

CHARLES UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

Mutual Perceptions of Armenians, Greeks and Latins during the Komnenian Era (1081-1185)

Bachelor Thesis

Supervisor: Mgr. František Kalenda

Areg Vardanyan

Prague 2020

Contents

Abstract	
Introduction.....	1
Methodology	4
Historical Context.....	5
Sources.....	9
Part I: Armenian sources on Greeks and Latins.....	14
Part II: Latin sources on Armenians and Greeks.....	24
Part III: Greek sources on Armenians and Latins.....	35
Conclusion.....	43
Bibliography	

Abstract

Middle East was home to a vast number of different ethnic and religious groups starting from the Hellenistic period. Constant demographic shifts, emergence of new religious movements, schisms in the existing religions and many other processes significantly enriched the cultural map of the Middle East. One of the zeniths of this diversity was reached during the Komnenian period of Byzantine History. In the long 12th century the Middle East witnessed emergence of a whole new culture brought by the Crusaders, formation of Armenian Principality of Cilicia, extreme ethnic, dynastic and denominational variety inside the Islamic part of the region. In this context the comparative examination of mutual perceptions of different ethnic groups of the region can be useful. Thus, in this thesis we will concentrate on the mutual perceptions of Armenians, Greeks and Latins. Relevant passages from contemporary historical sources will be discussed and analyzed in comparison with one another. The aim is to reveal the patterns descriptive of perception of one group by another, if those exist, and analyze those patterns in the scope of the political situation in the Middle East during 11th -12th centuries A. D.

Key words: stereotype; image of the other; Crusaders; Kingdom of Cilicia; Byzantine Empire; Komnenian Era

Introduction

Komnenian Era has been in the scope of scientific interest as a period of diverse geopolitical conjunctures and far-reaching internal changes that are mostly connected with three generations of long-reigning rulers Alexios I (1081¹-1118), John II (1118-1143) and Manuel I (1143-1180). During the Komnenian “restoration”, Byzantine Empire gained back much of its economic prosperity, military stability and geopolitical influence that was lost in the aftermath of the battle of Manzikert (1071). Historical evidence does not suggest that Alexios I had a coherent “reform program”², but during his long reign several changes were introduced. Among most notable events of the Komeneian period are the return to the standardized gold coinage by Alexios I³ as well as military expansion and strong diplomacy of Manuel I who has received six heads of states during his reign⁴. Komnenian period was also marked by the beginning of the Crusader movements, which will have a crucial role in the geopolitics of the Middle East in the upcoming centuries.

When talking about Komnenian period, it is worth noting that the Empire went through social changes as well. Most notably, “Hellenization of the Empire” had taken place. This was manifested in the legal sphere (from the 11th century it was prohibited to own a Greek slave⁵) as well

¹ Unless specifically stated all the dates in the text are Anno Domini

² M. Angold, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025-1204: a Political History*. New York 1997p. 17

³ A. P. Kazhdan, and Ann Wharton Epstein. *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. California 1990 p.25

⁴ P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*. Cambridge 1993 p.1

⁵ *Kultura Vizantii* vol.II, edited by Z. V. Udaltsova and G. G. Litavrin , Moscow 1989 p.83

as in a growing trend to make an ethnic distinction between the *Romaioi*⁶ of different ethnic backgrounds.⁷

Thus the Komnenian period represents a shift from the realities of the Macedonian system in many dimensions of the social life. This can be seen in the decline of potentiate families of Constantinopolitan elite and the Senate⁸ during the reign of Alexios I, rise of provincial magnates, as well as ascent of new families into the political zenith of Byzantium. Analyzing names of emerging families Kazhdan and Epstein note: “Not coincidentally, the military aristocrats of the eleventh century often drew their family names from the sites where their estates were located: the Botaneiates of Botana, for example, or the Dokeianoι of Dokeia, or the Dalassenoi of Dalassa”⁹. In this context of changing social realities, analysis of mutual perceptions of different nations in contact with Byzantium can be useful. Recently there have been several studies focusing on perception of Turks and Pechenegs during early Komnenian period¹⁰. Obviously one-sided view of the articles can probably be attributed, amongst others, to the lack of contemporary Pecheneg and Turkic written sources. As in the scope of our research question we have written sources from all the three groups we will use comparative method to analyze mutual perceptions of Armenians, Greeks and Latins. Thus our research question is: What were the characteristics of mutual perception of Armenians, Greeks and Latins during the Komnenian Era?

To answer this question, we will discuss views of contemporary authors. Thus in each section, a view of one specific group towards others will be discussed. At the end of every section a small conclusion will be made clarifying the characteristics and patterns of the perception of other by the group discussed. Eventually, in the concluding section we will draw into one all the findings and will try to create a coherent picture to answer our research question.

The description of other is an important aspect of modern historiography. A more concise view to the pattern of history shows us that the way we view the differences between people affects not only our mindset, but our very actions. In extreme cases, implications can lead to ideologically

⁶ In spite of the fact that for most of its history Greek was the “official” language of the Empire, people called themselves *Romaioi* (Greek language equivalent of the English word “Romans”). This word was used in the traditional contrast to *Barbaroi* (all other nationalities)

⁷ *Kultura Vizantji* p.84

⁸ Angold *The Byzantine Empire* p.146-148

⁹ Kazhdan, Epstein *Change in Byzantine Culture* p. 63

¹⁰ See A. Papageorgiou, “οί δέ λύκοι ως Πέρσάι: The image of the “Turks” in the reign of John II Komnenos (1118-1143)”. *Byzantinoslavica* vol. 69 n.1-2 (2011): 149-161 and S. A. Kozlov, “Bolše, čem vrag: Osobennosti Izobraženia Pečengov v Vizantijskoj Literature Epoxi Pervix Komnena”. *Byzantinoslavica* 71, n.1-2 (2013): 145-162

motivated segregation and even to genocide. One of the possible ways to avoid ossification of description of the other in our mindsets is to constantly examine the dynamics of its creation. In this context historical research is crucial, as every social dynamics has a historical aspect

Byzantine studies as an academic discipline saw its nascence with the work of Karl Krumbacher (1856-1909) who is credited with the establishment of the first research institute focused on the Byzantine studies in Munich in 1890s¹¹. Detailed examination of Komeneian period starts with monographs of French historian Ferdinand Chalandon (1875-1921) who examined reigns of Alexios I, John II, and Manuel I. In the second half of 20th century several important contributions were made to the study of the Komenian Era. Those include work of Alexander Kazhdan, Michael Angold, and Paul Magdalino among others. The image of other is a recent topic in Byzantine studies. Two articles mentioned above are among the important steps to incorporate the concept of “otherness” into Byzantine studies. As Byzantine Empire was maintaining cultural, economic as well as political contacts from Latin West to Islamic East, with Slavic and Turkic nations from Balkans up to the Eurasian steppe, was a country which historically had diverse population, the study of the image of other can be of a peculiar interest

¹¹ *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies* p. 5

Methodology

The research question will be examined mostly through semantic as well as partially linguistic analysis of two contemporary texts from each literary tradition. The partiality of linguistic analysis is due to my limited knowledge of Grabar (Old Armenian), my extremely rudimentary training in Greek and lack of any formal knowledge of Latin. Nevertheless some linguistic component will be included in the analysis. The authors analyzed are William of Tyre¹² and Fulcher of Charters¹³ from Latin tradition, Niketas Choniates¹⁴ and Anna Komnene¹⁵ from Greek tradition as well as Matthew of Edessa¹⁶ and Samuel of Ani¹⁷ from Armenian tradition. Greek and Latin authors will be accessed in the English translations, whereas Armenian sources in original Grabar/Modern Armenian¹⁸.

The selection of sources is not a random one. We included all the surviving historical compositions of Armenian tradition from 12th century. Anna Komnene is a major author on Alexios I's reign that is absent in the two other notable secular historians of 12th century Byzantium: Choniates and Kinnamos. The History of Niketas Choniates covers reigns of young Alexios II as well as Andronikos I that are absent in Kinnamos. Thus a decision was made to include Alexiad of Anna Komnena and History of Niketas Choniates in the scope of this research as Greek-language primary sources. As the research question is primarily concerned with mutual perceptions of denoted groups, it was important to select from the ample availability of 12th century Crusader chronicles only the ones, whose authors had lived in the Middle East and were not just travelers. From major chroniclers only two correspond to the criterion: Fulcher of Charters and William of Tyre. William of Tyre was born in the Kingdom of Jerusalem and lived in the Middle East most of his life. Fulcher of Charters took part in the first crusade and lived in Jerusalem for more than 30 years most probably passing away in the Middle East.

¹² William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, translated and annotated by Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey, vol. 2, New York 1943

¹³ Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, edited by H. S. Fink, translated by F. R. Ryan, New York 1973.

¹⁴ *O City of Byzantium Annals of Niketas Choniates*, translated by Harry J. Magoulias, Detroit 1984

¹⁵ Anna Komnene. *Alexiad*, translated by E. R. A. Sewter, revised with introduction and notes by Peter Frankopan, New York, 2009

¹⁶ Matteos Urahyci, *Žamanakagrutyun*, translation, introduction and notes by Hrach Bartikyan, Yerevan 1973

¹⁷ Samuel Aneci Ew Šarunakoghner, *Žamanakagrutyun*, edited by Karen Matevosyan, Yerevan 2014

¹⁸ This is due to the fact that the chronicle of Samuel of Ani is only available in Grabar (Old Armenian)

Historical Context

Byzantine Empire

In 1081 Alexios I Komnenos was proclaimed Byzantine Emperor. The situation of Empire was more than troublesome. Constant internal strife, the Great schism and eventually the defeat in the Battle of Manzikert with capture of Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes made Byzantine Empire extremely weak and vulnerable to constant threat from outside. Most of the Anatolian territory of the empire was under Seljuk rule. At the end of Alexios I's rule, empire regained its relative territorial stability it used to have in Anatolia and Balkans. As noted above, Alexios I had a remarkable role in the events surrounding the First Crusade. Firstly there is a letter attributed to Alexios I addressing Roger of Flanders. There Alexios I describes atrocities of Turks and Pechenegs against Christians and calls Latins to help him in his struggle against them. Scholarly views are ambiguous about the authenticity¹⁹. Nevertheless, Alexios I's meeting with the leaders of the First Crusaders in Constantinople in 1096 is a fact of high historical accuracy. It is worth noting that cooperation with the Crusaders was crucial for Alexios I to maintain Constantinople and capture Nicaea pushing Turks eastwards to Ikonium²⁰.

John II Komnenos succeeded his father in 1118 as the emperor. He pursued expansionistic policies on both directions of Anatolia and Balkans. He was able to secure his role as an overlord over the Crusader States (Antioch and Edessa) as well as Armenian Cilicia. Overall he was true to the Alexios I's idea of restoration of the Empire and was able to balance the Turks by employing local Armenian lords around Cilicia²¹

Manuel I Komnenos succeeded his father John II as the emperor in 1143. Manuel's reign marked the apogee of Komnenian political and military might. Due to successful military campaigns and diplomatic agility, he was able to extend Byzantine hegemony from Hungary to the Middle East. His might was seriously challenged as a result of defeat to Seljuks in the Battle of Myriokephalon (1176). Several researchers²² have equated the catastrophic nature of the defeat for

¹⁹ See E. Joranson. "The Problem of the Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexius to the Court of Flanders." *The American Historical Review* 55, no. 4 (1950): pp. 811–832

²⁰ Magdalino *The Empire* p.29

²¹ *Ibid* p.37

²²L. Ter-Petrosyan *Xačakirnerj Ew Hayerj*, vol.2, Yerevan 2007

Byzantium to the one in Manazikert (1071). During Manuel I's reign matrimonial relations were formed between Komnenian dynasty and the royal houses of Kingdom of Hungary and Kingdom of Jerusalem. He also recovered suzerainty of the empire over Armenian Cilicia. Throughout his long reign he had both military confrontations and diplomatic reconciliations as with Latins as well as with Armenians. Noteworthy are his campaigns against Thoros II and Reynald of Antioch on one hand, and the plan of ecumenical dialog with Armenians²³ and joint Latin-Greek expedition to Egypt on the other.

