



Normans and the Papacy

A micro history of the years 1053-1059

Marloes Buimer
S4787234
Radboud University
January 15th, 2019

Dr. S. Meeder
Radboud University
SCRSEM1 V

NORMAN²

NOUN

- **1** member of a people of mixed Frankish and Scandinavian origin who settled in Normandy from about AD 912 and became a dominant military power in western Europe and the Mediterranean in the 11th century.¹

¹ English Oxford living dictionaries, <<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/norman>> [consulted on the 19th of January 2018].

Index

INDEX	1
PREFACE	3
ABBREVIATIONS	5
LIST OF PEOPLE	7
CHAPTER 1: STATUS QUAESTIONIS	9
CHAPTER 2: BATTLE AT CIVITATE <i>1000-1053</i>	15
CHAPTER 3: SCHISM <i>1054</i>	25
CHAPTER 4: PEACE IN ITALY <i>1055-1059</i>	35
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47

Preface

During my pre-master program at the Radboud University, I decided to write my bachelor thesis about the Vikings Rollo, Guthrum and Rörik. Thanks to that thesis, my interest for medieval history grew and I decided to start the master *Eternal Rome*. That thesis also made me more enthusiastic about the history of the Vikings, and especially the Vikings who entered the Mediterranean. In the History Channel series *Vikings*, Björn Ironside decides to go towards the Mediterranean, and I was wondering in what way this affected the status of Vikings. While reading literature about this conquest, there was not a clear matter to investigate. Continuing reading, the matter of the Normans who settled in Italy came across. The literature made it clear, on some levels, why the Normans came to Italy. It is not clear why and how the Normans and popes came across each other, and what the exact circumstances around the relationship were. Therefore, this thesis focuses on the next question: In which manner was the interaction between the Normans and the papacy divided between the years 1053-1059?

In order to answer this question, the following approach was used: first of all, in modern literature it was studied how and why the Normans came to Italy. Subsequently, with the help of both primary sources as well as the general literature, in this study the key events of the years 1053-1059 were investigated. The key events are the battle of Civitate (1053), the schism of 1054 and the Council at Melfi (1059). This thesis will add a new perspective on the years 1053-1059, trying to expose why the shift in the way of thinking of the popes towards the Normans occurred during those years.

Abbreviations

- HR* *Die Chronik Herimanns von Reichenau*, ed. K.Nobbe (Leipzig, 1893)
- HN* Amatus of Montecassino, *History of the Normans*, trans. P.N. Dunbar (Woodbridge 2004)
- LP* *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, vol.2 (Paris, 1955)
- PRV* *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae*, Vol. I-IV, ed. I.M. Watterich (1862)
- DRG* Guillaume de Pouille, *La geste de Robert Guiscard*, ed. and trans. M. Mathieu (Palermo, 1961)

List of people

Normans

Rainulf I of Aversa (d. 1045)

William 'the Iron Arm' of Hauteville (d.1045/1046)

Drogo of Hauteville (d.1051)

Humphrey of Hauteville (d.1057)

Robert Guiscard (d.1085)

Richard I (d.1078)

Popes

John XII (955-964)

Benedict VIII (1012-1024)

Benedictus IX (1032-1045, 1057-1058)

Sylvester III (1045)

Gregory VI (1045-1046)

Clement II (1046-1057)

Damasus II (1048)

Leo IX (1049-1054)

Victor II (1055-1057)

Stephen IX (1057-1058)

Benedict X (1058-1059)

Nicholas II (1058-1061)

German Emperor

Otto the Saxon (r. 936-973)

Henry II (r. 973-1024)

Conrad II (r. 1024-1039)

Henry III (r. 1039-1056)

Byzantine

Boioannes (Byzantine catapan 1017-1027)

Constantine IX Monomachus (r. 1042-1055)

Michael Cerularius (d. 1059)

Others

Melo (d.1020)

Sergio IV (r. 1002-1036)

Pandulf IV of Capua (r. 1016-1049)

Guaimar IV (r. 1027-1052)

Pandulf III of Benevento (r. 1011-1059)

Humbert of Silva Candida (d. 1061)

Argyrus (Lombard nobleman and Byzantine general; Son of Melo; d. 1068)

Hildebrand (d. 1085)

Chapter 1: Status Quaestionis

Before analysing the changing interaction between the Normans and the papacy in the years 1053-1059, a short introduction of the main players is necessary: who were the Normans and who were the popes that were connected to the Normans? Furthermore, I will offer a historiographical overview, which will introduce the primary sources used as well as the modern sources. Lastly, there will be described how the thesis will be layered as well as the new insights this thesis will shine on the relationship between the Normans and the papacy.

I

The two main players in this thesis are the Normans and the different popes they have encountered. First of all, it is useful to explain who the Normans were. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the definition of a Norman is as follows: “A member of a people of mixed Frankish and Scandinavian origin who settled in Normandy from about AD 912 and became a dominant military power in western Europe and the Mediterranean in the 11th century.”² In this thesis Normans will be regarded as the people originating from Normandy, and not those from Scandinavia. Some Normans, however, decided to leave Normandy due to overpopulation and feuds or rebellions, according to Marjorie Chibnall.³ One of the places they went to was Italy. Between tenth century Normandy and Italy, there were some differences but there was also a common factor, namely the weakness of the authority. The difference between both lands was the distribution of power and the social structure. The cultural divisions in Italy were more deeply rooted.⁴ In Italy, there were Lombards, Greeks, and Saracens.⁵

While settling in Italy (around the year 1017, the date, however, is not exactly known), the Normans encountered different popes. During their time in Italy they were in contact with more or less fifteen different popes. They signed contracts with some popes, although in the years 1053-1059 the Normans were mainly seen as enemies. An important family for the Normans, and in this thesis, was the Hauteville family. The first important family members are William (d. 1045/1046) and Drogo (d.1051). They were descendants from Tancred of Hauteville, who was a Norman

² English Oxford living dictionaries, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/norman> (consulted on the 19th of January 2018).

³ Majorie Chibnall, *The Normans* (MA, Oxford and Victoria 2006) 75.

⁴ M. Chibnall, *The Normans*, 75.

⁵ *Ibid*, 76.

lord. Besides William and Drogo, Humphrey and Robert Guiscard are also were descendants from Tancred. William and Drogo arrived in Italy somewhere between 1037-1038.⁶ For this thesis it is not important to know the background of the different popes, it is, however, important to know what their attitude was towards the Normans. The popes who are known for their contact with the Normans will now be described. The first pope who is mentioned in contemporary sources is Benedict VIII, who was pope from 1012-1024. According to Rodulfus Glaber (ca.980 - ca.1046) and Adhemar of Chabannes (ca.989-1034), the Norman Rodulf had come directly from Normandy to Rome, to help Benedict VIII with his struggle against the Greeks.⁷ According to Rodolfus, the pope had enlisted the aid of Rodulf to fight against the Greeks on behalf of Benevento. Adhemar describes that Rodulf was sent to Apulia to fight the Greeks.⁸ The popes that will be examined in this thesis, and who are important for the years 1053-1059 are the following: Clement II (1046-1047); Damasus II (1048); Leo IX (1049-1054); Victor II (1055-1057); Stephen IX (1057-1058); Nicolas II (1059-1061); and lastly Benedict X (antipope, 1058-1073/1080).

Besides the Normans and the papacy as main players in this thesis, there are three different players who play a part in the affair as well. First of all the German Empire, and especially the German emperor. Second, the Roman aristocracy, and finally the emperor of Constantinople, that is, the influence of the Eastern Church as well as the influence of the Byzantines in parts of Italy.

II

In order to analyse the changing relationship, different primary sources were used during this thesis, which will be elaborated on in the following paragraph.

The first source that is used is *The History of the Normans* by Amatus of Montecassino (eleventh century), hereafter *HN*.⁹ Using this source, it is important to understand what view Amatus had towards the Normans. In the *HN*, a history of the Norman conquest of southern Italy and Sicily is given. Amatus was the earliest historian of the Norman conquest in Italy. Scholars have disagreed on when the *HN* was written, although it is clear that it had been completed a few years after the last

⁶ K.B. Wolf, *Making History: The Normans and their Historians in Eleventh-Century Italy* (Pennsylvania, 1995), 12.

⁷ Wolf, *Making History*, 46.

⁸ Wolf, *Making History*, 10.

⁹ Amatus of Montecassino, *History of the Normans*, trans. Prescott N. Dunbar (Woodbridge, 2004).

event mentioned at the end of the work. It seems probable that the work dates from around 1080.¹⁰ What we know about Amatus is written by Peter the Deacon in his 'Book concerning the Illustrious Men of the abbey of Cassino', which was completed around 1133. Amatus was a bishop and Cassinese monk, and, according to Graham A. Loud, he originally stemmed from the area of Salerno.¹¹ According to Amatus, the story that he wrote in the *HN* was only possible because God willed it, and he therefore saw the Norman conquest as God's favour.¹² He also regarded Pandulf IV of Capua as a villain.¹³ Thus, the *HN* can be seen as a source, not particularly in favour of the Normans, but not against the Normans either.

The second source used is *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard* by William of Apulia, hereafter *DRG*. The story told in the *DRG* starts with the arrival of the first Normans in Italy (shortly before 1017 according to William), and ends with the burial of Robert Guiscard in 1085. It is divided into five books and has two main themes: firstly the replacement of the Greeks by the Normans in Italy, and secondly the exaltation of the Hauteville family in Italy.¹⁴ Not much is known of William, although his name, in French Guillaume, as well as his relationship with the French Urban II, seems to indicate that William was French. It does seem sufficiently that William lived in Apulia, considering his knowledge about the history, the geography, and the annals written in this area.¹⁵ There are also arguments claiming William was of Norman origin, and there are, up to the point Mathieu wrote this book, no arguments against that hypothesis.¹⁶ Thus, when using this source, it is important to realise that this is probably written from a Norman, or at least a French, point of view. This might have influenced William's way of writing about the Normans.

