

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)INTRODUCTION. ROGER II: A
CONTROVERSIAL RULER

————— • —————

The period from 1050 to 1200 has been described as a ‘turning point in European and German history’.¹ In terms of German history we think mainly of the Investiture Contest and its consequences, and the struggle between empire and papacy. From the European perspective we think of the development of the urban communes, the schism between the eastern and the western Church, the Crusades, and the development of the universities. In the early Middle Ages the Christian west was put on the defensive mainly by the expansion of the Arabs, but also by the attacks of the Vikings and Hungarians (Magyars). It was only by making a great effort that the Christian west was able to fend off an invasion by these peoples. Since the eleventh century it had prepared for a kind of ‘counter attack’. A number of different factors, not least the massive growth in population, contributed to the western borders starting to expand. The most important change was the reconquest of the Mediterranean, hitherto ruled by the Arabs, the *mare nostrum* (‘our sea’) of the Romans, the birthplace of western culture.

The Normans played a decisive role in this development. Coming from Scandinavia, they had settled in Normandy in the tenth century and had been subsumed by the Frankish–Christian culture. They took part in the Crusades, and in southern Italy and in Sicily they founded a new and novel state. At the same time they conquered England where a Norman kingdom also emerged. The circumstances in which this kingdom was created were very different from those in southern Italy, even though certain similarities can be established. The same is true of the principality

¹ Fuhrmann (1986), 39. See also Violante and Fried (1993).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)

of Antioch, founded by the Norman Bohemond in 1098, which was to last for just as long as did the much better-known Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Whilst the Norman principality of Antioch has only occasionally attracted the interest of scholars, the Norman foundation of the state in southern Italy has benefited from a long history of scholarly study.

What is important from the German point of view is the fact that the kingdom of Sicily was united with the Romano-German empire by the emperors of the Staufien dynasty. As a result of Henry VI marrying Constance of Sicily in 1186, Roger II became the grandfather of Frederick II on his mother's side, alongside Frederick I Barbarossa on his father's side. The monarchy created by Roger II has been viewed by British scholars as part of a Norman 'commonwealth', by the French as 'an astonishing chapter in the history of the French aristocracy outside of France', ('un curieux chapitre de l'histoire de la noblesse française hors de France'), while for the Italians it has appeared as a precursor of the Italian national state. As a point of intersection of the Latin-western European, Byzantine-eastern and the Islamic-oriental culture, Norman Sicily has even recently aroused the interest of a Japanese historian.²

By the beginning of the twentieth century the Norman state in southern Italy and its founder Roger II were already proving extremely interesting to European historians. According to Erich Caspar in his 1904 monograph about Roger II – in many ways still the leading work on the subject – Roger II was 'the strong man whom strife-torn Sicily needed'. This historian from Berlin saw in the foundation of the Norman-Sicilian monarchy 'the historically appealing spectacle of a young, strong, rapidly rising power: it rose quickly from the ruins of decayed states, first conquered its immediate neighbours, then it encountered increasingly greater opposition, exerted a growing influence over a wider area, finally it asserted itself after dangerous battles against a world of enemies, and entered the circle of the established powers as a recognized equal member'. Here, an implicit comparison was made between the Norman kingdom and the Hohenzollern monarchy, the new German empire, which wanted to secure for itself 'amidst a world of enemies' a place amongst the European great powers.³

Three years later (1907) Ferdinand Chalandon published his two-volume history of Norman rule in southern Italy, which was also based on thorough knowledge of both primary sources and modern scholarship. For

² Douglas (1969, 1976), Brown (1984), especially 6–8, Chalandon (1907), I.I. Fonseca (1979), 16–18, reprinted in Fonseca (1987), 289–91. Takayama (1993), based on his Yale PhD thesis of 1990.