The last two rulers of the Komnenian dynasty were Manuel's son Alexios II (1180-1183) and Andronikos I (1183-1185) who was grandson of Alexios I. Alexios II has never reigned, because of his young age and first had as a regent his mother Empress Maria. After 1182 the regency was taken by Andronikos I. Although being in power for 3 years, Andronikos I became notoriously remembered in subsequent historiography for massacre of Latins. Initially a popular figure, Andronikos I was deposed by a nobleman Isaac I Angelos who led the coup against him. This marked the end of Komnenoi ruling Constantinople. In spite of this the Emperors of Grand Komnenoi dynasty that ruled over Empire of Trebizond for another 300 years up until Ottomanization of the Middle East, were tracing back their ancestry to the Komnenian dynasty.

Crusader States

The Crusader states were four sovereign states that were created as a result of the First Crusade. Those were the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1099-1291), Principality of Antioch (1098-1268), Counties of Edessa (1098-1144) and Tripoli (1102-1289). Although countries occupied smaller territory compared to their Greek and Muslim neighbors, they represented distinct political and military force in the region. Initially, the Crusaders States had an offensive policy of acquiring new and new territories. At the height of its, power King Amalric of Jerusalem took part in a campaign against Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt together with Manuel I Komnenos²⁴. In spite of this, series of events considerably weakened the states. In 1144 Edessa fell to Seljuks. With the Byzantine defeat in Myriokephalon (1176) the balance of powers in Middle East was disturbed. Soon afterwards there was a coup in Fatimid Caliphate. As a result Ayyubid dynasty came to rule over Egypt. Ayyubids

²³ Magdalino *The Empire* p. 75

²⁴ S. Ruinman, *A History of the Crusades*. vol.2, Cambridge 1952 p. 379

commenced an expansionary military policy and country started a counter-campaign against the Crusader States, culminating with the fall of Jerusalem (1187). In 1204, Constantinople fell to the Fourth Crusade. Thus remaining Greek territories were in a constant state of war with Latin Empire and its vassals in order to reconquer Constantinople. As a result, Kingdom of Jerusalem, Principalities of Antioch and Tripoli became vulnerable to constant Muslim raids and were brought down to smaller and smaller territories ceasing their existence in late 13th century.

Kingdom of Cilicia

After incorporation of Bagratid Kingdom of Armenia into Byzantine Empire in 1045, majority of Armenian princedoms and communities from Ani to Edessa and Tarsus were under Byzantine rule. Soon afterwards Armenian territory fell under Seljuk raids. A considerable amount of Armenians relocated from the territory of Bagratid Armenia to coastal areas of Cilicia. The situation of interregnum over Armenian populated areas did not last long. After the Battle of Manzikert (1071) Byzantine-Armenian general Philaretos Brachamios unified Armenian princes into a short lasting state and ruled over several important cities like Edessa and Antioch. This created an important basis for a more solid statehood of Armenian Cilicia (1080-1375). During Komnenian period Armenian Cilicia was independent in many respect, but was under Byzantine domain hegemony as several Lords of Cilicia at that time bore Byzantine title likes *sebastos* and *protosebastos*²⁵. Cilician Armenia reached its height when Lord Leo II was proclaimed King of Armenia as Leo I in 1198. After Mongol invasion Cilicia became a tributary of Mongol Empire. The kingdom remained as a sovereign entity up until 1375 when Mamelukes conquered the region²⁶.

Geopolitical situation

As one may guess, in spite of common Christian identity, political conflicts between the three parties were common. Byzantine Empire was trying to establish itself as the “overlord” of the region. On contrary Latin and Armenian rulers wanted to gain as much autonomy as possible. It is

²⁵ A. Bozoyan “Kilikiyi Byuzandakan Karavariçnerë Ew Rubinyan Işxanutyunÿ XII-rd Dari 40-70-akan Ťvakannerin” *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* n.3 (1984): 74-86

²⁶ Ter-Petrosyan *Xaçakirnerÿ* p.450

impossible to specify a pattern of interrelation between the three parties as they were extremely situational. During reign of each Emperor there were instances of cooperation and hostility between the Byzantium and the Latin states. Armenian rulers at this period of time were formally under Byzantine Empire, but there were constant political processes to establish an independent kingdom. Relationships between Armenian and Latin rulers were of more local a scale and involved both conflict and cooperation.

Sources

As mentioned above six contemporary sources will be examined. Out of referencing considerations sources will be cited according to the below mentioned system of abbreviations.

S. A. – Samuel of Ani

M. E. – Matthew of Edessa

N. Ch. – Niketas Choniates

A. K. – Anna Komnene

F. Ch. – Fulcher of Chartres

W. T. – William of Tyre

Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa (continued by Gregory the Priest)

Both Matthew of Edessa and Gregory the Priest were members of the Armenian community of Edessa. Matthew was probably born in the second half of 11-th century and lived up until 1138-44²⁷. According to Bartikyan he may have been killed during Zangi's siege of Edessa in 1144²⁸. Christopher MacEvitt suggests ca.1070-ca.1136 according to the end-date of the chronicle²⁹. Tara L. Andrews suggests 1137 or 1138 as a limit for Matthews's career as John II Komnenos' campaign to Cilicia is absent in it³⁰. There is very little available information about Matthew's life. Matthew himself refers to his education as being insufficient to write a chronicle. In spite of this we can find references in the text to the Bible, older Armenian historian Hakob, who is identified with Hakob of

²⁷ V. A. Arutjunova-Findanjan, "Armjanskije Srednevekovye Istočniki ob Ekspanzii Vizantijskoj Imperii na vostok v X-XI v. v." *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* 2 (1978): 191-206 p.197

²⁸ Bartikyan in M. E. p. iii

²⁹ Ch. MacEvitt, "The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade, and the Armenian Diaspora." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 61 (2007): 157-181 p.157

³⁰ Tara L. Andrews, "Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa, with a Discussion of Computer-Aided Methods Used to Edit the Text." D.Phil, diss., Oxford, 2009. p.10

Sanahin by Levon Khach'ikyan³¹, sages Moses and David who are identified with Moses of Chorene David the Invincible by Dulaurier³² and to Church Fathers like Gregory of Nyssa.

The chronicle is divided into three parts. The first book begins around 952 and ends in 1051. Second book covers the period from 1053 to 1102 and the third book, being the longest, covers the period from 1102-1137³³. The chronicle was continued by Gregory the Priest up to 1162-1163. In the scope of our research question we will make our focus on the parts of the chronicle covering Komnenian period: second and third books of Matthew's chronicle as well as continuation written by Gregory the Priest.

Chronicle of Samuel of Ani

Samuel was a priest of the Cathedral of Ani. He was among students of prominent polymath Hovhannes Sarkavag³⁴. This is based on an addition by a later scribe to one of the manuscripts of his chronicle as well as on the fact that Samuel named his son Sarkavag³⁵. He wrote the chronicle for Armenian Catholicos Grigor³⁶ who is now identified with Grigor III Pahlavuni who lead Armenian Church in mid-12th century. In contrary to Matthew of Edessa, there is no contemporary translation of his work. The critical edition available in Armenian contains only the original written in Grabar (Old Armenian). Separate philological and contextual examinations on different aspects of the Chronicle are also lacking. In spite of this, Karen Matevosyan has reconstructed several aspects of his biography noting that terminus ante quem for the chronicle is 1173³⁷.

³¹ Andrews *Prolegomena* p.8

³² M. E. p.338

³³ Matevosyan, K., "Samuel Aneću "Žamanakagrutyan" Avartman Tvakanĭ Ew Patviratun" *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* n.1 (1992): 156-162 p.156

³⁴ Armenian equivalent of John

³⁵ The word Սարկավագ (Sarkavag) is Armenian word for deacon and is extremely rare in Armenian anthroponymy

³⁶ Armenian equivalent of Gregory

³⁷ Matevosyan in S. A. p.18

History by Niketas Choniates

Niketas Choniates was a native of city Chonai. Kazhdan puts his birth date 1150-1155³⁸. According to Page it is c.1155³⁹, according to Neville 1150-1160⁴⁰. He was educated in Constantinople under aegis of his elder brother Michael who had later become bishop of Athens. Living in Constantinople from the age of nine, Choniates entered imperial civil service under last Komnenoi and reached zenith of his career under Isaac II Angelos, when he was promoted to the rank of *logothetes*⁴¹. After sack of Constantinople in 1204, he left for different cities ending up in Nicaea where he tried to enter the court of Theodore I Lasakris but was not very successful. He died in poverty⁴² in 1217⁴³.

History (which is called chronicle (Χρονική Διήγησις) in Greek⁴⁴) is the primary work of Choniates. A collection of orations and letters as well as a theological compendium of his authorship also survive. The History covers period from reign of John II Komnenos to the fall of Constantinople in 1204 and consecutive years. In the scope of this thesis our attention will be focused on the first five sections describing reigns of Komnenian Emperors.

Alexiad by Anna Komnene

Anna Komnene was born in 1083⁴⁵ in Constantinople. She was daughter of then Emperor Alexios I Komnenos, thus she is sometimes referred to as Anna Porphyrogennita. She received substantial education in different disciplines of the time including ancient philosophy and medicine. Evidence suggests that among others, she was familiar with works of Plato, Aristotle and Proclus Diadochus. She also commissioned a commentary on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics.⁴⁶ At some point in her life she was engaged with Constantine Doukas, son of Emperor Michael VII Doukas⁴⁷. After death of Constantine she was engaged to Nikipheros Brennios, a scion of a Byzantine noble family. There is a scientific consensus that she was connected with a palace intrigue of bringing her husband to power instead of her brother John II. As a result she was forced into an "intellectual"

³⁸ A. P. Kazhdan, *Nikita Xoniat i ego Vremja*, Saint Petersburg 2005 p.287

³⁹ G. Page, *Being Byzantine: Greek Identity Before the Ottomans, 1200–1420*. Cambridge, 2008. (2008) p.72

⁴⁰ L. Neville, *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*. Cambridge, 2018 p.220

⁴¹ A rough equivalent to modern office of minister

⁴² Kazhdan *Nikita Xoniat* p. 287

⁴³ Page dates his death to 1215,

⁴⁴ Kazhdan *Nikita Xoniat* p. 287

⁴⁵ Neville *Guide* p. 176

⁴⁶ *Ibid* p.177

⁴⁷ Y. N. Ljubarsky, "Vvedenije" in *Aleksiada*, Moscow 1965 p. 14

seclusion and formed a circle of literati. Ljubarsky is inclined to estimate her death from 1153-1155 based on an analysis of Tornikes' funeral oration.⁴⁸

Alexiad is Anna Komnene's principal work (two poems and a short prose piece also survive). It is centered on life of her father whom she calls the "13th Apostle". Indeed the panegyric nature of the work can be seen from the name itself alluding to Homer's Iliad. In spite of this, Alexiad is an important primary source, not only for examining reign of Alexios I Komnenos and the first crusade, but for getting a grasp in the Byzantine interest towards classical culture. In the scope of this research Alexiad will be examined in full.

