

Issue 2
December
2016



**White Rose**
College of the Arts
& Humanities
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield & York

Student Journal

Editorial Board:

Stephanie Williams
University of York

Mirjam Galley
University of Sheffield

Lucy Rowland
University of Leeds

Josh Bengough
University of Sheffield

Jade Douglas
University of Leeds

A Body, A Nation: The Enigma of 4
a Body and a Nation in T. S. Eliot
and Wyndham Lewis

SHEIK BEGUM

School of English, University of Leeds
en15slb@leeds.ac.uk

Book Review: Sam Edwards, *Allies in . . 14*
Memory: World War II and the
Politics of American Commemoration
in Europe c. 1941- 2001

HARRIET BEADNELL

School of History, University of York
Heb533@york.ac.uk

Translation Strategies for Long 20
Sentences in Public Speech,
using a Chinese
Translation of a Public Speech by
President Obama as a Case Study

LONG YANG

School of Languages, Cultures, and Societies,
University of Leeds
milly@leeds.ac.uk

Male Models: Fatherhood and 30
Gentleman-Making in the Late
Victorian *Bildungsroman*

VICTORIA CLARKE

Schools of English & History,
University of Leeds
en14vjc@leeds.ac.uk

The Development of the Qasida in 39
al-Andalus

DAVID HARRISON

School of Philosophy, Religion, and
History of Science, University of Leeds
harrisonde.uk@gmail.com

Sensing the Shoal: Film and Lyric 52
in the Anthropocene

JULIA TANNER

School of English, University of Leeds
j.r.tanner14@leeds.ac.uk

Political Manoeuvring in the 63
Norman Kingdom of Sicily: Civitate
and Carinola in the Development of
the Southern Italian County

HERVIN FERNÁNDEZ-ACEVES

Institute for Medieval Studies, University of
Leeds
Ms11hfa@leeds.ac.uk

'The True Life is Not Reducible to . . . 74
Words': The Disintegration of
Language in Post-Millennial American
Fiction

RUTH DALY

School of English, University of Leeds
enrd@leeds.ac.uk

COPYRIGHT INFO

All the content of this Journal, unless explicitly stated otherwise, is copyright of the WRoCAH Journal and may not be reproduced without prior permission. By accessing the Journal, you agree that any downloading of content is for personal, non-commercial reference only.

No part of this journal may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior consent of the Journal administrators.

For any queries about re-use of content from the website, please contact journal@wrocah.ac.uk

DISCLAIMER

Whilst every care has been taken in preparing the information published in this journal, the administrators do not guarantee the accuracy or currency of the content. The WRoCAH Journal cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions and accepts no liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising. The Journal the right to remove or alter content or take down this Journal at any time without notice.

Political Manoeuvring in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily: Civitate and Carinola in the Development of the South-Italian County

HERVIN FERNÁNDEZ-ACEVES, Institute for Medieval Studies, University of Leeds
Ms11hfa@leeds.ac.uk

One of the most interesting documents concerning the social and political history of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily can be found in the first instance in Giuseppe Del Giudice's appendix to his diplomatic collection of Angevin documents.¹ The document records Robert, Count of Civitate, restoring some lands that Robert Guiscard and Roger II had formerly granted to Abbot Unfredus of Terra Maggiore, and agreeing upon some exemptions and privileges. The original document is dated January 1152. While it used to be part of the Great Neapolitan Archive, *Arca D, mazzo 49, nr. 15*, the original document is now lost. It only survives, to my knowledge, as an edited document in Del Giudice's work. The edited document, though seemingly unimportant and relevant only at a local level, is not only crucial for the understanding of King Roger's rearrangement of the nobility and their dominions in the mainland. What I argue here is that it also exemplifies the contemporary usage of the notion of county as a construction of something more than just a 'countship,' and rather a cluster of lordships defined by the social role exercised by the Norman count.

The protagonist of the aforementioned document is recorded as 'Robert, the son of Richard, late Count of Civitate by the grace of God and the King'.² Robert, son of Richard is also remembered in an early thirteenth-century testimony as an 'old count' (*vetus comes*) who had given land as a dowry for his daughter.³ This land was in a place that used to host a monastery called Sanctus Angelus in Vico, in the vicinity of Lucera and Fiorentino:⁴ the former is the same town that, according to Falco of Benevento, was taken by Robert, son of Richard in 1127.⁵ Falco was a notary and scribe in the papal palace in his native city of Benevento. He was also a prominent chronicler for the years between 1102 and 1139. On the other hand, the 1152 charter records the existence of a previous count of Civitate, Count Jonathan, who used to lawfully hold the title and the holdings corresponding to it.⁶ Another piece of evidence in which Jonathan is named Count of Civitate can be found in an imperial confirmation made to the

1 G. Del Giudice, ed., *Codice diplomatico del regno di Carlo I. e II. d'Angiò*, (Naples: Stamperia della Regia Università, 1869), app. II no. 11 pp. xxvii-ix.

2 'Robertus filius quondam Roberti comitis dei et regia gratia civitatensium comes', Del Giudice, *Codice diplomatico*, app. II, p. xxviii.

