



INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH  
SECTION OF BYZANTINE RESEARCH  
NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION



ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ  
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ  
ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ



# BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA

BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA

ΤΟΜΟΣ 34 VOLUME

GUILHERME WELTE BERNARDO

MICHAEL ATTALEIATES' *ΑΛΒΑΝΟΙ* AND *ΛΑΤΙΝΟΙ*:  
THE SOUTHERN ITALIAN REBELS AND THE CHANGING PERCEPTION  
OF THE NORMANS IN BYZANTIUM

ΑΘΗΝΑ • 2024 • ATHENS

MICHAEL ATTALEIATES' *ΑΛΒΑΝΟΙ* AND *ΛΑΤΙΝΟΙ*: THE SOUTHERN ITALIAN REBELS AND THE CHANGING PERCEPTION OF THE NORMANS IN BYZANTIUM\*

Michael Attaleiates' use of archaic terms to refer to Westerners can easily confuse modern readers, as exemplified by the ethnonym *Ἀλβανοὶ* in two passages of his *History*. This ethnonym sparked a heated debate between Era Vranousse and Alain Ducellier in the 1970s<sup>1</sup>. While Byzantinists generally believed that the term referred to “medieval Albanians”, Vranousse challenged this view. According to Vranousse, those who participated in George Maniakes' army could not be equated with the people associated in the long term with modern Albanians. Instead, she argued that they were Norman mercenaries from southern Italy in the 1020s and 1030s. Her work represented the first serious criticism of the prevailing view that these passages are the earliest evidence of “medieval Albanians”, though Ducellier continued to defend the former interpretation<sup>2</sup>. This intellectual

---

\* This paper presents conclusions drawn from the research conducted for my master's dissertation, which received financial support from CAPES. Several aspects have been revised and improved. I am grateful to Leandro César Santana Neves, Graham A. Loud, Anthony Kaldellis, and Annick Peters-Custot for the several helpful comments and suggestions. I am also indebted to Karolina Santos da Rocha for helping me with the TLG. All remaining errors are mine.

1. For a summary of the debate, see J. QUANRUD, *The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History: Revisiting the Vranoussi-Ducellier Debate*, *BMGS* 45 (2021), 1-17; A. PLASARI, *The Albanians in the attestations from Late Antiquity until the Early Middle Ages*, *Albanian Studies* 2 (2020), 7-52.

2. See E. Λ. ΒΡΑΝΟΥΣΗ, *Οἱ ὄροι “Ἀλβανοὶ” καὶ “Ἀρβανῖται” καὶ ἡ πρώτη μνεΐα τοῦ ὁμωνύμου λαοῦ τῆς Βαλκανικῆς εἰς τὰς πηγὰς τοῦ ΙΑ΄ αἰῶνος*, *Σύμμυ* 2 (1970), 207-254; A. DUCELLIER, *Nouvel essai de mise au point sur l'apparition du peuple albanais dans les sources historiques byzantines*, *Studia albanica* 2 (1972), 299-306.

dispute has lasted for decades without reaching a consensus, as observed by John Quanrud<sup>3</sup>.

Vranousse's conclusions about the identification of the Ἀλβανοὶ in Attaleiates' *History* is somewhat accepted by scholars today, despite the fact that this debate has been scarcely reevaluated in recent times and the association between this people and the Normans is often treated as some established fact<sup>4</sup>. Quanrud himself reignited the debate by advocating the older association between these Ἀλβανοὶ and Albanians. Moreover, the Λατῖνοι in Attaleiates' *History* also present a similar problem. Vranousse associates them to the Lombards, whereas Quanrud argues that they were probably Varangian and/or Scandinavians, and Alexander Kazhdan categorizes them as Franks or Normans<sup>5</sup>. In a recent article, Alexander Olson suggested that both terms Ἀλβανοὶ and Λατῖνοι could refer to

3. QUANRUD, *The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History*, 2.

4. See, e.g., L. MELAZZO, The Normans through their languages, in: *Anglo-Norman Studies XV. Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1992*, ed. M. CHIBNALL, Woodbridge 1993, 244-248, here 246 ("The Normans, the Φράγγοι of Scylitzes, are named Ἀλβανοὶ by Michael Attaleiates."); D. KRALLIS, *Michael Attaleiates and the Politics of Imperial Decline in Eleventh-Century Byzantium* [Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 422, Medieval Confluences Series 2], Tempe, Arizona 2012, 185 ("According to the *History*, he [Maniakes] marched east placing the Romans and the Albans (Norman mercenaries) under his banner ..."), also ID., *Serving Byzantium's Emperors: The Courtly Life and Career of Michael Attaleiates*, Cham 2019, 152 ("The Albans and Latins of Attaleiates' narrative are in fact the Normans and the local Latinate populations."); A. K. OLSON, Working with Roman history: Attaleiates' portrayal of the Normans, *BMGS* 41 (2017), 1-14, here 2, 10 ("It is entirely possible, indeed probable, that in the case of the Sicilian campaign these 'Albans' were Normans ..."), 14. See also the translators' note on Ἀλβανοὶ at *Michael Attaleiates, The History*, trans. A. KALDELLIS – D. KRALLIS [Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 16], Cambridge, MA 2012, 595, n. 11 ("An antiquarian term referring probably to the Normans (from ancient Alba, near Rome), not modern Albanians"). Henceforth quotations from Attaleiates' text follow the critical edition by E. TSOLAKIS, *Michaelis Attaliatae Historia* [CFHB 50], hereafter *Attaliata*, followed by page numbers; corresponding references to chapter and paragraph numbers introduced in KALDELLIS' – KRALLIS' translation [hereafter as Attaleiates, *History*], are added.

5. ΒΡΑΝΟΥΣΗ, Οἱ ὅροι "Ἀλβανοὶ" καὶ "Ἀρβανῖται", 225; QUANRUD, *The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History*, 15-16; A. KAZHDAN, Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century, in: *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. A. E. LAIOU – R. P. MOTTAHEDEH, Washington, D.C. 2001, 83-100, here 86.

the Normans, whilst defending an integrationist Norman agenda in the *History*<sup>6</sup>.

This paper aims to contribute to the continuing debate by re-examining Attaleiates' historical context and bringing Byzantine Romanness into discussion, thus offering new insights into the complex relationship between the medieval Eastern Roman Empire and its Italian neighbors. To shed light on these groups, this study focuses on the rebels of southern Italy, who are typically overlooked in favor of the Norman warriors in the region. Based on the available historical evidence, I argue that the Ἀλβανοὶ should be associated with the Lombards of southern Italy (the "Byzantine Italy"), and that it is necessary to identify two different contexts in which the term Λατῖνοι was used by Attaleiates: the first, related to events from the first half of the eleventh century and associated with the term Ἀλβανοί, pertains to those former Lombard allies; the second, related to later events, associates Λατῖνοι with the Normans ("Franks") coming to the Empire through southern Italy.

### Ἀλβανοί / Λατῖνοι

These groups are specifically mentioned twice in the *History*: at the beginning of the narrative of Emperor Michael IV the Paphlagonian's (1034-1041) military campaigns and in the account of George Maniakes' rebellion in 1043<sup>7</sup>. In the first passage, Attaleiates notes that Roman forces were pressuring the Saracens in Sicily (Arabs) and mourns the fact that, had Maniakes not been unjustly accused of trying to usurp the throne and deposed, the island could have been brought under Roman control. He thus blames the successor commanders for the loss, for they made "wretched and base decisions" (... αἰσχροῦς γὰρ καὶ ἀγεννῶς βουλευσαμένων τῶν ὕστερον στρατηγῶν ...) that caused the Romans to lose the island and most of their army. He then continues: Οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ποτε σύμμαχοι καὶ τῆς ἰσοπολιτείας ἡμῖν συμμιετέχοντες, ὡς καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς θρησκείας, Ἀλβανοὶ καὶ Λατῖνοι, ὅσοι μετὰ τὴν ἐσπερίαν Ρώμην τοῖς ἰταλικοῖς πλησιάζουσι μέρεσι, πολέμιοι παραλογώτατοι ἐχρημάτισαν ἐμπεπαρωνηκότος εἰς τὸν ἄρχοντα τούτων τοῦ τότε τὴν στρατηγίαν ἰθύνοντος Μιχαὴλ δουκὸς τοῦ Δοκαιοῦ.

6. OLSON, *Working with Roman history*, 2.

7. *Attaliata*, 7, 15 = Attaleiates, *History*, 3.1; 5.1.

(*Not only that, but the Albans and Latins who abut upon the Italian regions by the Elder Rome and were previously allies and formed part of our commonwealth, even practicing the same religion, most unexpectedly now became our enemies because the man who held the command, the doux Michael Dokeianos, offended their ruler*<sup>8</sup>).

More recently, John Quanrud returned to the idea that these Ἀλβανοὶ are medieval Albanians by associating the territory of the Albanians with an expanded geographical view of Italy that would encompass this region across the Adriatic<sup>9</sup>. I agree with him when he states that it is highly unlikely that these Ἀλβανοὶ could be Normans, as it is very improbable that Attaleiates would have been startled by a small number of mercenaries and raiders breaking away from the Empire. After all, the Normans were not allies (σύμμαχοι) of the Eastern Romans or participants in an ἰσοπολιτεία with them<sup>10</sup>.

The relationship between the Eastern Roman Empire and its neighboring peoples has been envisioned by Byzantinists in different ways. Dimitri Obolensky used the term “commonwealth” to describe the relationship between the Byzantines and the Slavic peoples as a type of supranational league<sup>11</sup>. Although this view has been criticized as modern fiction, it is noteworthy that Attaleiates employs an extremely uncommon yet similar term to describe the relationship between the Romans of his time and these “Albans” and “Latins”: ἰσοπολιτεία<sup>12</sup>. In the Hellenistic period, it referred to a type of citizenship sharing or transfer between city-states<sup>13</sup>. In the Greco-Roman historiographical context, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century BCE), author of the *Roman Antiquities*, used the term in relation to the granting of citizenship to foreign peoples by Rome, such as

---

8. *Attaliata*, 7 = Attaleiates, *History*, 3.1.

