

Robert Lee Wolff

Studies in the Latin Empire
of Constantinople



VARIORUM REPRINTS

London 1976

X

HOPF'S SO-CALLED 'FRAGMENTUM' OF MARINO SANUDO TORSELLO

The Latin document with which we are dealing is of considerable importance as a historical source. It contains a short account of the poverty of the Latin Empire of Constantinople during its last years, reports the capture of the city by the Greeks in 1261 and the flight of the last Latin Emperor Baldwin II, and describes the unsuccessful efforts of Baldwin, of his son Philip of Courtenay, of Charles of Anjou, of Charles of Valois, and of the Venetians to recapture the city and to re-establish the Latin Empire. Internal evidence shows that it was written between 1328 and 1341. It is the chief narrative historical source for the important role played by Alfonso of Castile in the affairs of the Latin Empire in the years just before and just after its capture: a problem with which I expect to deal elsewhere.

The text has been published three times previously: in the seventeenth century by Du Cange, and in the nineteenth by Buchon and by Hopf. Hopf attributed it to the great propagandist for the Crusade, the Venetian Marino Sanudo Torsello, and called it a 'fragment.'¹ All three previous editions are now very rare, but this alone would not justify a new edition.

What does justify it is first the fact that all three previous editors used the same single manuscript as the basis for their texts, although another and better manuscript exists; and second that the character and purpose of the document have never been properly understood, apparently because this second manuscript has hitherto been ignored. The purpose of this paper is to publish a new edition of the text, and to discuss its character, purpose, and authorship. The study is offered as a tribute to the memory of my learned wartime colleague, Joshua Starr, whose interests so often led him to the historia of Venice and of 'Romania.'

Du Cange, Buchon, and Hopf all printed their text from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, *fonds Français* 4792, formerly numbered Paris 9644. This is a late fourteenth-century parchment ms of Villehardouin's

¹ C. du F. du Cange, *Histoire de Constantinople sous les Empereurs Français* (Paris 1657), pp. 230 ff.; J. A. Buchon, *Recherches et matériaux pour servir à une histoire de la domination Française au XIIIe, XIVe, et XVe siècles dans les provinces demembrées de l'empire Grec à la suite de la quatrième croisade* (Paris 1840), vol. II, pp. 9 ff.; C. Hopf, *Chroniques Gréco-Romanes* (Berlin 1873), pp. 171 ff.

Conquête de Constantinople. Our text appears on three preliminary leaves, before the work of Villehardouin.² The most recent editor of Villehardouin, Edmond Faral, in classifying the mss of his author, calls this ms A, its traditional designation. In the same category as A he places one and only one other ms, Oxford, Bodleian, Laud. Misc. 587, also of the second half of the fourteenth century. This he calls O. He concludes that it is closely related to A, and that together they represent the best textual tradition of Villehardouin. He uses A and O together as the basis for his edition. Until Faral, no editor of Villehardouin had made full use of O, although Natalis de Wailly mentions it, and had at his disposal a partial collation made for him by Paul Meyer.³

What interests us here is that O also contains our short Latin text, found elsewhere only in A. In O, however, the Latin follows the Old French text of Villehardouin, instead of preceding it, as in A. Herewith the Latin text, as it appears in O, with all variants from A noted, and minimal historical notes for purposes of identification. (I should like to thank my friend Professor Henry L. Roberts of Columbia University for procuring me the necessary photographs).