3 L. A. Huillard-Bréholles and H. D'Albert de Luynes, eds., *Historia Diplomatica Friderica Secundi*, (Paris: Plon Fratres, 1852), II, p. 481.

4 Fiorentino was a town in the Capitanata, between Lucera and San Severo, in Capitanata; see G. A. Loud, *Roger II and the Making of the Kingdom of Sicily* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), p. 174.

5 E. D'Angelo, ed., *Falco di Benevento: Chronicon Beneventanum: città e feudi nell'Italia dei normanni*, (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998), p. 86.

6 Del Giudice, *Codice diplomatico*, p. xxviii.

monastery of S. Maria di Pulsano by Frederick II in 1225. In this charter it is recorded that late Jonathan, count of Civitate by the grace of God and the King donated two plots of land to the monastery.⁷ However, where did these counts of Civitate come from, and how were they connected?

Count Robert, son of Richard

Robert was recorded in July 1121 as the Lord of Cerentia, and confirmed the castle of Cantelupo, which his Baron Richard of Iguazu and his son Robert had previously given to the monastery, was to be given to Abbot John of S. Sophia in Benevento at the latter's request.⁸ The notary Falco mentioned here must be the chronicler Falco of Benevento, the only notary of this name active at Benevento at this time. The Beneventan notary also recorded in his chronicle that Robert, son of Richard, requested that Count Jordan of Ariano join him to help take the city of Fiorentino in 1127.⁹ We are told by Alexander of Telesse that by 1134, after Roger II had captured Capua and Sergius VII of Naples rendered homage and swore fealty to the new King, Roger II granted to Robert, son of Richard the lands that Hugh of Molise, Count of Boiano, had surrendered to him. Hugh had succeeded his uncle Robert, brother of his father, Count Simon, who had died during the earthquake of 1117 in Isernia.¹⁰ Furthermore, the Telesian Abbot remarks that while Roger was at war with the Count of Boiano and the others, he had promised those lands to Robert, son of Richard, providing that he kept loyal to the King.¹¹ The aforementioned lands given to Robert were those to the east of the Biferno River, and the fortified village of Maris, and were situated at the mouth of the River Volturno. The fortified village of Maris, though physically far away from the lordship of Boiano, had long been a possession of the Molise family. In February 1097, Hugh I of Molise granted fishing rights at *castello Maris* to the monastery of S. Angelo in Formis.¹² These lands cannot have constituted all of Hugh of Molise's possessions, but they most likely made up half of his Apulian dominions, and provided him with two strategic zones. One of these was in the northern Capitanata that bordered the lordships of Loritello and Civitate, and the other was a point on the Tyrrhenian shore between Gaeta and Naples.

We are told by Alexander of Telesse that, by 1135, Robert son of Richard was a member of the king's army. The army was then near to Caserta, defending Terra di Lavoro under the command of Emir John, and had recently received reinforcements from Apulia of both knights and foot soldiers.¹³ However, Robert was not confirmed as a count until after Roger II had granted the dignity of Prince of

7 'Quondam Jonathas Dei et regis gratia Civitatis comes in territorio predictae terre', ed. by Huillard-Bréholles and D'Albert de Luynes (Paris: Plon Frères, 1852), II, p.481.

8 Museo del Sannio, Fondo S. Sofia, vol. 2, no. 5; unpublished document.

9 D'Angelo, p. 86. See also E. Cuozzo, 'Prosopografia di una famiglia feudale normanna: i Balvano', in *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, vol. 98 (1980), pp. 61-80, here p. 82.

10 A. De Francesco, 'Origini e sviluppo dei Feudalismo nel Molise fino alla caduta della dominazione normanna', in *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, vols. 34-35 (1909), pp.432-60, 640-671-698, 273-307; E.M. Jamison, *I conti di Molise e di Marsia nei secoli XII e XIII* (Casalbordino: Nicola de Arcangelis, 1932). Cf. E.M. Jamison, 'The Administration of the County of Molise in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', in *English Historical Review*, vol. 45, no.177 (1930), pp.1-34.

11 L. De Nava (ed.), *Alexandri Telesini abbatis Ystoria Rogerii regis Siciliae, Calabriae atque Apuliae*, FSI, cxii (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1991), p. 56.

12 M. Inguanez (ed.), *Regesto Di S. Angelo in Formis* (Montecassino: Camastro & Figli, 1925), no. 17.

13 De Nava, *Alexandri Telesini*, pp. 62-63.

Capua to his son Alfonso, when, whilst in Aversa, the King entrusted the command of the Knights being chosen to defend the north-western territories to several Counts deemed worthy of his trust. These temporary commanders were to succeed each other for set terms, and Robert, son of Richard was appointed to the second of these periods in command.¹⁴ As Commander of the Royal Knights, Count Robert blockaded the borders of Naples with such military prowess and energy that its defenders never dared to inflict injury on their enemies.¹⁵ He completed his two-month term of duty at Aversa, from November to December 1135, and then returned home to the Capitanata.¹⁶ He was then succeeded by Count Simon of Monte S. Angelo in Gargano.