9. QUANRUD, *The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History*, 4-8.

10. QUANRUD, *The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History*, 8-9.

11. D. OBOLENSKY, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453*, New York 1971.

12. For the criticism of the concept of a Byzantine commonwealth, see, e.g., C. RAFFENSPERGER, *Revisiting the Idea of the Byzantine Commonwealth*, *BF* 28 (2004), 159-174; A. KALDELLIS, *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*, Philadelphia, PA 2013, 137-139.

13. S. SABA, *Isopoliteia in Hellenistic Times*, Leiden 2020.

its various neighbors on the Italian Peninsula. The term even appears as a synonym of *πολιτεία*, since legally, this “alliance” is unilateral, unlike that in Hellenic contexts: it is the Romans who make these people part of a single community of Roman citizens<sup>14</sup>.

It is possible that Attaleiates is drawing on the semantics of Dionysius, as some similarities with the *Roman Antiquities* can be noted, particularly in passages where the ancient Latins are related to this *ἰσοπολιτεία*. One example is where the Latins and the Hernici are described as fellow citizens and allies (... τοῖς δ' ἰσοπολίταις τε καὶ συμμάχοις ...) of the Romans in the same sentence, something very similar to Attaleiates' own writing in the excerpt in question<sup>15</sup>. The Byzantine historian also seems to echo a mournful passage in Dionysius about the relationship between the ancient Romans and Latins: δοκεῖ τ' οὐδὲ τὸ Λατίνων συγγενὲς ἔτι βέβαιον ἡμῖν διαμένειν φίλιον εἰς πίστιν ἔλθόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτου πολὺ μέρος διαγγέλλεται νοσεῖν ἔρωτι κρατούμενον, ἧς ἅπαντες γλίσχονται, μεταβολῆς.

(Not even the kindred race of Latins, as it seems, longer remains steadfastly loyal to us, though it entered into relations of confidence with us, but a large part even of this people is reported to be disaffected, succumbing to the passion for change which all men crave)<sup>16</sup>.

Although it cannot be definitively affirmed that this passage, or even Dionysius himself, had a direct influence on Attaleiates, similar ideas are undoubtedly shared. However, it is important to keep in mind that such a relationship which the term *ἰσοπολιτεία* implies, even if not taken literally, is more solid than the relationship that the Eastern Romans had with the Normans in southern Italy at that time (or, indeed, at any time).

Quanrud's attempt to explain who the Ἀλβανοὶ and Λατῖνοι are, is difficult to substantiate. First, the idea of medieval Albanians presents some problems, as there is no evidence of “Albanians” working for Maniakes or

14. P. SANCHEZ, L'isopoliteia chez Denys d'Halicarnasse: nouvelle interprétation, *Chiron* 46 (2016), 47-83. This conception of *ἰσοπολιτεία* is, in fact, completely different from Obolensky' commonwealth.

15. Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities*, VIII, 76.2, text and trans. E. CARY, *The Roman Antiquities* [Loeb Classical Library L372], v. 5, Cambridge, MA 1945.

16. Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities*, VI, 50.2, text and trans. E. CARY, *The Roman Antiquities* [Loeb Classical Library L364], v. 4, Cambridge, MA 1943.

of a “Latin people” being governed or led at the same time by the same person. In fact, the only reference in the *History* that would better fit this association would be of the Ἀρβανῖται mentioned here with the Bulgarians<sup>17</sup>. Second, assuming that the Ἀλβανοὶ are Albanians, he argues that the Λατῖνοι in this passage are the soldiers of the Varangian guard (perhaps of Italian/Norman origin) and/or Harald Hardrada’s men, since, in the Varangians case, they were very closely tied to the Eastern Romans<sup>18</sup>. However, there are no references from this period that describe Varangians or Scandinavians as Latins (or even as Albans, as Olson suggests<sup>19</sup>). For these “Latin Varangians”, he mentions Mikhail V. Bibikov’s interpretation that in Psellos’ *Χρονογραφία*, the Varangians were identified as Italians<sup>20</sup>. Even if a differentiation between the Rus’ and the Varangians was taking place at this time, as Bibikov defends, Psellos identifies two groups of foreign soldiers who supported Alexios Komnenos in his rebellion. The first, which he calls Italians, are probably Normans; the second, the Tauro-Scythians, are generally identified as Rus’<sup>21</sup>. It is not affirmed anywhere that either group or other “Italians” were Varangians. Also, Hardrada, a member of Maniakes’ army and later the King of Norway, is not described as such by the sources<sup>22</sup>. Nordic nobility had contact with the Eastern Romans and sometimes perceived themselves as connected in a religious or political manner. Many were influenced by Constantinople due to the admiration that the nobility had for imperial elements. In the context of the eleventh

---

17. Attaliata, 228-229 (... εἶχε γὰρ καὶ Ῥωμαίων πολλῶν στρατιωτικόν, Βουλγάρων τε καὶ Ἀρβανιτῶν ...) = Attaleiates, *History*, 35.5.

18. QUANRUD, *The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates’ History*, 15-16.

19. OLSON (*Working with Roman history*, 10) suggests that in the second reference to the Ἀλβανοί, which will be seen later, Attaleiates could be referring to the Normans, Varangians, or Scandinavians.

20. M. BIBIKOV, Byzantine sources for the history of Balticum and Scandinavia, in: *Byzantino-Nordica 2004: papers presented at the International Symposium of Byzantine Studies held on 7-11 May 2004 in Tartu, Estonia*, ed. I. VOLT – J. PÄLL, Tartu 2005, 12-28, here 17.

21. Psellos, *Χρονογραφία*, ed. D. R. REINSCH, *Michaelis Pselli Chronographia* [Millennium-Studien 51], Berlin 2014, 7.24 and n. 37, p. 843 (“Gemeint sind Normannen aus Südtalien.”).

22. For Hardrada, see S. JAKOBSSON, *The Varangians: In God’s Holy Fire*, Cham 2020, 75-88.

century, it would be unusual to perceive them in this way<sup>23</sup>. In fact, “Latins” as a general term for those westerners connected to the Pope and the Latin Church, had not yet been adopted, making it highly improbable that Nordics would have been seen as such at that time<sup>24</sup>.

Attaleiates’ use of ethnonyms is not as precise as a modern reader would expect<sup>25</sup>. For example, he sometimes refers to the same peoples using different terms. Arabs are referred to as Arabs, Hagarenes, and Saracens<sup>26</sup>. Seljuk Turks are referred to as Turks, Naphthalite Huns, and Persians<sup>27</sup>. The inhabitants of the German Empire are called *Νεμίτιξοι*, a Slavic term, and they are associated with the ancient Sauromatae<sup>28</sup>, while the Hungarians are likely to be the Sauromatae in the west<sup>29</sup>. The ancient Germans are now Franks, including the ones that are actually Normans<sup>30</sup>. However, regarding the passage about the *Ἀλβανοὶ* and *Λατῖνοι*, it is more likely that Attaleiates is referring generically to the inhabitants of the Byzantine Italy. This is because it appears as though he is lamenting the Roman failure to maintain territories in the Italian regions.

---

23. See D. FÖLLER, *Byzantium and Scandinavia*, in: *A Companion to Byzantium and the West, 900-1204*, ed. N. DROCOURT – S. KOLDITZ, Leiden 2022, 273-299; JAKOBSSON, *The Varangians*, esp. 147-158; S. JAKOBSSON, *The Schism that Never Was: Old Norse Views on Byzantium and Russia*, *BSL* 66 (2008), 173-188.

24. The term *Λατῖνοι* resurged in mid-eleventh-century Byzantine sources, but it was not until the twelfth century that it became settled as a generic appellation for Westerners. See KAZHDAN, *Latins and Franks in Byzantium*, 86. As far as I am aware, the perception of Nordics as Latin Christians appears during the Crusades. See FÖLLER, *Byzantium and Scandinavia*, 284.

25. ΒΡΑΝΟΥΣΗ (*Οἱ ὄροι “Ἀλβανοὶ” καὶ “Ἀρβανῖται”*, 235), claimed that Attaleiates would not use multiple terms to refer to the same group of people, whereas A. DUCCELLIER (*Les Albans dans l’empire byzantine: de la communauté à l’expansion*, in: *Οἱ Ἀλβανοὶ στο Μεσαίωνα*, ed. C. GASPARIS, Athens 1998, 17-45, here 38-39) argued that his use of two ethnonyms for “Albanians”, i.e., *Ἀλβανοὶ* and *Ἀρβανῖται*, might suggest a difference between Albanians more or less acculturated.

26. See, e.g., *Attaliata*, 75 (Arabs), 7 (Agarenes), 87 (Saracens) = Attaleiates, *History*, 16.5; 3.1; 17.7.

27. See, e.g., *Attaliata*, 86 (Turks), 62 (Nephthalite Huns), 82 (Persians) = Attaleiates, *History*, 17.4; 8.1-2; 17.3-4.

28. *Attaliata*, 114 = Attaleiates, *History*, 20.7.

29. *Attaliata*, 53 = Attaleiates, *History*, 12.13.

30. *Attaliata*, 115 (... ἐπαπέστειλε δὲ καὶ Γερμανοὺς, τοὺς λεγομένους Φράγγους ...) = Attaleiates, *History*, 20.9.

During the tenth and eleventh centuries, there was a growing dissatisfaction with the Byzantine administration among the Lombards, which was reflected in a series of events that disrupted the political stability of the region. This has already been well described by historiography. In 987 and 990, two officers holding the position of ἐξκουβίτωρ, named Peter and Mark Theodoros respectively, were assassinated by members of local communities. A year later, one of the individuals involved in the assassination of Theodoros even went so far as to betray Bari, the capital of the Byzantine Italy, and side with the Muslims. Even pro-Byzantine Lombards have been targeted: the πρωτοσπαθάριος Serge, for example, was assassinated by the local inhabitants in 987. After this, it appeared as though the locals were no longer trusted, since, in 999, an officer in Taranto was commended for his steadfast loyalty, in contrast to others who were not. In 1003, a high-ranking Byzantine official was expelled from Conversano, while others joined the Muslims and participated in the looting of the Tricarico region in Lucania. Still, the most severe incident was a large-scale uprising in 1009 that was led by Melus, a Lombard nobleman from Bari. He also fomented another large rebellion in 1017, aided by Norman mercenaries. This revolt was supported by large cities such as Bari and Trani (where a Lombard named Romuald was probably the rebel leader). The Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy was also a prominent voice for the independence movement, since the Archbishop Romuald of Bari had to be exiled to Constantinople with his brother in 1035<sup>31</sup>.

