

**REMILITARISING THE BYZANTINE IMPERIAL IMAGE:
A STUDY OF NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE AND OTHER
VISUAL MEDIA 1042-1453**

by

MICHAEL STEPHEN SAXBY

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
March 2017

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

The messages in the imagery on Byzantine coins, although often neglected by scholars, were a key means of projecting imperial power. Emperors could project power via dress, ceremonial, and displays, but these methods would not have reached all subjects. Byzantine coins had the advantage of reaching all subjects, as the Byzantine economy was fundamentally monetized. Military symbols (figures, dress, and weapons), whose study has been rather overlooked, formed an important part of this imagery. Whilst military symbols disappeared from Byzantine coins in the early eighth century, and were absent for some three centuries, they were reintroduced in the mid-eleventh century and appeared until 1394/5. Their importance is indicated by the fact that military types comprised over half the overall total of types for some emperors.

This study examines military symbols on Byzantine coins from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, and notes also imperial representations in other media. The numismatic sources for this study are the collections in the Barber Institute of Fine Arts, and Dumbarton Oaks. The general conclusions are that military symbols were used most frequently from 1204 to 1261, less frequently from 1261 to 1394/5, and least frequently from 1042 to 1204. The variety of military saints portrayed increased at first, but declined in the fourteenth century, until only St Demetrios remained, but in the highest status: riding with the emperor.

Dedicated to Dianne Saxby in gratitude

Acknowledgements

I wish to record my sincere thanks to my supervisor Dr Ruth Macrides for her unstinting kindness, help and guidance and for enabling me to deepen my understanding of the Byzantine world.

I am very grateful to the following persons for their help:

Dr Eurydice Georganteli, for all her work as my supervisor in the early stages of this thesis.

Professor Dimiter Angelov and Professor Leslie Brubaker for stimulating discussions on specific topics.

I am very grateful to the following for corresponding with me and for guiding me to much valuable information:

Professor Anthony Kaldellis.

Dr Cécile Morrisson.

Dr Pagona Papadopoulou.

Professor Vassiliki Penna.

Dr Jonathan Shea.

I am very grateful to the following for assistance in specific areas:

Mrs Joni Joseph (Dumbarton Oaks) and Dr Maria Vrij (Barber Institute of Fine Arts) for much help in supplying illustrations.

The staff of several University of Birmingham Libraries: Barber Institute of Fine Arts, Cadbury Research Library, and Main Library.

I record with great gratitude the support and help over many years of my wife Dianne, and dedicate this thesis to her.

Contents

Volume 1

1. Themes of Imperial Power and their Projection

Introduction	1
The aims of coin design: an example of propaganda?	5
The need for projection of imperial themes of power	14
The role of coin design in projecting imperial themes of power	24
The role of dress, ceremonial and displays in projecting imperial themes of power	31
Conclusions	40

2. Military Symbols on Byzantine Coins from 1042 to 1425

Methods of study	42
The mounted emperor	43
The military saints and the Archangel Michael	48
Military items of dress	54
Protection for other body parts	58
Weapons of the emperor and the warrior saints	70
Conclusions	82

3. Reintroduction and Development of Military Symbolism on Coins 1042 to 1143

Reintroduction and development of military symbolism on coins 1042 to 1143	84
Conclusions	100
Development of military symbols	101
Further development of military symbols	119
Conclusions	131

<u>4. Development of Military Symbolism on Coins 1143 to 1204</u>	
Development of military symbolism on coins 1143 to 1204	132
Comparative analysis of military types 1042 to 1204	165
Conclusions	170
 <u>5. Military Symbolism on Coins 1204 to 1261</u>	
Introduction	173
The Latin imitative coinage	179
Coin issues with military symbolism from the empire of Nicaea	188
Conclusions	210
Coin issues with military symbolism from Thessaloniki	211
Conclusions	237
Coin issues with military symbolism from Epeiros	237
Conclusions	243
Portraits of the rulers of the successor states in other media	243
Conclusions	244
 <u>6. Military Symbolism on Coins 1261 to 1425</u>	
Introduction: mints and proportions of military types	247
Military symbolism on coins from the thirteenth to mid-fourteenth centuries	250
Conclusions	323
Military symbolism on coins from the mid-fourteenth to the late fourteenth century	324
Imperial portraits in other media 1261-1453	347
Conclusions	349
 <u>Conclusions</u>	351

Volume 2

Illustrations
Bibliography: primary sources
Bibliography: secondary sources

List of Illustrations

Figure	Facing Page
1. Silver tetradrachm of Philip II (359-336 BC)	1
2. Orich sestertius of Trajan (AD 98-117)	1
3. Gold solidus of Justin II (565-78)	1
4. Gold solidus of Anastasios (491-518)	2
5. Bronze coin of Arcadios (383-408)	2
6. Silver ceremonial coin of Leo III (717-41)	2
7. Class 13 copper trachy of Andronikos III (1328-41)	3
8. Class 12 copper trachy of Andronikos III (1328-41)	3
9. Class 14 copper trachy of Andronikos III (1328-41)	3
10. Aspron trachy nomisma in electrum of John II (1118-43)	4
11. Class IV gold histamenon of Constantine IX (1042-55)	4
12. Silver miliaresion of Constantine IX (1042-55)	4
13. Portrait of Basil II (976-1025)	5
14. The Barberini Ivory, c. 6 th century	6
15. Class I gold histamenon of Isaac I (1057-59)	7
16. Class II gold histamenon of Isaac I (1057-59)	7
17. Silver miliaresion of Michael VII (1071-78)	7
18. Class II miliaresion in billon of Nikephoros (1078-81)	8
19. Aspron trachy nomisma in silver of Michael VIII (1259-82)	8
20. Histamenon in billon of Alexios I (1081-1118)	9
21. Type B half terarteron noummion in copper of John II (1118-43)	9
22. Aspron trachy nomisma in electrum of Manuel I (1143-80)	9
23. Type B tetarteron noummion in bronze of Andronikos I (1183-85)	10
24. Gold nomisma hyperpyron of Isaac II (1185-95)	10
25. Bronze terarteron noummion of Alexios III (1195-1204)	10
26. Type B aspron trachy nomisma in electrum of Theodore I (1208-21)	11
27. Type B aspron trachy nomisma in billon of John III (1221-54)	11
28. Type Q aspron trachy nomisma in billon of John III (1221-54)	11

