

# **BYZANTIUM AND THE OTHER: RELATIONS AND EXCHANGES**

---

Angeliki E. Laiou and edited by Cécile  
Morrisson

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES  
SERIES





# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

*Also in the Variorum Collected Studies Series:*

**ANGELIKI E. LAIOU**

Women, Family and Society in Byzantium

**ANGELIKI E. LAIOU**

Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium

**JULIAN CHRYSOSTOMIDES**

Byzantium and Venice, 1204–1453

Collected Studies

**CHRISTOPHER D. SCHABEL**

Greeks, Latins, and the Church in Early Frankish Cyprus

**DAVID JACOBY**

Latins, Greeks and Muslims: Encounters in the Eastern Mediterranean,  
10th–15th Centuries

**ANTHONY LUTTRELL**

Studies on the Hospitallers after 1306

Rhodes and the West

**NICOLAS OIKONOMIDES**

Society, Culture and Politics in Byzantium

**DAVID JACOBY**

Commercial Exchange Across the Mediterranean

Byzantium, the Crusader Levant, Egypt and Italy

**NICOLAS OIKONOMIDES**

Social and Economic Life in Byzantium

**DAVID JACOBY**

Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean

**ANTHONY LUTTRELL**

The Hospitaller State on Rhodes and its Western Provinces, 1306–1462

**PETER W. EDBURY**

Kingdoms of the Crusaders

From Jerusalem to Cyprus

**DAVID JACOBY**

Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES

---

Byzantium and the Other:  
Relations and Exchanges

---



Angeliki E. Laiou

Angeliki E. Laiou

---

Byzantium and the Other:  
Relations and Exchanges

---

Edited by Cécile Morrisson  
and Rowan Dorin

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2012 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

This edition © 2012 by Vassili Thomadakis

Vassili Thomadakis has asserted the moral right of Angeliki E. Laiou, under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

#### **British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

Laiou, Angeliki E.

Byzantium and the other : relations and exchanges.

– (Variorum collected studies series ; CS1005)

1. Byzantine Empire – Foreign relations – 1081–1453.

2. Byzantine Empire – Commerce. 3. Crusades.

I. Title II. Series III. Morrisson, Cécile. IV. Dorin, Rowan.

949.5–dc23

ISBN 9781409432067 (hbk)

**Library of Congress Control Number:** 2012936462

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES CS1005

# CONTENTS

Preface: Cécile Morrisson and Rowan Dorin	ix
Acknowledgements	x
Introduction: David Jacoby	xi

## BYZANTIUM AND THE OTHER

I	The foreigner and the stranger in 12th century Byzantium: means of propitiation and acculturation <i>Fremde der Gesellschaft, ed. M.-Th. Fögen. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1991</i>	71–97
II	L'étranger de passage et l'étranger privilégié à Byzance, XIe–XIIe siècles <i>Identité et droit de l'autre, ed. L. Mayali. Berkeley: Robbins, 1994</i>	69–88
III	Institutional mechanisms of integration <i>Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire, eds H. Ahrweiler and A.E. Laiou. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1998</i>	161–181

## BYZANTIUM AND THE CRUSADES

IV	Byzantium and the crusades in the twelfth century: why was the Fourth Crusade late in coming? <i>Urbs Capta: The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences. La IVe Croisade et ses conséquences, ed. A.E. Laiou. Paris: Lethielleux, 2005</i>	17–40
V	On just war in Byzantium <i>TO EAAHNIKON: Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis, Jr. Volume I: Hellenic Antiquity and Byzantium, eds J.S. Langdon, S.W. Reinert, J.S. Allen and C.P. Ioannides. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas, 1993</i>	153–177

VI	The just war of eastern Christians and the Holy War of the crusaders <i>The Ethics of War: Shared Problems in Different Traditions</i> , eds R. Sorabji and D. Rodin. Ashgate: Variorum, 2006	30–43
VII	The many faces of medieval colonization <i>Native Traditions in the Postconquest World</i> , eds E.H. Boone and T. Cummins. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1998	13–30
LONG DISTANCE TRADE AND RELATIONS		
VIII	Byzantine trade with Christians and Muslims and the crusades <i>The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World</i> , eds A.E. Laiou and R.P. Mottahedeh. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001	157–196
IX	Venice as a centre of trade and of artistic production in the thirteenth century <i>Il Medio Oriente e l'Occidente nell'arte del XIII secolo: Atti del XXIV Congresso del Comitato Internazionale di storia dell'Arte, Bologna, 1975, sezione 2</i> , ed. H. Belting. Bologna: CLUEB, 1982	11–26
X	Italy and the Italians in the political geography of the Byzantines (14th century) <i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i> 49, 1995	73–98
XI	Monopoly and privilege: the Byzantine reaction to the Genoese presence in the Black Sea <i>Oriente e Occidente tra Medioevo ed Età Moderna. Studi in onore de Geo Pistarino</i> , ed. L. Balletto. Genoa: Brigati, 1997	675–686
XII	Monopoly and privileged free trade in the Eastern Mediterranean (8th – 14th century) <i>Chemins d'outre-mer: Etudes d'histoire sur la Méditerranée médiévale offertes à Michel Balard</i> , eds D. Coulon et al. ( <i>Byzantina Sorbonensia</i> 20). Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2004	511–526

XIII	Regional networks in the Balkans in the middle and late Byzantine Period <i>Also published in Trade and Markets in Byzantium, ed. C. Morrisson. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2012</i>	1–35
XIV	Byzantium and the neighboring powers: small-state policies and complexities <i>Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261–1557), Perspectives on Late Byzantine Art and Culture, ed. S.T. Brooks. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006, 42–53</i>	1–13
Index		1–12

This volume contains xvi + 322 pages
--------------------------------------

### PUBLISHER'S NOTE

*The articles in this volume, as in all others in the Variorum Collected Studies Series, have not been given a new, continuous pagination. In order to avoid confusion, and to facilitate their use where these same studies have been referred to elsewhere, the original pagination has been maintained wherever possible. Articles XIII and XIV have necessarily been reset with a new pagination, and with the original page numbers given in square brackets within the text.*

*Each article has been given a Roman number in order of appearance, as listed in the Contents. This number is repeated on each page and is quoted in the index entries.*



# Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

## PREFACE

*Daß wir erschranken, da du starbst, nein, daß  
dein starker Tod uns dunkel unterbrach,  
das Bisdahin abreißend vom Seither:  
das geht uns an; das einzuordnen wird  
die Arbeit sein, die wir mit allem tun.*

Rilke, *Requiem für eine Freundin* (1908)

Angeliki Laiou (1941-2008) was among the leading Byzantinists of her generation.<sup>1</sup> Armed with a penetrating intellect and graced with an uncommon clarity of thought and expression, she broke new ground in the field of Byzantine social and economic history. Fruitfully drawing on the insights of other historical periods and scholarly disciplines, but always sensitive to the specificities of the Byzantine experience, she published pioneering studies of topics ranging from family structure to economic ideology.

The articles gathered here bear witness to these qualities, as well as to her readiness to revisit her own earlier work in light of new insights and discoveries. They testify equally to the tragedy of her swift and unexpected passing, which left Byzantine Studies bereft of one of its most eloquent defenders and robbed her colleagues and students of a beloved friend and mentor. It is on behalf of these colleagues and students that we have undertaken the task of preparing three collections of her articles to be published posthumously in the Variorum series.<sup>2</sup> Though the vitality of her presence is now but a treasured memory, it is our hope that these volumes will ensure that her scholarly legacy remains alive and well.

We are particularly grateful to David Jacoby for suggesting this project in the first place, to John Smedley for shepherding it through the publication process with patience and good humour, and to Vassili Thomadakis for his support and encouragement. We would also like to thank David Jacoby for generously agreeing to write the Introduction to this volume, and Gilbert Dagron, Michael McCormick, Nevra Necipoğlu, and the staff at Dumbarton Oaks for their assistance.

CÉCILE MORRISSON & ROWAN DORIN

---

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed account of her life and achievements, as well as a full bibliography, see the obituary by Cécile Morriison and Alice-Mary Talbot in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 63 (2011): 1-14.

<sup>2</sup> *Women, Family and Society in Byzantium, Byzantium and the Other: Relations and Exchanges*, and *Economic Thought and Economic Life in Byzantium*.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the following persons, institutions, journals and publishers for their kind permission to reproduce the papers included in this volume: Vittorio Klostermann GmbH, Frankfurt am Main (for article I); The Robbins Religious and Civil Law Collection, and The Regents of the University of California, Berkeley, CA (II); Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington D.C. (III, VII, VIII, X, XIII); Editions Lethielleux, Paris (IV); Aristide D. Caratzas (V); Casa Editrice CLUEB, Bologna (IX); Glauco Brigati, Genoa (XI); Bertrand Hirsch, Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris (XII); and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY (XIV).

Every effort has been made to trace all the copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity.

