

Filip VAN TRICHT*

Gent University

Gent

Belgium

BEING BYZANTINE IN THE POST-1204 EMPIRE OF CONSTANTINOPLE: CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

(POLITICS, GOVERNMENT, CHURCH AND RELIGION)

Abstract: The impact of the Latin conquest of Constantinople has often been treated from either the perspective of the Western newcomers who established themselves in various Byzantine territories, or from the perspective of the Byzantines who left the regions that came under Latin control and who managed to establish themselves elsewhere (Nicaea, Epiros, Trebizond). In this contribution the momentous consequences of the Fourth Crusade are addressed from the perspective of those Byzantines that came under Latin rule. By zooming in on a selection of individuals and subgroups a picture is sketched of the varied Byzantine experience within the confines of the (Latin) Empire of Constantinople after 1204. Attention will be given to the various – political, religious, socio-economic and cultural – spheres of society. The focus is on the capital and the region around Constantinople, but other regions come into view as well (Thessaloniki, Adrianople, Philippopolis, Achaia/Morea, Attica, Beotia, Euobia, Crete, etc.). Chronologically this contribution is primarily limited to the period until the loss of Latin Constantinople in 1261.

Keywords: Byzantium – Frankokratia – Latin Romania – political history – church history – cultural history

Анотација: Утицај латинског освајања Цариграда често је разматран или из перспективе западних дошљака који су се настанили у различитим византијским областима или из перспективе Византинаца који су напустили области које су пале под контролу Латина и населили се на другим местима (у Никеји, Епиру, Трапезунту). У овом раду, значајне последице Четвртог крсташког рата сагледавају се из перспективе оних Византинаца који су пали под власт Латина. Стављањем тежишта на одређене појединце и подгрупе, дата је слика различитих византијских искустава у оквирима (Латинског) царства у Цариграду након 1204. године. Пажња је посвећена различитим – политичким, религијским, друштвено-

* filip.van.tricht@telenet.be

привредним и културним – сферама друштва. Акцентат је стављен на престоницу и област око Цариграда, али су размотрене и друге области (Солун, Хадријанопољ, Филипољ, Ахаја/Мореја, Атика, Беотија, Еубеја, Крит итд.). Рад је хронолошки ограничен пре свега на период до губитка латинског Цариграда 1261. године.

Кључне речи: Византија, франкократија, латинска Романија, политичка историја, црквена историја, културна историја

Introduction

In 1203–1204 the Byzantine – or (East-)Roman – Empire was faced with a series of exceptional events.¹ Its impregnable deemed capital was captured twice by a crusader army. Next the crusaders from their ranks proclaimed and crowned a new emperor, count Baldwin of Flanders and Hainault. The Empire’s territories were divided among the crusade’s chief leaders, including marquis Boniface of Monferrat and the city of Venice represented by doge Enrico Dandolo, all to be held as fiefs – with the most important constituting largely autonomous regions – by the new Latin emperor. The patriarchal throne of Constantinople likewise became Latinized, with the Venetian Thomas Morosini replacing the Byzantine occupant John X Kamateros. Faced with these developments, a part of the Byzantine Constantinopolitan ruling elite chose to flee the city. Together or in competition with local Byzantine elites they succeeded in establishing regional principalities in both Asia Minor and Western Greece, which all at one point or another claimed the imperial legacy.²

¹ In this contribution I use the term ‘Byzantine(s)’ as an equivalent of “East Roman(s)”, referring to people from lands belonging to (or claimed by) the Eastern Empire and with a political or religious attachment to its central authorities (emperor, patriarch). The term ‘Latin(s)’ refers to people with roots in Western Europe and belonging to the Roman Church.

² On the political fragmentation of the Byzantine space after 1204 with a number of what sometimes have been called Latin and Byzantine ‘successor states’ (with further references): Jean Longnon, *L’empire latin de Constantinople*, Paris 1949. Robert L. Wolff, *Studies in the Latin Empire of Constantinople*, London 1976. Antonio Carile, *Per una storia dell’impero latino di Constantinopoli (1204–1261)*, 2nd ed., Il mondo medievale. Sezione di storia bizantina e slava 2, Bologna 1978. Filip Van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium. The Empire of Constantinople (1204–1228)*, *The Medieval Mediterranean* 90, Leiden 2011. Michael Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile. The Empire of Nicaea*, Oxford, 1975. John S. Langdon, *John III Ducas Vatatzes’ Byzantine Empire in Anatolian Exile, 1222–54. The Legacy of His Diplomatic, Military and Internal Program for the “Restitutio Orbis”*, Ann Arbor 1980. Donald M. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford 1957. François Bredenkamp, *The Byzantine Empire of Thessaloniki, 1224–1242*, Thessaloniki 1996. Anthony A. M. Bryer, *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos*, London 1980.

The crusade expedition arrived in Constantinople in the late spring of 1203 at the request of and accompanied by prince Alexios (IV) Angelos, who aspired to the imperial throne. His father Isaac II (1185–1195) had been deposed by the latter's brother Alexios III (1195–1203). The latter had also imprisoned his nephew, but Alexios managed to escape to the West, where he contacted and visited the papal court, his brother-in-law and German king (*rex Romanorum*) Philip of Swabia (married to his sister Irene), and ultimately the crusade army's leaders in search of aid. Faced with the crusade army, emperor Alexios III lost heart and abandoned his capital to his nephew and his Western helpers. Next Alexios IV and his father Isaac II ruled for a few months, but both soon ended up dead because their politics were perceived as too pro-Latin by part of the ruling elite, giving rise to a palace revolution led by Alexios (V) Doukas. This in turn resulted in the crusade army capturing Constantinople a second time, now for themselves.³

Existing historiography has mostly either treated the Latin take-over from the perspective of the Western newcomers and their establishment in Byzantine territories, or from the perspective of the group of Byzantines who left the regions that came under (some form of) Latin control and who established themselves outside Latin territory. In this contribution I would like to address the momentous events of 1204 and their consequences from the perspective of those Byzantines that stayed, either by choice or by necessity, under Latin rule or suzerainty. This group has up until now been underexposed in existing historiography. By zooming in on a selection of individuals and subgroups I

³ The bibliography on the Fourth Crusade is very extensive. A number of recent studies: Donald E. Queller, and Thomas F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade. The Conquest of Constantinople*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia 1997. Michael Angold, *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context*, Harlow 2003. Jonathan Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*, London 2005. Overviews of existing historiography: Donald E. Queller, *The Latin conquest of Constantinople*, New York 1971. Thomas F. Madden, "Outside and inside the fourth crusade", *International History Review* 17 (1995) 726–743. Michel Balard, "L'historiographie occidentale de la quatrième croisade", in: Angeliki E. Laiou (ed.), *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its consequences*, Paris 2005, 161–174. The 800th anniversary of the crusade also produced several collections of articles in the past decade: Angeliki Laiou, ed., *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its consequences*, Paris 2005. Gherardo Ortalli, Giorgio Ravegnani and Peter Schreiner, eds., *Quarta crociata. Venezia, Bisanzio, Impero latino*, 2 vols., Venice 2006. Thomas F. Madden, ed., *The Fourth Crusade: Event, Aftermath, and Perceptions. Papers from the Sixth Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Istanbul, Turkey, 25–29 August 2004*, Crusades – Subsidia 2, Aldershot 2008. Filip Van Tricht, "Venice's Need for Settling the 'Byzantine question' by Conquest: The Fourth Crusade's Second Siege of Constantinople (early 1204)", in: *Byzantion 'dan Constantinopolis' e İstanbul Kuşatmaları*, Murat Arslan and Turhan Kaçar, eds., Istanbul 2017, 311–334.

will sketch a picture of the continuities and discontinuities in the Byzantine space during this period in order to complement current views. Attention will be given to the political, religious, socio-economic and cultural spheres of society. I will focus on the capital and the region around Constantinople, but other regions will come into view as well (Thessaloniki, Achaia/Morea, Attica, Beotia, Euobia, Crete, etc.). Chronologically this contribution will be limited primarily to the first six decades of Frankokratia, until the loss of Latin Constantinople in 1261.

One of the reasons why historians generally have tended to neglect the said group no doubt must be that they have left only modest traces in the preserved sources. The Latin Empire has left no chronicle in Greek tracing of its history compared, for example, to the well-known work by the Nicaean politician George Akropolites. There are no letter collections of prominent churchmen such as those available in the principality of Epiros and the later Empire of Thessaloniki (such as, for instance, Demetrios Chomatenos, the archbishop of Ochrid, and John Apokaukos, the bishop of Naupaktos). Also lacking are charter collections of Byzantine religious institutions in Latin controlled regions, which are, for example, available in the Empire of Nicaea. This observation in itself could be taken as meaningful, but personally I would not attach too much importance to it. It should, on the contrary, be stressed that similar Latin source material is largely lacking as well. I have argued elsewhere that the preservation of documents from the period 1204–1261 must not have been a priority – quite the contrary, while conscious *damnatio memoriae* is also a possibility to consider.⁴

The Angeloi in Latin Romania

Although a new Western imperial dynasty now occupied the Constantinopolitan throne and Latin lords acquired extensive hereditary feudal principalities and other fiefs, this did not mean that the pre-1204 Byzantine elite was absent in the Latin Empire. A part of it – in particular those who were closely associated with the regimes of Alexios III Angelos and Alexios V Doukas, and were therefore turned down by the new emperor Baldwin I and his most important vassal, Boniface of Montferrat, the ruler of Thessaloniki – of course did flee the capital to either Epiros, Bulgaria, or Nicaea, where, for

⁴ Filip Van Tricht, *The Horoscope of Emperor Baldwin II. Political and Sociocultural Dynamics in Latin-Byzantine Constantinople*, The Medieval Mediterranean, Leiden 2019, 149.

example, Alexios III's son-in-law Theodore Laskaris had sought refuge.⁵ However, another part of the Byzantine elite chose to work with the Latin newcomers, who indeed did not ban Byzantine aristocrats from the positions of power. One underexposed aspect in this respect is how both in Constantinople and in Thessaloniki the Latin rulers throughout the period 1204–1261 tried to establish and maintain close connections with the lineage of, in Latin eyes, the most recent legitimate Byzantine emperors, Isaac II and his son Alexios IV. The intention was clear: if members of the former imperial family accepted the Latin emperors as the legitimate rulers of the Byzantine Empire, why then should other Byzantine magnates or the population in general have doubts? Boniface of Montferrat lost no time in marrying in 1204 Isaac II's widow, Margaret of Hungary, in the process establishing himself as the stepfather of Margaret's two sons with Isaac, Manuel (born around 1193–1195) and John Angelos (born shortly after 1195 probably). The political value of Isaac's young sons was not lost on Boniface: during his short-lived quarrel in the summer of 1204 with emperor Baldwin over Thessaloniki he proclaimed Manuel as emperor in front of the Byzantine population of Didymoteichon in Thrace.⁶ Afterwards, around 1205–1206, Manuel or John seems to have fitted in a plan Boniface had for the Thessalonikan church, which is mentioned in the papal registers but without any details.⁷ In spite of this, after 1204 Manuel and John must have continued to enjoy a predominantly Byzantine aristocratic upbringing. Their stepfather already died in 1207 and after this their Byzantinophile mother was in charge of their education.⁸

⁵ See for example: Donald M. Nicol, "Refugees, mixed population and local patriotism in Epiros and western Macedonia after the fourth crusade", in: *XVe Congrès international d'Études byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports*, Athènes 1976. Teresa Shawcross, "The Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade: The Lost Generation (c. 1204 – c. 1222): Political Allegiance and Local Interests under the Impact of the 4th Crusade", in: *Identities and allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain, eds., Farnham 2011, 9–45.

⁶ Benjamin Hendrickx, "Boniface de Montferrat et Manuel Angelos, empereur "manqué" de Byzance (1204)", *Byzantinos Domos* 12 (2001) 71–75. On the conflict between Baldwin and Boniface: Thomas F. Madden, "The Latin Empire of Constantinople's Fractured Foundation: The Rift between Boniface of Montferrat and Baldwin of Flanders", in: *The Fourth Crusade: Event, Aftermath, and Perceptions. Papers from the Sixth Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Istanbul, Turkey, 25–29 August 2004*, Thomas F. Madden, ed., Aldershot 2008, 45–52.

⁷ Innocentius III, *Regesta*, Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., Patrologia Latina 215, Roma 1855, n° 189–190, col. 1028–1029.

⁸ On Margaret of Hungary: M. Wertner, "Margarethe von Ungarn, Kaiserin von Griechenland und Königin von Thessalonich", *Vierteljahrschrift für Siegel-, Wappen- und Familienkunde* 17 (1890) 219–255. Aloysius L. Tautu, "Margarethe di Ungheria imperatrice di Bisancio",

Meanwhile emperor Henry (1206–1216) tried to establish his own connection with the Angeloi. The anonymous Chronicle of Laon under the year 1208 mentions that Henry proposed to the German king of the Romans Philip of Swabia (1198–1208) to marry one of his daughters by his wife Irene Angelina, herself a daughter of Isaac II Angelos.⁹ Philip however refused, leading Henry to create his own connections with the Angeloi in Thessaloniki. During his 1208–1209 campaign to establish imperial authority vis-à-vis his Lombard vassals in Thessaloniki and southern Greece, he built good relations with Margaret and her sons. He not only upheld the rights to Thessaloniki of Demetrios, Margaret's young son by Boniface, but also granted the former empress and all her sons extensive landed possessions in southern Thessaly, including Besaina, Demetrias and the two Halmyroi.¹⁰ It is obvious that Henry intended for Manuel – who by this time was nearing adulthood – and John Angelos to be key players in the region alongside their younger half-brother Demetrios. Henry's successors – his sister Yolande (1217–1219) or her son Robert of Courtenay (1221–1227) – continued to keep a lively interest in the two brothers' futures. At some point John Angelos married Mathilde of Courtenay, a daughter of empress Yolande and her husband emperor Peter of Courtenay (1217–1218). John must have been in his early twenties by 1217 at the latest and it sounds logical that a suitable marriage partner was sought for him around that time. We know that emperor Henry around 1215 had already married his sister's daughter Margaret to king Andrew II of Hungary. Empress Yolande herself married her daughter Mary to emperor of Nicaea Theodore I Laskaris (1206/08–1221), her daughter Agnes to prince of Achaia Geoffrey II of Villehardouin, and another daughter probably to tsar Boril of Bulgaria. In 1221 Robert appears to have married one of his relatives to the Serbian king Stephen II Nemanja.¹¹ John marrying Mathilde (° around 1210) on the initiative of either Yolande or Robert would fit this pattern well, presumably before his retreat to Hungary, following the successful conquests in Thessaly and Macedonia by the ruler of Epiros Theodore Doukas, ultimately crowned with

Antemurale 3 (1956) 51–79. An introduction to Byzantine childhood: Cecily Hennessy, “Young People in Byzantium”, in: *A Companion to Byzantium*, Liz James ed., Chichester 2010, 81–92.

⁹ *Chronicon universalis anonymi Laudunensis*, Georg Waitz, ed., Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Series Scriptorum 26, Hannover 1882, 453. Filip Van Tricht, “‘La Gloire de l’Empire.’ L’idée impériale de Henri de Flandre-Hainaut, deuxième empereur latin de Constantinople (1206–1216)”, *Byzantion* 70 (2000) 227–228.

¹⁰ Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 215, col. 227 (XIII, 34).

¹¹ On this network of marriage alliances, see extensively: F. Van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 391–421.

the capture of Thessaloniki in 1224.¹² In any case, the marriage at last established a family relationship between the former imperial lineage and the new Latin emperors.

In Constantinople itself the presence of the Angeloi is also attested. The metropolitan baron Anseau I of Cayeux, imperial regent in the 1230s, in the late 1220s – after a marriage project with emperor Robert had failed – married Eudokia Laskaris, the daughter of the Nicaean emperor Theodore I and his first wife Anna Angelos, the daughter of emperor Alexios III.¹³ From a 1233 papal letter by Gregory IX we furthermore learn that Isabelle of Clermont, a daughter or close relative of the metropolitan baron Macaire of Clermont, around 1228 had contracted a marriage with a person designated as *Angelus*. Imperial regent Narjot I of Toucy had been instrumental in bringing about the marriage. The marriage was however bigamous, since Isabelle was already married to another metropolitan baron, Milo III le Bréban, who circa 1228 must have been absent from the capital for a longer period of time and must have been presumed dead.¹⁴ The outcome of the affair is not known, but the personal involvement

¹² McDaniel situates John's marriage to Mathilde around 1234–35, but this is impossible: in 1240 Helena, one of his daughters by Mathilde (see reference in note 16), had been married for years with Guglielmo of Verona, the triarch of Euboia, with whom she by that time already had four sons. Compare: Gordon L. McDaniel, "On Hungarian-Serbian Relations in the Thirteenth Century: John Angelos and Queen Jelena", *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 12 (1982–83) 44–45. Filip Van Tricht, "Latin Emperors and Serbian Queens: Anna and Helena", *Frankokratia* 1 (2020) 63, 74–75. John arrived in Hungary sometime before 1227. He may have left Thessaloniki with his mother and his half-brother William by his mother's third husband, Nicholas of Saint-Omer. Around 1222 Margaret had been given lands in Syrmia by her brother king Andrew II (probably corresponding with her dower at the time of her marriage with Isaac II), confirmed to her by pope Honorius III in 1223. In December 1224, however, at her request the same pope still confirmed Margaret's *ius patronatus* over a Byzantine monastery in the bishopric of Patzuna in Thessaly, suggesting that the former empress until then had remained in Romania. Another option is that in 1222 John travelled with his half-brother Demetrios to emperor Frederick II in southern Italy in search for aid against the contemporary large-scale Epirote offensive. By the early 1220s, the ruling family of Thessaloniki (Montferrat-Angelos-Saint-Omer) appears to have adopted a strategy of splitting up in order to address all possible sources of aid for the kingdom, with Nicholas (and his other son by Margaret named Bela) staying behind in Beotia, and with Demetrios' wife Hermingarde of La Roche establishing herself at the imperial court in Constantinople. Compare: Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum. Letters to Frankish Greece and Constantinople*, William O. Duba and Christopher C. Schabel, eds., Mediterranean Nexus 1100–1700, Leuven 2015, n° 89, n° 168; F. Van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 381–382; A. Tautu, "Margarethe di Ungheria imperatrice di Bisancio", 51–79; Jean Longnon, Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée", *Journal des Savants* (1946) 147–149.

¹³ On this marriage: Filip Van Tricht, "Robert of Courtenay (1221–1227): An Idiot on the Throne of Constantinople?", *Speculum* 88 (2013) 1004–1015, 1024–1029.

