

1. Byzantium and the Seljuks: Background and Main Research Question

When medievalists speak about twelfth-century Byzantium, they usually and especially in recent discussions mention the crusades and problems of mutual misunderstanding between east and west, which led to the fall of Constantinople in the wake of the Fourth Crusade in 1204. In such discussions specialists in the western middle ages occasionally neglect the fact that twelfth-century Byzantium was not solely occupied with the crusades, but also with the complex relations with the new neighbors to the east and to the west. I am particularly interested in the relations between Byzantium and its eastern neighbors: the Seljuk Turks. By this name I mean all Turkic-speaking tribes who invaded Anatolia in the end of the eleventh century and formed up their conglomerates-states there in the twelfth century. To denote them in the text I use both terms: “the Turks” and “the Seljuks”.

The Seljuks appeared on the Byzantine borders suddenly in the 1040s. In 1071 they defeated Byzantine emperor Romanos IV Diogenes in the battle of Manzikert. Ten years later they arrived at the shores of the Bosphorus. Alexios I Komnenos (r. 1081–1118), by means of war and diplomacy, moved the Byzantine-Seljuk border zone eastward. His son John II Komnenos (r. 1118–1143) and grandson Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143–1180) continued Alexios’ policies and pushed the Turks further east, from the valleys of coastal Asia Minor. Two nomadic conglomerates – the Danishmendide emirate and the Seljuk sultanate centered around Ikonion – fought for river valleys and grazing lands with Byzantium and each other. The border war continued all the way down to the fall of Constantinople in 1204. The newly emerging “empire of Nicaea” and the renewed sultanate of Ikonion concluded a conscious piece, which lasted more than fifty years until the coming of the Mongols.

These deeds of the Seljuk Turks and the Byzantines were recorded by the same Byzantine writers who wrote about Byzantium and the crusades. The aim of my dissertation is to investigate the image of the Seljuk Turks in Byzantine literature of the eleventh and twelfth centuries – defining literature (mostly court rhetoric, in prose and verse) as the political and public discourse of the empire – and thus add a crucial aspect to our ever deepening understanding of pre-Komnenian and Komnenian Byzantine history and culture, always keeping in mind the different agendas of different authors and the intricate interplay between rhetorical production and *Realpolitik* in a courtly world of patronage and performances.

What then was the image of Seljuk Turks in eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine literature? This large question falls into groups of subquestions, which will be answered successively in the chapters of the dissertation.

2. Sources

Currently, I have around fifty source texts of different genres, lengths, and value. The most important sources for my topic are the works of historiographers (e.g., Michael Attaleiates, Anna Komnene, Niketas Choniates), but I also use court poetry (Theodore Prodromos, “Manganeios Prodromos”), court rhetoric (Michael Italikos), epistolography (Theophylact of Ochrid), one epic poem (*Digenis Akrites*) and many other works of different genres including one astrological poem.

There are three main problems with the sources for my dissertation. First one is the problem of “Byzantine historiography”, second is the problem of “selective use” of my sources and the third one is the problem of “unuse” or “disuse” of some of them.

First problem is the interpretation of Byzantine historiography. Byzantinists, who are working in the field which only lately had a gentle touch of postmodernism, still tend to believe their “histories”. One can explain this by the fact that for some periods of the Byzantine millennium there’s only one source or there are no sources at all. Perception of Byzantine historiography as a genre of Byzantine literature appeared in the field only in the second half of the twentieth century: one can connect it with the name of the famous scholar Alexander Kazhdan and his works on Niketas Choniates. Kazhdan created the basis for the “reinterpretation” of the Byzantine historiography on the basis of “modern literary theory”. He started his project of total re-evaluation of Byzantine literature on the basis of “linguistic turn” but did not manage to finish it until his death. Younger colleagues continued his work on the “de-positivisation” of Byzantinistics: among the most prominent one I can name Paul Magdalino and Margaret Mullett. Yet their work is far from the end: positivism with the direct retelling of sources remains the basic methodology for many of the colleagues.