History of William of Tyre

Biographical data about William of Tyre is ample but "uneven". For instance we know about his education and diplomatic involvement in details, but exact date of his birth is unknown. Edbury and Rowe made a calculation based on secondary facts and place his date of birth around 1130⁴⁹. Krey is in accord with abovementioned authors on the point that Williams's family background is unknown.⁵⁰ It is clear though that he was born in Latin East and got educated in Latin West. He studied liberal arts, theology and law in leading European universities of the time: universities of Paris and Bologna. William was involved in the politics of the Kingdom of Jerusalem at various positions, firstly being diplomatic emissary to Manuel I, then as a chancellor to King Raymond and eventually as archbishop of Tyre. As the date of his birth, the date of his death is a matter of scientific debate, although it is suggested that he has died before 1186.

William's History is an invaluable source for the examination of the Crusader movement in 12th century. Due to its extensive volume, it includes vast array of important details and descriptions which give room for concise analysis of the period. William's history covers period from 1095 to 1184 (a part of it refers to events in 7th century). Besides its historical value, William's chronicle is an outstanding piece of literature in comparison to other contemporary sources because of ample

⁴⁸ Ibid p.18, Neville notes that the date is unknown

⁴⁹ Peter W. Edbury and John Gordon Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*. Cambridge, 1988.p. 13

⁵⁰ A. C. Krey, "William of Tyre: The Making of an Historian in the Middle Ages." *Speculum*, vol. 16, no. 2 (1941): 149-166 p. 150

references to the New and Old Testaments as well as Latin classics including Ovid, Horace and Livy.

History of Fulcher of Chartres

In contrary to William of Tyre, Fulcher of Chartres did not receive so much scholarly attention recently. This can be probably explained by the fact that William is an exceptional source for events succeeding the first crusade, whereas period covered by Fulcher (1095-1127) is covered by other sources including *Gesta Francorum*, Albert of Aix and etc. In spite of this, Fulcher of Chartres remains a principal Latin-language source for the history of Crusader movement. According to Fink he was born in 1058-1059⁵¹ somewhere around Chartres in modern-day France. According to Peters he was born in 1059⁵². Nothing is known about his life in France, but it was suggested that he was of clerical background. He was chaplain of Baldwin I, King of Jerusalem and was resident of the city from c1100 to at least 1127. After 1127 no information is available about Fulcher.

⁵¹ Fink in F. Ch. p.7

⁵² E. Peters, "Biographical note" in *The First Crusade "The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres" and Other Source Materials* edited E. Peters, Second Edition, Philadelphia, 1998 p.1

Part I: Armenian sources on Greeks and Latins

In spite of different conditions of compositions, lamenting nature is a distinctive characteristic which unites both chronicles. Ani, a former capital of Bagratid Armenia was under constant warfare. Muslim dynasty of Shahadids was ruling the city, whereas Georgians backed by Armenian population of the city were trying to gain control over it. In contrary to Ani, which had a majority Armenian population, Edessa was historically a multi-ethnic city: Syrians, Armenians, Greeks, Arabs and many others were making the population of the city. Interestingly the political situation there was no better. In the course of 11th century it was controlled by Muslims, then Byzantines, then Armenian lords and eventually by the Crusaders. As a result of this military turmoil which covered the whole region, both chroniclers have this overall near-catastrophic description of their times.

Obviously this is much more vividly seen in the text of Matthew of Edessa. This difference can be attributed to the structural and ideological differences of the chronicles. Matthew used a more “free-style” version of chronicle as he was writing out of “academic curiosity” for further generations. Nevertheless it would be a mistake to deem Matthew’s chronicle as an unstructured one. Chronicle has three parts, each of which covers approximately chronological half of the one before (first part 100 years, second part 50 years and etc.). This structural peculiarity goes back to 5th century Armenian author Moses of Chorene⁵³. Thus he is free to show his attitudes and feelings. In contrary, Samuel of Ani wrote his chronicle for Catholicos Grigor III. Thus he used strict structure of chronological tablets providing information from Adam and Eve to 1163. Perhaps the limitations of this “Eusebean” style and existence of a patron did not allow him to fully express his feelings. In spite of the brevity of descriptions some of the passages can be useful in scope of this thesis.

First mention that is relevant to our research question in the chronicle of Samuel of Ani refers to accession of Alexios I to Byzantine throne. Samuel of Ani dates it to 1080, but the date is

⁵³ MacEvitt “Matthew of Edessa” p. 161

corrected by a later editor Hetum (Hayton) of Corycos to 1083. The description is of neutral nature and states “Alex [Alexios I ruled in Constantinople for] 38 years and 7 months ”⁵⁴.

Next mention of Alexios I by Samuel is dated to 1097 and refers to the arrival of the Crusaders: “Romans went from the Thrace to the Asian side to revenge for tortures of Christians from Scythians and Persians up to *Tachkastan*. And they [Romans] were subjected to many troubles by the son of Satan called Alex [Alexios I], who [was] king of Greeks in Constantinople... ”⁵⁵. The passage continues criticizing Alexios I in a similar spirit. It is worth noting that Samuel uses word “Romans” to refer to the crusaders. As we can see, author here is highly critical of Alexios I as a betrayer of the crusaders who were coming to “help” the Christians of the East.

Next passage relevant to our analysis describes events of 1113.⁵⁶ It includes a panegyric towards the new Catholicos Grigor III, lamenting of death of Prince Tancred in Antioch, and a note about solar eclipse. In the part which represents a panegyric towards Catholicos Grigor III⁵⁷ Samuel praises him for the respect among “Roman king and patriarch”. The description of Tancred is also positive. Samuel uses epithets like “pious and kind”, He writes; “On the same year Tancred of Romans, who possessed the city of Antiochenes among many other towns and parishes, pious and kind man died of medicine of their patriarch of the same city of Antioch”⁵⁸. It is hard to determine whether Samuel supports the idea of Tancred being poisoned, or weather he asserts that Patriarch’s medications were useless against illness. Despite of the rumours of poison Runciman, notes that it is more probable that Tancread has died of typhoid⁵⁹

Samuel of Ani dates death of Alexios I to 1118⁶⁰. He notes that his son starts to rule. Here he uses a peculiar word for denoting John I; *Kalavzhan* (Կալաւձան). Unfortunately the meaning of the word remains open to further investigations. In spite of it, we can note that Samuel’s continuator Hayton of Corycos (as well as Matthew of Edessa) names John II as *Perperozhan* (Պերփերոձան),

⁵⁴ S. A. p. 196

⁵⁵ Ibid p. 200, the word Tachkastan (Տաճկաստան) can be translated as the land of Turks, but in this context, it is probably referring to Persian domains rather than to the Central Asia

⁵⁶ Ibid p. 203-204

⁵⁷ This passage was used by researchers to determine the patron of Samuel of Ani

⁵⁸ S. A. p. 204

⁵⁹ Runciman *The Crusades* p. 125

⁶⁰ S. A. p. 205

which is a Graecism from the term *porphyrogennitos*⁶¹. A note of same, neutral tonality is found in the table corresponding to 1132, where Manuel I's accession is mentioned⁶².

It is worth noting that other passages regarding Komnenian period are found in different manuscripts of Samuel of Ani. Nevertheless those are not particularly useful for our analysis as those were latter additions by later historians (e.g. Hayton of Corycos) or scribes.

In the second book of his chronicle Matthew of Edessa refers to the accession of Alexios I in 1077-1078. In spite of a chronological error Matthew uses epithets like "kind, pious, courageously fighting"⁶³. Another interesting description refers to a "Persian" (Seljuk) attack on the city of Nicaea and their plans to conquer Constantinople. Matthew refers to their leader as one who "got mad with empty hopes"⁶⁴ to conquer Constantinople which is described as a city that stands "unmoved"⁶⁵ with a "heavenly protection."⁶⁶. Byzantine Emperor Alexios I is mentioned in a negative light in events of 1101-02. Matthew refers to a Crusader army passing through Constantinople. He notes that Alexios I behaved himself like "Judas"⁶⁷ initially presenting them gifts and then creating various hazards, including firing the plains to create hunger among the soldier and asking Turks to attack them. Matthew also refers to calendrical debates in 1102-1103 regarding the day of Easter celebration. He notes that only Armenian and Syriac churches celebrated the Easter on the "right" day whereas Greeks and Latins believed to a "heretic" and chose a "wrong" day⁶⁸.

An important phrase can be found in Matthews's lamenting passage on Catholicos Grigor III's death. In a vividly expressed panegyric form, Matthew uses descriptions like "erudite in Bible"⁶⁹, "having an Athenian head"⁷⁰ and compares him to Armenian "sages"⁷¹ Moses of Chorene and David the Invincible.⁷² The final mention of Alexios I in Mathew's chronicle marks his death and he misdates it to 1119-20. Referring to Alexios I, Matthew writes that he was "kind and wise,

⁶¹ Porphyrogennitos or purple-born refers to the members of Byzantine Imperial families who were born during the reign of their parent

⁶² Ibid. p. 210

⁶³ M. E. p.112

⁶⁴ Ibid p 159

⁶⁵ Ibid p.159

⁶⁶ Ibid p.159

⁶⁷ Ibid p.187

⁶⁸ Ibid p.189

⁶⁹ Ibid p.199

⁷⁰ Ibid p.199

⁷¹ Ibid p.199

⁷² Ibid p.199

powerful in wars, enormously merciful towards Christians”⁷³. Nevertheless the rest of the description is in a negative light, as Matthew cites “anti-Armenian”⁷⁴ (in fact anti-Armenian Apostolic) actions of Alexios I who initiated re-baptism of adherents of Armenian Apostolic Christianity to Byzantine Orthodox Christianity. To justify the criticism, he quotes Pauline epistles. The passage ends with accession of John II, whom he describes as “courageous and fighter, pious and affable.”⁷⁵ He further notes that John II was “kind to Armenians”⁷⁶ as he altered-back his father’s religious policies.⁷⁷

Death of Alexios I was the last passage about the Byzantine Empire relevant in Matthew’s chronicle. Nevertheless, his continuator Gregory the Priest has several descriptions concerning later Komnenian period. His chronicle begins with John II’s campaign to Cilicia. He tells us that John II captured Leo I of Armenian Cilicia and his family⁷⁸. In spite of it, John II’s description is a neutral one. In Gregory’s continuation, John II is mentioned two more times once trying to bribe Antiochenes⁷⁹, second time in a description of his death during a hunt.⁸⁰ In the same passage he describes accession of Manuel I to the Byzantine throne. All those events are described in a neutral manner.

In contrary to Gregory’s neutral description of Byzantine Emperors, his chronicle contains eulogy of certain *vardapet*⁸¹ Barsegh⁸² on death of Baldwin of Marash.⁸³ In this eulogy he mentions “merciless, arrogant and lawless Roman generals.”⁸⁴ in comparison to whom Baldwin was an ideal of virtuous leader.

Next reference to Greeks in Gregory’s continuation refers to the “grand knave” of the era, future Andronikos I, who was at that time Byzantine governor of Cilicia. Gregory mentions that Thoros II of Armenia was becoming more and more powerful governing territories controlled by his forefathers and even adding some other domains. According to Gregory this made Andronikos envy

⁷³ Ibid p.231

⁷⁴ Ibid p.231

⁷⁵ Ibid p.231

⁷⁶ Ibid p.231

⁷⁷ Ibid p. 231

⁷⁸ Ibid p. 248

⁷⁹ Ibid p. 249

⁸⁰ Ibid p. 250

⁸¹ A loose equivalent of Doctor of Theology in Latin tradition. Armenian church has two-level doctorate system with title of *vardapet* being the lower one

⁸² Armenian equivalent of Basil

⁸³ M. E. 253-267

⁸⁴ Ibid p. 253

and keen to attack Armenians. He continues that Armenians did not respond to attacks due to “love and reverence”⁸⁵ towards Manuel I and were asking for a peaceful solution. Then he states that Greeks told Thoros II that they have the chains which were used to capture his father Leo I. Gregory attests this as an unbearable insult for Thoros II who attacked Andronikos and won the battle. Here Andronikos is depicted in a negative light. Gregory uses adjectives like “malicious”⁸⁶ and “effeminate”⁸⁷ to describe him.

