

BYZANTINE DIPLOMATIC STRATEGIES DURING THE PERIOD OF THE FIRST FOUR CRUSADES

Raul Constantin TĂNASE*

ABSTRACT:

IN THE CONTEXT OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN THE GREEKS AND THE LATINS DURING THE PERIOD OF THE FIRST CRUSADES, THE BYZANTINE DIPLOMATIC CEREMONIAL CONSTITUTED A SYMBOLIC STATEMENT OF THE VALUES OF THE GREEK CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION AND A WAY OF LEGITIMIZING THE UNIVERSALIST CLAIMS OF THE EMPIRE OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT TOWARDS THE FOREIGN NATIONS. FOR THE FOREIGN VISITORS, THE MESSAGE OF THIS RITUAL WAS AT THE SAME TIME CULTURAL, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL, EMPHASIZING THE GLORY AND THE MAJESTY OF THE BASILEUS WITHIN THE TERRESTRIAL AND CELESTE ORDER. AS AN INDICATOR OF THE BYZANTINE IDENTITY AND OF THE DIVERSITY BETWEEN THE GREEKS AND THE WESTERN, THE IMPERIAL PROTOCOL BECAME ONE OF THE ESSENTIAL REFERENCE FRAME FOR THE CULTURAL - IDEOLOGICAL ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN THE TWO CHRISTIAN WORLDS DURING THE AGE OF THE HOLY WARS OF THE CHRISTIANITY. THIS STUDY AIMS TO ANALYZE A NUMBER OF THE MEANS AND STRATEGIES OF THE GREEK DIPLOMACY USED BY THE BYZANTINE LEADERS FOR THE CONSERVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT OF ITS MILITARY, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES.

KEY WORDS: CEREMONIAL, BYZANTINES, OATH, GIFTS, VOLUBILITY.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of the diplomatic exchanges between the East and the West during the period of the first crusades, the imperial ceremony represented a full expression of the Byzantine ideology and a symbolic way of asserting the profound beliefs and values of a group. The ceremonial determines the functioning of the Byzantine court and Greek society as a whole, since its subjects fulfilled certain roles within it¹. Because the protocol was intended to impress and to emphasize the imperial mystery, several crusaders eyewitnesses who participated, were generally fascinated by the extent of its development and the showing

* PhD. Candidate, Faculty of Orthodox Theology at University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania. Contact: tanase.raul@yahoo.com

This work was supported by the project "Excellence academic routes in the doctoral and postdoctoral research – READ" co-funded from the European Social Fund through the Development of Human Resources Operational Programme 2007-2013, contract no. POSDRU/159/1.5/S/137926.

¹ For example, the acclamations that are the responsibility of the people are a direct involvement of the subjects in the various rituals. Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, *Le livre des cérémonies*, tome I, traduit par Albert Vogt, (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1935-1939), cap. 2, 32.

of richness²; these elements were designed to emphasize the dignity of the protagonists and, at the same time, the majesty of the Byzantine Empire and the particular Greek sovereign's status. The discipline of the imperial court was strictly regulated by a complex system of priorities (*taxis*)³, specifying the rank and the role of the various officials within the protocol and their position in relation to the Basileus, considered the thirteenth apostle and the representative of the divine authority on earth. The divine and inaccessible nature of the Byzantine sovereign underlined the distance that separates him from his subjects, so that the contact of the latter with the terrestrial God's lieutenant was limited by a number of specific rules. The gifts offered to the Western leaders, the ritual exchanging the kiss of peace, the oath accomplished by the Latin leaders, the basileus's volubility, the banquets, the matrimonial alliances, all of this represented strategies that assured in many cases the success of the Byzantine diplomatic process during the period of the holy wars of Christianity.

THE BYZANTINE DIPLOMATIC STRATEGIES: OATH, GIFTS, VOLUBILITY.