¹⁴ Gregorius IX, *Les registres*, Lucien Auvray, Suzanne Clémencet and Louis Carolus-Barré, eds., *Registres des papes du XIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1890–1955, n° 1138.

of regent Narjot suggests that the marriage was politically important. This leads me to conclude that *Angelus* is not a Christian name, but here refers to a member of the imperial Angelos lineage. No one else belonging to the highest social strata could have been designated in such a lapidary manner. Perhaps the Angelos in question is to be identified with John's brother Manuel, but there is no way to be sure.¹⁵ This in any case illustrates how the Angeloi present in Latin Romania were held in the highest regard and how the marriage of one of them was clearly a matter of state interest. During the 1230s – no doubt initiated by the Constantinopolitan court, probably in the context of Baldwin II's journey to his capital with a crusade army in the late 1239–early 1240 – a marriage was negotiated between John Angelos and Mathilde of Courtenay's daughter Helena and Guglielmo I of Verona, the triarch of Euboea. Although John by this time had left Latin Romania for Hungary, where his uncle king Andrew II entrusted him with the government of various counties (inter alia Syrmia and Bacs, both close to the Serbian border), he obviously remained in contact with Constantinople. For the imperial court the match was a two for one, with on the one hand the establishment of a family connection between the Courtenay family and an important lord in southern Greece, and the reintroduction of the Angelos name in the said region. Little is known about Helena's life in Hungary, but her father and grandmother's background and her Christian name – and that of her sister Maria – would seem to suggest that her education was characterized by a mix of both Byzantine and Western influences.

Helena Angelos and her husband were probably present at Baldwin II's imperial coronation at Hagia Sophia in April 1240. In May both were in any

¹⁵ There is no certain information about Manuel after 1205. He may have been included in emperor Henry's mentioned land grant to Margaret of Hungary and her children around 1209 and confirmed by pope Innocent III in 1210. The *necrologium* of the cathedral chapter of Speyer (composed around the mid-13th century) mentioning Irene Angelina's death (1208) states that the queen had founded an anniversary for her parents and for her sister Euphrosyna and her brother Manuel. It seems however hard to explain why Irene would include her half-brother Manuel, whom she only may have known as an infant, and not her full brother emperor Alexios IV (†1204), whom she had still met a few years before at the German court. 'Manuel' may then well be a mistake for 'Alexius' in the said *necrologium* by either the author of the entry or a copyist (*Fontes Rerum Germanicarum*, vol. 4, Johannes F. Boehmer, ed., Stuttgart 1868, 323). Manuel Angelos should also not be confused with the 'prigkeps Manuel' found in a Nicaean funerary inscription dated 1211. The prince in question is to be identified with Manuel Komnenos, the son of prince of Antioch Bohemond III (1163–1201) and Theodora/Irene Komnena. From his Constantinopolitan/Nicaean exile this Manuel obviously claimed the Antiochian principality. According to the said inscription he died "aged 35", which places his date of birth in 1176 (Filip Van Tricht, "La politique étrangère de l'empire de Constantinople, de 1210 à 1216. Sa Position en Méditerranée orientale: problèmes de chronologie et d'interprétation (1^{ère} partie)", *Le Moyen Age* 107/1 (2001) 224, with further references).

case present as a married couple in Constantinople, where the emperor invested Guglielmo I of Verona with the Kingdom of Thessaloniki, on account of his wife's family relationship with the deceased king Demetrios of Montferrat.¹⁶ During Baldwin's coronation ceremony (or in any case shortly afterwards) Isaac II's granddaughter – perhaps together with the mentioned *Angelus* – could thus be seen to accept the new Courtenay emperor as the legitimate ruler of the Constantinopolitan Empire, just as Eudokia Laskaris probably had at John of Brienne's coronation in 1231. The effect of this on the Byzantine elite and population of Constantinople and the other regions under the Latin emperors' rule should not be underestimated. It was an important legitimizing instrument vis-à-vis these groups, in addition to the emperors' effective control over the imperial capital. It is also important to note that by giving – to be reconquered – the Kingdom of Thessaloniki to Guglielmo and Helena, the emperor made clear that this principality in the future was to be ruled by descendants of the Angelos – and of course also Courtenay – lineage. Again, vis-à-vis the Byzantine elite and population, this must have been a strong signal: descendants of the imperial Angelos family were to rule the Empire's second city. After her first husband's death Helena was, as I argued elsewhere, married to the Serbian king Uroš I (circa 1245/50), no doubt to be seen in the context of Baldwin II's continuous search for allies.¹⁷ Helena's sister Maria Angelos in 1254 – after a papal dispensation had been obtained at the request of Baldwin II – married the Constantinopolitan baron Anselin of Cayeux, the son of Anseau II of Cayeux and Eudokia Laskaris, the granddaughter of Alexios III.¹⁸ This marriage alliance, and the imperial involvement in it, shows that the presence of the Angelos family in the Empire and in Constantinople itself in the 1250s was still deemed to be important. We have practically no information concerning the functioning of either Helena, Maria, Eudokia or (Manuel?) *Angelus* in Constantinople or elsewhere, but they must have served as a bridge, or were used as such, between the Byzantine and Latin communities, and must have contributed to the coming into being of a Latin-Byzantine community on the basis of a shared Roman legacy. We should in any

¹⁶ The 1240 investiture charter: Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, "Les seigneurs tiers de Négrepont de 1205 à 1280", *Byzantion* 35 (1965) n° 1, 268. See on Helena and her marriage to Guglielmo I of Verona: F. Van Tricht, "Latin Emperors and Serbian Queens: Anna and Helena", 64–77.

¹⁷ F. Van Tricht, "Latin Emperors and Serbian Queens: Anna and Helena", 92–98.

¹⁸ Innocentius IV, *Les registres (1243–1254)*, Elie Berger, ed., Paris 1884–1921, n° 6862 and 7178. Alexander IV, *Les registres (1254–1261)*, Charles Bourel de la Roncière, ed., Paris 1896–1959, n° 48. See also: F. Van Tricht, "Latin Emperors and Serbian Queens: Anna and Helena", 98–100.

case not see them in a passive role: the fact that in 1247 Anseau II left his wife Eudokia in charge of the defense of the Thracian town of Tzouroulon against a Nicaean offensive by John III Vatatzes in this context seems telling.¹⁹

Politics and Government

For a number of Byzantine magnates after 1204 cooperation with and recognition of the Latin emperors as the legitimate Byzantine/Roman emperors of Constantinople was more preferable than cooperation with or recognition of Alexios III's son-in-law Theodore I Laskaris, who – based at Nicaea – likewise claimed the Byzantine imperial legacy. This is remarkable, not only in view of the Latin emperors and their compatriots' ethnic-cultural origins, but for example also because the patriarchate of Constantinople had been placed under Latin control as well. For the Byzantine Theodore Laskaris and his successors and supporters, a Latin on the Constantinopolitan imperial and patriarchal thrones was a situation that was unacceptable and that had to be combatted vigorously with patriotic zeal. For the Byzantines, David Komnenos, the ruler of Paphlagonia, Theodore Branas, the ruler of Adrianople-Didymoteichon, and Philokales, the lord of Lemnos, however, a Latin emperor and patriarch were deemed acceptable.²⁰ The three of them all became the Latin emperor's vassals. Michael Doukas, the ruler of Epiros, did so too and his brother/successor Theodore briefly as well, albeit with limited enthusiasm and not without grave conflicts (see *infra*).²¹ Emperor Henry and David fought together against

¹⁹ Georgios Akropolites, *Historia*, August Heisenberg, ed., *Georgii Acropolitae Opera* 1, Leipzig, 1903, §47.

²⁰ On Theodore Branas: Filip Van Tricht, "The Byzantino-Latin Principality of Adrianople", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 68 (2015) 329–340. On David Komnenos and Philokales: F. Van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 239–240, 354–355; Alexandre A. Vasiliev, "The Foundation of the Empire of Trebizond", *Speculum* 11 (1936) 1–37; Anthony Bryer, "David Komnenos and Saint Eleutherios", *Archeion Pontou* 42 (1988–89) 161–188; Ian Booth, "Theodore Laskaris and Paphlagonia, 1204–1214; towards a chronological description", *Archeion Pontou* 50 (2003–2004) 151–224; Guillaume Saint-Guillain, "Deux îles grecques au temps de l'empire latin. Andros et Lemnos au XIIIe siècle", *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome. Moyen Âge* 113 (2001) 603–609.

²¹ On Michael I and Theodore Doukas: Filip Van Tricht, "La politique étrangère de l'empire latin de Constantinople. Sa position en Méditerranée orientale problèmes de chronologie et d'interprétation (première partie)", *Le Moyen Âge* 107 (2001) 232–234. Idem, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 186–187, 242–244, 374–387. See recently: Brendan Osswald, *L'Épire du treizième au quinzième siècle: autonomie et hétérogénéité d'une région balkanique* (thèse doctorale, Université de Toulouse, 2011), 37–70, 647–653. The author generally downplays the feudal relationship between the Latin emperors and the Doukai. His hypothesis

Laskaris in the years 1206–1208 and perhaps again some years later. The ruler of the Rhodopes region, Alexios Sthlabos – who belonged to the Asen lineage – likewise preferred Henry over his relative tsar Boril of Bulgaria.²² The stance taken by these magnates must have been shared by many: these rulers each stood at the top of large client and family networks that included both laymen and clerics.

The divergence in reactions among the Byzantine aristocracy to the 1204 regime change can be explained by looking at the varying contexts within which these magnates found themselves after the crusaders' capture of Constantinople. For *despotes* Theodore Laskaris, who, as a son-in-law of emperor Alexios III, was a likely successor to the throne, cooperation with the Latins must have been unthinkable. He could never have maintained his position. Indeed, as mentioned, emperor Baldwin I and marquis Boniface of Montferrat turned down Byzantine aristocrats who had been closely associated with Alexios III's regime. This policy option would prove to be an important factor contributing to the Byzantine revolt with Bulgarian aid in Thrace in 1205–1206.²³ The only acceptable course of action for Laskaris was to resist the Latins, carve out a territorial base (around Nicaea in Asia Minor as it turned out), and try to establish himself as the legitimate emperor.²⁴ David Komnenos together with his brother Alexios, both grandsons of emperor Andronikos I

concerning Michael I's supposed conquest of southern Thessaly around 1212–1213, adopted from Donald Nicol (*The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford, 1957), is ill-founded and relies on the erroneous assumption that Latin rule was incompatible with the presence of Byzantine bishops (see also *infra*).

²² On Alexios Sthlabos: Nikolay Kanev, "Alexius Slav – The Contender of Henri de Hainaut for the Bulgarian Imperial Throne [in Bulgarian]", in: *Velikite Asenevtsi*, Veliko Trnovo 2016, 84–99. Filip Van Tricht, "Who Murdered Archbishop William of Rouen? The Valley of Philippi under Latin Rule (1204–circa 1224/25)", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 70 (2020) 305–334.

²³ On the Byzantine revolt in Thrace: Günter Prinzing, *Die Bedeutung Bulgariens und Serbiens in den Jahren 1204–1219 im Zusammenhang mit der Entstehung und Entwicklung der byzantinischen Teilstaaten nach der Einnahme Konstantinopels infolge des 4. Kreuzzuges*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 12, Munich 1972, 1–63. Jean-Claude Cheynet, *Pouvoir et Contestations à Byzance (963–1210)*, *Byzantina Sorbonensia* 9, Paris 1990, 470–71. F. Van Tricht, *Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 388–89. Alexandru Madgearu, *The Asanids. The Political and Military History of the Second Bulgarian Empire (1185–1280)*, *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages* 41, Leiden 2017, 144–165.

²⁴ See *inter alia*: M. Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile*. Vincent Puech, "The Aristocracy and the Empire of Nicaea", in: *Identities and allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain, eds., Farnham 2011, 69–80. Ekaterini Mitsiou, "Networks of Nicaea: 13th-century Socio-economic Ties, Structures and Prosopography", in: *Liquid and Multiple: Individuals and Identities in the Thirteenth-Century Aegean*, Guillaume Saint-Guillain and D. Stathakopoulos, eds., Paris 2012, 91–104.

Komnenos (1183–1185), and with Georgian help, conquered Trebizond and the Black Sea coast up to Paphlagonia. Probably still unaware of the crusader conquest of 12 April 1204, Alexios had himself crowned emperor in Trebizond (25 April) in opposition to the regime in Constantinople (Angeloi, Alexios V Doukas). David, in control of Paphlagonia, in 1206 saw himself confronted with Laskaris invading his territories. He successfully turned for aid to emperor Henry and consequently recognized the latter's suzerainty. His choice may not have been well received at his brother Alexios' court: his name does not figure in Michael Panaretos's (admittedly brief) chronicle entry on Alexios's conquest and reign or in any other Trebizond sources.²⁵ The Angelos-Komnenos rivalry accounts for David's choice, plus the consideration that a position as a feudal regional prince under a Latin emperor was to be preferred over a compromise with Laskaris, who presumably could only have retained David as a regional governor or a high ranking dignitary/commander at best. Before the incorporation of the Doukai of Epiros in the late 1240s, the Nicaean Empire did not include any autonomous provinces under a separate ruling family. The Latin emperor could thus exploit internal divisions within the Byzantine aristocracy and offer advantages which his Nicaean rival would not. Here we should note that although the pre-1204 Byzantine Empire was characterized by a tradition of centralized government in the core regions, this was not the only form of government: various regions away from the heartland and near the frontiers were largely autonomous, for example the Roubenid principality (later kingdom) in Cilician Armenia and the Latin principality of Antioch. In the decades after Emperor Manuel I's death (1180) local magnates aspiring to rule autonomous provinces can be observed in a number of provinces, inter alia in southwestern Asia Minor, in the Peloponnese and Beotia, or in Serbia and Bulgaria.²⁶

Theodore Branas, who was related to the Komnenoi, recognized Latin imperial rule from the very start and, conversely, was accepted by the new Latin rulers, in spite of his prominence under Alexios III. Branas's marriage to the former empress Agnes, the daughter of French king Louis VII, must have been an important factor. When Bulgarian tsar Kalojan turned out to be an unreliable and destructive ally, the revolted Byzantines of Thrace, looking for

²⁵ See references in note 20.

²⁶ Jürgen Hoffman, *Rudimente von Territorialstaaten im byzantinischen Reich (1071–1210). Untersuchungen über Unabhängigkeitsbestrebungen und ihr Verhältnis zu Kaiser und Reich*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 17, München 1974, 77–140. J.-C. Cheynet, *Pouvoir et Contestations à Byzance*, 110–145. Edouard Baraton, *La Romanie orientale. L'empire de Constantinople et ses avatars au Levant à l'époque des Croisades* (thèse doctorale, Université de Rouen, 2018), 102–123. Florin Curta, *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500–1300)*, Brill's Companions to European History 19, Leiden 2019, 656–663, 674–685.

new protectors, proposed that Branas, the then lord of Apros, would be accepted as the feudal ruler of the region around Adrianople and Didymoteichon under Latin imperial suzerainty. Henry, at the time still a regent for his brother Baldwin who had been captured at the Battle of Adrianople (April 1205), accepted the proposal and provided the necessary support against the continued raids by Kalojan and his successor Boril. Vice versa, Adrianople would provide troops for the Latin imperial army.²⁷ Kinship was also probably the critical factor in Philokales's decision to serve the Latin emperor, obtaining the island of Lemnos and the title of *megas doux*. In a 1210 Venetian trade contract, the *megas doux* appears with the surname Navigaioso, suggesting that his father – or perhaps he himself – had married a member of the prominent Venetian Navigaioso family.²⁸ Alexios Sthlabos, a scion of the Bulgarian ruling family who had carved out a principality for himself around Tzepaina and Melnik in the Rhodopes mountains (after tsar Kalojan's death in 1207), had reasons not dissimilar to those of David Komnenos to recognize the Latin emperor in 1208: against the threat of annexation by his relative tsar Boril, Henry could provide aid and protection, while respecting his regional autonomy.²⁹ Other magnates were convinced by military pressure. Michael I Doukas (1204–1214), who was related to the Komnenoi and the Angeloi, was at first a follower of marquis Boniface, but later opted for an independent principality in Epiros. When in 1209 emperor Henry appeared with an army near his borders, Michael decided to recognize imperial suzerainty – as did Strez, the independent lord of Prosek in Macedonia and also a member of the Bulgarian ruling family. In both cases this resulted in a wavering attachment to the Latin emperor, which needed constant military pressure to be maintained or re-established. Here, obvious common interests inspiring loyal cooperation were missing. Michael's successor and brother Theodore (1214/15–1230) in 1217 broke with the Latin emperor in a spectacular fashion by capturing and imprisoning the newly crowned Peter of Courtenay, but only because the latter seemed to be threatening Epirote interests – especially in the key port of Dyrrachion – by favouring Venice. Nevertheless, around 1236–1241 Theodore's brother Manuel, as the ruler of Thessaly, appears to have recognized the prince of Achaia William II of Villehardouin as the suzerain,

²⁷ On the principality of Adrianople: F. Van Tricht, "The Byzantino-Latin Principality of Adrianople", 325–342. See also in general on Byzantine troops in Latin armies: Benjamin Hendrickx and Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx, "Indigenous and local troops and soldiers in the service of the Latin conquerors of the Peloponnese after 1204", *Journal of Early Christian History* 4 (2014) 43–51.

²⁸ See references in note 20.

²⁹ See references in note 22.

and his nephew Michael II in 1258–1263 seems to have recognized Latin imperial suzerainty once more. The feudal bond in both cases was aimed against external threats, Theodore Doukas (Thessaloniki) and Michael VIII Paleologos (Nicaea) respectively. Again we see that in order to safeguard personal or regional interests Latins were preferred over Byzantine compatriots.³⁰

Just as the presence of members of the imperial Angelos lineage supported the legitimacy of the Latin emperors, these regional magnates accepting Latin imperial rule must have legitimized the position of the Flemish and later Courtenay emperors in the eyes of many Byzantines. Indeed, when in 1208–1209 emperor Henry travelled through Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly and southern Greece, the local Byzantine elites and populations invariably came out to enthusiastically greet him as their rightful emperor, according to imperial cleric Henry of Valenciennes.³¹ That this was problematic for the Nicaean competitor can be shown by the fact that court chronicler George Akropolites, when discussing David Komnenos's and Alexios Sthlabos's exploits, fails to mention that these were actually the Latin emperor's vassals.³² Branais is omitted from his account altogether. While as feudal princes they had ample regional autonomy – just as their Latin counterparts in, inter alia, Thessaloniki, Athens, Euboaia and Achaia/Morea – at the same time they stayed connected to the central government in Constantinople. The emperors used various instruments, found in both the West and Byzantium before 1204, to advance political unity: marriage alliances, the bestowal of dignities, imperial garrisons, and, of course, aid against external threats in the context of the reciprocal feudal *auxilium* duty. Alexios Sthlabos married emperor Henry's illegitimate daughter and was granted the title of *despotes*. In his principality we also find a *sebastos ton Phranton* (or *sebastos Phranton*), who must have had a link with or was possibly appointed by the Frankish emperor. Michael Doukas' daughter, who brought a sizeable dowry, was married to Henry's brother Eustache. In 1258 his son Michael II, in the context of the Pelagonia alliance that brought Epiros temporarily back into the Latin imperial fold, would marry his daughter Anna to the prince of Achaia William II of Villehardouin. Theodore Branais obtained the title of *kaisar* and one of his daughters married Narjot I of Toucy, and another probably Baldwin of Béthune. Both barons belonged to the highest Constantinopolitan aristocracy, being related to the Latin imperial lineage. Their offspring consequently were part of Branais/Komnenoi. That a number of Latin barons had married into the highest Byzantine aristocracy – for example

³⁰ See references in note 21. F. Van Tricht, *The Horoscope of Emperor Baldwin II*, 82–85.