## INTRODUCTION

The doctoral thesis of Angeliki Laiou, published in a revised version as *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282–1328* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), her first book, signaled the beginning of her lasting interest in two closely interrelated topics: first, the encounter between Byzantines and foreigners, both at the individual and collective level, whether within or outside the Empire, and secondly, the economic history of Byzantium. These major topics remained at the focus of her research over the years. She repeatedly returned to them, each time exploring different aspects of their complexities, as illustrated by the fourteen papers assembled in this volume.

The first group of papers examines Byzantine definitions, perceptions, attitudes, institutional issues, and mechanisms of integration regarding foreigners and strangers residing in the Empire. The perception of ‘self’ and ‘other’ among intellectuals and the bureaucracy of Constantinople underwent an important development in the period preceding the twelfth century. By then the relative weight of religion and state service as defining group identification and differentiation from foreigners had been largely replaced by a cultural and especially a linguistic criterion. With respect to the state, political considerations, namely hostility and friendship toward Byzantium, defined respectively foreign-ness and Byzantine identity, as illustrated by the Venetians. In dealing with foreigners Byzantium strove to bring them into a status of dependence to the emperor by oaths and quasi-legal devices. Acculturation and assimilation, primarily by mixed marriages, were the path to the full integration of individual foreigners within the Byzantine system and to the loss of their foreign-ness (article I).

The foreigners’ self-perception of their own identity, rights and place within the Byzantine system and the Byzantine perception in that respect differed according to the circumstances. Byzantine admission of the specific self-identity of foreigners residing and operating within the empire, namely Georgians and Armenians, and imperial service furthered their assimilation. This is illustrated by Gregorios Pakourianos, imperial subject and orthodox Christian, though considering himself Georgian. On the other hand, the insertion of crusaders within the Byzantine system gave rise to disagreement and was unsuccessful. The emperors considered the legal link between themselves and crusaders as entailing the latter’s subordination, whereas the crusaders viewed it as creating

bilateral feudal obligations that granted them certain rights, amplified by their status as fighters in the service of the Christian faith. The gap between these two interpretations was an important factor of dissension and occasional conflict between the two sides in the twelfth century (article II).

The Empire used its judicial system and taxation to integrate or assimilate various ethnic groups and foreign individuals. While maintaining the principle that all residents were subject to the same state law, the Byzantine judicial system displayed flexibility at the practical level regarding the application of foreign custom and individual arrangements in private legal transactions, as illustrated with respect to Georgians and Jews. The special tax delivered by the Milingoi and Ezeritai in the Peloponnese were in fact the payment of a tribute and a recognition of imperial sovereignty which, while integrating these peoples within the Byzantine political system, reinforced in their midst ethnic solidarity running counter integration. Foreign merchants permanently residing in the Empire created a different challenge. The emperors imposed Byzantine law on these foreigners and maintained it in cases opposing them to imperial subjects. The breach of this principle in 1198 resulted in the Palaiologan period in the loss of Byzantine jurisdiction and taxation within the extraterritorial enclaves of Venice and Genoa in Constantinople (article III).

The Western crusades compelled the Empire to confront new political and ideological issues, examined in the second section of this volume. The Normans of South Italy and Sicily were paramount in the development of plans for a crusade against Byzantium and in the formation of the Byzantine response. The Norman attacks on the Empire led by Robert Guiscard in 1081 and especially the one by Bohemond of Taranto in 1101 generated Byzantine fears of an assault on Constantinople. Proper plans to that effect were elaborated following the failures of the crusades against the Muslims in 1101 and 1147–49. However, three factors delayed the attack, namely the resolve of the crusaders to carry out the crusade, the opposition to war against Byzantium, considered a perversion of crusading, and effective Byzantine activity to thwart the enterprise. The successful propaganda campaign waged by Emperor Alexios I Komnenos and the astute diplomacy of Emperor Manuel I, which exploited the rifts between the Normans, the Papacy and the German emperors, were decisive in that respect. However, by 1203 Manuel's policy had collapsed under his successors and the Western opposition to an attack on Constantinople had considerably diminished, paving the way for the city's conquest in 1204 (article IV).

The Byzantine encounter with the crusading movement also raised the issue of war and its justification. The Byzantine approach is examined in the light of Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* which, though lacking a systematic statement, nevertheless provides a fairly coherent idea about 'just war', as

fought by her father Alexios I. War is justified as a measure of self-defense, aimed at recovery of lost territory, the result of breached agreements, and as a pursuit of peace, based on the idea that the Empire sought peace but was forced into war. Most of Anna Komnene's ideas were supported by Aristotelian and Roman concepts already found in earlier Byzantine writings (article V). The Byzantines considered 'just war' a secular concept, the state being competent to declare war. Foreign to them was the western 'holy war' ideology of the crusades elaborated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which implied a fight for the Christian faith by God's army, ordered by the Church and entailing the remission of sin and martyrdom as a reward for death in battle. At the socio-political level the opposition between the two different ideologies of war reflected the contrast between upward mobility largely through the civil service of a bureaucratic state headed by the emperor, versus a knightly military class partly achieving wealth, power and social status through war. The clash between these ideologies contributed to the breakdown of the Christian alliance and to the sack of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade, which turned the rift between eastern and western Christendom into a permanent feature (article VI).

The ideology of 'holy war' also impacted upon the encounters between western colonizers and native populations from the eleventh century onward, and was reflected by the social structure of conquered territories. Expansion based on Christian ideology was an important factor in creating a predisposition toward a profound formalized and institutionalized intolerance toward the subjugated non-Christian population involving three options, namely assimilation, annihilation or separation. In Slavic lands heavy German immigration and uncompromising religious approach resulted in the extermination or expulsion of some Prussian tribes and the assimilation of others. In the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem the colonists erected a closed, exclusionist and defensive system to preserve their identity, leaving the fabric of the native society unchanged. No true assimilation occurred, and the two societies lived side by side, each with its own culture and language. In contrast, economic expansion fueled by trade and carried out by merchants and sailors is illustrated in Crete, where the Christian population, composed of Greeks and Latins, became an integrated society following the acculturation and assimilation of the foreign Western elite (article VII).

The impact of the crusades and the existence of the crusader states in the Levant also extended to economic issues, both within the Empire and in the latter's commercial relations with other regions. The first paper in the third section of this volume deals with the problems involved in the provisioning of the crusaders and their cash payments in various currencies during their journey across Byzantine territories. These problems were solved by a combination

of state intervention and free market operations. A reorientation of Byzantine trade relations with the Seljuks and Egypt took place, and the Byzantine attitude toward the Italians evolved over time. In addition, the crusades and the crusader states were instrumental in the development and spread of institutions facilitating trade in the entire eastern Mediterranean. These included exchange and negotiation mechanisms and the expansion of the law of salvage, first elaborated in Byzantium (article VIII).

The Byzantine reaction to the early phase of Genoese expansion in the Black Sea is expressed in a letter sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Georgios Kyprios, to Theodoros Mouzalon, the Grand Logothete from the 1280s. It states that Byzantine merchants are compelled to sail with their goods on the ships of the Genoese and presumably also to sell them their merchandise. In addition, the Genoese have neutralized the imperial fleet patrolling the Black Sea, thus preventing it from ensuring the safety of navigation. Angeliki Laiou argued that the letter signals a new attitude of the emperors and the Byzantine elite toward the merchants, elaborated after 1261, which involved support for their activities and the defense of their interests. Twenty years after Georgios Kyprios Patriarch Athanasios I advocated control over the grain trade feeding Constantinople to protect consumers and gave practical advice to prevent the privileged Italians from acquiring a monopoly in this trade. The new attitude toward the Empire's merchants is illustrated by a short-lived attempt to protect their interests by the lowering of the *kommerkion* or trade tax in Constantinople in the late 1340s (article XI).

The influence of the Italians on the Byzantine economy and, more generally, on the destiny of late Byzantium raises the question how much the Byzantines knew about Italy and how much they cared about that region, its people and its politics. The investigation of the three major narrative historians of the fourteenth century reveals an evolution in this respect. George Pachymeres uses 'Italian' as a generic name for Westerners and Catholics and has some knowledge of politics in Italy and of Genoese commercial policy. Some fifty years later John Kantakuzenos and Nikephoros Gregoras revert to the generic name 'Latin'. In the meantime the Empire had lost Asia Minor and there was a growing Byzantine interest in Italy and the Italians, especially in Genoa on which the fate of Constantinople rather than the Empire depended. This shift reflects the weakness of Byzantium and its inclusion in the broader Mediterranean world in which the Italian maritime powers were the main players, the decline of the Byzantine navy being as a major factor in Genoese supremacy in the Black Sea in that period (article X).