The Byzantine diplomacy showed flexibility and had always adjusted to the internal and international political context generated by the passage of the Crusaders towards Constantinople. The Alexios Comnenus's negotiations with the Western leaders took into account the values and customs of the opponent. In this respect, the loyalty oath required by the basileus to foreign princes constituted a way of building mutual trust and a manner whereby the treaties acquired the validity and mandatory character. Apparently, it was a vow unilaterally provided by the foreign prince, king, nobles and Italian maritime republics. The Byzantine sources don't remember ever the Byzantine emperor's homage for reinforcing the agreements concluded with the participants in the first Crusade⁴. With the Comneni, treaties were bilateral in content but unilateral in form; the free act of the basileus donation remained a form of the Byzantine diplomacy until 1453. The oath of allegiance represents a part of the agreement⁵. Although in theory it was inviolable, in practice, the Byzantines could transgress the agreement when the imperial interests were threatened. The priority principle, according to which the Greek sovereign was able to abstain in a reply to subordinates, became intolerable for the Western leaders, for which the oath obligations were mutual and could not be violated. The soldiers of Christ began to doubt the sincerity of the gestures and statements of the Constantine's successors, especially when the latter sealed the alliances and agreements with the gifts.

The homage was considered a humiliating thing in the western feudal relations. Raoul de Caen indicates that Bohemond's oath was a humiliation and injustice to the Latins⁶. The idea that the Greeks were unfaithful, lazy and without dignity, opposed to the honor of the soldiers of Christ⁷. Raoul de Caen believes that the dishonor at which the Basileus subjected the Crusaders was the reason for the oath trespass. *Anonymous* noted that, although initially

² Guillaume de Tyr, *Chronique du Royaume Franc de Jerusalem de 1095 à 1184*, tome second, trad. de Geneviève et René Métais, (Paris:1999), XX, XXII, 355-356.

³ For this concept see Hélène Ahrweiler, *Ideologia politică a Imperiului bizantin*, (București: Corint, 2002), 123-135.

⁴ Angeliki Laiou, „The emperor's word: chrysobolls, oaths and synallagmatic relations in Byzantium (11th-12th C.)”, în: *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron, Travaux et Mémoires*, 14, Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, (Paris: 2002), 355.

⁵ Angeliki Laiou, „The emperor's word: chrysobolls, oaths and synallagmatic relations in Byzantium.....”, 362.

⁶ Raoul de Caen, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen – A history of the normans on the first crusade*, translated by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, (Ashgate, 2010), XII, 32-33.

⁷ Guibert de Nogent, *Geste de Dieu par les Francs. Histoire de la première croisade*, trad. de Monique-Cécile Garand, (Turnhout: Brepols), 1998, III, 4, 100.

they refused to perform the homage, pressed by necessity, the Westerners were forced to humble themselves in front of the Greek leader⁸. Guibert of Nogent stated that the Franks weren't afraid of anything except to being forced to swear before the small Greeks, the most coward of the people, fact that was an everlasting shame⁹. The chroniclers are critical to those who have accepted the conditions of the Orientals, even if the Latin acts are explained by other more pressing reasons than the pride¹⁰.

A concluding mechanism of the treaty requiring the familiarity with the enemy constituted the ratification by oath. Employing the oath as a way to ensure the viability of the agreement involves the knowledge of the religious dogmata of the enemy and represents a manner of recognizing the other's beliefs in delicate moments of suspicion when the assurances were necessary. One of the vows was performed on the Gospel, which was the usual western procedure in making the covenant and belonged to the legal procedures of the Latin kingdom. For Christians, to swear by touching sacred relics or a holy book, served as a certainty because the involvement of the sacred character was a guarantee of the good faith of those who perform the oath¹¹. This gesture of touching a sacred object had no significance in the Muslim world, since for the Turkish the verbal component of an agreement was essential¹².