In another passage concerning Byzantine-Armenian relations, Gregory describes reconciliation between Thoros II and Manuel I that was achieved with help of Baldwin III of Jerusalem. Manuel I here is described in a positive light as being gracious and wise. Indeed he goes on to criticize Thoros II in this passage for not following the ancient wisdom of not attacking the stronger⁸⁸.

Continuation of Gregory contains an extremely relevant passage to our research question in which he contrast Greeks and Latins. He argues that Greeks did nothing for “salvation of Christians”⁸⁹ and their only labor is to “seize and loot”⁹⁰ cities and provinces. He laments on Armenian-populated cities of Sebastia, Ani and Mytilene passing to Turks and sees Byzantine Emperors as responsible for that. In contrary to this Gregory has a positive attitude to Latins. He notes that they intended to fight for salvation of Christians, but their plans were broken due to treason of Greeks. As a justification he states Manuel’s “time-wasting”⁹¹ stay in Msis for 7 months. He uses epithets like “courageous”⁹² to denote Latins and “effeminate”⁹³ for Greeks.

Chronicle of Mathew of Edessa as well as its continuation by Gregory the Priest contain useful information about Latins which will be discussed in the passages below. The beginning of the First Crusade in Matthew’s chronicle is marked within the context of prophesy of 10th century Armenian author Hovhanness Kozern. Researchers have noted similarities between the Syriac narrative of pseudo-Methodius and texts of prophesies of Kozern.⁹⁴ Interestingly the same Syriac

⁸⁵M. E. p. 272; Here Gregory uses word *uh* that has dual meaning in Armenian denoting “fear” as well as “reverence”. In context of fear it is usually used with word *սարսափ* as a phrase in which both words have same meaning of “fear”.

⁸⁶ *Ibid* p.272

⁸⁷ *Ibid* p.272

⁸⁸ *Ibid* p. 284

⁸⁹ *Ibid* p. 287

⁹⁰ *Ibid* p. 287

⁹¹ *Ibid* p. 287

⁹² *Ibid* p. 287

⁹³ *Ibid* p. 287

⁹⁴ Andrews *Prolegomena* p.4

narrative has a similarity to another 10th century Armenian apocalyptic narrative which the author attributes to 5th century Catholicos Nerses the Great⁹⁵. In our context, a passage from the second prophesy of Hovhannes Kozern is of particular interest: “And then the nation of valiant ones will come, known as Franks, and with a multitude of troops they will take the holy city Jerusalem, and the holy tomb that held God is freed from captivity.”⁹⁶

Thus the inception of the Crusades is full of extremely positive descriptions. Glorifying epithets can be found noting virtues of Crusader leaders like Godfrey and Baldwin de Boulogne, Jocelyn de Courtenay and Raymond of Toulouse. Matthew marks that the Crusaders met hostility in all the countries they passed through including Byzantine Empire, but eventually came to a peaceful agreement with Alexios I.⁹⁷ Alexios I is described in a neutral manner. It is worth noting that Matthew uses the phrase “land of Romans” to denote countries of origin of crusaders but usually uses word “Franks” while describing them throughout the chronicle.

Another noteworthy episode in Matthew’s chronicle concerns capture of Edessa by Baldwin of Boulogne. Here, Matthew describes relations between crusaders and Armenian lord Thoros of Edessa⁹⁸. Initially Thoros makes agreement with Baldwin of Boulogne but eventually is tortured and killed as a result of a treason. Matthew acknowledges that Baldwin was in the group of betrayers, but attributes him a very passive role in the process. Most of the negative descriptions in the passage refer to a group of “evil and malicious people” who convinced Baldwin to act against Thoros. He refers to those once again calling them “forty people [who] made the judgment of Judas.”⁹⁹ Interestingly Matthew, who throughout chronicle attests his emotions in different passages, does not use any negative epithets to describe Baldwin even when he promises immunity to Thoros, but then allows a group of people to torture him.

In contrast to this descriptions, in another passage, Matthew notes about cooperation of Armenian lords and Crusaders. In 1104-5 section he notes about another Armenian lord Kogh Vasil and Bohemond, son of Robert Guiscard. Vasil pays ransom to Danishmand, a Muslim lord, to rescue Bohemond and then makes latter his “son”¹⁰⁰. The following year we can find a story in which a

⁹⁵ A. G. Madoyan, “Nerses Meci Tesil̄y Mijnadaryan Hay Poeziayum”, *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* no.4 (1969): 237-247 p.237

⁹⁶ Andrews *Prolegomena* p.84

⁹⁷ M. E. p.166-168

⁹⁸ *Ibid* p. 171-172

⁹⁹ *Ibid* p. 172

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid* p.195

crusader is “polluting”¹⁰¹ a piece of bread. As the event takes place in the context of famine, Matthew tells about negative reaction of the “wise men”¹⁰² of the city. A similar event takes place next year when population of an Armenian city expels Latins as a result of “calamities”¹⁰³ that occurred on the city due to latter. Matthew does not specify the “calamities”, but states that Latins were defeated and expelled. Another negative description of Latins can be noticed in Mathew’s description of different crusader leaders trying to get the control over Edessa. According to Matthew, Jocelyn and Baldwin I misunderstood plans of Edessenes, who acted to protect themselves from notorious (in their perception) Crusader leaders namely, Raymond and Tancred. As a result they tortured a lot of people. Here Matthew makes a generalization stating that Latins easily believe every delation. He states that they even tried to blind Armenian Bishop of Edessa but citizens gave a ransom to free him¹⁰⁴.

Matthew continues his criticism of the Crusaders, this time referring to an alliance between county of Edessa and Muslim ruler of Mosul. He refers to it as a “decision that is not appropriate for a pious [Christian] man”¹⁰⁵. In spite of this, on another occasion Matthew acknowledges courage of Jocelyn¹⁰⁶. Acknowledging once again courage of Jocelyn in another passage he, criticizes him for his cruelty against Edessenes¹⁰⁷. In contrary to abovementioned criticism, Matthew laments death of Tancred of Antioch in a passage covering years 1012-13. He notes Tancred as being “saint and pious man, humble and merciful”¹⁰⁸ adding that he was just in religious and secular issues.

Matthew’s next description of the crusaders is similar to the previous ones. Once again several “provocateurs” among Latins convinced count of Edessa Baldwin (Baldwin II of Jerusalem), that Edessians decided to pass the city to the Turks. Angered count ordered to deport Edessa’s population. Implementation of the order resulted in a lot of casualties. Matthew once again generalizes on Latins: “With a villainousness peculiar to their nation, they thought that everybody was abhorrent”¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰¹ Ibid p. 196

¹⁰² Ibid p. 196

¹⁰³ Ibid p. 201

¹⁰⁴ Ibid p.206

¹⁰⁵ Ibid p.208

¹⁰⁶ Ibid p. 212

¹⁰⁷ Ibid p. 215

¹⁰⁸ Ibid p. 217

¹⁰⁹ Ibid p.218

Final description of Latins in Matthew's chronicle is in some sense a brief summary of all the grievances that Armenian population, small lordships as well as Principality of Cilicia had suffered from the Crusaders. He reports different Armenian lords being tortured or killed by Crusaders and their domains being seized. He names atrocities that crusaders did to people. The passage is very dark and shows Crusaders and their activities in extremely negative light¹¹⁰. Matthew concludes the passage telling about his desire to write about all the unjust actions of Latins, but abstains from it, as he lives under the Latin rule.

This is the last notable description of crusaders in Matthews's chronicle. There is some notable material in Gregory's continuation as well. First of all, there is an extensive eulogy to Baldwin of Marash which we have already mentioned¹¹¹. Here, we have a clearly idealized perception of Baldwin. *Vardapet* Barsegh, Baldwin's confessor refers to Baldwin's sins and states that those are his [Barsegh's] sins. Then the eulogy turns into a general moral preaching on sins and their nature with quotes from the Bible.

Besides this eulogy, it is noteworthy to mention about several lexicographical changes in Gregory's continuation. Most notably we can meet Latinisms like "Սիր/sir", "Կոմս/count", "Փրերքեր/friars". In Gregory's continuation names of the month are also changed from traditional Armenian names to Latin based equivalents.

Analysis

As noted above Matthew of Edessa has received much more scholarly attention compared to Samuel of Ani around whom there is only an emerging scholarly interest in Armenia. This can be explained firstly by the fact that Mathew's chronicle is much lengthier on one side and deals with Crusades, Byzantine Empire and Muslim domains much more frequently and in detail. Until recently there was a scholarly consensus, at least in western academia, of Matthew being a partisan author with hatred towards non-Armenians. MacEvitt however has brought a new paradigm showing that Matthew has both negative and positive description of non-Armenian ethnic and religious groups. Tara L. Andrews made another important contribution noting that Matthew's chronicle must be treated as a work of literature as well. Interestingly, the structural and linguistic variety between

¹¹⁰ Ibid p.226-227

¹¹¹ Ibid p.253-267

the two chronicles is so big that both points seem irrelevant, if we apply them to the chronicle of Samuel of Ani. His chronicle is a predominantly fact-based representation of history with blinks of descriptions emerging time-to-time in the text. Nevertheless some important generalizations can be made from Samuel's small amount of descriptions.

Firstly we can say about overall negative attitude towards Byzantine Emperor. This is most vividly seen in the descriptions of Alexios I. Both Matthew and Samuel provide sufficient reasons for their negative attitude. Nevertheless in spite of those "obvious" reasons, it can be suggested that this criticism is a part of a larger meta-narrative. For instance in one of the passage cited above, Matthew presents Constantinople as a city with "heavenly" stability. From this point of view we can theorize that Byzantine Emperor is seen as a worldly guarantor of this stability, especially in light of lost Bagratid statehood and constant Turkic raids against Armenian populated territories. As a result we can suggest a hypothesis that this criticism was also a result of "unjust" treatment of Armenians by Byzantine Emperor, who instead of providing protection was trying to convert them to Orthodoxy, as well as was barring Crusaders from "helping" them.

Overall attitude towards Greeks is different. Matthew depicts Greek priests and intellectuals as "heretics", but on the other hand emphasizes knowledge of Greek (and Syriac) while referring to an Armenian erudite. Thus we have a dual situation concerning perception of Greeks. On one side there is constant political struggle between the nations, on the other hand a reverence towards Byzantine cultural institutes. This can be perhaps explained by a separate perceptions of Byzantium and Greek language on one side and Greek nation contemporary to the authors examined on the other side. Armenian historical tradition has for centuries preserved information about ethnic Armenians having high positions in Byzantium. They were also informed about Armenian community living in Constantinople (Matthew writes about population of Kogh Vasil's lordship fleeing to Constantinople in the final note about crusaders). Greek language as well, was perceived as a language of ancient sages as a few middle Byzantine Greek works have been ever translated to Armenian. Even in 10-12th centuries, considerable of the translation effort from Greek to Armenian was centered on Plato, Aristotle, Neoplatonic philosophers (mostly Porphyry) and Greek Fathers. Thus it is possible to think of a dual understanding of Greek language: one of ancient sages and one of contemporary neighbors.