29. Type A tetarteron noummion in bronze of John III (1221-54)	12
30. Type C tetarteron noummion in bronze of John III (1221-54)	12
31. Type C aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Theodore II (1254-58)	12
32. Type D aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Theodore II (1254-58)	13
33. Type C aspron trachy nomisma in electrum of Theodore Angelos (1225/7-30)	13
34. Type C aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Theodore Angelos (1225/7-30)	13
35. Type B aspron trachy nomisma in silver of Theodore Angelos (1225/7-30)	14
36. Type F aspron trachy nomisma in billon of of Theodore Angelos (1225/7-30)	14
37. Variety B tetarteron noummion in bronze of Theodore Angelos (1225/7-30)	15
38. Type B aspron trachy nomisma in silver of Manuel Komnenos Doukas (1230-37)	15
39. Type A aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Manuel Komnenos Doukas (1230-37)	15
40. Type C aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Manuel Komnenos Doukas (1230-37)	16
41. Type B aspron trachy nomisma in billon of John Komnenos Doukas (1237-42)	16
42. Aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Demetrios Komnenos Doukas (1244-46)	16
43. Type G aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Manuel Komnenos Doukas (1230-37)	17
44. Type Q aspron trachy nomisma in billon of John Komnenos Doukas (1237-42)	17
45. Type D aspron trachy nomisma in billon of John III (1246-54)	18
46. Type I aspron trachy nomisma in billon of John III (1246-54)	18
47. Aspron trachy nomisma in billon of Theodore II (1254-58)	19
48. Type 25 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	19

49. Steatite icon with three military saints (12 th century)	20
50. Type III gold hyperpyron of Michael VIII (1259-82)	21
51. Type 8 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	21
52. Type 9 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	21
53. Type 11 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	22
54. Type 19 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	22
55. Type 38 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	22
56. Type 43 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	23
57. Type 53 copper trachy of Michael VIII (1259-82)	23
58. Class 2 copper trachy of Andronikos II (1282-1328)	24
59. Class 2 copper trachy of Andronikos II (1282-1328)	24
60. Class 9 copper assarion of Andronikos II (1282-1328) with Michael IX (1294-1320)	24
61. Class 11 copper trachy of Andronikos II (1282-1328)	25
62. Class 2 copper trachy of Andronikos II (1282-1328)	25
63. Class 8 copper trachy of Andronikos II (1282-1328)	26
64. Class 1 half-stavraton in silver of John V (1341-91)	26
65. Silver half-basilicon (heavy series) of Andronikos III (1328-41)	27
66. Silver basilicon (heavy series) of Andronikos III (1328-41)	27
67. Class 2 silver basilicon (light series) of Andronikos III (1328-41)	27
68. Class 1 copper assarion of Andronikos III (1328-41)	28
69. Class 4 billon tornese of Andronikos III (1328-41)	28
70. Copper assarion of John V (1341-91)	28
71. Class 15 copper trachy of Andronikos III (1328-41)	29
72. Class 8 basilicon in silver of John V (1341-91)	29
73. Class 4 copper assarion of John V (1341-91)	29
74. Copper follis of Andronikos IV (1376-79) and John V (1341-91)	30
75. Class 1 copper follis, light series, of Manuel II (1391-1425)	30
76. Class 4 copper follis, of Manuel II (1391-1425), for John V (1382-87)	30
77. Half-stavraton in silver of Manuel II (1391-1425)	31
78. Preliminary drawing of John VIII (1425-48) by Pisanello	32
79. Bronze medal of John VIII (1425-48) by Pisanello	32

Preliminary Notes

1. Transliteration
2. Illustrations
3. Inscriptions
4. Coins of Trebizond
5. Abbreviations

1. Transliteration.

I have followed the principles of transliteration stated in *George Akropolites The History*, trans. and ed. R. Macrides, (Oxford, 2007), xi. Greek names and terms have been transliterated as closely as possible, with common Christian names and place names in the form most familiar to English readers. Greek η is rendered as 'e', and β as 'b', unless a Latin or Slavic origin of a name makes 'v' more appropriate.

2. Illustrations.

All coins with military symbolism 1042-1453 are described and referenced in the text. Because of the large number of these coins I have made a selection of which to illustrate. In general, I have selected coins for illustration on the basis of significance, and have tried to include at least one coin for each emperor. This selection has been affected by several factors, such as excessive wear with loss of detail, and a small number of coins in the Barber Institute and Dumbarton Oaks Collections for which images were unavailable.

Because of the number of pages in this thesis it has not been possible to bind all the material into one volume. I have therefore placed all the illustrations in the second volume, with page numbers referring to the facing page. This allows the text and illustrations to be studied simultaneously. It should be noted that Dumbarton Oaks uses two separate sets of numbers to identify its coins: one set refers to the coin's number in the on site catalogue, while a different number identifies the same coin in the published catalogue. The coin numbers used in the illustrations of Dumbarton Oaks coins in volume 2 of this thesis correspond to the on site catalogue and follow strictly the copyright requirements of Dumbarton Oaks. The coin numbers of Dumbarton Oaks coins listed in the text in volume 1 of this thesis correspond to the coin numbers in the published catalogues and also record concordances for the Barber Institute Coin Collection, and, where appropriate, Bendall and Donald's *The Later Palaeologan Coinage*. Where coins mentioned in the text of volume 1 of the thesis appear in the illustrations in volume 2, they are indicated in the text and in a footnote by a note 'see fig.', with the figure number. This enables a direct link between volumes 1 and 2, and links the two Dumbarton Oaks numbers.

3. Inscriptions.

I have reproduced the *Dumbarton Oaks Catalogues'* readings of Α, Δ and Λ as such, even though each one of these is often to be interpreted as one of the other two letters.

I have obtained the Dumbarton Oaks font of ligatured letters, but have been unable to use it as it causes my computer to crash. I have been informed by a member of staff at Dumbarton Oaks that the font is problematic to use. I have therefore transliterated all ligatured letters into individual letters, according to the table in the *Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue* 4.2, p. 726. Two particularly common ligatures occur in Byzantine coin inscriptions in the *Dumbarton Oaks Catalogues* and are reproduced in this thesis. O at the start of many inscriptions can stand without a ligature, or can be ligated with a central dot, or an inscribed A. This represents O ΑΓΙΟΣ. A second common ligature is for OY (or Y represented as V), which stands for OU, as in Doukas.

Columnar inscriptions are indicated by the use of vertical bars. An absence of vertical bars indicates a circular inscription. A combined columnar and circular inscription is indicated by the use of vertical bars in the columnar part.

4. Coins of Trebizond.

The standard catalogue of coins from Trebizond is now over one hundred years old. Because of this absence of a modern catalogue I have not attempted to cover the whole range of Trapezuntine coins. However I have included the riding emperor symbol on Trapezuntine coins in the discussion of influences on Byzantine coin symbols, alongside the influence of riding figure symbols on other coinages such as crusader, Seljuk and Armenian. I regret that as I have no knowledge of Arabic and Armenian I have been unable to reproduce the inscriptions on these two groups of coins, but I have provided full references.

5. Abbreviations.

I have used the following abbreviations.

BD: Bendall, S. and Donald, P.J. 1974. *The Billon Trachea of Michael VIII Palaeologos 1258-1282*, London.

CED: *Collins English Dictionary*, seventh edition, 2007, Glasgow.

DOC 1: Bellinger, A. R. 1966. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, volume 1, Washington, D.C.

DOC 2.1 and DOC 2.2: Grierson, P. 1968. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, volume 2, part 1, and volume 2, part 2, Washington, D.C.