³ Caspar (1904), vii, 236. Caspar described Roger as 'the first statesman in the modern sense', 'the first medieval prince who was not a knight', and as 'this first absolute monarch of the medieval west', *ibid.*, 436, 438.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Roger II: a controversial ruler*

3

the French the Norman period was ‘par sa grandeur inouïe’ (‘because this period was so extraordinary’) the most brilliant phase in the history of southern Italy. In 1912 a biography of Roger was included in the British series ‘Heroes of the Nations’. This book by Edmund Curtis was written for the general public, and it met with little response amongst academics since it was largely limited to a summary of the findings of Chalandon and Caspar. A study of the Norman administration of southern Italy by Evelyn Jamison (1877–1972), which appeared in 1913, was quite different, providing new source material, and the author remained faithful to this subject throughout her life. Apart from that, interest in Roger and his kingdom seemed largely exhausted after the First World War.⁴

There was no new impetus until 1954 when a conference was organized in Palermo to commemorate the 800th anniversary of the death of Roger II. Important progress came in 1966 with a study of legal history by Mario Caravale, as well as in a series of conferences: in 1972 in Palermo on the 900th anniversary of the Norman capture of the city; and from 1973 onwards with the bi-annual ‘Giornate normanno-sveve’ which take place in Bari. Meanwhile, an interested layman, the Englishman John Julius Norwich, published a two-volume history of the Normans in southern Italy (1967–70), which was aimed at the general reader. It was soon translated into other languages and went through several editions.⁵

Judgements on Roger II have varied considerably. The right-wing historian Antonio Marongiu credited him with creating a medieval ‘model state’, a forerunner of the early modern state. He referred specifically to Jacob Burckhardt, who had seen in the Sicilian kingdom of Frederick II a ‘model’ for the Italian Renaissance states. Another right-wing historian, Léon-Robert Ménager, arrived at a diametrically opposed judgement. He believed that Roger’s state did not have any original characteristics; he also disputed its dependence on the Byzantine model, as emphasized for instance by Josef Deér.⁶

The most recent assessments are also controversial. In 1989 Errico Cuozzo endorsed Marongiu’s opinion and spoke of the ‘conception of an absolute monarchy based on bureaucracy’; he argued that even more so than Frederick II, Roger regarded his kingdom as a ‘work of art’. However, in 1992 Donald Matthew was largely in agreement with Ménager’s

⁴ Chalandon (1907), II.742. See the bibliography for full details of these other works.

⁵ Fonseca (1979) assesses the historiography up to 1977. Cf. Norwich (1967), xi: ‘Why is it that one of the most extraordinary and fascinating epics of European history between the ages of Julius Caesar and Napoleon should be so little known to the world at large?’

⁶ Marongiu (1964, 1973), Ménager (1959, 1969), criticized by Elze (1964). Cf. Deér (1972), 169: ‘a rare synthesis of ancient Norman traditions... with the Byzantine ideas, that is with East Roman political and ecclesiastical concepts’.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)

argument that the kingdom of Sicily was not an original creation. Roger did not have a definite concept as his starting point when he founded the state – he largely improvised, following available structures and models. Jean-Marie Martin (1994) regarded it as a state with an ambivalent structure: on the one hand western and ‘feudal’, on the other hand eastern and bureaucratic; a monarchy which was western in its structure, but in its heart was eastern, that is its court was oriental.⁷

Roger was controversial even amongst his contemporaries. For the so-called Saxon annalist, who is identified with the abbot Arnold of Berge and Nienburg (d. 1166), he was ‘Rokker, a certain tyrant of Sicily’ and ‘a semi-pagan’. He was viewed in similar terms in Magdeburg as ‘the tyrant Ruoker’. However, another German monk, from Pöhlde in Saxony, painted a more positive picture. He called Roger (*Rozierus*) ‘King of Apulia’ and praised his piety. The great religious reformer Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) regarded him as an upstart whose support had been bought by the antipope Anacletus II ‘for the ridiculous price of a usurped crown’. In a letter to the emperor Lothar III this influential Cistercian abbot called Roger ‘the Sicilian usurper’ and ‘an intruder in the empire’. Bishop Otto of Freising (d. 1158) expressed similar views a few years later. It is true that after Roger’s kingdom had been recognized by the pope, Bernard of Clairvaux did change his opinion. He hoped that its ruler would support his order in southern Italy: ‘Your Royal Highness has spread far and wide across the earth. In fact, where has the renown of your name not spread? . . . Oh King! You have the light of my eyes, my heart and my soul.’⁸

Although John of Salisbury (d. 1180) did not describe this ruler directly as a tyrant, he nevertheless considered him to be one: ‘In the manner of

⁷ Cuzzo (1989a), 639, 655, with reference to Mazzarese Fardella (1966), 22. However, Tramontana (1983), like Caravale (1966), stresses that ‘feudal’ jurisdictions still continued even under Roger II; cf. Matthew (1992), 208–9, Martin (1994), 78, 287. Giunta (1982), provides a biographical sketch, without footnotes, while neither Tessitore (1995) nor Musca and Iorio (1997) have much claim to scholarship.