³¹ Henri de Valenciennes, *Histoire de l'empereur Henri de Constantinople*, Jean Longnon, ed., Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades 2, Paris 1948, §663, §671–673, §683.

³² Georgios Akropolites, *Historia*, §11, §24.

also the Cayeux family – was not lost on Byzantine contemporaries.³³ As mentioned Philokales, connected to the Navigaios family, obtained the title of *mezas doux* (or commander of the imperial fleet), which he used on his bilingual (Latin-Greek) seal and which his successors also bore. Whether David Komnenos also became connected through marriage to the Latin elite, is not known. In view, however, of the obviously systematic use of marriages to create a Latin-Byzantine aristocracy, this is quite possible.³⁴ Latin garrisons are attested in the principalities of Sthlabos, Branas and probably also Komnenos, who in any case obtained military support on various occasions.

These regional princes obviously contributed to the Byzantine character of Latin imperial rule during its first decades. By 1230, however, all these principalities no longer belonged to Constantinople, together with various other regions ruled by Latin princes, inter alia Thessaloniki and by 1237 also Philippopolis. This was largely the consequence of successive military debacles under emperor Robert of Courtenay in the mid-1220s against both Theodore Doukas of Epiros, who ultimately established himself as emperor in Thessaloniki, and John III Vatatzes of Nicaea. This, however, did not mean the end of Latin-Byzantine cooperation. Although the evidence is sketchy, it is clear that both before and after these military and territorial setbacks, Byzantines were and remained present in the government, administration and defense of the various principalities and regions ruled by Latin lords and lineages. They were most prominent in the emperor's own domain (Constantinople, Thrace, northwestern Asia Minor) and in the Kingdom of Thessaloniki. *Logothetes tou dromou* Constantine Tornikes served emperor Baldwin I, but after the Battle of Adrianople (1205) switched sides to the Bulgarian victor Kalojan, who promptly executed him. Emperor Henry entrusted the defense of northern Asia Minor to the local commander George Theophilopoulos. In his chronicle Akropolites also states, in general, that emperor Henry accepted many Byzantines as his courtiers, officials and military commanders, and that he treated the *Romaioi* as if they were his own people. Akropolites's own father appears to have been rather close with the Latin elite and may have functioned as a government official (1204–early

³³ See for the Toucy or Cayeux as being related to the highest Byzantine aristocracy: Georgios Akropolites, *Historia*, §81, §83.

³⁴ Michael Angold misses a number of mixed marriages in the available source material, which undermines his thesis that these were infrequent or unimportant (Michael Angold, "The Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1204–1261: Marriage Strategies", in: *Identities and allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain, eds., Farnham 2011, 47–67).

1230s).³⁵ The chronicler and former *logothetes ton sekretou* Niketas Choniates – returning to Constantinople from Salymbria in 1206 – probably aspired to an important position in the Latin administration but presumably was refused, just as would be the case later in Nicaea. Under Baldwin II (1240–1273), *hupogrammateis* Aloubardes and Nikephoros/Nikephoritzes worked in the imperial chancery. The latter also served on diplomatic missions, just as did other Byzantines belonging to pre-1204 Constantinopolitan elite families, for example in the context of the Latin emperor’s embassy to Michael VIII Paleologos in late 1258/early 1259. One of Baldwin II’s financial functionaries was the Byzantine *phylax* John. The Byzantine priest Demetrios (Pyrros?) – possibly also *epi tou deeseon* in the imperial chancery – was part of his personal entourage and at one point was instructed to build a church devoted to Saint George. Interesting also is that typically Byzantine chancery positions could be held by Latins, which, is for instance, exemplified by *epi tou kanikleiou* (or *caniclius*) Robert of Buccaleone.³⁶

Institutional governmental continuity is indicated by, for example, emperor Baldwin I’s confirmation of the privileges of the Empire’s second city Thessaloniki in 1204.³⁷ In both a Latin and a Byzantine source the same Baldwin is credited with upholding the Byzantine legal system in general. Although these relatively late 14th-century sources give no details, they nevertheless indicate that, even from a Byzantine perspective, the existing justice system was to an important degree continued within the new feudal superstructure.³⁸ A number of contemporary documents confirm this, for example the pact between Venice and Theodore Branas regarding Adrianople (1206), stating that the latter was to rule Adrianople *secundum usum Grecorum*, and the successive pacts between Venice and the feudal rulers of Euboia (1209 and 1216), stating that they were to govern the local Byzantines as they were

³⁵ Georgios Akropolites, *Historia*, §16, §29.

³⁶ On Baldwin’s collaborators: F. Van Tricht, *The Horoscope of Emperor Baldwin II*, 35, 112, 148, 162, 172, 180, 184. On the Saint George church: see references in note 183.

³⁷ Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. Jean-Louis Van Dieten, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Bizantinae*. Series Berolinensis 11, Berlin 1975, vol. 2, 599. In general on municipal privileges in Byzantium: Jean-Claude Cheynet, “Les droits concédés par les empereurs aux populations urbaines (Xe–XIV siècle),” in: *Städte im lateinischen Westen und im griechischen Osten zwischen Spätantike und Früher Neuzeit: Topographie – Recht – Religion*, Elisabeth Grüber, Mihailo Popović and Martin Scheutz, eds., *Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 66, Wien 2016, 149–163.

³⁸ *Catalogus et cronica principum et comitum Flandrie et Forestariorum*, Joseph-Jean De Smet, ed., *Recueil des chroniques de Flandre*, Bruxelles 1837, vol. 1, 136–137. Ephraem Aenius, *Historia Chronica*, ed. Odysseus Lampsides, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*. Series Atheniensis 27, Athens 1990, v7198.

accustomed (*in eo statu quo domini Emanuelis imperatoris tempore tenebantur*).³⁹ Likewise the so-called *Assises de Romanie*, an early 14th-century unofficial codification of mostly feudal law for the principality of Achaia and its dependencies (and based, in my opinion, following La Monte, on an earlier code of feudal law for the Empire which developed from 1204 onward at the imperial initiative), contain a number of stipulations – concerning inheritance and dower – derived from Byzantine law with regard to land that was originally held by Byzantine *archontes* and others. The same *Assises* also comprise a clause stating that anyone (though not dependent peasants or *paroikoi*, as follows from other clauses) not content with the decisions of the local seignorial, baronial or princely courts could appeal to the imperial court, which would seem to derive from the centralized Byzantine justice system before 1204.⁴⁰ A passage in the Greek version of the Chronicle of Morea confirms that the Byzantine elite and population were to live under Byzantine law and customs as before.⁴¹ On Venetian Crete, Byzantine law and customs up to a point, and alongside Venetian law, also remained in force.⁴² As for the fiscal administration, a Latin *praktikon* or tax register based on a Byzantine model has been preserved for the Venetian-held town of Lampsakos on the eastern side of the Hellespont in the Troad region. For the region of Athens, a 13th-century copy (in Greek) of an earlier *praktikon* has been preserved, and for the principality of Achaia, including Venetian Messenia and the island county of

³⁹ Adrianople: Gottlieb L. Tafel and Georg M. Thomas, eds., *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, Fontes Rerum Austriacarum. Diplomataria et Acta, Wien 1856–1857, vol. 2, n° 169, p. 18. Eubolia: *Ibidem*, vol. 2, n° 205, p. 95; n° 241–242, p. 178, p. 183.

⁴⁰ *Les Assises de Romanie*, George Recoura, ed., Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études. Section philologique et historique 258, Paris, 1930, §138, §143. John L. La Monte, “Three Questions concerning the Assises de Jerusalem”, *Byzantina-Metabyzantina* 1 (1945) 204–208. Peter Topping, *Feudal Institutions as revealed in the Assises of Romania. The Law Code of Frankish Greece*, Translations and Reprints from Original Sources of History. Series 3.3, Philadelphia 1949. *Idem*, “The formation of the Assizes of Romania”, *Byzantion* 17 (1944/45) 304–314. Jean Longnon, “Les Assises de Romanie”, *Journal des Savants* (1953) 13–26. David Jacoby, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale. Les ‘assises de Romanie’, sources, application et diffusion*, Documents et recherches 10, Paris/La Haye 1971, 17–91. *Idem*, “Les archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque”, *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967) 422–445. Panayotis J. Zepos, “Las Assises del Oriente”, *Bizantion-Nea Hellas* 7–8 (1985) 29–31. F. Van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 199–200, 207–210.

⁴¹ *The Chronicle of Morea*, John Schmitt, ed., Byzantine Texts, London 1904, v2091–2092. P. Zepos, “Las Assisas del Oriente,” 31.

⁴² Chryssa A. Maltezou, “Byzantine ‘consuetudines’ in Venetian Crete”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1996) 269–270. See also: David Jacoby, “Les ‘Assises de Romanie’ et le droit vénitien dans les colonies vénitiennes, in: *Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV*, vol. 1.1, Firenze 1973, 347–360.

Kefalonia and Zakynthos, a number of *praktika* in both Greek and Latin are known. These documents presuppose the participation of Byzantine functionaries in the administration and attest to the continuation of the existing fiscal system at the local level. The broad geographical range indicates that this must have been common practice all over the Empire, both in the principalities/regions ruled by Latin princes and, evidently, in those ruled by Byzantines.

In the late 13th-century and 14th-century principality of Achaia, and probably before as well, one of the four grand dignitaries of the principality (next to the constable, the marshal, and the chancellor/*logothetes*), the *protovestiaros* – the equivalent of the Western *camerarius* or chief financial official, who was, among other things, responsible for keeping up to date the land register (including all the fiefs), managing the princely estates and collecting the princely revenues – was regularly a Byzantine *archon*. One Vasilopoulos is attested in 1297, and Stephen Koutroules and John Mourmouras – who before had been *magister massarius* of the princely castellany of Kalamata – around 1336. In 1324 John Misito, whose descendents would become prominent Moreote barons, is attested as the captain of the castle of Kalamata.⁴³ In the Kingdom of Thessaloniki (1204–1224) George Phrangopoulos was *doux* under former empress Margaret of Hungary, at that time the guardian for her son, king Demetrios of Montferrat. We only know of him through a later letter by Demetrios Chomatenos, the archbishop of Ochrid under Theodore Doukas.⁴⁴ He is attested as presiding over a regional court in Thessaloniki together with Byzantine bishops from the surrounding area. In addition, he no doubt also had fiscal, policing and military responsibilities just like the pre-1204 *doukes* or provincial governors, although he must have shared these with the local Latin castellans, lords and feudatories. Chomatenos considered the judgments

⁴³ Jean Longnon and Peter Topping, eds., *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIV^e siècle*, Documents et recherches 9, Paris/La Haye 1969, 33. Antoine Bon, *La Morée Franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1430)*, Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 213, Paris 1969, vol.1, 83. David Jacoby, "The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnesus after the Fourth Crusade", *American Historical Review* 78 (1973) 895. Florence Sampsonis, "L'administration de la Morée par Charles Ier d'Anjou (1267–1285). L'apport majeur d'une source délicate: les registres angevins", *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen-Age* 120 (2008) 139–157. Benjamin Hendrickx and Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx, "Les institutions de la Principauté d'Achaïe sous les Villehardouin: la chancellerie et la trésorerie", *Byzantiaka* 33 (2016) 265–294.

⁴⁴ Demetrios Chomatenos, *Ponemata Diaphora*, Günther Prinzing, ed., *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis* 38, Berlin 2002, n° 106. Dieter Simon, "Witwe Sachlikina gegen Witwe Horaia", in: *Fontes Minores* 6, Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 11, Frankfurt am Main 1984, 335.

made by the mentioned court to be valid, indicating that Byzantine law and procedures were being applied. Just as the Achaian *protovestiarioi* Phrangopoulos must have had staff of Byzantine functionaries. Other *doukes* may have been functioning in other parts of the extensive royal domain, or for example in the imperial domain in northwestern Asia Minor where Theophilopoulos was the supreme military commander. Some of the persons mentioned belonged to the pre-1204 Constantinopolitan landed or bureaucratic top elite (Akropolites, Choniates, Petraliphas, Phrangopoulos, Pyrros, Tornikes), others must have belonged to the local elites or must have been *homines novi* (Theophilopoulos, Aloubardes, Nikephoritzes). It is safe to say that while the feudalization of the Empire brought with it important changes in its governmental superstructure, at the same time within these new feudal entities (principalities, baronies, lordships) at the local level, existing Byzantine administrative practices were continued to a large degree. For the majority of the population, who rarely had business with the higher authorities, this must have meant that their daily lives in this respect did not radically change. Here we should also note that the adequacy or popularity of the Byzantine provincial government before 1204 is not to be overrated.⁴⁵

Church and Religion

The immediate replacement in 1204 of Byzantine patriarch John X Kamateros with a Latin incumbent – Venetian Thomas Morosini – did not imply a complete Latinization of the Byzantine church, although at the same time the introduction of a parallel Latin and Byzantine episcopal hierarchy was firmly rejected by the pope, who did not respond to a proposal by the Byzantine Constantinopolitan clergy – and with conditional backing from emperor Henry – to let them elect their own patriarch after Kamateros' death in 1206.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Ralph-Johannes Lilie, "Des Kaisers macht und Ohnmacht. Zum Zerfall des Zentralgewalt in Byzanz vor dem 4. Kreuzzug", in: *Poikila Byzantina* 4, Varia 1, Bonn 1984, 9–120. Leonora Neville, *Authority in Byzantine Provincial Society, 950–1100*, Cambridge 2004, 2, 66–98. Judith Herrin, "Realities of Byzantine Provincial Government: Hellas and Peloponnesos, 1180–1205," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29 (1975) 252–284.

⁴⁶ A number of important contributions on the Latin Empire's ecclesiastical history: Robert L. Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople 1204–1261. Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest", *Traditio* 6 (1948) 33–60. Idem, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954) 225–304. Kenneth M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204 – 1571)*. Vol. 1: *The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, Philadelphia 1976, 1–105. Jean Richard, "The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople (1204–27)", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4

Innocent III in 1208 instructed patriarch Morosini to uphold all Byzantine bishops who recognized papal authority. The pope also introduced the principle that in areas with a Byzantine population Byzantine bishops should occupy the episcopal sees, in regions with a mixed Latin-Byzantine population there should be Latin bishops. There was no question of installing parallel ecclesiastical hierarchies as was the case elsewhere in the Latin Orient. Although in the context of the initial conquest a number of Byzantine bishops chose to flee, there is evidence that a considerable number remained in place. This evidently must have been the case in the feudal principalities ruled by Byzantine princes. Indeed, these regions (inter alia Paphlagonia, Adrianople-Didymoteichon, the Rhodopes region, for a few years also Epiros) in practice functioned as autocephalous ecclesiastical provinces. There is virtually no trace of a Latin ecclesiastical presence in these regions. This was confirmed with papal policy requiring Byzantine bishops to be appointed in regions with a purely Byzantine population.⁴⁷ It should be noted that the re-established Byzantine patriarch in Nicaea (1208) did not have any control over these sees. In Paphlagonia under David Komnenos a new bishop of Amastris was appointed without any reference to his authority. Likewise in Adrianople under Theodore Branas the local metropolitan appointed his suffragan bishops without reference to Nicaea, as the Epirote bishop of Naupaktos John Apokaukos mentioned in a 1222 letter. This also appears to have been the case in the Rhodopes region under Alexios Sthlabos. The Saint Nicholas church in Melnik contains an early-13th-century fresco presumably depicting the consecration of a (local?) bishop by Christ and Saint Peter, a clear reference to the formal acceptance of papal authority.⁴⁸ Michael Doukas of Epiros post

(1989) 45–62. Tommaso M. Violante, “Innocenzo III e l’Oriente bizantino”, *Nicolaus* 24 (1997) 311–352. Nicholas Coureas, “The Latin and Greek Churches in former Byzantine Lands under Latin Rule”, in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Brill’s Companion’s to European History 6, Leiden 2014, 145–184. Elena Kaffa, *The Greek Church of Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople during the Frankish Era (1196–1303). A New Perspective*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2014.

⁴⁷ The archbishopric of Adrianople was included in the *Provincialia Romana* from 1210 and 1228, which may be interpreted as an indication that the local Byzantine metropolitan had formally recognized the authority of the Roman Church (R.L. Wolff, “*The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople*,” 53). Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 215, col. 963–964 (IX, 140).

⁴⁸ See for this novel interpretation: Branislav Todić, “The Symbolical Investiture of the Archbishop Basil of Bulgaria at Melnik”, *Zograf* 32 (2008) 59–68. It would, however, seem to make more sense to identify the represented prelate with the bishop of Melnik himself, rather than – as Todić proposes – the archbishop of Bulgaria Basil I whose own episcopal seat was in faraway Veliko Trnovo. The fresco in my view needs to be seen in the context of local ruler Alexios Sthlabos’ recognition of Latin emperor Henry of Flanders as his suzerain from 1208 onward.

factum did try to obtain Nicaean confirmation for two episcopal appointments (Larissa and Dyrrachion), but this would prove to be an only very temporary line of action.⁴⁹ The Byzantine rulers and their networks seem to have valued ecclesiastical autonomy and, in most cases, a good working relationship with the Latin imperial government more than a connection with the patriarch in Nicaea, whose legitimacy they may have questioned.

In the Latin principalities and regions Byzantine bishops – in accordance with papal policy – were not absent either from the ecclesiastical hierarchy, although over time – especially in southern Greece – their number drastically diminished. In 1206 Innocent III indeed stipulated that Byzantine bishops recognizing papal authority should keep their position, but also that Latin bishops should be appointed in areas with a mixed population. Furthermore he prescribed that the use of the Byzantine rite for the eucharist and other sacraments should be tolerated, but all new bishops were to be ordained according to the Latin rite (1208).⁵⁰ In 1212 we find in the region around Constantinople John, the bishop of Raideustos, a coastal town belonging to Venice. In a letter pope Innocent congratulates him for accepting papal authority and invites him to convince his *coepiscopi* to do the same.⁵¹ Obviously, in the surrounding region John appears to have had a number of colleagues who likewise had kept their see, although this evidently did not need to imply acceptance of papal authority. One suspects they only could have done so with Latin support, either from the emperor or local rulers. The fact that Byzantine bishop John in the papal registers is never commissioned to deal with local ecclesiastical affairs may suggest that many of the other bishoprics not figuring in the papal correspondence, which is relatively abundant, likewise had Byzantine incumbents. Such bishoprics could in any case be found in all parts of the Empire. The court *doux* Phrangopoulos presided over in 1213 in Thessaloniki counted six Byzantine bishops from the surrounding area (Hierissos, Kitros, Berrhoia, Kassandreia, Kampania and Ardameres). They

⁴⁹ Adrianople: Vasily G. Vasiljevskij, “Epirotica saeculi XIII”, *Vizantiskij vremennik* 3 (1896) n° 17, p. 274. For the date of Apokaukos’s letter: Kosmas Lambropoulos, *Ioannis Apocaukos. A contribution to the study of his life and work*, Athens 1988, n° 70, 216. Epiros: François Bredenkamp, “The ‘Sampson incident’ (ca. 1215) and the Deterioration of Epirote-Nicaean Orthodox Ecclesiastical Relations”, *Byzantiaka* 4 (1984) 9–31. See also: Apostolos D. Karpozilos, *The Ecclesiastical Controversy between the Kingdom of Nicaea and the Principality of Epiros (1217–1233)*, Byzantina Keimena kai Melatai 7, Thessalonike 1973, 14–15, 52. Christian Gastgeber, “Das ‘Epiros’-Dossier im Codex Vindobonensis theologicus graecus 276”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 66 (2016) 1–109.