OXFORD, BODLEIAN, LAUD. MISC. 587, 57v-58v

Cum in libro conquestus imperii / Romanie in parte precedenti sit / scriptum et non sit completum usque ad / amissionem civitatis Constantinopolitane / ideo aliqua in scriptis ponam, scilicet quod / civitas Constantinopolitana fuit per impe- / ratorem Balduinum Comitem Flan- / die^a et Hannonie^b et heredes suos ac / nobilissimos barones suos,^c ac / etiam per dominum ducem et Comune Venetia- / rum et Venetos suos^d circa lxxviii^d / annos acquisita retenta et posses- / sa. Et tanta fuit dilectio utriusque / partis tam ex parte imperatoris supradicti / et hominum eius quam ex parte ducis et comunis / Venetiarum et Venetorum suorum quod / ad complementum non possem expri- / mere nec narrare. Etiam Veneti / fuerunt multum gravati quamplu- / rimis^e expensis ad sub- stinendum / civitatem Constantinopolitanam pre- / dictam. Ac similiter dictus impera- / tor Latinus cum successoribus suis / in tantum fuit gravatus, quod ultimus / Balduinus imperator^f vendidit et di- / stribuit quasi totum quod habebat in Con- / stantinopoli, discooperiendo pala- / tia plumbea et vendendo, ac etiam / alia graviora^f agendo. Et

* Flandrie. ^b Hannonie. * alios ^d LVIII * in plurimis ^f gravamina

¹ Buchon, p. 9; Hopf, p. xxiii.

² E. Faral, "Pour l'établissement du texte de Villehardouin," *Romania* vol. LXIV (1938), 289-312; and introduction to his edition: *Villehardouin, La Conquête de Constantinople* (Paris 1938), vol. I, xlii. See also de Wailly's edition (Paris 1872), p. xiv.

³ Baldwin, Count of Flanders and Hainaut, elected first Emperor in 1204, held one quarter of its territory; his Venetian allies held three eighths.

⁴ This is Baldwin II (1228-1261), whose father-in-law John of Brienne was Emperor and regent for him between 1229 and 1237.

maxime / quia unigenitum filium suum Phy- / lippum^o dedit pro pignore quibusdam / burgensibus Constantinopolitanis / Venetis de Ca Ferro^a pro certa pe- / cunie quantitate.

col. 1

col. 2

Qui Phylippus / fuit transmissus Venetias, diu in / Venetiis moram contrahens ultra / post amissionemⁱ Constantinopolita- / nam aliquoⁱ tempore.⁶ Amissa vero civitate / Constantinopolitana, currente / anno domini milesimo ducentesimo,⁷ imperator Bal- / duinus de Constantinopoli fuit egres / sus, cum navibus comunitatis^b Venetiarum / veniens cum multo populo tam Vene- / to quam aliis gentium generationibus, ma- / sculis feminis et parvulis, qui cum eo se / reduxerunt in navigiis Venetorum. / Potestas vero Venetorum nomine dominus / Marco Gradonico egressus erat / terram cum exercitu galearum ut / iret et dampnificaret inimicos / Grecos, et accipereⁱ quandam terram que ei / fuerat promissa dari.⁸ Verum se inve- / nit deceptum. Quia cum dictus pote- / stas esset vir probissimus, proditores / qui erant in Constantinopoli dextrum / habentes quomodo terra erat evacuata / gentibus dederunt ipsam terram imperatori / Chyer- / micali Palialogo^m Grecorum.⁹ Quam / usque in hodiernum diem ipse imperator / cum heredibus suis tenuit et possedit. / Cuius imperatoris Chyerandronicus^o / fuit filius et successor.^o Postea An- / dronicus qui nunc regnat filius / filii Chyerandronici predicti ipsi Con- / stantinopoli dominatur.¹¹ Sed ad imperato- / rem Balduinum Latinum rever- / tari, qui / venit de Constantinopoli Nigropontem¹² / ubi a suis hominibus fuit gratanter
57r 58r
recep- // tus, prout ab illis de Rocia qui duca- / tui Athenarum dominabantur.¹³ Ac etiam a du- / cissa Nichie et Andre et aliarum insu- / larum.¹⁴ Et a dominis Nigro-

^o Philippum ^a Ca Pesaro, recte corrigit Hopf ⁱ omissionem ⁱ aliquanto ^b de Ca Pesaro civitatis ⁱ acciperet ^m palcalogo ⁿ verbum deest ^o Micali imperatori Chyer Andronicus filius fuit et successor ^p Nigrepontem

⁶ I expect shortly to publish an article on the mortgage of Philip of Courtenay, and Castilian relations with the Latin Empire.

⁷ Both O and A make the error in date here. It should of course be 1261, not 1200.