The third primary source used is *Die Chronik Herimanns von Reichenau*, translated by K. Nobbe, and hereafter *HR*.¹⁷ Hermann von Reichenau (1013-1054) was a German chronicler and a contemporary of Emperor Henry III.¹⁸ He was one of the contemporaries who wrote about the battle at Civitate in 1053, and considering the

¹⁰ *HN*, 1.

¹¹ *HN*, 11.

¹² *HN*, 24.

¹³ *HN*, 28.

¹⁴ Guillaume de Pouille, *La geste de Robert Guiscard*, ed. and trans. M. Mathieu (Palermo, 1961) 11.

¹⁵ *DRG*, 17-18.

¹⁶ *DRG*, 18.

¹⁷ K. Nobbe, *Die Chronik Herimanns von Reichenau* (Leipzig, 1893).

¹⁸ Encyclopaedia Britannica, <<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Hermann-von-Reichenau>> (consulted on 09 January 2019).

dates he lived, it can be assumed that he was alive during the battle at Civitate, and therefore his Chronicon can be used as a trustful account. Furthermore, the *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae* (*PRV*) and the *Liber Pontificalis* (*LP*) will be used to describe events that occurred during the years 1053-1059.¹⁹

III

In order to fully understand what happened during the six years in question, it is necessary to look at modern literature as well. During the research, it became clear that in modern literature, the authors mostly agree on how the Norman conquest went. The years 1053-1509 are mostly described within a few pages, sometimes even in just one page or even only a few sentences. While reading the sources, for me the main problem occurred, which is the centre of this thesis: what happened in those six years? Within those years the attitude of the papacy towards the Normans had changed completely. First they wanted to fight against the Normans and later they signed some kind of peace with the Normans, which made the Normans allies of the papacy. In the literature written about the Normans, the schism of 1054 is hardly named, which had an influence on the attitude of the papacy towards the Normans, as I will show in this thesis. The second problem, which occurred while reading the sources, is that most sources are focused on one of the two major players: either the Normans or the papacy. In order to fully understand the changes that occurred, it is necessary to combine both primary as modern sources which will make it possible to picture a new image of the changing attitude of the papacy towards the Normans.

In this thesis, the events that occurred between 1053 and 1059 are the main focus and there will be elaborated on how these events changed the attitude of the papacy towards the Normans. In order to do so, the thesis will be divided in three chapters. Firstly the Battle of Civitate in 1053 will be explained, with the help of contemporary sources as well as the modern literature about the Norman conquest. The second chapter is focused on the schism of 1054. In this chapter, the events that led up to the schism will be explained, as well as the influence of the German emperor and the Roman aristocracy in this affair. Lastly I will attempt to show how the Normans could (perhaps) be blamed for the schism. In the third and final chapter, the years 1055-1059 will be analysed. In these years, four popes were assigned and had to

¹⁹ *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae*, Vol. I-IV, ed. I.M. Watterich (1862); L.L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis* (Paris, 1955)

deal with the Normans. They still regarded the Normans as a threat, and up to 1059 there were still plans to drive the Normans out of Italy. In 1059, Nicholas II would change this attitude towards the Normans, and decided to ally with them.

Chapter 2: Battle at Civitate

1000-1053

On the eighteenth of June 1053, the papal army of Leo IX (r. 1049-1054) met the Norman army, commanded by Humphrey of Apulia, Richard of Aversa and Robert Guiscard of Calabria, at the city of Civitate, in the region of Apulia.²⁰ The papal army lost the battle and Leo was subsequently taken hostage and held in Benevento. At that time, the Normans already looked back on an impressive though brief military history since their arrival in Italy in the early eleventh century, in the course of which they had encountered a large number of popes and secular leaders.

This chapter discusses the events that caused the battle at Civitate to take place, the battle itself - from the viewpoint of contemporaries as well as through modern literature - and the aftermath of the battle.

I

Eleventh century Italy was nothing more than a geographical expression. The unity of the region during the Roman era was broken since the invasions of the Lombards (568) and the Frankish conquest (773). In the eyes of Haskins, in cultural as well as political terms, a division developed between the centre and the north on the one hand, and the south on the other hand. The centre and the north came into the currents of the Western politics, while southern Italy continued to look to the East with Constantinople as its capital.²¹ In these conditions the first Normans arrived in Italy sometime in the early eleventh century; the exact date of the first arrival is unknown. After the first encounters of the Normans with Melo, who was the leader of a revolt against the Byzantine power in Apulia, which took place around 1017, the Normans spread out and went separate ways, offering their military services to various leaders, including Guaimar IV of Salerno (999-1027), Pandulf III of Benevento (1011-1059) and Pandulf IV of Capua (1016-1049). One group of Normans reached an agreement with Abbot Atenulf of Montecassino (1011-1022), brother of the ruler of Capua. Boioannes, who was the Byzantine catapan of Italy during the years 1017-1027, and who also used Normans in his service.²² For this thesis, the (intertwining) storylines

²⁰ Wolf, *Making History*, 17.

²¹ C.H. Haskins, *The Normans in European History* (Boston, 1915) 196.

²² Wolf, *Making History*, 11.

of Guaimar IV, who was Prince of Salerno from 1027-1052, and Pandulf IV are of particular importance as they provided the foundation of the later influences of the Normans in Italy and of the battle at Civitate.

After establishing these alliances, pope Benedict VIII (r. 1012-1024) asked Henry II, the Holy Roman Emperor from 1014-1024, to intervene in the situation. Henry responded, but also sent a separate force to deal with Pandulf IV and his brother, Atenulf of Montecassino, because they had chosen the side of the catapan after the defeat of Melo. Melo fled to Germany after the failed attempt of the rebellion.²³ Pandulf was taken into imperial custody and was replaced by count Pandulf of Teano, while Atenulf was also replaced. The coalition between Henry and Benedict did not last long, as both of them died in 1024. Guaimar IV asked the new German king, Conrad II (r.1024-1039), to restore Pandulf IV as prince of Capua and Conrad complied: in 1026 Pandulf IV became the prince of Capua again. Afterwards, Pandulf IV succeeded in seizing Naples, which he only retained control of for some three years. Naples was in possession of Sergio IV (d. after 1036) before, and after regaining Naples, he decided to ask the Normans for help.²⁴ The threat of Pandulf IV led Sergio to invest the Norman Rainulf with the town of Aversa. Aversa was located at the border of his duchy.²⁵ This is the first principality of the Normans in Italy.²⁶ Rainulf also married Sergio's sister. The settlement of Rainulf in Aversa attracted other Normans to Rainulf's service.²⁷

Following Guaimar IV's death in 1027, Pandulf IV managed to gain control of Gaeta and surrounding area, previously controlled by Guaimar IV's widow (and Pandulf's sister) Gaitelgrima. Pandulf IV also took advantage of the death of Rainulf's first wife, Sergio's sister, offering the lord of Aversa his niece in marriage, which resulted in an alliance between Rainulf and Pandulf IV. The acceptance of Rainulf made Sergio retire as a monk at the monastery of the Holy Saviour, according to Amatus of Montecassino. With doing so he left his duchy to his son John V.²⁸ In 1037 Emperor Conrad II again decided to intervene in Italy, and entered Capua in May 1038, investing Guaimar V with the city. Subsequently, Pandulf fled to

²³ Wolf, *Making History*, 10-11.

²⁴ G.A. Loud, 'Southern Italy in the eleventh century', in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History vol. 4 c.1042-c.1198, part 2* (2015), 101.

²⁵ Loud, *Southern Italy in the eleventh century*, 102.

²⁶ Wolf, *Making History*, 11.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 12.

²⁸ *HN*, I.45, p. 61

Constantinople. During Conrad's sojourn in Italy, a new group of Normans arrived from Normandy, led by William and Drogo of Hauteville. They entered the service at Guaimar's court. Some years later, in 1042, the Normans chose William of Hauteville as their leader. Guaimar V recognised William as the count of Melfi, and arranged a marriage between William and his niece.²⁹ Henceforth there were two Norman settlements in Italy, both in the region of Apulia, one in Melfi, and one in Aversa.

II

In the year 1046, Conrad's son and successor Henry III (r. 1046-1056) arrived in Italy for his imperial coronation. At the Synod of Sutri he ended the papal crisis which begun two years earlier with the rising of Rome against Benedict IX. Henry III deposed three popes who claimed rights to the papal see and appointed his own pope, Clement II, who in turn crowned Henry III.³⁰ The emperor subsequently made his way to Capua in 1047 and handed the town back to Pandulf IV and his son, the future Pandulf IV (d.1057). Henry also confirmed Drogo and Rainulf II as the counts of Apulia and Aversa.³¹ Changes occurred in the Norman camp as well.

Around the years 1045/1046 William of Apulia died. After his death, Guaimar V wanted to be certain that William was succeeded by his brother, Drogo. By giving his daughter in marriage, Guaimar strengthened his ties with Drogo.³² This meant that Drogo was still an ally of Guaimar. As G.A. Loud explains it, it was a relationship of mutual advantage, sealed by gifts and family alliance.³³ During the time this happened another son of Tancred the Hauteville arrived: Robert Guiscard entered Italy.

