p. 156.

the crusaders against such an action. The crusading clergy's assurances were a perversion of Innocent's wishes and prohibitions.¹²⁶

The issue of the purported disobedience of the Greeks to the Church of Rome, which had been hardly raised during the course of the expedition, was now fully exploited for propaganda purposes to legitimize a crusader conquest of Constantinople. Ultimately, in order for the army to survive, the French crusading clergy had little option but to proceed to "de-Christianise" the Greeks and make them the enemy of Christianity.¹²⁷ Clari, who, like most of his fellow crusaders, was heretofore ignorant of the rift between Rome and Constantinople, records that the clerics declared that the Greeks "were worse than Jews (*pieur que juis*).... The bishops commanded the pilgrims to confess and take communion very devoutly, and not to be at all afraid to attack the Greeks, for they were the enemies of God (*enemi damedieu*)".¹²⁸ On 12 April 1204, the final assault on Constantinople led to the fall of the city to the crusaders. On 16 May a Fleming count, Baldwin of Flanders, ascended the imperial throne, thereby opening a new chapter in the history of the Empire of Constantinople and Greco-Frankish relations.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Adémar de Chabannes, *Chronicon*, trans. Y. Chauvin/G. Pon, *Chronique*, Turnhout 2003.
- Albert of Aachen, *Historia Ierosolimitana*, ed. and trans. S.B. Edgington, *Historia Ierosolimitana/History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, Oxford 2007.
- Anna Komnene, *Alexias*, eds. D.R. Reinsch/A. Kambylis, 2 vols. (*Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 40), Berlin 2001; trans. E.R.A. Sewter, *The Alexiad of Anna Comnena*, Harmondsworth 1969.
- Bernold of Constance, *Chronicon*, ed. I.S. Robinson, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz 1054–1100* (*Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, Nova series, 14), Hannover 2003, pp. 383–540.
- Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, eds. S. Gregory/C. Luttrell (*Arthurian Studies*, 28), Cambridge 1993; trans. B. Raffel, New Haven 1997.
- Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, Innsbruck 1901.

126 Neocleous, "Financial, Chivalric or Religious?", pp. 202–03; id., "Guilty or Innocent?", pp. 555–94.

127 Neocleous, "Financial, Chivalric or Religious?", pp. 202–04; Tyerman, *God's War*, pp. 550–52.

128 Robert of Clari, *La conquête* 73, ed. and trans. Noble, pp. 88–89. See also Neocleous, *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics?*, pp. 157–62.

- Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. and trans. J. Dufournet, Paris 2004; trans. M.R.B. Shaw, "The Conquest of Constantinople", in ead. (ed. and trans.), *Chronicles of the Crusades*, London 1963, pp. 29–160.
- Gerbert of Aurillac, *Epistolae*, ed. F. Weigle, *Die Briefsammlung Gerberts von Reims* (Monumenta Germaniae historica: Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 2), Berlin 1966.
- Gregory VII, Pope, *Registrum*, ed. E. Caspar, *Das Register Gregors VII*, 2 vols. (Monumenta Germaniae historica. Epistolae selectae, 2), Berlin 1920–23; trans. H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085*, Oxford 2002.
- Guibert of Nogent, *Dei gesta per Francos*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, (Corpus christianorum: Continuatio medievalis, 127A), Turhout 1996; trans. R. Levine, *The Deeds of God through the Franks*, Woodbridge 1997.
- Krey, A.C., ed. and trans., *The First Crusade: Accounts of Eye-Witnesses and Participants*, 2nd ed., Princeton 2012.
- La chanson de Girart de Roussillon*, eds. and trans. M. de Combarieu du Grès/G. Gouiran, Paris 1993; trans. P. Meyer, *Girart de Roussillon: Chanson de geste*, Paris 1884.
- Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and trans. V.G. Berry, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem/The Journey of Louis VII to the East*, New York 1948.
- Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, 5 vols., Oxford 1969–80.
- Peter the Venerable, *Epistolae*, ed. Constable, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1967; trans. G.A. Loud, "Five Letters Concerning the Second Crusade", in A.V. Murray (ed.), *The Crusades: An Encyclopedia*, 4 vols., Santa Barbara 2006, vol. 4, pp. 1298–1301.
- Robert of Clari, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. and trans. P. Noble, Edinburgh 2005.
- Robert the Monk, *Historia Iherosolimitana*, eds. D. Kempf/M.G. Bull, *The Historia Iherosolimitana of Robert the Monk*, Woodbridge 2013; trans. C. Sweetenham, *History of the First Crusade*, Aldershot 2005.
- Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque*, ed. and trans. J. France, *Historiarum libri quinque/The Five Books of the Histories*, Oxford 1989.
- Stephen of Blois, *Epistolae*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. 3, Paris 1866, pp. 885–90.
- William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi*, eds. and trans. R.H.C. Davis/M. Chibnall, Oxford 1998.

Secondary Literature

- Angold, M., "Knowledge of Byzantine History in the West: The Norman Historians (Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries)", in J. Gillingham (ed.), *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies* 25, Woodbridge 2003, pp. 19–33.

- Angold, M., *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204: A Political History*, 2nd ed., London 1997.
- Angold, M., *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context*, Harlow 2003.
- Asbridge, T., *The First Crusade: A New History*, London 2004.
- Auzépy, M.-F., “State of Emergency”, in J. Shepard (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c. 500–1492*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 251–91.
- Berry, V.G., “Introduction”, in id. (ed. and trans.), *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, New York 1948, pp. xiii–xliv.
- Berschin, W., *Ελληνικά γράμματα και λατινικός Μεσαίωνας: Από τον Ιερώνυμο ως τον Νικόλαο Κουσανό* [Greek letters and the Latin Middle Ages: from Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa], trans. D.Z. Niketas, Thessaloniki 1998.
- Bogdanović, J., “Rethinking the Dionysian Legacy in Medieval Architecture: East and West”, in F. Ivanović (ed.), *Dionysius the Areopagite: Between Orthodoxy and Heresy*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2011, pp. 109–34.
- Brennan, M., *Guide des études érigéniennes: Bibliographie commentée des publications 1930–1987/A Guide to Eriugenian Studies: A Survey of Publications 1930–1987*, Fribourg 1989.
- Callahan, D.F., *Jerusalem and the Cross in the Life and Writings of Ademar of Chabannes* (Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, 181), Leiden 2016.
- Cate, J.L., “The Crusade of 1101”, in K.M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, 2nd ed., Madison 1969, vol. 1, pp. 343–67.
- Ciggaar, K.N., “Flemish Counts and Emperors: Friends and Foreigners in Byzantium”, in id./V. van Aalst (eds.), *The Latin Empire: Some Contributions*, Hernen 1990, pp. 33–62.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium, 962–1204, Cultural and Political Relations*, Leiden 1996.
- Constable, G., “The Crusading Project of 1150”, in B.Z. Kedar/J. Riley-Smith/R. Hiestand (eds.), *Montjoie: Studies in Crusade History in Honour of Hans Eberhard Mayer*, Aldershot 1997, pp. 67–75.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., “Pope Urban II’s Preaching of the First Crusade”, *History* 55 (1970), 177–88.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., “Pope Gregory VII’s ‘Crusading’ Plans of 1074”, in B.Z. Kedar/H.E. Mayer/R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer: Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Jerusalem 1982, pp. 27–40.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., “The Gregorian Papacy, Byzantium, and the First Crusade”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 13 (1988), 145–69.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., *Pope Gregory VII, 1073–1085*, Oxford 1998.
- Daly, W.M., “Christian Fraternity, the Crusaders and the Security of Constantinople”, *Medieval Studies* 22 (1960), 43–91.
- Davids, A., “Marriage Negotiations between Byzantium and the West and the Name of Theophano in Byzantium (Eight to Tenth Centuries)”, in id. (ed.) *The Empress*

- Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, Cambridge 1995, pp. 99–120.
- Delisle, L., “Traductions de textes grecs faites par des religieux de Saint Denis au XII^e siècle”, *Journal des savants* (1900), 725–39.
- Devereaux, R., *Constantinople and the West in Medieval French Literature: Renewal and Utopia*, Cambridge 2012.
- Duby, G., *France in the Middle Ages 987–1469: From Hugh Capet to Jean of Arc*, trans. J. Vale, Oxford 1991.
- Dunbabin, J., “West Francia: The Kingdom”, in T. Reuter (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 3: c.900–c.1024, Cambridge 1999, pp. 372–90.
- France, J., *Victory in the East: A Military History of the First Crusade*, Cambridge 1994.
- France, J., “Byzantium in Western Chronicles before the First Crusade”, in N. Housley (ed.), *Knighthoods of Christ: Essays on the History of the Crusades and the Knights Templar, Presented to Malcolm Barber*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 3–16.
- Frankopan, P., *The First Crusade: The Call from the East*, London 2012.
- Ganshof, F.L., “Recherches sur le lien juridique qui unissait les chefs de la première Croisade à l'empereur byzantin”, in *Mélanges offerts à M. Paul E. Martin* (Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève, 40), Geneva 1961, pp. 49–63.
- Geanakoplos, D.J., “Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism”, *Church History* 34 (1965), 381–403.
- Hallam, E.M./Everard, J., *Capetian France 987–1328*, 2nd ed., Harlow 2001.
- Hamilton, B./McNulty P.A., “*Orientalis Lumen et Magistra Latinitatis*: Greek Influences on Western Monasticism (900–1100)”, in B. Hamilton (ed.), *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900–1300)*, Aldershot 1997, pp. 181–216.
- Häring, N.M., “A Latin Dialogue on the Doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers”, *Mediaeval Studies* 15 (1953), 243–89.
- Kazhdan, A., “Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century”, in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, DC 2001, pp. 83–99.
- Labory, G., “Essai d'une histoire nationale au XIII^e siècle: la chronique de l'Anonyme de Chantilly-Vatican”, *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 148 (1990), 301–54.
- Laiou, A., “Byzantium and the Crusades in the Twelfth Century: Why Was the Fourth Crusade Late in Coming?”, in ead. (ed.), *Urbs Capta: The Fourth Crusade and Its Consequences/La IV^e Croisade et ses conséquences*, Paris 2005, pp. 17–40.
- Leyser, K.J., “The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships”, in D. Baker (ed.), *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, Edinburgh 1973, pp. 29–63.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096–1204*, trans. J.C. Morris/J.E. Ridings, Oxford 1993.
- Lock, P., *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*, London 2006.

- Madden, T.F., *The New Concise History of the Crusades*, Oxford 2005.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993.
- Mayr-Harting, H., “Odo of Deuil, the Second Crusade and the Monastery of Saint-Denis”, in M.A. Meyer (ed.), *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Memory of Denis L.T. Bethel*, London 1993, pp. 225–41.
- McQueen, W.B., “Relations between the Normans and Byzantium, 1071–1112”, *Byzantion* 56 (1986), 427–76.
- Müller-Mertens, E., “The Ottonians as Kings and Emperors”, in T. Reuter (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 3: c.900–c.1024, Cambridge 1999, pp. 233–66.
- Munro, D.C., “The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095”, *American Historical Review* 11 (1906), 231–42.
- Nelson, J.L., “The Frankish Kingdoms, 814–898: The West”, in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 2: c.700–c.900, Cambridge 1995, pp. 110–41.
- Neocleous, S., “Is the Contemporary Latin Historiography of the First Crusade and its Aftermath ‘Anti-Byzantine’?”, in id. (ed.), *Papers from the First and Second Postgraduate Forums in Byzantine Studies: Sailing to Byzantium*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2009, pp. 27–52.
- Neocleous, S., “Byzantine-Muslim Conspiracies against the Crusades: History and Myth”, *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010), 253–74.
- Neocleous, S., “Financial, Chivalric or Religious? The Motives of the Fourth Crusaders Reconsidered”, *Journal of Medieval History* 38 (2012), 183–206.
- Neocleous, S., “Greeks and Italians in Twelfth-Century Constantinople: *Convivencia* or Conflict?”, in B. Crostini/S. La Porta (eds.), *Negotiating Co-Existence: Communities, Cultures and Convivencia in Byzantine Society*, Trier 2013, pp. 221–50.
- Neocleous, S., “Guilty or Innocent? Pope Innocent III’s Perceptions and Attitudes towards the Byzantines (1198–1204)”, *Studi Medievali* 56 (2015), 555–94.
- Neocleous, S., *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics? Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century* (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Studies and Texts, 216), Toronto 2019.
- Nicholas, D., *Medieval Flanders*, London 1992.
- Phillips, J., *Defenders of the Holy Land: Relations between the Latin East and the West, 109–1187*, Oxford 1996.
- Phillips, J., “Odo of Deuil’s *De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem* as a Source for the Second Crusade”, in M. Bull/N. Housley (eds.), *The Experience of Crusading*, vol. 1: *Western Approaches*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 80–95.
- Phillips, J., *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*, London 2004.
- Phillips, J., *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*, New Haven 2007.
- Pryor, J.H., “The Oaths of the Leaders of the First Crusade to the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus: Fealty, Homage – πίστις, δουλεία”, *Parergon* n.s. 2 (1984), 111–41.

- Queller, D.E./Madden, T.F., *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia 1997.
- Reuter, T., "The 'Non-Crusade' of 1149–50", in J. Phillips/M. Hoch (eds.), *The Second Crusade: Scope and Consequences*, Manchester 2001, pp. 150–63.
- Riley-Smith, J., "The Crusades, 1095–1198", in D. Luscombe/J. Riley-Smith (eds.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4: c.1024–c.1198, part 1, Cambridge 2004, pp. 534–63.
- Rowe, J.G., "Paschal II, Bohemund of Antioch and the Byzantine Empire", *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 49 (1966), 165–202.
- Sayers, J.E., "Review of *Le Pape Innocent III et la France*, by R. Foreville", *The English Historical Review* 109 (1994), 106–07.
- Shepard, J., "'Father' or 'Scorpion'? Style and Substance in Alexios's Diplomacy", in M. Mullett/D. Smythe (eds.), *Alexios I Komnenos: Papers of the Second Belfast Byzantine International Colloquium, 14–16 April 1989*, Belfast 1996, pp. 68–132.
- Spiegel, G.M., *The Chronicle Tradition of Saint-Denis: A Survey*, Brookline 1978.
- Spiegel, G.M., *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France*, Berkeley 1993.
- Spiegel, G.M., *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography*, Baltimore 1997.
- Tyerman, C., *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, London 2006.
- Vasiliev, A.A., "Hugh Capet of France and Byzantium", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 (1951), 227–51.
- Von Mosheim, J.L., *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern*, trans. J. Murdock, 3 vols., New Haven 1832.
- Weiss, R., "Lo studio del greco all'abbazia di San Dionigi durante il Medio Evo", *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 6 (1952), 426–38.
- Whalen, B.E., *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, Mass. 2009.
- Whalen, B.E., "God's Will or Not? Bohemond's Campaign against the Byzantine Empire (1105–1107)", in T.F. Madden/J.L. Naus/V. Ryan (eds.), *The Crusades: Medieval Worlds in Conflict*, Farnham 2010, pp. 111–26.
- Yewdale, R.B., *Bohemond I: Prince of Antioch*, Princeton 1924.

Latins in Byzantium and Orthodox Christians in the Crusader States, 1096 to 1190

Johannes Pahlitzsch

The dispute in 1054 between the papal legate Humbert of Silva Candida and Michael Keroularios, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, was by no means the beginning of the schism between the Roman and the Byzantine Orthodox Church.¹ The fact that relations between Rome and Byzantium did not end after 1054 corroborates this. On the contrary, Byzantine Emperors, while weighing up the respective political situation carefully, repeatedly sought alliances. It is evident that the interest in maintaining good relations was mutual. So Pope Urban II, too, sought a rapprochement with Byzantium after his election in 1088.²

Indeed, relations improved to the point that in 1095, at the Council of Piacenza, Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) requested the pope's help in finding mercenary forces to secure his empire, hard-pressed as it was by the Seljuks and the Pechenegs. As we know, this led to Urban II's call for a crusade in Clermont in 1095.³ In his appeal, however, Urban went much further than Alexios had originally requested.⁴ Instead of sending Alexios what he had asked for – some mercenaries who could easily have been integrated into the imperial army – Urban began to raise completely independent troops. A number of factors indicate that he initially planned to raise a large army in the south of France with Raymond, Count of Toulouse, and Bishop Adhémar

¹ See also the contribution of Axel Bayer in this volume.

² Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, pp. 55–56; Nicol, *Byzantium and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century*, p. 18; for Urban II's attempts to improve Roman-Byzantine relations, see in general Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, pp. 1–205.

³ Bernold, *Chronicon*, ed. I.S. Robinson, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz 1054–1100 (Bertholdi et Bernoldi Chronica MLIV–MC)* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores, n.s. 14), Hannover 2003, pp. 385–540, here p. 520; Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, p. 185. Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, pp. 87–100.

⁴ Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens*, pp. 307 and 347; Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, p. 418.

of Le Puy as the commanders-in-chief. It is safe to assume that Adhémar and Raymond were well informed of Urban's plans and motives.⁵

However, the Crusade was not directed against Byzantium, nor was its objective to achieve papal primacy over Byzantium by military means. On the contrary, Urban's aim was co-operation with the Byzantine Emperor, if only for pragmatic reasons.⁶ While the pope had no intention of founding a Latin Church in the East, his goal was to gain supremacy over the Eastern Churches. A closer look at the army Urban sent into battle demonstrates this clearly. Although Pope Urban could not foresee the enormously successful reaction to his rallying call, it is nonetheless clear that he intended to send an independent army to Constantinople – an army that would not fight as mercenary troops, but as an ally of the imperial Byzantine forces, joined in the struggle to reconquer the Christian provinces. A war of this kind would have been a powerful demonstration of the pope's universal position, a fulfilment of the papal claim to responsibility for the whole of Christendom: it would have been an incredible gain in prestige.⁷ With this in view, and with an eye to the extent of the preparations made for the Crusade, we can safely say that this was not a case of the West making a few "prior concessions", and vaguely hoping that relations between East and West might improve as a result.⁸

In contrast to the pope's intentions, the crusaders, however, developed ideas of their own which had little to do with Urban's goals. Their focus was to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre. Naturally, this changed the nature of the Crusade from what the pope had intended. The concept of a liberation of the Eastern Christians was replaced by one goal: Jerusalem. This modification of the campaign reflects the general lack of interest in Urban's idea of an all-encompassing Christianity on the part of the crusaders. The idea of an armed pilgrimage which offered the chance of achieving a better status,

5 Krey, "Urban's Crusade", p. 237; Hill, "Raymond of St. Gilles", p. 266; Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, p. 430; Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, pp. 101–12. Cf. also, in general, Tyerman, *How to Plan a Crusade*.

6 These observations have led historians to assume that Urban had made an arrangement of some kind with Alexios: Hill, "Raymond of St. Gilles", pp. 265–66.

7 Concerning the Crusade as part of a *reconquista* policy encompassing East and West, see Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, pp. 337–42, 415–19. For the importance of the idea of *libertas ecclesiae* in Urban's concept of crusade, which included subordination under papal primacy, see Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 61–73. See also the controversial thesis of Stark, *God's Battalion*, who emphasizes the religious motivation of the crusaders and understands the First Crusade as a reaction to Muslim expansion.

8 As does Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, p. 179; Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, p. 78, assumes Urban's "burning desire to help the Christians of the East" to be the motive for his crusade plans.

both materially and spiritually, was much more attractive than the concept of freeing the Eastern Christians. Completely self-interested, the crusaders were motivated either by the hope of remission of their sins or the prospect of erecting their own principality.⁹

Obviously, these motives have nothing in common with the idea of integrating Eastern Christianity into the Roman Church. On the contrary: contact with foreign countries, their unfamiliar customs and their unknown inhabitants caused the crusaders to distance themselves from these experiences of otherness, contributing considerably to the rise of a communal spirit in the Latin West. This construction of otherness certainly and especially included the Byzantines, causing further Latin dissociation from Byzantium.¹⁰

The so-called People's Crusade, a group of knights and peasants with the itinerant preacher Peter the Hermit of Amiens as its spiritual leader, but without noble commanders, reached Byzantine territory in the summer of 1096. From the start the undisciplined group attacked the local population so that their relationship with the Byzantines was tense.¹¹ The actual army of knights set out six months later in several contingents, most of them from France, alongside a large Norman contingent from the south of Italy. This was not what Alexios had requested and without doubt constituted an enormous threat to the Byzantine Empire. Indeed, the Norman commander, Bohemund of Taranto, had himself tried to conquer the Byzantine Empire ten years before. Alexios therefore attempted to ferry the crusaders on to Anatolia as quickly as possible. But first of all he demanded an oath of fealty from the crusaders. The crusaders grudgingly pledged, with a few exceptions, that in the cases where they conquered former Byzantine territories these would be returned to the emperor.¹²

9 Cowdrey, "Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade"; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 108; Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 73–75. According to Hehl, "Was ist eigentlich ein Kreuzzug?", p. 315, a crusade differed from a normal pilgrimage in that the crusader was to offer his life for his oppressed Christian brothers, just as Christ had offered his own life for the salvation of mankind. See also the contributions in a collected volume on the origins of the First Crusade: Edgington (ed.), *Jerusalem the Golden*.

10 Lemerle, *Byzance et la croisade*, pp. 595–620; Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, pp. 79–80, mentions it would be mere idealism, to "believe that if only the peoples of the world could get to know each other there would be peace and goodwill for ever."

11 For the People's Crusade, cf. Flori, *Pierre l'ermite et la première croisade*; Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, pp. 118–24.

12 Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 38–49; Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, pp. 53–72; Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, pp. 131–37; Beihammer, "Ceremonies and Court Rituals in Byzantine Imperial Audiences in the Time of the First Crusade", pp. 37–61. See also John, *Godfrey of Bouillon*.

As far as relations between the crusaders and Byzantines were concerned, the unavoidable friction on a march of this magnitude between the passing troops and their Byzantine escorts intent on the preservation of order, contributed to the worsening of the mood. So did the disappointment with imperial behaviour at the conquest of Nicaea in June 1097, where the crusaders, in accordance with the previous oath, were forced to hand the city over intact to the Byzantine emperor and to refrain from plundering, though that had supposedly been promised to them.¹³ Latin sources reporting on the First Crusade refer time and again to tension. Emphasizing their own good intentions and their peaceful conduct, they allege Greek aggression from the first encounter and accuse the Byzantine Emperor of lulling the guileless crusaders into a sense of false security with empty promises. Two key events coloured the relationship of the crusaders to Byzantium: one was Nicaea and the other Alexios' decision to discontinue his campaign supporting the crusaders in the siege of Antioch, on the grounds of false information that the siege had failed. According to the Latin Chronicles it was now clear that Alexios was a traitor. It became equally evident that the emperor had led Peter of Amiens' crusade to disaster.¹⁴

The objective of this one-sided representation of the Byzantines as traitors is apparent. Using this argument, the chroniclers took a great deal of trouble to legitimize, retrospectively, the foundation of the independent Crusader States, which in itself signalled an open breach of the agreement with Alexios.¹⁵ This is particularly true for Bohemund of Taranto, who assumed power in the city of Antioch after conquering it in 1098 instead of handing it over to the Byzantines, as had been stipulated in the agreement. He developed a strategy to justify his authority, which other commanders in turn adopted. The core of his argument was that the Greeks had violated the conditions agreed with them, combined

13 Kindlimann, *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel*, pp. 73–76; Hill/Hill, *Raymond IV*, pp. 56–57.

14 Raymond of Aguilers, eds. J.H. Hill/L.L. Hill, *Le "Liber" de Raymond d'Aguilers* (Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 9), Paris 1969, p. 44. This point of view can also be found in other Latin chroniclers of the First Crusade: cf. Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen*, pp. 49–91; Frankopan, *The First Crusade*, p. 124.

15 Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 51–52, who also points out that Latin chroniclers are more tendentious than Anna Komnene, since they attempted to legitimate themselves. For the legal relationship between individual crusaders and Alexios, see Pryor, "The Oaths of the Leaders", pp. 111–41; Lilie, "Der erste Kreuzzug", pp. 108–45.

with accusations of Greek military incompetence, and a generally hostile attitude towards the crusaders.¹⁶

It is striking that religious differences hardly played any role in the disputes between the Byzantines and the crusaders at this point. In their defamation of the Greeks the chroniclers resort to classical *topoi*, such as cowardice, deviousness, and effeminacy. The consensus between the justification named above and this classical characterization of the Greeks is conspicuous. It shows, as Ebels-Hoving outlined, how they chose their criticism from a well-known repertoire according to their need. The chronicler's concern was to substantiate their justification strategy, according to which Byzantium had proved itself to be incapable of defending Oriental Christianity and indeed as the enemy of the crusaders. The religious accusation of Orthodox heresy became relevant when it proved itself helpful to legitimate an attack on the Byzantines themselves.¹⁷ It is therefore understandable that Bohemund was the only one to use religious arguments as early as the first years of the Crusader States.¹⁸ For mainstream crusaders fundamental religious differences were not the real cause of the increasing tension. Together with cultural differences and a general suspicion of anything alien, in the opinion of the overwhelming mass of the crusaders it was above all the practical problems which arose in the course of events, hindering the achievement of their goal: the pilgrimage to Jerusalem.¹⁹ Effectively, national prejudice and cultural differences caused increasing tension between crusaders, Byzantines, and the indigenous population of Syria and Palestine. The Byzantines, too, utilized well-known stereotypes, alleging that the crusaders were of a wild and greedy disposition as well as avaricious. The difficulties in verbal communication also worsened the situation: they could not understand each other because they did not want to understand each other.²⁰

16 Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 53–54. According to Shephard, “Cross-Purposes”, p. 122, Alexios made it easy for his opponents to accuse him of treason because of the discrepancy between his promise to help the crusaders and his pursuit of Byzantine interests.

17 Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen*, pp. 282–83; see also Brincken, *Die “Nationes christianorum orientaliū”*, pp. 75–76; Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade*, p. 108, points out that the antagonism in the Latin sources is directed against the Byzantine government and not so much against the Greeks as such.

18 Neocleous, “Contemporary Latin Historiography”, pp. 27–52. For Bohemund's letter to Paschalis II from 1107, see Lilie, “Die lateinische Kirche”, pp. 214–15, n. 61, who emphasizes the uniqueness of Bohemund's religious accusations as a lay person in this letter.

19 Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance*, pp. 236–43; Dennis, “Schism, Union and the Crusades”, p. 183.

20 Michel, “Der kirchliche Wechselverkehr”, pp. 171–72. For language problems, see Dennis, “Schism, Union, and the Crusades”, p. 183; Ebels-Hoving, *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen*, pp. 281–83; Kolia-Dermizaki, “Die Kreuzfahrer und die Kreuzzüge”, pp. 163–88; Laiou,

The Patriarch of Jerusalem, Symeon, evidently played a key role in the relations between Byzantium and the army of the crusaders. The Muslim rulers of Jerusalem had expelled Symeon in view of the approaching crusader army. As representative of the Byzantine Emperor he contacted the crusader army from Cyprus.²¹ We can conclude this from two letters written by the crusaders in Symeon's name appealing to Western Christendom for help.²² It is particularly interesting that the crusaders acknowledged Symeon in these letters as the legitimate Patriarch of Jerusalem.

It is commonly assumed that the crusaders abandoned Urban II's policy towards Byzantium and the Orthodox Church after the death of the papal legate Adhémar of Le Puy on 1 August 1098.²³ The events at Laodicea towards the end of 1099 show, however, that not all the crusaders had turned their backs on Byzantium after the Byzantine auxiliary forces failed to materialize.²⁴ The leading exponent of a pro-Byzantine policy was Count Raymond IV of Toulouse, who was recognized by some of the crusaders as their commander after the army left Antioch in January 1099 to approach Jerusalem.²⁵ Moreover, after the conquest of Antioch and the breakdown of relations with Bohemund, the Byzantines knew to differentiate between the individual crusaders, and due to the conflict with Bohemund they may even have been interested in cooperation with the other crusaders.²⁶ Apart from the Normans it is therefore not possible to observe a general trend away from Byzantium and the Orthodox

"L'interprétation byzantine de l'expansion occidentale", pp. 163–79; and the controversy between Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", pp. 257–74, and Lilie, "Anna Komnene und die Lateiner", pp. 169–82.

21 France, *Victory in the East*, pp. 208–09, emphasizes that Cyprus was central to the crusader's supply chain. See also Favreau-Lilie, *Die Italiener im Heiligen Land*, pp. 43–51.

22 For the authorship and dating of these letters, see Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 298–305.

23 Runciman, "Adhemar of Puy", p. 330; Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, p. 8.

24 During the siege of Laodicea, Bohemund called the residents *falsos Christianos* when talking with the papal legate Daibert of Pisa, who had just arrived in the Near East. He hoped to persuade him to participate in the siege and to justify the attack on a Christian city. Raymond of Toulouse and several other crusader commanders convinced Bohemund to abandon the siege: Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolymitana* VI 50, ed. Edgington, pp. 468–71. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance*, pp. 224–26; Kindlimann, *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel*, pp. 117–19. For Daibert's attitude, see Matzke, *Daibert von Pisa*, p. 150.

25 Krey, "Urban's Crusade", pp. 243–45, emphasizes Raymond's role in continuing Urban II's policy; Hill, "Raymond of Saint Gilles", p. 272; Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, vol. 2, pp. 428–30. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, pp. 55–56; Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 49–55; see also France, *The Crisis of the First Crusade*, pp. 295–97.

26 Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, p. 59 n. 238 and p. 61; France, *The Crisis of the First Crusade*, pp. 303–08.

Church among the crusaders after Adhémar's death. Since the Orthodox were in principle recognized as brothers in Christ, relations between the crusader commanders and Byzantium were determined to a much greater extent by political circumstances.

Emperor Alexios was therefore in principle open to cooperation after the establishment of the Crusader States, as long as Byzantine sovereignty was recognized. While this question played only a minor role for relations with the Kingdom of Jerusalem, which did not lie in the direct sphere of influence of Byzantium, Emperor Alexios insisted upon the handing over of the Principality of Antioch, which did border this area. Yet, an expedition planned by Alexios never came to fruition. By contrast, his successor John II Komnenos (1118–43) twice moved into northern Syria at the head of a large army in 1137/38 and 1142/43 to compel the Franks to surrender Antioch. His untimely death during the campaign early in 1143, however, prevented this from occurring.²⁷

As far as the ecclesiastical situation was concerned, soon after the conquest of Jerusalem the Franks established their own Latin Church. The Latin chronicler Albert of Aachen writes that Symeon died at about the time of the conquest of Jerusalem. His death made it necessary for the crusaders to appoint a new patriarch, for which position only a Latin came into question.²⁸ Since Symeon was probably still very much alive after the conquest of the city, it is easy to recognize this description of events as an effort to justify the takeover of the patriarchate by the Latins.²⁹ It would appear that the crusaders did not initially pursue a clear ecclesiastical policy in their new territory. Indeed the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, John Oxeites IV, was left in office after the seizure of the town in 1098.³⁰ In the course of the year 1099, however, the conviction evidently grew that, as the new sovereigns of the Holy Land, they needed ecclesiastical structures they were familiar with from home. In addition, it was not acceptable to be spiritually subject to Orthodox bishops who belonged, in the frame of crusader society, to a subject social class. Pope Urban had died shortly after the conquest of Jerusalem in the summer of 1099, and when the papal legate arrived in the Holy City at the end of that year, retaining an Orthodox patriarch was no longer even considered. Rather, the new pope immediately authorized the foundation of the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem. This was a first step towards the supersession of Orthodoxy, a far cry from the integration of the Orthodox Church as Urban II had initially planned. The

27 For this development cf. Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 61–141.

28 Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolymitana* VI 39, ed. Edgington, pp. 452–55.

29 For Symeon II, see Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 89–98.

30 For the establishment of the first Latin bishopric in Syria in 1098, see Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, pp. 10–11.

crusaders thus created their own Church for reasons of internal policy, so as to facilitate the administration of the land and in order to remain independent from Byzantium.³¹

1 Orthodox Christians in the Crusader States

In the newly established Kingdom of Jerusalem the crusaders set up a two-class society, in which the Latins were the ruling elite. Christians who did not follow the “laws of Rome”, as well as the non-Christian population, were assigned a subordinate legal status, as the assizes of the Kingdom of Jerusalem reveal. The decisive factor was therefore not nationality but belonging to the Roman Church.³² The Franks did not, however, create a new social order. Essentially, they adopted the existing Muslim *dhimmī*-system within which the various non-Islamic religious confessions were vouchsafed great autonomy, above all in the area of marriage and inheritance law. Their status was defined as a religious community, while governance and jurisdiction remained with the respective Church authorities.³³

The community of Orthodox Christians in the Holy Land comprised different groups. Besides the Greeks from Byzantium there was a strong Georgian community centred on the Monastery of the Holy Cross near Jerusalem and, particularly, there were the Melkites, that is Arabic-speaking Orthodox Christians.³⁴ The Latins regarded the Orthodox Church as a part of the one Church encompassing West and East. They thus felt themselves justified in incorporating the existing structures of the Orthodox Church into the

31 For the foundation of the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, see Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, pp. 53–55; Mayer, *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*, pp. 3–8; Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 98; Barber, *The Crusader States*, pp. 98–120.

32 Philipp of Novara, *Livre*, ed. A. Beugnot, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Lois, Assises de Jérusalem ou recueil des ouvrages de jurisprudence composés pendant le XIII^e siècle dans les royaumes de Jérusalem et de Chypre*, Paris 1841, vol. 1, pp. 469–571, here p. 502 (c. 28): “Grès et Suriens et tous autres Crestiens qui ne sont de la ley de Rome”; Prawer, “Social Classes”, pp. 70–71.

33 For the adoption of the *dhimmī*-system by the crusaders, see Prawer, “Social Classes”, pp. 101–02; Cahen, *Orient et Occident au temps des croisades*, p. 158. For the farmers who were cultivating the land everything stayed as it was, only the landowners changed: Riley-Smith, “The Survival in Latin Palestine of Muslim Administration”, pp. 9–22; Mayer, “Latins, Muslims and Greeks”, pp. 177–83; and Kedar, “The Subjected Muslims of the Frankish Levant”, pp. 168–71. For the legal status of the Orthodox, see Pahlitzsch/Weltecke, “Konflikte zwischen den nicht-lateinischen Kirchen im Königreich Jerusalem”, pp. 125–30.

34 These Orthodox Melkites ought not to be confused with the modern Melkites who joined the Roman Church in the 18th century, for which see, in general, Dick, *Les Melkites*. For the Georgians, see Pahlitzsch, “Georgians and Greeks in Jerusalem”.

newly created Latin Church.³⁵ In doing so, they followed the principle that only one bishop could exist in each bishopric. By appointing Latin bishops, the Orthodox hierarchy was therefore superseded. The Orthodox clergy was forced to acknowledge the supremacy of the Latin bishops and of the Latin patriarch.³⁶ In contrast, other Oriental Churches, such as the Syrian Orthodox or the Armenians, were regarded as heretical since they had never acknowledged the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451). As a consequence, the independent status of their Churches remained untouched. Thus, the Orthodox hierarchy lost its former leading role which it had held amongst the Christians of Palestine during the period of Islamic rule.³⁷

However, during the early stages of crusader rule, the presence of a Greek Orthodox Patriarch in Jerusalem seems to have been tolerated for some time. Possibly the incorporation of the Orthodox Church into the Latin hierarchy took some time to be achieved. Furthermore, King Baldwin I, the second ruler of the Crusader State, adopted a friendly attitude towards local Christians. He resettled Christians from east of the Jordan river in Jerusalem, for the city had lost a considerable part of its population during the conquest. The toleration of an Orthodox Patriarch alongside the Latin hierarchy may thus fall within the context of the reconciliation between crusaders and indigenous Christians which the king took upon himself. The Latin hierarchy would hardly have agreed to the installation of an Orthodox Patriarch, but they were obviously unable to withstand the king at this stage because of internal altercations.³⁸

The transition to a Latin Church leadership does not seem to have gone smoothly. It included concrete disputes concerning property, as the account of the Easter ceremony of 1101 by the Armenian chronicler Matthew of Edessa demonstrates. He reports that the "miracle" of the self-igniting Easter fire, thus far performed every year by Greek clerics, had not taken place that year. Matthew also supplies the reason for this pyrotechnical failure: the Oriental Christians had been driven from their monasteries. Only after the Latins reinstituted the indigenous Christians into their rightful possessions was the miracle performed again.³⁹

35 Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, pp. 159 and 188; Prawer, "Social Classes", pp. 70–74.

36 This principle was laid down explicitly as a rule of canonical law at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215; Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, pp. 181–82.

37 Pahlitzsch, "The Melkites in Fatimid Egypt and Syria", pp. 485–515.

38 Prawer, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, p. 232; for the settling of indigenous Christians in Jerusalem by Baldwin I, see id., "The Latin Settlement of Jerusalem", pp. 92–94; Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 108–09.

39 Matthew of Edessa, *Chronicle*, ed. E. Dulaurier, "Extraits de la Chronique de Matthieu d'Édesse", in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades historiens arméniens*, vol. 1, Paris 1869, pp. 4–150, here pp. 54–55. MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, pp. 119–20; for this chronicle, see Andrews, *Matt'ēos Urhayec'i and His Chronicle*.

The ideological nature of the disagreements between Latins and Orthodox is demonstrated by two tracts written in Jerusalem around 1107 by the Greek Patriarch John VIII dealing with the question of the azymes, the unleavened eucharistic bread used by the Latins in contrast to Orthodox practice. John writes that Latins make fun of the Orthodox, calling them bad Christians and proceeding against the Orthodox in a very harsh and tyrannical manner.⁴⁰ It appears that John has specific events in mind when he accuses the Latins of insulting members of the Melkite community and using force against them. The eminent importance of the eucharistic bread in the local clashes becomes very clear, especially if we call to mind that Easter, and perhaps the other main festivities, too, were celebrated together by the Orthodox and the Latins. The use of leavened or unleavened bread during the key part of the ceremony was the distinctive characteristic for recognizing each group.⁴¹

These quarrels probably constituted one of the main reasons why John VIII could not stay in Jerusalem. In the further course of the 12th century the patriarchs of Jerusalem, as well as some of the bishops, spent their lives in exile in Constantinople. Soon the main activity of the exiled Greek Orthodox patriarchs of Jerusalem consisted in keeping the Orthodox Church's claim to the patriarchate in Jerusalem alive.⁴²

But even after the Orthodox patriarchs had been driven out, the Greek patriarchal clergy still performed their duties in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The colophon found in a *typikon* of the Anastasis dated 1122, which depicts the liturgy of the Easter week, shows that the manuscript was commissioned by a certain Georgios. He was not only the *archon* and judge of the Orthodox community in the Holy City, but also held the clerical office of the *chartophylax* of the Anastasis.⁴³ Since the *chartophylax* was also the deputy of the absent patriarch, the cleric Georgios must have been the leader of the Melkite congregation, who conducted secular as well as ecclesiastical matters as in the time before the Crusades.⁴⁴ In the liturgy of the *typikon*, the Orthodox patriarch plays a very active role. The prayers of intercession mention the current Greek

40 These two tracts were published by the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheos II, in Dositheos II of Jerusalem, *Tomos agapes*, Iassi 1698, pp. 516–27 and 527–38, here pp. 518–19.

41 Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 109–33; for the literary genre of dialogues between Orthodox and Latins, see Cameron, *Arguing it Out*, pp. 59–99.

42 For the Orthodox patriarchs of Jerusalem in exile, cf. Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 140–50; Spingou, “John IX Patriarch of Jerusalem in Exile”.

43 *Typikon of the Church of Jerusalem*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, p. 252.

44 Pahlitzsch/Weltecke, “Konflikte zwischen den nicht-lateinischen Kirchen im Königreich Jerusalem”, pp. 128–30.

Patriarch in exile Nicholas (before 1122- after 1156) by name. Furthermore, he is accompanied by the archbishops, bishops, clerics, and monks.⁴⁵ Since the liturgy transmitted in the *typikon* dates from about the 10th century and was revised in part in the 12th century, the question arises why this old liturgy was retained by the Melkites although, under completely changed conditions, it was no longer celebrated in this form. Obviously they must have considered it a sign of their identity: in preserving this liturgy they declare themselves to be the real community of the legitimate Patriarch of Jerusalem, meaning the Orthodox patriarch exiled in Constantinople.

When seen against this historical backdrop, the first Greek refutation of the Roman claim to primacy over all Christians during the ecclesiastical disputes in 1112 in Constantinople was not a matter of coincidence.⁴⁶ The expulsion of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem and the call for the submission of the remaining clergy to the authority of the Latin bishops, had made it very clear to Orthodox Christians what this claim meant.

In Bernard Hamilton's opinion, one consequence of the establishment of the Crusader States and the Latin Church, which directly affected the relations of Byzantium and indigenous Orthodox Christians in the Holy Land, was the nomination of Melkites (who were called *suriani*) instead of "Greeks" as bishops of the local Chalcedonian Christians. According to Hamilton this was a complete reversal of the practice before the Crusades, since local Christians had been excluded from episcopal positions at this time. This assumed policy suggests that Melkites accepted the Latin hierarchy, and that the only ones who remained loyal to the exiled patriarchs were Greek clerics who had not left the Holy Land.⁴⁷ However, these assumptions are inconsistent with the evidence available. First of all we find indigenous Melkite bishops in the 11th century, as the example of Sulaymān al-Gazzī shows.⁴⁸ Furthermore there is no evidence that Melkite bishops under Latin rule distanced themselves

45 *Typikon of the Church of Jerusalem*, ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, p. 26. See, in general, Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*.

46 This refutation was written by Niketas Seides. It has been published with a commentary by Gahbauer, *Gegen den Primat des Papstes*, pp. 1–78. For the negotiations between Rome and Byzantium in 1112, see Spiteris, *La critica bizantina*, pp. 56–84.

47 Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, pp. 181–83; MacEvitt, *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East*, pp. 110–22, more or less follows Hamilton and states that the Latins recognized only linguistic differences and refused to consider the Melkites on theological terms. However, MacEvitt does not take into consideration the detailed analysis of the available sources by Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, for example of the various anti-Latin theological treatises of the Greek-Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, John VIII (see above).

48 Pahlitzsch, "The Melkites in Fatimid Egypt and Syria", pp. 491–92, 510–12.

from Byzantium.⁴⁹ On the contrary, the Melkite community in the Holy Land never failed in their loyalty to the exiled patriarchs. An inscription found in the Monastery of Kalamon in the Judean desert provides evidence for this.⁵⁰ Despite the efforts undertaken by Latins in the Holy Land, the indigenous Christian populace did not recognize the Latin hierarchy. If the authority of the Latin Patriarch and his bishops did indeed find a certain degree of acceptance, this was only maintained for the sake of appearances and to correspond with the factual relationship of power.⁵¹

On the contrary, the Crusades forced the patriarchs of Jerusalem to stay in Constantinople, which resulted in an increasing “Byzantinization” of the Palestinian Church. The term “Byzantinization” designates the closer alignment of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem with Constantinople on the levels of ritual and law. Until the 12th century, the three Orthodox patriarchates in the Orient were able to maintain to a certain degree their own ritual forms: in Antioch and in Jerusalem the liturgy of St James, while in Alexandria the Melkites celebrated the liturgy of St Mark. From the second half of the 12th century onwards, the Patriarchate of Constantinople intensified its efforts towards standardizing the liturgy in the entire Orthodox world by inducing the Oriental patriarchates to adopt the liturgy of John Chrysostom, which was prevalent in the capital. Although it took until the end of the 13th century and even further to establish the Chrysostom liturgy as the only valid form,⁵² this unification was facilitated considerably by the fact that from the 1120s until their return to Jerusalem between 1204 and 1206/07, the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch enjoyed permanent exile in Constantinople. Theodore Balsamon, who advocated the policy of Byzantinization, was appointed Patriarch of Antioch in exile in about 1185. Upon being questioned by the Patriarch of Alexandria whether the liturgies of St James and St Mark usual in Jerusalem and Antioch were accepted by the Byzantine Church, Balsamon answered dismissively. His reason was that all Churches should follow the New Rome, that is Constantinople, in their rites

49 Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 194–201.

50 Vailhé, “Les laures de St. Gerasime et de Calamon”, pp. 116–17; Schneider, “Das Kalamon-Kloster in der Jerichoebene”, pp. 41–42.

51 According to the well-known quote of James of Vitry, the archbishop of Acre, on the attitude of the Greek Orthodox bishops living in the crusaders’ dominions: James of Vitry, *Historia orientalis*, ed. and French trans. J. Donnadieu, *Histoire orientale* (Sous la Règle de saint Augustin, 12), Turnhout 2008, pp. 298–99. Hamilton, *The Latin Church*, p. 316.

52 Karalevsky, *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites*, pp. 20–21; Nasrallah, “La liturgie des Patriarcats”, pp. 156–81; Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, pp. 134–53; Lüstraeten, *Die handschriftlichen arabischen Übersetzungen*, pp. 114–18.

and should celebrate the liturgy according to the teachings of John Chrysostom and Basil.⁵³

In the field of law, a similar development can be discerned. From the 8th century onwards the Melkites had created their own collection of laws in Arabic which, however, was only partially based on Byzantine law. Probably in the 12th century or maybe even earlier, this collection was extended to include a number of texts relating to civil law, one of them being the Arabic translation of the Greek *Procheiros Nomos*, which was originally published around 900 in Constantinople by the emperor.⁵⁴ The reason for the almost verbatim translation of this collection of Byzantine or rather Justinianic law, was most probably that the Melkites followed the express wish of Constantinople to enforce Byzantine law in their community.⁵⁵ This close connection to Byzantium is found very clearly again in Theodore Balsamon's answer to a question posed by the Melkite Patriarch of Alexandria at the end of the 12th century. The patriarch asked him whether it was reprehensible that his congregation was not familiar with the *Basilica*, another Byzantine law book. Balsamon answered: "Those who pride themselves on an orthodox way of life, whether they come from the Orient, from Alexandria or somewhere else, are called *Rhomaioi* [i.e. Romans or Byzantines] and must be ruled over in accordance with the laws."⁵⁶

The rule of the Latins did not mean the decline of the Melkite community. On the contrary, they seem to have been on the upswing since the 1150s. As far as the intellectual and artistic life of the Melkite community under crusader rule is concerned, numerous indications can be found. A number of Orthodox monasteries continued to exist, the most important of them being the monastery of St Sabas in the Judaeian desert, which maintained a Metochion in Jerusalem. Others, like the John Prodromos monastery on the shores of the river Jordan, were rebuilt by Emperor Manuel I (1143–80). Orthodox monastic life in Palestine, whose traditions go back to the beginnings of monastic and anchoritic life, strongly influenced Byzantine monasticism and also the Latin

53 *Syntagma* IV, eds. Rhalles/Potles, pp. 448–49; Theodore Balsamon, *Guide*, trans. Viscuso, pp. 66–70; Nasrallah, "La liturgie des Patriarchats melchites", p. 163, n. 38. Pahlitzsch, "Greek – Syriac – Arabic", pp. 495–505; Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, pp. 136–37.

54 The Arabic translation has been published and studied by Pahlitzsch, *Der arabische Procheiros Nomos*.

55 Pahlitzsch, *Der arabische Procheiros Nomos*, pp. 56*–57*.

56 *Syntagma* IV, eds. Rhalles/Potles, p. 451; Theodore Balsamon, *Guide*, trans. Viscuso, pp. 72–73. However, Balsamon made the concession that "those who live outside of Rome, namely, peasants and the rest, much more Alexandrians, who do not know the civil law, are pardoned" (see *ibid.*).

monks in the Holy Land.⁵⁷ The production of books and the continued existence of the libraries of the Orthodox monasteries and churches in the 12th century, especially that of the patriarchate, may be regarded as an expression of the intellectual and religious life of the Melkite community under Latin rule. All in all, around 100 Greek manuscripts can be ascertained which were probably written either in the 12th or 13th century in Palestine or which were located there at that time. An intensive exchange took place between the Holy Land and Cyprus, so that one could almost speak of a common cultural area characterized especially by the manifold monastic connections of the Palestine Churches and monasteries with Cyprus.⁵⁸

This could be seen as a result of the politics pursued by the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, who replaced his predecessors' anti-crusader doctrine with the so called "policy of détente". In this, Manuel assumed the role of a protector of the Crusader States. This meant, on the one hand, that Latin rule was acknowledged, while, on the other, the crusaders' increasing dependence gave the Byzantine Emperor greater influence there. In 1165, Manuel was even able to replace the Latin patriarch in Antioch with a Greek Orthodox one for a short period.⁵⁹ The Kingdom of Jerusalem was rather more independent from the Byzantine Empire as a result of its greater distance from it, so that Manuel initially had to content himself with financing construction measures in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, as well as in Bethlehem and in several Orthodox monasteries, all the while closely co-operating with the King of Jerusalem.⁶⁰ According to Jotischky, Manuel thereby reconstructed "a Byzantine religious past within the frontiers of the new Latin kingdom", so that his sponsorship assumed a strongly political character.⁶¹

A combined expedition against Egypt together with King Amalric I of Jerusalem (1162–74) was even planned, though it failed because in the end the Franks were concerned that the Byzantines would have too much influence. Thus they tried to conquer Egypt on their own, without the approval of their allies. After the failure of this expedition Amalric again sought to win

57 Pahlitzsch, "Byzantine Monasticism and the Holy Land"; see also Hamilton/Jotischky, *Latin and Greek Monasticism*.

58 Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 213–34, with an extensive list of the manuscripts on pp. 325–58.

59 Failler, "Le patriarche d'Antioche Athanase I^{er} Manassès (1157–1170)", pp. 63–75.

60 Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 135–211; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, pp. 66–76.

61 Jotischky, *The Perfection of Solitude*, p. 84. Patlagean, "Byzantium's Dual Holy Land", pp. 120–21, discusses Manuel's veneration of Constantinople as the new Jerusalem while also promoting the city of Jerusalem. See also Messis, "Littérature, voyage et politique au XII^e siècle: l'ekphrasis des lieux saints de Jean 'Phokas'".

Byzantine support by personally travelling to Constantinople in 1171, where he remained for several months, negotiated with Manuel and supposedly even offered the emperor an oath of fealty for Jerusalem. Though Manuel was open to a new campaign, it never came to fruition.⁶²

Marriage and Church politics were integral parts of the new policy pursued by Manuel I. In contrast to his actions in Antioch, Manuel had thus far not appointed an Orthodox patriarch in Jerusalem. In 1176/77, this seems to have changed when the new patriarch, Leontios II, was sent to Jerusalem. Probably King Baldwin IV's diagnosis of leprosy was the reason for this, an illness which made it impossible for him to marry a Byzantine princess, as his predecessors Baldwin III and Amalric I had done. Thus, Manuel sent the new patriarch Leontios to Jerusalem as his representative there. When Leontios II arrived in Palestine in 1177, the Latins, as sovereign rulers of the country, initially refused him access to the city of Jerusalem. Presumably the Frankish king intervened, and Leontios was permitted to enter the city, where he was enthusiastically welcomed by the entire Orthodox community. As a result of pressure exerted by the Latin patriarch, however, he soon had to leave the city again. The king as the secular lord was evidently willing to compromise for political reasons, in order to improve the relationship with Byzantium. The Latin Church, by contrast, sensed that its ruling position was jeopardized by the installation of a Greek Orthodox patriarch in Jerusalem.⁶³ The relationship of the Greek and indigenous Orthodox Christians towards the Latins is illustrated by the reason supplied by the author of the *Vita* of Leontios for Leontios' return to Constantinople. As he had only been granted permission to show his reverence for the Holy Sepulchre like any other man, he had recognized that it would be better to leave the city, "lest anything untoward be mischievously concocted because of him between the Orthodox Romans and Syrians [i.e. the *suriani*, the Arabic speaking members of the Orthodox church] on the one hand and the Latins on the other."⁶⁴

Against this background, it is not surprising that the Melkites sympathized with Saladin during the siege of the city in 1187. According to the Coptic *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, they were even prepared to open the gates to Saladin because of their rejection of the Latins, thus contributing to

62 Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, pp. 55–56; Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 309–20. For Amalric's sojourn in Constantinople, see Vučetić, *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern*.

63 Hamilton, *The Leper King and his Heirs*, pp. 113–15; Pahlitzsch, *Graeci und Suriani*, pp. 150–81.

64 Theodosios Goudeles, *Life of Leontius*, § 88, ed. D. Tsougarakis, *The Life of Leontios. Patriarch of Jerusalem*, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1993, pp. 138–39.

the surrender of the city by the crusaders.⁶⁵ To what extent they were acting in co-ordination with the Byzantine Emperor Isaac II Angelos is not known. However, the ties possibly established with Saladin would fit in well with the existing relations between Saladin and Isaac.⁶⁶

Leontios II spent the rest of his life in exile in Constantinople. His successor Dositheos I, who succeeded to office in 1185, did not return to Jerusalem even after it was conquered by Saladin in 1187. Various inquiries made by the Byzantine Emperor to Saladin, requesting that the Orthodox patriarch be permitted to return, were refused. Nonetheless, the Melkite position in Jerusalem was apparently quite good. They had, after all, been willing to help Saladin during the siege of the city. It is presumably for this reason, and in return for the construction of a mosque in Constantinople,⁶⁷ that Saladin permitted the Orthodox Christians to practise their religion freely. Furthermore, he returned those Orthodox churches and monasteries which had been taken over by the Latins after the foundation of the Crusader States. The Orthodox Christians were also permitted to celebrate their liturgy in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. With the expulsion of the Latin patriarch, new venues opened for the Greek Orthodox Church in Jerusalem, and from the beginning of the 13th century onward the patriarchs seem to have resided in the Holy City again.⁶⁸

2 Latins in Byzantium

Already in the 11th century many Latins, above all Normans, had settled in Byzantium. Most of them were mercenaries in the Byzantine army. Some settled permanently and were promoted to high military office. Members of these families, such as Raoul/Ralles, Petraliphas, or Rogerios, were awarded prestigious titles, particularly under Alexios I. In the 12th century, important commands were generally given to members of the Komnenos family, while the families of Latin immigrants were increasingly Hellenized and formed ties of kinship in Byzantium, even with the imperial family.⁶⁹

65 Severus ibn al-Muqaffa', *History of the Patriarchs*, eds. and trans. O.H.E. KHS-Burmester/A. Khater, *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church Known as the History of the Holy Church* (Publications de la Société d'Archéologie Copte, 12), Cairo 1970, vol. 3/2, pp. 78–79, trans. pp. 132–33.

66 Brand, "The Byzantines and Saladin", p. 170; Möhring, *Saladin und der Dritte Kreuzzug*, pp. 186–87.

67 Reinert, "The Muslim Presence in Constantinople", pp. 140–41.

68 Pahlitzsch, "The People of the Book", pp. 435–40.

69 Kazhdan, "Latins and Franks in Byzantium", pp. 94–97.

Dynastic marriages between Byzantine nobles and Latin women, who as a prerequisite for marriage adopted the Orthodox faith, were quite common in the 12th century, too. Manuel I, for example, first married Bertha von Sulzbach, the sister-in-law of the German king, Conrad III, then a princess from the Norman principality in Antioch. His son Alexios II Komnenos (died 1183) also married a princess from a Western dynasty, Agnes, the daughter of the French king, Louis VII. Latin princesses inevitably brought their retinue with them, so that Latin customs found their way into the court and thereafter into Byzantine society. Manuel was known to champion Latins particularly. He appointed many Latins to counterbalance the influence of the Byzantine nobility. The Byzantine historian Niketas Choniates strongly criticized this policy. As far as the Byzantine aristocracy was concerned, the Latins were despised, foreign rivals.⁷⁰

In addition, the Latin expansion into the eastern Mediterranean over the course of the Crusades increasingly led to direct encounters between Byzantine Emperors and Latin sovereigns from western Europe or the Crusader States. Louis VII and the German king, Conrad III, met the *basileus* during the Second Crusade, while the King of Jerusalem, Amalric I, visited Constantinople in 1171. These encounters also contributed to cultural exchange, as the tournament held at Antioch with Byzantine and Frankish participants in 1159 demonstrated. It was hosted by Manuel I, after the Prince of Antioch and the King of Jerusalem had acknowledged him as the suzerain of the city. Tournaments of this sort were essentially unknown in Byzantium until that time.⁷¹

The Latins were increasingly seen by the Byzantines as a homogenous group, to whom particular habits and characteristics were attributed. The sources emphasize first of all the Latins' martial prowess. For the rest they were commonly considered to be cruel, stupid, and ambitious to achieve glory and profit. Niketas Choniates called the Latins half-barbarians (*mixobarbaroi*).⁷² Differences in outward appearance, custom and manners were also emphasized, since outward features function as identifiable criterion for the construction of a group identity.⁷³

Latin expansion into the eastern Mediterranean in consequence of the Crusades significantly increased the numbers of Latins in Byzantium. Latin pilgrims and crusaders travelled regularly through the empire. Many settled,

⁷⁰ Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 191–96.

⁷¹ Vučetić, *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern*; also see Anca, *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation*; Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, pp. 168–84, 274–77; Roche, *The Crusade of King Conrad III of Germany*.

⁷² Kazhdan, "Latins and Franks in Byzantium", p. 95.

⁷³ Lilie, "Anna Komnene und die Lateiner", pp. 169–82; Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner", pp. 257–74. On Latins in religious disputes, see Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*.

no longer as mercenaries but instead as merchants.⁷⁴ In return for military support the Byzantine emperors bestowed special privileges upon the Italian trade cities, in particular Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, including the assignment of semi-autonomous town quarters throughout the empire, and especially in Constantinople. The residents in the Latin districts enjoyed a special status, although they were officially subject to Byzantine jurisdiction until the end of the 12th century. In breach of previous Byzantine jurisdictional tradition, they were conceded their own jurisdictional status from 1198 onwards.⁷⁵ Despite their privileged status, or perhaps because of it, the situation of Latins in Byzantium was uncertain. Assaults on Latins in the Byzantine Empire became more frequent in the second half of the 12th century, a consequence too of increasing anti-Latin resentment. In 1171, Manuel arrested the Venetians and confiscated their property. During the usurpation of Andronikos I in Constantinople in 1182, the so-called “massacre of the Latins” took place.⁷⁶

Savvas Neocleous recently attempted to put the concept of a deep, continuing antagonism between Latins and Byzantines into perspective. He claims that while the Byzantine elite made very derogatory remarks about Latins in the surviving source material, a discrepancy between their writings and reality remained. Indeed, we should remember that many sources on the massacre of Latins in 1182 or the conquest of Constantinople in 1204 were written retrospectively. Therefore, it is difficult to ascertain the real state of affairs. Evidently close relations and even friendships did exist at the business or personal level. Marriages between Venetians and Byzantines were not unusual.⁷⁷ Latins in Constantinople often lived outside their official quarters and mixed with the local Byzantine population. Therefore, anti-Latin assaults did not result from blind hatred of Latins, rather they were the consequence of particular situations. Thus, Neocleous attempts to show that the ramifications of the “massacre on the Latins” in 1182 were exaggerated in the sources, and that in fact Andronikos’s propaganda and his troops were responsible for the brutality.⁷⁸

Scholars and translators were another important group in Byzantium. The political and religious disputes with the West, for example those induced by the controversy of 1054, made it necessary in the 12th century, in particular during the rule of Manuel I, to draw on the linguistic and cultural competence

74 Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks in Byzantium”, p. 98; Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, p. 193.

75 Lilie, *Handel und Politik*; Laiou, “The Foreigner and the Stranger”, pp. 71–97; Balar, *Les Latins en Orient*, pp. 140–46, 233–35.

76 Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, pp. 195–221.

77 Neocleous, “Greeks and Italians in Twelfth-Century Constantinople”, pp. 225–29.

78 Neocleous, “Greeks and Italians in Twelfth-Century Constantinople”, pp. 229–40.

of Latin aides. Cerbanon and Moses of Bergamo were probably engaged in issuing and translating documents and diplomatic correspondence with the West at the court of John II. Moses was responsible for translating the religious disputes with Anselm of Havelberg in Constantinople in 1136. Burgundio of Pisa acted as the Pisan envoy at the court of Manuel I in 1169–71.⁷⁹ Whole families, for example the brothers Hugh Eteriano and Leo Tuscus, who also served as spiritual advisors of Manuel I, named themselves experts in relations between Byzantium and the West, in linguistic, religious, or political matters. At the same time, these scholars also translated medical, philosophical, and religious works from Greek into Latin, and contributed in this way to the dissemination of classical learning in the Latin West. Most of these translators came from Italy, a region which played a special role as an intermediary between Byzantium and the West, and particularly from the Italian trade cities, which furthermore illustrates the close correlation between economic and cultural exchange.⁸⁰

After the death of Emperor Manuel Komnenos in 1180, Byzantium experienced a fundamental crisis at the end of the 12th century, and its relationship with the West deteriorated rapidly. The 1182 pogrom against Latin Christians in Constantinople and the conquest of Thessalonica by the Normans in 1185, bear witness to this development. In addition, the Byzantine Emperors found themselves forced to enter into an alliance with Saladin against the Seljuks, who were expanding their realm in Asia Minor. In the West, this was regarded as another betrayal of the Crusader States.⁸¹ With the conquest of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade, and the resulting establishment of a Latin Empire and a Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, the relations between Byzantium and the West reached their nadir. The 12th century was characterized by intense encounters and contacts between Byzantines and Latins, but also by frequent conflicts. Friendly relations were certainly possible at an individual level and hardly constituted an exception. Nonetheless, different political and ecclesiastical interests in the end led to deep alienation, which would affect further relations.

79 Classen, *Burgundio von Pisa*.

80 Rodríguez Suarez, "From Greek into Latin", pp. 91–109; Gastgeber, "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung", pp. 105–22. See also the forthcoming study of Leonie Exarchos: Exarchos, *Lateiner am Kaiserhof in Konstantinopel: Expertise und Loyalitäten zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen (1143–1204)*.

81 Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, pp. 129–35. See, for this period in general, Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*; Lilie, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, pp. 124–26.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, ed. S.B. Edgington, *Historia Ierosolimitana. History of the Journey to Jerusalem* (Oxford Medieval Texts), Oxford 2007.
- Syntagma ton theion kai hieron kanonon*, eds. R.A. Rhalles/M. Potles, vol. 4, Athens 1856, (reprint Athens 1966).
- Theodore Balsamon, *Guide for a Church under Islām: The Sixty Six Canonical Questions Attributed to Theodōros Balsamōn. A Translation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate's Twelfth-Century Guidance to the Patriarchate of Alexandria*, trans. Patrick Demetrios Viscuso, Brookline, Mass 2014.
- Typikon of the Church of Jerusalem*, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta Hierosolymitikis stachyologias*, Saint Petersburg 1894 (repr. Brussels 1963), vol. 2, pp. 1–254.

Secondary Literature

- Andrews, T., *Matt'ēos Urhayec'i and His Chronicle. History as Apocalypse in a Crossroads of Cultures* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 108), London-Boston 2017.
- Anca, A.S., *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation und kaiserliches Selbstverständnis. Berührung der westlichen mit der byzantinischen Welt in der Zeit der ersten Kreuzzüge* (Symbolische Kommunikation und gesellschaftliche Wertesysteme, 31), Münster 2010.
- Balard, M., *Les Latins en Orient XI^e–XV^e siècle*, Paris 2007.
- Barber, M., *The Crusader States*, New Haven 2012.
- Becker, A., *Papst Urban II* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Schriften, 1–2), 2 vols., Stuttgart 1964/1988.
- Beihammer, A., “Ceremonies and Court Rituals in Byzantine Imperial Audiences in the Time of the First Crusade”, in E. Orthmann/A. Kollatz, (eds.), *The Ceremonial of Audience. Transcultural Approaches* (Macht und Herrschaft, 2), Göttingen 2019, pp. 37–61.
- Brand, C.M., “The Byzantines and Saladin, 1185–1192, Opponents of the Third Crusade”, *Speculum* 37 (1962), 167–82.
- Brand, C.M., *Byzantium Confronts the West*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968.
- Brincken, A.-D. von den, *Die “Nationes christianorum orientaliū” im Verständnis der lateinischen Historiographie von der Mitte des 12. bis in die zweite Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Kölner historische Abhandlungen, 22), Cologne-Vienna 1973.
- Cahen, C., *Orient et Occident au temps des croisades*, Paris 1983.
- Cameron, A., *Arguing it Out. Discussion in Twelfth-Century Byzantium* (The Natalie Zemon Davis Annual Lecture Series), Budapest-New York 2016.
- Classen, P., *Burgundio von Pisa*, Heidelberg 1974.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., “Pope Urban II's Preaching of the First Crusade”, *History* 55 (1970), 177–88.