Some years later, the scenario in Byzantine Italy was still chaotic, if not worse. After the death of the κατεπάνω, Nikephoros Dokeianos, in January 1040 at the hands of the *conterati* (professional soldiers led by the local elite), a succession of challenges arose. In May, there was a rebellion in the Taranto region, which resulted in the killing of two high-ranking Byzantine officials. Shortly thereafter, they suffered another blow with the loss of Bari to the Lombard Argyros, the son of the rebel Melus, who had spent some time in exile in Constantinople and became somewhat “Romanized”

---

31. G. NOYÉ, New Light on the Society of Byzantine Italy, in: *Social Change in Town and Country in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, ed. J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, Oxford 2020, 157-195, here 182-185; G. A. LOUD, *The Age of Robert Guiscard: Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest*, London 2000, 28-29.

(but not particularly faithful to the Empire). Arriving at the peninsula in November, the new *κατεπάνω*, Michael Dokeianos, the man mentioned by Attaleiates as responsible for the situation, decided to hang his predecessors' murderer and four other men, in addition to blinding another four. However, the pedagogy of fear he attempted to create with these actions did not work well, since Arduin, his *τοποτηρητής* of Melfi, who presumably had been on Byzantine service for some time and knew how to speak Greek, rebelled in 1041, using his new position to take the city of Melfi for himself and then depart for Apulia<sup>32</sup>. According to Ghislaine Noyé, the executions under the orders of Dokeianos could have provided a pretext for Arduin to summon the Normans and initiate another uprising<sup>33</sup>.

Considering this, Attaleiates may have a point in suggesting that a humiliation suffered by the ruler (*ἄρχων*) of the *Ἀλβανοὶ* and *Λατῖνοι* from Dokeianos worsened the situation. However, it was just another small step in a series of problems that the Empire faced in its territories in southern Italy. This leader is generally identified as the northern Lombard Arduin mentioned above, who once supported Maniakes in leading a group of soldiers, including Normans. According to sources, it was a dispute about booty or wages agreed previously, which resulted in Arduin being flogged<sup>34</sup>.

---

32. LOUD, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, 79-80; NOYÉ, *New Light on the Society of Byzantine Italy*, 76-77.

33. NOYÉ, *New Light on the Society of Byzantine Italy*, 80.

34. Amatus, *L'ystoire de li Normant*, II, XIV-XV, ed. M. CHAMPOLLION-FIGEAC, *L'ystoire de li Normant et la chronique de Robert Viscart, par Aimé, moine du Mont-Cassin*, Paris 1835, 1-259; G. Malaterra, *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii*, I.8, ed. E. PONTIERI, *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii Calabriae et Siciliae Comitis et Roberti Guiscardi Ducis fratris eius*, in: *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, dir. G. CARDUCCI – V. FIORINI – P. FEDELE, v. 5, part 1, Bologna 1927-1928, 3-108; William of Apulia, *Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, I, ed. M. MATHIEU, *La Geste de Robert Guiscard*, Palermo 1961, 108-110; trans. G. A. LOUD, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, 8, available on the website of the Medieval History Texts in Translation project, University of Leeds, <https://ims.leeds.ac.uk/archives/translations/>; Vatican Anonymous, 749, ed. G. B. CARUSO, *Anonymi Historia Sicula a Normannis ad Petrum Aragonensem*, in: *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, dir. L. A. MURATORI, v. 8, Milan 1726, 745-780; Skylitzes, *Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*, ed. H. THURN, *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum* [CFHB 5], Berlin 1973, 426; trans. J. WORTLEY, *John Skylitzes: A Synopsis of Byzantine History*, 811-1057, Cambridge 2010, 21.3; Attaliata, 7 = Attaleiates, *History*, 3.1. A conflict between Maniakes (Gyrgir) and the "Latins" is also alluded in Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla*, 5, p. 581, trans. L. M.

John Skylitzes states that Arduin and his “Franks” were involved in the event, but the historian, William of Apulia, possibly himself a Lombard<sup>35</sup>, asserts that Arduin’s followers were also Lombards, which demonstrates that it is impossible to “Normanize” the entire situation<sup>36</sup>. Furthermore, it is more likely that the dispute occurred during the leadership of Maniakes himself (as indicated by Malaterra, Amatus, the Vatican Anonymous and Snorri Sturluson), and not Dokeianos (as indicated by William, Skylitzes and Attaleiates), since Arduin was elevated to *τοποτηρητής* of Melfi during Dokeianos’ administration<sup>37</sup>. For Jonathan Shepard, Skylitzes and especially Attaleiates were creating pro-Maniakes propaganda, while Dokeianos’ name as the Norman chief foe in 1041 may have eclipsed Maniakes in William of Apulia’s source. For Paul Brown, however, William may have been in contact with Byzantine sources, which is a very plausible considering his cultural and political context<sup>38</sup>.

As Arduin is nominally mentioned by Skylitzes and not Attaleiates, Quanrud believes that these authors are referring to two different events, opening the possibility of separating Attaleiates’ *Ἀλβανοὶ* from Skylitzes’ Franks. Despite this theory, there is no evidence of two distinct events, only a variation in the pieces of information given by different sources. Also, the question of whether Arduin was just a liaison and interpreter and not an *ἄρχων* does not hold much significance if the narrative has already

---

Hollander, *Heimskringla: History of the Kings of Norway*, Austin 1964. See also J. SHEPARD, Byzantium’s last Sicilian expedition: Skylitzes’ testimony, *RSBN* 14-16 (1977-1979), 145-159, here 152-153 (and n. 1).

35. According to P. BROWN [The Gesta Roberti Wiscardi: A ‘Byzantine’ history?, *Journal of Medieval History* 37 (2011), 162-179, here 167], William’s writing certainly demonstrated a Lombard perspective of the Norman invasion, even “Reminding the audience of the Norman debt to Lombard leaders, not to mention that the first few decades of their ‘conquest’ was actually performed in the ancillary role as Lombard mercenaries – facts which are essentially ignored by Amatus and Geoffrey [Malaterra] ...”.

36. Skylitzes, *Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*, 21.3 [426]; William of Apulia, *Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, I, 108-110 [8].

37. LOUD, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, 78-79; SHEPARD, *Byzantium’s last Sicilian expedition*, 152. For the sources, see n. 34 in this paper.

38. SHEPARD, *Byzantium’s last Sicilian expedition*, 152-153, n. 1; BROWN, *The Gesta Roberti Wiscardi*, 171.

been “distorted” by propaganda<sup>39</sup>. By attributing the event to Dokeianos, Attaleiates may have placed Arduin as an *ἄρχων* because he was a local *τοποτηρητής* under this Byzantine official. Leaders of various types of states or groups could be considered *ἄρχοντες*, which is a general term with multiple applications. On the other hand, *τοποτηρητής* is a technical term that specifically refers to the lieutenant of the commander in a *τάγμα*, *θέμα*, or navy<sup>40</sup>. The *Kletorologion of Philotheos* (end of the ninth century) listed the position among other *ἄρχοντες*<sup>41</sup>; and a man named Michael, son of Moroleon, mentioned as a *τοποτηρητής* by the tenth-century *Chronicle of the Logothete*, is placed by Skylitzes as a *ταγματάρχης*, i.e., an *ἄρχων* of the *τάγμα*<sup>42</sup>. So, as a *τοποτηρητής*, Arduin was an *ἄρχων* leading a group of people who could be described at best as *σύμμαχοι* and co-participants of an *ἰσοπολιτεία*.

These eleventh-century rebellions and seditions were not orchestrated by Normans or the like; they involved the leadership and participation of the local elites and inhabitants, who took advantage of Norman military strength. When Argyros deserted to the Empire, he pushed the Normans to take control of the situation<sup>43</sup>. As Noyé said, “... the new conquerors only gradually replaced Lombards alongside the indigenous dissidents ...”<sup>44</sup>. It is known that in both Apulia and Calabria, for example, the local population, whether Lombard or Italo-Greek, was somewhat “integrated” into the Empire, although with different nuances<sup>45</sup>. Therefore, considering that these rebellions

39. QUANRUD, *The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History*, 9-10.

40. J-C. CHEYNET, *Toparque et topotèrètès à la fin du 11e siècle*, *REB* 42 (1984), 215-224, here 217, 222-223; *ODB*, v. 3, entry *Topoteretes* (A. Kazhdan).

41. N. OIKONOMIDES, *Listes de préséance byzantines*, Paris 1973, 110; see also Constantine VII, *Book of Ceremonies*, II.52 [R475, R476], text and trans. A. MOFFATT – M. TALL, *Constantine Porphyrogenetos: The Book of Ceremonies* [ByzAus 18], Leiden 2012.

42. Symeon, *Chronicle*, 136.17, ed. S. WAHLGREN, *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon* [CFHB 44], Berlin 2006, 315 (the text is also present in Theophanes Continuatus, VI.5, ed. I. BEKKER, *Theophanes continuatus; Ioannes Cameniata; Symeon Magister; Georgius Monachus*, Bonn, 1838, 400); Skylitzes, *Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*, 10.4 [214]. For Skylitzes' generalized phraseology, see C. HOLMES, *Basil II and the Governance of Empire (976-1025)*, Oxford 2005, 145-147.

43. LOUD, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, 97.

44. NOYÉ, *New Light on the Society of Byzantine Italy*, 74.

45. See A. PETERS-CUSTOT, *Between Rome and Constantinople: the Romanness of*

were indeed led by integrated local leaders, like Melus, Argyros and even Arduin, who were discontent with the imperial administration in the region, it makes much more sense to view both Ἀλβανοὶ and Λατῖνοι as “integrated” populations of Byzantine Italy. Again, this fits with Attaleiates’ words that they were allies and part of the *ἰσοπολιτεία*, but then became enemies.