Pope Clement II died after only a short tenure, as did his successor Damasus II. This pope also died shortly after he got assigned, and Henry III chose a new pope: his cousin, the bishop of Toul, pope Leo IX (1002-1054).³⁴ The new pope seemed to pay special attention to Benevento, which turned to Rome for protection from the Normans. The reason for the attention was because the Normans were beginning to intrude in the Beneventan territory.³⁵ Leo specifically charged Drogo and Guaimar V of Salerno with the protection of Benevento's territory. Drogo and Guaimar, however,

²⁹ Wolf, *Making History*, 13.

³⁰ G. Tabacco, 'Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century', in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History vol. 4 c.1042-c.1198, part 2* (2015), 78.

³¹ Wolf, *Making History*, 15.

³² *Ibid*, 14.

³³ Loud, *Southern Italy in the eleventh century*, 105.

³⁴ Wolf, *Making History*, 16.

³⁵ Wolf, *Making History*, 16.

were not able to control all the bands of Normans in the area. In his *History of the Normans* (written c.1080), Amatus of Montecassino (an eleventh century monk) related how Drogo promised the pope to defend Benevento. After Drogo left Benevento, the Normans in the area were unable to control themselves and attacked the city.³⁶ Amatus recorded the pope's response, and said that the pope wanted to defend the city and also 'break the pride of the Normans'.³⁷ Shortly after the attack on Benevento, Drogo was assassinated, probably in church.³⁸ The attacks of Benevento and the assassination on Drogo constitute a turning point in the pope's attitude towards the Normans.

III

The threat of a Norman conquest of all of southern Italy was increasing during the 1050s, and that threat started already in the 1040s. A new revolt happened in Byzantine Apulia in the years 1041-1042. Even though the Normans were only helpers in the beginning, by autumn 1042 the Normans had chosen their own leader and acted independently in Apulia. The election of William of Hauteville as leader can be marked as the beginning of the new power of the Normans, since they had only worked for others up to this point.³⁹ By 1047 a Norman count was ruling at Lesina on the Adriatic, to the north of the Gargano peninsula and Drogo invaded Lucania and northern Calabria.⁴⁰ The methods that the Normans used were often brutal in the extreme.⁴¹ Leo IX is seen as the first pope who handled the Normans, who were considered as a problem. After the death of Drogo, Leo unsuccessfully asked for military assistance from Henry III and the king of France. They either feared the Normans, or were asked not to help the pope.⁴² Yet, help came from Frederick of Lorraine (d. 1058), who would later fight next to Leo during the battle at Civitate and who would become pope Stephen IX; and allies from among the southern Italian principalities.⁴³ According to Amatus, Frederick said: 'Even if I had a hundred effeminate knights, I would fight against all the Norman knights'. On that, men from

³⁶ *HN*, 1.

³⁷ *HN*, III.18, p. 92.

³⁸ *HN*, III.22, p. 94.

³⁹ Loud, 'Southern Italy in the eleventh century', 103-104.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 105.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 106.

⁴² *HN*, III.23, p. 94

⁴³ Wolf, *Making History*, 16.

Gaeta, Valva and the March ran to arms. Men from Marsia and other counties joined them.⁴⁴

The army gathered by Leo IX, was a serious effort to reduce the influence of the Normans in Italy. The army met with the Normans on the eighteenth of June 1053, at Civitate in northern Apulia. Humphrey of Apulia (Drogo's brother and successor, d. 1057), Richard of Aversa (d.1078), and Robert Guiscard of Calabria (1015-1085) led the Norman army.⁴⁵ The papal army consisted of the Italian allies and Swabians, despite Henry III previous rejection of help. The reason for this change in attitude was due to the fact that the pope spent Christmas 1052 at Worms with the emperor. The pope told Henry that the Normans were holding the property of St. Peter by force, and the emperor therefore changed his previous statement, and granted help to drive the Normans out of the property of St. Peter.⁴⁶

Contemporaries wrote about the battle at Civitate. One of those contemporaries is Hermann of Reichenau (1013-1054). In his *Chronicon* he wrote about the battle at Civitate. What is interesting in Hermann's text, is the account he makes about the Normans asking for peace:

‘Der Herr Papst hielt nach Ostern eine Synode zu Rom und brach dann gegen die Nordmannen seinem Entschluß gemäß mit dem Heere auf. Und da jene um Frieden baten, ihm Unterwerfung und Dienstbarkeit versprachen, und was sie früher mit Unrecht sich angemäßt und beseßt hatten, mit seiner Erlaubniß und Vergünstigung behalten zu wollen erklärten, dieses aber der Papst abschlug und die mit Gewalt und Unrecht geraubten Besitzungen des heiligen Petrus zurückforderte und ihnen befahl aus der widerrechtlich überzogenen Gegend zu gehen, so wiesen jene, weil sie an Zahl weit überlegen waren, diese Forderung als eine Sache der Unmöglichkeit zurück, und erklärten, daß mit Waffen eroberte Vaterland mit den Waffen vertheidigen oder im Tode unterliegen wollten.’⁴⁷

In this citation Hermann says that the Normans, besides asking for peace, also promised Leo IX submission and service. Yet, Leo IX declined the offer, which led to

⁴⁴ *HN*, III.24, p.94

⁴⁵ Wolf, *Making History*, 17.

⁴⁶ *HN*, III. ff 55, p. 99

⁴⁷ *HR*, 55.

the battle that happened in June 1053. According to Hermann, the decision for violence rather than peace appears to have been Leo's decision. Besides this, Hermann also describes the battle itself, which is described as a huge battle and a defeat for the papal army, even though according to him the Normans were initially almost defeated. The Normans then planned a series of ambushes, which caused the Italian part of the army to flee. The Normans thus won a 'very bloody victory'.⁴⁸

Hermann was not the only contemporary who wrote about the battle at Civitate. In his *History of the Normans*, Amatus of Montecassino also relates the events during the Battle at Civitate. He wrote this around 1080, which means it is written decades after the battle.⁴⁹ According to Amatus, pope Leo was beloved by the German emperor as well as by the whole Roman Church.⁵⁰ Although initially seeking help from the Normans, after Drogo's death, the pope became 'eager for the ruin and dispersal of the Normans'.⁵¹ In the course of time this eagerness led towards the battle at Civitate, which, according to Amatus, the pope expected to win on account of his army's strength of numbers. Like Hermann, Amatus also mentions that the Normans sought 'peace and harmony'.⁵² They promised to give incense and tribute money each year to the Holy Church and they agreed to accept papal lordship over the lands they had conquered by force. In Amatus's account, however, the negotiations were not conducted by the pope, but by his chancellor, Frederick of Lorraine. He threatened the Normans with death if they would not flee.⁵³ Amatus wrote that the pope then made the sign of the cross and gave order to do battle.

Another contemporary source is *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard (DRG)*, by William of Apulia.⁵⁴ According to the *DRG*, the Normans sought peace after hearing of the pope's arrival with a large army of Italians, Alemannic, and Teutons. The Normans asked the pope kindly to be their lord and to accept their oath of fidelity.⁵⁵ In contrast with Amatus's account, not Frederick of Lorraine but the Teutons, who probably were Frederick Lorraine's followers, told the Normans to leave Italy.⁵⁶ The pope could not calm the spirit of the Teutons, and so the Normans returned, saddened

⁴⁸ *HR*, 55.

⁴⁹ *HN*, 1.

⁵⁰ *HN*, II.15, p. 91

⁵¹ *HN*, II.23, p. 94

⁵² *HN*, III.39, p. 100

⁵³ *HN*, III.39, p. 100

⁵⁴ *DRG*.

⁵⁵ *DRG*, 137.

⁵⁶ *DRG*, 137.

by their failed attempt for peace.⁵⁷ It is interesting to see that the pope, according to William of Apulia, wanted to calm the spirits of the Teutons, but was not able to. Therefore, a fight between the papal army and the Normans took place, hence, William blames the Teutons for the war. According to William of Apulia, victory in battle is not determined by numbers on the battlefield, but by heavenly design. Thus in the end, the Normans won the battle as they had God on their side.⁵⁸ Both William and Amatus said that the pope had not been the reason that the battle started, which is probably because of the respect they had towards the papacy.

A completely different story is found in the *Liber Pontificalis*. The anonymous author, writing from a papal standpoint, does not acknowledge the defeat of the papal army: in fact, there is no mention of defeat at all. Instead, the text relates how the papal army won the battle and that all the lands were returned to the pope.⁵⁹

The contemporary sources are thus unclear about who declined the Normans' peace offer: it was either pope Leo IX himself (according to Hermann), his chancellor Frederick (Amatus) or the Teutons in general (*DRG*). The sources agree, however, that peace was offered, declined by the papal side though, and that the battle at Civitate was its consequence. The question as to why they did decline the peace proposal remains however.

After the battle, the Normans captured the pope. The *HN* states that the Normans asked the pope to come with them, while the *DRG* tells us that the pope went into the city of Civitate. The citizens of Civitate, however, did not want to receive him because of fear for the Normans. The *DRG* goes on to relate that the Normans subsequently begged the pope to forgive them and the pope admonished them piously and blessed them.⁶⁰

IV

While in Norman captivity, pope Leo IX sent a letter to Emperor Constantine Monomachos (r.1042-1055), in which he asks for Byzantine help in order to start a new fight against the Normans. It sounds risky to send a letter for another battle while being held captive by the Normans. Considering the respect the Normans had for the

⁵⁷ *DRG*, 139.

⁵⁸ *DRG*, 141.

⁵⁹ *LP*, 275.