Second problem is in the “selective use” of the sources. Sources in question here are famous examples of Byzantine historiography, such as *The Alexiad* of Anna Komnene or *Historia* of Niketas Choniates. Both sources became famous in the second half of the nineteenth century, when European (and partly American) historians focused their attention on the Crusades. Bits and pieces from these two Byzantine sources started their wandering through the endless volumes of textbooks and reference books of “Medieval History” and “Medieval literature”. There is no wonder, that these pieces (carefully selected by nineteenth-century European readers) depicted Byzantium in a very specific view, which was suitable for nineteenth century popular ideas about Byzantium as a weak, declining state. The standards of the perception of these two sources remained strong until the middle of the twentieth century, when some scholars started to understand, that reading whole *Alexiad* or *Historia* can be much more fruitful than partial translation of the most “interesting” pieces. Alexander Kazhdan prepared ground for the complete re-evaluation of the work of Niketas Choniates: same was done by Georgina Buckler for the work of Anna Komnene. In the end of the twentieth century Paul Magdalino did considerable contribution to the re-evaluation of these two sources. In the case of Choniates he proved, that supposedly “anti-Western” Niketas Choniates was in fact, a German sympathizer, while Anna Komnene, who was writing about the First Crusade some forty years after the event, obviously introduced in her source some biases and setbacks of her own time.

Third problem -- “Unuse” of sources -- leads to the serious gaps in the modern corpus of knowledge. The main problem here again is “tradition” which tends to reconstruct “history” on the basis of Byzantine “historiography”. In the same time, huge amount of information suitable for “reconstruction” aims is present in the court poems and panegyrics of the Komnenian period, or in some “second rank” chronicles, like works of John Zonaras and Michael Glykas. The problem here remains in the language (Middle-Byzantine Greek of panegyrics is not easy to follow), in the number of scholars (one can count all Byzantinists working on the twelfth century with the fingers of two hands) and in the absence of critical editions. In some cases, when critical edition is present, it is usually made by philologist: analysis of historical details in these editions is not sufficient. The situation with the latter problem improved significantly in last years with the presence of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* – an on-line database, which allows one to see the needed Greek text from any computer with the access to Internet. To my knowledge, TLG covers around 90% of the sources for my dissertation and thus is suitable for my topic.

3. Secondary literature

Previous Scholarship

In my analysis of the previous scholarship I divided the works of my predecessors into three groups. First one deals with the problem of “historical” Byzantine-Seljuk relations, second – with problems of Byzantine Historiography, third – with the works focusing on the Image of the Seljuk Turks in Byzantine literature.

a) Byzantine-Seljuk relations

To establish the relation between the image and “historical reality” one has to have a viable hypothesis about a “real” history of Byzantine-Seljuk relations. The problem of my topic is that a “viable” hypothesis is formed not by one, but by two seminal works. The first was written by French Arabist and Turkologist Claude Cahen. He reconstructed the history of the Seljuk states of Asia Minor in his detailed study issued in the 1960s.¹ The second was created later. In 1971 Greek scholar (and Greek patriot) Speros Vryonis, published his seminal monograph dedicated to the “De-Hellenisation of Medieval Asia Minor”.² Both scholars addressed the issue of the slow decline of Byzantine Asia Minor and its fall to different Turkic conglomerates. Vryonis called it “de-Hellenization” while Cahen called it “Turkization” or “Formation of Turkey”. Vryonis and Cahen also addressed the question of the “Gaza thesis,” a theory which portrays twelfth-century Anatolian Seljuks as warriors of the faith. This theory was (and is) extremely popular among the Turkish scholars.³ One can safely say, that field of Anatolian history is still full of ideological mines.

b) Byzantine historiography?

My second problem here is Byzantine historiography. I want to point to some “clusters” of problems, which are important for my topic. The first thing to mention here is cluster of problems related with the author. In the second half of the twentieth century this approach focused on the “social background” and “social” views of the author.⁴ Modern scholars take the biography of the authors into account, but no more perceive “social background” as the only factor of influence over the work. Another point of interest for modern scholarship is an aim, with which this or that work was written: work of historiography (e.g. *Alexiad*) is no more perceived as a history for the sake of history, but as a carrier of other messages, which can tell much about both audience and the author.⁵

Second cluster of problems deals with the content and structure of the works of historiography. Imitation of antique examples in the works of historiography remains a debated issue: it is no more perceived as a direct “borrowing” from antiquity, but as another medium by which the author conveys the message.⁶ Third group of problems is focused on the audience of these works and on their reception. Taking into account, that some of the sources of my proposal incorporate the material of the previous sources, this cluster of problems is extremely important. Here I rely on studies, which are dedicated to the circles of Byzantine elite, which were the audience for the most of the proposed works: Paul Magdalino described the interests of these elite in his seminal monograph.⁷

c) Previous Scholarship: Image of the Seljuk Turks?

