

© Copyrighted Material

# Contact and Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean, 1204–1453

Crusade, Religion and Trade  
between Latins, Greeks and Turks

*Edited by*

Nikolaos G. Chrissis  
*University of Athens, Greece*

Mike Carr  
*British School at Rome, Italy*

**ASHGATE**

© Copyrighted Material

# Contents

<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>List of Contributors</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Maps</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xvii</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xix</i>

Introduction	1
<i>Nikolaos G. Chrissis and Mike Carr</i>	

## **PART I: FRANKISH GREECE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST**

1	New Frontiers: Frankish Greece and the Development of Crusading in the Early Thirteenth Century	17
	<i>Nikolaos G. Chrissis</i>	
2	The Latin Empire and Western Contacts with Asia	43
	<i>Bernard Hamilton</i>	

## **PART II: BYZANTINE REACTIONS TO THE LATINIS**

3	Golden Athens: Episcopal Wealth and Power in Greece at the Time of the Crusades	65
	<i>Teresa Shawcross</i>	
4	Demetrius Kydones' 'History of the Crusades': Reality or Rhetoric?	97
	<i>Judith Ryder</i>	

## **PART III: LATINIS BETWEEN GREEKS AND TURKS IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY**

5	Trade or Crusade? The Zaccaria of Chios and Crusades against the Turks	115
	<i>Mike Carr</i>	
6	Sanudo, Turks, Greeks and Latins in the Early Fourteenth Century	135
	<i>Peter Lock</i>	

**PART IV: THE OTTOMANS' WESTERN 'FRONTIER'**

7	A Damascene Eyewitness to the Battle of Nicopolis: Shams al-Dīn Ibn al-Jazarī (d. 833/1429) <i>İlker Evrim Binbaş</i>	153
8	Bayezid I's Foreign Policy Plans and Priorities: Power Relations, Statecraft, Military Conditions and Diplomatic Practice in Anatolia and the Balkans <i>Rhoads Murphey</i>	177
	Conclusion <i>Bernard Hamilton</i>	217
	<i>Index</i>	227

# Introduction

*Nikolaos G. Chrissis and Mike Carr*

One could be excused for feeling hesitant before delving into the world of Greece and the Aegean in the late medieval period. The complexity and fluidity of political circumstances alone can make any examination of the area a daunting task. Following the capture of Constantinople by the army of the Fourth Crusade in 1204, all semblance of political unity from the eastern coast of the Adriatic to the littoral of Asia Minor and the Black Sea disappeared. The Frankish and Venetian conquerors carved up a multitude of dominions out of the Byzantine territories, while no less than three Greek states (not to mention several semi-independent *archontes*) surfaced from the ruins of imperial collapse and claimed the inheritance of Byzantium. This situation was complicated further in the fourteenth century by the appearance of a number of independent Turkish principalities, known as beyliks, on the Byzantine Anatolia frontier. The Turks soon replaced Greek control in the region, with the Ottomans eventually emerging as the dominant power amongst them. Thus, between the disintegration of the Byzantine Empire after 1204 and the consolidation of Ottoman power in the mid-fifteenth century, the area was an incredibly complex mosaic of peoples, religions and polities.

The need for research that cuts across sub-disciplinary boundaries, so often emphasized and widely acknowledged in modern historiography, is even more keenly felt with regard to this world of extreme political and religious fragmentation. Exploring the full range of interactions between Orthodox Greeks, Catholic Latins and Muslim Turks is a challenge for most individual scholars, not only on the basic level of linguistic skills needed to approach the available sources, but even more so on account of the diverse social relations and political and cultural traditions of each one of these groups. This was the stimulus for us to organize the conference on *Contact and Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean* in the summer of 2010 at the Institute of Historical Research in London, which eventually resulted in the present volume. Our main aim was, and remains, to contribute to a better understanding of the subject by combining the work of specialists in western medieval, Byzantine and Ottoman studies.

\* \* \*

Addressing issues of interaction between different ethnic and religious groups is par for the course for much of the historiography on the eastern Mediterranean in the Middle Ages – or in any other historical period for that matter. Yet, collective efforts dedicated to examining such cross-cultural and inter-religious contacts are

rarer than one might expect for the post-1204 Byzantine East, and certain aspects of contact and conflict in the region have not received due attention.

It has been more than 20 years since the volume *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* was published.<sup>1</sup> It was a seminal work, two contributors and one editor of which actually participated in the *Contact and Conflict* conference. Many of the essays in that volume are classics, still useful (and much used) to this day. Nonetheless, there have been major advances since then, for example, in the thriving field of crusade studies; furthermore, the 1989 volume focused on the interaction between Greeks and Latins without for the most part bringing into the discussion the third element, the Turks, except for a single contribution.<sup>2</sup> A number of volumes on eastern–western interaction in the context of the crusades have come out since, but the majority of them focus mostly on Outremer; when they address the Byzantine East it is usually for the period before and up to the Fourth Crusade. Meanwhile, works that consider western interaction with the Turks usually focus on the period after 1453, largely outside of the context of the crusades.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, there is a tendency in such collective works for the voice of specialists in the history

---

<sup>1</sup> Benjamin Arbel, Bernard Hamilton and David Jacoby (eds), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (London: Frank Cass, 1989) [= *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 4/1 (1989)].

<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth Zachariadou, ‘Holy War in the Aegean during the Fourteenth Century’, in Arbel, Hamilton and Jacoby, *Latins and Greeks*, pp. 212–25. Cf. the focus on the two sides in Martin Hinterberger and Christopher Schabel (eds), *Greeks, Latins and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011). The recent volume by Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillan (eds), *Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), also focuses on Greek, Latin and Slav perspectives and does not include chapters dedicated to the Muslims, which is for the most part understandable as it deals primarily with the period 1204 to 1261 from a Byzantine point of view.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Vladimir Goss (ed.), *The Meeting of Two Worlds: Cultural Exchange between East and West during the Period of the Crusades* (Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1986), which includes three contributions of Byzantine interest by Runciman, Nicol and Abrahamsy, for the most part examining the pre-1204 period. Similar emphasis on Outremer is given in Conor Kostick (ed.), *The Crusades and the Near East: Cultural Histories* (London: Routledge, 2011). The excellent volume by Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (eds), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), focuses heavily on the period before the thirteenth century, with the exception of contributions on art and the economy by Bouras, Gerstel and Jacoby. For a collection which includes much on cross-cultural contacts during the later period, see David Blanks and Michael Frassetto (eds), *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of the Other* (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1999); and also the two useful review articles by Eric R. Dursteler, ‘On Bazaars and Battlefields: Recent Scholarship on Mediterranean Cultural Contacts’, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 15 (2011), pp. 413–34; and Francesca Trivellato, ‘Renaissance Italy and the Muslim Mediterranean in Recent Historical Works’, *Journal of Modern History*, 82 (2010), pp. 127–55. On intercultural contacts in the context of trade, see also the forthcoming volume: Georg Christ, Stefan Burkhardt, Roberto Zaugg et al.

of the Muslim world not to be heard as much as that of their western medievalist colleagues.<sup>4</sup> The present volume, therefore, is almost unique in bringing together research by medievalists, Byzantinists and Ottomanists in order to explore relations between Greeks, Latins and Turks over the entire period from 1204 to 1453.<sup>5</sup>

The essays presented here explore various factors that defined contact and conflict between the three sides, with a view to highlighting salient themes that run through this period, as well as evaluating some wider changes that occurred over time. The volume lays particular emphasis on the crusades and the way they affected interaction in this area in the late Middle Ages. The reason for this is twofold. Crusade studies have attracted considerable scholarly interest in recent years and the impact of the crusades on Byzantine history up to 1204 has been repeatedly examined in the past.<sup>6</sup> However, there has been little work on the way crusading was implemented in the area from the thirteenth century onwards.<sup>7</sup> As a crusading front, Frankish Greece and the Aegean is relatively unexploited by comparison to other theatres of activity, such as Outremer, Iberia or the Baltic. Secondly, the crusade can provide narrative and thematic cohesion to an otherwise baffling nexus of shifting relations in a region which lacked a clearly identified political centre for over two-and-a-half centuries. Nevertheless, the contributions included here are by no means limited to crusading *per se* but rather use it as a starting point to examine

(eds), *Union in Separation: Trading Diasporas in the Eastern Mediterranean (1200–1700)* (Heidelberg: Springer, forthcoming 2014).