The vassalage contract was drawn up in written form rarely; usually, this happened when the two people involved were the key players on the political scene. The ritual whereby the relationships between the two were established included certain rites, gestures, as homage and faith or the fidelity oath. The homage entailed the pronouncement of the formula and, in particular, a symbolic gesture: the vassal placed his hands clasped in those of the lord. In some regions, such as in Northern Italy, the subjects didn't perform the tribute. The oath of fidelity had a necessary character: the vassal performs it by standing with his hand on the Bible or on holy relics¹³. In some countries, such as France, the homage and the oath were accompanied by a third rite: the kiss that the noble gave to the subject. These symbolic gestures were accomplished once and for all but, in exceptional cases, the oath may be renewed¹⁴. The main advantages arising from this contract for the subject was constituted by receiving a territory (feoff). This was accompanied by a symbolic gesture, the investiture. The lord conveyed to the vassal a symbolic object (scepter, baton, knife, gloves). This object may symbolize the transmission of the power on the feoff to the vassal, authority held by the lord until then. Initially, the subjects had the right to use the feud and benefit of what it produced. He couldn't divide it, sell it or give up. With the passage of time, as far as the vassal was fully recognized as a master of his land, he could dispose of his field as he wished.

⁸ *Histoire anonyme de la première croisade (Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum)*, éditée et traduite par Louis Bréhier, (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1924), 29-31. Foucher of Chartres justifies the oath's necessity for the Crusaders leaders in that they weren't enough strong if they didn't reach an agreement with the emperor. Foulcher de Chartres, *Histoire des croisades*, in: *Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, ed. M. Guizot, no. 68, (Paris: Librairie Chez J.L.J. Brière, 1825), IV, 24.

⁹ Guibert de Nogent, *Geste de Dieu par les Francs...*, III, 4, 100.

¹⁰ Raoul of Caen and *Gesta Francorum* complain that Bohemond was humiliated in front of Alexios, because he had sworn loyalty to basileus. Raoul de Caen, *Gesta Tancredi*, in: *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. III, (Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, 1866), xi, 612-613; *Histoire anonyme de la première croisade (Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum)*..., 6, 31.

¹¹ *O city of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, translated by Harry J. Magoulias, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), 46, 26-27; Ana Comnena, *Alexiada*, vol. II, trad. de Marina Marinescu, prefață și note de Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, (București: Minerva, 1977), XIV, 27, 251.

¹² Yvonne Friedman, „Peacemaking. Perceptions and practices in medieval Latin East”, in: *The crusades and the Near East. Cultural histories*, ed. Conor Kostick, (Routledge, London and New York, 2011), 247.

¹³ For the practice of the oath on the Bible see also Yvonne Friedman, „Peacemaking. Perceptions and practices in medieval Latin East”..., 247.

¹⁴ Jacques le Goff, *Le Moyen Âge*, (Paris: Bordsas, 1962), 29.

At his death, the feud passed again in the lord's possession, but, in the next period, it will return to the greatest son, who had to renew the vow¹⁵. When the subject was considered violated in his rights by the senior, he could deny his faith, by keeping the land. In turn, the lord, in case of the agreement violation, could withdraw the support and the domain to the vassal, after a consultation with his staff.

The presence of mercenaries in the Byzantine army was considered inadmissible by the Latin chroniclers. This is an indicator of the Greeks cowardice and a clue of the lack of military resources in the empire. The Crusaders were afraid of being regarded as mercenaries by the Byzantine, refusing to take the risk on behalf of those who weren't enough brave to lead their troops. This problem occurred during the time of the first holy expedition, when the emperor got the Crusaders the vow that they will fight against the Turks, keeping the spoils that refused to share with the soldiers of Christ. Guillaume of Tyr and Robert of Clari claimed that basileus, aware of the fact that the Greeks were effeminate, preferred the Latin loyalty and courage and entrusted to them the main tasks.

