

The Crisis of the Fourth Crusade in Byzantium (1203-1204) and the Emergence of Networks for Anti-Latin Reaction and Political Action

Ilias GIARENIS

In spite of a great number of important publications on the relevant issues,¹ the Fourth Crusade and its impact in the Eastern Mediterranean are often – even nowadays – neither fully apprehended nor sufficiently explained. Important aspects of the rich scientific debate still are the collapse of the Byzantine state, the formation of smaller political entities, and the processes through which such immense changes took place. As is well known, the two most prominent among those successor polities were the States of Nicaea and of Epirus, which were both established mainly by members of the high Byzantine Constantinopolitan aristocracy;² nevertheless, the empire of Trebizond, where the imperial legacy of the Komnenoi had been considered as a solid ground for the Grand Komnenoi rulership, should also not be neglected in the study of the historical framework.³

The events of 1203/1204 led to the conquest of Constantinople by the Latin Crusaders, the *milites Christi* of the Fourth Crusade who had reached the Byzantine capital in a “diversion” from the declared original destination of the Crusade, i.e. Jerusalem. The latter, a Sacred

*This paper is dedicated to Nikolaos G. Moschonas.

1 See D. E. Queller and Th. F. Madden, *The Fourth Crusade. The Conquest of Constantinople*, second edition, Philadelphia 1997; M Angold, *The Fourth Crusade. Event and Context*, [The Medieval World] Harlow 2003; J. Phillips, *The Fourth Crusade and the Sack of Constantinople*, London 2004; *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences*, edited by Angeliki Laiou, [Réalités Byzantines 10] Paris 2005; *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek World*, edited by N. G. Moschonas, [Byzantium Today 5] Athens 2008; *The Fourth Crusade Revisited. Atti della Conferenza Internazionale nell'ottavo centenario della IV Crociata, 1204-2004 (Andros, Grecia, 27-30 maggio 2004)*, edited by P. Piatti, [Pontificio Comitato di Scienze Storiche / Atti e documenti 25] Vatican City 2008.

2 See M. Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile. Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204-1261)*, [Oxford Historical Monographs] Oxford 1975; I. Giarenis, *Η συγκρότηση και η εδραίωση της αυτοκρατορίας της Νίκαιας. Ο αυτοκράτορας Θεόδωρος Α΄ Κομνηνός Λάσκαρις*, [Monographs 12] Athens 2008; Alkmene Stavridou-Zafraka, *Νίκαια και Ηπειρος τον 13ο αιώνα. Ιδεολογική αντιπαράθεση στην προσπάθειά τους να ανακτήσουν την αυτοκρατορία*, Thessaloniki 1990; Alkmene Stavridou-Zafraka, *Βυζάντιο, 13ος αιώνας: Από την κατάρρευση στην ανασυγκρότηση. Κράτος της Ηπείρου – Αυτοκρατορία της Θεσσαλονίκης*, Thessaloniki 2016.

3 See A. M. Bryer, *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos*, [Variorum Reprints] London 1980; S. P. Karpov, *Istorija Trapezundskoi Imperii*, Sankt-Petersburg 2007; A. G. C. Savvides, *Ιστορία της αυτοκρατορίας των Μεγάλων Κομνηνών της Τραπεζούντας (1204-1461)*, third edition, Thessaloniki 2016.

City for both Eastern and Western Christendom, had been recently reconquered, in 1181, by the sultan Saladin of Egypt. The Crusade had its origins in 1201 under the spiritual guidance of Pope Innocent III.⁴ Interestingly, the diversion to Constantinople was not the first one for that Crusade; the events which took place in late 1202 in Zara had somehow shown the immediate future of the military movement. The background of the actions on the spiritual and ecclesiastical sphere were naturally associated with the Great Rift, the Schism between the Eastern and the Western Church,⁵ and with the multifaceted actualities of the Crusades movement, its visions, targets, versions, diversions and practices.