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, Benjamin Arbel (ed.), *Intercultural Contacts in the Medieval Mediterranean* (London: Frank Cass, 1996) [= *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 10/1–2 (1995)] where, out of 24 contributors, only two are scholars of the Muslim world.

<sup>5</sup> A collective volume with a similar approach came out while the present volume was in the final stages of preparation, confirming that this is indeed a fruitful direction to be followed in studying the region in this era: Jonathan Harris, Catherine Holmes and Eugenia Russell (eds), *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean World after 1150* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

<sup>6</sup> Most extensively in Jonathan Harris, *Byzantium and the Crusades* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2003); and Ralph-Johannes Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States, 1096–1204*, trans. J.C. Morris and Jean E. Ridings (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

<sup>7</sup> This has been the focus of our research: Nikolaos G. Christis, *Crusading in Frankish Greece: A Study of Byzantine–Western Relations and Attitudes, 1204–1282* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012); Michael Carr, ‘Motivations and Response to Crusades in the Aegean, c. 1300–1350’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2011). Researchers of the later crusades are largely indebted to the works of Norman Housley, who remains the authority on the later crusades in general: Norman Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); idem, *The Avignon Papacy and the Crusades, 1305–1378* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); idem, *Crusading and Warfare in Medieval and Renaissance Europe*, Variorum Reprints (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001); idem, *Religious Warfare in Europe, 1400–1536* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); idem, *Crusading and the Ottoman Threat, 1453–1505* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

various aspects of contact, including trade, interfaith relations and geographical exploration.

The present volume, therefore, makes available original research in the form of new interpretations, themes and sources, but at the same time it is also meant to make the history of the region in this period more widely accessible. In particular, this collection of essays aims to familiarize those with an interest in the area (whether Byzantinists, crusade historians or Ottomanists) with the latest advances in the other relative fields. Bearing this in mind, in this volume we have all attempted to explain our findings in terms intelligible to those working outside our particular sub-fields, and to outline the relevant debates in our areas of expertise when appropriate. Similarly, even though this introduction is not meant as a detailed survey of the current state of research on Frankish Greece and the Aegean, we hope that it will provide the reader with a basic bibliographical background to some of the works which we feel are most relevant to this field.<sup>8</sup>

### **Historical Outline: Frankish Greece and the Aegean, 1204–1453**

Latin presence in *Romania* (Ρομανία) was from the outset fragmented. Though the Latin emperor installed in Constantinople was theoretically the overlord of all the former imperial domains, in practice his direct control extended to a rather limited territory on both sides of the Straits and to some of the nearby islands in the northern Aegean. Nominally the heir of the political institutions of Byzantium, it proved difficult for both the Latin emperor and the strongest lords among the Frankish host to shake off their feudal background. Combined with the patchy and piecemeal progress of the conquest, this resulted in the establishment of some practically autonomous Latin ‘crusader’ states in Greek lands, the most important of which, besides the Latin Empire, were the kingdom of Thessalonica, the duchy of Athens and Thebes, the principality of Achaia and the duchy of the Archipelago (in the Cyclades). Alongside these feudal lordships, there were also several Venetian colonies administered by representatives of the metropolis, while still under the obligation to provide support to the Latin emperor. The most important Venetian possessions were Modon and Coron in the Peloponnese, and Crete which remained in the hands of the *Serenissima* until the seventeenth century.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Given the introductory nature of this attempt to bring together work from different sub-fields, there is an emphasis on English-language publications, which are more widely accessible for both students and scholars, though we have included some major and indispensable works in other languages. Additional references to notable works on the major relevant topics can be found in the individual chapters.

<sup>9</sup> For the Frankish states, see: Lock, *Franks*; David Jacoby, ‘The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Frankish States in Greece’, *NCMH*, vol. 5, pp. 525–42; idem, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale: Les ‘Assises de Romanie’, sources, application et diffusion* (Paris: Mouton, 1971); Peter Topping, *Studies on Latin Greece, AD 1205–1715* (London:

On the eve of the attack on Constantinople, the Frankish and Venetian crusaders had drawn up a document dividing all the lands of the empire among themselves. A complete conquest was never achieved, however. Three successor Byzantine states were set up at Nicaea in Asia Minor, at Arta in Epiros and at Trebizond on the coast of the Black Sea. Trebizond was soon cut off from most of the developments further west, but Nicaea and Epiros were to play a central role in the affairs of Greece and the Aegean as major rallying points for resistance to the Latins.<sup>10</sup>

With the exception of a brief period under the inspired leadership of the Latin emperor Henry of Hainault (1206–16), the Latins generally found themselves on the defensive. In order to defend the Frankish possessions from the resurgent Greeks, calls for reinforcements were issued to the West. A number of crusades were proclaimed by the papacy, for example, in 1205–1207 to stabilize the recent conquests, in 1222–25 to protect Thessalonica, and in 1235–40 to break the combined pressure of Nicaea and the Bulgarian kingdom on the Latin Empire. However, these efforts met with limited success and any results were evanescent. Latin presence in Greek lands was progressively eroded in the thirteenth century. Theodore of Epiros destroyed the kingdom of Thessalonica in 1224 and for a while seemed likely to reclaim Constantinople as well. Eventually this was accomplished by Nicaea, which became the greatest power in the region from the 1230s onwards. Michael Palaiologos took the ultimate prize of control over the imperial capital in 1261. A new crusade, in 1262–64, was proclaimed by Pope Urban IV to recover Constantinople and to buttress the principality of Achaia, the most important

---

Variorum Reprints, 1977); Robert Lee Wolff, *Studies in the Latin Empire of Constantinople* (London: Variorum, 1976); Antoine Bon, *La Morée franque: recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1430)* (2 vols, Paris: Boccard, 1969); Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris: Payot, 1949); Filip van Tricht, *The Latin 'Renovatio' of Byzantium: The Empire of Constantinople (1204–1228)*, trans. Peter Longbottom (Leiden: Brill, 2011). For the Venetian presence, see: Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge: le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien, XIIIe–XVe siècles* (Paris: Boccard, 1959); Frederick C. Lane, *Venice: A Maritime Republic* (London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); Donald M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 148–422; John E. Dotson, 'Venice, Genoa and Control of the Seas in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', in John B. Hattendorf and Richard W. Unger (eds), *War at Sea in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), pp. 119–36. Immensely useful as a general and detailed work of reference is Setton, *Papacy*.

<sup>10</sup> For the Byzantine successor states, see: Michael Angold, 'Byzantium in Exile', *NCMH*, vol. 5, pp. 543–68; idem, *A Byzantine Government in Exile: Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea, 1204–1261* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975); Alice Gardner, *The Laskarids of Nicaea: The Story of an Empire in Exile* (London: Methuen, 1912); Donald M. Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957); idem, *The Despotate of Epiros, 1267–1479: A Contribution to the History of Greece in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).



remaining Frankish state in Greece, but this attempt fared no better than the earlier ones.<sup>11</sup>

A major new power entered the stage in the 1260s, in the person of Charles of Anjou, brother of King Louis IX of France and crowned as king of Sicily as the papal champion against the Hohenstaufen. In 1267 Charles undertook to lead a campaign to restore the Latin Empire, while he was also recognized as the suzerain of Achaia (and in 1278 he gained direct control of the principality after the death of Prince William II). The Angevins represented the greatest threat to Byzantium for the following 15 years. During this period, Charles was locked in a duel with Michael Palaiologos where the two sides pitted their military, diplomatic and financial means against each other. The Byzantine emperor managed to hold back Angevin designs by a variety of manoeuvres, including the agreement with the papacy that led to the Union of the Greek and Roman Churches at the Second Council of Lyon (1274).<sup>12</sup> But the final blow to Charles' ambitions in the eastern Mediterranean came with the uprising of the Sicilian Vespers (1282), which destroyed his power base in Sicily. The war that followed involved French, Spanish and Italian fleets and armies in clashes throughout the Mediterranean for two decades.<sup>13</sup>

It would not be until the early fourteenth century that western claimants to the throne of Constantinople would reappear with the goal of restoring the Latin Empire, but the plans of Charles of Valois and Philip of Taranto came to nothing.<sup>14</sup> Meanwhile, the rise of Turkish power in Anatolia and the loss of the last Latin outposts in Outremer in 1291 would lead to a reorientation of policies and crusading priorities in the Levant.<sup>15</sup> In the process, the enfeebled Byzantine Empire gradually

---

<sup>11</sup> Chrissis, *Crusading in Frankish Greece*, pp. 1–178.