⁶⁰ *HN*, III.41, p. 101; *DRG*, 147.

pope however, they probably would not read the letter, and therefore the pope probably was able to send it. In the letter he said:

Because of the concern that I need to protect all churches, seeing the rebellious and foreign people of the Normans rise up with cruel and unheard-of madness and, even more, a heathen impiety against the church of God, slaughtering Christians everywhere (...) it seemed to me that human defence should be gathered from all around to bear witness to their iniquity or, if it should thus turn out to be effective, to repress their disobedience.⁶¹

In this particular part he explains that he needed to fight against the Normans again, due to the actions of the Normans against Christians. The only possibility was to repress the disobedience of the Normans. In the letter he furthermore explains what happened at the battle of Civitate. According to Leo the Normans suddenly attacked the papal army, which brought them the victory, although they regretted their victory more than enjoying it.⁶² Charles Homer Haskins explains that the Normans even felt embarrassed, because they fought against the pope.⁶³ Finally the pope asked the Byzantine emperor to help in order to ‘expel that hostile nation from this side and that and cause them to flee far away’. Leo still had hope that if both Henry III and the Byzantine emperor would stand with him, it would be possible to remove the Normans from the country.⁶⁴

After ten months in captivity, the pope was released by the Normans and returned to Rome with the protection of the Normans. On the nineteenth of April, pope Leo IX died.⁶⁵

V

In this chapter two statements were made concerning the changing attitude of the pope regarding the Norman presence in southern Italy. First of all, in part II, the assassination of Drogo was described as a turning point in the papal attitude. According to Wolf, the assassination may have encouraged the pope to take a more

⁶¹ ‘Letter of Pope Leo IX to the Emperor Constantine Monomachos (1054), trans. S.M. Meeder, founded in: *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae*, Vol. I-IV, ed. I.M. Watterich (1862) 163-165.

⁶² *PRV*, 163-165.

⁶³ Haskins, *The Normans*, 203.

⁶⁴ *PRV*, 163-165.

⁶⁵ *HN*, III.42, p. 101.

active role in controlling the Normans.⁶⁶ Why can the assassination be considered as a turning point? First of all, after the assassination, the Normans did not have a leader. Without a leader it might have been more difficult for the pope to control the Normans, considering that there was not one person he could talk to. The Normans therefore could do however they pleased. On the other hand, it could have been easier as well, considering that the pope could do whatever he liked, without consulting with a leader first.

Besides the assassination, the pope was also mad because the Normans attacked Benevento, before the assassination of Drogo. Looking at the *HN*, the attack on Benevento seems more important for the changing attitude of the pope than the assassination of Drogo. There might be three explanations for this: first of all, it was a violation of trust from the Normans. Drogo promised that Benevento would not be attacked, whereas as soon as the pope left the town, the town was attacked. Secondly, it showed the dangers of the Norman presence in Italy, and thirdly, it showed that the Normans did whatever they wanted. Considering that Drogo promised the pope not to attack Benevento and it still happened showed in a way that the Normans did as they desired to, even when they had a leader.

Another possible reason for the attitudinal change is that the Normans became a bigger power in Italy. During the 1050s the threat of an entire the Norman conquest in the south became more significant. In addition, the methods of the Normans to achieve this conquest were 'brutal in extreme'.⁶⁷ This might have been based on information given by contemporaries. The methods did little, to endear the Normans to the native citizens, according to Loud.⁶⁸ This perceived brutality towards the Italian citizens might be considered as a third reason for the pope to attack the Normans. Even though Amatus and the *LP* claim that the Roman Church loved Leo IX, the support from the Italian citizens was perhaps more forthcoming when the pope took a forceful stance against Norman threats, taken in mind that Leo was chosen by the German emperor Henry III, instead of by the Roman nobility. In the letter written to the Emperor Constantine Monomachos in 1054, it becomes clear that the pope justified his actions because good Christians were in danger.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Wolf, *Making History*, 16.

⁶⁷ G.A. Loud, 'Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century', 106.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 106.

⁶⁹ *PRV*, 163-165.

Returning to the second question: why did the papal army decide to decline the peace offer made by the Normans? According to John Julius Norwich, neither side wanted to fight, yet they ended up in battle. It is possible that the papal side objected to the terms the Normans were giving. The Normans would give money to the Church, while also keeping the lands they already conquered. Perhaps fear of the already growing power of the Normans played a role.

Another reason, suggested by G.A. Loud, is the fact that the pope expected that a Byzantine army would arrive. This part of the army, however, failed to link up with the papal army.⁷⁰ The *DRG* also states that the Normans wanted to make peace due to the large size of the papal army. The papal army might hence have been confident of their victory as well. Frederick of Lorraine's threat, being death if the Normans did not flee, also testifies to great confidence.⁷¹ Thus why would they sign a peace if they would win anyway?

Another reason the pope had for the fight against the Normans, which will be elaborated on in the next chapter, is the fact that within the church itself many changes were occurring. The calls for the church's revival and reform had two aspects: putting an end to the disorders produced by simony and by the marriage of the clergy, and a desire to extend the temporal power and influence of the pope in the peninsula.⁷² In the year following the Battle of Civitate, the developments within the church came to a climax, which is known for the Great Schism in 1054.

⁷⁰ G.A. Loud, 'Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century', 106.

⁷¹ *HN*, III.39, p. 100

⁷² Haskins, *The Normans*, 202 – 203.

Chapter 3: Schism

1054

The letter Leo sent in captivity reached Constantinople since the papal legation consisted of Humbert, Frederick, and Peter, archbishop of Amalfi.⁷³ The arrival of the legation caused problems within both Churches, meaning the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church, and in the end developed in what we call the schism of 1054. It is important to realise that the break between both Churches began before 1054, and that, according to different sources, the Churches did not know a break was happening at the time.⁷⁴

This chapter is divided into three sections: firstly the events in papal history up to 1054 will be analysed, secondly the papal history of the year 1054 will be explained. Lastly, the effects of the schism on the relationship between the Normans and the pope will be explicated.

I

According to Steven Runciman, a British historian, there had always been a difference in outlook between the Eastern and Western halves of the Christian world.⁷⁵ In the East, the cultural background and common language was Greek and the Eastern provinces of the Roman Empire were better educated than the Western. Some differences were of importance to the Church. For instance, in the East, everyone was interested in the theological discussion, whilst in the West, the theological language was Latin, which meant that it was a foreign language to most of the faithful in the West.⁷⁶ A second difference, which occurred between the East and the West, was the position of the patriarch (East) and the pope (West). The pope was identified with his Church, which meant that if someone insulted the pope, the whole Western Church was insulted. The patriarch, when insulted, was insulted to his person alone.⁷⁷ Apart from these different views on the Church, other events occurred as well in the years before 1054, starting this chapter with the interference of the German emperor.

⁷³ A. Louth, *Greek East and Latin West The Church AD 681-1071* (New York, 2007) 308.

⁷⁴ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 316. R.W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (1970) 67. S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism, A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (London, 1963) 34.

⁷⁵ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, 4.

⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 4-9.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 10.

The interference of the emperor started in 960, when pope John XII (r.955 – 964) asked the King of Germany, Otto the Saxon (912-973), for help to defeat enemies in Italy. As a reward, Otto would get the emperor’s crown and as Otto wanted to have this crown, he decided to help the pope.⁷⁸ The interference of the German emperor meant that for the next forty years a struggle of power occurred between the emperor and the Roman nobility. The House of Crescentius, kin to the House of Theophylact, which enjoyed the sympathy of the Byzantines, led this nobility.⁷⁹ Whilst the Germans set foot in Rome, the Byzantines were engaged with their own civil wars and with reconquering lands in the East and the Balkans. The coming of the German emperor in Rome also meant that ideas from the north of the Alps were exported to Rome, as well as the German theology.⁸⁰ This theology brought the word *Filioque* to the Creed. This addition became one of the disputes between the East and the West.⁸¹ According to the East, the term gave a distorted view of the divine μοναρχία.⁸² The term *Filioque* means that the Holy Spirit is proceeding from both the father and the son, whilst in the Orthodox Church the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the father. Runciman stated that the final schism occurred in 1009 that is, if we start with the last mention of a Roman pope in the diptychs of Constantinople.⁸³ The last pope mentioned was John XVIII (r.1004-1009), because the next pope, Sergius IV (r.1009-1012), believed in *Filioque* in the Creed. After this no pope was ever mentioned again. It is, however, important to know that the lists on the diptychs were already incomplete.⁸⁴

II

1054 is nevertheless considered as the year of the final schism between both Churches. The previous chapter already mentioned the imperial coronation of Henry III in the year 1046 and the Synod of Sutri, which ended the papal crisis. This papal crisis occurred two years before with the rise of Rome against Benedict IX, the last Tusculan pope.⁸⁵ The House of Crescentius and the counts of Tusculum regarded the papacy as a family possession, which resulted in the election of undesirable popes. In

⁷⁸ J.J. Norwich, *De Pausen een geschiedenis*, trans. R. Fagel (Amsterdam, 2013) 97.

⁷⁹ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, 28.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid, 29-30.

⁸² M.H. Smith III, *And taking bread, cerularius and the azyme controversy of 1054* (Paris, 1978) 23.

⁸³ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, 32.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 32-33.

⁸⁵ G. Tabacco (2015), ‘Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century’, 78.