⁸ On Marco Gradenigo and the other Venetian Podestàs of Constantinople see my forthcoming article to appear in the *Mélanges Grégoire III* (Brussels 1952). Gradenigo was attacking Daphnouseion when the Greeks seized Constantinople.

⁹ Michael VIII Palaeologus, Emperor 1261-1282. The Chyer is the Greek κύριος, (lord).

¹⁰ Andronicus II, 1282-1328.

¹¹ Andronicus III 1328-1341, grandson of Andronicus II, as our author says. The father of Andronicus III was Michael IX, who died in 1320, while Andronicus II was still on the throne. The words 'qui nunc regnat' give us a date for our document.

¹² Regular western name for the island of Euboea, from the Greek Εὐβοία.

¹³ The Burgundian family of de la Roche. In 1261 the title of Duke of Athens was only a year old, and was held by Guy I de la Roche, on whom it had been bestowed by St. Louis.

¹⁴ The Duchess of Naxos, Andros, and other islands is the wife of the Duke of the Archipelago Angelo Sanudo, c. 1227-1262. We do not know her first name, but she was the daughter of Macaire de Sainte Ménéould, one of the original crusaders of the fourth Crusade, and had been married at Constantinople in the imperial palace. Cf. Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Istoria del Regno di Romania*, ed. Hopf, *Chroniques*, p. 115. The Sanudi of the Archipelago were kinsmen of Marino.

pontis¹⁵ magnifice / fuit receptus et quamplurimum hono- / ratus, eidem dona magna
 largien- / tibus secundum possibilitatem eorum. Qui / imperator ibi plures^r milites fe- /
 cit. Et inde descendens^s venit in Apu- / liam, illic inveniens quod princeps Man- /
 fredus Tarenti in Apulia et Sicilia / regnabat.¹⁶ Qui princens^t eum hono- / rifice susceperit,
 et tam ipse quam eius / homines eum honoraverunt, eidem do- / na magna et multa
 largiendo. / Inde vero discedens ivit in Franciam / ac etiam in Hannoniam, ubi ipse
 certam terram / habebat.¹⁷ Domina vero imperatrix uxor eius pre- / cesserat ad peten-
 dum auxilia regum / principum et baronum et aliorum quorum- / cumque fidelium.
 Inter alios vero regis A- / ragonum^u Jacobi ac etiam Nanfosi^v gene- / ri sui regis Castelle¹⁸
 petens auxili- / um pro recuperatione filii sui Phylippi / iam dicti. Et habuit maxime a
 re- / ge Castelle, cum quo etiam ipsam^w tractabat / parentelam, scilicet velle dare filiam /
 suam filio suo Phylippo pro acquirendo / imperium Romanie. Sed ad Venetos / redeamus.
 Dominus dux et comune Venetie / videntes se adeo de Constantinopoli / expulsos dolo-
 erunt multum et vehementer / turbati^z sunt. Quocirca scrutaban- / tur omnem viam et
 modum ut recu- / perarent ipsam civitatem Constantino- / politanam^y et imperium,
 mittentes ad do- / minum papam et ad alios barones fideles / quos ad istud negotium
 valere cre- / debant, scilicet^t conquirendi imperium Roma- / nie. Et inter alios ad regem
 Castelle / predictum.^{aa} Ambasciator^{bb} vero fuit dominus Mar- / cus Justinianus Sancti
 Pantaleonis^{cc} / vir probissimus, ibi in Castella diu / morando, set non habuit complemen-
 tum. / Finaliter ipse imperator Balduinus acce- / pit pro filio suo Phylippo filiam regis /
 Karoli magnifici primi Ierusalem / et Sicilie regis,¹⁹ qui iam acquisiverat / regnum
 predictum de manibus Manfre- / di, filii naturalis imperatoris Federici.^{dd} / Cum quo
 finaliter se Veneti socia- / runt. Sed propter rebellionem Sicilie²⁰ rex / predictus intendere

col. 1 col. 2

^r Nigrepontis ^s multos ^t discedens ^u princeps ^v Aragoniam ^w n'Anfossi ^x ipse
^z habiti ^y Constantinopolis ^{aa} verbum deest ^{bb} ac etiam ad Alfonso regem Castille
 predictum ^{cc} Ambaxator ^{dd} Panthaleonis ^{ee} Frederici

¹⁵ Nigropont was ruled by 'terciers', usually translated 'triarchs.' The island was often subdivided. In 1261 its rulers were Michele Morosini and his wife, Berta dalle Carceri of the Veronese family prominent there, each of whom held one sixth, Narzotto dalle Carceri, and Grapella dalle Carceri, each lord of a third.