<sup>12</sup> Jean Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe* (London: Longman, 1998); Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282: A Study in Late Byzantine–Western Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959); Joseph Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy, 1198–1400* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979), pp. 113–81.

<sup>13</sup> Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers: A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958); Antonino Franchi, *I vespri siciliani e le relazioni tra Roma e Bisanzio: studio critico sulle fonti* (Palermo: Facoltà Teologica di Sicilia, 1984); David Abulafia, *The Western Mediterranean Kingdoms, 1200–1500* (London: Longman, 1997); see also idem, 'Charles of Anjou Reassessed', *JMH*, 26.1 (2000), pp. 93–114, for a discussion of the current state of research, with a very extensive bibliography on the revolt and its context.

<sup>14</sup> Erwin Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der lateinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel im Rahmen der abendländischen Politik, 1261 bis etwa 1310* (Jena: Frommann, 1938), esp. pp. 72–157; Angeliki E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282–1328* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).

<sup>15</sup> For an overview of crusading activity from the late thirteenth century onwards, see the works of Housley, cited above n. 7, as well as Silvia Schein, *Fideles Crucis: The Papacy, the West, and the Recovery of the Holy Land 1274–1314* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,

came to be seen as an ally, or as a Christian state in need of rescue, rather than as a target for crusading aggression.

The catalyst for this change was the gradual replacement, in the late thirteenth century, of Byzantine and Seljuk control of Anatolia by that of the Turkish beyliks: a patchwork of small dynastic principalities which, by the early fourteenth century, had established themselves across Asia Minor, stretching from the fringes of the Mongol Ilkhanate and Greek Trebizond in the east, to the shores of the Aegean in the west. By the second decade of the fourteenth century the maritime beyliks of the Aegean coast, especially those of Aydin and Menteshe, had begun to threaten Latin and Greek territories in the Aegean and Greece by launching raids into the sea, sometimes in alliance with one another, and at other times in league with the Catalan rulers of Athens or other disparate Christian groups in the region.<sup>16</sup> In these early encounters it was the newly established Knights Hospitallers on Rhodes and the Genoese Zaccaria lords of Chios who most tenaciously defended their territories from Turkish attack, although the Venetians also began to engage in limited military action as their possessions became endangered.<sup>17</sup>

The increasing pressure from the beyliks culminated in Venice taking the initiative against the Turks in 1333, when the Republic, along with other local Christian powers – the Hospitallers, Cyprus and initially Byzantium – together with the papacy and France, formed a naval league to defend the Aegean from Turkish raids. This league, without Byzantine participation in the end, won some important victories over the Turks in 1334, but once it had disbanded later in the

1991); and Anthony Leopold, *How to Recover the Holy Land: The Crusade Proposals of the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2000).

<sup>16</sup> For the Catalans of Athens, see: Kenneth M. Setton, *The Catalan Domination of Athens: 1311–1388* (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1948); David Jacoby, ‘Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens en Romanie (1305–1332): Un nouveau témoignage de Marino Sanudo Torsello’, *SM*, 15.1 (1974), pp. 217–61; Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, ‘The Catalans of Athens and the Beginning of Turkish Expansion in the Aegean Area’, *SM*, 21.2 (1980), pp. 821–38.

<sup>17</sup> The Hospitallers on Rhodes have been the focus of many studies by Anthony Luttrell, the majority of which have been reprinted in the following volumes: *Studies on the Hospitallers after 1306* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); *The Hospitaller State on Rhodes and its Western Provinces, 1306–1462* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999); *The Hospitallers of Rhodes and their Mediterranean World* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992); *Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the Crusades, 1291–1440* (Aldershot: Variorum Reprints, 1982); *The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece, and the West, 1291–1440: Collected Studies* (Aldershot: Variorum Reprints, 1978). For the Genoese possessions in Romania, see the landmark study by Michel Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XIIIe – début du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (2 vols, Rome: École française de Rome, 1978); and also Philip P. Argenti, *The Occupation of Chios by the Genoese and their Administration of the Island: 1346–1566* (3 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958); Geo Pistarino (ed.), *Genovesi d’Oriente* (Genoa: Civico istituto colombiano, 1990); William Miller, ‘The Zaccaria of Phocaea and Chios, 1275–1329’, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 31 (1911), pp. 44–55.

year, the Turkish raids resumed. In the following decade, the Turks, in particular those of Aydin, began to launch raids into the Aegean with increasing frequency and penetration, exacting tribute from a number of Christian territories and even threatening Venetian Crete, the most powerful of all Latin possessions. By this point, the severity of the Turkish menace had become well-known in the West, leading Pope Clement VI to proclaim a crusade against the main perpetrator of these raids, Umur Pasha, the lord of Smyrna, in 1343. This crusade managed to capture the port of Smyrna in 1344, leading to the death of Umur in 1348 and the temporary subjugation of Aydin.<sup>18</sup>

However, the Crusade of Smyrna did little to permanently reduce Turkish dominance in the region. In contrast, as the strength of the coastal beyliks began to wane in the latter half of the fourteenth century, one principality began to rise in their place – that initially established within landlocked boundaries in north-western Anatolia by Osman, the founder of the Ottoman dynasty. In 1326, the year of Osman's death, the important city of Bursa was captured from the Byzantines, followed by Nicaea/Iznik in 1331, taken by Osman's son and successor Orkhan. By 1350 the Ottoman war machine had virtually eliminated Byzantine power in Asia Minor and had annexed the coastal beylik of Karasi, providing access to the Aegean and the Sea of Marmara. The next crucial point in the expansion of Ottoman power came in 1354 when an army crossed the Dardanelles and seized the fortress of Gallipoli from the Byzantines, marking the first Turkish foothold in Europe. Under the reign of Murad I the Ottomans continued their expansion into Europe and across Asia Minor, capturing the second city of Byzantium, Thessalonica, in 1387 and, under Sultan Bayezid I, subjugating the Anatolian maritime beyliks of Mentеше and Aydin in 1389–90. Christian armies were raised to challenge the advancing

---

<sup>18</sup> For the emergence of the Turkish beyliks and their interactions with Latins and Greeks, see the studies of Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Mentеше and Aydin: 1300–1415* (Venice: Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia per tutti i paesi del mondo, 1983); and Paul Lemerle, *L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'occident: Recherches sur 'La geste d'Umur pacha'* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957). Also of interest are: Rudi Paul Lindner, 'Anatolia, 1300–1451', *CHOT*, pp. 102–37; Charles E. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Manual* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), pp. 213–42; Elizabeth A. Zachariadou (ed.), *The Ottoman Emirate (1300–1389): Halcyon Days in Crete I: A Symposium Held in Rethymnon, 11–13 January 1991* (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993); Paul Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentеше, Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.–15. Jh.* (Istanbul: Universum druckerei, 1934). Specific works on the crusades against the beyliks include: Mike Carr, 'Humbert of Viennois and the Crusade of Smyrna: A Reconsideration', *Crusades*, 13 (forthcoming, 2014); Alain Demurger, 'Le pape Clément VI et l'Orient: ligue ou croisade?', in J. Paviot and J. Verger (eds), *Guerre, pouvoir et noblesse au Moyen Âge, Mélanges en l'honneur de Philippe Contamine* (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2000), pp. 207–14; Angeliki E. Laiou, 'Marino Sanudo Torsello, Byzantium and the Turks: The Background to the Anti-Turkish League of 1332–1334', *Speculum*, 45 (1970), pp. 374–92.