The main parameter used by Attaleiates to employ these terms is geographical, as it refers to ancient peoples of the Italian Peninsula in Roman historiography. In fact, as Rustam Shukurov said, “Byzantine knowledge categorized nations by their geographical or, more precisely, *locative* features”<sup>46</sup>. Yet, the use of both terms together as referring to one group of people could be explained by Albans and Latins not constituting two distinct groups. In the *Roman Antiquities*, a possible source of influence on Attaleiates, Dionysius describes the constitution of the Albans as follows: Γένος δὲ τὸ τῶν Ἀλβανῶν μικτὸν ἦν ἔκ τε Πελασγῶν καὶ Ἀρκάδων καὶ Ἑπειῶν τῶν ἐξ Ἥλιδος ἐλθόντων, τελευταίων δὲ τῶν μετὰ τὴν Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν ἀφικομένων εἰς Ἰταλίαν Τρώων, οὓς ἤγεν Αἰνείας ὁ Ἀγχίσου καὶ Ἀφροδίτης. εἰκὸς δὲ τι καὶ βαρβαρικὸν ἐκ τῶν προσοίκων ἢ παλαιῶν οἰκητόρων ὑπολιπὲς τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ συγκαταμιγῆναι. Ὄνομα δὲ κοινὸν οἱ σύμπαντες οὗτοι Λατῖνοι ἐκλήθησαν ἐπ’ ἀνδρὸς δυναστεύσαντος τῶν τόπων Λατίνου τὰς κατὰ τὸ ἔθνος ὀνομασίας ἀφαιρεθέντες.

(The Albans were a mixed nation composed of Pelasgians, of Arcadians, of the Epeans who came from Elis, and, last of all, of the Trojans who came into Italy with Aeneas, the son of Anchises and Aphrodite, after the taking of Troy. It is probable that a barbarian element also from among the neighboring peoples or a remnant of the ancient inhabitants of the place was mixed with the Greek. But all these people, having lost their tribal designations, came to be called by one common name, Latins, after Latinus, who had been king of this country<sup>47</sup>).

---

Byzantine Southern Italy (9th-11th centuries), in: *Transformations of Romanness: Early Medieval Regions and Identities*, ed. W. POHL et al., Berlin 2018, 231-240; EAD., *Convivencia between Christians: The Greek and Latin communities of Byzantine South Italy (IXth-XIth centuries)*, in: *Negotiating Co-Existence: Communities, Cultures and Convivencia in Byzantine Society*, ed. B. CROSTINI – S. LA PROTA, Trier 2013, 203-220.

46. R. SHUKUROV, *The Byzantine Turks: 1204-1461*, Leiden 2016, 18, author’s emphasis.

47. Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities*, II. 2. 1-4, text and trans. E. CARY, *The Roman Antiquities* [Loeb Classical Library L319], v. 1, Cambridge, 1937.

In this author's narrative, the Albans were a conglomerate of peoples who later received a new name in honor of King Latinus. In the broader sense, Albans are Latins. As it is impossible to make two precise parallels between these ancient peoples and Attaleiates' contemporary peoples, the idea that he is using both *Ἀλβανοί* and *Λατῖνοι* in a generalizing and archaizing way to talk about these Italian allies, i.e., the Lombard of southern Italy, is reinforced. This is not even the most peculiar case presented, as Attaleiates refers to the Eastern Romans, i.e., his own compatriots, as Ausonians (*τοὺς Αὐσονας*), a term used by Greek poets to generally refer to the inhabitants of the Italian peninsula<sup>48</sup>. It does not make them Italians but it puts them in parallel with the ancient Romans. The same logic is being applied to the Lombards and the Eastern Romans: by calling the first Albans and Latins, Attaleiates puts them in parallel with these ancient Italian peoples allied with the ancient Romans.

Alexander Olson saw an appeal to a *common ancestry* in this first passage, which would have reflected Attaleiates' desire to promote the integration of the Normans into medieval Roman society, given that the Latins are presented in classical historiography as related to the Romans<sup>49</sup>. But this does not seem to be the case here. Instead, Attaleiates seems to emphasize the *political element* by establishing the parallel mentioned above. Shukurov demonstrated how Aristotle's descriptive models influenced how the Eastern Romans read these peoples, relating contemporary groups to ancient ones through analogy and similarities. This reveals a logic behind this process, which resembles somewhat of a "scientific" approach of the time, a way of apprehending reality, systematizing, and classifying the new<sup>50</sup>. They could thus signify the unknown and propose strategies in relationships with these peoples. In the case of the Byzantine Italy, the cultural memory was used to create a representation of this relationship, making them *σύμμαχοι* and co-participants of the *πολιτεία* in the manner of groups from Antiquity. Even if the fictitious common ancestry could have played a role in this, Attaleiates does not seem to have the Normans in mind.

---

48. *Attaliata*, 165 = Attaleiates, *History*, 27.3.

49. OLSON, *Working with Roman history*, 10-11.

50. SHUKUROV, *The Byzantine Turks*, 11-17.

In summary, it is precisely because of this political backdrop that one cannot assert that these Ἀλβανοὶ and Λατῖνοι were Normans. The terminology employed by Attaleiates implies a connection that was non-existent with the Normans, and the only group that better fits this association in Italy were the Lombards. When he states that these groups even practiced the same religion as the Romans, he is emphasizing proximity<sup>51</sup>. Once connected to the Romans in political and even religious ways, these people had become hostile to them. Only the local Italian conjecture and the Lombards rebellion fit properly into this picture. Still, subsequent passages in Attaleiates' *History* indicate that Norman generals and soldiers could be referred to as Latins, but that is only due to their association with the inhabitants of the south of the peninsula, as some kind of "Latinizing" perception. In fact, there is an important narrative shift in these occurrences which will be addressed later. For now, keep in mind that the Normans are basically Franks in his narrative. That is why Ἀλβανοί/Λατῖνοι and Φράγγοι/Λατῖνοι are grouped into separate sections in this paper.

In the second passage, regarding Maniakes' rebellion during the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1055), Attaleiates states that the general ... ἐκ τῆς ἰταλικῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξανάστας μετὰ τῶν ἐκεῖσε συνόντων στρατιωτῶν Ρωμαίων καὶ Ἀλβανῶν (... rebelled from his base in Italy along with the soldiers he commanded there, both Romans and Albans)<sup>52</sup>. Who were these Westerners who rebelled alongside Maniakes? One may perhaps immediately correlate this passage to the one in *Skylitzes Continuatus* which seems to connect the Franks to those who followed the general when he crossed the sea during his invasion<sup>53</sup>. In his words, Γεώργιος ὁ

---

51. Despite differences in customs and traditions, it would be illogical to claim that the Lombards and Eastern Romans did not belong to the same broad and imagined "Christian religion" during the eleventh century. Attaleiates himself portrays other Latins as morally superior Christians and speaks of a "Christian race" (both for rhetorical purposes, of course). See *Attaliata*, 37 (χριστιανικὸν φύλον), 206 (αἱμάτων χριστιανικῶν) = Attaleiates, *History*, 8.3; 18.2-3.

52. *Attaliata*, 15 = Attaleiates, *History*, 5.1.

53. QUANRUD (*The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History*, 14), for example, observed this as an error of the continuator of Skylitzes ("Furthermore, a reference in Skylitzes Continuatus asserts, among other things, that Maniakes (c.1042) took many Normans (Φράγγοι) with him from Italy to Byzantium to fight in his rebellion."), but I do not read it

Μανιάκης ἐπὶ καταστάσει τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ πραγμάτων ἀποσταλεῖς, παρὰ τῆς αὐγούστης Ζωῆς μάγιστρος τιμηθεὶς, προσηταιρίσατο μὲν Φράγκους πολλοὺς, καθημέρωσε δὲ καὶ τοὺς παρὰ τοῦ Δοκειανοῦ κακωθέντας καὶ ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν ἐν τισι θέμασι τῆς Ἰταλίας παρεσκεύασεν ἐδεδίεσαν γὰρ αὐτὸν πείραν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐν πολέμοις γενναιότητος ἔχοντες. Ἀντάραντος δὲ τῷ Μονομάχῳ καὶ κατηγωνισμένου, οἱ μὲν σὺν αὐτῷ περαιωθέντες τῷ βασιλεῖ δουλωθέντες Μανιακάτοι τε ἐπωνομάσθησαν καὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων πολλοὶ ἐναπέμειναν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ὑπελείφθησαν.

*(When George Maniakes was elevated to the rank of magistros by the empress Zoe and sent to restore the situation in Italy, he attracted many Franks into his service. He appeased the ones who had been mistreated by Dokeianos and got them to lead a peaceful existence in some of the themes in Italy, for they had come to fear him upon sampling his prowess in battle. After he rebelled against Monomachos and was defeated, his followers who had crossed over with him were made to serve the emperor and became known as Maniakatoi. Many remained in Roman territory, while the rest stayed behind in Italy)<sup>54</sup>*

It should be noted that the author does not attempt to rewrite Attaleiates' passage, and there is no need to correlate the passages and see the latter correcting the former's obscure archaisms. The continuator of Skylitzes describes two distinct moments: the first when Maniakes is restored to his position, elevated to μάγιστρος and re-sent to Italy; the second, when he rebels. In the first, Maniakes attracted Franks to his service, and in the second, it is unclear who his allies were when they crossed the Adriatic and accompanied him to the Balkans. There are good reasons to distinguish between these two contexts, as William of Apulia states that the Normans refused to join Maniakes in his rebellion<sup>55</sup>. Also, Jonathan Shepard notes that in his invasion of Sicily in 1038, Maniakes fought alongside Varangians, Rus', Lombards from northern Italy, and other men from Apulia and Calabria, with the Normans being a minority among his allies (based on

this way. See my argument below.

54. Skylitzes Continuatus, ed. E. ΤΣΟΛΑΚΗΣ, *Ἡ Συνέχεια τῆς Χρονογραφίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου Σκυλίτζη*, Thessaloniki 1968, 167; trans. E. MCGEER, *Byzantium in the Time of Troubles: The Continuation of the Chronicle of John Skylitzes (1057-1079)* [The Medieval Mediterranean, 20], Leiden 2020, VI.21.