The last group of scholarly works, which I want to summarize here is connected with the work of my direct predecessors, who studied different aspects of the image of Seljuk Turks.. The number of these works is not very big. Before mentioning them, I want to focus your attention on the article of Helene Ahrweiler dedicated (formally) to Byzantine nomads. In this article Ahrweiler raises several questions, which I will address in my thesis. These are: a) question of the Byzantine notions of “Scythians” and its connection with the notion of “nomads” b) question of Byzantine rhetoric of Nomadism and the idea of nomads and last, but not the

¹ C. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c. 1071-1330*, tr. J. Jones-Williams (New York: Taplinger, 1968).

² S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth century* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971).

³ For an overview of a long struggle of the Ottomanists and Byzantinists over “Gaza thesis” see Lowry, Heath, „Debate to Date,“ in *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (New York: SUNY Press, 2003), 5-15.

⁵P. Magdalino, “The Pen of the Aunt: Echoes of the mid-twelfth century in the *Alexiad*,” in *Anna Komnene and Her Times*, ed. T. Ghouma-Peterson (London: Garland, 2001), 15-43.

⁶ See Hunger, Herbert. “On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature.” *DOP* 23 (1969-70): 15-38.

⁷ P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

least c) question of half-barbarians (μιξοβάρβαροι).⁸ Ahrweiler does not give answers to this question, but the very questioning here is important for my topic.

Now I address the works, which deal with the image of the Seljuk Turks. First to mention here is seminal monograph of Gyula Moravcsik, who was the first to collect into one volume all the mentions of all “Turkic” names, toponyms and words, which he found in the Byzantine sources available in his time.⁹ The second important work is also a catalog of a kind. This is an article of Charles Michael Brand dedicated to the “Turkish element in Byzantium”.¹⁰ Despite the fact, that the text is methodologically problematic (the author treats heroes of Byzantine narratives as “real” persons) it is still an important contribution to the knowledge about Seljuk Turks.

Another group of important articles deals with the image of “other others” built up by Byzantine writers of the twelfth century, namely with the image of Western foreigners. In the twelfth-century Byzantine historiography “Franks” are neighbors of the Empire in the West, while the Seljuks are neighbors of the “East”. Studies on the image of Western foreigners in Byzantine literature are important for my topic because they bring in comparative material for the image of the Seljuk Turks.¹¹

4. *Dissertation Summary*

The introductory chapter deals with the sources. The first chapter is dedicated to several aspects of the Byzantine perception of the Seljuks as a (social) group. First, I address the myth of “Seljuk origin” (according to Byzantine ideas, the Seljuks were heirs to the Huns). Secondly, I study the question of Seljuk naming. Byzantine writers of the eleventh century described Seljuks as “Turks” and “Huns”, while in the works of some twelfth century writers the Seljuks all of a sudden became “Persians”. A special subchapter in the first part of the dissertation is focused on the questions who, when and why turned “Turks” into “Persians”.

The third part of the third chapter of my dissertation is about Byzantine impressions of Seljuk language. When did Byzantines started to understand Turkic-Seljuk dialect? How did they write it? Which words were incorporated in the Byzantine sources and why? Answers to these questions are not less important than the answers and questions about the naming of the Seljuks, because they demonstrate another aspect of comprehending “The Other” – a linguistic one. The fourth part of the chapter deals with “Seljuk time” and “Seljuk space” in the Byzantine narratives of different kinds. Bakhtin (who is not very popular among Byzantinists) called special combination of time and space “Chronotope”. In this subchapter I will try to trace the steps of “the Seljuk chronotope” in Byzantine literary discourse and to define the borders of it. Fifth part of the first chapter addresses the issue of the Byzantine perception of “Seljuk nomadism”: in this section I compare information found in Byzantine sources with the latest findings of archaeologists in the region and try to reconstruct the Byzantine attitude towards Seljuk nomadism.