Ottoman armies but were routinely defeated, such as the Serbs at Maritsa in 1371 and the crusaders at Nicopolis in 1396 and Varna in 1444.<sup>19</sup>

By the end of the fourteenth century the Ottomans had emerged as the dominant power in the region, and, under Bayezid I, even laid siege to Constantinople itself. After the defeat of Bayezid at Ankara by the Mongol chief Timur in 1402, the pre-eminence of the Ottomans was briefly challenged. Bayezid was imprisoned by Timur and the tributary states of Aydin and Mentеше, along with the other subjugated Anatolian beyliks, were temporarily restored, but within years the Ottomans had re-asserted their control over these territories and once again commenced their expansion under the rule of Mehmed I. By the mid-point of the fifteenth century, large swathes of Greece had come under Ottoman control and many Aegean islands, such as the Genoese colonies of Lesbos and Chios as well as the Venetian duchy of Naxos, became tributary states. The confirmation of Ottoman supremacy in the region came in 1453, when Mehmed II, ‘the Conqueror’, captured Constantinople, crowning over a century of Ottoman expansion and creating an empire which could rival that of Byzantium in its heyday. Although the language of crusading against the Turks persisted into the early modern period, the Ottoman Empire was gradually integrated into the diplomatic system of European powers, and its control over the Balkans was no longer seriously challenged.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> The establishment and expansion of the Ottoman beylik has received much attention from historians, including the works of Paul Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1938); Cemal Kafadar, *Between the Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Heath W. Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003); Rudi Paul Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007). For the later period, see: Dimitris J. Kastritsis, *The Sons of Bayezid: Empire Building and Representation in the Ottoman Civil War of 1402–1413* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire: 1300–1481* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1990), pp. 22–54.

<sup>20</sup> Jonathan Harris, *The End of Byzantium* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Franz Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Marios Philippides (ed.), *Mehmed II the Conqueror and the Fall of the Franco-Byzantine Levant to the Ottoman Turks: Some Western Views and Testimonies* (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2007). For crusading against the Ottomans, see: David Nicolle, *Nicopolis 1396: The Last Crusade* (Oxford: Osprey, 1999); Jacques Paviot and Martine Chauney-Bouillot (eds), *Nicopolis, 1396–1996: Actes du colloque international, Dijon, 18 octobre 1996* (Dijon: Société des Annales de Bourgogne, 1997) [= *Annales de Bourgogne* 68.3 (1996)]; Colin Imber, *The Crusade of Varna, 1443–45* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Housley, *The Later Crusades*, pp. 64–99; idem, *Crusading and the Ottoman Threat*; Setton, *Papacy*, vols 2–4; and also Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Margaret Meserve, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008); James Hankins, ‘Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II’, *DOP*, 49 (1995), pp. 111–207; for the later period, see Géraud Poumarède,

## **Fluidity and Ambiguity: Contact *and* Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean**

Helpful as this schematic outline of events might be, however, we should be on our guard against a narrative that paints too neat a picture of events in Frankish Greece and the Aegean, be that one of Byzantine resurgence versus chronic Frankish weakness in the thirteenth century, or the collapse of united Christian resistance in the face of Turkish expansion in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The reality on the ground was anything but neat. First of all, the Nicaean project of resurrecting the Byzantine Empire was never complete. To say nothing of faraway Trebizond, Epiros remained independent and frequently hostile, despite efforts to bring it into the fold through matrimonial alliances or force of arms. In the Peloponnese, the Latin principality of Achaia shrank as the Byzantine despotate of Morea gradually absorbed its territories, but it survived to the fifteenth century and the Byzantine takeover was only completed less than 30 years before the Ottoman conquest. Most of the islands in the Aegean remained under Venetian control; as regards the three largest ones, Negroponte was fought over fiercely, with the Byzantine reconquest by Licario in the 1270s proving ephemeral, until the island eventually fell to the Turks in 1471; Crete remained firmly in Venetian hands down to 1669, although it was rocked by various native rebellions, some of which had links with the government at Nicaea/Constantinople; Rhodes, on the other hand, passed from the control of the semi-independent Gabalas dynasty to Nicaea in the mid-thirteenth century, only to be conquered by the Knights Hospitallers in the early fourteenth century and become the order's base for 200 years, before it was eventually lost to the Ottomans (c. 1307–1522). Meanwhile, the return of the Byzantine government to Constantinople and the concentration on western affairs left the eastern flank exposed. This was exploited not so much by the collapsing Seljuk state, as by nomadic Turcomans who gradually overran most of Asia Minor and formed the Turkish beyliks which eventually emerged on the formerly Byzantine-controlled coast.

Even though it was the Ottomans who captured Constantinople and extinguished Byzantium, their rise was also far from straightforward and their success far from inevitable. For most of the early fourteenth century it was the coastal beyliks of Mentеше and Aydin which wielded the most power in Asia Minor, and for the majority of the period Turkish sea power remained inferior to that of the Italians in the Aegean or of the Hospitallers. Even the Ottoman land armies could be defeated, as was proved by Timur when he brought the mighty Sultan Bayezid to heel in 1402. This is to say nothing of the conflicts between the Ottomans and the other Anatolian beyliks and the internal strife which beset the Ottoman ruling dynasty, especially during the early fifteenth century, which probably more than anything

gave the Byzantines something to work with in delaying the eventual conquest of the imperial city.

Furthermore, discussion of political boundaries is by no means the whole story. Alliances and conflicts did not follow strictly confessional or ethnic lines. The coalition that the Nicaean army defeated at Pelagonia in 1259 included the Greek rulers of Epiros and Thessaly, alongside the prince of Achaia and troops sent by Manfred of Sicily.<sup>21</sup> The Genoese allied with Michael Palaiologos against Charles of Anjou, while discontented members of the Byzantine aristocracy offered their support to Charles of Valois against Andronikos II in 1307–10.<sup>22</sup> The Latin lords of Greece fought among themselves, not much more rarely than they did against Greek or Turkish enemies; one need only think about the revolt of the Lombard lords of Thessalonica against Emperor Henry in 1207–1209, or the war that the prince of Achaia fought against the Lombards and Venetians of Negroponte and the duke of Athens in 1256–58.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, the duke of Naxos, Niccolò Sanudo, allied with Andronikos III to capture Chios from the Genoese lord Martino Zaccaria in 1329, barely four years before both Sanudo and Andronikos agreed to ally with Venice for the naval league against the Turks.<sup>24</sup> During the Byzantine civil wars of the mid-fourteenth century, things became even more complicated as each side courted local Latin, Serb, Bulgarian and Turkish rulers to further their cause. To give one particularly well-known example, the establishment of the first Ottoman foothold in Europe at Gallipoli in 1354 is largely regarded as a result of the Ottoman alliance with Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos, who had allowed the Turks to cross the Dardanelles to accompany him on campaign in Thrace against John V and his Serbian and Bulgarian allies.<sup>25</sup>

Even harder to describe in black-and-white terms is the everyday life of Greek populations under Latin or Turkish rule. Complex issues of coexistence, loyalties and identity arise. For example, can we really speak of segregation or acculturation between Greeks and Latins? Relevant studies suggest the appearance of elements of a new mixed identity, forged between the conquerors and the conquered, particularly in the areas where Latin control was long-lasting, such as Frankish Achaia and Venetian Crete; most of these studies, however, also warn about the limits of this development.<sup>26</sup> There is evidence of persisting loyalties towards the Byzantine

---

<sup>21</sup> Deno J. Geanakoplos, 'Greco-Latin Relations on the Eve of the Byzantine Restoration: The Battle of Pelagonia, 1259', *DOP*, 7 (1953), pp. 99–141.

<sup>22</sup> Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins*, pp. 212–20, 341–3.

<sup>23</sup> Ernst Gerland, *Geschichte des lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel. I. Geschichte der Kaiser Balduin I. und Heinrich, 1204–1216* (Homburg von der Höhe: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1905), pp. 161–90; Lock, *Franks*, pp. 90–91.