⁵⁰ Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 215, col. 963–964 (IX, 140); col. 1353 (XI, 23).

⁵¹ Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 215, col. 1353 (XI, 23).

were all suffragans of the Latin archbishop of Thessaloniki Warin – who was also imperial chancellor – but none of them ever figure in the papal registers. In Thessaly the Latin archbishop of Larissa had several Byzantine suffragan bishops, among them bishop Arsenios of Demetrias in 1215. From papal correspondence we learn that ex-empress Margaret of Hungary, the guardian for her son king Demetrios of Thessaloniki, actively supported them.⁵² On Euboea the Byzantine bishops Theodore of Negroponte (also Chalkis or Euripos) and Demetrios Bardanes of Karystos remained in place, though by the 1220s both sees had Latin incumbents. Other suffragans of the Latin archbishop of Athens on the mainland that never figure in the papal registers (Kanala, Trichia, Platana) may perhaps also have had Byzantine incumbents. In the early 1230s the islands of Kea and Thermiai in any case had a Byzantine bishop named Ignatios, who was also active on the mainland where he founded a church (see *infra*).⁵³ In Achaia we know of a Byzantine bishop of Maina (certainly in 1222–23, possibly until the 1250s) and probably also in Damala. The Thessalonikan example indicates that these bishops not only continued to organise and supervise religious life in their dioceses, but also continued to take up their judicial responsibilities. In this way they remained important players in local society. While a number of Byzantine bishops thus remained in place throughout the Empire (especially during the opening decades, but partially also later), at the same time it is clear that virtually all metropolitan and archiepiscopal sees in Latin principalities soon after 1204 became Latinized. The Byzantine incumbents chose exile, such as the well-known metropolitan of Athens Michael Choniates, or were driven out in the context of the Latin conquest. Around 1211/12 the Byzantine metropolitans of Philippi and Serres – not willing to recognize papal obedience – were replaced with Latin incumbents. Only in the duchy of Philippopolis, under the Trith and Estreux families, there is no trace of the metropolitan and episcopal hierarchy ever having been Latinized.⁵⁴

⁵² Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 215, col. 1467 (XI, 152); PL 216, col. 227 (XIII, 36); col. 229 (XIII, 40) col. 299 (XIII, 103).

⁵³ Sophia Kalopissi-Verti, “Relations between East and West in the Lordship of Athens and Thebes after 1204: Archaeological and Artistic Evidence”, in: *Archaeology and the Crusades. Proceedings of the Round Table, Nicosia, 1 February 2005*, Peter Edbury and idem, eds., Athens 2007, 27.

⁵⁴ Michael Choniates, *Epistulae*, Foteini Kolovou (ed.), *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis* 41, Berlin 2001, n° 90–91. T. Shawcross, “The Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade: The Lost Generation,” 41. F. Van Tricht, “Who Murdered Archbishop William of Rouen?”, 312–316. Filip Van Tricht, “The Duchy of Philippopolis (1204–circa 1236/37?). A Latin Border Principality in a Byzantine (Greek/Bulgarian) Milieu”, *Crusades* 21 (2022) (forthcoming).

In dioceses with Latin bishops, Western-style cathedral chapters were installed, but this did not mean that Byzantines were absent from the episcopal organisation. In 1224 the Latin bishop of Negroponte appointed a Byzantine vicar in Oreoi.⁵⁵ Elsewhere religious care for the Byzantine communities was probably likewise entrusted to vicars or *protopapates* – as in Sicily and as the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 had stipulated. On the island of Zakynthos a Byzantine prelate had remained in place until the 1220s and after the see was united with Kefalonia a Byzantine *protopapas* appears to have been installed. In 1296 Nikephoros Ialina is attested as *protopapas* in Candia on Venetian Crete.⁵⁶ In some cases, for example in Modon and Koron in Venetian Messenia in the Peloponnese, there were both Latin and Byzantine occupants for the same sees, with the provision that the Byzantine prelates were not to reside in the towns themselves.⁵⁷ This was not in line with papal politics, but in Kitros in the Kingdom of Thessaloniki a similar situation existed: both a Byzantine and a Latin occupant are attested at the same time in the 1210s.⁵⁸ In Constantinople Byzantine clerics remained attached to the patriarchal church. For example in the 1230s Basileios Gemistos was a deacon and archon of Saint Sophia.⁵⁹ Byzantine clerics also continued to use the *Pantokrator* church, which was part of a monastery complex that after 1204 became the headquarters of the Venetian *podestà*. The exact modalities there of Latin-Byzantine interaction are not known, but it is clear that some sort of accommodation or shared use was reached.⁶⁰ In Thessaloniki Latin archbishop Warin in 1213 had in his entourage a *sakellarios* Jeremias Cheimadas and another Byzantine cleric named Romanos Logaras whose function is not known.⁶¹ In 1210 Innocent III had already expressed his joy at the fact that the *clerus Graecorum Thessalonicensis dioecesis* had recognized papal obedience.⁶² In Athens part of the exiled Michael Choniates' staff seems to have remained

⁵⁵ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 222.

⁵⁶ Peter Topping, "Co-existence of Greeks and Latins in Frankish Morea and Venetian Crete," in: *XVè Congrès international d'Etudes byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports*, Athènes 1976, p. 19.

⁵⁷ David Jacoby, "From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4 (1989) 1–44.

⁵⁸ Demetrios Chomatenos, *Ponemata Diaphora*, n° 106. Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 216, col. 582 (XV, 52).

⁵⁹ Vitalien Laurent, ed., *Les registes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*. Vol. 1: *Les actes des patriarches. Fasc. 4: Les registes de 1208 à 1309*, Paris 1971, n° 1304.

⁶⁰ Sofia Kotzabassi, "The Monastery of Pantokrator between 1204 and 1453", *Byzantinisches Archiv* 27 (2013) 58–60.

⁶¹ Demetrios Chomatenos, *Ponemata Diaphora*, n° 106.

⁶² Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 216, 216, col. 229 (XIII, 41).

in place under the new Latin archbishop, while at the same time staying in contact with their former metropolitan.⁶³ On the island see of Kefalonia the Latin bishop Benedictus in 1238 had several Greek priests among the canons of his cathedral chapter.⁶⁴

In local churches and monasteries the Byzantine clergy mostly remained in place, although to be sure a number of buildings and institutions were taken over by Latin clerics, especially in the capital and in the Empire's second city Thessaloniki, either because they were abandoned by the Byzantines in the context of the conquest or because they were confiscated by the new ruling elite, who introduced the Western religious orders (Benedictines, Cistercians, Augustinians, Franciscans, Dominicans and others) and military orders (Templars, Hospitallers, Teutonic Order, along with the new local Order of Saint Samson) in the conquered territories.⁶⁵ In Constantinople famed churches such as, for example, the *Nea* church in the Great (or Boukoleon) Palace, the *Theotokos ton Blachernon* church in the imperial Blacherna palace, the already mentioned *Pantokrator* monastery, the Saint George *Mangana* monastery, the Saint Samson complex, and several churches attached to the former Patriarchal School (Saint Paul in the *Orphanotropheion*, the *Theotokos Chalkoprateia*) came under the control of Latin clerics, though, as we have seen, this did not have to imply the complete absence of a Byzantine presence in or use of these churches. Indeed, one of the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) relating to Latin Romania – stipulating that Byzantine clerics should not cleanse altars after they had been used by Latins – indicates that the shared use of churches was not uncommon.⁶⁶ Other important churches remained in Byzantine hands, such as the Saint Peter (near Saint Sophia), Saint Theodore of Sphorakios, and the Christ *tou Chalkitou* churches, all three also belonging to the pre-1204 Patriarchal School network.⁶⁷ Other arrangements were also

⁶³ Judith Herrin, *Margins and Metropolis: Authority across the Byzantine Empire*, Princeton 2013, 70.

⁶⁴ Apostolos Kouroupakis and Christopher Schabel, “Bishop Benedetto of Cephalonia, 1207–post 1239”, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 32 (2017) 144.

⁶⁵ Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis, *The Western Religious Orders in Medieval Greece*, Leeds, 2008. Peter Lock, “The Military Orders in Mainland Greece”, in: *The Military Orders. Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick*, London 1994, 333–339.

⁶⁶ Innocentius III, *Acta*, Theodosius T. Haluscynskyj, ed., Pontificia commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis. Fontes. Series 3, vol. 2, Città del Vaticano 1944, n° 1, p. 482.

⁶⁷ Sophia Mergiali-Falagas, “L’Ecole Saint Paul de l’Orphelinat à Constantinople: bref aperçu sur son statut et son histoire”, *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 49 (1991) 241. Raymond Janin, “Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine”, *Etudes Byzantines* 2 (1944) 134–184. Eugenio Dalleggio d’Allessio, “Les sanctuaires urbains et suburbains de Byzance sous la domination latine, 1204–1261”, *Revue des études byzantines* 12 (1953) 50–61.

possible: papal legate Benedictus in 1206 made the *Theotokos Evergetis* monastery near Constantinople into a dependency of the Benedictines of Montecassino, but on the condition that the local Byzantine community remained in place. This seems to have worked, although not without occasional or more permanent friction: in 1222 Honorius III had to admonish the Byzantine abbot and monks to receive Montecassino's representatives well.⁶⁸ In a similar fashion, in 1221 the monastery of *Hagios Angelos tou Kyr Klemes* and the *metochion* of Rhaiktor in the diocese of Chalcedon were granted to the Pisan Saint Peter church in Constantinople, on the condition that the local Byzantine communities remained in place as long as they accepted Roman ecclesiastical obedience.⁶⁹ More in general, in the successive comprehensive pacts (1206–1223) between the religious and secular authorities regarding the ecclesiastical possessions in various parts of the Empire there is no trace of any discrimination against – or separate treatment of – Byzantine institutions or clerics.⁷⁰ However, Byzantine churches not obedient to the Roman Church could suffer the consequences. In 1219 the Byzantine monks of the Roufinianes monastery in Bithynia chose to abandon their monastery, rather than submit to the incessant demands of successive papal legates – Pelagius, cardinal-bishop of Albano, in 1213–1214 and Giovanni Colonna, cardinal-priest of Santa Prassede, in 1218–1219 – to recognize the Latin ecclesiastical authorities.⁷¹ In 1220 Colonna did not reconstitute the *metochion* of Mileas, that had just been recuperated from secular occupation, to, in his eyes, disobedient monks of the Kehiriani monastery (in the diocese of Constantinople), but instead conceded it to his own church of Santa Prassede in Rome.⁷²

Papal and Nicaean patriarchal correspondence and other sources likewise contain references to Latin aggression or pressure exerted against Byzantine clerics, often in the context of a refusal to recognize Latin ecclesiastical authority. In 1213 papal legate Pelagius shut down churches and imprisoned priests and monks in the capital for refusing to accept papal obedience. Emperor Henry intervened at the request of the local Byzantine elite and

⁶⁸ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 24–25, n° 163–165.

⁶⁹ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 179. On both Byzantine monastic establishments: Raymond Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bythinie, Hellespont, Latros, Gaësius, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)*, Paris 1975, 42, 59.

⁷⁰ On these pacts: R.L. Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople", 255–274. F. Van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 196–205.

⁷¹ Romain Clair, "Les filles d'Hautecombe dans l'Empire latin de Constantinople", *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* 17 (1961) 270–271. Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 135. On the Roufinianes monastery: R. Janin, *Les Eglises et les Monastères des Grands Centres byzantins*, 38–39.

⁷² Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 143.

nullified the legate's actions, but a number of Byzantine clerics nevertheless chose to leave for Nicaea.⁷³ Pelagius' actions were not an isolated affair: around 1230 the Nicaean patriarch Germanos II requested the new Latin patriarch – either Simon of Maugastel (1228/29–1232) or Nicolao della Porta (1234–1251) – to release a number of Byzantine monks who had been imprisoned by his predecessor, although it is unclear on what grounds exactly.⁷⁴ In March 1222 Honorius III granted all archbishops and bishops in the Empire at their own request that they themselves, without any referral to the papacy, could absolve Latins who committed violence against Byzantine clerics, since such acts of violence at that time had become frequent.⁷⁵ The latter fact may not be unrelated to the successful war Theodore Doukas of Epiros by this time was waging against the Kingdom of Thessaloniki, which must have created – or reinforced – mutual Latin-Byzantine distrust. Indeed, as reasons for the violence the pope not only mentions the Byzantine clerics' disobedience towards the Roman Church, but also that some engaged in tricks and plots against the Latins. At the same time it is clear from the 1222 papal letter that the ecclesiastical authorities did not want violence against Byzantine clerics to go unpunished. But action was also to be taken against the disobedient clerics themselves. In 1223 Honorius instructed the archbishop of Nicomedia to force local disobedient Byzantine monastic communities – who had first accepted Roman obedience, but then had turned to the Nicaean patriarch – to use ecclesiastical *censurae* to bring them back into the fold, if need be with the support of the secular authorities.⁷⁶ Violence also worked both ways: in 1212 a number of Byzantine laymen from Grabia attacked the Latin archdeacon of Daulia, *magister* Hugo. That Innocent III had to intervene personally suggests that the local Latin lord of Grabia was not very eager to take action, presumably preferring to avoid conflicts with the local Byzantine population.⁷⁷ In 1244 pope Innocent IV, at the request of the lord of Athens Guy I of La Roche, instructed patriarch of Constantinople Nicolao della Porta to transfer Byzantine monks who had been telling 'secrets' – no doubt valuable political or military information – to the neighbouring Byzantine *infideles* (from Epiros) to another monastery.⁷⁸ Individual Byzantine clerics were

⁷³ Georgios Akropolites, *Historia*, §17.

⁷⁴ Fjodor I. Uspenskij, *Organisation of the Second Bulgarian Empire* [in Russian], Odessa, 1879, Appendix, n° VIII, 75–78. V. Laurent, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1/4, n° 1277, 84–85.

⁷⁵ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 129.

⁷⁶ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 194.

⁷⁷ Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 216, col. 564 (XV, 27).

⁷⁸ Innocentius IV, *Acta*, Theodosius T. Haluscynskyj and Meletius Wojnar, eds., *Pontificia commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici Orientalis*. Fontes. Series 3, vol. 4/1, Città

also sometimes pressured by their Latin colleagues into explicitly subscribing to the Roman ecclesiastical dogmas. In the 1230s we find the cases of Lucas, *hieromonachos* of the *Hagios Mamas* monastery, and the already mentioned deacon of Saint Sophia Basileios Gemistos, who both afterwards appealed to patriarch of Nicaea Germanos II to be forgiven.⁷⁹ A further aspect of Latin-Byzantine conflict in the religious sphere is that years after the plundering of churches (treasures, relics) in the context of the capture of Constantinople in April 1204 Byzantine communities could still see themselves confronted with occasional Latin despoliation. In 1214, for example, the Venetian Robaldo, prior of the *Theotokos Psychosostrias* church, stole the body of martyr Saint John of Alexandria from a nearby Byzantine church.⁸⁰

While Latin-Byzantine relations in the religious sphere were in part characterized by tensions and conflict (as were, of course, intra-Latin and intra-Byzantine relations, for example between Nicaea and Epiros), at the same time there was also room for mutual rapprochement and respect.⁸¹ Both popes and emperors cared about the fate of Byzantine monasteries. Innocent III, for instance, supported the abbot of the *Komnenos* monastery in Bodonitza. The Latin bishop had chosen the monastery as his seat of residence (without replacing the Byzantine community), but eventually had to recede to a new location within the local castle.⁸² In 1214 Innocent took the monastic communities on Mount Athos under his protection. In the Great *Lavra* monastery there was reportedly once kept a portrait of emperor Henry of Flanders/Hainault, who at one point had provided support against a violent local Latin lord.⁸³ The same emperor, together with local Latin or Byzantine

del Vaticano, 1962, n° 11. Michael S. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262). A study of the Greek Population and the Orthodox Church under the Frankish Dominion*, Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Arts. Supplement 33, Joannina, 1987, 39.

⁷⁹ V. Laurent, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1/4, n° 1287, n° 1304.

⁸⁰ Petrus Calo, *Translatio Sancti Ioannis Alexandrini*, Paul E. Riant, ed., *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, vol. 1, Geneva 1876, 179–182. On the *Theotokos Psychosostrias* church: Raymond Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*. Vol. 1: *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, Paris 1969, 243.

⁸¹ Examples of intra-Latin and intra-Byzantine conflict: Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 216, col. 565 (XV, 29–30); col. 215–216 (XIII, 14–15). Michael Choniates, *Epistulae*, n° 126–127, n° 156. M. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262)*, p. 86. R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins*, 313, 330.

⁸² Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 215, col. 1557 (XI, 253); PL 216, col. 234 (XIII, 47). M. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262)*, p. 70. Johannes Koder and Friedrich Hild, *Hellas und Thessalia*, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* 1, Wien 1976, 274.

⁸³ Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 216, col. 956 (XVI, 168). Paul Lemerle, André Guillou, Nicolas Svoronos, and Denise Papachryssanthou, eds., *Actes de Lavra IV*, *Archives de l'Athos* 11, Paris 1982, 6. F. Van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium*, 89. See also Elisabeta Negrau,

potentes, defended the *Hosios Loukas* monastery near Thebes against claims of the Order of the Holy Sepulcher, who had been granted the monastery in 1207 by papal legate Benedictus of San Susanna.⁸⁴ In 1216 Honorius III granted papal protection to the *Theodosios Coenobiarcha* monastery in Berroia (and to its possessions in Constantinople, Palestine, Cyprus and Hungary), confirming that it should continue to observe the rule of Saint Basil. One of its monks, Effrem, in 1217 served as the pope's emissary to Theodore Doukas of Epiros, who at the time held captive papal legate John Colonna and emperor Peter of Courtenay.⁸⁵ A 1224 papal letter informs us that Margaret of Hungary acted as the benefactor of a community of Byzantine nuns in the bishopric of Patzuna, a suffragan of Larissa (*monasterium Pacenasiense*), which she had also convinced to recognize papal obedience.⁸⁶ In 1236 Gregory IX instructed the archbishop of Thebes and his suffragans to no longer harass the *Hosios Meletios* monastery with unjust exactions.⁸⁷ In 1247 Innocent IV confirmed to the Byzantine *Sancta Maria de Plagier* monastery that they were exempt from paying tithes for the possessions they had acquired before the Fourth Lateran Council (1215).⁸⁸ In 1252 the pope took thirteen Byzantine monasteries on Euboa under papal protection.⁸⁹ These examples show that some Byzantine monastic communities saw no problem in formally accepting and turning to Roman ecclesiastical authority to obtain privileges or to see their rights and possessions protected. The same can be observed for lay individuals. In 1232 one Theodora, clearly a Byzantine woman of means, turned to Gregory IX to divorce her husband on the grounds of *fornicatio spritualis*. The pope granted her request and instructed local Constantinopolitan prelates to assign her part of the matrimonial assets according to the local, obviously Byzantine custom.⁹⁰

“The Ruler’s Portrait in Byzantine Art. A Few Observations regarding Its Functions”, *European Journal of Science and Theology* 7 (2011) 63–75.