⁸ *Annalista Saxo*, MGH SS vi. 770–4; cf. Schmale (1978). *Annales Magdeburgenses*, MGH SS xvi. 185. *Annales Palidenses*, MGH SS xvi. 77, 83, 88–9. In the Middle High German poem *König Rother* the protagonist, like Roger II, ‘thanks to his force and intelligence shows himself superior to the Byzantine emperor’, Schreiner (1992), 573. However, the model here was probably not Roger II but the Lombard king Rothari (636–52), see Störmer (1992), 592. Bernard of Clairvaux, ‘Lettere’, *Opere di S. Bernardo*, ed. F. Gastardelli (Milan 1986–7), vi, no. 127, to Duke William X of Aquitaine, c. April 1131; no. 130, to Pisa c. 1134–5, ‘the evil of the Sicilian tyrant’; nos. 139–40, c. 1135–6; nos. 207–8, to Roger, after c. 1142. [English translations of all but the first of these letters in *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, ed. B. Scott James (London 1953), 201–2, 210–11, 348–9.] Otto of Freising, *Chronica* II.19, p. 90, ‘invasor imperii’. Cf. Wieruszowski (1963), 64–6.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Roger II: a controversial ruler*

5

other tyrants' Roger had oppressed his country's church. The judge Falco of Benevento was a critical opponent of the 'Godless king'. He described in his chronicle, amongst Roger's other misdeeds, the destruction of the vineyards around his home town and the starving out of his fellow citizens: 'We call on the eternal king and judge of all as a witness that to our knowledge not even the cruellest pagan emperor Nero committed such slaughter amongst the Christians.' Nor did the Byzantines have a high opinion of Roger. The historian John Kinnamos did not refer to him as a king at all, only as the tyrant of the Sicilians or of Sicily. Another writer, Theodore Prodromos, denounced him as the 'tyrant of a small toparchy of apes'.⁹

However, the 'History' of Abbot Alexander of Telese, a work commissioned by one of the Roger's sisters, gave a positive picture the king. His rise from count to duke and finally king was depicted as an act of divine Providence. His rule was justified by the necessity of restoring law and order in the political chaos of southern Italy. It was to the king's credit that he brought anarchy to an end there. In a letter to Roger, Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, is of the same opinion: 'Where once Saracens, robbers and thieves wreaked havoc, there is now peace and tranquillity', in short 'a peaceful and very pleasant kingdom like that of the peacemaker Solomon'. It is with good reason that the ruler can be counted amongst the 'great kings'. For the so-called 'Hugo Falcandus', author of the history of the kingdom of Sicily in the years after the death of Roger II (1154–69), the king was the embodiment of a model which his incompetent successors should have taken as their example. He represented the virtues of the ideal ruler: intelligence, wisdom, energy and justness.¹⁰

However, in the Middle Ages Roger was mainly painted in dark colours, particularly his deviation from the knightly canon of virtue which was the European ideal of a good ruler. On the other hand, a great deal of what his contemporaries viewed in the most negative light is regarded as positive by modern historians: his relentless ability to assert himself, his independent stance against the papacy, his receptiveness to Arab culture, and his innovations in legislation and administration.

⁹ *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, trans. M. Chibnall (London 1956), c. 32, p. 66. *Falco*, 158, *rex nefandus*. For Falco, Loud (1993), D'Angelo (1994), and the introduction to the edition. John Kinnamos, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Manuele Comnenis gestarum*, ed. C. Meineke (Bonn 1836), II.4, 12; III.5, 12; IV.2; = *Deeds of John and Manuel Komnenus by John Kinnamos*, trans. C. M. Brand (New York 1986), 38, 58, 80, 94, 107. For the citation from Theodore Prodromos, see Mathieu (1954), 65, cf. Pertusi (1977), 93–5, Bernardinello (1975), 53–5. Cf. also Theodoros Prodromos, *Historische Gedichte*, ed. W. Hörandner (Vienna 1974), 21ff.