¹⁶ Manfred, illegitimate son of the Emperor Frederick II, King of Sicily 1255-1266.

¹⁷ Baldwin II possessed Courtenay and other lands in France, had the legal title to Namur, rights in Valenciennes, and other holdings.

¹⁸ The empress was Baldwin's wife, Marie de Brienne, daughter of John of Brienne by Berengaria of Castile. Berengaria was the daughter of Alfonso IX, sister of St. Ferdinand, King of Castile (1217-1252), and aunt of Alfonso X the Wise (1252-1284), the King of Castile here referred to. Marie and Alfonso X were therefore first cousins. The King of Aragon mentioned is James I the Conqueror (1213-1276), father-in-law of Alfonso X.

¹⁹ Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily 1268-1285. For the diplomatic and military efforts which are here described see E. Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der lateinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel* (Jena 1938). Charles' daughter Beatrix married Baldwin II's son Philip of Courtenay, titular Latin Emperor, in 1273, their engagement having been fixed in 1267.

²⁰ The Sicilian Vespers 1282, and the ensuing war with the Aragonese.

non potuit. Ita- / que res remansit. Verum tamen ante rebelli- / onem Sicilie Rex Karolus supradictus / misit plures exercitus tam per terram quam / per mare, ad expugnandum imperium Ro- / manie. Sed parum fecerunt. Postmo- / dum vero multo tempore elapso Vene- / ti cum comite de Valesio patre istius⁶⁶ / regis Francie Phylippi⁶⁷ qui nunc regnat /²¹ se sociarunt, mittentes exercitus / galearum per plures annos expensis⁶⁸ / utriusque / partis ad expugnandum et conqui- / rendum / dictum imperium Romanie. Ac etiam cum so- / cietate Cathellanorum⁶⁹ in Romaniam / euntium trac-
58r
58v
tando conquestionem Con- / stantinopolitanam⁷⁰ et aliarum terrarum // imperii. Sed finaliter parum fecerunt. Mortua / vero domina Katerina uxore regis Karoli su- / predicti cui⁷¹ jus imperii Romanie spec- / tabat, dictus dominus Karolus,⁷² illam intentionem⁷³ / dimisit. Itaque huc usque res absque fine / perfecto⁷⁴ remansit. Dominus vero dux et comune / Venetiarum transeunt de treugua in treu- / guam cum imperatore Grecorum numquam pacem agere / volentes. Itaque semper homines Veneti sub- / stinuerunt et manutenuerunt gentem que in / imperio Romanie remansit, sicut etiam principa- / tus Amoree⁷⁵ et terrarum ad eam pertinentium, cum / etiam ipse dominus dux et comune Venetiarum tene- / ant bonam partem in iam dicta terra.⁷⁶ Et econ- / verso⁷⁷ / Januenses substinuerunt et manutenuerunt / aliam partem Grecorum contra deum et omnia jura / tam per comune quam per divisum. Quocirca ipsi / Ianuenses maximas divitias perceperunt⁷⁸ / Et econtrario Veneti multa dampna recepe- / runt ac etiam multam pecuniam expenderunt, / et maxime pro conservatione Nigropontis et aliarum / terrarum que pro⁷⁹ Francos et Latinos tenentur.⁸⁰ / Que omnia non possesit breviter ennar- / rari⁸¹ et propterea dimittemus.