⁸ H. Ahrweiler, “The Byzantine Concept of the Foreigner: The Case of Nomads,” in *Studies of the International Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, ed. Helene Ahrweiler and Angeliki E. Laiou (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998), 1-16

⁹ Moravcsik G, *Byzantinoturcica: Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker* (Leiden: Brill, 1983).

¹⁰ C. M. Brand, “The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh-Twelfth Centuries,” *DOP* 43 (1989): 1-25. Dion Smythe probably alluded to Brand’s methodology, when he asked participants of symposium on Byzantine Outsider not to “focus on the list of the foreigners.” See D. Smythe, “Editor’s Preface,” in *Strangers to Themselves: A Byzantine Outsider*, ed. D. C. Smythe (Aldershot: AshgateVariorum, 2000), viii.

¹¹ A. Kazhdan, “Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and the Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Centuries,” in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and Moslem World*, ed. A. Laiou, R. P. Mottahedeh (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001), 83-101; E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, “Wild beast from the West: Immediate literary reaction in Byzantium to the Second Crusade,” in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and Moslem World*, ed. A. Laiou, R. P. Mottahedeh (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001), 101-117.

My second chapter deals with the Byzantine views on the Seljuk religion. I start my analysis from some “religious” definitions found in the “Story of the Origins of the Turks”. Later in the chapter I trace down the cases, when Byzantines used religiously connotated terms (“caliph”) in connection with the Seljuks and their invasion. Results are strange: Byzantines imagined sultan of the Great Seljuks as an “emperor” and caliph as some analogue of Byzantine “patriarch”.¹² The next part of the chapter is dedicated to Seljuk paganism: despite the fact, that some obviously pagan *phenomenae* (cult of the wolf) were in front of their eyes, Byzantine did not notice it, but perceived this *phenomenae* as another demonstration of barbarity. I also focus my attention on a role, which image of “Seljuks” and “Islam” played in *Digenis Akrites*, a Byzantine epic one of the surviving version of which dates back to the twelfth century. In the final part of my chapter I work with the image of “Seljuk Islam” in very complex work of historian and canonist Niketas Choniates, who demonstrates some degree of Byzantine islamophobia.

My third chapter deals with the Seljuk distribution of power (again as seen through Byzantine eyes). It addresses the question of Byzantine views on the sultanate of the Great Seljuks (whose master was usually called “great sultan”) and on the formation of political conglomerates in Asia Minor. I dedicate special attention to the ancient terms which the Byzantines used to denote different Seljuk agents of power (“satraps,” “archsatraps”). The precision, with which Byzantines used different terms for different agents allows one to think, that many of the Byzantine writers knew about the Seljuks much more, than what was written in their books.

The fourth chapter of my dissertation is dedicated to the military aspect of the image. How did the Byzantines depict and imagine Seljuk tactics? What was their opinion about the military prowess of their competitors? In the same chapter I address the extensive information about the Byzantine-Seljuk diplomacy and try to decipher the intricate messages sent through special sets of diplomatic gifts. These deciphering is a complex thing: most of the authors did not observe the diplomatic procedures with their eyes and relied either on the stories of eyewitnesses (Anna Komnene) or on official reports (Niketas Choniates). Both eyewitnesses and official reports presented the situation in a special light. In some cases, it is impossible to distinguish between “possible fact” and “possible interpretation of the fact by the source”. When Niketas Choniates in *Historia* described the peace between Manuel Komnenos and sultan of Ikonion Kiliç Arslan II in 1176, he states that sultan sent to the emperor “Nisaeen horse” as a present. “Nisaeen horse” is a reference to Herodotus: according to this ancient author only king of Persia could ride them. Sultans of Ikonion with their Persian names and Persian as a court language tried to imitate rulers of ancient past: the coinage and other sources support this version. Thus, Kiliç Arslan could consciously send “Nisaeen horse” to his master Manuel Komnenos. The problem is that the Byzantine author, Niketas Choniates knew Herodotus well and inserted some quotations from this author in his narrative. Choniates could easily turn white horse into “Nisaeen” for the sake of the embellishment of the narrative. Was there really a Nisean horse there or is it just an image in *Historia*? In the fourth chapter I work with such cases and try to investigate what was *the image* of Seljuk diplomacy in the Byzantine literature of my period.