¹⁰ For Alexander, see Oldoni (1979), 269, Cilento (1981), 172ff. Delogu (1981), 186ff. *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, no. 131, pp. 300–1 (1142), cf. *ibid.* no. 90, p. 231 (1139). *Falcandus*, 57–8; cf. Cantarella (1994).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)

In order to achieve a balanced judgement on the historical significance of Roger II we must reconsider the sources used in research up to now. The foundations for this enterprise are now reasonably good. Thus, in the course of his work on the collected charters of the Kings of Sicily (*Codex diplomaticus regni Siciliae*), which he founded with Francesco Giunta and André Guillou, Carlrichard Brühl has examined and edited Roger's Latin documents. Jeremy Johns has undertaken a revision of the Arab sources. It is regrettable that we do not yet have a critical edition of the Greek charters, which probably account for about half of the entire production of the royal chancery. We suspect that Roger II issued more diplomas than his contemporary western European monarchs. Nevertheless, only around 150 of his charters from forty-one years of independent rule are preserved, making an annual average of 3.6. We must therefore assume exceptionally high losses in transmission.¹¹

The narrative sources are fairly well edited, this of course includes not only the Latin but the Greek and Arab as well. In the last few decades Roger's legislation and the ecclesiastical, economic and social history of the kingdom have been the subject of intensive research. The art and architectural evidence of multicultural Sicily have also repeatedly attracted the interest of scholars of a variety of nationalities.¹²

It goes without saying that this book is not in the true sense a biography. The personality of Roger II is reflected only in his deeds and statements, as they are transmitted to us by contemporary or later sources. We can only suspect what he felt, what he thought, and what he wanted. However, it is possible to put him into his historical context. This is important because recent research has increasingly accepted the view that the rulers of the Middle Ages were not 'the men who made the history', but were enmeshed 'in a complex network of relationships with political and social forces' and hence had only limited scope for independent action.¹³

Modern research therefore shows the development of the relationships which Roger found when he came to rule. The Norman conquest of

¹¹ Brühl (1978), 17–18, 22. Falkenhausen (1980a), Brühl (1983a), 18. Brühl estimated the proportion of Greek charters as 75–80 per cent of the total, Enzensberger (1995a), as 'more than 50 per cent'. Brühl (1994) 378 estimates the number of Roger II's diplomas that have been lost as about 1,350. For the Greek charters, see most recently Falkenhausen (1998b).

¹² See the primary sources and bibliography of secondary works at the end of this volume. On legal issues see especially the works by Caravale, Dilcher and Zecchino; on the Church, those by Fonseca, Houben, Kamp and Loud; on economic and social history, Abulafia, Bresc, Falkenhausen, Johns, Martin and Takayama; on art and architecture, Brenk, Deér, Kitzinger, Meier and Tronzo.

¹³ Quote from Beumann (1985), 7. For the 'margins of manoeuvre' [*Handlungsspielräume*] and 'modalities of action' [*Wirkungsweisen*] of a sovereign, see also Haverkamp (1992), 11 ff.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Roger II: a controversial ruler*

7

Sicily was mainly the work of his father, Roger I, whilst he owed the preservation of his inheritance to his mother, Adelaide, who after the death of her husband held the regency until Roger II came of age. After the extinction of the dynasty of the Dukes of Apulia, founded by his uncle Robert Guiscard and whose vassal the Count of Sicily was, Roger II was able to succeed to their inheritance, against the wishes of his papal overlords, and then unite the whole of southern Italy, including the old Lombard principalities of Salerno and Capua, under his rule.

The papal schism of 1130 prepared the way for the creation of the kingdom, something which was regarded by many contemporaries as a violation of the traditional, divinely willed order. By prudent action and as a result of a series of fortunate circumstances Roger managed to secure his kingdom despite the opposition of the pope, the Roman and Byzantine emperors, many of the nobility, and the towns. He was also able to bring under his rule the north African coast lying directly opposite to Sicily, bringing him the (unofficial title) of a 'King of Africa'. However, in the eyes of the Roman and the Byzantine emperors, as well as those of the European kings, Roger remained an upstart; and his attempt to use the Second Crusade to integrate his kingdom into the society of the established monarchs of the west met with only limited success. Nevertheless, by the end of Roger's lifetime the kingdom of Sicily had become a reality which could no longer be ignored.

