

This is an extract from:

*The Crusades from the Perspective
of Byzantium and the Muslim World*

edited by Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh

published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection

Washington, D.C.

© 2001 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century

Alexander Kazhdan[†]

When scholars write about relations between the West and Byzantium in the Middle Ages, they naturally emphasize the contrasts between the two societies:¹ Catholicism versus Orthodoxy, feudalism versus “totalitarian” regime, predominantly oral culture versus consistent textuality, barter economy versus uninterrupted circulation of coins, poetization of warfare versus the ideology of peace, a list of oppositions that could be continued almost to infinity. It is unclear whether these contrasts are in fact part of the reality of the medieval world or were spawned by the confessional intolerance of nineteenth-century historiography. Fortunately, this problem lies far beyond the limited tasks of this study. At first sight, the political and ecclesiastical events of the eleventh and twelfth centuries confirm the traditional opinion: this period begins with a theological clash and the so-called division (schism) of the church in 1054, and it ends with the sack of Constantinople by the Crusader army in 1204. Who could deny that the two worlds stood in opposition to each other?

Political conflicts are, however, a questionable litmus test for the evaluation of cultural relations, and the picture of an unbridgeable gap between the Greek empire and western kingdoms often trips over humble reality. We should not forget that the Latin West, in its turn, was split into various units of power, and the “internecine” struggles between the papacy and the German emperors, or between France and England, determined medieval structures much more than the Byzantine siege of Latin Antioch. As modern study of the medieval past advances, it becomes more and more doubtful that the dispute between Cardinal Humbert and Patriarch Michael Keroularios in 1054 (let alone that of Photios and Pope Nicholas I almost two hundred years earlier) created an actual schism, a separation of the two churches and two cultures.² The Byzantines forged alliances with

¹ This contrast that existed despite certain “points of convergence” is masterfully delineated by A. Laiou, “Byzantium and the West,” in *Byzantium: A World Civilization*, ed. A. Laiou and H. Maguire (Washington, D.C., 1992), 67–78, in the form of a narrative of the journey of two imaginary Westerners to Byzantium. Cf. M. Whittow, “How the East Was Lost: The Background to the Komnenian Reconquista,” in *Alexios I Komnenos*, ed. M. Mullett and D. Smythe (Belfast, 1996), 56–63.

² See esp. P. Lemerle, “L’Orthodoxie byzantine et l’œcuménisme médiéval: Les origines du ‘schisme’ des Eglises,” *BullBudé* (1965): 228–46.

some western and northern neighbors against other such neighbors, married western notables,³ accepted western warriors not only as defenders of their borders but also as saints of the Greek Orthodox church,⁴ and developed theological and secular intellectual exchanges with the allegedly schismatic West. The relations were too complex to reach a plausible conclusion based on common sense alone.⁵

I shall focus here on several aspects of Western-Byzantine relations in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, those that seem to me either ignored or misinterpreted. While not denying that there was a substantial element of hostility in Constantinople toward the West, and vice versa, I hope to demonstrate that the traditional concepts of contrast and hostility are insufficient to describe the relationship.

I begin with terminology.⁶ We usually describe the western world, in contrast to Byzantium, with the single, unifying term *Latins*. The Latin term *Latini* is an old one, which in Roman usage originally designated the population of Latium. It was extended by Roman law to include certain groups within the empire who were granted restricted legal rights: the so-called Junian *Latini* were manumitted slaves who were considered free during their lifetime but reverted to slave status at death, so that their properties were inherited by their patrons as *peculium*. Justinian I abolished the status of *Latini* in 531,⁷ and the term disappeared together with the institution.

Thus the ethnonym *Latinoi* is not used ca. 800 by the Greek historians Theophanes the Confessor and Patriarch Nikephoros. For Nikephoros, the western world lies outside his geographical horizons: after mentioning such northern neighbors as the Avars, Huns, Bulgarians (and Kotragoi), Khazars, Scythians, Slavians (and twice Slavs), the patriarch neglected the inhabitants of Central and Western Europe; even his land of the Goths is located in the Crimea.⁸ Theophanes knows all the northern neighbors (Avars, Bulgarians, Huns, Scythians, etc.) mentioned by Nikephoros, as well as numerous tribes active in the late Roman period to the west and north of the empire (Celts and Galli, Goths, Germans, Gepids, Vandals and Alemans, western Galatians and Iberians, Alans), and several peoples (Franks, Sicilians) and territories (Carthage, Spain, Gallia, Italy, Calabria, Campania) of later centuries, but no Latins. Nor does pseudo-Genesios, in the tenth century, refer to Latins, although he occasionally names some western territories (Spain, Italy, Sicily, Longibardia or Longibarbia [Lombardy], Frankia), and includes in the army

³ F. Tinnefeld, "Byzantinische auswärtige Heiratspolitik vom 9. zum 12. Jahrhundert," *BSI* 54 (1993): 21–28. From the Western point of view, the problem has been studied by G. Wolf, "Die byzantinisch-abendländische Heirats- und Verlobungspläne zwischen 750 und 1250," *ADipl* 37 (1991): 15–32.

⁴ C. P. Kyrris, "The 'Three Hundred Alaman Saints' of Cyprus," in *The Sweet Land of Cyprus*, ed. A. Bryer (Nicosia, 1993), 203–35.

⁵ This complexity is stressed by H.-G. Beck, "Byzanz und der Westen im 12. Jahrhundert," *Vorträge und Forschungen* 12 (Konstanz, 1969): 227–41, reprinted in his *Ideen und Realitäten in Byzanz* (London, 1972), no. VIII.

⁶ The problem of the Greek terminology of the Crusades was recently studied by A. Kolia-Dermitzaki, "Die Kreuzfahrer und die Kreuzzüge im Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner," *JÖB* 41 (1991): 163–88, but from a different viewpoint. The author argues that the Byzantines perceived the Crusades as an ordinary military expedition, no different from others.

⁷ A. Steinwenter, in *RE* 12 (1925): 922.

⁸ C. Mango, ed., *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople: Short History*, DOT 10 (Washington, D.C., 1990), para. 42.7.

of Thomas the Slav certain northern (Slavs, Huns, Alans) and western (Vandals and Getae) tribes.⁹ Richer is the ethnogeographic information of Genesis' contemporaries, the continuators of Theophanes (I consider all six books of Theophanes Continuatus as a group, notwithstanding the complexity of their authorship). These historians were aware of many western territories and peoples, such as Italy, Sicily, Calabria, Langobardia, Francia, Gallia, Spain, Andalusia; without hesitation, they call the Spanish Arabs *Spanoi*,¹⁰ while the general term *Latinoi* makes no appearance in the *Continuatio*. On the other hand, the Continuators know various northern tribes; in a passage of the fifth book (*Vita Basili*), we find Croatians, Serbs (Serbloi), Zachlumians, Terbuniotai, Kanalitai, Diokletianoi (from Dukla), and [A]rentanoi who are given the general label of "Scythians."¹¹ The same term is applied in the *Continuatio* to other ethnic groups, Bulgarians¹² and Rus', the latter being flatly defined as a Scythian tribe.¹³ We may surmise that Theophanes Continuatus had some idea (possibly influenced by an ancient tradition) of the unity of Byzantium's northern neighbors, but did not envisage the unity of the western peoples.

In the treatise "On the Administration of the Empire" attributed to Constantine VII and produced at approximately the same time as the *Continuatio*, we find numerous names of northern peoples (Avars, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croatians, Dalmatians, Pechenegs, Rus' and their tributaries, Turks [= Hungarians], etc.); the compiler gives the same list of Southern Slavic tribes¹⁴ as is rendered by the Continuator, omitting only the generalization "Scythian." The author is very cautious in applying the term "Scythian": only once does he use it in a generic sense, referring, as does the *Continuatio*, to the Rus' as one of the "northern and Scythian tribes."¹⁵ The term appears two more times,¹⁶ but in both cases is applied to a limited ethnogeographical area. The western lands and peoples appear frequently: Spain and its parts (Lusitania, etc.), Italy and its parts, especially often Langobardia and the Venetians, Gallia, Germanoi, Franks, Gepids, Goths (and Visigoths), Vandals. The general term *Latinoi*, however, is missing from the treatise. Nor is it found in the *Chronicle* of John Skylitzes written ca. 1100, which does mention such western peoples as Spaniards, Italians, Calabrians, and Franks. The chronicler also refers to various northern neighbors, including Varangians, Rus', Pechenegs, Hungarians, Serbs, Croatians, and Bulgarians, applying the term "Scythian" primarily (but not exceptionally) to the Rus'. Byzantine historians from Theophanes to Skylitzes were well aware of the disunity of the western world.