<sup>24</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp. 16–17.

<sup>25</sup> Nicol, *Last Centuries*, pp. 217–61.

<sup>26</sup> See: Sally McKee, *Uncommon Dominion: Venetian Crete and the Myth of Ethnic Purity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Aneta Ilieva, *Frankish Morea (1205–1262): Socio-Cultural Interaction between the Franks and the Local Population*

government and – particularly – ecclesiastical hierarchy in ‘exile’, as well as of indifference or even support towards the newly installed Latin regimes. Such issues were not limited to the populations under foreign rule. The collapse of the imperial order and the dismemberment of the Byzantine state generated an intense anxiety and a crisis of identity even among those Byzantines who remained free from conquest.<sup>27</sup> The radically changed circumstances required not only new ways of action but also new ways of thinking. It is telling that two recent publications start their examination of this period with the question of *what* exactly was Byzantium in the thirteenth century.<sup>28</sup> Parallels can, of course, be drawn on the Latin and Turkish sides; at times the Latin lords in the Aegean embraced Byzantine imperial identity as a marker of legitimacy and, as the Ottoman state began to replace that of Byzantium, the identity of Italian merchant communities in particular became more malleable in order to make coexistence possible under Turkish rule.<sup>29</sup> The Turks for their part also benefitted from a fluidity of relations with both Greeks and Latins, not least in the development of Ottoman economic and administrative institutions.<sup>30</sup>

---

(Athens: Historical Publications St. D. Basilopoulos, 1991); Michael S. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262): A Study of the Greek Population and the Orthodox Church under the Frankish Dominion* (Ioannina: Philosophike Schole Panepistemiou Ioanninon, 1987); Peter Topping, ‘Co-existence of Greeks and Latins in Frankish Morea and Venetian Crete’, in *XVe Congres international d’études byzantines. I. Histoire* (Athens: [s.n.], 1976), pp. 3–23 [= Topping, *Studies in Latin Greece*, no. XI]; David Jacoby, ‘The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnese after the Fourth Crusade’, *American Historical Review*, 78 (1973), pp. 873–906.

<sup>27</sup> Gill Page, *Being Byzantine: Greek Identity before the Ottomans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Anthony Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 317–88.

<sup>28</sup> Charlotte Roueché, ‘Introduction: Defining Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204’, in Herrin and Saint-Guillan, *Identities and Allegiances*, pp. 1–5, at 3–5; Antony Eastmond, *Art and Identity in Thirteenth-Century Byzantium: Hagia Sophia and the Empire of Trebizond* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. xix–xxi.

<sup>29</sup> Christopher Wright, ‘Byzantine Authority and Latin Rule in the Gattilusio Lordships’, in Harris, Holmes and Russell, *Byzantines, Latins, and Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, pp. 247–63; Nicholas Oikonomides, ‘The Byzantine Overlord of Genoese Possessions in Romania’, in Charalambos Dendrinos et al. (eds), *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 235–8. Valuable studies for the later period include: Eric R. Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006); E. Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).

<sup>30</sup> See: Kate Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Molly Greene, *A Shared World: Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). For Byzantine political and socio-economic

## Outline of the Present Volume

This volume consists of four parts, arranged roughly in chronological order, which encompass a variety of topics while maintaining a unity of focus on the factors affecting contact and conflict between Greeks, Latins and Turks.

The first part places Frankish Greece in the wider context of developments in East and West. The essay by Nikolaos Chrissis argues that western involvement in Romania bears close parallels with the other crusade fronts in the thirteenth century, such as the Baltic and the Albigensian Crusades, and that this crusading framework influenced both actions and perceptions between Latins and Greeks in the period. Bernard Hamilton, on the other hand, describes how the Latin conquest of Byzantium opened up new routes for western merchants, diplomats and friars to visit the Crimean Peninsula, the Caucasus and western Asia. As a result, western knowledge of, and familiarity with, the area grew immensely from the thirteenth century onwards.

The second part investigates the manifold and often contradictory ways in which the Byzantines responded to the Latin presence in the East. Teresa Shawcross examines the city of Athens before and after the Latin conquest, making a case about the importance of local interests and regional allegiances in shaping everyday life in a Byzantine province and consequently in affecting the possibilities for accommodation with the new Frankish masters. The growing prosperity of Athens in the late twelfth century and the worship of the Theotokos at the Parthenon, which turned the city into an important pilgrimage destination, initially acted as an incentive for successive conquerors but eventually won over the western settlers (as they had won over the snobbish bishops sent from Constantinople before the conquest) and guaranteed ‘a cohesive sense of identity’ for the local population. Judith Ryder’s chapter looks at a fascinating section of the oration *pro subsidio Latinorum* of Demetrius Kydones, in which the author tries to demonstrate the reliability and valour of the westerners through certain episodes from the history of the crusades, in order to convince his compatriots to accept an alliance with western powers against the Turks. Both essays challenge the view that Byzantines harboured a monolithic resentment towards the West after 1204, and make the point that in the volatile and ever-changing political circumstances of the period, attitudes and perceptions were equally prone to readjustment and re-evaluation.

---

relations with the Latins and the Turks in the Palaiologan period, see: John W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969); Nicolas Oikonomides, *Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIIIe–XVe siècles)* (Montreal: Institut d'études médiévales Albert-le-Grand, 1979); Nevra Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins: Politics and Society in the Late Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); and the relevant contributions in Angeliki E. Laiou, *Gender, Society and Economic Life in Byzantium* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992); and eadem, *Byzantium and the Other: Relations and Exchanges* (Farnham: Ashgate Variorum, 2012).



The third part consists of two closely related essays on fourteenth-century Latin relations with Greeks and Turks in the Aegean. Mike Carr examines the involvement of the Zaccaria lords of Chios in crusading activities against the Turks and argues that, rather than being mutually exclusive, the promotion of commerce in the East and defence of the faith were two complementary facets of their role as they perceived and projected it, that is, as frontline defenders of Christendom. Peter Lock draws from his research on the writings of the Venetian crusade propagandist Marino Sanudo Torsello and discusses how the image of the Greeks and Turks in his work changed over time. As the Turkish threat grew, Sanudo seems to have changed his view of the Greeks, from enemies to potential allies in the East.

In the fourth part, the focus turns to the Ottomans in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, offering a reassessment of their western frontier and reaction to crusading in that area. The chapter by İlker Evrim Binbaş includes an analysis and translation of Ibn al-Jazarī's eyewitness account of the Battle of Nicopolis (1396), which offers a unique – and for the most part neglected – Muslim viewpoint of developments in that crucial moment for the history of the area. The contribution by Rhoads Murphey examines the priorities of Bayezid's foreign policy, arguing that the sultan focused his attention on his eastern flank, effectively withdrawing from engagements in the west and showing little interest in confrontation with Christian powers. The chapter's more general aim is to illuminate the fundamental principles and mechanisms of policy-making in the Ottoman state during the proto-imperial era, which have often been obscured under the influence of later developments and priorities.

One of the unifying themes of the various investigations in this volume, therefore, is that our understanding of intergroup interaction in this region can be enhanced by examinations both on the macro-level, which take in a view of developments in the wider world in East and West (Chrissis, Hamilton, Murphey), and on the micro-level, by focusing on how wider trends can be radically reshaped on account of local factors and regional peculiarities (Shawcross, Carr) or refracted through the lens of individual perceptions at crucial turning points (Ryder, Lock, Binbaş).

In closing this introduction, we would like to note that as scholarship in Byzantine, crusade and Ottoman studies has been progressing in strides in recent years, it remains essential, but progressively more challenging, for scholars to remain conversant with research in the 'sibling' sub-disciplines. A sustained effort needs to be made to combine effectively the knowledge and insights produced in the various overlapping studies dealing with this turbulent period of change in the eastern Mediterranean. The present volume is only a small step; but one step, we hope, in the right direction.