The fifth chapter, entitled “Seljuk Kaleidoscope,” may well be the most entertaining for prospective readers. It deals with the images of different individual Seljuk Turks popular among Byzantine writers. Among the case studies in this chapter are the victor of Manzikert, sultan Alp Arslan,; a “loyal servant” of Andronikos Komnenos called Poupakas; the “treacherous sultan” Kiliç Arslan II; and, “ideal sultan” Kay-Khusraw . This kaleidoscope of Seljuk heroes obviously demonstrates the increasing “integration” of the Seljuks into the Byzantine thought-world over the course of the twelfth century.

¹² This reminds one about Crusaders, who imagined caliph of Baghdad as “Moslem pope”.

The sixth chapter will be dedicated to comparison of the image of the Seljuk Turks with the image of other “Others” of Byzantine literature, especially “the Franks”. In the conclusion I will draw the sum of the image of the Seljuk Turks in Byzantine literary discourse but first and foremost elucidate the reasons for which the Byzantines wrote about the Seljuks and for which narrative – and, by implication, political – purposes they used and misused them, and which political realities this reflected.

3. Methodology and Approaches

My sources are highly rhetoricized texts largely written in the artificial sociolect which became the trademark of Byzantine *litterati* from the ninth century onwards. The basic methodology which I use to study these intricate written sources is narratology and rhetorical analysis. Byzantine historiographers created the image of the Seljuk Turks with the help of different narrative (such as order, rhythm, focus etc.) and rhetorical (figures and tropes) features which can be well analyzed with the toolbox(es) provided by Gérard Genette, Mieke Bal, Heinrich Lausberg, and others.

A second approach, closely related to the first but highlighting one particularly significant aspect, is intertextuality. To build up different components of the image of the Seljuk Turks, Byzantine writers used “citations, references, cultural languages, which cut across the text in various stereophonies.”¹³ Intertextuality allows one to reveal all networks of allusions and quotations in the selected text and to read codes thus inserted into these texts.

Additionally, I borrow from the American school of religious studies, namely from the works of Jonathan Z. Smith, the definition of “locative” and “utopian” modes of *religion* and apply these concepts to the Byzantine *literature* of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. My first experimental paper on this topic at the 2012 Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies at the University of Oxford received good feedback: I am looking forward to applying the idea of these modes to the “Seljuk part” of Byzantine discourse and to see what the result will be.

Finally, my image studies are not entirely possible without the occasional reconstruction of the “real life” behind the image. Therefore, I draw on the results of archaeology and social history. I also use works on the “general history” of Seljuk Anatolia, which help a lot in clarifying details of biography of several important Seljuk leaders.

4. Preliminary Results

The first result of the project is rather general. Before and immediately after the civil wars toward the end of the eleventh century, Byzantine literature was primarily operating in the “locative” mode. Writers were mostly interested in events which happened *inside* the empire. In the twelfth century, this situation noticeably changed: the “utopian” mode became more significant. The key period in this turn from the “inside” to the “outside” was the beginning of reign of John II Komnenos. This emperor’s court poets coined a new, aggressive ideology of imperial reconquest, which is preserved, e.g., in the poems of Theodore Prodromos. Equally, Byzantine historiographers became more interested in different kinds of “Others”: Anna Komnene was writing the history of her father at the very end of John’s reign and introduced her famous description of the crusaders (especially the Norman Bohemond), which is present in all modern textbooks.

The image of the Seljuks in Byzantine literature also changed together in this great cultural shift. Before the reign of John Komnenos the Seljuks were called “Turks,” and, in some early writings, “Huns.” During the reign of John Komnenos this situation changed: the barbarians (“Turks”) all of a sudden became “Persians”,

¹³ Roland Barthes, *Image – Music – Text*, tr. S. Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), 160.