Given the prominent role played by Count Robert, son of Richard, as an avid Royalist, his conspicuous absence in the chronicle of Falco of Benevento should not come as a surprise to historians, since Falco was a clear opponent to the Royal Party. Count Robert is however referred to by Bishop Henry of Sant'Agata, an anti-Rogerian partisan. In the letter that Bishop Henry wrote to Pope Innocent informing him of Count Rainulf's victory over Roger II in Nocera in 1132, he recorded that the names of the barons of the duke (Roger II) who were captured and held were: Count R[oger] of Ariano, Count R[obert] of Civitate and almost thirty others.¹⁷ Henry of Sant'Agata clearly refused here to acknowledge Roger's royal title, referring to him simply as 'duke'. Interestingly enough, Robert, son of Richard, is acknowledged here as count of Civitate, which suggests two things: first, that Robert, son of Richard, had already been honoured with the comital distinction even before he received the lands confiscated from Hugh of Molise; second, the original lordship of Robert son of Richard was located in Civitate. Thanks to his performance as both a royalist commander and an outstandingly loyal baron, Count Robert was awarded in 1134 with the lands east of the Biferno River. However, Civitate would have been granted to another potential ally of King Roger. Therefore, my impression is that Robert was the overlord of the eastern Molisian dominions after 1134, but he was not allowed to keep also his lordship in the Capitanata, as it appears that the king had other plans for it.

Jonathan of Carinola, Count of Civitate

Jonathan was a relative – a son, according to Cuozzo¹⁸ – of Richard, Count of Carinola and Duke of Gaeta, a title that this branch of the Capuan princely kin group held between c. 1112 and 1135. In turn, Richard was the son of Bartholomew, the brother of Prince Jordan I of Capua.¹⁹ Jonathan is recorded in

¹⁴ De Nava, *Alexandri Telesini*, p. 77.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ 'Nomina autem baronum ducis, qui copti sunt et tenentur, hec sunt: comes R(ogerus) de Ariano, comes R. de Civitate et alii tales fere triginta I.', in P. Jaffé, ed., *Monumenta Bambergensia*, (Berlin: Weidmann, 1869), pp. 442-444.

¹⁸ E. Cuozzo, ed., *Catalogus Baronum: Commentario*, FSI, 101 (Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984), pp. 694-695; Cuozzo, *Prosopografia*, p. 78. See P. Skinner, who identified Jonathan as nephew of Richard instead; P. Skinner, *Family Power in Southern Italy: The Duchy of Gaeta and Its Neighbours, 850-1139* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), p. 159.

¹⁹ *Codex Diplomaticus Cajetanus*, 2 vols (Montecassino: Abbey of Monte Cassino, 1891), ii, no. 311, pp. 231-233. See also J. Mazzoleni, ed., *Le pergamene di Capua* (Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli, 1957), vol. I, no. 11.

dating clauses as the Duke-elect and Consul of Gaeta in 1116,²⁰ 1119,²¹ and 1120.²² All the dating clauses that refer to Jonathan's rule record him as a minor, who was most probably under the tutelage of his uncle Richard of Carinola: a charter of 1117 records that the Capuan princely court included Duke Richard, son of Count Bartholomew of Carinola, as one of his barons.²³ Additionally, a reference to Jonathan as being 'under the tutelage of his uncle (*avunculus*) Richard' is made in a footnote included by the nineteenth century editors of the Gaetan charters.²⁴ The young Duke seems to have lost his position, because by 1121, his uncle Richard is recorded as the sole Duke and Consul of Gaeta.²⁵ Richard is last attested as Duke of Gaeta in May 1135, in a charter that is dated the 13th year of Richard's rule.²⁶

A plethora of assumptions could be made about Richard's appropriation of the ducal title in 1121. Did Jonathan just die as a minor, or did Richard get rid of him? This is unclear, but one can quite reasonably argue that Jonathan's uncle simply pushed him away from the ducal seat, and took what had originally belonged to his younger relative. This presumption would also help to clarify Cuzzo's mistaken inference on Jonathan's parentage, because it would have been expected for Richard to have been mentioned in the dating clauses earlier than, or at least together with, Jonathan; had Richard been Jonathan's father. It would also shed some light on Jonathan's sudden absence, for when inheritance practices are diverse and rather versatile, Richard would find in an underage relative – nephew or even brother – a significant obstacle to claiming for himself the dukedom that could have originally belonged to another branch of his own kin group. It must be noted that primogeniture was not the imperative norm in Norman nor Lombard societies. Despite the apparent consolidation of this practice, there is no real evidence to support the claim of primogeniture as a social norm in southern Italy. Furthermore, the attested inheritance practices – such as partible inheritance exercised or *parage* – reveal a rather diverse panorama of practices and customs emerging from a variety of family situations.²⁷

The Counts of Carinola were related to the Drengot family (the kin group of the Norman princes of Capua), because the younger brothers of Prince Jordan I of Capua, Jonathan and then Bartholomew, had taken the title of *comes Caleni*: there were many other Latin names for the town of Carinola, such as *Calenum*, *Calinulum*, and *Carinula*. The title was perhaps taken by members of the princely family (i.e. Jonathan and Bartholomew) from the Lombard family of Landenolfus, who, before 1076, was the count of Carinola.²⁸ The kinship between this older Jonathan and Bartholomew as being that of brothers is confirmed in a 1089 *iudicatum translate* made by Prince Jordan of Capua 'in the presence of Jonathan and

20 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 289, pp. 194-196.