DOC 3.1 and DOC 3.2: Grierson, P. 1973. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, volume 3, part 1, and volume 3, part 2, Washington, D. C.

DOC 4.1 and DOC 4.2: Hendy, M. F. 1999. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, volume 4, part 1, and volume 4, part 2, Washington, D. C.

DOC 5.1 and DOC 5.2: Grierson, P. 1999. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, volume 5, part 1, and volume 5, part 2, Washington, D. C.

DO Seals 1: Nesbitt, J. and Oikonomides, N. 1991. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum*, volume 1, Washington, D. C.

DO Seals 2: Nesbitt, J. and Oikonomides, N. 1994. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum*, volume 2, Washington, D. C.

DO Seals 3: Nesbitt, J. and Oikonomides, N. 1996. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum*, volume 3, Washington, D. C.

DO Seals 4: McGeer, E., Nesbitt, J. and Oikonomides, N. 2001. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum*, volume 4, Washington, D. C.

DO Seals 5: McGeer, E., Nesbitt, J. and Oikonomides, N. 2005. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum*, volume 5, Washington, D. C.

DO Seals 6: Nesbitt, J. and Morrisson, C. 2009. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum*, volume 6, Washington, D. C.

LPC: Bendall, S. and Donald, P. J. 1979. *The Later Palaeologan Coinage*, Bath.

MEC: Grierson, P. and Travaini, L. 1998. *Medieval European Coinage*, vol. 14, Cambridge.

ODB: Kazhdan, A. 1991. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, New York, NY, and Oxford.

OED: *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, third edition, 1973, Oxford.

PCPC: Bendall, S. *A Private Collection of Palaeologan Coins*, 1988, Wolverhampton.

1. THEMES OF IMPERIAL POWER AND THEIR PROJECTION

Introduction

This thesis discusses the projection of imperial power by military symbols on coins. Coins represented a convenient and widely-circulating medium which could be used by emperors to project themes of imperial power. Military symbols on coins are taken to be the equestrian emperor; a military figure, comprising the warrior saints St Demetrios, St George, the Saints Theodore Tiron or Stratelates, or the Archangel Michael; military dress; and weapons. Coin types with military symbols were reintroduced during the reign of Constantine IX (1042-55), after an absence of some three centuries. Such symbols disappeared from the coinage during the reign of Manuel II (1391-1425).¹ The possible effects of these symbols and inscriptions on public opinion is discussed, and whether coin designs were intended to impress the public, or only the emperor himself, as a form of flattery. Study of the effect of coin design on public opinion is hampered by the lack of comment on coinage in Byzantine historical narratives. An exception is the Class II gold histamenon of Isaac I, where the reverse image of Isaac holding a drawn sword provoked comment from Attaleiates, Skylitzes Continuatus, Matthew of Edessa and Zonaras.² A related question is whether coin design can be termed 'propaganda'. Attention is drawn to the use of coin design in projecting imperial power, and whether or not the term 'propaganda' can apply to coin iconography. Such application of the term 'propaganda' to coin design and

¹ Although military symbolism on coins ceased in 1394/5, the symbol of the riding emperor continued to be seen after this date, e.g. on Pisanello's medal of John VIII (1425-48). This thesis therefore covers the period up to 1453.

² Attaleiates 2012, 12, [60], 1, 109; Skylitzes Continuatus 1968, 103, 1 - 4; Matthew of Edessa 1858, II, LXXIXC, 8-9; Zonaras 1897, III, 665.20 – 666.1-3.

function is more common in Byzantine numismatics, and its application in Roman numismatics has been less certain, particularly since experience of propaganda in the twentieth century has given the word in its general context a more pejorative meaning.³ This development has arisen from an association of propaganda with deception or bias, although in the projection of themes of power deception is an ancient concept, and the use of deception in Byzantine ceremonial is noted in this chapter.

In the imperial projection of power on coins a question arises of the degree of imperial involvement in coin design. Numismatic authorities differ; whereas Crawford views Roman coin design simply as a mint doing its best for its patron, Penna has entitled a book *Byzantine Coinage – Medium of Transaction and Manifestation of Imperial Propaganda*.⁴ But coinage was not an isolated part of imperial responsibilities that could be left to a group outside control of the emperor; it was an important component of the whole imperial structure. The exactitude of imperial rituals is well-known and was described by observers such as Liudprand of Cremona.⁵ Given the precision of imperial rituals, and the detail of the protocol described in *The Book of Ceremonies* and in Pseudo-Kodinos, it is difficult to believe that coin design would have been left to chance. *The Book of Ceremonies* shows the desire of Constantine VII to maintain tradition, and as the compilation covers in minute detail the projection of imperial power by ceremonies, and by imperial costumes for processions and acclamations, it is difficult to believe that coin

³ Howgego points out that 'scholars remain heavily influenced by their own experiences in this area; those from eastern Europe, for example, continue to give greater credence to views of coinages as systematic propaganda.' Howgego 1995, 71.

⁴ Crawford 1983, 59; Penna 2002.

⁵ Liudprand of Cremona 1993, 6, [5], 153.

design would have been left solely to a die-sinker. The comprehensiveness and attention to detail of *The Book of Ceremonies* is matched by Pseudo-Kodinos in the fourteenth century. Again, the accounts of rituals, costumes, and court hierarchy all suggest a high degree of *taxis* and care involving the protocols for the appearance of the emperor. It is hard to imagine that such care did not extend to the coinage as well.

That this point was appreciated from the early empire is shown well on some coins of Herakleios, which depict him with his family. Herakleios depicts himself not only with his wife Martina, but with his sons Herakleios Constantine and Heraklonas, where a strict protocol of seniority is observed: Herakleios appears in the central position, with the next most senior (Herakleios Constantine) on the viewer's right, and the most junior (Heraklonas) on the viewer's left.⁶ This order of precedence is always followed on Byzantine coins. In addition, the most senior has the largest beard, and the most junior the smallest beard, or no beard. Such care in depicting seniority again suggests a conscious decision to adopt a specific form.

If imperial input was involved in coin design it may be asked if specific coin designs can be linked to specific events. With a small number of exceptions, Byzantine coins can be identified with individual emperors, but dating specific coin designs within a reign is more difficult. Some coins can be dated precisely: the type B tetarteron noummion in bronze of Andronikos I is

⁶ e.g. gold solidus dated to 636/7. BICC: coin no B2908. DOC 2.1, 260, coin no 38a; plate IX coin no 38a. No obverse inscription. Reverse inscription: VICTORIA AUGU; in exergue CONOB.

dated to the siege of Thessaloniki in July/August 1185.⁷ By contrast, the coins of Constantine IX are difficult to date, but clues may be found in external events. As two large stars appear in the right and left fields of Constantine's Class IV gold histamenon, this coin is dated tentatively to 1054-55. The stars are suggested to represent the appearance of a supernova in the constellation Taurus, giving rise to the Crab Nebula;⁸ this phenomenon was visible from July 1054 to April 1056. However even if coins can be dated with relative precision, it may still be difficult to demonstrate a link between a coin issue and a specific event.