In case of attitude towards Crusaders the duality of perception can be explained based on the presence of exaggerated expectations. The prophecies quoted, initially made people to believe that a

mighty Christian force was coming to save the Christendom of the Orient from Muslims overlords. As a result an idealized perception of this movement was formed. Most probably Matthew used to believe that virtuous army of God was coming to help the Armenian community. The reality in a sense was a bit different. Crusaders were just human beings and were representatives of other cultural tradition in addition. It is out of the scope of our research to examine attitudes of different Middle Eastern ethnic and religious groups towards Crusaders. Nevertheless it is worth noting that we can trace some “cultural shock” from Crusades in works of historians from various historiographical traditions. Thus Matthew’s initial praise, gradual frustration and eventual negative summary of the Crusaders in general can be attributed to the cultural shock and exaggerated expectations. It is important to note about Matthew’s unbiased attitudes towards individuals. He praises Sultan Malik Shah and is extremely critical of Philaretos Brachamios who was a Byzantine general of Armenian origin.

In contrary to Matthew’s eventual negative summary, his continuator Gregory the Priest seems to be explicitly pro-Latin. His lexicon contains several Latinisms, which are absent in Matthew’s text. In the passages presented above, the pro-Latin stance of Gregory was seen in its all vividness of descriptions.

Thus the descriptions authors present above about Greeks and Latins can be more thoroughly understood in the respective contexts, rather than as a separate positive or negative comments about people and events.

Surely the points made above do not show overall Armenian sentiment towards Greeks and Latins. Unfortunately we lack appropriate amount of sources from different strata of society to make a firmer conclusion on the patterns of perception of other. Nevertheless the information that survives can be generalized in the conclusions above.

Part II: Latin sources on Armenians and Greeks

Chronicles of Fulcher of Chartres and William of Tyre are exceptional among other crusader chronicles, because both were composed in the Latin East. Structurally they are similar, although William's chronicle is much more extensive. Both authors represent a school of Medieval Latin historiography which took its beginnings from the Roman tradition. Already in Gregory of Tours' *Historia Francorum* we can find an interesting intellectual basis represented by a combination of Vulgate Latin, Roman classics, Latin patristics and Biblical narratives. William's chronicle is among the zeniths of this intellectual tradition. For instance his intellectual appetite includes jurist Ulpian and philosopher Boethius, poets Horace and Virgil not to mention ample use of foundational texts of Latin Christianity: Vulgate Bible and Jerome's writings.

Both chronicles were composed during the 12th century, which is the first intellectual renaissance in the West after the Carolingian era. This renaissance was, among others, represented by a growing interest for the classical science. This can be seen in the compositions of both authors, most notably in the passages comparing their knowledge of East from the classical era authors, with their own experiences in different locations.

One of the primary ontological aspects of the Crusader movement was its ideological side. Surely ideological component is one of many components of a historical process, but at least in minds of the intellectuals it usually represents the spirit of the era. In our case both authors (most notably Fulcher) are firm in their belief that what they are taking part in, is God's will.

Fulcher starts his narrative with the Council of Clermont (1095) where pope Urban II had his famous address. While referring to Greeks he uses words "Brethren in the East"¹¹². Next passage concerning Byzantine Empire in Fulcher's chronicle already represents his own words. It describes Crusaders approaching Constantinople. At their arrival Alexios I prohibits them from entering the city. In spite of this order, we see Fulcher's calm attitude. Instead of criticism, he explains that Alexios I "feared that possibly we would plot some harm to him"¹¹³. Fulcher notes that crusaders were entering the city in small groups to pray. In the following passage we can see Fulcher being amazed at beautiful edifices, as well as riches in Constantinople. Fulcher writes: "Oh what a noble

¹¹² F. Ch. p.65-66

¹¹³ Ibid p.78

and beautiful city is Constantinople! ... How many remarkable things may be seen in the principal avenues and even in lesser streets.”¹¹⁴.

Fulcher is far from generalizations about Greeks as an ethnic and religious group. Throughout the text there are only three mentions of Greeks as an ethnic group. Those refer to inhabitants in Bethlehem and Jerusalem.¹¹⁵ In these descriptions they either pray for, or welcome the crusaders.

In contrary to this, Fulcher shows his emotions while describing individuals. In spite of initial positive description of Alexios I, we find a passage criticizing him later in the chronicle. Fulcher tries to justify Bohemond’s attack on Byzantine territory telling that “by trickery or open violence he [Alexios I] thwarted or tyrannized over the pilgrims going to Jerusalem”¹¹⁶.

Throughout the chronicle Fulcher tells us about encounters with Armenians as well. Although we do not have ample descriptions of Armenians, in those sentence-long parts Fulcher is generally writing about Armenians in a positive manner. In this context we can mention Fulcher telling that Armenians gave Tell Bashir peacefully¹¹⁷, writing about an Armenian who hid crusaders in his castle¹¹⁸ as well as describing his amazement when Armenians of Edessa greeted crusaders with crosses and banners as protectors from the Turkic principalities¹¹⁹. It is worth mentioning that descriptions of Armenians are not always positive. Fulcher notes that Armenians “often acted to our [crusaders] detriment”¹²⁰. In another passage, where he quotes the letter of the crusader leaders to Pope Urban II, Armenians as well as Greeks and Syrians are denoted as “heretics”¹²¹.

Relations between crusaders and other ethnic and religious groups are more thoroughly described in the chronicle of William of Tyre, due to length of the text and timespan covered. In the final chapters of 14th book we can find William’s description of John II’s southern campaign. While describing his army, William writes: “from every part of his empire he had summoned people of all tribes and tongues, and now, with a countless number of cavalry and a vast array of chariots ... , he

¹¹⁴ Ibid p.79

¹¹⁵ Ibid p.115 p.143 p.242

¹¹⁶ Ibid p.192

¹¹⁷ Ibid p.89

¹¹⁸ Ibid p.90

¹¹⁹ Ibid p.91

¹²⁰ Ibid p.98

¹²¹ Ibid p.111

was on the march”¹²². William has another noteworthy description on this occasion: “... the emperor sent officers throughout all his empire, and an entire year was spent in making necessary preparations for a campaign, as befitted imperial magnificence. Then followed by chariots and horses, an innumerable host and accompanied by treasures of inestimable weight, number and measure, he sailed across the Hellespont... ”¹²³. In this passage William describes John II’s incentive for the campaign being the desire to take control of Antioch, based on the agreement between crusaders and Alexios I. William affirms the position that crusaders were ruling the cities legitimately “since Alexius, a vacillating and unstable man had dealt fraudulently with them and had been the first to break his own pledges”¹²⁴. The final chapter of this book is concerned with the siege of Antioch by John II¹²⁵. William takes a “peaceful” position in his description. Neither Byzantines are shown in negative light, nor the Antiochenes as heroes. Interestingly, William identifies the third “party” in a two-party battle. “As critical situation developed, men of good sense in both armies began to fear that, if wiser counsel did not speedily prevail, things would come to such a desperate pass that a fitting solution for possible dangerous crises would not be easily found.”¹²⁶ Thus William describes the reconciliation between Byzantines and Latins. Another noteworthy sentence can be found in this passage describing skirmish between Byzantines and Latins: “Without the regard to the fact that both sides professed the same faith, they fought with one another as with enemies”¹²⁷.

William continues description of John II’s relations with the Latin leaders in the first chapters of the fifteenth book. Here William describes joint Greek-Latin campaign to capture the city of Shayzar. William shows a positive attitude towards Greeks in this part of his narrative. He uses vast amount of different phrases to glorify John II including: “...a man of great courage...”, “...a man of the people...”, “...man of lofty spirit...”, “He gave himself no rest ...” “most powerful monarch on the land” and so on¹²⁸. It is interesting that William opposes John’s virtuously military behavior to the indolence of Prince of Antioch and Count of Edessa “...[who] let themselves be drawn away by the frivolous pursuits common to men of their years.”¹²⁹. The passage ends with a description of political maneuver, which saves the city’s Latin administration. Here William’s note

¹²² W. T. p.83

¹²³ Ibid p.84

¹²⁴ Ibid p.84

¹²⁵ Ibid p. 92-93

¹²⁶ Ibid p. 92

¹²⁷ Ibid p. 92

¹²⁸ Ibid p. 95

¹²⁹ Ibid p. 95

can be useful in the context of our research: “For it seemed a very harsh and serious matter that the city, which our nation had acquired at such peril and which had been restored to the Christian faith at the expense of the precious blood of the princes, should fall into the hands of effeminate Greeks”¹³⁰.

The last mention of John II in the chronicle is William’s vivid description of emperor’s death. He gives us details of the accident that occurred during the hunt. In this description John II is again standing in front of us as a virtuous ruler. Court physicians advised to cut his poisoned hand, in order to save his life as the illness was caused by a venom. “But the emperor, a man of lofty spirit, although suffering intense agony and convinced that death was imminent, still steadfastly preserved his imperial majesty and rejected the advice. He is said to have answered, ‘It would be unseemly that the Roman Empire should be ruled by one hand.’”¹³¹

This passage continues describing the succession process. John II was hesitating whether to give the throne to his elder son Isaac or younger one Manuel. Isaac is described in neutral terms whereas Manuel is described in a positive way. “Manuel ... stood high in the estimation and favor of the entire army, particularly with the Latins. ... His father also regarded him with more affection and inclined toward him more favorably, because he seemed wiser, more valiant in arms, and more affable in every way.”¹³²

William shows a quite negative attitude towards Greeks in his description of the Second Crusade. He attests the failure of the campaign to the treason of the Greek guides. When leaders of the second crusade reached Constantinople they met with Emperor Manuel I. He dispatched guides to help Holy Roman Emperor Conrad II’s army to move through Anatolia. Army faced various challenges including food shortage. Situation got critical when the army noticed that the guides had left. William gives his explanation to this behavior. “The guides however, led by the malice inherent in the Greek race, and also by their customary hatred of the Christians, acted treacherously. Either because commanded by their master or because bribed by the Turks, they purposely led the legions by unfrequented routes and draw them into places which offered the enemy favorable opportunities to attack...”¹³³.

¹³⁰ Ibid p.98

¹³¹ Ibid p.128

¹³² Ibid p.129

¹³³ Ibid p.168

Another passage from this part of the chronicle is worth our attention. “It was a common talk, and probably quite true, that these perilous wanderings were devised with the knowledge and at the command of the Greek emperor, who has always envied the successful advance of the Christians. For it is well known that the Greeks have always looked with distrust on all increase of power by Western nations (as they still do)... They take it ill that king of the Teutons calls himself emperor of the Romans.”¹³⁴ Despite this criticism, William mentions Manuel I giving lavish gifts to Conrad II and Louis of France every time they enter Constantinople.