21 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, nos. 292-3, pp. 200-204.

22 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 295, pp. 206-208.

23 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 290, pp. 196-198.

24 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, p. 195, n. a.

25 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 296 pp. 206-208.

26 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 328 pp. 260-262.

27 E. Searle, *Predatory Kinship and the Creation of Norman Power, 840-1066* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 173-175. J. Drell documented how the diverse family situations in the eleventh and twelfth century had generated different inheritance practices in Salerno's Italo-Norman society. See *Kinship & Conquest: Family Strategies in the Principality of Salerno during the Norman Period, 1077-1194* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 2002), 90-121.

28 Landenolfus 'qui fuerat comes Caleni', H. Hoffmann (ed.), *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, MGH SS, 34 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1980), p. 419.

his brother Bartholomew.²⁹ By 1092, Jonathan is recorded as having authorised a donation made by his tenant Omfridus, the count of Calvi. As the overlord of Calvi, Jonathan would most likely have been the Count of the region, namely that of Carinola, at the time.³⁰ Bartholomew would have then taken Carinola after 1092, based on the evidence that regards his son Richard as Count of Carinola.³¹ First, a document dated December 1109 records a donation made to Anne, mother of Richard of Carinola and former wife of Bartholomew. Then, in February 1115, Count Richard is attested as a donor to the Church of S. Maria fuori Carinola, which had been built by the same Anne.³² Additionally, an 1117 Gaetan charter records that the Capuan princely court included Duke Richard of Gaeta, the son of the Count of Carinola.³³

After that no Count of Carinola makes another documented appearance until Jonathan is recorded in both the 1152 charter and in the *quaternus magne expeditionis*; the *quaternus* is a listing of land tenancies and obligations in the principality of Capua and the duchy of Apulia contained in the compendium known as the *Catalogus Baronum*.³⁴ However, Richard of Carinola was definitely still operating in the Capua area during the decade in which the kingdom was created, for he was last attested as Duke of Gaeta in a May 1135 charter dated the 13th year of Duke Richard's rule.³⁵ Richard, the son of Bartholomew, may have thereafter been, in the second decade of the twelfth century, both Count of Carinola and Duke of Gaeta, as his father was before him. Nevertheless, although he was still considered the Duke of Gaeta, one cannot automatically assume that Richard of Carinola kept the comital distinction throughout the 1120s. The aforementioned Gaetan charters that record Richard of Carinola as duke of Gaeta establish at least one certainty: a unifying link between the count of Carinola and the nominal authority over Gaeta. As Count of Carinola, Richard probably already had a rather detailed knowledge of the Gaetan territories, for the lands of Carinola neighboured the eastern borders of the maritime city.³⁶ The influence of this cadet branch of the Capuan princely family seems therefore to have grown under Richard as Duke of Gaeta.

Jonathan would then have been the legitimate heir not only to the duchy of Gaeta but to the dignity and Lordship of Carinola as well, in the same way Richard of Carinola could have claimed the Gaetan title. Bartholomew might still have been alive before 1109; it is highly probable therefore that the Prince of Capua gave the ducal title of Gaeta to a second cadet branch of his own family as an alternative dignity that their relatives could have borne, apart from the comital honour. Whether or not one can be certain about the specific kinship relation between young Jonathan and Richard of Carinola (as his son,

29 'In presentia ionathae et bartholomei germanorum eius [Iordani].' *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 262, pp. 142-143. See G. Carelli, who assumes Bartholomew was Jonathan's son instead; G. Carelli, 'I conti Normanni di Calinulo (1062-1187). Note storiche', in *Rivista araldica*, vol. 11 (1913), p. 614. See G.A. Loud, 'Continuity and Change in Norman Italy: The Campania during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 22, no. 4 (1196), pp. 332-333.

30 A. Gallo, ed., *Codice diplomatico normanno di Aversa* (Naples: Luigi Lubrano editore, 1926), no. 54.

31 The parentage between Bartholomew and Richard is attested in *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 262, pp. 142-143; *Cod. Dipl. Aversa*, no. 54, pp. 401-402.

32 G. Bova (ed.), *Le pergamene normanne della Mater Ecclesia Capuana: 1091-1197* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1996), p. 247. See Mazzoleni, who has dated the latter document to 1114 instead; Mazzoleni, vol. 1, pp. 26-32.

33 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 290, pp. 196-198.

34 E. Jamison, ed., *Catalogus Baronum*, FSI, 11 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1972).

35 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 328, pp. 260-262.