Trade between Byzantium and the West also generated cross-cultural exchanges. Venice played a far more important role than Genoa in this respect, as a result of the accelerated expansion of its trade, the establishment of its

colonies, and Venetian settlement in the eastern Mediterranean after the Fourth Crusade. The impact of trade on artistic exchange is reflected by the minor arts and by luxury items. A transfer of marble columns and plaques taken from a temple or a church from the Peloponnese to Venice occurred in 1292. The pivotal function of Crete in trade stimulated the island's economy and artistic symbiosis, illustrated by Venetian and Greek painters. Angeliki Laiou ascribes Corinth's decline after the twelfth century to a large extent to the weakening of its glass production and the flourishing of the Venetian industry, which was already exporting its products to Romania by 1276. The Venetian export of crystal objects and miniatures under crystal was yet another aspect of the substitution of Byzantium by Venice as major producer of precious objects (article IX).

Angeliki Laiou returned to several aspects of the Empire's economic policies and enlarged the scope of her investigation in a study devoted to the interplay between monopoly, protected trade, privileged free trade, and the liberalization of trade conditions from the eighth through the late fourteenth century. The Byzantine economy was never fully controlled or directed, yet the state acted until some time in the eleventh century as a restraining agent. This is primarily illustrated by silk economics. The prohibition to export certain foodstuffs was a protectionist policy safeguarding until the twelfth century the interests of the consumers in times of shortage. By then Italian merchants both exported and traded within the Empire. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries a progressive lowering of duties and the development of a common law of the seas promoted the establishment of an integrated Mediterranean market. The growing role of Byzantium and the Black Sea as sources of grain for the West prompted the Empire to establish some control over its trade, yet the Byzantine quasi-monopoly was replaced by free trade and competition, economic factors that eroded 'national' sovereignty (article XII).

The following study deals with a topic that has not enjoyed the attention it deserves, namely regional trade, based upon exchanges within a limited geographic range and involving commodities produced within that area. Regional trade and the networks fueling it in the Balkans in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods responded to demand that could not be adequately met by local exchange, either because it was too large or because it involved specific industrial products. Large concentrated demand for alimentary products was typically associated with the existence of large cities. Angeliki Laiou dwells upon the distribution of various commodities, including ceramics which offer important insights into regional trade networks. She especially explores the evolution of those related to Constantinople, Thessalonike, Thebes, Corinth, Athens, and Sparta. To emphasize the importance of regional trade she states in her conclusion that it "occupies a nodal place in a society's

economic development. It is the point where both demand and production become differentiated and specialization sets in; where the productive forces of a large segment of the population become active; where demography, urbanization, and monetization meet and reinforce each other; it is the point at which products become commodities” (article XIII).

In the last study included in this volume Angeliki Laiou argued, with the support of chaos theory, that there was a dialectic relation between the political and territorial fragmentation of the Byzantine empire and economic unification in the eastern Mediterranean in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade. The fragmentation initiated in the late twelfth century and accelerated by the Fourth Crusade reached a peak by the end of the fourteenth century. Multipolarity increased the areas of instability and the likelihood of war, to the extent that the small-scale units became unsustainable economically. Networks linking small units in temporary and shifting alliances were cemented by marriage alliances between Byzantium, Serbia, Bulgaria, Trebizond and the Albanians, yet did not halt the process of political and territorial atomization. The absence of large internally self-sufficient, protectionist political units furthered economic integration within an international market organized by and for the profit of Venice and Genoa (article XIV).

The fourteen papers collected in this volume, divided in three groups, duly reflect the intimacy of Angeliki Laiou with an extensive body of primary sources, both Byzantine and non-Byzantine, her analytical power, her novel approaches, partly based on theoretical models elaborated in the social sciences, and the broad range of issues and developments she investigated in original ways.

DAVID JACOBY

*Jerusalem*  
*September 2011*

## The Foreigner and the Stranger in 12th century Byzantium: Means of Propitiation and Acculturation

The categories of "foreigner" and "stranger," are by no means co-terminous. The concept of foreigner is predicated upon a collective self-awareness which depends on ethnic or political identification, signifying those who do not participate in the political group of the subject, the national group in modern societies. The term foreigner often has a juridical meaning. The concept of stranger is both broader and narrower: broader because it would normally encompass that of foreigner without being limited to it; and narrower, because it is dependent on a self-awareness whose boundaries can be much narrower than those of ethnicity: boundaries of clan, of class, of family, of small social groupings. The Byzantines too had different terms to describe the two concepts. The word ξένος meant someone "other" than self, self being a unit of social identification<sup>1</sup>. The word ἀλλότριος has the same significance as ξένος, i.e. someone outside the small grouping, often meaning outside the family<sup>2</sup>. The terms that denote foreigners, i.e. the other by reference to a political unit, are many: τὰ ἔθνη, ἀλλόφυλος, τὸ ἀλλόγλωττον, ἑτερόφυλον ἔθνος, are among them<sup>3</sup>. We will return to these terms.

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Anna Comnena, *Alexias*, ed. REIFFERSCHIED, Leipzig, 1884; I, 114; Anna Dalassena was very accommodating to the poor; her house was open τοῖς ἐξ αἵματος πενομένοις, but also to the ξένοι, who in this case are simply people who were not her relatives. In the poem of Digenes Akrites, the wife of Digenes' father asks her brothers to spare the "stranger," in a passage where the meanings "stranger" and "foreigner" may be subsumed: ἡσχύνετο γὰρ φωραθεῖς, ὡς ξένος ἐροβεῖτο (G II, 481 ff.); "μῆ, πρὸς θεοῦ, ἀδελφιά μου, μὴ ἀδικηθεῖ ὁ ξένος, ὃς δι' ἐμὲ ἠρνήσατο συγγενεῖς καὶ τὴν πίστιν ..." E. TRAPP, *Digenes Akrites: Synoptische Ausgabe der ältesten Versionen*, Vienna, 1971; (G II, 533-534).

<sup>2</sup> Thus used by Choniates, who has John II say, on the occasion of the rebellion of his sister Anna and her husband, ἡ τάξις ἐπ' ἐμοί πως ἀντέστραπται τὸ μὲν γὰρ συγγενὲς πολέμιον εὐρηται, τὸ δ' ἀλλότριον φίλιον; cf. Nicetas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. VAN DIETEN, Berlin, 1975; 11.

<sup>3</sup> ἀλλόφυλος: Choniates, 117; ἀλλόγλωττον, Choniates 125, to be contrasted to "τὸ ὁμόφυλον ὡς ἀλλόγλωττον". ἑτερόφυλον ἔθνος: Choniates, 300. The term "τὰ ἔθνη" is used frequently: see, for example, Choniates, 199, 532. On this term, see H. AHRWEILER, "Citoyens et étrangers dans l'Empire romain d'Orient", in *La nozione di "Romano" tra cittadinanza e universalità*, (Rome 1982), pp. 343-345. For a definition of "foreigner," see J. GILISSEN, "Le statut des étrangers à la lumière de l'histoire comparative", *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin* 9 (1958), 10 ff. I have profited considerably from Jeannette Schmid's presentation at the Symposium (*infra* p. 147-167), and from the bibliographical references she provided, particularly H. TAJFEL, ed., *Differentiation Between Social Groups*, London, New York, San Francisco, 1978, and H. TAJFEL, *Human Groups and Social Categories*, Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney, 1981.

I will concentrate here on the Byzantines' view of the "foreigner" in the twelfth century, with only a passing glance at their view of the "stranger." Furthermore, my discussion will center on a particular point of view. That is the view from the center, the capital, Constantinople. It will be the view of the intellectuals who were also members of the civil bureaucracy, occasionally members of the high clergy, the first reporting or representing, to some extent, but only to some extent, the views of the government, including the Emperors. The inquiry is therefore clearly biased, although the sense of the bias is not necessarily evident. It can, perhaps, be assumed that this group of intellectuals/bureaucrats, which possessed high (but not the highest) social status and created ideology had a well developed conscience of their own group identity, and thus of the difference between themselves and the other<sup>4</sup>. The other strata of the population may have had different concepts of both the foreigner and the stranger, but these will be mentioned only briefly here. Finally, the fact that my inquiry will be limited to the twelfth century needs a little elaboration. The twelfth century was a time of important developments as far as our topic is concerned. The Byzantines lived in a world where contact with foreigners, in the most simplistic definition of the term, not only was constant, but was taking place under new conditions. Western Europe was then in an expansionary phase, undergoing its own process of self-definition; its contacts with Byzantium were aggressive in the political and economic sphere<sup>5</sup>. At the same time, hostile contact with the Turks, the Petchenegs and others was endemic, as also was friendly contact with some foreigners both within the Byzantine Empire and outside it. A little after the turn of the century, the process culminated with the conquest of Constantinople by western European troops, a traumatic event which once again would force a clearer self-definition. Furthermore, the 12th century is marked by the existence of highly educated, perceptive intellectuals, whose writings allow us to try to examine their view of the world and of themselves. What I will discuss is both perceived exclusion and the means of inclusion.