We can trace the same pattern of positive description of Manuel I in the passage about marriage preparations of Baldwin III. It was decided that ambassadors will approach Manuel I to get a bride for Baldwin III. “In his palace there were many noble maidens closely related to him [Manuel I] by ties of blood and furthermore it would be possible for him, as the most powerful and wealthy prince of the world, to relive from his own abundance the distress under which our realm was suffering and to change our poverty into superabundance.”¹³⁵

William makes an interesting remark in a passage describing the delayed return of the ambassadors with the niece of Manuel I. “After numberless delays and equivocal answers expressed in mystifying circumlocutions, such as the subtle Greeks delight in and usually employ. Their request was gratified.”¹³⁶

In the context of our analysis another description of Manuel I can be useful. Here he assists Baldwin III who suffered a fracture as a result of an accident. “As soon as the emperor learned of the accident, he took upon himself, with the most gracious sympathy, the office of surgeon; he knelt down by the king and attentively ministered him, as if he himself were merely an ordinary person. Meanwhile, his nobles and kinsmen were dumb with wonder and dismay. That the emperor, regardless of his imperial majesty, should lay aside his august dignity and show himself so devoted and friendly to the king appeared to all unseemly.”¹³⁷

Williams’s peculiar understanding of the Greek character is once again noted in the description of marriage arrangement for Manuel I. “As always Greeks gave evasive answers and tried to drag the matter along still longer.”¹³⁸ The same tonality of discourse continues while

¹³⁴ Ibid p. 170

¹³⁵ Ibid p. 265

¹³⁶ Ibid p. 274

¹³⁷ Ibid p. 280

¹³⁸ Ibid p. 289

describing Andronikos I, at the time a high ranking courtier in Constantinople. William quotes Virgil: “I fear the Greeks even when bearing gifts”¹³⁹

William’s chronicle contains a noteworthy description of Constantinople. As a member of royal delegation from Kingdom of Jerusalem, William visited the city. The passage,¹⁴⁰ describing it, is full of amazement from the pomp of imperial ceremonies and aesthetics of the city. William also notes that to write the full description of riches of Constantinople he would need to write another treatise. Among the spectacles of the city he mentions hippodromes and other shows. He also mentions luxurious furniture and garments.¹⁴¹

In the penultimate book of the chronicle, William tells us about events that are known in historiography as the massacre of Latins¹⁴². This was an attack by Constantinopolitan mob lead by Andronikos I against adherents of Roman Catholicism residing in Constantinople. William’s death toll is 4000 not to count various barbaric acts, which are described in the respective chapters. Obviously the passage is emotional one with Greeks referred to as “heretics”, “serpents” and so on. Alexios II and Andronikos I are also described in a negative light. Most notably Alexios II is contrasted to his father Manuel I who stands in positive light especially in the middle books of the chronicle¹⁴³.

It is worth noting that the epithet “effeminate” is usually attached to Greeks throughout the chronicle¹⁴⁴. In spite of it, a rare praise of Greeks, as good warriors, can be traced in the context of joint Latin-Greek campaign to Egypt.¹⁴⁵

Interactions of William with Armenians were on a smaller scale compared to Greeks. In spite of this, we can still find some remarkable descriptions. Several rulers of Armenian Cilicia are present in the chronicle. One of them is Thoros II: “In the land of Cilicia near Tarsus, there dwelt a powerful Armenian noble, called Thoros. This man by his capricious and unloyal acts had often fallen under the displeasure of the Emperor and incurred his rebuke. Since his lands were far distant from the empire and his residence in high mountains was difficult to access, he often descended into

¹³⁹ Ibid p. 345

¹⁴⁰ Ibid p. 389-392

¹⁴¹ Ibid p. 450

¹⁴² Ibid p. 461-457

¹⁴³ Ibid p. 361, 449, 461

¹⁴⁴ Ibid p.96, 208, 210, 471

¹⁴⁵ Ibid p. 367

the plain of Cilicia and carried of booty and spoils.”¹⁴⁶ Thoros II here is described in the context of Raynald de Chatillon’s campaign against him triggered by Manuel I.

There is another description of Thoros II, now in the context of Manuel I’s campaign against him. “A powerful Armenian prince Thoros, of whom mention has been made, had seized by force the entire land of Cilicia... Not a single walled city or the most distant village escaped... he had driven out the governors placed there in charge of imperial affairs.”¹⁴⁷

Thoros II is once again mentioned in the description of reconciliation process between him and Manuel I. William notes the instrumental character of Baldwin III in this process¹⁴⁸. Thoros II once again appears in the chronicle as a member of joint Christian army fighting against Nur ad-Din of Aleppo: “At this crisis Thoros the Armenian, perceiving that the Turks were gaining the upper hand and that the Christians, on the contrary had succumbed, decided to save himself by flight and withdrew from the tumult of the battle. From the first he had opposed the pursuit of the Turks and had endeavored to dissuade the Christians from attempting it, but the foolish advice of others prevailed.”¹⁴⁹

Thoros II’s brother Malih who ruled Cilicia in 1170-75 is also present in the chronicle. He is first mentioned in the chronicle as head of “bandits” who attacked and looted Stephen du Bois¹⁵⁰. Then he is present in a more negative light as an ally of Nur ad-Din. “About this time occurred death of Thoros, a magnificent and noble man whom I have often mentioned as a powerful prince of the Armenians. His brother Malih, a most wicked man, desired to seize the heritage for himself. He accordingly went to Nureddin [Nur ad-Din] and earnestly begged that he be given a body of cavalry with which to take forcible possession of his brother’s domains.”¹⁵¹

The last ruler of Cilicia present in William chronicle is Ruben III. He is briefly mentioned in a passage describing transfer of Tarsus from the Principality of Antioch to Armenian Cilicia.¹⁵² It is important to mention that there is also a brief mention about Leo I in the chronicle.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁶ Ibid p.253

¹⁴⁷ Ibid p. 275

¹⁴⁸ Ibid p. 278

¹⁴⁹ Ibid p.308

¹⁵⁰ Ibid p.384

¹⁵¹ Ibid p. 386

¹⁵² Ibid p. 491

¹⁵³ Ibid p. 52

There are several noteworthy descriptions of Armenians in general throughout the chronicle. Twice in the chronicle we see a description of Armenians (as well as Syrians) as peaceful inhabitants of the Middle East. “The inhabitants of Edessa were native Chaldeans and peaceful Armenians. They were utterly ignorant of the use of arms and familiar only with the business of trading”¹⁵⁴. “The fields around [Marash] were occupied entirely By Syrian and Armenian Christians, who tilled the soil and devoted themselves to agriculture.”¹⁵⁵

Analysis

As we can see Fulcher is much more balanced in his descriptions and rarely shows his attitude, whereas William’s chronicle is full of descriptive passages. William’s oscillation from one extreme to another, especially when referring to the Byzantium has been noted by the researchers¹⁵⁶. Unfortunately due to lack of biographical information, it would be hard to give a precise reason for this stylistic difference. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge the general descriptive pattern of the authors to make a framework for the further analysis.

With rare exceptions, both Armenians and Greeks are shown in a positive or neutral light in Fulcher’s chronicle. Alexios I who is a “betrayers” for William is a quite rational figure for Fulcher¹⁵⁷. It is hard to give a precise reason for that, but several hypotheses can be made. Firstly Fulcher was member of the First Crusade. Despite different demographic and political reasons, it was clear that for many crusaders there was a clear ideological reason of liberating the Holy Lands and helping Christians of the East. Of course ideology is not always the dominant motive of individual action, but it should always be counted while analyzing any process. Thus one reason for Fulcher’s tolerant attitude towards Alexios I can be understood through idea of Christian “brotherhood” against “infidels” which was surely absent for William who was a native of the Middle East. As he has seen the whole fragmentary nature of Middle Eastern domains, antipathies of different Christian denominations and domains against each other as well as different Muslim denominations and domains against each other, he probably had a more pragmatic view of the

¹⁵⁴ Ibid p. 141

¹⁵⁵ Ibid p. 287

¹⁵⁶ Edbury and Rowe *William of Tyre* p. 131

¹⁵⁷ Nevertheless we have seen the idea of Alexios I being a betrayer in Fulcher as well. Obviously that idea was not as developed there as in the chronicle of William

region. Thus for William Alexios I is negative figure, simply because he had a negative attitude towards Latins, at least in Williams understanding.

In contrary to this negative attitude towards Alexios I, William is usually mentioning John II and Manuel I in a positive light. As we have seen, those were depicted as strong and just monarchs, whose policies were comprehensible for William. We have seen Williams's fascination in the "scene" where John II helps Baldwin II, or when John II is described levying troops. In both of these descriptions he is shown as a "grand monarch" with considerable power and prestige. The same is true for Manuel I. We have seen a similar aggrandizing description of him in the passage describing the marriage preparations. It is important to mention that this reverence towards imperial institute is not preventing William to bring in substantial criticism towards individual emperors including John II and Manuel I.

Despite this acknowledgement of ultimate prestige, both authors show tendency towards understanding actions of Emperors rather than judging them. William's description of Andronikos I and young Alexios II is an exception. Obviously one would not expect a medieval chronicler to be balanced when describing his nation being a target of an ethnic cleansing.

In the context of acknowledgement of the imperial prestige an important part is played by the city of Constantinople. In the eyes of the both authors, Constantinople is a crucial cultural and economic hub as well as a unique symbol of the imperial might. As we have seen, both authors showed their fascination with the city in different passages. Thus we can sum up that the Emperor and the City had an important symbolic meaning for both authors, especially for William.

Alongside with the description of individuals and institutions of Byzantium, it is important to write about generalizations about the Greeks found in both chronicles. As we have noted above Fulcher has a mostly neutral attitude towards Greeks in general. He did not present us any generalized thoughts on Greeks and their behavior.

We have an opposite picture in William's chronicle. We can cluster those generalizations into two groups. Firstly we can note multiple usage of the adjective "effeminate" by William to denote Greeks (also Syriacs¹⁵⁸). It is a topic of a separate article or perhaps a monography to compare mindsets and everyday lives of people of Christian and Muslim Orient and Christian Occident to understand why for former Latins were "barbarian" and for latter Middle Eastern people

¹⁵⁸ W. T. p. 471

“effeminate”. Nevertheless William uses this adjective to denote “lax” and “unwarlike” nature of Greeks. Interestingly we can notice the same adjective occur rarely in Armenian sources, interestingly, in the continuation of Matthew’s chronicle by Gregory the Priest. We have already noted above that several Latinisms were found in Gregory’s language. It can be suggested that usage of Armenian equivalent for the word “effeminate” as a derogatory term for Greeks is another evidence of Gregory being influenced by the Latin culture.

It is also worth noting that negative descriptions and generalizations of Greeks were very much connected with the context. In the part of William’s chronicle describing possible passage of Antioch to John II, Greeks are described as “effeminate”. In contrary, during the description of joint expedition against Fatimids, Greeks are described as excellent warriors.

The second generalization of William on the character of Greeks, can be formulated as a tendency for “useless” deliberation and speeches. As seen in the descriptions cited above, William shows his annoyance with the long speeches and useless, in his view, delays concerning key decisions.

In both chronicles there are much less descriptions of individual Armenians. Nevertheless we can analyze and bring in several patterns of thought based on abovementioned descriptions. Fulcher does not have any noteworthy descriptions of individual Armenians in the text, although some individuals like Gabriel of Mytilene¹⁵⁹ are mentioned. His overall attitude towards Armenians cannot be seen clear cut as in several occasions he describes Armenians assisting crusaders, but then generalizes noting that Armenians often acted against them.

In contrary to Fulcher, William has several noteworthy descriptions of Armenian lords of Cilicia. Thoros II whom William usually describes in positive terms is contrasted to Mleh (Malih) who is a negative figure in the text. In regards to Armenians as a nation, William has an overall positive attitude. This can be explained by the fact that Latin states were more or less of the same geopolitical weight with Armenian Cilicia and the problem of one dominating another was absent at least at this point. Moreover Latin states perhaps did not have any substantial political or economic expectations form Armenian Cilicia.

Again, it is worth noting that individual remarks can be analyzed in the scope of complex relationships between the parties. Byzantine Empire was seen as an important ally from one side, but

¹⁵⁹ F. Ch. p.135

on the other hand it was a cultural antagonist. On contrary relationships with Armenians were less intense and thus more neutral.