36 Skinner, *Family Power in Southern Italy*, pp. 158-160.

nephew or brother), the rest of the evidence serves to support the contention that his affinity to the Drengot kin-group allowed him to hold Gaeta, and be closely connected to Richard of Carinola. Consequently, a legitimate heir to such a prominent dignity in the principality of Capua would have surely been a key ally to King Roger in his attempt to consolidate his authority in the mainland. If the former Duke of Gaeta had survived, he could have then been a natural and expected supporter of the Royal Party against the Capuan nobles. Taking into consideration all the aforementioned pieces of evidence on the lineage and ties between Gaeta and the Counts of Carinola, and given that ostensibly the former Duke of Gaeta Jonathan would have been alive in the 1130s, I support Cuozzo in identifying Jonathan as the Count of Carinola of the new kingdom. Jonathan recovers the lordship and titles he should have been entitled to, and the Sicilian King tallies a noble Capuan collaborator to his side.

Cuozzo has taken the speculation one step further. He argues that Jonathan was nominated Count of Civitate in 1137, after Roger II's ally, Robert, son of Richard – a man described by Alexander of Teleso as 'most faithful to the king'³⁷ – had lost to the invading German emperor Lothar.³⁸ Cuozzo argues that Jonathan received the county of Civitate from Lothar after he lent himself to the imperial cause, as could be expected from a member of the Capuan princely family. The Italian scholar however fails to explain how a count who was not simply a sympathiser of the opposing party but was also invested count by the German emperor could have remained under the mercy of the Sicilian king, who would later endow him with both the comital title of Carinola and the lordship of Conza. Contrary to Cuozzo's assumptions, two other considerations must be made. First, the two main contemporary narrative witnesses, Alexander of Teleso and Falco of Benevento, do not make any mention of Jonathan as a member or sympathiser of the anti-Rogerian party. Since both chroniclers, in particular the Beneventan notary, are rather explicit in naming the King's enemies, it would be quite improbable for contemporary testimonies to have omitted an imperial supporter made Count by Lothar himself. Second, a later 1152 charter endorsed by the Count of Civitate, Robert, son of Richard, records Jonathan not only as having held previously his *county* wholly and integrally, but as having done so rightfully.³⁹ Had Jonathan held Civitate from Lothar, the son of the royalist Robert would hardly have acquiesced that the former held it lawfully, or even properly.

I am therefore inclined to suggest that Roger II granted the lands and lordships that would later constitute the *county* of Civitate to Jonathan of Carinola at some point between 1132 and 1137, before the entire region was shattered by Lothar's expedition. This new Lordship could have been created to restore Jonathan's comital dignity, thus keeping him within the royal ranks but still far away from the original Capuan lands he might have been entitled to. At the beginning of Roger's Kingship, in the 30s, the king was more cautious and willing to negotiate with the Capuan nobility, and for that reason, relinquishing Carinola might not have been a feasible option. Even if Count Robert, son of Richard, had not surrendered to the emperor's army at that time, he would have had to do so later, during Lothar's

37 De Nava, *Alexandri Telesini*, pp. 62-63.

38 Cuozzo, *Prosopografia*, pp. 78-79; Cuozzo, *Commentario*, p. 181.

39 'Iuste tenuit penitus et integer [comitatum] suis minibus.' Del Giudice, app. II no. 11 pp. xxvii-ix.

campaign. After seizing Bari, the imperial expedition advanced into the Beneventan plain and the principality of Capua. According to the Monte Cassino chronicle, the entire Capuan principality abandoned its obedience to Roger, and the Barons of the region surrendered themselves, their property and their city to the Lordships of Pope Innocent II and Prince Robert II of Capua.⁴⁰

The creation of the counties of Carinola and Civitate in the aftermath of the war

Roger II was able to recover and secure his hold over the entire mainland in the following year, 1138. Boiano, furthermore, seems to have been restored to Hugh of Molise. First, the Chronicle of Santa Maria di Ferraria indicates that in 1141 King Roger married Hugh of Molise's sister, by whom he had his son Simon, the same son who was allegedly appointed Prince of Capua.⁴¹ Assuming that the date referred to in the Chronicle of Ferraria is correct, it is not impossible that the couple got married, as this would have been after Roger's first wife Elvira of Castilla's had died in 1135, and well before the King's marriage to Sibylla of Burgundy in 1149. Houben has suggested that she was in fact one of Roger II's mistresses.⁴² In any case, Hugh of Molise might have negotiated the recovery of his extensive dominions with the King between 1139 and 1142.

The restoration of the county of Hugh of Molise must have diminished the lordships and lands that Count Robert, son of Richard had amassed in the northern Capitanata, east of the Biferno river, under his comital title. It would have been necessary then to grant another lordship whose importance and extension matched that of his former holdings to one of the king's trusted allies, as Robert, son of Richard, was. The lordship of Civitate and its holdings in the Capitanata, which bordered the lands east of the Biferno, seem to have been an ideal alternative for Count Robert, son of Richard, as this was the original lordship Robert held before 1134. Roger II appears to have seen a fitting opportunity to manoeuvre his nobles politically towards the rearrangement of his dominions and the consolidation of his rule by permuting Civitate and Carinola. The King would have hence returned Jonathan's previous dominions to Count Robert, son of Richard, in order to maintain the social and economic power the latter wielded as lord of the Biferno lands between 1134 and 1137. And since the Capuan principality was finally subjugated after the end of the civil war, Jonathan could finally be restored to his place of origin: Carinola. In this way, after years of war and occasional permutations, Counts Hugh of Molise, Jonathan of Carinola and Robert, son of Richard, were finally settled in their respective original lordships.