In the twelfth century, traditional Byzantine views of the world, of the place of the Byzantines in it, and therefore of the place of the foreigner, still survive. The Byzantine Empire is, as it always was, still the center of the Universe,

<sup>4</sup> For the cognitive element in self-identification, see HENRI TAJFEL, *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, New York, 1978, 28 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> Among various works on the subject, I note H. HUNGER, *Graeculus Perfidus*, ITAΛOΣ ITAMOΣ, Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell'Arte, Rome, 1987, with earlier bibliography. See also A. P. KAZHDAN, ANNE WHARTON EPSTEIN, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1985, 167-196. G. DAGRON's "'Ceux d'en face': les peuples étrangers dans les traités militaires byzantins," *Travaux et Mémoires*, 10 (1987), 207-232, although it stops before the twelfth century, is very useful for its perceptive analysis of a similar topic.

which is oriented by reference to Constantinople<sup>6</sup>. It is still buffeted by hostile foreigners from all sides. “Ἐως με καὶ δυσμῆ μαχόμενον ἐβλεψεν, τὰ πρὸς ἄμφω τὰς ἡπείρους ἔθνη μετῆλθον,” says the Emperor John II Comnenus on his deathbed, and in Anna Comnena’s narrative the transitional sentence when she shifts from one front of war to another is often a sentence which suggests that the foreigners on either side of the Empire and on the northern frontier do not let the state (and her imperial father) rest<sup>7</sup>. In the perception of the Byzantines, Constantinople remains the center of the world, against which the world measures itself. In the late twelfth century, in a reversion of the model, the city becomes, in the by then jaundiced view of Choniates, a model of evil to the rest of the world, promoting civil war by example: “Fratricide came out of the Queen of Cities, as though from a model, a *typos*, a common law, and it invaded the ends of the earth, so that not only the Persians and the Tauroscythians (Russians), the Dalmatians and the Pannonians, but also the other dynasts of nations (ἔθνη) filled their countries with rebellions and murder, raising their swords against their own people”<sup>8</sup>. What are the factors defining a foreigner, and how do they develop? On the other side of the same coin, what is the definition of self for the Byzantines of this period?

An old, general terminology is still in place: Byzantium is surrounded by people who are called “ἔθνη”, or “βάρβαροι”, (that is, peoples who are acknowledged as having their own distinguishing traits). Such peoples are also called ἀλλόφυλοι or ἑτερόφυλοι, of “other races”, self being the norm<sup>9</sup>. They are identified by specific ethnic names, whether ancient and traditional (Persians, Mysoi, Huns, Latins), or modern: Turks, Bulgarians, Hungarians (Οὔγγροι), Italians, Sicilians, Normans<sup>10</sup>. They are ascribed various ethnic characteristics, again traditional and time-honored: all westerners, for example, are said to be quick to anger, rash, arrogant, much too warlike<sup>11</sup>. These descriptions mostly come from the ethnographic stock of antiquity, which gives them a certain respectability. Contemporary ethnographic observation is kept to a minimum, for the Byzantines

<sup>6</sup> DAGRON, *op.cit.*, 221–224 for the period of Leo VI.

<sup>7</sup> Choniates, 42–43. In the *Alexias*, see, for example, I, 117 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Choniates, 532: ἐκ γὰρ τῆς τῶν πόλεων βασιλίδος ὡσπερ τινὸς ὑπογραμμοῦ καὶ τύπου καὶ κοινοῦ θεμιστεύματος τῆς ἀδελφοκτονίας ἐξιούσης καὶ διαδραμούσης τῆς γῆς τὰ πέρατα, οὐ Πέρσαι μόνον καὶ Ταυροσκῦθαι καὶ οἶδε οἱ Δαλμάται καὶ μετέπειτα Πάνωνες, ἀλλὰ καὶ λοιποὶ ἕτεροι παρ’ ἔθνεσι δυναστεύοντες στάσεων καὶ φόνων τὰς ἐαυτῶν πατρίδας ἐνέπλησαν, καθ’ ὁμογενῶν τὰ ζῆφη σπασάμενοι. For English translation, see HARRY J. MAGOULIAS, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Detroit, 1984, p. 292.

<sup>9</sup> Kinnamos IV.22, III.6; Choniates, 116–117, 86, 90, 133.

<sup>10</sup> Choniates, 52–53 (Turks), 368 ff, 394, 397, 398, 34, 436–37 (Vlachs, Mysoi, Serbs); for the Latins, see Choniates, 357 ff. and HUNGER, *op.cit.* For ethnic descriptions, see also PH. ΚΟΥΚΟΥΛΗΣ, *Θεσσαλονίκης Εὐσταθίου τὰ Λαογραφικά*, II, Athens, 1950, 375ff; on the Latins, 375–378; on the Paiones, 383–385.

<sup>11</sup> See HUNGER, *op.cit.*, pp. 39 ff. for earlier references. Cf. Choniates 166, and 102, 253 on the Armenians.

labored under the burden of an old tradition, going as far back as Herodotus. The historiographic commonplaces by which old traits are ascribed to old and new peoples function in a way similar to the use of classical designations for contemporary peoples, that is, calling the Turks Persians or the Petchenegs Scythians. This is a way of taming the barbarians, by inscribing them in the category of known peoples, for whom there are also known and venerable remedies<sup>12</sup>. Only rarely and briefly do ethnographic observations appear, specifically in the case of the Petchenegs<sup>13</sup>. The nomadic element is stressed, perhaps because nomadic peoples traditionally function as the quintessential foreigner / barbarian. Being on the other side of civilisation, they preserve a fascination, and are given some specific attention. Still, there is nothing like the ethnographic recording of contemporary Western Europe, for example, the description of the Welsh by Gerald of Wales<sup>14</sup>.

So the 12th-century Byzantines could and did use traditional designations for foreigners. These were, as we have seen, stereotypical descriptions and as such incorporated past experiences and past traditions<sup>15</sup>. Nevertheless, the Byzantines were not limited to traditional ways of conceptualising what constituted a foreigner – and what constituted a Roman. Indeed, their view had changed since the tenth century in one very important way. No longer was religion seen to create a community the members of which were held together by common bonds, which transcended whatever other elements differentiated them. Gilbert Dagron has called Christianisation a “savonnette à ethnies,” a factor which blunted ethnic differentiation, and created one Christian community, fundamentally different from that of the world of the pagans or non-Christians, and dividing the world into Christian and non-Christian. In the first half of the twelfth century, reflecting perhaps the late eleventh-century situation, this concept still had a life, at least in rhetorical statements<sup>16</sup>. Anna Comnena could report her father as saying that Christians should not fight each other, and certainly not during major holy days<sup>17</sup>. But in the passages of Kinnamos and Choniates, religion plays a very minor role in defining the foreigner. Peoples long Christianised, like the Bulgarians, the Serbs, the Hungarians, Western Christians are

<sup>12</sup> For the Byzantine use of classical designations, see, among others, DAGRON, *op.cit.*, pp. 213, 217 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Choniates, 93–94.

<sup>14</sup> On the nomads, see also KOUKOULES, *op.cit.*, II, 381, and ROBERT BARTLETT, *Gerald of Wales, 1146–1223*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 161.

<sup>15</sup> On stereotypes, see A. VAN KNIPPERBERG in TAJFEL, *Differentiation*, 171 ff., TAJFEL, in *ibid.*, 5–6, and H. TAJFEL, *Human Groups and Social Categories*, Cambridge, 1981, 104 ff.

<sup>16</sup> DAGRON, *op.cit.*, 220.

<sup>17</sup> *Alexias*, X.9 (vol. II, 87–88). Similarly, Anna Dalassena's and Isaac Comnenus' confiscation of the holy vessels of the Church was justified by the argument that these would be used to free Christians who had been captured by the Turks, so that the Christians would not be 'defiled': *Alexias*, I, 157.

called barbarians just as easily and in the same way as are the Turks or the Petchenegs<sup>18</sup>. As an example of this phenomenon, one may take the letter of Theophylact of Ochrid to Gregorios Taronites, celebrating the latter's victory when he "defeated the arrogance of two nations (ἔθνη)"<sup>19</sup>. Theophylact praises him for having brought down, with a single victory, the tower of "Persian" folly and the mountain of "Frankish" folly (ἀπόνοια, in both cases). The Turks and the Franks are always mentioned together and in a parallel way in this text, and the differentiation between them, although it exists, is subsumed in the similarities: "Because of you, the most godless Turk bends his head and looks only at what is at his feet, he who yesterday cast his insolent eyes (τὰς σοβάδας κόρας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν), everywhere, and thought of destroying the entire earth and the sea. Now, his only hope of salvation lies in treaties . . . And the Frank [Bohemond] who once had an iron neck, now is shown to be softer than wax, and does obeisance to you, and through you to our mighty Emperor . . . For the Turk, forced by your hand, has been persuaded despite himself to make treaties and, among other things, to turn the Frank over to our victorious Emperor . . . All those who bear the name of Christ and who counsel and wish the best for the Empire of the Romans, owe a debt to you."<sup>20</sup> Only occasionally does religion differentiate specifically between Christians and non-Christians: thus, the Turks are called ἀλλόφυλοι καὶ ἀσεβεῖς<sup>21</sup>. And on occasion the church reminded people, including the Emperor himself, that the Turks should not enter churches, whether Santa Sophia or others<sup>22</sup>. On occasion, too, Nicetas Choniates could reproduce a view of the Byzantines and the Turks which had the Bible as a point of reference, and as a model of prose: the Turks were the sons of the servant Hagar, and he asked the Lord how long He would suffer the legitimate heirs, the sons of a free woman, His "holy people" (τὸ σὸν ἅγιον ἔθνος) to be destroyed by the Hagarenes<sup>23</sup>. But this signifies very little. For the same historian records, without adverse comment, the triumphs celebrated in Constantinople by Byzantine Emperors after their victories against Christian nations, and the part played by the Virgin or the saints in such victories; thus invalidat-

<sup>18</sup> Kinnamos IV.22, III.6, Choniates 86, 90, 133, 436–437, 296, 368, 465 ff. (Asen) 474 (northern barbarians, i.e. Scythians and Vlachs); Westerners: Choniates 479.