Part III: Greek sources on Armenians and Latins

As in the case of the Latin chronicles, Greek sources are in a chronological sequence. Anna Komnene's primary focus is Alexios I's reign, whereas Niketas Choniates starts his work with the reign of John II. We can see high level of erudition in both texts with ample references to the Bible and Greek classics. This is surely a result of profound education that both authors have received. The conditions of writing were nevertheless different. Anna Komnene was writing her work in seclusion with a group of intellectuals surrounding her. At that time Byzantine Empire was already fully recovered from defeat under Manzikert. In contrary, Choniates was writing his chronicle after fall of Constantinople in 1204. He lost all the privileges he had as high-ranking member of the imperial civil service and was trying to adapt to the new realities. From the perspective a modern historian, fall of Constantinople is perhaps just a major event, but for Byzantine citizen of the period, this was seen as something unbelievable. Indeed the whole grandeur of Constantinople was in some sense based on its exceptional stability to the invasions. As a result conditions of writing had their influence on the tonalities of the works.

Before passing to the actual analysis of the content, it should be mentioned that there is a huge terminological irregularity in naming nations. Whether it was a part of Byzantine mindset or was a result of authors' desire to show their erudition is a matter of separate research. Nevertheless it is worth mentioning that for crusaders names like Kelt, Frank and Latin are used. The same pattern is seen in naming other ethnic and religious groups as well, but those are out of scope.

Armenia or its rulers are not extensively mentioned in the *Alexiad*¹⁶⁰, but there are several references to high ranking Byzantine generals of Armenian origin and Armenian people in general. The first person to be mentioned in this context is Byzantine-Armenian¹⁶¹ general Gregory Pakourianos. Pakourianos made a remarkable career becoming one of the notable military commanders of Byzantium at that time, as well as became a patron of a monastery that is located in the territory of today's Bulgaria. The passage¹⁶² covers Alexios' and his brother Isaac's revolt against Nikiphoros III. "...he [Alexios I] went to see Pakourianos...the latter was of tiny body, as

¹⁶⁰ There is one brief mention of Leo and Thoros Roubenians, see A. K. p.392

¹⁶¹ There is an open debate around actual ethnicity of Pakourianos as some scholars believe he was of Armenian-Georgian background. As Anna Komnene assumes him being an Armenian in the context of our research we will not analyze this proposition

¹⁶² A. K. p. 58

the poet says, but mighty warrior, born of a noble family in Armenia”¹⁶³. Alexios tries to convince him to ally with them in a revolt. “Pakourianos ... said “If you leave here at daybreak tomorrow, I will follow you, and I will fight willingly at your side; but if you defer your plan to the next day, I must warn you that I shall go to the emperor...”¹⁶⁴. Eventually Pakourianos joined Komnene Brothers and Alexios I became emperor.

Another noteworthy passage regarding Pakourianos is the one describing his death. “The Emperor Alexios ... ordered...Pakourianos, an excellent commander and skilled at drawing up his forces in battle for formation and for free combat, to march with his army against them [Scythians¹⁶⁵]”¹⁶⁶. Anna Komnene reports that Pechenegs vastly outnumbered the Byzantine troops. “The domestikos [Pakourianos], fighting furiously and charging the Scythians with great violence, crushed into an oak tree and died on the spot”¹⁶⁷. Finally Alexios I is mentioned lamenting Pakourianos’ death. “The emperor mourned all those who had fallen, individually and as a body, but in particular he lamented the death of Pakourianos, for even before his accession he had loved him dearly. He shed many tears for the domestikos.”¹⁶⁸

Philaretos Brachamios is also mentioned in the text. “An Armenian called Philaretos, highly respected for his bravery and intelligence, had been promoted to the rank of *domestikos* by the former emperor Romanos Diogenes, and when he saw Diogenes’ downfall and knew moreover that he had been blinded, it was more than he could bear, for he had a deep affection for this Emperor. He organized a rebellion seized the power for himself in Antioch.”¹⁶⁹ Anna Komnene continues the passage with further events concerning Brachamios’s fate including his plan to become a Muslim and his son’s rebellion against him.

Lastly we should mention about Aspietes an Armenian noble ruling Cilicia under Byzantine patronage. Anna Komnene gives us a useful description of Aspietes in the context of Tancred’s campaign to Cilicia. “This individual was a member of a noble Armenian family. He had a great reputation for bravery, according to reports from that time, although the present crisis absolutely

¹⁶³ Ibid p.58

¹⁶⁴ Ibid p.58

¹⁶⁵ Pechenegs

¹⁶⁶ A. K. p. 183

¹⁶⁷ Ibid p.183

¹⁶⁸ Ibid p.183

¹⁶⁹ Ibid p. 169

belied it, at least as far as his leadership was concerned”¹⁷⁰. Here she mentions Tancred’s open plans to conquer Cilicia, to the degree that Tancred sent treating letters to Aspietes. “While he was engaged thus, the Armenian Aspietes was idly taking his ease, devoting himself to heavy drinking bouts by nights...”¹⁷¹ As a result Tancred’s army was able to penetrate into Cilicia. “... the reader may well wonder how Aspietes’ military ineptitude escaped the emperor’s [Alexios I] notice. My reply in defense of my father would be that he was impressed by the distinction of his family, and that his glorious lineage and the celebrity of his name contributed much to the appointment of Aspietes to the command position.”¹⁷² She further notes that he was a scion of Arsakid family¹⁷³. Then Anna Komnene continues the story of Aspietes noting his bravery in a battle against Robert Guiscard. Aspietes was wounded by a Norman warrior “who towered head and shoulders above the rest”¹⁷⁴, but did not lose his consciousness and was able to kill the Norman by splitting his head into two. Thus she concludes that this act of “heroism” and his noble lineage were sources of imperial credit towards him.

Armenian people as an ethnic group are mentioned several times in the text, those usually being neutral references. Nevertheless in one description Armenians are shown as heretics. The passage refers to certain Neilos whose ideas were later condemned as heresy. “At that time there were in the capital many Armenians, from whom Neilos’ doctrines acted as a spur to their own further impieties, since he held frequent conferences with notorious Arsakes and Tigranes”¹⁷⁵.

The beginning of the first crusade is described in the tenth book of Alexiad. Anna Komnene tells that Alexios I “dreaded”¹⁷⁶ arrival of crusaders. Here we can notice amplitude of negative descriptions like “uncontrollable passion”, “erratic character”, “unpredictability”¹⁷⁷, “greed for money”¹⁷⁸ as well as the fact that they do not follow the treaties. She notes about Peter the Hermit and passes to the descriptions of crusader leaders. First is Godfrey de Bouillon who “was very rich man, extremely proud of his noble birth, his own courage and the glory of his family – every Kelt is anxious to outdo his peers”¹⁷⁹. Then she passes to Bohemond who later became Prince of Antioch

¹⁷⁰ Ibid p.335

¹⁷¹ Ibid p.335

¹⁷² Ibid p.336

¹⁷³ A royal house that ruled in Armenian during 1st – 5th centuries AD

¹⁷⁴ A. K. p.336

¹⁷⁵ Ibid p.261

¹⁷⁶ Ibid p.274

¹⁷⁷ Ibid p.274

¹⁷⁸ Ibid p.275

¹⁷⁹ Ibid p.277

and was son of Robert Guiscard. "... but the more villainous characters, in particular Bohemond and his like, had an ulterior motive, for they hoped on their journey to seize the imperial capital..."¹⁸⁰. Afterwards Anna Komnene makes a generalization on Latins "As I have said before, the Latin race at all times is unusually greedy"¹⁸¹. Another crusader leader mentioned in this part of Alexiad is Hugh of Vermandois who is mentioned sending an "absurd"¹⁸² message to Alexios I, noting that he should be received with an appropriate pomp. Afterwards, Anna Komnene describes how some courtiers of Godfrey de Bouillon were invited to Alexios and makes another generalization about Latins. "The Latins, however, wasted time with their usual verbosity and love of long speeches ..."¹⁸³

In the next noteworthy description Anna Komnene refers to Godfrey's brother, Baldwin (Baldwin I). A Latin is described seating on the imperial throne during an assembly. "The emperor endured this without word, knowing of old the arrogance of Latins"¹⁸⁴. Here Baldwin intervenes and orders the nobleman to follow Byzantine customs. The latter gets off the throne and tells to Alexios in "his own language: 'What as peasant! He sits alone while generals like these stand beside him!'"¹⁸⁵ Alexios I ordered to translate the words but did not respond to the insult. In following passages, Bohemond is variously described as a person of "deceitful and treacherous nature"¹⁸⁶, "cunning", "by nature a liar"¹⁸⁷ and having no intention to liberate the Holy Sepulture, but rather to conquer Byzantium. Nevertheless it is important to mention that in spite of her open negative attitude towards Bohemond, Anna Komnene acknowledges his military excellence throughout the book. "Bohemond was outstanding as besieger of cities, surpassing even the famous Demetrios Poliorketes"¹⁸⁸, "The outstanding warrior Bohemond..."¹⁸⁹

In this general negative sentiment towards crusaders, Raymond IV of Toulouse who, is referred by Anna Komnene as St. Gilles is described in an interestingly positive manner. "Alexios had a deep affection for St. Gilles because of count's superior intellect, his untarnished reputation

¹⁸⁰ Ibid p.277

¹⁸¹ Ibid p.278

¹⁸² Ibid p.279

¹⁸³ Ibid p.285

¹⁸⁴ Ibid p. 291

¹⁸⁵ Ibid p.291

¹⁸⁶ Ibid p. 292

¹⁸⁷ Ibid p. 293

¹⁸⁸ Ibid p. 355

¹⁸⁹ Ibid p. 373

and the purity of his life. ... In fact, he outshone all Latins in every quality, as the sun outshines the stars.”¹⁹⁰

Throughout the text there are negative generalizations on Latins. “... They are inconsistent, changing to opposite extremes in the twinkling of an eye. You can see one and the same man boasting that he will shake the whole world and the very next minute cringing prostrate in the dust – and this is even more likely to happen when they meet stronger character”¹⁹¹. There are also multiple mentions, throughout the text, of Latins being “greedy”.

First noteworthy description of Armenians in the History of Niketas Choniates refers to John II’s campaign to Cilicia. “... John declared an expedition against Cilicia because Leon, who ruled Armenia, wanted to march against and subdue other fortresses subject to the Romans.”¹⁹² Choniates continues the story noting that John II successfully subjected various towns and fortresses of Armenian Cilicia. Then, he describes an incident with Constantine, an Armenian lord who is possibly brother of Leo I. An incident took place during the siege of fortress called Baka. Constantine is described as “... an Armenian of highest nobility who excelled all in brave deeds. Not only he band populace together and rouse them to fight Romans, but he often appeared above the fortress with weapons on the hilltop...”¹⁹³ Choniates further describes Constantine insulting John II, having a duel with a Macedonian warrior, which he lost and escaped. Eventually John II takes the fortress of Baka and captures Constantine. “But the audacious and reckless Armenian attacked his guards at night killing many...”¹⁹⁴ Constantine started another rebellion afterwards, but was once again captured. Choniates tells us that John II continued his campaign further and captured another Armenian city using siege machines.

Not very late after his father’s campaign, Manuel I decides to reaffirm his suzerainty over Cilicia, which was under a treat due to independent actions of Thoros II. Choniates describes Thoros II as “devious, dissembling and crafty”¹⁹⁵ who was terrified by the presence of Manuel I. Eventually Manuel made a treaty with Thoros II.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid p. 296

¹⁹¹ Ibid p. 382

¹⁹² N. Ch. p. 14

¹⁹³ Ibid p.14

¹⁹⁴ Ibid p.15

¹⁹⁵ Ibid p.59

In the history of Choniates, the last noteworthy mention of Armenians in the context of our research, refers to Andronikos I's meeting with Patriarch Theodosios. When seeing the Patriarch, Andronikos I knelt, but Patriarch gave a cold answer. Andronikos I took this as an offense and replied "Behold the deep Armenian' for it was rumored that patriarch's paternal family were Armenians."¹⁹⁶

Choniates' descriptions of Latin leaders of the Komnenian Era are mostly neutral. For instance he mentions Raymond of Antioch greeting John II after he reaches Antioch during the campaign to Cilicia. Raymond is also mentioned when Manuel II marries his daughter Maria¹⁹⁷. Baldwin III is mentioned once in the text during a description of a relationship between Theodora (Baldwin's wife) and Andronikos I.