# Index

- Achaia, principality of, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 17, 21, 121; *see also* Morea
- Acre, 50, 56, 222
- Adrianople, 93; *see also* Edirne
- Aegean, 1–14 *passim*, 17, 115–149 *passim*, 183, 190, 192–3, 217, 221, 222, 225; *see also individual islands*
- Africa, 141
- Agarenes (= Muslims), 139, 149; *see also* infidels; Saracens
- Ahmad Jalayir (Jalayirid sultan), 173, 195–6, 200
- Albanians, 139, 146
- Albigensian Crusade, 13, 24n, 27–32, 36, 38, 41
- Alexios I Komnenos (Byzantine emperor), 103n, 220
- alum, 117–21, 128, 133, 222
- Alexandria, 107, 110, 118, 119, 125, 126, 137, 141, 157, 158, 167
- alliances, 7, 10, 11, 14, 44, 46, 49, 80, 93, 159, 178–9, 187, 197–8, 221; between Latins and Greeks, 6, 11, 103n, 56, 97–118 *passim*, 132n, 192–3, 218; between Latins and Turks, 7, 148–9, 186–7; between Greeks and Turks, 11, 105, 185–6; between Latins against the Turks, 115–34 *passim*, 223; between Latins and Mongols, 49, 59, 221; between Turks, 7, 182, 186, 188, 194–217 *passim*
- Amadeo VI (count of Savoy), 99, 110, 220
- Anatolia, 1, 6–10, 61, 115, 122, 125, 128–9, 153, 158, 161, 167–9, 171, 177, 179–85, 188–92, 196–7, 199–202, 204–10, 213–14, 217, 220–4; *see also* Asia Minor; Turkey
- Andronikos II Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 11, 118–19, 222
- Andronikos III Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 11, 99n, 128, 132–4,
- Andronikos IV Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 185–6
- Ankara, 9, 154, 161, 178, 181, 194–5, 200, 212, 215, 224–5
- Antioch, 103, 158–9, 167, 168, 220
- Antioch-on-the-Maeander, 104, 108
- Aragon/Aragonese, 88
- Archipelago, duchy of, 4, 17, 142n, 222; *see also* Naxos; Niccolò Sanudo
- Armenia/Armenians, 50, 52, 55–6, 58n, 124, 137, 139–41, 145, 219, 221, 223
- Asia Minor, 1, 5, 7–8, 10, 27, 65, 74–5, 79, 86, 104, 108, 117–18, 130, 147–8, 177, 179, 181, 184, 190, 207, 212, 220, 223; *see also* Anatolia; Turkey
- assimilation, 93, 219
- Athens/Athenians, 4, 7, 11–13, 17, 65–95, 146–7, 218–19
- Avignon, 60–61, 126, 224
- Aydin, Anatolian beylik, 7–10, 122, 124–5, 127, 131–4, 199, 221, 222; *see also* Mehmed; Umur Pasha
- Baghdad, 47, 52, 59, 195–6
- Baldwin I (Latin emperor), 20–21, 23, 32, 34, 86
- Baldwin II (Latin emperor), 50
- Baldwin of Hainault, 50
- Balkans, 9, 99, 153, 177, 184n, 187, 189, 191, 193, 194n, 206, 209–10, 214–15, 218, 220, 223–4, 226
- Baltic, 3, 13, 18–19, 22–3, 27–33, 39–41, 46
- Barkuk (Mamluk sultan), 178, 195–7, 209
- Bartolommeo Zaccaria, *see* Zaccaria family
- Basil II (Byzantine emperor), 72–3, 218
- Bayezid I (Ottoman sultan), 8–10, 14, 153–61, 165–6, 168–9, 171n, 173, 177–215
- Benedetto Zaccaria, *see* Zaccaria family
- Benedict XII (pope), 60
- Benedict XIII (pope), 224
- beyliks, 1, 7–10, 115, 122, 125, 128–9, 181, 207, 212, 221–3; *see also* Aydin; Candarid; Germiyan; Karaman; Karasi; Mentеше; Turks

- Black Sea, 1, 5, 43–6, 55–6, 62, 84, 90, 99, 119, 171n, 183, 221; *see also* Caffa; Crimea; Tana
- Boniface IX (pope), 224
- Bulgaria/Bulgarians, 5, 11, 17, 24, 45, 91, 99–103, 111, 153, 215, 218
- Bursa, 8, 157–61, 168, 169, 179, 183n, 192, 196, 203
- Byzantine Empire, 1, 6, 10, 65, 67, 73, 86, 90–91, 97–112, 130, 185–6, 214, 218, 220–3
- Byzantines, 8, 11–13, 36, 45, 99–111, 120, 171n, 182n, 217–26 *passim*; *see also* Greeks; Romans; schismatics
- Caffa, 56–7, 60, 62, 145, 221
- Cairo, 157–9, 161, 163–4, 167, 196, 197, 214
- Candarid, Anatolian dynasty and beylik, 183, 192, 195, 199, 203–4, 206–7, 211–14
- captives, 21, 34, 51–2, 54, 122, 132, 143, 198, 225; *see also* slaves/slavery
- Catalans, 7, 88, 118, 138, 142, 145–9
- Catherine of Valois (titular Latin empress), 130
- Charles II (king of Naples), 146n
- Charles VI (king of France), 173n, 224–5
- Charles of Anjou (king of Sicily), 6, 11, 38, 144
- Charles of Valois (titular Latin emperor), 6, 11
- China, 43, 51–3, 55–61, 162
- Chios, 7, 9, 11, 14, 82, 115–34, 141, 222; *see also* Zaccaria family (lords of Chios)
- Church Union, *see* Union of Churches
- Cilician Armenia, *see* Armenia
- coexistence, 11–12, 18–19, 52, 93–4, 115, 214–15
- coins/coinage, 120, 127, 130–31, 186, 211
- commerce, *see* trade
- Constantinople, 1, 5, 9, 10, 13, 17–41, 46, 50, 53, 60, 66, 70–3, 79, 81–2, 86, 90–91, 99, 101, 106n, 109, 119; 132, 142, 153, 186, 218; crusader conquest of (1204), 1, 5, 17, 43, 65, 108, 140, 217, 221; Greek recovery of (1261), 37, 56, 218, 222; New Rome, 65, 71; Ottoman siege of (1394–1402), 153, 160, 168, 172, 190–93, 224–5; Ottoman conquest of (1453), 9, 154, 182; *see also* Latin Empire of Constantinople
- corsairs, 183
- Crete, 4, 8, 10–11, 142, 145, 147
- Crimea, 13, 43–5, 50, 55–7, 60–2, 221
- cross taking, 22–6; 33–4
- crusades: against the Byzantines, 5–6, 17–41 *passim*, 130, 135; in support of the Byzantines, 97–112 *passim*; against the Turks, 115–49 *passim*; in support/for the recovery of the Holy Land, 17–41 *passim*, 44, 138–9, 143, 146, 222–4, 225; definitions of, 217–18; ideology and justifications for, 17–41, 97–112, 115–34, 135–49 *passim*; history of the earlier crusades, 103, 108, 220; *see also* Albigensian Crusade
- crusade indulgences, 20, 22–6, 29–31, 41, 125–7, 131, 133, 142
- crusade tithes, 22, 26, 28–9
- crusade vows, 22–7; commutation of vows, 24, 27
- crusader states, 4, 43, 218–19, 223
- Cyclades, 4
- Cyprus, 7, 49, 55, 118, 126n, 137, 140, 142, 145, 149, 223
- Dardanelles, 8, 11, 106n, 193
- Demetrius (king of Thessalonica), 21
- Demetrius Chomatenos (archbishop of Ochrid), 65–7
- Demetrius Kydones, 13, 97–112, 219–20, 225
- Dominicans, 44, 47, 49, 57, 219–20
- Dubrovnik, 187
- Edirne, 179, 183n, 188, 192; *see also* Adrianople
- Edward I (king of England), 59, 140
- Egypt/Egyptians, 44, 59, 78, 84, 118, 125–6, 139–41, 149, 158, 195, 209, 222; sultans of, 49, 59, 145, 178; *see also* Mamluks