1046, a member of the Tusculan house held the papal chair: Benedict IX (r.1032-1045, 1047-1048). The response of the Romans was to assign an anti-pope, Sylvester III (1045), and Benedict IX responded by selling the chair to a third applicant: Gregory VI (r.1045-1046).⁸⁶ With the Synod of Sutri, Henry dismissed the three popes and assigned a new pope: Clement II (r.1046-1047). Clement crowned Henry III.⁸⁷ Shortly after, Clement II died and Henry assigned a new pope: Damasus II (1048). This pope died shortly after and a new pope was chosen, the bishop of Toul and Henry's cousin: pope Leo IX.⁸⁸ Leo IX, as mentioned in the previous chapter, sent a letter to Emperor Constantine Monomachos in 1054. In this letter, he asked the emperor for help against the Normans. With this letter, and in particular with the deputies and receivers of the letter, a new problem occurred between both Churches.

Whilst modern dogmatists have directed attention to the question of papal primacy and *Filioque*, in 1054 these issues had not much attention. The biggest problem that occurred was the use of either leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist.⁸⁹ The Latin legates in Constantinople, Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, Frederick of Lorraine and Archbishop Peter of Amalfi, were sent to Constantinople to dispute the use of sacramental bread, yet, they also brought back the use of *Filioque*, as explained before.⁹⁰ The dispute on the use of bread was based on two arguments, the first one with an etymological character, the second based on symbolism. The etymological reason was that at the Last Supper, Jesus took *artos*. *Artos* is derived from *airô*, *epairô* and *pherô epi ta anô* – to elevate and raise up and carry to the heights. Accordingly, the bread used must be leavened.⁹¹

Secondly, the Latins said that their use of azymes was justified on the grounds that Christ's incarnation was free from corruption of original sin. In 1 Cor 5:6-8 it is said that the old leaven should be dismissed, and that there should be a new lump, because you are unleavened.⁹² In this verse it is said that Jesus Christ is unleavened breath, which means it is sincerity and truth.⁹³ Erickson stated that there is a problem in translation of the verse. The Greek verse reads: 'οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ', whilst the Latin verse reads: 'Nescitis quia modicum fermentum

⁸⁶ M. Deanesly, *A History of the Medieval Church 590-1500* (London, 1969) 89.

⁸⁷ G. Tabacco (2015), 'Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century', 78.

⁸⁸ Wolf, *Making History*, 15.

⁸⁹ J.H. Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past* (Crestwood, 1991) 134.

⁹⁰ Smith III, *And taking bread*, 23-24.

⁹¹ Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past*, 135-136.

⁹² *Bijbel*, ed. Het Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap (1967) print.; Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past*, 136.

⁹³ *Ibid*.

totam massam *corrumpit*.⁹⁴ The Latin saw the reference to leaven in a bad light, for Christ is unleavened. The Greeks see the same verse in an opposite meaning: that we should be leavened by the new leaven which is Christ.⁹⁵ Besides verse 1 Cor 5:6-8, the Greeks also used Mt 13:33 to explain the reasons for leavened bread, for it says: ‘The kingdom of God is like unto leaven...’⁹⁶

The conflict between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church thus started with the issue of using either leavened or unleavened bread. Different sources also mention the importance of two persons in particular: Cardinal Humbert and Michael Cerularius. To understand this situation, it is important to go back a few years and see when the issues between Cerularius and the papacy in Rome started.

In 1043, Michael Cerularius (1000-1059) was appointed to the patriarchal throne. Cerularius was an administrator yet had the mind of a civil servant and he was not well acquainted in Church history nor theology. He enjoyed popularity in Constantinople and his influence was far greater than that of the Byzantine emperor.⁹⁷ When Cerularius was appointed, the Normans set foot in Italy and had conquered land in southern Italy. The Hauteville family was successful and the papacy as well as the Byzantine emperor wanted to suppress them. Argyrus (1000-1068), son of Melo, was named commander of the Imperial troops in Italy by the Byzantine emperor.⁹⁸ The problem for Italy was that the Normans were Latin. This meant that the occupied territory came under Latin ecclesiastical domination. The pope did not want the territories to come under Byzantine usages, thus even though the Normans were a threat, the pope at the same time did not mind the fact that the conquered territories became Latin.⁹⁹ The role of Cerularius in this affair is, according to Runciman, known for three issues that played a part. Firstly, Cerularius knew the situation that occurred in Rome, secondly, he personally disliked Argyrus, and thirdly, Cerularius wanted uniformity of usages within his Patriarchate.¹⁰⁰ Deanesly, however, states that Cerularius feared an imperial transfer of the province of Bari to the pope would end if an alliance were formed between Leo IX and the Byzantine emperor. For that reason,

⁹⁴ Bible Study Tools, <<https://www.biblestudytools.com/sblg/1-corinthians/5.html>> (consulted on 29 december 2018).; Bible Study Tools, <<https://www.biblestudytools.com/vul/1-corinthians/5.html>> (consulted on 29 december 2018).

trans. “Don’t you know that a tiny grain of yeast makes a whole batch of dough rise?”

⁹⁵ Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past*, 136.

⁹⁶ Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past*, 136.

⁹⁷ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, 39-40.

⁹⁸ Ibid, 38-39.

⁹⁹ Ibid, 39.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, 40.

he supported an attack on Latin uses, the use of unleavened bread, the Saturday fast and the celibacy of priests.¹⁰¹ In 1053, Cerularius ordered to close all the churches of the Latin rite in Constantinople.¹⁰² In Italy, however, the Normans did the same to the Greek churches: the cult of Greek saints was suppressed and the devotion to more Latin saints was encouraged.¹⁰³ Cerularius then persuaded Leo, Archbishop of Orchid (d. 1056) to write a letter to John (eleventh century), Bishop of the Greek city of Trani in Apulia and patriarchal agent in Italy, which he was to pass on to the Pope.¹⁰⁴ The letter consisted of a fierce attack on the use of unleavened bread, the fasting on Saturdays, eating strangled meat and of not singing alleluia in the days following on Septuagesima.¹⁰⁵ This document arrived in Italy at the time of the battle of Civitate. The second reason Runciman gives, the disliking of Argyrus by Cerularius, needs further explanation, which is found in the history of Argyrus and the Normans, the pope and the Byzantine Emperor.

III

As mentioned above, Argyrus was the commander of the Byzantine troops in Italy. He was appointed in 1051 as the governor of Byzantine Apulia.¹⁰⁶ It is not clear on which side Argyrus stood in the whole affair between the Normans, the papacy and the Byzantine emperor. According to the contemporaries, Argyrus fought with and against the Normans, and was an ally of both the pope and the emperor at the same time.

William of Apulia describes that the Byzantine emperor asked Argyros how to expel the ‘Gauls’ from Italy. The Emperor had heard that the Normans could be bribed with presents, in order to gain the Normans as allies. He therefore asked Argyros to do so. The Normans however, replied that they would not leave Apulia until they had conquered it. Argyros response was to send a message to the pope and asked him to help the citizens of Apulia.¹⁰⁷ Following this account, one might argue that Argyros was loyal to both the Byzantine emperor and the pope. Going back a few years, however, there could be a different interpretation of the loyalty of Argyrus.

¹⁰¹ Deanesly, *A History of the Medieval Church*, 79.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 306.

¹⁰⁴ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, 41.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 42.

¹⁰⁶ Loud, ‘Southern Italy in the eleventh century’, 106.

¹⁰⁷ *DRG*, 135, 137.

The *DRG* tells the attack of Trani in the year 1042. Argyrus had promised the Normans gifts if they would be loyal to him, he therefore probably caused the siege of Trani, the only city that supported the Greek army. At the same time, Argyros did not want to lose the imperial favour.¹⁰⁸ It is not clear from the *DRG* why Argyrus caused the siege of Trani, however, the explanation of this can be found in the *HN* by Amatus. Amatus explains that Argyrus was chosen as the Norman leader after losing their leader. They conquered cities and made them subject to their command. Some of the cities submitted voluntarily while others were forced. Then the Normans went to Trani, which they conquered. According to Amatus, Argyrus ‘spoiled the victory by his folly, for he opposed the victorious wrath of the Normans’.¹⁰⁹ Following this account, one might argue that Argyrus was loyal to both the Normans and the Byzantine emperor.

Finally, Loud said that Argyrus was ‘prepared to cooperate with the pope’, which would mean that Argyrus was loyal to the pope.¹¹⁰ Taken all of this into consideration, the history of Argyrus towards the Byzantine emperor can be seen as a complicated history. The suspicion of Cerularius towards Argyrus is determined partly because of this history and will cause further problems between the papacy and the Byzantine emperor.

IV

The second player besides Michael Cerularius is Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida (1000-1061). He came to Rome after the election of Leo IX. After the battle at Civitate, Humbert was allowed to join the pope in captivity. He first went to Argyrus though, who had an alliance with the pope. On his way to Argyrus, Humbert passed through Trani and received the letter written by Leo of Ochrid. He then made a translation, which probably overstated the already disrespectful tone.¹¹¹ Pope Leo wanted Humbert to reply to the letter that Leo of Orchid had sent. The response, however, was a reassertion of Roman claims to primacy in the church.¹¹² In this response, he set out the pope’s claim as successors of St Peter to absolute supremacy

¹⁰⁸ *DRG*, 125.

¹⁰⁹ *HN*, II.28, p. 75.

¹¹⁰ Loud, ‘Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century’, 106.

¹¹¹ *Ibid*, 42.