A description of a joint campaign of Byzantine-Latin forces to Egypt is slightly more extensive. Initially Choniates writes about Manuel I forming a cooperation with Amalric. Then Manuel sent a delegation headed by Andronikos Kontostephanos to Amalric. "... Amalric once again procrastinated and a smoldering regret weighed heavily on his soul. Putting forward among many other excuses 'the pretext for Patroklos' he cited levying of his troops as not the least of those."¹⁹⁸ Eventually they moved towards Egypt. Throughout the passage Amalric and Latin troops are shown to be passive towards military action, which makes Andronikos Kontostephanos angry. "But he [Andronikos Kontostephanos] realized that Amalric was neither devising an effective plan nor assisting nor sharing toils. ... In disgust, he [Andronikos Kontostephanos] stripped himself of the Latin drivel and decided to conduct the campaign on his own"¹⁹⁹.

The final description that is noteworthy in our context refers to the massacre of Latins. Choniates writes that Andronikos I (at the time regent of Alexios II) dispatched soldiers and ordered them to attack Latin population of Constantinople. As a result, population of the city joined the soldiers in purges. "Surrounded and hemmed in by both throngs, the Latins were unable to resist. They attempted to save themselves as best they could, leaving behind their homes filled with riches and treasures of all kinds such as are sought by men bent on plunder; nor did they dare to remain where they were or to attack the Romans or to submit to, and endure, their onslaught. Some took their chances by scattering throughout the City, others sought asylum in the homes of the nobility,

¹⁹⁶ Ibid p.142

¹⁹⁷ Ibid p.66

¹⁹⁸ Ibid p.92

¹⁹⁹ Ibid p.93

while yet others boarded the long ships manned by their fellow countrymen and escaped being cut down by the sword”²⁰⁰.

Analysis

As we have seen, Anna Komnene is describing individual Armenian generals of Byzantine army in positive terms. In contrary to this, Armenians of Constantinople are referred to as adherents of a new heresy, and as heretics in general. It is hard to determine a specific reason for this, but we can propose several hypotheses. Firstly Pakourianos was of Orthodox faith²⁰¹ thus he was seen as a full member of Byzantine community of Greek-speaking, orthodox *Romaioi*. Surely Byzantine historians usually noted the ancestry of non-Greek figures of Byzantine history, but throughout their millennial history, the *Romaioi* of Byzantium were people of different ethnic backgrounds. In contrary to this, actual adherents of Armenian Apostolicism were historically seen as “heretics” by Byzantine Orthodoxy. This idea was perhaps reinforced by the fact that centuries ago a massive “heretical” movement of Paulicians had its roots in Armenian circles.

Anna Komnene’s perception of Latins is extremely negative and stereotypical. As seen above, she depicted Alexios I being cautious about the Crusades as if he was expecting “barbaric invasion”. Surely, Anna Komnene’s perception of different Crusader leaders varies from positive descriptions of Raymond of Toulouse to extremely negative description of Bohemond. It is worth noting that Anna Komnene’s perception of Bohemond was to some degree based on the fact that his father, Robert Guiscard was among prime adversaries of Byzantium in Mediterranean for a decade. Nevertheless we see more or less balanced perception of individual Latins in Alexiad.

As noted above generalizations about Latins throughout Alexiad are negative. The stereotypes include Latins being greedy and arrogant. Those are in a sense recurring epithets that can be seen in passages describing different events. Another interesting point in this context is Anna Komnene’s note that Latins are apt for long speeches and circumlocutions.

As we have seen, History of Niketas Choniates does not contain any generalization regarding Armenians. We can see both Thoros II and Constantine I are being described predominately in a

²⁰⁰ Ibid p. 140-141

²⁰¹ Due to lack of information, it is hard to determine whether Aspietes and Brachamios were adherents of Greek Orthodoxy or Armenian Apostolicism.

negative light. This can be due to the fact that they were trying to promote interests of newly formed Armenian Principality of Cilicia. This was obviously against Byzantine interests, as they would rather prefer to govern the region via a civil or military representative of the imperial administration.

The allusion to ethnicity in a quasi-quarrel between Andronikos I and Patriarch Theodosius can be probably seen in the context of Hellenization of the Byzantium. Surely, an extensive comparative analysis should be done for this hypothesis to have a firm ground.

While referring to Choniates' perception for Latins we should bear in mind that he was a survivor of the sack of Constantinople (1204). Although the parts of the History covering this event are out of the scope of the present research, the tonality is surly obvious. This can also explain lack of compassion while referring to the purges of Latins of Constantinople. In regard to individual leaders of Crusader states, Choniates' attitudes vary. Raymond of Antioch is described in a positive manner whereas Amalric is described in a negative way.

To get a full picture of Byzantine attitudes towards other nations we should note that Greek notion of *Barbaroi* stemming from the classical antiquity was still in use in Byzantium and was used to denote virtually all non-*Romaioi*. Anna Komnene is going even further to explicitly note that *Romaioi* are the superior nation on the earth with a natural mission of ruling over all other nations²⁰².

²⁰² A. K. p.420

Conclusion

In the context of this research we tried to show the overall patterns of mutual perceptions of Armenians, Greeks and Latins during the Komnenian Era. As can be clearly seen from the quoted passages and their analysis, mutual perceptions were both based on geopolitical situation during a specific event as well as on stereotypes present in the perceptions of different authors. It is not always the case, but usually the background of writer has an important influence over his/her mindset. For instance Armenian chronicles were “catastrophic” in their general tonality. This was most probably due to the interregnum of several decades from the fall of Bagratid kingdom to the establishment and eventual consolidation of the kingdom of Cilicia. On the other hand Crusader chronicles contain passages with explicit similarity to travelogues. Histories of different cities are described up to biblical details. Moreover, in some cases we can see even descriptions of the flora and fauna. Obviously this paradigm is natural for Latin authors, as they were discovering new territories on every campaign to which they were familiar only from the books of antiquity. Interestingly, Williams’s chronicle also contains this kind of descriptions, in spite of the fact that he was native of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. This is another marker of intellectual curiosity of that time.

The paradigm of Byzantine perception was, in a sense, based on overall notion of superiority over other nations and territories. For instance the ontological basis for Crusader campaigns in the eyes of Latin chronicles was liberation of territory from infidels. Byzantine authors were not trying to justify their actions. It was natural in their mindsets to initiate offensive campaigns to subjugate every possible territory to Byzantium. Nevertheless these are generalizations and as in any case, majority of generalizations have considerable limitations.

In addition, I would like to note several similarities that can be derived from the analysis of sources. Firstly we can observe the reverence towards Byzantine institutions in both Latin and Armenian sources. As noted above, authors especially perceive Byzantium to be the richest Christian realm, with emperor possessing tremendous political prestige. The city of Constantinople is also important in this context. Another interesting point can be observed in stereotypes. In Anna Komnene’s opinion Latins extensively use circumlocutions in their speeches, whereas William of Tyre notes essentially the same for Greeks. Lastly, it is important to mention about massacre of Latins. William’s and Choniates’ descriptions vary considerably. In contrary to Williams’s

description full of lamentation, Choniates seems to describe the event in a “cold blood” and perhaps to be on the side of Andronikos I and Constantinopolitan mob.

Thus an attempt was made to unveil the attitudes and mutual-perceptions of Armenian, Greek and Latin authors of the Komnenian period. Surely a more extensive study is needed to come to more specific conclusions. Also, further studies should perhaps take a comparative turn, examining this attitudes for epochs before and after Komnenian period. Only in that case we will have a deeper picture of the mindsets governing at least the official discourses in the Armenian, Greek and Latin literary traditions of the period.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Anna Komnene. *Alexiad*, translated by E. R. A. Sewter, revised with introduction and notes by Peter Frankopan, New York 2009
- Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, edited by H. S. Fink, translated by F. R. Ryan, New York 1973.
- *O City of Byzantium Annals of Niketas Choniates*, translated by Harry J. Magoulias, Detroit 1984
- Matteos Urahyeci, *Žamanakagrutyun*, translation, introduction and notes by Hrach Bartikyan, Yerevan 1973
- Samuel Aneci Ew Šarunakoghner, *Žamanakagrutyun*, edited by Karen Matevosyan, Yerevan 2014
- William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, translated and annotated by Emily Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey, vol. 2, New York 1943

Secondary sources

- Angold, M., *The Byzantine Empire, 1025-1204: a Political History*. New York 1997
- Andrews, Tara L. “Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa, with a Discussion of Computer-Aided Methods Used to Edit the Text.” D.Phil, diss., Oxford, 2009.
- Arutjunova-Findanjan, V. A. “Armjanskije Srednevekovye Istočniki ob Ekspansii Vizantijskoj Imperii na vostok v X-XI v. v.” *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* 2 (1978): 191-206
- Bozoyan, A., “Kilikiyi Byuzandakan Karavaričnerë Ew Rubinyan Išxanutyuny XII-rd Dari 40-70-akan Ĥvakannerin” *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* n.3 (1984): 74-86

- Edbury, Peter W., and John Gordon Rowe. *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East*. Cambridge, 1988.
- Joranson, E. "The Problem of the Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexius to the Court of Flanders." *The American Historical Review* 55, no. 4 (1950): pp. 811–832
- Kazhdan, A. P., and Ann Wharton Epstein. *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. California 1990
- Kazhdan, A. P. *Nikita Xoniat i ego Vremja*, Saint Petersburg 2005
- Kozlov, S. A. "Bolše, čem vrag: Osobennosti Izobraženia Pečengov v Vizantijskoj Literature Epoxi Pervix Komnena". *Byzantinoslavica* 71, n.1-2 (2013): 145-162
- Krey, A. C. "William of Tyre: The Making of an Historian in the Middle Ages." *Speculum*, vol. 16, no. 2 (1941): 149-166
- *Kultura Vizantii* vol.II, edited by Z. V. Udaltsova and G. G. Litavrin , Moscow 1989
- Ljubarsky, Y. N. "Vvedenije" in *Aleksjada*, Moscow 1965
- Madoyan, A. G., "Nerses Meci Tesil̄y Mijnadaryan Hay Poeziayum", *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* no.4 (1969): 237-247
- Magdalino, P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*. Cambridge 1993
- Matevosyan, K., "Samuel Aneću "Žamanakagrutyan" Avartman Tvakan̄y Ew Patviratun" *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* n.1 (1992): 156-162
- MacEvitt, Ch., "The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa: Apocalypse, the First Crusade, and the Armenian Diaspora." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 61 (2007): 157-181
- Neville, L., *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*. Cambridge, 2018
- Page, G., *Being Byzantine: Greek Identity Before the Ottomans, 1200–1420*. Cambridge, 2008.
- Papageorgiou, A., "οί δέ λύκοι ὡς Πέρσαι: The image of the "Turks" in the reign of John II Komnenos (1118-1143)". *Byzantinoslavica* vol. 69 n.1-2 (2011): 149-161
- Peters, E., "Biographical note" in *The First Crusade "The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres" and Other Source Materials* edited E. Peters, Second Edition, Philadelphia, 1998
- Ruincman, S., *A History of the Crusades*. vol.2, Cambridge 1952
- Ter-Petrosyan, L., *Xačakirner̄y Ew Hayer̄y*, vol.2, Yerevan 2007
- *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies* edited by R. Cormack, J. F. Haldon and E. Jeffreys, Oxford 2008