Jonathan's restoration was not that simple, however. The city of Gaeta was not given back to him, for the ducal dignity was removed by the King. The city of Gaeta was nevertheless given as a lordship to another one of Roger's allies: Geoffrey of Aquila, later appointed Count of Fondi. This Geoffrey was closely tied to the city of Gaeta, for his father Richard I of Aquila had been Duke of Gaeta between c.1105 and 1107. Furthermore, as soon as Richard of Carinola was no longer attested in Gaetan

⁴⁰ Hoffmann, *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, p. 567.

⁴¹ G.H. Pertz and A. Gaudenzi (ed.), *Ignoti Monachi Cisterciensis S. Mariae de Ferraria Chronica et Ryccardi de Sancto Germano Chronica Priora*, (Naples: F. Giannini, 1888), p. 28.

⁴² H. Houben, *Roger II of Sicily: A Ruler between East and West*, trans. by G.A. Loud (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), p. 36.

date clauses as Duke, Geoffrey of Aquila is instead already acknowledged as ‘our lord’ by June 1135, and later in August 1136.⁴³ It is also noteworthy that in c. 1150, his son Richard is recorded as holding in the city of Gaeta only a fief of three knights.⁴⁴ It is probable that the lordship over the city was held directly by Roger II after 1140. In order to make this up to Jonathan, Roger granted a small but strategic lordship to him: Conza.

The transfer of Conza opened up another problematic but rich episode in the transformation of the Italo-Norman nobility. This calls to attention another notable document, retrieved from the Buoncompagni-Ludovisi collection. The document under consideration, an original charter dated January 1124, records how Lord William accepted from 40 Salernitan gold coins from Abbot Ursone and hence renounced the possession of the disputed territory according to the boundaries specified in the presented ancient privileges granted to S. Mary Elce by the Prince of Salerno. This followed an unfavourable decision made by Duke William of Apulia in the dispute brought up by Ursus, Abbot of S. Maria in Elce, for the territory of Luzzano, held by the William of Bisaccia⁴⁵ and claimed by the Abbot.⁴⁶ The charter has the following dating clause: in the time of Count Geoffrey, in whose county the church is located; in the month of January, second indiction.⁴⁷ Although the allusion here to a *county* as a territorial reference is rather suspicious, both Volpini and Cuozzo agree that this is a reliable document that attests the authority Count Geoffrey of Catanzaro exercised outside of Calabria, in the Apulian Apennines.⁴⁸ The disputed lands in the charter provide a meaningful insight to what could have been the lordship of Conza as held by the Loritello branch.⁴⁹ The quoted clause also suggests that Count Geoffrey was the Overlord of the Lord of Bisaccia and Luzano. Furthermore, the charter was drafted by Dauferius, who was directly connected to the comital family of Catanzaro, as he described himself as the notary of countess lady Bertha of Loritello.⁵⁰

William of Bisaccia appears to have nevertheless been the same lord that is recorded without an apparent overlord (that is, not holding it ‘in servitio’ of any lord), holding a fief of three knights, and whose military services were placed under the command of the *constable* Gilbert of Balbano.⁵¹ Although the exact location of Luzano is unclear, one can safely assume that it was in the vicinity of Conza, as attested in the charter: [next] to the boundaries of the land previously referred to as Luzano, out of the

43 *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, nos. 329-330, pp. 262-264. He is no longer attested in the Gaetan charters until after the King restored and consolidated his rule c. 1138 against the rebels and the Pisan invaders, for Roger is finally recorded in Gaeta’s date clauses in 1138 and 1140. *Cod. Dipl. Cajetanus*, no. 332, pp. 265-266 ; no. 334, pp. 268-269.

44 ‘In Gaeta tenet [Riccardus filius Comitis Goffridi de Aquila] iii militum.’ Jamison, *Catalogus Baronum*, para. 995, p. 179.

45 The town of Bisaccia is West of Melfi, and less than 20 km North of Conza. Not to be confused with the *Bisaccia* that William of Scalfo used to hold from the Count of Loritello c.1150-1167 which, according to Jamison, corresponds to Montenero di Bisaccia, in Northern Adriatic Apulia. Jamison, *Catalogus Baronum*, para. 362.

46 R. Volpini, ‘Diplomi sconosciuti dei principi longobardi di Salerno e dei re normanni di Sicilia’, in *Contributi dell’Istituto di Storia medioevale* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1968), x, pp. 481-544, here pp. 532-39. The church of S. Maria in Elce, of which there are just some shabby ruins left today, takes its name from the plants of holm oak (*Elce* in Italian), and was located in the region of Irpina, in the vicinity of Conza.

47 ‘Sub tempore domini loffridi comitis, in cuius comitatu heccllesia sita est, m(ense) ianuario, secunda indiction’ Volpini, ‘Diplomi’, x, p. 536.