- Dennis, G.T., "Schism, Union and the Crusades", in V.P. Goss (ed.), *The Meeting of the Two Worlds. Cultural Exchange between East and West during the Period of the Crusades*, Kalamazoo 1986, pp. 181–87.
- Dick, I., *Les Melkites. Grecs-Orthodoxes et Grecs-Catholiques des Patriarcats d'Antioche, d'Alexandrie et de Jérusalem*, Turnhout 1994.
- Ebels-Hoving, B., *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen, 1096–1204*, Assen 1971.
- Edgington, S.B. (ed.), *Jerusalem the Golden. The Origins and Impact of the First Crusade*, Turnhout 2014.
- Erdmann, C., *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens*, Stuttgart 1935 (repr. Darmstadt 1980).
- Exarchos, L., *Lateiner am Kaiserhof in Konstantinopel: Expertise und Loyalitäten zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen (1143–1204)* (Mittelmeerstudien, 22) forthcoming.
- Failler, A., "Le patriarche d'Antioche Athanase I^{er} Manassès (1157–1170)", *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 51 (1993), 63–75.
- Favreau-Lilie, M.-L., *Die Italiener im Heiligen Land vom ersten Kreuzzug bis zum Tode Heinrichs von Champagne (1098–1197)*, Amsterdam 1989.
- Flori, J., *Pierre l'ermite et la première croisade*, Paris 1999.
- France, J., "The Crisis of the First Crusade: From the Defeat of Kerbogha to the Departure from Arqa", *Byzantion* 40 (1970), 276–308.
- France, J., *Victory in the East. A Military History of the First Crusade*, Cambridge 1994.
- Frankopan, P., *The First Crusade. The Call from the East*, Cambridge, Mass. 2012.
- Gahbauer, F.R., *Gegen den Primat des Papstes*, Munich 1975.
- Galadza, D., *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, Oxford 2018.
- Gastgeber, C., "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei unter den Komnenen und Angeloi. Neue Ergebnisse zur Arbeit in der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei", in M. Balard/E. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur, Contacts, relations, échanges, Actes de trois séances du XX^e Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines, Paris, 19–25 août 2001* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 21), Paris 2005, pp. 105–22.
- Hamilton, B., *The Latin Church in the Crusader States. The Secular Church*, London 1980.
- Hamilton, B., *The Leper King and his Heirs. Baldwin IV and the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Oxford-New York 2000.
- Hamilton, B./Jotischky, A., *Latin and Greek Monasticism in the Crusader States*, Cambridge 2020.
- Harris, J., *Byzantium and the Crusades*, London 2003.
- Hehl, E.-D., "Was ist eigentlich ein Kreuzzug?", *Historische Zeitschrift* 259 (1994), 297–336.
- Hill, J.H., "Raymond of St. Gilles in Urban's Plan of Greek and Latin Friendship", *Speculum* 26 (1951), 265–76.

- Hill, J.H./Hill, L.L., *Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse*, Syracuse 1962.
- John, S., *Godfrey of Bouillon. Duke of Lower Lotharingia, Ruler of Latin Jerusalem, c. 1060–1100* (Rulers of the Latin East), London-New York 2018.
- Jotischky, A., *The Perfection of Solitude. Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States*, University Park, Penn. 1995.
- Karalevsky, C., *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites (Alexandrie, Antioche, Jérusalem) depuis le schisme monophysite du VI^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours*, vol. 3: *Les institutions, liturgie, hiérarchie, statistique, sources du droit canonique et organisation*, Rome 1911.
- Kazhdan, A.P., "Latins and Franks in Byzantium", in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington D.C. 2001, pp. 83–100.
- Kedar, B.Z., "The Subjected Muslims of the Frankish Levant", in J.M. Powell (ed.), *Muslims under Latin Rule, 1100–1300*, Princeton 1990, pp. 135–74.
- Kindlimann, S., *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens im Hochmittelalter. Studien zur Entwicklung der Idee eines lateinischen Kaiserreichs in Byzanz* (Geist und Werk der Zeiten, 20), Zürich 1969.
- Kolbaba, T.M., *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins in Byzantium*, Urbana-Chicago 2000.
- Kolia-Dermitzaki, A., "Die Kreuzfahrer und die Kreuzzüge im Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner", *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 41 (1991), 163–88.
- Krey, A.C.: "Urban's Crusade – Success or Failure?", *American Historical Review* 53 (1948), 235–50.
- LaMonte, J.L., "To What Extent Was the Byzantine Empire the Suzerain of the Latin Crusading States?", *Byzantion* 7 (1932), 253–61.
- Laiou, A., "The Foreigner and the Stranger in 12th century Byzantium: Means of Propitiation and Acculturation", in M.T. Fögen (ed.), *Fremde der Gesellschaft. Historische und sozialwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zur Differenzierung von Normalität und Fremdheit* (Ius Commune. Studien zur Europäischen Rechtsgeschichte, 56). Frankfurt 1991, pp. 71–97.
- Laiou, A., "L'interprétation byzantine de l'expansion occidentale (XI^e–XII^e siècles)", in M. Balard/A. Ducellier (eds.), *Le partage du monde. Échanges et colonisation dans la Méditerranée médiévale*, Paris 1998, pp. 163–79.
- Leib, B., *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle. Rapports religieux des Latins et des Gréco-Russes sous le Pontificat d'Urbain II (1088–1099)*, Paris 1924.
- Lemerle, P., "Byzance et la croisade", in *Congrès international des sciences historiques*, Rome 1955, vol. 3, pp. 595–620.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeli* (1081–1204), Amsterdam 1984.

- Lilie, R.-J., "Der erste Kreuzzug in der Darstellung Anna Komnenes", in *Varia II* (Poikila Byzantina, 6), Bonn 1987, pp. 108–45.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Die lateinische Kirche in der Romania vor dem Vierten Kreuzzug. Versuch einer Bestandaufnahme", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 82 (1989), 202–20.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, trans. J.C. Morris/J.E. Ridings, Oxford 1993.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Anna Komnene und die Lateiner", *Byzantinoslavica* 54 (1993), 169–82.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, Stuttgart 2004.
- Lüstraeten, M., *Die handschriftlichen arabischen Übersetzungen des byzantinischen Typikons* (Jerusalem theologisches Forum, 31), Münster 2017.
- MacEvitt, C.H., *The Crusades and the Christian World of the East. Rough Tolerance*, Philadelphia 2008.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993.
- Matzke, M., *Daibert von Pisa. Zwischen Pisa, Papst und erstem Kreuzzug* (Vorträge und Forschungen, Sonderband 44), Sigmaringen 1998.
- Mayer, H.E., *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*, Stuttgart 1977.
- Mayer, H.E., "Latins, Muslims and Greeks in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem", *History* 8 (1978), 175–92.
- Mayer, H.E., *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Stuttgart-Berlin-Cologne 1995.
- Messis, C., "Littérature, voyage et politique au XII^e siècle: l'ekphrasis des lieux saints de Jean 'Phokas,'" in V. Vavřínek/P. Odorico/V. Drbal (eds.), *Ekphrasis: la représentation des monuments dans les littératures byzantine et byzantino-slaves: réalités et imaginaires*, Prague 2011, pp. 146–66.
- Michel, A., "Der kirchliche Wechselverkehr zwischen West und Ost vor dem verschärften Schisma des Kerullarios", *Ostkirchliche Studien* 1 (1952), 145–73.
- Möhring, H., *Saladin und der Dritte Kreuzzug: Aiyubidische Strategie und Diplomatie im Vergleich vornehmlich der arabischen mit den lateinischen Quellen* (Frankfurter Historische Abhandlungen, 21), Wiesbaden 1980.
- Nasrallah, J., "La liturgie des Patriarcats melchites de 969 à 1300", *Oriens Christianus* 71 (1987), 156–81.
- Neocleous, S., "Is the Contemporary Latin Historiography of the First Crusade and Its Aftermath 'Anti-Byzantine'?", in id. (ed.), *Sailing to Byzantium: Papers from the First and Second Postgraduate Forums in Byzantine Studies*, Newcastle 2009, pp. 27–52.
- Neocleous, S., "Greeks and Italians in Twelfth-Century Constantinople: Convivencia or Conflict?", in B. Crostini/S. La Porta (eds.), *Negotiating Co-Existence. Communities, Cultures and "Convivencia" in Byzantine Society* (Bochumer altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 96), Trier 2013, pp. 221–50.
- Nicol, D.M., "Byzantium and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 13 (1962), 1–20.

- Pahlitzsch, J., *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit. Beiträge und Quellen zur Geschichte des griechisch-orthodoxen Patriarchats von Jerusalem* (Berliner Historische Studien, 33), Berlin 2001.
- Pahlitzsch, J., "Georgians and Greeks in Jerusalem from the End of the 11th to the Early 14th Century", in K.N. Ciggaar/H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States. Context – Contacts – Confrontations III* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 125), Leuven-Dudley, Mass., 2003, pp. 35–51.
- Pahlitzsch, J., "The People of the Book", in R. Hillenbrand/S. Auld (eds.), *Ayyubid Jerusalem. The Holy City in Context*, London 2009, pp. 435–40.
- Pahlitzsch, J., *Der arabische Procheiros Nomos. Untersuchung und Edition der Übersetzung eines byzantinischen Rechtstextes* (Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte, 31), Frankfurt 2014.
- Pahlitzsch, J., "The Melkites in Fatimid Egypt and Syria (1021 to 1171)", *Medieval Encounters* 21 (2015), 485–515.
- Pahlitzsch, J., "Greek – Syriac – Arabic: The Relationship between Liturgical and Colloquial Languages in Melkite Palestine in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries", in S. Johnson (ed.), *Languages and Cultures of Eastern Christianity: Greek* (The Worlds of Eastern Christianity, 300–1500, 6), Farnham 2015, pp. 495–505.
- Pahlitzsch, J., "Byzantine Monasticism and the Holy Land: Palestine in Byzantine Hagiography of the 11th and 12th Centuries", in D. Bertaina/S. Keating/M. Swanson/A. Treiger (eds.), *Heirs of the Apostles. Studies on Arabic Christianity in Honor of Sidney H. Griffith*, Leiden-New York 2018, pp. 229–53.
- Pahlitzsch, J./Weltecke, D., "Konflikte zwischen den nicht-lateinischen Kirchen im Königreich Jerusalem", in D. Bauer/K. Herbers/N. Jaspert (eds.), *Jerusalem im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter: Konflikte und Konfliktbewältigung – Vorstellungen und Vergegenwärtigungen* (Campus Historische Studien, 29), Frankfurt-New York 2001, pp. 119–45.
- Patlagean, E., "Byzantium's Dual Holy Land", in B.Z. Kedar/R.J. Zwi Werblowsky (eds.), *Sacred Space. Shrine, City, Land, Proceedings of the International Conference in Memory of Joshua Prawer*, London-Jerusalem 1998, pp. 112–26.
- Phillips, J., *The Second Crusade. Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*, New Haven, Conn.-London 2007.
- Prawer, J., "The Latin Settlement of Jerusalem", *Speculum* 27 (1952), 490–503 (repr. in id., *Crusader Institutions*, Oxford 1980, pp. 85–101).
- Prawer, J., *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages*, London 1972.
- Prawer, J., "Social Classes in the Crusader States: The 'Minorities'", in H.W. Hazard/N.P. Zacour (eds.), *The Impact of the Crusades on the Near East* (A History of the Crusades, 5), Madison, Wisc.-London 1985, pp. 59–116.

- Pryor, J.H., "The Oaths of the Leaders of the First Crusade to Emperor Alexius I Comnenus: Fealty, Homage – πίστις, δουλεία", *Parergon. Bulletin of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1984), 111–41.
- Reinert, S., "The Muslim Presence in Constantinople, 9th–15th Centuries", in H. Ahrweiler/A.E. Laiou (eds.), *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, Washington 1998, pp. 125–50.
- Reinsch, D.R., "Ausländer und Byzantiner im Werk der Anna Komnene", *Rechtshistorisches Journal* 8 (1989), 257–74.
- Riley-Smith, J., "The Survival in Latin Palestine of Muslim Administration", in P.M. Holt (ed.), *Eastern Mediterranean Lands in the Period of the Crusades*, Warminster 1977, pp. 9–22.
- Riley-Smith, J., *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*, Philadelphia-London 1986.
- Roche, J.T., *The Crusade of King Conrad III of Germany. Warfare and Diplomacy in Byzantium, Anatolia and Outremer*, 1146–48, Turnhout 2021.
- Rodriguez Suarez, A., "From Greek into Latin: Western Scholars and Translators in Constantinople during the Reign of John II", in A. Bucossi/A. Rodriguez Suarez (eds.), *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium: In the Shadow of Father and Son*, London-New York 2016, pp. 91–109.
- Runciman, S., "Adhemar of Le Puy and the Eastern Churches", in *Actes du VI^e congrès international des études byzantines*, Paris 1950, vol. 1, pp. 319–32.
- Runciman, S., *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries*, Oxford 1955.
- Schneider, A.M., "Das Kalamon-Kloster in der Jerichoebene", *Oriens Christianus* 35 (1938), 39–42.
- Shephard, J., "Cross-Purposes: Alexius Comnenus and the First Crusade", in J. Phillips (ed.), *The First Crusade: Origins and Impact*, Manchester 1997, pp. 107–29.
- Spingou, F., "John IX Patriarch of Jerusalem in Exile. A Holy Man from Mar Saba to St Diomedes/New Zion", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 109 (2016), 179–206.
- Spiteris, J., *La critica bizantina del Primato Romano nel secolo XII* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 208), Rome 1979, pp. 56–84.
- Stark, R., *God's Battalion. The Case for the Crusades*, New York 2010.
- Tyerman, C., *How to Plan a Crusade. Reason and Religious War in the High Middle Ages*, London 2015.
- Vailhé, S., "Les laures de St. Gerasime et de Calamon", *Échos d'Orient* 2 (1898/99), 106–19.
- Vučetić, M., *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern (395–1204). Vorbereitung, Gestaltung, Funktionen* (Byzantinistische Studien und Texte, 8), Berlin-Münster 2021.

PART 4

Agents and Objects



Travellers, Diplomats, Interpreters and Others: Agents of Political Relations

Nicolas Drocourt

We arrived in Constantinople on the day before the nones of June [968] and ... we were received in a shameful way, rudely and shamefully handled. We were closed into a certain mansion, quite big and open, which neither protected from the cold nor kept out the heat; armed soldiers were stationed there as guards, who forbade all my people from leaving and others from entering ... It added to our disastrous position that the wine of the Greeks was undrinkable for us because of their commingling pitch, pine sap and plaster in it ... Never in 120 days did a single one pass that did not provide us with a moan or sorrow.



Much has been said about this account by Liudprand, Bishop of Cremona, after his diplomatic mission to Constantinople on behalf of Emperor Otto I.^{1,2} This section opens the rather long report he made on his mission to Byzantium, and it sets the tone for the rest of his account. If we believe him, he was not very well received by the Byzantine authorities nor by the Byzantine Emperor himself. Numerous aspects of his stay seem to confirm this view: Liudprand and the members of his retinue were badly lodged, far from the Great Palace of Constantinople; the diplomatic negotiations with the Byzantines revealed how far apart from each other the positions of the two emperors were; and he deemed the official dinners long, outdated, and boring. Furthermore, he was not authorized to return to Italy until the end of the year and thus describes his sojourn as a kind of imprisonment. Being forced to travel back during the

¹ Liudprand, *Legatio* 1, ed. Chiesa, p. 187, trans. Squatriti, pp. 238–39.

² I would like to express my warmest thanks to Cynthia Johnson for her careful reading and linguistic amendments.

winter 968–69, Liudprand and his retinue had again to suffer: they faced critical situations such as storms, an eclipse, and an earthquake on the island of Corfu, as if nature itself was set against them. Of course, all the information Liudprand gives in his report serve to illustrate his personal narrative of sufferings since Otto I's envoy had to justify the failure of the actual objective of his mission, namely to arrange an official marriage alliance that would bring the two empires together. Yet, the bishop's account remains a valuable source if we try to understand it within the context of the movement of political agents between Byzantium and the West from c.860–1204.

Additional information about these agents of political relations also appears in the official correspondence and the letters produced and exchanged between chanceries, be they Greek or Latin. For example, thanks to these documents, the identity and ecclesiastical functions held by papal legates are well known. Of course, scholars have to be cautious in analysing these texts, as they deliver official messages and follow certain writing conventions, but they remain useful sources nonetheless.³ Personal correspondence is also extant, although rare. For example, letters written by Metropolitan Leon of Synada contain important information about the relations between Otto III and Basil II, since Leon served as Basil's envoy to Otto and to Rome and wrote during his mission. Compared to other Greek or Latin accounts during the same period, some historians have suggested a parallel between Liudprand of Cremona and Leon of Synada.⁴

Be they chronicles, letters, or direct testimonies, one has to bear in mind that descriptions of official contacts and the political agents involved were never neutral, objective accounts. Biased views are common in these sources, since the depiction of diplomatic relations was closely linked to the image rulers wanted to portray within those relations. Renown and prestige were fundamental: just as rulers display their power, real or exaggerated, their political agents and ambassadors have to reflect that power abroad. This image of superiority, even if it is not based in fact, must be made to appear real in the account an author gives of official contacts with another head of state.

In spite of these reservations, these sources are rich and enable scholars to reconstruct various aspects of the activities of diplomatic agents between Byzantium and the West. The study of these agents raises many questions. First, who were the envoys and what was their political and social background? Can we observe any changes over time with regard to these men as a result of

3 Mullett, "The Language of Diplomacy", pp. 203–16.

4 Kolditz, "Leon von Synada," pp. 509–11; Koder, "Sicht des 'Anderen'", p. 126.

geopolitical changes in the relations between Byzantium and its Latin neighbours? The end of the 11th century and the beginning of the age of the Crusades inaugurated a new era that would finally lead to the fall of Constantinople in 1204. Did this new constellation imply any change for political agents sent abroad? This chapter begins with an overview of the various kinds of persons involved in these diplomatic journeys and the main reasons for choosing those people. This will then help us to differentiate between official ambassadors leading the more prestigious embassies, other messengers carrying political or military information between the courts, and the interpreters and all other persons in the retinue of these embassies: persons whose choice and role have also to be discerned. Furthermore, I will examine the various consequences of these exchanges, not only in political terms, but also in cultural ones.

1 Diplomatic Envoys in the High Middle Ages

Recent studies have demonstrated that a significant number of ambassadors were travelling throughout the Mediterranean area during the High Middle Ages. A comparison with other travellers shows that official emissaries play a dominant role in our records about travels. In an exhaustive survey of the period 700–900, Michael McCormick has found out that 43 per cent of the 410 journeys attested during this period were indeed undertaken by ambassadors.⁵ Unfortunately, no global register for the following centuries exists to verify this data. Yet, other studies have shown that a great many political envoys were sent between Byzantium and its western partners from the 860s to the fall of Constantinople in 1204. Daniel Nerlich identified 75 diplomatic exchanges between western sovereigns (including the popes) and Byzantium in both directions from 860 to 1002, while Telemachos Lounghis has studied no less than 79 missions sent from Constantinople to various western diplomatic partners from 860 to 1095.⁶ As Karl J. Leyser rightly states, diplomacy was certainly the main channel of communication between Byzantium and the Western

5 In comparison, the second-largest category of travellers, pilgrims, only made up 13 per cent: McCormick, *Origins*, p. 434. Nevertheless, these data must be used with caution since embassies and ambassadors were certainly more frequently mentioned in the traditional narrative sources than other travellers, such as pilgrims, prisoners, or merchants.

6 Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 248–305 (for the period 860–1002); Lounghis, *Ambassades*, pp. 474–81. Both studies include the official contacts between the Patriarch of Constantinople and that of Rome.

Latin world, until the 10th century at least.⁷ Embassies and their retinues, however, remained numerous during the last century considered here.⁸

Moreover, it is important to note that as a result of political choices and of the extant documentation, the diplomatic contacts attested appear unequally distributed depending on the direction in which they were sent: 83 Byzantine envoys travelled to the courts of Western rulers between 700 and 900, while only 34 Westerners were selected for missions to Constantinople.⁹ If we limit the period to 860–900, the gap remains significant with 33 Byzantine missions versus only 5 from the Western Carolingian courts.¹⁰ Even after 900, the gap remains sizeable: Daniel Nerlich has found only 13 officials sent from Western courts (including the one of Rome) to Constantinople during the long century between 900 and 1002, while 24 are attested in the other direction.¹¹

A second aspect about the ambassadors merits closer attention. Their political and social origins show that they were part of the elite. All of them were close to the rulers they represented abroad, and sometimes they even belonged to the ruler's family, as will be discussed in further detail below. Unfortunately, although we know that they held high offices and titles, the names of a large number of these official emissaries will never be known: literary texts, be they Greek or Latin, mention them as *presbeutai* or *legati* without giving more information. As such, they are *anonymi* for us and it is quite impossible to know more about them.¹² For instance, the register drawn up by McCormick records

7 Leyser, "The Tenth Century", p. 46 also noted that during the next century, after 1095, when the so-called "age of the Crusades" began, this kind of official mission was overshadowed by the more continuous traffic of pilgrims – and of crusaders I should add – and thus that "an age of diplomacy ... gave way to an age of mass contacts."

8 See for example, Ciggaar, *Travellers*; Brand, *Byzantium*. See also the assessment proposed by Schreiner, "Geschenke", pp. 255–56.

9 McCormick, "From One Center", p. 55, although this historian underlines the fact that "the elite most intensively associated with the Carolingian ruler and the center of power probably numbered in the *hundreds*, in sharp contrast to Byzantium's two or three *thousands*": *ibid.*, p. 51.

10 McCormick, "From One Center", pp. 70–72; and *id.*, "Check List of Byzantine and Carolingian Ambassadors", although it includes Byzantine envoys sent to Rome but not the Roman and pontifical *legati* who travelled to the East. Therefore, this list has to be completed according to the final register of McCormick, *Origins*, pp. 931–64 and the list given by Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 278–291. The latter records that, between 860 and 900, 22 contacts from Byzantium to the West are mentioned in Greek and Latin sources, while 15 appear at the same time in the opposite direction.

11 This leads to a total of 46 (22 + 24) contacts from Byzantium to the West compared with 28 (15 + 13) from the Western courts to the Byzantine East from 860 to 1002, thanks to the register of Nerlich, who includes in it the contacts with Rome and the Roman delegations.

12 See Lounghis, *Ambassades*, p. 297.

no more than nine *anonymi* in the group of Byzantine ambassadors sent to the West between 860 and 900, and only one of them is mentioned as a metropolitan accompanied by another *anonymus* who is identified as a *basilikos anthrōpos*.¹³ In official letters, sometimes neither the name nor the identity of an official envoy are given, even in the last century examined here, which is generally well-documented. Thus, the Byzantine envoys as well as the Roman delegates circulating between Rome and Constantinople in 1139, and again in 1141, are mentioned but not named in the two Greek official letters written in the name of John II Komnenos and sent to Pope Innocent II, now conserved in the *Archivio Vaticano*.¹⁴

2 Byzantine Envoys Sent to the West

Some ambassadors and political agents are better known along with their political and social background. Available evidence consists of the official functions they held and, in the case of the Byzantines, of their dignities. Quite surprisingly, the first embassy sent from Byzantium to Rome in the period examined here set the tone for the composition of many later delegations. Sometime before 25 September 860, Emperor Michael III and Photios, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, sent the *spatharius* Arsaber together with the metropolitans Methodios of Gangra and Samuel of Chonai to Pope Nicholas I.¹⁵ This embassy, which represented both the emperor and the patriarch, is interesting because it was composed of a civil courtier and two high-ranking churchmen, all of whom can be considered members of the ruling elite. Although the title *spatharios* decreased in importance by the 9th century,¹⁶ other *spatharioi* were still chosen at the end of the century for other missions to Rome, such as Basil Pinakas and Euthymios.¹⁷

Other ambassadors held dignities that were superior to the *spatharios*, such as the *protospatharios* sent to Rome in 865.¹⁸ This dignity, and thus the men

13 McCormick, "From One Center", p. 71; they are the *Anonymi* 303 and 304 of his previous register in McCormick, *Origins*, p. 810 and register no. (henceforth R) 725, p. 962, sent to Rome by Leon VI in 889–91; see also Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 291.

14 Dölger, *Regesten*, nos 1320a and 1320b; Kresten-Müller, "Die Auslandsschreiben", pp. 422–29.

15 See McCormick, *Origins*, R 525, pp. 932–33 for the references; Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 275.

16 Kazdhan, "Spatharios".

17 McCormick, *Origins*, R 568 and R 573, respectively; cf. Lilie et al. (eds.), *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit* (henceforth *PmbZ*) # 20 843 and # 21 915.

18 McCormick, *Origins*, R 553 ("Michael 4"). On the *protospatharioi* employed as ambassadors, see Lounghis, *Ambassades*, pp. 320–23; and Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 116–21.

who held it, implied a high rank and conferred membership in the senate. Five *protospatharioi* again appear as envoys during the next century, including the well-known mission of the *protospatharios* Epiphánios on behalf of Romanos I Lakapénos to Hugh of Arles.¹⁹ The functions linked to this dignity are also significant. The *protospatharios* Anastasios, who was sent to Rome in 933, for example held the office of an *asekretis*.²⁰ As such, he acted as an imperial secretary, working in the official chancery; choosing him as ambassador reveals the importance of writing and written culture in diplomatic relations.²¹ But the military dimension should not be forgotten either. Thus, the *protospatharios* Paschalios, *strategos* of Langobardia, headed an important mission sent to Hugh of Arles, King of Italy, in 943. This diplomatic contact also concerned a military alliance against the Saracens, which ended, however, when Paschalios returned to Constantinople bringing Hugh's daughter Berta with him, who was married to Romanos, son of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and renamed Eudocia in the following year.²² In the middle of the 11th century, we find again a *protospatharios* involved in the contact between the two imperial courts.²³

Patrikioi and *magistroi* were also chosen as ambassadors to the West. In 869, for instance, the *patrikios* Niketas Ooryphas reached Bari where he met the Frankish King Louis II, and Nicholas Mystikos mentions that a *magistros* was sent as an envoy by Emperor Alexander to the pope.²⁴ At the end of the period under investigation here, another holder of an important dignity, the *kouropalates* Basil Mesemerios, was chosen twice to represent Byzantine interests; for the first time in Pisa in 1109 and three years later in Rome.²⁵ High dignitaries were also chosen by the Komnenoi and their successors until 1204, after Alexios I's reform of titles. Thus *sebastoi*, most of whom belonged to the ruling

19 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis* II 44, ed. Reiske, p. 661; *PmbZ* # 21 710; Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 294.

20 Theodore Daphnopates, *Letter* 1, eds Darrouzès/Westerink, pp. 36–37; Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 625. The delegation was headed still by a second person, Orestes, *protonotarios* of the Patriarch of Constantinople. A certain Leon was also an *asekretis* when he represented Michael III in Rome in 861–62: McCormick, *Origins*, R 538 (Leo 6).

21 Earlier, in 906, another *asekretis* carried out an official mission to Rome in the name of Leon VI: Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 547a; *PmbZ* # 27 468.

22 This mission and its consequences have been mentioned by various Greek and Latin sources. See the overview of these texts in Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 295–96; see also *PmbZ* # 26 279; Schreiner, “Kaiserliche Familie”, no. 5, p. 764.

23 See Lounghis, *Ambassades*, pp. 231 and 478–79 with references.

24 Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 284 and 292; and McCormick, *Origins*, R 593, p. 942. Already between September 867 and 869/70, another patrician had been sent to Louis II: McCormick, *Origins*, R 569, p. 938 (Iohannes 18).

25 Dölger, *Regesten*, nos 1245e and 1263. The story of Mesemerios illustrates the situation of *ad hoc* ambassadors who were sent abroad several times.

family, were quite often sent as envoys to various Western courts.²⁶ Finally, the *protonobelissimos* John Kataphloros led a mission to Venice in 1195 in the name of Alexios III Angelos.²⁷

Choosing a high ranking dignitary to officially represent Byzantium abroad was never an insignificant nor a disinterested choice for the *basileis* and their counsellors. The choice of envoy should be understood as a way to indicate the measure of respect accorded to the sovereign who would be visited by the dignitary in question. Thus, historians usually interpret the imperial choice of ambassador as a clear indication that, in the eyes of the *basileis*, a kind of hierarchy prevailed among the Western princes. The fact that King Hugh of Arles twice received *protospatharioi*, as seen above, while his rival Berenger II only received an envoy who held the position of a *komes kortis*, and thus certainly only the dignity of a *spatharios*, reveals that the Byzantine court regarded Hugh to be superior to Berenger.²⁸

Yet, the few examples of high-ranking dignitaries are not enough to illustrate the extent to which Byzantine political agents sent to the West were members of the elite. The high official functions they fulfilled were also relevant, even though, in Byzantium, high-ranking dignitaries were usually also high-ranking civil servants. In the first embassy mentioned above (in 860), we saw that metropolitans were chosen as political envoys, which was common during the first decades of the period. Out of 33 Byzantine envoys in McCormick's list of ambassadors for the period 860–900, ten were metropolitans, who thus make up the largest sub-group.²⁹ Choosing metropolitans as envoys was a calculated choice: they may have been sent on behalf of the emperors and/or the Patriarch of Constantinople and were usually sent to one destination: Rome (nine out of ten).³⁰ Their choice as representatives is largely explained by the relevance of ecclesiastical matters in discussions with Roman authorities.

26 See their names, and some who remain *anonymi*, in Dölger, *Regesten*, nos 1388a, 1398a, 1401, 1413, 1435, 1442, 1477, 1480, 1598, and 1639. The *protosebastos* John, along with the *protostrator* Alexios, were sent to Baldwin III of Jerusalem in 1159: Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1429.

27 Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1632.

28 Lounggis, *Ambassades*, pp. 31–12 and 321; for the source linked to the mission of 947–48, see Liudprand, *Antapodosis* VI 2, ed. Chiesa, p. 146.

29 Except for those who were *anonymi* (12), although one *anonymus* is mentioned as a metropolitan: McCormick, "From One Center", pp. 70–72.

30 The tenth was sent to Louis the German at Regensburg (Metropolitan Agatho, in 873: McCormick, *Origins*, R 624); two of the nine had to reach Rome after meeting Emperor Louis II and Empress Agilberga in southern Italy (the metropolitans Zachary of Chalcedon and Theodorus of Laodicea), but Emperor Basil I called them back mid-route: McCormick, *Origins*, R 566, p. 937 (c. August–September 867).

Furthermore, it is not surprising that the envoys sent by the patriarchs of New Rome were always members of the clergy.³¹ Also chosen by the *basileis*, they reminded their Western Christian neighbours of the common faith that united them.³² Not only were metropolitans frequently sent to the West because they were clerics, they were also chosen because they spent a great deal of time in Constantinople. As members of the *endemousa synodos* they could have been at the heart of Byzantine ecclesiastical decisions, close to the patriarch and possibly also to the emperor, sometimes even as their trusted advisers.³³ Among these metropolitans, the most well-known is Leon of Synada, mentioned above. Thanks to his correspondence, we learn that he was sent to the Apostolic See and then to the Western imperial court, notably to negotiate a matrimonial alliance with Otto III. His writings reveal that he was a prime witness and probably also a central player in the events happening in Rome during his mission.³⁴

To a lesser degree than metropolitans, bishops also led official missions to the West on behalf of the patriarch or the emperor. For example, Peter of Troas was sent to Rome together with other Byzantine ambassadors at the very end of 867, while another bishop, Lazarus, met Emperor Arnulf in Regensburg in the name of Leon VI as mentioned in the *Annales Fuldenses*.³⁵ This latter mission is interesting because it seems to have pursued a double aim: Lazarus had to discuss with Arnulf the way Byzantines and Germans would divide up the evangelization of pagan eastern Europe as well as the common threat to both empires posed by the imperial aspirations of the Dukes of Spoleto in Italy.³⁶

Until the 12th century, bishops continued to be chosen as ambassadors sent to the pope or to the German emperor.³⁷ At the same time, members of the top of the bureaucratic elite also served on diplomatic missions to Western

31 As underlined by Lounghis, *Ambassades*, p. 290, the patriarchate did not have any civil officers under its jurisdiction.

32 Sent together with laymen, these members of the Byzantine clergy acted in the shadow of the laymen, according to Lounghis, *Ambassades*, p. 294, who considers them “un élément purement décoratif du point de vue politique.” Monks were rare in this diplomatic function: see McCormick, *Origins*, R 573, p. 939; Lounghis, *Ambassades*, pp. 295, 480–81.

33 The fundamental reasons for their choice remain unknown if we read the Greek sources; see the reflections proposed by Moulet, “Personnel ecclésiastique”, pp. 340–41, 343 and 349.

34 Leo of Synada, *Letters* 1–11, ed. Pollard Vinson, pp. 2–18; Moulet, “Personnel ecclésiastique”, pp. 344–47; Kolditz, “Leon von Synada”, pp. 544–53.

35 McCormick, *Origins*, R 573, p. 939, and R 733, p. 963 with complete references; for Lazarus, see *PmbZ* # 24 282.

36 Moulet, *Evêques*, pp. 315–16.

37 Dölger, *Regesten*, nos 1218 (1102) and 1309 (1135).

sovereigns. A *Megas doux*, two holders of the title *Megas hetaireiarches*, an Eparch of the City, and even two *logothetai* of the *dromos* are mentioned in the sources acting in this capacity.³⁸

Finally, there were also Westerners residing in the Byzantine Empire and its capital, or merely travelling through it.³⁹ They may have been called ‘interpreters’ in the sources or by modern historians, but they were certainly more than that.⁴⁰ At the end of the period, a certain Benenato, the prior of the Pisan churches in Constantinople, served twice as an ambassador for the Byzantines to Pope Innocent III and to Pisa. In choosing Westerners to represent them diplomatically, the *basileis* made pragmatic choices depending on geopolitical circumstances, which had led to a growing presence of Latins within the Empire as well as an increasing number of official contacts with them.⁴¹

3 Western Ambassadors Sent to Byzantium

In the other direction, from Western courts to Byzantium, similar characteristics can be seen in the choice of political agents as well as in their function when carrying out a mission. Quite a number of Western bishops and archbishops took to the road and the sea in order to reach Constantinople; they make up nine of the 17 envoys identified by Daniel Nerlich for the 10th century.⁴² Liudprand of Cremona, Gero of Cologne, Bernard of Würzburg, and John Philagathus of Piacenza were among these envoys. Bishops and archbishops remained numerous during the two next centuries and were chosen by different courts and sovereigns. While Werner of Strasbourg (in 1028–29),⁴³ Otto of Novara (1054), Albert of Meissen (1151), Anselm of Havelberg (1136 and 1154), and Christian of Mainz (1170) were chosen by the respective German kings or emperors, the Archdeacon of Catania, Henry Aristippus, and Aitard, the Archbishop of Nazareth, were sent by Kings William I of Sicily and Baldwin III

38 See Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1442; nos 1477 and 1526; no. 1638; nos 1581 and 1587, respectively.

39 Brand, *Byzantium*, p. 100.

40 For instance: Dölger, *Regesten*, nos 1600, 1602, 1603, 1610 and 1618.

41 For Benenato, see Brand, *Byzantium*, pp. 216, 219–220 and 276. For the choice of Latins by Manuel I among his envoys sent to the West, see Magdalino, *Manuel I*, p. 222, and the examples mentioned further in this chapter.

42 Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 292–304. The first recorded embassy led by Bishop Nicholas and Cardinal John is placed in 907, but must in fact have taken place at an earlier date: McCormick, *Origins*, R 737, p. 963; in 899. Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 297 calls Liudprand the Bishop of Cremona in 949 during his first mission to Constantinople, but at that time he was only a deacon of Pavia.

43 For the date and references, see Kresten, “*Correctiunculae*”, p. 143.

of Jerusalem respectively.⁴⁴ More rarely, monks appear as envoys in the sources, such the Cistercian monk Berno on behalf of Conrad III, or the two *fratres Templi* sent by Louis VII to Manuel I.⁴⁵ In 1058, a certain monk named Mainardus also led an embassy on behalf of Pope Stephen IX.⁴⁶

This last example invites us to turn our attention to pontifical envoys. Fairly recent studies have shown how the Roman Church developed the ecclesiastical office of *legatus* during the Early Middle Ages.⁴⁷ As with other official representatives of political authority, the *legatus*' mission was temporary. While the functions held by papal *apocrisarioi* in Constantinople in the very High Middle Ages ceased to exist by the beginning of the mid-Byzantine period, Roman *legati* were frequently chosen as envoys between Old and New Rome, even in times of strained relations. For the first decades examined here, the *Liber pontificalis* provides more detailed information about the identity of these *legati* staying on the Bosphorus. Some of them were, logically, holders of bishoprics in the vicinity of Rome. Among them, Donatus of Ostia was sent twice to Constantinople while the question of the patriarchate of Photios and the rivalry between the two Romes about their objectives of evangelization and Christianization of the Balkans were on the agenda.⁴⁸ During these two embassies he was accompanied by the deacon Marinus.⁴⁹ Having served as a subdeacon at Santa Maria Maggiore, he became one of the deacons who were forerunners of the cardinal deacons of the Roman Church. He already held these offices when he was chosen for the two missions mentioned above, which, due to the conflictual geopolitical context, were only "for intrepid men". He also conducted missions to the Carolingian Emperor Charles III and to Naples to help organize the struggle against the Arabs.⁵⁰ He may have been sent a third time to Constantinople in the name of John VIII in the middle of 880, but this trip remains debated.⁵¹ After the latter's death in 882, he became

44 For an overview of the sources mentioning all of them, see Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 94–95.

45 Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, p. 97.

46 See Bayer, *Spaltung*, p. 120 and n. 27; his delegation was led by Desiderius, the future abbot of Monte Cassino.

47 See recently Rennie, *Papal Legation*, with the bibliography.

48 *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, vol. 2, pp. 165 and 180–81; these two delegations took place in 866–67 and 869–70, respectively: McCormick, *Origins*, R 559, p. 936, R 592 and R 594, pp. 941–43; *PmbZ* #21 589. On the geopolitical context, see Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, pp. 199–203; and Herbers, *Konflikt*, pp. 61–62 for the second mission.

49 McCormick, *Origins*, pp. 143–47; *PmbZ* # 24 983, also for what follows.

50 McCormick, *Origins*, pp. 144 and 146. He was then Bishop of Cerveteri and treasurer (*arcarius*) of the Roman Church.

51 This is considered hypothetical by Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 290, while Simeonova, *Diplomacy*, pp. 324–25 argues in support of the trip.

pope himself. Even though his pontificate was short, his career proves that he was clearly a member of the Roman elite. Thus, his case is revealing of the existence of a small group of Roman churchmen who maintained close relations with the Byzantine Empire.⁵²

In the perspective of the Great Palace of the *basileis*, pontifical legates were considered to be particularly important persons among all other foreign envoys hosted in Byzantium. Indeed, in the mid-10th century, the famous *Book of Ceremonies* mentions them in the chapter that describes in detail the formulaic greetings between envoys and the *logothetes tou dromou* during the first solemn encounter in the palace. Significantly, they are the only Western ambassadors mentioned in this passage, next to the Bulgarians and the eastern Muslims.⁵³ Earlier, at the turn of the 9th and 10th centuries, the so-called *Kletorogion* of Philotheos – the list of precedence of dignitaries of the imperial court – included a space for possible bishop-envoys from Rome.⁵⁴ In the same period, the new office of cardinal was created; some of the first cardinals were chosen to represent the popes to the Byzantine emperors. From 1000 to 1200, cardinals were particularly numerous among the legates. Although the most famous was Humbert, Cardinal Bishop of Silva Candida, in 1054, cardinals were regularly chosen as ambassadors after that date, notably by Pope Alexander III.⁵⁵ Once again, the close relations between the popes and their legates are revealed in these latter examples; Roman cardinals were certainly the closest and most eminent advisors of the popes. In a broader perspective, whether they were cardinals or not, Roman envoys were close to the person they represented as they acted as the pope's alter ego.

Yet, other sovereigns who sent ambassadors to the *basileis* were also often close to their chosen ambassadors, which can be interpreted politically. The *Annales Hildesheimenses*, for instance, explain that the two envoys sent by Otto III to Basil II were chosen *ex latere regis*. In the mid-12th century, the choice of Evrardus de Barris, legate of King Louis VII, is easily understood, since his family remained solid allies of the Capetians throughout the century.⁵⁶ One of the major criteria for choosing a diplomatic representative was the

52 He also had direct connections with Patriarch Photios: Schreiner, "Geschenke", no. 11, p. 273.

53 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis* II 47, ed. and trans. Dagron et al., II, 47, pp. 346–57, esp. 346–47.

54 Oikonomides, *Listes de préséance*, pp. 162–63 and n. 129; this list expressly mentions two Roman legates, one bishop named Nicholas and a cardinal named John. Their mission took place in 899: McCormick, *Origins*, R 737, p. 963; rather than in 907, as Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 292, has claimed.

55 Ohnsorge, *Legaten*; Bayer, *Spaltung*.

56 On these two examples, see Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 156–57 with references and other examples.

confidence between an envoy and the person he represented abroad; and this was true for both Western ambassadors sent to Byzantium and vice versa. For example, in 869, Emperor Louis II decided that Count Suppo would represent him in Constantinople, as Suppo was related to Empress Angilberga.⁵⁷ He was accompanied by another Carolingian count named Evrardus, who served as Seneschal (*praepositus mensae*).⁵⁸ When Louis II sent Auprand to meet Basil I in 871, the letter accompanying this envoy referred to him as *fidelem ac familiarem hominem nostrum*.⁵⁹

There was thus another category of people chosen by Western rulers as ambassadors: men with high-ranking civil functions. Counts and dukes were frequently sent abroad for diplomatic reasons. Some remain unnamed like in 972, when Gero of Cologne concluded a matrimonial alliance between the two imperial courts *cum ducibus et comitibus* as stated by Hugh of Flavigny.⁶⁰ Some are better known, such as: Count Manegold of Werden in 1028–29,⁶¹ Baldwin of Mons in July 1098,⁶² Ramon de Moncada in 1176,⁶³ and the Duke of Austria, Henry Jasormigott, who led a mission for Frederick Barbarossa in 1166, an understandable choice since Henry had married a Comnenian princess.⁶⁴ Perhaps less prestigious but no less important in the administrative organization of the political entities they represent, chancellors and notaries also took to the road to meet with Byzantine authorities. While some chancellors are attested by name before the 12th century, their number increases afterwards. In the Kingdom of Jerusalem, William of Tyre provides evidence of this during his third stay in Constantinople (1179–80),⁶⁵ while the cases of Christian of Mainz on behalf of Frederick I, and Henry Aristippus acting for William I of Sicily, are well known.⁶⁶ As already mentioned, the role of literacy and the importance of written documents (official and private letters, credentials,

57 See the remarks by McCormick, "From One Center", p. 59 n.47; Bougard, "Les Supponides", pp. 390, 401.

58 McCormick, *Origins*, R 597, p. 943 and R 599, pp. 943–44. Suppo was a *primus concofanariorum* (standard-bearer).

59 *Chronicon Salernitanum*, c. 107, ed. U. Westerbergh, Stockholm 1956, p. 120; McCormick, *Origins*, R 609, p. 946; *PmbZ*, # 20 701.

60 Nerlich, *Gesandtschaften*, p. 302.

61 Wolfram, "Gesandtschaft", pp. 163 n.11, and 167–68; Kresten, "Correctiunculae", pp. 143–44.

62 Lilie, *Crusader States*, pp. 17, 27, 39–40, 42.

63 Ciggaar, *Travellers*, pp. 304–05, who presents him as a "lord and master of Tortosa".

64 Rhoby, "Byzanz und Österreich", pp. 591, 603–07.

65 Brand, *Byzantium*, pp. 24–26.

66 Lamma, *Comneni*, vol. 1, pp. 236–40 and vol. 2, pp. 207–08, 227. For other as well as previous examples of *cancellarii* sent to Constantinople, see Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 122–23, 127–28.

scripta commonitoria, official treaties concluded in the form of *chrysobulla*, etc.) certainly explains the presence of such officers. The presence of notaries also reveals the importance of written culture, as does the choice of pontifical legates in 1155 and, at the very end of the 12th century, the papal notary Albertinus.⁶⁷ Even a judge, such as Burgundio of Pisa, served as an envoy, reinforcing the intellectual profile of the Westerners received for diplomatic purposes in Byzantium.⁶⁸

Finally, it should be noted that the political and commercial interests of the maritime republics of Pisa and Genoa were usually defended by consuls of these cities. In 1168, Burgundio was accompanied by the consul Alberto Bulsi,⁶⁹ while six years earlier two other consuls, Cocco Griffi and Ranieri Bottaci, were received by Emperor Manuel I.⁷⁰ Contacts were also numerous between Venice and Constantinople and started earlier than those with Pisa and Genoa. The tradition of the Doge's son staying in the Byzantine court was still in evidence in 1184, when Pietro Ziani, son of the Doge Domenico, was received in Constantinople with two other members of high-ranking Venetian families, Domenico Sanudo and Enrico Dandolo.⁷¹

Before becoming Doge of Venice, Dandolo was sent twice to Constantinople for diplomatic and commercial reasons. He thus represents those envoys who led two and even three missions. Even though, in this period, we cannot really speak of a diplomatic corps with professional ambassadors, it should be noted that some envoys came close to this idea by repeatedly being called to head a mission. Some cases have already been mentioned (Donatus and Marinus at the end of the 9th century; William of Tyre or Anselm of Havelberg in the 12th century); some have remained famous to this day, such as Liudprand of Cremona, while others have been forgotten.⁷² Out of all the many reasons for choosing an envoy, most importantly they had the confidence of the sovereign they represented.

67 "camere nostre notarius" as attested by Innocent III: Innocent III, *Register I*, no. 353, eds. O. Hageneder/A. Haidacher, *Die Register Innocenz' III.*, vol. 1: *Pontifikatsjahr, 1198/1199*, Graz-Cologne 1964, p. 528; and Innocent III, *Register II*, no. 199(208), eds. O. Hageneder/W. Maleczek/A.A. Strnad, *Die Register Innocenz' III.*, vol. 2: *Pontifikatsjahr, 1199/1200*, Vienna 1979, p. 379. One should note that in the same year, 1198, the protonotary Theodore Aulikalamelos was sent to Venice on behalf of Alexius III: Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1647.

68 Classen, *Burgundio*, pp. 12–13, 24–29 and 76.

69 Lilie, *Handel*, p. 480.

70 Lilie, *Handel*, p. 458. For some Genoese cases, see Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, p. 130.

71 Lilie, *Handel*, p. 549; Brand, *Byzantium*, pp. 196–197.

72 Notably the case of Genoan Amico de Murta, or that of Louis VII's chancellor, Barthelemy: Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 232–38.

Moreover, confidence in an envoy could also work in the other direction: Byzantine emperors occasionally asked for certain people to be sent (again) as envoys to their court. For example, during the Tetragamy crisis, Romanos I Lakapenos asked Pope John x to send a certain Bishop Jacob, who had already been to the city and met the emperor.⁷³ This case illustrates both the cause and consequence of envoys conducting multiple official missions, and thus the knowledge and confidence between envoys and sovereigns in sending as well as receiving them. In another example, Count Alexander of Gravina was a high-ranking official who first acted on behalf of the German emperors Conrad III and Frederick I, and then in the name of the Byzantine Empire, from the 1140s to the 1170s.⁷⁴ Alexander was one of those Latins whose presence in Constantinople and connections with the Latin Western world explain their being chosen as representatives of the *basileis*. Furthermore, connections between some Western ambassadors, such as Liudprand of Cremona, and Byzantium authorities, and even “international” networks of envoys linking Byzantium and the West, could appear in the texts, with two recent studies attempting to demonstrate it.⁷⁵

4 Merchants, Interpreters, Members of the Retinue, Hostages and Other Intermediaries

While envoys were numerous between Byzantium and Venice in both directions, and later also with the Pisans and the Genoese, and while commercial negotiations were important for the Byzantine authorities, historians have regularly noticed that merchants were rarely chosen as official ambassadors. The case of Liutefred, a “rich merchant of Mainz” according to Liudprand, who acted as an ambassador for King Otto I in 949, is the exception that confirms the rule.⁷⁶ During the 12th century, economic issues were the main subject Italian ambassadors had to deal with. At least one Genoese merchant, Baldovino Guercio, was involved in the Byzantine-Genoese exchanges of that period, acting as an envoy for his city but also defending Byzantine interests

73 Nicholas Mystikos, *Letters*, no. 53, eds R.J.H. Jenkins/L.G. Westerink, *Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 6) Washington, D.C. 1973, p. 290; *PmbZ* # 22659 (Iakobos).

74 Magdalino, *Manuel I*, p. 222; Chalandon, *Comnène*, vol. 2, pp. 169–70, 338–39, 344–47 and 536.

75 Drocourt, “Liens et réseaux de personne”; Small, “Constantinople Connections”.

76 Liudprand, *Antapodosis*, VI, 4, ed. Chiesa, p. 146; *PmbZ* #24 749 (Liutfrid).

in the West.⁷⁷ It is almost certain that official envoys were present in the main marketplaces (*fora*), notably those in Constantinople, and thus were able to take advantage of commercial opportunities as Liudprand did in 949.⁷⁸ To take another example, in 885–86, a Byzantine envoy came to Venice for “imperial business” and discovered that some of the missionary Methodius’ disciples had been sold as slaves to Jewish traders. He decided to ransom them in Venice and send them back to Basil I.⁷⁹ In other circumstances, such as the famous arrival of Princess Olga in Constantinople in the mid-10th century, merchants or *pragmateutai* were part of an official delegation and were received in the Great Palace.⁸⁰

Yet, not much is known about the other members of the envoys’ retinues. They usually remain *anonymi* in the extant sources. Some exceptions confirm the rule, such as that of Constantine Manasses in 1160–62, showing that a high-ranking intellectual could be selected as a member of such a Byzantine retinue. Nevertheless, when reading his account, we learn that he did not even know the exact purpose of the embassy in which he was involved.⁸¹ In 968, Liudprand informs us that 25 men accompanied him during his long stay in Constantinople,⁸² and this number was rather on the low end, since delegations usually contained between 25 and 50 men.⁸³ Of course, important delegations could count more participants, notably in the case of personal visits foreign sovereigns paid to Constantinople to meet the emperor there.⁸⁴

In addition to just numbers, however, Liudprand furnishes interesting details on the role played by some of these men in his entourage. For example, a cook was brought along for the adventure.⁸⁵ While Liudprand was complaining about the bad treatment he suffered, he mentioned this cook, the only man

77 See the references in Dölger, *Regesten*, nos 1527b, 1549d and 1549e; Brand, *Byzantium*, pp. 23, 208–09, 212; Magdalino, *Manuel I*, p. 222, with the mention of another Latin envoy, Count Alexander Raynieri Strambo, who took part in the mission to the West with Baldovino Guercio in 1178–79; the latter was rewarded by Manuel I for his loyal service with estates “in fief”: *ibid.*, 222 “in feudi beneficium”.

78 As he confesses it in 968: Liudprand, *Legatio*, 55, ed. Chiesa, p. 212.

79 McCormick, *Origins*, R 700, p. 959.

80 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis* II 15, ed. and trans. Dagron et al., pp. 142–43.

81 *Hodoiporikon*, vv. 122–29, quoted by Aerts, “A Byzantine Traveller”, pp. 178–80.

82 Liudprand, *Legatio*, 34, ed. Chiesa, p. 201.

83 See the analysis of McCormick, *Origins*, p. 139, to be compared with Anna Komnena’s account: *The Alexiad* X. vii, 3, ed. Leib, vol. 2, pp. 213–14.

84 Amalric of Jerusalem needed ten galleys to reach Constantinople with his retinue in 1171: William of Tyre, *Chronicle* xx 22, ed. Huygens, p. 942.

85 Liudprand, *Legatio* 46, ed. Chiesa, p. 207. Cooks, grooms, and bakers also took part in a Byzantine embassy sent to Frederick I Barbarossa: Niketas Choniates, *History*, ed. Van Dieten, p. 410.

of his retinue permitted to leave the lodging assigned to the delegation. As the cook did not speak Greek, he could only communicate by movements of his hands or head, a detail that highlights the linguistic aspect of these diplomatic contacts. In the same passage, Liudprand states that another man in his entourage played a key role: his *grecologon, id est Graecae linguae gnarum*. This information is crucial, confirming that men with official envoys were also chosen for their language skills. However, it is also true that several interpreters worked at the Great Palace on behalf of the Byzantine court, yet knowledge of Greek was another criterion when choosing Western ambassadors. Some of them were renowned for their language skill, such as Anastasius Bibliothecarius at the very beginning of the period, or, for the last century, Henry Aristippus or Burgundio of Pisa.⁸⁶ Among the men who accompanied the latter during his second stay in Constantinople was his own son Hugolinus,⁸⁷ which shows that kinship was also taken into consideration when ambassadors had to compose their retinue. Logically, persons who were close to official envoys may have gone overseas with them, such as monks when their abbot was chosen to undertake a mission.⁸⁸ Last but not least scribes and secretaries were part of these delegations, for example Leon of Synada mentions the death of his *grapheus* during a mission.⁸⁹

Added to these members of the retinue, one may think of other persons involved in diplomatic contacts, who have not yet been mentioned: hostages are among them. Their role must not be compared to modern examples, since hostages were usually chosen for a limited time as guarantees to secure truces or with the intention to conclude a peace treaty. Sons or kinsmen of foreign sovereigns – be they Westerners or not – had frequently been chosen to play this role at the Byzantine court. The rank of these hostages could have been important, and, conversely, in 1097, Alexios I Komnenos was ready to send his own son, John as hostage to Godfrey of Bouillon. It was then a significant choice in order to calm the tensions between Latins of the First Crusade and the Byzantines: John was a nine-year-old boy, but he was also a *porphyregennetos*.⁹⁰

86 The knowledge of Greek among Latin envoys seems to have been improving between the 9th and 12th centuries: Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 169–81.

87 He died during this stay: Classen, *Burgundio*, p. 102.

88 See the example proposed by McCormick, *Origins*, p. 424.

89 Leo of Synada, *Letters* 7 and 11, ed. Pollard Vinson, p. 10, ll. 11–12 and p. 16, l. 23; Drocourt, “Mort de l’ambassadeur”, p. 77.

90 Albert of Aachen, *History* II, 15, ed. S.B. Edgington, *Historia Ierosolimitana. History of the Journey to Jerusalem*, Oxford 2007, pp. 84–85; Shepard, “‘Father’ or ‘Scorpions’?”, p. 93, and its references (on n.116) to other hostages chosen by Alexios among his relatives, and sent to the Latins in May 1097.

Alexios could not have chosen a person closer to him, and his decision appears thus as a true sign of confidence between him and Godfrey. At the end of the following century, other hostages appear in Latin and Greek sources when Isaac II concluded an agreement with Frederick Barbarossa, in the framework of the Third Crusade. A Latin chronicler details the rank of the Byzantines who had to play this role to guarantee the engagements of logistic aid proposed by the emperor to Barbarossa. Here again, we find certain relatives of Isaac among them.⁹¹ But the Greek account of Niketas Choniates explains that some of the judges of the *velum*, who were to be sent, disobeyed the emperor's will and "they entombed themselves in holes and corners of other homes" to escape their responsibilities.⁹²

Already in September 1108, when the Norman Bohemond militarily failed in his attack on the western Byzantine territories and had to negotiate peace with Alexios, he asked the latter that "hostages drawn from illustrious figures be surrendered to him" during the direct meeting between the two sovereigns. Alexios agreed and sent four men to Bohemond's camp. Among them was a certain Adralesstos who understood the "Keltic language".⁹³ But two others, Marinos Neapolites and the "famously courageous Frank Roger", are of particular interest for our purpose. They are presented by Anna Komnena as "both intelligent and well versed in the Latin customs". It is clear that for the emperor they were his men of confidence, as were other Latin counsellors around him at that time. A third one of the same political circle must be added here, named Peter Aliphas. All three appear among the final signatories of the treaty concluded a few days later between Bohemond and Alexios, and the most striking circumstance may be that they had already tried to plot against Bohemond in the past, of course at the behest of Alexios.⁹⁴ Marinos was not only linked to the most important lineage of Naples, he had also obtained the Byzantine

91 *Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzugs Kaiser Friedrich I* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum n.s., 5), Berlin 1928, pp. 1–115, here p. 65. They were 18 hostages, notably Isaac's nephew Andronikos, and three of his cousins: Brand, *Byzantium*, p. 186.

92 Niketas Choniates, *History*, ed. Van Dieten, p. 411, trans. Magoulias, p. 226. This treaty is the so-called "Peace of Andrianople", see Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1603.

93 *The Alexiad* XIII. IX, 1, ed. Leib, vol. 3, p. 117, and for what follows.

94 *The Alexiad* XIII. XII, 28, ed. Leib, vol. 3, pp. 138–39. On these three men and all the other signatories, see Malamut, *Alexis I^{er}*, pp. 417–22, who interprets their presence as a sign how far the court of Alexios was "westernized"; on Marinos, see Shepard, "The Emperor's 'Significant Others'", p. 137, who also insists on the key role of Maurus, Archbishop of Amalfi, as papal legate during this diplomatic encounter between Alexios and Bohemond (pp. 138 and 142). On the so-called "treaty of Deabolis/Devol", see Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1243.

dignity of *sebastos*.⁹⁵ He and his two diplomatic companions offer us a precise, though temporary, image of who could have been “diplomatic intermediaries” other than envoys, members of the retinue or even hostages, between Byzantium and the West.

5 Power, Influence, Immunity and Cultural Consequences

High-ranking officials and dignitaries close to the sovereign they represented both embodied and enjoyed authority. In addition to what can be called “grand embassies”, some missions were more secret and/or have left few traces in the extant sources. Distinguishing between different levels of envoys – from the ambassador empowered to negotiate and even conclude a treaty to the “simple” messenger – is necessary but often difficult to establish with certainty.⁹⁶ Furthermore, some envoys had to deal with “on-the-spot decisions and swift actions.”⁹⁷ This fact was recognized at the time, as can be seen in the treatise *Peri Presbeōn*, a Middle Byzantine text: while ambassadors needed to have a reputation for “piety,” this document recommends testing them before their departure, to establish “how [they] should use [their] judgment” during the mission. This advice demonstrates what could be called the discretionary powers of ambassadors, and not only those considered here.⁹⁸ We must also examine the diplomatic role played by some “trouble-shooters” between Byzantium and the West. Thus the role played by Tatikios, the trusty servant of Emperor Alexios I, during the First Crusade has recently been analysed.⁹⁹ This story highlights that official representatives had to take decisions involving both peace and war, and that there was a constant interplay between centre and periphery, which was conceived of as an essential quality of Byzantine diplomacy.

Besides making swift decisions on occasion, ambassadors also had to possess another quality, which was a real part of their influence: a mastery of rhetoric and languages. While this aspect has been demonstrated for Byzantine ambassadors,¹⁰⁰ it also seems to be valid for Western envoys since both had to make use of persuasion in order to convince others. One of these

95 On his profile and his role between Amalfi and Constantinople, see Martin, “De l’usage des dignités impériales”, pp. 543–45.

96 Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 309–19.

97 Shepard, “Masters of Improvisations”, p. 357; Shepard, “Trouble-Shooters”.

98 Shepard, “Trouble-Shooters”, p. 692 with the references to the *Peri Presbeōn*.

99 Shepard, “Trouble-Shooters”, pp. 694–96; Shepard, “Masters of Improvisation”, p. 358.

100 Koutrakou, “*Logos and pathos*”.

trouble-shooters with linguistic skills was Constantine Doukas. As duke of the Dalmatian coastline he was sent to Ancona in September 1173 when the city was under German siege. In the Latin sources, he is described as eloquent and persuasive, speaking both Greek and Latin.¹⁰¹ Although accounts are scarce for the previous centuries, the ability of Byzantine envoys to use the Latin language is well attested in the 12th century. William of Tyre states that one of the Byzantine envoys sent to the King of Jerusalem in 1160, was the *maximus palatinorum interpretum* of Constantinople.¹⁰² Ten years later, the interpreter Gi(l)bertus was sent to Rome and Genoa with other prestigious envoys and, as already mentioned, Latins were also employed as ambassadors during the reign of Manuel I Komnenos and afterwards.¹⁰³ In the opposite direction, there were envoys coming from Venice or Grado who spoke Greek, and were well aware of territorial questions concerning the northern part of the Adriatic Sea.¹⁰⁴

In addition to the question of how the envoys communicated, it is important to know what official powers they were granted. Usually the envoys did not have the permission and power to conclude formal written treaties with the authorities they visited. This could delay or even stop negotiations, as in the case of Tanto, a Genoese ambassador who lacked the authority to conclude a treaty with Isaac II, as the latter informed the Genoese who then had to send two adequately empowered representatives.¹⁰⁵ In other cases we find that official envoys overstepped the bounds of their commission, as did the two pontifical legates sent to Constantinople in 860, the bishops Zachary of Anagni and Radoald of Porto.¹⁰⁶ In the framework of relations between Byzantium and Genoa, there is the well-known case of Constantine Mesopotamites sent to northern Italy in 1188–92.¹⁰⁷ For the senders, such actions may have been interpreted as a sort of betrayal by their own representatives. When corruption was the reason for overstepping their bounds, envoys were subject to severe penalties by their rulers, as the example of Basil Xeros, corrupted by the money of Roger II of Sicily, shows.¹⁰⁸ This case also reminds us of the circumstance that instructions, though undoubtedly existing, have only rarely come down to

101 Shepard, "Trouble-Shooters", pp. 708–09.

102 William of Tyre, *Chronicle* XVIII 30, ed. Huygens, p. 855; Gastgeber, "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung", p. 106; Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, p. 397.

103 See Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1496; Gastgeber, "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung", pp. 110 and 112 n.37; Magdalino, *Manuel I*, p. 222.

104 Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 194–97.