Let us try to shed some light to certain aspects of the major crisis which was dominant in Byzantium after 1204; in fact the crisis presented symptoms in all the spheres of life – political, social, religious, scholarly and spiritual – and had a huge impact in the subsequent life and action on the lands which were until then included in the territory of the Byzantine Empire.⁶ In that perspective, one should bear in mind that the notion of “crisis” is a general and rather hard to define category, with sometimes unspecified causes, and the remedy to a crisis can often present vaguely declared goals and ambitions, or even real intentions circumstantially distinct from the propagated ones.

In the framework of the Fourth Crusade, a lot of noble men, especially coming from the regions of Flanders, Northern France and Germany, had taken the Cross and undertaken the task to fulfil the pious goal of liberating the Holy Land from the hands of the infidels, i.e. the Seljuk Turks. Some of the most prominent figures among them were Boniface of Montferrat, count Baldwin of Flanders, his brother Henry of Hainaut, and Geoffrey Villehardouin.⁷ All those, accompanied by approximately 15,000 soldiers, responded to the call for a massive

4 On the person and his actions see Jane Sayers, *Innocent III: Leader of Europe 1198-1216*, [The Medieval World] London 1994; *Innocent III: Vicar of Christ or Lord of the World?*, edited by J. M. Powell, second edition, Washington D.C. 1994; Brenda Bolton, *Innocent III: Studies on Papal Authority and Pastoral Care*, [Variorum Reprints] Aldershot 1995; J. C. Moore, *Pope Innocent III (1160/61-1216). To Root Up and to Plant*, [The Medieval Mediterranean 47] Leiden & Boston 2003; O. Hanne, *Innocent III. La stupeur du monde*, Paris 2012.

5 See St. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism. A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth centuries*, Oxford 1955; Tia M. Kolbaba, *Inventing Latin Heretics. Byzantines and the Filioque in the Ninth Century*, Kalamazoo 2008; H. Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church. From Apostolic Times Until the Council of Florence* [Oxford History of the Christian Church] Oxford & New York 2003.

6 On a similar approach line, see M. T. Mansouri, “The Social Crisis in Byzantium after the Fourth Crusade, 1203-1204”, *Mediterranean World* 22 (2015), 147-153. See also I. Dujčev, *La crise ideologique de 1203-1204 et ses répercussions sur la civilisation byzantine*, [Cahiers de Travaux et de Conférences, I: Christianisme byzantin et Archéologie Chrétienne] Paris 1975; I. Giarenis, “Η Δ΄ Σταυροφορία, η άλωση της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1204) και η συγκρότηση των κρατών της Τραπεζούντας, της Νικαίας και της Ηπείρου”, in: *Dialexeis II*, edited by C. N. Constantinides, Ioannina 2004, esp. pp. 63-73; I. Giarenis, “Τα κράτη της Νικαίας, της Ηπείρου και της Τραπεζούντας έως το 1230. Δράση, αντιπαραθέσεις, αντοχές και συμβιβασμοί”, in: *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek World*, edited by N. G. Moschonas, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 251-253.

7 On the most eminent figures between the Crusaders, see J. Longnon, *Les compagnons de Villehardouin. Recherches sur les croisés de la quatrième croisade*, Geneva 1978.

intervention which would lead to the overcoming of a general crisis for the Christian World, which was symbolically epitomized in the dominance of the Holy Land by the Muslims. That situation had been regarded already since the late 11th century as totally inappropriate and unacceptable from a pious Christian point of view; therefore, military and political action had been considered as absolutely necessary.

For a better apprehension of the political, social and military data of the era, one should always bear in mind that at the beginning of the 13th century, when the Fourth Crusade had been propagated and largely prepared, Crusader States had already been founded in the East and had functioned as hybrid states from a political, social and ideological point of view.⁸

In 1201 the Crusader army was assembled in Venice, with the declared destination of Egypt. But the Venetian chief, the doge Enrico Dandolo,⁹ put a – first, as it was to prove – diversion of the Crusade as a precondition for the transfer of the Crusaders to their declared destination. The “station” which the Crusaders were pressed to make was at Zara (modern Zadar), Dalmatia, which had recently rebelled against Venice and had subsequently renowned the sovereignty of the king of Hungary. The Crusaders had to accept the Venetian offer, since there was no realistic alternative. As a result, Zara was besieged and conquered in November 1202, whereas looting and ferocities also did happen.¹⁰ By that point, an urgent crisis on the Holy Land which was calling for immediate and effective action had resulted in the conquest of a city whose control Venice intended to regain.