55. William of Apulia, *Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, I, 127 [15].

Amatus, Leo Marsicanus, and Skylitzes)<sup>56</sup>. In 1042, considering Attaleiates' report, Maniakes fought alongside Romans and Albans. According to a Psellos' encomium to Monomachos, possibly composed in 1043, the general ... ὑποσπᾷ δὲ καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς Ῥώμης οὐκ ὀλίγην ἱππικὴν τε καὶ πεζικὴν δύναμιν, συνάπτει τούτοις καὶ τῆς ἐώας τὸ κράτιστον στράτευμα, καὶ τῆς Ῥωσικῆς μοίρας οὐκ ἐλάχιστον ... (... took under himself not a small cavalry and infantry force from ancient Rome, as well as the strongest army of the East, and not least the Rus' division ...), i.e., Italians, Romans, and Rus'<sup>57</sup>. (In this context, "ancient Rome" is a rhetoric flourish, and can only mean the old Roman territories in Italy, not the city of Rome). Therefore, the groups were not so different after all from that of 1038. Thus, by "Albans", Attaleiates can mean men from Apulia and other local Italians (Calabrians are probably considered Romans here). It is easy to look back at the Norman rise and forget that the local population also had some form of a native defense, albeit weak, apart from the Norman newcomers.

Note that the continuator of Skylitzes refers to this group as the *Μανιακάτοι*, which many understand to be linked to the Normans<sup>58</sup>. However, the term actually refers to a group of soldiers who were with Maniakes, so it is possible that their composition was mixed. If one considers the ethnic diversity of this general's troops and the tension he had with the Normans at the time, that group certainly included other foreign soldiers and the Normans may have been in the minority. Anyway, it is possible that by calling them Albans, Attaleiates wanted to emphasize the

---

56. J. SHEPARD, *The Uses of the Franks in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, *Anglo-norman Studies* 15 (1993), 275-305, here 282. Cf. Amatus, *Chronique de Robert Viscart*, I, 4 [as in n. 34], 263-313; Leo Marsicanus, *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, II, 66, ed. W. WATTENBACH, *Leonis Marsicani et Petri diaconi chronica monasterii Casinensis* [MGH SS 7], Hanover 1846, 551-844; Skylitzes, *Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*, 21.3 [425].

57. Psellos, *Orationes Panegyricae*, 2, 717-720, ed. G. DENNIS, *Michaelis Pselli Orationes Panegyricae* [Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana], Stuttgart 1994. QUANRUD (*The Albanoi in Michael Attaleiates' History*, 14, n. 77), quotes this work, but only to mention the Rus'.

58. See SHEPARD, *The Uses of the Franks*, 283-284; G. THEOTOKIS, *Rus, Varangian and Frankish mercenaries in the service of the Byzantine Emperors (9th-11th c.): Numbers, Organisation and Battle Tactics in the operational theatres of Asia Minor and the Balkans*, *ByzSymm* 22 (2012), 125-156, here 126-127; M. MEŠKO, *Alexios I Komnenos in the Balkans, 1081-1095*, Cham 2023, 38, n. 170.

participation of these local Italians and their connection to the Romans (also, Maniakes' ability to join forces connected to the Romans). Even if there were a few Norman soldiers who had strayed from their main group and joined Maniakes, their presence is irrelevant; what matters is how they were perceived.

Although William of Apulia states that the Normans refused to support Maniakes, he notes that the general arrived in Bari with a large army to negotiate with Argyros and the Normans before their refusal<sup>59</sup>. According to Annick Peters-Custot, the resistance of certain Lombards against the Normans resulted in a less straightforward conquest of Apulia compared to Calabria<sup>60</sup>. Moreover, according to G. A. Loud, after the Lombard Argyros left Bari and became an important member of the court in Constantinople in 1045 or 1046, coastal cities such as Apulia, Bari, and Brindisi remained strongly tied to the Empire against the Normans. Given the fragile state of the Roman troops at the time, the defense of cities under imperial rule certainly relied heavily on local contingents<sup>61</sup>. Therefore, it makes perfect sense that these Albans were in fact Lombards, i.e., the southern Italian chieftains and soldiers co-opted by Maniakes, through any means possible at that time, rather than just a Norman contingent. Even if some Normans were part of this group, Attaleiates' focus would not have been on them, but on the local population who were former allies of the empire.

### Φράγγοι / Λατῖνοι

As previously mentioned, Alexander Olson argues that the Normans were generally perceived as Latins by Attaleiates. This would present the possibility of the Normans being seen in parallel with the Latins of Antiquity, invoking a common ancestry and a possibility of assimilation, since the Romans were also descendants of these Latins<sup>62</sup>. However, in Attaleiates' *History*, the Normans are primarily referred to as Franks. This association carries certain connotations, such as a reputation for a warlike nature, fierceness, and unfaithfulness. When the Normans are called Latins, different nuances are presented which should be analyzed separately. My

59. William of Apulia, *Deeds of Robert Guiscard*, I, 127 [15].

60. PETERS-CUSTOT, *Convivencia between Christians*, 10 in the digital file.

61. LOUD, *The Age of Robert Guiscard*, 99-100.

62. OLSON, *Working with Roman history*, 2, 7, 9-10.

approach here will focus on why the Normans were referred to this way, considering that they were not the traditional bearers of this appellation.

Regarding the first campaign of Romanos IV Diogenes (1068-1071) against the Seljuk Turks, Attaleiates reports that all of the Franks were sent to Melitene by the emperor to block the attacks led by the Turkish commander Afshin. They are described as ... *men who were warlike and enjoyed bloodshed* ...<sup>63</sup>, sent with the purpose of ... *prevail in war through a strong force* ...<sup>64</sup>. This image is repeated in other moments, such as in the confrontation between Doukas and Diogenes, where the former prepared a strong enough force against the latter because ... *προσερρύησαν δὲ τῷ Διογένει τῶν Φράγγων οἱ πλείους κακ' αὐτῶν ἔχειν τὸ ἰσχυρὸν προσεδόκα*... (*the majority of the Franks went over to Diogenes, and because of this they expected that he would be in the stronger position*)<sup>65</sup>.

The Franks are also connected to Robert Crispin, who is described as *Ἄνθρωπος γὰρ Λατίνος ἐξ Ἰταλίας* (“A certain Latin man from Italy”)<sup>66</sup>. In fact, Crispin was not from Italy but from Normandy, having fought alongside the Normans in southern Italy, possibly departing from there to Constantinople<sup>67</sup>. As a result, later on in the text, he appears as a “Frank”<sup>68</sup>. During Diogenes’ second campaign against the Seljuks, he is sent east to spend the winter with his “compatriots” (*ὁμογενεῖς*) who sailed and arrived with him. After that, Attaleiates speaks of his rebellion, reporting his spoils, but emphasizing that no Romans were killed. In the second attack against the rebel, the emperor sends the Bulgarian nobleman Samuel Alousianos to attack Crispin’s camp at Easter while Crispin and his soldiers rested. They end up drawing the *Franks*’ attention, who manage to drive the Romans away, pursuing and capturing some of them. Crispin now appears as the leader of the *Latins*, speaking about the ungodliness of the Romans in spilling Christian blood on a day like that, a viewpoint that Attaleiates

63. *Attaliata*, 85 (... *ἄνδρας αἰμοχαρεῖς καὶ πολεμικοὺς* ...) = Attaleiates, *History*, 17.6.

64. *Attaliata*, 85 (ἐφ’ ᾧ καὶ δι’ ἁδράς δυνάμεως περιγίνεσθαι τοῦ πολέμου) = Attaleiates, *History*, 17.6.

65. *Attaliata*, 131 = Attaleiates, *History*, 21.6.

66. *Attaliata*, 96 = Attaleiates, *History*, 18.2.

67. E. M. C. VAN HOUTS, Normandy and Byzantium in the Eleventh century, *Byz.* 55 (1985), 544-559, here 555-559.

68. *Attaliata*, 131-132 = Attaleiates, *History*, 21.5.

endorses<sup>69</sup>. Some may perceive a religious bias here, but I am not convinced that it is simply their religion that turns them into “Latins”<sup>70</sup>. That would be a major departure from Attaleiates’ Byzantine archaizing bent.

After the parties agreed, the emperor receives Crispin’s declaration of loyalty with happiness due to his ... *courage and his reputation for martial deeds and ability to command. In fact, he had previously encountered great multitudes of Turks and had accomplished exceptionally valiant deeds in close combat*<sup>71</sup>. He then appears as a loyal servant, accompanying the emperor along with some of his soldiers. Crispin, however, ends up being condemned, because, according to Attaleiates, ... *he was accused before the emperor of again planning something cruel and faithless, as was to be expected of his race — for by nature the Frankish race is faithless ...*<sup>72</sup>. In retaliation, his companions, who remained in the fortress in Mavrocastro, invaded Mesopotamia and caused harm to the local population. Among the men who accused him was a prominent Νεμίτζος, that is, a “German”<sup>73</sup>.

Attaleiates presents negative characteristics of the Franks after describing a ruthless act committed by the Romans. He may be using irony or reinforcing his argument about the reasons for the Romans’ failures<sup>74</sup>. What stands out from the text, however, is that Crispin is initially portrayed with tones of moral superiority and invoked as a Latin, not a Frank. He even treats the captured and injured Romans with pity. Later, during the combat between the imperial forces and the Turks, some Franks engage in close combat with their enemies, receiving no help from the Romans<sup>75</sup>. Once

69. *Attaliata*, 96-97 = Attaleiates, *History*, 18.2-3.

70. Note the contrast Attaleiates draws between the Sultan’s treatment of Diogenes and that of Michael VII Doukas. His primary objective is to criticize his contemporaries. Cf. *Attaliata*, 127; 136 = Attaleiates, *History*, 20.25-27; 21.10-13.

71. *Attaliata*, 97 (διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς γενναῖον καὶ πρὸς τὰς πολεμικὰς πράξεις καὶ διατάξεις ἐπίδοξον καὶ γὰρ καὶ Τούρκων προεντυχὼν πληθύνῃ πολλῇ μεγάλας τὰς ἀνδραγαθίας ἐκ χειρὸς ἀπειργάσατο) = Attaleiates, *History*, 18.4.

72. *Attaliata*, 98 (... Διαβληθεὶς δὲ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα καὶ αὐθις ὁμὸν τι καὶ ἄπιστον κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν γὰρ ἄπιστον τὸ γένος τῶν Φράγγων ...) = Attaleiates, *History*, 18.5.

73. *Attaliata*, 98 = Attaleiates, *History*, 18.5.