The data collected by the Dumbarton Oaks Hagiography Project, which includes the *vitae* of saints who died between 700 and 1000, records the use of the ethnonym *Latinoi*

⁹ *Genesis Regum libri quattuor*, ed. A. Lesmüller-Werner and J. Thurn (Berlin-New York, 1978), 24.18–19.

¹⁰ *Theophanes Continuatus*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1838), 474.22 (hereafter *TheophCont*).

¹¹ *TheophCont* 288.19–20.

¹² *TheophCont* 11.17, 420.4.

¹³ *TheophCont* 196.6–7.

¹⁴ *De administrando imperio*, vol. 1, ed. G. Moravcsik and R. Jenkins (Washington, D.C., 1967), chap. 29.56–58 (hereafter *DAI*).

¹⁵ *DAI*, chap. 13.25.

¹⁶ *DAI*, chaps. 43.2, 53.129.

only rarely: all examples are gleaned from the stories of holy men of South Italy (the biographies of Christopher and Makarios, Elias Speleotes, Sabas the Younger), and all refer to the Latin language as contrasted with Greek. Another Italian hagiographer, who wrote about Neilos (Nilus) of Rossano (d. 1004) in the first half of the eleventh century, speaks of *Latinoi*, contrasting them with the Greek population of South Italy.¹⁷

To the best of my knowledge, the Greek term *Latinos* first appears as a generic appellation of Westerners in a patriarchal decision of 1054;¹⁸ in most passages the compiler of the document speaks of the “Italian language” or “Italian characters,” and only in a section translated from Latin is the term *Latinos* used. Michael Attaleiates, at the end of the eleventh century, used the term *Latinos* several times, but the meaning of the ethnonym is confused: his Latins are evidently good warriors,¹⁹ but their ethnic identity is obscure. The *Albanoi* and Latins in Italy²⁰ echo the ancient nomenclature that is in general typical of Attaleiates, who, for instance, explains the contemporary name *Nemitzoi* as designating ancient Sarmatians.²¹ We shall see later that Attaleiates employed the ethnic term *Latinis* where his contemporaries spoke about Franks or Normans.

After the First Crusade the situation changed quickly: Anna Komnene, according to the index to the *Alexiad* prepared by P. Gautier,²² used the noun *Latinos* 97 times and 4 times the adjective *Latinikos*. Even more frequent, in the *Alexiad*, is the ethnonym *Keltos* (176 times plus 20 cases of the adjective *Keltikos*), applied interchangeably with the word *Latinos*. Anna also employs specific designations such as Frank (20 times plus 14 times the adjective *Frankikos*), *Italos* (7 times), and rarely *Germanos*/*Germanikos*. Niketas Choniates, in his *Chronike diegesis*, employs the term *Latinos* (as noun and adjective) 127 times, the feminine form *Latinis* 4 times, and the adjective *Latinikos* 26 times. Other (specific?) ethnic names used by Anna are rare in Choniates, except for *Italos* (17 times): *Keltos* appears once, and once its adjective, in the expression *Κελτικὸν γένος*,²³ while Frank is found three times. On the other hand, Alemans are common (52 times), and new designations (*Ἰταλιώτης*, *Φραγγίσκος*, *Ἰγγλίνος*) are employed here and there. John Kinnamos prefers specific, sometimes confusing ethnonyms (such as Alemans, Germans, Italians), but even he several times speaks of Latin armies, Latin customs, Latin peoples, and Latin language.²⁴ In other words, before the twelfth century, the Byzantines saw the West as composed of separate territories and distinct peoples (Italians, Spaniards, Germanic tribes, and so on), while the concept of Latin language entered Greek literature of the late tenth century in a specific area, South Italy. By the twelfth century, the notion of Latin peoples (and of Latin habits) was firmly established: wrongly or rightly, Byzantine intellectuals began to consider the West as a unified entity.

¹⁷ G. Giovanelli, *Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Νείλου τοῦ Νέου* (Grottaferrata, 1972), 112.8. Nilus is described as using the “Hellenic” (p. 113.12–13) and “Roman” (p. 114.1) languages.

¹⁸ *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, fasc. 3, ed. V. Grumel ([Constantinople], 1947), no. 869.

¹⁹ *Michaelis Attaliothae Historia*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1853), 35.12–13, 46.22 (hereafter Attal.).

²⁰ Attal. 9.12.

²¹ Attal. 147.1.

²² *Anne Comnène, Alexiade*, ed. P. Gautier, vol. 4 (Paris, 1976), 73 f (hereafter *Alexiad*).

²³ *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. J. L. van Dieten (Berlin–New York, 1975), 264.64 (hereafter NikChon).

²⁴ *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome*, ed. A. Meineke (Bonn, 1836), 19.6, 47.9, 146.19, 199.17, 208.20, 267.20, 282.5 (hereafter Kinnam.).

Along with this progression from the notion of the “Latin language” to the “Latin people[s]” and “Latin habits,” the Byzantines began to distinguish particular features (beyond linguistic differences) typical of the Westerners or “Latins.” Like Kinnamos, Anna speaks of Latin habits (ἔθη).²⁵ Among the characteristic traits of their behavior is first of all their martial prowess: Anna constantly mentions Latin troops, *στρατεύματα* and *φάλαγγες*, their “irresistible attacks,” their horses and weapons, especially long spears and the so-called *tzangra*, and defines them as “noble.”²⁶ Several times Anna describes their habit of swearing an oath and characterizes them as arrogant, avaricious, and greedy for power;²⁷ she knows that the Latins differ from the Byzantines in their interpretation of theological problems and believe that the Roman pope is the head of the whole universe.²⁸ In passing, Anna notes that an educated Latin is as strange a figure as a Hellenized Scythian.²⁹

Choniates presents a similar, albeit more differentiated picture of the Latins. He speaks, of course, about the Latin language³⁰ and—what is more substantial for our purpose—Latin peoples either in the singular or plural, *γένη*³¹ and *φύλα*.³² Thus Choniates considered the Latins as a unity that, in its turn, consisted of a plurality of peoples or tribes. The Crusaders who conquered Syria are characterized as a unity, “the Latins”;³³ at the same time, he notes that Constantinople was populated by the Latins of various peoples (*διαφορογενῶν*).³⁴ Since Bertha of Sulzbach is described as a Latin by her *γένος*,³⁵ the Germans were included in this category. Choniates applies the ethnonym “Latin” also to the Normans of Sicily.³⁶

Like Anna, Choniates emphasizes the military role of the Latins: he speaks of the Latin *στρατεύματα*, *στρατιωτικόν*, *στρατός*, *στρατιά*, *δυνάμεις*, *σῆφος*, *σύνταγμα*, *στρατόπεδον*, *μοῖρα*.³⁷ He is aware of the Latin retainers and Latin mercenaries.³⁸ Some Latins appear in his narrative as infantry soldiers, others as mounted warriors, or fighting in heavily armed *phalanges*.³⁹ Like Anna, Choniates emphasizes that the Latins bore spears which they used skillfully.⁴⁰ Choniates respects the military prowess of the Latins: he

²⁵ *Alexiad* 3:79.28–29, 117.22.

²⁶ *Alexiad* 2:97.10–11.

²⁷ On the oath, see *Alexiad* 2:105.21, 215.4–5, 232.25–26; on their arrogance, 2:212.20–21, 229.27–28, 3:18.12; on their avariciousness, 2:211.18–19, 3:148.21; on their greed for power, 2:212.25–28.