Byzantium subsequently provided the Crusaders with a highly attractive motive or alibi for a second diversion, on the ground of another crisis which was also existent and crucial at that very era, and was evident both in the capital and in the provinces of Byzantine Empire. That crisis had its roots on the political and economic weakening of the Byzantine Empire, which had been gradually intensified and somehow maximized during the reign of the Angeloi emperors, from 1185 to the arrival of the Crusaders and the conquest of the city in 1203/1204.¹¹

However, the main causes of the gradual economic downfall of the Byzantine Empire had been effectively present and apparent from the end of the 11th century onwards; the overall fiscal policy of the Komnenoi emperors and especially their practice of granting tax privileges to the Italian maritime powers of the era, namely Venice, Genoa and Pisa, contributed to a situation which can be described, as a modern Italian scholar put it – admittingly, with a

8 On their relationship with Byzantium up to that period, see R.-J. Lilie, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096-1204*, translated by J. C. Morris and Jean E. Ridings, Oxford 1995.

9 On the person and his career see Th. F. Madden, *Enrico Dandolo and the Rise of Venice*, Baltimore 2003.

10 J. Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-126; see also M. Meschini, *1204, l'incompiuta. La quarta crociata e le conquiste di Costantinopoli*, [Meditazioni] Milan 2004, pp. 72-74.

11 On critical aspects of the respective process see M. Angold, *The Byzantine Empire 1025-1204. A Political History*, London & New York 1984, pp. 263-283; *Byzantium, 1180-1204: "The Sad Quarter of a Century"?*, edited by Alicia Simpson, [International Symposium 22] Athens 2015.

generous portion of anachronism – “when Italy was a superpower”.¹² Byzantium was weak and unceasingly further impoverished in that competition; it had thus been led to the position of a state which desperately needed assistance from the West to confront the dangers and threats its opponents (especially Normans and Seljuk Turks) presented to it.

The assistance Byzantium received from the West to deal with an urgent problem gradually led to the further deepening and consolidation of the crisis, and to the creation of a situation in which the state had almost entirely lost its economic and military integrity. What was left to happen was the complete loss of its political entity. That occurred in 1203, after a respective call for action from a player in the internal Byzantine system of political controversy and balance of the era.¹³

His name was Alexios; he was the son of the former Byzantine emperor Isaakios II Angelos. Alexios had been able to flee from Constantinople on a Pisan boat heading to the West, and soon called the Crusaders to help himself and his father to re-establish themselves on the throne of Constantinople. Alexios found shelter at the court of his brother-in-law Philip of Swabia, where he also met some other important and influential Crusaders and tried to create the preconditions for a diversion of the Crusade movement to Byzantium and its capital. Alexios subsequently met Pope Innocent III, who kindly welcomed him, but practically discouraged him on his ambitions.¹⁴

The Byzantine prince at that point attempted to persuade the Crusaders, making the promise that he would provide them with substantial grants and profits if they helped him re-establish himself on the Byzantine throne. Vast amounts of money, namely 800,000 *hyperpyron* coins,¹⁵ the Church Union and the supply of a Byzantine army consisting of 10,000 men for the continuation of Crusade were among the rich and generous promises. Those consequently led to high expectations for the Crusaders; the traditional position and identity of Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire were not incompatible to that. Nevertheless, in all those estimations the existent crisis, which had radically changed the economic and social data of the empire, had been either neglected or underestimated.