74. For Attaleiates and the imperial crisis, see KRALLIS, *Michael Attaleiates*, esp. 115-234.

75. *Attaliata*, 99 = Attaleiates, *History*, 18.7.

again, it appears that Attaleiates is subtly questioning the morality of the Romans regarding their allies<sup>76</sup>.

The Franks reappear in the Battle of Manzikert, where they are described as ... *the Germans who are called Franks* ...<sup>77</sup>. They were sent by Romanos IV Diogenes ... *under one of their leaders, a warrior strong of arm, Rouselios by name*, i.e., Roussel de Bailleul<sup>78</sup>. The association between Franks and Germans dates as far back as the late antique scholar Procopius, if not further<sup>79</sup>. This passage shows that Attaleiates understands these Latins differently, that is, they are not southern Italians; they are actually connected to the ancient “Germans”. Later, as mentioned above, Crispin appears as ... *that Frank, Krispinos* ...<sup>80</sup>, now associated with Doukas, who called him from his exile in Abydos to fight against Diogenes, who had exiled him, presenting him with honors and favors to strengthen the alliance. Despite this, Attaleiates’ narrative is “positive”: he highlights Crispin’s bravery in hand-to-hand combat, his strength, superior fervor, noble acts, and the fact that the presence of the general increases the morale of the soldiers<sup>81</sup>. Overall, the Franks also appear as important characters in internal conflicts, as Attaleiates reports that Varangians and Franks fought alongside rebel Bryennios during his rebellion against Monomachos and that “Franks from Italy” were summoned by rebel Basilakes to fight against the emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates<sup>82</sup>.

Around 1051-1052, during the war against the Pechenegs, ... *a certain Latin, who was extremely brave in battle and second to none in understanding what had to be done* was appointed as commander<sup>83</sup>. This could be

---

76. For his criticism of his contemporaries, even comparing them to the more successful ancient Romans, see Attaliata, 149-150 = Attaleiates, *History*, 24.1-5; see also the analysis in KRALLIS, *Michael Attaleiates*, 189-199.

77. Attaliata, 115 = Attaleiates, *History*, 20.9, see n. 30 above.

78. Attaliata, 115 (... *μετά τινος ἡγουμένου τούτων ἀνδρὸς εὐσθενοῦς κατὰ χεῖρα. Πουσέλιος τούτῳ τὸ ὄνομα*) = Attaleiates, *History*, 20.9.

79. See R. STEINACHER, Rome and its created Northerners, in: *Interrogating the ‘Germanic’: a category and its use in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M. FRIEDRICH, M. – J. M. HARLAND, Berlin 2021, 51-53.

80. Attaliata, 132 (... *ὁ Φράγγοις ἐκείνοις Κρισπίνος* ...) = Attaleiates, *History*, 21.5.

81. Attaliata, 132 = Attaleiates, *History*, 21.5.

82. Attaliata, 228 = Attaleiates, *History*, 31.1; 35.4.

83. Attaliata, 29 (... *καὶ τινὰ Λατῖνον, ἀνδρὰ γενναῖον ἐς τὰ μάλιστα κατὰ χεῖρα καὶ*

Hervé Frankopoulos, leader of the Normans during this war.<sup>84</sup> Another Latin appears as the savior of the Christian race in a heroic act when the Seljuk Sultan Tughril tries to attack Manzikert in 1054. The narrative has important nuances and is worthy of evaluation: ἀλλ' ὁ πάντα δυνάμενος καὶ μετασκευάζων πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον θεός, ὁ τὸ Χριστιανικὸν φῦλον περιέπων αἰεὶ, τινὲ τῶν Λατίνων ἰσχὺν καὶ βουλὴν ὑπερτέραν ἐννοίας ἐνέπνευσε καὶ λαβὼν οὗτος ἄγγος τι φέρον ἔνδον τοῦ Μηδικοῦ πυρὸς συσκευήν, τῆς τοῦ ἄστεως πύλης δρομαῖος ἐξήλασε, καὶ καθιεὶς ἑαυτὸν εἰς μέσους τοὺς ἐναντίους, πῦρ τε τῷ στόματι τοῦ ἄγγους ἐναπερείσας, τοῦτο συντριβεῖ πρὸς τὸ μηχανήμα. καὶ αὐτίκα πῦρ ἀναφθὲν ἅπαν ἐξέληξε καὶ κατενεμήσατο .... καὶ παλίνορσος ὁ Λατῖνος πρὸς τὸ ἄστν γενόμενος ἀθιγῆς ἐρρῦσθη τῆς τῶν ἐναντίων χειρὸς καὶ καταδιώξεως. ἐκ τούτου δυσχεράνας ὁ πολεμῆτωρ, καὶ πολλὴν εὐήθειαν τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν κατεγνωκὼς ὅτι τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀνανδρίαν καταψηφίζονται τοσοῦτων ὄντων τὴν ἀρετὴν, εὐθὺς ἄρας ἐκείθεν ἐπὶ τὴν ἰδίαν μετεστρατοπεδεύσατο γῆν.

(But God, who holds the power to do all things and turns everything to our benefit, he who always protects the Christian race, inspired in one of the Latins a powerful plan of superior conception. He took a jar containing the concoction of Median fire, ran out of the gates of the city into the very midst of the enemy, affixed a flame to the mouth of the jar, and smashed it upon the engine. A fire immediately was kindled, ignited, and engulfed the entire engine ... The Latin returned to the city, escaping unharmed from the hands of the enemies who pursued him. Their leader was now furious and accused his subordinates of much foolishness for having thought that the Romans were cowards, when plainly they were exceptionally brave. He immediately departed from there and marched back to his own land<sup>85</sup>).

Given the accusations of cowardice against the Romans in his *History*, it is clear that Attaleiates is indirectly criticizing them again by emphasizing that the sultan attributes bravery to the Romans, when in fact it was a Latin<sup>86</sup>. Attaleiates would likely not have known the sultan's exact

νοῆσαι τὸ δέον οὐδενὸς ἦτονα ...) = Attaleiates, *History*, 7.7.

84. See Skylitzes, *Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*, 21.22 [467].

85. Attaliata, 37-38 = Attaleiates, *History*, 8.3, italics added.

86. For Attaleiates' criticism of his contemporary Romans as cowardly, imprudent, and ruthless, see Attaliata, 88-89, 90; 101-102; 104, 120; 152-153 = ATTALEIATES, *History*,

words, but he presents the sultan as crediting the Romans for bravery, even though it is clearly stated that this courage was shown by a foreigner. This inconsistency can be easily noticed by the reader.

Undoubtedly, Attaleiates invokes the idea of a Christian community, but this does not seem to be evidence of an agenda to defend equality between Latin and Eastern Roman Christians, as this may not even be a matter of concern for the author. Rather, his aim is to criticize the Romans of his time. During Roussel's rebellion, it is even said that Emperor Michael VII Doukas ... προηρεῖτο μᾶλλον τοὺς Τούρκους τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἔχειν καὶ ἄγειν πράγματα ἢ τὸν Λατῖνον τοῦτον ἐν ἐνὶ τοπῷ χωρεῖσθαι καὶ ἀπεῖργειν τὰς ἐκείνων ἐπιδρομὰς (... preferred to have the land of the Romans under the rule of the Turks than to see that Latin ensconced in one place and blocking their raids)<sup>87</sup>. This is not a defense of the Latins, but rather a criticism of Roman inflexibility in failing to overcome wounded pride and in understanding Roussel as a powerful and indispensable military resource, all in pursuit of the greater good of the Empire<sup>88</sup>. Attaleiates himself affirms in another passage that he ... realized that the Romans of our day are neither capable of seizing opportunities, ... nor of deciding everything prudently in the midst of bitter war ...<sup>89</sup>.

It was previously noted that Ἀλβανοὶ and Λατῖνοι are archaic terms. When Λατῖνοι is used in parallel with Φράγγος, it is possible to observe that it creates different nuances in the narrative about those "Frankish" warriors. It changes their representation in the text, portraying them as more Christian and more like allies rather than just unbeatable soldiers. This context was completely different from the first mention of the Ἀλβανοὶ and Λατῖνοι, as in the second half of the eleventh century the Franks/Normans were acting as allies to the Eastern Romans, living and working inside the Empire's eastern territories, and making connections with the emperor. It was an era of integrated Frankish/Norman leaders inside Byzantine politics and

---

17.11, 14; 18.10, 15; 20.17; 24.5. In his *History*, Attaleiates tends to show barbarians standing out morally in comparison to the Romans, particularly regarding mercy, piety, and bravery. See also n. 70-71 in this paper.

87. Attaliata, 153 = Attaleiates, *History*, 25.2.

88. See KRALLIS, *Michael Attaleiates*, 157-169.

89. Attaliata, 90 (οὕτως εἶδον ἐγὼ τοὺς νῦν Ῥωμαίους μῆτε καιρὸν ἀρπάσαι δεδυνημένους ...μῆτε πολέμῳ δρῶμεν κρῖναι) = Attaleiates, *History*, 17.14.

warfare, like the μάγιστρος, βέστης, and στρατηλάτης Hervé Frankopoulos, Robert Crispin (the first deeply connected to Byzantine internal politics; the titles he possibly earned are, however, unknown), and the βέστης Roussel de Bailleul (certainly the most “Romanized” of the three), as well as others who entered into Byzantine service and even married members of noble families in the late century<sup>90</sup>.

It becomes clear that there is something implied which brings these foreigners somewhat closer to the Eastern Romans. Another aspect to consider is their connection to Italy, since it is emphasized that Crispin came from Italy with his contingent, and it is known that Roussel fought alongside the Normans in Sicily before departing for the Empire<sup>91</sup>. As previously noted, Attaleiates also reports the presence of some “Franks from Italy” who fought alongside the rebel Basilakes during his rebellion<sup>92</sup>. Their connection to Italy, alongside their status as allies and Christians, made it possible for them to be referred to as Latins by Attaleiates. The term does not seem to evoke a generalization about all of the groups in the west, since the prominent “German” (Νεμίτζος) mentioned is not referred to as a Latin in any moment, while Crispin and Roussel are. I consider thus geography to be the most significant factor in Attaleiates’ application of the term Λατίνοι to these Normans serving in Byzantium.