²⁸ On theology, see *Alexiad* 2:218.18–20; on the pope, 1:48.12–14.

²⁹ *Alexiad* 2:218.4–5.

³⁰ E.g., NikChon 200.88, 308.2.

³¹ In singular, NikChon 178.7, 350.47; in plural, 392.64, 612.87.

³² NikChon 537.57.

³³ NikChon 417.56–57.

³⁴ NikChon 247.31.

³⁵ NikChon 147.86.

³⁶ E.g., NikChon 360.48.

³⁷ For *στρατεύματα*, see NikChon 67.52, 550.34–35, 600.46–47, 619.26; *στρατιωτικόν*, 108.53; *στρατός*, 556.71; *στρατιά*, 365.56; *δυνάμεις*, 556.78, 563.67, 568.71; *σῆφος*, 391.41, 532.28, 616.58, 633.55; *σύνταγμα*, 618.12, 630.64–65, 639.83–84; *στρατόπεδον*, 615.25, 616.40, 624.8; *μοῖρα*, 637.30.

³⁸ For Latin retainers, see NikChon 238.94; for mercenaries, 386.86.

³⁹ For infantry soldiers, see NikChon 379.91–92 (and cf. *ὀπλιτικόν*, 628.18); mounted warriors, 542.68, 568.71, 605.63–65, 616.47; *φάλαγγες*, 572.76–77 (cf. 640.8).

⁴⁰ NikChon 610.88, 35.2.

speaks of their invincible force and precision in battle;⁴¹ the Byzantines fled from the Latins like a herd of deer from a roaring lion and foolishly mistook the Latin security for cowardice.⁴² And once more he stresses that the Latins acted in a certain way not because of cowardice but following the principles of military technique.⁴³

Only in passing does Choniates note that the Latins espoused a different creed, but he does not spare negative adjectives to characterize the “accursed” Latins.⁴⁴ They were cruel, treacherous, stupid, unrestrained in speech, arrogant, unreliable, ambitious for glory and profit, and hostile toward the empire.⁴⁵ Choniates notes that they wore a garment different from that of the Byzantines, and mentions a cape that was a product of Latin wool-spinning;⁴⁶ disdainfully he calls the Latins cobblers and beef-eaters;⁴⁷ he ridicules their ravenous appetite and metaphorically laments the victims of Latin jaws.⁴⁸ Only once does Choniates deviate from this biased image of the Latins and mention that some of them were graceful.⁴⁹

Choniates emphatically contrasts the Latins and Byzantines. “Between us and them,” he says, “lies an open gap, and we are separated in our views and diametrically opposed.”⁵⁰ The historian presents the Byzantines as gentle and modest, whereas the Latins are supercilious, boastful, arrogant, and stupid. His stereotype of the Latin completely coincides with another stereotype favored by Choniates, that of the barbarians, which encompasses the Latins. The barbarian in the *Chronike diegesis* is also cruel, arrogant, greedy, unstable (unreliable), and foulmouthed. Choniates supplements these negative qualities, common with the Latins, with two more features that he attaches specifically to the “barbarians,” not Latins, even though some of his “barbarians” were Westerners: noisiness and lack of culture.⁵¹

Thus the stereotype of the Latin was molded by Niketas Choniates on the stereotype of the barbarian. But was Choniates as exceedingly anti-Latin as he seemed in forming this stereotype? Let us compare the description of the Second Crusade by Kinnamos and Choniates.⁵² Kinnamos’ conclusion is simple: the Crusaders were responsible for all the misunderstandings and conflicts, whereas the position of the Byzantine administration toward them was justified at all points. Choniates is much more cautious in his evaluation of the event: he not only emphasizes the manliness of the Crusaders but condemns Man-

⁴¹ NikChon 203.66, 618.19.

⁴² On the Byzantine flight, see NikChon 561.21–22; Latin security, 614.2.

⁴³ NikChon 644.33–35.

⁴⁴ NikChon 576.92, 301.21.

⁴⁵ On Latin cruelty, see NikChon 301.6; on their treachery, 623.57; stupidity, 39.39, 164.60; unbridled speech, 392.61; arrogance, 612.56, 625.20; unreliability, 540.21–22, 622.25 (cf. 602.4–5); ambition, 550.40; hostility to Byzantines, 551.44.

⁴⁶ NikChon 537.42, 557.20–21.

⁴⁷ NikChon 317.15–16, 594.75.

⁴⁸ NikChon 560.86, 571.48.

⁴⁹ NikChon 557.22–23.

⁵⁰ NikChon 301.27–28.

⁵¹ On Latin noisiness, see NikChon 26.69, 398.17; on their lack of culture, 155.73, 322.44, 653.94, etc.

⁵² See also C. Astracha, “L’image de l’homme occidental à Byzance: Le témoignage de Kinnamos et de Choniates,” *BSI* 44 (1983): 31–40, and S. Rakova, “Eastern and Western Man in Nicetas Choniates,” *EtBalk* 29.4 (1993): 55–63.

uel I's unfair actions toward the participants in the Second Crusade, and acknowledges that the Byzantines were deceiving the Western knights.⁵³ Even more astonishing is Choniates' panegyric portrait of Frederick Barbarossa.⁵⁴ Among the virtues of the Roman emperor he includes his noble origins, reason, invincibility in battles, and extraordinary love of Christ, and even compares Frederick with the apostle Paul. Choniates praises the handsomeness, manliness, reason, and strength of Conrad of Montferrat; he lauds the Antiochene notable Baldwin who died bravely at Myriokephalon, Raymond of Poitiers, prince of Antioch, and Peter of Bracieux.⁵⁵ Near the end of his book, he recollects a Venetian merchant who became his friend, after Choniates had helped him and his wife;⁵⁶ one of the manuscripts preserves the name of the man, Dominicus, who "dealing with barbarians as a barbarian" saved Choniates and his family. In another passage the historian blatantly defines as foolishness the indiscriminating Byzantine animosity toward Westerners, the lack of desire to distinguish between the bad and good among them.⁵⁷

While "Latins" was a generic term, the ethnonym "Frank" seems to have had a predominantly specific meaning. Theophanes follows the principles of late antique ethnology when he lists Alans and Germanic tribes as allies of the Vandals; the *Germanoi*, he adds, are now called Franks.⁵⁸ This definition goes back to Prokopios⁵⁹ and continued to be used in later centuries: both the author of the book *De administrando imperio* and Attaleiates identified the *Germanoi* as Franks.⁶⁰ Theophanes perceived Pipinus (Pepin), who routed the Arabs, as a king of the Franks, and Karoulos (Charlemagne) as another king of the Franks.⁶¹ The ethnic affiliation of his *Frankoi* is beyond doubt; their land is defined as *Frankike*.⁶² Like Theophanes (and Prokopios), Constantine Porphyrogenitos construed the Franks as a specific people among the "alien tribes": while the regulation imposed by Constantine the Great forbade marriages between foreigners and the emperor of the Romans, the Franks were excluded from this regulation due to their constant interaction with the Romans.⁶³ Constantine's vision of the Franks expanded, however, beyond the borders of former Gallia: the Franks who subdued "the Croats in Delmatia" are the subjects of "Otto, the great king of Frankia and Saxia" (Saxonia), while Venetians are called "Franks from Aquileia."⁶⁴ In any event, his Franks are a specific people located primarily north of the Alps or in northern Italy.

⁵³ NikChon 66.18–33; cf. 568.74–76.

⁵⁴ NikChon, 416.29–50; cf. F. Boehm, *Das Bild Friedrich Barbarossas und seines Kaisertums in den auslaendischen Quellen seiner Zeit* (Berlin, 1936), 49–59.

⁵⁵ On Conrad, see NikChon 201.93–95; Baldwin, 181.7–13; Raymond of Poitiers, 116.58–59; Peter of Bracieux, 601.85–86.

⁵⁶ NikChon 588.13–16, 27–29.

⁵⁷ NikChon 552.79–81.

⁵⁸ *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1883), 94.24–25 (hereafter Theoph.).