In addition to coins the imperial image was employed in other visual media, including portraits and murals, or in imperial inscriptions in public places, with the aim of projecting his power. In addition to public displays, other means of projecting imperial power by the presence of the emperor, such as imperial dress and ceremonial, are discussed. Chapter 1 discusses the need for the projection of imperial themes of power and ideology via coin design and the possible impact of such design on coin users. Chapter 2 covers methods of study, and the classification of military symbols on coins. Chapters 3 to 6 discuss the projection of imperial themes of power by a discussion of military symbols on coins, followed by shorter sections on military symbolism in other visual media.

In summary, these discussions raise a number of issues: can reasons be identified for the reintroduction and continuing use of military symbols on coins? Could the use of these symbols be matched to any actions, such as

⁷ BICC B5844; DOC no specimen. This coin is discussed in detail in chapter 4.

⁸ The astronomical evidence adds to the numismatic, whereby over his reign Constantine's histamena decreased in fineness, but increased in concavity, with the Class IV being the least fine and most concave. This evidence suggests the date of 1054-55. DOC 3.2, 734-6.

internal and external threats to the throne? What degree of variation was there between emperors in the numbers of military types issued in each reign? How did the issue of military types vary between different mints? Were there variations in the numbers of military types issued between 1042 to 1204; 1204 to 1261; and 1261 to 1425? And for the period 1204 to 1261, were there variations in the numbers of military types issued from Nicaea, Thessaloniki, and Epeiros?

The collections used for this study are the Barber Institute Coin Collection (BICC) and the Catalogue of the Dumbarton Oaks Coin Collection (DOC). Bendall and Donald's *The Later Palaeologan Coinage* (LPC) was used to supplement the years 1282 to 1425. Full details with both BICC references and DOC concordances (and LPC concordances where applicable) of all Byzantine coins with military symbolism from 1042 to 1453 are incorporated in the text.

The Aims of Coin Design: an Example of Propaganda?

A metal disc marked with symbols and possibly a value and source can function as money.⁹ If a design and inscription featuring the ruler are incorporated, a further function can be added: the projection of themes of power by the ruler. There is general acceptance that coin design represents a means of expressing a ruler's ideology and of projecting his power. Some authorities would see this form of expression as propaganda. Such provision of publicity for a ruler can operate at several levels, as may be seen at least as early as Roman coins. Thus Mattingly suggested that Roman coins

⁹ The coins discussed in this thesis do not show their place of origin.

provided not simply publicity, but could be considered a form of propaganda.¹⁰ Subsequent discussion of the concept of propaganda on coins has been influenced by experience of propaganda in the twentieth century, which has attached more negative connotations to the word. The Oxford English Dictionary defines propaganda as 'any association, systematic scheme, or concerted movement for the propagation of a particular doctrine or practice', and finds the word's origin in the *Congregation* or *College of the Propaganda*, a 'committee of Cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church having the care and oversight of foreign missions, founded in 1622.'¹¹ More recent definitions are 'the organised dissemination of information, allegations, etc, to assist or damage the cause of a government, movement, etc';¹² and 'biased information promoting a cause'.¹³ In Britain the use of propaganda when Mattingly was writing during the First World War had the effect of attaching a sense of false representation to propaganda. Fabrication of propaganda stories was recognised officially by the War Office in 1916.¹⁴ Official British propagandists did not themselves fabricate atrocity stories, but did encourage press dissemination of such stories.¹⁵ But even some degree of scrupulousness such as this did not mitigate the negative aspects ascribed to

¹⁰ Mattingly 1917, 66, 69-70.

¹¹ Shorter Oxford English Dictionary 1973, 1687.

¹² Collins English Dictionary 2007, 1298. The linking of information with allegations indicates the range of material which may be covered by the word 'propaganda'. In practice, the word can cover activities ranging from straightforward advertising to outright deception. It needs to be remembered that 'propaganda' is a word that is often used loosely.

¹³ New Oxford Dictionary for Writers and Editors 2005, 304. It is possible that a suggestion of bias forms the basis of misgiving about much of the use of the word 'propaganda' in relation to coin design.

¹⁴ 'Until the idea is grasped of combating enemy propaganda not merely by *news*, which it is *impolitic to fabricate*, but also and even mainly by views, which it is quite possible to propagate...' Sanders and Taylor 1982, 55: official source not given; and note 2, 273. My emphasis.

¹⁵ Sanders and Taylor 1982, 137.

propaganda: writing in *The Times* Robert Donald stated that propaganda was 'utterly repugnant to our feelings and contrary to our traditions.'¹⁶ Not surprisingly, British propaganda efforts were discredited postwar when elements of falsehood were recalled, serving to malign the work of many official British propagandists; this effect was reinforced by no official history of their work being commissioned. It also made it more difficult for stories of Nazi atrocities, which started to appear in the 1930s, to be believed.¹⁷ The use of propaganda by the Nazis added further to concepts of falsehood associated with the word.

Care is needed therefore in considering whether propaganda can apply to ancient coin designs and inscriptions. It is probably no coincidence that the idea that Roman coins represented propaganda was put forward in 1917, with a political background of the increasing use of propaganda by governments during the Great War. However it is essential to consider exactly what Mattingly wrote, for it suggests that Mattingly treated coins as part of the historical record, and saw propaganda as a form of advertisement.¹⁸ He does not appear to be imputing false representation to the concept of 'propaganda'; and does not appear to be using the word with the implications attached to it later in the century. Thus in considering the usages of 'propaganda' later in

¹⁶ *The Times* 22nd February 1918; quoted by Sanders and Taylor 1982, 249, and note 11, 294.

¹⁷ Sanders and Taylor 1982, 264.

¹⁸ 'The one other point is the importance of the coin in this period, not only as currency, but as a convenient means of political advertisement and propaganda.....there is no doubt that every political event of importance tended to find speedy representation on the coins and that every new emperor or rebel at once resorted to coinage to publish the fact of his rising and to give some idea of the programme he proposed to pursue.....*Where historical material is scanty, then the coins will often actually supply new facts; even where our knowledge is as good as it is for the years A.D. 68-69, the coins offer a most interesting illustration and confirmation of literature – in some cases, a criterion of accuracy.*' Mattingly 1917, 69-70. My emphasis.

the twentieth century regarding Roman and Byzantine coinages it is important to recall the negative connotations this term had acquired. Suggestions that coin designs and inscriptions could have represented propaganda may have been rejected by some numismatists because of dislike of how propaganda had been used during the Great War. The idea of Roman coin design as propaganda was reinforced at another time of significant employment of propaganda, during the Second World War, by Sutherland.¹⁹ In a later development, during the political tensions of the Cold War, Grant propounded the idea that early Greek coin design represented propaganda.²⁰ Thus during the twentieth century a concept was described of the use of coin design to project imperial themes of power, with the suggestion that such design could represent propaganda.