105 Brand, *Byzantium*, p. 209; Dölger, *Regesten*, no. 1606.

106 Rennie, *Papal Legation*, pp. 144–48.

107 Brand, *Byzantium*, p. 100.

108 John Kinnamos, *Epitome*, III, 2, ed. A. Meinecke, *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome Rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis* (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn 1836, pp. 91–92.

us for this period. In 879, a *Commonitorium* written by the pontifical chancery and linked to the mission of two legates in Constantinople is one source of this sort, and we also might refer to what Liudprand suggests about his *praeceptum* bearing his sovereign's seal.¹⁰⁹ For the second half of the 12th century, a few Latin documents provide examples of detailed *instructiones* relating to diplomatic and commercial contacts between Pisa, Genoa, or Venice and Constantinople.¹¹⁰ It is also from this period that we have the first complete safe-conducts for political envoys between Byzantium and the West.¹¹¹

Although envoys enjoyed official powers, their occupations were not limited to the tasks mentioned in their official instructions. Gathering political or military information or just spying was usually on their agenda, too. The treatise *Peri Presbeōn* recommends being very careful with envoys, notably those coming from a country "greatly superior to us", to whom "our wealth" should not be displayed, but rather more "the number of our men, the polish of our weapons, and the heights of our walls."¹¹² Members of the retinue should be kept under control the text asserts: "their attendants ... should be kept under surveillance to keep them from obtaining any information by asking questions of our people." Conversely, there are cases of ambassadors who were told to give vague answers to certain questions.¹¹³ Oral or written reports by ambassadors were of crucial importance in the relations between Byzantium and the West. Byzantine envoys, as well as Western ones, are usually considered prime sources for the knowledge the Byzantine court had of its Western partners, as seen in works such as *De administrando imperio*.¹¹⁴ Thanks to Latin sources and the general political tension between Byzantium and the West during the long 12th century, it seems that some Latin envoys played a key role in constructing a negative image of the Byzantine court and of the empire's weakness.¹¹⁵

Even though a mission could be dangerous, immunity was not merely an official definition found in different juridical texts from the *Digesta* to the 13th

109 McCormick, "Lettre diplomatique", p. 141; Liudprand, *Legatio* 26, ed. Chiesa, p. 198.

110 Among others: instructions to Amico de Murta in 1168: Balard, *Romanie*, pp. 28–29; Enrico Dandolo's instructions to Amico Navigaioso and Andrea Donato in 1197: Brand, *Byzantium*, pp. 201–02; instructions to Pisan envoys: Brand, *Byzantium*, pp. 215–16.

111 Kresten, "Geleitbrief".

112 *The Anonymous Byzantine Treatise on Strategy*, c. 43, ed. G.T. Dennis, *Three Byzantine Military Treatises* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 25), Washington, D.C. 1985, pp. 10–134, here pp. 124–25.

113 See Koder, "Sicht des 'Anderen'", p. 115 (with references).

114 See, among others studies, Malamut, "Image de l'Italie." On the other side, the envoy Sigefred, Bishop of Parma, may have been an informant of Liudprand of Cremona: Drocourt, "Political Information", p. 106.

115 Drocourt, "Political Information", pp. 106–11.

century.¹¹⁶ Occasionally envoys died during their mission; usually this was not due to political circumstances but to their age or the difficulties inherent in travels in the Mediterranean area. The spectacular death of a pontifical legate in 1182 is an exception, which seems to be the result of the general massacre of Latins in Constantinople and not a specific attempt against this man as an envoy.¹¹⁷ Of course, the strained relationship between Byzantium and some of its Western partners could also have psychological consequences, rather than physical ones, for political agents. They could experience various methods of intimidation, as Liudprand explains in 968, such as the refusal to receive the gifts he and his sovereign offered, or the refusal to read their sovereign's letter, up to isolating the ambassador and his attendants or delaying their reception by the emperor. In certain cases, violence, whether symbolic or real, was involved, as in 867, when three papal envoys were badly received on the border between Bulgaria and the empire. The Byzantine frontier guard "branded them with countless wrongs, ... struck the heads of the horses on which they were mounted", and forced them to stay there "for 40 days" before returning to Rome.¹¹⁸

One final dimension has to be underlined in this overview of political envoys. As often stated, diplomatic relations fostered cultural exchange, not only for the relations and the period considered here. Some ambassadors played a major role in this cultural interaction, which must be understood in a broad sense.¹¹⁹ Certainly, embassies travelling between two distant places were also a means to discover and, perhaps, understand different cultures or ways of life. Liudprand's testimony is important in this sense. Although, in 968, he criticized many aspects of Byzantine culture – the "undrinkable wine of the Greeks", the dishes sprinkled with this "awful fish sauce" (*garum*), the "long-haired, tunic-wearing, long-sleeved king of the Greeks", etc. – his perspective reveals how diplomatic encounters were, above all, cultural ones.¹²⁰ If we believe him, the effeminate and mendacious nature of the Byzantines was entirely represented by the garments of this "idle people [who] strut around in purple".¹²¹ Of course, in such a polemic text his views are biased, although

116 See Drocourt, "Mort de l'ambassadeur", p. 85 for the references.

117 Drocourt, "Mort de l'ambassadeur", pp. 86–87, 97 and 99.

118 *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, vol. 2, p. 165, trans. Davis, pp. 242–43.

119 See Drocourt, "Ambassadors", notably pp. 87–90 on this topic.

120 Liudprand, *Legatio* 11, 20, 32, 40, ed. Chiesa, pp. 192, 196, 201, and 205; Hoffmann, "Diplomatie".

121 Liudprand, *Legatio* 54, ed. Chiesa, p. 211, trans Squatriti, p. 272.

another Latin author in 1063 asserts that three Byzantine envoys appeared *purpura induti* and were received by the anti-pope Honorius II (Cadalus).¹²²

Conversely, the sending of political envoys was also a chance to better understand the cultural differences between Byzantium and the West. As already mentioned, some ambassadors were distinguished intellectuals, such as Anastasius Bibliothecarius at the end of the 9th century, or Anselm of Havelberg, Burgundio of Pisa, Henry Aristippus, and Wibald of Stavelot during the 12th century. Intellectuals were also sent in the other direction, and Greek sources provide numerous examples of them serving as official envoys, even though these men remain less well known than their Western counterparts. For example, Theodore Daphnopates presents the two envoys sent by Romanos I to Pope John XI in 933 as “men of profound piety and wide scholarship.”¹²³

Furthermore, the gifts associated with diplomatic exchanges and offered by envoys were also a major means to circulate intellectual, artistic, or cultural objects.¹²⁴ Greek manuscripts moving from East to West and translated into Latin by some of these scholar-envoys were also a subject for diplomatic negotiations, notably when matrimonial alliances were concluded.¹²⁵ Other goods were also involved in these exchanges, such as luxury products brought by ambassadors in order to illustrate the superiority of the court sending them. The role of mosaics and the influence of Byzantine artists in Italy, through the role of envoys such as Nicholas of Grottaferrata and Desiderius of Monte Cassino, must be underlined in this regard.¹²⁶

6 Conclusion

The agents of political relations between Byzantium and the West were certainly numerous between 860 and 1204, but they also played a key role in the political and diplomatic spheres that fostered closer relations between the Byzantine Empire and its various Western partners. Whether “Greeks” or

122 Benzo of Alba, *Ad Heinricum* II 12, ed. H. Seyffert, *Benzo von Alba, Sieben Bücher an Kaiser Heinrich IV.* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, 65), Hannover 1996, p. 224.

123 Theodore Daphnopates, *Letter 1*, eds Darrouzès/Westerink, p. 37, here we quote the translation in Koutrakou, “*Logos and Pathos*”, p. 9.

124 For an overview, see Schreiner, “Geschenke”.

125 Drocourt, *Diplomatie*, pp. 715–24. The arrival of Theophano, wife of Otto II, in the West had significant cultural and intellectual consequences: see Ciggaar, *Travellers*, pp. 206–11 and 325.

126 See the hypothesis of Parenti, *Grottaferrata*, pp. 215–16; on Desiderius, see Ciggaar, *Travellers*, pp. 257–59. See also the chapter of Dominik Heher in this volume.

“Latins,” they were part of the elite of the state or political entity they represented abroad. This is even more true if we consider the ambassadors proper, distinguished from other “diplomatic” travellers, like the many members of the retinues, interpreters, etc. Even though these travellers also had political responsibilities, the extant documentation remains more or less silent about them; only a few signs allow modern historians to grasp their precise role and function. This is not the case for ambassadors and official envoys, even though many of them likewise remain *anonymi* in the sources. They usually held important functions and/or dignities when they carried out a mission, demonstrating that they were part of the political and social elite surrounding the sovereign they represented. They also enjoyed official powers that led them to play a major role during and at the end of negotiations. They were protected by official immunity, which was rarely challenged. Furthermore, ambassadors were at the heart of intellectual and cultural relations between the West and Byzantium. As such, they can be considered cultural brokers. While the criteria for selecting ambassadors followed basic and constant rules, some sovereigns involved in these official contacts also knew how to adapt these rules in light of new circumstances. For example, in the 12th century, the fact that the *basileis* chose people of Latin origin as envoys is revealing, even though this new familiarity did not prevent the deviation of the Fourth Crusade and the Western attack on Constantinople and its empire in 1204.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anna Komnena, *The Alexiad*, ed. B. Leib, *Anne Comnène, Alexiade*, 3 vols, Paris 1967.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis*, ed. J.J. Reiske, *De Cerimoniis aulae byzantinae libri duo*, 2 vols (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn 1829–30; eds. G. Dagron/D. Feissel/B. Flusin/C. Zuckerman/M. Stavrou, *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des cérémonies*, vol. 3/2 (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 52/3), Paris 2020.
- Leo of Synada, *Letters*, ed. M. Pollard Vinson, *The Correspondence of Leo, Metropolitan of Synada and Syncellus* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 23), Washington, D.C. 1985.
- Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis*, 3 vols, 2nd ed. Paris 1955–57; trans. R. Davis, *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes* (Translated Texts for Historians, 20), Liverpool 1995.
- Liudprand, *Antapodosis*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liudprandi Cremonensis. Opera omnia* (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio mediaevalis, 156), Turnhout 1998, pp. 1–150.

- Liudprand, *Legatio*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liudprandi Cremonensis. Opera omnia* (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio mediaevalis, 156), Turnhout 1998, pp. 187–218; trans. P. Squatriti, *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*, Washington D.C. 2007.
- Niketas Choniates, *History*, ed. J.L. van Dieten, *Historia* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 11/1–2) Berlin-New York 1975; trans. H.I. Magoulias, *Ō City of Byzantium. Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Detroit 1984.
- Theodore Daphnopates, *Letters*, eds J. Darrouzès/L.G. Westerink, *Théodore Daphnopates, Correspondance*, Paris 1978.
- William of Tyre, *Chronicle*, ed. R.B.C. Huygens, *Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon*, 2 vols (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 63–63A), Turnhout 1986.

Secondary Literature

- Aerts, W.J., “A Byzantine Traveller to One of the Crusader States”, in K. Ciggaar/H. Teule (eds.), *East and West in the Crusader States. Context-Contacts-Confrontations*, Leuven-Dudley 2003, vol. 3, pp. 165–221.
- Balard, M., *La Romanie génoise*, 2 vols, Rome-Paris 1978.
- Bayer, A., *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 2002.
- Bougard, F., “Les Supponides: échec à la reine”, in F. Bougard/L. Feller/R. Le Jan (eds.), *Les élites au haut Moyen Âge: crises et renouvellements*, Turnhout 2006, pp. 381–401.
- Brand, C.M., *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*, Cambridge 1968.
- Chalandon, F., *Les Comnène. Études sur l'empire byzantin au XI^e et au XII^e siècles*, vol. 2: *Jean II (1118–1143) et Manuel I^{er} Comnène (1143–1180)*, Paris 1912.
- Ciggaar, K., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations*, New York-Cologne 1996.
- Classen, P., *Burgundio von Pisa. Richter, Gesandter, Übersetzer* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1974/4), Heidelberg 1974.
- Dölger, F./Wirth, P., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 2: *Teil, Regesten von 1025–1204*, 2nd ed., Munich 1995.
- Dölger, F./Müller, A.E./Beihammer, A., *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, part 1/2: *Regesten von 867–1025*, 2nd ed., Munich 2003.
- Drocourt, N., “Al-Andalus, l'Occident chrétien et Byzance. Liens et réseaux de personnes autour des évêques Recemundo et Liutprand de Crémone: quelques hypothèses”, in P. Sénac (ed.), *Le Maghreb, al-Andalus et la Méditerranée au Moyen Âge*, Toulouse 2007, pp. 147–69.
- Drocourt, N., “Passing on Political Information between Major Powers: the Key Role of Ambassadors between Byzantium and its Neighbours during the Middle Byzantine Period”, *Al-Masāq. Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean* 24 (2012), 91–112.

- Drocourt, N., "La mort de l'ambassadeur. Faits, causes, enjeux (7^e–12^e s.)," *Revue des études byzantines* 71 (2013), 67–104.
- Drocourt, N., *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore. Les ambassadeurs étrangers dans l'Empire byzantin des années 640 à 1204*, 2 vols, Leuven 2015.
- Drocourt, N., "Ambassadors as Informants and Cultural Brokers between Byzantium and the West (8th to 12th c.)," in F. Daim/C. Gastgeber/D. Heher/C. Rapp (eds.), *Menschen, Bilder, Sprache, Dinge. Wege der Kommunikation zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen*, vol. 2: *Menschen und Worte*, Mainz 2018, pp. 81–93.
- Gastgeber, C., "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei unter den Komnenen und Angeloi," in M. Balard/E. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur: contacts, relations, échanges*, Paris 2005, pp. 105–22.
- Herbers, K., "Rom und Byzanz im Konflikt. Die Jahre 869/870 in der Perspektive der Hadriansvita des Liber pontificalis," in W. Hartmann/K. Herbers (eds.), *Die Faszination der Papstgeschichte. Neue Zugänge zum frühen und hohen Mittelalter*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 2008, pp. 55–69.
- Hoffmann, T., "Diplomatie in der Krise. Liutprand von Cremona am Hofe Nikephoros II. Phokas," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 43 (2009), 113–78.
- Kazhdan, A., "Spatharios," in A. Kazhdan *et al.* (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, New York-Oxford 1991, vol. 3, pp. 1935–36.
- Koder, J., "Die Sicht des 'Anderen' in Gesandtenberichten," in O. Engels/P. Schreiner (eds.), *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten*, Sigmaringen 1993, pp. 113–29.
- Kolditz, S., "Leon von Synada und Liudprand von Cremona. Untersuchungen zu den Ost-West-Kontakten des 10. Jahrhunderts," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95 (2002), 509–83.
- Koutrakou, N., "Logos and Pathos between Peace and War: Rhetoric as a Tool of Diplomacy in the Middle Byzantine Period," *Thesaurismata* 25 (1995), 7–20.
- Kresten, O., "Correctiunculae zu Auslandsschreiben byzantinischer Kaiser des 11. Jahrhunderts," *Aachener Kunstblätter* 60 (1994), 143–62.
- Kresten, O., "Der Geleitbrief – Ein wenig beachteter Typus der byzantinischen Kaiserurkunde. Mit einem Exkurs: Zur Verwendung des Terminus Sigillion in der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei," *Römische historische Mitteilungen* 38 (1996), 41–83.
- Kresten O./Müller, A.E., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Specimen einer kritischen Ausgabe," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86/87 (1993–94), 402–29.
- Lamma, P., *Comneni e Staufer. Ricerche sui rapporti fra Bisanzio e l'Occidente nel secolo XII*, 2 vols, Rome 1955–57.
- Leyser, K., "The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships," in D. Baker (ed.) *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, Edinburgh 1973, pp. 29–63.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)*, Amsterdam 1984.

- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096–1204*, Oxford 1993.
- Lilie, R.-J./Ludwig, C./Pratsch, T. et al. (eds.), *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit, 867–1025*, 9 vols, Berlin-Boston 2013.
- Lounghis, T., *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident: depuis la fondation des Etats barbares jusqu'aux croisades (407–1096)*, Athens 1980.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993.
- Malamut, E., “Constantin VII et son image de l'Italie”, in E. Konstantinou (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1997, pp. 269–92.
- Malamut, E., *Alexis I^{er} Comnène*, Paris 2007.
- Martin, J.-M., “De l'usage des dignités impériales en Italie (fin du VIII^e–début du XII^e siècle)”, in *Mélanges Cécile Morrisson* (Travaux et Mémoires, 16) Paris 2010, pp. 533–48.
- McCormick, M., *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce, A.D. 300–900*, Cambridge 2001.
- McCormick, M., “La lettre diplomatique du premier millénaire vue de l'Occident et l'énigme du papyrus de Paris”, in M. Balard/E. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur: contacts, relations, échanges*, Paris 2005, pp. 135–49.
- McCormick, M., “From One Center of Power to Another: Comparing Byzantine and Carolingian Ambassadors”, in C. Ehlers (ed.) *Places of Power – Orte der Herrschaft – Lieux de Pouvoir*, Göttingen 2007, pp. 45–72.
- Moulet, B., *Évêques, pouvoir et société à Byzance (VIII^e–XI^e siècles). Territoires, Communautés et individus dans la société provinciale byzantine*, Paris 2011.
- Moulet, B., “Le personnel ecclésiastique au service de la diplomatie mésobyzantine”, in A. Becker/N. Drocourt (eds.), *Ambassadeurs et ambassades au coeur de l'activité diplomatique. Rome-Occident médiéval-Byzance (VIII^e s. avant J.-C.–XII^e s. ap. J.-C.)*, Metz 2012, pp. 333–49.
- Mullett, M., “The Language of Diplomacy”, in S. Franklin/J. Shepard (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 203–16.
- Nerlich, D., *Diplomatische Gesandtschaften zwischen Ost- und Westkaisern, 756–1002* (Geist und Werk der Zeiten, 92), Bern 1999.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Die Legaten Alexanders III. im ersten Jahrzehnt seines Pontifikats (1159–1169)*, Berlin 1928.
- Oikonomidès, N., *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles*, Paris 1972.
- Parenti, S., *Il monasterio di Grottaferrata nel Medioevo (1004–1462). Segni e percorsi di una identità*, Rome 2005.
- Rennie, K.R., *The Foundations of Medieval Papal Legation*, Basingstoke-New York 2013.
- Rhoby, A., “Byzanz und ‘Österreich’ im 12./13. Jahrhundert: Mythos und Realität”, in A. Speer/P. Steinkrüger (eds.), *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*, Berlin-Boston 2012, pp. 589–610.

- Schreiner, P., "Diplomatische Geschenke zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen ca. 800–1200: Eine Analyse der Texte mit Quellenanhang", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 251–82.
- Schreiner, P., "Die kaiserliche Familie: Ideologie und Praxis im Rahmen der internationalen Beziehungen in Byzanz", in *Le relazioni internazionali nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 58), Spoleto 2011, pp. 735–73.
- Shepard, J., "'Father' or 'Scorpions'? Style and Substance in Alexios's Diplomacy", in M. Mullett/D. Smythe (eds.), *Alexios I Komnenos*, Belfast 1996, pp. 68–132.
- Shepard, J., "Trouble-Shooters and Men-on-the-Spot: the Emperor's Dealings with Outsiders", in *Le relazioni internazionali nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 58), Spoleto 2011, pp. 691–723.
- Shepard, J., "Imperial Troubleshooters – Cultural Representatives and Master of Improvisations", in A. Becker/N. Drocourt (eds.), *Ambassades et ambassadeurs au coeur des relations diplomatiques. Rome-Occident médiévale-Byzance* (VIII^e s. av. J.-C.–XII^e s. ap. J.-C.), Metz 2012, pp. 351–69.
- Shepard, J., "The Emperor's 'Significant Others'. Alexios I Komnenos and his 'Pivot to the West'", in S. Tougher (ed.) *The Emperor in the Byzantine World*, Abingdon-New York 2019, pp. 135–55.
- Simeonova, L., *Diplomacy of the Letter and the Cross. Photius, Bulgaria and the Papacy, 860s–880s*, Amsterdam 1998.
- Small, A.C., "Constantinopolitan Connections: Liudprand of Cremona and Byzantium", in N.S.M. Matheou/Th. Kampaniaki/L.M. Bondioli (eds.), *From Constantinople to the Frontier. The City and the Cities*, Leiden-Boston 2016, pp. 84–97.
- Wolfram, H., "Die Gesandtschaft Konrads II. nach Konstantinopel (1027/1029)", *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 100 (1992), 161–74.

Monastic Travel between the Byzantine Empire and the West: The Italo-Greek *Brokers*, 10th–13th Century

Annick Peters-Custot

The monastic ‘rule’ of *stabilitas loci* was not cast in stone, unlike what has commonly been thought. Monks were not prohibited from travelling all around the world, especially between the eastern and western Mediterranean. Throughout the Middle Ages, their regular journeys helped keep alive the links between these areas, which had existed ever since they were both part of a common political whole, the Roman Empire. While political, linguistic, and ecclesiastical differences may have slowly widened the gap between these two regions, they did not stop monastic travel, which continued throughout the three centuries considered in this volume. In particular, one cannot overemphasize the fact that the so-called “Schism of 1054” never generated new obstacles to travel. This event certainly intensified the production of polemical writings, above all from the Byzantine side, but they never affected everyday contact nor the deep awareness of shared faith in the contact zones within Christianity.¹ For example, the common veneration of saints lasted long after 1054 and can be understood as a sign of the deep feeling that Christianity was similar to Christ’s seamless robe.² Monks and, especially, Byzantine monks, served as cultural brokers between the Byzantine and the Western worlds.³

To understand this period, a few essential elements need to be taken into account. First, one substantial factor favoured continuity: during these three centuries, there were a great many places where Byzantine monks could meet members and representatives of institutions from Western Christianity. Constantinople, “Queen of the Cities”, was a cosmopolitan place where people

- 1 For a new approach to the 1054 event, see Kaplan, “La place du schisme de 1054”; Bayer, *Spaltung der Christenheit*. For scholarly debates on the event, see Ryder, “Changing Perspectives on 1054”; and Kolbaba, “1054 Revisited: Response to Ryder”.
- 2 Paschalidis, “Un mode de relation entre Rome et Constantinople”. On the hymnography, see D’Aiuto, “L’innografia”; Follieri, “Santi occidentali”; Peters-Custot, “Neilos the Younger and Benedict”.
- 3 The present chapter does not address the particular case of monks travelling for diplomatic reasons, which are covered in Nicolas Drocourt’s chapter in this volume.

from southern Europe, above all Italians from the great commercial cities of Venice, Pisa, and Genova, gathered. Yet these contacts were not primarily monastic ones. Mount Athos, on the contrary, was the site of the Latin monastery of St John founded by Amalfitan people as early as the 9th century, about which a great deal has already been written.⁴ Nevertheless, the documentary evidence of actual exchange and communication between Western and Byzantine monks through this Athonite channel is poor, too.⁵ The main contact zone between Byzantine and Western monks was therefore southern Italy, which we shall define as the regions of the Italian Peninsula extending from Rome to the extreme end of Calabria and Apulia, and the island of Sicily. As soon as Late Antiquity this area had been the main monastic bridge by which the West became familiar with numerous Eastern ascetic experiences, either through physical meetings or through Latin translations of Greek texts such as those produced by St Jerome's circle. This area remained the key spot for exchange thanks to the political presence of the Byzantine Empire until the end of the 11th century and thanks to Italo-Greek monasticism, which survived there throughout the Middle Ages and preserved contact with some eminent poles of Western Christianity, such as Montecassino, Naples and, above all, Rome.⁶ As we will see, the Eternal City still exerted a great attractive power over Byzantine monks.

A second key feature of this period involved two important historical changes, one of these being a result of the First Crusade: the creation of Frankish eastern states in the 12th century.⁷ This event triggered and changed the patterns of pilgrimage, partially shifting the routes for pilgrims and monks around the Mediterranean and establishing a new zone of contact between Byzantium and the West. There, Western Latin Christians were then in direct contact, *in situ*, with Eastern Christianity and previously unknown groups of Eastern Christians (Coptic, Syrian, and even Ethiopian).⁸ Byzantine (and Armenian) monks were no longer, *de facto*, the only incarnation of exotic Eastern Christianity. Thus, the means through which one could have direct contact with eastern society changed at the end of this period.

4 See Pertusi, "Monasteri e monaci italiani all'Athos nell'Alto Medioevo"; Falkenhausen, "Il monastero degli Amalfitani sul Monte Athos"; Delouis, "Saint Benoît de Nursie à Byzance".

5 See *infra*, p. 462.

6 Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome*; Burgarella, "Presenze greche a Roma"; Peters-Custot A., *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-byzantine*; ead., "Le monachisme byzantin de l'Italie méridionale"; Nordhagen, "Constantinople on the Tiber".

7 At the end of the 11th century, the crusading movement was based upon an earlier massive growth in the practice of pilgrimage to the Holy Land and to Constantinople.

8 Rouxpetel, *L'Occident au miroir de l'Orient chrétien*.

The other change was the new conditions that emerged to alter the perception of Byzantine monasticism. The three centuries examined here are those which prepared and accomplished the Pontifical Reform movement, also called the Gregorian Reform after Pope Gregory VII (1073–85). This multifaceted and long-lasting process promoted a vision of reform as a return to the roots of Christianity which were, in Western eyes, the early monastic and ecclesiastical forms of the Byzantine and Greek-speaking world. We must not forget that, in addition to actual encounters between the Byzantine world and the West, Byzantine monks and ascetic saints were viewed within a global vision of reform – and in the common imaginary – as a way to regain the original purity of Christianity. Byzantine monasticism was a reference point both in the shared imaginary and in real life, and, in the 10th to 13th centuries, the most practical way to encounter that tradition was in southern Italy, with its native Byzantine monks and holy men coming from other parts of the empire.⁹

1 Southern Italy as a Contact Zone between Byzantine and Western Monasticism?

1.1 *Byzantine Monasticism in Southern Italy*

In southern Italy, the presence of Byzantine monasticism was the direct inheritance of the political domination of the Eastern Roman Empire starting from Justinian's reign, but also of a migration wave that had led Syrian and Egyptian monks to Sicily and Calabria, fleeing the Arab conquests of the 7th to 8th centuries. The various parts of Byzantine Italy (the Exarchate of Ravenna, the isles of Sardinia and Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia) did not experience the same transformations between the 6th and the 12th centuries.¹⁰ During this period, only a small part of southern Calabria and Apulia remained continuously part of the Byzantine Empire. The Exarchate of Ravenna gradually separated from the empire over the 8th century, and Sicily was under Islamic rule from the 9th century onwards. In all these regions, however, the Byzantine legacy lived on, whose monastic expression is obvious.¹¹ Since the 8th century, the

9 Déroche, "Les variantes italiques de la folie en Christ"; Efthymiadis, "D'Orient en Occident mais étranger aux deux mondes"; Peters-Custot, "La *vita* di san Nicola di Trani".

10 Martin, "L'Italie byzantine (641–1071)".

11 Peters-Custot, "Le monachisme byzantin de l'Italie méridionale", pp. 176–81, 197–218, 275–306 and 569–76. The Byzantine inheritance in Italy has been thoroughly studied in recent years. Note the following volumes published by the research programme "L'héritage byzantin en Italie, VIII^e–XII^e siècles" at the École française de Rome: See *L'héritage byzantin en Italie I–IV*.

autonomous regions of the late Exarchate had split into various political entities that were often dominated by an attractive capital city (Rome, Ravenna, Venice, Naples) with a multitude of cultures and institutions. Eastern monasticism thus had the conditions for its survival. Moreover, it was revitalized by an influx of people fleeing troubles in the eastern provinces, such as the Persian invasion, the Arab conquest, and the iconoclastic controversy. The arrival of religious manuscripts from these eastern regions reflects these migrations, among which there were certainly many Eastern monks.¹² In early medieval Rome, the Greek monastic tradition remained culturally significant, despite small numbers of monks, until the end of the 10th century. Eastern monasticism was the expression of Byzantine culture and spirituality, fed by the Eastern liturgy and often appreciated and encouraged by the popes themselves until the 11th century.¹³ Later studies have shown the importance of Rome in the relationships between Eastern and Western Christianity throughout the Early Middle Ages.¹⁴

In Naples, a city that frequently claimed its Roman identity (in law) and its Byzantine inheritance, we find a sort of “pseudo-Hellenism”¹⁵ in the middle of the 10th century. This was a cultural marker for the elite to set themselves apart and had some noticeable consequences in the monastic *milieu* of the city.¹⁶ Some monasteries, which claimed to be “Greek” but were in fact Latin, were characterized in some charters by their submission to “St Basil’s Rule”.¹⁷ In Sicily, after the Islamic conquest, which cut off the island from the Byzantine Empire from the beginning of the 9th century on, monasticism is mainly known through hagiographical texts whose heroes are holy Sicilian monks fleeing the Saracens’ persecutions and seeking safety in Calabria or further north.¹⁸ These migrations attest to the continuity of Byzantine monastic life in Sicily – and probably also of a Christian Greek-speaking population – above all in the mountainous part of the island, the Val Demone, the origin of many Greek monks migrating towards the Italian Peninsula according to the

12 See Ronconi, “La circulation des ouvrages patristiques grecs”.

13 Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome*.

14 Chiesa “Tradizioni e traduttori a Roma nell’alto medioevo”; Faraggiana di Sarzana, “Gli insegnamenti dei Padri del deserto”; Burgarella, “Presenze greche a Roma”.

15 This is reflected in the use of Greek capital letters to sign notarial deeds in Latin, for example.

16 Martin, “Hellénisme politique”.

17 Granier, “Les moines ‘grecs’ de Saints-Serge-et-Bacchus et Saints-Théodore-et-Sébastien”.

18 Prior to this period, monasticism is poorly documented. See the *typikon* (foundation deed) of the monastery of St John the Baptist of Pantelleria, dated to the 8th century, in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, eds. Thomas/Constantinides Hero, vol. 1, pp. 59–66.

Italo-Greek *Lives*.¹⁹ The Byzantine presence lasted longer in this region as did the Greek language and Byzantine monasteries, in particular San Filippo di Fragalà.²⁰ These monasteries gained a second lease of life under the Normans, who controlled their development for political reasons and for territorial domination.²¹

Thus, in the middle of the 10th century, Calabria and southern Apulia as parts of the Byzantine Empire only contained Byzantine monasteries. For the 10th to 13th centuries, Italo-Greek monks are fairly well known, thanks to a vigorous hagiographical tradition reflecting the strength of Byzantine monasticism in this part of southern Italy.²² By contrast, in Rome, Byzantine monasticism had left only residual traces at the very same time, and in Naples it had disappeared behind the mask of Neapolitan pseudo-Hellenism mentioned above.²³ In these Latin cities, however, and in their monastic extension in Montecassino, Byzantine monks travelled to, and met with, their Western peers in rather large numbers.

1.2 *Italo-Greek Monks Go North, 950–1000*

In this monastic history, there is one event whose importance and impact has not yet been fully appreciated: the massive migratory wave of Greek people from the south (Sicily and southern Calabria) toward the north of the peninsula and beyond in the 970s and 980s. Greek communities created a Greek-speaking enclave in southern Basilicata²⁴ and a stronger Greek presence can be found in the Salento and in Taranto,²⁵ as well as in Salerno,²⁶ Rome, and the Lazio region,²⁷ in Naples, and even further afield in the Iberian Peninsula and in Germany. Of course, these communities were not purely monastic ones, and they tended to have specific secular institutions such as the 'Judge of the

19 Da Costa-Louillet, "Saints de Sicile et d'Italie méridionale".

20 See Brodbeck/Di Giorgi/Falla Castelfranchi (eds.), *San Filippo di Fragalà. Monastère grec de la Sicile normande*.

21 New research in archaeology and art history has uncovered this evidence. See *Monasteri italo-greci*.

22 Peters-Custot, "La vie quotidienne"; see also the volume Crostini/Angeli Murzaku (eds.), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy*; and above all Efthymiadis, "L'hagiographie grecque d'Italie".

23 Martin, "Hellénisme politique".

24 Peters-Custot A., "Les communautés grecques de Basilicate".

25 Martin, "Une origine calabraise pour la Grécia salentine?"; Falkenhausen, "Taranto in epoca bizantina".

26 Peters-Custot, "L'identité d'une communauté minoritaire".

27 Falkenhausen, "Il monachesimo greco nel Lazio medievale"; ead., "Greek Monasticism in Campania and Latium".

Greeks' attested in some Latin deeds in Taranto and Salerno, or the Greek *chōrepiskopos* who took specific care of Byzantine communities.²⁸ Greek monks are nevertheless well documented among these populations. In addition, Greek monks also crossed the frontiers of Byzantine Italy, either to travel or to settle permanently.

Encounters with Latin lay people and monks are also well documented, and thus the presence of Greek monks spread basic knowledge about Byzantine monasticism in the Western Church.²⁹ Greek monks were signing Latin charters in the late 10th century.³⁰ At the same time, Neilos the Younger, one of the main Italo-Greek saints, travelled as far as the Lombard principality of Capua as well as Rome and Montecassino,³¹ remaining quite a while in each place. At the end of the 10th century (970–80s), Italo-Greek monasteries were founded, sometimes by local landlords, in particular Lombard ones, such as: San Nicola di Gallocanta near Salerno, Santa Maria di Grottaferrata near Rome (Neilos the Younger's last foundation), and San Pietro of Pontecorvo in southern Lazio. Here again, the hagiographical texts celebrate monastic *eparchiai* (*eparchia* of Merkurion or of Latinianon³²), that is to say, regions devoted to monastic life and following the model of the early beginnings of organized ascetism in the Egyptian and Syrian deserts during the heroic era of Anthony the Great, Sabas, and Pachomios. Byzantine monasticism was thus strengthened by this expansion that brought it into direct contact with the Latin Church. Even though the relationship between the patriarchates of Rome and of Constantinople was often unstable in this period, it seems that this never affected local relationships between churches and communities outside Byzantine Italy.³³

28 Peters-Custot, "L'identité d'une communauté minoritaire"; and Martin, "Κίνναμος Ἐπίσκοπος-Cennamus episcopus".

29 For example Kalhous, "East Meets West, West Meets East?".

30 See the famous Greek subscription at the end of a Latin diploma dated 986, from the archives of Cava Abbey (near Salerno): *Codex Diplomaticus Cavensis*, no. 382, eds. M. Morcaldi/M. Schiani/S. De Stephano, Milan-Naples 1875, vol. 2, pp. 233–34. This donation of a church, made by two Lombards to "Saba, presbiter et abbas", and to "Cosma, presbiter, qui fuerunt natibi ex genere grecorum", bears the recipients' subscriptions in the form: "Σάβας ἀμαρτολὸς ἡγούμενος // Ἐγὼ Κόσμος πρεσβύτερος". Sabas has been identified as St Sabas of Collesano, a famous Italo-Greek monk, whose presence here at this time is confirmed by his *Life*: see Borsari, *Il monachesimo bizantino*, p. 73.

31 See *Life of Saint Neilos of Rossano*. ed. and trans. Capra et al. For his visit to Montecassino, see Rousseau, "La visite de Nil de Rossano au Mont Cassin"; and Peters-Custot, *Neilos the Younger and Benedict*. See also Kalhous, "East Meets West, West Meets East?".

32 Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-byzantine*, p. 106.

33 Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-byzantine*, pp. 538–45.

Coexistence was also common in Byzantine Italy, where the imperial administration did not concern itself with liturgical and ecclesiastical diversity, as is often the case with empires.³⁴ This *convivencia* was limited to certain areas; these communities were dispersed throughout several culturally homogeneous regions. In Calabria and southern Apulia, there were Greek-speaking lay people living along with flourishing Byzantine monasticism such as in Rossano; and in most of Longobardia, named “the Catepanate of Italy” from the end of the 10th century, the Latin inhabitants had a Roman priest although bishoprics tended to be controlled by the emperor’s agents. In this “Latin area” Byzantine monks gathered in strategic cities, above all Taranto, which had a large Greek community,³⁵ and Bari, the capital of the Catepanate.³⁶ They also gathered in several Byzantine monasteries,³⁷ such as San Pietro all’Isola Maggiore, San Bartolomeo, and San Pietro, called a *basilikē monē* (“imperial monastery”) that was, the latter, directly subject to the Byzantine Emperor’s authority.

As we have seen, the establishment of Byzantine monastic communities followed the Greek expansion of the late 10th century in Basilicata, Salerno, and Rome, resulting in a more nuanced cartography of monasticism, with new Greek zones. Nevertheless, this cartography became permanent under Norman rule; a map of the distribution of monasticism in the 12th century would not differ much from that of the Byzantine era. Yet, the Norman period introduced two major differences: first, the expansion of Byzantine monasticism to the island of Sicily, under Norman control; and second, the slow and partial penetration of Latin monasticism into the Greek-speaking regions of southern Italy (southern Apulia, Calabria), first imported by Benedictine Norman abbots³⁸ and then by the introduction of the Cistercian Order.³⁹ Overall, however, the Norman conquest did not greatly change the coexistence and contacts between monastic institutions that had existed previously. Byzantine monasticism prospered under Norman protection and under Hauteville rule, and that form of protection was certainly inspired by the Byzantine model of the *basileus*. The Italo-Greek Church, especially the Italo-Greek monasteries, remained in close contact with the Byzantine Empire, perhaps even closer than under Byzantine rule. Similarly, the Norman conquest did not affect the Italo-Greek monastic

34 Peters-Custot, “Convivencia between Christians”.

35 Falkenhausen, “Taranto in epoca bizantina”.

36 Falkenhausen, “Bari bizantina”. Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie méridionale post-byzantine*, pp. 65–67.

37 Lunardi/Houben/Spinelli (eds.), *Monasticon Italiae*, vol. 3, pp. 309–10.

38 Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie méridionale post-byzantine*, pp. 268–89 and maps pp. 601–02.

39 Peters-Custot, “Clairvaux et l’ordre cistercien”.

way of life, nor its culture, practice, or liturgy; they remained attached to their Byzantine identity and to traditional forms of ascetic life, according to the Italo-Greek *typika*⁴⁰ and other extant sources.⁴¹ As a result, the use of the terms “Byzantine” or “Italo-Greek” for this monasticism is certainly justified until the beginning of the 13th century (and even after); but calling them “Basilian” is clearly not supported by the evidence, as we will see below.

Thus, in a way, until the middle of the 13th century, Italo-Greek monastics remained the most active “brokers” between the Byzantine world and the West, even though these communities were no longer within the Byzantine Empire. Moreover, they held this role for a long time, which explains why, even as late as the 12th century, a great number of Western monks continued to travel to southern Italy when they were looking for eastern inspiration for their own reform movements.

This network of Byzantine go-between monks was a physically stable one. Yet there was also a moving Byzantine monastic group of brokers: that of Byzantine monks visiting Rome, which continued to be seen as the holy centre of Christendom.

2 Rome: The Privileged Destination for Byzantine Monks⁴²

Byzantine monks’ travels to Rome have already been the subject of numerous studies.⁴³ Therefore, I will offer only a general summary of those results here. Among the almost hundred *Lives* written in Greek from the 8th to the 12th century, the main character’s travel to Rome is never an insignificant choice. When going on a pilgrimage,⁴⁴ travel to Rome was above all an opportunity to build prestige and notoriety for a previously unknown but ambitious monk. For

40 *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, eds. Thomas/Constantinides Hero, vol. 2, pp. 621–36 (San Filippo di Fragalà (12th century)), pp. 637–48 (San Salvatore di Messina (12th century)). See also, for San Nicola di Casole: Omont, “Le *typikon* de S. Nicola di Casole”.

41 Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie méridionale post-byzantine*, pp. 266–306.

42 The following part is a brief summary of Delouis/Peters-Custot, “Le voyage de Rome dans la fabrique des saints byzantins”.

43 Malamut, *Sur la route des saints byzantins*, pp. 316–17; McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy*, pp. 211–36; Kaplan, “Les saints en pèlerinage à l’époque mésobyzantine”.

44 Sometimes this pilgrimage was aimed at but never carried out, as in the case of Michael the Synkellos in the 9th century, see: *The Life of Saint Michael the Synkellos*, ed. and trans. M.B. Cunningham (Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 1), Belfast 1991; or the *Life of Saint Lazarus the Galesiot*, ed. H. Delehay, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. 3 (BHG 979), Brussels 1910, pp. 508–88.

example, there was Blasios of Amorion, who left Constantinople as an anonymous monk, but upon his return met the patriarch and the emperor himself, Leon VI (886–906), and lived four years at the prestigious Constantinopolitan monastery of Stoudios.⁴⁵ When travel to Rome was impossible, meeting monks from the city could serve as a substitute. This was the case for St Luke the Younger, who decided to enter the ascetic life when two Roman monks stayed in his home on their way to Jerusalem. He left with them to Athens, where he entered a monastery to take on the “Little Habit”. After a while, two other monks, who came back to Rome from Jerusalem, paid him a visit and he seized this opportunity to take the “Great Habit” from them. The entire monastic life of this saint-monk is framed by Roman monks.⁴⁶ From that time on, Luke displayed prophetic charisma and, even though he never went to Rome, the city played an important part in the construction of his sanctity and in the legitimation of his status as a holy man. However, by the 11th century, for Cyril Phileotes,⁴⁷ Rome was less a destination than the motivation for a long, dangerous, and in itself ascetic, travel: it was very far and too unknown by the potential audience of a Byzantine hagiographical work. In sum, the Eternal City had become less necessary for constructing a saint-monk's life.

Among all the hagiographic texts describing the lives and deeds of holy Italo-Greek monks from the end of the 8th century to the end of the 12th century, only two of the protagonists did not go to Rome.⁴⁸ Rome was a privileged

45 *Life of Saint Blasios of Amorion*, ed. H. Delehay, *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov. 4 (BHG 278), Brussels 1925, pp. 657–69.

46 *Life of Saint Luke the Younger*, ed. D.Z. Sophianos, *Ὁσιος Λουκάς. Ὁ βίος τοῦ ὁσίου Λουκά τοῦ Στεριώτου*, Athens 1989; trans. C.L. and W.R. Connor, *The Life and Miracles of Saint Luke of Steiris* (The Archbishop Iakovos Library of Ecclesiastical and Historical Sources, 18), Brookline, Mass. 1994.

47 *Life of Saint Cyril Phileotes*, ed. and trans. E. Sargologos, *La vie de Saint Cyrille le Philéote moine byzantin* († mo) (Subsidia hagiographica, 39), Brussels 1964.

48 There are 12 *Lives* (four in Latin, eight in Greek) of Italo-Greek saints. Among the following list of Latin and Greek *Lives* of Italo-Greek monks from the 10th to the 13th century, a * indicates those which mention a journey to Rome: for the *Lives* written in Latin: Gregory of Cassano* (around 930–1002), BHL (=Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina) 3671; Simeon of Trier* (around 990, †1st June, 1035), BHL 7963; Vitalis from Castronuovo* († 994), BHL 8697; Luke of Armento, BHL 4978. For the *Lives* written in Greek: Gregory Dekapolites* (around 780/90–841), BHG 712; Elias the Younger* (823–903), BHG 580; Elias the Speleotes* (860/70–960), BHG 581; Phantinos the Younger (c.902–c.974), BHG nov. Auct 2366z; Christophoros of Collesano* and his son Makarios* (10th century), BHG 312; Sabas of Collesano*, son of Christophoros (c.950–c.995), BHG 1611; Leo-Luke from Corleone* (10th century), BHG 4842; Neilos the Younger* (910–1004), BHG 1370. More details can be found in Peters-Custot/Delouis, “Le voyage de Rome dans la fabrique des saints byzantins”.

destination for wandering Byzantine monks coming from southern Italy. By comparison, only one of these Italo-Greek monks went to Constantinople (Gregory of Agrigento).⁴⁹

The main motive proclaimed, as for all Byzantine monks, was pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, sometimes with a deferent visit to the pope as well, but this is rare and secondary to the story. Beyond devotion, there was also the expression of a deep attachment to Rome's status as one of the patriarchates that constituted the ancient Church's pentarchal organization. It is not a coincidence that, frequently, these wandering monks travelled along a patriarchal network, from one to the other. This is the case, for example, with the journeys of Simeon of Trier and of Gregory of Agrigento. In both texts, the first in Latin, the second in Greek, the narrative discourse recreates the pentarchal network through the saint's peregrinations. Gregory of Agrigento's *Life*, probably written during the 9th century,⁵⁰ describes a *Wandermönch* circulating from Sicily to Alexandria and from Jerusalem to Antioch where he met the patriarch of each See, before going to Constantinople at the behest of the Byzantine patriarch, and finally to Rome, where he was able to interview the pope himself. According to Marie-France Auzépy,⁵¹ the cities visited were not only pilgrimage destinations; as described by a Greek monk writing in Rome in the perilous context of the growing distance between the Eastern and Western churches, they played an essential part in advocating the return to the Church's pentarchal ideal and form of government.

One century later, the same pentarchal value given to the diverse destinations of a wandering Italo-Greek monk can be read in a *Life* written in Latin by a German abbot and pilgrim to Jerusalem. Shortly after 1035, Eberwinus, the Abbot of Saint-Martin in Trier, wrote the *vita* of a Greek monk whom he had met during his journey to Jerusalem and who then became his pilgrimage companion. This monk was Simeon, born around 990 in Syracuse in Islamic Sicily. He had travelled all around the Mediterranean and France before finding his final refuge in the Roman Porta Nigra as a recluse.⁵² Eberwinus' description of

49 Elias the Younger and Phantinos the Younger tried to reach Constantinople but failed and died on the road. Neilos the Younger refused the proposal to take over as head of a Constantinopolitan monastery: *Life of Saint Neilos of Rossano*, c. 66, ed. and trans. Capra et al., pp. 202–03.

50 The events themselves are dated to the 7th century.

51 Auzépy, "Les moines et l'errance à Byzance", p. 249.

52 Haverkamp, "Der heilige Simeon". The son of a Byzantine civil servant (or a soldier), he left Sicily at the age of seven, following his father on a trip to Constantinople, and further to Jerusalem, where he specialized in helping the pilgrims. He later appears on Mount Sinai where he eventually became a monk. After a few years he left his monastery to collect some money that the Duke of Normandy pledged to offer to St Catherine. His journey

Simeon's travels is unreliable in a few instances and some errors can perhaps be attributed to his geographical and political misconceptions. The Western Patriarchate, mentioned in one sentence, seems to be only a prerequisite so that all the five main cities of universal Christianity can be mentioned. Nevertheless, a global vision of a united Christianity that was what remained of the Roman Empire can be seen in this hagiographical text.

Other accounts confirm the place of Rome as one of the five Christian patriarchates in the eyes of Byzantine monks⁵³ and according to the Church's most ancient tradition. However, even though these *Lives* were written in very different contexts and periods, they are coherent with the way the Papacy wanted to be seen at this time, according to many biographical notes on individual popes in the *Liber pontificalis*. For example, the *Life* of Pope Hadrian II states that in 868, the pope gathered together many monks coming from the four other patriarchates for a common banquet: "cuncti famuli Domini, videlicet Hierosolimitani, Antiocheni, Alexandrini ac Constantinopolitani."⁵⁴ This listing, ordered by increasing importance of the patriarchal Sees, expresses the superiority of the See not mentioned explicitly, the Patriarchate of Rome, and the universality of the Papacy as the only point of union for all Christianity: an ideological meaning, if not an imperial one. For the Papacy at this time, nothing could better manifest the universal dimension of Rome than the fact that it was the only cosmopolitan city where Christians from all regions and all languages and liturgical traditions could gather. This detail partially explains why several popes dedicated ecclesiastical foundations to Greek communities in Rome during the 8th and 9th centuries.⁵⁵ In 1054, even at the highpoint of

was quite disturbed by events, and he successively went to Cairo, Antioch, and Belgrade, where he was stopped as he headed to Constantinople. We have later references that he was in Rome, and then Limoges and Rouen, France, his destination. Yet he was disappointed because the Duke of Normandy had died and his successor refused to honour his father's obligations. We later find Simeon in Jerusalem again, and finally in Trier.

53 Let us add the example of Elias of Enna (Sicily), one of these Italo-Greek monks who had the opportunity to meet the pope, who is referred to in Elias' *Life* as "the man who is holding the tiller of the church of the Romans": *Life of Saint Elias the Younger*, c. 36, ed. G. Rossi-Taibbi, *Vita di Sant'Elia Giovane* (Istituto siciliano di Studi bizantini e neoellenici. Testi, 7), Palermo 1962, p. 24 whereas, in the same text, Emperor Leon VI (886–906) was holding "the *basileia* of the Romans": *Ibid.*, c. 66, p. 42. On the sense of "Roman" here, see Peters-Custot, "Between Rome and Constantinople".

54 *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, vol. 2, pp. 176–77.

55 See: Pope Paul I (757–67) and S. Silvestro: "Hic sanctissimus presul in sua propria domu monasterium a fundamentis in honore sancti Stephani, scilicet martyris atque pontificis, necnon et beati Silvestri, idem pontificis et confessoris Christi construxit [...] Ubi et monachorum congregationem constituens grece modulationis psalmodie cynovium esse decrevit ...": *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, vol. 1, p. 464 l. 11–p. 465 l. 5; Pope Paschal I

tensions between Rome and Constantinople, Pope Leo IX rejoiced in a letter to Patriarch Michael Keroularios about the many Greek monasteries in the Eternal City.⁵⁶ Their presence was intended to convince Keroularios that both Greek and Byzantine Christians were welcome under papal jurisdiction, but also of the universal nature of the Papacy.

The significance of Rome as a destination changed at the end of the 10th century; more precisely, in addition to the usual devotional motivations (pilgrimage and meeting with the pope), travel to the city took on a new aspect for political reasons, linked to the renewal under the Ottonian emperors. To understand this, let us return to the migratory wave of the 970s–80s. The cause for this wave is generally considered to be the Islamic conquest and occupation of Sicily. Yet in fact, this migration was multifaceted with two main elements: first, a large migration of people belonging to multiple social groups who settled permanently in Basilicata, Taranto, and Salerno; and a second group consisting primarily of monks and ecclesiastical elites, whose social and intellectual level was high enough to give them access to the popes and Western emperors in Rome. The Islamic conquest may justify the first wave of immigrants, but cannot explain the second, which sought proximity with the powerful. As holy men, these Byzantine wandering monks used the privilege of *parrhēsia* (free speech) to rulers who were claiming to wield sovereignty, whether Lombard, pontifical or imperial, in the area between Naples, Rome, Montecassino, and Salerno. For example, there was Sabas of Collesano, who was a counsellor first to the Lombard prince of Salerno, then to the Western Emperor Otto II (973–83) and who died in the presence of the emperor's wife, the Byzantine Theophanō. Neilos the Younger from Rossano was another example; he was part of the entourage of the Prince of Capua, Pandulf Ironhead (961–81) and later of Emperor Otto III (983–1002). Neilos dared to sharply criticize the emperor for his cruelty towards the antipope John (xvi) Philagathos (997–98), Neilos' compatriot. Finally, we have Gregory of Cassano, another Greek monk, who became the emperor's counsellor before ending his life in Germany.

(817–24) and S. Prassede: “[Pascal] construxit in eodem loco a fundamenta cenobium, quod et nomine sanctae Praxedis virginis titulavit ; in quo et sanctam Grecorum congregationem adgregans, quae die noctuque grece modulationis psalmodie laudes omnipotenti Deo sanctisque illius ibidem quiescentibus sedule persolverent introduxit”: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, vol. 2, p. 54 ll. 27–31.

56 “... cum intra et extra Romam plurima Graecorum reperiantur monasteria sive ecclesiae, nullum eorum adhuc perturbatur vel prohibetur a paterna traditione, sive sua consuetudine ; quin potius suadetur et admonetur eam observare ... Scit namque quia nil obsunt salutis credentium diversae pro loco et tempore consuetudines, quando una fides, per dilectionem operans bona quae potest, uni Deo commendat omnes ...”: Leo IX, *Letter* 100, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 143 col. 764 A et B.

Thus, these travels of Italo-Greek monks to Rome at the end of the 10th century reflect the city's new attraction thanks to imperial rebuilding under the Ottonians. This was even more true when the emperor's presence in Rome became more frequent during Otto III's reign (994–1002) and, before him, during his mother's regency (985–94).⁵⁷ These two phases correspond precisely to an increased active presence of Italo-Greeks in Rome, Naples, Capua, and the Lazio region. The political explanation seems quite clear: the meaning of "Romanness"⁵⁸ had changed from the end of the 9th century in the West and was increasingly bound to the city of Rome itself and less to the legacy of the Roman Empire. Moreover, the city of Rome was easier to reach from southern Italy than Constantinople. Should we assume then that for these Italo-Greek monks travelling towards the Ottonian Emperor's city, Rome was merely a political destination? While this may be true, providing counsel as well as criticism for rulers was part of the Byzantine holy man's mission, thus part of their spiritual function as instruments for converting God's people. The examples mentioned above are exceptional only because of the status of the sovereigns who benefited from these monks' counsel: in fact, Gregory, Neilos, and Sabas were fulfilling the same function for Lombard and Ottonian princes as their compatriots in Byzantine Italy did for Byzantine civil or military officers, such as the *stratēgoi*, bishops, and catepans.⁵⁹ Byzantine monks, just like Italo-Greek monks, were endowed with charisma for prophecy, judgement, and divine wisdom precisely for this specific mission: to hold the princes' conversion to the Christian standards of *Christomimesis*.⁶⁰ Playing this role was one of the labels of Eastern holiness and for the author of a saint's life; fulfilling this function was part of constructing the sanctity of the saint. We cannot reduce these journeys to purely political motives; the spiritual aspect was also important. Rome was able to expand the holy man's natural and traditional role on an imperial scale without necessitating the long travel to Constantinople: whether he counselled Basil II or Otto III made no difference.⁶¹

57 Panarelli, "Ottone III e il monachesimo nell'Italia Meridionale".

58 On this notion, see Peters-Custot, "Between Rome and Constantinople".

59 As demonstrated by Adele Cilento, the meeting between Vitalis from Castronuovo and the catepan Basil falls within the Byzantine tradition of spiritual paternity between monks and the powerful people: see Cilento, *Potere e monachesimo*, p. 106.

60 On the necessity for the sovereign's perpetual conversion, see the striking analysis in Dagron, "Lawful Society and Legitimate Power"; and Leveleux-Teixeira/Peters-Custot, "Gouverner les hommes, gouverner les âmes".

61 Francesco Panarelli has, however, noticed how the considerable influence these holy men around Otto III had on the emperor was used by Otto to try to put these monks at the head of great cenobitic institutions. This was the case with Greek as well as with Latin

3 Byzantine Monks as *Brokers* between Byzantium and the West: a Reassessment

After this overview of Byzantine monks as intermediaries towards the West for religious, monastic, and cultural matters, let us now turn to assessing the evidence. I shall address two main issues: the first concerns the tangible results these encounters may have had. Did these journeys of Byzantine monks, especially those to Rome or through southern Italy, allow for increased mutual understanding, with exchange and influence born from these contacts? Can we determine the actual effects of the meetings between Byzantine monks and the Western world?

The second issue is connected to the first: in these monastic contacts, what was the role of the medieval imaginary and the construction of otherness? In other words, is it possible to assess the actual results of these interactions, since they have come down to us almost exclusively through indirect and biased sources? After all, the purpose of these texts (above all hagiographic sources) was not solely to explain or defend Western stereotypes of Eastern monks. Anyway, we cannot answer this question without a history of the construction of those stereotypes.

The monastic and, more broadly, religious links between East and West, at least partially, inherited an initial asymmetry that became a cliché. When Christian asceticism developed in the *pars orientalis* of the Roman Empire (Anthony the Great, Pachomios, Sabas, Hilarion, Euthymios and, in geographical terms, Egypt, Syria, Palestine and Anatolia) and was later recognized by the Church, the East had been the leading, creative, and driving region in the genesis of monasticism, and the West had been the receiving part.⁶² This monastic debt is directly measurable in the almost one-sided flow of texts such as ecclesiastical histories, lives of holy men, and writings by the Church Fathers: there are many translations from a Greek original (or Coptic via Greek) to Latin, but only very few in the other direction.⁶³ Of course, there are some brilliant

monks (such as Romuald, the founder of Camaldoli Abbey): see Panarelli, "Ottone III e il monachesimo nell'Italia Meridionale".

62 Leclercq, "Les relations entre le monachisme oriental et le monachisme occidental" p. 60: "D'une manière générale, on peut dire que l'Orient donne, et que c'est l'Occident qui reçoit, du moins dans les domaines des idées et de l'idéal", quoted by Delouis, "Saint Benoît de Nursie à Byzance ...", p. 73.

63 On this matter the bibliography is very large: see Dekkers, "Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins"; Bianconi, "Le traduzioni in greco di testi latini"; Gounelle, "Traduction de textes hagiographiques et apocryphes latins en grec"; and last but not least, Lequeux, "Latin Hagiographical Literature Translated into Greek".

exceptions reflecting genuine Western experiences, particularly Irish monasticism or that of northern Gaul (such as St Martin of Tours, who was also known and revered in the Greek-speaking Christian world).⁶⁴ Nevertheless, starting in the 4th century, the Eastern imprint on the West is undeniable, even if Eastern texts were adapted to the Western audience.⁶⁵ And from its very beginning, this imprint contained a fictitious construction: that of the Eastern athletic champions of ascetical achievement, who were sometimes engaged in rough competition. Some translators modified the Latin version in order to temper the agonistic nature of the *Lives*, since expressing pride for an ascetic victory was incompatible with monastic ideals of humility.⁶⁶ Others nuanced their excesses, seen as unreachable by “ordinary” monks.⁶⁷ However, the Eastern filiation was welcome, even proclaimed, because it legitimated monastic foundations and ascetic experiences, which were novelties in the West. From the Jura Fathers to St Benedict, sources about the Western founders of monastic communities almost always mentioned the deep knowledge the Western ascetic fathers had of monastic examples from the East.⁶⁸ The Eastern “label” was so powerful that sometimes the identity of Western founders was falsified

64 Jacob, “Le culte de saint Martin de Tours”.

65 Isaïa, “Rufin traducteur de *l'Historia monachorum in Aegypto*”.

66 Isaïa, “Rufin traducteur de *l'Historia monachorum in Aegypto*”.

67 See the final chapter of St Benedict's Rule (ch. 73) where the creation of a new rule is justified by the fact that the “ordinary monks” are unable to follow the prescriptions given by the Holy Fathers of monasticism, in particular by the *regula S. Basilii* (this is the first mention of Basil's *Asketikon* as a rule), which can lead to the “perfection of monastic life” but is considered unreachable for poor and mediocre monks: “Aut quis liber sanctorum catholicorum Patrum hoc non resonat ut recto cursu perueniamus ad creatorem nostrum? Necnon et Collationes Patrum et Instituta et Vitas eorum, sed et Regula sancti Patris nostri Basilii, quid aliud sunt nisi bene uiuentium et oboedentium monachorum instrumenta uirtutum?” (*La règle de saint Benoît*, ed. transl. and commentary of A. de Vogüé and J. Neufville, 6 vol., Paris (Sources chrétiennes, 181–186), 1971–1972, vol. 2, ch. 73, pp. 672–673).

68 See Peters-Custot, “... Et saint Basile de Césarée en Occident”. See also Rufinus' justification of his translation of Basil's *Asketikon* into Latin: “Ad haec ego ne quid tibi minus digne, non dico quam geritur, sed quam geri debet, exponerem, sancti Basilii episcopi, viri fide et operibus, et omni sanctitate satis clari Instituta monachorum quae interrogantibus se monachis velut sancti cuiusdam juris responsa statuit, protuli. Cuius cum definitiones ac sententias miraregis, magnopere popocisti ut hoc opus in Latinum verterem, pollicens mihi quod per uniuersa Occiduae partis monasteria, si haec sancti et spiritualis viri sancta et spiritualia innotescerent instituta, omnis ille servorum Dei profectus, qui ex huiusmodi institutionibus nasceretur, mihi quoque ex eorum vel meritis, vel orationibus aliquid gratiae vel mercedis afferret ...”: *Rule of St Basil Rendered by Rufinus*, no. 9, ed. K. Zelzer, *Basilii Regula a Rufino Latine uersa* (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 86), Vienna 1986, pp. 3–4.

or hidden behind typical Eastern names: this was the case with Serapionus, Macarius, Paphnutius, and the other Macarius, Western monks who founded the Abbey of Lérins and established the “Four Fathers’ Rule.”⁶⁹

For monasticism, the transition period between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages thus introduced an asymmetrical way of conceiving of ascetical experience that would last for most of the Middle Ages, and especially from the 9th to 12th century. On the Western side, there was interest, curiosity, and an eagerness for exemplarity, while on the Eastern side, we observe mostly cautious distance, awareness of differences, feeling superior, and somehow indifferent, as an inward-looking community can sometimes be. This unequal relationship is well illustrated by the meeting of St Adalbert of Prague and Neilos of Rossano in the monastery of Valleduccio, where Neilos had been sent by the abbot of Montecassino. This encounter is related only in the “prior version” of the *Life of Adalbert of Prague*,⁷⁰ and even though we may have reason to think that the meeting was mentioned in Rome by Adalbert himself,⁷¹ its absence in the *Life of Neilos* is telling.⁷² In any case, Adalbert was in pursuit of the true ascetic way of life and was quite disappointed by what he found at Montecassino. He was told that a holy man was living somewhere nearby according to the pure and original monastic way of life, with a few disciples. When Adalbert asked Neilos to accept him as a brother, Neilos refused, arguing that “as attested by his beard and his untouched hair, [he] was a Greek.”⁷³ This explicit awareness of otherness⁷⁴ is also a confession of Neilos’ status as a foreigner at Montecassino, which made him unable to welcome Adalbert into his community. At this time, Neilos was dependent on the abbot of Montecassino, and he could not afford to offend him by accepting among his disciples a man whose arrival underlined Neilos’ spiritual and ascetic superiority over the Benedictine monks. However, the beard argument, which was the characteristic identifying element of a Byzantine monk for a Western person, and the identity as “Greek” – a term almost never used in the Byzantine literature of the time⁷⁵ – also reveals Western stereotypes of Eastern monks. This is a typical sign to which I will return below.⁷⁶

69 Weiss, “Lérins et la ‘Règle des Quatre Pères’”.

70 *Life of Saint Adalbert of Prague*, ch. 15, ed. Karwasinska, p. 78.

71 See the argument in Karwasinska, *Les trois rédactions de « Vita I » de S. Adalbert*.

72 Kalhous, “East Meets West, West Meets East?”.

73 *Life of Saint Adalbert of Prague*, ch. 15, ed. Karwasinska, p. 78: “Etenim, ut iste habitus et intonsi barbe pili testantur, non indigena, sed homo Grecus sum.”

74 Kalhous, “East Meets West, West Meets East?”.

75 Peters-Custot, “L’Autre est le même”.

76 Rouxpetel, *L’Occident au miroir de l’Orient chrétien*, pp. 171–75.

Yet, despite the monastic roaming mentioned in Byzantine hagiographies, and something typical of Byzantine and Italo-Greek holy men, the evidence for mutual influence is only occasional. We need to revise, or at least question, the notions of a “contact zone” and *convivencia*, especially when applied to Byzantine Italy and its monastic history.⁷⁷ Jean-Marie Sansterre argued for this as well, when he revised the actual effects of contact between monks, which was primarily the communion of two souls and an expression of mutual esteem, but with no deep effects on their respective communities.⁷⁸

Even so, we cannot deny the fact that there were actual exchanges, a real mutual interest, and liturgical and religious go-betweens between the two branches of Christianity that came out of the ashes of the Roman Empire. One example is the circulation of St Benedict’s Rule in the Byzantine world, even though it is rarely documented outside the Athos monasteries. Another is the translation of the second book of the *Dialogues* by Pope Zacharias in the middle of the 8th century.⁷⁹ Both translations gave birth to an unexpected result: the Greek hymns that Neilos the Younger composed in honour of St Benedict at the end of the 10th century.⁸⁰

Eastern monasticism, however, was a subject of real fascination in the West from the very beginning. The translation into Latin and the diffusion of what has been named the *regula S. Basilii*, from southern Italy to all of Western Christianity, is significant in this respect. Carolingian monastic reform in the beginning of the 9th century contributed even further.⁸¹ This curiosity intensified in the 10th and 11th centuries, but with a new aspect: at that time, numerous sources show the development of Western clichés about Byzantine monks. In the Latin hagiographical literature, there was a very peculiar fashion for the “Greek” saint monk. Ralph-Johannes Lilie’s work provides a catalogue of these Eastern saints, whose authenticity is, for some, debatable, but who were known through Latin *Lives* written in a Western context in the 11th century.⁸² These include Macarius the Great, Simeon of Polirone, Simeon of Trier, Gregory of Nicopolis, Davinus of Lucca, Jorius of Béthune, Gregory of Passau, Peter of Salzburg, and Gregory of Cassano. To this impressive list, we can add Nicholas

77 Peters-Custot, “Convivencia between Christians”.

78 Sansterre, “Saint Nil de Rossano et le monachisme latin”; id., “Témoignages des textes latins”.

79 Delouis, “Saint Benoît de Nursie à Byzance ...”.

80 Peters-Custot, “Neilos the Younger and Benedict”. The hymns remained in the Grottaferata monastic community for internal use and had no influence on other regions of the Byzantine world.