¹¹² M.A. Noll, *Turning Points, Decisive Moments in the History of Christianity* (Michigan, 1997) 132.

in the Church.¹¹³ Leo IX may have thought that the letters Humbert wrote were too stern, therefore the letters were not sent.¹¹⁴ Meanwhile, two letters from Constantinople came to Italy, one from the Emperor and one from Cerularius; both containing elements of rapprochement.¹¹⁵ There was no mention of disputed usages in the church, in contrary to the first letter that was sent.¹¹⁶ The staff of Leo IX, however, again wrongly translated the letter of Cerularius.¹¹⁷ Because of the bad health of pope Leo IX, Leo decided to let Humbert control the affair.¹¹⁸ Humbert disliked the Greeks and decided to send more letters in Leo's name. One of the letters was addressed to Cerularius, in which the supremacy of the Holy See was again explained. The second letter, which was addressed to the Emperor, contained a complaint about Cerularius.¹¹⁹ As far as Runciman tells, the letters did not contain information about the Normans anymore; therefore, one might argue that the Normans were not a priority to the Churches at that time.

Leo IX appointed a three-man legation to visit Constantinople and discuss a more satisfying relationship between the West and the East.¹²⁰ As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the legation consisted of Humbert, Frederick of Lorraine, and Peter, the archbishop of Amalfi. While going to Constantinople, the legation once more interviewed Argyrus, who told them to ignore Cerularius and treat only with the Emperor. This was, according to Runciman, a foolish advice, due to the popularity of Cerularius over the Emperor's.¹²¹ When this embassy arrived in Constantinople, pope Leo IX had died. The legation was received with respect at the imperial palace and the patriarch received the letters that Leo IX wrote.¹²² The letters, however, contained a discourtesy and abusive tone, which astounded Cerularius for he had been convinced that the pope would be a more sympathetic man.¹²³

The seal of the letter was broken, which led Cerularius to conclude that a conspiracy was plotted against him, engineered by Argyros and Humbert.¹²⁴ Cerularius rejected the letter and also questioned whether Humbert even was a

¹¹³ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 308.

¹¹⁴ Runciman, 42-43.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 43.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 44.

¹¹⁹ Runciman, 44.

¹²⁰ Noll, *Turning points*, 132.

¹²¹ Runciman, 45.

¹²² Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 308.

¹²³ Runciman, 45.

¹²⁴ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 308.

properly credentialed legate, considering the death of the pope. This was offensive to Humbert and he placed a bull of excommunicating Cerularius.¹²⁵ According to Louth, this bull tried to drive a wedge between the Byzantine emperor and the patriarch. The emperor allowed Cerularius to curse the authors of the bull and also to burn the bull. With this, any hope of an alliance against the Normans was gone, as well as the future of Byzantine presence in Italy.¹²⁶

V

This chapter focused on the schism of 1054 and what it meant for the papacy. The sources used, however, do not elaborate on what the schism meant for the relationship between the Normans and the papacy. Both William of Apulia and Amatus do not mention the events that led towards the schism. It is evident that the events which led to the schism assured that an alliance between the Byzantine emperor and the pope against the Normans was not an option anymore. In the previous part of this chapter, an illustration was made of the consequences that Cerularius made towards the Latin Churches in Constantinople, as a response to the actions of the Normans in southern Italy. The Normans suppressed the Greek ways and Latin customs were introduced. This also meant that the use of leavened or unleavened bread was attacked. Whilst it was always clear that there was a geographical difference between the Churches, the attack of the Normans on the Greek Churches, as well as the response of Cerularius to Latin Churches, was an attack where ordinary people became aware of the different costumes.¹²⁷ The conquest of the Normans thus affected the schism of 1054, with the change of costumes in Byzantine Italy. What effect did the clash between both Churches have on the Norman supremacy in Italy, if it had an effect at all?

According to Wolf, the Normans took advantage of their victory at Civitate, as well as the delays in selecting a new pope after the death of Leo IX. During that time, they tightened their grip on Apulia.¹²⁸ Loud confirms this view, saying the Normans went into southern Apulia, capturing the city of Conversano in 1054 and the year after capturing Otranto. This might have been possible considering the break between the emperor and the pope, and the lack of an anti-Norman front. Both Churches focused on each other instead of on the threat of the Normans, which ensured that the

¹²⁵ Noll, *Turning points*, 133.

¹²⁶ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 310.

¹²⁷ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 307.

¹²⁸ Wolf, *Making History*, 17.

conquest of the Normans on the mainland was not seriously challenged, subsequently quickening the conquest.¹²⁹

It is clear that the actions of the Normans had an impact on what occurred in Constantinople, however, I would say that the Normans might even be blamed for the whole schism, instead of the small role the territorial conquest had. The reason for this blame lies in the affair between Argyrus and Cerularius. Runciman stated that Cerularius personally disliked Argyrus. Argyrus was appointed in 1051 as governor of Byzantine Apulia. He fought against the Normans, because the threat of the Normans was there, and therefore he cooperated with the pope against the Normans.¹³⁰ So one might say, that if Argyrus had been loyal towards the Byzantine emperor alone, the personal affair between Argyrus and Cerularius would not have taken place. If so, Cerularius might have trusted the letter Humbert gave to him in Constantinople, without thinking there would be a conspiracy against him. This could have prevented the excommunication of Cerularius by Humbert, and therefore the schism could have occurred later than 1054. Apart from the personal affair, one can also state that if the battle at Civitate did not happen, and if a peace was signed between the pope and the Normans, the affair did not take place, considering the statement Deansley made. Cerularius was afraid that an alliance between the pope and the emperor would affect the Byzantine part in Italy, thus if the Normans and pope would have signed a treaty in Civitate, the conquest of the Normans might have been stopped, and the pope had never asked the Byzantine emperor for help, and therefore the letter would not have been sent. Thus, Leo IX or the Teutons could be blamed for the schism as well.

This statement, however, is one of many ‘what if’s’. The Normans could be blamed for the schism, but the Teutons, Leo IX and, as the sources already say, Cerularius and Humbert as well. The Normans definitely had an influence on the events that occurred around the schism, it is, however, rather bold to say that they were to blame for the schism. But the question is, whether the Normans knew the consequences of their actions in Italy. They might have known they were attacking Byzantine areas, although it is questionable whether they knew that their actions would led to problems between both Churches, considering that the pope and the emperor did not even know at that time a schism occurred.

¹²⁹ G.A. Loud, ‘Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century’, 107.

¹³⁰ Ibid, 106.

The schism of 1054 meant that there was a definitive break between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church. Even though the actions of the Normans in Italy were accepted by the pope, that is, the conquest of the Byzantine areas in Italy, the pope was still threatened by the Normans, which led to the Battle at Civitate in 1053. The schism could have led to an alliance between the Normans and the pope, considering the strength of an ally, however, both the pope and the emperor were more occupied with their own issues than with the issue of the Normans. Thus, the threat of the Normans remained, and for the next few years the different popes struggled with the presence of the Normans in Italy.

Chapter 4: Peace in Italy

1055-1059

In the years before 1055, as mentioned in the previous chapters, a lot of changes happened within the papal see. A short overview will be given of the events that matter for the years 1055-1059, which are already discussed more broadly in the previous chapters. The first important change that occurred is the connection of the German Empire to the papal see. In 960 Otto the Saxon was asked by pope John XII to help him, due to enemies he had in Italy. As a result, the German Empire influenced the papal see. Besides the influence of the Empire, the Roman nobility also interfered with the papal see, thus up to this point the papal see itself had not much to say about who became the new pope after the death of the seated pope. The second important change was the schism of 1054. With this schism, the focus of both the Churches switched from fighting against the Normans to ‘fighting’ against each other. Therefore, the Normans could continue their conquest.

The years 1055-1059 are characterised by different popes and different attitudes of the popes towards the Normans. Apart from the various popes, these years are also characterised by Norman conquests, and therefore more Norman territory in Italy. In this final chapter the events that led up to the Council of Melfi will be explained.

I

In order to understand the events that occurred before the Council of Melfi, it is important to explain the Reform Movement, which existed within the Church. In the tenth century, the power of both king and emperor were weakened, which led to a sort of political vacuum. Because of this vacuum, the local aristocracy became more influential. The local lord would build his own churches, and the local magnates had influence on the facilities they provided. With the local aristocracy, local law and order was established as well, which led to a society of armed combat.¹³¹ In this society, a group of churchmen decided to try to contain the violence in the society, and this movement became known as the ‘Peace of God’ movement.¹³² The movement developed and led to the ‘Truce of God’ movement, who wanted to ban

¹³¹ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 291.

¹³² *Ibid*, 292.

fighting on Sundays and during periods of fasting.¹³³ Besides this, the movement also tried to introduce Christian ideals into society, for example through the promotion of the ideals of Christian marriage.¹³⁴ This movement also made it clear that there were ‘three orders of society’: those who fight, those who pray, and those who work. ‘Those who pray’ should define society. But within the group of clergy, reform was also necessary, and this reform was focused on two matters: the heresies of simony and Nicolaism.¹³⁵ The Church should be ‘catholic, chaste and free’; therefore the three orders of society were to be kept separate.¹³⁶

The Reform Movement thus started because of a group of churchmen. It is interesting that in the early eleventh century, the German emperors, Henry II and Henry III, centralised the Reform Movement, because of their reliance on the imperial Church in the running of the empire. After the crisis of the last Tusculan pope, Benedict X, which is explained in chapter 3, the movement became focused on the papacy.¹³⁷ With the appointment of Leo IX as pope, the beginning of the Papal Reform Movement starts, because he gathered around him a group of reformers who carried out his ideals.¹³⁸ Henry III and Leo IX focused mostly on simony and celibacy among the priesthood. Another, although more hidden, reform was the restitution of dignity to the papacy itself.¹³⁹ In order to achieve this, the papacy should be extracted from local political strife and should become an independent authority.¹⁴⁰

These points of reform would play an important role in the agreements that were made between the papacy and the Normans, which will be elaborated more in the next part of this chapter.