This study will examine the nature of this new monarchy, including its cultural aspects, representations of its ruler, its legislation, administration and economy. It will then address the question of the later destiny of the kingdom, which fell to the Staufens by a dynastic accident, namely the childless death of Roger's grandson William II. It was then linked by Henry VI in a personal union with the Romano-German empire. Under Frederick II, a grandson of Roger II through his mother Constance, the kingdom of Sicily would continue to play a central role in the history of Europe for several decades.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)

I

THE INHERITANCE

ROGER I, THE CONQUEROR

Roger II was left a considerable inheritance by his parents. His father, Roger I (c. 1040–1101) had created a comital lordship in Calabria and Sicily, which allowed him to become a desirable ally to the ruling houses of Europe. As the youngest of twelve sons of a minor Norman nobleman, Tancred of Hauteville, Roger I could not count on any inheritance. In 1055 he followed his brothers who had sought and found their fortune in southern Italy. In the 1090s Geoffrey Malaterra, a Norman monk, who had settled in the cathedral monastery of Catania, wrote a history of the Norman conquest of Sicily, in which Roger I stood at the centre. He reported that the future count had come to the south at a young age.¹

The first Normans had arrived in southern Italy about the year 1000. When returning from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem they had helped Prince Guaimar III of Salerno (989–1027) to defend that town against the Saracens. This Lombard prince rewarded them handsomely and invited them to stay. Around 1016 other Normans undertook a pilgrimage to the

¹ *Amatus* III.43, p. 159, suggests that Roger came to Italy after the battle of Civitate (1053), although according to *Malaterra* I.19, p. 18, this was only after the death of his brother Humphrey (1057). This latter claim cannot be accepted insofar as, according to the letters of Jewish merchants from Sicily, the conquest of the Island, undertaken by Roger some time after his arrival in the peninsula, was already under way by 1057; see Gil (1995), 120ff. One should therefore correct the chronology, based on *Malaterra*, in Chalandon (1907), I.150–2. *Malaterra* suggests that Roger came to Italy while of *juvenilis aetas*, for which cf. Hofmeister (1926), 315ff, suggesting that he was born c. 1040. The notice in *Romuald*, 202, that he was aged fifty-one when he died in 1101 (and thus was born c. 1050) cannot therefore be accurate. Cf. also Matthew (1981), 266.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Roger I, the conqueror*

9

shrine of St Michael on Monte Gargano in northern Apulia. There they met Melus, also called Ishmael, the leader of an anti-Byzantine rebellion in Bari, who asked them for help as he tried to free his native town from the rule of the Byzantine emperor. Nor did the Normans have any hesitation in making their military skills available to him. At first they met with some minor success, but at the battlefield of Cannae, which had once witnessed the victory of Hannibal over the Romans, they were defeated by Byzantine troops in 1018. Melus fled to Germany and requested help from Henry II (1002–24). It is possible that the emperor enfeoffed Melus with the duchy of Apulia. However, before Henry was able to set off for the south with an army, Melus died at Bamberg in 1020.²

The first Norman to achieve rank and reputation in southern Italy was Rainulf I Drenkot (d. 1045). In 1030 the Duke of Naples, Sergius IV, gave him his sister, the widow of the Duke of Gaeta, in marriage and enfeoffed him with the newly created county of Aversa. Aversa, lying half way between Capua and Naples, was the only town in southern Italy to be founded by the Normans. Otherwise they settled in already existing communities. After the death of his wife in 1034 Rainulf changed sides. He married a niece of the Duke of Naples's enemy, Prince Pandulf IV of Capua (1026–49), and became his vassal. However, he soon changed sides once more; now he supported Prince Guaimar IV of Salerno (d. 1052). In May 1038 Guaimar's rule was recognized by the emperor Conrad II (1024–39), who enfeoffed him in Capua with the county of Aversa. Later, in 1041, he also received the duchy of Gaeta from Guaimar IV. Around this time the brothers William, known as 'the Iron Arm', and Drogo de Hauteville came to the south and entered the service of the Prince of Salerno.³

Both brothers appear to have soon become a nuisance to Guaimar IV. In 1038 he sent them to Sicily – they were supposed to help the Byzantines