81 Peters-Custot, “... Et saint Basile de Césarée en Occident”.

82 Lilie, “Sonderbare Heilige”.

the Pilgrim,⁸³ Anastasius of the Mont-Saint-Michel, and the meeting between Adalbert of Prague and Neilos the Younger.

All these Eastern monastic figures, whether real or not, and despite their peculiarities, shared the same ascetic model inherited from a common Western fictional landscape: that of the Eastern monk seen through the eyes of Latin Christianity. This landscape was already established in the 4th century; its main features were reinforced in 11th-century Latin hagiography with the “Greek” monk as hero. Following the reassuring practice of collective and stable eremitism (the Western world remained suspicious of wandering monks), which was fully compatible with the “reasonable eremitism” recommended by the Western monastic reform movement,⁸⁴ the Eastern holy man had a wonderfully rigorous practice of *ascesis* (as a recluse or *salos*, or a bare hermit), and displayed the characteristic figure of being a skinny, long-bearded, and severe monk with specific rites and liturgy. He may also have possessed charisma (prophecy, the gift of tears, or speaking many languages), which explained people’s quest for spiritual kinship with him or the veneration for his dead but thaumaturgic body. In a word, he was a “new Antony”,⁸⁵ and his presence fed the desire to return to the glorious, heroic origins of Christianity and monasticism, in a vision of the ancient Egyptian Thebaid that the Western world was creating for itself.⁸⁶ These holy men were all coming from a geographically limited East that existed in Western minds before the Crusades. This included the Byzantine areas best known in the West such as Sicily, southern Italy, Greece, and Armenia (the place of the Old Covenant in the Old Testament), while excluding the Holy Land, which served as a privileged goal for pilgrimage, but not as a “suitable” birthplace for holy men.

83 Peters-Custot, “La *vita* di san Nicola di Trani”.

84 This form of eremitism, where hermits gather and follow a rule, is celebrated in particular by Bruno of Querfurt around 1006–08, in the *Passio Sanctorum Benedicti et Johannis ac sociorum eorundem*, see: Bruno of Querfurt, *Vita quinque fratrum*, ed. D. B. Ignesti, *Vita dei Cinque Fratelli e Lettera a Re Enrico da Bruno da Querfurt*, Arezzo 1951, pp. 111–51, here p. 113: “Ut fama venit Romaldum, patrem rationabilium heremitarum, qui cum lege vivunt, venisse”.

85 *Life of Saint Neilos of Rossano*, ch. 73–2, ed. and trans. Capra et al., pp. 222–23 (when St Neilos is welcomed by the Montecassino monks): “The holy man then journeyed to see the aforementioned illustrious monastery, and the whole community came to meet him at the foot of the mountain ... and thus they escorted the holy man to the monastery, thinking that what they saw and heard was nothing less than the advent of the great Anthony from Alexandria or the rising from the dead of the great Benedict, their divine lawgiver and teacher [ὁ θεῖος νομοθέτης αὐτῶν καὶ διδάσκαλος]”.

86 The aesthetic version of this mental construction can be seen in Quattrocento Italian art: see Malquori, *Il giardino dell'anima*.

Eventually, the narrative pattern of these *Lives* systematically ends with the birth of a devotional community around the body of these wandering holy men who offered their heroic sanctity. These ancient virtues, which had been entirely preserved from the origins of Christianity, were imported for the salvation of Western abbeys and cities, eager for these exotic cults with the taste of Antiquity. The context of these Latin *Lives* of “Greek” monks, written for a Western public, was a Western Christianity seeking legitimation for Church reform – in particular, monastic reform – through a return to its roots. The Greeks *were* these roots, petrified in their ascetic figures. At the same time the Roman Church built its institutional framework which rejected the model of wandering ascetic monks, embodied by these glorified Byzantine monks. In a way, the papal canonization of these “Greek” holy men certified the validity of pontifical reform, while the same reform completely broke with the Christian past and tradition, that is to say, with the tradition maintained in the Byzantine Empire.

At the end of the period studied here, what remained of the Byzantine presence in southern Italy, which had been peacefully protected by sovereigns and popes,⁸⁷ was integrated into Western categories of monasticism. Italo-Greek monasticism was progressively forced into the framework of the “rule” and of the “monastic order,” starting in the early 13th century. From that time on, and only for classification purposes, the Italo-Greek monasteries and monks were supposed to be under St Basil’s Rule (*regula S. Basilii*) which, in fact, did not exist. Later, the papal milieu began to use the expression “St Basil’s Order” (*Ordo S. Basilii*) for the same purpose.⁸⁸ It was only in the middle of the 15th century, with Cardinal Bessarion, that Italo-Greek monasticism would receive a real institutional framework that looked like a Western monastic order. But this is another story, to which the Byzantine world itself no longer belonged.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents, eds. J. Thomas/A. Constantinides Hero,
Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving

87 These Italo-Greek monks played a prominent role in discussions on Church union. They were also useful for explaining the features of Orthodox liturgy and ecclesiology, as demonstrated by Nicholas-Nektarios’s function: see Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie méridionale post-byzantine*, pp. 532–46; and Schiano, “Nicholas-Nektarios of Otranto”.

88 Peters-Custot, *Les Grecs de l’Italie méridionale post-byzantine*, pp. 459–73.

- Founders' Typika and Testaments* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 35), 5 vols., Washington, DC 2000.
- Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis* 2 vols., Paris 1955 (repr. Paris 1981).
- Life of Saint Adalbert of Prague*, ed. J. Karwasinska, *Sancti Adalberti episcopi Pragensis et martyris Vita prior, C. redactio Casinensis* (Monumenta Poloniae Historica, n.s. 4/1), Warsaw 1962.
- Life of Saint Neilos of Rossano*, ed. and trans. R.L. Capra/I.A. Murzaku/D. Milewski (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, 47), Cambridge, Mass.-London 2018.

Secondary Literature

- Auzépy, M.-F., "Les moines et l'errance à Byzance", in C. Moatti/W. Kaiser/C. Pébarthe (eds.), *Le monde de l'itinérance en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne: procédures de contrôle et d'identification. Actes des tables rondes, Madrid 2004-Istanbul 2005*, Bordeaux-Paris 2009, pp. 241–51.
- Bayer, A., *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054*, Cologne 2002.
- Bianconi, D., "Le traduzioni in greco di testi latini", in G. Cavallo (ed.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo*, vol. 3: *Le culture circostanti*, part 1: *La cultura bizantina*, Rome 2004, pp. 519–56.
- Borsari, S., *Il monachesimo bizantino nella Sicilia e nell'Italia meridionale prenormanna*, Naples 1963.
- Brodbeck, S./Di Giorgi, M./Falla Castelfranchi, M. et al. (eds.), *San Filippo di Fragalà. Monastère grec de la Sicile normande. Histoire, architecture et décor peint* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 533), Rome-Bari 2018.
- Burgarella, F., "Presenze greche a Roma: aspetti culturali e religiosi", in *Roma fra oriente e occidente*, vol. 2, pp. 943–88.
- Chiesa, P., "Tradizioni e traduttori a Roma nell'alto medioevo", in *Roma fra oriente e occidente*, vol. 1, pp. 455–87.
- Cilento, A., *Potere e monachesimo. Ceti dirigenti e mondo monastico nella Calabria Bizantina (secoli IX–XI)*, Florence 2000.
- Crostiti, B./Angeli Murzaku, I. (eds.), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy, The Life of Neilos in Context*, Routledge 2018.
- Da Costa-Louillet, G., "Saints de Sicile et d'Italie méridionale aux VIII^e, IX^e et X^e siècles", *Byzantion* 29–30 (1959/60), 89–173.
- D'Aiuto, F., "L'innografia", in G. Cavallo (ed.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo*, vol. 3/1: *La cultura bizantina*, Salerno 2004, pp. 257–97.
- Dagron, G., "Lawful Society and Legitimate Power. Ἐννομος πολιτεία, ἔννομος ἀρχή", in A. Laiou/D. Simon (eds.), *Law and Society in Byzantium: Ninth–Twelfth Centuries*, Washington, D.C. 1994, pp. 27–51.

- Dekkers, E., "Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins", *Sacris Erudiri* 5 (1953), 193–233.
- Delouis, O., "Saint Benoît de Nursie à Byzance ...", in Excoffon/Hurel/Peters-Custot (eds.), *Interactions, emprunts, confrontations chez les religieux*, pp. 73–92.
- Delouis, O./Peters-Custot, A., "Le voyage de Rome dans la fabrique des saints byzantins", in O. Delouis/M. Mossakowska-Gaubert/A. Peters-Custot/C. Rapp (eds.), *Les mobilités monastiques en Orient et en Occident de l'Antiquité tardive au Moyen Âge (IV^e–XV^e siècle)* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 558) pp. 311–336.
- Déroche, V., "Les variantes italiennes de la folie en Christ", *Néa Rhomè* 2 (2005), 193–203.
- Efthymiadis, S., "D'Orient en Occident mais étranger aux deux mondes. Messages et renseignements tirés de la *Vie* de saint Nicolas le Pèlerin (BHL 6223)", in E. Cuozzo et al. (eds.), *Puer Apuliae. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Marie Martin* (Centre de recherche d'histoire et de civilisation de Byzance. Monographies, 30), Paris 2008, vol. 1, pp. 207–23.
- Efthymiadis, S., "L'hagiographie grecque d'Italie", in M. Goullet (ed.), *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550/International History of the Latin and Vernacular Hagiographical Literature in the West from its Origins to 1550*, Turnhout 2017, vol. 7, pp. 345–421.
- Excoffon, S./Hurel, D.-O./Peters-Custot, A. (eds.), *Interactions, emprunts, confrontations chez les religieux (Antiquité tardive-fin du XIX^e siècle). Actes du VIII^e Colloque international du CERCOR. Célébration du trentenaire (1982–2012), Saint-Etienne, 24–26 octobre 2012*, Saint-Étienne 2015.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Taranto in epoca bizantina", *Studi medievali*, Ser. III, 9 (1968), 133–66.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Bari bizantina : profilo di un capoluogo di provincia (sec. IX–XI)", in G. Rossetti (ed.), *Spazio, società, potere nell'Italia dei comuni*, Naples 1986, pp. 195–227.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Il monastero degli Amalfitani sul Monte Athos", in S. Chialà/L. Cresmaschi (eds.), *Atanasio e il monachesimo al Monte Athos. Atti del XII Convegno oecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa. Sezione bizantina*, Magnagno 2005, pp. 101–18.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Il monachesimo greco nel Lazio medievale", in G. Bordi et al. (eds.), *L'officina dello sguardo. Scritti in onore di Maria Andaloro*, vol. 1: *I luoghi dell'arte*, Rome 2014, pp. 305–14.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Greek monasticism in Campania and Latium from the tenth to the fifteenth century", in Crostini/Angeli Murzaku (eds.), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy*, pp. 78–95.
- Faraggiana di Sarzana, C., "Gli insegnamenti dei Padri del deserto nella Roma altomedievale (secc. V–IX): vie e modi di diffusione", in *Roma fra oriente e occidente*, vol. 1, pp. 587–602.

- Fischer, E., "Greek Translations of Latin Literature in the Fourth Century A.D.", *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982), 173–215.
- Follieri, E., "Santi occidentali nell'innografia bizantina", in *Atti del Convegno internazionale sul tema: l'Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà* (Roma, 31 marzo–3 aprile 1963, Firenze 4 aprile 1963), Rome 1964, pp. 251–71.
- Gounelle, R., "Traduction de textes hagiographiques et apocryphes latins en grec", *Apocrypha* 16 (2005), 35–73.
- Granier, T., "Les moines 'grecs' de Saints-Serge-et-Bacchus et Saints-Théodore-et-Sébastien dans la société napolitaine des VII^e–XII^e siècles", in C. Carozzi/D. Le Blévec/H. Taviani-Carozzi (eds.), *Vivre en société au Moyen Âge, Occident chrétien, VI^e–XV^e siècle*, Aix-en-Provence 2008, pp. 197–218.
- Haverkamp, A., "Der heilige Simeon (gest. 1035), Grieche im fatimidischen Orient und im lateinischen Okzident. Geschichten und Geschichte", *Historische Zeitschrift* 290 (2010), 1–51.
- L'héritage byzantin en Italie ed. J.-M. Martin, A. Peters-Custot and V. Prigent, Rome, I. *La fabrique documentaire*, 2011 (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 449); II. *Les cadres juridiques et sociaux et les institutions publiques*, 2012 (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 461); III. (with S. Brodbeck) *Décor monumental, objets, tradition textuelle*, 2015 (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 510); IV. *Habitat et structure agraire*, 2017 (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 531).
- Isaïa, M.-C., "Rufin traducteur de *l'Historia monachorum in Aegypto*", *Collectanea Cisterciensia* 74 (2012), 289–96.
- Jacob, A., "Le culte de saint Martin de Tours dans la terre d'Otrante hellénophone", in E. Cuozzo et al. (eds.), *Puer Apuliae. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Marie Martin*, Paris 2008, vol. 1, pp. 345–56.
- Kalhous, D., "East Meets West, West Meets East? Constructing Difference in the *First Life of St Adalbert* and in the *Life of St Neilos*", in Crostini/Angeli Murzaku (eds.), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy*, pp. 282–307.
- Kaplan, M., "Les saints en pèlerinage à l'époque mésobyzantine (7^e–12^e siècles)", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 56 (2002), 109–127 (repr. in id., *Pouvoirs, Église et sainteté*, pp. 433–60).
- Kaplan, M., "La place du schisme de 1054 dans les relations entre Byzance, Rome et l'Italie", in id., *Pouvoirs, Église et sainteté. Essais sur la société byzantine. Recueil d'articles publiés de 1990 à 2010* (Les Classiques de la Sorbonne, 3), Paris 2011, pp. 23–34.
- Karwasinska, J., *Les trois rédactions de « Vita I » de S. Adalbert* (Conferenze dell'Accademia polacca di scienze e lettere. Biblioteca di Roma, 9), Rome 1959.
- Kolbaba, T.M., "1054 revisited: Response to Ryder", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 35 (2011), 38–44.
- Leclercq, J., "Les relations entre le monachisme oriental et le monachisme occidental dans le haut Moyen Âge", in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos (963–1963)*, Chèvotogne 1963, vol. 2, pp. 49–80.

- Lequeux, X., "Latin Hagiographical Literature Translated into Greek", in S. Efthymiadis (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, vol. 1: *Periods and Places*, Farnham-Burlington 2011, pp. 385–99.
- Leveleux-Teixeira, C./Peters-Custot, A., "Gouverner les hommes, gouverner les âmes. Quelques considérations en guise d'introduction", in *Gouverner les hommes, gouverner les âmes. Actes du 46^e Congrès de la SHMESP* (Publications de la Sorbonne. Histoire ancienne et médiévale, 144), Paris 2016, pp. 11–35.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Sonderbare Heilige. Zur Präsenz orthodoxer Heiliger im Westen während des 11. Jahrhunderts", *Millenium. Jahrbuch* 5 (2008), 225–59.
- Lunardi, G./Houben, H./Spinelli, G. (eds.), *Monasticon Italiae. Repertorio topobibliografico dei monasteri italiani*, vol. 3: *Puglia e Basilicata* (Centro Storico benedettino italiano, 3), Cesena 1986.
- Malamut, E., *Sur la route des saints byzantins*, Paris 1993.
- Malquori, A., *Il giardino dell'anima. Ascesi e propaganda nelle Tebaidi fiorentine del Quattrocento* (Gli Uffizi. Studi e ricerche, 23), Florence 2012.
- Martin, J.-M., "Une origine calabraise pour la Grécia salentine?", *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 22–23 (1985/86), 51–63.
- Martin, J.-M., "Κίνναμος Ἐπίσκοπος-Cennamus episcopus. Aux avant-postes de l'hellénisme sud-italien vers l'an Mil", *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 27 (1990), 89–99.
- Martin, J.-M., "Hellénisme politique, hellénisme religieux et pseudo-hellénisme à Naples (VII^e–XII^e siècle)", *Νέα Πώμη* 2 (2005), 59–77.
- Martin, J.-M., "L'Italie byzantine (641–1071)", in J.-C. Cheynet (ed.), *Le monde byzantin*, Paris 2006, vol. 2, pp. 473–94.
- Martin, J.-M. et al. (eds.), *L'héritage byzantin en Italie (VIII^e–XII^e s.)* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 449, 461, 510, 531), 4 vols., Rome 2011–17.
- McCormick, M., *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce, A.D. 300–900*, Cambridge 2001.
- Monasteri italo-greci (secoli VII–XI). Una lettura archeologica*, ed. F. Marazzi and C. Raimondo, Cerro al Volturno 2018 (Studi Vulturnensi).
- Nordhagen, P.J., "Constantinople on the Tiber: The Byzantines in Rome and the Iconography of their Images", in J.M.H. Smith (ed.), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West. Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, Leiden 2000, pp. 113–34.
- Omout, H., "Le *typon* de S. Nicola di Casole près d'Otrante. Notice du ms. C III, 17 de Turin", *Revue des études grecques* 3 (1890), 381–91.
- Panarelli, F., "Ottone III e il monachesimo nell'Italia Meridionale", in *Ottone III e Romualdo di Ravenna. Impero, monasteri e santi asceti. Atti del XXIV Convegno del Centro Studi Avellaniti*, Verona 2003, pp. 137–59.
- Paschalidis, S., "Un mode de relation entre Rome et Constantinople: la vénération commune des saints", *Revue des sciences religieuses* [on-line], 89/4 (2015), URL:

- <http://rsr.revues.org/2847> (accessed, on-line since October 1st, 2017, consulted on October, 1st, 2017).
- Pertusi, A., "Monasteri e monaci italiani all'Athos nell'Alto Medioevo", in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos (963–1963)*, Chèvotogne 1963, vol. 2, pp. 217–51.
- Peters-Custot, A., "Les communautés grecques de Basilicate à l'époque byzantine", in G. Noyé/J.-M. Martin/A. Jacob (eds.), *Histoire et culture dans l'Italie byzantine. Acquis et nouvelles recherches* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 363), Rome 2006, pp. 559–87.
- Peters-Custot, A., *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-byzantine. Une acculturation en douceur (IX^e–XIV^e siècles)* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 420), Rome 2009.
- Peters-Custot, A., "L'identité d'une communauté minoritaire au Moyen Âge. La population grecque de la principauté lombarde de Salerne, IX^e–XII^e siècles", *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Moyen Âge* 121/1 (2009), 83–97.
- Peters-Custot, A., "La vita di san Nicola di Trani, o la sintesi della santità nell'XI secolo", in *Bizantini, Longobardi e Arabi in Puglia nell'alto medioevo. Atti del XX Congresso internazionale di studio sull'alto medioevo (Savellettri di Fasano, 3–6 novembre 2011)*, Spoleto 2012, pp. 433–53.
- Peters-Custot, A., "Convivencia between Christians: The Greek and Latin Communities of Byzantine South Italy (9th–11th centuries)", in B. Crostini/S. La Porta (eds.), *Negotiating Co-Existence: Communities, Cultures and 'Convivencia' in Byzantine Society*, Trier 2013, pp. 203–20.
- Peters-Custot, A., "La vie quotidienne des moines d'Orient et d'Occident, IV^e–X^e siècle. L'Italie méridionale byzantine", in O. Delouis/M. Mossakowska-Gaubert (eds.), *La vie quotidienne des moines en Orient et en Occident, IV^e–X^e siècles. I. État des sources* (IFAO-EFA, Bibliothèque d'études, 163), Athens 2015, pp. 289–304.
- Peters-Custot, A., "... Et saint Basile de Césarée en Occident", in Excoffon/Hurel/Peters-Custot (eds.), *Interactions, emprunts, confrontations chez les religieux*, pp. 93–112.
- Peters-Custot, A., "Clairvaux et l'ordre cistercien dans un espace aux marges de la chrétienté romaine: le royaume de Sicile aux époques normande et souabe", in A. Baudin/A. Grélois (eds.), *Le Temps long de Clairvaux. Nouvelles recherches, nouvelles perspectives (XII^e–XX^e siècle). Actes du Colloque international Troyes-Clairvaux, 16–18 juin 2015*, Paris 2016, pp. 63–76.
- Peters-Custot, A., "Le monachisme byzantin de l'Italie méridionale. Réalité et perception, du IX^e au XI^e siècle", in *Monachesimo d'oriente, monachesimo d'Occidente* (Settimane di Studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medio Evo, 64), Spoleto 2017, pp. 359–96.
- Peters-Custot, A., "L'Autre est le même: qu'est-ce qu'être 'grec' dans les sources latines de l'Italie (VIII^e–XI^e siècles)?", in P. Josserand/J. Pysiak (eds.), *À la rencontre de*

- l'autre au Moyen Âge*. In memoriam Jacques Le Goff. *Actes des premières Assises franco-polonaises d'histoire médiévale*, Rennes 2017, pp. 53–78.
- Peters-Custot, A., “Neilos the Younger and Benedict: on the Greek Hymns Composed by Neilos in Campania”, in Crostini/Angeli Murzaku (eds.), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy*, pp. 308–47.
- Peters-Custot, A., “Between Rome and Constantinople: The Romanness of Byzantine Southern Italy (9th–11th Centuries)”, in W. Pohl et al. (eds.), *Transformations of Romanness. Early Medieval Regions and Identities* (Millenium Studies, 71), Berlin 2018, pp. 231–40.
- Roma fra oriente e occidente* (Atti delle Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 49), 2 vols., Spoleto 2002.
- Ronconi, F., “Ouvrages patristiques grecs en Italie méridionale entre Antiquité tardive et haut Moyen Âge”, in C. Rouxpetel/B. Cabouret/A. Peters-Custot (eds.), *La réception des Pères grecs en Italie au Moyen Âge (V^e–XV^e siècle)*, Paris 2020, pp. 107–38.
- Rousseau, O., “La visite de Nil de Rossano au Mont Cassin”, in *La Chiesa greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo. Atti del convegno storico interecclesiale* (Bari, 30 aprile–4 maggio 1969) (Italia Sacra, 22), Padua 1973, vol. 2, pp. 111–37.
- Rouxpetel, C., *L'Occident au miroir de l'Orient chrétien. Cilicie, Syrie, Palestine et Égypte (XII^e–XIV^e siècle)* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 369), Rome 2015.
- Ryder, J., “Changing Perspectives on 1054”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek studies* 35 (2011), 20–37.
- Sansterre, J.-M., *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantines et carolingiennes (milieu du VI^e s.–fin du IX^e s.)*, 2 vols., Brussels 1980.
- Sansterre, J.-M., “Saint Nil de Rossano et le monachisme latin”, in A. Acconcia Longo/S. Lucà/L. Perria (eds.), *Miscellanea di Studi in onore di P. Marco Petta* (Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata, n.s. 45/2), Grottaferrata 1992, vol. 2, pp. 339–86.
- Sansterre, J.-M., “Témoignages des textes latins du Haut Moyen Âge sur le monachisme oriental et des textes byzantins sur le monachisme occidental”, in A. Dierkens/D. Misonne/J.-M. Sansterre (eds.), *Le monachisme à Byzance et en Occident du VIII^e au X^e siècle. Aspects internes et relations avec la société. Actes du colloque international de la Section d'histoire de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles (14–16 mai 1992)*, (Revue bénédictine, 103/1–2), Maredsous 1993, pp. 12–30.
- Schiano, C., “Nicholas-Nektarios of Otranto: a Greek Monk under Roman Obedience”, in Crostini/Angeli Murzaku (eds.), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy*, pp. 208–25.
- Weiss, J.-P., “Lérins et la Règle des Quatre Pères”, in Y. Codou/M. Lauwers (eds.), *Lérins, une île sainte de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge* (Collection d'études médiévales de Nice, 9), Turnhout 2010, pp. 121–40.

Italian Traders in Byzantium, c.800–1204

David Jacoby

The Venetians were the first Italians trading in the eastern Mediterranean. They appear to have regularly visited Jerusalem by the late 8th century, undoubtedly in connection with the seasonal fair surrounding Christian pilgrimage, which offered costly oriental commodities arriving from Baghdad. The Venetians also reached Egypt. In 828, ten of their ships sailed to Alexandria, in what was clearly not an exceptional journey, and returned with St Mark's relics. It is inconceivable that the Venetians would not have also sailed to Constantinople at that time, in view of the strong political links between Venice and Byzantium. Moreover, the imperial city offered silk textiles. Byzantine silks must have been among those sold by the Venetians at Pavia during the reign of Charlemagne, which extended from 768 to 814.¹

Venetians sailing to Constantinople or to Alexandria implies anchoring along the Balkan shore, in the Aegean islands, and respectively in southern and western Anatolian ports, all under Byzantine rule. Coastal sailing was customary, and anchoring in safe havens and ports along the way indispensable to renew the water provision or to load and unload passengers and goods.² Until the 12th century Italian ships sailing to or from the empire were not filled to capacity at ports of departure or destination. Therefore, their long-range voyages were only profitable when involving cabotage, the transport of passengers and cargo between ports located at short or medium-range distance one from another, or else tramping, calling into ports without a fixed schedule. These sailing patterns illustrate the importance of Italian trade in the empire's provinces, which has not aroused the attention it deserves since research has been largely focused on Constantinople.

Clearly, the basic patterns of Venetian trade in the eastern Mediterranean were already established by the late 8th century. By the late 9th century, the Venetians were pursuing the conveyance of silk textiles from the empire and

1 This chapter is largely based on previous studies of mine, where the reader will find more references to primary sources and earlier publications. [References in square brackets have been added to David Jacoby's original manuscript by Miriam Salzmann and Johannes Pahlitzsch.]

2 On sailing across the Aegean, see Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", p. 376.

the Levant to the fairs of Pavia. Constantinople also offered oriental food condiments, dyestuffs, and aromatics, collectively called “spices” in the Middle Ages, mostly from southern and eastern Asia, which arrived via the Black Sea port of Trebizond.³ Other Italians joined the Venetians in Byzantium in the 10th and 11th century. Merchants from Amalfi were trading in Antioch, Syria, and Egypt in the course of the 10th century, sailing along the southern Anatolian shore. They are first attested in Constantinople in 945, when together with merchants from Gaeta they assisted Emperor Constantine VII in his struggle for the imperial throne against the sons of the deposed Romanos I. The Venetians are documented in Constantinople from 949–50. Together with the Amalfitans, they assisted Emperor Nikephoros II Phocas in 968 in his expedition to Syria. In both cases the support presumably consisted in the maritime transport of troops and provisions. The temporary presence of Venetian and Amalfitan merchants in the empire’s capital was clearly quite common at that time.⁴

Ongoing Venetian sailing to Constantinople in the second half of the 10th century is illustrated by Venetian and Byzantine decrees, the transfer of letters and silks, and the transport of merchants. Liudprand, the later Bishop of Cremona, sailed on a Venetian ship to Constantinople on his first diplomatic mission in 949. In 992, the Byzantine Emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII barred Venetian vessels from transporting Amalfitans and Latins residing in Bari when returning from Constantinople to their home base, in order to prevent them from illegally exporting silk textiles. The decree reveals that merchants did not always board their nation’s ships and that, therefore, information on Italian trading and sailing must be clearly distinguished.⁵

Two macro-economic developments stimulated Italian trade in the empire in the early 11th century, one internal and the other external. Economic growth and increasing purchasing power among the social elite and the urban middle stratum, especially in Constantinople, generated a growing and more diversified demand for agricultural, pastoral, and manufactured commodities, as well as for industrial raw materials. In addition, the Red Sea replaced the Persian Gulf in the channelling of oriental spices, dyestuffs, and aromatics from the region of the Indian Ocean and the Far East. Instead of travelling via Trebizond and Constantinople to the Mediterranean they now reached Alexandria, which

3 Vryonis Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, pp. 15–16.

4 [For an overview of Amalfi’s connections with Byzantium, see Falkenhausen, “Gli Amalfitani”; Skinner, *Medieval Amalfi*, ch. 9.]

5 Jacoby, “Venetian Commercial Expansion”, pp. 371–77; Jacoby, “Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani”, pp. 89–90, 93. On continuous western imports of silks in the late 8th, 9th and 10th centuries, see Jacoby, “Silk Crosses the Mediterranean”, pp. 56–58, 60.

became the main Mediterranean outlet for these costly commodities. As a result, the empire became increasingly dependent upon Egypt for their supply.⁶

Italian merchants successfully adjusted to the changing circumstances. They could only offer a fairly limited range of western goods, mainly of low value, in exchange for mostly Byzantine luxury products such as silks and other costly commodities they purchased in the empire. The extant sources documenting Venetian trading in Byzantium in the 11th century occasionally refer to capital investments in bullion, spices, or money of account, yet fail to offer evidence regarding goods, except in one instance. Therefore, trading along the way, combined with cabotage and tramping which involved the transfer of cargo and people, must have been far more important sources of capital. Moreover, instead of relying exclusively on income accruing from chance customers and goods taken on board in ports of call, the Venetians integrated themselves within the Byzantine supply system, conveying commodities in demand from the empire's provinces and foreign countries to Constantinople, the major Byzantine market, as well as exporting them from the empire. These trade and transportation services furthered a speedier turnover of the initial capital and generated additional financial means that could be reinvested along the way.⁷

The Venetian involvement in the Byzantine supply system is increasingly illustrated in the 11th century. In 1022, the Venetian Leone da Molin brought to Constantinople at least 2,860 kg of high-grade cheese from Byzantine Crete, which was highly appreciated. It is possible that the Venetian purchases of *agrarium* in the island also covered Cretan wine. In the 1060s or 1070s Venetian and Genoese, alongside Byzantine, merchants were exporting pastoral and agricultural products from Crete, sailing along the Anatolian and Levantine shores to Alexandria.⁸ It is likely that the Venetians and the Genoese also returned to their home base with Cretan cheese.⁹

There was also a demand for olive oil, a fairly expensive commodity produced in more restricted areas than today. Sparta already acted as an oil market by the last decades of the 10th century. Two brothers from Equilium, modern Jesolo north of Venice, were settled in the city and most likely exported oil to Venice. In 1071, a Venetian ship returning from Egypt to Venice anchored at Modon in the south-western Peloponnese, an outlet for oil from its hinterland, as attested shortly before 1201. Venetian exports of Peloponnesian oil to

6 [Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", pp. 376–77.]

7 Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", pp. 376–77, 381, 390–91.

8 Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete", pp. 521–23, 525–28; see also Jacoby, "Italian Privileges and Trade", pp. 353–56, 363–67.

9 This is attested for the Genoese in the 12th century; see below.

Alexandria are documented by the 1130s and to Constantinople by the 1140s, yet it is likely that oil was already conveyed to the capital in the 11th century. Growing production of Peloponnesian oil appears to have halted the transport of oil from the Dalmatian coast, Apulia, and Sicily, to Constantinople on board vessels from Bari and Venice, attested from 1051 to 1118. Pisan merchants also participated in the oil trade in Modon in 1201, nine years after obtaining a marked tax reduction on their trade in the empire. The Byzantine *archontes* or large landowners fulfilled an important role in the marketing of local products, acting as middlemen between producers on their own or neighbouring estates and merchants engaging in export.¹⁰

The Italian integration within the empire's internal trade and transportation networks is also illustrated with respect to Byzantine silk textiles. Venetian, Amalfitan, and other Italian merchants pursued their export to Italy in the 11th century.¹¹ However, the Venetians were apparently the only foreigners who succeeded in taking advantage of the rise of Thebes as manufacturer of high-grade silks from the mid-11th century, to have access to its products, and to export them before the Fourth Crusade. The *taxegium de Stives* or "journey of Thebes" in 1071 and 1073 suggests that, by that time, Venetians were regularly sailing to Corinth and proceeding from there by land to their destination. Annual sailings from Venice to Corinth are also attested in the 1080s and 1090s. It is unclear whether Corinth already produced silk textiles by that time, yet that was definitely the case around 1110. According to the author of the *Timarion*, who around that time described the fair of St Demetrios in Thessalonica, Italian merchants were selling cloth from Boeotia and the Peloponnese. He is clearly referring to silk textiles woven at Thebes and Corinth, respectively, since the two cities were the only textile manufacturers in these regions at that time, and silks were the only fabrics they produced.¹²

Italian trading and sailing along southern Anatolia in the 11th century are either implied or documented by various sources. "Frankish" or Western merchants passed through Byzantine Antioch to reach Aleppo before 1040/41. Vessels from the land of the *Farang*, that is "Frankish" ships, were anchoring in Tripoli in 1047. They must have been either Venetian or Amalfitan, or else belonged to both Italian nations. Merchants from Bari traded in the Cilician city of Tarsus by 1045, and for many years in Myra and Antioch before transferring the relics of St Nicholas from Myra to their home city in 1087. According

10 Jacoby, "Rural Exploitation", pp. 233–39. On the Pisan privileges, see below.

11 Jacoby, "Silk Crosses the Mediterranean", pp. 57–58, 60.

12 Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium", pp. 462–63, 466–68, 476–82, 494–95; Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", pp. 379–80.

to an account of that transfer, Venetian merchants had also been trading in Antioch for a long time, financing their purchases of purple and other silks, carpets, and gems with much gold and silver. Indeed, they are attested in the city in the 1050s and the 1070s. A Venetian commercial contract of 1083 mentions the *taxegium* of Tripoli, a term implying regular sailings to this Levantine city with a stopover at Antioch's port. Silk textiles produced in Tripoli and Antioch were presumably the main incentives for trade in the two cities. Antioch was an important industrial and commercial centre in the 11th century. It was also a transit station for pilgrims on the way to the Holy Land and for merchants sailing to Egypt. Amalfitan ships must have been carrying pilgrims before 1071, as suggested by the hospice to house them which a rich Amalfitan merchant established in the city around that year. Amalfitan merchants also established two hospices for pilgrims in Jerusalem at that time.¹³

The intensification of commercial exchange between the empire and Fatimid territories in the 11th century induced Amalfitan and Venetian merchants and maritime carriers to extend the geographical range of their trade and transportation services based on cabotage and tramping. They integrated within the networks operated by imperial subjects and Muslim merchants between the empire and the Levant. Amalfitan sailings between Constantinople and Alexandria are attested by Jewish letters from the mid-11th century onward. The chrysobull of Emperor Alexios I, issued in favour of Venice in 1082, lists Byzantine ports located along the coast from Laodicea (modern Latakia) to Constantinople, and reflects the perspective of Venetians sailing from Alexandria toward the imperial city.¹⁴

Venice was the first Italian city-state to obtain commercial privileges in the empire and a quarter in Constantinople along the southern shore of the Golden Horn. The chrysobull of 1082 mentioned above granted the Venetians freedom of trade and total tax exemption throughout the empire. It nevertheless lists specific ports and some inland cities, which strikingly illustrates the Venetians' acquaintance with these markets, including the major grain outlets of Demetrias in Thessaly, Chrysopolis in Macedonia, and Rhaidestos (called *Rodosto* by the Latins), a port on the Sea of Marmara. The familiarity with grain markets is especially borne out by places along the stretch of coast between Thessalonica and Constantinople.¹⁵ It raises the question whether

13 Jacoby, "Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani", pp. 107–08, 113; Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", pp. 384–86, 388; Jacoby, "Silk Crosses the Mediterranean", pp. 63–65. [For Antioch, see also Todt, *Dukat*.]

14 [For an alternative dating of the chrysobull, see Frankopan, "Byzantine Trade Privileges".]

15 Laiou, "Regional Networks", pp. 130–37.

the Venetians were already conveying grain to Constantinople. They may have indeed been involved in that activity between 1071 and 1078, when the imperial authorities enforced a state monopoly on the grain trade in Rhaidestos.¹⁶ The grant of 1082 was renewed several times before 1171, when Manuel I ordered the arrest of all Venetians in the empire and had their property confiscated. By 1176 they had returned to Constantinople. Venetian trade in the city was again halted by the “massacre of the Latins” in 1182, carried out by the city’s mob.¹⁷ Venice arrived at an agreement with the empire in 1183 and concluded a new formal treaty in 1187. Its privileges were enlarged in 1198 to include the exercise of judicial authority.¹⁸

The Pisans had been acquainted with the Aegean islands and the southern shore of Anatolia since the First Crusade. Their negotiations with the empire possibly began in 1109. On 18 April 1110 their envoys took an oath of fealty to Alexios I.¹⁹ It is presumably in one of these instances that the emperor granted to Odimundus, son of Oddo, the dignity of *kouropalates*.²⁰ This Pisan was among the witnesses to the treaty Pisa concluded with the empire in 1111, by which it obtained privileges and a quarter east of the Venetian neighbourhood along the Golden Horn. However, the tax exemption Pisa obtained was limited to the import of bullion, while the rate of the *kommerkion*, the commercial tax, was reduced from ten to four per cent for other imports and trading in domestic commodities within the empire. Exports were liable to the full amount. Pisa’s privileges were renewed in the course of the 12th century, yet their implementation was interrupted by the massacre of 1182. The new treaty of 1192 with Emperor Isaac II Angelos extended the reduced rate to all transactions, except for exports, which remained fully taxed, and enlarged the Pisan quarter in Constantinople.²¹

As noted above, Genoese merchants were sailing to Egypt by the 1060s or 1070s and were, therefore, familiar with the economic resources of the Aegean islands and southern Anatolia. By the 1130s Genoese vessels returning from *Romania*, that is the Byzantine Empire, were ordered to pay a tax in grain,

16 Amalfitans may have also been involved: Jacoby, “Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani”, p. 103.

17 On the massacre, see Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, pp. 41–42.

18 For the entire paragraph, see Jacoby, “Italian Privileges and Trade”, pp. 349–57; Jacoby, “The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople”, pp. 153–70; Jacoby, “The Expansion of Venetian Government”, pp. 74–83.

19 Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, pp. 87–90.

20 *Documenti*, ed. Müller, p. 43 (Greek), p. 52 (Latin), no. xxxiv. On the Byzantine title, see Kazhdan et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2, p. 1157.

21 Jacoby, “Italian Privileges and Trade”, pp. 357–59. On the Pisan quarter, see Jacoby, “Pisan Presence and Trade”, pp. 47–49.

which implies the import of this commodity from Crete, Macedonia, Thessaly, or Thrace. By that time Genoese merchants were reaching Constantinople, whether directly from Genoa, from Bari on a local ship, or after sailing first to Alexandria. The boarding of foreign ships seems to imply that Genoese vessels were not yet reaching Constantinople, or rarely did so. It is quite possible, therefore, that the first stage of Genoa's commercial expansion as far as the imperial capital was restricted to merchants, without the participation of Genoese ships. The peace treaty concluded in 1149 between Genoa and Pisa covered the entire Mediterranean "as far as Constantinople", which suggests that by that time the sailing of Genoese ships to the Byzantine capital had become more common.²²

The growing interest of Genoese merchants and maritime carriers in that traffic led to the grant of commercial privileges and a quarter in Constantinople by Emperor Manuel I. However, Genoa did not manage to take hold of a quarter until 1160, and only in 1170 did the emperor award it one along the southern shore of the Golden Horn. The Genoese's trading in Constantinople was interrupted in 1162 following an attack on their quarter by Pisans and some Venetians. It resumed in 1164. As for the preferential trade tax of four per cent: it was limited to imports to Constantinople from 1169 on. Genoese operations after the massacre of 1182 were rather intermittent, and resumed on a large scale for short periods only, each time in close relation with diplomatic missions and high expectations in Genoa for a renewal of full trading. Some Genoese nevertheless visited Constantinople in these years and even stayed there for some time. It is only in 1192 that Genoa obtained an extension of the reduced tax rate to transactions throughout the empire.²³

Until 1204 the Venetians were the only foreigners enjoying full tax exemption in the empire. It afforded them a substantial edge over their Italian, Byzantine, and other foreign competitors.²⁴ This was even the case after the Pisans and Genoese obtained an extension of their tax exemption in 1192. For the empire's subjects the sale of domestic surpluses to all these Italians was particularly attractive, since the latter could offer higher purchase prices while retaining an advantage over Byzantine and other foreign merchants, liable to full tax payments on transactions between themselves.²⁵ However, at several occasions and sometimes for extended periods, the empire's officers disregarded the privileges of the Italian city-states, the implementation of which

22 Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete", pp. 530–33.

23 Jacoby, "Italian Privileges and Trade", pp. 359–63.

24 The foreigners included both Christians and Muslims from Syria and Egypt.

25 On these considerations, see Laiou, "Byzantine Traders and Seafarers", pp. 84–87.

was only restored after the latter submitted their grievances to the emperors and these intervened. The non-implementation of privileges did not necessarily interrupt trading or shipping.²⁶

Nations other than Venice, Pisa, or Genoa lacked the naval forces, the bargaining power, and the favourable political circumstances required to obtain commercial privileges in the empire. However, the absence of such privileges or quarters did not prevent the citizens of the minor nations from trading. It is most likely in 1111 that the Amalfitans obtained a quarter in Constantinople south of the Pisan neighbourhood and a wharf along its shore, yet no trading privileges. Amalfitan ships sailing to or from Constantinople are attested in the 1090s and the 1110s. In 1119 one of them sailed from the city to Alexandria. The Amalfitan and the neighbouring Pisan quarter in Constantinople were destroyed by the city's mob in 1203. The Byzantine historian Niketas Choniates, a contemporary of the event, considered the Amalfitans the most "Byzantinized" among the Latin settlers.²⁷

Merchants and maritime carriers from Bari pursued their trading mentioned above in the 12th century sailing to Egypt and Constantinople, which implies anchoring in Anatolian ports along the way. In 1200, a shipmate from Bari dictated his will before sailing to the Byzantine Empire. Bari was a major transit station for pilgrims sailing to the Holy Land. The inhabitants of Bari may have been among those of southern Italy called Longobards, attested in Constantinople whether as merchants, ship crew, or settlers before 1204. Some Longobards were apparently shipping grain from Halmyros to Constantinople in 1169. A ship jointly owned by Longobards and Venetians carrying Genoese merchants trading in silks sank off the island of Chios shortly before 1174.

The support of Manuel I to Ancona in the framework of his Italian policy created favourable conditions for the city's merchants in the empire. The Anconitans had a church in Constantinople by 1199. The Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela encountered in Constantinople merchants from Lombardy in northern Italy between late 1161 and the spring of 1163. A merchant from Treviso and a shipmate from Verona, attested in Constantinople in 1189, are among the few Italians from northern Italy appearing in the extant 12th-century sources referring to the empire.²⁸

26 Jacoby, "Italian Privileges and Trade", pp. 354–55, 359, 361–64.

27 Jacoby, "Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani", pp. 95–98, 102–03, 116–17.

28 Jacoby, "The Minor Western Nations", pp. 319–26. For the will, see *Codice diplomatico barese*, v, ed. F. Nitti, Bari 1906, pp. 20–22, no. 10. For 1174, see Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium", pp. 460–61. On pilgrimage via Bari, see Jacoby, "Evolving Routes of Western Pilgrimage", pp. 81–82, 84, 85 n.53.

Italian merchants began to settle in Byzantium in the 11th century at the latest, whether for a number of years or permanently. Rich Amalfitans resided in Constantinople by the early 1050s, among them Pantaleone, son of Mauro de Maurone Comite. The Venetians had a church, St Akindynos, and resided before 1082 in the urban region that became the Venetian quarter, following the grant of Alexios I.²⁹ Amalfitan settlers are mentioned in Constantinople in 1075 and their workshops in 1082.³⁰ The citizens of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa settled in their nation's quarter. Yet already by the first half of the 12th century, some Venetians acquired houses outside their national quarter, wedded Greek women, and conducted business in partnership with local Greeks. These Venetians claimed to be exempt from Byzantine taxes on real estate in view of their privileged status. In fact, they combined the privileges and exemptions of Venetian citizens with the rights of Byzantine subjects. Shortly before 1171 Manuel I compelled these Venetians to choose between Venetian and Byzantine status, with all the relevant rights, restrictions, and obligations deriving from either. We do not know whether the regulation was successfully enforced, nor for how long. In any event, shortly before the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 some Venetians resided outside their national quarter.³¹

The issue of nationality also affected the Pisans. Some of them resided outside their national quarter and became imperial subjects. Such was the case of Signoretto, a wealthy merchant who died in 1166 leaving a fortune of more than 30,000 hyperpers. Hugh Eteriano, one of the Pisan executors of the deceased's will, has described the clash that followed between them and the Byzantine authorities, yet without spelling out the underlying legal issue. The Pisans claimed that since Signoretto was Pisan, they should deal with his fortune, whereas the tax collector of Manuel I contended that the deceased was the emperor's subject and, therefore, he had jurisdiction over the money.³² Pisan sailors who had opted for Byzantine status are attested in 1174. In 1197, Pisa requested that its privileges be extended to all *Pisani et qui pro Pisanis habentur*, "Pisans and those considered Pisan", in other words, Pisan citizens and other individuals having Pisan status. These were most likely the offspring

29 [For the Latin church, its status and the locations of its church buildings in Byzantium before 1204, see Lilie, "Die lateinische Kirche".]

30 Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", p. 389; Jacoby, "The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople", pp. 154–55.

31 Jacoby, "The Byzantine Outsider", pp. 135–40. [For the status of foreign merchants in Byzantium before and after 1204, see Laiou, "Institutional Mechanisms of Integration", pp. 171–78.]

32 *Documenti*, ed Müller, pp. 11–13, no. x. [For Hugh Eteriano, see the recent study by Kapriev, *Lateinische Rivalen*.]

of marriages or extra-marital relations between Pisan men and Greek women, as well as Greeks having acquired Pisan status and the latter's descendants. On the other hand, Niketas Choniates refers to Pisan settlers who favoured Constantinople over their mother city. These were long-time settlers who had presumably wedded Greek women, had strong business relations with local Greeks, or had even become imperial subjects. Despite the social integration of these Pisans, they were considered foreigners hostile to the empire, and the mob destroyed their quarter in August 1203. Genoese settlers also married Greek women.³³ Some Italian settlers had Latin wives, who together with their children were among those killed by the Constantinopolitan mob in the massacre of 1182.³⁴

Some sources offer direct or indirect information regarding the number of Italians in Constantinople in the 12th century. In 1110, a Venetian vessel returning from the city carried 73 passengers, 70 men and three women, in addition to the crew. The men were clearly merchants and the ship quite large.³⁵ The Genoese chronicler Caffaro mentions that 300 of his fellow-citizens were present in the Genoese quarter when it was attacked in 1162 by 1,000 Pisans and some Venetians, who inflicted losses amounting to 30,000 hyperpers, a round figure confirmed by a list of claims totalling 29,443 hyperpers submitted in 1174 in the name of 146 merchants. According to the Venetian *Historia ducum* there were 10,000 Venetians in Constantinople when Manuel I proceeded to arrest them in 1171. Archbishop Eustathios of Thessalonica, who was very hostile toward the Latins, claims that 60,000 of them were in Constantinople in 1182, thousands being killed by the city's population. More than 4,000 surviving Latins were supposedly sold as slaves to the Turks.³⁶

-
- 33 Jacoby, "The Byzantine Outsider", pp. 136–37; Jacoby, "Pisan Presence and Trade", p. 49. The sister of the Pisan priest Benenato is listed in 1199 as *Kyura Bona: Documenti*, ed. Müller, p. 74, no. XLVI. The use of Greek *kyura*, in fact *kyra*, or lady, suggests that she was the widow of a Greek who is not mentioned.
- 34 Eustathios, *Capture of Thessalonike*, ed. S. Kyriakidis, *Eustazio di Tessalonica, La espugnazione di Tessalonica* (Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici, Testi, 5), Palermo 1961, pp. 34–36, trans. J.R. Melville-Jones, *Eustathios of Thessaloniki, The Capture of Thessaloniki* (Byzantina Australiensia, 8), Canberra 1988, pp. 34–36.
- 35 Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, pp. 65–67. On the size and tonnage of ships in that period, see Jacoby, "Byzantine Maritime Trade", pp. 633–34.
- 36 Jacoby, "Pisan Presence and Trade", pp. 48–49. The claims of 146 merchants are recorded in *Genoese Documents*, eds. A. Sanguineti/G. Bertolotto, "Nuova serie di documenti sulle relazioni di Genova con l'Impero bizantino", *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 28 (1897), 337–573, here pp. 389–97. On 1182, see above, n. 17.

A critical examination of these figures requires a distinction between settlers, visiting merchants, and the ships' crews, which as a rule remained on board their vessels. We do not know how many vessels carried Italian merchants to or from Constantinople in 1110, yet the small figure of around 85 men (73 passengers and crew) on the Venetian ship mentioned above should serve as a warning against estimates in the thousands, especially since Venetians were the only Italians enjoying privileges in the city by that time. In 1162, the crews of the Pisan crafts may have joined Pisan merchants and settlers in the attack on the Genoese quarter, yet even so the number of 1,000 cited by Caffaro appears to be inflated to explain the Genoese defeat. On the other hand, the number of 300 Genoese settlers and visiting merchants in 1162 appears to be reliable, since only 146 merchants claimed compensations for the losses they had incurred.³⁷ Pisan evidence also yields small figures. We may safely assume that most Pisans resided in their national quarter. In 1199, there were 64 tenants of property in that quarter, four of them Greek. A few additional Pisans who were not tenants are registered in 1200. Even if we adopt a coefficient of four per household, we reach a figure in the hundreds.³⁸ A clause in the Byzantine-Venetian treaty of 1198 suggests a similar figure. It states that the Venetian ducal legate and the judges under his authority should swear to dispense fair justice in cases opposing Venetians to imperial subjects.³⁹ The ceremony was to take place in one of the Venetian churches of Constantinople, in the presence of *all* Venetians staying in the city at that time. Considering the size of the churches, undoubtedly small, there would have been at most a few hundred men in attendance, settlers and visiting merchants combined. The figures of 1162 and 1199, and the assumed one for 1198, clearly exclude the inflated figures in the thousands provided by medieval authors, who implicitly justify the arrest of the Venetians in 1171 and the 1182 massacre by the large numbers of Latins competing with the Greeks in Constantinople. Figures in the hundreds are far more plausible for Italian male settlers. However, it is not the number, but the collective image of the Italians as privileged foreigners that fuelled xenophobic attitudes among the Greek population.⁴⁰

37 See above, n. 23 and n. 36.

38 *Documenti*, ed. Müller, pp. 74–76, nos. XLVI–XLVII. The Greeks are: Kaloianne Pilocti, Leo Malvasiotus (originally from Monemvasia), Ranieri greca (presumably the Greek widow of a Pisan), and Sevasti. I have adopted a coefficient of four considering that several other female tenants also appear to have been widows, and that some property was jointly held by brothers or sisters who presumably were young and possibly unmarried.

39 Jacoby, "The Expansion of Venetian Government", p. 83.

40 Jacoby, "The Byzantine Outsider", p. 142.

The 12th-century imperial policy applied in provincial cities with respect to foreigners was far more flexible than in Constantinople.⁴¹ There were no grants of specific quarters, yet also no impediments to the purchase of real estate as in the capital.⁴² It is likely, therefore, that the Italians themselves determined the location of their residences and trading facilities in the provincial cities, whether renting, purchasing, or building the premises they needed. Venetian trading and settlement in the provinces were suspended for several years, as in Constantinople, following the imperial action against Venice in 1171, and the operations of all Italians ceased after the massacre of 1182.

The information regarding Italian settlers in the empire's provinces reveals that the geographical distribution of the Venetians was the most extensive. This is not surprising, given their privileges covering the whole empire from 1082, broader than those of either the Pisans or the Genoese, even after 1192.⁴³ Moreover, since they had obtained their privileges much earlier than their competitors, they managed to limit or even exclude entirely the latter's access to various markets. These factors account for the limited Pisan settlement and the total absence of Genoese settlers along the Balkan shore, where the Venetians were the dominant group among the Italians. Venetian settlement in provincial cities, whether short-term or lengthy, is documented by various sources, including evidence regarding Venetian churches.

Venetian and Amalfitan settlers resided in separate neighbourhoods at Dyrrachium (modern Durazzo) by 1081, at the time of the Norman attack on the city. The city's location at the Adriatic end of the Via Egnatia leading to Constantinople, and at a fairly short distance from southern Italian ports, suggests that these Italians were involved in commercial exchanges across the Balkans and the Adriatic. It is likely that some Amalfitans resided in Antioch by the 1070s, and furthermore some Venetians before the city's fall to the Seljuks in 1084.⁴⁴

Halmyros replaced Demetrias as the main grain outlet of Thessaly in the 12th century. The establishment of Venetians and Pisans there was primarily connected with grain exports to Constantinople. This is also suggested by many contracts concluded in the capital for trade in Halmyros. Venetians may have been settled in the city by 1112, when an Amalfitan ship carried several of them to Constantinople. Venetian settlement in Halmyros appears even more likely

41 Oikonomides, "Le marchand byzantin des provinces", pp. 655–60; id., "The Economic Region of Constantinople", pp. 221–38.

42 See Jacoby, "The Byzantine Outsider", pp. 135–36.

43 See above.

44 Jacoby, "Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani", pp. 98, 107–08; Jacoby, "Venetian Commercial Expansion", pp. 389–90.

by 1122. By 1150, the Venetian Stefano Capello owned land there, on which he had built houses and a wine cellar and was growing vines. The Venetian church is attested in 1156. The 20 Venetian ships anchoring at Halmyros in 1171 were presumably involved in grain export. Pisans were settled in Halmyros before 1180, despite their limited tax exemption in the provinces at that time. They owned houses, churches, a covered street, a hospital, land, vineyards, gardens, and mills. A few Venetians held property from the Pisan church of S. Giacomo or from the Pisan commune. The treaty of 1180 between Venice and Pisa reveals that their respective nationals resided in Halmyros in separate, though contiguous areas. They presumably exported their agricultural surpluses.⁴⁵

Thessalonica appears in the second half of the 12th century as a destination, transit station, and base of operations for Venetian as well as Pisan merchants and ships, the Venetians also reaching the city by land from the Peloponnese via Corinth and Thebes.⁴⁶ The existence of a dependency of the Venetian monastery of S. Nicolò di Lido in Thessalonica in 1165 implies the presence of Venetian settlers at that time. The Pisans had a *fondaco* or caravanserai in the city before 1182. From its existence we may gather that the Pisans and the Venetians resided and operated in separate, though contiguous areas in the vicinity of the harbour. Genoese ships sailing around the Peloponnese on their way to or from Constantinople occasionally anchored in Thessalonica, yet there is no evidence of Genoese settlers in the city before the Fourth Crusade.⁴⁷

Venetians visited Thebes and Corinth from the 1070s, as noted above, yet the local Venetian churches are only attested respectively in 1159 and in 1146, the year preceding the attack of King Roger II of Sicily on the two cities. The Venetians traded in Sparta from the 1130s at the latest, while a Venetian monastery in the city is attested in 1168. Venetians also resided in Abydos at the Dardanelles and Rhaidestos on the Sea of Marmara's shore, yet the Venetian churches are not recorded there respectively before 1189 and 1151. There were also Venetian churches on the islands of Lemnos and Rhodes, situated along the waterway between Constantinople and Alexandria, attested respectively in 1136 and 1187. It is noteworthy that there is no evidence of Venetian settlement

45 Jacoby, "Migrations familiales", pp. 360–61; Jacoby, "Les Latins dans les villes de Romanie", pp. 16–18; Jacoby, "Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani", p. 102; Jacoby, "Pisan Presence and Trade", p. 50; *Documenti*, ed. Müller, pp. 20–23, no. XVIII, for the treaty of 1180, and p. 71, no. XLIV, for the Pisan property lost in 1182.

46 Jacoby, "Les Latins dans les villes de Romanie", p. 17; Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, p. 94. [For a new study of the material culture, topography, and history of Thessalonica, see Antonaras, *Arts, Crafts and Trades*.]

47 Jacoby, "Foreigners and the Urban Economy", pp. 88–92; Jacoby, "Les Latins dans les villes de Romanie", pp. 18–19.

along the Anatolian shore south of the Dardanelles, despite Venetian sailing to the Crusader States and Egypt in the 12th century.

A Latin monastery is recorded in Adrianople in 1157 and 1174; it was apparently Venetian. All the 12th-century imperial chrysobulls in favour of Venice mention the city, and Venice obtained it within its share of the empire in the partition treaty concluded with the crusaders in 1204. Situated in the midst of a fertile grain-producing region, it was reached from Constantinople. A Genoese trading in Adrianople around 1174 had already paid the tax on his goods in the capital, and the chrysobull of 1187, issued by Emperor Isaac II to the Venetians, mentions their presence between the empire's capital and Adrianople. The monastery suggests some kind of Venetian settlement in the city.⁴⁸ By the mid-12th century there was a Latin *burgus* outside Philippopolis in Thrace, yet there is no evidence regarding the identity of the settlers.⁴⁹

It is commonly believed that throughout the Middle Ages, Crete occupied a strategic location at the crossing of the major maritime lanes of the Mediterranean. However, only gradually was the island integrated within the shipping and commercial networks of Venice and Genoa. As noted above, Venetian merchants were visiting Crete in the early 11th century, and by the 1060s they were joined by Genoese merchants to purchase pastoral and agricultural products. In addition to cheese, Crete produced wool, grain, wine, honey, as well as medicinal and aromatic herbs. The island does not appear in the chrysobull of 1082 in favour of Venice, yet by 1136 the number of Venetians trading in the island had increased and they requested full enjoyment of their privileges as elsewhere in the empire. By that time Candia, the main Cretan port, was serving as a stopover and a source of the island's products for ships sailing to Constantinople, the Crusader States, Egypt, and to Italy by ships returning to their home base. Crete nevertheless remained of secondary importance for Venice and there were no Venetian settlers on the island before the Fourth Crusade. Genoa's trading in Crete seems to have been fairly limited even after the extension of its tax reductions. The Genoan Guglielmo de Candida, attested in the 1150s, may have been a settler on the island.⁵⁰

Italian settlement in Anatolia is not documented before the second half of the 12th century. By 1172, an Amalfitan appears to have been permanently

48 For the churches in the last two paragraphs, see Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, pp. 40–41 and n. 46. My interpretation of the evidence regarding Adrianople differs from that of Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 178–79.

49 Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, p. 88.

50 Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete", pp. 517–40. Candida was the Latin name of Candia. [For the history of Byzantine Crete until its conquest by the Venetians in general, see Tsougarakis, *Byzantine Crete*.]

residing at Phokaia, on the Aegean shore, and was probably not the only one settled in that port, an outlet for grain.⁵¹ By 1156, Genoese merchants visited Attaleia (modern Antalya), the maritime outlet of a caravan route extending from Tabriz in Iran across Anatolia. Some of these merchants were settled in Attaleia from the 1170s, as revealed by their surname 'de Satalia', the western appellation for the city. These Genoese probably engaged in the silk trade. Pisans too appear to have settled in Attaleia in the 12th century. A member of the Pisan Aldobrandini family, described as 'Byzantinized', managed to establish his rule over the city shortly after the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, presumably after having resided there for many years.⁵² Italian trade in Anatolia was also conducted by merchants settled in the eastern Mediterranean. Venetians residing in Acre operated in Attaleia in 1147, and others from Constantinople in Adramyttion (modern Edremit) and Smyrna on the Aegean shore in the 1150s and 1160s.⁵³

The 12th century witnessed growing trade between Italy and Egypt, as well as with the Crusader States of the Levant. Italian trading and shipping between Constantinople and Alexandria also intensified, with anchoring in ports of call along the western and southern shores of Anatolia. Most Italian ships followed this course of navigation, even when sailing in the open seas from the region of Crete to the Levant was being practised after 1150.⁵⁴ The Venetian, Pisan, and Genoese merchants and ship operators gradually expanded their share within the trading and transportation network connecting the empire and Egypt at the expense of their Byzantine and foreign competitors, and around 1200 they had gained the upper hand in that respect. One of the major factors ensuring their success was the ability of their respective governments to obtain extensive privileges in the empire, the Crusader States, as well as in Egypt.⁵⁵ In his manual of mathematics composed in 1202, the Pisan Leonardo Pisano, also known as Fibonacci, refers to two business partners, one residing for more than five years in Alexandria and the other in Constantinople.⁵⁶ Fibonacci's wording suggests that this was not an isolated case.

Italian merchants partly financed their purchases of spices, colorants, and aromatics in Fatimid Egypt with timber for naval construction, and iron. In return the Italian maritime nations obtained commercial and fiscal

51 Jacoby, "Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani", p. 103.

52 Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, pp. 149–50; Jacoby, "Silk Crosses the Mediterranean", pp. 75–76.

53 Lilie, *Handel und Politik*, p. 167; Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, p. 92.

54 Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete", pp. 536–37.

55 Jacoby, "Byzantine Trade with Egypt", pp. 47–77.

56 Leonard of Pisa, *Liber abbaci*, ed. B. Boncompagni, *Scritti di Leonardo Pisani*, vol. 1: *Il liber abbaci di Leonardo Pisano*, Rome 1857, pp. 274–76.

concessions for their nationals. Italian timber was apparently shipped from the late 10th century onward. Yet, a document drafted between 1101 and 1130 suggests that five Christian merchants, one of them Amalfitan and another Genoese, imported timber from southern Anatolia. This region was an important source of timber for Egypt. An incident involving a Genoese ship close to Attaleia shortly before 1174 illustrates this traffic. Byzantine officials confiscated the vessel and its cargo, which consisted of 1,332 oars, 120 beams, and an unspecified number of large boards and small wooden columns, most likely purchased at Attaleia. The number of oars was more or less sufficient for the equipment of ten war galleys. The timber was obviously on its way to Egypt. Italian exports of Anatolian timber and iron to Egypt are well attested in the 1270s. There is good reason to believe that, like the exports of timber, Anatolian iron was being conveyed to Alexandria in the 12th century.⁵⁷

As noted above, by the 11th century the Italians were sailing to Egypt hugging the southern Anatolian and Levantine seaboard. They displayed little if any interest in Byzantine Cyprus, which is not explicitly mentioned in the charter issued in 1082 by Alexios I to the Venetians. However, around 1136 and in 1147 Venice requested the full implementation of its privileges in the island. The Venetian requests reflect a change in Venice's attitude related to a growing interest, presence, and activity of its citizens in the island. Venetian ships anchoring in Limassol and Paphos were involved at that time in trading between Cyprus, Egypt, the Frankish states of the Levant, and Byzantine territories, especially Constantinople, yet the island remained at the margin of trans-Mediterranean trade and navigation throughout the 12th century.