However Crawford rejects the idea that Roman coin design could represent propaganda, believing that at most an emperor might have issued a general directive that the coinage should represent his 'personality'. Crawford views Roman coin design as essentially a mint doing its best for its patron, and rejects the idea that coin designs represent propaganda, as that word's twentieth-century interpretation involves deliberate false representation.²¹ By contrast, Levick believes that although Roman coins did carry a propaganda message, the target of the message was not the public, but the emperor

¹⁹ '.....Roman coins left nothing to chance. The literate and illiterate alike were supplied with information in the form of complementary words and pictures. A man who could not read could at least sense the personality of an emperor from the highly individual, highly polished treatment of his portrait, and could comprehend the essentials of his policy and achievement from the simple and clearly conceived pictures which accompanied the portrait. The imperial coinage was a masterly tool used in the interests of imperial philosophy.' Sutherland 1940, 72, 74.

²⁰ 'Many city governments deliberately made their coins beautiful. They did so because they thought this was worthwhile. And it was worthwhile because it was first rate propaganda.' Grant 1952, 81.

²¹ Crawford 1983, 59. Crawford himself places the word 'personality' in inverted commas.

himself: such iconography was thus a form of flattery.²² Bellinger had expressed a more equivocal position to Crawford, accepting the use of propaganda only on some earlier Roman coins, but not on later Roman coins because of propaganda's twentieth-century connotations.²³ But the application of the term 'propaganda' to coin design underwent changes in understanding during the twentieth century. By 1987 Burnett regarded the application of the term 'propaganda' in the persuasive sense to coinage as 'unexceptionable', while cautioning against 'deliberate falsehood'.²⁴ Currently there is acceptance that coinage can carry a message, and that coinage can convey 'thinking about the power within the state and thinking by the very men who were engaged in the struggle for power'.²⁵ Non-numismatists may be more forthright about coin design: Jowett and O'Donnell (academics in the field of communications) see a coin of Julius Caesar as mass propaganda.²⁶

It is also possible that those like Crawford who argue that coin designs do not represent propaganda in that word's twentieth-century interpretation of possibly involving deliberate false representation could ignore that in projecting imperial authority by means other than coins, a deliberate degree of deception could occur. Emperors could celebrate triumphs following quite modest military success; it has been suggested that the triumphs of Basil I in

²² Levick 1982, 108-9.

²³ 'Through the fourth century and the first half of the fifth the element of propaganda may be said to have continued in a much reduced form, but thereafter "propaganda" is hardly a proper term to be used for the function of the coinage, particularly considering the modern connotations of the term.' Bellinger 1956, 70.

²⁴ Burnett 1987, 66.

²⁵ Levick 1999, 58. For a discussion of current thinking on Roman coinage with reference to 'propaganda' see Cribb 2009, 500-03.

²⁶ 'Coins were the first genuine form of mass propaganda, in that they were widely circulated and clearly were intended to represent the power of the state with the symbology stamped on them.' Jowett and O'Donnell 1999, 54.

873 and of Constantine VII in 956 fell into this category.²⁷ In some triumphs too attempts were made to misrepresent the number of prisoners, by making it appear that their numbers were greater than they were, as Choniates relates of a triumph which Manuel I celebrated in Constantinople in 1152.²⁸ Other instances of deception include that seen during the rebellion (820/1 to 823) of Thomas the Slav, when Thomas is believed to have published victory bulletins which may have been false, but which probably helped his cause;²⁹ and the action of Isaac II in celebrating false victories in his campaigns against the Vlachs.³⁰ The personal actions of an emperor could also involve cynical calculation: the decision of John Tzimiskes in his triumph of 971 not to ride in the triumphal wagon prepared for him, but to place in it an icon of the Virgin, and to ride behind it, has been described as 'a spectacularly ostentatious act of humility'.³¹ It would appear therefore that those who reject the idea of coin designs as propaganda because there was no deliberate attempt to mislead could be underestimating the use of deception in other forms of the projection of imperial power. In overall terms, if

²⁷ McCormick 1986, 154-7, 159-65.

²⁸ 'He turned this triumphal festival into a marvel and presented the prisoners of war not in a single throng but in groups presented at intervals to deceive the spectators into imagining that the captives parading by were more numerous than they really were.' Choniates 1984, [93], 54.

²⁹ McCormick 1986, 192 and fn 16.

³⁰ 'He.....determined that crushing their uprising would gain him much needed military credibility. However, and in spite of his attempt to prove otherwise by announcing false victories to the faithful in Constantinople, Isaac had miscalculated.' Stephenson 2000, 293. Stephenson does not quote a source for this statement. Choniates records that Isaac stayed only a short time in the field, before returning to the 'delights of the Propontis', having been 'induced to desert to them'. Choniates 1984, [399], 219.

³¹ McCormick 1986, 173-4. And such actions had a long pedigree: the tyrant Pisistratus regained power in Athens by dressing a peasant girl as Athena in full armour and riding with her in a chariot into the city, with heralds announcing that the goddess was bringing him back. Herodotus, *Histories* 1.60; cited by McKeown 2013, 59.

triumphs could involve deception, coin design might also be viewed as a means of manipulating public opinion.³²

Crawford's arguments about the chance nature of coin design were made in relation to Roman coins, and much of the discussion of coin function as propaganda in the literature has been in terms of Roman, rather than Byzantine, coins. In a comment in 1956 on Byzantine coins Bellinger, whilst hesitant of using the term 'propaganda' nevertheless refers to 'the sovereign's desire to communicate definite ideas'. Even more tellingly he notes that 'By ceaseless iteration they [coins] kept before the eyes of the subject the majesty of the sovereign.'³³ Byzantine numismatists tend to have fewer reservations about applying the term 'propaganda' to Byzantine coinage than Roman numismatists to Roman coinage: the title of Penna's book '*Byzantine Coinage – Medium of Transaction and Manifestation of Imperial Propaganda*', is a case in point, and in a 2017 paper Maric refers to Romanos I's 'excellent examples of imperial attempts at propaganda'.³⁴ Whilst an important element in the argument against the possibility of coin designs being used as propaganda is that there are very few, if any, references in the primary sources to emperors (Roman or Byzantine) directing the use of a specific image, such references do exist, as noted by Skylitzes of John Tzimiskes.³⁵ Grierson refers to this

³² Deception was also seen in other areas of imperial life. *The Book of Ceremonies* describes how it may be necessary for the emperor, whilst on campaign, to direct one of his representatives to 'fabricate good rumours'. Fabricated rumours included the arrival of news from a member of the force, to curtail the indifference of some citizens and disturbance by others. *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, [450; HB74], 450.

³³ Bellinger 1956, 70. And currently Morrisson argues that the Byzantine public would pay attention to coin design and could identify coins, as a means of recognising their authenticity and purchasing power. They would thus be able to appreciate an imperial message on coins. Morrisson 2013, 79.

³⁴ Penna 2002; Maric 2017, 101.