What shocked the imaginary of the soldiers of Christ was the Byzantines' lack of loyalty to their king, which often took the form of the power usurpation. The murder of the les-majesty constituted the most reprehensible practice in the feudal world, where the obedience and the defense of the lord preceded other considerations; the assault to the sovereign power can disrupt the providential order. Michael VII is overthrown by Nicephorus III Botaniates (1078-1081); this will serve as a pretext for Robert Guiscard to attack the empire, arguing that his actions had as a reason the reinstatement on the throne for Michael and the justice restoring, especially since his daughter was engaged to the son of the deposed basileus¹⁶. Guillaume of Tyr shows that cunning Alexios maliciously usurped the throne of Nechifor Botaniates¹⁷. What was a simple coup d'état for the Byzantines, represented the most serious act of disloyalty from the point of view of the soldiers of Christ. Alexius Comnenus, for overthrowing Nichefor III Botaniates from the throne fifteen years before the start of the crusade, constituted the subject of serious complaints from the Latin chroniclers¹⁸. Guibert of Nogent refuses to recognize the legitimate succession of Alexios, who usurped the imperial title¹⁹. The emperor's betrayal was reflected on the subjects as they tolerated the tyrannical acts of their master and become accomplices in its actions. Because the murder and perjury were complementary in the Western world, the usurpation was related to the credibility of the oaths and treaties concluded by the Byzantines. The loyalty and fidelity values seemed to be respected by the Muslims rather than the Christ's fellows to the disappointment of Westerners²⁰. The chivalrous ethics forbade the accompanying with a guilty person and postulated the punish by a divine punishment worthy of the crime.

Regarding to the sincerity of the Greek leader, the Western chroniclers denounced the volubility. The eloquence represents an important asset of imperial diplomacy, the art of convincing or to flatter in order to earn the goodwill of the partner. Odon of Deuil mentions the long phrases of the speaker and interpreter during the audience offered by the King Louis

¹⁵ Jacques le Goff, *Le Moyen Âge...*, 30.

¹⁶ Ana Comnena, *Alexiada*, vol. I, trad. de Marina Marinescu, prefață și note de Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, (București: Minerva, 1977), I, XIII, 2, 53.

¹⁷ Guillaume de Tyr, *Chronique du Royaume Franc de Jerusalem de 1095 à 1184*, tome premier, trad. de Geneviève et René Métails, (Paris, 1999), II, IV, 57.

¹⁸ Guillaume de Tyr, *Chronique du Royaume Franc de Jerusalem de 1095 à 1184*, tome premier..., II, IV, 57.

¹⁹ Guibert de Nogent, *Geste de Dieu par les Francs...*, I, 5, 70.

²⁰ Marc Carrier, *L'Autre à l'époque des croisades: les Byzantins vus par les chroniqueurs du monde latin (1096-1261)*, Éditions universitaires européennes, 2012, 75.

VII to the basileus envoys²¹, while Order Vital testified that the Greeks are superior in eloquence on other peoples but regarding to the armed conflict they are lacking of courage²². The Byzantins considered this quality as an essential virtue of the ideal ruler and a manifestation of the divine inspiration by which he seduced his subjects. What Latins perceived as an exaggerated verbalism, constituted a proud for the Greeks who boasted of their oratorical skills. Ana Comnena attributed this quality to his father, who was distinguished as an exemplary general and emperor because of his eloquence and charm of his conversation²³. The lie wasn't necessarily dishonorable from the Byzantine perspective, especially when it was the view of the Greek sovereign's on the other nations. The Constantine's successors considered themselves superior to the other nations and the deformation of the truth was accepted when there were taken into account the empire's interest²⁴. For Latins, in contradiction, the volubility of the Orientals was destabilizing and elusive: the Western seniors preferred what was certain and honest, since the person's merit is quantified by deeds rather than by words. On the other hand, the Byzantines preferred the words instead of the facts, "the emperor's ambassadors gave good news but they didn't confirm it by facts; the Crusaders couldn't believe them because they used every time the same language full of excessive flattery"²⁵. The Constantine's successors chatter was considered a way to make a diversion on the real stakes of the negotiations and produced the interlocutors' confusion through the medium of an ongoing excessive rhetoric. Their habit of hiding the truth in beautiful words caused the appearance of the heresy²⁶. Because the volubility represented a common attribute for all Greeks, Odon of Deuil believes that one should always be suspicious about them²⁷. According to him, even the honorable receptions questioned the sincerity of the emperor. During the journey to Constantinople in 1147, the French chronicler says that Louis VII received letters expressing an exaggerated affection to be honest, but they also emphasized the fear of the basileus regarding to the Francs to whom he was tempted to persuade with vain and honeyed words²⁸. During the imperial audience granted to the Louis VII by Manuel Comnenus, Odon adds that the emperor's words were gracious but disingenuous: "if the body's gestures, the facial appearance and the words came from the heart, all those present could say that the emperor cherishes the king with a great affection; but such arguments were not only likely, never sure"²⁹. As soon as the Christ's soldiers crossed the Bosphorus, the willingness of the basileus disappeared. When Louis VII sent delegates to Manuel for restoring the march from which they retired, they hadn't benefited by the special reception as a few days before; the delegates had to wait one day to get the audience, without food, and were forced to sleep on the cold marble. Raymond d'Aguilers mentions also the Byzantine's perfidy. Arriving at Durazzo, the soldiers of Christ believed to be in their country, considering that Alexios and his subjects are brothers and cooperators; however, the latter had become cruel as lions, they attacked the Crusaders and