Venetians began to settle in Byzantine Cyprus in the first half of the 12th century. Shortly before the conquest of the island by King Richard I of England in 1191, almost 90 households from some 45 Venetian families resided in Nicosia, the administrative and ecclesiastical centre of Cyprus, in Paphos, and mainly in Limassol, the major Cypriot port in the 12th century. The Venetians in Limassol owned 46 shops and more than 100 houses, as well as rural estates and mills. In addition, there were communal facilities and Venetian churches in the three cities. It is likely that the Latins of Limassol who welcomed Richard I in 1191 were Venetians, since there is no evidence of other Latin settlers in the city at that time. The Venetian settlers operated in three sectors of the Cypriot economy: the export of foodstuffs and wine, partly from their own estates; trade in other commodities within a regional commercial network connecting Cyprus with Egypt, the Crusader States, and Anatolia; and the renting out of houses

57 Jacoby, "The Supply of War Materials", pp. 105–10, 119–25; Jacoby, "Byzantine Trade with Egypt", pp. 35–36.

and shops in Cypriot cities. All Venetian property in Cyprus was confiscated by King Guy of Lusignan in the early years of his reign over Cyprus, which began in 1192, presumably because Venice had supported his rival Conrad of Montferrat in the struggle for the throne of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The expropriation prompted most, if not all Venetians to leave Cyprus.⁵⁸

There was no Byzantine closure of the Black Sea to western trade before 1204, as often claimed. Genoese merchants exported grain from the western shore of that region for some time in the second half of the 12th century. Venetian merchants may also have traded in the Black Sea. However, none of the Italian maritime powers displayed strong interest in trade in the region until the early 13th century. The Byzantine-Venetian treaties of 1082 and 1198 do not mention a single Black Sea port or province, nor does the partition treaty of the empire concluded by Venice with the crusaders in 1204.⁵⁹

Sporadic and indirect evidence suggests that already before 1100 merchants and ships from Venice, Amalfi, Genoa, Gaeta, Bari, and Pisa were anchoring in the islands of the Aegean and in ports along the western and southern Anatolian shores, whether as a destination or on the way between their home base and Constantinople or Alexandria. By the second half of the 12th century the Venetians, the Pisans, and the Genoese were the dominant forces among the Italians, Amalfitan trade being on the decline.⁶⁰ The Italian integration within the Byzantine supply system, which gradually expanded from the 11th century, is often viewed as largely leading to the replacement of Byzantine with Italian merchants and ships, and to Italian supremacy in domestic maritime trade and shipping by the end of the 12th century. The scarcity of Byzantine evidence and the more abundant Italian sources regarding economic activity in the empire before 1204 are largely responsible for this skewed assessment. Yet, there were also economic factors that limited the Italian impact, which in the absence of reliable quantitative data must be taken into account. The Italians operated within a dynamic, expanding Byzantine economy, primarily stimulated by *domestic* demand, which undoubtedly resulted in growing maritime trade practised by Byzantine merchants and ships.⁶¹ Moreover, the Italians conducted operations throughout the entire eastern Mediterranean, Genoa and Pisa even beyond, which limited both the capital and available ship tonnage they could muster for trade in the empire. It is only from the second

58 For the last two paragraphs, see Jacoby, "The Venetians in Byzantine and Lusignan Cyprus", pp. 59–63 [For Limassol, see also the new collective volume by Nicolaou-Konnari/Schabel (eds.), *Lemesos*].

59 Jacoby, "Byzantium, the Italian Maritime Powers, and the Black Sea", pp. 677–99.

60 Jacoby, "Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani", pp. 114–16, 123–28.

61 Jacoby, "The Byzantine Social Elite", pp. 67–80, 84–86.

half of the 13th century that Genoa and Venice assumed a dominant role in trans-Mediterranean trade and transportation along the major sea lanes across the Byzantine maritime space.

Addendum: Research on Italian Traders in Byzantium between c.800 and 1204

Miriam Salzmann and Johannes Pahlitzsch

In recent decades, rather few scholars have undertaken research on Italian trade with, and in Byzantium, before 1204, but of these, David Jacoby was one of the most prolific.⁶² As his above overview suggests, Jacoby has shed light on numerous aspects of the developing Italian trade in the eastern Mediterranean over the years in question. He was not able to complete his comprehensive treatment of the topic with a research overview before he sadly passed away in 2018. The following very short remarks may therefore serve as a small complement to his synthesis, without in any way claiming comprehensiveness.

The source situation for the period before 1204 is difficult since the archives of the Italian trading cities do not preserve many documents for this period, contrasting sharply with the centuries of the later Middle Ages, for which state documents, but also notarial registers and family archives abound.⁶³ As a result, scholars have often treated the period as part of their more general work on the Italian trading communities and their connections with the East. Apart from David Jacoby, who wrote about both Italian and Byzantine traders in general, and about specific communities, such as the Venetians, Pisans, or Amalfitans, other authors dedicated themselves to either a few specific or more general studies on the subject. Michel Balard, in 1978, analysed the foundation of the Genoese trading colonies in the East at the beginning of his comprehensive study on the urban characteristics and governmental structures of the main Genoese outposts in that region, such as Pera, Caffa, and Chios.⁶⁴ Much of Balard's later work touched upon the Italian connections with the eastern Mediterranean before 1204, sometimes analysing specific relationships, i.e. between Pisa and Byzantium, at other times also focusing on broader topics,

62 For a list of Jacoby's publications, see "David Jacoby Publications".

63 Nevertheless, for an initial overview of early sources concerning Genoa and Venice and their relations with Byzantium, see Balard, "Mediterraneo, Levante e Mar Nero"; Angold/Balard, "Venice: a Bibliography". For Amalfi, see the discussion of sources in Skinner, *Medieval Amalfi*, ch. 1. For Pisa, see Borsari, "Pisani a Bisanzio".

64 Balard, *La Romanie génoise*.

such as Italian travellers in general.⁶⁵ The broader scope of these studies may also reflect the small number of written sources, that encourages this more general perspective. A comprehensive viewpoint also characterizes Ralph-Johannes Lilie's 1984 work on politics and trade between Byzantium and the Italian trading cities Genoa, Venice, and Pisa between 1081 and 1204, while Silvano Borsari's 1988 monograph focused more narrowly on the economic relations between Venice and Byzantium in the 12th century.⁶⁶ Later, Angeliki Laiou examined the economic relations between Byzantium and the Italians within the framework of a history of the Byzantine economy. Most recently, Sandra Origone has examined the changing Byzantine perspective towards Italian, and specifically Genoese traders, from the 12th century onwards.⁶⁷

Among the scarcely researched details of the development of Italian trade with Byzantium, the trading privileges for Venice, and especially the treaty that granted the Venetians freedom from taxes within the Byzantine Empire, have received the most attention. Scholars have actively debated the dating of the latter. Though most scholars favour the year 1082, Peter Frankopan has fervently argued for the year 1092, the date that has come down to us in the existing copies of the treaty itself.⁶⁸ Daphne Penna in turn has taken these trading privileges as a starting point for a study of the legal issues between Byzantium and the Italian merchants from the 10th through to the 12th century.⁶⁹

Another topic that has attracted some recent attention is the city of Amalfi. Scholars have discussed the exact structure and scope of the Amalfitan trading community in the Mediterranean – ranging from the characterization of a well established network of merchants to disconnected individual merchants dispersed through the Mediterranean – as well as its decline in the second half of the 12th century. Patricia Skinner has been the most recent scholar to tackle these questions in her 2013 monograph.⁷⁰ Other recent studies, specifically on Amalfi's relations with Byzantium, include Vera von Falkenhausen's

65 A selection would be: Balard, "Pisa e l'Oriente bizantino"; Balard, *Les Latins en Orient*; Balard, "Voyageurs italiens". Balard has also written some useful bibliographies both for the connections of Venice and of Genoa with Byzantium, see Balard, "Mediterraneo, Levante e Mar Nero"; Angold/Balard, "Venice: a Bibliography".

66 Lilie, *Handel und Politik*; Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*. Borsari later similarly wrote on the Pisans in 12th-century Byzantium: Borsari, "Pisani a Bisanzio".

67 Laiou, "Exchange and Trade"; Origone, "Genoa and Byzantium".

68 For the debate on the date, see most recently Madden, "The Chrysobull of Alexius I"; Jacoby, "The Chrysobull of Alexius I"; and Frankopan, "Byzantine Trade Privileges", who also list older literature on the debate.

69 Penna, *The Byzantine Imperial Acts*; Penna, "Similar Problems, Similar Solutions"; Penna, "Venetian Judges".

70 Skinner, *Medieval Amalfi*.

article “Gli Amalfitani nell'impero byzantino”, first given as a paper at the symposium “Amalfi and Byzantium” in 2008, to commemorate the anniversary of the translation of the relics of St Andrew the Apostle from Constantinople to Amalfi in 1208.⁷¹ Holger Klein has discussed the issue of Byzantine influence on an Amalfitan ivory workshop in the second half of the 11th century in the context of the trading networks of Amalfi.⁷²

With the exception of these studies, the economic relations between the Italian trading cities and Byzantium during the period in question have received little attention in recent years. This lack of specific literature stands in contrast to other fields of research concerning the relations between Byzantium and the Latin West, such as questions of identity,⁷³ and of broader structural economic developments in the Byzantine Empire, the Mediterranean, and in early medieval Europe in general. For the latter, a mention of Michael McCormick's seminal study on the origins of the European Economy is the obligatory starting point; in recent times, Chris Wickham, among others, has contributed to an analysis of Mediterranean trade cycles between the late antique and early medieval periods. Romney David Smith has, inter alia, shown how the vibrant Arab trading network between Alexandria, Mahdia, and Palermo around the year 1000 was substituted with Italian dominated shipping networks during the 11th and 12th centuries.⁷⁴ Concerning trade within the Byzantine Empire itself, the find of 37 exceptionally well-preserved shipwrecks dating to the 5th through to the 10th/11th centuries in İstanbul's Yenikapı neighbourhood in 2004, has fuelled economic research ever since.⁷⁵ Collective volumes such as *Trade in Byzantium* and *Trade and Markets in Byzantium* have aimed at evaluating various aspects of Byzantine trade and economy, crucially encompassing the 9th through to the 12th centuries as well.⁷⁶

71 Von Falkenhausen, “Gli Amalfitani”.

72 Klein, “Amalfi, Byzantium”.

73 For an introduction to these studies concerning the Italians in the eastern Mediterranean, though mostly after 1204, see Otten-Froux, “Identities and Allegiances”; Saint-Guillain (ed.), *Liquid and Multiple*.

74 McCormick, *Origins*; Wickham, “The Mediterranean around 800”; Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages*; Smith, “Calamity and Transition”.

75 For an introduction to the Yenikapı finds, see Kızıltan (ed.), *Stories from the Hidden Harbour*. New research on the ports of Constantinople may be found in Daim (ed.), *Die byzantinischen Häfen*.

76 Morrisson (ed.), *Trade and Markets in Byzantium*; Magdalino/Necipoğlu (eds.), *Trade in Byzantium*.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Documenti, ed. G. Müller, *Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'Oriente cristiano e coi Turchi fino all'anno MDXXXI*, Florence 1879.

Secondary Literature

- Angold, M./Balard, M., "Venice: a Bibliography", in M. Whitby (ed.), *Byzantines and Crusaders in Non-Greek Sources, 1025–1204* (Proceedings of the British Academy, 132), Oxford 2007, pp. 86–94.
- Antonaras, A. Ch., *Arts, Crafts and Trades in Ancient and Byzantine Thessaloniki. Archaeological, Literary and Epigraphic Evidence* (Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident, 2), 2nd ed., Mainz 2019.
- Balard, M., *La Romanie génoise (XII^e–début du XV^e siècle)*, Genoa-Rome 1978.
- Balard, M., "Voyageurs italiens à Byzance (VI^e–XI^e siècles)", in J.-L. Kupper/A. Dierkens (eds.), *Voyages et Voyageurs à Byzance et en Occident du VI^e au XI^e siècle*, Geneva 2000, pp. 255–72.
- Balard, M., "Pisa e l'Oriente bizantino", in M. Tangheroni (ed.), *Pisa e il Mediterraneo: uomini, merci, idee dagli Etruschi ai Medici*, Milan 2003, pp. 228–33.
- Balard, M., *Les Latins en Orient (XI^e–XV^e siècle)*, Paris 2006.
- Balard, M., "Mediterraneo, Levante e Mar Nero", in D. Puncuh (ed.), *La Società Ligure di Storia Patria nella storiografia italiana. 1857–2007* (Atti della Società ligure di Storia Patria, n.s. 50), Genoa 2010, vol. 1, pp. 331–48.
- Borsari, S., *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici*, Venice 1988.
- Borsari, S., "Pisani a Bisanzio nel XII secolo", *Bollettino Storico Pisano* 60 (1991), 59–76.
- Brand, C., *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968.
- Daim, F. (ed.), *Die byzantinischen Häfen Konstantinopels* (Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident, 4), Mainz 2016.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Gli Amalfitani nell'Impero bizantino", in E.G. Farrugia (ed.), *Amalfi and Byzantium. Acts of the International Symposium on the Eighth Centenary of the Translation of the Relics of St Andrew the Apostle from Constantinople to Amalfi (1208–2008). Rome 6 May, 2008* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 287), Rome 2010, pp. 17–44.
- Frankopan, P., "Byzantine Trade Privileges to Venice in the Eleventh Century: the Chrysobull of 1092", *Journal of Medieval History* 30 (2004), 135–60.
- "David Jacoby Publications", in S. Menache et al. (eds.), *Crusading and Trading between West and East. Studies in Honour of David Jacoby*, London 2019, xiii–xxxiii.
- Jacoby, D., "Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84/85 (1991/92), 452–500 (repr. in Jacoby, *Trade*, no. VII).

- Jacoby, D., "Italian Privileges and Trade in Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade: a Reconsideration", *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 24 (1994), 349–69 (repr. in Jacoby, *Trade*, no. II).
- Jacoby, D., "Silk Crosses the Mediterranean", in G. Airaldi (ed.), *Le vie del Mediterraneo. Idee, uomini, oggetti (secoli XI–XVI)* (Università degli studi di Genova, Collana dell'Istituto di storia del medioevo e della espansione europea, 1), Genoa 1997, pp. 55–79 (repr. with corrections in Jacoby, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean*, no. X).
- Jacoby, D., *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot 1997.
- Jacoby, D., "Byzantine Crete in the Navigation and Trade Networks of Venice and Genoa", in L. Balletto (ed.), *Oriente e Occidente tra medioevo ed età moderna. Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino* (Università degli Studi di Genova, Sede di Acqui Terme, Collana di Fonti e Studi, 1.1), Acqui Terme 1997, pp. 517–40 (repr. in Jacoby, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean*, no. II).
- Jacoby, D., "The Byzantine Outsider in Trade (c.900–c.1350)", in D.C. Smythe (ed.), *Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider*, Aldershot 2000, pp. 129–47 (repr. in Jacoby, *Latins, Greeks and Muslims*, no. I).
- Jacoby, D., "Byzantine Trade with Egypt from the Mid-Tenth Century to the Fourth Crusade", *Thesaurismata* 30 (2000), 25–77 (repr. in Jacoby, *Commercial Exchange*, no. I).
- Jacoby, D., "The Supply of War Materials to Egypt in the Crusader Period", *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 25 (2001), 102–32 (repr. in Jacoby, *Commercial Exchange*, no. II).
- Jacoby, D., "The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople from 1082 to 1261: Topographical Considerations", in C. Sode/S. Takács (eds.), *Novum Millennium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck*, Aldershot 2001, pp. 153–70 (repr. in Jacoby, *Commercial Exchange*, no. III).
- Jacoby, D., *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean*, Aldershot 2001.
- Jacoby, D., "Migrations familiales et stratégies commerciales vénitiennes aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles", in M. Balard/A. Ducellier (eds.), *Migrations et diasporas méditerranéennes (X^e–XVI^e siècles)* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 19), Paris 2002, pp. 355–73 (repr. in Jacoby, *Latins, Greeks and Muslims*, no. III).
- Jacoby, D., "The Chrysobull of Alexius I Comnenus to the Venetians: the Date and the Debate: a Rejoinder", *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002), 199–204.
- Jacoby, D., "Foreigners and the Urban Economy in Thessalonike, c. 1150–c. 1430", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 57 (2003), 85–132 (repr. in Jacoby, *Latins, Greeks and Muslims*, no. VII).
- Jacoby, D., *Commercial Exchange Across the Mediterranean: Byzantium, the Crusader Levant, Egypt and Italy*, Aldershot 2005.

- Jacoby, D., "Les Latins dans les villes de Romanie jusqu'en 1261: le versant méditerranéen des Balkans", in M. Balard/É. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur. Contacts, relations, échanges*, Paris 2005, pp. 13–26.
- Jacoby, D., "Byzantium, the Italian Maritime Powers, and the Black Sea before 1204", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 100 (2007), 677–99.
- Jacoby, D., "The Venetians in Byzantine and Lusignan Cyprus: Trade, Settlement, and Politics", in A. Nicolaou-Konnari (ed.), *La Serenissima and la Nobilissima: Venice in Cyprus and Cyprus in Venice* (Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation), Nicosia 2009, pp. 59–100.
- Jacoby, D., *Latins, Greeks and Muslims: Encounters in the Eastern Mediterranean, Tenth–Fifteenth Centuries*, Farnham 2009.
- Jacoby, D., "Venetian Commercial Expansion in the Eastern Mediterranean, 8th–11th centuries", in M.M. Mango (ed.), *Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries. The Archaeology of Local, Regional and International Exchange*, Farnham 2009, pp. 371–91.
- Jacoby, D., "The Minor Western Nations in Constantinople: Trade and Shipping from the Early Twelfth Century to 1261", in G.K. Barzelote/K.G. Tsiknakes (eds.), *Γαληνοτάτη. Τιμή στη Χρύσα Μαλτέζου*, Athens 2013, pp. 319–32.
- Jacoby, D., "Rural Exploitation and Market Economy in the Late Medieval Peloponnese", in S.E.J. Gerstel (ed.), *Viewing the Morea. Land and People in the Late Medieval Peloponnese*, Washington, D.C. 2013, pp. 213–75.
- Jacoby, D., "Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani nel Mediterraneo orientale: sviluppo e declino", in B. Figliuolo/P.F. Simbula (eds.), *Interscambi socio-culturali ed economici fra le città marinare d'Italia e l'Occidente dagli osservatori mediterranei*, Amalfi 2014, pp. 89–128.
- Jacoby, D., "The Expansion of Venetian Government in the Eastern Mediterranean until the Late Thirteenth Century", in G. Ortalli/O.J. Schmitt/E. Orlando (eds.), *Il Commonwealth veneziano tra il 1204 e la fine della Repubblica. Identità e peculiarità*, Venice 2015, pp. 19–79.
- Jacoby, D., "The Byzantine Social Elite and the Market Economy, Eleventh to Mid-Fifteenth Century", in A. Frazier/P. Nold (eds.), *Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters in Honor of John Monfasani*, Leiden-Boston 2015, pp. 67–86.
- Jacoby, D., "Evolving Routes of Western Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Eleventh to Fifteenth Century: an Overview", in K. Herbers/H.C. Lehner (eds.), *Unterwegs im Namen der Religion/On the Road in the Name of Religion*, vol. 2: *Wege und Ziele in vergleichender Perspektive – das mittelalterliche Europa und Asien/Ways and Destinations in Comparative Perspective – Medieval Europe and Asia*, Stuttgart 2016, pp. 75–97.
- Jacoby, D., "Pisan Presence and Trade in Later Byzantium", in A. Berger/S. Mariev/G. Prinzing/A. Riehle (eds.), *Koinotaton Doron. Das späte Byzanz zwischen Machtlosigkeit und kultureller Blüte (1204–1461)* (Byzantinisches Archiv, 31), Berlin-Boston 2016, pp. 47–59.

- Jacoby, D., "Byzantine Maritime Trade, 1025–1118", in J.-C. Cheynet/B. Flusin (eds.), *Autour du Premier humanisme byzantin et des Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle, quarante ans après Paul Lemerle* (Travaux et Mémoires, 21/2), Paris 2017, pp. 627–48.
- Kapriev, G., *Lateinische Rivalen in Konstantinopel. Anselm von Havelberg und Hugo Eterianus* (Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales. Bibliotheca 15), Leuven 2018.
- Kazhdan, P., et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, New York-Oxford 1991.
- Kızıltan, Z. (ed.), *Stories from the Hidden Harbour. Shipwrecks of Yenikapı*, İstanbul 2013.
- Klein, H.A., "Amalfi, Byzantium, and the Vexed Question of Artistic ›Influence‹", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 69 (2015), 130–56.
- Laiou, A.E., "Byzantine Traders and Seafarers", in S. Vryonis Jr. (ed.), *The Greeks and the Sea*, New Rochelle, N.Y. 1993, pp. 79–96.
- Laiou, A.E., "Institutional Mechanisms of Integration", in ead./H. Ahrweiler (eds.), *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, Washington 1998, pp. 161–81.
- Laiou, A.E., "Exchange and Trade, Seventh–Twelfth Centuries", in ead. (ed.), *The Economic History of Byzantium. From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Washington 2002, vol. 2, pp. 681–754.
- Laiou, A.E., "Regional Networks in the Balkans in the Middle and Late Byzantine Period", in C. Morrison (ed.), *Trade and Markets in Byzantium*, Washington, D.C. 2012, pp. 1–35 (repr. in Laiou, *Byzantium and the Other*, no. XIII).
- Laiou, A.E., *Byzantium and the Other: Relations and Exchanges*, eds. C. Morrison/R. Dorin, Farnham 2012.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)*, Amsterdam 1984.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096–1204*, Oxford 1993.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Die lateinische Kirche in der Romania vor dem vierten Kreuzzug", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 82 (2009), 202–220.
- Madden, T.F., "The Chrysobull of Alexius I Comnenus to the Venetians: the Date and the Debate", *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002), 23–41.
- Magdalino, P./Necipoğlu, N. (eds.), *Trade in Byzantium: Papers from the Third International Sevgi Göniül Byzantine Studies Symposium*, İstanbul 2016.
- McCormick, M., *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, A.D. 300–900*, Cambridge 2002.
- Morrisson, C. (ed.), *Trade and Markets in Byzantium*, Washington 2012.
- Nicolaou-Konnari, A./Schabel, C. (eds.), *Lemesos. A History of Limassol in Cyprus from Antiquity to the Ottoman Conquest*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2015.
- Oikonomides, N., "Le marchand byzantin des provinces (IX^e–XI^e s.)", in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: l'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea*. (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 40), Spoleto 1993, pp. 633–65.

- Oikonomides, N., "The Economic Region of Constantinople: From Directed Economy to Free Economy, and the Role of the Italians", in G. Arnaldi/G. Cavallo (eds.), *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino. Contatti effettivi e possibilità di studi comparati* (Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, Nuovi studi storici, 40), Rome 1997, pp. 221–38.
- Origone, S., "Genoa and Byzantium. Aspects of a Long Relationship", in N.G. Chrissis et al. (eds.), *Byzantium and the West. Perception and Reality (11th–15th c.)*, London 2019, pp. 38–55.
- Otten-Froux, C., "Identities and Allegiances: The Perspective of Genoa and Pisa", in J. Herrin/G. Saint-Guillain (eds.), *Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Farnham 2010, pp. 245–64.
- Penna, D., "Venetian Judges and their Jurisdiction in Constantinople in the Twelfth Century. Some Observations Based on Information Drawn from the Chrysobull of Alexios III Angelos to Venice in 1198", in J.H.A. Lokin et al. (eds.), *Subseciva Groningana. Studies in Roman and Byzantine Law*, Groningen 2008, vol. 8, pp. 135–46.
- Penna, D., *The Byzantine Imperial Acts to Venice, Pisa and Genoa, 10th–12th Centuries. A Comparative Legal Study*, Groningen 2012.
- Penna, D., "Similar Problems, Similar Solutions? Byzantine Chrysobulls and Crusader Charters on Legal Issues Regarding the Italian Maritime Republics", in D. Slootjes/M. Verhoeven (eds.), *Byzantium in Dialogue with the Mediterranean. History and Heritage* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 116), Leiden 2019, pp. 162–81.
- Saint-Guillain, G./Stathakopoulos, D. Ch. (eds.), *Liquid and Multiple. Individuals and Identities in the Thirteenth-Century Aegan*, Paris 2012.
- Skinner, P., *Medieval Amalfi and its Diaspora, 800–1250*, Oxford 2013.
- Smith, R.D., "Calamity and Transition: Re-imagining Italian Trade in the Eleventh-Century Mediterranean", *Past and Present* 228 (2015), 15–56.
- Todt, K.-P., *Dukat und griechisch-orthodoxes Patriarchat von Antiocheia in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit (969–1084)* (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik, 14), Wiesbaden 2020.
- Tsougarakis, D., *Byzantine Crete: from the 5th Century to the Venetian Conquest*, Athens 1988.
- Vryonis, S. Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Berkeley 1971.
- Wickham, C., *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean 400–800*, Oxford 2005.
- Wickham, C., "The Mediterranean around 800: On the Brink of the Second Trade Cycle", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 161–74.

Jews as Cultural Brokers between Byzantium and the Latin West, 850–1200 AD

Saskia Dönitz

In a medieval Jewish context, the Latin world is synonymous with northern France and Germany, usually called Ashkenaz.¹ The earliest Jewish communities of Ashkenaz, namely the famous communities of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz, came into existence from the late 9th to early 10th centuries.² Cultural life in these communities was shaped by immigrants from Spain, southern France and Italy. The latter brought traditions from southern Italy and Byzantium. This close connection between Ashkenaz and Byzantium via Italy – which is relatively well documented, especially in quotations from Byzantine sages in Ashkenazic works – continued after the assaults on the Rhineland communities during the First Crusade in 1096.³

By contrast, the Jewish communities of Byzantium had existed since Antiquity.⁴ It is significant that the majority of Jewish sources known from the period studied here were composed in southern Italy, which was part of the Byzantine Empire until the Norman Conquest in 1071; however, few works by Byzantine Jews from this timeframe originate from Byzantium proper.⁵ In the 10th century, Karaites began migrating from Palestine into the Byzantine Empire, and settled in Constantinople, where they established a huge translation project which rendered a corpus of Karaite Judeo-Arabic works into Hebrew.⁶ Furthermore, the works of a number of Hebrew poets have been

1 For a discussion of the term “Latin West”, see Steckel, “Introduction: Towards a Connected History”, p. XXI. Southern France, in particular Provence, will not be dealt with here since relations between Provence and Byzantium in this period is an entirely unexamined field.

2 For a general overview, see Haverkamp, “Germany”; Ben-Shalom, “Medieval Jewry”; Haverkamp, “Jews in Christian Europe”. On cultural history, see Kanarfogel, *The Intellectual History*; Grossman, *The Early Sages of Ashkenaz*; Grossman, *The Early Sages of France*.

3 Ta-Shma, “Toward a History”; see below.

4 For general surveys on Byzantine Jewry, see Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*; Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*; Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*.

5 For the sources see *Greek Jewish Texts*, ed. N. de Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 51), Tübingen 1996; de Lange, “Hebrew Scholarship in Byzantium”; Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*. Examples are discussed below.

6 Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*.

transmitted.⁷ Thus, the quantity of known sources for the period discussed here is limited and most have not yet been examined in detail.⁸

In general, historical information on individual Jews from 850–1200 is scarce, especially in Byzantium. Therefore, it is difficult to provide a detailed analysis of whether, and how, Jews functioned as cultural brokers between Ashkenaz and Byzantium. Of course, any conclusion concerning that topic depends on how the term “cultural broker” is defined. If understood as one who mediates between various cultural spheres as an office holder at the imperial court, then the evidence is meagre for Byzantine and Ashkenazic Jews alike in the era being examined here.⁹ In Andalusian Spain – which was under Muslim rule until the mid-12th century – a considerable number of individual Jews are documented to have served in positions that brought them close to the ruler and, thus, they functioned as cultural brokers between the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds, e.g. the famous Ḥasday ibn Shaprūt (c.915–c.970), chief minister in the court of ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān III in Córdoba.¹⁰

The vague information from Byzantium and Ashkenaz does not signify an absence of individual Jews mediating between their community and the local government in general. For the Holy Roman Empire, more detailed historical evidence only exists from the 13th and 14th century onward.¹¹ One of the most famous examples from Early Modern Ashkenaz is Josef ben Gershon (Josel) of Rosheim (1476–1554), who acted as a *shtadlan* (“mediator”) between German and Polish Jewry and the Emperors Maximilian I and Charles V by intervening on behalf of Jews who were accused of blood libel.¹² The earliest record of the term *shtadlan* is from 13th-century Spain: after the reconquista, Christian rulers adopted this formal position for a Jewish advisor or minister from the Muslim rulers, in order to gain profit from his ability to raise money and serve as a mediator.¹³

7 Weinberger, *Jewish Hymnography*, chs 4, 5, and 7.

8 Early Byzantine exegesis has been analysed by Brin, *Reuel and his Friends*. For an overview of current research on Byzantine Jewry, see de Lange, “Research on Byzantine Jewry”; and Bonfil et al., *Jews in Byzantium*. Thousands of Hebrew manuscripts have been traced to Byzantium by the Hebrew Palaeography Project of the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts in Jerusalem. This vast corpus still awaits systematic analysis: see de Lange, “Research on Byzantine Jewry”, pp. 43, 50; Bowman, “Survival in Decline”, pp. 115 and 117.

9 For the various definitions of this term, see Jaspert/Oesterle/von der Höh, “Courts, Brokers and Brokerage”.

10 Kaplan, “Court Jews”.

11 Ries, “Politische Kommunikation und Shtadlanut”.

12 Stern, *Josel von Rosheim*; Carlebach, “Between History and Myth”.

13 Anon., “Shtadlan”. Latin sources refer to the head of the Jewish community as *episcopus Judaeorum* (bishop of the Jews). The exact meaning of this title is debated: see Levitats,

In Ashkenaz, Jews were not appointed to such positions, and Jewish communal structures were far less formalized than in Muslim countries. Not until the 13th century were well-defined leadership roles instituted in Ashkenazic communities.¹⁴ Previously, the community was headed by the families of its leading scholars.¹⁵ The most elevated families were those of the ShUM-communities (Speyer, Worms, and Mainz). The outstanding scholars themselves probably served as mediators between Jewish communities and Christian rulers, but without holding posts as court officials.¹⁶ Between 850–1200, we can enumerate some important leading figures in Ashkenazic communities who likely had contact with the local government: e.g. Gershom Me’or ha-Golah (c.960–1028, Mainz); Qalonymus ben Meshullam (d. 1096, Mainz);¹⁷ Solomon ben Isaak (also known as Rashi: 1040–1105, Troyes); the brothers Solomon ben Meir (known as Rashbam: c.1080–c.1160, Ramerupt) and Jacob ben Meir (known as Rabbenu Tam: c.1100–71, Troyes); Eliezer ben Nathan (known as Raban: c.1090–1170, Mainz); and Eliezer ben Joel ha-Levi of Bonn (known as Ravia: 1140–1225).¹⁸ None of them held an official position at the court, but all surely had contact with local rulers or even with the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. During the persecutions of 1096, Qalonymus ben Meshullam wrote to Henry IV on behalf of the Jewish communities under attack, seeking his protection. Unfortunately, this sage’s efforts were not successful and he died as a martyr.¹⁹

The sources on Byzantine Jewry from this period are less numerous. Unlike with the Holy Roman Empire and Muslim Spain, the *Quellenlage* concerning Byzantium is very problematic. We also lack exact information on community structures.²⁰ Moreover, with the exception of some literary notes, almost no information concerning Jews who played decisive roles in the Byzantine court

“Episcopus Judaeorum”. In Jewish sources, the community leader was called *Parnas* (supplier), whose responsibilities also lack an exact definition: see Graboïs, “Parnasim’s Government”.

14 Yuval, *Scholars in their Time*.

15 Ben-Sasson, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, pp. 532–33, 616, 629; Toch, *Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Reich*, pp. 18–21; Haverkamp, “Jews in Christian Europe”, pp. 172–73.

16 Graboïs, “Parnasim’s Government”.

17 On other members of the Qalonymus family and their Italian origins, see below.

18 Eliezer ben Joel ha-Levi mentions Jews who appealed to local rulers on their communities’ behalf: see Anon., “Shtadlan”.

19 *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Ersten Kreuzzugs*, ed. E. Haverkamp (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Hebräische Texte aus dem mittelalterlichen Deutschland, 1), Hannover 2005, pp. 294–97; for an English version of this story, see Cohen, *Sanctifying the Name of God*, ch. 7.

20 See above and de Lange, “Research on Byzantine Jewry”, esp. pp. 42–47.

has survived.²¹ Most extensive historical information can be derived from the *Megillat Ahima'as* (*Scroll of Ahimaaz*), a chronicle of one of the leading Jewish families of southern Italy, written in Capua in 1054.²² Another important source is Benjamin of Tudela's travelogue, which describes his journey from his native town in Spain via southern France, Italy, Greece, and Palestine, to Mesopotamia, Persia, and Egypt from 1160–73.²³ His report is a central historical source for the presence of Jewish communities around the Mediterranean during the 12th century.²⁴ En route, Benjamin noted numbers of families, and the leaders of the Jewish communities. Among his descriptions of the Jewish communities in Italy and Byzantium he often records the names of men in leadership positions, mostly entitled “rabbi” in the sense of a sage or a teacher. The majority of these names are not known from any other source. For this study, it is particularly interesting that, in his description of Constantinople and the Jews living there, Benjamin notes that the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I (1118–1180) had a Jewish doctor:

Amongst the scholars are several wise men, at their head being the chief rabbi R. Abtalion, R. Obadiah, R. Aaron Bechor Shoro, R. Joseph Shir-Guru, and R. Eliakim, the warden.²⁵ [...] No Jew there is allowed to ride on horseback. The one exception is R. Solomon ha-Mitsri, who is the king's physician, and through whom the Jews enjoy considerable alleviation of their oppression. For their condition is very low, and there is much hatred against them ...²⁶

This is one of the few witnesses to Byzantine Jews serving an official function – here as a physician of the Byzantine Emperor – where they could act as cultural brokers. Unfortunately, nothing is known about this Solomon ha-Misri (the Egyptian), except that his family was obviously from Egypt and that, as the emperor's physician, he was able to influence his ruler in favour of the Jewish

21 In studies on the late Byzantine court, Jews are not mentioned, see e.g. Kolditz, “Cultural Brokers”; there is a suggestion of a Jewish interpreter at the court of Andronicus III: see Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, pp. 254–55.

22 *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil.

23 Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. and trans. Adler.

24 Jacoby, “Benjamin of Tudela”.

25 Hebrew: הרפנס (ha-Parnas); on this term, see n. 13 (above).

26 Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. and trans. Adler, Engl. text, p. 14. In his description of Salonica, Benjamin also mentions that the leading scholar Rabbi Samuel ha-Rav was appointed as head of the Jews by royal authority: see Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. and trans. Adler, Engl. text, p. 11. It is not clear what he is referring to exactly.

population. There is no information regarding the other individuals named by Benjamin.

The second text, the already mentioned *Scroll of Ahimaaz*, is the most important source for Jewish history in Byzantine Italy and the transition of knowledge (*translatio scientiae*) from Babylonia to Italy. It tells several stories of the past generations of the Ahimaaz family in southern Italy. The foundation legend states that a certain Abu Ahron from Baghdad was expelled and came via Palestine to Italy, bringing with him authoritative knowledge concerning Jewish traditions.²⁷ Another story records the visit by Rabbi Shephatiah to the Byzantine Emperor Basil (reigned 867–86).²⁸ This emperor subjected the Jews of Byzantium to forced conversions in 873–74, one of the few attempts to coerce Byzantine Jews to abandon their religion and embrace Christianity.²⁹ Rabbi Shephatiah proved his wisdom and abilities by saving the emperor's daughter from a demon. He was rewarded with an invitation to dine with Basil and an opportunity to have an audience with Empress Eudokia Ingerina. Finally, the rabbi asked for his home town, Oria in Apulia, to be exempt from forced conversions; the emperor granted this request.³⁰ R. Shephatiah's brother, R. Ḥananel, also had very good relations with the local bishop in Oria.³¹

Both sources demonstrate that the Jews of Byzantium and Italy were led by figures who played important roles in the relationship between rulers and Jewish communities under Byzantine dominion, especially during times when Jews were subject to persecution.³² In his edition of the *Scroll of Ahimaaz*, Robert Bonfil even suggests that, in Byzantine southern Italy in the 9th century, there were Jewish courtiers much like those in Spain.³³ Unfortunately only the story of Rabbi Shephatiah has corroborating evidence. It seems likely that leadership positions in Byzantine Jewish communities were held by members of leading families and, as in Ashkenaz, these members found ways to make contact with the ruler. When another persecution arose in Byzantium under Romanos I Lekapenos (reigned 920–44), there was probably no such public figure to influence the emperor. In this situation, the Jews of Bari contacted

27 *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil, pp. 53–66.

28 *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil, pp. 260–70.

29 Stemberger, "Zwangstaufen im 4. und 7. Jahrhundert"; Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, pp. 82–94.

30 According to another tradition, he delivered all Jewish communities in southern Italy from the emperor's persecution: see *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil, p. 79. See, on these passages, Falkenhausen, "The Jews in Byzantine Southern Italy", pp. 281–82.

31 *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil, pp. 284–91.

32 Rabbi Shephatiah is known as the author of *piyyutim*, i.e. Hebrew liturgical poetry: see *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil, pp. 78–80.

33 *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil, pp. 109–13.

the above mentioned Ḥasday ibn Shaprūt, Jewish chief minister in Córdoba, who intervened later on behalf of Italian Jewry by appealing to Helena, wife of Constantine VII, successor of Romanos.³⁴

If so little information exists about Jewish courtiers in Byzantium and in the Latin West at that time, what can we say about the function of Jews as cultural brokers between Byzantium and the West? Throughout the Christian world, it may be assumed that Jewish merchants, travellers, wandering scholars, pilgrims, and the like, established contact between Jewish communities in the West and in Byzantium.³⁵ Of course, the standard political mechanisms (diplomacy, embassies, wars, or crusades) were not available to the Jews.³⁶ Given our scant knowledge of individuals who served as cultural brokers in positions of authority *within* Ashkenaz and Byzantium, we have even less information about individuals who served as cultural brokers *between* Byzantium and the West.

Thus, it is worthwhile to look at the more general subject of migration and cultural transfer between Byzantium and central Europe.³⁷ The extraordinary degree of mobility among Jews has been stressed concerning nearly all Mediterranean regions.³⁸ After the Islamic conquest of the Near East in the 7th century, Jews migrated from Palestine to the areas that remained under Byzantine control, i.e. Asia Minor and southern Italy, and brought their Palestinian heritage with them. From the 10th century onward, Jews from Italy moved into the Holy Roman Empire beyond the Alps, again taking these traditions to the north, to the newly founded Ashkenazic communities.³⁹ Dominated by Byzantium, southern Italy provided contact and the transfer of cultural goods between Byzantium and the Latin West.⁴⁰ The Jewish communities in Byzantine southern Italy served as a hub for transmitting Palestinian (as

34 Starr, *Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, p. 156, source no. 99; Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, pp. 95–101.

35 Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, see esp. ch. 1.

36 Marriages between Jewish families from different geocultural areas, against the backdrop of cultural transfer, would be a promising subject for future research; on the politics of marriage in general, see Grossman, *Pious and Rebellious*.

37 The same can be traced in the Christian world, e.g. in the arts. The marriage of Otto II to a Byzantine princess introduced Byzantine style to the West: see Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, esp. chs 7 and 10.

38 Jacoby, “The Jewish Communities of the Byzantine World”; id., “The Jews in the Byzantine Economy”.

39 Haverkamp, “Germany”.

40 It is noteworthy that trade and travel routes from the Holy Roman Empire to the Holy Land also passed through southern Italy and Constantinople; thus, the transfer of cultural goods also followed these routes.

well as Babylonian) traditions via southern Italy/Byzantium into Ashkenaz.⁴¹ This transfer of cultural goods took place through the migration of Jewish scholars from southern Italy to Ashkenaz, for which there is some evidence. The transfer can also be detected in the cultural portfolio of the Ashkenazic communities, which adopted customs, liturgical poetry, and mystical traditions that originated in Palestine and were brought north via southern Italy.

When the famous communities of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz were founded in the 9th and 10th century, their cultural profile was shaped by immigrants from France and Italy, e.g. the prominent Qalonymus family. Several of its members migrated from Italy to Ashkenaz: i.e., Meshullam ben Qalonymus (d. 1020 in Mainz); and Moses ben Qalonymus and Qalonymus ben Moses of Lucca (both 10th–11th century). They became community leaders and dominated the cultural life of Ashkenazic Jewry in the 10th–13th centuries.⁴²

In addition to persons known to have migrated from southern Italy to Ashkenaz, information on cultural brokerage may also be derived from literary works and religious traditions from Byzantine southern Italy, and even Byzantium proper, which were accepted in Ashkenaz. This material arrived perhaps in the suitcase of a member of the Qalonymus family.⁴³ Thus, early Ashkenazic customs were characterized by Palestinian traditions that were transmitted via Byzantium.⁴⁴

The reception of these traditions can especially be traced in the writings of the esoteric group of German pietists known as Ḥaside Ashkenaz. They established a family tree based on information found in the *Scroll of Ahimaaz*, focusing on the immigrants of the Qalonymus family from Italy.⁴⁵ They fostered the liturgical tradition as well as the mystical Hekhalot tradition.⁴⁶ According to one of these pietists, Eleazar ben Judah ben Qalonymus of Worms, these secret esoteric traditions were transmitted from Abu Ahron (the first mediator of these traditions in the *Scroll of Ahimaaz*) to Moses ben Qalonymus who “was the first to emigrate from Italy”, and who brought them to Mainz.⁴⁷ This story functions concomitantly as the legitimation of the authority of the

41 Ta-Shma, “Toward a History”.

42 Grossman, “The Migration of the Kalonymus Family”; id., *The Early Sages of Ashkenaz*, pp. 44–48; Stow, “By Land or by Sea”; for a critical view, see Prinzing, “Das mittelalterliche Mainz”, pp. 66–67.

43 Dönitz, “Von Italien nach Ashkenaz”.

44 For customs, see Grossman, “Ties between Ashkenazi Jewry”; Ta-Shma, *Early Franco-German Ritual*; Perri, “Byzantium’s Role”.

45 See Haverkamp, “Jews in Christian Europe”, pp. 169–70.

46 Idel, “From Italy to Ashkenaz and Back”; Abrams, “Ma’aseh Merkabah as a Literary Work”; Kuyt, “Traces of a Mutual Influence”.

47 *History and Folklore*, ed. Bonfil, p. 57; Idel, “From Italy to Ashkenaz and Back”, pp. 52–54.

Qalonymus family. When these esoteric texts and traditions were transferred to Ashkenaz, they were adopted, reworked, and rewritten by members of the pietists and others.⁴⁸ This Ashkenazic method of rewriting is also clearly evident in a revision of the *Sefer Yosippon* (the Hebrew paraphrase of the works of Flavius Josephus), a book written in southern Italy. After its transmission from Naples to Mainz, the work was subject to a revision by the production of an “Ashkenazic” version of the text.⁴⁹ Both examples demonstrate the process of transfer and adaptation of texts brought from (southern) Italy to Ashkenaz. Another example of southern Italian writings read in Ashkenaz are the works of Shabtai Donnolo, a physician from Oria, writing on mysticism, medicine and astrology.⁵⁰ Scholars have also recently discussed the extent to which the exegetical method, based on a literal reading of the Bible (*peshat*), which was introduced by Rashi in Ashkenaz, may have been influenced by Byzantine exegesis.⁵¹ Therefore, it is possible to speak of an important Byzantine impact on Ashkenazic liturgy, exegesis, mysticism, and science.

Beyond this evidence of Byzantine elements in Ashkenazic culture, a number of quotations in Ashkenazic writings show familiarity with Byzantine sages and their works. The first example is a commentary on the Torah and the Five Scrolls (*Leqah Tov*), authored by a Byzantine scholar named Tovia ben Eliezer (born c.1100 in Kastoria, in the north-western part of Greece). His work was quoted by Rashbam, Rabbenu Tam, and other Ashkenazic scholars.⁵² Tovia ben Eliezer was aware of the massacres of 1096, during the First Crusade,⁵³ and he refers to those that happened in Mainz in his *Commentary on Canticles*.⁵⁴ This is a rare example of information travelling in the reverse direction, from Ashkenaz to Byzantium.

48 The process of rewriting these texts has been described and discussed by Ta-Shma, “The ‘Open Book’ in Medieval Hebrew Literature”; id., “The Library of the French and German Sages”; see also Kuyt, “The Haside Ashkenaz and their Mystical Sources”.

49 Dönitz, *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon*, esp. pp. 44–45.

50 Shabtai Donnolo, *Sefer Ḥakhmoni*, ed. and trans. P. Mancuso, *Shabbatai Donnolo's Sefer Ḥakhmoni* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture, 27), Leiden-Boston 2010; Lacerenza, *Šabbetai Donnolo*; Sharf, “Shabbetai Donnolo”.

51 Ta-Shma, “Early Byzantine Bible Exegesis”; Sand, “Traces of Byzantine Jewish Exegesis”; see also Steiner, “The ‘Lemma Complement’ in Hebrew Commentaries”. See now Cohen, *The Rule of the Peshat*.

52 The reception history of this book is in need of further analysis; see Toutiou, “Traces of *Leqah Tov*” and Jacobs, “The Allegorical Exegesis”.

53 Starr, *Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 203–08, source no. 153.

54 In his commentary on Cant 1:3, he mentions the martyrs from the First Crusade; see Jacobs, “The Allegorical Exegesis”, p. 86.

Another Byzantine scholar known to have been cited by Ashkenazic sages is Hillel bar Eliaqim (12th century, from Selymbria/Silivri near Constantinople).⁵⁵ His commentaries on early Palestinian Midrashic works were widespread in Ashkenaz.⁵⁶ Some Byzantine scholars are only known from quotations preserved in Ashkenazic sources.⁵⁷ For example, in a report on the famous debate between Rabbenu Tam and his student Efraim of Regensburg (c.1110–c.1175) over whether hemp should be designated as kosher, a certain Moses ha-Cohen of Greece (i.e. Byzantium) is mentioned.⁵⁸ Jewish engagement in the Byzantine textile business made such questions highly pertinent to their daily work.⁵⁹ However, nothing more is known about this Moses ha-Cohen, particularly since he is one of several persons mentioned by that name who are otherwise unknown, therefore pinpointing his identity is very difficult.

A more detailed picture can be drawn about the cultural transfer between Byzantium and Ashkenaz that took place in the early 13th century through the figure of Isaiah of Trani (c.1200–before 1260).⁶⁰ Although his lifetime does not strictly fit into the timeframe of this essay, the life and the works of this Italian scholar show his close connection to both Byzantium and Ashkenaz, so are therefore worth considering. Born in Trani, Isaiah studied with Simḥa of Speyer and was educated according to the approach of the Tosafists in Ashkenaz. He definitely travelled to Constantinople several times. His monumental commentary on the Talmud, *Tosfot ha-Rid*, features discussions on Jewish Byzantine habits; for example, he condemns the practice of Byzantine women who would typically visit a public bathhouse to fulfil the commandment of immersing in a ritual bath (*mikveh*).⁶¹ Thus, Isaiah of Trani provides evidence of an active scholarly network between Byzantium and the West (albeit at a slightly later time).⁶²

Concerning Ashkenazic influence on Byzantium, virtually no evidence exists for the period in question. This may be due to the problem outlined at the opening of this chapter: the number of transmitted Byzantine Jewish sources from the 10th–13th centuries, that could represent contact between Byzantium and newly established communities in the West, is limited to the aforementioned works from southern Italy and a handful from Byzantium.

55 Ta-Shma, “Rabbenu Hillel bar Eliaqim”.

56 See Ta-Shma, “Toward a History”, p. 68; Ta-Shma, “Rabbenu Hillel bar Eliaqim”, pp. 328–29.

57 Emanuel, *Fragments of the Tables*.

58 See Ta-Shma, “Toward a History”, p. 67 and n.29.

59 Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, pp. 119–21.

60 Ta-Shma, “Rabbenu Hillel bar Eliaqim”, chs 2–4.

61 Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, nos 8–11, 13; Dönitz, “Forderung nach physischer Distanz”.

62 His works are an important source for Byzantine Jewish custom in the 13th century.

It must be acknowledged though that a significant number of Byzantine Hebrew manuscripts still needs to be examined. Therefore, it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions on this topic. Nevertheless, it is striking that the known Byzantine Hebrew sources display no trace of Ashkenazic influence.⁶³ Although there exists ongoing contact between these regions, revealed by the references to Byzantine writings in Ashkenazic sources, the Byzantines did not use Ashkenazic traditions, at least not before the 13th century, when Byzantine Karaites in particular started to demonstrate openness to Rabbanite sources, including those from Ashkenaz, e.g. the renowned commentator Rashi.⁶⁴ Whereas Ashkenazic scholarship was characterized by Byzantine writings and traditions from its inception, Byzantium was unaffected by Ashkenazic scholarship until the 13th century.⁶⁵

Notwithstanding this, Byzantine Jewish scholars in the 12th and 13th centuries were deeply influenced by the exegete and polymath Abraham ibn Ezra (1089–1164), who lived in Muslim Spain until 1140. For the rest of his life, he travelled to all the countries between Italy and England. His works encompass exegesis, grammar, philosophy, poetry, and the sciences (especially astrology and astronomy).⁶⁶ Already during his lifetime, Ibn Ezra's works were cited in the Byzantine Karaite encyclopaedia, *Eshkol ha-Kofer*, by Judah Hadassi (written in 1148).⁶⁷ From that time onward, his writings circulated widely among Byzantine Jewish authors.⁶⁸ It is reasonable to assume that his works were transferred from Italy to Byzantium.

Conclusion

The question of whether Jews functioned as cultural brokers between Byzantium and the Latin West between 850–1200 is not easy to answer. First,

63 For a discussion about possible influences from Rashi in Tovia ben Eliezer's work, see Jacobs, "The Allegorical Exegesis".

64 Rashi was quoted by the Karaite scholar Ahron ben Josef (c.1250–c.1320): see Akhiezer, "Byzantine Karaism", p. 735. In the 15th century, two Byzantine exegetes wrote supercommentaries on Rashi (Dosa ben Moses and Eliah Mizrahi): see Bowman, *Jews of Byzantium*, pp. 130 and 147 n.3; and now Lawee, *Rashi's Commentary on the Torah*.

65 From the 13th century onward, there is evidence that the migrants from Ashkenaz to Palestine also left their imprint on Byzantine soil, especially in Crete: see Cuffel, "Call and Response".

66 Jospe/Simon, "Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir"; Sela, *Abraham Ibn Ezra*.

67 Akhiezer, "Byzantine Karaism", p. 732.

68 See Frank, "Ibn Ezra and the Karaite Exegetes"; de Lange, "Abraham Ibn Ezra and Byzantium"; Dönitz, "Knotenpunkt Byzanz".

the institution of a Jewish position in the imperial court, as is known from Muslim Spain, certainly did not exist in Ashkenaz and probably not in Byzantium. Furthermore, it is difficult to identify individuals that could have served as cultural brokers during the period examined here. While we may hypothesise that leaders of Jewish communities also functioned as representatives to Christian authorities, we have little actual evidence for this role, especially from Byzantium. This reflects a lack of historical evidence on Byzantine Jewry within our timeframe, but also the fact that the corpus of Byzantine Hebrew manuscripts is a treasure trove of sources yet to be mined. For a more detailed picture, this vast corpus of Hebrew manuscripts originating from Byzantium has to be systematically and thoroughly examined.⁶⁹

Far more information can be discerned on the subject of cultural brokerage between Byzantium and the Latin West if we turn to cultural transfer between the Jewish communities of these two regions. The Ashkenazic communities were formed during the 9th–10th centuries and their cultural profile displays the deep influence of Byzantine Jewish traditions, especially those transmitted via southern Italy. This is particularly important in the fields of liturgy, exegesis, science, and mysticism. But Jewish authors from Greece proper were known among the Ashkenazic scholars, too. These traditions were transported by the constant stream of migration and economic, as well as scholarly, contact between the two regions.⁷⁰

Interestingly, this mechanism did not work in the opposite direction. Byzantine Jewish writings show no knowledge of Ashkenazic traditions until the 13th century. One could raise the question, why Byzantine Jewish culture and tradition was openly received north of the Alps whereas, in Byzantium, Ashkenazic culture did not leave any effective impression until the Fourth Crusade in 1204.⁷¹ However, this Byzantine silence should again be attributed to the dearth of sources. While there is evidence for the Byzantine orthodox view of the West, which can be characterized largely as deprecatory and contemptuous, unfortunately there is no evidence for how Byzantine Jewry saw their fellow Jews from the West.⁷²

69 See above.

70 Interestingly, the Crusades are actually irrelevant for these processes of cultural transfer within the Jewish world, while they played a crucial role in cultural exchange between “Christian” Byzantium and the West.

71 See Ciggaar, *Western Travellers to Constantinople*, esp. pp. 13, 322–54.

72 See Shepard, “Aspects of Byzantine Attitudes”; Schreiner, “Byzanz und der Westen”. For a comparison between the status of the Jewish communities in Byzantium and Ashkenaz, see Dönitz, “Jüdisch-christliche Begegnungen”.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Benjamin of Tudela, *Itinerary*, ed. and trans. M.N. Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, New York-London 1907.
- History and Folklore in a Medieval Jewish Chronicle: The Family Chronicle of Ahima'az ben Paltiel*, ed. R. Bonfil (Studies in Jewish History and Culture, 22), Leiden 2009.

Secondary Literature

- Abrams, D., "Ma'aseh Merkabah as a Literary Work: The Reception of Hekhalot Traditions by the German Pietists and Kabbalistic Reinterpretation", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 5 (1998), 329–45.
- Akhiezer, G., "Byzantine Karaism in the Eleventh to Fifteenth Century", in Bonfil et al. (eds.), *Jews in Byzantium*, pp. 723–58.
- Ankori, Z., *Karaites in Byzantium: The Formative Years 970–1100* (Columbia Studies in the Social Sciences, 597), New York 1959.
- Anon., "Shtadlan", in M. Berenbaum/F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., Detroit 2007, vol. 18, pp. 521–22.
- Ben-Sasson, H.H., *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes: Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Beck's historische Bibliothek), Munich 1995.
- Ben-Shalom, R., "Medieval Jewry in Christendom", in M. Goodman/J. Cohen (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Studies*, Oxford 2005, pp. 153–92.
- Bonfil, R./Irshai, O./Stroumsa, G.A./Talgam, R. (eds.), *Jews in Byzantium: Dialectics of Minority and Majority Cultures* (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture, 14), Leiden-Boston 2012.
- Bowman, S., *The Jews of Byzantium 1204–1453*, Alabama 1985.
- Bowman, S., "Survival in Decline: Romaniote Jewry Post-1204", in Bonfil et al. (eds.), *Jews in Byzantium*, pp. 101–32.
- Brin, G., Re'uel ve-ḥaveraw [*Reuel and his Friends: Jewish Byzantine Exegetes from Around the Tenth Century CE*], Tel Aviv 2012.
- Carlebach, E., "Between History and Myth: The Regensburg Expulsion in Josel of Rosheim's Sefer ha-Miknah", in ead./D. Myers/J.M. Efron (eds.), *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi* (The Tauber Institute for the Study of European Jewry Series, 29), Hanover-London 1998, pp. 40–53.
- Christ, G./Dönitz S./König D.G. et al., *Transkulturelle Verflechtungen: Mediävistische Perspektiven*, Göttingen 2016.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople: The West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden 1996.
- Cohen, J., *Sanctifying the Name of God: Jewish Martyrs and Jewish Memories of the First Crusade* (Jewish Culture and Contexts), Philadelphia 2004.

- Cohen, M., *The Rule of Peshat: Jewish Constructions of the Plain Sense of Scripture and Their Christian and Muslim Contexts, 900–1270* (Jewish Culture and Contexts), Philadelphia, 2020.
- Cuffel, A., “Call and Response: European Jewish Emigration to Egypt and Palestine in the Middle Ages”, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 90 (1999), 61–102.
- Díaz Esteban, F. (ed.), *Abraham Ibn Ezra y su tiempo: Actas del simposio internacional: Madrid, Tudela, Toledo, 1–8 febrero 1989*, Madrid 1990.
- Dönitz, S., “Von Italien nach Ashkenaz: Sefer Yosippon und die historiographische Tradition des Mittelalters”, in A. Kuyt/G. Necker (eds.), *Orient als Grenzbereich?: Rabbinisches und Außerrabbinisches Judentum* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 60), Wiesbaden 2008, pp. 169–82.
- Dönitz, S., “Jüdisch-christliche Begegnungen in verschiedenen Kulturräumen des Mittelalters: Byzanz und Ashkenaz im Vergleich”, *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 38 (2013), 85–100.
- Dönitz, S., *Überlieferung und Rezeption des Sefer Yosippon* (Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism, 29), Tübingen 2013.
- Dönitz, S., “Forderung nach physischer Distanz: Jüdische und christliche Kritik am gemeinsamen Bad”, in Christ et al., *Transkulturelle Verflechtungen*, pp. 243–46.
- Dönitz, S./Hollender E., “Knotenpunkt Byzanz – Aharon ben Yosef und die Vermittlung sefardisch-andalusischer Traditionen nach Byzanz”, *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 41 (2016/17), 19–36.
- Emanuel, S., *Shivre luhot. Sefarim avudim shel ba’ale ha-tosafot* [Fragments of the Tables: Lost Books of the Tosaphists], Jerusalem 2006.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, “The Jews in Southern Italy”, in Bonfil (ed.), *Jews of Byzantium*, pp. 271–94.
- Frank, D.H., “Ibn Ezra and the Karaite Exegetes Aaron ben Joseph and Aaron ben Elijah”, in Díaz Esteban (ed.), *Abraham Ibn Ezra y su tiempo*, pp. 99–107.
- Graboïs, A., “Hanhagat ha-parnasim be-qehilot šarfāt ha-šefonit be-me’ot ha-11 ve-ha-12” [The Parnasim’s Government of the Northern France Communities in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries; the boni viri of the Communities and the Elders of the Cities], in M. Ben-Sasson/R. Bonfil/J. Hacker (eds.), *Tarbut ve-ḥevrah be-toldot yisra’el be-yemei ha-beynayyim* [Culture and Society in Medieval Jewry: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of H.H. Ben-Sasson], Jerusalem 1989/90, pp. 303–14.
- Grossman, A., “Hagiratah shel mishpaḥat Qalonymus me-iṭalyah le-germaniah” [“The Migration of the Kalonymus Family from Italy to Germany”], *Zion* 40 (1975), 154–85.
- Grossman, A., “Ziqatah shel yahadut ashkenaz ha-qedumah el ereš yisra’el” [“Ties between Ashkenazi Jewry and the Jewry of Ereš Israel in the 11th century”], *Shalem* 3 (1981), 57–92.
- Grossman, A., *Ḥokhmei Ashkenaz ha-rishonim* [The Early Sages of Ashkenaz: Their Lives, Leadership and Works (900–1096)], 3rd ed., Jerusalem 2001.

- Grossman, A., *Hokhmei Sarfat ha-rishonim* [*The Early Sages of France: Their Lives, Leadership and Works*], 3rd ed., Jerusalem 2001.
- Grossman, A., *Pious and Rebellious: Jewish Women in Medieval Europe* (Brandeis Series on Jewish Women), Waltham, Mass. 2004.
- Haverkamp, A., "Germany", in R.L. Chazan (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 6: *The Middle Ages – the Christian World*, Cambridge 2018, pp. 239–81.
- Haverkamp, E., "Jews in Christian Europe: Ashkenaz in the Middle Ages", in A.T. Levenson (ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell History of Jews and Judaism* (The Wiley-Blackwell Histories of Religion), Malden, Mass. 2012, pp. 169–206.
- Idel, M., "From Italy to Ashkenaz and Back: On the Circulation of Jewish Mystical Traditions", *Kabbalah* 14 (2006), 47–94.
- Jacobs, J., "The Allegorical Exegesis of Song of Songs by R. Tuviah ben Eliezer – Lekah Tov and its Relation to Rashi's Commentary", *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 39 (2015), 75–92.
- Jacoby, D., "Benjamin of Tudela and his 'Book of Travels'", in K. Herbers/F. Schmieder (eds.), *Venezia, incrocio di culture: Percezioni di viaggiatori europei e non europei a confronto; atti del convegno, Venezia, 26–27 gennaio 2006* (Ricerche/Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani, 4), Rome 2008, pp. 135–64.
- Jacoby, D., "The Jewish Communities of the Byzantine World from the Tenth to the Mid-Fifteenth Century: Some Aspects of their Evolution", in N. de Lange/C. Boyd-Taylor/J. Krivoruchko (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions: Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism, 23), Tübingen 2009, pp. 157–81.
- Jacoby, D., "The Jews in the Byzantine Economy: Seventh to Mid-Fifteenth Century", in Bonfil et al. (eds.), *Jews in Byzantium*, pp. 219–55.
- Jaspert, N./Oesterle, J.R./von der Höh, M., "Courts, Brokers and Brokerage in the Medieval Mediterranean", in id. (eds.), *Cultural Brokers between Religions: Border Crossers and Experts at Mediterranean Courts* (Mittelmeerstudien, 1) Bochum 2012, pp. 9–31.
- Jospe, R./Simon, U., "Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir", in M. Berenbaum/F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., Detroit 2007, vol. 9, pp. 665–72.
- Kanarfogel, E., *The Intellectual History and Rabbinic Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz*, Detroit 2013.
- Kaplan, Y., "Court Jews before the Hofjuden", in V.B. Mann (ed.), *From Court Jews to the Rothschilds: Art, Patronage, and Power: 1600–1800*, Munich 1996, pp. 11–25.
- Kolditz, S., "Cultural Brokers in Relation with the Byzantine Court in the Later 14th and 15th Centuries", in Jaspert/Oesterle/von der Höh (eds.), *Cultural Brokers between Religions*, pp. 183–216.
- Kuyt, A., "The Haside Ashkenaz and their Mystical Sources: Continuity and Innovation", in U. Haxen (ed.), *Jewish Studies in a New Europe: Proceedings of the Fifth Congress of Jewish Studies in Copenhagen 1994*, Copenhagen 1998, pp. 462–71.

- Kuyt, A., "Traces of a Mutual Influence of the Haside Ashkenaz and the Hekhalot Literature", in N.A. van Uchelen (ed.), *From Narbonne to Regensburg: Studies in Medieval Hebrew Texts*, Amsterdam 1993, pp. 62–68.
- Lacerenza, G. (ed.), *Šabbetai Donnolo: scienza et cultura ebraica nell' Italia del secolo X*, Naples 2004.
- de Lange, N., "Abraham Ibn Ezra and Byzantium", in Díaz Esteban (ed.), *Abraham Ibn Ezra y su tiempo*, pp. 181–92.
- de Lange, N., "Hebrew Scholarship in Byzantium", in id. (ed.), *Hebrew Scholarship and the Medieval World*, Cambridge 2001, pp. 23–37.
- de Lange, N., "Research on Byzantine Jewry: The State of the Question", *Jewish Studies at the Central European University* 4 (2003), 41–51.
- Lawee, Eric, *Rashi's Commentary on the Torah: Canonization and Resistance in the Reception of a Jewish Classic*, New York 2019.
- Levitats, I., "Episcopus Judaeorum", in M. Berenbaum/F. Skolnik (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., Detroit 2007, vol. 6, p. 463.
- Perri, M., "Byzantium's Role in the Transmission of Jewish Knowledge in the Middle Ages: The Attitude toward Circumcision", in Bonfil et al. (eds.), *Jews in Byzantium*, pp. 643–57.
- Prinzing, G., "Das mittelalterliche Mainz und Byzanz. Historisch-politische, kirchen- und kulturgeschichtliche Aspekte", *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 91 (2009), 45–78.
- Ries, R., "Politische Kommunikation und Shtadlanut der frühneuzeitlichen Judentum", in R. Kießling/A. Sczesny (eds.), *Räume und Wege: Jüdische Geschichte im Alten Reich; 1300–1800* (Colloquia Augustana, 25), Berlin 2007, pp. 169–90.
- Sand, E., "Iqvot shel parshanut yehudit bizantit be-firushe rashi u-veit midrasho" ["Traces of Byzantine Jewish Exegesis in Rashi's Commentary"], *Jewish Studies (Journal of The World Union of Jewish Studies)* 50 (2014), 1–47.
- Schreiner, P., "Byzanz und der Westen: Die gegenseitige Betrachtungsweise in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts", in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa: Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 40), Sigmaringen 1992, pp. 551–80.
- Sela, S., *Abraham Ibn Ezra and the Rise of Medieval Hebrew Science* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies, 32), Leiden 2003.
- Sharf, A., *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade* (The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization), London 1971.
- Sharf, A., "Shabbetai Donnolo as a Byzantine Jewish Figure", *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 3 (1975), 1–18.
- Shepard, J., "Aspects of Byzantine Attitudes and Policy towards the West in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", in J. Howard-Johnston (ed.), *Byzantium and the West: c. 850–c. 1200*, Amsterdam 1988, pp. 67–118.
- Starr, J., *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire (641–1204)*, Athens 1939.