³⁵ He [John I] also ordered that the image of the saviour be inscribed on the gold and copper coins, something which had not happened before, and on one of the sides there was written

use of an image of Christ on copper coins (the Anonymous Folles series) as 'religious propaganda'.³⁶

It is also significant that Skylitzes linked John's introduction of an image of Christ in this way to two other actions by John in celebration of his victories: he rebuilt the church above the vault of the Chalke; and he excused all taxpayers the tax on hearths (the *kapnikon*).³⁷ McCormick dates this linkage by Skylitzes to 972; it may then be possible to extrapolate from McCormick's dating and suggest that if John deliberately reduced taxation, in a move of which people would have been aware, then his action in relation to the copper coinage was equally a deliberate act.³⁸ Whilst Grierson dates the copper coinage to 970 he accepts that John's action was deliberate.³⁹ Thus even if there is some disagreement about detail, these authorities accept that John ordered the design of the coinage in this way. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that other emperors did so, even if a reference does not exist in the primary sources. Additional evidence of a possible imperial role in coin design is seen in the silver miliaresion of Constantine IX, even though there is no reference in the primary sources to his action. This coin is distinguished by an

Roman letters saying, 'Jesus Christ, king of kings' – a practice which subsequent emperors retained.' Skylitzes 2010, 19, [311], 294-5. In another example Calomino cites Suetonius as describing a coin struck on the orders of Nero, but does not give the full citation. Calomino 2016, 75.

³⁶ Grierson, DOC 3.2, 635. Strictly speaking what was new here was the appearance of an image of Christ on the copper (and hence widely circulating) coinage, c. 970-2. DOC 3.2, 591. An image of Christ had appeared on the gold coinage since its introduction very early (probably in 843) in the reign of Michael III (842-67), by his mother and regent, Theodora. This image revived the brief use of a bust of Christ by Justinian II (685-95 and 705-11), before the advent of Iconoclasm in the 720s eliminated it. DOC 3.1, 146. BICC: coin no B4380. DOC II.2, 578-80, coin nos 7a.3, 7c.2, 7e.2, 7h; plate XXXVII coin nos 7a.3, 7c.2, 7e.2, 7h.

³⁷ Skylitzes 2010, 19, [311], 294.

³⁸ McCormick 1986, 175 and fn 175.

³⁹ DOC 3.2, 634-5 and fn 5. 'The continuation, if not the origin, of the series involved a probably conscious element of religious propaganda, since the Saracen wars of Nicephorus and John showed some aspects of a Crusade and the follis was the denomination that would circulate most widely amongst the common people in the conquered provinces.'

inscription which is dodecasyllabic and which runs in continuity from obverse to reverse. The obverse inscription is: ΜΡ ΘΥ +ΔΕCΠOINA CΩZOIC; and the reverse is: EVCERH MONOMAXON; the whole inscription thus reads, 'O Lady, preserve the pious Monomachos'. Such a deliberate link between Constantine and the Virgin was probably not accidental. (**Fig. 12.**)⁴⁰ A further example of deliberate intent in coin inscriptions is seen on two two-thirds miliaresia in silver, one of Michael VI (1056-57) and one of Isaac (1057-59), where each emperor is referred to as 'ὀρθόδοξος'.⁴¹ This epithet is believed by Papadopoulou and Morrisson, and Grierson, to relate to the papal excommunication of the patriarch of Constantinople in 1054, resulting in schism from Rome. 'Orthodox' thus asserts the rightness of Byzantine theological beliefs.⁴² The use of this epithet in such a narrow time frame would appear to be deliberate.

Imperial direction in Byzantine coin design to project the power of the emperor should not be surprising, given the precarious nature of the Byzantine succession, and the number of revolts against emperors. That coinage was seen as a means of projecting imperial power is confirmed by the fact that all emperors, having reached the throne, took early action to issue coins in their name. Further, considered in the perspective of a long time frame, trends can be detected, such as the reintroduction of military

⁴⁰ BICC: coin no B5356. **See fig. 12.** A full discussion of this coin and its dodecasyllabic stichos is given in chapter 3.

⁴¹ BICC no specimen for either emperor. DOC 3.2, 758 coin no 3 (Michael VI); 763 coin no 4 (Isaac I).

⁴² Papadopoulou and Morrisson 2013, 82; Grierson DOC 3.2, 755. Papadopoulou and Morrisson acknowledge Bertelè's contribution to the debate, but note also Laurent's suggestion that 'ὀρθόδοξος' could be used by any emperor and in this case refers to Michael's and Isaac's wish to assert their orthodoxy against the powerful and ambitious patriarch Michael Keroularios. See their footnotes 35 and 37, p. 82.

types by Constantine IX (1042-55), after an absence of over three centuries. It is difficult to justify such change, unless an emperor was aiming to reinforce his projection of power. Penna provides a clear description of a role for coin design in the projection of imperial theme of power.⁴³

In this thesis coin design is viewed as an expression of imperial ideology, and as a means of projecting imperial themes of power. It is accepted that coin design can be said to represent a form of propaganda, but notes that the word 'propaganda' is often used loosely in relation to coinage, and can be said to lack precision. 'Progagandistic', with its suggestion of a reflection of propaganda, is a useful term.⁴⁴ In general terms, in this thesis the expressions 'projection of imperial power', or 'projection of imperial themes of power', are used to describe the function of coin design, instead of 'propaganda'.

The Need for the Projection of Imperial Themes of Power

The projection of imperial power by use of military symbols on Byzantine coins falls into two phases. In the first phase, from 491 to the early eighth century, such types were carried over from Roman coinage, but their use was gradually phased out. This use and abandonment of military types

⁴³ 'Symbol and mirror, cornerstone and weapon of a mighty Empire, Byzantine coinage became an ideal means of projecting the imperial ideal and promoting imperial policy. Through it the central authority transmitted messages to its subjects as well as to other peoples..... On the tiny circular surface of the flan, the emperor was transformed into an icon, in which all sense of depth, volume and perspective is purposefully avoided. The emphasis is placed on the symbolism expressed through the emblems of imperial raiment and the insignia of authority, and manifested in the juxtaposition of the imperial figure on one face with a divine or saintly figure on the other. This symbolism expressed the emperor's religious mission, his role on earth, the source of his power and authority, his political status.' Penna 2002, 127-8. Howgego has written succinctly that 'At a minimum it should not be controversial that coin types may reflect what we may as well call propaganda.' Howgego 1995, 73.