⁵⁹ *Wars* 3:3.1; cf. 5:11.29, 12.8, in *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, ed. J. Haury, rev. G. Wirth, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1962), 317.16–17; vol. 2 (1963), 63.3, 64.9–11.

⁶⁰ *DAI*, chap. 25.29–30; Attal. 148.1.

⁶¹ Theoph. 403.14–15, 455.20.

⁶² Theoph. 402.22, 403.9.

⁶³ *DAI*, chap. 13.111–19.

⁶⁴ On Otto, see *DAI*, chap. 30.71–79, and cf. chap. 31.86–87; on the Venetians, see chap. 28.4–5.

The meaning of the ethnonym “Franks” changed by the end of the eleventh century.⁶⁵ According to Skylitzes,⁶⁶ five hundred “Franks” under the command of [H]ardouin [of Milan] joined the army of the Byzantine general George Maniakes, who was campaigning in Sicily; Skylitzes described them as originating from Transalpine Gallia, but from Italian sources we learn that they were Normans.⁶⁷ While William of Apulia calls them Galli,⁶⁸ other Italian chroniclers speak plainly of Maniakes’ Norman allies.⁶⁹

Skylitzes goes on to state that the Franks behaved in Italy as in a conquered land and that Maniakes was ordered to expel them;⁷⁰ he also writes that Constantine IX sent his allies, the Franks and Varangians, against the Turks.⁷¹ Thus, in the chronicle of Skylitzes, the *Frankoi* are separated from Frankia or Gallia; the ethnic term is applied, as we may gather from the context, primarily to the Normans of South Italy.

The term “Franks” is common in the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnene. Sometimes she used the terms “Franks” and “Latins” interchangeably: thus she writes that Alexios I wanted to join the Latin expedition against the Turks but was apprehensive when he saw the innumerable troops of the Franks.⁷² In another passage, Anna describes a band of Crusaders whom Alexios ordered to join “the other army of the Latins,” but they did not want to “be united with the Franks.”⁷³ In most cases, however, the Franks are construed as a particular part of the generic mass of Latins. Anna relates a conversation between the emperor and an arrogant Latin when Alexios, with the help of a Latin interpreter, asked the man about his specific origin. “I am,” answered the knight, “a pure Frank of a noble lineage.”⁷⁴ The emperor, she says, explained to Saint Gilles what the Latins should expect along their route; he also expressed some doubts about the intentions of the Franks.⁷⁵ Anna speaks of the troops of the Franks and Celts, and lists Lombards, all the Latins, Germans, and “our” (τοὺς καθ’ ἡμᾶς) Franks.⁷⁶

In Anna’s terminology, the Franks have no connection with the land called Frankia. The king of Frankia, the count of Frankia Stephen, and probably “all the counts in Frankia” are French,⁷⁷ while the Franks, where they are identifiable, are predominantly Normans. The “large army of the Franks” under the command of Bohemond is evi-

⁶⁵ On the application of the term *Franci* to Normans in South Italy, see A. Gallo, *Aversa Normanna* (Naples, 1938), 7 f.

⁶⁶ *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, ed. J. Thurn (Berlin-New York, 1973), 425.10–12 (hereafter Skyl.).

⁶⁷ On Ardouin and his Normans, see F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile* (Paris, 1907), 91 f; J. Gay, *L’Italie méridionale et l’empire byzantin* (Rome, 1904), 453 f; M. Mathieu in *Guillaume de Pouille, La geste de Robert Guiscard* (Palermo, 1961), 268.

⁶⁸ *Guillaume de Pouille*, ed. Mathieu, book 1.195, 204.

⁶⁹ *Gaufredus Malaterra, De rebus gestis Rogerii . . .*, in *Raccolta degli storici Italiani* 5.1 (Bologna, 1928), 12.25 and 31; *Amato di Montecassino, Storia de’ Normanni* (Rome, 1935), 67 f; *Leo Mariscanus, Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, MGH, SS 7 (Hannover, 1846), 675.

⁷⁰ Skyl. 427.47, 55.

⁷¹ Skyl. 471.17–18, 474.6–7.

⁷² *Alexiad* 3:11.9–12.

⁷³ *Alexiad* 3:36.23–28.

⁷⁴ *Alexiad* 2:229.26–230.1.

⁷⁵ *Alexiad* 2:235.9–12.

⁷⁶ *Alexiad* 3:82.26–27, 52.23–24.

⁷⁷ For the king of Frankia, see *Alexiad* 2:213.1, 3:53.15; for the count of Frankia, 3:27.21; for “all the counts” in Frankia, 2:207.22.

dently a Norman contingent; the Frankish navy a Norman fleet; and the famous Frankish warrior Roger a Norman commander.⁷⁸ Choniates realized the disjunction between the country called Frankia and the people called Franks, and introduced the ethnonym Φραγγίσκοι to designate the French,⁷⁹ although he had no clear perception of their nationality and described them as formerly called Flemish, Φλαμίονες.⁸⁰ Kinnamos was more archaizing and termed the French *Germanoi*, while the Germans in his history were Alemans.

According to Anna, Bohemond and his “Franks” caused serious troubles to the empire of Alexios but, unlike the Latins, they are rarely characterized in a negative fashion by the princess-historian. Two exceptions are her reference to their irascibility and their habit of breaking oaths.⁸¹ Unlike other Latins, she perceived the Franks as “ours,” at least in theory, and mentions a contingent of Franks that followed her father during a military expedition.⁸² The Latins in general were perceived by Anna as dangerous aliens, while the Normans (“Franks”), in her day, were more than simple mercenaries; some of them entered the ranks of the Byzantine ruling class.

The imperial chrysobulls of the second half of the eleventh century often contain a formula exempting monasteries from billeting foreign military contingents.⁸³ This formula avoids the generic term “Latins” as well as archaic designations such as Celts, Alemans, or *Germanoi*, but itemizes various specific ethnonyms, including Franks. The edict of 1060 comprises a limited list of foreigners: Varangians, Rus’, Saracens, and Franks; in 1073 the enigmatic Koulpingoi (*Kolbjagi* of the *Lex Rossica*) are added, in 1074 Bulgarians. In 1082 the formula includes Rus’, Varangians, Koulpingoi, English, and Germans (*Nemitzoi*); the absence of the Franks (the Normans of South Italy) in the heat of the war against Robert Guiscard is understandable. They reappear in the chrysobull of 1086, and the edict of 1088 supplements the list with two new ethnic groups—Alans and Abasgians (most probably Georgians in general).

The role of individual “Latins” or Westerners in Byzantine society of the eleventh and twelfth centuries has been well studied,⁸⁴ and we may enumerate the outstanding “Latins” active in the empire during this period. According to Kekaumenos, Byzantine emperors of the first half of the eleventh century (he explicitly names Romanos III) did not grant any Frank or Varangian the title of *patrikios*.⁸⁵ Even Kekaumenos, however, men-

⁷⁸ For the army under Bohemond, see *Alexiad* 3:125.12; for the Frankish navy, 1:147.20; for Roger, 3:101.14, 117.20–21, 120.25.

⁷⁹ On Frankia, see NikChon 417.67; for Frankiskoi, see 588.21, 32; 596.43; 597.64; 647.4.

⁸⁰ NikChon 553.93.

⁸¹ On Norman irascibility, see *Alexiad* 3:162.18–19; on breaking oaths, 3:146.8.

⁸² *Alexiad* 1:24.18–19.

⁸³ For a survey of them, see A. Kazhdan and B. Fonkić, “Novoe izdanie aktov Lavry i ego znachenie dlja vizantinovedeniia,” *Viz Vrem* 34 (1973): 49.

⁸⁴ R. Janin, “Les Francs au service des Byzantins,” *EO* 29 (1930): 61–72; Marquis de la Force, “Les conseillers latins du basileus Alexis Comnène,” *Byzantion* 11 (1936): 153–65; A. Kazhdan, *Social’nyj sostav gosподstvujushchego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow, 1974), 200–205, 212–18; E. Jeffreys, “Western Infiltration of the Byzantine Aristocracy: Some Suggestions,” in *The Byzantine Aristocracy*, ed. M. Angold (Oxford, 1984), 202–10; W. McQueen, “Relations between the Normans and Byzantium: 1071–1112,” *Byzantion* 56 (1986): 436 f, 444–47, 465–67.