- Steckel, S., "Introduction: Towards a Connected History of Learning in Byzantium and the Latin West", in ead./N. Gaul/M. Grünbart (eds.), *Networks of Learning: Perspectives on Scholars in the Byzantine East and Latin West, c. 1000–1200* (Byzantinistische Studien und Texte, 6), Zürich 2014, pp. ix–xxxv.
- Steiner, R.C., "The 'Lemma Complement' in Hebrew Commentaries from Byzantium and its Diffusion to Northern France and Germany", *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 18 (2011), 367–79.
- Stemberger, G., "Zwangstaufen im 4. und 7. Jahrhundert: Mythos oder Wirklichkeit?", in C. Thoma/G. Stemberger (eds.), *Judentum – Ausblicke und Einsichten: Festgabe für Kurt Schubert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Judentum und Umwelt, 43), Frankfurt 1993, pp. 81–114.
- Stern, S., *Josel von Rosheim: Befehlshaber der Judenschaft im Heiligen Römischen Reich Deutscher Nation*, Stuttgart 1959.
- Stow, K.R., "By Land or by Sea: The Passage of the Kalonymides to the Rhineland in the Tenth Century", in S. Menache (ed.), *Communication in the Jewish Diaspora: The Pre-Modern World* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies, 16), Leiden 1996, pp. 59–71.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., *Minhag ashkenaz ha-qadum* [Early Franco-German Ritual and Custom], Jerusalem 1992.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., "The 'Open Book' in Medieval Hebrew Literature: The Problem of Authorized Editions", *Bulletin of the John Rylands University of Manchester* 75 (1993), 17–24.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., "Parshanut Miqra 'ivrit bizanțit qedumah sviv shnat 1000 min ha-Genizah" ["Early Byzantine Bible Exegesis around the Year 1000 from the Genizah"], *Tarbiz* 69 (2000), 247–56.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., "Ha-qesharim ha-tarbutim ben yehudei bizanțion le-ashkenaz" ["Toward a History of the Cultural Links between Byzantine and Ashkenazic Jewry"], in G.J. Blidstein et al. (eds.), *Me'ah She'arim. Iyunim be-olamam ha-ruhani shel yisra'el be-yemei ha-beynayyim* [Me'ah She'arim: Studies in Medieval Jewish Spiritual Life in Memory of I. Twersky], Jerusalem 2001, pp. 61–71.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., "Sifriyyatam shel hokhmei ashkenaz ve-šarfat bnei ha-me'ot ha-11 ve ha-12" ["The Library of the French and German Sages in the 11th and 12th Century"], in id. (ed.), *Studies in Rabbinic Literature*, vol. 1: *Ashkenaz*, Jerusalem 2004, pp. 21–42.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., "Rabbenu Hillel bar Eliaqim", in id. (ed.), *Studies in Rabbinic Literature*, vol. 3: *Italy and Byzantium*, Jerusalem 2005, pp. 326–30.
- Ta-Shma, I.M. (ed.), *Iyyunim be-sifrut ha-rabbanit be-yemei ha-beynayyim: Ashkenaz* [Studies in Rabbinic Literature, vol. 1: *Ashkenaz*], Jerusalem 2004.
- Ta-Shma, I.M. (ed.), *Iyyunim be-sifrut ha-rabbanit be-yemei ha-beynayyim: Italiyah ve-Bizanțion* [Studies in Rabbinic Literature, vol. 3: *Italy and Byzantium*], Jerusalem 2005.

- Toch, M., *Die Juden im mittelalterlichen Reich* (Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, 47), Munich 1998.
- Touitou, A., “Iqvot shel Leqaḥ Tov be-nusaḥ perush Rashi la-torah” [“Traces of Leqaḥ Tov in a Version of Rashi’s Commentary on the Torah”], *Ale Sefer* 15 (1989), 37–44.
- Weinberger, L.J., *Jewish Hymnography: A Literary History* (The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization) London 1998.
- Yuval, I.J., *Ḥakhamim be-doram. Ha-manhigut shel yehudei germaniah be-shilhei yemei ha-beynayyim* [*Scholars in their Time: the Religious Leadership of German Jewry in the Late Middle Ages*], Jerusalem 1988.

Objects of Desire: Exchange in Commodities and Gifts

Dominik Heher

1 Introduction

In 935, the Byzantine *protospatharios* Epiphánios arrived at the court of Hugh of Provence, King of Italy (r. 924–47). With him, he brought a wide range of high-end products from the Byzantine Empire as gifts from Emperor Romanos I Lakapénos (r. 920–44). The envoy's aim was to instigate an alliance against the Lombard princes of Capua and Salerno, as well as against Hugh's opponent Alberic, who held control of Rome.¹ The list of gifts reads like a compilation of most of the objects of undoubted Byzantine origin circulating in the Latin West between 800 and 1200. They comprise one *kentenarion* (= 32 kg) of gold, an onyx cup, three items of gilded silverware, 17 glass vessels, many silk cloths of various colours for Hugh himself and his highest vassals (both counts and bishops), 30 small containers of incense, and 500 different unguents.² Be it due to the common interest, the envoy's eloquence, or indeed the persuasive power of the gifts, the negotiations turned out well, and culminated in the marriage of Romanos' grandson and Hugh's daughter Bertha in 944.³

A few years later, in 949, we witness another diplomatic mission between the Italian and the Byzantine court. This time the legates of Berengar II (r. 950–61), the new King of Italy, visited Constantinople under the guidance of Liudprand of Cremona, then deacon at the Cathedral of Pavia, who provides one of the rare medieval first-hand accounts of an embassy. The gifts he bore differed considerably from the Byzantine ones we have seen above, but again, they may be taken as a symptomatic set of the most valuable items 10th century

1 For the embassy and the gifts conveyed, see Mundell Mango, "Hierarchies". Cf. Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", p. 273 (no. 13a).

2 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De cerimoniis* II 44, ed. Reiske, pp. 661–62, ed. and trans. Dagron et al., vol. 3, pp. 311–13. Epiphánios also distributed another 45 silk garments during his diplomatic mission in southern Italy.

3 Runciman, *Romanus Lecapenus*, pp. 191–201.

Italy could offer to the East. Liudprand's inventory⁴ included nine chain mails, seven shields with gilt bosses, two silver gilt chalices, swords, lances, skewers, and, finally, four castrated slaves to serve as eunuchs at the Byzantine court.⁵

These two examples may serve as a suitable introduction to our topic inasmuch as they not only list the customary sets of items that both sides had to offer, but also one of the most common ways of exchange. The term "exchange" implies reciprocity and, indeed, objects travelled constantly from the Latin West to the Byzantine East and vice versa. Yet, the flow of commodities cannot be considered to have been balanced; at least until the merchants of Amalfi, Venice, Genoa, and Pisa intensified their activities in the eastern Mediterranean in the course of the 11th and 12th centuries, Byzantine "exports" (both trading goods and gifts) surpassed those from the West in number and quality.

Compared to the lavish presents brought along by Byzantine envoys, that allowed a glance into a world full of mundane and sacral treasures alike, the Latin West had only few things to offer that could impress Byzantine addressees. The latter's expectations were probably low anyway. Due to their notorious superiority complex with regard to other, non-Roman cultures, most Byzantines regarded both material and non-material output of the Latin world with indifference, if not with contempt. What, then, did Latin embassies bring with them as gifts when they went to Constantinople? Due to the Byzantine sources' conspicuous lack of interest, the question cannot be easily answered. From Latin sources, however, we do know of whole herds of cattle, horses, sheep and pigs being sent, which were meant to impress by their quantity.⁶ High-quality products are mentioned only rarely; on at two occasions at least, Western rulers sent hunting dogs,⁷ and weapons were also given away as diplomatic gifts.⁸ Slaves, castrated or not, were an important merchandise until the 9th century, when Christianization among the Slavs shortened the supply.⁹

4 Liudprand stresses that these were all personal gifts he had brought along since his king, Berengar, had not provided any. Due to the fact that the clergyman had fallen out of the king's favour after his return from Constantinople (and before writing his account), which led to Liudprand's flight to the court of Otto I, the critique is to be treated with caution.

5 Liudprand, *Antapodosis* VI 6, ed. Chiesa, pp. 147–48; cf. Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", p. 274 (no. 14).

6 E.g. Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi*, c. 22, ed. H. Bresslau, *Wiponis Opera* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum, 61), 3rd ed., Hannover 1915, p. 41.

7 Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", Appendix, nos 13 and 55.

8 Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", p. 252.

9 McCormick, *Origins*, pp. 733–77; Hoffmann, "Sklavenhandel".

When Liudprand brought with him young eunuchs in 949, they already seem to have been an exceptional gift in the diplomatic traffic with Constantinople.¹⁰

This asymmetrical picture, conveyed by the written sources, is partially confirmed by the number of Byzantine items carefully preserved in church treasures all over western Europe, as well as their art historical impact.¹¹ Despite all the political and military clashes that were increasingly weighing on the relationship between the Latin and the Byzantine Worlds from the 8th century onwards, the high esteem which objects from the Christian (and Islamic) East enjoyed, remained stable among Western elites. This desire, however, does not mean they felt culturally inferior. On the contrary, Western sources often make no secret of their scorn for the decadence and moral weakness of their fellow Christian believers in the East. Beyond that, masterpieces of Carolingian and Ottonian book illumination and goldsmith's art show that the skills of Western craftsmen and artists were, in many cases, by no means inferior to their Byzantine counterparts. But still, for any aristocrat, the possession of an exclusive object from the East could make the difference in the struggle for prestige and standing within their peer group.

2 Gift-Giving

When dealing with exchange in relics and material objects, the role of gifts was crucial.¹² Goods that had made their way into the West by means of robbery or trade may not have enjoyed the same attention among medieval authors as lavish gifts. Yet, the frequent emphasis on the exclusivity and extremely limited availability of certain kinds of objects in sources both Latin and Greek, is very suggestive of gift-giving being perhaps the most important channel in the exchange of objects with the messages inherent in them.¹³ Furthermore, diplomatic traffic deserves to be in focus here as envoys not only transported official

10 Liudprand bought them from slave traders in Verdun, who normally shipped them to Muslim Spain: Liudprand, *Antapodosis* VI 6, ed. Chiesa, p. 148.

11 Bauer, "Geschenkdiplomatie"; Demus, *Byzantine Art*.

12 For a more sceptical view on the impact of gifts Byzantine envoys brought with them, see Lounghis, "Gesandte als Vermittler", pp. 62–63.

13 For the symbolic value of all things Byzantine in the West, see Herrin, "Material Culture", with some important considerations on cultural influence in the opposite direction, e.g. cloisonné enamel and gilded enlarged initials in manuscripts, which cannot be treated here in detail.

gifts, that had been handed over to them solemnly, but they often received private gifts too, and bought other merchandise at Constantinople's markets.¹⁴

Gift-giving as a significant pattern of social and political interaction has aroused the interest of historians increasingly since the 1990s. For Byzantium, the culture of gift-giving has been studied more intensely since the turn of the millennium. In a fundamental essay, Anthony Cutler concentrated on gifts exchanged between Constantinople and Islamic courts, stressing their impact on the economy.¹⁵ Conferences on the topic in Munich (2002)¹⁶ and Münster (2009)¹⁷ shed new light on the topic from various methodological perspectives.

In their studies, historians and art-historians alike draw from anthropological theories that approach gift-giving from both a structuralist and post-structuralist point of view. These, in short, stress first the meaning of gifts in the construction of social and political structures, and second (and connected to the first point), the (mostly) obligatory reciprocity of the process. Although mutual indebtedness is created, the process itself may very well be asymmetrical.¹⁸ Gifts serve multiple purposes: they can simply ameliorate the recipient's mood, try to influence decisions, illustrate dependence or friendship, or buy affection. Inferior gifts, however, can convey very clear messages, too. Appropriateness was always a main concern, and can be seen in the protocols of the *Book of Ceremonies*, according to which foreign embassies had to give their gifts first, so that Byzantine officials could choose suitable counter-gifts.¹⁹ Even on military campaigns, the imperial household brought with them a carefully graduated range of gifts to be ready for all eventualities.²⁰

3 Constantinople: City of Miracles and Abundance

To a certain extent, gifts also follow the principles of economics. Keeping supply low and demand high was essential for Byzantine diplomacy, and advertisement likewise mattered. Constantinople itself with all its palaces, churches, and gardens was the best showcase for conveying impressions of wealth, piety,

14 Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", p. 253.

15 Cutler, "Gifts and Gift Exchange".

16 The papers are published in Deckers/Restle/Shalem (eds.), *Akten des Symposiums*.

17 Grünbart (ed.), *Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft*.

18 Hilsdale, "Gift", p. 171.

19 Nechaeva, *Embassies*, pp. 165–66; Treitinger, *Reichsidee*, p. 198.

20 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De expeditionibus*, ed. J.F. Haldon, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions. Introduction, Edition, Translation and Commentary* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 28), Vienna 1990, pp. 108–12 (C).

and technological supremacy worthy of a New Rome. Accounts of Western travellers and pilgrims are full of amazement and admiration for the wonders of the largest city in the Christian world, a *topos* that also left its mark on Western literary fiction from the 9th century onwards.²¹ The enthusiastic description of Constantinople by Fulcher of Chartres, participant and chronicler of the First Crusade, may stand for a number of very similar accounts:

Oh, what an excellent and beautiful city! How many monasteries, and how many palaces there are in it, of wonderful work skilfully fashioned! How many marvellous works are to be seen in the streets and districts of the town! It is a great nuisance to recite what an opulence of all kind of goods are found there; of gold, of silver, of many kinds of mantles, and of holy relics. In every season, merchants, in frequent sailings, bring to that place everything that man might need. Almost twenty thousand eunuchs, I judge, are kept there continuously.²²

Some of these accounts were written by diplomats who came to Constantinople as envoys, and were thus even permitted to see the Great Palace.²³ Diplomatic receptions provide excellent insight into applied Byzantine ideology serving strategic purposes.²⁴ One key feature of such ceremonies was the exchange of gifts, to which we will come back to later. Apart from gift-giving proper, it was even more important to increase the visitors' desire for potential future possessions.²⁵ For that reason, foreign envoys were shown around selected (and especially prepared) parts of the city and the palace. Not surprisingly, the decoration and items that were assembled to impress the visitors consisted mainly of precious fabrics, gold- and silverwork, enamels, and self-operating mechanical devices (*automata*).²⁶ At special occasions, the *Chrysotriklinos*, the

21 Wolfzettel, "Bemächtigung"; Schreiner, "Byzanz und der Westen".

22 Fulcher of Chartres I 9, I, ed. H. Hagenmeyer, *Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana* (1095–1127), Heidelberg 1913, pp. 176–77, trans. M.E. McGinty, *Fulcher of Chartres. Chronicle of the First Crusade* (Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana), London-Oxford 1941 (repr. Philadelphia 1978), p. 28.

23 For the routes travellers to and from Constantinople used to take, see Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, vol. 2, pp. 335–483; Kislinger, "Verkehrsrouten".

24 For the ceremonial of receptions, see especially Cormack, "But is it Art?"; Tinnfeld, "Ceremonies"; Angelidi, "Designing Receptions".

25 Bauer, "Potentieller Besitz".

26 Drocourt, *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore*, pp. 492–597. See also the recent analyses of relevant passages in the *Book of Ceremonies* by Featherstone, "Display"; and Bauer, "Potentieller Besitz", pp. 159–60. For Byzantine *automata*, see most recently Berger, "Akustische Dimension" (with further literature).

ceremonial heart of the Great Palace,²⁷ was even refurbished as a showcase for a small part of Constantinople's riches: the so-called *pentapyrgion* had been commissioned by Emperor Theophilos (829–43) and most likely was a kind of architectural model with five turrets and walls that served to put jewellery and insignia on display.²⁸

Right next to the *Chrysotriklinos*, the Church of the Virgin of the Pharos (i.e. Lighthouse) served a similar purpose, as it housed a number of the most venerated relics of Christianity, especially those associated with the Passion of Christ. They comprised parts of the True Cross, the crown of thorns, the nails, the sponge, and the lance, but also other sacred treasures like a sandal of Christ, the holy Mandylion of Edessa, the right arm of John the Baptist, and many more.²⁹ Since the church was within the boundaries of the Great Palace, these treasures were not accessible to everybody but only to distinguished guests, like King Louis VII of France who passed through Constantinople in 1147.³⁰

4 (Ulterior) Motives of Byzantine Gift-Giving

According to the mechanisms of Byzantine diplomacy, one basic function of gifts was to establish or reassure supremacy (nominally, at least) over minor states. If possible, their ruler (at times, also at their explicit request) were integrated into the empire's hierarchy by being granted Byzantine titles, insignia, gifts, and access to things otherwise unaffordable. The construction of virtual suzerainty over Western powers by integration had its apex in the Early Middle Ages,³¹ but to a lesser extent this diplomatic strategy continued into the 9th to 10th centuries.

Venice is a case in point. After the conquest of Ravenna in 750/51, the coastal settlements of Dalmatia and the Upper Adriatic remained the only Adriatic

27 Bardill, "Visualizing the Great Palace"; Featherstone "The Great Palace".

28 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De cerimoniis* 11, 15, ed. Reiske, pp. 582, ed. and trans. Dagron et al., vol. 3, pp. 120–21; for the *pentapyrgion*, see now Angar, "Furniture"; Dagron, "Architecture"; Bauer, "Potentieller Besitz", p. 159.

29 Kalavrezou, "Helping Hands", pp. 54–57; Magdalino, "L'église du Phare"; Klein, "His Kingdom"; Bauer, "Potentieller Besitz", pp. 146–47.

30 For Louis's visit, see the account in John Kinnamos, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, ed. A. Meineke, *Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum* (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn 1836, p. 83.

31 Nechaeva, *Embassies*, pp. 163–205 (gifts) and 207–35 (insignia). On the famous case of the Merovingian king Clovis (r. 481/82–511) who was promoted to *patrikios* ("consul", according to Gregory of Tours) by Anastasios I, see McCormick, "Clovis at Tours".

footholds under loose Byzantine control. When, in the early 9th century, the Carolingians' expansion towards the Adriatic became an imminent threat, Constantinople tried to reassure its hegemony by interfering again more intensively in its "colonies".³² The main strategy was to convince the Venetian elite of the advantages attained through their affiliation with the Byzantine Empire. Regularly, the *duces* of the town in the lagoon received the imperial titles of *spatharios* and *protospatharios*, and the accompanying gifts and objects of status, like insignia.³³ Apart from that, Constantinople aimed at reinforcing cultural and spiritual bonds with its Adriatic bridgeheads: in 819, Emperor Leon V (813–20) sent relics of St Zachary to Rialto, and with them he sent architects who would build a church worthy of them.³⁴ There is also evidence that the first San Marco had the shape of a Byzantine cross-in-square church.³⁵ A similar exertion of influence is visible at the same time further south in the Adriatic, where Kotor received relics of St Tryphon in 809, and Zadar those of St Anastasia in 811.³⁶ In the latter town, the church of St Anastasia shows signs of Byzantine influence too.³⁷ Even if this intensive interest in the Adriatic grew less after the Treaty of Aachen (812), in which the Carolingians gave up their claims on Venetia and Dalmatia, Constantinople did not forget its Adriatic provinces: the construction of two warships of Byzantine type (*chelandia*) around 840 reveals the ongoing ties between the lagoon and the capital.³⁸ From the second half of the 9th century onwards, however, Venice had become an equal partner rather than a province. Still, the political and cultural ties remained strong. The *doges* kept bearing Byzantine titles until 1118, and even some Eastern princesses found their way to the lagoon, keeping the exchange in material objects alive.³⁹

Already long before Venice reached its *de facto* independence, Byzantium had – *nolens volens* – got used to negotiating with other Western powers at eye-level too, especially with the emerging Carolingian realm and the Papacy. In the context of one of the first major political crises between Constantinople and these new powers, a very special diplomatic gift reached the West: a

32 For the background, see now Borri, "L'Adriatico".

33 Pertusi, "Insigne", pp. 555–61.

34 Andrea Dandolo, *Chronicle*, ed. E. Pastorello, *Andreae Danduli Ducis Venetiarum Chronica per extensum descripta aa. 46–1280 d.C.* (Rerum Italicorum Scriptores, 2nd ed., 12/1), Bologna 1938, pp. 142–43.

35 Cecchi, *San Marco*.

36 Osborne, "Cult of Relics".

37 Vežić, "Elementi di architettura".

38 John the Deacon, *History*, II, 55, ed. L.A. Berto, *Giovanni Diacono. Istoria Veneticorum* (Fonti per la storia dell'Italia medievale, 2), Bologna 1992, p. 126.

39 Ravegnani, "Dogi", pp. 27–34.

Byzantine organ. Knowledge of this instrument had fallen into oblivion in the West at some point after the fall of Rome, whereas in the Byzantine Empire it remained inseparably connected to imperial ceremonial, and accompanied most public appearances of the emperor.⁴⁰ In 757, an embassy of Constantine V to King Pippin brought along one of these royal instruments. The immediate diplomatic cause for choosing such an exquisite present was without doubt the recently established alliance between the Frankish king and Pope Stephen II, which had been accompanied by two affronts to the Byzantine crown. In 754 the pope had bestowed the Byzantine title *patricius Romanorum* on Pippin and, two years later, when the Carolingians had conquered parts of the former Byzantine exarchate of Ravenna, he gave these territories to the pope instead of returning them to Constantinople.⁴¹

Still, modern analyses disagree on the intended message. Judith Herrin takes it as an appreciation of Pippin's increasing power and a Byzantine effort to win him away from his recently established alliance with the pope.⁴² Franz Tinnefeld, on the other hand, stressing its exclusive ceremonial use at the Byzantine court, thinks that the organ was to remind the Frankish king of Constantinople's supremacy.⁴³ The impossibility of reconstructing an object's message is neither caused solely by our distant view, nor by our dependence on selective and tendentious sources, but rather it is inherent in the character of gift-giving itself. As in any process of communication, there can be discrepancies between the message intended by the sender and the one interpreted by the recipient, depending on the degree of the gift's symbolic ambivalence.

In any case it is clear that despite Constantinople's ideological claim to political supremacy over the whole inhabited world (*oikoumenē*), diplomatic gifts must be seen in a more realistic context. Often they took on a much more defensive, soothing, flattering, or tempting function and mainly aimed at making prospects of alliances or cooperation (or even armistice) more interesting.⁴⁴ Accepting lavish gifts from the East did not necessarily mean recognizing any supremacy whatsoever. Still, their symbolic capital, based on their material and/or spiritual value, was extremely high. Thus, demand for Byzantine gifts among the Western elite remained stable until the 13th century.

40 Maliaras, *Orgel*.

41 For the background, see Herrin, "Constantinople".

42 Herrin, "Constantinople", p. 107.

43 Tinnefeld, "Exquisite Geschenke", p. 122.

44 See examples in Tinnefeld, "Exquisite Geschenke", pp. 126–29.

A good example of how Byzantine gift diplomacy was intended to work can be found in the *Alexiad*.⁴⁵ In 1083, Emperor Alexios I Komnenos had to wage war on three fronts. In the east, Asia Minor had been overrun by the Seljuks, while in the north the Pechenegues threatened the Danube frontier and, finally, in the west, the Norman Robert Guiscard, planned to invade the empire's western provinces from his south Italian territories. In order to free himself from at least the Norman menace, Alexios wanted King Henry IV, who was at that time in Italy, to intervene. After several mutual embassies had prepared the ground, the emperor sent his legate Constantine Choirospaktes to Henry with a highly interesting letter that explicitly lists everything Alexios was willing to give in order to see his wish fulfilled and Robert's territories invaded by the Germans. In accordance with the preceding negotiations, the emperor reminded Henry that he had already sent him silver coins of 144,000 *nomismata* in value, plus 100 purple cloths of silk. Another 216,000 *nomismata* and salaries for 20 of Henry's dignitaries should be forwarded as soon as the king has invaded the Norman principality. On top of that, Alexios proposed an alliance by marriage and – crucial for our topic – gifts accompanied the letter:

I have now sent to you, as a pledge of my goodwill, a gold pectoral cross set with pearls; a reliquary inlaid with gold containing fragments of various saints, identified in each case by a small label; a cup of sardonyx and a crystal goblet; an *astropelekin* [i.e. a kind of talisman] attached to a chain of gold; and some wood [better: resin] of the balsam tree.⁴⁶

The text is symptomatic as it shows not only the strategic employment of gifts but also an astonishingly complete panopticon of the Byzantine products and treasures that made their way into the West as personal or diplomatic gifts.

5 Delights from the East

In a meticulous article, Peter Schreiner assembled the literary evidence for the exchange of diplomatic gifts between Byzantium and the West from 800

45 Anna Komnene, *Alexiad* 111 10, eds. D.R. Reinsch/A. Kambylis, *Annae Comnenae Alexias, I: Prolegomena et textus* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 40), Berlin-New York 2001, p. 7; cf. Kresten, "Auslandsschreiben".

46 The translation is from E.R.A. Sewter (trans.), *The Alexiad. Revised Edition with Introduction and Notes* by P. Frankopan, London 2009, p. 103. The remarks in square brackets are mine.

to 1200. Although in only 64 cases are the presents borne by the embassies known, Schreiner's list gives a very clear impression of common gift-giving practices⁴⁷

The most valuable diplomatic gifts were always those which could not (or with great difficulty) be obtained by means of regular trade, nor be replaced by local imitations. Display of exoticism and refined arts and crafts were therefore among the most intensively used strategies of pre-modern diplomacy. Taking advantage of their exclusive access to African and Asian fauna, Islamic courts, for example, made abundant use of exotic animals in their negotiations with both western and the eastern empires (and other courts).⁴⁸ Byzantine foreign policy towards the Latin West did not usually rely on animals, apart from two goats given to Liudprand of Cremona by Nikephoros II (under quite unfavourable diplomatic circumstances).⁴⁹

Yet, Byzantine diplomats were also aware of the desire for exotic products in the West.⁵⁰ Among these, our sources predominantly mention valuables made of glass and ivory, jewellery, precious stones, incense, dye, balms and ointments, as well as various kinds of receptacles and chalices made of rock crystal, gold, silver, and onyx, for liturgical or profane use.⁵¹ Judging from the high number of chalices of Byzantine origin preserved in church treasuries all over Europe (albeit frequently reworked in later periods), and especially in the treasury of San Marco in Venice,⁵² these examples of Eastern craftsmanship indeed seem to have been held in high esteem both by laymen and clergy in the West.

Very rare, on the other hand, is the evidence for books serving as diplomatic gifts.⁵³ One of the earliest and most famous examples of a Byzantine codex reaching a Western library is a copy of the complete works of Dionysius Areopagites, which the Byzantine Emperor Michael II gave to the Frankish King Louis the Pious in 827.⁵⁴ Reportedly, Byzantine legates had realized the deep veneration of St Dionysius among the Franks some years before, and so the next embassy brought along the carefully written uncial manuscript, which

47 Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke". The article is to be complemented by Tinnefeld, "Exquisite Geschenke"; and Bauer, "Potentieller Besitz". See also Nerlich, *Diplomatische Gesandtschaften*.

48 See the many cases in *The Book of Gifts and Rarities/Kitāb al-Hadāyā wa al-Tuḥaf*, ed. al-Qaddumi, Ghada al-Hijawi (Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs, 29), Cambridge 1996.

49 Liudprand, *Legatio* 38, ed. Chiesa, p. 203; see also Drocourt, "Les animaux", pp. 91–92.

50 Several examples between 800 and 1200 are assembled in Tinnefeld, "Exquisite Geschenke".

51 Tinnefeld, "Exquisite Geschenke", p. 134; Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", p. 267.

52 Buckton, *The Treasury of San Marco*, nos 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23.

53 Lowden, "Luxury Book"; Magdalino, "Evaluation".

54 Lowden, "Luxury Book", pp. 250–51; Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", Appendix, no. 5; Tinnefeld, "Exquisite Geschenke", p. 126.

is today kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Paris. gr. 437). Very soon, King Louis gave orders to translate the Greek text into Latin and, starting with this very manuscript, the writings of St Dionysius Areopagites began to leave their mark on Western philosophy over the next centuries.⁵⁵ Books for liturgical purposes were likewise considered appropriate gifts: in 871, Pope Hadrian II received a bilingual copy of the gospels (“Graeco-latinum evangelium diligentissime correctum”) from the Patriarch of Constantinople.⁵⁶ Others, like the missal with golden letters which was given to King Sigurd of Norway, functioned merely as a status symbol.⁵⁷ A copy of Ptolemy’s *Almagest* that made its way from Constantinople to the Court of King William I of Sicily⁵⁸ is the fourth – and last – example of a book which certainly served as a diplomatic gift between 800 and 1200.

Basically, however, Byzantine diplomacy relied on two “resources” that were appreciated among the Christian elites in the West more than anything else: silks and relics.

6 Silks

From antiquity to modern times, from the Mediterranean to the Yellow Sea, few products have been more tempting for elites than silken garments. Being recognizable from afar both for their colour and material, these clothes provided an excellent opportunity to express status and wealth. The Romans were able to manufacture silk fabrics, but for the raw material they were dependent on imports from inner Asia. Only by the 6th century did they seem to have finally started their own production, and were determined not to give away their knowhow easily.⁵⁹ To the Latin West, silk production remained a mystery; in 1073, when looking at the shroud of St Cuthbert, Reginald of Durham described the textile as “precious silken fabric, whose production is still beyond our knowledge”.⁶⁰

55 Suchla, *Dionysius Areopagita*.

56 Schreiner, “Diplomatische Geschenke”, Appendix, no. 8.

57 Schreiner, “Diplomatische Geschenke”, Appendix, no. 37.

58 Schreiner, “Diplomatische Geschenke”, Appendix, no. 47a.

59 Jacoby, “Silk Economics”, pp. 198–99; Schreiner, “Seide in der schönen Literatur”, pp. 31–35. Muthesius (“From Seed to Samite”, pp. 136–37; “Silk Industry”, pp. 22–23) argues for silk production in Byzantine Syria as early as the 5th century. It is, however, far from certain if the Chinese source she bases her assumption on does indeed refer to Syria as a centre of sericulture or to another country.

60 Reginald of Durham, *Libellus*, ed. Raine, p. 88; cf. Staufer, “Seide aus Byzanz”, p. 9.

Byzantine silks were tempting for elites all over Latin Europe (and even in Scandinavia⁶¹) who wanted to dress *à la mode*. Apparently, demand grew with the consolidation of the Carolingian Empire, and remained at a high level at least until the 13th century. As far as we can see from texts and preserved textiles, the vast majority of silks came from or via Byzantium.⁶²

In the Byzantine Empire, silk was produced in Constantinople and, as well-attested from the 11th century onwards, also in Greece (Corinth, Thebes, Patras, Andros). Private workshops produced different types of fabric in order to feed both Byzantine demand and the export market.⁶³ Silken garments of the highest quality, however, were more difficult to obtain since they were produced primarily in the imperial workshops of Constantinople and their export was subject to imperial regulations.⁶⁴ These workshops always tried to retain their exclusive rights to the best resources, dyes, and production methods; murex-purple dyed silks were in particular regarded as the *basileus'* prerogative, and were thus considered one of the most generous kinds of gifts that could be obtained in Constantinople.⁶⁵

Until c.900 there seems to have been a total embargo on purple-dyed silks, which only Emperor Leon VI (886–912) weakened by an amendment, in which he concedes to at least the sale of scraps and clippings to his subjects.⁶⁶ The *Book of the Eparch* explicitly forbids the sale of silks of the highest quality to foreigners,⁶⁷ and in 968 the above mentioned envoy Liudprand became furious when the silken fabrics he had bought at the market – with the emperor's

61 Vedeler, *Silk for the Vikings*, esp. ch. 2. Rus' graveyards of the 12th and 13th centuries also yield decent quantities of fragments of Byzantine silks, serving as collars and yokes of female clothes: see Shepard, "Silks" (with literature).

62 Stauffer, "Seide aus Byzanz", p. 9.

63 For Byzantine silk production, see Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium"; Lopez, "Silk Industry"; Muthesius, "Silk Industry"; Shepard, "Silks".

64 See Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium", pp. 481–82. Most information on the capital's workshops, especially regulations concerning various guilds involved in processing and trading silk, is derived from the 10th century *Book of the Eparch*, ed. Koder.

65 There is evidence that in the 12th century the workshops of Thebes produced purple-dyed silken fabrics for the court in Constantinople, too. See Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium", pp. 481–82.

66 Leon VI, *Novellae* 80, eds. and trans. P. Noailles/A. Dain, *Les Nouvelles de Léon VI le sage. Texte et traduction*, Paris 1944, pp. 272–73; cf. Muthesius, "Silk, Power and Diplomacy", pp. 99–100. Only the Kievan court enjoyed special trade privileges that were negotiated in the course of the 10th century, which allowed them to buy more precious silks too (Muthesius, "Silk, Power and Diplomacy", pp. 105–06).

67 *Book of the Eparch* IV 1–4, VI 16, VIII 1–5 and 7, ed. Koder, pp. 90–92, 100, 102–04; see Muthesius, "Silk Industry", pp. 40–43, and esp. pp. 46–47 for a commented list of forbidden silks.

consent, which he emphasizes – were confiscated by the *patrikios* Christophoros. The Byzantine official justified his action (in the words of Liudprand):

But those things are *κολυόμενα*, that is forbidden [...] and if the emperor said what you claim he said, he could scarcely intend such cloths as you dream of; for we ought to outclass other nations in dress just as in wealth and wisdom, so that those who have a unique grace in their virtues may have also a unique beauty in their clothes.⁶⁸

Liudprand kept insisting and argued in response that Venetian and Amalfitan merchants used to ship such forbidden textiles to Italian markets. Early Venetian presence in the Near East may have made Islamic markets directly accessible; purple-dyed clothes from Tyrus (*tyria purpura*) were available in Pavia already around 780,⁶⁹ but commercial distribution of high-end textiles seems to have been the exception until the late 11th century. Due to the intensified involvement of Italian (initially Venetian) merchants in the eastern Mediterranean, and the rise of the Greek production centres, a larger quantity of silks reached the West by means of trade.⁷⁰ Still, imperial restrictions on the export quota continued,⁷¹ and thus Byzantine silks remained a precious rarity to many. But for their military assistance the Pisans (1111, 1192) and Genoese (1155, 1192) were granted four and three *pallia* per year as gifts, respectively.⁷²

However, up until the rise of the Italian merchant states (and for most Western powers also beyond this time), the usual way to acquire untailored material of considerable size and quality, or even tailored silk garments, had been to receive them as a gift, and the Byzantine court was well aware of their suggestive power in diplomatic negotiations with both the Islamic and the Latin worlds.⁷³ It is therefore little wonder that such fabrics of different kinds

68 Liudprand, *Legatio* 54, ed. Chiesa, p. 211, trans. Squatriti, p. 272.

69 Notker Balbulus, *Gesta Karoli Magni imperatoris*, ed. H.F. Haefele (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, n.s., 12), Berlin 1959, p. 86. Although written only in the late 9th century, Notker's account fits with numerous sources that clearly illustrate the connections between the northern Adriatic and the eastern Mediterranean around 800. On this topic, see McCormick, *Origins*, pp. 885–897 (Appendix 4); Ortalli, "Il mercante", p. 96.

70 Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium", pp. 494–95; Muthesius, "Silk Trade", p. 128; Muthesius, "Silk Industry", pp. 63–64.

71 Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium", pp. 490–92.

72 Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke", p. 265.

73 Muthesius, "Silk, Power and Diplomacy"; ead., "Silken Diplomacy".

make up the most frequently mentioned category among the pieces of evidence for diplomatic or personal gifts to Western recipients.⁷⁴

Among the silks that have been preserved in western contexts, Anna Muthesius has tried to identify several examples, which very likely arrived by means of embassies.⁷⁵ One group of these fabrics bears inscriptions referring to Byzantine Emperors or imperial workshops, which might indicate they were manufactured to serve as gifts in the name of these sovereigns. This group comprises the so-called “Nature Goddess” silk in Durham,⁷⁶ the Elephant-silk in Aachen,⁷⁷ and a couple of silks depicting striding lions (the surviving examples are today in Cologne, Berlin, and Düsseldorf).⁷⁸ Based on unequivocal depictions of Byzantine Emperors, Muthesius is perhaps right in considering the shroud of St Austremonie (today in Lyons)⁷⁹ and the so-called “Guntertuch” (Gunther’s shroud) in Bamberg,⁸⁰ imperial gifts too. Furthermore, for reasons of excellence in terms of material and workmanship, she adds to this the Griffin silk from Sion, dyed with purple murex.⁸¹ Most of them can be hypothetically connected to diplomatic events mentioned in written sources between the 9th and 12th centuries.⁸² To my knowledge, however, only one single preserved Byzantine silk can be connected with a specific occasion without doubt. When, in the winter of 1260/61, Michael VIII Palaiologos, exile emperor in Nikaia, welcomed a Genoese embassy, the diplomats were rewarded with a silken *pallium* embroidered with scenes from the martyrdom of St Lawrence, the patron saint of their city.⁸³ Not only is there an enthusiastic description of the item by Manuel Holobolos, but the original fabric is also preserved in the Museum of Palazzo Bianco in Genoa.

Westerners who were lucky enough to add Byzantine silk garments to their wardrobe, were fully conscious of the outstanding symbolism of their exotic clothes, which put them very close to the elite of the imperial court

74 Schreiner, “Diplomatische Geschenke”, p. 266. The terms used for these fabrics, however, do not always reveal its material, size, quality, etc. See Stauffer, “Seide aus Byzanz”, p. 17.

75 Muthesius, “Silken Diplomacy”, pp. 239–40; Muthesius, “Silk, Power and Diplomacy”, pp. 102–03.

76 Muthesius, *Byzantine Silk*, pp. 177–78 (M 42). For a contemporary description, see Reginald of Durham, *Libellus*, ed. Raine, pp. 88–89.

77 Muthesius, *Byzantine Silk*, p. 183 (M 58).

78 Ibid., pp. 34–43 and 180–81 (M 52, 53, 54).

79 Ibid., p. 175 (M 34).

80 Ibid., p. 193 (M 90). See, most recently, Prinzing, “Guntertuch”.

81 Muthesius, *Byzantine Silk*, pp. 50–54 and 179 (M 48).

82 Muthesius, “Silken Diplomacy”, pp. 240–48; Muthesius, “Silk, Power and Diplomacy”, pp. 102–03.

83 For an excellent analysis and description of the political and ideological background, see now Hilsdale, “Imperial Image”.

of Constantinople. A famous example from the very beginning of our time period, is related to the Synod of Ponthion in 876. On its first day, the patron of the synod, Charles the Bald, appeared “dressed in golden garments, tailored in Frankish style” (“in vestitu deaurato, habito Francisco”), whereas on the last day he was “dressed in the Byzantine way and wore his crown” (“graecisco more paratus et coronatus”). Obviously, Charles changed his Frankish short tunic and hose for a long tunic with mantle, thus adopting the attire of the Byzantine Emperor. However, the precious cloth was by no means bound to Eastern fashion. A manuscript from Regensburg, from c.990,⁸⁴ shows Henry II, Duke of Bavaria (d. 995), clad in traditional Germanic garb, whose fabric can be identified as Byzantine with a high probability thanks to its large woven roundels.⁸⁵ Most Byzantine silks seem to have reached the West as untailored *pallia* anyway, which could be easily customized, be it to serve as secular or liturgical vestments, or as *antependia* or other decorative hangings.

Those who were not so fortunate as to possess Byzantine garments and fabrics, often sought to imitate their style. The large woven roundels in particular – with depictions of either panthers, griffons, leopards, or lions, so typical of Byzantine products – were copied by means of embroidery, as is obvious from a number of depictions in illuminated manuscripts.⁸⁶ Books also reflect the impact of Byzantine silk in other ways. Although they have very seldom survived, book covers of precious manuscripts could consist of imported silk,⁸⁷ and since the patterns of Byzantine silks were considered a distinctive feature of high-quality products, they served artists as models for decorative pages. The famous marriage charter of Empress Theophanu is simultaneously an imitation of precious Byzantine imperial charters and Byzantine silk roundels.⁸⁸

The fact that Byzantine and Oriental silks were held in high esteem in the West also becomes manifest in the many examples of secondary or even tertiary use of such precious textiles. There is abundant evidence of clothes reworked into new liturgical vestments, grave clothes, or shrouds for relics in church treasuries and shrines in western Europe. The deep respect for these precious textiles becomes obvious once again with their use as shrouds; they were often wrapped around the relics with their “beautiful” side facing inside.⁸⁹

84 Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Lit. 142, fol. 4v.

85 Stauffer, “Seide aus Byzanz”, p. 14.

86 Stauffer, “Seide aus Byzanz”, pp. 15–16, with examples.

87 Stauffer, “Seide aus dem Frauenstift”, pp. 129–34.

88 Schulze, *Heiratsurkunde*.

89 Muthesius, “Silken Diplomacy”, pp. 237–38, with a distribution map of preserved silks. Schorta, “Reliquienhüllen”; Schorta, “Textilreliquien”; Stauffer, “Seide aus dem Frauenstift”. For the numerous finds at Bamberg Cathedral, see Helmecke, *Seidenstoffe*.

At times one encounters fiercely critical voices from Westerners, who condemn this desire for luxurious textiles from the – in their eyes – effeminate and decadent cultures of the eastern Mediterranean. The motives for this critique can be easily unmasked, however. Most authors belong to clerical or monastic circles, and mainly criticize their spiritual brothers and sisters who had deviated from their ideals of humility, or condemn the secular elites' decadence. The Byzantine princess Theophanu (d. 991) brought much of the Constantinopolitan lifestyle to Germany when she married Otto II.⁹⁰ According to Otloh of St Emmeram (c.1010–c.1070) however, being a trendsetter proved fatal to Theophanu. The monk claims to have heard from a nun that the late empress had appeared to her in a vision in which she revealed to her that she suffered eternal damnation because she had enticed so many German ladies into the sinful passion for the superfluous and lavish fashion of the Greeks, something previously unknown in their lands (“multa superflua et luxuriosa mulierum ornamenta, quibus Grecia uti solet, sed eatenus in Germaniae Franciaeque provinciis erant incognita”).⁹¹ Not surprisingly, one encounters similar criticism in similar Byzantine contexts too.⁹²

7 Relics

The symbolic power of Byzantine silks was based, ultimately, on their material value. Constantinople, however, was the keeper of things even more precious than any silken garment, of things beyond affordability, that is, the physical remains of saints and items associated with their lives and deaths.⁹³ Thanks to its political and economic importance, Constantinople had quickly risen to religious importance soon after the city's foundation. Not least due to imperial interest, from the time of Constantine the Great onwards, the Byzantine Empire's capital had assembled countless relics in its churches, among them those of the Passion of Christ (see above).⁹⁴ They were guarded with jealousy and pride, but already in the 6th century Byzantine Emperors residing in Constantinople at times used the city's reservoir of relics for their diplomatic

90 See the contributions in Davids (ed.), *The Empress Theophano*.

91 Otloh, *Visio* 17, ed. P.G. Schmidt, *Otloh von St. Emmeram, Liber Visionum* (Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 13), Weimar 1989, pp. 91–92.

92 Schreiner, “Seide in der schönen Literatur”, pp. 42–43.

93 Klein, “Brighter than the Sun”; Kalavrezou, “Helping Hands”.

94 Mergialis-Sahas, “Emperors and Relics”, pp. 42–47 (with literature).

goals.⁹⁵ Justin II (565–78), for example, sent pieces of the True Cross to the Lateran, as well as to Poitiers. However, this was an exception, and the political exploitation of relics reached its peak exactly in the period that concerns us here. Among the earliest examples of this are the translations of relics to the Byzantine outposts in the Adriatic in the early 9th century (see above). From this time on, relics start to figure more prominently among the diplomatic gifts granted to the powerful in the Latin West, accommodating – and triggering – growing demand.⁹⁶ The increasing number of pilgrims and crusaders passing, or by-passing, Constantinople⁹⁷ on their way to and from the Holy Land, and the tales they told after their return (be they based on facts or imagination), must have contributed additionally to the city's reputation as the hoard of Christianity's biggest treasures. In the 12th century, Constantinople even seems to have surpassed Jerusalem as a destination of faith tourism, at least for those who hoped to acquire prestigious relics.⁹⁸

Relics travelled to the West either within reliquaries or in simple receptacles or coverings. In the first case, the gift's value was doubled, since the spiritual power of the relic was complemented by the aesthetics of its receptacle. Preserved Byzantine reliquaries are proof of the excellent craftsmanship and lavish use of precious materials. Although Byzantine reliquaries were obviously held in high esteem, until the 12th century they had no stylistic impact on those produced by Western artisans. Even in the heyday of imitation of all things Byzantine under the Ottonians, one looks in vain for Eastern influence on reliquaries.⁹⁹ Although traditional aesthetics may have also played a role here, the main reason for this obviously deliberate rejection of such influence, seems to be rooted in a very different approach to the veneration of the sacred objects themselves. In Byzantium, veneration of relics was based on visual, sometimes even haptic, contact with the remains. At certain days in the year they were shown to the faithful, or even offered to them to be touched or kissed. This means reliquaries had to serve this purpose as a showcase for their

95 See the fundamental study by Klein, "Western Desires". For the construction of the value of relics, see Geary, "Sacred Commodities", esp. pp. 200–08.

96 See the cases assembled in Klein, "Western Desires"; and Schreiner, "Diplomatische Geschenke"; cf. Lounghis, "Gesandte als Vermittler", pp. 58–61. Also, "internal" circulation of relics within the Latin world relied primarily on gift-giving: see Geary, "Sacred Commodities", pp. 208–10.

97 See Macrides, "Constantinople".

98 Klein, "Western Desires", p. 299; Wolfzettel, "Bemächtigung", p. 84.

99 Klein, "Western Desires", p. 293.

contents. In the West, in contrast, relics did not leave their receptacles once they were solemnly put there.¹⁰⁰

These different attitudes can be seen best in the case of head relics. Whereas in Byzantium the bone of the skull remained bare, receiving, at best, only metal fittings on which the saint's name was inscribed, such veneration was unimaginable in Latin Christendom. In the West, a more metaphorical approach prevailed, by putting bones into containers that resembled the shape of the part of the body in question, such as reliquaries shaped as a head or arm.¹⁰¹

This refusal to follow Byzantine reliquary types changed to a certain extent in the aftermath of the Sack of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204. The looting of the city and the first years of Latin rule prompted the massive export of relics and reliquaries. This spate seems to have contributed to a conceptional change of design in the West, since, in the wake of the Fourth Crusade, Western Latin reliquaries began to put their contents on display for the first time.¹⁰² However, this influx of Byzantine relics soon cast doubt on their authenticity as a whole. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 decreed that no relics should be passed on without their original reliquary.¹⁰³ In this context, the possession of Eastern receptacles became more important than ever, and if there was none, Western artists busily integrated at least some parts of Byzantine artifacts into their own works, or decorated them with Greek letters. The artistic impact of one single item can be seen best in Rhenish and Mosan art,¹⁰⁴ where the arrival of a precious *staurotheke* in Limburg triggered several imitations, above all in Mettlach and St Matthias.¹⁰⁵ Another good example of this appreciation of objects regarded as Byzantine, can be seen in the remains of an ivory panel from Constantinople, now in Halberstadt, which was unscrupulously cut into pieces, only to be carefully rearranged and to serve henceforth as a relic chest.¹⁰⁶

Appropriation (both physical and cultural) of Byzantine cultural output in Latin Europe reached its last peak in the immediate aftermath of the Fourth Crusade.¹⁰⁷ The relics flooding into the treasuries of Latin churches attracted many pilgrims, thus leading to significant financial gain for their

100 Toussaint, "Schöne Schädel"; Kalavrezou, "Helping Hands", p. 68.

101 Klein, "Brighter than the Sun".

102 Toussaint, "Sichtbarkeit".

103 *Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis una cum Commentariis glossatorum*, c. 62, ed. A. García y García (Monumenta Iuris Canonici ser. A: Corpus glossatorum, 2), Rome 1981, vol. 2, pp. 101–02; Klein, "Western Desires", p. 305.

104 Belting, "Die Reaktion der Kunst", p. 38.

105 Klein, "Western Desires", pp. 304–05 (with further literature).

106 Janke, *Heilbringender Schatz*, pp. 242–44 (no. 28a).

107 This issue, however, is far beyond the scope of the present article. For some fundamental contributions see Demus, *Byzantium and the West*; Belting et al. (eds.), *Il medio Oriente*.

new owners.¹⁰⁸ Even the relics of the Passion of Christ made their way from the Church of the Pharos to the court of Saint Louis (r. 1226–70), who gave the order to build Sainte Chapelle to provide them once more with a worthy home.¹⁰⁹ It is symptomatic of the self-esteem of the Latin West that Louis's new chapel, being a pure and pre-eminent expression of the self-confidence and boldness of French Gothic architecture, shows no Byzantine influence at all. However enriching the effects on Western art it may have been, the postulate of Byzantine superiority – be it in terms of wealth, power, technology, or spirituality – was no longer tenable. Exchange in objects continued of course, but in contrast with former centuries, the West began to be on equal terms, with predominance continuously shifting to the Latin West.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Book of the Eparch*, ed. J. Koder, *Leonis Sapientis librum Praefecti/Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 33), Vienna 1991.
- Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De cerimoniis*, ed. J. Reiske, *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris de cerimoniis aulae byzantinae libri duo*, 2 vols., Bonn 1829; ed. and French trans. G. Dagron et al., *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des cérémonies*, 6 vols. (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 52), Paris 2020.
- Liudprand, *Antapodosis/Legatio*, ed. P. Chiesa, *Liudprandi Cremonensis Antapodosis, Homelia Paschalis, Historia Ottonis, Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 156), Turnhout 1998; trans. P. Squatriti, *Liudprand of Cremona. The Complete Works of Liudprand. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Washington, D.C. 2007.
- Reginald of Durham, *Libellus*, ed. J. Raine, *Reginaldi monachi Dunelmensis libellus de admirandis beati Cuthberti virtutibus quae novellis patratae sunt temporibus* (Publications of the Surtees Society), London 1835.

Secondary Literature

- Angar, M., "Furniture and Imperial Ceremony in the Great Palace. Revisiting the Pentapyrgion", in M. Featherstone/J.-M. Spieser/G. Tanman/U. Wulf-Rheidt (eds.), *The Emperor's House. Palaces from Augustus to the Age of Absolutism* (Urban Spaces, 4), Berlin 2015, pp. 181–200.

108 Belting, "Die Reaktion der Kunst", pp. 35–37; Klein, "Western Desires", pp. 302–03; Cutler, "Loot".

109 Flusin, "Sainte-Chapelle".

- Angelidi, Ch., "Designing Receptions in the Palace (De Cerimoniis 2.15)", in A. Beihammer/St. Constantinou/M. Parani (eds.), *Court Ceremonies and Rituals of Power in Byzantium and the Medieval Mediterranean. Comparative Perspectives* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 98), Leiden 2013, pp. 465–85.
- Bardill, J., "Visualizing the Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors at Constantinople. Archaeology, Text, and Topography", in F.A. Bauer (ed.), *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft. Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen. Gestalt und Zeremoniell. Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004, Istanbul* (Byzas, 5), Istanbul 2006, pp. 5–45.
- Bauer, F.A., "Potentieller Besitz. Geschenke im Rahmen des byzantinischen Kaiserzeremoniells", in id. (ed.), *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft. Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen. Gestalt und Zeremoniell. Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004, Istanbul* (Byzas, 5), Istanbul 2006, pp. 135–69.
- Bauer, F.A., "Byzantinische Geschenkdiplomatie", in F. Daim/J. Drauschke (eds.), *Byzanz. Das Römerreich im Mittelalter*, vol. 3: *Peripherie und Nachbarschaft*, Mainz 2010, pp. 1–55.
- Belting, H. (ed.), *Il medio Oriente e l'Occidente nell'arte del XIII secolo* (Atti del XXIV Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte, 2), Bologna 1982.
- Belting, H., "Die Reaktion der Kunst des 13. Jahrhunderts auf den Import von Reliquien und Ikonen", in id. (ed.), *Il medio Oriente e l'Occidente nell'arte del XIII secolo*. Bologna 1982, pp. 35–54.
- Berger, A., "Die akustische Dimension des Kaiserzeremoniells. Gesang, Orgelspiel und Automaten", in F.A. Bauer (ed.), *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft. Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen. Gestalt und Zeremoniell. Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004, Istanbul* (Byzas, 5), Istanbul 2006, pp. 63–77.
- Borri, F., "L'Adriatico tra Bizantini, Longobardi e Franchi. Dalla conquista di Ravenna alla pace di Aquisgrana (751–812)", *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo* 112 (2010), 1–56.
- Buckton, D. (ed.), *The Treasury of San Marco, Venice*, Milan 1984.
- Cecchi, R., *La basilica di San Marco. La costruzione bizantina del IX secolo. Permanenze e trasformazioni*, Venice 2003.
- Cormack, R., "But is it Art?", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 218–36.
- Cutler, A., "From Loot to Scholarship: Changing Modes in the Italian Response to Byzantine Artifacts, ca. 1200–1750", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1995), 237–67.
- Cutler, A., "Gifts and Gift Exchange as Aspects of the Byzantine, Arab, and Related Economies", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001), 247–78.
- Dagron, G., "Architecture d'intérieur: le Pentapyrgion", *Travaux et Mémoires* 15 (2005), 109–17.

- Davids, A. (ed.), *The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, Cambridge-New York 1995.
- Deckers, J.G./Restle, M./Shalem, A. (eds.), *Akten des Symposiums »Austausch diplomatischer Geschenke in Spätantike und Byzanz« in München vom 28. Februar bis 1. März 2002* (Mitteilungen zur spätantiken Archäologie und byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte, 4), Munich 2005.
- Demus, O., *Byzantine Art and the West* (The Wrightsman Lectures, 3), London 1970.
- Drocourt, N., "Les animaux comme cadeaux d'ambassade entre Byzance et ses voisins (VII^e–XII^e siècle)", in B. Doumerc/Ch. Picard (eds.), *Byzance et ses périphéries. Hommage à Alain Ducellier*, Toulouse 2004, pp. 67–93.
- Drocourt, N., *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore. Les ambassadeurs étrangers dans l'empire byzantine des années 640 à 1204* (Association pour la Promotion de l'Histoire et de l'Archéologie Orientales, Université de Liège, mémoires, 11), 2 vols., Louvain 2015.
- Featherstone, J.M., "The Great Palace as Reflected in the De Cerimoniis", in F.A. Bauer (ed.), *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft. Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen. Gestalt und Zeremoniell. Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004, Istanbul* (Byzas, 5), Istanbul 2006, pp. 47–61.
- Featherstone, J.M., "Δι' ἐνδοξίας: Display in Court Ceremonial (De cerimoniis II,15)", in A. Cutler/A. Papaconstantinou (eds.), *The Material and the Ideal. Essays in Mediaeval Art and Archaeology in Honour of Jean-Michel Spieser*, Leiden 2008, pp. 75–112.
- Flusin, B., "Les reliques de la Sainte-Chapelle et leur passé impérial à Constantinople", in J. Durand/M.-P. Laffitte (eds.), *Le trésor de la Sainte-Chapelle*, Paris 2001, pp. 20–31.
- Geary, P., "Sacred Commodities: The Circulation of Medieval Relics", in A. Appadurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Social Perspective*, Cambridge 1986, pp. 169–91.
- Grünbart, M. (ed.), *Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft. Gabentausch und Netzwerkpflege im europäischen Mittelalter. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums Münster, 19.–20. November 2009* (Byzantinistische Studien und Texte, 1), Münster 2011.
- Helmecke, G., *Byzantinische und orientalische Seidenstoffe. Grabfunde aus der Sepulchur der Bamberger Domherren* (Veröffentlichungen des Diözesanmuseums Bamberg), Bamberg 2001.
- Herrin, J., "Constantinople, Rome and the Franks in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 91–107.
- Herrin, J., "Material Culture and the Myth of Byzantium", in G. Arnaldi/G. Cavallo (eds.), *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino. Contatti effettivi e possibilità di studi comparati. Tavola rotonda del XVIII Congresso del CISH, Montréal, 29 agosto 1995* (Nuovi Studi Storici, 40), Rome 1997, pp. 33–41.

- Hilsdale, C.J., "The Imperial Image at the End of Exile. The Byzantine Embroidered Silk in Genoa and the Treaty of Nymphaion (1261)", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 64 (2010), 151–232.
- Hilsdale, C.J., "Gift", *Studies in Iconography* 33 (2012), 171–82.
- Hoffmann, J., "Die östliche Adriaküste als Hauptnachschubbasis für den venezianischen Sklavenhandel bis zum Ausgang des elften Jahrhunderts", *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 55/2 (1968), 165–81.
- Jacoby, D., "Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84–85 (1991–92), 452–500 (repr. in id., *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot/Brookfield 1997, no. vii).
- Jacoby, D., "Silk Economics and Cross-Cultural Artistic Interaction: Byzantium, the Muslim World and the Christian West", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 197–240.
- Janke, P., *Ein heilbringender Schatz. Reliquienverehrung am Halberstädter Dom im Mittelalter*, Munich/Berlin 2006.
- Kalavrezou, I., "Helping Hands for the Empire: Imperial Ceremonies and the Cult of Relics at the Byzantine Court", in H. Maguire (ed.), *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, Washington, D.C. 1997, pp. 53–79.
- Kislinger, E., "Verkehrsrouten zur See im byzantinischen Raum", in id./J. Koder/A. Külzer (eds.), *Handelsgüter und Verkehrswege. Aspekte der Warenversorgung im östlichen Mittelmeerraum (4.–15. Jahrhundert)*, *Akten des Internationalen Symposions Wien, 19.–22. Oktober 2005* (Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., Denkschriften, 388 = Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, 18), Vienna 2010, pp. 149–74.
- Klein, H.A., "Eastern Objects and Western Desires: Relics and Reliquaries between Byzantium and the West", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 283–314.
- Klein, H.A., "Brighter than the Sun: Saints, Relics, and the Power of Arts in Byzantium", in A. Speer/Ph. Steinkrüger (eds.), *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36), Berlin-Boston 2012, pp. 635–54.
- Klein, H.A., "The Crown of His Kingdom: Imperial Ideology, Palace Ritual, and the Relics of Christ's Passion", in M. Featherstone/J.-M. Spieser/G. Tanman/U. Wulf-Rheidt (eds.), *The Emperor's House. Palaces from Augustus to the Age of Absolutism* (Urban Spaces, 4), Berlin 2015, pp. 201–12.
- Kresten, O., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser der Komnenenzeit: die literarische Überlieferung bei Anna Komnene und Ioannes Kinnamos. Mit einem Exkurs zur Chronologie der Auslandsschreiben Dölger-Wirth, Reg. 1068, 1077, 1080 und 1114", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 39 (1996), 21–59.
- Lounghis, T., "Die byzantinischen Gesandten als Vermittler materieller Kultur vom 5. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert", in H. Hundsbichler (ed.), *Kommunikation zwischen Orient und Okzident. Alltag und Sachkultur. Internationaler Kongress, Krems an der*

- Donau*, 6. bis 9. Oktober 1992 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit, 16), Vienna 1994, pp. 49–67.
- Lowden, J., "The Luxury Book as Diplomatic Gift", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 249–60.
- Macrides, R., "Constantinople: the Crusaders' Gaze", in *Travel in the Byzantine World. Papers from the 34th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, April 2000* (Society of the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Publications, 10), Aldershot 2002, pp. 193–212.
- Magdalino, P., "L'église du Phare et les reliques de la passion à Constantinople (VII^e/VIII^e–XIII^e siècles)", in J. Durand/B. Flusin (eds.), *Byzance et les reliques du Christ. Actes du XX^e Congrès International des Études Byzantines, 19–25 août 2001* (Monographies du Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, 17), Paris 2004, pp. 15–30.
- Magdalino, P., "Evaluation de dons et donation de livres dans la diplomatie byzantine", in M. Grünbart (ed.), *Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft. Gabentausch und Netzwerkpflege im europäischen Mittelalter*, Berlin 2011, pp. 103–16.
- Maliaras, N., *Die Orgel im byzantinischen Hofzeremoniell des 9. und des 10. Jahrhunderts. Eine Quellenuntersuchung* (Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, 33), Munich 1991.
- McCormick, M., "Clovis at Tours, Byzantine Public Ritual and the Origins of Medieval Ruler Symbolism", in E.K. Chrysos/A. Schwarcz (eds.), *Das Reich und die Barbaren* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 29), Vienna-Cologne 1989, pp. 155–80.
- McCormick, M., *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce, AD 300–900*, Cambridge 2001.
- Mergiali-Sahas, S., "Byzantine Emperors and Holy Relics. Use and Misuse of Sanctity and Authority", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 51 (2001), 41–60.
- Mundell Mango, M., "Hierarchies of Rank and Materials. Diplomatic Gifts Sent by Romanus I in 935 and 938", *Deltion tes Christianikes Archaiologikes Hetaireias*, ser. 4, 24 (2003), 365–74.
- Muthesius, A., "From Seed to Samit", *Textile History* 20 (1989), 135–49.
- Muthesius, A., "Impact of the Mediterranean Silk Trade on Western Europe before 1200 AD", in *Textiles in Trade. Proceedings of the Second Biennial Symposium of the Textile Society of America*, Washington, DC 1990, pp. 126–35.
- Muthesius, A., "Silk, Power and Diplomacy", *Textile Society of America, Proceedings* 24–26 (1992), 99–110.
- Muthesius, A., "Silken Diplomacy", in J. Shepard/S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot 1992, pp. 237–48.

- Muthesius, A., "The Byzantine Silk Industry: Lopez and Beyond", *Journal of Medieval History* 19 (1993), 1–67 (repr. in ead., *Studies in Byzantine and Islamic Silk Weaving*, London 1995, pp. 255–314).
- Muthesius, A., *Byzantine Silk Weaving, AD 400 to AD 1200*, Vienna 1997.
- Nechaeva, E., *Embassies – Negotiations – Gifts. Systems of East Roman Diplomacy in Late Antiquity* (Geographica Historica, 30), Stuttgart 2014.
- Nerlich, D., *Diplomatische Gesandtschaften zwischen Ost- und Westkaisern 756–1002* (Geist und Werk der Zeiten, 92), Bern 1999.
- Ortalli, G., "Il mercante e lo stato: strutture della Venezia altomedievale", in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: l'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea* (Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 40), Spoleto 1993, pp. 85–135.
- Osborne, J., "Politics, Diplomacy and the Cult of Relics in Venice and the Northern Adriatic in the First Half of the Ninth Century", *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999), 369–86.
- Pertusi, A., "Insigne del potere sovrano e delegato a Bisanzio e nei paesi di influenza bizantina", in *Simboli e simbologia nell'alto medioevo, 3–9 aprile 1975*, (Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 23), Spoleto 1976, vol. 2, pp. 481–568.
- Prinzing, G., "Nochmals zur historischen Deutung des Bamberger Gunthertuches auf Johannes Tzimiskes", in M. Kaimakamova/M. Salamom/M. Smorag Rozycka (eds.), *Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone, from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century* (Byzantina et Slavica Cracovensia, 5), Cracow 2007, pp. 123–52.
- Ravegnani, G., "I dogi di Venezia e la corte di Bisanzio", in G. Benzoni (ed.), *L'eredità greca e l'ellenismo veneziano*, Venice 2002, pp. 23–51.
- Runciman, S., *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and his Reign*, Cambridge 1963.
- Schorta, R., "Reliquienhüllen und textile Reliquien im Welfenschatz", in J. Ehlers/D. Kötzsche (eds.), *Der Welfenschatz und sein Umkreis*, Mainz 1998, pp. 140–76.
- Schorta, R., "Textilreliquien und textile Reliquienhüllen", *Kunst + Architektur in der Schweiz* 56/1 (2005), 12–19.
- Schreiner, P., "Byzanz und der Westen: Die gegenseitige Betrachtungsweise in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts", in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa. Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 40), Sigmaringen 1992, pp. 551–80.
- Schreiner, P., "Diplomatische Geschenke zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen ca. 800–1200", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 251–82.
- Schreiner, P., "Seide in der schönen Literatur der Byzantiner", in Th. Schilp/A. Stauffer (eds.), *Seide im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Frauenstift. Besitz – Umdeutung – Umnutzung* (Essener Forschungen zum Frauenstift, 11), Essen 2013, pp. 29–48.