The following comments may be made with regard to those of the textual variants which are of interest. In four instances: *d*, *l*, *t*, and *pp*, ms A, as printed by Du Cange, Buchon, and Hopf, offers what appear to

⁶⁶ illius ⁶⁷ verbum deest ⁶⁸ ad expensas ⁶⁹ Catelanorum ⁷⁰ Constantinopolis
⁷¹ ad quam ⁷² in Franciam ⁷³ predicto ⁷⁴ terra iam dicta ⁷⁵ eius verso ⁷⁶ preceperunt
⁷⁷ per ⁷⁸ enarrari

²¹ The Count of Valois is Charles, younger son of Philip III of France, brother of Philip IV, and father of Philip VI (1328-1350) 'qui nunc regnat.' This is the second indication of the date of our document (see note 1) above). Since the accession dates of Philip VI and Andronicus III were the same (1328), our dating is not narrowed by this statement.

²² The Charles here, although called King by our author, is still Charles of Valois, who never was actually King of anything, although he was candidate at various times for the thrones of Aragon, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Latin Empire of Constantinople. He married in 1301 Catherine, daughter of Philip de Courtenay, and heiress to the Latin Empire, 'cui jus imperii Romanie spectabat.' His crusading plans were actually not dropped at her death in 1308 but continued for a while longer on behalf of their daughter Catherine. See Dade, or J. Delaville Le Roulx, *La France en Orient au XIV^e siècle* (Paris 1886), vol. I, 40 ff. The 'societas Cathellanorum' is of course the Catalan Grand Company of 1303 and later.

²³ The Morea, i. e. the principality of Achaia.

²⁴ This praise of the Venetians and bitter criticism of the Genoese establish the nationality of our author.

be superior readings. In *d*, the figure LVIII, fifty-eight, given by A as the number of years which the Latins held Constantinople, is precisely accurate: the Latin Empire lasted from 1204 to 1261, and both terminal years were counted. The figure lxxviii, sixty-eight, given by O, is of course wrong, and may be a scribal error. In *l*, A's 'acciperet' is correct, and in *t*, of course, O's 'princens' for 'princeps' is a scribal error. In *pp* the preposition 'per' given by A properly followed by the accusative, is correct, instead of the reading *pro* given by O.

But there are at least seven instances where O offers what appear to be better readings: *c*, *h*, *n*, *x*, *kk*, *ll*, and *nn*. In *c*, the 'suos' given by O is clearly preferable to the 'alios' given by A: the barons in question were Baldwin's barons and not 'other' barons. In *h* we have an error in A, which was caught in Hopf: it was not, as A has it, the Venetian firm of Ca Pesaro which loaned Baldwin II money, taking the person of his son Philip of Courtenay as security, but the firm of Ca Ferro, as O rightly says. (See note 6). In *n*, the addition by O of the word 'Grecorum,' absent in A, helps the reader identify Michael Palaeologus. In *x*, the reading 'turbati' given by O is manifestly better than 'habiti' given by A: the Venetians were greatly 'disturbed' by the loss of Constantinople, not greatly 'had.'

Kk is probably the most significant of all the variants, since it brings meaning to an otherwise mysterious sentence. A has it that, after the death of his wife Catherine, to whom the title to the Latin Empire belonged, Charles of Valois sent her to France: 'illam in Franciam dimisit.' Why he should have sent his wife's corpse to France, and what this has to do with the episodes here being discussed is not made clear. Hopf too was bothered by this, and suggested reading 'illum' for 'illam', which, however, does not help matters. When one finds in O, however, the reading 'intentionem' for 'in Franciam,' all becomes clear: after the death of his wife, Charles of Valois 'gave up the intention' of conquering the Latin Empire, which he had for so long been trying to do. In *ll* and *nn*, O's readings of 'perfecto' and 'econverso' are clearly superior to 'predicto' and 'eius verso.'

In three cases: *k*, *r*, and *w*, one cannot determine which of the two versions is preferable. In *k*, A may be correct in saying that the ships in which the Latins escaped from Constantinople belonged to the firm of Ca Pesaro; on the other hand, O may be correct in saying only the ships belonged to the commune of Venice. A erred with regard to the Ca Pesaro in variant *h*, and this may be another error, but it cannot be proven. (See, however, text and note 33 below). In *r* we cannot now determine whether Baldwin II made 'many' knights (A) or only 'several' (O). In *w* both mss appear to err: the subject of the sentence is the Empress Marie, engaged in negotiations with her Castilian relatives;

therefore the 'ipse' of A is the wrong gender. On the other hand no arrangement already reached has been previously mentioned, so that the 'ipsam' of O, which must go with 'parentelam' is in the wrong case. 'Ipsa' would seem to be better than either reading.