Thus, the fierce internal political competitions and fractions led to a management of

12 G. Ruffolo, *Quando l'Italia era una superpotenza. Il ferro di Roma e l'oro dei mercanti*, Milan 2008.

13 On those issues see E. Chrysos, “Whose Fault? Reflections on Byzantine Shortcomings before and during the capture of Constantinople”, in: *The Fourth Crusade Revisited*, edited by P. Piatti, *op. cit.*, 155-162.

14 See T. G. Koliass, “Η διαχείριση της σταυροφορικής κίνησης από το Βυζάντιο”, in: *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek World*, edited by N. G. Moschonas, *op. cit.*, p. 109; Z. N. Tsiapanlis, “Η άλωση της Κωνσταντινούπολης το 1204 κατά τις δυτικές πηγές. Ερμηνευτική προσέγγιση στο ζήτημα της «εκτροπής»”, *ibid.*, esp. pp. 190-191.

15 On that value see M. Hendy, *Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire 1081-1261*, Washington D.C. 1969, p. 14. See also W. Treadgold, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*, Stanford 1997, p. 663; Maria Ntourou-Iliopoulou, “Η Δ΄ Σταυροφορία. Οργάνωση της κίνησης και παρέκκλιση των στόχων”, in: *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek World*, edited by N. G. Moschonas, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-121.

the existent Byzantine crisis which promoted the Crusaders as a vital force that would hopefully solve the problem and smoothen the situation; the political and military step that was eventually decided and put in action was propagated as a “temporary diversion” of the Crusade and a cure for the problems of the Empire. Nonetheless, that very step was to further deepen the already existent crisis, and also consolidate the sharp political, cultural and religious rift, between East and West, as practically irreversible.

Until May 1203 the Crusaders had come to an agreement to make that diversion, the second one in their movement; their march now seemed to have actually taken the shape of a zig-zag, wherever wealth and interest called. On the 24th of May 1203, the Crusader fleet departed from Venice, after having pled for the protection of saint Nikolaos.¹⁶ One month later, the pope sent a letter to his cardinal legate Petro Capuano to express his anger and despair for the Crusaders’ decision for diversion to the byzantine capital. In June 1203, he also wrote immediately to the leaders of the Crusaders and actually forbade them to head towards Constantinople.¹⁷

The Crusaders travelled through Dyrrachion, Corfu (where they seem to have signed the highly important document of the *Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romaniae*), from Northern to Southern Ionian Sea, then from Trikeri they entered the Aegean Sea, passed by Northern Aegean islands such as Lemnos, and came to the port of Abydos.¹⁸ From there, the view was a magnificent one: According to the first-hand testimony of Robert de Clari, the crusaders “regarded the great size of the city, which was so long and so wide, and they marvelled it exceedingly”.¹⁹ Departing from there, the united Crusader fleet passed by and made port at Chalkedon, on the sea of Marmara.

The Byzantine navy was at that time in a really disappointing condition. When in the spring of 1203 Alexios III Angelos first tried to deal with the urgent issue, the abandonment of the army and navy preparations for a period of twenty years, under the reign of the Angeloi emperors, had resulted to the fact that only twenty ships were now in the emperor’s availability; furthermore, their condition was not the best possible.²⁰

16 See E. Faral (ed.), *Geoffrey de Villehardouin, La conquête de Constantinople*, Paris 1938-1939, vol. I, p. 122. On the importance of saint Nikolaos’s cult in the Mediterranean and beyond see especially M. Bacci (ed.), *San Nicola: splendori d’arte d’Oriente e Occidente*, Milan 2006; Idem, *San Nicola. Il grande taumaturgo*, [Storia e Società] Rome & Bari 2009.

17 On the papal attitude see *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 215, col. 106-110. See also D. E. Queller and Th. F. Madden, *op. cit.*, p. 102. On the papal legate see W. Maleczek, *Petrus Capuanus. Kardinal, Legat am vierten Kreuzzug, Theologe († 1214)*, [Publikationen des Historischen Instituts beim Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom, Abhandlungen, 8] Vienna 1988.