<sup>19</sup> P. GAUTIER, *Theophylacte d'Achrida, Lettres*. Thessalonika 1980, letter 81. The letter refers to the liberation of either Bohemond, or his cousin, Richard of Salerno, from the emir of Sivas: p. 427 (date of the letter: summer of 1103).

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 429–431. Cf. *Alexias* I, 13–14, where both Toutakh and Roussel de Bailleul are called barbarians; and *ibid.*, I, 54: "οἱ βάρβαροι δοῦλοι τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος."

<sup>21</sup> Choniates, 118. Note also that the Emperor did not allow the defeated Vlachs to be handed over to the Turkish allies, so that they would not renege on their Christian faith: Choniates, 504.

<sup>22</sup> Choniates, 422; also Choniates 123, 175 and Kinnamos V.3.

<sup>23</sup> Choniates, 116–117. These words of Choniates are not borrowed from a specific Biblical reference, at least not verbatim. On the other hand, Biblical references abound in the lament for the fall of Constantinople to the crusaders in 1204: Choniates 576 ff.

ing any special weight we might be tempted to give to Manuel's prayer in Santa Sophia before he left for his ill-fated encounter with the Turks at the battle of Myriokephalon<sup>24</sup>. Prayers, triumphs, the intercession of the saints played a part in all Byzantine wars of the period, whether these were undertaken against pagans or against peoples Christianised long ago<sup>25</sup>. The Christian world-view, differentiating between pagans and Christians, a world-view which had adherents in the tenth century, was no longer operative. Hostile foreigners were, for all intents and purposes, undifferentiated, or differentiated only as to the manner in which one could best deal with them<sup>26</sup>.

Religion in the Middle Ages served as a powerful means of self-identification, and as an important distinguishing trait between one large group and the others, the foreigners. If it did not play this role in twelfth-century Byzantium, what did the Byzantines substitute?

We have, here, an early effort toward a secular definition of ethnicity and of the foreigner. As in Western medieval Europe, there is a duality between one's community and the foreigner, but since the duality no longer functions in religious terms, a secular basis for distinction is sought. The basic distinction the Byzantines made was between the "Romans", i.e. themselves, and the others, the non-Romans. The term "Roman", however, as used in the twelfth century, lacks a specific and consistent content. It certainly lacks any ethnic content. It can function as a means of inclusion as well as of exclusion. Thus, the army which was collected by the Byzantines to fight against the Hungarians (1167) is called a "Roman" army; but Kinnamos who reports its composition says that it was made up of Cumans, Turks, Germans, Serbs, Italian mercenaries and "Romans", the term here designating a subset of the Roman army. This "Roman" army fought against the Hungarians, here qualified as "barbarians", whom they eventually slaughtered<sup>27</sup>. It need hardly be pointed out that the Roman forces included pagans, while the barbarian Hungarians were Christians. Similarly, Manuel I, taking the road to his defeat in Myriokephalon, collected as large an army as he could; to the existing forces, he added foreigners (ξενικὸν οὐκ ὀλίγον), recruited especially among the "Latins" and the "Pari-strian Scyths" (Petchenegs). This medley of peoples, who in other circum-

<sup>24</sup> Choniates, 178.

<sup>25</sup> Choniates, 157, on thanksgiving to the Virgin for victories against the Hungarians; cf. 18–19 and 92–93 (against the Serbs and the Hungarians). Cf. Kinnamos IV. 21.

<sup>26</sup> E.g., Choniates, 199 on Turks and westerners. On ἔθνη, meaning those peoples not subject to the Emperor, and therefore not a part of the οἰκουμένη, see Hunger, *op.cit.*, 34, with references to Keroularios. See also J. GAUDEMET, "L'étranger au Bas Empire", in *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 9 (1956), 217 ff., 129 ff., on religion as a criterion for "Romanness" in the 4th–5th centuries.

<sup>27</sup> Kinnamos VI.7: τοσοῦτος μέντοι βαρβάρων φόνος ἐγένετο . . . ; ὃ πάμμεγα τοῖς βαρβάροις τοῦτοις ἐπὶ ἀμάξης ἐφέρετο . . .

stances would be called barbarian, is called the army of the Romans<sup>28</sup>. It might be added that the Byzantines were perfectly capable of perceiving distinctions between peoples in practice, if not in ideology: a seasoned soldier like John II organized his army by race, so that they would support each other as “friends,” and fight better<sup>29</sup>.

The general phenomenon is well known, and one can give a general explanation. The Byzantines, in good statist fashion, used the term “Roman” with a political meaning: a “Roman” was a Christian subject of the Byzantine emperor, or, at least, someone who temporarily or regularly acted for his interest and on his side. This answer is, indeed, correct, and underlies the argument that Byzantium, in the twelfth century, shows an impressive capacity for assimilating foreigners, and a growing liberalism in its attitude toward foreigners<sup>30</sup>. This is particularly true in the specific context of the assimilation of foreign generals or aristocrats. The explanation, however, which assumes that the Byzantines had a political or statist definition of the foreigner, is neither sufficient, nor entirely accurate. For there were, in the twelfth century, peoples who were Byzantine subjects, but who were considered barbarians, internal barbarians, for example the Bulgarians: Byzantine subjects, not strangers at all, but still foreigners in a sense. Pertinent in this respect is the well-known text of Theophylact, bishop of Ochrid, which discusses his flock, Christians and certainly subjects of the Byzantine Emperor, but clearly differentiated from the “Romans”, and alien to himself: “Here I am,” he says, “serving not a rich, clean, beautiful queen, but the *barbarian dirty slaves* who stink of the pelt of sheep, and are as poor in substance as they are rich in nastiness . . . Rescue me from this shameful servitude, you, who have the power to do so”<sup>31</sup>. From his position of “exile,” he wrote to the bishop of Vidin, telling him that the Cumans, who were attacking his area from the outside (and were pagans) were better than the Bulgarians who inhabited his own diocese<sup>32</sup>. The distinction between Roman and foreigner is not simply a statist distinction: it is also a *cultural* distinction, and becomes increasingly so in the course of the twelfth century, as the intellectuals, at least, strive to define themselves. Under the pressure of political events, the older concepts, the older

<sup>28</sup> Choniates, 178 ff., and *Alexias* I, 209 ff., 250; II, 190. Kinnamos II, 7 (p. 48) mentions as a Roman soldier Poupakes, “a Turk by birth”, who fights against the “barbarians” (i.e., the Turks). For a slight twist on such concepts, see *Alexias* I, 84–85 where the Germans are called a ‘barbarian people who have always served the Roman Emperor’.

<sup>29</sup> Choniates 29–30.

<sup>30</sup> KAZHDAN-EPSTEIN, *op.cit.*, 180, 184. Cf. AHRWEILER, *op.cit.*, 343–345, 348–349; D. A. ZAKYTHINOS, “Byzance, état national ou multinational,” *ΔΧΑΕ*, ser. 4, vol. 10 (1980–81), 29–52.

<sup>31</sup> GAUTIER, *Lettres*, letter 5 (ca. 1088–89), p. 145: πλὴν ὅσον οὐ βασιλίδι δουλεύω πλουσία, καθαρίω τε καὶ καλῇ καὶ συνόλωσ Ἀφροδίτη χρυσῇ, ἀλλὰ δούλοις βαρβάρους ἀκαθάρτοις κινάβρας κωδίων ἀπόζουσιν καὶ πενεστέροις τὸν βίον, ἢ ὅσον τὴν κακοθήειαν πλούσιοι . . . Λύσατέ με τῆς αἰσχρᾶς ταύτης δουλείας οἱ τοῦτο δυνάμενοι . . .