On the whole then, O seems to offer a better text. Yet perhaps its greatest usefulness is in enabling us to settle the question as to what kind of document we are dealing with. Hopf was the first to attribute it to Marino Sanudo Torsello, saying:

Un examen attentif de cette pièce curieuse . . . prouve évidemment qu'elle doit appartenir à Sanudo, avec les lettres duquel elle consent parfois littéralement, comme aussi, principalement pour le fin, avec l'histoire de Romanie. Je voudrais croire que ce fragment faisait part originalement de quelque lettre perdue ou du moins jusqu'à présent inconnue du Venitien; il me suffit de la revendiquer à son véritable auteur.²⁵

Leaving aside for the moment the question of authorship, one may yet hazard a guess that the text is in fact not part of a letter, or indeed a fragment of anything. The author's own opening words suggest a different explanation:

Cum in libro conquistus imperii Romanie in parte precedenti sit scriptum et non sit completum usque ad amissionem civitatis Constantinopolitane ideo aliqua in scriptis ponam . . .

If our text were the fragment of a letter, these words would be meaningless: it was clearly written to supplement another book, 'the book of the conquest of the Empire of Romania,' which did not carry the story down to the loss of Constantinople. Hopf himself took cognizance of this, and made a suggestion which is contradictory to his own theory that the text was a letter: he identified the 'book of the conquest of the Empire of Romania' as the *Gran Conquista de Ultramar*, written for Alfonso X of Castile, a text which ends with a notice of John of Brienne, Latin Emperor 1229-1237, and with two final lines on the loss of Constantinople.²⁶ Yet this suggestion cannot be accepted: the lines quoted above demonstrate that the book which our document was intended to supplement had *no* notice whatever of the fall of Constantinople ('non sit completum usque ad amissionem civitatis'), and that our document was written to supply this lack. Moreover 'Ultramar' does not mean 'Romania,' the Latin Empire of Constantinople, but 'Outremer,' Syria and Palestine; and thus the *Gran Conquista de Ultramar* cannot be the 'liber conquistus Romanie' for which we are searching.²⁷

²⁵ *Chroniques*, p. xxiii.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 171, note 1.

²⁷ For the history of the meanings of the term 'Romania,' see my article 'Romania; the Latin Empire of Constantinople,' *Speculum* vol. XXIII (1948), 1-34.

Arturo Magnocavallo, the leading authority on Sanudo, has suggested that our document was written by Sanudo as a supplement to his own history of Romania, whose Latin text is lost, but an Italian version of which was discovered by Hopf in an eighteenth-century Venetian manuscript and published by him as the *Istoria del Regno di Romania*.²⁸ The main difficulty with Magnocavallo's theory is that Sanudo's *Istoria* is in fact complete down to and far beyond the capture of Constantinople by the Greeks: our text does not supplement but rather parallels the *Istoria*, as we shall see. Thus we are still left with the question: what work was our text designed to supplement?

Our document exists in only two mss. Both are mss of Villehardouin. Villehardouin's *Conquête de Constantinople* is a 'liber conquistus Romanie.' Villehardouin's work stops in 1207, shortly after the death of the Emperor Baldwin I and the accession of his brother the Emperor Henry. Therefore any fourteenth-century reader of Villehardouin would naturally wish for a continuation down to the loss of Constantinople in 1261 and later. This leads us to the conjecture that our document was written as a supplement to Villehardouin. And this conjecture is now strikingly confirmed by the arrangement of O. In O we have a ms, where our text appears *after* the text of Villehardouin, and all the conditions indicated in the first sentence of our text are fulfilled:

'Cum in libro conquistus imperii Romanie *in parte precedenti* sit scriptum et non sit completum usque ad amissionem civitatis Constantinopolitane

In O, the 'book of the conquest of Romania' is physically 'in parte precedenti.' The reverse is the case with A, the only ms scholars have hitherto examined. Their failure to look at O has led them to exercise their ingenuity in searching for another book of the conquest of Romania, when what they sought actually lay before them. The ostensible purpose and character of our document are its real ones.