²¹ Odon de Deuil, *Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII.*, in: *Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, ed. M. Guizot, no. 68, (Paris: Librairie Chez J.L.J.Brière, 1825), II, 296.

²² Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, vol. VI, trans. Marjorie Chibnall, (Oxford University Press, 1969-1980), XIII, 34, 505.

²³ Ana Comnena, *Alexiada*, vol. I....., III, VII, 3, 131.

²⁴ Marc Carrier, „Perfidious and Effeminate Greeks: the Representations of Byzantine Ceremonial in the Western Chronicles of the Crusades (1096-1204)”, in: *Annuario dell'Istituto Romeno di Cultura e Ricerca Umanistica Venezia*, IV (2002): 54.

²⁵ Odon de Deuil, *Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII....*, III, 318.

²⁶ Liutprand de Crémone, *Ambassades à Byzance*, traduit du latin par Joël Schnapp, (Toulouse: Anacharsis Éditions, 2004), 27.

²⁷ Odon de Deuil, *Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII...*, II, 296.

²⁸ Odon de Deuil, *Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII....*,II, 295.

²⁹ Odon de Deuil, *Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII...*,III, 320.

killed them, although the emperor sent to them letters during the way in letters talking about peace and brotherhood, words which remained without consequences. The same complaints are addressed by Guibert of Nogent to Alexios, since the latter ordered secretly the killing of the men of Godefroy of Bouillon³⁰. During the second Crusade, the Byzantines attacked the German troops even if before they had sworn that they would facilitate the transition and will not be aggressive³¹. Even Nicetas Choniates recalls that as soon as the German armies were camped before Adrianople because one of the relatives of the king fell ill, the Greeks attacked at midnight and they burned the sick man and his company³². Therefore, it is not surprising that many chroniclers and Crusaders have suddenly become distrustful regarding to the Byzantine diplomacy. This doubt was apparent during the ritual of the kisses exchange at the beginning of each diplomatic meeting, a medieval tradition suggesting the good faith, honesty and loyalty of each participant³³.

The gifts were a fundamental step in the process of building mutual trust within the negotiations³⁴. The gifts of the Greeks confirmed the empire's superiority over the other nations and were a mean to gain their friendship and loyalty³⁵. Although this method was successful in whole, the empire's products being considered of the best quality, however there was a disadvantage to the diplomatic level, since, in the time, the offerings of Constantine's successors will be seen as a tool of purchasing different people. For example, in the tenth century, the Russians believes that behind the offers of the Byzantines were hidden the deceit and, therefore, they showed caution in their dealings with the emperor. Although some nations had appreciated the basileus' generosity, those who came in direct contact with him had suspicions on the real intentions of the Orientals, considering that the latter exploited the greed of the foreigners to their advantage. The gifts of the basileus depended on the ambassadors' importance and rank, and on the existing relations between the two nations. The offers aimed at shocking the visitors and they sealed the alliance concluded.