⁸⁵ G. G. Litavrin, *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena* (Moscow, 1972), 280.5–6 (hereafter Kekaum.).

tions a certain Peter, nephew of “the basileus of Frankia” (or of “the king of the Germans”), who settled in Byzantium and whom Basil II appointed *spatharios* and *domestikos* of the *exkoubitai* of Hellas.⁸⁶ Peter is otherwise unknown, but his title and office are relatively minor ones, as Kekaumenos himself emphasizes.

Attitudes toward Westerners changed soon after the reigns of Basil II and Romanos III. In the mid-eleventh century, Hervé Frankopoulos (lit. “a young Frank” or “the son of a Frank”) was one of the leading commanders of the Byzantine army:⁸⁷ Skylitzes relates how he requested the title of *magistros* (i.e., one level higher than *patrikios*), but Emperor Michael VI turned him down with contempt.⁸⁸ Later Hervé reached his goal: on a seal he is named *magistros, vestes* and *stratelates* of the Orient.⁸⁹ He headed a contingent of Franks and owned an estate called Dagarabe located in Armeniakon.⁹⁰ It is probable that “the illustrious magnate called Francopoulos,” known from the chronicle of Matthew of Edessa, who defeated the Turks and was eventually drowned in the Mediterranean by the order of [Constantine X] Doukas,⁹¹ was the same Hervé. During the reign of Romanos IV Diogenes, “the Frank Krispinos,” that is, Robert Crépin, of the lineage of Grimaldi, had commanded the right wing of the Byzantine army in the battle against the rebel Khachatur;⁹² later he acted independently and clashed with the imperial troops. He was arrested and exiled to Abydos, and in vengeance his soldiers revolted and pillaged Mesopotamia. Attaleiates and, following him, the Continuator of Skylitzes call Crépin a *Latinos* from Italy.⁹³ The third outstanding Norman commander in Byzantine service at the same time was Roussel de Bailleul, Ourselios/Rouselios of Greek texts. Bryennios calls him a Frank, a lieutenant of Crépin, while in Attaleiates and in the Continuation of Skylitzes Roussel appears as a Latin in charge of a Frankish contingent of four hundred men.⁹⁴ In another passage, however, Attaleiates seems to have applied to Roussel a different ethnic term, *Frankos*.⁹⁵ Anna Komnene defines Roussel as a Celt or barbarian, but does not specify him as a Frank.⁹⁶ On a seal he is titled *vestes* and defined as Frankopoulos,⁹⁷ but later he became his own master and refused the high title of *kouropalates* offered to him by Emperor Michael VII.⁹⁸ An influential commander, he was the force behind the proclamation of the Caesar John Doukas as emperor in 1074.⁹⁹

⁸⁶ Kekaum. 280.15–22.

⁸⁷ G. Schlumberger, *Récits de Byzance et des croisades* (Paris, 1922), 71–77.

⁸⁸ Skyl. 484.41–47.

⁸⁹ G. Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1884), 656–60.

⁹⁰ Skyl. 485.52.

⁹¹ Trans. A. E. Dostourian, *Armenia and the Crusades: Tenth to Twelfth Centuries* (Lanham, Md., 1993), 99–101.

⁹² *Nicéphore Bryennios, Histoire*, ed. P. Gautier (Brussels, 1975), 135.5 (hereafter Bryen.).

⁹³ Attal. 122.22, 170.21; E. Th. Tsolakes, *Ἡ συνέχεια τῆς χρονολογίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου Σκυλίτζη* (Thessaloniki, 1968), 134.2–3 (hereafter Skyl. Cont.).

⁹⁴ Bryen. 147.23–24; Attal. 183.11–12, 269.4; Skyl. Cont. 157.6–7.

⁹⁵ Attal. 186.18.

⁹⁶ *Alexiad* 1:10.4, 12.1.

⁹⁷ Schlumberger, *Sigillographie*, 660–63.

⁹⁸ R. Guiland, “Études sur l'histoire administrative de l'empire byzantin,” *Byzantina* 2 (1970): 220.

⁹⁹ See on him, C. Diehl, “Les aventures d'un chef normand en Orient,” *Revue des cours et conférences de la Faculté des lettres de Paris* 20 (7 Dec. 1911): 172–88; D. Polemis, “Notes on the Eleventh-Century Chronology,” *BZ* 58 (1965): 66–68.

Less famous than these generals was the “Frank Otton” (Otos), who was granted land by Nikephoros III; some time later, when Otton joined the conspiracy of a certain Pounteses, his land was confiscated.¹⁰⁰ As for Pounteses, he is mentioned by Anna Komnene;¹⁰¹ he is usually identified as Raoul de Pontoise, a Norman commander who deserted to the Byzantines soon after 1082, but this identification does not seem to be valid.¹⁰²

The stream of Norman mercenaries continued under Alexios I. According to Anna, the emperor attracted to his camp Guido (Guy Hauteville), a son of Robert Guiscard (Bohemond’s stepbrother), having promised the Norman money, honors, and a brilliant marriage.¹⁰³ Guido became Alexios’ councillor: in 1098, when the emperor learned that the Crusaders in Antioch were in a predicament, he summoned first of all “Guido, Bohemond’s brother.”¹⁰⁴ In the legendary *Tale of Antioch*, Guido is presented as a close friend and seneschal of the emperor.¹⁰⁵ The brothers Raoul¹⁰⁶ and Roger deserted to Byzantium ca. 1080. Anna defined the latter as a noble Frank,¹⁰⁷ while Nicholas Kallikles devoted to him a poem “On the grave of the *sebastos* Rogerios.” According to this poem, Alexios I conferred upon Roger, who originated “from the Frankish land,”¹⁰⁸ “seas of gold,” glory, and a high title, as well as imperial connections (he was married to a woman from the lineage of the Dalassenoi, related to the Komnenoi). Possibly he is the same person as Roger, son of Takoupertos (Dagobert), one of the dignitaries who signed the treaty of Devol in 1108.¹⁰⁹ He was, most probably, the founder of the Normano-Byzantine lineage of the Rogerioi.¹¹⁰

More confusing is the evidence concerning Raoul. Albert of Aachen relates that Rudolf (Raoul?), “the Wolf’s Skin,” and Rotger (Roger), son of Dagobert, Franks by origin, served as Alexios I’s envoys in 1096.¹¹¹ If Dagobert’s son is, most probably, the above-mentioned founder of the lineage of Rogerioi, some scholars consider Rudolf his brother;¹¹² indeed, Roger had a brother Raoul. Albert, however, does not imply that the envoys of 1096 were brothers. It is also difficult to prove that Humbert, son of Graoul, also a signer of the treaty of Devol,¹¹³ was a descendant of Roger’s brother. The Raoul

¹⁰⁰ *Actes de Lavra*, vol. 1, ed. P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, et al. (Paris, 1970), no. 45.9–13 (hereafter *Lavra*).

¹⁰¹ *Alexiad* 2:22.10–29.

¹⁰² See objections by Marquis de la Force, “Les conseillers,” 161 f, supported by McQueen, “Relations,” 444 f.

¹⁰³ *Alexiad* 2:51.10–12.

¹⁰⁴ *Histoire anonyme de la première croisade*, ed. L. Bréhier (Paris, 1924), 142.

¹⁰⁵ *La Chanson d’Antioche* (Paris, 1848), 1:79, 89, 2:156.

¹⁰⁶ On him, see F. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d’Alexis Ier Comnène* (Paris, 1900), 64 and esp. n. 2.

¹⁰⁷ *Alexiad* 3:101.14.

¹⁰⁸ *Nicola Callicle, Carmi*, ed. R. Romano (Naples, 1980), no. 19.10.

¹⁰⁹ *Alexiad* 3:138.28. On this treaty, Ja. N. Ljubarskij and M. M. Frejdenberg, “Devol’skij dogovor 1108 g. mezhdu Alekseem Komninom i Boemundom,” *Viz Vrem* 21 (1962): 260–74. The authors abstain from identifying the signers, “natives of the western lands.”