⁸⁴ Innocentius III, *Regesta*, PL 216, col. 303 (XIII, 114–115). In 1217 Honorius III ordered an investigation into the behaviour of the local Byzantine abbot (who claimed to be exempt from episcopal jurisdiction) and in 1222 confirmed papal legate Benedictus’s grant, suggesting that the order’s control over the monastery was still problematic (Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 43, n° 156). M. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262)*, 68.

⁸⁵ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 5, n° 46, n° 49, n° 52.

⁸⁶ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 246.

⁸⁷ Honorius III and Gregorius IX, *Acta*, Aloysius L. Tautu, ed., Pontificia Commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis. Fontes. Series 3, vol. 3, Città del Vaticano, 1950, n° 216. The Latin prelates demanded the payment of certain tithes, but the monasteries had been exempted by Innocent. III.

⁸⁸ Innocentius IV, *Acta*, n° 38. On this monastery: J. Koder and F. Hild, *Hellas und Thessalie*, 270.

⁸⁹ Innocentius IV, *Acta*, n° 83. On these monasteries: J. Koder and F. Hild, *Hellas und Thessalie*, 129, 155–156, 175, 205, 230, 244, 277.

⁹⁰ Honorius III and Gregorius IX, *Acta*, n° 182.

In 1233 Gregory reprimanded the archdeacon of Athens for exacting money – instead of the customary fee of one hen and one bread – from marrying Byzantine couples, both *nobiles* and *ignobiles*. The situation had scandalized both Latins and Byzantines, who had apparently appealed to the pope. The cleric was to be sanctioned, the money restituted and the existing Byzantine custom was to be observed.⁹¹ In 1218 Honorius III also advised leniency to his legate Colonna in dealing with transgressing Byzantine – and also Latin – clerics and laymen. The pope lists in particular Byzantine and Latin bishops consecrating priests and collecting tithes outside their own dioceses, excommunicated Byzantine priests saying Mass in churches placed under interdict, Byzantine laymen arbitrarily divorcing their wives and remarrying, and Byzantine and Latin barons and knights occupying ecclesiastical possessions and refusing to pay tithes.⁹² In 1220 Honorius stated in the same conciliatory vein that suspended or excommunicated Byzantine clerics wishing to recognize papal obedience should be accepted through a simple *promissio manualis*, the *iuramentum iuxta formam Ecclesiae* was deemed unnecessary if the clerics refused to do so.⁹³

Two letters by the Nicaean patriarchs Theodore II Eirenikos and Germanos II from around 1214–1215 and 1223 respectively indicate that while part of the Byzantine elite – the Latin *mezas doux* Philokales being among them, who obviously was capable of corresponding freely with the Nicaean patriarch – and population of Constantinople remained loyal to the Byzantine faith (cf. the principal bones of contention between the Roman and Byzantine Churches: the *filioque* issue, the azymes controversy, and the acceptance of papal primacy), at the same time another part of the metropolitan elite and population was wavering in the absence of firm Orthodox guidance. Indeed, Eirenikos explicitly states that part of the Constantinopolitan community had already accepted the Latin faith, while Germanos' admonitions to the Byzantine metropolitan community had a definite urgency about them. Recently Michael Angold has drawn attention to serious divisions within the Byzantine clergy and society as to cooperation with the Latin Church in the context of the 1215 Lateran Council.⁹⁴ An anti-Latin treatise on the azymes controversy written in Constantinople around 1214 should be seen in the same light. The anonymous

⁹¹ Honorius III and Gregorius IX, *Acta*, n° 185.

⁹² Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 78.

⁹³ Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum*, n° 99.

⁹⁴ V. Laurent, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1/4, n° 1219, n° 1233. Michael Angold, "The Preliminaries of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215): From an Orthodox Perspective", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70 (2019) 38–56.

author from 1214 states that he had written his treatise because part of the Byzantine population was starting to doubt the Byzantine position.⁹⁵ This Byzantine treatise together with the bilingual 1252 *Tractatus Contra Graecos* by an anonymous Constantinopolitan Dominican – who, since it was in part based on a variety of Greek sources and was itself composed in both Latin and Greek, was presumably aided by one or more Byzantine colleagues (see *infra*) – indicates that the ecclesiastical union debate, apart from the official negotiations between the papacy and the Nicaean patriarchs (in 1214, 1234, 1254–56; also with the metropolitan clergy in 1206), was also part of the local religious and intellectual life.⁹⁶ That loyalty to both the Byzantine and Latin Churches, however, could also go hand in hand is exemplified by the Saints Peter and Paul church in Kalyvia Kouvara in Attika, founded in the early 1230s by Ignatios, the Byzantine bishop of the islands of Thermiai and Kea. Both saints, clearly representing the Latin and Byzantine Church respectively, are depicted in several scenes, but at the same time there is also present the effigy of Michael Choniates, the metropolitan of Athens in 1204 who chose to go into exile on the island of Kea, after negotiations in Thessaloniki (1205) with papal legate Benedict, the cardinal of Santa Susanna, had not yielded the desired results.

Choniates continued to care for his former flock by corresponding with local Byzantine bishops (who had remained in place), monasteries and aristocrats (inter alia on Euboea), and also with the Nicaean emperor and patriarch, before retreating to the *Joannes Prodromos* monastery in Bodonitza. Choniates characterized the new Latin regime with the terms ‘tempest’, ‘tyranny’ and ‘flood’, just like his colleagues – and propagandists of the local regimes there – in Epiros and Nicaea, such as John Apokaukos, the metropolitan

⁹⁵ Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Documents grecs pour servir à l’histoire de la quatrième croisade (liturgie et reliques)”, *Revue de l’Orient latin* 1 (1893) 540–555. Johannes M. Hoeck and Raimund J. Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otrante, Abt von Casole. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innozenz III. und Friedrich II.*, *Studia patristica et bizantina* 11, Ettal, 1965, 39 (note 51).

⁹⁶ Antoine Dondaine, “‘Contra Graecos.’ Premiers écrits polémiques des Dominicains d’Orient”, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 21 (1951) 321–446. Andrea Riedl, *Kirchenbild und Kircheneinheit. Der dominikanische Tractatus contra Graecos (1252) in seinem theologischen und historischen Kontext*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie 69, Berlin 2020. Only a non-critical edition is available: *Tractatus Contra Errores Graecorum*, Peter Stevart and Jean-Paul Migne, eds., *Patrologia Graeca* 140, Paris 1887, 487–574 (a reimpression of Stevart’s 1616 edition). See also: Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, “Les prêcheurs, du dialogue à la polémique (XIIIe–XIVe siècle),” in: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., *Bibliotheca* 11 (Leuven, 2011), 151–167.

of Naupaktos. At the same time the former metropolitan counselled cooperation with the new Latin rulers and he himself continued to deal with the Latin authorities as well, for example by sending his secretary to the renewed 1214 ecclesiastical union negotiations in Constantinople.⁹⁷ Examples of religious accommodation can also be found elsewhere. The iconographical layout of the Byzantine monastic church of Omorphi Ekklesia (1289) in Galatsi (Athens) again portrays the saints Peter and Paul, but also a Cistercian monk and three Latin monastic saints. In Venetian Crete a number of Byzantine churches likewise contain depictions of Western saints, namely Saint Francis and Saint Bartholomew, although to be sure most Byzantine churches built during the period of *Frankokratia* show no recognizable Western influence. Two examples on the island of Naxos are the Panagia church (1288/89) at Agiossos and the Saint George church (last quarter of the 13th century) at Lathrino. The donor inscriptions indicate that the *ktetors* – with notably George Peditasimos and Michael Tsikalopoulos respectively, both from Constantinopolitan families – adhered to traditional Orthodox doctrine. Nektarios Zarras’ proposal that they should be interpreted in the context of anti-unionist protest against Michael VIII Paleologos’ religious policies and that Peditasimos and Tsikalopoulos must have fled or have been exiled from the reconquered Byzantine capital, however, is not convincing. Why would Peditasimos and Tsikalopoulos then have gone to a Latin-ruled island? It sounds more credible that both families had migrated to the island earlier, perhaps in 1261 when emperor Baldwin II was forced to flee Constantinople: the Chronicle of Morea mentions that a number of Byzantine archontal families fled the capital together with the Latin emperor, presumably fearing retribution from the Nicaean (re)conquerors. Seen in this light the mentioned inscriptions may then simply indicate a climate of tolerant religious Latin-Byzantine cohabitation.⁹⁸ Latin

⁹⁷ Michael Choniates, *Epistulae*, n° 90–91, n° 94–95, n° 102, n° 107, n° 110, n° 117, n° 124, n° 134–137, n° 161, n° 165. Georg Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 33, Roma 1934, 154–212. Kenneth M. Setton, “Athens in the later XIIth century”, *Speculum* 19 (1944) 179–208. M. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262)*, 26, 33, 38–39, 43–44, 86–87. T. Shawcross, “The Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade: The Lost Generation”, 17–23. Idem, “Golden Athens: Episcopal Wealth and Power in Greece at the Time of the Crusades”, in: *Contact and Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean, 1204–1453*, Nikolaos G. Chrissis and Mike Carr, eds., *Crusades – Subsidia* 5, Farnham 2014, 85–89.

⁹⁸ Nektarios Zarras, “Identity and Patronage in Byzantium: Epigraphic Evidence and Donor Portraits of Naxos”, in: *Inscriptions in the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine History and History of Art*, Christos Stavrakos, ed., Wiesbaden 2016, 64–75. The author’s contention – on the basis of a passage in George Pachymeres’ chronicle – that Naxos around 1263 would have been conquered by Michael VIII’s *protostrator* Alexios Philantropenos is unconvincing. Since

aristocrats also sometimes built (partially) Byzantine inspired churches. For example Baldwin II instructed his Byzantine priest Demetrios to build a church dedicated to Saint George in Constantinople, Anthony le Flamenc commissioned a Byzantine-style church in Beotian Karditsa also dedicated to Saint George to house his tomb, and the famed scholar and translator William of Moerbeke as the archbishop of Corinth probably had the largely Byzantine-style church in Merbaka built. To be noted is that Baldwin's choice for Saint George was in line with Byzantine imperial traditions: since the 11th century Byzantine emperors had closely associated themselves with this particular warrior saint, who would also become very popular in crusader circles and could thus serve as a bridge between both communities.⁹⁹ Prince of Achaia William II of Villehardouin is credited with making donations to both Latin and Byzantine monasteries, which he confirmed at the time of his death. One of these must have been the monastery of Hagia Marina, to which William's widow Anna Doukas in 1276/77 donated a book, as is clear from a dedication in Greek in the preserved manuscript. The monastery must – as Sharon Gerstel has argued – no doubt be equated with the church of Zoodochos Pege in Messenia, where Western-influenced, high quality wall paintings dating from about 1260 have been found.¹⁰⁰

That Latin-Byzantine relations in the religious sphere did not have to be problematic also follows from the fact that a number of Byzantines entered Latin monastic communities. This phenomenon can be observed in the capital, but also in southern Greece. In 1249 the *lector Constantinopolitanus Thomas Grecus ex ordine Minorum qui sanctus homo erat et Grece et Latine*

no Western source mentions such a (in any case very temporary) conquest, Philantropenos' actions were probably limited to a local raid. Compare: Michael Angold, "Michael VIII Palaiologos and the Aegean", in: *Liquid and Multiple. Individuals and Identities in the Thirteenth-Century Aegean*, Guillaume Saint-Guillain and Dionysios Stathakopoulos, eds., Paris 2012, 31.

⁹⁹ Sophia Kalopissi-Verti, "Monumental Art in the Lordship of Athens and Thebes under Frankish and Catalan Rule (1212–1388): Latin and Greek Patronage", in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Brill's Companion's to European History 6, Leiden 2014, 374–376. Guy Sanders, "Use of Ancient Spolia to Make Personal and Political Statements: William of Moerbeke's Church at Merbaka (Ayia Triada, Argolida)", *Hesperia* 84 (2015) 583–626. Christopher Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*, Ashgate 2003, 109–143.

¹⁰⁰ *The Chronicle of Morea*, √7770–7790. Sharon Gerstel and Michalis Kappas, "Between East and West: Locating Monumental Painting from the Peloponnese," in: *Cross-Cultural Interaction between Byzantium and the West, 1204–1669*, Angeliki Lymberopoulou, ed., Publications of the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 22 London and New York 2018, 190–191.

loquebatur, whose surname indicates that he was a Byzantine Greek, acted as John III Vatatzes' messenger to Innocent IV together with a second messenger, also a Franciscan, who is described as having a Byzantine father and Latin mother (*Grecus ex uno parente et Latinus ex altera*).¹⁰¹ Thomas or one of his companions may well have written the preserved Greek translation of the Franciscan Rule that has been attributed to a 13th-century Byzantine native.¹⁰² Another example is the Byzantine Constantinopolitan Franciscan John Parastron/Parastos (†1275), who no doubt had entered the Franciscan metropolitan convent before 1261. During the preparations of the Second Council of Lyons (1274) he served as a messenger to emperor Michael VIII (from 1270).¹⁰³ The Dominicans also recruited local Byzantines, such as *frater* Simon the Constantinopolitan, who was born around 1235 and entered the Constantinopolitan convent sometime before 1261. After Michael VIII's conquest of the city he sought refuge in Euboea, but returned to the capital in 1299. Four letters in Greek by him discussing the differences between the Latin and Byzantine Churches, addressed to emperor Andronikos II Paleologos (1282–1328) and various prominent Byzantine intellectuals and dignitaries, have been preserved.¹⁰⁴ Greek translations and transcriptions of the Latin liturgy, apparently made in early 13th-century Constantinople, may well have been used by Byzantine clerics working in a Latin milieu (the imperial court, Latin religious institutions, etc.), allowing them to fully understand the Latin liturgy, and to read a Latin mass if they were not familiar with the Latin alphabet.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, Giuseppe Scalia, ed., Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, Turnhout 1998, vol. 1, 489.

¹⁰² Séverien Salaville, "Fragment inédit de traduction grecque de la Règle de saint François", *Échos d'Orient* 28 (1929) 167–172. Elizabeth Fisher, "Homo Byzantinus and Homo Italicus in Late 13th-century Constantinople", in: *Dante and the Greeks*, Jan M. Ziolkowski, ed., Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Humanities, Washington D.C. 2014, 69.

¹⁰³ Elizabeth Fisher, "Monks, Monasteries and the Latin Language in Constantinople", in: *Change in the Byzantine World in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Ayla Ödekan, Engin Akyürek, and Nevra Necipoglu, eds., Istanbul, 2010, 392–393.

¹⁰⁴ Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, "Frère Simon le Constantinopolitain, O.P. (1235?–1325?)", *Revue des études byzantines* 45 (1987) 165–174.

¹⁰⁵ Brendan McGuire's analysis of the nature of these texts in my view convincingly shows that these – and especially the awkward transcription in Greek letters – must have had a practical day-to-day use and could not exclusively have been produced and/or used in the context of the discussions on ecclesiastical union of 1214 by the Byzantine delegation led by Nicholas Mesarites. See Brendan J. McGuire, "Evidence for religious accommodation in Latin Constantinople: a new approach to bilingual liturgical texts", *Journal of Medieval History* 39 (2013) 342–356. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Documents grecs pour servir à l'histoire de la Quatrième croisade", 540–555. J. Hoeck and R. Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, 39–40. See also: Jean Darrouzès, "Conférence sur la primauté du Pape à Constantinople en

In the 1260s we find in the principality of Achaia Demeta Paleologina as the abbess of the Cistercian monastery of *Sancta Maria de Verge* near the town of Modon. In 1267, in the context of the Peloponnesian offensive of her presumed and distant relative emperor Michael VIII Paleologos, she decided to permanently relocate her community to Conversano in southern Italy. In a late list of abbesses, Demeta is said to have been *imperiali sanguine nata*, no doubt referring to the long-standing connections of the Paleologoi with the imperial Doukas and Komnenos families. One Theodore Paleologos from Modon, whom we will meet engaged in merchant activities further on, must have been a relative. Michael Paleologos, Michael VIII's great-grandfather, in the mid-twelfth century seems to have possessed landed estates in the theme of Hellas-Peloponnesos, making it conceivable that after 1204 a branch of the Paleologos family (re)settled there. We do not know Demeta's exact relationship to the Paleologoi of Nicaea, but her example indicates that members of the highest Byzantine aristocracy could also feel attracted to certain forms of Latin religious life. In the same region two dedicatory inscriptions (1244/45 and 1354) in local churches suggest that a number of *archontes* had explicitly embraced the Latin faith.¹⁰⁶ The choices made by Demeta and these Moreote *archontes* furthermore help explain the presence of a Cistercian monk and Western saints in Byzantine churches in Beotia and Attika noted earlier. Worth mentioning here is that none of the dedicatory inscriptions of Byzantine churches built in Latin Romania before the (re)capture of Constantinople in 1261 make reference to the Nicaean emperors, as is the case in a number of churches in Cappadocia (first half of the 13th century), then a part of the Seljuk sultanate of Konya. In Latin Achaia and Euboia none are found after 1261 either (mentioning the Paleologan emperors).¹⁰⁷ That the dogmatic, liturgical

1357", *Revue des études byzantines* 19 (1961) 81. E. Fisher, "Homo Byzantinus and Homo Italicus in Late 13th-century Constantinople," 69.

¹⁰⁶ Demeta: Ferdinando Ughelli, (ed., *Italia Sacra*, Venice, 1721, 706–709 (edition of a number of episcopal and papal letters and other documents concerning the monastery). M. Angold, "The Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1204–1261: Marriage Strategies," 63–64. Jean-Claude Cheynet and Jean-François Vannier, "Les premiers Paléologues", in: *Études prosopographiques*, Paris 1986, 133–186 (especially n° 17). On the dedicatory inscriptions: Georgios Soteriou, "He Hagia Trias tou Kranidiou", *Epeteris tes hetaireas byzantinon spoudon* 3 (1926) 193–205. A. Bon, *La Morée franque*, vol. 1, 115, 591. D. Jacoby, "The Encounter of Two Societies", 898.