“noble enemies from the east.” From this time onward court poets and rhetoricians referred to the Seljuks as “Persians,” while other writers who circle continued to call them “Turks.” Some authors, like Anna Komnene, used both terms, which confused modern scholars.

As is well known, learned Byzantines hardly ever referred to their current neighbors by contemporary nomenclature but preferred ethnonyms attested in ancient historiography (such as “Persians” for Seljuks). While these ancient terms used by the Byzantines rarely retained their original meanings, they were not randomly used; close reading does allow to establish precise contemporary meanings. It can be shown that Byzantine writers, especially Niketas Choniates, had a very exact and clear idea about power balance in the nomadic conglomerates of Asia Minor: they used different ancient titles such as “satraps” or “archsatraps” to denote the functionaries of different levels.

In terms of such religiously inspired ideology, the Byzantines did not see Seljuks as a “holy warriors of Islam.” For them, the Seljuk rather were barbarians. When court poets of John Komnenos re-invented the Seljuks as “Persians,” they started to mention “fire-worshipping” as their religion. This seems to be a pure literary in- or perhaps rather *convention*: the Seljuks of the twelfth century could be animists, but not Zoroastrians. It is interesting to note that the Byzantines never tried to convert the Seljuks to Christianity: Anna Komnene says that her father had an idea of conversion, but did not have the time to execute it. Equally intriguingly, the Byzantines also did not engage in religious polemics with the Seljuks (as they later would with the Ottoman or, contemporarily, with the Latins and Jews). In the same time, Byzantine attitude towards the religion of Seljuks was different in different eras: two versions of *Digenis Akrites* demonstrate two completely different attitudes towards “Moslems” and “Turks”.

The “individual” Turks of Byzantine literature were different from “Turks” en masse. “Turks” as entity were the people associated with plunder and raids, while individual “Turkic” characters in Byzantine narratives demonstrated rather “positive” qualities. Sultan Alp-Arslan, who defeated Romanos Diogenes had a long evolution in different Byzantine chronicles: one of the authors, Skylitzes Continuatus turned him into a preacher, who spoke with defeated Romanos Diogenes about the ideals of Christianity and gave him a lesson of humility and *philanthropia* – quality reserved in Byzantine chronicles for ideal emperors only. Sometimes image of one and the same Turkic character evolved in the different versions of one and the same work. Sultan of Ikonion Kay-Khusraw is a character in *Historia* of Niketas Choniates. His image differs very much in different versions of *Historia*. In the first version (so-called (b)revior) Kay-Khusraw is an enemy leader, who runs for Constantinople for help in the day of the need, but does not receive it. In the last version of *Historia*, (so-called (a)uctoris) Niketas Choniates turned Kay-Khusraw into humble and benevolent ruler, who is helping his Byzantine prisoners to start the fire in the cold Anatolian winter. The aim of this change is obvious: in the last version of his chronicle Niketas Choniates introduced harsh critique of Alexios III Angelos and benevolence of Kay-Khusraw underlines the absence of benevolence on the side of Alexios. In other words, Turks are good when Byzantines are bad.

To sum up, Byzantine perception of the Turks changed with time. First, Byzantines perceived the Turks as nomads from nowhere, who come and go. Later, Byzantines change their views and renamed Turks into Persians, granting them the title of old enemy from Herodotus. They perceived the Turks as Moslems, nomads and fine warriors and archers, who were in many cases superior to Byzantine army. “The Turks” as a mass were associated with robbery and plundering. In the same time, many Byzantine writers used Turkic characters and heroes in their works as mirrors to Byzantine characters and heroes.

Yet I think that, the Turks were not the main Byzantine “Others” of the twelfth century. Their coming was shocking and important, but the shock produced by Crusaders (“The Franks”) seems to be much more sensitive. For the Turks Byzantines found dictionary, language and logic, for Crusaders they did not. The Turks

were, after all, the Persians with whom ancient Greeks fought in the time of Herodotus. The Franks were new: Byzantines looked on them with hope and fear. Their hopes failed them and their fears realized in full when in 1204 Crusader knights stormed Constantinople, thus putting an effective end to the glory of Byzantium and traumatizing the Byzantine perception of “Western Other” for all remaining imperial years.