48 Volpini, ‘Diplomi’, x, pp. 532-5; E. Cuozzo, ‘I conti normanni di Catanzaro’, in *Miscellanea di Studi / Università degli studi della Calabria*, no. 2 (1982), pp. 109-127, here pp. 113-114.

49 ‘Territorium de Luzzano cum suis finibus et pertinentiis sicut in veteri privilegio Salemitani principis continet. Volpini, ‘Diplomi’, x, p. 537.

50 ‘N(otariu)s domine Berte Loretellensis comitisse’. Volpini, ‘Diplomi’, x, p. 538.

51 Jamison, *Catalogus Baronum*, p. 125.

part of land of Bisaccia.⁵² This small lordship seems to have stayed at the margin of the lordships of both Count Jonathan of Carinola and Count Philip of Balvano until around 1150, and even though it is not clear why it was disconnected from the Lordship of Conza, it might reflect the lack of a clear geographical definition of the so-called counties of Conza and S. Angelo dei Lombardi. Cuozzo has argued convincingly that the county that has been traditionally labelled as the ‘county of Balvano,’ as found in Jamison’s edition of the *Catalogus Baronum*,⁵³ was in fact the county of S. Angelo dei Lombardi, for the title ‘comes de Balvano’ was in fact a toponymic name that referred to the original lordship that the Count’s family held before they received the comital title.⁵⁴

Conza and Bisaccia were not the only remnants left in Apulia from the branch of Rao of Loritello, of the Hauteville kin group. His younger son Raymond might have inherited some lands closer to the toponymic nucleus of his lineage: Loritello. Whereas the older brother held the Calabrian comital lordship, Raymond appears to have held *Mons Odorisius* and *Mons Ylaris*, in the dioceses of Bovino. An 1118 document records that Raymond son of Rao of Loritello offered a house to the church of S. Efreim in ‘the fields’ (*campus*) of Deliceto, and handed it over to Abbot Bernard of S. Sofia di Benevento, while the former was in the *castello* of *Mons Ylaris*.⁵⁵ All of these places, which belong to the diocese of Bovino, are located in a region that stands between Conza and Civitate. Unsurprisingly, *Mons Odorisius*, *Mons Ylaris*, and *Licetum* (Deliceto) are all places that are found in the *quaternus magne expeditionis* as ‘feuda’ of both the Count of Civitate and Count Jonathan.⁵⁶ This could either mean that these places were shared as ‘feuda’ in equal proportions by the two Counts, or, more likely, that these two records might actually manifest two different snapshots in time: before and after a change that could have occurred between 1150 and 1167. In any case, this situation does indicate how liquid the delimitations of the Counts’ dominions were, and how closely the counties of Civitate and Carinola were weaved together.

However, what is much clearer is to whom Conza belonged, for it is recorded in the *quaternus* as a ‘feuda’ held ‘in demanio’ solely by Count Jonathan c.1150.⁵⁷ It seems hence that Geoffrey of Catanzaro originally held Conza, not as a county but simply as a lordship. Conza was then left vacant between 1143 and 1145 after Geoffrey’s death, and later given to the Count of Carinola as a sort of compensation for the earlier permutations. This can be inferred from Geoffrey’s presence at a royal court at Capua in 1143 and a donation made by his mother Countess Bertha of Loritello to the church of S. Maria Requisita, in Calabria, for the salvation of the souls of her son Count Geoffrey, of Geoffrey’s brothers, of C[lementia], Geoffrey’s sister, and Count Rudolph (Rao), the father of all the above mentioned.⁵⁸ The county of Carinola was thus enhanced with the lordship of Conza, a city that would play a crucial role in bringing

52 ‘Fines autem supra dicti Luczani ex parte Bisaziensis terre’. Volpini, ‘Diplomi’, x, p. 537.

53 Jamison, *Catalogus Baronum*, p. 124.

54 Cuozzo, *Prosopografia*, p. 73.

55 J. M. Martin (ed.), *Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae: cod. Vat. Lat. 4939*, (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 2000), pp. 769-772.

56 Jamison, *Catalogus Baronum*, p. 69.

57 Jamison, *Catalogus Baronum*, pp. 122-123.

58 C-R. Brühl (ed.), *Rogeri II. Regis Diplomata Latina*, Codex Diplomaticus Regni Siciliae, 2 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987), no. 59, pp. 166-170, especially p. 169; A. Pratesi (ed.), *Carte latine di abbazie calabresi provenienti dall’archivio Aldobrandini* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1958), no. 14.

together the Count of Carinola's holdings in Apulia and in the development of what would be known in subsequent centuries as the county of Conza. I therefore argue that after 1140 Robert, son of Richard was created Count of Civitate, while Jonathan was established as Count of Carinola, Jonathan was Lord of Conza only after 1144.

Conclusion

To conclude, at some point between 1139 and definitely before 1150, Hugh of Molise was either restored or confirmed as count of Boiano; after 1140 Count Robert, son of Richard, received the county of Civitate, and Jonathan was deprived of Civitate but then given the county of Carinola; and after 1144 Count Jonathan obtained the lordship of Conza. If one sought to follow the tradition of Jamison and Cuozzo, the general territorial reform that might have taken place in the year 1142 in Silva Marca could have been the setting in which these changes were negotiated and took effect. The possible existence of an assembly in Silva Marca is, however, another issue that merits a separate discussion. What is certain, however, is that by 1150, when the records that served as the basis of the *quaternus magne expeditionis* were drafted, the Counts of Civitate and Carinola were the Overlords of a cluster of Barons, and the Lords of the respective *capitis* of their Lordships.