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, letter 57 (1093–1094 or 1095), pp. 323–325.

statist definitions, become dysfunctional, and what remains at the end is a cultural distinction between Romans (increasingly identified as Hellenes) and barbarians. That distinction had always been there, but it emerges with clarity by the end of the twelfth century. Linguistic identification now becomes paramount, language functioning as an indicator of culture, of participation in Greek culture. Self-identification is based on language, a shared classical past, an appreciation of the classics and the virtues of the Greeks.

We can trace the evolution of the concept through a number of texts. Anna Comnena, speaking of John Italos, who was, like his father, Italian by birth but a Byzantine subject, says that he went to Constantinople, and studied with Michael Psellos, whose erudition she admired greatly. But Italos, “because of his barbarous and untutored ways, was unable to comprehend the profound truths of philosophy, nor was he at all capable of accepting his teachers, even in the act of learning, but, full of arrogance and barbaric folly, thought he was better than anyone else, even before he had been taught . . .”<sup>33</sup> This is contrasted to Michael Psellos who, through his own native intelligence and with the help of God and his mother, was able to acquire all the wisdom of the Hellenes and the Chaldaeans. By the mid-twelfth century, when the term “Hellene” becomes more common, the situation is clearer. George Tornikes, Metropolitan of Ephesos and of Greek origin, (i.e. from Greece proper) distinguishes between barbarians and Hellenes, those who are “slaves by nature” (τοῖς φύσει δούλοις) and those who are free (ἐλεύθεροι) (it is implied that they are free also “by nature”); those who speak a barbarous tongue, have barbarous mores and serve the God of war, and those whose tongue and behaviour is Greek, and who are disciples of the Muses and of Hermes: Μή μοι τοῖς βαρβάροις τὸν Ἑλληνα μηδὲ τοῖς φύσει δούλοις τὸν ἐλεύθερον συναπόγραφε ὁ φιλέλλην καὶ φιλελεύθερος<sup>34</sup>. The concept of Roman/Hellene as free by nature and of the barbarian as a slave by nature, perhaps deriving from Aristotle’s *Politics*, becomes common in this period.

The development culminates with Nicetas Choniates. This historian is as inconsistent as anyone in his use of the term “Roman”, and quite subtle in his attitude toward foreigners; an intelligent man, he did not assume the pose of presenting all foreigners, collectively and individually, in a negative way. Furthermore, writing as he was in difficult times, he often presents the Byzantines,

<sup>33</sup> *Alexias*, I, 177–178. Nor did Italos ever learn Greek perfectly: *ibid.*, 180–181. Cf. *Alexias* II, 93, for her well known statement that she could not name the crusaders, because barbarian tongues are ἀναρῆροι.

<sup>34</sup> J. DARROUZÈS, *Georges et Démétrios Tornikès; Lettres et discours*, Paris, 1970, letter 10. He urges John Kamateros, logothete and sevastos, not to prefer a barbarian to a Greek. Cf. p. 235. On the distinction between Greek and barbarian as founded in nature, see Aristotle, *Politics*, I.2. 13–15; I.2, 18–19; cf. Hunger, *op.cit.*, 34–35.

or at least, the inhabitants of Constantinople and their rulers, in a worse light than he does foreigners. Indeed, sometimes the foreigner serves, as he had for Tacitus, for an adverse commentary on contemporary mores: a mirror through which the Byzantines could view their decline. However, Choniates' conceptualisations extend beyond such matters. For he, too, has a view of the collective self, with different connotations from the statist definition of the term "Roman." Events close at home forced him to differentiate between his own people and the foreigners. The accession of foreigners to positions of power in the Byzantine Empire; the expulsion of the Venetians by Manuel I; the capture of Thessaloniki by the Normans, and, finally, the Fourth Crusade were all dramatic events. It is therefore not surprising that they forced self-definition. Choniates is much more conscious than Kinnamos of the ethnic background of highly-placed people, and of the differentiation between them and "true" Romans. He contests a basic principle underlying the concept of Romanity and the practice of the Byzantine state, i.e. the inclusion of foreigners into Byzantine service: thus, his well-known criticism of Manuel I, that he despised the "Romans" as thieves, and used foreigners in his administration, and that the Romans were forced to pay taxes to half-barbarous little men, is inscribed into his larger developing cultural self-definition. The foreigners of whom he speaks are ἀπὸ γένων ἑτερογλώσσων (from races who speak other languages); they have no culture, nor can they speak any Greek: "they have no education, and they search for the traces of the Greek tongue as the peaks and the rocks seek out the reverberating echo of the shepherds' flute"<sup>35</sup>. Similarly, Andronikos I is blamed for appointing as his personal guard barbarian men, totally uncultured, and, for the most part, ignorant of the Greek tongue<sup>36</sup>. Culture is sometimes thought to posit a superiority not only in the arts of peace but in the arts of war, as when Andronikos Kontostefanos makes an oration to his troops before the battle with the Hungarians, and tells them, among other things, that they (here qualified as Romans) are superior to the barbarians in reason and culture, and thus in their knowledge of strategy<sup>37</sup>.

Given the historical circumstances, it is not surprising that Choniates' most clear-cut definition of "foreigner" is undertaken in connection with Western Europe. This is understandable for other reasons as well. For it was the western Europeans who were most visible at Constantinople. It was they who were closest to the "Romans", they with whom the "Romans" had had close historical and ecclesiastical ties, they whom Constantine VII had considered alone

<sup>35</sup> Choniates, 204–205, 209. Cf. M. Psellos, *Chronographie*, II, 35. On language as an important defining characteristic, cf. Choniates, 322.

<sup>36</sup> Choniates, 322: Ἑλληνίδος φωνῆς.

<sup>37</sup> Choniates, 154–155.

worthy of marrying Byzantine princesses<sup>38</sup>. It was, therefore, with them that the problem of differentiation had always been the most difficult. Choniates' reaction is a refuge into cultural differences. The capture of Thessalonika by the Normans he ascribes to profound hatred against the Greeks: "ἀνὴρ μισορρώμιοις καὶ τοσαύτην ἀποθησαυρίσας ἐν ἑαυτῷ καθ' Ἕλληνας ἀνδρὸς τὴν ἀπέχθειαν ..."<sup>39</sup>. The fall of Constantinople in 1204 urges the historian to press this Hellenic identification still further, as he does the differentiation with the western barbarians. Constantinople, "the beautiful city of Constantine," had been the common pride (ἐντρύφημά τε καὶ περιάλημα) of all the nations; it was captured and looted by wind-sown western races, mostly unknown and nameless<sup>40</sup>. These westerners were barbarians, ignorant of the Graces and the Muses<sup>41</sup>. The lament addressed to the statue of Helen of Troy, melted down by the crusaders, reflects the cultural identification: Helen was "the prize of Greeks and Trojans." Fully aware of the fact that the Franks considered themselves to be descendants of the Trojans, Choniates considers for a moment the possibility that they melted down the statue in revenge for the burning of Troy; but he cannot believe it, for he knows that these men are above all rapacious and money-grubbing. Besides, he says, "how can these unlettered and totally ignorant barbarians have read and known the epic verses written for you – 'it were no shame for the Trojans and the well-greaved Achaeans to have suffered so long over such a woman. For she resembles the immortal Goddesses'"<sup>42</sup>. In this passage, the identification is clear: the Byzantines, i.e., Choniates' Byzantines, who knew Homer, and cherished the ancient statues, are the descendants of the ancient Greeks; the foreigners are barbarians, and the westerners cannot even be the descendants of the Trojans, i.e. they have no respectable classical antecedents. The Byzantines stand alone, as they did in the past – but not as the Christian *oikoumene*; rather, as the cultural heirs of ancient Greece. This becomes clear, too, when Choniates speaks of the crusaders' progress into Greece – the area normally known as the *κατωτικὰ μέρη*. The text is replete with classical cultural references: there is Corinth, glorious of old; Pylos, the birth-place of Nestor; Lakonia; Alpheios, the "Greek river" ("Ἕλληνας ποταμὸν Ἀλφειῖον), which is being beseeched not to allow victory to the barbarians<sup>43</sup>. The self-iden-

<sup>38</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed., transl. GY. MORAVCSIK, R.J.H. JENKINS, Washington, D. C., 1967, p. 70: *διάταξις φοβερά ... ἐναπογέγραπται ... τοῦ μηδέποτε βασιλέα Ῥωμαίων συμπενθεριάσαι μετὰ ἔθνους παρηλλαγμένοις καὶ ξένοις ἔθεσι χρωμένον τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς καταστάσεως, μάλιστα δὲ ἀλλοπίστου καὶ ἀβασπιστοῦ, εἰ μὴ μετὰ μόνων τῶν Φράγγων ...*

<sup>39</sup> Choniates, 301.

<sup>40</sup> Choniates, 585: *ἠδάλωται πυρὶ καὶ ἡμαύρωται ... παρὰ γενῶν ἐσπερίων σποραδικῶν, ἀφανερῶν τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ ἀνωνύμων ... Cf. Choniates, 576.*

<sup>41</sup> Choniates, 598.