⁴⁴ E.g. Baker 2006, 409.

was considered in an earlier work, where it was suggested that a major influence on their decline was the increasing power of the Church and the development of the cult of the Virgin.⁴⁵ The second phase of issue of military types saw their reintroduction by Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-55), and continued until 1394/5 under Manuel II. If the christianization of society from the late fifth century to the early eighth century had sufficient force to produce this change in the projection of imperial power it may be asked if any comparable force is discernible in the late tenth and the eleventh centuries, leading to the remilitarisation of the imperial image. Significant factors were at work, for this later time saw the development of the military aristocracy as a powerful elite, and was also marked by increased emphasis on noble character and aristocratic values.⁴⁶ These developments, which became apparent under the Macedonian dynasty from Basil I to Basil II, had several precursor factors. Firstly, consolidation and reconquest occurred along the empire's eastern and southern borders; whilst emperors faced external threats from neighbouring powers the increased power of the military aristocracy created internal threats, making necessary the assertion of imperial power. Secondly, there were changes to the cults of three warrior saints: Demetrios, George, and Theodore, as they became more closely associated with the court and with each other. These three saints became effectively divine patrons in war.⁴⁷

If potential threats to imperial authority increased significantly through the rise of the military aristocracy these threats may have made the projection

⁴⁵ Saxby, 2009.

⁴⁶ Kazhdan and Epstein 1985, 104, 112.

⁴⁷ White 2013, 32.

of imperial power more necessary. But even prior to the rise of the military aristocracy factors can be discerned in Byzantine power structures which would have made it necessary for an emperor to project the imperial power. Hereditary succession in Byzantium was never routine, and most emperors were not secure on the throne.⁴⁸ Angelov has noted that throughout the entire history of the empire only approximately one third of emperors died in their beds; he refers to revolution as a 'constitutional norm'.⁴⁹ Usurpation was commonplace, and part of an emperor's efforts to maintain his rule was the projection of imperial power. Considering only coinage, Penna has noted that 'It is characteristic that the first concern of each emperor who ascended the throne, whether legitimately or by *coup d'état*, was to issue coins in his name as an act of consolidating his authority.'⁵⁰ Whilst Penna implies that a *coup d'état* was not regarded as legitimate, Kazhdan and Franklin refer to the 'traditional Byzantine right of usurpation, the assumption that God favoured a successful coup'.⁵¹

Basil I (867-86) staged a successful coup, involving the murder of Michael III (842-67), with whom Basil had been co-emperor since 866. Basil then demonstrated his imperial authority with a public display. Very early in his reign Basil staged a procession to Hagia Sophia, designed as a thanksgiving after vague reports of a victory and release of Christian

⁴⁸ Dagron quotes a Chinese traveller of the seventh/eighth centuries, who recorded: 'Their kings are not men who last. They choose the most capable and they put him on the throne; but if a misfortune or something out of the ordinary happens in the Empire, or if the wind or the rain arrive at the wrong season, then they at once depose the emperor and put another in his place.' Dagron 2003, 13. Dagron cites *Xin T'ang shu*, ch. 198, ed. Zhonghua shuju (Beijing, 1975), pp. 5313-4.

⁴⁹ Angelov 2007, 1. 1.

⁵⁰ Penna 2002, 127.

⁵¹ Kazhdan and Franklin 1984, 232.

prisoners, and as thanksgiving to God for this victory and for his accession.⁵² In 873 Basil's military expedition against Samosata, Zapetra and Melitene produced mixed results, but he nevertheless staged a triumphant entry into Constantinople, with acclamation of victory and a procession to Hagia Sophia.⁵³ In 879 his campaign against Germanicia and Adata was followed by a similar triumph, featuring one particularly significant event: Basil was crowned with the 'crown of victory' by the patriarch Photius. As Basil was not crowned at the time of his usurpation, but in 866 as co-emperor with Michael III, his crowning in 879 would have had the effect of celebrating a military victory, and of conveying ecclesiastical approval of him.⁵⁴

Another threat to emperors, the military aristocracy, had come to a position of power in the late tenth and the eleventh centuries. The epic *Digenes Akritis*, with its extensive and lasting popularity confirmed the appeal of the military aristocracy.⁵⁵ *Digenes Akritis* is a record and celebration of a frontier society which provided military leadership and was key to the defence of, and reconquests by, the empire in the ninth and tenth centuries.⁵⁶ *Digenes*

⁵² The victory in question may have been the defeat of the rebel Symbarion, or success against the Frankish emperor Louis II in southern Italy; thanksgiving to God naturally implied that Basil had God's blessing for his ascent to the throne. McCormick 1986, 152-3 and fn 77.

⁵³ Basil was also aware of the need for support from the army, for prior to his triumphal entry to Constantinople in 873 he had held a special ceremony for the army before its dispersal for the winter, in which rewards were presented to soldiers who had distinguished themselves in the summer's campaign. McCormick 1986, 155 and fn 85.

⁵⁴ Whilst Basil's coronation in 866 made it unnecessary for him to be crowned in 867, the patriarch's action in crowning him in 879 could not but give the impression of legitimation which Basil appears to have been trying to create. McCormick 1986, 154-7.

⁵⁵ Kazhdan and Epstein 1985, 117. Its two parts are dated to the period under discussion: the song of the Arab emir Musur (the father of Digenes) is believed to date to the first half of the tenth century; and the romance of Digenes to the eleventh or twelfth century. The parts are contained in two versions: the Grottaferrata and the Escorial. The text of the Grottaferrata version existed in southern Italy by c. 1300. E. Jeffreys 1993, 37. Jeffreys states that one text underlies both the Grottaferrata and Escorial versions; she believes that this text was created in Constantinople in the 1150s.

⁵⁶ Magdalino 1993, 1.

is portrayed as developing hunting and fighting skills at a young age, winning an aristocratic wife at great odds, and enjoying the leisure activities of the noble – hunting and feasting. Two particular episodes in the epic are important as background in the current study: in the first, Digenes is visited by the Byzantine emperor, while the second provides a description of Digenes' palace.⁵⁷ When the emperor meets Digenes the latter offers him advice on rulership, even though Digenes is referred to as 'the boy'.⁵⁸ Whilst this episode may appear unreal, it demonstrates the power of the military aristocracy in presuming to advise the emperor. Beaton refers to this 'blatantly unrealistic episode', but compares it to a *topos* in saints' lives, where the emperor visits a prominent holy man in his cell; in both there is an inversion of the norm. The episode is more significant in terms of political power than as a comparison with spiritual power: it suggests that Digenes has established his power relative to the emperor. Further, in return for military services to the emperor, Digenes receives status from entitlements, economic security from hereditary land tenure, and power from control of frontiers.⁵⁹ Commenting further on the question of realism, Magdalino notes that Digenes both accepts from the emperor a marcher lordship, but is also somewhat reluctant to meet the emperor; when the two do meet, Digenes displays his possessions. Magdalino interprets Digenes' reluctance to meet the emperor

⁵⁷ The emperor is named Basil. Whilst this could be Basil I (867-86), Basil II (976-1025) is the more convincing candidate, as the text refers to him as 'Basil the fortunate and the great winner of victories, who interred the imperial glory with himself'. Jeffreys 1998, G.4, p.125, l. 973-74.