There is a cultural difference between the East and the West when granting the offerings. In the East, bringing gifts constituted a primary gesture for opening the negotiations. In an old French manuscript of Guillaume of Tyr it is available the description of an event when the northern leaders offered gifts of gold, horses and expensive clothes of Baldwin I who was receiving them sitting on his throne³⁶. In the West, the gifts marked the culmination of the process of negotiation and often meant the hierarchical relationship between the parties. The prominent part gave offerings to the lower, marking its dependency status. Apart from the greed of the soldiers of Christ, the Byzantine's gifts were perceived as a veil for their dishonest intentions. Guillaume of Tyr shows that basileus fills the princes with gifts, but not because of his generosity or benevolence but only out of fear and astuteness. The principles, led by their simplicity and sincerity of heart, believed in the evil of Greeks, in the persevering wiles of the emperor, especially since the latter has filled them with offerings and showed a great kindness to all. Albert d'Aix claims that the Greeks'

³⁰ Guibert de Nogent, *Geste de Dieu par les Francs...*, II, 12, 96.

³¹ Odon de Deuil, *Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII.....*, III, 316.

³² *O city of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates.....*, 63, 37.

³³ Odon de Deuil, *Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII.....*, III, 320.

³⁴ Ana Comnena, *Alexiada*, vol. II,, X, VII, 3-5, 92-93.

³⁵ Guillaume de Tyr, *Chronique du Royaume Franc de Jerusalem de 1095 à 1184*, tome premier ..., II, XXI, p. 80 ; II, XVI, pp. 71-72; II, XVI, 73.

³⁶ Yvonne Friedman, „Peacemaking. Perceptions and practices in medieval Latin East”, 244.

presents were misleading since they were returning to the imperial coffers as Christ's soldiers had to buy supplies at higher prices set by the Greek sovereign³⁷.

The Western chroniclers believed that the offerings are a manifestation of the betrayal of the Greeks and many Latin leaders have fallen into their trap because of greed. The Byzantines easily remarked the Latin avarice; Ana Comnena presents the Franks who had always their greedy mouths open in front of the richness³⁸. The gifts were a means by which Westerners have fallen prey to the fake of the Byzantines. Some Crusaders' leaders were aware of this danger and therefore tried to avoid to participate to the diplomatic meeting and Byzantine ceremony: according to Albert d'Aix, Godfrey of Bouillon refused several times the meeting with Alexios before encamped in front of Constantinople, preferring to stay safe from the tricks of the Greeks³⁹, receiving what the emperor gave him from the distance⁴⁰.

CONCLUSION

The means and strategies of the Greek's diplomacy were always adapted to the needs of the empire and the values of the opponent. The Byzantine custom of adopting foreign rules aimed to include the other nations in the Greek hierarchy and taming potential adversaries through gifts and privileges. Thus, based on the tradition of western feudal oath, Alexios requested to the senior western the homage, which sanctioned the position of the basileus and the obligation of the Crusaders to return to the empire the conquered territories of the Muslim. Simultaneously, the homage represents an important step in building the mutual trust and a practical way in which treaties were ratified. The volubility of the Greek sovereign was often criticized by the Western chroniclers, since this diversion trying to attract the attention of Latin leaders and their willingness to support the cause of the successor of Constantine the Great. The lie was accepted by the Byzantines as long as thereby ensuring the fulfillment of their objectives; on the other side, the Westerners considered exaggerated the Greeks' flattery, preferring the armed struggle to the detriment of oratorical art. Contrary to the eloquence which was a feature of the knight, the volubility was considered a means to confuse the other part in front of a subterfuge. The gifts offered to the ambassadors aimed at winning their goodwill and loyalty and confirmed the superiority of the empire in relation with the foreign nations. Although they had speculated the Westerners' greed, the Greek's gifts became a veil hiding their dishonest and treacherous intentions, raising the suspicion and distrust of the Christ's soldiers. The vassalic oath, providing presents, the volubility of the basileus, constituted the means by which the Byzantines tried to ensure the efficiency of the diplomatic process and to fulfill their political, economical and military goals.

³⁷ Albert D'Aix, *Histoire des faits et gestes dans les régions d'outre mer, depuis l'année 1095 jusqu'à l'année 1120 de Jésus Christ*, vol. I, ed. F. Guizot, in: *Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, tome 20-21, (Paris: Librairie Chez J.L.J.Brière, 1825), II, 65.