² *Amatus* 1.16–21, pp. 21–8. *W. Ap.* 1.1–34, pp. 98–100. Cf. Hoffmann (1969), and with a different, but far from convincing interpretation, France (1991). The whole issue has recently been re-examined by Loud (2000b), 60–6. *Notae sepulchrales Babenbergenses*, MGH SS xvii.640. On Melus, Chalandon (1907) 1.42–4, Deér (1972), 44ff; for the Armenian origin of his family, Falkenhausen (1982a), 67. Although, as Martin (1993), 520, notes, the name Melus was widely used at Bari, the fact that his son carried the Greek name of Argyros undoubtedly suggests that he belonged to the Byzantine governing class. The gold-embroidered cloak – the so-called 'starred cloak' – given by Melus appears not to have come from southern Italy, as was once thought, but from southern Germany (perhaps Regensburg), Baumgärtel-Fleischmann (1990). The 'description of the world' (*descriptio totius orbis*) embroidered on the cloak, with its characterization of Henry II as the 'honour of Europe' (*decus Europae*) and the wish that his empire would increase, may perhaps reflect the ideas of the donor.

³ *Amatus* 1.41ff, pp. 52ff; II.6, pp. 63ff. Cf. Chalandon (1907), 1.82ff. Houben (1987), 75ff [reprinted in Houben (1989), 46ff]. Cuozzo (1992), 689–92. Taviani-Carozzi (1991), 930ff; (1996), 145ff. Loud (2000b), 74–80.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-65208-7 - Roger II of Sicily: A ruler between east and west

Hubert Houben

Excerpt

[More information](#)

reconquer the island which had now been under Arab rule for two centuries. But there disputes arose over the way the booty was shared out. As a result the Hauteville brothers left the island, along with the other Normans and Arduin, a northern Italian who had led their contingent of troops, and made themselves independent. They settled on the border between the Basilicata and Apulia, in an area that had been under Byzantine rule. The town of Melfi became their 'capital'. Mercenaries started to become conquerors. The twelve most powerful amongst the Normans acquired the title of count. In 1042 they elected William 'the Iron Arm' as their leader, the 'Count of Apulia' – his pre-eminent position was also reflected in his marriage to a niece of Guaimar IV of Salerno.⁴

All this was an affront both to Byzantium and to the German king (and Roman emperor). As the successor to Charlemagne, who had incorporated the Lombard kingdom into his empire, he laid claim to rule the whole of Italy. However, Henry III (1039–56) was forced to grin and bear it. When he arrived in the south in 1047 he could not avoid recognizing the status quo which had been created in the meantime. Drogo of Hauteville (d. 1051), the successor of William 'the Iron Arm' (d. 1046), was enfeoffed with the county of Apulia, and Rainulf II 'Trincanocte' (d. 1048) with the county of Aversa.⁵

The pope wanted to play a role in southern Italy as well. When the population of Apulia appealed to Leo IX (1049–54) for help against the invaders, the latter attempted to drive the Normans out of southern Italy with the aid of German and Byzantine troops. However, in 1053 he suffered a crushing defeat at Civitate in the north of Apulia. As a result papal policy towards the Normans changed. Nicholas II (1058–61) concluded an alliance with the invaders. At the synod of Melfi (1059) he enfeoffed the Count of Aversa, Richard I Quarrel (1050–78), with the principality of Capua, which had been conquered by this Norman leader in 1058 and which had previously been under the lordship of the emperor. At the same time he granted investiture to Robert Guiscard, who had succeeded his brother Humphrey (d. 1057) as Count of Apulia, of the duchy 'of Apulia, Calabria, and in the future, with the help of God and St Peter, of Sicily'. The pope did not make clear from where he derived this right. Probably he drew implicitly on the Donation of Constantine, and perhaps also on Carolingian and Ottonian privileges which had allowed the Roman pontiffs lordship over southern Italy and Sicily. The papal–Norman alliance

⁴ *Amatus* II.8, pp. 66–8; II.14, pp. 72ff; II.29, p. 93. Cf. Chalandon (1907), 1.91ff. Jahn (1989), 24, 42ff. Houben (1993b), 314ff [reprinted in Houben (1996a), 321ff]. Taviani-Carozzi (1996), 168ff. Loud (2000b), 92–9.

⁵ *Amatus* III.2, p. 117. Cf. Chalandon (1907), 1.113. Kehr (1934), 7ff. Deér (1972), 46ff. Loud (2000b), 106–7.