- embargo, *see* trade embargo  
 Ephesos, 81, 122–3  
 Epiros, 5, 10–11, 20–21, 25–7, 34, 65, 86, 147, 217  
 Euboea, *see* Negroponte  
 excommunication, 143
- Famagusta, 119  
 Fifth Crusade, 20, 25, 26, 30–31, 34–5  
 First Crusade, 103, 108, 220  
 Florence, 60, 143, 218  
 Foça, 117n; *see also* Phokaia
- Fourth Crusade, 1–2, 17, 24, 33, 65, 68–70, 85, 90, 93–4, 104, 108, 137, 139, 141, 143, 217, 220–21; *see also* Constantinople, crusader conquest of (1204)
- fragmentation, 1, 4–12, 61, 91–3, 111, 133, 182, 207, 210, 217
- France/French, 6–7, 17–41 *passim*, 49, 52, 55, 58, 87–8, 120, 123, 130, 139, 145, 173n, 219, 224–5
- Franciscans, 47–9, 57, 59–61  
 Frederick II (king of Sicily), 31
- Galata, 160, 168, 186  
 galleys, 105n, 115–34 *passim*, 138, 141–2, 146
- Gallipoli, 8, 11, 99, 106n, 109–10, 182–3, 220, 223
- Genoa/Genoese, 7, 9, 11, 56–7, 59–60, 62, 67, 106n, 115–34 *passim*, 141, 183, 186, 211, 219, 221–2, 224–5
- Georgia/Georgians, 43–44, 78, 148  
 Germiyan, Anatolian beylik, 199, 203–4, 213
- Greeks, 1–2, 5, 11–14; crusades against, 17–41 *passim*, 103, 106n, 115, 132–4; perceptions of, 135–49 *passim*; *see also* Byzantines; schismatics
- Hellespont, 105–7, 223  
 Henry IV (king of England), 225  
 Henry VI (Holy Roman emperor), 31  
 Henry of Flanders (Latin emperor), 5, 11, 21, 32, 142
- heresy/heretics, 18, 20, 23, 27–8, 29–31, 33, 36, 38–9, 41, 108, 139, 141, 143–5
- Hethum I (king of Armenia), 221  
 Hohenstaufen, 6  
 Holy Land, 44; *see also* crusades in support/for the recovery of the Holy Land; Jerusalem
- Honorius III (pope), 17–41 *passim*, 44, 217  
 Hospitallers, 7, 10, 29n, 30, 105n, 106n, 122–4, 133, 138
- Hugh Eteriano (Pisan theologian), 220  
 Hungary, 28, 44, 47–8, 51, 57, 99, 144, 169, 171, 180, 187–9, 193, 224
- Iberia, 3, 18, 27  
 Ibn al-Jazari, 153–175 *passim*, 225  
 Icaria, 130
- identities, 11–12, 13, 66, 93, 210n  
 indulgences, *see* crusade privileges  
 infidels, 35–6, 116, 125, 160, 168–9, 171, 205; *see also* Agarenes; Saracens
- Innocent III (pope), 18–21, 23–24, 26, 28n, 30–33, 36, 38, 41, 43–4, 86, 217  
 Innocent IV (pope), 48–9  
 Innocent VI (pope), 61  
 inquisition, 94, 143
- interfaith/interdenominational contacts, 1, 4, 43–4, 47–50, 52–4, 86–8, 93–4, 98, 104, 111, 144–6, 147–9, 218–20; *see also* Union of Churches
- Italy/Italians, 6, 10, 12, 18, 21, 26–8, 31, 43, 57, 59–60, 77n, 84, 86, 88, 115–34 *passim*, 144, 146, 218, 221
- Jacques of Vitry, 138, 143  
 James of Voragine, 53  
 Jerusalem, 28, 32–4, 43–4, 59, 137–9, 143, 171, 223; *see also* crusades in support/for the recovery of the Holy Land
- Jews, 39, 46–7, 52, 55  
 John II Bekkos (patriarch of Constantinople), 148  
 John III Vatatzes (Byzantine emperor), 38, 221  
 John V Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 11, 98–9, 185–6, 224  
 John VI Kantakouzenos (Byzantine emperor and author), 11, 98, 103, 105, 118n, 128, 132–3, 219

- John VII Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 186
- John VIII Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 218
- John XXII (pope), 57, 122–6, 131, 133, 143, 145, 222
- John of Brienne (titular king of Jerusalem), 139
- John Colonna (cardinal), 20, 26, 28
- John of Gaunt (duke of Lancaster), 224
- John of Gravina, 146
- John Laskaris Kalopheros, 110n
- John of Monte Corvino (Franciscan friar), 59–60
- John of Plano Carpini, 48–50
- John of Salisbury, 138
- Kara Yusuf (leader of the Kara Koyunlu), 197, 199, 200, 209
- Karakorum, 48, 50–55 *passim*, 56
- Karaman, Anatolian beylik, 153, 167n, 168, 178, 180–82, 193, 199, 207–9, 211
- Karasi, Anatolian beylik, 8, 203
- Kiev, 43, 46–8
- Konya, 168, 211, 117, 159
- Kos, 124, 130
- Köse Dagħ, battle of, 221
- Kosovo, 202–3, 213, 223
- Latin Empire of Constantinople, 4–6, 17–62 *passim*, 108, 142, 217–19, 221, 225; Latin Emperors of, 4, 33–4; *see also* Baldwin I; Baldwin II; Henry of Flanders; Peter of Courtenay; Philip of Taranto; Robert of Courtenay
- Lesbos, 9, 130
- Levant, 6, 43, 223, 226
- Lithuania, 140
- Livonia, 28–9, 32
- Louis VIII (king of France), 31
- Louis IX (king of France), 6, 49–50, 55, 59n, 85, 107, 139
- Louis of Bavaria (Holy Roman emperor), 146–7
- Macedonia, 27, 74, 82, 84, 181–2
- Mamluks, 59, 118–19, 126n, 127, 133, 139, 141, 145, 148, 153–75 *passim*, 178, 195–7, 209, 214, 222–3; *see also* Egypt/Egyptians
- Manfred (king of Sicily), 11, 38
- Manuel I Komnenos (Byzantine emperor), 220
- Manuel I Megas Komnenos (emperor of Trebizond), 221
- Manuel II Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 186, 190–93, 214–15, 224, 225
- Manuel Zaccaria, *see* Zaccaria family
- Markward of Anweiler, 31, 40
- Marmara, 8, 130, 169
- mastic, 118–19, 125–8, 131, 133
- Martino Zaccaria, *see* Zaccaria family
- Mehmed (emir of Aydin), 122, 131n
- Mehmed (emir of Mentеше), 206–8, 211–12
- Mehmed I (Ottoman sultan), 9, 165, 169
- Mehmed II (Ottoman sultan), 9, 102n, 154, 177
- mendicants, 37, 43, 50, 53, 57, 61–2; *see also* Dominicans; Franciscans
- Menteshe, Anatolian beylik, 7–9, 10, 124, 206–7, 211n, 221; *see also* Mehmed
- merchants/merchandise, 12–13, 28, 43–44, 50, 55–62, 94, 115–34 *passim*, 137, 141–2, 157, 182, 221; *see also* trade
- Michael IV Autoreianos (patriarch at Nicaea), 65–7
- Michael VIII Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 5–6, 11, 38, 56, 116, 144, 218, 222–3
- Michael IX Palaiologos (Byzantine emperor), 144n
- Michael Doukas (ruler of Epiros), 86
- Michael Choniates (metropolitan of Athens), 68, 79, 89–95
- military orders, 29–30, 40, 48, 138; *see also* Hospitallers; Templars; Teutonic Knights
- Mircea the Elder (ruler of Wallachia), 187–9, 195, 197, 211, 215
- mission/missionaries, 28, 29, 43–62 *passim*
- Mongols, 43–62 *passim*, 148, 201, 221
- Morea, principality of, 10, 69, 129, 130n, 131, 138, 144–7, 192–3, 219; *see also* Achaia