The permutation of Carinola and Civitate, together with the concession of the strategic lordship of Conza, is an illustrative example of how the dignity of the count was neither restricted to military commanders nor sufficient to secure an important baron's allegiance. Granting lands was not sufficient either. Securing certain territories and lords under the Overlordship of a count seems to have been the strategy followed by the Sicilian monarchy in the mainland. Consequently, although the *county* was not necessarily a fixed territorial demarcation at that point in history, it became a useful unit for organising the aristocracy and their holdings. The county under the early Hauteville monarchy seems to have been employed thus: as a unit of social power for manoeuvring with and against the upper strata of society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bova, Giancarlo (ed.), *Le pergamene normanne della Mater Ecclesia Capuana: 1091-1197* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1996).

Brühl, Carlrichard (ed.), *Rogerii II. Regis Diplomata Latina. Codex Diplomaticus Regni Siciliae*, vol. 2 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987).

Carelli, G., 'I conti Normanni di Calinulo (1062-1187). Note storiche', in *Rivista araldica*, vol. 11 (1913), pp. 609-616.

Codex Diplomaticus Cajetanus, 2 vols (Montecassino: Abbey of Monte Cassino, 1891).

Cuozzo, Errico (ed.), *Catalogus Baronum: Commentario*, FSI, vol. 101 (Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984).

———, 'I conti normanni di Catanzaro', *Miscellanea di Studi / Università degli studi della Calabria*, vol. 2 (1982), pp. 109-127.

———, 'Prosopografia di una famiglia feudale normanna: i Balvano', in *Archivio storico per le province Napoletane*, vol. 98 (1980), pp. 61-80.

D'Angelo, Edoardo (ed.), *Falcone di Benevento. Chronicon Beneventanum: città e feudi nell'Italia dei normanni* (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998).

De Francesco, A., 'Origini e sviluppo del Feudalismo nel Molise fino alla caduta della dominazione normanna', in *Archivio storico per le province Napoletane*, vols. 34-35 (1909), pp. 432-460, 640-671-98, 273-307.

De Nava, Ludovica (ed.), *Alexandri Telesini abbatiss Ystoria Rogerii regis Siciliae, Calabriae atque Apuliae*, FSI, vol. cxii (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1991).

Del Giudice, G. (ed.), *Codice diplomatico del regno di Carlo I. e II. d'Angiò* (Naples: Stamperia della Regia Università, 1869).

Drell, Johanna H., *Kinship & Conquest: Family Strategies in the Principality of Salerno during the Norman Period, 1077-1194* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 2002).

Hoffmann, Hartmut (ed.), *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*, MGH SS, vol. 34 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1980).

Houben, Hubert, *Roger II of Sicily: A Ruler between East and West*, trans. by G.A. Loud (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002).

Huillard-Bréholles, J.-L.-A., and H. D'Albert de Luynes (eds.), *Historia Diplomatica Friderici Secundi* (Paris: Plon Fratres, 1852).

Inguanez, M., ed., *Regesto Di S. Angelo in Formis* (Montecassino: Camastro & figli, 1925).

Jaffé, P. (ed.), *Monumenta Bambergensia* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1869).

Jamison, Evelyn M. (ed.), *Catalogus Baronum*, FSI, vol. 11 (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1972).

———, *I conti di Molise e di Marsia nei secoli XII e XIII*

(Casalbordino: Nicola de Arcangelis, 1932).

———, 'The Administration of the County of Molise in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', in *English Historical Review*, vol. 45 (1930), pp. 1-34.

Loud, Graham A., 'Continuity and Change in Norman Italy: The Campania during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 22 (1996), pp. 313-43.

———, *Roger II and the Making of the Kingdom of Sicily* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2012).

Martin, J.-M., ed., *Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae: cod. Vat. Lat. 4939* (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 2000).

Mazzoleni, J. (ed.), *Le pergamene di Capua* (Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli, 1957).

Pertz, G.H., and A. Gaudenzi (eds.), *Ignoti Monachi Cisterciensis S. Mariae de Ferraria Chronica et Ryccardi de Sancto Germano Chronica Priora* (Naples: F. Giannini, 1888).

Pratesi, Alessandro (ed.), *Carte latine di abbazie calabresi provenienti dall'archivio Aldobrandini* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1958).

Searle, Eleanor, *Predatory Kinship and the Creation of Norman Power, 840-1066* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Skinner, Patricia, *Family Power in Southern Italy: The Duchy of Gaeta and Its Neighbours, 850-1139* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995).

Volpini, R., 'Diplomi sconosciuti dei principi longobardi di Salerno e dei re normanni di Sicilia', in *Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia medioevale* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1968), vol. x, pp. 481-544.

Manuscript sources:

Museo del Sannio, Fondo S. Sofia, vol. 2 no. 5.