### Latins = Italians

Although Attaleiates’ usage of the term is somewhat unique in the eleventh-century Byzantine historiography (at least in the works that have been passed down), evidence supporting this interpretation can be found in other sources. For example, Alexander Kazhdan noted that the term appears in hagiographies from southern Italy, and in the first half of the eleventh century, the Calabrian monk who wrote *The Life of St. Neilos*, a saint from

---

90. S. WIERZBIŃSKI, Normans and Other Franks in 11th Century Byzantium: The Careers of the Adventurers before the Rule of Alexius I Comnenus, *Studia Ceranea* 4 (2014), 277-288, here 284-286. For Roussel disposal toward Byzantine symbols of power, see SHEPARD, *The Uses of the Franks*, 300.

91. See HOUTS, *Normandy and Byzantium*, 555-559.

92. Attaliata, 228 = Attaleiates, *History*, 35.4; Malaterra, *De Rebus Gestis Rogerii*, II.33.

a Greek-speaking family in Rossano, referred to the *Λατίνοι* to distinguish them from the Italo-Greek population: *Ἐξελέξατο δὲ τὴν μετὰ τῶν Λατίνων ἀναστροφὴν, ὥς ἄγνωστος ὦν παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ μηδαμῶς παρ' αὐτῶν τιμώμενος* (*He chose rather to go among the Latins, in the hopes that he would be unknown to them and so receive no honor*<sup>93</sup>). Kazhdan also noticed the term in a passage translated from Latin to Greek (the excommunication letter against the Patriarch Michael Keroularios by the papal legates) in a patriarchal decision written in 1054. In fact, the term appears three times when talking about the “Churches of the Latins” (*Λατίνων ἐκκλησίας*). The rest of the edict mentions only “Italian language” and “Italian characters”<sup>94</sup>. In his second letter to Patriarch Peter III of Antioch, Keroularios also used the term when referring to the excommunication delivered by the papal legates at the altar of Hagia Sophia. He noted how Western religious customs were used as a basis for condemning the Easterners: ... *ὥς μήτε τοὺς πώγωνας παραπλησίως τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τοῖς Λατίνοις βουλομένων ξυρᾶν, μήτε μὴν διακρινομένων μεταλαμβάνειν προσφορᾶς ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων γεγαμηκότων* ... (*... since who are in it [i.e., in the Orthodox Church] do not shave their beards like the Latins, nor hesitate to receive the prosphora from married presbyters* ...<sup>95</sup>). Yet, he does not refer to the legates as Latins, but as coming from the west (if that matters, Humbert of Silva Candida, for example, was “German”, although he served in Italy as a cardinal)<sup>96</sup>. In this context, however, the term is associated with Latin religious customs, which are still linked to the Roman See in Italy. Another contemporary, Michael Psellos used the term to refer to both the ancient Latins and those of his time. He mentions “Latins and Franks” in his *Poem 57 (Against the*

93. *Life of St. Neilos*, 72.3, ed. and trans. R. L. CAPRA – I. A. MURZAKU – D. J. MILEWSKI, *The Life of Saint Neilos of Rossano* [Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 47]. Cambridge, MA 2018.

94. Cf. KAZHDAN, *Latins and Franks in Byzantium*, 85-86. For the patriarchal decision, see *Edictum Pseudosynodi Constantinopolitanae*, ed. C. WILL, *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo undecima composita extant*, Leipzig 1861, 155-168, here 161, 163-164.

95. Keroularios, *Epistulae ad Petrum III Antiochenum*, 2.4, ed. C. WILL, *Acta et scripta*, 172-188.

96. Keroularios, *Epistulae ad Petrum III Antiochenum*, 2.1 (compare to *Edictum Pseudosynodi Constantinopolitanae*, 157).

*Latins*) and criticizes their theology<sup>97</sup>. It is thus implied that Franks and Latins are different groups, despite sharing the same religious traditions. The geographical association becomes even more implicit in Psellos' *Oratio* 19 (*In praise of the Italian*, i.e., John Italos) when he says Ὡς εὖ τῷ Ἰταλῷ, εἰ δὲ βούλοιτο Λατίνῳ καὶ Αὔσονι ... (*How well he did, the Italian, or if he preferred, the Latin and the Ausonian ...*)<sup>98</sup>.

Complementarily, it is possible to extract some information from western sources from this period. In the tenth century, Liutprand of Cremona, a man from Pavia, defined himself as both a Lombard and a Latin<sup>99</sup>. In the eleventh century, another Lombard from northern Italy, Bishop Benzo of Alba, attributed a letter to an Amalfitan patrician named Pantaleon with the following words: *Credo non esse ignotum Latinis et Grecis de concordia inter utrumque principem, Romanum quidem atque Constantinopolitanum, mediante Romano apostolico. Nunc autem quia de finibus orbis terrae venerunt Normanni, conturbantes fraternum foedus indivisibilis imperii, ad dedecus atque communem verecundiam ausi sunt nostra invadere in medio nostrum contumaci praesumptione.*

(*I believe that the agreement between the two princes, the Roman [Germanic] and the Constantinopolitan, mediated by the Roman apostolic [the Pope], is not unknown to the Latins and Greeks. However, now, coming from the ends of the Earth, the Normans, disturbing the brotherly pact of the indivisible empire, to their own disgrace and common shame, dared to invade our midst with insolent presumption*<sup>100</sup>).

In another passage, Benzo also mentions a supposed letter written to him and the Antipope Honorius II by Emperor Constantine X Doukas (1059-1067) stating that: *Per manum enim Malfitani patricii direxit domno*

97. Psellos, *Poem* 57, ed. L. G. WESTERINK, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata* [Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana], Leipzig 1992, 407-415.

98. Psellos, *Oration* 19, ed. A. R. LITTLEWOOD, *Michaelis Pselli Oratoria Minora* [Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana], Leipzig 1985, 69-73.

99. LIUDPRAND, *Embassy*, 12; 57, ed. P. CHIESA, *Liutprandi Cremonensis Opera omnia* [CCCM 156], Turnhout 1998; trans. P. SQUATRITI, *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona* [Medieval Texts in Translation], Washington, D.C. 2007, 246-247; 274.

100. BENZO OF ALBA, *Ad Heinricum IV*, 2.7, ed. K. PERTZ, *Ad Heinricum IV. imperatorem libri VII* [MGH SS 11], Hannoverae 1854.

*Kadalo et michi rescriptum pyticii in hec verba: ... Vos qui estis portitores pueri regis, domini vestri Heinrici, agite cum ceteris fidelibus Teutonicis et Latinis, ut veniat idem dominus vester rex cum centum milibus in Apuliam atque Calabriam ...*

(Through the hands of the patrician of Amalfi, he directed to Lord Cadalus and me a copy of the small letter with these words: ... You who are the bearers of the young king, your Lord Henry, act with the other loyal Teutonic and Latin [followers], so that your Lord king comes to Apulia and Calabria with a hundred thousand [soldiers] ...<sup>101</sup>).

The second passage makes it clear that by Latins, he is referring to the “Italians”, such as the Pope and himself, and by Teutonic, the “Germans”. Also, note that the Normans appear outside of this reality: they are simply described as disturbers who came from the ends of the earth to destroy the concord previously established by Latins and “Greeks”. Although the use of the term by westerners has an archaic element and is possibly attached to a religious and scholarly tradition, it also possesses a strong geographical connotation, since whoever is called Latin is from Italy.

Something similar can be observed in a letter from Pope Gregory VII to his German flock in 1079 in the midst of the tensions between the Papacy and the German Empire: *Pervenit ad nos, quod quidam ex vobis de me dubitant, tanquam in instanti modo necessitate usus sim seculari levitate. Qua certe in causa nullus vestrum preter instantiam preliorum maiores me et partitur angustias et suffert iniurias. Quotquot enim Latini sunt, omnes causam Heinrici preter admodum paucos laudant ac defendunt et pernime duritie ac impietatis circa eum me redarguunt.*

(It has come to our attention that some of you doubt me, as if I were using secular frivolity in an urgent situation. Certainly, in this case, none of you, except in the case of battles, share and suffer as much the greatest anguishes and insults. As many Latins as there are, all praise and defend the cause of Henry [IV], except for a few, and accuse me of excessive harshness and impiety towards him<sup>102</sup>).

It is noteworthy that the inhabitants of the German Empire are not included among the Latins, who, in this context, can only be the “Italians”,

101. BENZO OF ALBA, *Ad Heinricum IV*, 3.23-27.

102. GREGORY VII, *Register*, VII, 3, ed. E. CASPAR, *Das Register Gregors VII* [MGH ES 2], v. 2, Berlin 1923.

i.e., the “Lombards” and the natives of the city of Rome<sup>103</sup>. The same can be observed in the Arnulf of Milan’ *Book of Recent Deeds* written around 1077 (... *Otto [III] set out without delay on the road to Rome along with legions of Latins and Germans, striking terror into all the surrounding areas*)<sup>104</sup> and in the writings of another man born in the Peninsula, the Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury. While Anselm’s *De Processione Spiritus Sancti* of 1102, which recaps his arguments at the Council of Bari in 1098<sup>105</sup>, contrasts *Latins* and *Greeks* (*That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, as we Latins confess, is denied by the Greeks*<sup>106</sup>), his letter to the German bishop Walram of Naumburg on the controversy of the azymes, dated around 1105, contrasts only *us* and *Greeks*<sup>107</sup>.

How did the Normans come to be identified as Latins in the Byzantine perception? Based on the available data, it could be presumed that these “disturbers”, possibly along with other groups from the Kingdom of France, were one of the main western groups to leave their mark in the

---

103. Compare it with this narrative about the following events after the Fritzlar conference in 1079 in Berthold, *Chronicle II*, 1079, trans. I. S. ROBINSON, *Eleventh-century Germany: The Swabian Chronicles* [Manchester Medieval Sources], Manchester 2008, 108-244, emphasis added: *The papal legates, who indeed (so they say) were unwilling participants in these proceedings, at last, laden with magnificent gifts, returned to Rome, although not together and without accomplishing all that they had been sent to do. ... When he [Bishop Udalric of Padua] came before the lord pope, the treacherous hypocrite, wonderfully supplied with every kind of clever inventions and answers, his purpose was not only incidentally to deceive the Lombards and the Romans but also to deceive the pope himself and most diligently to earn the favour of his Henry by whatever means he could.*

104. Arnulf of Milan, *Book of Recent Deeds*, 1.12, ed. C. ZEY, *Liber gestorum recentium* [MGH SRG 67], Hannover 1994, 134; trans. W. L. NORTH, *The Book of Recent Deeds*, 11, available on the website of the Carleton College: <https://acad.carleton.edu/curricular/MARS/Arnulf.pdf>.