¹¹⁰ On this lineage, see L. Stiennon, “Notes de la titulature et de prosopographie byzantines: A propos de trois membres de la famille Rogerios (XIIe siècle),” *REB* 22 (1964): 184–98.

¹¹¹ PL 166:415c; cf. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1925), no. 1188.

¹¹² A. Ch. Chatzes, *Oi Ραούλ, Πάλ, Πάλατ* (Kirchhain N.-L., 1909), 10.

¹¹³ *Alexiad* 3:139.1.

family became a mixed Normano-Byzantine lineage, but they did not play a part commensurate with that of the Rogerioi: in 1138 a certain Leo Raoul compiled a manuscript of Theophylaktos' commentary on the Gospels;¹¹⁴ much later, in 1195, the *sebastos* Constantine Raoul-Doukas, a high-ranking relative of the ruling dynasty, was a supporter of Alexios III's putsch.¹¹⁵

During the reign of Alexios I, many other Westerners held high positions in the Byzantine army and at the imperial court. Constantine [H]oumbertopoulos, Robert Guiscard's brother, commanded the *tagma* of the Franks.¹¹⁶ The *sebastos* Marinus of Naples, in Anna's words a member of the family of Maistromilioi, was the first among the Byzantine signers of the treaty of 1108;¹¹⁷ he was followed by Roger, son of Dagobert (see above), and Peter Aliphas, described by Anna as a warrior glorious in battles and faithful to the emperor.¹¹⁸ Modern historians of the Crusades usually identify him as the Provençal knight Peter of Aulps.¹¹⁹ The *Anonymous History of the First Crusade* calls him Petrus de Alpibus,¹²⁰ thus making the identification plausible; in Orderic Vitalis, however, he appears as Peter de Alfia (that has nothing to do with Aulps) and possibly (in another passage) Petrus Francigena¹²¹ (= Greek "Frankopoulos"). Accordingly Marquis de la Force considered him a close relative of Robert, Norman lord of Chiazza and Alifa. The *Anonymous History* states that *omnes seniores* granted Peter "a certain beautiful and rich city," usually identified as Placentia, formerly Comana.¹²² Peter was the founder of the Byzantine lineage of Petraliphai: Niketas Choniates narrates that four Petraliphas brothers, men of Frankish descent, who settled in Didymoteichon in Thrace, distinguished themselves during the siege of Kerkyra in 1149.¹²³ The later *Song of Belisarios* preserved a tradition that the Petraliphai were an insignificant family from Didymoteichon,¹²⁴ but in the days of Manuel I the Petraliphai were far from insignificant: the *sebastos* Alexios, *vestiarites* in 1166, was a general,¹²⁵ as was Nikephoros.¹²⁶ Later (ca. 1200?), Nikephoros Komnenos-Petraliphas conferred on the monastery of Xeropotamos a *sigillion*¹²⁷ in which he is twice titled *sebastokrator*; there is no ground to question his title, as did B. Ferjančić.¹²⁸ The *sigillion* confirms the donation by Nikephoros' grand-

¹¹⁴ H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, vol. 1.1 (Berlin, 1902), 262.

¹¹⁵ On him, see D. Polemis, *The Doukai* (London, 1968), 172 f.

¹¹⁶ *Alexiad* 1:152.2-4.

¹¹⁷ *Alexiad* 3:101.9-10, 138.28. His name is a distortion of the Latin term *magister militum*.

¹¹⁸ *Alexiad* 3:101.15-17.

¹¹⁹ For instance, R. Grousset, *Histoire des croisades*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1934), 31 n. 2; S. Runciman in *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton, vol. 1 (Philadelphia, 1955), 297; M. Zaborov, *Vvedenie v istoriografiju krestovyx pokhodov* (Moscow, 1966), 225.

¹²⁰ *Histoire anonyme de la première Croisade*, ed. L. Bréhier (Paris, 1924), 60.

¹²¹ *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. M. Chibnall, vol. 5 (Oxford, 1975), 66; cf. vol. 4 (1973), 34.

¹²² S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1953), 191.

¹²³ NikChon 83.81-83.

¹²⁴ E. Follieri, "Il poema bizantino di Belisario," in *La poesia epica e la sua formazione* (Rome, 1970), 632.226-27.

¹²⁵ PG 140:236D; cf. Kinnam. 292.15.

¹²⁶ Kinnam. 260.22-23.

¹²⁷ F. Dölger, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges* (Munich, 1948), no. 33 = *Actes de Xeropotamou*, ed.

J. Bompaire (Paris, 1964), no. 8.

¹²⁸ B. Ferjančić, "Sevastokratori u Bizantiji," *ZRVI* 11 (1968): 147 n. 26.

mother Maria Tzousmene Komnene; according to J. Bompaire, Maria (died in 1144) was a daughter of the emperor John II; she married Nikephoros' father. Another Petraliphas, baptized John, was also a *sebastokrator*, if we believe the late and legendary *vita* of Theodora Petraliphaina: under the dynasty of the Angeloi he served as a governor of Macedonia and Thessaly.¹²⁹

Anna lists some other mercenaries who signed the treaty of 1108: Richard of Principat (Printzitas), a brother of Robert Guiscard, and several obscure persons: Guillaume Ganetzes, Joffroy Males, and Paul Rhomaïos. Marquis de la Force thinks that the latter was not a Byzantine by birth but originated from Rome, a thesis that cannot be substantiated.

It is a common perception that Alexios' grandson Manuel I was a Latinophile.¹³⁰ Both Niketas Choniates and Eustathios of Thessalonike stressed that Manuel attracted to his court foreigners from various corners of the world; the difference between the two writers consists only in the evaluation of the emperor's policy. Niketas is unhappy at the privileges bestowed upon the "half-barbarians" (μιξοβάρβαρος), whereas the native Rhomaïoi, experienced warriors, were neglected; on the contrary, Eustathios praises Manuel for summoning men from different countries.¹³¹ Some Westerners confirm this evidence of the Greek authors. William of Tyre, a writer well informed about the situation in Constantinople,¹³² eulogizes Manuel I for his extreme love of the *Latinus populus*; the late emperor, says the archbishop of Tyre, scorned the effeminate *Greculi* and trusted only the Latins, whose merits and strength he highly appreciated.¹³³ Robert of Auxerre is even more straightforward: according to him, Manuel led only Latins on his expeditions and crowned them with the highest honors of his palace.¹³⁴ The Continuator of Sigebert of Gembloux writes that Manuel's son [Alexios II] imitated his father and like him spurned Greeks and loved Latins; he used their advice and support, their theology and legal knowledge.¹³⁵ In the same vein, Walter Map asserts that Manuel assembled in his capital the Franks of all nations.¹³⁶ But strangely enough, prosopographical data to some extent contradict or place in question the unequivocal evidence of Greek and Western sources.

¹²⁹ For the *vita* of Theodora see PG 127:904AB. On John Petraliphas, see D. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epirus* (Oxford, 1957), 215 f. For some additional notes on the Petraliphai, see E. Branousse, review of *Guillaume de Pouille*, in *Athina* 65 (1961): 327, and E. Patlagean, "Une sainte souveraine grecque: Theodora impératrice d'Épire (XIIIe siècle)," *BSI* 56 (1995): 453–60.

¹³⁰ G. Ostrogorskij, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich, 1963), 314 f, speaks of Manuel's "westliche Orientierung" and calls him "Westler." On the scholarly evaluation of the Komnenoi, see A. Kazhdan, "Zagadka Komninov," *Viz Vrem* 25 (1964): 53–98. Important corrections to the common concept of Manuel's policy with regard to the Westerners were suggested by P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), 107 f, who emphasizes that the mixture of races was typical not only of the empire of Constantinople but of several other states of the 12th century.

¹³¹ NikChon 209.44–49; *Fontes rerum byzantinorum*, ed. V. Regel and N. Novosadskij (St. Petersburg, 1892–1917; repr. Leipzig, 1982), 81.5–11.