¹⁰⁷ Achaia: D. Jacoby, "From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change", 25. On the Cappadocian dedicatory inscriptions: Sophie Métivier, "Byzantium in question in 13th century Seljuk Anatolia", in: *Liquid & Multiple: Individuals & Identities in the Thirteenth-century Aegean*, Guillaume Saint-Guillain and Dionysios Stathakopoulos, eds., Paris 2012, 234–257. Tolga Uyar, "Thirteenth-Century Byzantine Painting in Cappadocia: New Evidence",

and other differences between the Latin and Byzantine Churches did not impede a certain measure of shared religious experience is also apparent from the fact that special occasions and holidays were celebrated together. In 1214 both the Byzantine and Latin population of Constantinople warmly welcomed the Nicaean legate Nicholas Mesarites, who had come to the capital in the context of a new round of negotiations concerning ecclesiastical union.¹⁰⁸ Around the same year both Latins and Byzantines were present for the traditional veneration of the Saint John of Alexandria relic (which was subsequently robbed) in the *Theotokos* church near the *Theotokos Psychosostrias* monastery.¹⁰⁹ On 4 May 1215 the feast of Saint Helen was celebrated by the entire region around Constantinople, especially in the Thracian coastal town of Athyra, where the saint's body had rested until 1204. Its recent translation to the West was lamented by the entire province, Byzantines and Latins alike.¹¹⁰ More generally, in areas not densely populated by Latins, the latter also turned to Byzantine priests for religious services and spiritual care, a situation which is attested in, inter alia, Achaia and on Venetian Crete.¹¹¹

in: *First International Byzantine Studies Symposium. Change in the Byzantine World in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Ayla Odekan, Engin Akyurek and Nevra Necipoglu, eds., Istanbul 2010, 617–625. After 1261 we do find inscriptions citing the Paleologan emperors (especially Emperor Andronikos II who abandoned the 1274 ecclesiastical union), inter alia in the mentioned Omorphi Ekklesia church near Athens and on Venetian Crete. See: Sophia Kalopissi-Verti, "The Impact of the Fourth Crusade on Monumental Painting in the Peloponnese and Eastern Central Greece up to the End of the Thirteenth Century", in: *Byzantine Art in the Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences (International Congress, March 9–12, 2004)*, Panayotis L. Vocotopoulos, ed., Athens 2007, 82–88. Dimitrios Tsougarakis, "La tradizione culturale bizantina nel primo periodo della dominazione Veneziana a Creta. Alcune osservazioni in merito alla questione dell'identità culturale", in: *Venezia e Creta. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, Gherardo Ortalli, ed., Venice 1998, 510–22. Chryssa A. Maltezou, "Byzantine 'consuetudines' in Venetian Crete", 269–280. In general on 13th-century dedicatory inscriptions: Sophia Kalopissi-Verti, *Dedicatory inscriptions and Donor Portraits in Thirteenth-Century Churches of Greece*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Tabula Imperii Byzantini 5, Wien 1992, 47–110.

¹⁰⁸ Nikolaos Mesarites, *Der Bericht des Nikolaos Mesarites über die politischen und kirchlichen Ereignisse des Jahres 1214*, in: August Heisenberg, ed., "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion 3", *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse* (1923, 3. Abteilung), § 14, p. 21.

¹⁰⁹ Petrus Calo, *Translatio Sancti Ioannis Alexandrini*, 181.

¹¹⁰ Paul E. Riant, *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae* (Geneva 1976), vol. 2, n° 44, p. 105–106.

¹¹¹ David Jacoby, "Social Evolution in Latin Greece," in: *A History of the Crusades*. Vol. 6: *The Impact of the Crusades on Europe*, Norman P. Zacour and Harry W. Hazard, eds., Madison 1989, 218–219.

Conclusion

It is clear that the ‘Byzantine experience’ in the Latin Empire during the 13th century was, as is to be expected, varied and characterized by regional differences (the imperial capital, Byzantine and Latin principalities, the Venetian territories). Overall, however, the new Latin rulers were prepared to share power with the Byzantine elite on all levels, while on a local level for the common populace continuity with the pre-1204 realities – albeit within a feudally restructured Empire – was the starting point. Conversely, part of the Byzantine elite and population was prepared to cooperate with the Latins: although the 1204 cataclysm was not of their making or choosing, a number of them nevertheless pragmatically saw opportunities for workable cohabitation. Here we should bear in mind that at the beginning of the thirteenth century Byzantine imperial rule and the metropolitan elite were not all that popular outside the capital, as is clear from the cold welcome fleeing aristocrats – patriarch John X Kamateros being among them – received from the local populace in Thrace, as witnessed by Niketas Choniates.¹¹² The Latin aristocracy may have politically become the dominant group, especially after the Byzantine feudal principalities had fallen away (by the 1230s), but in most regions Byzantine members of the local or former imperial elites were well connected – through marriage and as prominent functionaries or feudatories – with the imperial and regional courts. That as such they wielded real political influence is exemplified by the French queen-mother Blanche of Castile’s concern that Baldwin II relied too much on Byzantine counselors. The emperor politely denied this in his return letter (1243), but obviously the person who had informed Blanche – either her or her son Louis IX’s envoy or a visiting baron, knight or cleric from Constantinople or Latin Romania in general – was of a different opinion or had presented things otherwise.¹¹³ Latin rule also left room – the Westerners always being demographically outnumbered – for different responses from the Byzantine elite and population: some adhered to a purely Byzantine way of living (religion, art, science, literature, etc.), while others were open to Western influence, just as there were Latins that were receptive to Byzantine culture. What is ultimately important is that Byzantines were always very much part of the Constantinopolitan Empire in the years 1204–1261 (and beyond that date in Latin Romania). The recent trend in the field of Byzantine studies to more and more include the Latin Empire and its offshoots in the analyses of thirteenth century Byzantium – alongside Nicaea, Epiros, Trebizond and other political entities – is therefore strongly to be encouraged.

¹¹² Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, vol. 2, 586–587.

¹¹³ See Baldwin’s August 1243 letter to Blanche: André Duchesne, ed., *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, Paris 1649, vol. 5, 423–424.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Published Primary Sources

Alexander IV, *Les registres (1254–1261)*, Charles Bourel de la Roncière, ed., Registres des papes du XIIIe siècle, Paris 1896–1959.

Bees Nikos A., “Eine politisches Treubekentnis von Benedictus, dem römisch-katholischen Bischof von Kefalonia (1228),” *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 3 (1922) 165–176.

Catalogus et cronica principum et comitum Flandrie et Forestariorum, Joseph-Jean De Smet, ed., Recueil des chroniques de Flandre, Bruxelles 1837.

Chronicon universalis anonymi Laudunensis, Georg Waitz, ed., Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Series Scriptorum 26, Hannover 1882.

Demetrios Chomatenos, *Ponemata Diaphora*, Günther Prinzing, ed., Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 38, Berlin 2002.

Duchesne André, ed., *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, vol. 5, Paris 1649.

Ephraem Aenius, *Historia Chronica*, ed. Odysseus Lampsides, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Athenienis 27, Athens 1990.

Georgios Akropolites, *Historia*, August Heisenberg, ed., Georgii Acropolitae Opera 1, Leipzig 1903.

Georgios Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, Albert Failler, (ed., and Vitalien Laurent, tr., Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Parisienses 24/1–2, Paris 1984.

Gregorius IX, *Les registres*, Lucien Auvray, Suzanne Clémencet and Louis Carolus-Barré, eds., Registres des papes du XIIIe siècle, Paris 1890–1955.

Gunther of Paris, *Hystoria Constantinopolitana*, Peter Orth, ed., Spolia Berolinensia. Berliner Beiträge zur Mediävistik 5, Hildesheim 1994.

Henri de Valenciennes, *Histoire de l'empereur Henri de Constantinople*, Jean Longnon, ed., Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades 2, Paris 1948.

Honorius III and Gregorius IX, *Acta*, Aloysius L. Tautu, ed., Pontificia Commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis. Fontes. Series 3, vol. 3, Città del Vaticano 1950.

Honorius III, *Bullarium Hellenicum. Letters to Frankish Greece and Constantinople*, William O. Duba and Christopher C. Schabel, eds., Mediterranean Nexus 1100–1700, Leuven 2015.

Innocentius III, *Regesta*, Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., Patrologia Latina 214–217, Roma 1855.

Innocentius III, *Acta*, Theodosius T. Haluscynskij, ed., Pontificia commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis. Fontes. Series 3, vol. 2, Città del Vaticano 1944.

Innocentius IV, *Les registres (1243–1254)*, Elie Berger, ed., Registres des papes du XIIIe siècle, Paris 1884–1921.

Innocentius IV, *Acta*, Theodosius T. Haluscynskyj and Meletius Wojnar, eds., Pontificia commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris canonici Orientalis. Fontes. Series 3, vol. 4/1, Città del Vaticano 1962.

Les Assises de Roumanie, George Recoura, ed., Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études. Section philologique et historique 258, Paris 1930.

Libro de los fechos et conquistas del Principado de la Morea, Alfred Morel-Fatio, ed., Société de l'Orient latin. Série historique 4, Genève 1885.

Livre de la Conquête de la Princesse de l'Amorée. Chronique de Morée (1204–1305), Jean Longnon, ed., Paris 1911.

Laurent Vitalien, ed., *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople. Vol. 1: Les actes des patriarches. Fasc. 4: Les registes de 1208 à 1309*, Paris 1971.

Lemerle Paul, André Guillou, Nicolas Svoronos, and Denise Papachryssanthou, eds., *Actes de Lavra IV*, Archives de l'Athos 11, Paris 1982.

Longnon Jean and Peter Topping, eds., *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIV siècle*, Documents et recherches 9, Paris/La Haye 1969.

Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Istoria del Regno di Romania*, in: *Chroniques Gréco-Romanes inédites ou peu connues publiées avec notes et tables généalogiques*, Carl Hopf, ed., Paris 1873.

Matthaeus Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, Henry R. Luard, ed., *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, 7 vols., London 1872–1883,

Michael Choniates, *Epistulae*, Foteini Kolovou (ed.), *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*. Series Berolinensis 41, Berlin 2001.

Mošin A, ed., *Zbornik srednjovekovnih ćirilčkih povelja i pisama Srbije, Bosne i Dubrovnika 1: 1186–1321*, Beograd 2011.

Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. Jean-Louis Van Dieten, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Bizantinae*. Series Berolinensis 11, Berlin 1975.

Nikephoros Blemmydes, *Autobiographia sive Curriculum Vitae necnon Epistola universalior*, Joseph A. Munitiz, ed., *Corpus Christianorum*. Series Graeca 19, Turnhout 1984.

Nikephoros Gregoras, *Bizantina Historia*, Ludwig Schopen and Immanuel Bekker, eds., *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Bonn 1829–1855.

Nikolaos Mesarites, *Die Disputation mit dem Kardinallegaten Benedikt und dem lateinischen Patriarchen Thomas Morosini am 30. August 1206*, in: August Heisenberg, ed., "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion 2/1", *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse* (1923, 2. Abteilung) 15–25.

Nikolaos Mesarites, *Der Bericht des Nikolaos Mesarites über die politischen und kirchlichen Ereignisse des Jahres 1214*, in: August Heisenberg, ed., "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion 3", *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse* (1923, 3. Abteilung) 3–96.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus Athanasios, "Documents grecs pour servir à l'histoire de la quatrième croisade (liturgie et reliques)", *Revue de l'Orient latin* 1 (1893) 540–555.

- Riant E., ed., *Exuviae Sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, 2 vols., Geneva 1876.
- Sévérien Salaville, “Fragment inédit de traduction grecque de la Règle de saint François”, *Échos d’Orient* 28 (1929) 167–172.
- Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, Giuseppe Scalia, ed., Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, Turnhout 1998.
- Tafel Gottlieb L. and Georg M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, 3 vols., Fontes Rerum Austriacarum. Diplomataria et Acta, Wien 1856–1857.
- The Chronicle of Morea*, John Schmitt, ed., Byzantine Texts, London 1904.
- The Fall of Constantinople, Fourth Crusade. A Critical Edition with Translation and Historical Commentary of the Codex 408 Marcianus Graecus (ff. 1–13v) in the Library of St. Mark*, Corinna Matzukis, ed./tr., Venice/Athens 2004.
- Theiner Augustin, *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, 2 vols., Roma 1859–1860.
- Tractatus Contra Errores Graecorum*, Peter Stevart and Jean-Paul Migne, eds., Patrologia Graeca 140, Paris 1887, 487–574.
- Vasiljevskij Vasily G., “Epirotica saeculi XIII”, *Vizantiskij vremmenik* 3 (1896) 233–299.

Secondary Works

- Acheimastou-Potamianou Myrtali, “Monumental Painting on the Aegean Islands in the Thirteenth Century: Rhodes and Naxos”, in: *Byzantine Art in the Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. The Fourth Crusade and Its Consequences. International Congress, March 9–12, 2004*, Panayotis L. Vocotopoulos, ed., Athens 2007, 25–30.
- Aerts W.J., “Proverbial passages taken from Vincent of Beauvais’ ‘Speculum Doctrinale’ translated into Medieval Greek: the methods of translation used by the anonymous Greek author”, in: *Vincent of Beauvais and Alexander the Great. Studies on the ‘Speculum Maius’ and its translations into medieval vernaculars*, Idem, E.R. Smits, and J. B. Voorbij, eds., Mediaevalia Groningana 7, Groningen 1986, 141–176.
- Agapitos Panagiotis A. and Ole L. Smith, *The Study of Medieval Greek Romance. A Reassessment of Recent Work*, Copenhagen 1992.
- Agrigoroaei Vladimir, “Traduction et sotériologie. Nouvelles recherches au sujet du Barlaam français du Mont Athos”, in: *Francofoni medievali: lingue e letteratura gallo-romanze fuori di Francia (sec. XII–XV)*, Anna Maria Babbi and Chiara Concina, eds., Studi Medioevi, Verona 2016, 229–249.
- Ahrweiler Hélène, “La ‘pronoia’ à Byzance,” in: *Structures féodales et féodalisme dans l’Occident méditerranéen (Xe – XIIIe siècles). Bilan et perspectives de recherches, Colloque international organisé par le centre national de la recherche scientifique et l’école française de Rome (Rome, 10–13 octobre 1978)*, Collection de l’école française de Rome 44, Rome 1980, 681–689.
- Allard André, “Le premier traité byzantin de calcul indien: classement des manuscrits et édition critique du texte”, *Revue d’histoire des textes* 7 (1977) 57–64.

Alpers Klaus, “Zonarae Lexicon,” in: *Brill’s New Pauly. Antiquity volumes*, Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, eds., http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e12217830 (first published online 2006).

Angold Michael, *A Byzantine Government in Exile. The Empire of Nicaea*, Oxford 1975.

Angold Michael, *The Fourth Crusade: Event and Context*, Harlow 2003.

Angold Michael, “The Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1204–1261: Marriage Strategies”, in: *Identities and allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain, eds., Farnham 2011, 47–67.

Angold Michael, “Michael VIII Palaiologos and the Aegean”, in: *Liquid and Multiple. Individuals and Identities in the Thirteenth-Century Aegean*, Guillaume Saint-Guillain and Dionysios Stathakopoulos, eds., Paris 2012, 27–44.

Angold Michael, “The Preliminaries of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215): From an Orthodox Perspective”, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 70 (2019) 38–56.

Balard Michel, “L’historiographie occidentale de la quatrième croisade”, in: *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its consequences*, Angeliki E. Laiou, ed., Paris 2005, 161–174.

Baraton Edouard, *La Romanie orientale. L’empire de Constantinople et ses avatars au Levant à l’époque des Croisades* (thèse doctorale, Université de Rouen 2018)

Bartusis Mark C., *The late Byzantine army. Arms and society, 1204 – 1453*, Philadelphia 1992.

Bartusis Mark C., *Land and Privilege in Byzantium: The Institution of Pronoia*, Cambridge 2012.

Beaton Roderick, *The Medieval Greek Romance*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 6, Cambridge 1989.

Bon Antoine, *La Morée Franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d’Achaïe (1205–1430)*, 2 vols., Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome 213, Paris 1969.

Booth Ian, “Theodore Laskaris and Paphlagonia, 1204–1214; towards a chronological description”, *Archeion Pontou* 50 (2003–2004) 151–224.

Borsari Silvano, *Il dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo*, Napoli 1963.

Bouchet René, *Romans de chevalerie du moyen âge grec*, Paris 2007.

Bouras Charalambos, “The Impact of Frankish Architecture on Thirteenth Century Byzantine Architecture,” in: Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh, eds., *The Crusades from the Perspective of the Byzantine and the Muslim World*, Washington 2001, 247–262.

Bredenkamp François, “The ‘Sampson incident’ (ca. 1215) and the Deterioration of Epirote-Nicaean Orthodox Ecclesiastical Relations”, *Byzantiaka* 4 (1984) 9–31.

Bredenkamp François, *The Byzantine Empire of Thessaloniki, 1224–1242*, Thessaloniki 1996.

Brooke Rosalind B., *The Image of Saint Francis. Responses to Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge 2006.

Bryer A.M., *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos*, London 1980.

Bryer Anthony, “David Komnenos and Saint Eleutherios”, *Archeion Pontou* 42 (1988–89) 161–188.

Byden Börje, “‘Strangle Them with These Meshes of Syllogisms!’: Latin Philosophy in Greek Translations of the Thirteenth Century”, in: *Interaction and Isolation in Late Byzantine Culture*, Jan O. Rosenqvist, ed., Stockholm and New York 2004, 133–157.

Čanak-Medić Milka, Danica Popović, and Dragan Vojvodić, eds., *Žiča Monastery*, Belgrade 2014.

Carile Antonio, “Sulla pronomia nel Peloponneso Bizantino anteriormente alla conquista Latina”, *Studi urbinati* 46 (1972) 327–335.

Carile Antonio, “Rapporti fra signoria rurale e despoteia alla luce della formazione della rendita feudale nella Morea Latina del XIV secolo”, *Rivista Storica Italiana* 88 (1976) 548–570.

Carile Antonio, *Per una storia dell'impero latino di Constantinopoli (1204–1261)*, 2nd ed., Bologna 1978.

Carile Antonio, “Signoria rurale e feudalesimo nell'Impero Latino di Constantinopoli (1204–1261)”, in: *Structures féodales et féodalisme dans l'Occident méditerranéen (Xe – XIIIe siècles). Bilan et perspectives de recherches, Colloque international organisé par le centre national de la recherche scientifique et l'école française de Rome (Rome, 10–13 octobre 1978)*, Collection de l'école française de Rome 44, Rome 1980, 667–678.

Chatzidakis Nano, “The Character of the Painting of Icons from Latin-held Areas”, in: *Byzantine Art in the Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences (International Congress, March 9–12, 2004)*, Panayotis L. Vocotopoulos, ed., Athens 2007, 133–142.

Cheyne Jean-Claude and Jean-François Vannier, “Les premiers Paléologues”, in: *Études prosopographiques*, Paris 1986, 133–186.

Cheyne Jean-Claude, *Pouvoir et Contestations à Byzance (963–1210)*, Byzantina Sorbonensia 9, Paris 1990.

Cheyne Jean-Claude, “Les droits concédés par les empereurs aux populations urbaines (Xe–XIV siècle)”, in: *Städte im lateinischen Westen und im griechischen Osten zwischen Spätantike und Früher Neuzeit: Topographie – Recht – Religion*, Elisabeth Grüber, Mihailo Popović and Martin Scheutz, eds., Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 66, Wien 2016, 149–163.