II

After the death of Leo IX, it took almost a year before a new pope was chosen, still named by the German emperor. In 1054, Henry III summoned the great men of Italy to Zurich, to choose the successor of Leo IX.¹⁴¹ Bishop Gebhard of Eichstätt was appointed as the new pope, and became pope Victor II in 1055 (r.1055-1057). Victor

¹³³ Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 292.

¹³⁴ Ibid, 292.

¹³⁵ Ibid, 294.

¹³⁶ Ibid, 295-296.

¹³⁷ Ibid, 297.

¹³⁸ Ibid, 297, 298.

¹³⁹ Noll, *Turning points*, 130.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, 131.

¹⁴¹ Tabacco, ‘Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century’, 79.

II turned out to be the last pope chosen by Henry III, who unexpectedly died in 1056.¹⁴² Victor II was, just as Leo IX, a protector of the Church. Henry III gave Viktor II papal authority over a few regions in Italy: the duchy of Spoleto and all of the coastal areas from the Adriatic to central Italy. This had not been recognised before.¹⁴³ According to Amatus, Victor II was a great friend of the emperor and was not hostile towards the Norman knights; he wanted to make peace with them instead.¹⁴⁴ When Henry III went back to Germany in 1056, he died unexpectedly, leaving his six-year-old son Henry IV as successor.¹⁴⁵ Pope Victor II, who was present in Germany when Henry III died, assured that Henry IV would be king of Germany, as well as the regency for the widowed empress.¹⁴⁶

With the death of Henry III, Victor had to search for another protector of the reform party. This body, in which Leo IX was also placed, wanted to reform the Church. Therefore, Victor began to strengthen his ties with Frederick of Lorraine's brother, Godfrey of Lorraine (997-1069). Godfrey had control of Tuscany, due to his marriage to the countess Beatrice (1020-1076).¹⁴⁷ This led to a dispute between Henry III and Godfrey; however, Godfrey was able to flee on time. As a response, Henry wanted to capture Frederick, who on his turn, decided to enter Montecassino as a monk.¹⁴⁸ Viktor had still good relations with Godfrey, so after the death of Henry he decided to patch up the relation between the imperial family and Godfrey.¹⁴⁹ When Viktor II died, Frederick of Lorraine became the new pope, under the name Stephen IX. The Italian Reform Party chose this pope, instead of the German emperor, Henry IV.¹⁵⁰ Norwich stated that Stephen IX was not popular among the imperial court. According to him, the marriage of Godfrey and Beatrice, and the therefore obtained power of Tuscany, was a threat to Henry III, and thus a threat to Henry IV. There were stories told that the pope wanted to take advantage of the underaged Henry.¹⁵¹ It is not clear where Norwich retrieved his information from, it is however a statement that might be true. The unpopularity makes sense, considering the history between Henry III and Godfrey, as well as the fact that the new pope was not chosen by the

¹⁴² Wolf, *Making History*, 17-18.

¹⁴³ Tabacco, 'Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century', 79.

¹⁴⁴ *HN*, III.47, p.103.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 83.

¹⁴⁶ Tabacco, 'Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century', 83.

¹⁴⁷ Wolf, *Making History*, 18.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 18.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid*.

¹⁵⁰ Tabacco, 'Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century', 83.

¹⁵¹ Norwich, *De Pausen*, 119.

emperor, but by the reform movement of the Roman clergy. This was not something the Empire wished for, because it meant that the power of the Empire in the Italian state would be decreased.

The attitude of Stephen IX towards the Normans was a hateful one. As Frederick of Lorraine, he fought against the Normans at the Battle of Civitate, and afterwards he was still hostile towards the Normans. In the *HN* it is said that Frederick had said that he would use his power to destroy the Normans, however, he could not achieve this due to his death.¹⁵² Pope Stephen IX died soon after being appointed, in 1058. A new problem emerged after his death. The Roman aristocracy had their chance to choose their own pope: Benedict X (1058-1059). He had the same name as the last Tusculan pope (Benedict IX), who had been disposed after the synod of Sutri (1046). The reform party, however, came with their own candidate as well, the bishop of Florence: pope Nicholas II (1058-1061).¹⁵³ Thus there were two popes, one chosen by the Roman aristocracy and one chosen by the Roman clergy.

III

Back to 1054, the Norman side. The Normans won the battle at Civitate, captured Leo IX and released him a few months later. In the same year the pope died, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the Normans were able to conquer more land in southern Apulia and the heel of Italy. After conquering those territories, they continued to the principality of Salerno. Robert Guiscard succeeded his brother Humphrey the Hauteville in 1057. He became the leader of the Apulian Normans and continued the conquest of Calabria.¹⁵⁴ He was able to capture all the fortresses of Calabria, except of Reggio, because the citizens of that city did not want to surrender to Robert.¹⁵⁵ The leadership of Guiscard made sure that the whole southern part of the peninsula and Sicily were in power of the Normans. The method used by Guiscard in the conquered lands was one of adaptation. In Apulia it meant that Guiscard took over the established state taxes and he had loose control over his vassals.¹⁵⁶ In Calabria the conquest was more systematic, which started with the building of castles. The castle was used as a base. From this base they could force the surrounding region into

¹⁵² *HN*, III.50, p. 104.

¹⁵³ Tabacco, 'Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century', 84.

¹⁵⁴ G.A. Loud, 'Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century', 108.

¹⁵⁵ *HN*, IV.3, p. 112.

¹⁵⁶ Chibnall, *The Normans*, 79.

surrender. Subsequently, treaties were secured.¹⁵⁷ In 1058, Richard of Aversa attacked Capua and secured the city's surrender, and Richard was recognised as their new prince.¹⁵⁸ Hildebrand, Nicholas II, and Richard met in the year 1059. Hildebrand was already Cardinal during Leo IX's reign as pope and Stephen IX asked to postpone the election of a new pope until Cardinal Hildebrand came back from Germany. Eventually he became pope, under the name Gregory VII (r.1073-1085).

IV

With the appointment of two popes, the reform party realised that they needed to depose Benedict X. In order to do so, they needed help, and help came from the Normans. According to Norwich, this was a surprising and fateful step.¹⁵⁹ This indeed can be said, considering the fact that a few years earlier the papacy and clergy wanted to fight the Normans, and even the last pope, Stephen IX, wanted to fight against the Normans. It therefore, one might argue, can be seen as a desperate step as well. The papacy wanted to do everything, even receive help from the barbaric Normans, in order to disengage the papacy of the empire as well as the Roman aristocracy. Thus, in 1059, Richard of Aversa was asked to help the papacy in order to dispose Benedict X.¹⁶⁰ Hildebrand was sent to Richard to ask for help, and Richard replied by sending troops to besiege Galeria, where Benedict had retreated.¹⁶¹ With the help of the Normans, the reform party was able to implement their plans, and in April 1059 Nicholas II held a Lateran Council.

During the Lateran Council, a new way of electing the pope was recorded. The high clergy of Italy was present at the council and with them, the future election of the pope was defined.¹⁶² This meant that the process of selecting a pope was handed to the cardinal bishops, which previously was in the hands of the clergy and nobility of Rome. The imperial intervention, which was there since the interference of Otto I, was based on the claim that the German emperor was a delegate representing the Roman citizens.¹⁶³ Without the help of the Normans, this was not possible. Hägermann stated that due to the Normans, the pontificate of Nicolas II acquired a

¹⁵⁷ Chibnall, *The Normans*, 80.

¹⁵⁸ G.A. Loud, 'Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century', 108.

¹⁵⁹ Norwich, *De Pausen*, 120.

¹⁶⁰ Wolf, *Making History*, 19.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² D. Hägermann, *Das Papsttum am Vorabend des Investiturstreits; Stephan IX. (1057-1058), Benedikt X. (1058) und Nikolaus II. (1058-1061)* (Stuttgart, 2008) 103.

¹⁶³ Wolf, *Making History*, 19, 40.

significant and lasting format.¹⁶⁴ More rules were written down during the Lateran Council, on the subjects of monastic discipline, simony, Nicolaitism and practical questions of the Canon Law, such as the problem of marriage legislation.¹⁶⁵

William of Apulia also wrote about the events of 1059, yet he only speaks of a meeting in Melfi in 1059, and not of the Lateran Council. He does, however, describe rules that were discussed during the Lateran Council. According to William, the pope was received in Melfi with great honours. Besides, he stated that the pope came to Melfi to deal with ecclesiastical affairs, as mentioned above as well. The problems that occurred had to do something with the marriage of the clergy, because priests, deacons and the clergy were openly married. At the council, the pope summoned the priest and minister to arm themselves with chastity: ‘for he who indulges in lust is not a true priest’.¹⁶⁶

After the Lateran Council, Nicholas II held another Council at Melfi. During this Council, he recognised the Norman leaders Robert Guiscard and Richard of Capua. Robert Guiscard was granted the title of Duke of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily, whilst Richard was invested with Aversa.¹⁶⁷ In return, both Robert and Richard swore fealty to the pope.¹⁶⁸ The oath of Robert Guiscard survived. In his oath, Robert made several promises, to the Church as well as to Nicholas II himself. It was said that Robert would be faithful to the holy Roman Church and to Nicholas II. He would not take part in a plan that would cause Nicholas II to lose his life or to be captured; he would assist the Roman church in holding their possessions, and would help the pope to secure the Roman Papacy and the land that he holds. Robert also said that he would not invade or acquire the land that is hold by the papacy. An interesting promise Robert made is one that is clearly a result of the Lateran Council, because he said he would assist the Roman clerics and layman in such a way that the pope can be elected.¹⁶⁹ This part is also described by William of Apulia, who said that Nicholas II gave Robert the status of ‘duke’. Robert himself took an oath of fidelity, and the pope conceded him with Calabria and Apulia, as well as the domination over his countrymen in Italy.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁴ Hägermann, *Das Papsttum am Vorabend des Investiturstreit*, 103.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 135, 140.