- Schulze, H.K., *Die Heiratsurkunde der Kaiserin Theophanu: die griechische Kaiserin und das römisch-deutsche Reich 972–991* (Veröffentlichungen der Niedersächsischen Archivverwaltung, Sonderband), Hannover 2007.
- Shepard, J., “Silks, Skills and Opportunities in Byzantium: Some Reflexions”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 21 (1997), 236–57.
- Stauffer, A., “Seide aus Byzanz im Westen”, in Th. Schilp/ead. (eds.), *Seide im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Frauenstift. Besitz – Umdeutung – Umnutzung* (Essener Forschungen zum Frauenstift, 11), Essen 2013, pp. 9–28.
- Stauffer, A., “Seide aus dem Frauenstift. Befunde, Herkunft, Kontexte”, in Th. Schilp/ead. (eds.), *Seide im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Frauenstift. Besitz – Umdeutung – Umnutzung* (Essener Forschungen zum Frauenstift, 11), Essen 2013, pp. 101–35.
- Suchla, B.R., *Dionysius Areopagita, Leben – Werk – Wirkung*, Freiburg im Breisgau 2008.
- Tinnefeld, F., “Ceremonies for Foreign Ambassadors at the Court of Byzantium and Their Political Background”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 29 (1993), 193–213.
- Tinnefeld, F., “Mira varietas. Exquisite Geschenke byzantinischer Gesandtschaften in ihrem politischen Kontext (8.–12.Jh.)”, in Deckers/Restle/Shalem (eds.), *Akten des Symposiums*, pp. 121–37.
- Toussaint, G., “Die Sichtbarkeit des Gebeins im Reliquiar – eine Folge der Plünderung Konstantinopels?”, in B. Reudenbach/G. Toussaint (eds.), *Reliquiare im Mittelalter* (Hamburger Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte, 5), Berlin 2005, pp. 89–106.
- Toussaint, G., “Schöne Schädel. Die Häupter der Heiligen in Ost und West”, in A. Speer/Ph. Steinkrüger (eds.), *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen* (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36), Berlin-Boston 2012, pp. 655–87.
- Treitinger, O., *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im Zeremoniell.*, Jena 1938 (repr. Darmstadt 1956).
- Vedeler, M., *Silk for the Vikings* (Ancient Textiles Series, 15), Oxford-Philadelphia 2014.
- Vežić, P., “Elementi di architettura bizantina nelle costruzioni alto medievali di Zara”, *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 4 (1998), 55–70.
- Wolfzettel, W., “Byzanz im lateinisch-französischen Mittelalter oder Literaturgeschichte der Bemächtigung”, *Das Mittelalter. Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung* 6 (2001), 83–108.

General Bibliography

- Abulafia, D., "Ancona, Byzantium and the Adriatic, 1155–1173", in id., *Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean, 1100–1400* (Collected Studies Series, 250), London 1987, pp. 195–216.
- Anca, A.S., *Herrschaftliche Repräsentation und kaiserliches Selbstverständnis. Berührung der westlichen mit der byzantinischen Welt in der Zeit der ersten Kreuzzüge* (Symbolische Kommunikation und gesellschaftliche Wertesysteme, 31), Münster 2010.
- Androshchuk, F./Shepard, J./White, M. (eds.), *Byzantium and the Viking World* (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia, 16), Uppsala 2016.
- Angold, M., "Knowledge of Byzantine History in the West: The Norman Historians (Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries)", in J. Gillingham (ed.), *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies 25*, Woodbridge 2003, pp. 19–33.
- Arbagi, M.G., *Byzantium in Latin Eyes: 800–1204* (Ph.D thesis, Rutgers University 1969), University Microfilms. Inc. 70–041.
- Asdracha, C., "L'image de l'homme occidental à Byzance: le témoignage de Kinnamos et de Choniatès", *Byzantinoslavica* 44 (1983), 31–40.
- Augé, I., *Byzantins, Arméniens et Francs au temps de la Croisade, Politique religieuse et reconquête en Orient sous la dynastie des Comnènes*, Paris 2007.
- Avvakumov, G., *Die Entstehung des Unionsgedankens. Die lateinische Theologie des Hochmittelalters in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Ritus der Ostkirche* (Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie, 47), Berlin 2002.
- Bacile, R., "Stimulating Perceptions of Kingship: Royal Imagery in the Cathedral of Monreale and in the Church of Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio in Palermo", *Al-Masaq* 16/1 (2004), 17–52.
- Balard, M., *Les Latins en Orient XI^e–XV^e siècle*, Paris 2007.
- Bauer, F.A., "Potentieller Besitz. Geschenke im Rahmen des byzantinischen Kaiserzeremoniells", in F.A. Bauer (ed.), *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft. Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen. Gestalt und Zeremoniell. Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004, Istanbul* (Byzas, 5), Istanbul 2006, pp. 135–69.
- Bayer, A., *Spaltung der Christenheit. Das sogenannte Morgenländische Schisma von 1054* (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 53), 2nd ed., Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 2004.
- Berschin, W., *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter. Von Hieronymus zu Nikolaus von Kues*, Bern 1980 (English trans. J.C. Frakes, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: from Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*, Washington, D.C. 1988).
- Bischoff, G./Tock, B.-M. (eds.), *Léon IX et son temps. Actes du colloque international organisé par l'Institut d'Histoire Médiévale de l'Université Marc-Bloch, Strasbourg-Eguisheim, 20–22 juin 2002* (ARTEM, 8), Turnhout 2006.

- Bloch, H., "Monte Cassino, Byzantium and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 3 (1946), 163–224.
- Blöndal, S., *The Varangians of Byzantium. An Aspect of Byzantine Military History* (Translated, Revised and Rewritten by B.S. Benediktz), Cambridge 1978.
- Boeck, E.N., *Imagining the Byzantine Past: The Perception of History in the Manuscripts of Skylitzes and Manasses*, New York 2015.
- Bonfil, R./Irshai, O./Stroumsa, G.A./Talgam, R. (eds.), *Jews in Byzantium: Dialectics of Minority and Majority Cultures* (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture, 14), Leiden-Boston 2012.
- Borsari, S., *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici*, Venice 1988.
- Brand, C.M., *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968.
- Brandes, W., "Liudprand von Cremona (Legatio Cap. 39–41) und eine bisher unbeachtete west-östliche Korrespondenz über die Bedeutung des Jahres 1000 AD", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 93 (2000), 435–63.
- Brink, S./Price, N. (eds.), *The Viking World* (The Routledge Worlds), Oxford-New York 2008.
- Brown, P., "The Gesta Roberti Wiscardi: A 'Byzantine' History?", *Journal of Medieval History* 37 (2011), 162–79.
- Bucossi, A./Rodriguez Suarez, A. (eds.), *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium. In the Shadow of Father and Son*, Abingdon 2016.
- Burgarella, P., "Chiesa d'Oriente e d'Occidente alla vigilia dell'anno mille", in G. Arnaldi/G. Cavallo (eds.), *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino*, Rome 1997, pp. 179–212.
- Burkhardt, S., "Iuxta regulam sancti patris Benedicti atque Basilii. Die Klöster Südtaliens als Begegnungsräume zwischen West und Ost", in K. Oschema/L. Lieb/J. Heil (eds.), *Abrahams Erbe. Konkurrenz, Konflikt und Koexistenz der Religionen im europäischen Mittelalter*, Berlin 2015, pp. 309–24.
- Burkhardt, S./Foerster, T. (eds.), *Norman Tradition and Transcultural Heritage. Exchange of Cultures in the 'Norman' Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, Farnham 2013.
- Carile, A., "Roma e Romania dagli Isaurici ai Comneni", in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 34), Spoleto 1988, vol. 2, pp. 531–82.
- Carrier, M., *L'Autre chrétien à l'époque des Croisades: les Byzantins vus par les chroniqueurs du monde latin (1096–1261)*, Saarbrücken 2012.
- Castiñeiras, M., "Bizanci, el Mediterrani i l'art de 1200 a Catalunya", *Síntesi. Quaderns dels Seminaris de Besalú* 2 (2014), 9–25.
- Chadwick, H., *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church. From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence*, Oxford 2003.
- Cheyne, J.-C., "Le schisme de 1054: un non-événement?", in C. Carozzi/H. Taviani-Carozzi (eds.), *Faire l'événement au Moyen Âge* (Le temps de l'histoire), Aix-en-Provence 2007, pp. 299–311.

- Chrissis, N.G./Kolia-Dermitzaki, A./Papageorgiou, A. (eds.), *Byzantium and the West. Perception and Reality (9th–15th c.)*, London-New York 2019.
- Ciggaar, K.N., “L’émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066: un nouveau texte en latin sur les Varangues à Constantinople”, *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974), 301–42.
- Ciggaar, K.N., *Western Travellers to Constantinople. The West and Byzantium, 962–1204: Cultural and Political Relations* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 10), Leiden 1996.
- Ciggaar, K.N./van Aalst, V. (eds.), *Byzantium and the Low Countries in the Tenth Century. Aspects of Art and History in the Ottonian Era*, Hernen 1985.
- Classen, P., “Die Komnenen und die Kaiserkrone des Westens”, *Journal of Medieval History* 3 (1977), 207–24.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J., “The Gregorian Papacy, Byzantium, and the First Crusade”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 13 (1988), 145–69.
- Cuffel, A., “Call and Response: European Jewish Emigration to Egypt and Palestine in the Middle Ages”, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 90 (1999), 61–102.
- Cutler, A., “Gifts and Gift Exchange as Aspects of the Byzantine, Arab, and Related Economies”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001), 247–78.
- Da Costa-Louillet, G., “Saints de Sicile et d’Italie méridionale aux VIII^e, IX^e et X^e siècles”, *Byzantion* 29–30 (1959/60), 89–173.
- Dagron, G., “Formes et fonctions du pluralisme linguistique à Byzance (IX^e–XII^e siècle)”, *Travaux et Mémoires* 12 (1994), 219–40.
- Davids, A. (ed.), *The Empress Theophano. Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, Cambridge 1995.
- Day, G.W., *Genoa’s Response to Byzantium, 1155–1204. Commercial Expansion and Factionalism in a Medieval City*, Urbana 1988.
- Delouis, O./Peters-Custot, A., “Le voyage de Rome dans la fabrique des saints byzantins”, in O. Delouis et al. (eds.), *Les mobilités monastiques en Orient et en Occident de l’Antiquité tardive au Moyen Âge (IV^e–XV^e siècle)* (Collection de l’École française de Rome, 558), Rome 2019, pp. 311–36.
- Demus, O., *Byzantine Art and the West* (The Wrightsman Lectures, 3), London 1970.
- Dennis, G.T., “Schism, Union and the Crusades”, in V.P. Goss (ed.), *The Meeting of the Two Worlds. Cultural Exchange between East and West during the Period of the Crusades*, Kalamazoo, 1986, pp. 181–87.
- Devereaux, R., *Constantinople and the West in Medieval French Literature: Renewal and Utopia*, Cambridge 2012.
- Dölger, F., “Die ‘Familie der Könige’ im Mittelalter”, in id., *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, Ettal 1953, pp. 34–69.
- Dondaine, A., “Hugues Ethérien et Léon Tuscan”, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 19 (1952), 67–134.
- Dönitz, S., “Jüdisch-christliche Begegnungen in verschiedenen Kulturräumen des Mittelalters: Byzanz und Ashkenaz im Vergleich”, *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 38 (2013), 85–100.

- Drocourt, N., "Ambassades latines et musulmanes à Byzance: Une situation contrastée (VIII^e–XI^e siècles)", *Byzantion* 74 (2004), 348–81.
- Drocourt, N., "La place de l'écrit dans les contacts diplomatiques du haut Moyen Âge. Le cas des relations entre Byzance et ses voisins (de la fin du VII^e siècle à 1204)", in *L'autorité de l'écrit au Moyen Âge (Orient-Occident) (XXXIX^e congrès de la SHMESP)*, Paris 2009, pp. 25–44.
- Drocourt, N., "Passing on Political Information between Major Powers: the Key Role of Ambassadors between Byzantium and its Neighbours during the Middle Byzantine Period", *Al-Masāq: Islam and the Medieval Mediterranean* 24 (2012), 91–112.
- Drocourt, N., *Diplomatie sur le Bosphore. Les ambassadeurs étrangers dans l'empire byzantine des années 640 à 1204* (Association pour la Promotion de l'Histoire et de l'Archéologie Orientales, Université de Liège, mémoires, 11), 2 vols, Louvain-Paris-Bristol 2015.
- Drocourt, N., "Une diplomatie sans langue ? La question des échanges linguistiques dans la diplomatie médio-byzantine", in D. Couto/S. Péquignot (eds.), *Les langues de la négociation. Approches historiennes*, Rennes 2017, pp. 25–61.
- Ducellier, A., "Une mythologie urbaine: Constantinople vue de l'Occident au Moyen Âge", *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Âge* 96/1 (1984), 405–24.
- Duczko, W., *Viking Rus. Studies on the Presence of Scandinavians in Eastern Europe* (The Northern World, 12), Leiden 2004.
- Dvornik, F., *Byzance et la Primauté Romaine*, Paris 1964.
- Dvornik, F., *The Photian Schism. History and Legend*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1970.
- Ebels-Hoving, B., *Byzantium in Westerse Ogen 1096–1204* (Ph.D thesis, University of Groningen 1971).
- Efthymiadis, S., "L'hagiographie grecque d'Italie", in M. Goullet (ed.), *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550/International History of the Latin and Vernacular Hagiographical Literature in the West from its Origins to 1550*, Turnhout 2017, vol. 7, pp. 345–421.
- Euw, A. von/Schreiner, P. (eds.), *Kaiserin Theophanu. Begegnung des Ostens und Westens um die Wende des ersten Jahrtausends. Gedenkschrift des Kölner Schnütgen-Museums zum 1000. Todesjahr der Kaiserin*, 2 vols., Cologne 1991.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden 1967.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Between Two Empires: Southern Italy in the Reign of Basil II", in P. Magdalino (ed.), *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, Leiden 2003, pp. 135–60.
- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Gli Amalfitani nell'Impero bizantino", in E.G. Farrugia (ed.), *Amalfi and Byzantium*, Rome 2010, pp. 17–44.

- Falkenhausen, V. von, "Greek Monasticism in Campania and Latium from the Tenth to the Fifteenth Century", in B. Crostini/I. Angeli Maurzaku (eds.), *Greek Monasticism in Southern Italy, The Life of Neilos in Context*, New York 2018, pp. 78–95.
- Favreau-Lilie, M.-L., *Die Italiener im Heiligen Land vom ersten Kreuzzug bis zum Tode Heinrichs von Champagne (1098–1197)*, Amsterdam 1989.
- Featherstone, J.M., "Δι' ἐνδειξιῶν: Display in Court Ceremonial (De cerimoniis II,15)", in A. Cutler/A. Papaconstantinou (eds.), *The Material and the Ideal. Essays in Mediaeval Art and Archaeology in Honour of Jean-Michel Spieser*, Leiden 2008, pp. 75–112.
- France, J., *Victory in the East. A Military History of the First Crusade*, Cambridge 1994.
- France, J., "Byzantium in Western Chronicles before the First Crusade", in N. Housley (ed.), *Knighthoods of Christ. Essays on the History of the Crusades and the Knights Templar. Presented to Malcolm Barber*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 3–16.
- Franklin, S./Shepard, J., *The Emergence of Rus' 750–1200*, London 1996.
- Frankopan, P., "Turning Latin into Greek: Anna Komnene and the *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*", *Journal of Medieval History* 39 (2013), 80–99.
- Gantner, C., *Freunde Roms und Völker der Finsternis. Die päpstliche Konstruktion von Anderen im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert*, Vienna 2014.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "Die lateinische Übersetzungsabteilung der byzantinischen Kaiserkanzlei unter den Komnenen und Angeloi", in M. Balard/E. Malamut/J.-M. Spieser (eds.), *Byzance et le monde extérieur*, Paris 2005, pp. 105–22.
- Gastgeber, Ch., "The So-Called Schism of 1054 and its Impact on Byzantine Society", in B. Crostini Lappin/G. Peers (eds.), *A Book of Psalms from Eleventh-Century Byzantium: The Complex of Texts and Images in Vat. Gr. 752* (Studi e Testi, 504), Vatican City 2016, pp. 193–225.
- Gemeinhardt, P., *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 82), Berlin 2002.
- Goetz, H.-W., *Die Wahrnehmung anderer Religionen und christlich-abendländisches Selbstverständnis im frühen und hohen Mittelalter (5.–12. Jahrhundert)*, 2 vols., Berlin 2013.
- Grierson, Ph., "The Carolingian Empire in the Eyes of Byzantium", in *Nascità dell'Europa ed Europa carolingia: un'equazione da verificare* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 27), Spoleto 1981, vol. 2, pp. 885–916.
- Haenssler, F., *Byzanz und Byzantiner. Ihr Bild im Spiegel der Überlieferung der germanischen Reiche im früheren Mittelalter* (Ph.D thesis, University of Bern 1960).
- Harris, J., "Wars and Rumours of Wars: England and the Byzantine World in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 14 (1999), 29–46.
- Harris, J., *Byzantium and the Crusades*, London 2003.
- Head, C., "Alexios Komnenos and the English", *Byzantion* 47 (1977), 186–98.

- Hehl, E.-D., "Zwei Kaiser – (k)ein Problem? Byzanz, das westliche Kaisertum und ein missverständlicher Forschungsbegriff", in L. Körntgen et al. (eds.), *Byzanz und seine europäischen Nachbarn: Politische Interdependenzen und kulturelle Missverständnisse* (Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident, 17), Mainz 2020, pp. 41–77.
- Heinemeyer, W., "Die Verträge zwischen dem Oströmischen Reiche und den italienischen Städten Genua, Pisa und Venedig vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert", *Archiv für Diplomatik* 3 (1957), 79–161.
- Herbers, K., "Papst Nikolaus I. und Patriarch Photios. Das Bild des byzantinischen Gegners in lateinischen Quellen", in O. Engels/P. Schreiner (eds.), *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten. Kongreßakten des 4. Symposiums des Mediävistenverbandes in Köln 1991 aus Anlaß des 1000. Todesjahres der Kaiserin Theophanu*, Sigmaringen 1993, pp. 51–74.
- Herbers, K., "Rom und Byzanz im Konflikt. Die Jahre 869/870 in der Perspektive der Hadriansvita des Liber pontificalis", in W. Hartmann/K. Herbers (eds.), *Die Faszination der Papstgeschichte. Neue Zugänge zum frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 28), Cologne 2008, pp. 55–69.
- Herbers, K., *Europa: Christen und Muslime in Kontakt und Konfrontation. Italien und Spanien im langen 9. Jahrhundert* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, 2016/2), Stuttgart 2016.
- Herren, M.J., *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages* (King's College London Medieval Studies, 2), London 1988.
- Hiestand, R., *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum im 10. Jahrhundert* (Geist und Werk der Zeiten, 9), Zurich 1964.
- Hoffmann, T., "Diplomatie in der Krise. Liutprand von Cremona am Hofe Nikephoros II. Phokas", *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 43 (2009), 113–78.
- Hofmann, G., "Papst und Patriarch unter Manuel I. Komnenos. Ein Briefwechsel", *Epeteris Etaireias Byzantinon Spoudon* 23 (1953), 74–82.
- Holmes, C., "Shared Worlds': Religious Identities – A Question of Evidence", in J. Harris/id./E. Russel (eds.), *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean World after 1150*, Oxford 2012, pp. 31–59.
- Howard-Johnston, J.D. (ed.), *Byzantium and the West: c.850–c.1200. Proceedings of the XVIII Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, 30 March–1 April 1984* (Byzantinische Forschungen, 13), Amsterdam 1988.
- Hunger, H., *Graeculus perfidus – Italos itamos. Il senso dell'alterità nei rapporti greco-romani ed italo-bizantini*, Rome 1987.
- Hutter, I. (ed.), *Byzanz und der Westen. Studien zur Kunst des europäischen Mittelalters*, Vienna 1984.
- Jäckel, D., "Heinrich III. und eine Brautschau in Byzanz. Zugleich ein Einblick in die Werkstatt von Regestenmachern", in G. Lubich/D. Jäckel (eds.), *Heinrich III.*

- Dynastie – Region – Europa*, (Forschungen zur Kaiser- und Papstgeschichte des Mittelalters, 43), Vienna-Cologne-Weimar 2018, pp. 181–206.
- Jacoby, D., “Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84/85 (1991/92), 452–500 (repr. in Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot 1997, no. VII).
- Jacoby, D., “Italian Privileges and Trade in Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade: a Reconsideration”, *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 24 (1994), 349–69 (repr. in Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot 1997, no. II).
- Jacoby, D., “Venetian Commercial Expansion in the Eastern Mediterranean, 8th–11th Centuries”, in M.M. Mango (ed.), *Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries. The Archaeology of Local, Regional and International Exchange. Papers of the Thirty-eighth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St. John’s College, University of Oxford, March 2004*, Farnham 2009, pp. 371–91.
- Jacoby, D., “The Jewish Communities of the Byzantine World from the Tenth to the Mid-Fifteenth Century: Some Aspects of their Evolution”, in N. de Lange/C. Boyd-Taylor/J. Krivoruchko (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions: Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism, 23), Tübingen 2009, pp. 157–81.
- Jacoby, D., “Commercio e navigazione degli Amalfitani nel Mediterraneo orientale: sviluppo e declino”, in B. Figliuolo/P.F. Simbula (eds.), *Interscambi socio-culturali ed economici fra le città marinare d’Italia e l’Occidente dagli osservatori mediterranei*, Amalfi 2014, pp. 89–128.
- Jeffreys, E.M./Jeffreys, M.J., “‘The Wild Beast from the West’: Immediate Literary Reactions in Byzantium to the Second Crusade”, in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington D.C. 2001, pp. 101–16.
- Jeffreys, M.J. et al. (eds.) *Prosopography of the Byzantine World*, London 2011, URL: <http://blog.pbw.cch.kcl.ac.uk>.
- Jesch, J., *Ships and Men in the Late Viking Age. The Vocabulary of Runic Inscriptions and Skaldic Verse*, Woodbridge 2001.
- Kahl, H.-D., “Römische Krönungspläne im Komnenenhouse? Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Zweikaiserproblems im 12. Jahrhundert”, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 59 (1977), 259–320.
- Kalavrezou, I., “Helping Hands for the Empire: Imperial Ceremonies and the Cult of Relics at the Byzantine Court”, in H. Maguire (ed.), *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, Washington, D.C. 1997, pp. 53–79.
- Kaldellis, A., *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*, Philadelphia 2013.

- Kaplan, M., "La place du schisme de 1054 dans les relations entre Byzance, Rome et l'Italie", in id., *Pouvoirs, Église et sainteté. Essais sur la société byzantine. Recueil d'articles publiés de 1990 à 2010* (Les Classiques de la Sorbonne, 3), Paris 2011, pp. 23–34.
- Karageorgos, B., *Λιουτπράνδος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Κρεμῶνης ὡς ἱστορικός καὶ διπλωμάτης*, Athens 1978.
- Kazhdan, A., "Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century", in A.E. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusaders from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington, D.C. 2001, pp. 83–100.
- Keller, H., "Das ottonische Kirchenreich und Byzanz", in *Cristianità d'Occidente e cristianità d'Oriente, secoli VI–XI* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 51), Spoleto 2004, vol. 1, pp. 249–88.
- Kindlimann, S., *Die Eroberung von Konstantinopel als politische Forderung des Westens im Hochmittelalter. Studien zur Entwicklung der Idee eines lateinischen Kaiserreichs in Byzanz*, Zurich 1969.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege zwischen Byzanz und dem Abendland vom neunten bis in die Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts", in E. Konstantinou (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 1997, pp. 231–57.
- Kislinger, E., "Vertauschte Notizen. Anna Komnene und die Chronologie der byzantinisch-normannischen Auseinandersetzung 1081–1085", *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 59 (2010), 127–47.
- Kislinger, E., "Reisen und Verkehrswege in Byzanz. Realität und Mentalität, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen", in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Plenary Papers*, Sofia 2011, pp. 341–88.
- Klein, H.A., *Byzanz, der Westen und das 'wahre' Kreuz. Die Geschichte einer Reliquie und ihrer künstlerischen Fassung in Byzanz und dem Abendland*, Wiesbaden 2004.
- Klein, H.A., "Eastern Objects and Western Desires: Relics and Reliquaries between Byzantium and the West", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 283–314.
- Koder, J., "Die Sicht des 'Anderen' in Gesandtenberichten", in O. Engels/P. Schreiner (eds.), *Die Begegnung des Westens mit dem Osten. Kongreßakten des 4. Symposiums des Mediävistenverbandes in Köln 1991 aus Anlaß des 1000. Todesjahres der Kaiserin Theophanu*, Sigmaringen 1993, pp. 113–29.
- Koder, J., "Byzanz als Mythos und Erfahrung im Zeitalter Ottos I.", in B. Schneidmüller/S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Ottomische Neuanfänge*, Mainz 2001, pp. 237–50.
- Koder, J., "Latinoi – The Image of the Other According to Greek Sources", in C. Maltezos/P. Schreiner (eds.), *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo). Atti del colloquio internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz O.P.*, Venezia, 1–2 dicembre 2000, Venice 2002, pp. 25–39.
- Kolbaba, T.M., *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins*, Urbana 2000.

- Kolbaba, T.M., "Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious 'Errors': Themes and Changes from 850 to 1350", in A. Laiou/R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Washington 2001, pp. 117–43.
- Kolditz, S., "Leon von Synada und Liudprand von Cremona. Untersuchungen zu den Ost-West-Kontakten des 10. Jahrhunderts", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 95 (2002), 509–83.
- Kolia-Dermitzaki, A., "Die Kreuzfahrer und die Kreuzzüge im Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner", *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 41 (1991), 163–88.
- Kresten, O., "Der 'Anredestreit' zwischen Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa nach der Schlacht von Myriokephalon", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 34/35 (1992/93), 65–110.
- Kresten, O., "Der Geleitbrief. Ein wenig beachteter Typus der byzantinischen Kaiserurkunde", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 38 (1996), 41–83.
- Kresten, O., "Zur Chrysographie in den Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 40 (1998), 139–86.
- Kresten, O./Müller, A.E., "Die Auslandsschreiben der byzantinischen Kaiser des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Specimen einer kritischen Ausgabe", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86/87 (1993/94), 402–29.
- Kreutz, B.M., *Before the Normans. Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, Philadelphia 1991.
- Laiou, A.E., "L'interprétation byzantine de l'expansion occidentale (XI^e–XII^e siècles)", in M. Balard/A. Ducellier (eds.), *Le partage du monde: échanges et colonisation dans la Méditerranée médiévale* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 17), Paris 1998, pp. 163–79.
- Laiou, A.E., *Byzantium and the Other: Relations and Exchanges*, eds. C. Morrison/R. Dorin, Farnham 2012.
- Lamma, P. *Comneni e Staufer. Ricerche sui rapporti fra Bisanzio e l'Occidente nel secolo XII*, 2 vols, Rome 1955–57.
- Lamma, P., "Il problema dei due imperi e dell'Italia meridionale nel giudizio delle fonti letterarie dei secoli IX e X", in id., *Oriente e occidente nell'alto medioevo. Studi storici sulle due civiltà*, Padua 1968, pp. 231–337.
- Leib, B., *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle. Rapports religieux des Latins et des Gréco-Russes sous le Pontificat d'Urbain II (1088–1099)*, Paris 1924.
- Leyser, K., "The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships", in D. Baker (ed.), *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, Edinburgh 1973, pp. 29–63.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeleri (1081–1204)*, Amsterdam 1984.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Das 'Zweikaiserproblem' und sein Einfluss auf die Aussenpolitik der Komnenen", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985), 219–44.
- Lilie, R.-J., "Manuel I. Komnenos und Friedrich I. Barbarossa. Die deutsche und die byzantinische Italienpolitik während der zweiten Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts in der neueren Literatur", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 42 (1992), 157–70.

- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096–1204*, trans. J.C. Morris/J.E. Ridings, Oxford 1993.
- Lilie, R.-J., *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge*, Stuttgart 2004.
- Lilie, R.-J. et al. (eds.), *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung (867–1025)*, 9 vols., Berlin 2009–13.
- Loud, G.A., “Anna Komnena and her Sources for the Normans in Southern Italy”, in I. Wood/G.A. Loud (eds.), *Church and Chronicle in the Middle Ages. Essays Presented to John Taylor*, London 1991, pp. 41–57.
- Loud, G.A., “Southern Italy and the Eastern and Western Empires, c.900–1050”, *Journal of Medieval History* 38 (2012), 1–19.
- Lounghis, T., *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident : depuis la fondation des États barbares jusqu’aux croisades (407–1096)*, Athens 1980.
- Lounghis, T., “Die byzantinischen Gesandten als Vermittler materieller Kultur vom 5. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert”, in *Kommunikation zwischen Orient und Okzident. Alltag und Sachkultur. Internationaler Kongress, Krems an der Donau, 6. bis 9. Oktober 1992* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit, 16), Vienna 1994, pp. 49–67.
- Lounghis, T., “Die byzantinische Ideologie der ‘begrenzten Ökumene’ und die römische Frage im ausgehenden 10. Jahrhundert”, *Byzantinoslavica* 56 (1995), 117–28.
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993 (repr. Cambridge 2002).
- Makk, F., *The Árpáds and the Comneni: Political Relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the 12th Century*, Budapest 1989.
- Marcos Hierro, E., *Die byzantinisch-katalanischen Beziehungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Chronik Jakobs I. von Katalonien-Aragon* (Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, 37), Munich 1996.
- Marcos Hierro, E., “El catalans i l'imperi bizantí”, in M.T. Ferrer i Mallol (ed.), *Els catalans a la Mediterrània oriental a l'edat mitjana. Jornades científiques de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans. Secció històrico-arqueològica* (Sèrie Jornades Científiques, 11), Barcelona 2003, pp. 23–78.
- Martin, J.-M., “L'occident chrétien dans le Livre des cérémonies, II, 48”, *Travaux et Mémoires* 13 (2000), 617–45.
- Martin, J.-M., “Hellénisme politique, hellénisme religieux et pseudo-hellénisme à Naples (VII^e–XII^e siècle)”, *Nea Rhome* 2 (2005), 59–77.
- Mayer, H.E., “Latins, Muslims and Greeks in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem”, *History* 8 (1978), 175–92.
- McCormick, M., *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce, AD 300–900*, Cambridge 2001.
- McCormick, M., “From one Center of Power to Another: Comparing Byzantine and Carolingian Ambassadors”, in C. Ehlers (ed.), *Places of Power – Orte der Herrschaft – Lieux du Pouvoir*, Göttingen 2007, pp. 45–72.

- McQueen, W.B., "Relations between the Normans and Byzantium, 1071–1112", *Byzantion* 56 (1986), 427–76.
- Michel, A., *Humbert und Kerullarios*, 2 vols, Paderborn 1924–30.
- Miller, D.A., "Byzantine Treaties and Treaty-Making: 500–1025 AD", *Byzantinoslavica* 32 (1971), 56–76.
- Morton, J., "A Byzantine Canon Law Scholar in Norman Sicily: Revisiting Neilos Doxopatres's Order of the Patriarchal Thrones", *Speculum* 92 (2017), 724–54.
- Muthesius, A., *Byzantine Silk Weaving, AD 400 to AD 1200*, Vienna 1997.
- Neocleous, S., "Byzantine-Muslim Conspiracies against the Crusades: History and Myth", *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010), 253–74.
- Neocleous, S., "Greeks and Italians in Twelfth-Century Constantinople: Convivencia or Conflict?", in B. Crostini/S. La Porta (eds.), *Negotiating Co-Existence. Communities, Cultures and "Convivencia" in Byzantine Society* (Bochumer altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 96), Trier 2013, pp. 221–50.
- Neocleous, S., *Heretics, Schismatics, or Catholics? Latin Attitudes to the Greeks in the Long Twelfth Century* (PIMS Studies and Texts, 216), Toronto 2019.
- Nerlich, N., *Diplomatische Gesandtschaften zwischen Ost- und Westkaisern, 756–1002*, Bern 1999.
- Nicol, D.M., "Byzantium and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 13 (1962), 1–20.
- Nicol, D.M., "Byzantium and England", *Balkan Studies* 15 (1974), 173–203.
- Nicol, D.M., *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*, Cambridge 1992.
- Niederkorn, J.P., "Thessalonike – Konstanz – Ancona. Kontinuität und Wandel in der staufischen Außenpolitik 1148 bis 1155", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 42 (2000), 213–44.
- Nikolaou, T./Neuner, P./Wenz, G. (eds.), *Das Schisma zwischen Ost- und Westkirche 950 bzw. 800 Jahre danach (1054 und 1204)* (Beiträge aus dem Zentrum für ökumenische Forschung München, 2), Münster 2004.
- Ochoa, J.A., "El imperio bizantino en el viaje de Benjamín de Tudela", in G. Busi (ed.), *Viaggiatori ebrei. Berichte jüdischer Reisender vom Mittelalter bis in die Gegenwart*, Bologna 1992, pp. 81–98.
- Ocón Alonso, D.M., "Alfonso VIII, la llegada de las corrientes artísticas de la corte inglesa y el bizantinismo de la escultura hispánica a finales del siglo XII", in *Alfonso VIII y su época*, Madrid 1992, pp. 307–20.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter*, Hildesheim 1947.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Abendland und Byzanz. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1958.
- Ohnsorge, W., *Konstantinopel und der Okzident. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1966.

- Ohnsorge, W., *Ost-Rom und der Westen. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte der byzantinisch-abendländischen Beziehungen und des Kaisertums*, Darmstadt 1983.
- Oikonomides, N., "L'"unilinguisme" officiel de Constantinople byzantine (VI^e–XII^e siècle)", *Symmeikta* 13 (1999), 9–22.
- Olson, A., "Working with the Roman History: Attaleiates' Portrayal of the Normans", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41 (2017), 1–17.
- Pahlitzsch, J., *Graeci und Suriani im Palästina der Kreuzfahrerzeit: Beiträge und Quellen zur Geschichte des griechisch-orthodoxen Patriarchats von Jerusalem* (Berliner Historische Studien, 33), Berlin 2001.
- Pahlitzsch, J., "Byzantine Monasticism and the Holy Land: Palestine in Byzantine Hagiography of the 11th and 12th Centuries", in D. Bertaina et al. (eds.), *Heirs of the Apostles. Studies on Arabic Christianity in Honor of Sidney H. Griffith*, Leiden 2018, pp. 229–53.
- Penna, D., *The Byzantine Imperial Acts to Venice, Pisa and Genoa, 10th–12th centuries: A Comparative Legal Study*, The Hague 2012.
- Pertusi, A., "Insegne del potere sovrano e delegato a Bisanzio e nei paesi di influenza bizantina", in *Simboli e simbologia nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 23), Spoleto 1976, vol. 2, pp. 481–568.
- Peters-Custot, A., "Les communautés grecques de Basilicate à l'époque byzantine", in G. Noyé/J.-M. Martin/A. Jacob (eds.), *Histoire et culture dans l'Italie byzantine. Acquis et nouvelles recherches* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 363), Rome 2006, pp. 559–87.
- Peters-Custot, A., *Les Grecs de l'Italie méridionale post-byzantine (IX^e–XIV^e siècle): une acculturation en douceur* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 420), Rome 2009.
- Peters-Custot, A., "Le monachisme byzantin de l'Italie méridionale. Réalité et perception, du IX^e au XI^e siècle", in *Monachesimo d'oriente, monachesimo d'Occidente* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 64), Spoleto 2017, pp. 359–96.
- Phillips, J., *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*, London 2004.
- Phillips, J., *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*, New Haven, Conn. 2007.
- Portnykh, V.L., "Les Byzantins vus par les chroniqueurs de la Première croisade", *Le Moyen Âge* 120 (2014), 713–26.
- Prinzing, G., "Das Papsttum und der orthodox geprägte Südosten Europas 1180–1216", in E.-D. Hehl/I.H. Ringel/H. Seibert (eds.), *Das Papsttum in der Welt des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Mittelalter-Forschungen, 6), Stuttgart 2002, pp. 137–83.
- Prinzing, G./Salamon, M. (eds.), *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950–1453: Beiträge zu einer table-ronde des XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Copenhagen 1996*, Wiesbaden 1999.

- Queller, D.E./Madden, T.F., *The Fourth Crusade: The Conquest of Constantinople*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia 1997.
- Rennie, K.R., *The Foundations of Medieval Papal Legation*, Basingstoke-New York 2013.
- Rentschler, M., "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 10. Jahrhunderts", *Saeculum* 29 (1978), 324–55.
- Rentschler, M., "Griechische Kultur und Byzanz im Urteil westlicher Autoren des 11. Jahrhunderts", *Saeculum* 31 (1980), 112–56.
- Rentschler, M., *Liudprand von Cremona. Eine Studie zum ost-westlichen Kulturgefälle im Mittelalter* (Frankfurter Wissenschaftliche Beiträge. Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe, 14), Frankfurt 1981.
- Runciman, S., *The Eastern Schism*, Oxford 1955.
- Salamon, M., "Polen und Byzanz. Die Perspektiven des 11. und des 14. Jahrhunderts", in V. Múcska (ed.), *East Central Europe at the Turn of the 1st and 2nd Millennia*, Bratislava 2002, pp. 89–102.
- Sansterre, J.-M., "Saint Nil de Rossano et le monachisme latin", in A. Acconcia Longo / S. Lucà / L. Perria (eds.), *Miscellanea di Studi in onore di P. Marco Petta* (Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata, n. s., 45–2), Grottaferrata 1992, vol. 2, pp. 339–86.
- Sarti, L., "From Romanus to Graecus. The Identity and Perceptions of the Byzantines in the Frankish West", *Journal of Medieval History* 44 (2018), 1–20.
- Scheel, R., *Skandinavien und Byzanz. Bedingungen und Konsequenzen mittelalterlicher Kulturbeziehungen* (Historische Semantik, 23), 2 vols, Göttingen 2015.
- Schieffer, R., "Zum lateinischen Byzan(z)bild vor 1204", in P. Piatti (ed.), *The Fourth Crusade Revisited. Atti della Conferenza Internazionale nell'ottavo centenario della IV Crociata 1204–2004, Andros (Grecia), 27–30 maggio 2004* (Pontificio comitato di scienze storiche. Atti e documenti, 25), Vatican City 2008, pp. 18–31.
- Schreiner, P., "Byzanz und der Westen. Die gegenseitige Betrachtungsweise in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts", in A. Haverkamp (ed.), *Friedrich Barbarossa. Handlungsspielräume und Wirkungsweisen des staufischen Kaisers* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 40), Sigmaringen 1992, pp. 551–80.
- Schreiner, P., "Diplomatische Geschenke zwischen Byzanz und dem Westen ca. 800–1200", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 58 (2004), 251–82.
- Schreiner, P., "Zu Gast in den Kaiserpalästen Konstantinopels. Architektur und Topographie in der Sicht fremdländischer Betrachter", in F.A. Bauer (ed.), *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft. Frühmittelalterliche Residenzen. Gestalt und Zeremoniell. Internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004, Istanbul* (Byzas, 5), Istanbul 2006, pp. 101–34.
- Schreiner, P., "Die kaiserliche Familie: Ideologie und Praxis im Rahmen der internationalen Beziehungen in Byzanz", in *Le relazioni internazionali nell'Alto Medioevo* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 58), Spoleto 2011, pp. 735–73.

- Sharf, A., *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade* (The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization), London 1971.
- Sharf, A., "Shabbetai Donnolo as a Byzantine Jewish Figure", *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 3 (1975), 1–18.
- Shepard, J., "The English and Byzantium: a Study of their Role in the Byzantine Army in the Later Eleventh Century", *Traditio* 29 (1973), 53–92.
- Shepard, J., "Aspects of Byzantine Attitudes and Policy Towards the West in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 13 (1988), 67–118.
- Shepard, J., "Trouble-Shooters and Men-on-the-Spot: the Emperor's Dealings with Outsiders", in *Le relazioni internazionali nell'alto medioevo* (Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 58), Spoleto 2011, pp. 691–723.
- Shepard, J., "Storm Clouds and a Thunderclap. East-West Tensions towards the Mid-Eleventh Century", in M. Lauxtermann/M. Whittow (eds.), *Byzantium in the Eleventh Century. Being in Between. Papers from the 45th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, Oxford, 24–26 March 2012*, Abingdon 2017, pp. 127–53.
- Shepard, J./Franklin, S. (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot 1992.
- Siecienski, A.E., *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy*, Oxford-New York 2010.
- Signes Codoñer, J., "Bizancio y al-Ándalus en los siglos IX y X", in I. Pérez Martín/P. Bádenas de la Peña (eds.), *Bizancio y la península ibérica. De la Antigüedad tardía a la Edad Moderna* (Nueva Roma, 24), Madrid 2004, pp. 177–245.
- Signes Codoñer, J., "Bizancio y las Baleares en los siglos VIII–IX", in R. Durán Tapia (ed.), *Bizancio y las Baleares*, Palma de Mallorca 2005, pp. 45–101.
- Simeonova, L. *Diplomacy of the Letter and the Cross. Photius, Bulgaria and the Papacy, 860s–880s*, Amsterdam 1998.
- Spiteris, J., *La Critica Bizantina del Primato Romano nel secolo XII* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 208), Rome 1979.
- Die Staufer und Byzanz* (Schriften zur staufischen Geschichte und Kunst, 33), Göppingen 2013.
- Stauffer, A., "Seide aus Byzanz im Westen", in Th. Schilp/ead. (eds.), *Seide im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Frauenstift. Besitz – Umdeutung – Umnutzung* (Essener Forschungen zum Frauenstift, 11), Essen 2013, pp. 9–28.
- Stephenson, P., "Manuel I Comnenus, the Hungarian Crown and the 'Feudal Subjection' of Hungary, 1162–1167", *Byzantinoslavica* 57 (1996), 33–59.
- Stow, K.R., "By Land or by Sea: The Passage of the Kalonymides to the Rhineland in the Tenth Century", in S. Menache (ed.), *Communication in the Jewish Diaspora: The Pre-Modern World* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies, 16), Leiden 1996, pp. 59–71.
- Strano, G., "La campagna antinormanna per la riconquista di Corfù (1149): Schemi ideologici e contingenza storica nelle fonti letterarie bizantine", in R. Lavagnini/

- C. Rognoni (eds.), *La Sicilia e Bisanzio nei secoli XI e XII* (Byzantino-Sicula, 6), Palermo 2014, pp. 76–94.
- Sutherland, J.N., “The Mission to Constantinople in 968 and Liudprand of Cremona”, *Traditio* 31 (1975), 55–81.
- Ta-Shma, I.M., “Ha-qesharim ha-tarbutim ben yehudei bizanṭion le-ashkenaz” [“Toward a History of the Cultural Links between Byzantine and Ashkenazic Jewry”], in G.J. Blidstein et al. (eds.), *Me’ah She’arim. Iyunim be-olamam ha-ruḥani shel yisra’el be-yemei ha-beynayyim* [*Me’ah She’arim: Studies in Medieval Jewish Spiritual Life in Memory of I. Twersky*], Jerusalem 2001, pp. 61–71.
- Tinnefeld, F., “Ceremonies for Foreign Ambassadors at the Court of Byzantium and their Political Background”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 29 (1993), 193–213.
- Tinnefeld, F., “Mira varietas. Exquisite Geschenke byzantinischer Gesandtschaften in ihrem politischen Kontext”, *Mitteilungen zur spätantiken Archäologie und byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte* 4 (2005), 121–37.
- Tounta, E., *To δυτικό sacrum imperium και η βυζαντινή αυτοκρατορία. Ιδεολογικές τριβές και αλληλοεπιδράσεις στην ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική σκηνή του 12ου αιώνα (1135–1177)*, Athens 2008.
- Tounta, E., “Thessaloniki (1148) – Besançon (1157): Die staufisch-byzantinischen Beziehungen und die “Heiligkeit” des staufischen Reiches”, *Historisches Jahrbuch* 131 (2011), 167–214.
- Tronzo, W., *Cultures of His Kingdom. Roger II and the Capella Palatina in Palermo*, Princeton 1997.
- Van Houts, E.M., “Normandy and Byzantium in the Eleventh Century”, *Byzantion* 55 (1985), 544–59.
- Vasiliev, A.A., “The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration to Byzantium in the Eleventh Century”, *Annales de l’Institut Kondakov* 9 (1937), 39–70.
- Vasiliev, A.A., “Hugh Capet of France and Byzantium”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 6 (1951), 227–51.
- Vollrath, H., “Konrad III. und Byzanz”, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 59 (1977), 321–65.
- Vučetić, M., *Zusammenkünfte byzantinischer Kaiser mit fremden Herrschern (395–1204). Vorbereitung, Gestaltung, Funktionen* (Byzantinistische Studien und Texte, 8), Berlin-Münster 2021.
- Wickham, Ch., “Ninth-Century Byzantium through Western Eyes”, in L. Brubaker (ed.), *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive? Papers from the Thirtieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1996* (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications, 5), Aldershot 1998, pp. 245–56.
- Wingler, C., *Construire pour soumettre. L’image du Basileus dans la littérature française et allemande des croisades* (Autour de Byzance, 4), Paris 2016.
- Wolf, K./Herbers, K. (eds.), *Southern Italy as Contact Area and Border Region during the Early Middle Ages. Religious-Cultural Heterogeneity and Competing Powers in Local*,

- Transregional and Universal Dimensions* (Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 80), Cologne 2017.
- Wolfzettel, W., "Byzanz im lateinisch-französischen Mittelalter oder Literaturgeschichte der Bemächtigung", *Das Mittelalter. Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung* 6 (2001), 83–108.
- Zeillinger, K., "Friedrich I. Barbarossa, Manuel I. Komnenos und Süditalien in den Jahren 1155/1156", *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 27 (1985), 53–83.

Index

- Aachen, Treaty of 11, 138n, 519
 Aaron Bechor Shoro, rabbi 499
 Abbasid Caliphate/Abbasids, dynasty 45,
 302, 320, 326
 'Abd al-Rahmān II, Cordovan emir 325, 326
 'Abd al-Rahmān III, Cordovan caliph 116,
 126n, 326, 327–28, 497
 Abraham ibn Ezra 505
 Abtalion, Rabbi 499
 Abu Ahron 500, 502
 Abydos 340 (map), 483
 Acre 290, 345, 402n, 485
 Adalbert, archbishop of Bremen 168n,
 Adalbert, bishop of Prague, saint 461, 463
 Adalbert, king of Italy 162
 Adam of Bremen, chronicler 166
 Adela of Normandy, countess of Blois 368
 Adelasia, wife of Roger I of Sicily 52
 Ademar of Chabannes, chronicler 360,
 361, 362
 Adhémar, bishop of Le Puy 204, 391–92,
 396–97
 Admont 168
 Adomnán, abbot 303
 Adralestos 435
 Adrian, abbot of St Peter's and St Paul's,
 Canterbury 301, 316
 Adrianople 484
 Adriatic Sea 12, 18, 31, 35–36, 38, 44, 52, 171,
 172, 250, 255, 258, 259, 265, 437, 482,
 518–19, 525n, 529
 Aegean Sea 36, 42, 280, 309n, 343, 345, 471,
 476, 485, 487
 Aeneas 251
 Aeneas, bishop of Paris 99, 101
 Aethelred II, king of England 320
 Aethelstan, king of England 318–20
 Aethelweard, chronicler 316
 Aethiopian(s), see Ethiopia
 Africa 326, 329, 342, 522
 Agnes (Anna) of France, Byzantine
 empress 38, 39, 58, 227, 348, 376, 407
 Ahimaaz, scroll of 499–500, 502
 Ahron ben Josef 505n
 Aimoin of Fleury, chronicler 93
 Aitard, Archbishop of Nazareth 427
 Alaró (Mallorca) 325
 Albania 254
 Alberic, duke of Spoleto 159
 Alberic, *princeps* of Rome 160, 513
 Alberic of Trois-Fontaines 379n, 208
 Albert of Aachen, chronicler 95, 173n, 369n,
 370n, 396n, 397, 434n
 Albert, bishop of Meissen 427
 Albert, *fidelis* 171
 Albertinus, Papal notary 431
 Alberto Bulsi, consul of Pisa 431
 Alcuin 98, 319
 Aldfrith, king of Northumbria 303
 Aldobrandini, family 485
 Aleppo 474
 Alexander, Byzantine emperor 424
 Alexander, fictitious emperor of
 Constantinople 377–78
 Alexander II, pope 168n
 Alexander III, pope 38, 62, 206, 225–26,
 228, 263, 376, 429
 Alexander of Gravina, count 432
 Alexander Raynieri Strambo 433
 Alexander, painter 337
 Alexandria 40, 340 (map), 342, 402, 403,
 455, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 477, 478,
 483, 485, 486, 487, 490
 Alexios I Komnenos, Byzantine emperor
 35, 37n, 42–43, 48, 49–52, 54, 57, 59–62,
 66, 103, 120, 123, 171–73, 176–77, 203,
 204, 205n, 206n, 216n, 253–54, 257, 258,
 281, 304n, 305, 307, 309, 310, 312, 314,
 317, 364–65, 367–70, 371n, 372, 378, 391,
 393–94, 395n, 397, 406, 424, 434–35,
 436, 475, 476, 479, 486, 521
 Alexios II Komnenos, Byzantine
 emperor 38, 39, 227, 228, 346, 348, 376,
 379, 407
 Alexios III Angelos, Byzantine emperor 56,
 127, 283, 383, 425
 Alexios IV, Byzantine emperor 383–84
 Alexios V, Byzantine emperor 384
 Alexios I Stoudites, patriarch of
 Constantinople 196n

- Alexios Komnenos, Byzantine envoy (1179)
348
- Alexios Komnenos, protostrator,
protosebastos 39, 425
- Alfonso II, king of Aragon 334, 337, 342n,
347–48, 349
- Alfonso VI, king of Galicia, León and
Castile 332, 334
- Alfonso VII, king of León and Castile 331n,
349
- Alfonso VIII, king of Castile 337
- Alfred the Great, king of Wessex 301–02,
315
- Almería 331, 339
- Almohads 331n, 340 (map), 344
- Alps 32, 36, 139, 150, 306, 501, 506
- Amalfi, Amalfitan 16, 33, 65, 67, 161, 167,
168, 177, 435n, 436n, 447, 472, 474–75,
476n, 478, 479, 482, 484, 486, 487, 488,
489–90, 514, 525
- Amalric I, king of Jerusalem 404–05, 407,
433n
- Amaseia 49
- Amiens 393, 394
- Amorion 326, 454
- Anacletus II, pope 258
- Anagni 437
- Anastasia, saint 519
- Anastasios, Byzantine emperor 518n
- Anastasios, monk at Cluny 362
- Anastasios, protospatharios 424
- Anastasius III, Pope 143, 144
- Anastasius Bibliothecarius 91n, 92, 93n, 99,
139, 142–43, 434, 440
- Anastasius of Mont-Saint-Michel 463
- Anatolia 65, 309n, 333, 335, 363, 393, 459,
474, 476, 484–86
- Ancona, Anconitan 17, 48, 118, 126, 223n,
224, 228, 229, 437, 478
- al-Andalus, Andalusia 13, 325–28, 331, 339,
342, 345, 497
- Andronikos Angelos, son of John
Angelos 435n
- Andronikos I Komnenos, Byzantine
emperor 41, 228, 345, 346, 408
- Andronikos Kamateros 62
- Andronikos Komnenos, son of John II 52,
54
- Angeloi, dynasty 12, 119, 123–25, 127, 216,
228–30, 235
- Angers 311
- Anglesola, barony 338
- Anglo-Saxons 13, 284, 288, 300, 302, 303–
06, 307n, 309–10, 312, 315–21 *passim*
- Angoulême 362
- Aniane 349
- Anjou 358, 366
- Anna, daughter of Leon VI 159n
- Anna Komnene 2n, 42, 48–55 *passim*, 61,
110, 157, 170n, 171n, 172n, 253n, 255–56,
284n, 307–10, 333, 334, 338, 365, 369n,
370n, 394n, 433n, 435, 521n
- Anonymus 719, translator 122n
- Anonymus 1097/98, translator 120n
- Anonymus 1111/12, translator 120n
- Anonymus 1187–1193, translator 124–25
- Anonymus 1188, translator 125
- Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury 93n, 99,
100, 205
- Anselm, bishop of Havelberg 53, 61, 99–100,
101, 174, 193n, 207, 409, 427, 431, 440
- Anthony the Great, saint 451, 459, 463
- Antioch, Antiochenes 14, 37, 54n, 58, 59, 62,
122, 123, 196, 204, 205, 218n, 254, 334,
368, 371, 373, 394, 396, 397, 401, 402,
404, 405, 407, 455, 456n, 472, 474–75,
482
- Antioch, Principality of 219, 368, 369–71,
373, 397, 407
- Apennine peninsula 138, 178
- Apollonios of Tyana 327
- Apulia, Apulians 17, 18n, 33, 35, 157, 161,
162n, 165–68, 195, 197, 221–23, 247, 248,
252, 254, 258, 259, 263, 447, 448, 450,
452, 474, 500
- Arabia, Arabs 6n, 33, 34, 120, 260n, 301, 325,
341, 342, 343, 428, 448, 449, 490
- Aragon 13, 332, 333–34, 335, 340 (map),
347–49
- Arculf, Gaulish Bishop 303
- Arelat 347
- Arethas, Archbishop of Caesarea 118n
- Argyros (Argyros), governor of Southern
Italy 46, 197, 201,
- Argyros, Marianos, *see* Marianos
- Aristotle 53, 317

- Arles 340 (map), 348,
 Armenia, Armenian 3n, 58, 62, 196n, 199,
 275n, 399, 447, 463
 Armeniakon, theme 250
 Arnaldo/Arnau Ermengol, bishop of
 Barcelona 335
 Arnulf, East Frankish king, emperor 139,
 156n, 157, 158n, 426
 Arnulf II, count of Flanders 359
 Arnulf, archbishop of Milan 164n
 Arsaber 423
 Arta 340 (map), 343
 Arthur, legendary king of the Britons
 377–78
 Ashkenaz 17, 496–506
 Asia Minor 35, 42, 203, 215, 250, 300, 363,
 367, 368, 378, 409, 501, 521
 Asia
 Eastern Asia 472, 523
 Southern Asia 472
 Asser 302
 Athanasios, Athonite father 41
 Athenagoras I, patriarch of
 Constantinople 192
 Athens 259, 380, 454
 Athos 46, 447, 462
 Grand Lavra, monastery 47
 St John of the Amalfitans, monastery 41,
 67, 118, 447
 Attaleia 485–86
 Aulon 254
 Auprand 430
 Ausonians 34
Austrvegr, see “Eastern way”
 Aversa 167, 247
 Avlona 338
 Azov, Sea of 312
- Babylon, Babylonia 342, 500, 502
 Baghdad 116, 117, 341, 342, 471, 500
 Baldovino Guercio 432, 433n
 Baldric, archbishop of Dol-en-Bretagne 366
 Baldwin I, king of Jerusalem 173n, 399
 Baldwin III, king of Jerusalem 235–36, 405,
 425n, 427–28
 Baldwin IV, king of Jerusalem 405
 Baldwin V, count of Flanders 361
 Baldwin IX, count of Flanders 382, 385
- Baldwin of Mons, count of Hainault 430
 Balearic islands/Baleares 325, 334, 339, 340
 (map), 343, 349
 Balkan(s) 6, 8, 18, 42, 50, 54, 171, 178, 194,
 251, 253, 254, 256, 257, 263, 302, 428,
 471, 482
 Barangoi (see also Varangians) 274n, 281,
 283–84, 289, 290
 Barcelona 329, 333, 334, 335, 337, 339, 340
 (map) 342, 347
 Bardas, caesar 140
 Bari 17, 18, 34, 35, 43n, 50, 139, 149, 162n, 164,
 169, 248, 250, 251, 255, 259, 302, 335,
 340 (map), 424, 452, 472, 474, 477, 478,
 487, 500
 Barnabas, Greek bishop and monk at Saint
 Bénigne 362
 Barzenona 173n
 Basil I, Byzantine emperor 8, 11, 43, 90,
 119n, 141, 142, 425n, 430, 433, 500
 Basil II, Byzantine emperor 31n, 45, 148,
 164, 165, 178, 195, 196n, 281, 359, 360,
 361, 420, 429, 458, 472
 Basil the Great, saint 403, 449, 460n, 462,
 464
 Basil Boiannes, catepan of Italy 34, 247,
 458n
 Basil Mesemerios 173n, 424
 Basil Pinakas 423
 Basil Xeros 437
 Basilicata 450, 452, 457
 Basra 342
 Bavaria 156n
 Beatrice, empress, wife of Frederick I 224
 Bec, monastery 52
 Bede, the Venerable 300, 301, 316
 Belarus 273
 Belgrade 456n
 Benedict VI, pope 163
 Benedict VIII, pope 165
 Benedict IX, pope 362n
 Benedict, saint 460, 462, 463n
 Benenato, prior of Pisan churches in
 Constantinople 427, 480n
 Benevento 31, 139, 150, 162, 177, 197, 340
 (map)
 Principality of 197
 Treaty of 224, 263

- Benjamin of Tudela 13, 339–45, 346n, 478, 499–500
- Benno II, bishop of Osnabrück 170–71
- Benzo, bishop of Alba 157, 167–68, 169n, 172n, 440n
- Berengar I (of Friuli), king of Italy, Western emperor 137, 159
- Berengar II of Ivrea, king of Italy 93, 150n, 160–61, 162, 425, 513, 514n
- Berenguer Ramon II, count of Barcelona 334
- Berezan' 280
- Berguedà, county 337
- Bermudo II, king of Galicia 332
- Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux 102, 206
- Bernard, bishop of Würzburg 427
- Berno, monk 428
- Beroë 365
- Berta/Bertha (Eudokia), daughter of Hugh of Italy, Byzantine empress 31n, 32, 43, 160, 424, 513
- Bertha (Eirene) of Sulzbach, Byzantine empress 57, 220–22, 225, 232n, 235, 236, 407
- Besalú 330
- Bessarion, cardinal 464
- Bethlehem 404
- Black Sea 6, 13, 278, 279, 280, 284, 312, 472, 487
- Blasios of Amorion, Saint 454
- Bobbio 330
- Boeotia 474
- Bogomils 18, 172n
- Bohemia 14
- Bohemond/Bohemund I, prince of Taranto and Antioch 12, 35, 48, 49, 253–54, 308–09, 367, 368, 369–70, 435
- Bohemond II, prince of Antioch 371
- Boniface VII, pope 163
- Boniface, marquis of Montferrat 382, 383
- Boris I, ruler of Bulgaria 141
- Borrell II, count of Barcelona 329
- Boso, cardinal 225–26
- Bosporus 2, 11, 359, 367, 383, 428
- Bretannikoi 274n
- Brettania 301, 308
- Brindisi 340 (map), 343
- Britain 13, 31, 42, 300–01, 307–08, 311, 314, 317, 318, 378
- Brittia 301
- Bruno of Querfurt 46n, 463n
- Bulgaria, Bulgars/Bulgarians 6, 11, 15, 18, 42, 45, 64, 88, 98, 101, 137, 140–43, 144, 196, 302, 429, 439
- Burchard II, duke of Swabia 158n
- Burchard, bishop of Münster 171, 173
- Burgos 335, 337
- Burgundio of Pisa 124n, 409, 431, 434, 440
- Burgundy, Burgundian 44n, 178, 195, 224, 348, 357, 360, 361, 369
- Cadalus, see Honorius II
- Cádiz 344
- Caffa 488
- Caffaro, Genoese chronicler 480, 481
- Cairo 327, 341, 369, 456n
- Calabria, Calabrians 31, 33, 34, 35, 46, 64, 139, 157, 161, 162n, 166–68, 195n, 221, 248, 258–60, 447, 448–50, 452
- Campania, Campanian 223n, 247, 248
- Canaan 342
- Candia 484
- Cannae, Battle of 247
- Capello, Stefano 483
- Capetians, dynasty 358–60, 376–81, 429
- Capua 31, 458, 499
- Principality of 140, 150, 177, 248, 451, 513
- Carolingian Empire/Carolingians, dynasty 3, 7, 8, 10, 44, 90, 97, 99, 137–39, 142, 143, 159, 161, 319, 332, 357–59, 422, 430, 462, 515, 519, 520, 524,
- Castile 331, 332, 337, 340 (map)
- Catalonia, Catalans 13, 329, 331, 334, 335, 338, 339, 343, 348, 349
- Catania, see Henry Aristippus
- Catepanate of Italy, see Italy
- Cathars 19
- Caucasia, Caucasus 4, 275, 342
- Cava, abbey 451n
- Celts, Keltoi 32, 274n, 338
- Cephalonia 50, 254
- Cerbano Cerbani, Latin translator 37n, 53, 123, 124, 409
- Cerdaña 334n, 337
- Ceuta 340 (map) 344, 346

- Chalcedon, Chalcedonian 3, 399, 401, 425n
 Chalcis 259
 Champenois 379
 Charlemagne (Charles), Frankish king,
 emperor 3, 7, 44, 87, 88, 96, 137, 138, 153,
 170, 193, 194n, 218, 231, 302, 319, 320, 471
 Charles II the Bald, West Frankish king,
 emperor 139, 143, 527
 Charles III, East Frankish king,
 emperor 428
 Charles V, Holy Roman emperor, king of
 Spain 497
 Charles, duke of Lower Lorraine 359
 Charles Martel, Frankish *maior domus* 377
 Chios 340 (map), 478, 488
 Chrétien de Troyes 377–78
 Christian, archbishop of Mainz 227, 228,
 427, 430
 Christodoulos, abbot of St John's Monastery,
 Patmos 65
 Christodoulos, admiral 51–52
 Christophoros, Byzantine emperor 94
 Christophoros of Collesano, saint 454n
 Christophoros, patrikios 525
 Chrysocheir 280
 Chrysopolis 475
 Cilicia 58, 474
 Civetot (Kibotos) 66
 Civitate 34
 Battle of 167, 248
 Clement II, pope 197n
 Clement III, pope 172
 Clermont 366, 391
 Council of 366
 Clovis, Frankish king 518n
 Cluny, abbey 66, 362, 369, 375, 376
 Cnut the Great, king of England, Denmark
 and Norway 288, 308, 320
 Cocco Griffi, consul of Pisa 431
 Coimbra 332, 333
 Cologne (see also Gero) 167n, 382, 526
 Compiègne 382
 Conflent 337
 Conrad I, East Frankish king 158
 Conrad II, Western emperor 165–67, 259,
 360
 Conrad III, king of Germany 1, 91, 217,
 219–22, 231–32, 233, 234–36, 372, 407,
 428, 432
 Conrad, margrave of Montferrat 487
 Constance, city
 Treaty of 222, 223n,
 Constance of Hauteville, princess of
 Antioch 371
 Constance, queen of Sicily, empress 229,
 264
 Constantine I, "the Great", Roman
 emperor 32, 89, 90n, 234n, 528
 Constantine V, Byzantine emperor 520
 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, Byzantine
 emperor 31n, 32–33, 34n, 38, 41, 43–45,
 114, 116, 126n, 153n, 156n, 158, 160, 176,
 279, 281n, 282, 283, 284n, 326, 327, 328,
 424, 429n, 433n, 472, 501, 513n, 516n,
 518n
 Constantine VIII, Byzantine emperor 148,
 164, 165, 359, 360, 472
 Constantine IX Monomachos, Byzantine
 emperor 34, 117, 122, 166, 176, 197, 201,
 250, 314n
 Constantine X Doukas, Byzantine emperor
 167
 Constantine Choirosphaktes 171–72, 521
 Constantine Doukas, duke of Dalmatia 437
 Constantine Doukas, son of Michael VII 35,
 169, 252
 Constantine Lakapenos, Byzantine
 Co-emperor 94, 158n
 Constantine Manasses 433
 Constantine Mesopotamites 437
 Constantine Skleros 148
 Constantine-Cyril, Missionary 142
 Constantinople 471–90 and passim
 Amalfitan Quarter 478, 479, 482
 Blachernae 374
 Bosporus, see Bosporus
 Chrysotriklinos 517–18
 Church of/Patriarchate of 11, 14, 162,
 168n, 193, 195, 198n, 201n, 203, 262, 282,
 361, 402, 451
 Church of the Virgin of the Pharos 518,
 531
 Council (869/870) [Constantinople IV]
 142
 Council (879/80) 142, 193
 Genoese Quarter 118, 480, 481
 Golden Horn 475, 476, 477
 Great Palace 419, 429, 433, 434, 517–18

Constantinople (cont.)