<sup>42</sup> Choniates, 652–653.

<sup>43</sup> Choniates, 610–611.

tification is now complete and obvious: the “Romans”, for Choniates still speaks of Romans, are in fact the descendants of the Hellenes. What is paramount in this self-definition is the Greek language and classical culture. The foreigners are those who do not participate in this culture, Christian though they may be. This self-definition is the result of a crisis.

It may be argued that the crisis, in its multiple forms, created a situation in which the concept “Roman” no longer provided sufficient means of self-identification to the members of the group we are examining. This is perhaps connected with the entrance of non-Greek speakers, or people of non-Greek culture into the “Roman” ruling class; those who spoke Greek and partook of a high Hellenic culture, i.e., the members of the upper bureaucracy, civil and ecclesiastic, would thus necessarily focus on language and culture as an important element of differentiation and group identification<sup>44</sup>. The insufficiency and non-functionality of the term “Roman”, a statist term, is certainly also connected with the growing inadequacy and eventual dissolution of the twelfth-century state. Furthermore, the development of terminology carries with it a somewhat increased exclusivity. We start with a broad, flexible, open-ended concept of “Romans” (in the statist sense) versus non-Romans. This, then, develops into a differentiation between Greeks and barbarians. The older concept was potentially highly inclusive. The new concept is more restrictive, but remains weak, and still allows the assimilation of some foreigners. It is true, as Hunger has argued, that once one qualifies the foreigners as “barbarians”, they are then assumed to have certain characteristics by nature, that is, the nature of a barbarian<sup>45</sup>. But at the same time, acquiring Greek culture, or becoming part of the Byzantine social fabric, can act as a purifier, cleansing people of their barbarity. The boundaries of foreignness become stricter, but are still elusive.

In order to underline the fluidity of the Byzantine concept, one might usefully contrast it with a strain in western European attitudes toward foreigners, that strain which is exemplified by the historical accounts of the First Crusade, and the *Song of Roland* (early twelfth century). In these writings, the differentiation of self and other is stark. The *Song of Roland* is much the clearest text, as works of literature often are. In the poem there is an express parallelism between the behavior and society of the Christians and the Muslims – a parallelism which is structural and conceptual. The political process, for example, is exactly the same in both camps. There is a process of consultation, a feudal court, with

<sup>44</sup> See TAJFEL, *Differentiation*, 5, on stereotypes as providing rationalisations for keeping others at bay.

<sup>45</sup> For the ancient Greek distinction between barbarians and Hellenes, see HUNGER, *op.cit.*, 20–21, and J. JUETHNER, *Hellenen und Barbaren; aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins*, Leipzig, 1923, 70.

which the poem opens: first in Saragossa, i.e. the Muslim court, then in Charlemagne's court; Charlemagne has twelve peers, as does the kings of the Saracens; Charlemagne meets a brave enemy in the Egyptian sultan Baligant. The means of battle are essentially the same, the heroes having special horses, swift steeds with pedigrees and names, and individual swords, with a pedigree, a history and a name. The Christian Trinity is paralleled by the fictitious Muslim trinity. In short, here are two societies, very similar to each other, conceived in feudal terms. But there is one difference, which hovers above the similarities, and makes the two societies clearly antithetical. That is, of course, religion, which creates a stark and unbridgeable differentiation, encapsulated in a line of the poem, "Christians are right, Saracens are wrong." That means that the Saracens do not and cannot exist in a natural world, with its own moral and legal differentiations. They cannot be rightful lords or good knights; they cannot be pious. What they can be and are by definition is the negative aspect of a duality; they are the evil in a world separated by religion into good and evil. Even their names bear witness to this fact: thus there is Falseron, whose name carries a character evaluation, and whose description is that of an ugly man, with a huge head and a fearful aspect. Often, such characters are pitted against specific Christians, in fights with powerful symbolic overtones.

The parallelism of the two societies posits a duality: the other, the foreigner, who is also the enemy, is a negative image of self. The contact between the two is a cosmic conflict of good and evil. For example, Roland, the hero, a man surrounded by light, is pitted against Chernuble, "the ruler of that land men call the Hills of Darkness . . . In that land, they say,/ The sun shines not, nor rain nor gentle dew/ Fall from the heavens, and not a grain of corn/ May ripen; no stone is there that isn't solid black; some say it is the Devil's habitation"<sup>46</sup>. In a generalised way, the war between what might have been two feudal forces becomes a cosmic battle between good and evil, the forces of light and the forces of darkness, the true God and the false deities, as can be seen in the reaction of nature itself to the fighting: "And meanwhile, far away in France, a storm/ Of rushing wind and thunder swept the land,/ And rain and hail were mingled, and the earth/ Trembled, and over all was fearful darkness,/ Save where the sky was split by thunderbolts,/ From Sens to Saint Michael of the Sea./ From East to West there is no house in France/ Unshaken and men cry 'It is the end!/ The end of all the world!' They do not know the truth. Alas! It is the sorrowing/ Of

<sup>46</sup> The translation used here is partly from F. B. LUQUIENS, *The Song of Roland*, MacMillan paperback ed., 1964, p. 35, and partly from R. HARRISON, *The Song of Roland*, Mentor paperback ed., 1970, p. 82. For the French original, see T. ATKINSON JENKINS, *La Chanson de Roland*, Boston, New York, 1924.

land and sea and sky for Roland's death!"<sup>47</sup> To this duality there is only one solution: return to unicity, by the destruction of the enemy: either physical destruction, i.e. extermination, or moral destruction, i.e. conversion.

The Song of Roland is, as I have suggested, the clearest statement of this attitude; and it is also the most powerful, because of its literary value. But the views it expresses are in complete accord with those of the writers who wrote on the First Crusade. The Turks, for them, were "an accursed race, a race utterly alienated from God, a generation forsooth which has not directed its heart and has not entrusted its spirit to God ..."<sup>48</sup> Compare this with the description of Abysme in the *Song of Roland*: "spotted with many sins, believing not in God, the son of Mary, loving ... treason and murder of his fellow man"<sup>49</sup>. The ultimate statement is perhaps made in the *Gesta Francorum*, where the bravery of the Turks is posited and then negated: "What man ... would dare to write of the skill and prowess and courage of the Turks? ... Yet, please God, their men will never be as good as ours ... If only they had stood firm in the faith of Christ ... and had been willing to accept One God in three persons ... you could not find stronger or braver or more skillful soldiers; and yet, by God's grace, they were beaten by our men"<sup>50</sup>. The translation of this attitude into action is to be found in the *Annales Augustani*: "Hierosolima a duce Gotefrido et sequacibus eius est capta; religio christiana per provintias dilatatur; barbari omnes aut extincti aut fugati sunt"<sup>51</sup>. As for the army of Charlemagne in the *Song of Roland*, it is composed of all those who were, in the early twelfth century, Catholic Christians, and its enemies were those who were, historically or in actuality, not orthodox Christians: Frenchmen – Normans, Burgundians, Bretons – Flemings and some Germans (Bavarians, Burgundians, Frisians); against an army composed of the Egyptian, African and Spanish contingents, Persians and Turks – all Muslim; but also Slavs (Christian or not, is not clear) and Petchenegs, still pagan; Avars

<sup>47</sup> LUQUIENS, p. 50. I have changed his "Xanten" into "Sens". See *Chanson de Roland*, note to line 1428.

<sup>48</sup> Robert the Monk. *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux* III, Paris, 1866, p. 727. Translation from E. PETERS, *The First Crusade*, Philadelphia, 1971, p. 2. On this topic, see W. TAVERNIER, *Zur Vorgeschichte des altfranzösischen Rolandliedes*, Berlin, 1903.

<sup>49</sup> LUQUIENS, p. 52.

<sup>50</sup> *Gesta*, 21. To be compared with the *Song of Roland*: "Were he but a Christian, he'd be a rightful Lord". (fust chrestiens, asez ouïst barnet, 1.899; cf. Solimannus ... vir nobilissimus, sed gentilis ... Albert of Aix, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux* IV, 314). Intelligent leaders could use such widespread attitudes to good effect. Thus, Bohemond captured some Petchenegs who served in Alexios I's army and took them to Italy where he displayed them, calling them "Παγάνους ἄνω καὶ κάτω" in order to show that Alexios was using infidels against the Christians and thus give force to his argument for a virtual crusade against Byzantium: *Alexias* II, 168.

<sup>51</sup> Ed. G. H. PERTZ, *MGH SS* 3: 135. cf. BENJAMIN Z. KEDAR, *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims*, Princeton, 1984, p. 65.

and Huns, long defunct; Hungarians (already Christianised); Armenians, Bulgarians, and Byzantines.