¹³² See on him, A. Kazhdan and M. Zaborov, "Gijom Tirkij o sostave gospodstvujushchego klassa v Vizantii (konec XI–XII v.)," *Viz Vrem* 32 (1971): 48–54.

¹³³ *Guillaume de Tyr, Chronique*, chap. 22:11.14–19, ed. R. Huygens (Turnhout, 1986), 1020.

¹³⁴ MGH, SS 26:246.49–51.

¹³⁵ MGH, SS 6:421.40–42.

¹³⁶ Walter Map, *De nugis curialium* (Oxford, 1914), 87.

Among the leading military commanders under Manuel I as well as his father John II, Western mercenaries were infrequent. Only two significant personages can be ranked among them, but their role was ephemeral and they were active only at the very end of Manuel's reign: first, in 1176 Baldwin, a brother of Manuel's second wife, commanded the right wing of the Byzantine army at Myriokephalon, where he fell in battle;¹³⁷ second, Renier/Rainerius of Montferrat moved to Constantinople in 1179, married Maria, Manuel's daughter, the next year, and was invested with the title of caesar and given the new name of John Komnenos.¹³⁸ Some Western chroniclers affirm that Renier was granted as a "fief" the city of Thessalonike and donned a regal crown.¹³⁹ Most probably, Western informants confused the caesar's coronet with the imperial headgear. The legend of the regal crown may have originated in Maria's title, "porphyrogenitas empress" that she bore until the coronation of her younger brother Alexios II.¹⁴⁰ In a manuscript in St. Petersburg (Public Library, Greek no. 512), there is a note that characterizes the "purple-born" Maria as the ruler side by side with her brother-emperor.¹⁴¹ The legend also could have perversely reflected a later event, the establishment of the Kingdom of Thessalonike conferred upon Boniface of Montferrat. We may surmise that Renier obtained some rights over Thessalonike,¹⁴² or that the couple stayed in Thessalonike for some time after the wedding,¹⁴³ but all this is no more than a guess. William of Tyre, the most reliable Latin informant concerning affairs in Constantinople, knows nothing about the fief of Thessalonike, and relates only that Manuel married Maria to Renier and rebaptized him John in honor of John II Komnenos.¹⁴⁴ P. Magdalino, referring to a document issued by Boniface in 1204, assumes that Renier actually received the "fief" of Thessalonike;¹⁴⁵ Boniface, however, speaks in the act of Manuel's grant of the *totum feudum* given to his father (*patri meo*), that is, William VI of Montferrat, and not to Renier, who was Boniface's brother. Furthermore, the document does not imply that William's fief incorporated Thessalonike; Thessalonike appears only in the next clause dealing with the *possessiones* of the inhabitants of this city.

After Manuel's death Maria and her spouse acquired extraordinary political influence, and even plotted to demote Alexios II (or at least his favorite, the *protosebastos* Alexios

¹³⁷ NikChon 180.85–86, 181.7–13.

¹³⁸ R. Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, vol. 2 (Amsterdam, 1967), 32. Cf. G. Usseglio, *Imarchesi di Monferrato in Italia ed in Oriente durante i secoli XII e XIII*, vol. 1 (Monferrato, 1926), 156 f.

¹³⁹ *Roberti de Monte* (= Robert of Torigny) *cronica*, MGH, SS 6:528; cf. as well the chronicles of Sicard of Cremona (MGH, SS 31:173), Salimbene (MGH, SS 32:3), and Albert Milioli (MGH, SS 31:643).

¹⁴⁰ See, for instance, the act of 1167: N. Wilson and J. Darrouzès, "Restes du cartulaire de Hiéra," *REB* 26 (1968): 24.7–12.

¹⁴¹ E. E. Granstrem, "Katalog grecheskikh rukopisej leningradskikh khranilishch," *Viz Vrem* 23 (1963): 173, no. 321.

¹⁴² H. Grégoire, "Empereurs belges ou français de Constantinople," *Bulletin de la Faculté des lettres de Strasbourg* 25.7 (1947): 24 f; C. Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 19. A. Laiou, "A Byzantine Prince Latinized: Theodore Palaeologus, Marquis of Montferrat," *Byzantion* 38 (1968–69): 387, describes Renier's right as *pronoia*.

¹⁴³ S. Runciman, "Thessalonica and the Montferrat Inheritance," *Gregorios ho Palamas* 42 (1959): 28.

¹⁴⁴ *Guillaume de Tyr, Chronique*, ed. Huygens, chap. 22:4.38–39, p. 1010.

¹⁴⁵ G. L. F. Tafel and G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1856), 513; see Magdalino, *The Empire*, 100 n. 311.

Kommenos). After bloodshed in the streets of Constantinople caused by their attempt in 1181 or 1182, the parties reached an agreement. The triumph was of short duration: both Renier and Maria perished as soon as Andronikos I took power.

We know less about other Western contemporaries of Manuel I, unless we count such Hellenized families as the Rogerioi, Petraliphai, and Raoul. To them we may possibly add the lineage of Gifard (Giphardos), which bore a non-Greek name and could be of Norman descent.¹⁴⁶ They served in the army: a certain Gifard was a *hypostrategos*¹⁴⁷ and participated in the war against the Serbs in 1149/50. Alexios Gifard (the same man or another?) was a correspondent of George Tornikes; he held the post of governor of Thrakesion in the 1150s. Ca. 1158 Alexios Gifard went on a diplomatic mission to the sultan Kiliç Arslan II.¹⁴⁸ Leo Gifard is known only by a seal of the twelfth or thirteenth century; neither his title nor office is indicated.¹⁴⁹ The lineage of Gidoi comes to the fore after Manuel's death: Alexios Gidos held the high post of *domestikos* of the Orient under Andronikos I and *domestikos* of the West under Isaac II; in 1194 he led Byzantine troops against the Bulgarians.¹⁵⁰ Another Gidos, Andronikos, unsuccessfully commanded a contingent at the beginning of the thirteenth century.¹⁵¹ No text treats the Gidoi as foreigners; their name, however, resembles that of Guido, but it is not possible to demonstrate that they were descendants of the son of Robert Guiscard. W. Hecht even questions the Western origin of the Gidoi.¹⁵²

Our sources do not always bother to name a Westerner whom they describe. Niketas Choniates narrates how Emperor John II ordered his nephew John to give his horse to an anonymous Western warrior who is characterized as a notable from Italy and then as a Latin.¹⁵³ Another anonymous Westerner, identified as an "axe-bearer of Celtic origin," is said to have arrested the fugitive sons of John Batatzes who revolted against Andronikos I.¹⁵⁴ In other cases the name is preserved but biographical information is minimal: thus a document of 1162 mentions a threshing-floor in the area of Thessalonike that belonged to the archon John Moliscott;¹⁵⁵ the name sounds "Western," but we know nothing about this modest official and landowner.

Comparison of the information about Western generals under the "Latinophile" Manuel I with data on commanders of the second half of the eleventh century leads to an unexpected conclusion. Leaving aside those "Latins" who became assimilated into the Byzantine milieu and only preserved their "barbaric" family names, the Westerners under Manuel lost rather than gained social status: not only did the number of high-ranking military commanders diminish while the highest military positions fell into the

¹⁴⁶ J. Darrouzès, in *Georges et Dèmètrios Tornikès, Lettres et discours* (Paris, 1970), 150 n. 1.

¹⁴⁷ Kinnam, 94.7; cf. 108.21.

¹⁴⁸ Kinnam, 176.10.

¹⁴⁹ V. Laurent, *Les bulles métriques dans la sigillographie byzantine* (Athens, 1932), no. 59.

¹⁵⁰ Guillard, *Institutions*, 1:408 f.

¹⁵¹ NikChon 641.45–46.

¹⁵² W. Hecht, *Die byzantinische Aussenpolitik zur Zeit der letzten Komnenenkaiser* (Neustadt a.d. Aisch, 1967), 85.

¹⁵³ NikChon 35.40–51.

¹⁵⁴ NikChon 264.64.