³⁸ Ana Comnena, *Alexiada*, vol. II, ..., X, VI, 4, p. 89; XI, IX, 2, p. 151; X, V, 4, 84.

³⁹ Albert D'Aix, *Histoire des faits et gestes dans les régions d'outre mer....*, trad. F. Guizot, II, 58-59; Marc Carrier, „Perfidious and Effeminate Greeks: the Representations of Byzantine Ceremonial ...”, 60.

⁴⁰ Albert D'Aix believed that the Greeks' gifts are temporary and deceptive, since afterwards the Crusaders were forced to buy food and equipment for their journey to higher prices. Albert D'Aix, *Histoire des faits et gestes dans les régions d'outre mer....*, trad. F. Guizot, II, 58-59.

REFERENCES

1. **Ahrweiler, Hélène**; *Ideologia politică a Imperiului bizantin*, trad. de Cristina Jinga, București: Corint, 2002;
2. **Albert D'Aix**; „Histoire des faits et gestes dans les régions d'outre mer depuis l'année 1095 jusqu'à l'année 1120 de Jésus Christ”, vol. I, ed. F. Guizot, in: *Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, tome 20-21, Paris: Librairie Chez J.L.J.Brière, 1825;
3. **Ana Comnena**; *Alexiada*, vol. I-II, trad. de Marina Marinescu, prefață și note de Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, București: Minerva, 1977;
4. **Carrier, Marc**, „Perfidious and Effeminate Greeks: the Representations of Byzantine Ceremonial in the Western Chronicles of the Crusades (1096-1204)”, in: *Annuario dell'Istituto Romeno di Cultura e Ricerca Umanistica Venezia*, IV (2002): 47-68;
5. **Carrier, Marc**; *L'Autre à l'époque des croisades: les Byzantins vus par les chroniqueurs du monde latin (1096-1261)*, Éditions universitaires européennes, 2012;
6. **Constantin VII Porphyrogénète**; *Le livre des cérémonies*, I-II, trad. par Albert Vogt, Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1935-1939;
7. **Friedman, Yvonne**; „Peacemaking. Perceptions and practices in medieval Latin East”, in: *The crusades and the Near East. Cultural histories*, ed. Conor Kostick, (Routledge, London and New York, 2011) : 229-257;
8. **Guibert de Nogent**, *Geste de Dieu par les Francs. Histoire de la première croisade*, trad. de Monique-Cécile Garand, Turnhout : Brepols, 1998;
9. **Guillaume de Tyr**; *Chronique du Royaume Franc de Jerusalem de 1095 à 1184*, vol. I-II, trad. de Geneviève et René Métails, Paris, 1999;
10. *Histoire anonyme de la première croisade (Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum)*, éditée et traduite par Louis Bréhier, Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1924;
11. **Laiou, Angeliki**, „The emperor's word: chrysobolls, oaths and synallagmatic relations in Byzantium (11th-12th C.)”, in: *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron, Travaux et Mémoires*, 14, Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, (Paris, 2002) : 347-362;
12. **Le Goff, Jacques**, *Le Moyen Âge*, Paris: Bordas, 1962;
13. **Liutprand de Crémone**; *Ambassades à Byzance*, traduit du latin par Joël Schnapp, Toulouse: Anacharsis Éditions, 2004;
14. *O city of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, translated by Harry J. Magoulias, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984;
15. **Odon de Deuil**; „Histoire de la croisade de Louis VII”, in: *Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, ed. M. Guizot, no. 68, Paris: Librairie Chez J.L.J.Brière, 1825;
16. **Raoul de Caen**, *The Gesta Tancredi of Ralph of Caen— A history of the normans on the first crusade*, translated by Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach, Ashgate, 2010; *Gesta Tancredi*, in : *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux*, vol. III, Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, 1866;
17. **Vitalis, Orderic**, *The Ecclesiastical History*, vol. VI, trans. Marjorie Chibnall, Oxford University Press, 1969-1980.