18 On the route see J. Pryor, “Winds, Waves, and Rocks: The Routes and Perils among them”, in: *Maritime Aspects of Migration*, edited by Kl. Fiedland, Cologne & Vienna 1989, esp. pp. 82-83; J. Richard, “Le transport outremer des croisés et des pèlerins”, *ibid.*, pp. 37-44. See also D. E. Queller and Th. F. Madden, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 106-107; J. Phillips, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 143-144.

19 See *Robert of Clari, The Conquest of Constantinople*, translated with introduction and notes by E. H. McNeal, reprint, [Records of Western Civilization] New York 2005, p. 67.

20 For a sketch of the military data, see J.-Cl. Cheynet, “La défense de l’Empire Romain d’Orient

When the Crusaders held a part of the walls of Constantinople, the Byzantine emperor Alexios III readily abandoned the city and his power, taking along with him a part of the imperial treasury. The crisis was again transformed, taking an intense social aspect; fires burst out throughout the city, destroying church and secular buildings alike, depriving many of the inhabitants from their properties, and leaving many families homeless or in a need to move urgently. The Crusaders tried to control the political situation in Constantinople and such an evolution was believed to have been accomplished when the Latins reinstalled Issakios II as a nominal emperor and Alexios IV Angelos as co-emperor and actual ruler of the empire.

Nevertheless, the political crisis was not over; the heavy fiscal burdens which were imposed by the new rulers rapidly made them highly unpopular to the subjects of the Empire.²¹ A contestation led to their dethronement and the ascension to the throne of another emperor named Alexios again, Alexios V, the so-called “Moutzouphlos”.²²

Alexios immediately initiated anti-Latin military expeditions, since he saw them as a political opponent of his power and his empire. He demonstrated bravery and strategic skills, but on February the loss of the miraculous icon of the *Panagia Nikopoios* (*Theotokos the Victory-giver*) led to a massive psychological trauma.²³ An “iconic icon” of Theotokos, who was the traditional patron of the city, now fell on the hands of the opponents, and soon a conviction spread throughout the inhabitants of the city that the victory was now to be given by her to the Crusaders, because of the Byzantines’ sins.

Apart from beliefs and convictions, the Crusaders saw things more practically. They had a quite easy choice to make. One possibility was to leave Alexios, a declared enemy of theirs, to the Byzantine throne and head to the Holy Land; the alternative was considered much more attractive to them: an attempt to conquer and rule the Byzantine Empire themselves, for their own sake and interest. Acting towards that prospective, they took care to divide all the lands of the empire between them, following the treaty called *Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romaniae*. According to that a Latin Emperor and a Roman Catholic Patriarch of Constantinople were to be established in the City as soon as the targets of the Crusaders were achieved.²⁴

lors de la quatrième croisade”, in: *La Grèce et la Guerre*, edited by Ph. Contamine, J. Jouanna and M. Zink, [Cahiers de la Villa Kéryllos 26] Paris 2015, 171-192.

21 J. Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-232.

22 On the person and his activity, see B. Hendrickx and Corinna Matzukis, “Alexios V Ducas Mourtzouphlos: His Life, Reign, and Death (?-1204)”, *Hellenika* 31 (1979), 108-132.

23 On the icon, its cult, and the respective iconographical type see A. Rizzi, “Un’icona costantinopolitana del XII secolo a Venezia: la Madonna Nicopeia”, *Thesaurismata* 17 (1980), 290-306; W. Seibt, “Der Bildtypus der Theotokos Nikopoios. Zur Ikonographie der Gottesmutter-Ikone, die 1030/31 in der Blachernenkirche wiederaufgefunden wurde”, *Byzantina* 13 (1985), 551-564; Chryssa Maltezos, “Βενετία και βυζαντινή παράδοση: Η εικόνα της Παναγίας Νικοποίου”, *Symmeikta* 9 (1994), 7-20.