¹⁵⁵ *Lavra*, 1: no. 64.36–37.

hands of the Komnenian clan, but the Westerners lacked the independence typical of such pugnacious mercenaries as Hervé and Roussel; neither are we told about any attempts to create feudal principalities such as had been the aim of several Norman generals before the Komnenian upsurge. The Komnenoi tamed the relentless spirit of earlier “Franks” and transformed them into obedient servants of the empire.

Let me emphasize that this conclusion does not mean that the number of Westerners decreased under Manuel. Just the opposite occurred, for the figures we have from the twelfth century—with all their exaggeration—show how enormous was the influx of Westerners into Byzantium. Eustathios of Thessalonike thought that the number of Latins in Constantinople reached sixty thousand.¹⁵⁶ Gregory Abu al-Faraj (Bar Hebraeus) counted thirty thousand “Frankish” merchants in the capital, adding, however, that “on account of the great size of the city they were not conspicuous therein.”¹⁵⁷ According to Western annals, twenty thousand Venetians fled Constantinople after the hostilities of the 1160s; supposedly more than ten thousand Venetians were arrested in Byzantium in 1172.¹⁵⁸ The Genoese chronicle of Caffaro contains more modest figures, calculating the Pisans and Genoese in the “royal city” as one thousand and three hundred respectively.¹⁵⁹ Thus the number of Westerners in the empire of the twelfth century was high, but their social status seems to have changed: few were high-ranking military commanders, merchants formed the majority, and prosopographical data demonstrate that the Westerners played an important part in diplomatic service as emissaries and interpreters and as ideological advisers of Manuel. According to my calculations,¹⁶⁰ in the mid-eleventh century at least fifteen “Latin” generals are mentioned (and only one translator); during the reign of Alexios I, twelve generals and five councillors, some of whom could exercise military functions as well. The social pattern of known Westerners in the administration of Manuel I is different: six military commanders, two or three civil officials, five diplomats, and an interpreter. For the short span at the end of the twelfth century, besides the ephemeral activity of Conrad of Montferrat¹⁶¹ (Renier’s brother) and that of the lineage of Gidoi, I traced three Westerner-generals (the evidence is pretty obscure), six diplomats, one translator, and one patriarch of Venetian descent. The list of “Latins in imperial service” during the reign of Manuel I as independently established by P. Magdalino¹⁶² follows the same pattern. Besides the Rogerios, Petraliphas, and Raoul families, Magdalino counts two Westerners in military service. The first is the Genoese knight William sent in 1156 to recruit Genoese pirates, that is, not a direct military command; the second is Roger “Sclavone,” *dux* of Dalmatia and Croatia, *lidzios* of Manuel I in 1180. Ja. Ferluga identified him as Roger “Sclavus,” the natural son of the count

¹⁵⁶ Eustazio di Tessalonica, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica*, ed. S. Kyriakidis (Palermo, 1961), 34.2.

¹⁵⁷ *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj*, trans. E. A. W. Budge, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1932), 358.

¹⁵⁸ *Historia ducorum Veneticorum*, MHG, SS 14:78; see H. F. Brown, “The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter in Constantinople to the Close of the XIIth Century,” *JHS* 40 (1920): 82.

¹⁵⁹ MGH, SS 18:33.

¹⁶⁰ Kazhdan, *Social'nyj sostav*, 217 f.

¹⁶¹ On him, see Th. Ilgen, *Markgraf Conrad von Montferrat* (Marburg, 1880); Usseglio, *I marchesi di Monferrato*, 1:150–53; Brand, *Byzantium*, 18–20, 80–84.

¹⁶² Magdalino, *The Empire*, 222 f.

Simon, who in 1161 revolted against the Norman king William I and soon went into exile.¹⁶³ The Norman origin of the man dubbed “Sclavone” is not ascertained, albeit not impossible; it is noteworthy that Roger, like Renier and Baldwin, was active at the very end of Manuel’s reign.

Magdalino lists three interpreters, including Leo Tuscus who, with his brother Hugo Eteriano, was not simply one “of Manuel’s agents”: the brothers, professional theologians, served as the emperor’s spiritual advisers.¹⁶⁴ Eight men in Magdalino’s inventory are emissaries or diplomatic envoys, the best known of them being the Genoese Baldovino Guercio.¹⁶⁵ There is some possibility that the young Baldovino remained in Byzantium as a soldier in the service of John II, although it is hard to imagine that the man who negotiated with Alexios III in 1193 was the same Baldovino who accompanied the Genoese embassy to John II in 1142. His activity is primarily connected, however, with diplomatic missions sent both by Manuel I to the West and by the Ligurian republic to Constantinople.

Manuel I was a Latinophile but only to a certain extent: he entrusted the command of the army primarily to his relatives, although in his late years some Western generals may appear in top positions. It is even possible that Turkish commanders had a greater role in Manuel’s army than their Western counterparts.¹⁶⁶ Latins of his reign were first of all ordinary soldiers and merchants, while in the administration of the empire they held posts primarily in the diplomatic service.

Summing up, we may formulate the following observations. (1) Up to the eleventh century, the Byzantines treated the western world as consisting of separate countries and peoples or tribes; the idea of the unity of the West developed only in the eleventh century and was expressed in the introduction of the generic term *Latinoi* that encompassed all western peoples. Another generic ethnonym, *Keltoi*, popular with Anna Komnene, did not withstand the test of time. (2) The term *Frankoi* was used as a specific designation of individual peoples; to begin with, it was applied to the Germanic tribes settled on the territory of ancient Gallia, then to the population of Gallia in general, and eventually to the Normans of Italy, reflecting the historical fact of their invasion from the land north of the Alps. (3) The Franks/Normans penetrated Byzantine military service en masse in the eleventh century, when Norman mercenaries assumed a leading role in the Byzantine army. Their generals, using ethnic contingents as their base, were more or less independent; they attempted to obtain not only high titles but also territories, and they dared to revolt against the central administration. (4) The Komnenoi managed to suppress this

¹⁶³ J. Ferluga, *Byzantium on the Balkans* (Amsterdam, 1976), 209 f and 420; cf. D. Abulafia, “The Crown and the Economy under Roger II and His Successors,” *DOP* 37 (1983): 13. Previously, Ferluga, *Vizantijska uprava u Dalmaciji* (Belgrade, 1957), 141 f, was inclined to consider Roger a Slav and a feudal lord of Dalmatia; see, however, objections in a review by M. Klaić, *Historijski zbornik* 13 (1960): 254.

¹⁶⁴ See A. Dondaine, “Hughes Ethérien et Léo Toscan,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge* 19 (1952–53): 67–134; cf. his “Hughes Ethérien et le Concile de Constantinople de 1166,” *HJ* 77 (1958): 473–83.

¹⁶⁵ On him, see G. W. Day, *Genoa’s Response to Byzantium, 1155–1204* (Urbana–Chicago, 1988), 110–13. Day’s statement that Baldovino received a *pronoia* from Manuel cannot be substantiated, but he was granted some estates.

¹⁶⁶ On the Turks under John II and Manuel I, see C. Brand, “The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh–Twelfth Centuries,” *DOP* 43 (1989): 5–11.

independent spirit of the Norman mercenaries. On the one hand, the Franks entered the elite of Byzantine society, entered into marital contracts with members of the Komnenian clan, created mixed families, and became Hellenized. On the other hand, after the reign of Alexios I, foreigners were deprived of their commanding role in the army and exchanged their military career for diplomatic service; possibly, the last years of Manuel I witnessed the reverse process, and this return to the eleventh-century situation continued during the reign of Andronikos I and the dynasty of the Angeloi. The mercenaries (like the eunuchs),¹⁶⁷ who were pushed away from the highest echelons of Komnenian society, then began to recover the positions they had lost under the chivalric Komnenoi.

Dumbarton Oaks

¹⁶⁷ On the social destiny of eunuchs that chronologically parallels that of Westerners, see A. Kazhdan, "Sostav gosподstvujushchego klassa v Vizantii XI–XII vv. Anketa I chastnye vyvody, VI: Evnukhi," *Antičnaja drevnost' i srednie veka* 10 (Sverdlovsk, 1973): 184–94.