¹⁶⁶ *DRG*, 153.

¹⁶⁷ G.A. Loud, ‘Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century’, 107.; Wolf, *Making History*, 19.

¹⁶⁸ G.A. Loud, ‘Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century’, 107.

¹⁶⁹ Wolf, *Making History*, 51-52.

¹⁷⁰ *DRG*, 155.

V

An interesting statement Wolf makes about the oath is that it sounds negative and proscriptive. Robert said what he should not do as a papal vassal, instead of showing what he can do. There is a prohibition against military invasion of papal jurisdiction.¹⁷¹ Thus, even though it was an oath that was necessary for both sides, it seemed like the Normans would relinquish more than the pope did. Nevertheless, the Normans, and in this case Robert Guiscard, decided to fulfil the oath. The question is: why would he?

Up to this point, the Normans were able to gain more and more land in Italy, and nothing had stopped them. Apparently Robert saw the oath as a good thing for the Normans. According to Loud, it was clear why the Normans wanted to become papal vassals: by fulfilling the oath, the Normans were recognised as territorial rulers. It also justified their conquest.¹⁷² In addition, Robert gained Sicily, which was not even conquered at that time. It allowed Robert to continue conquering parts in Italy. Questionable is whether the Normans would gain more land if they had decided not to be papal vassals, considering the lands they already had conquered up to this point. Becoming a papal servant makes sense when looking back to 1053. Before the battle at Civitate took place, the Normans wanted to make peace. One might thus argue, that the Normans never wanted the conflict between them and the papacy, and therefore this peace signed in 1059, was a peace they already wanted to gain back in 1053.

This oath has two sides, so why did the papacy, and in this case the reform party, wanted to accept the oath of the Normans? It is clear that Nicholas II and the reform movement needed the Normans to achieve their goals to reform the Church. Was this the only reason why they accepted the oath of the Normans? According to Loud, it might also have been recognition of the inevitable: the Normans would permanently settle in Italy, so why not make them allies? Loud, however, also states that it is a reflection of the situation of the papacy and the reform party. As mentioned above, when Nicholas II was assigned, there already was a pope, chosen by the Roman aristocracy. With securing ties with the Normans, Nicholas II would also be more secured of his position as pope, and therefore also securing the reform

¹⁷¹ Wolf, *Making History*, 53.

¹⁷² G.A. Loud, 'Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century', 107.

movement. The price paid by the pope was only papal recognition towards the Normans, and in return he would get help and assistance.¹⁷³

Thus, one might conclude, the Normans were but a pawn in the power struggle between the papacy, the Roman aristocracy, and the German Empire. The Normans were only used by the papacy to gain their own rights and to become an independent institute.

¹⁷³ G.A. Loud, 'Southern Italy in the Eleventh Century', 107-108.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The theme of this thesis was the interaction between the Normans and the papacy between the years 1053-1059, with special attention to the changing attitude of the papacy towards the Normans. In order to answer the question of why the attitude changed, a few events were analysed and enlarged: the battle at Civitate in 1053, the schism of 1054, and the council of Melfi in 1059. The major players in the events were the Normans, with the Hauteville family as the most important Normans, as well as the different popes: Leo IX, Victor II, Stephen IX, Nicholas II, and Benedict X. The analysis of the events led to new insights on the papal-Norman relation.

The battle of Civitate was described as the first anti-Norman campaign by the papacy. Pope Leo IX had several reasons for this anti-Norman campaign. Firstly, the assassination of Drogo is a turning point in the changing attitude, and a few reasons can be given to support this statement: a leaderless group can either be easier to overthrow or more difficult to overthrow. Without a leader, it might have been more difficult for Leo to consult with the Normans, considering there was not one spokesman to talk to. On the other hand, it could have been easier because of that as well, the pope could do however he pleases. Considering the attack at Benevento, which is also the second reason for the changing attitude after Drogo's assassination, it is, however, more likely that it would be more difficult for the pope to control the Normans without a leader, since the Normans did as they pleased, even with a leader. The attack on Benevento showed the dangers of the Norman presence in Italy, and for the pope that would be a reason to start an anti-Norman campaign. The second reason for this campaign was the growing power of the Normans in Italy, because they kept conquering more and more lands. The third possible reason for pope Leo IX was that of securing his own papal power. The German emperor Henry III chose the pope, and the papacy was, in 1053, still an institution that was controlled by either the German emperor or the Roman aristocracy. Therefore, one might argue that a forceful stand against the Normans would help him secure his papacy with the Italian citizens. These reasons might have played part in the fact that the Normans and the pope were not able to draw a peace before the battle at Civitate. The contemporary sources have different explanations on whom decided to fight against the Normans, it is, however, clear that the expectation of a larger army was one of the reasons why the papal army did not sign the peace. Another explanation that can be given is fear of an already

growing power of the Normans in Italy. If the pope accepted the terms given by the Normans, he would accept the Norman conquest, and therefore he might have lost the trust of the Italian citizens again. Thus, the battle at Civitate did not change the attitude of the papacy towards the Normans, even though there was a change to gain peace between both groups.

The schism of 1054 was mostly described from the papal side of history. The role the Normans played was described as: the Normans suppressed the Greek ways and Latin costumes were introduced.¹⁷⁴ In this thesis I made the statement that the Normans could be blamed for the schism, which gives them a much bigger part than was found so far. The reason for this is the affair between Argyrus and Cerularius. If the Normans would not have invaded the lands of Argyrus, and therefore no alliance was made between Argyrus and Leo IX, there might have been trust between Argyrus and Cerularius. The letter that Humbert brought to Constantinople might have been accepted, and it would have prevented the excommunication of Cerularius. Therefore, the schism might have occurred later than 1054, considering that in the letter that was given, other issues were appointed as well. Another statement that can be made is the fact that Cerularius was afraid that an alliance between the pope and the emperor would affect the Byzantine part in Italy. If a peace was signed before the battle of Civitate that fear would have been unnecessary, and therefore he did not had to interfere in the events that happened in Italy. This view, however, is a view based on many 'what if's' and would be a good subject for a follow-up study.

The last event that changed the attitude between the papacy and the Normans was the appointment of Benedict X by the Roman aristocracy. As a response, the Reform Movement appointed their own pope, Nicholas II, and they realised that without help, they could not overthrow Benedict X as pope. Thus they asked for help, and help came from the Normans. Concluding, I would say that the Normans were but a pawn in the power struggle of the papacy. Even though the reform party might still feared the Normans, they feared their own position in Italy more.

Concluding all this, the changing attitude of the papacy to the Normans was partly because of fear of the growing power of the Normans in Italy. Looking at those six years though, one might argue, that the reason for the changing attitude was one of self-protection, and one of securing their own position in Italy. Even though the

¹⁷⁴ Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, 39.

council in Melfi meant that the papacy had to accept the Normans in Italy, it also gave that secureness.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- HR Die Chronik Herimanns von Reichenau, ed. K.Nobbe (Leipzig, 1893).
- HN Amatus of Montecassino, History of the Normans, trans. P.N. Dunbar (Woodbridge, 2004).
- LP Liber Pontificalis, ed. L. Duchesne, vol.2 (Paris, 1955).
- PRV Pontificum Romanorum Vitae, Vol. I-IV, ed. I.M. Watterich (1862).
- DRG Guillaume de Pouille, La geste de Robert Guiscard, ed. and trans. M. Mathieu (Palermo, 1961).

Modern Literature

- Bijbel*, ed. Het Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap (1967) print.
- Chibnall, M., *The Normans* (MA, Oxford and Victoria, 2006).
- Deanesly, D., *A History of the Medieval Church 590-1500* (London, 1969).
- Erickson, J.H., *The Challenge of Our Past* (Crestwood, 1991).
- Hägermann, D., *Das Papsttum am Vorabend des Investiturstreits; Stephan IX. (1057-1058), Benedikt X. (1058) und Nikolaus II. (1058-1061)* (Stuttgart, 2008).
- Haskins, C.H., *The Normans in European History* (Boston, 1915).
- Loud, G.A., 'Southern Italy in the eleventh century', in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History vol. 4 c.1042-c.1198, part 2* (2015).
- Louth, A. *Greek East and Latin West The Church AD 681-1071* (New York, 2007).
- Noll, M.A., *Turning Points, Decisive Moments in the History of Christianity* (Michigan, 1997).
- Norwich, J.J., *De Pausen een geschiedenis*, trans. R. Fagel (Amsterdam, 2013).
- Runciman, S., *The Eastern Schism, A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (London, 1963).
- Smith III, M.H., *And taking bread, cerularius and the azyme controversy of 1054* (Paris, 1978).

Southern, R.W., *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (1970).
Tabacco, G., 'Northern and Central Italy in the Eleventh Century', in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History vol. 4 c.1042-c.1198, part 2* (2015).

Wolf, K.B., *Making History: The Normans and their Historians in Eleventh-Century Italy* (Pennsylvania, 1995).

Websites

English Oxford living dictionaries,

<<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/norman>> (consulted on the 19th of January 2018).

Encyclopaedia Britannica, <<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Hermann-von-Reichenau>> (consulted on 09 January 2019).

Bible Study Tools, <<https://www.biblestudytools.com/sblg/1-corinthians/5.html>> (consulted on 29 december 2018).

Bible Study Tools, <<https://www.biblestudytools.com/vul/1-corinthians/5.html>> (consulted on 29 december 2018).