- Murad I (Ottoman sultan), 8, 168, 179–215  
*passim*
- Murad II (Ottoman sultan), 179, 183, 187
- Muslims, 2n, 36, 53–5, 57, 139, 141, 171, 173–4; *see also* Agarenes; infidels; Saracens
- Naples, 60, 130
- naval leagues, 7–8, 11, 125, 145
- Naxos, island and duchy, 9, 11, 132n, 137, 222; *see also* Archipelago; Niccolò Sanudo
- Negroponte (Euboea), 10, 11, 69, 80, 82, 91, 137–9, 142, 145–8, 222
- Nicaea, city and empire of, 5, 8, 10–11, 27, 56, 65, 89, 103n, 104, 144n, 217, 220–21
- Niccolò Sanudo (duke of the Archipelago), 11, 132n; *see also* Archipelago; Naxos
- Nicholas IV (pope), 59, 118
- Nicholas Hagiotheodorites (metropolitan of Athens), 68, 79, 81, 91
- Nicopolis, crusade of, 9, 14, 153–75, 178, 180, 188, 190, 210, 211n, 224–5
- Orkhan (Ottoman sultan), 8, 168
- Osman (Ottoman sultan), 8, 168, 204
- Ottomans, 1, 3–4, 8, 10–12, 19, 62, 98–9, 111, 148, 153–215 *passim*; crusades against, 9, 14, 153–75, 178, 180, 183, 188, 190, 210, 211n, 224–5; *see also* Bayezid I; Mehmed I; Mehmed II; Orkhan; Osman; Turks
- Outremer, 2, 3, 6, 18n, 24–5, 32, 34; *see also* Holy Land
- Palestine, 103, 143
- papacy, 5–7, 21, 17–41 *passim*, 43–4, 59–60, 86, 93, 125–7, 131, 134, 217–8, 224; *see also* individual popes; Roman Church
- Pelagonia, battle of, 11
- Peloponnese, 4, 10, 68, 70, 74, 82, 86–7, 93, 105, 105, 121, 219
- Peter IV (king of Aragon), 88
- Peter of Courtenay (Latin emperor), 20, 26, 28
- Peter Thomas, 106
- Philip II Augustus (king of France), 23
- Philip II the Bold (duke of Burgundy), 224
- Philip IV (king of France), 59
- Philip V (king of France), 139
- Philip de Mézières, 106n, 225
- Philip of Taranto (titular Latin Emperor), 6, 130, 132, 134, 143n, 146n
- Phokaia, 117–22, 128–9, 132, 222; *see also* Foça
- pilgrimage, 13, 23, 43, 59, 69–95 *passim*, 157, 163–4, 219
- Pīr-Muḥammad b. ‘Umar-Shaykh (Timurid prince), 156n, 163–4, 166, 173, 174
- piracy/pirates, 18, 105, 122
- Poland, 48, 51, 189
- Prussia, 28–9, 32
- Ramon Muntaner, 118, 119n
- Rhodes, 7, 10, 82, 119–26, 133, 137–8, 222
- Robert I (king of Naples), 143n, 146
- Robert of Courtenay (Latin emperor), 142
- Robert II (king of Naples), 146n, 147
- Romania, 4, 13, 17–41 *passim*, 135–49 *passim*, 188
- Roman Church, 6, 36, 137, 142, 144–5; *see also* papacy
- Romans (= Byzantines), 45, 65–6, 93, 185
- Rome, 23, 33, 59, 98, 101, 138, 146n, 218, 224; *see also* Constantinople, New Rome
- Rumelia, 177, 179, 182, 184, 213
- Russia/Russians, 18n, 43–62 *passim*, 171, 218, 221
- Samarkand, 61, 161–2, 163, 224
- Samos, 130
- Sanudo, Marino Torsello the Elder, 14, 119, 129, 135–49 *passim*, 222–3, 225; *see also* Niccolò Sanudo
- Saracens (= Muslims), 35–6, 38, 139, 141–3, 149; *see also* Agarenes; infidels
- Scandinavia/Scandinavians, 28, 40, 46
- schism, 33, 36, 38, 100n, 218, 224
- schismatics (= Greeks), 34, 37, 38n, 39–40, 139–45, 149, 217–18, 225; *see also* Byzantines; Greeks

- Seljuks, 7, 10, 220–21, 223
- Serbia/Serbs, 9, 11, 100–105, 111, 140, 171, 178, 181, 187, 194, 215, 223
- Serres conference, 190–94, 215
- Shāhrukh (Timurid ruler), 162–4, 174, 175n,
- Shams al-Dīn Ibn al-Jazarī, *see* Ibn al-Jazarī
- Siberia, 51, 62
- Sicily, 6, 11, 31, 38, 40, 78, 147, 218
- Sigismund (king of Hungary), 178–89 *passim*, 224
- Sivas, 193, 196, 197, 202, 209
- slaves/slavery, 51, 60, 72, 86, 105, 124, 132n, 148, 160, 168, 182, 208; *see also* captives
- Smyrna, 117, 121–2, 129, 131–3, 222; crusade of, 8, 105, 110
- Syria, 46, 103, 119, 143, 171, 178, 197–8, 200, 209, 214, 220
- Tana, 56–8, 62
- Tartars, *see* Mongols
- Templars, 29
- Tenedos, 130
- Teutonic Knights, 18, 30
- Thebes, 4, 17, 70, 74, 82, 86
- Thessalonica, city and kingdom of, 4–5, 8, 11, 17, 21, 25–8, 31, 36, 39, 74, 79, 83, 85, 86, 90, 92–3, 190–92, 210
- Thessaly, 11, 26, 65, 82, 86, 92, 105, 146–7, 192
- Thomas Aquinas, 98, 102n, 219
- Thrace, 11, 74, 82, 84, 93, 109, 192, 217, 223
- timar system, 189, 208, 224
- Timur (Mongol Khan), 9–10, 60–2, 154, 159, 159, 161–70, 173–5, 178–9, 184, 189, 194–200, 206–15 *passim*, 212, 215, 224–6
- Trebizond, 5, 10, 78, 221
- Turcomans/Turkmen, 10, 178, 182, 200, 205, 207, 208n, 212, 213
- Turkey, 147, 155; *see also* Anatolia; Asia Minor
- Turkmen, *see* Turcomans
- Turks, 1–14 *passim*, 18, 62, 100–108 *passim*, 115–49 *passim*, 205–6, 217, 220–21, 226; crusades against, 115–49 *passim*; *see also* Ottomans
- Theodore I Laskaris (emperor of Nicaea), 67, 86, 89n
- Theodore I Palaiologos (despot of the Morea), 192–3
- Theodore Doukas (ruler of Epiros), 5, 20, 25–7, 34–5, 89n
- trade, 2n, 4, 9, 14, 28, 43, 46, 50, 55–7, 62, 70, 84, 90, 93, 115–34 *passim*, 139–43, 145, 148–9, 186, 193, 221–2; trade embargo, 117–18n, 126n, 139, 141, 148, 222; *see also* merchants/merchandise
- Tripoli, 118
- Umur Pasha (emir of Aydin), 8, 105, 127, 131–4
- Union of Churches, 6, 38, 43, 146, 148, 218
- Varna, crusade of, 9, 183
- Venice/Venetians, 1–14 *passim*, 17, 43–4, 55–7, 62, 106n, 109, 115, 119, 125, 129, 135–49 *passim*, 190, 192, 217, 221–2
- Wallachia/Wallachians, 168, 171, 180, 187–90; *see also* Mircea
- William II (prince of Achaia), 6
- William VI (marquis of Montferrat), 21, 25–7, 29–30, 33, 36
- William Adam, 121n, 122, 125–6, 128–9
- William of Rubruck, 49–56
- William of Tyre, 138, 143
- Zaccaria, family (Genoese lords of Chios), 7, 11, 14, 115–34 *passim*, 222; Bartolommeo Zaccaria, 129–30; Benedetto I Zaccaria, 116–18, 119n, 120; Benedetto II Zaccaria, 120, 130–31, 133; Manuel Zaccaria, 116–18, 119n, 120; Martino Zaccaria, 11, 120–24, 126, 128–34; *see also* Chios