If it then be objected that our document — fragment no longer but complete in itself — provides an entirely inadequate supplement to Villehardouin, that it skips all the Emperors between Baldwin I and Baldwin II [Henry (1206–1216), Peter of Courtenay (1217–1219), Robert (1221–1228) and John of Brienne (1229–1237)], and that even about the reign of Baldwin II it tells us almost nothing, concentrating instead upon 1261 and the period thereafter, the answer to this objection, I suggest, is that our author was writing between 1328 and 1341, and that much of what had happened at Constantinople between 1207 and

²⁸ A. Magnocavallo, *Marin Sanudo il Vecchio e il suo Progetto di Crociata* (Bergamo 1901) p. 16. Sanudo's *Istoria* in Hopf, *Chroniques*, pp. 99–170.

1261, the period of the Latin Empire left untouched by Villehardouin, was by then only dimly known to him. This is entirely consonant with the theory that our author was Marino Sanudo Torsello, who in his other works mentions the Latin Empire very seldom, and who makes a serious mistake in one of his few references to it, when he tells a story about the disgraceful marriage of an Emperor whom he calls Henry: it was really the Emperor Robert who made this marriage.²⁹ Sanudo, we may conclude, was both uninformed and misinformed about the period before 1261.

Hopf's statement that our document in places coincides literally with some of Sanudo's letters seems somewhat too strong. An examination of the letters³⁰ produces no sustained passage which actually coincides, but rather a few sentences from a single letter dealing with the same theme, which seem to echo our document:

Et hoc facto rex praedictus (Charles of Anjou) se cum Venetis sociavit et non multum post se insula Sicilia rebellavit. Et sic omnia quae facta fuerunt causa acquirendi et conquirendi imperium Romaniae ad nihilum devenerunt. Postmodum transactis plurimis annis dominus Carolus (of Valois), frater serenissimi Franciae regis Philippi (Philip IV), et pater illius regis Franciae qui regnat ad praesens (Philip VI), sociavit se cum domino duce et comuni Venetiarum ut possent acquirere imperium Romaniae Demum mortua est uxor domini Caroli, domina Caterina, filia quondam imperatoris Philippi (Philip of Courtenay) ad quam spectabat imperium. Unde praedictus magnificus dominus Carolus reliquit intentionem illam de acquirendo imperium.³¹

The parallel is obvious, especially in the last two sentences, but on the strength of this single passage it would be risky to make a confident attribution of our document to Sanudo.

When one turns to the *Secreta Fidelium Crucis*, Sanudo's major work,

²⁹ Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Secreta Fidelium Crucis*, ed. J. Bongars in *Gesta Dei per Francos* (Hanover 1611), II, 73, story told in marginal rubric. In the *Istoria del Regno di Romania* only pp. 114-116 mention the Latin Empire, and these give much the same information as that in the text we are examining. For the story of Robert's marriage see *Chronique d'Ernoult*, ed. L. de Mas Latrie (Paris 1871), p. 394; *Eracles*, Recueil des historiens des croisades, Historiens Occidentaux vol. II, 294-295; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, ed. Muratori, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores XII (Bologna 1939), 291; and *Chronicle of St. Martin of Tours*, ed. Bouquet, Recueil des historiens de Gaul et de France, vol. XVIII, 310-311, this portion of the text not included in the edition in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. XXIV.

³⁰ Bongars, *op. cit.* II, 289-316 prints twenty three of Sanudo's letters; F. Kunstmann, 'Studien über Marino Sanudo den Aelteren,' *Abhandlungen der historischen Klasse der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. VII (1855), 697-819 prints ten; C. de la Roncière and L. Dorez, 'Lettres inédites et mémoires de Marino Sanudo l'ancien,' *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* LVI (1895), 21-44 print seven.