Clair Romain, “Les filles d'Hautecombe dans l'Empire latin de Constantinople”, *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* 17 (1961) 262–277.

Colantuoni Alice, “Multilingual Traditions in Multilingual Contexts. State of the Art and Methodological Problems in the Study of the Chronicle of Morea (XIV c.)”, *Byzantion* 91 (2021) 75–98.

Congourdeau Marie-Hélène, “Frère Simon le Constantinopolitain, O.P. (1235?–1325?)”, *Revue des études byzantines* 45 (1987) 165–174.

Constantinides C.N., *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204–ca. 1310)*, Nicosia 1982.

Corrie Rebecca W., “The Kahn and Mellon Madonnas and Their Place in the History of the Virgin and Child Enthroned in Italy and the East”, in: *Images of the Mother of God. Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, Maria Vassilaki, ed., Aldershot 2005, 293–303.

Coureas Nicholas, “The Latin and Greek Churches in former Byzantine Lands under Latin Rule”, in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Brill’s Companion’s to European History 6, Leiden 2014, 145–184.

Cupane Carolina, “In the Realm of Eros: The Late Byzantine Vernacular Romance—Original Texts”, in: *Fictional Storytelling in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond*, Eadem and Bettina Krönung, eds., Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World 1, Leiden 2016, 95–126.

Cupane Carolina, “Intercultural Encounters in the Late Byzantine Romances”, in: *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance. A Handbook*, Adam J. Goldwyn and Ingela Nilsson, eds., Cambridge 2019, 40–68.

Curta Florin, *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500–1300)*, Brill’s Companions to European History 19, Leiden 2019.

Dalleggio d’Alessio Eugenio, “Les sanctuaires urbains et suburbains de Byzance sous la domination latine, 1204–1261”, *Revue des études byzantines* 12 (1953) 50–61.

Darrouzès Jean, “Conference sur la primauté du Pape à Constantinople en 1357”, *Revue des études byzantines* 19 (1961) 76–109.

Darrouzès Jean, “Notes sur Euthyme Tornikès, Euthyme Malakès et Georges Tornikès”, *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 23 (1965) 148–167.

Davies John, “Anna Komnene and Niketas Choniates ‘translated’: The Fourteenth-century Byzantine Metaphrases”, in: *History as Literature in Byzantium: Papers from the Fortieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, Ruth Macrides, ed., Farnham 2010, 55–72.

Delacroix-Besnier Claudine, “Les prêcheurs, du dialogue à la polémique (XIIIe–XIVe siècle)”, in: *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., Bibliotheca 11 (Leuven 2011) 151–167.

Dondaine Antoine, “‘Contra Graecos.’ Premiers écrits polémiques des Dominicains d’Orient”, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 21 (1951) 321–446.

Durand Jannic, “Diptyque en ivoire byzantin du xiiiie siècle représentant la Nativité, la Crucifixion et des prophètes”, *La Revue des musées de France. Revue du Louvre* (2013/3, juin) 11–13.

Ebbesen Sten, “Greek and Latin Medieval Logic”, *Cahiers de l’institut du moyen-âge grec et latin* 66 (1996) 67–95.

Ebbesen Sten, “Pachymeres and the Topics”, *Cahiers de l’institut du moyen-âge grec et latin* 66 (1996) 169–185.

Evans Helen C., ed., *Byzantium: Faith and Power*, New York 2004.

Ferluga Jadran, “L’aristocratie byzantine en Morée au temps de la conquête latine”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 4 (1972) 76–87.

Fisher Elizabeth, “Monks, Monasteries and the Latin Language in Constantinople”, in: *Change in the Byzantine World in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Ayla Ödekan, Engin Akyürek, and Nevra Necipoglu, eds., Istanbul 2010, 390–395.

Fisher Elizabeth, “Arabs, Latins and Persians Bearing Gifts: Greek Translations of Astronomical Texts, ca. 1300”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36 (2012) 161–177.

Fisher Elizabeth, "Homo Byzantinus and Homo Italicus in Late 13th-century Constantinople", in: *Dante and the Greeks*, Jan M. Ziolkowski, ed., Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Humanities, Washington D.C. 2014, 63–82.

Folda Jaroslav, *Crusader Art in the Holy Land, from the Third Crusade to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291*, Cambridge 2005.

Folda Jaroslav and Lucy J. Wrapson, *Byzantine Art and Italian Panel Painting. The Virgin and Child Hodegetria and the Art of Chrysography*, Cambridge 2015.

Gasparis Charalambos, "The Period of Venetian Rule on Crete", in: *Urbs capta. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences*, Angeliki Laiou, ed., Paris 2005, 233–246.

Gasparis Charalambos, "Catastica Feudorum Crete: Land Ownership and Political Changes in Medieval Crete (13th–15th Centuries)", in: *Diplomatics in the Eastern Mediterranean 1000–1500. Aspects of Cross-Cultural Communication*, Alexander D. Beihammer, Maria G. Parani & Christopher D. Schabel, eds., The Medieval Mediterranean 74, Leiden 2008, 49–61.

Gasparis Charalambos, "Land and Landowners in the Greek Territories under Latin Dominion, 13th–14th Centuries," in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Brill's Companion's to European History 6, Leiden 2014, 73–113.

Gasparis Charalambos, *Byzantine Families in Venetian Context: The Gavalas and Ialinas Families in Venetian Crete (XIIIth–XIVth centuries)*, Byzantina Symmeikta 29. Appendix, Athens 2019.

Gastgeber Christian, "Das 'Epiros'-Dossier im Codex Vindobonensis theologicus graecus 276", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 66 (2016) 1–109.

Georgopolou Maria, "Vernacular Architecture in Venetian Crete: Urban and Rural Practices", *Medieval Encounters* 18 (2012) 447–480.

Georgopoulou Maria, "The Landscape of Medieval Greece", in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Brill's Companion's to European History 6, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Leiden 2014, 326–368.

Gerstel Sharon and Michalis Kappas, "Between East and West: Locating Monumental Painting from the Peloponnese," in: *Cross-Cultural Interaction between Byzantium and the West, 1204–1669*, Angeliki Lymberopoulou, ed., Publications of the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 22 London and New York 2018, 175–202.

Grossman Heather E., "Syncretism Made Concrete: The Case for a Hybrid Moreote Architecture in Post-Fourth Crusade Greece," in: *Archaeology in Architecture. Papers in Honor of Cecil L. Striker*, Deborah Deliyannis and Judson Emerick, eds., Mainz 2005, 65–73.

Giancarlo Prato, "La produzione libraria in area greco-orientale nel periodo del regno latino di Costantinopoli (1204–1261)", *Scrittura e Civiltà* 5 (1981) 105–147.

Haldon John, *The Social History of Byzantium*, Chichester 2009.

Harvey Alan, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire*, Cambridge 1989.

Hendrickx-Sansaridou Thekla, "The Gasmules in the 13th and the 14th centuries: Social outcasts or advocates of cultural integration?", *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 8 (1997) 135–143.

Hendrickx Benjamin, “Boniface de Montferrat et Manuel Angelos, empereur ‘manqué’ de Byzance (1204)”, *Byzantinos Domos* 12 (2001) 71–75.

Hendrickx Benjamin and Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx, “Indigenous and local troops and soldiers in the service of the Latin conquerors of the Peloponnese after 1204”, *Journal of Early Christian History* 4 (2014) 43–51.

Hendrickx Benjamin and Thekla Sansaridou-Hendrickx, “Les institutions de la Principauté d’Achaïe sous les Villehardouin: la chancellerie et la trésorerie”, *Byzantiaka* 33 (2016) 265–294.

Hennessy Cecily, “Young People in Byzantium”, in: *A Companion to Byzantium*, Liz James ed., Chichester 2010, 81–92.

Herrin Judith, “Realities of Byzantine Provincial Government: Hellas and Peloponnesos, 1180–1205,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 29 (1975) 252–284.

Herrin Judith, *Margins and Metropolis: Authority across the Byzantine Empire*, Princeton 2013.

Hoeck Johannes M. and Raimund J. Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otrante, Abt von Casole. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innozenz III. und Friedrich II.*, *Studia patristica et bizantina* 11, Ettal 1965.

Hoffman Jürgen, *Rudimente von Territorialstaaten im byzantinischen Reich (1071–1210). Untersuchungen über Unabhängigkeitsbestrebungen und ihr Verhältnis zu Kaiser und Reich*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 17, München 1974.

Hunger Herbert, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, Munich 1978.

Hunger Herbert, ed., *Anonyme Metaphrase zu Anna Komnene, Alexias XI–XIII. Ein Beitrag zur Erschließung der byzantinischen Umgangssprache*, *Wiener Byzantinistische Studien* 15, Vienna 1981.

Ilieva Aneta, “The Phenomenon Leo Sgouros”, *Etudes balkaniques* 26 (1990) 31–51.

Jacoby David, “Les archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque”, *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967) 422–445.

Jacoby David, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale. Les ‘assises de Romanie’, sources, application et diffusion*, *Documents et recherches* 10, Paris/La Haye 1971.

Jacoby David, “Les ‘Assises de Romanie’ et le droit vénitien dans les colonies vénitiennes”, in: *Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV*, vol. 1.1, Firenze 1973, 347–360.

Jacoby David, “The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnese after the Fourth Crusade”, *American Historical Review* 78 (1973) 873–906.

Jacoby David, “Les états latins en Romanie: phénomènes sociaux et économiques (1204 – 1350 environ)”, in: *XVe Congrès international d’Etudes byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports*, Athènes 1976.

Jacoby David, “From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change”, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4 (1989) 1–44.

Jacoby David, “Social Evolution in Latin Greece,” in: *A History of the Crusades. Vol. 6: The Impact of the Crusades on Europe*, Norman P. Zacour and Harry W. Hazard, eds., Madison 1989, 165–222.

Jacoby David, "The Venetian Presence in the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204–1261): The Challenge of Feudalism and the Byzantine Inheritance", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 43 (1993) 141–201.

Jacoby David, "La colonisation militaire vénitienne de la Crète au XIIIe s.: une nouvelle approche", in: *Le partage du monde. Proceedings of colloquium at Toulouse-Conques 1995*, Michel Balard and Alain Ducellier, eds., Paris 1997, 297–313.

Jacoby David, "Changing economic patterns in Latin Romania: the impact of the West," in: *The Crusades from the Perspective of the Byzantine and the Muslim World*, Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh, eds., Washington D.C. 2001, 197–233.

Jacoby David, "Les Génois dans le duché d'Athènes au 13e siècle", *Histoire médiévale et archéologie* 13 (2002) 267–273.

Jacoby David, "New evidence on the Greek peasantry in Latin Romania", in: *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, Charalambos Dendrinos, Eirene Harvalia-Crook, Jonathan Harris and Judith Herrin, eds., Aldershot 2003, 239–252.

Jacoby David, "The Demographic Evolution of Euboea under Latin Rule, 1205–1470," in: *The Greek Islands and the Sea, Proceedings of the First International Colloquium held at the Hellenic Institute, Royal Holloway, Univ. of London, 21–22 September 2001*, Julian Chrysostomides, Charalambos Dendrinos and Jonathan Harris, eds., Camberley 2004, 131–179.

Jacoby David, "The Greeks of Constantinople under Latin Rule 1204–1261", in: *The Fourth Crusade: Event, Aftermath, and Perceptions. Papers from the Sixth Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Istanbul, Turkey, 25–29 August 2004*, Thomas F. Madden, ed., Aldershot 2008, 53–73.

Jacoby David, "The Economy of Latin Greece," in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Brill's Companion's to European History 6, Leiden 2014, 185–216.

Janin Raymond, "Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine", *Etudes Byzantines* 2 (1944) 134–184.

Janin Raymond, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. Vol. 1: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, Paris 1969.

Janin Raymond, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bythinie, Hellespont, Latros, Gaèsius, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)*, Paris 1975.

Jeffreys Elizabeth, "Medieval Greek Epic Poetry", in: *Medieval Oral Literature*, K. Reichl, ed., Berlin 2012, 459–477.

Jeffreys Elizabeth, "Byzantine Romances: Eastern or Western?", in: *Renaissance Encounters: Greek East and Latin West, Medieval and Renaissance Authors and Texts* 8, Marina S. Brownlee and Dimitri H. Gondicas, eds., Leiden 2013, 221–237.

Jolivet-Levy Cathérine, "La peinture à Constantinople au XIIIe siècle. Contacts et échanges avec l'Occident", in: *Orient & Occident méditerranéens au XIIIe siècle. Les programmes picturaux*, Fabienne Joubert and Jean-Pierre Caillet, eds., Paris 2012, 21–40.

Kaffa Elena, *The Greek Church of Cyprus, the Morea and Constantinople during the Frankish Era (1196–1303). A New Perspective*, Newcastle upon Tyne 2014.

Kalopissi-Verti Sophia, *Dedicatory inscriptions and Donor Portraits in Thirteenth-Century Churches of Greece*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Tabula Imperii Byzantini 5, Wien 1992.

Kalopissi-Verti Sophia, "Relations between East and West in the Lordship of Athens and Thebes after 1204: Archaeological and Artistic Evidence", in: *Archaeology and the Crusades. Proceedings of the Round Table, Nicosia, 1 February 2005*, Peter Edbury and idem, eds., Athens 2007, 1–33.

Kalopissi-Verti Sophia, "The Impact of the Fourth Crusade on Monumental Painting in the Peloponnese and Eastern Central Greece up to the End of the Thirteenth Century", in: *Byzantine Art in the Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences (International Congress, March 9–12, 2004)*, Panayotis L. Vocotopoulos, ed., Athens 2007, 82–88.

Kalopissi-Verti Sophia, "Monumental Art in the Lordship of Athens and Thebes under Frankish and Catalan Rule (1212–1388): Latin and Greek Patronage", in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Brill's Companion's to European History 6, Leiden 2014, 326–368.

Kanev Nikolay, "Alexius Slav – The Contender of Henri de Hainaut for the Bulgarian Imperial Throne [in Bulgarian]", in: *Velikite Asenevtsi*, Veliko Trnovo 2016, 84–99.

Karpozilos Apostolos D., *The Ecclesiastical Controversy between the Kingdom of Nicaea and the Principality of Epiros (1217–1233)*, Byzantina Keimena kai Melatai 7, Thessalonike 1973.

Kazhdan Alexander, "Pronoia: The History of a Scholarly Discussion", *Mediterranean Scholarly Review* 10 (1995) 133–163.

Kiesewetter Andreas, "Megareites di Brindisi, Maio di Monopoli e la signoria sulle isole ionie (1185–1250)", *Archivio storico pugliese* 59 (2006) 45–90.

Koder Johannes and Friedrich Hild, *Hellas und Thessalia*, Tabula Imperii Byzantini 1, Wien 1976.

Kolovou Foteini, "Euthymios Tornikes als Briefschreiber. Vier unedierte Briefe des Euthymios Tornikes an Michael Choniates im Codex Buc. Gr. 508", *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 45 (1995) 53–74.

Kordoses Michael S., *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262). A Study of the Greek Population and the Orthodox Church under the Frankish Dominion*, Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Arts. Supplement 33, Joannina 1987.

Korobeinikov Dimitri, *Byzantium and the Turks in the Thirteenth Century*, Oxford 2014.

Kotzabassi Sofia, "The Monastery of Pantokrator between 1204 and 1453", *Byzantinisches Archiv* 27 (2013) 57–69.

Koumanoudi Marina, "The Latins in the Aegean after 1204", in: *Urbs capta. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences*, Angeliki Laiou, ed., Paris 2005, 258–263.

Kouroupakis Apostolos and Christopher Schabel, "Bishop Benedetto of Cephalonia, 1207–post 1239", *Mediterranean Historical Review* 32 (2017) 139–152.

Laiou Angeliki, ed., *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its consequences*, Paris 2005.

La Monte John L., "Three Questions concerning the Assises de Jerusalem", *Byzantina-Metabyzantina* 1 (1945) 201–211.

Langdon John S., *John III Ducas Vatatzes' Byzantine Empire in Anatolian Exile, 1222–54. The Legacy of His Diplomatic, Military and Internal Program for the "Restitutio Orbis"*, Ann Arbor 1980.

Lefort Jacques, "Rural Economy and Social Relations in the Countryside", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 47 (1993) 101–113.

Lemerle Paul, *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century*, Galway 1979.

Lilie Ralph-Johannes, "Des Kaisers macht und Ohnmacht. Zum Zerfall des Zentralgewalt in Byzanz vor dem 4. Kreuzzug", in: *Poikila Byzantina* 4. Varia 1, Bonn 1984, 9–120.

Lock Peter "The Frankish Towers of Central Greece", *Annual of the British School at Athens* 81 (1986) 101–124.

Lock Peter, "The Military Orders in Mainland Greece", in: *The Military Orders. Fighting for the Faith and Caring for the Sick*, London 1994, 333–339.

Loenertz Raymond-Joseph, "Les seigneurs tiersiers de Négrepont de 1205 à 1280", *Byzantion* 35 (1965) 235–276.

Loizou Chrystalla, "The Medieval Towers in the Landscape of Euboea: Landmarks of Feudalism", *Journal of Greek Archaeology* 1 (2016) 331–352.

Longnon Jean, Problèmes de l'histoire de la principauté de Morée", *Journal des Savants* (1946) 77–93, 147–161.

Longnon Jean, *L'empire latin de Constantinople*, Paris 1949.

Longnon Jean, "Les Assises de Romanie", *Journal des Savants* (1953) 13–26.

Longnon Jean, "La vie rurale dans la Grèce franque", *Journal des Savants* (1965) 343–357.

Madden Thomas F., "Outside and inside the fourth crusade", *International History Review* 17 (1995) 726–743.

Madden Thomas F., ed., *The Fourth Crusade: Event, Aftermath, and Perceptions. Papers from the Sixth Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Istanbul, Turkey, 25–29 August 2004*, Crusades – Subsidia 2, Aldershot 2008.

Madden Thomas F., "The Latin Empire of Constantinople's Fractured Foundation: The Rift between Boniface of Montferrat and Baldwin of Flanders", in: *The Fourth Crusade: Event, Aftermath, and Perceptions. Papers from the Sixth Conference of the Society for the Study of the Crusades and the Latin East, Istanbul, Turkey, 25–29 August 2004*, Thomas F. Madden, ed., Aldershot 2008, 45–52.

Madgearu Alexandru, *The Asanids. The Political and Military History of the Second Bulgarian Empire (1185–1280)*, Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages 41, Leiden 2017.

Magdalino Paul, "A Neglected Authority for the History of the Peloponnese in the Early XIIIth Cent.: Demetrios Chomatianos, Archbishop of Bulgaria", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 70 (1977) 316–323.

Magdalino Paul, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180)*, Cambridge 1993.

Magdalino Paul, *L'orthodoxie des astrologues. La science entre le dogme et la divination à Byzance, VIIe–XIVe siècle*, Réalités byzantines 12, Paris 2006.

Maltezou Chryssa A., “Cythère. Société et économie pendant la période de la domination vénitienne”, *Balkan Studies* 21 (1980) 33–43.