- Hagia Sophia/Megale Ekklesia 57, 61, 63, 121, 122, 200
- Latin Empire of 86, 88, 409
- Latin Patriarchate of 409
- Mosque 406
- Phanar 192
- Pisan Quarter 478, 479–80
- St Akindynos, Church 479
 - San Giacomo, Church 483
- St Mamas, Monastery 47
- St Maria of the Latins (Monastery) 67
- Stoudios Monastery (St. John the Forerunner) 65, 66, 67, 196n, 454
- Theodosian harbour 490
- Venetian Quarter 476, 479, 481
- Yenikapı Quarter 490
- Constanza, daughter of Alfonso II of Aragon 337
- Córdoba 17, 116, 126n, 150n, 325, 326–28, 331, 346, 497, 501
- Corfu 52, 219n, 259, 340 (map), 343, 420
- Corinth 219n, 259, 340 (map), 343, 474, 483, 524
- Cormery, Monastery (Loire) 66
- Cosmas, translator 122, 123
- Cremona, see Liudprand/Liutprand
- Crescentii 33
- Crescentius, Roman patricius 164
- Crete, Cretan 17, 111n, 326, 329, 340 (map), 345, 473, 477, 484, 485, 505n
- Crimea, Crimean 284, 312, 342
- Crotone 163
- Crusades 4, 5, 14, 86, 91, 95n, 96, 103, 117, 124, 215, 276, 282n, 283, 284, 290, 400–02, 407, 421, 463, 506n
 - First 4, 13, 14, 42, 43, 59, 86, 155, 172, 192, 203, 205, 206, 208, 254, 256, 304, 332, 333–35, 364–69, 372, 381, 392n, 393n, 394, 434, 436, 447, 476, 496, 503, 517
 - of 1101 369
 - People's 393
 - Second 14, 37, 56, 206, 221, 235, 256, 259, 371–76, 381, 407
 - Third 56, 95n, 229, 290, 337, 338, 379, 435
 - Fourth 11, 14, 56, 64, 86, 96, 103, 193, 230n, 300, 320, 338, 349, 378, 379, 381–85, 409, 441, 474, 483, 484, 506, 530

- Crusader States 12, 14, 95, 215, 216n, 217, 236, 335, 338, 339, 394, 395, 397, 398–406, 407, 409, 484, 485, 486
- Cuno, bishop of Praeneste 173
- Cuthbert, saint 313, 523
- Cynewulf 317
- Cyprus, Cypriot 17, 65, 111n, 207n, 312, 337, 340 (map), 341, 343, 396, 404, 486–87
- Cyril the Philotes, saint 454
- Da Molin, Leone 473
- Daibert, bishop of Pisa 396n
- Dalmatia, Dalmatian 44, 53, 194, 227, 382, 437, 474, 518, 519
- Damascus 118n, 341
- Damasus II, pope 197n
- Dandolo, Enrico, doge of Venice 382, 431, 438n
- Danes, see Denmark
- Danube, river 306, 521
- Dardanelles 483, 484
- Davinus of Lucca, saint 462
- Demetrias 475, 482
- Demetrios, saint 339, 474
- Demetrios Tornikes 121
- Denia 340 (map), 344, 345
- Denmark, Danes 274, 286n, 288, 307–08
- Desiderius, abbot of Montecassino 169, 170n, 428n, 440
- Devol/Diabolis 48
 - Treaty of 254, 435n
- Dijon
 - Saint-Bénigne, abbey 362
- Dionysius Areopagites, Saint 92, 143, 374, 380, 522–23
- Dioscorides 327, 328
- Dnieper, river 279, 280, 313
- Domapia 312
- Dominicus III Marango, patriarch of Grado 121, 198
- Dominicus IV Cervoni, patriarch of Grado 170
- Donatus, bishop of Ostia 428, 431
- Dositheos I, Greek patriarch of Jerusalem and Constantinople 63, 406
- Dositheos II, Greek patriarch of Jerusalem 400n
- Douce II, countess of Provence 347

- Drogo of Hauteville 247–48
 Dromitai 274n
 Dueñas (Palencia) 329
 Dyrrachium (Dyrrhachion/Durazzo/
 Durrës) 35, 49, 50, 254, 309, 343, 482

 Eadred, king of England 320
 Eadwig, king of England 320
 East Frankish Kingdom, East Francia (see
 also Germany) 137, 139, 149, 152, 155, 157,
 158, 161, 357
 Eastern Christians/Eastern Churches 36,
 47, 60, 65, 66, 67, 101, 286, 329, 363, 364,
 366, 367, 392–93, 447
 Eastern Illyricum 198
 “Eastern way” (*austrvegr*) 278–80, 285, 290
 Eberwinus, abbot of Saint-Martin, Trier
 455–56
 Ebro, river 331n, 333, 334
 Edessa 372, 518
 Edgar, king of England 303, 315, 320
 Edith of England, wife of Otto I 313
 Edmund I, king of England 313, 320
 Edward the Confessor, king of England 304,
 305, 306, 313, 314, 319, 320
 Edward the Elder, king of England 313
 Efraim of Regensburg 504
 Egypt, Egyptian 17, 327, 331n, 339, 341,
 342, 370, 382, 404, 448, 451, 459, 463,
 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, 477n, 478, 484,
 485–86, 499
 Eilbert of Goslar 174n
 Eirene, Byzantine Empress 44
 Eirene, Byzantine Empress, wife of Manuel I
 see Bertha-Eirene
 Eirene Angelina, daughter of Isaac II
 Angelos, wife of Phillip of Swabia 39,
 235, 264
 Eirene Sebastokratorissa, wife of Andronikos
 Komnenos 52, 54, 55, 68
 Ekkehard IV of Sankt Gallen 158n
 Ekkehard of Aura 171n, 173n, 364n
 Eleanor of Aquitaine, Queen of France and
 England 311n, 336, 337, 371
 Eleanor of England, Queen of Castile 337
 Eleazar ben Judah ben Qalonymus,
 rabbi 502
 Eliakim, rabbi 499

 Elias the Speleotes, Saint 454n
 Elias the Younger, Saint, also called Elias of
 Enna 454n, 455n, 456n
 Elias, patriarch of Jerusalem 302
 Eliezer ben Joel ha-Levi of Bonn, rabbi
 (Ravia) 498
 Eliezer ben Nathan, rabbi (Raban) 498
 Elvira of León, queen of Sicily 337n
 Elvira of León, countess of Toulouse 334
 Emeric, king of Hungary 382
 England, English 7, 13, 300–21, 337, 358, 505
 Enklinoi/Inklinoi 274n
 Enna (Sicily), see Elias of Ella
 Ephesus 47, 304
 Ephraim, Metropolitan of Rus 59
 Epiphanius, protospatharios 160, 424, 513
 Epirus/Epeiros 167n, 254
 Erchempert 139
 Erfurt 174n
 Essen 167n
 Étampes 372
 Ethiopia, Ethiopians/Aethiopian 94, 140,
 447
 Eudokia, see Bert(h)a-Eudokia
 Eudokia Ingerina, Byzantine empress 500
 Eudokia Komnene, lady of Montpellier 348,
 349, 377
 Eudokia, Byzantine princess, wife of Roman
 Guelph 348
 Eugenius III, pope 123n, 125, 222, 372
 Eugenius, cardinal bishop of Ostia 126
 Eugenius of Sicily 261
 Europe (see also Western Europe) 8, 12, 14,
 15, 19, 41, 88, 158, 173n, 252, 254, 274,
 275n, 278–80, 284, 287, 290, 300, 320,
 329, 359, 366, 367, 426, 447, 490, 501,
 522, 524, 530
 Eustathios, metropolitan/archbishop of
 Thessalonica 39, 264, 480
 Eustathios, patriarch of
 Constantinople 195, 361
 Eustratios, metropolitan of Nicaea 205
 Euthymios I, patriarch of
 Constantinople 32, 45, 137, 144
 Euthymios, patriarch of Antioch 314
 Euthymios, saint 459
 Euthymios, spatharios 423
 Euthymios Malakes 59n

- Euthymios Zigabenos 59
 Everard of Ypres, scholar and monk 380
 Evrardus de Barris 429
 Evrardus, Carolingian count and seneschal 430
- Fatimids, dynasty 326–27, 340 (map), 369, 475, 485
 Favignana 345
 Felicia of Roucy, queen of Aragon 331–32
 Ferdinand I, king of León 332
 Fibonacci, see Leonardo
 Flanders, Flemings 13, 357, 359, 361, 365, 367, 369, 382, 385
 Flavius Josephus 503
 Foggia 167
 Formosus, bishop of Porto, Pope 141
 France, French 7, 13, 14, 56, 58, 86, 97, 192, 208, 217, 225, 226, 227, 230n, 254n, 311, 329, 340 (map), 343, 344, 347, 348, 357–85, 391, 393, 407, 455, 456n, 496, 499, 502, 531
 Frangia 156n, 178
 Frankfurt, council of 138
 Frankish Empire, Franks 3, 39, 43, 44, 63, 66, 86, 96, 97, 141, 153, 156n, 161, 319, 359–60, 367–71, 373, 378, 379, 382, 385, 405, 407, 447, 474, 486, 527
 Fraxinetum 160
 Frederick I Barbarossa, Western emperor 4, 12, 38, 56, 63n, 93, 217, 218n, 221–33, 235, 237, 263, 264, 347, 348–49, 376, 430, 432, 433n, 435
 Frederick II, Western emperor, king of Sicily 8, 217, 337
 Frutolf 171, 172n
 Fulcher of Chartres, chronicler 366n, 381, 517
 Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe 101
 Fulk le Réchin, count of Anjou 366
- Gabita 345
 Gaeta 33, 161, 472, 487
 Gallia/Gaul(s) (see also West Frankish Kingdom, France) 32, 156n, 303, 336, 359, 361, 460
 Garigliano 159
- Gausbert, counsellor of Alexios I Komnenos, later monk in Marmoutier 66n
 Gebhard, archbishop of Salzburg 168, 169n
 Genoa, Genoese 5, 17, 20, 37, 38, 47–48, 118, 119, 124, 125n, 218, 227, 229, 331, 339, 340 (map), 341, 342, 344, 345, 347, 408, 431, 432, 437, 438, 473, 476, 477–78, 479, 480–89, 514, 525, 526
 Geoffrey Malaterra, chronicler 256, 257, 309–10
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, historiographer 317
 Geoffrey of Villehardouin, chronicler 381, 383n, 384n
 George of Antioch, admiral of Sicily 261
 Georgia, Georgians 275n, 398,
 Georgios II Xiphilinos, patriarch of Constantinople 127
 Georgios Maniakes 35, 166, 247
 Georgios Metochites 208
 Georgios Synkellos, chronicler 143
 Georgios, *archon* in Jerusalem 400
 Gerardus Alamanopulus 125
 Gerbert of Aurillac 359
 Gerhoh, provost of Reichersberg 100
 Germanoi 274n
 Germany, Germans 3, 12, 32, 37, 44, 47, 57, 59, 86, 91, 97, 100, 125, 151, 153, 156, 161, 166, 168–70, 176, 177–78, 216, 217, 220, 221n, 224, 226, 227, 229, 248, 258, 264, 308, 344, 347, 358–61, 366, 376, 378, 426, 427, 432, 437, 450, 455, 457, 496, 497, 502, 521, 527, 528
 Gero, archbishop of Cologne 162, 427, 430
 Gerona/Girona 330, 331n, 340 (map)
 Gershom Me'or ha-Golah, rabbi 498
 Gertrude, queen of Germany, wife of Conrad III 220
 Ghent 362
 Gi(l)bertus, interpreter 124, 437
 Gilbert of Mons, chronicler 364–65
 Girard of Rosselló 334
 Gisulf I, prince of Salerno 177
 Godehard, Saint 166n, 174n
 Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lower Lorraine 367, 434, 435
 Godfrey, bishop of Langres 372, 374
 Goscelin 306

- Gotland 279, 280, 288
 Grado (see also Dominicus) 36n, 437
 Granada 340 (map), 344
 Greece, Greeks 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, 33, 34, 41, 54,
 59, 85–93, 95–103, 113, 115–16, 120, 122,
 139, 141, 149, 163, 166, 169n, 173–75, 198,
 204–05, 208n, 222, 234, 273, 285, 290,
 313n, 318, 341, 342–44, 358, 361, 365, 371,
 372–76, 379, 383–85, 394–95, 398, 401,
 419, 439, 449–52, 460, 463, 464, 479–81,
 499, 503, 506, 524, 528
 Gregory VII, pope 95n, 101, 170–71, 253, 254,
 339, 363–64, 365, 366, 448
 Gregory Dekapolites, saint 454n
 Gregory of Agrigento, saint 455
 Gregory of Cassano, saint 46, 454n, 457,
 458, 462
 Gregory of Nicopolis, saint 462
 Gregory of Passau, saint 462
 Gregory of Tours 518n
Grikkia (see also Greeks) 283–86
 Grimizo 162n
 Grottaferrata, abbey 440, 451, 462n
 Guaimar IV, prince of Salerno 167, 247, 248
 Guglielmo de Candida 484
 Guibert of Nogent, chronicler 95, 366n,
 368n, 370n
 Guido de Bazoches, chronicler 378–79
 Guillaume, monk of Cormery, counsellor of
 Alexios I Komnenos 66
 Gunther, bishop of Bamberg 169, 526
 Guy de Lusignan, king of Cyprus 487
 Guy, abbot of Vaux-de-Cernay 383

 Hadrian I, pope 90, 97, 98
 Hadrian II, pope 141, 142, 456, 523
 Hadrian IV, pope 206
 Hadwig, duchess of Swabia 158n
 al-Ḥakam II, Cordovan caliph 327
 Halmyros 340 (map), 478, 482–83
 Hananel, rabbi 500
 Harald Hardrada, king of Norway 42, 281,
 283, 285, 288, 305
 Harold Godwinson, king of England 305,
 307
 Ḥasday ibn Shaprūt, Jewish scholar 328,
 343, 497, 501

 Hauteville, dynasty 52, 54, 247, 248, 251n,
 264, 367, 452
 Havelberg (see also Anselm) 176
 Helena, Byzantine empress, wife of
 Constantine VII 328, 501
 Helena, saint 317
 Helena, see Olympias
 Helga, see Ol'ga
 Hélinand of Froidmont 208
 Hellas 96
 Henry II, Western emperor 165, 175
 Henry III, Western emperor 165, 166, 167,
 176
 Henry IV, Western emperor 167, 168–72,
 205, 254, 498, 521
 Henry V, Western emperor 173, 177
 Henry VI, Western emperor 56, 63n, 229,
 264
 Henry I, king of England 310
 Henry II Plantagenet, king of England 38,
 109, 124n, 310–11
 Henry VIII, king of England 314n
 Henry (VI), king of Germany, son of
 Conrad III 222, 232n, 236
 Henry II Jasomirgott, duke of Austria 55,
 225n, 430
 Henry I, duke of Bavaria, brother of
 Otto I 158n
 Henry II (the “Wrangler”), duke of
 Bavaria 163, 527
 Henry I, count of Champagne 378
 Henry II, count of Champagne 379
 Henry, count of Portugal 335
 Henry Aristippus, archdeacon of
 Catania 261, 427, 430, 434, 440
 Hervé, Norman chieftain 250
 Hilarion, saint 459
 Hildebert, bishop of Le Mans, Archbishop of
 Tours 93
 Hilduin, abbot of Saint-Denis 92
 Hillel bar Eliaqim 504
 Hincmar, archbishop of Reims 139
 Hishām ibn Kulayb, bishop of Córdoba 328
 Holy Land 14, 47, 66, 67, 68, 169, 206, 282,
 303, 304, 333–35, 338, 342, 369, 370,
 397, 398, 401–02, 404, 447n, 463, 475,
 478, 501n, 529

- Holy Roman Empire (see also Western Empire) 12, 286, 290, 340 (map), 347, 349, 497, 498, 501
- Holy See, see Papacy
- Honorius II (Cadalus), (anti-)pope 167, 168n, 440
- Hormanno Paganello, Pisan nobleman 348
- Huesca 337
- Hugh of Arles, king of Italy 32, 156n, 160, 161, 424, 425, 513
- Hugh Capet, king of France 358, 359
- Hugh, abbot of Cluny 363
- Hugh, count of Vermandois 367, 368
- Hugh Eteriano, Latin interpreter 38, 39n, 61–62, 64, 124n, 409, 479
- Hugh of Flavigny, chronicler 430
- Hugh of Saint-Victor, scholar 92, 93
- Hugolinus 434
- Humbert, cardinal bishop of Silva Candida 100, 101, 121, 122, 199, 332–33, 391, 429
- Humphrey de Hauteville, count of Apulia 167, 248
- Hungary, Hungarian(s) (see also Magyars) 7, 12, 14–15, 19n, 38, 41, 43, 58, 169n, 215, 216–17, 224, 225n, 236, 237n, 312, 342
- Iberian Peninsula 8, 13, 19, 329, 332, 333, 338, 339, 342, 343, 450
- Ibiza 345
- Ibn Ḥayyān, Andalusian historian 325–26
- Ibn Ḥazm, Andalusian writer 328
- Ibn Jubayr, Andalusian traveller 13, 340 (map), 344–46
- Iceland, Icelanders 274, 286, 306, 312
- Iconium 373
- al-Idrisi, geographer 331n, 346
- Ignatios, patriarch of Constantinople 140, 141, 142
- Île-de-France 367, 375
- Indian Ocean 472
- Innocent II, pope 123n, 125, 205, 258, 423
- Innocent III, pope 127, 208n, 382, 383, 384, 385, 427, 431n
- Investiture Contest 156, 364
- Ionian Sea 64
- Isaac I Komnenos, Byzantine emperor 216n, 315
- Isaac II Angelos, Byzantine emperor 39, 57, 58, 228, 229, 235, 264, 228, 383, 384, 406, 435, 437, 476, 484
- Isaac Komnenos, ruler of Cyprus 312
- Isaac Komnenos, brother of Manuel I 348
- Isaiah of Trani 504
- Isidoros of Chios 329
- Israel 284
- Istanbul (see also Constantinople) 192
- Italians 17, 31, 34n, 63, 68, 226, 227, 307, 447, 471, 472, 477, 478, 480–82, 486, 487, 489, 490n
- Italo-Greeks 16, 260, 261, 262, 263n, 265, 330, 446–58, 462, 464
- Italy 192–209 and *passim*
- Northern 18, 160, 161, 437, 478
- Southern 8, 11, 12, 14, 46, 52, 54, 67, 88, 89, 115, 117, 118, 119n, 138–40, 149, 150, 154, 160–63, 165–66, 168, 169, 174, 176–78, 195, 197–98, 201, 206, 215, 216n, 218, 220–22, 224, 226, 229, 237, 247–51, 255, 256, 263, 316, 367, 425n, 447–50, 452, 453, 455, 458, 459, 462–64, 478, 496, 499, 500–04, 506, 513n
- Catepanate 18, 452
- Kingdom of (regnum Italiae) 8, 11, 159, 173, 358
- Ivo II, abbot of Saint-Denis 380
- Izmit, Gulf of 310
- Jaca 335
- Jacob ben Meir, rabbi (Rabbenu Tam) 498
- Jacob, translator and envoy 125
- Jaén 340 (map), 344
- James I, king of Aragon 342n, 349
- James, saint 402
- James of Venice, Latin translator 53
- James of Vitry, archbishop of Acre 402n
- Jerome, Saint 447
- Jerusalem 10, 14, 46, 62, 67, 173n, 204, 249n, 259, 302, 303–04, 332–39, 341–43, 360, 365, 366, 369, 372, 378, 382, 392, 395–406, 454–55, 456n, 471, 475, 497n, 529
- Church of the Holy Sepulchre (Anastasis) 56, 168, 392, 400, 404, 405, 406

- Kingdom of 397, 398, 404, 430, 487
 Monastery of the Holy Cross 398
 Patriarchate 196, 204, 302, 314, 396,
 399–402, 405–06
 Patriarchate (Latin) 397–98
 Jesolo (Equilium) 473
 Jews, Jewish 15, 17, 90, 140, 328, 341–44, 385,
 433, 475, 478, 496–506
 Joan, queen consort of Sicily 311
 Job Jasites 208
 John I Tzimiskes, Byzantine emperor 41,
 148, 162, 177, 313, 314n, 327, 358
 John II Komnenos, Byzantine emperor 1,
 37, 50, 52, 53, 56, 57–58, 91, 123–24, 125,
 174, 177, 205n, 206, 218, 219, 220, 234,
 235, 258, 262, 317, 371, 376, 397, 409,
 423, 434
 John III Vatatzes, Byzantine emperor 8
 John VIII, pope 98, 101, 126, 142, 428
 John X, pope 45, 144, 159, 432
 John XI, pope 45, 160, 440
 John XII, pope 32, 43, 161, 194
 John XIII, pope 148, 149
 John XVI, pope, see John Philagathos
 John XIX, pope 195, 361
 John the Almsgiver, patriarch of
 Alexandria 143
 John IV Oxeites, patriarch of Antioch 59,
 397
 John V, patriarch of Antioch 204
 John X Kamateros, patriarch of
 Constantinople 127
 John XI Bekkos, patriarch of
 Constantinople 208
 John VIII, Greek patriarch of Jerusalem 59,
 400, 401n
 John Chrysostom, saint, bishop of
 Constantinople 348, 402, 403
 John of Claudiopolis 64–65
 John Roger Dalassenos, caesar 37, 54, 258
 John Doukas, caesar 35
 John Hymonides 143
 John Italos 53n, 170n
 John Kataphloros 425
 John Kinnamos, chronicler 37n, 55–58, 62n,
 221–22, 223, 236n, 437n, 518n
 John Philagathos, archbishop of Piacenza,
 (anti)pope 33, 164, 178, 427, 457
 John Phournes, prōtos on Mount
 Ganos 205
 John Prodromos monastery 403
 John of Salisbury, bishop of Chartres,
 scholar 372
 John Scotus Eriugena 92, 99
 John Skylitzes, chronicler 31n, 32, 35n, 42n,
 43, 159n, 161n, 165n, 194, 205, 255, 262,
 289n
 John Tzetzes 37, 262
 John Xiphilinos, historiographer 49
 John, monk and translator 122, 123, 332
 Jordan, river 399, 403
 Jorius of Béthune, Saint 462
 Joscelin, count of Edessa 58
 Joscelin, count of Molfetta 251
 Josef ben Gershon (Josel) of Rosheim 497
 Joseph of Exeter 317
 Joseph Genesios, chronicler 43
 Joseph Shir-Guru, Rabbi 499
 Juan de Quintanaortuño 335
 Juan Fernández de Heredia 349–50
 Judah Hadassi 505
 Justin II, Byzantine emperor 529
 Justinian I, Roman/Byzantine
 emperor 234n, 260, 330, 403, 448
 Justinian II, Byzantine emperor 198n
 Jutland 308

 Kalamon, monastery 402
 Kantara 207n
 Kekaumenos 42n, 45n, 178n, 283, 285n,
 305n, 309
 Keltoi, see Celts
 Keroularios, see Michael I Keroularios
 Khazaria, Khazars 6n, 328, 342, 343
 Kiev 282–83, 342, 524n
 Kilij Arslan, see Qilij Arslān ibn Mas‘ūd
 Komnenoi, dynasty passim, esp. 12, 111,
 123–25, 155, 215–38, 258, 424
 Konstantinos, see Constantine
 Konstantios Doukas, Byzantine prince 169
 Koulpingoi 274n
 Kotor 519

 La Charité-sur-Loire, priory 66, 369
 Lakapenoi, dynasty 160, 161n
 Lambert, Western emperor 158n

- Lampert of Hersfeld 158n, 202
 Landulf the Elder, historiographer 164n
 Langobards 87, 138, 139
 Laodicea 396, 425n, 475
 Larissa 254
 Latinianon, eparchy of 451
 Lavinia 251
 Lazarus, bishop 426
 Lazio 450, 451, 458
 Legnano 228
 Leo III, pope 139, 193, 194
 Leo IV, pope 138, 302
 Leo IX, pope 121, 122n, 167, 197, 198n, 199, 201, 202, 248, 457
 Leo-Luke from Corleone, Saint 454n
 Leo Malvasiotus 481n
 Leo Tuscus 37, 38, 40n, 124, 409
 León, kingdom 332, 334
 Leon V, Byzantine emperor 519
 Leon VI, Byzantine emperor 11, 32, 34n, 94, 137, 142, 143, 158n, 159, 176n, 423n, 424n, 426, 454, 456n, 524
 Leon, archbishop of Ohrid 36n, 42, 59, 121, 122, 196, 198, 200
 Leon, metropolitan of Synada 33, 151n, 157, 164, 420, 426, 434
 Leon, genikos logothetes 41
 Leonardo Pisano 485
 Leontios II, patriarch of Jerusalem 405, 406
 Lérida 333
 Lérins, abbey
 Fathers of (Serapionus, Macarius, Paphnutius and Macarius) 461
 Levant, Levantine 37, 59, 68, 472, 473, 475, 485, 486
 Limassol 486, 487n
 Limoges 456n
 Lincoln 313
 Lincolnshire 314
 Liudfred/Liutefred of Mainz 158, 432n
 Liudprand/Liutprand of Cremona, bishop 11, 16, 45, 86, 89, 91, 93–95, 96, 100, 101, 115, 149–52, 154n, 158n, 159–62, 175, 419–20, 427, 431–34, 438, 439, 472, 513–15, 522, 524–25
 Liutius, monk of Monte Cassino 46
 Lombardy, Lombards, Longobards (see also Langobards) 18, 31, 34, 35, 43, 140, 150, 160, 161, 162, 165, 177, 197, 218, 226n, 227, 228, 247, 248, 255, 342, 451, 457, 458, 478, 513
 London 283, 312–15
 Longibardia/Longobardia (see also Apulia) 34, 452
 Lorraine 359, 367
 Lothair III, Western Emperor 11, 152, 174–75
 Lothair, King of Italy 161
 Lotharingia 173n
 Louis the Pious, Western emperor 522–23
 Louis II, king of Italy, Western emperor 8, 11, 90–91, 119n, 137, 138–39, 424, 425, 430
 Louis III the Blind, king of Provence and Italy, Western emperor 137, 156n, 159
 Louis the Child, East Frankish king 137
 Louis VII, king of France 38, 124, 259, 348, 371, 372, 374, 375, 376, 378, 407, 428, 429, 431n, 518
 Louis IX, king of France, saint 531
 Louis I, count of Blois 382
 Low Countries 7, 14
 Luke of Armento, saint 454n
 Luke the Younger, saint 454
 Lyon, council of 111n, 206n, 208
 Lyon(s) 526
 Macarius the Great, saint 461, 462
 Macedonia 254, 475, 477
 Macedonian Dynasty 4, 8, 114, 148, 154, 165, 360
 Madinat az-Zahrā 328
 Mafalda of Apulia 333
 Magyars 153, 158
 Mahdia 490
 Mainardus, monk 428
 Maine 358
 Mainz (see also Christian, Willigis) 158, 166, 176, 432, 496, 498, 502, 503
 Makarios of Antioch, monk at Saint-Bertin (presented as archbishop) 362
 Makarios of Collesano, saint 454n
 Mälaren region 273
 Mallorca 325, 334, 338, 339, 340 (map), 344

- Mamas 158n
 Manegold, count of Werden 430
 Manganeios Prodhromos 37n, 54, 55, 59n
 Mantzikert, battle of 169, 250n, 309n, 311n, 363
 Manuel I Komnenos, Byzantine emperor
 2n, 4, 12, 14, 37–39, 40, 48, 50, 55–58,
 61–63, 68, 103, 109, 114, 124, 125, 206,
 207n, 218, 220, 221–28, 232n, 233, 234n,
 235–37, 257n, 259, 261, 263, 310–11,
 314n, 336, 342n, 346–49, 371, 373–80,
 403–05, 407–09, 427n, 428, 431, 433n,
 437, 476–80, 499
 Manuel II, Byzantine emperor 9
 Manuel Holobolos 526
 Marcigny 366
 Maria of Antioch, Byzantine empress 38,
 57, 311n, 346
 Maria, daughter of John II Komnenos 258
 Maria, kaisarissa, daughter of Manuel I
 Komnenos 39, 57, 263, 348
 Maria of Montpellier 349
 Marianos Argyros, Byzantine
 domestikos 327
 Marinos Neapolites 435
 Marinus, deacon 428, 431
 Mark, Saint 402, 471
 Marmara, Sea of 475, 483
 Marmoutier, monastery (Loire) 66n
 Marozia, *senatrix* of Rome 160n
 Martin of Tours, Saint 460
 Mary I, queen of England 314n
 Mas'ud I, Seljuk sultan of Iconium 373
 Matthew of Edessa 311n, 399
 Mauro de Maurone Comite, Amalfitan
 479
 Mauro, Amalfitan trader in Anatolia 65
 Maximilian I, Holy Roman emperor 497
 Mecca 339, 344
 Media 342
 Medina 339
 Mediterranean 5, 13, 16, 17, 19, 35, 41, 65, 67,
 177, 178, 204, 215, 217–19, 254, 279, 300,
 302, 304, 325–26, 329, 332–34, 337, 338,
 339, 341, 344–47, 349, 407, 421, 439,
 446, 447, 455, 471–73, 477, 484–90, 499,
 501, 514, 523, 525, 528
 Meles/Melus, duke of Apulia 165, 247
 Meletios the Younger 336
 Melfi 247, 248
 Melkites 14, 196, 204, 398, 400–06
 Melus, see Meles
 Menia, mythic figure 288
 Menorca 334, 339, 340 (map), 344
 Merkurion 451
 Merseburg 174
 Meshullam ben Qalonymus 498, 502
 Mesopotamia 341, 342, 499
 Messina 345
 Holy Saviour, monastery 262, 453n
 Methodios I, patriarch of
 Constantinople 137
 Methodios, metropolitan of Gangra 423
 Methodius, missionary, archbishop of
 Pannonia 142, 433
 Methone (see also Modon) 259
 Methymna 171
 Mezzogiorno 247–48, 252, 255, 258, 265
 Michael I, Byzantine emperor 138
 Michael II, Byzantine emperor 522
 Michael III, Byzantine emperor 116n, 137,
 140, 141, 357, 423, 424n
 Michael IV, Byzantine emperor 307, 360
 Michael VI, Byzantine emperor 167n
 Michael VII Doukas, Byzantine emperor 35,
 50, 51, 169–70, 252, 253, 256
 Michael VIII Palaiologos, Byzantine
 emperor 208, 526
 Michael I Keroularios, patriarch of
 Constantinople 36, 42n, 46, 59, 64, 100,
 109, 121–23, 192, 197–202, 205, 208, 209,
 332–33, 391, 457
 Michael III of Anchialos, patriarch of
 Constantinople 62–63, 206
 Michael Attaleiates, historiographer 36,
 48n, 49n, 251, 255
 Michael Italikos 58
 Michael Komnenos Doukas, Despot of
 Epeiros 167n
 Michael Psellos, scholar and
 historiographer 35, 41, 49n, 202, 252,
 253n, 308, 316, 317
 Michael Synkellos, monk and saint 380,
 453n

- Middle Frankish Kingdom 357, 358
 Milan 60, 164n, 176, 205, 227
 Modon 473, 474
 Moncada, see Ramon de Moncada
 Monemvasia 481n
 Monreale 337
 Mont Saint Michel, monastery 52, 463
 Montecassino, monastery 16, 46, 120, 139,
 157, 165, 166n, 169–70, 176, 177, 260, 330,
 331, 428n, 440, 447, 450, 451, 457, 461,
 463n
 Montpellier 340 (map) 342, 347, 349
 Moravia (Great), kingdom 142
 Moses (del Brolo) of Bergamo 123, 124, 125,
 126, 409
 Mose(s) ben Qalonymus 502
 Moses ha-Cohen of Greece 504
 Mount Athos, see Athos
 Mount Sinai, see Sinai
 Münster (see also Burchard) 176
 Muslims 6, 8, 11, 13, 45, 63, 159, 160, 163, 165,
 178, 206, 247, 280, 325, 326, 329, 333,
 334, 339, 341, 342, 344–46, 366, 368,
 369, 372, 378, 392n, 396, 398, 429, 475,
 477n, 497, 498, 505, 506, 515n
 Myoupolis (Cappadocia) 336
 Myra 474
 Myriokephalon 38, 124n, 228, 311

 Naples, Neapolitan(s) 4, 31, 33, 43, 140, 143,
 161, 177, 340 (map), 428, 435, 447, 449,
 450, 457, 458, 503
 Naupaktos 343
 Nauplion 259
 Navarra 341, 343, 344
 Navas de Tolosa 334
 Nazareth, see Aitard
 Neapolitans, see Naples
 Near East 8, 215, 303, 304n, 396n, 501, 525
 Neilos Doxopates 262
 Neilos/Nilos the Younger of Rossano,
 saint 16, 46, 451, 454n, 455n, 457, 458,
 461, 462, 463
 Nemitzoi 47, 156n
 Neophytos, abbot of Kykkos Monastery,
 Cyprus 65
 Nicaea/Nikaia 8, 205, 304, 368, 394, 526
 First Council of 98, 99
 Second Council of 137

 Nice 347
 Nicholas I, pope 97, 98, 141–42, 143, 423
 Nicholas II, pope 35, 248
 Nicholas I Mystikos, patriarch of
 Constantinople 33, 45, 143–44, 159,
 424, 432n
 Nicholas, Greek patriarch of Jerusalem 401
 Nicholas, bishop and envoy 427n, 429n
 Nicholas, metropolitan of Andida 40, 64
 Nicholas, abbot of Grottaferrata 440
 Nicholas, saint 306, 335–36, 474
 Nicholas, Greek monk in Rome 170n
 Nichoas, Greek monk in Córdoba 327
 Nicholas the Pilgrim, saint 462–63
 Nicholas Doxopates 262
 Nicholas Kallikles 54, 257
 Nicholas of Methone, Byzantine writer 336
 Nicholas-Nektarios of Otranto 464n
 Nicomedia/Nikomedeia 61, 66, 174, 310
 Nikephoros II Phokas, Byzantine
 Emperor 34, 93, 94, 148, 149, 154, 162,
 328, 360, 472, 522
 Nikephoros III Botaneiates, Byzantine
 Emperor 170, 253, 307
 Nikephoros I, patriarch of
 Constantinople 143, 194
 Nikephoros, Byzantine envoy to Germany
 (1145) 220
 Nikephoros, protospatharios 167
 Nikephoros Basilakes 58
 Nikephoros Bryennios, historiographer 49
 Niketas, metropolitan of Nicomedia/
 Nikomedeia 61, 174, 193n, 207
 Niketas, metropolitan of Thessalonica 60
 Niketas, chartophylax 195n
 Niketas Choniates, historiographer 40n, 48,
 56, 57, 58n, 63n, 226, 227n, 233n, 281n,
 380, 407, 433n, 435, 436n, 478, 480
 Niketas David the Paphlagonian 31n, 45
 Niketas Ooryphas 424
 Niketas Seides 61, 204n, 205, 401n
 Niketas Stethatos 36n, 47n, 59n, 66, 67, 100,
 122, 200
 Nile, river 343
 Nilus, see Neilos
 Norman(s) 1n, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 18, 34, 35, 37,
 39, 49, 50–55, 65, 67, 68, 88, 164, 167,
 169, 170n, 175–78, 197, 199, 206, 217–20,
 222, 224, 237, 247–65, 300, 302, 304,

- 305, 306n, 307, 309–11, 317, 333, 336, 337n, 338, 346, 360, 361, 367, 369, 370, 372, 393, 396, 406, 407, 409, 435, 450, 452, 482, 496, 521
- Normandy 49, 53, 249, 250, 358, 361, 365n, 367, 373, 455n, 456n
- Norse, Norsemen (see also Scandinavians) 274–76, 278, 281–87, 300
- Northerners, see Scandinavians
- Norway, Norwegians 274, 281, 283, 285, 288, 305, 523
- Notker (Balbulus) of St. Gallen 96, 525n
- Nova Anglia (“New England”) 13, 312
- Novara (see also Otto) 176
- an-Nu‘mān, Fatimid judge 327
- Obadiah, rabbi 499
- Oderisius, abbot of Montecassino 176
- Odimundus, kouropalates 476
- Odo Arpin, viscount of Bourges 369
- Odo of Deuil, chronicler 39, 371n, 372, 373n, 374–75
- Odo I Stigand 249
- Odo II Stigand 249, 250n
- Offa, king of Mercia 319, 320
- Ohrid (see also Leon, Theophylaktos) 6, 42
- Ol’ga/Olga (Helga), regent of Kiev, Saint 114n, 282, 283, 433
- Olaf Haraldsson, king of Norway, Saint 289
- Olegario/Oleguer, bishop of Barcelona, Saint 335
- Oliba, abbot of Ripoll, bishop of Vic 330, 331
- Oliba Cabreta, count of Cerdanya 331
- Olympias (Helena), daughter of Robert Guiscard 35, 169n, 170, 252
- Orcadians 274
- Orderic Vitalis, monk and historiographer 305, 309–10, 317, 365n, 366n, 369n, 370–71n
- Orestes, patriarch of Jerusalem 46
- Orestes, koitonites 165n
- Orestes, protonotarios of the Patriarchate 424n
- Oria 500, 503
- Orosius, chronicler 302, 327
- Osnabrück 170, 171
- Otloh of St Emmeram 528
- Otranto 162, 253, 340 (map) 343
- Otto I, East Frankish king, Western emperor 32, 33, 43, 44, 88, 93, 148–50, 153, 156, 158, 161–62, 194, 282, 313, 358, 419, 420, 432, 514n
- Otto II, Western emperor 88, 148, 152n, 156, 163, 313, 358, 440n, 457, 501n, 528
- Otto III, Western emperor 3, 33, 46, 151, 152n, 153, 157, 163–64, 358, 420, 426, 429, 457, 458
- Otto, bishop of Freising 1n, 2n, 91, 219, 220n, 221n, 223, 224n, 232n, 234n, 235n, 237n
- Otto, bishop of Novara 167, 427
- Ottomans 7, 9
- Ottonians, Dynasty/Ottonian Kingdom 3, 11, 16, 20n, 91, 97, 148–64, 178, 282, 313, 315, 316, 321, 358, 359, 457–58, 515, 529
- Pachomios, Saint 451, 459
- Palaestrina 173n
- Palaiologoi, Dynasty 8, 13
- Palermo 140, 248, 259, 261, 264, 337n, 338, 345, 346, 490
- Cappella Palatina 337
- Palestine 56, 286, 290, 342, 379, 383, 395, 399, 403, 404, 405, 459, 496, 499–502, 505n
- Pamplona 335
- Pandulf I “Ironhead”, prince of Capua 162, 177, 457
- Pandulf IV, prince of Capua 165, 166, 177
- Pannonia 142
- Pantaleon, patricius of Amalfi 167, 168, 479
- Pantelleria St John the Baptist, monastery 449n
- Papacy 2, 3, 8–11, 16, 32, 33, 36, 38, 45, 55, 59, 62, 65–67, 88–90, 97, 98, 102, 122, 137n, 139n, 142, 159–61, 170–73, 175, 176, 192–209, 219, 224, 225, 232, 248, 254, 262, 302–03, 319, 332, 361, 364, 368, 391–92, 397, 420, 428, 435, 439, 456–57, 464, 519
- Paphos 486
- Paris, Parisian 61, 375, 380
- Saint-Germain des-Prés, abbey 375
- Paschal I, pope 456–57n
- Paschal II, pope 60, 173, 204, 206, 395n
- Paschalios, protospatharios 424
- Patmos 67
- Patras 340 (map), 343, 524

- Patzinakia 342
 Paul I, pope 90, 97, 99, 456n
 Paul VI, pope 192
 Paul, bishop of Ancona 126
 Paul(us), Latin interpreter 122
 Paulicians 18–19
 Pavia 313, 427n, 471, 472, 513, 525
 Pechenegs (see also Patzinakia) 172, 307, 391, 521
 Pelekēphoroi/Pelekyphoroi 274n, 289
 Peloponnese 259, 343, 473, 474, 483
 Pepin, “king of France” (literary figure) 377
 Pera (Constantinople) 344, 488
 Persia 319, 342, 449, 499
 Persian Gulf 472
 Petahyah of Regensburg, Jewish pilgrim 342
 Peter I, king of Aragon 349
 Peter III, patriarch of Antioch 36n, 42, 46n, 64, 121, 122, 202
 Peter, bishop of Troas 426
 Peter, bishop of Tyre 335
 Peter, nephew of the Frankish king 178
 Peter Abelard, scholar 99
 Peter of Alife/Peter Aliphas, Norman knight 258, 435
 Peter the Deacon/Petrus Diaconus, monk at Montecassino 157n, 175, 176n, 177
 Peter the Hermit, preacher 66, 367, 393
 Peter of Salzburg, saint 462
 Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny 66n, 375, 376
 Petraliphas, Byzantine family 258, 406
 Petronilla, queen of Aragon 347
 Petrus Diaconus, see Peter the Deacon
 Phantinos the Younger, Saint 454n, 455n
 Philagathos of Cerami 261
 Philip II Augustus, king of France 357, 375, 378
 Philip of Swabia, king of Germany 39, 235n, 264, 383
 Philippopolis 57, 484
 Philopatium, palace 374
 Philotheos, Byzantine master of Ceremonies 44, 429
 Phokaia 485
 Photios I, patriarch of Constantinople 88, 98, 137, 140–42, 144, 193, 200n, 281, 282n, 284n, 423, 428, 429n
 Piacenza (see also John Philagathos) Council of 364, 391
 Piasts, dynasty 14
 Picardy, Picard(s) 367, 378, 379
 Pietro Grossolano, archbishop of Milan 60, 205
 Pilgārds 279
 Pillars/Columns of Hercules 33, 339,
 Pilocti, Kaloïannes 481n
 Pippin the Younger (Pepin), Frankish King 99, 520
 Piraeus 273, 291
 Pisa, Pisan(s) 5, 17, 19, 37, 47, 48, 114, 118–20, 125, 173, 174, 175n, 218, 227, 229, 331n, 339–42, 347–49, 408, 409, 424, 427, 431, 432, 438, 447, 474, 476–83, 485, 487–89, 514, 525
 Pöhlde 166
 Poitiers (see also Raymond, William) 529
 Poland, Polish 7, 14, 59, 497
 Pontecorvo (San Pietro), abbey 451
 Ponthion 527
 Porto (near Rome) 141, 437
 Portsmouth 314
 Portugal, see Henry, count of Portugal
 Prague 342
 Přemyslids, Dynasty 14
 Procopius, historiographer 44n, 301
 Provence 159, 160, 336, 339, 340 (map), 347–49, 367, 496n
 Ptolemy, geographer 261, 346, 523
 Put’ iz Vareg’ v Greki (see also “Eastern way”) 278
 Pyrrhos, translator 122
 al-Qā’im, caliph of Baghdad 117
 Qalonymus, Jewish family 17, 498n, 502–03
 Qalonymus ben Meshullam, rabbi 498
 Qalonymus ben Moses of Lucca 502
 Qilij Arslān II ibn Mas’ūd, Seljuk sultan of Rūm 124n, 346
 Quedlinburg 149, 168n
 Rabī’ ibn Zayd, see Recemund
 ar-Rāḍī, caliph of Baghdad 116
 Radoald, bishop of Porto 437
 Rainulf Drengot 247

- Ralph de Diceto, historiographer 109
 Ralph of Caen, chronicler 373
 Ramiro I, king of Aragon 333
 Ramla, battle of 369
 Ramon Berenguer I, count of
 Barcelona 334n
 Ramon Berenguer II, count of
 Barcelona 333
 Ramon Berenguer III, count of
 Provence 347
 Ramon Berenguer IV, count of
 Provence 347, 348
 Ramon Berenguer IV, count of
 Barcelona 331n, 333–34, 347
 Ramon de Moncada, count and
 seneschal 348, 430
 Ranieri Bottaci, consul of Pisa 431
 Ranieri greca 481
 Raoul/Ralles, Byzantine family 258, 406
 Rashbam, see Solomon ben Meir
 Rashi, see Solomon ben Isaak
 Rather, bishop of Verona 92, 93
 Rathramnus of Corbie 99
 Ravenna 149n, 448, 449, 518, 520
 Raymond of Poitiers, prince of Antioch 38,
 58, 371
 Raymond IV, count of Toulouse 334, 367,
 391–92, 396
 Raymond V, count of Toulouse 347
 Recemund, bishop of Elvira 150n, 328
 Red Sea 472
 Regensburg 157, 425n, 426, 527
 Reginald of Durham, hagiographer 523,
 526n
 Renier of Montferrat 57, 348
 Reynald, prince of Antioch 58
 Rhaidestos 340 (map), 475, 476, 483
 Rhine, river 17
 Rhineland 496
 Rhodes 40, 340 (map), 343, 483
 Rhōmaioi 2, 274, 285, 290, 403
 Rhōs, see Rus'
 Richard I, king of England 311–12, 486
 Richard I, count of Aversa 248
 Richard II, duke of Normandy 361
 Rigord of Saint-Denis, chronicler 378
 Ripoll, abbey 330, 331
 Robert II, king of France 359, 360
 Robert Guiscard, duke of Calabria and
 Apulia 12, 35, 50–51, 67, 164, 169, 171, 172,
 248, 250–59, 333, 521
 Robert I the Frisian, count of Flanders 365
 Robert II, count of Flanders 367
 Robert I the Magnificent, duke of
 Normandy 249n, 304
 Robert II Curthose, duke of Normandy 367
 Robert of Clari, chronicler 378, 379, 381,
 385n
 Robert Crispin, Norman chieftain 250
 Robert Stigand 249, 250
 Robert the Monk, chronicler 365n, 366n,
 370n
 Robertines, dynasty 358
 Rodulfus Glaber, chronicler 195, 360, 361n
 Roger, "Frank" 435
 Roger I, count of Sicily 51, 52n, 248, 256,
 258
 Roger II, king of Sicily 37–38, 52, 174–75,
 218, 219n, 258–64, 337n, 346, 372, 375,
 376, 437, 483
 Roger III, king of Sicily 39, 264
 Roger Borsa, Duke of Apulia 50, 52, 253,
 254, 258
 Roger of Howden/Hoveden, chronicler
 109, 311n
 Roger, son of Dagobert, sebastos 54, 257
 Rogerios, Byzantine family 258, 406
 Roman Empire 3, 87, 89, 90, 148, 175n, 217,
 226, 234, 256, 286, 300n, 308, 315n, 446,
 456, 458, 459, 462
 Romania (Byzantine Empire) 9, 20, 476
 Romanos I Lakapenos, Byzantine Emperor
 33n, 45, 94, 116, 118n, 157, 158n, 159–60,
 314n, 424, 432, 440, 472, 500, 501, 513
 Romanos II, Byzantine Emperor 32, 43, 116,
 126n, 148, 158n, 160, 161n
 Romanos III Argyros, Byzantine Emperor
 360
 Romanos IV Diogenes, Byzantine Emperor
 169, 252, 369, 370
 Rome 1–3, 11, 16, 31–33, 37, 38, 44–47, 49,
 55, 58, 69, 86, 89–92, 101, 113, 115, 121,
 122, 137–43, 148, 151, 157, 159–61, 163,
 165, 168n, 172, 173, 177, 192–209, 222,

- Rome (cont.)
 254, 302–03, 313, 331, 336, 340 (map),
 341, 358, 384, 385, 391, 398, 401, 403n,
 420–29, 437, 439, 447, 449–61, 513, 520
 Church of (see also Papacy) 192–95, 202,
 385
 Lateran 173n, 399n, 529, 530
 San Silvestro 456n
 Santa Maria Maggiore 428
 Santa Prassede 456–57n
 Rometta 325
 Romuald of Ravenna, Saint 459n
 Roncaglia 38
 Rossano 452, 457, 461
 Rouen 361, 456n,
 Roussel de Bailleul, Norman chieftain 35,
 36, 49, 250, 251n
 Rozela, countess of Flanders 359–60
 Rudolf of Rheinfelden, king of
 Germany 170
 Rum, Seljuk Sultanate of 346, 368
 Ruotger, hagiographer 92
 Rupert, abbot of Deutz 100, 101
 Rus'/Rhos 13, 15, 19, 41, 59, 64, 196, 274,
 275–76, 278–84, 288, 289n, 290, 305,
 524n
 Russia 273, 274, 306, 314, 315, 342

 Sabas (the Elder), saint 403, 451, 459
 Sabas the Younger (of Collesano), saint 46,
 454n, 457, 458
 Særkland 285
 Saint Gall/Sankt Gallen 158n, 302, 330
 Saint Sabas, monastery 403
 Saint-Bertin, abbey 362
 Saint-Denis, abbey 372, 374n, 375, 378, 380
 Sainte-Barbe-en-Auge, abbey 249
 Saint-Évroul (Normandy), abbey 365n
 Saintonge 358
 Saladin, Ayyubid sultan of Egypt 14, 95, 337,
 339, 405–06, 409
 Salento 34, 195n, 450
 Salerno 33, 138n, 139, 253, 340 (map), 450,
 451, 452, 457
 Principality 140, 150, 177, 247, 248, 457,
 513
 San Nicola di Gallocanta, monastery 451
 Salians, dynasty 11, 91, 97, 152, 155–56, 165,
 171, 175, 178

 Salomon, koitonites 158
 Salzburg (see also Gebhard) 176
 Samuel, metropolitan of Chonai 423
 Samuel ha-Rav, Rabbi 499n
 San Filippo di Fragalà, monastery 450, 453n
 San Pietro all'Isola Maggiore, monastery
 452
 San Vincenzo al Volturno, abbey 120
 Sancha of Castile 349
 Sancho Ramírez, king of Aragon 332
 Sancho Ramírez, count of Ribagorza 333
 Santa Maria della Martorana, church 261
 Santiago de Compostela 13, 332, 335–36,
 338
 Sanudo, Domenico 431
 Saracens (see also Arabs, Muslims) 41, 92,
 138, 139, 161, 163, 285, 363, 424, 449
 Sardinia, Sardinians 31, 34, 325, 340 (map),
 343, 345, 448
 Saxony 152, 156
 Scandinavia, Scandinavians 7, 12–13, 19, 42,
 273–91, 306–10, 313, 315, 320, 524
 Scythians/Skythai 116n, 274n, 307
 Secundus the Philosopher 380
 Seljuk Turks/Seljuqs 172, 215, 228, 249, 250,
 252, 333, 346, 363, 364, 368, 369, 373,
 391, 409, 482, 521
 Selymbria/Silivri 504
 Sepharad 342
 Serbia, Serbs 15, 225n
 Sergios II, patriarch of Constantinople 194
 Sergius II, pope 137
 Sergius III, pope 137, 143, 144, 159
 Sergius IV, pope 192, 194, 195n
 Sergius, archbishop of Damascus 46
 Sevasti 481n
 Shabtai Donnolo 503
 Shephatiah, rabbi 500
 Sicily, Sicilians 1n, 10, 33, 35, 36, 38, 46,
 51, 52, 67, 140, 163, 165, 195n, 222, 223,
 247–48, 256, 258–62, 309, 325–27, 333,
 337, 340 (map), 342, 343, 345–46, 361,
 447–50, 452, 455, 456n, 457, 463, 474
 Kingdom of 37, 39, 174, 220, 226, 228–29,
 258, 259, 261, 263, 264, 311, 340 (map),
 346, 372, 376
 Sigebert of Gembloux, chronicler 205, 208
 Sigefrid/Sigefred, Bishop of Parma 161n,
 438n

- Signoretto of Pisa, merchant 479
 Sikelgaita, wife of Robert Guiscard 248, 253
 Simeon/Symeon II, patriarch of
 Jerusalem 204, 396, 397
 Simeon of Polirone, saint 462
 Simeon of Reichenau, monk 178
 Simeon of Trier, saint 454n, 455–56, 462
 Simḥa of Speyer 504
 Sinai 46, 361, 455n
 St Catherine, monastery 361, 455n
 Skylitzes, see John Skylitzes
 Skythai, see Scythians
 Slavs 6, 514
 Smyrna 485
 Solomon ben Isaak, rabbi (Rashi) 498, 503,
 505
 Solomon ben Meir, rabbi (Rashbam) 498,
 503
 Solomon ha-Miṣri, rabbi 499
 Sophronios II, patriarch of Jerusalem 314
 Soria 337
 Spain 326, 329–39, 341–50, 496–500, 505,
 506, 515n
 Sparta 473, 483
 Speyer 172n, 496, 498, 502, 504
 Sphenis (Sveinn) 285
 Spoleto 159, 426
 Staufien, dynasty 8, 12, 152, 155, 175, 216,
 218–23, 225, 229–36, 286,
 Stavelot, see Wibald
 Stephanos Lakapenos, Byzantine
 co-emperor 94
 Stephen II, pope 90, 520
 Stephen IX, pope 428
 Stephen, count of Blois 66n, 367, 368,
 370n
 Stockholm 273, 291
 Strasbourg 176
 Suger, abbot of Saint-Denis 380
 Sulaymān al-Ḡazzī 401
 Suppo, count 430
 Suriani 401, 405
 Svend Estridsen, king of Denmark 287
 Svyatoslav I, prince of Kiev 282
 Swabia 39, 152, 158n, 222, 235, 264, 383
 Sweden, Swedes 273, 274
 Symeon, tsar of Bulgaria 45
 Symeon, patriarch of Jerusalem, see
 Simeon II
 Symeon of Armenia, pilgrim 332
 Symeon the Logothete, chronicler 43
 Symeon the New Theologian, Saint 47, 66
 Symeon Pentaglottos, ascetic 361, 362n
 Synada, see Leo(n), metropolitan of Synada
 Syracuse 140, 325, 455
 Syria, Syrians/Syriac 58, 115, 175n, 196n,
 261n, 304, 339, 342, 365, 395, 397, 399,
 405, 447, 448, 451, 459, 472, 477n, 523n
 Tabriz 485
 Tancred of Hauteville, regent of the
 principality of Antioch 254, 369, 373
 Tancred of Lecce, King of Sicily 264
 Tanto 437
 Taormina 325
 Taranto 224, 254, 340 (map), 450–52, 457
 Tarascó 347
 Tarragona 333, 335, 340 (map), 348n
 Tarsus, Tarsians 140, 301, 474
 Tatikios 436
 Tauroskythai 274n, 284
 Teruel 334
 Thames, river 314n
 Thebaid (Egypt) 463
 Thebes (Boiotia) 42, 219n, 259, 340 (map),
 343, 474, 483, 524
 Theobald (Thibaut) III, count of
 Champagne 382
 Theodora, Byzantine empress, wife of
 Theophilos 357
 Theodora, Byzantine Empress, daughter of
 Constantine VIII 167
 Theodora Komnena, duchess of Austria, wife
 of Henry II Jasomirgott 54–55, 225
 Theodore II Laskaris, Byzantine
 emperor 116
 Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury 301,
 316
 Theodore Aulikalamelos, protonotarios
 431n
 Theodore Balsamon, canonist 40, 402,
 403
 Theodore Daphnopates, patrikios and
 magistros 45n, 157, 159n, 160n, 424n,
 440
 Theodore Prodomos, Byzantine writer 38n,
 40n, 54, 58, 336
 Theodosios the Deacon 34n

- Theodosios Goudeles 65n, 405n
 Theodosios monachus 140
 Theophanes the Confessor, chronicler 93n, 143
 Theophanes Continuatus, chronicler 31–32n, 43, 160n, 329
 Theophano/Theophanu, Western empress 11, 46, 88, 93, 148, 151–52, 162–63, 166, 177, 313, 358, 440n, 457, 527, 528
 Theophano, wife of Constantine Lakapenos 158n
 Theophilos, Byzantine emperor 325, 357, 518
 Theophylact/Theophylaktos Lakapenos, patriarch of Constantinople 45, 157, 160n
 Theophylact/Theophylaktos, archbishop of Ohrid 36, 60, 61, 205
 Theophylactus, Roman senator 159
 Theophylactus Exubitus, megas diermeneutes 37, 38, 114
 Thessalonica 39, 60, 219n, 221, 263, 339, 340 (map), 343, 409, 474, 475, 480, 483
 Thessaly 254, 258, 343, 475, 477, 482
 Thietmar, bishop of Merseburg, chronicler 93, 149n, 158n, 163n, 165n
 Thomas, monk 170n
 Thrace 258, 477, 484
 Thule 307–08
 Toledo 333
 Tortosa (Lebanon) 339
 Tortosa (Spain) 333, 338, 340 (map), 430nToulouse 347
 Touraine 358
 Tovia ben Eliezer 503, 505n
 Trani 340 (map), 504
 Trapani 345
 Trebizond 472
 Treviso 17, 478
 Trier 149n, 362n, 455, 456n
 Porta Nigra 455
 Saint-Martin, monastery 455
 Tripoli (Lebanon) 334n, 339, 474, 475
 Troia (Apulia) 34, 165
 Troy 317
 Troyes 498
 Tudela (see also Benjamin of Tudela) 340 (map), 343
 Tunis 326
 Tunisia, Tunisian 261n
 Turk(s) (see also Seljuk/s) 9, 35, 38, 49, 66, 203, 249, 254, 333, 335, 363, 365, 367, 378, 480
 Tyre/Tyros (see also William of Tyre) 317, 339, 525
 Ukraine 273
 Ulric, bishop of Orleans 360
 Umayyads, dynasty 13, 326, 327
 Urban II, pope 172, 203, 204, 364–67, 391, 392, 396, 397
 Urgell 330, 331
Væringr, *Væringiar* (see also Barangoi, Scandinavians) 284
 Val Demone (Sicily) 449
 Valencia 344, 349
 Vall d'Aran 329
 Valleduccio 461
 Varangians (see also Barangoi, Scandinavians) 13, 41, 42, 47, 274, 276, 278, 281, 305, 307–10, 312, 313n
 Venice, Venetians 4, 5, 16, 17, 19, 33, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 52, 53, 56, 57, 63, 111n, 118, 119, 120, 123, 125n, 153, 171, 193, 218, 227–29, 259, 273n, 362, 382–84, 408, 425, 431–33, 437, 438, 447, 449, 471–89, 514, 518, 519, 525
 San Marco, church 519, 522
 San Nicolò di Lido, monastery 483
 Peace of (1177) 38, 228, 229
 Treaty of (1202) 382, 383
 Venosa 50
 Verdun 515n
 Treaty of 137, 357
 Verona 478
 Via Egnatia 35, 42, 340 (map), 343, 482
 Vic 330, 331n
 Victor IV, (anti)pope 225
 Vikings (see also Scandinavians) 15, 41, 273, 276, 280, 286, 300, 315
 Vitalis of Castronuovo, saint 454n, 458n
 Vlachs 344
 Vladimir the Great, prince of Kiev 281, 282
 Volturno, see San Vincenzo

- Walram, bishop of Naumburg 204
 Walter Map 317–18
 Walter, lord of Boissy-sans-Avoir 367
 Werner, bishop of Strasbourg 165, 427
 West Frankish Kingdom 14, 178, 357–58
 Western Christians 36n, 144, 363, 364, 396,
 426, 446, 447, 449, 462, 464
 Western Empire (see also Holy Roman
 Empire) 9, 12, 14, 18, 148, 156, 157, 162–65,
 170, 175, 178, 194, 216–18, 223n, 225–33,
 237
 Western Europe 15n, 252, 280, 289, 300n,
 318, 357, 362–64, 369, 377, 378, 407,
 515, 527
 Wibald, abbot of Stablo (Stavelot) and
 Corvey 222n, 223n, 231n, 232, 234n, 235,
 236n, 440
 Wido, Western emperor 158n
 Widukind of Corvey, historiographer 93,
 149n, 158–59, 162n
 Wilfred the Hairy, count of Barcelona 329
 William I the Conqueror, king of England
 and duke of Normandy 250n, 304, 306,
 310, 315, 316, 320, 368
 William I, king of Sicily 223, 224, 261, 263,
 337n, 427, 430, 523
 William II, king of Sicily 263, 264, 311, 345,
 346
 William I, duke of Apulia 52, 258
 William IX, duke of Aquitaine 368
 William II Jordan, count of Berga 334n
 William I, count of Burgundy 363
 William 'Iron Arm', count of Melfi 247
 William VIII, lord of Montpellier 349, 377
 William II, count of Nevers 368
 William IV, count of Poitiers 362
 William VI, count of Poitiers 363
 William, abbot of Volpiano 362
 William, monk at Saint-Denis 380
 William of Apulia, historiographer 50–53
 253n, 255, 256, 259
 William of Malmesbury, chronicler 303,
 317, 366n
 William Medicus of Gap, theologian and
 abbot of Saint-Denis 380
 William of Poitiers, chronicler 360, 361
 William of Tyre, archbishop and
 chronicler 58, 65, 95, 102, 103, 109, 114n,
 233n, 236n, 334, 430, 431, 433n, 437
 Willibald, bishop of Eichstätt 303
 Willigis, archbishop of Mainz 163
 Winchester 303, 314–16, 337
 Wipo, historiographer 93, 166n, 514n
 Wolfhere, hagiographer 166n
 Worms 496, 498, 502
 synod of 99–101
 Würzburg 176, 222
 York 312, 313
 Zacharias, pope 462
 Zachary, bishop of Anagni 437
 Zachary, metropolitan of Chalcedon 425n
 Zachary, saint 519
 Zadar/Zara 382–83, 519
 St. Anastasia, church 519
 Zante 345
 Zaragoza 333, 340 (map)
 Ziani, Domenico, doge of Venice 431
 Ziani, Pietro 431