The duality which we find in these texts is powerful, the self-identification is clear, the foreigner is the enemy, easy to identify and easy to describe, as a negative image of self, with religion as the main identifier of self. In Byzantium of the twelfth century, this was never the case, if it ever had been the case in the past. There is no equivalent to the *Song of Roland* in literature or historiography, nor is there an equivalent to the uncompromising western concept of the foreigner. In Choniates, the duality of Roman-barbarian, or Roman-Helene is present, but it dissolves under pressure: the barbarians of various sorts have strange mores, and are described as beasts of various kinds; but the Emperor Andronicus I is also a beast, a θήρ<sup>52</sup>. This may be the result of Choniates' own alienation, or of societal malaise: the positive correlation of "Roman" and good attributes no longer holds<sup>53</sup>. A clear example of this alienation is provided by Choniates' description of civil strife in the Empire: καὶ κατ' ἀλλήλων ἐκπεπολέμωτο τὸ ὁμόφυλον βαρβαρωθὲν καὶ τῆς συγγενείας νόμους ἠγνοηκός<sup>54</sup>. At the same time, Frederick Barbarossa, enemy of the Emperor and of the Byzantines, is an admirably pious man, and duly admired by Choniates<sup>55</sup>. The power of religion is rarely invoked, and martyrs are rarely accommodated; an exceptional case is that of Theodore Gavras, whom Zonaras calls a martyr because he fell in battle against the Turks<sup>56</sup>. In the romance of Digenes Akrites, dualities become resolved, the hero himself is the embodiment of the conciliation of two cultures, and what remains is a disturbingly individualistic definition of self and a broad but not inflexible definition of the foreigner. The hero is "ἔθνηκός μὲν ἀπὸ πατρός, ἐκ δὲ μητρὸς ῥωμαῖος"<sup>57</sup>. When he builds his palace, no "Roman, Saracen, Persian or inhabitant of Tarsus" dares come near; his identification with the Romans is slight indeed.

The Byzantine concept of foreigner in the twelfth century was subject for one thing to political considerations: this was to some extent connected to the concept of self as Roman, i.e. to the statist definition, which officially considered as Romans those newcomers (whether they be peoples or individuals) who served the Byzantine Empire or became subjected to it<sup>58</sup>. It also varies according to the sources and the nature of the source: official state documents sometimes contain a different concept of the foreigner than do narrative sources, which can

<sup>52</sup> Choniates, 254, 272, 283.

<sup>53</sup> On the emotional component of group membership, see TAJFEL, *Differentiation*, 28.

<sup>54</sup> Choniates, 263.

<sup>55</sup> Choniates, 416–417.

<sup>56</sup> Zonaras 3, 739.

<sup>57</sup> E. TRAPP, *Digenes Akrites*, G. IV. 1002.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. GAUDEMET, *op. cit.*, 218 ff. for similar attitudes in the late Roman Empire.

present a more hostile picture of the foreigner. This may be due to differences between conceptualisation and actual behavior<sup>59</sup>. It is also connected with cultural biases, or with a cultural definition of the foreigner, and therefore becomes clearer by the end of the twelfth century. In both kinds of sources one must distinguish between friendly and unfriendly foreigners.

The ambivalence and relative open-endedness of the Byzantine official concept of foreigner may be seen in connection with the Venetians who, because initially they were formally a part of the Byzantine Empire, had in any case an ambivalent position<sup>60</sup>. In the privileges granted to them, the Venetians are sometimes treated as foreigners and sometimes as Byzantines. The first privilege, granted by Basil II at the end of the tenth century, calls them *extraneos*: contrasting them to those who were *sub manu nostra*, even though the Venetians were still subjects of the Byzantine Emperor<sup>61</sup>. In the chrysobull of 1082, they are considered as *recti* (or *fideles*) *duli imperii mei*. They have the right to inhabit and receive revenues from landed property in Constantinople and Durazzo – although the right to own it is not explicitly stated<sup>62</sup>. The reason why the Venetians are now considered Byzantines is political: it is the help the Venetians gave Alexius I against Robert Guiscard. This mark of Venetian devotion is repeated some generations later: John II says “*fideliū gesta Veneticorum nullus de hominibus ignoravit*”<sup>63</sup>. More than one hundred years after the fact, in 1187, Isaac II Angelus still remembers, as the clearest token of Venetian devotion to the Byzantine Empire, their help against Guiscard. His predecessors, he says, because of this, made them into *one body with Romania, under one head, the Emperor*<sup>64</sup>. This, however, is rhetorical, since the Venetians are later called *amici fideles*, who have for the Byzantine Empire *fides, servitus* and *amor*, suggesting that they are not, in fact, the same as Romans<sup>65</sup>. In 1189, the same Emperor, at a moment when he is courting the Venetians and negotiating the restoration of the property confiscated by Manuel I, produces another rhetorical statement: “*verumtamen, quia non ut alienigenas, immo ut aborigines*

<sup>59</sup> The point was made by Jeannette Schmid in discussion.

<sup>60</sup> On this topic, see R. S. LOPEZ, “Foreigners in Byzantium,” in *Bulletin de l’Institut belge de Rome* 44 (1974), pp. 341–352, and P. SCHREINER, “Untersuchungen zu den Niederlassungen westlicher Kaufleute im Byzantinischen Reich des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts,” *Byzantinische Forschungen* 7 (1979), pp. 175–191.

<sup>61</sup> J. and P. ZEPOS, *Jus Graecoromanum I*, Athens, 1931, 260; F. THIRIET, *Le Romaine vénitienne au moyen âge*, Paris, 1975, p. 34 and R. -J. LILIE, *Handel und Politik*, Amsterdam, 1984, 3, n. 6.

<sup>62</sup> S. BORSARI, “Il Crisobullo di Alessio I”, *Annali dell’ Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici*, Naples, 1970, 115; G. TAFEL and G. THOMAS, *Urkunden zur Älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, Venice, 1856, I, pp. 43 ff. Cf. LILIE, 11, THIRIET, *op. cit.*, 39.

<sup>63</sup> *JGR* I, 139; Cf. Kinnamos, Bonn, 281; BORSARI, 116.

<sup>64</sup> *JGR* I, 437 (1187).

<sup>65</sup> *JGR* I, 438.

*Romanos genus Veneticorum nostra serenitas reputat*<sup>66</sup>. The reason is, by now, familiar to us: “*Tantumque pro Romania dolent, quantum et ipsi Romani, tantamque erga eam habent devotionem, quantam et erga terram qua eos emisit*”. They are Romans, at least *ab origine*, because of their devotion to the Byzantine cause. By 1199, the situation is even more complex: the privilege of Alexios Angelos distinguishes (I think for the first time) between Venetians and Greeks (*Grecos*), in connection with judicial disputes; it makes specific arrangements for the resolution of judicial disputes between Venetians and Greeks; it provides (at the request of the Venetians) for the disposition of the property of a Venetian who might die in the Byzantine Empire, which must be handed over to his heirs, even if he dies without a testament, or to his *fideicommissarii*; and it mentions a novel (lost) of Manuel I, which regulated judicial matters “*inter extraneos et indigenas*”<sup>67</sup>. There is, thus, a vacillation of the official position, in which the Venetians are treated both as foreigners and as quasi-Byzantines. The vacillation is reflected in the fact that for one hundred years the privileges granted to the Venetians did not make specific dispositions for things such as ownership of property, rights of succession, judicial procedure, i.e., those things which might distinguish between a foreigner and a Byzantine subject. The chrysobull of 1199 treats the Venetians as foreigners in a new, more formal way, which may have something to do with the Venetians’ own need for regulated relationships; the judicial dispositions are perhaps connected with the development of laws regarding foreigners in western Europe<sup>68</sup>.

The ambiguity of the official position is reproduced in the narrative sources, but with significant differences. Kinnamos, describing a highly charged political situation (Manuel’s opposition to Frederick Barbarossa in Italy in the 1160s), has a Byzantine envoy, Chalouphes, say to the Venetians: “Since out of the rest who exist under his sway (ὕπὸ τὴν παλάμην τελοῦσι αὐτοῦ) he (Manuel) is particularly confident of your gratitude,” thus making the Venetians almost into subjects of the Byzantine Empire<sup>69</sup>. For the rest, Kinnamos distinguishes clearly the Venetians from the “Romans”. He focuses on their hostile actions against the Byzantines. He has Manuel I saying to them that they had “poured into the Romans’ state as vagabonds (ἀλήτται) gripped by poverty”<sup>70</sup>. He does not actually call them barbarians, but he describes them as follows: “ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἔθ-

<sup>66</sup> *JGR* I, 454.

<sup>67</sup> *JGR* I, 479.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. M. BOULET-SAUTEL, “L’aubain dans la France coutumière,” *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, II Brussels (1956), 65 ff., and GILISSEN, *ibid.*, 46 ff. There is a debate concerning the exact effect of the privilege on the juridical status of the Venetians: see LILIE, *op. cit.*, 47–48, 105.

<sup>69</sup> Kinnamos, 230: cf. “sub manu eius” of the chrysobull of 992. cf. Choniates 173: ἰσοπολίταις οὖσι Ῥωμαίοις.

<sup>70</sup> Kinnamos, 285.