³¹ Kunstmann, *loc. cit.*, p. 774-775, letter no. II.

not mentioned by Hopf in this connection, one finds further evidence in the following passage:

Balduinus . . . filium suum Philippum nomine (Philip of Courtenay) quibusdam burgensibus Constantinopolitanis coactus fuit pro certo quantitate pecuniae obligare: qui dictum puerulum . . . Venetias postmodum transmiserunt: et nonnulla palatia sua, plumba cooperta nobiliter ab antiquo, discooperire et plumbi vendidere coopturam, et alia plura agere ut vivere posset . . . Praedicti . . . Veneti . . . praedictam civitatem . . . defensarunt . . . Perdita vero Constantinopoli, Veneti per XXX annos et ultra, ad recuperationem ipsius fideliter laborarunt: super hoc requirentes solícite quasi omnes Reges et principes occidentis, specialiter Alfonsum Regem Castellae, cum quo nihil extitit executioni mandatum. Tandem cum Siciliae Rege Karolo primo super hoc societatem fecerunt et ligam: qui propter amissionem Siciliae intendere non potuit ad praedicta. Novissime vero cum Comite Karolo de Valoys societatem fecerunt, propter mortem uxoris ad quam Imperii hereditas pertinebat: sed parum aut nihil ex hoc extitit adimpletum. . . .²²

Finally, in the *Istoria del Regno di Romania*, which, it must be remembered, survives only in a late Italian version whose phraseology may be greatly changed from that of Sanudo's Latin original, one finds the following:

Al Miser Marco Gradenigo . . . ch'era andato Podestà à Costantinopoli per i Veneziani parse far un'Armata di Gallee e Navilii per corsizar contra la Terra de Greci inimici suoi, ed essendosi esso partito de Costantinopoli con questa Armata, l'Imperator Sir Michiel Paleologo tratto con alquanti Borghesi di Costantinopoli che li dovessero aprir le Porte, e darli la Terra, e cosi fu ricevuto. L'Imperator Balduin . . . fu forza con un gran moltitudine di Donne e di Putte ritirarsi in alcune Navi del Commun di Vineggia²³ . . . el qual si ridusse al Nigroponte, ove li fu fatto grande onor . . . indi partitosi se na andò a Tebbe (Thebes), ove similmente fu onorato e presentato dal Signor della Rocia . . . Ivi andò la Madre di Miser Marco Sanudo (This is the Duchess of Naxos, see above, note 14) . . . ed fece che l'Imperator fece Cavalier suo Fiol Miser Marco Sanudo. Questo Imperator partitosi d'indi, andò in Puglia e trovò il Re Manfredi, che li fece grande onor con suoi Baroni e li dono gran presento; indi si partì l'Imperator e andò in Francia nel suo paese, ch'avea ivi d'Anonia . . . e al suo Figlio Filippo diede per Moglie la Figlia di Carlo (primo Re di Jerusalem e di Sicilia). El qual Filippo era stato obstaso in Venetia per una

²² Bongars, *op. cit.*, p. 73. It is of incidental interest that this passage and our document are the only sources, so far as I know, which mention the picturesque detail that Baldwin II stripped the lead from the roofs of the palaces of Byzantium, and sold it to raise money. Baldwin's proverty is well-known; so is the destruction and damage wrought by the Latins, sometimes to specific buildings; but the information conveyed here does not appear elsewhere.

²³ This reading suggests that ms O which agrees with it may be better at this point than ms A. ce above, variant *k* and comment.

quantità di denari, che'l Padre avea avuto da quelli di Cà Ferro. Dappoi il detto Imperator con suo Fiol venne in Puglia, ove finì la sua vita: del qual rimase Madonna Catterina Moglie del Miser Carlo (of Valois) . . .²⁴

When the three parallel passages, all by Sanudo, are taken together, it is hard to oppose Hopf's conjecture that our document was written by Marino Sanudo Torsello. If he did not write it, it was surely written by an author thoroughly steeped in Sanudo's writings. Whoever wrote it wrote it as a supplement to Villehardouin.

²⁴ *Chroniques*, pp. 114-116