24 For a critical and carefully annotated edition of the treaty see A. Carile, “Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romaniae”, *Studi Veneziani* 7 (1965), 125-305. For the political framework and the difficulties in its implementation, see N. Oikonomidès, “La décomposition de l’empire byzantin à la veille de 1204 et les origines de l’empire de Nicée”, *Actes du XV^e Congrès International d’Études Byzantines*, vol. I/1, Athens 1976, pp. 3-28 [reprinted in: N. Oikonomides, *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade*:

On the 13th of April 1204 the Crusaders conquered and sacked Constantinople. That proved to be the starting point for the establishment of the Latin Empire of Constantinople.²⁵ Furthermore, decisive steps were made for the intensification and consolidation of fragmentation on the lands which were until then either part of the Byzantine Empire or had not yet been definitely separated from it. Apart from that, beside the Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople, another one – the Latin (i.e. Roman Catholic) – started to exist and compete it, or rather tried hard to substitute it in its ecclesiastical and ideological functions.²⁶ The Orthodox Patriarch Ioannes X Kamateros had to flee and find temporary shelter in Didymoteichon, Thrace,²⁷ and his successors had Nicaea as their actual seat in exile. That city was of great religious value, as the place where the first and the last Ecumenical Councils had taken place –according to the Orthodox Christians’ counting, of course.

As an outcome of the Latin conquest, a new deep and rapidly expanded crisis emerged throughout the capital and other cities on the lands of the former empire. The latter's political death provoked an immense shock and further deepened the crisis. It now took the characteristics of a major social and humanitarian one, with important and critical political, economic and demographic aspects. Furthermore, the symbolic and ideological value of the conquest was immense. What proved to be the decisive – though, certainly not the final – conquest of the City also determined substantial data in religious, spiritual and artistic spheres.²⁸

The Byzantines were steadily considered by the Westerners as schismatic, and that perception facilitated fierce, savage and cruel behaviour during the three days of the sack which had been unfolded in the city. Works of art, icons and relics had been destroyed or grabbed to be eventually moved to the West (Venice, France and elsewhere).²⁹ Just to mention

Studies, Texts, Monuments, Hampshire 1992 (as study no. XX)].

25 On the structure, character and function of that empire see B. Hendrickx, *Οι πολιτικοί και στρατιωτικοί θεσμοί της λατινικής αυτοκρατορίας της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, Thessaloniki 1970 [reprinted, Athens 1999]; Idem, *Οι θεσμοί της Φραγκοκρατίας. Η λατινική αυτοκρατορία της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως και το λατινικό βασίλειο της Θεσσαλονίκης*, Thessaloniki 2007; F. van Tricht, *The Latin Renovatio of Byzantium. The Empire of Constantinople (1204-1228)*, transl. P. Longbottom [The Medieval Mediterranean 90] Leiden & Boston 2011; S. Burkhardt, *Mediterranes Kaisertum und imperiale Ordnungen. Das lateinische Kaiserreich von Konstantinopel*, [Europa im Mittelalter 25] Berlin 2014.

26 G. Fedalto, “Il patriarcato latino di Costantinopoli, 1204-1261”, *Studia Patavina* 18 (1971), 390-464. See also R. Janin, “Au lendemain de la conquête de Constantinople. Les tentatives d’union des Églises (1204-1208)”, *Échos d’Orient* 32 (1933), 5-21, 195-202; R. Janin, “Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine (1204-1261)”, *Études Byzantines* 2 (1944), 134-184. See also E. Lambriniadis, “Die Brüder Ioannis und Nikolaos Mesaritis. Verteidiger der Orthodoxie in den Unionsverhandlungen von 1204 bis 1214 (im historischen und theologischen Rahme der Epoche)”, *Kleronomia* 28 (1996), 187-236.

27 P. Wirth, “Zur Frage eines politischen Engagements Patriarch Johannes’ X Kamateros nach dem vierten Kreuzzug”, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 4 (1977), 239-252; I. Giarenis, *Η συγκρότηση και η εδραίωση*, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 234-246.