Maltezou Chryssa A., “Les Grecs de la Mer Egée pendant la période de la latinocratie”, in: *Oriente y Occidente en la Edad Media. Influjos bizantinos en la cultura occidental*, P. Badenas and J.M. Egea, eds., Vitia/ Gasteiz 1993, 137–150.

Maltezou Chryssa A., “Byzantine ‘consuetudines’ in Venetian Crete”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1996) 269–280.

Maltezou Chryssa A., “De la mer Égée à l’archipel : quelques remarques sur l’histoire insulaire égéenne”, in: *Eupsuchia. Mélanges offerts à Hélène ahrweiler*, Byzantina Sorbonensia 16, Paris 1998, 459–467.

Maxwell Kathleen, *Between Constantinople and Rome: An Illuminated Gospel Book (Paris gr. 54) and the Union of Churches*, Farnham 2014.

McDaniel Gordon L., “On Hungarian-Serbian Relations in the Thirteenth Century: John Angelos and Queen Jelena”, *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 12 (1982–83) 44–54.

McGuire Brendan J., “Evidence for religious accommodation in Latin Constantinople: a new approach to bilingual liturgical texts”, *Journal of Medieval History* 39 (2013) 342–356.

McKee Sally, *Uncommon Dominion. Venetian Crete and the Myth of Ethnic Purity*, The Middle Ages Series, Philadelphia 2000.

Mergiali-Falangas Sophia, “L’Ecole Saint Paul de l’Orphelinat à Constantinople: bref aperçu sur son statut et son histoire”, *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 49 (1991) 237–246.

Métivier Sophie, “Byzantium in question in 13th century Seljuk Anatolia”, in: *Liquid & Multiple: Individuals & Identities in the Thirteenth-century Aegean*, Guillaume Saint-Guillain and Dionysios Stathakopoulos, eds., Paris 2012, 234–257.

Mitsani Angeliki, “Monumental Painting in the Cyclades during the 13th century”, *Deltion tis Christianikis Archaialogikis Etaireias* 21 (2000) 93–122.

Mitsiou Ekaterini, “Networks of Nicaea: 13th-century Socio-economic Ties, Structures and Prosopography”, in: *Liquid and Multiple: Individuals and Identities in the Thirteenth-Century Aegean*, Guillaume Saint-Guillain and D. Stathakopoulos, eds., Paris 2012, 91–104.

Nader Marwan, *Burgesses and Burgess Law in the Latin Kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus (1099–1325)*, Aldershot 2006.

Negrau Elisabeta, “The Ruler’s Portrait in Byzantine Art. A Few Observations regarding Its Functions”, *European Journal of Science and Theology* 7 (2011) 63–75.

Neville Leonora, *Authority in Byzantine Provincial Society, 950–1100*, Cambridge 2004.

Nicol Donald M., *The Despotate of Epiros*, Oxford 1957.

Nicol Donald M., “Refugees, mixed population and local patriotism in Epiros and western Macedonia after the fourth crusade”, in: *XVe Congrès international d’Etudes byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports*, (Athènes 1976)

Obolensky Dimitri, *Six Byzantine Portraits*, Oxford 1988.

Oikonomides Nicholas, “The Role of the Byzantine State in the Economy”, in: *The Economic History of Byzantium*, Angeliki E. Laiou, ed., Washington D.C. 2002, vol. 3, 1024–1057.

Ortalli Gherardo, Giorgio Ravegnani and Peter Schreiner, eds., *Quarta crociata. Venezia, Bisanzio, Impero latino*, 2 vols., Venice 2006.

Osswald Brendan, *L'Épire du treizième au quinzième siècle: autonomie et hétérogénéité d'une région balkanique* (thèse doctorale, Université de Toulouse 2011)

Ostrogorsky George and Henri Grégoire, tr., *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine*, Bruxelles, 1954.

Ostrogorsky George, "Pour l'histoire de l'immunité à Byzance", *Byzantion* 28 (1958) 165–254.

Ostrogorsky George, "Die pronoiā unter den Komnenen", *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta* 12 (1970) 41–54.

Ousterhout Robert, "Architecture and Cultural Identity in the Eastern Mediterranean", in: *Hybrid Cultures in Medieval Europe*, Michael Borgolte and Bernd Schneidmüller, eds., Berlin 2010, 261–275.

Page Gill, "Literature in Frankish Greece", in: *A Companion to Latin Greece*, Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis and Peter Lock, eds., Brill's Companions to European History 6, Leiden 2014, 317–324.

Panayotidi Maria, "Les peintures murales de Saint-Georges de Lathrino à Naxos", *Deltion tis Christianikis Archaialogikis Etaireias* 16 (1991–1992) 139–154.

Papalexandrou Amy, "The Architectural Layering of History in the Medieval Morea. Monuments, Memories and Fragments of the Past," in: *Viewing the Morea. Land and People in the Late Medieval Peloponnese*, Sharon E. Gerstel, ed., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington D.C. 2013, 23–54.

Patlagean Evelyne, "'Economie paysanne' et 'Féodalité byzantine'", *Annales. Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 30 (1975) 1371–1396.

Paulmier-Foucart Monique and Serge Lusignan, "Vincent de Beauvais et l'histoire du Speculum Maius", *Journal des Savants* 1 (1990) 97–124.

Perez Martin Inmaculada, "El libro de Actor. Una traducción bizantina del *Speculum doctrinale* de Beauvais (*Vat. Gr. 12 y 1144*)", *Revue des études byzantines* 55 (1997) 81–137.

Perez Martin Inmaculada, "The Transmission of Some Writings by Psellos in Thirteenth-century Constantinople", in: *Theologica Minora: The Minor Genres of Byzantine Theological Literature*, Antonio Rigo, ed., Byzantios. Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 8, Turnhout 2013, 159–174.

Phillips Jonathan, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*, London 2005.

Prinzing Günter, *Die Bedeutung Bulgariens und Serbiens in den Jahren 1204–1219 im Zusammenhang mit der Entstehung und Entwicklung der byzantinischen Teilstaaten nach der Einnahme Konstantinopels infolge des 4. Kreuzzuges*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 12, Munich 1972.

Puech Vincent, "The Aristocracy and the Empire of Nicaea, in: *Identities and allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain, eds., Farnham 2011, 69–80.

Queller Donald E., *The Latin conquest of Constantinople*, New York 1971.

Donald E. Donald E. and Thomas F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade. The Conquest of Constantinople*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia 1997.

Richard Jean, “The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople (1204–27)”, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4 (1989) 45–62.

Riedl Andrea, *Kirchenbild und Kircheneinheit. Der dominikanische Tractatus contra Graecos (1252) in seinem theologischen und historischen Kontext*, Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Theologie und Philosophie 69, Berlin 2020.

Saint-Guillain Guillaume, “Deux îles grecques au temps de l’empire latin. Andros et Lemnos au XIIIe siècle”, *Mélanges de l’école française de Rome. Moyen Âge* 113 (2001) 579–620.

Saint-Guillain Guillaume, “Seigneuries insulaires: les Cyclades au temps de la domination latine (XIIIe–Xve siècle)”, *Médiévales. Langues, textes, histoire* 47 (2004) 31–45.

Saint-Guillain Guillaume, “The Conquest of Monemvasia by the Franks: Date and Context”, *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici, n.s.* 52 (2015) 253–257.

Sampsonis Florence, “L’administration de la Morée par Charles Ier d’Anjou (1267–1285). L’apport majeur d’une source délicate: les registres angevins”, *Mélanges de l’Ecole française de Rome. Moyen-Age* 120 (2008) 139–157.

Sanders Guy, “Use of Ancient Spolia to Make Personal and Political Statements: William of Moerbeke’s Church at Merbaka (Ayia Triada, Argolida)”, *Hesperia* 84 (2015), 583–626. Christopher Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*, Ashgate 2003, 109–143.

Savvides Alexis S., “A Note on the Death of Leo Sgurus in A.D. 1208”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12 (1988) 289–295.

Schmalzbauer Gudrun, “Die Tornikioi in der Palaiologenzeit. Prosopographischer Untersuchung zu einer byzantinischen Familie”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 18 (1969) 115–135.

Setton Kenneth M., “Athens in the later XIIIth century”, *Speculum* 19 (1944) 179–208.

Setton Kenneth M., *The Papacy and the Levant (1204 – 1571)*. Vol. 1: *The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, Philadelphia, 1976.

Shawcross Teresa, *The Chronicle of Morea. Historiography in Crusader Greece*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium, Oxford 2009.

Shawcross Teresa, “The Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade: The Lost Generation (c. 1204 – c. 1222): Political Allegiance and Local Interests under the Impact of the 4th Crusade”, in: *Identities and allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain, eds., Farnham 2011, 9–45.

Shawcross Teresa, “Greeks and Franks after the Fourth Crusade: Identity in the Chronicle of Morea”, in: *Languages of Love and Hate: Conflict, Communication, and Identity in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Sarah Lambert and Helen Nicholson, eds., Turnhout 2012, 141–158.

Shawcross Teresa, “Golden Athens: Episcopal Wealth and Power in Greece at the Time of the Crusades”, in: *Contact and Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean, 1204–1453*, Nikolaos G. Chrissis and Mike Carr, eds., *Crusades – Subsidia* 5, Farnham 2014, 65–96.

Simon Dieter, “Witwe Sachlikina gegen Witwe Horaia”, in: *Fontes Minores* 6, Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte 11, Frankfurt am Main 1984, 325–375.

Soteriou Georgios, “He Hagia Trias tou Kranidiou”, *Epeteris tes hetaireas byzantinon spoudon* 3 (1926) 193–205.

Stadtmüller Georg, *Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 33, Roma 1934.

Striker Cecil L. and Y. Dogan Kuban, eds., *Kalenderhane in Istanbul: The Buildings, Their History, Architecture, and Decoration*, Mainz 1997.

Tautu Aloysius L., “Margarethe di Ungheria imperatrice di Bisancio”, *Antemurale* 3 (1956) 51–79.

Thiriet Freddy, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge. Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XIIe – XVe siècles)*, Paris 1959.

Tihon Anne, “Traité byzantins sur l’astrolabe”, *Physis. Rivista internazionale di storia della scienza* 32 (1995) 323–357.

Todić Branislav, “The Symbolical Investiture of the Archbishop Basil of Bulgaria at Melnik”, *Zograf* 32 (2008) 59–68.

Topping Peter, “The formation of the Assizes of Romania”, *Byzantion* 17 (1944/45) 304–314.

Topping Peter, *Feudal Institutions as revealed in the Assises of Romania. The Law Code of Frankish Greece*, Translations and Reprints from Original Sources of History. Series 3.3, Philadelphia 1949.

Topping Peter, “Co-existence of Greeks and Latins in Frankish Morea and Venetian Crete,” in: *XVe Congrès international d’Etudes byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports*, Athènes 1976.

Tsougarakis Dimitrios, “La tradizione culturale bizantina nel primo periodo della dominazione Veneziana a Creta. Alcune osservazioni in merito alla questione dell’identità culturale”, in: *Venezia e Creta. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, Gherardo Ortalli, ed., Venice 1998, 510–22.

Tsougarakis Nickiphoros I., *The Western Religious Orders in Medieval Greece*, Leeds 2008.

Uspenskij Fjodor I., *Organisation of the Second Bulgarian Empire* [in Russian], Odessa 1879.

Uyar Tolga, “Thirteenth-Century Byzantine Painting in Cappadocia: New Evidence”, in: *First International Byzantine Studies Symposium. Change in the Byzantine World in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Ayla Odekan, Engin Akyurek and Nevra Necipoglu, eds., Istanbul 2010, 617–625.

Van Dielen Jan Louis, “Die drei Fassungen der Historia des Niketas Choniates über die Eroberung von Konstantinopel und die Ereignisse danach,” in: *Lesarten: Festschrift für Athanasios Kambylis zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Schülern, Kollegen und Freunden*, Ioannis Vassis, ed., Berlin 1998, 137–160.

Van Tricht Filip, “‘La Gloire de l’Empire.’ L’idée impériale de Henri de Flandre-Hainaut, deuxième empereur latin de Constantinople (1206–1216)”, *Byzantion* 70 (2000) 211–241.

Van Tricht Filip, “La politique étrangère de l’empire de Constantinople, de 1210 à 1216. Sa Position en Méditerranée orientale: problèmes de chronologie et d’interprétation (première partie)”, *Le Moyen Age* 107/2 (2001) 219–238.

Van Tricht Filip, “La politique étrangère de l’empire de Constantinople, de 1210 à 1216. Sa Position en Méditerranée orientale: problèmes de chronologie et d’interprétation (deuxième partie)”, *Le Moyen Age* 107/3–4 (2001) 409–438.

Van Tricht Filip, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium. The Empire of Constantinople (1204–1228)*, *The Medieval Mediterranean* 90, Leiden 2011.

Van Tricht Filip, “Robert of Courtenay (1221–1227): An Idiot on the Throne of Constantinople?”, *Speculum* 88 (2013) 996–1034.

Van Tricht Filip, “The Byzantino-Latin Principality of Adrianople”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 68 (2015) 325–342.

Van Tricht Filip, “Venice’s Need for Settling the ‘Byzantine question’ by Conquest: The Fourth Crusade’s Second Siege of Constantinople (early 1204)”, in: *Byzantion’ dan Constantinopolis’e İstanbul Kuşatmaları*, Murat Arslan and Turhan Kaçar, eds., Istanbul 2017, 311–334.

Van Tricht Filip, *The Horoscope of Emperor Baldwin II. Political and Sociocultural Dynamics in Latin-Byzantine Constantinople*, *The Medieval Mediterranean*, Leiden 2019.

Van Tricht Filip, “Latin Emperors and Serbian Queens: Anna and Helena”, *Frankokratia* 1 (2020) 56–107.

Van Tricht Filip, “Who Murdered Archbishop William of Rouen? The Valley of Philippi under Latin Rule (1204–circa 1224/25)”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 70 (2020) 305–334.

Van Tricht Filip, “The Duchy of Philippopolis (1204–circa 1236/37?). A Latin Border Principality in a Byzantine (Greek/Bulgarian) Milieu”, *Crusades* 21 (2022) (forthcoming).

Vasiliev Alexandre A., “The Foundation of the Empire of Trebizond”, *Speculum* 11 (1936) 1–37.

Vassilaki Maria, “Crete under Venetian Rule. The Evidence of the Thirteenth Century Monuments”, in: *Byzantine Art in the Aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. The Fourth Crusade and Its Consequences. International Congress, March 9–12, 2004*, Panayotis L. Vocotopoulos, ed., Athens 2007, 42–46.

Violante Tommaso M., “Innocenzo III e l’Oriente bizantino”, *Nicolaus* 24 (1997) 311–352.

Weitzmann Kurt, “Constantinopolitan Book Illumination in the Period of the Latin Conquest”, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 25 (1944) 193–214.

Wertner M., “Margarethe von Ungarn, Kaiserin von Griechenland und Königin von Thessalonich”, *Vierteljahrschrift für Siegel-, Wappen- und Familienkunde* 17 (1890) 219–255.

Westerlink Leendert G., “La profession de foi de Grégoire Chionidès”, *Revue des études byzantines* 38 (1980) 233–245.

Wolff Robert L., “The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople 1204–1261. Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest”, *Traditio* 6 (1948) 33–60.

Wolff Robert L., “Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954) 225–304.

Wolff Robert L., *Studies in the Latin Empire of Constantinople*, London 1976.

Yiavis Kostas, “The Adaptations of Western Sources by Byzantine Vernacular Romances”, in: *Fictional Storytelling in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond*, Eadem and Bettina Krönung, eds., Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World 1, Leiden 2016, 127–155.

Yordanov Kalin, “The Case of ‘S. princeps Philippensis’: Two letters by Pope Honorius III as a source for the relations between Alexius Slav and the Latins [in Bulgarian]”, *Bulgaria Mediaevalis* 8 (2017) 173–218.

Zarras Nektarios, “Identity and Patronage in Byzantium: Epigraphic Evidence and Donor Portraits of Naxos”, in: *Inscriptions in the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine History and History of Art*, Christos Stavrakos, ed., Wiesbaden 2016, 64–75.

Zepos Panayotis J., “Las Assises del Oriente,” *Bizantion-Nea Hellas* 7–8 (1985) 13–34.

Филип Ван Трихт

БИТИ ВИЗАНТИНАЦ У ЦАРСТВУ У ЦАРИГРАДУ НАКОН 1204. ГОДИНЕ: КОНТИНУИТЕТ И ПРОМЕНА (ПОЛИТИКА, УПРАВА, ЦРКВА И РЕЛИГИЈА)

Резиме

Јасно је да је „византијско искуство“ у Латинском царству током XIII века било, што је и очекивано, разнолико и обележено регионалним разликама (царска престоница, византијске и латинске кнежевине, млетачке области). Међутим, генерално гледано, нови латински владари били су спремни да деле власт са византијском елитом на свим нивоима, док је на локалном нивоу за обичан народ континуитет са стањем пре 1204. године – иако у оквиру феудално реструктурираног Царства – представљао полазну тачку. С друге стране, један део византијске елите и становништва био је спреман да сарађује са Латинима – иако катаклизма из 1204. није била њихово дело нити намера, један број њих ипак је прагматично видео могућности кохабитације. Потребно је имати у виду да почетком XIII века византијска царска власт и престоничка елита нису били толико популарни изван престонице, што је очигледно судећи према хладном дочеку племића који су одбегли – а међу њима је био и патријарх Јован X Каматерос – од стране локалног становништва у Тракији, према сведочењу Никите Хонијата. Латинско племство је можда постало политички доминантна група, нарочито након одвајања византијских феудалних кнежевина (до 30. година XIII века), али су у већини области византијски припадници локалне или некадашње царске елите били добро повезани – путем бракова и као истакнути званичници или феудалци – са царским и обласним дворовима. Чињеница да су на тај начин вршили реалан политички утицај видљива је у забринутости француске краљице мајке Бланке од Кастиље да се Балдвин II превише ослања на византијске саветнике. Цар је љубазно одбацио те бојазни у писму у коме јој је одговорио (1243), али је очигледно особа која је обавестила Бјанку – њен изасланик или изасланик њеног сина Луја IX или барон, витез или клерик који је дошао у посету из Цариграда или генерално из латинске Романије – била другачијег мишљења или је ствари другачије представила. Латинска власт је такође отворила простор, при чему су западњаци увек били демографски надјачани – за различите реакције византијске елите и становништва: поједини су се држали искључиво византијског начина живота (у религији, уметности, науци, књижевности итд.), док су други били отворени за западни утицај, као што је било и Латина који су били отворени за византијску културу. Оно што је у крајњој

линији важно јесте да су Византинци били увек у великој мери део Царства у Цариграду током 1204–1261. (и касније у латинској Романији). Стога недавни тренд у области византијских студија да се Латинско царство и његове творевине све више укључују у анализе Византије XIII века – поред Никеје, Епира, Трапезунта и других политичих ентитета – треба снажно подстицати.

Оригиналан научни рад

Примљен: 31.3.2022.

Коначно прихваћен за објављивање: 23.9.2022.