105. For Anselm’s role in the doctrinal debate, see A. E. SIECIENSKI, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy*. Oxford 2010, 117-118.

106. Anselm of Canterbury, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, I, ed. F. S. SCHMITT, *Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, v. 2, Edinburgh 1946, 177; trans. J. HOPKINS – H. RICHARDSON, *Complete philosophical and theological treatises of Anselm of Canterbury*, Minneapolis 2000, 466-514.

107. Anselm of Canterbury, *Epistola de Sacrificio Azimi et Fermentati*, passim, ed. F. S. SCHMITT [as in previous n.], 223; trans. J. HOPKINS – H. RICHARDSON [as in previous n.], 515-522.

East<sup>108</sup>. This could have further strengthened the relationship between Latin religious customs and those of the “Franks”. The association between Franks/Normans and Latins could have been facilitated by the fact that they spoke a Romance vernacular language and, more importantly, by their settlement in the Italian Peninsula, which gradually led to their integration into the local population<sup>109</sup>. It is worth noticing that the *Gesta Francorum*, possibly written in 1099, refers to the established Normans of southern Italy as “Longobards”<sup>110</sup>. Thus, “Latins” would gradually include not only the traditional medieval inhabitants of the Italian Peninsula but also these new Gallo-Italian, Italo-Norman residents.

There is both direct and indirect evidence from Latin, Italo-Greek, and even Byzantine sources which supports the idea of a connection between the terms *Λατῖνοι/Latini* and geography in the eleventh century. Attaleiates certainly learned from ancient stories that the ancient Latins inhabited the Italian Peninsula. From contemporary Italians, he probably heard some of them calling themselves Latins or heard a fellow Greek-speaking Calabrian referring to Latin-rite Italians as Latins. His contemporary religious zealots also talked about the Franks’ theological errors, but they were also becoming familiar with the new term through the so-called Latins themselves. Still, nothing polemical or negative appears to be associated with it in his *History*. However, by adopting this archaic terminology, Attaleiates took the opportunity to infuse the idea of Normans serving in the medieval

---

108. See WIERZBIŃSKI, *Normans and Other Franks*, 277-288.

109. For discussions on the origin and identity of the Normans in southern Italy, see G. A. LOUD, How ‘Norman’ was the Norman Conquest of Southern Italy?, *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 25 (1981), 13-34; Id., Norman Traditions in Southern Italy, in: *Norman Tradition and Transcultural Heritage: Exchange of Cultures in the ‘Norman’ Peripheries of Medieval Europe*, ed. S. BURKHARDT – T. FOERSTER, London: 2013, 35-56; P. Z. HAILSTONE, *Recalcitrant Crusaders? The Relationship Between Southern Italy and Sicily, Crusading and the Crusader States, c. 1060–1198*, London 2019. On the Normans in general, see especially C. DAVIS, *The Normans and their Myth*, London 1976; G. A. LOUD, The ‘Gens Normannorum’ – myth or reality?, in: *Proceedings of the Fourth Battle Conference on Norman Studies 1981*, ed. R. A. BROWN, Woodbridge 1982, 104-116, 204-209, with a strong critique of Davis; N. WEBBER, *The Evolution of Norman Identity, 911–1154*, Rochester 2005.

110. E.g., *Gesta Francorum*, I, ed. R. HILL, *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, Oxford 1962, 2-3; trans. N. DASS, *The Deeds of the Franks and other Jerusalem-bound pilgrims: The Earliest Chronicle of the First Crusades*, Lanham 2011, 26-27.

Roman Empire as allies of the Romans, turning the “Franks from Italy”, such as Crispin and Roussel, into “Latins”.

## Conclusions

Michael Attaleiates used the terms Ἀλβανοὶ and Λατῖνοι to make sense of the relationships between the medieval Roman Empire and the contemporary groups in the Italian Peninsula who were associated with it, as he utilized an archaic and stylized language to decode the relationships between them. The rise of the Normans was certainly impactful, but a closer analysis of Attaleiates' language demonstrates a context more intimately linked to the unsuccessful internal politics of the Empire in handling the crises in its territory in southern Italy and the actions of its local players.

It is important to note that Attaleiates was imbued with a historical and cultural idea of Rome, where parallels could be drawn between the medieval Empire ruled from the New Rome and the ancient one ruled from the Old Rome. The concept of *ἰσοπολιτεία* and its implications for how the relationship between the Empire and these peoples in the Italian Peninsula could be thinking, in turn, allows the understanding of how the Roman models of citizenship could have been drawn from ancient sources and infused into different historical and rhetorical contexts. Attaleiates' work thus sheds light on the complex interplay between historical continuity and change in the medieval Roman Empire and how it impacts the way the empire's relations with its neighbors is imagined. The choice of terms such as Albans and Latins to refer to the Lombard communities in southern Italy also reflects an imagined relationship between them and the Eastern Romans in the manner of ancient Rome.

Nevertheless, those Christian northern “Franks” who settled in the southern Italian Peninsula, were becoming Latins in Michael Attaleiates' perception through association with the regional setting, as it was customary to identify groups using ancient geography. These “new Latins” even served as mercenaries and allies in the Empire, playing roles in internal rebellions and plotting their own seditions. For that reason, I argued that it is crucial to identify the two different contexts in which the term Λατῖνοι was used in his *History* to better distinguish the traditional medieval local population, i.e., the Southern Italians who were allied or formerly allied with

the Empire, from the newcomers of Normandy/France, and to avoid erasing the “Lombard” role in the eleventh-century Italian crisis.

I presume that the initial key factor in the evolution of the Latin identification was the integration of other peoples into the broader cultural, linguistic, and religious framework of the Italian Peninsula. In the case of the Normans, they adopted and contributed to the local culture and gradually became integrated within it, probably the same away as Lombards and other groups in the past. But how western sources reacted to this in the long term cannot be answered in this study. This paper only considered how this process may also have been working behind Attaleiates’ perception of the Normans. Yet, it is uncertain whether the Eastern Romans used the term *Λατῖνοι* to refer to the inhabitants of the Italian Peninsula in previous centuries<sup>111</sup>. However, given that Attaleiates found the term useful, it is possible to assume a similar reasoning in its expansion to these “Franks”.

As the term expanded to include new groups and communities over time, it became a more inclusive and expansive identity, highlighting the ways in which different groups can share common cultural and religious ties, even if they do not share all of the same characteristics. By identifying with the Latin Church, people in the west were able to establish a sense of unity and solidarity, even with those who were not strictly “Latin”. This generalized usage of the term can be observed in the following centuries, especially during the troubled period of the Crusades, when all of this gradually crystallized and expanded on a large scale<sup>112</sup>. In other words, this allowed the creation of an umbrella identity that encompassed a range of cultures and ethnicities, whilst still emphasizing the shared values and beliefs of the Roman (Latin) Church and allowing them to contrast the sons of the Roman See with the “Greeks”<sup>113</sup>. While this phenomenon can

---

111. See KAZHDAN, *Latins and Franks in Byzantium*, 84-86.

112. For the period of the First Crusade, see M. BULL, Overlapping and Competing Identities in the Frankish First Crusade, in: *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l'appel à la croisade: Actes du Colloque Universitaire International de Clermont-Ferrand (23-25 juin 1995)*, ed. A. VAUCHEZ, Rome 1997, 195-211, esp. 202-203.

113. See G. E. DEMACOPOULOS – A. PAPANIKOLAOU, Orthodox Naming of the Other: A Postcolonial Approach, in: *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, ed. G. E. DEMACOPOULOS – A. PAPANIKOLAOU, New York 2013, 1-22. For the Eastern Romans as “Greeks” in Western Sources, see, for example, L. SARTI, From Romanus to Graecus. The identity and perceptions

be observed in twelfth-century Byzantine sources<sup>114</sup>, it cannot be projected without due attention paid to those of the eleventh century. At that time, the term *Λατίνοι* was still rarely used and, as argued in this paper, it primarily had a geographical meaning.

---

of the Byzantines in the Frankish West, *Journal of Medieval History* 44 (2018), 1-20; A. PETERS-CUSTOT, L'Autre est le meme : qu'est-ce qu'être "grec" dans les sources latines de l'Italie (VIIIe-XIe siècles), in: *A la rencontre de l'Autre au Moyen Âge: In memoriam Jacques Le Goff. Actes des premières assises franco-polonaises d'histoire médiévale*, dir. PH. JOSSE- RAND – J. PYSIAK, Paris 2017, 53-78.

114. See KAZHDAN, *Latins and Franks in Byzantium*, 86-89.

Les Ἀλβανοὶ et les Λατῖνοι de Michel Attaleiates : les rebelles du sud de l'Italie et l'évolution de la perception des Normands à Byzance

Cet article passe en revue l'interprétation actuelle de qui étaient les Ἀλβανοὶ (Albains) et les Λατῖνοι (Latins) mentionnés dans l'*Histoire* de Michael Attaleiates, écrite au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Alors que les érudits précédents ont identifié ces groupes comme étant des Albanais et des Normands, l'article soutient qu'Attaleiates utilise ces deux termes de manière générique pour établir un parallèle entre les groupes anciens qui apparaissent dans l'historiographie gréco-romaine et les groupes contemporains de l'auteur dans le sud de l'Italie, comme les Lombards. Il propose également que les Normands (Les "Francs d'Italie") soient parfois appelés Λατῖνοι dans l'œuvre, notamment en raison de leur association avec la population lombarde du sud de l'Italie, où ils s'installaient. Pour une meilleure analyse, l'article identifie deux contextes différents dans lesquels le terme Λατῖνοι a été utilisé par Attaleiates : le premier, en association avec les Ἀλβανοί (c'est-à-dire les Lombards), et le second, en parallèle avec les Φράγγοι (Francs, c'est-à-dire les Normands). Grâce à ces réexamens, l'article fournit de nouvelles informations sur les relations complexes entre l'Empire romain médiéval et ses voisins de la péninsule italienne.