28 D. Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*, Cambridge 2007.

29 See P. Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, Genova 1878-1879 [re-impression, introduced by J. Durand, (Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques - Histoire, 19) Paris 2004]. See also Athena

one of them, the Holy Face (Mandylion), in which the characteristics of the face of Jesus Christ were thought to have been miraculously depicted, seems to have been translated to France and to have become a part of Sainte-Chapelle, the royal chapel in Paris.³⁰

The people also suffered from the conquest. Many Byzantines were killed in Constantinople in the summer of 1204. Women were raped, children were tortured or killed. A substantial part of the city's populace had to leave their fatherland and try to move to more remote areas, where there was a hope for the establishment of independent political life (and independent states trying to survive, prevail, and also propagate their linkage to the Byzantine imperial legacy).³¹

Anti-Latin sentiments were common to wide parts of the Byzantine people,³² the traditional misunderstandings between the two worlds now met the wild behaviour of the conquerors and the deep trauma of the Byzantine people, that now felt even more like the *New Israel*. The actuality and the experience of the exile urgently asked for a vision of the return to the lost paradise, a reconquest *par excellence*.³³ That reconquest of Constantinople and its hinterland constituted the *raison d'être* for the empire of Nicaea until 1261, when it was eventually accomplished. It also played an important role in the construction of politics, diplomacy and ideology in the state of Epiros and the empire of Trebizond,³⁴ which nevertheless continued to exist and act after 1261 as rival states to the re-established Byzantine Empire.

Kolia-Dermitzaki, "Ληλασία και μεταφορά λαφύρων και κινητών πολιτισμικών αγαθών στη Δύση", in: *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek World*, edited by N. G. Moschonas, *op. cit.*, 299-326.

30 See St. Runciman, "Some Remarks on the Image of Edessa", *Cambridge Historical Journal* 3 (1931), esp. pp. 251-252; J. Durand, "L'image d'Abgar à la Sainte-Chapelle de Paris", in: *Das Christusbild. Zu Herkunft und Entwicklung in Ost und West*, edited by K. Dietz, Ch. Hannick, Carolina Lutzka and Elisabeth Maier, [Das Östliche Christentum, Neue Folge 62], Würzburg 2016, 336-359.

31 See D. E. Queller and Th. F. Madden, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-203; J. Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 258-280.

32 P. Gounaridis, "Η εικόνα των Λατίνων", in: *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek World*, edited by N. G. Moschonas, *op. cit.*, 43-60.

33 See M. Angold, "Greeks and Latins after 1204: the perspective of exile", in: *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, edited by B. Arbel, B. Hamilton and D. Jacoby, London 1986, 63-86; "Byzantium in Exile", in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. V: c. 1198-c. 1300, edited by D. Abulafia, Cambridge 1999, 543-568. See also D. Angelov, "Byzantine Ideological Reactions to the Latin Conquest of Constantinople", in: *Urbs Capta. The Fourth Crusade and its Consequences*, edited by Angeliki Laiou, *op. cit.*, 293-310; I. Giarenis, "Nicaea and the West, 1204-1261: Reality in Rhetoric", in: *Byzantium and the West: Perception and Reality. Papers from a conference held at the University of Athens, 5-6 September 2014*, edited by N. G. Chrissis, Athina Kolia-Dermitzaki and Angeliki Papa-georgiou, London (forthcoming).

34 See I. Giarenis, *Η συγκρότηση και η εδραίωση*, *op. cit.*; Alkmene Stavridou-Zafraka, *Νίκαια και Ηπειρος τον 13ο αιώνα*, *op. cit.*; I. Giarenis, "Τα κράτη της Νίκαιας, της Ηπείρου και της Τραπεζούντας έως το 1230. Δράση, αντιπαραθέσεις, ανταγές και συμβιβασμοί", in: *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek World*, edited by N. G. Moschonas, *op. cit.*, 251-268; M. Fassolio, "Una comparazione possibile? La crisi di Bisanzio e lo sviluppo dei principati separatisti di Trebisonda e di Epiro", in: *Medioevo in formazione. Studi storici e multidisciplinarietà*, edited by A. Luongo and M. Paperini, [Confronti 8] Livorno 2015, 211-221.