⁵⁸ 'I ask and entreat your glorious Majesty to love his subjects, to pity the needy, to rescue the oppressed from wrong-doers, to give pardon to those who err unintentionally, to pay no heed to slanders, not to accept what is unjust, frightening off heretics and strengthening the orthodox. These, emperor, are the weapons of justice with which you will be able to get the better of your enemies.' Jeffreys 1998, G.4, p. 129, l. 1028, l. 1032-41.

⁵⁹ Beaton 1989, 42; Kazhdan and Epstein 1985, 117.

as reflecting either the real power exercised by the military aristocracy of Asia Minor in the tenth and eleventh centuries, or as wishful thinking of the captive aristocracy at the court in Constantinople. Magdalino suggests that imperial authority over the frontier was precarious from 1025 onwards, but that Digenes Akritis was a 'potent inspiration for the Comnenian imperial ideal'.⁶⁰

The second of the two episodes is an extensive description of the palace Digenes has built.⁶¹ The importance of military virtues is demonstrated particularly by the church in the courtyard of the palace: it is dedicated to a military saint, St Theodore.⁶² On the ceilings of the dining-chambers Digenes has recorded 'the triumphs of all the illustrious men of valour from the past in beautiful mosaics of gold',⁶³ including Achilles, Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Alexander. However the longest section of text devoted to a single man concerns David,⁶⁴ who is exalted in markedly heroic terms in comparison to Goliath. The overall prominence given to David points to his role as an exemplar to the military aristocracy. Usurpers from the military aristocracy would have been attracted to David as a model because David succeeded Saul not by heredity, but by being God's elect. In the case of a successful usurpation, David could then have remained an exemplar to an emperor.

⁶⁰ Magdalino 1993b, 6; 1993a, 241.

⁶¹ Jeffreys 1998, G.7, p. 203-09, l. 1-107.

⁶² Jeffreys 1998, G.7, p. 209, l.102-05. St Theodore Tiron ('the Recruit') was martyred in the fourth century, and a cult developed. A separate cult developed later concerning St Theodore Stratelates ('the General'), possibly because a saint with a higher military standing would have been more attractive to higher ranks in the army. White 2013, 73, 74. St Theodore Stratelates was, however, fictitious, even though often chosen by the military aristocracy as a patron. Walter 2003, 59-66; Haldon 2016, 1-12.

⁶³ Jeffreys 1998, G.7, p. 204-09, l. 59-101.

⁶⁴ Jeffreys 1998, G.7, p. 207, l. 71-83.

Buchta1 suggests that David was from the time of the early empire a role model for the emperor.⁶⁵

It may be argued that *Digenes Akritis* is a romance and not a historical narrative. However, it is also generally held that *Digenes Akritis* is a source providing valuable insights into the military aristocracy on the eastern frontier of the Byzantine empire from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. It is also possible to read it to understand the mentality and aspirations of this aristocracy, and to infer its power and attraction from the long-lasting popularity of *Digenes Akritis*.⁶⁶ A key characteristic of this group is noted in the *Materials for a History* of Nikephoros Bryennios (c. 1064-?1136/7); the author in referring to military men describes as their key attribute a kind of noble bravery (γενναῖος). He also refers specifically to such men as being 'brave of hand', τὴν χεῖρα γενναῖος.⁶⁷ This emphasis on fighting qualities in the Grottaferrata version of *Digenes Akritis* is accentuated by a lack of attention to practical matters, such as management of animals or people, building maintenance, and taxes.⁶⁸ If we accept the martial values displayed in *Digenes Akritis* as reflecting a historical situation, then the two episodes noted above suggest implications in the balance of power between the military aristocracy and the emperor. But if the two episodes reflect a change in this balance of power they could also represent a degree of wishful thinking. It is possible that such a change in the balance of power was likely, after the long

⁶⁵ Buchta1 1974, 330-33. The present study will note several emperors who sought comparison to David, e.g. Andronikos I. In the later empire Angelov notes that David was a comparative figure in imperial panegyrics for Theodore I, John III, Michael VIII, Andronikos II, and Andronikos II with Michael IX. Angelov 2006, table 2, 86-90; 127-8.

⁶⁶ Kazhdan and Epstein 1985, 117.

⁶⁷ Bryennios 1975, 1.2.10-11. Neville 2012, 89; and 211-15, where she provides a full discussion of the term.

⁶⁸ Bryer 1993, 102.

period of stability represented by the reign of Basil II (976-1025). Basil II needed to celebrate very few triumphs⁶⁹ to project his imperial power, but not all his successors enjoyed the same good fortune. Constantine IX (1042-55), who reintroduced military symbolism to the coinage after an interval of over three centuries, faced early challenges to his power.⁷⁰

Constantine Monomachos, having been exiled as a possible rival by Michael IV, was recalled and became emperor. In the first year of his reign he faced the revolt of George Maniakes; Maniakes was defeated, and Constantine celebrated a triumph.⁷¹ Constantine had the head of Maniakes displayed above the Hippodrome, and reinforced his success with a ceremony thanking the army and reinforcing the emperor's power. Psellos describes the scene,⁷² and goes on to describe the procession; the Byzantine army in glory, the humiliated rebel army, shaven-headed and draped in refuse, seated backwards on asses. They were followed by the head of Maniakes, more Byzantine troops, the army commander Stephanos Pergamenos in the position of honour, and the Imperial Guard.

This revolt by Maniakes demonstrates the importance of military commanders, but also shows that a success by a commander could be interpreted by the emperor as a threat as Attaleiates implied.⁷³ It would

⁶⁹ McCormick 1986, 177.

⁷⁰ Psellos 1966, [15-22], 162-5.

⁷¹ Skylitzes 2010, [428], 403.

⁷² 'When the army came back, most of the soldiers were decorated with crowns in honour of the victory. They were now encamped near the walls, in front of the city, and Constantine decided that he must celebrate their success with a Triumph. He had a genius for organising shows on a grand scale.' Psellos 1966, [87-88], 198.

⁷³ The Greek is quoted here because of the significance of the position of Stephanos: 'Θριαμβεύσας δὲ ὁ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐσχικὼς τοῦ πολέμου σεβαστοφόρος Στέφανος διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, τὰ πρῶτα παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς λαμπρότητος ἔσχηκε καὶ ζηλωτὸς πᾶσι καὶ περισπούδαστος ἐγνωρίζετο.' 'The general in charge of the war, the

appear that Attaleiates was emphasising the rank and honour accorded to Stephanos, for in the ceremony Stephanos was not strictly 'beside the emperor', but rode in the procession, whilst Constantine watched from the forecourt of the church of the Chalke.⁷⁴ This scene is illustrated in the *Madrid Skylitzes* where Constantine appears seated before a church, watching the head of Maniakes on a lance, carried by a horseman.⁷⁵ He is followed by three rebels mounted on donkeys, while behind them rides Stephanos on a white horse. But while Stephanos was accorded the highest honour by Constantine, the relationship between a military commander and an emperor was not static, but could change according to circumstances. Psellos notes Constantine's modesty, but also his inconsistency, and the unfortunate effects of the latter.⁷⁶ The victory celebration and the status it accorded to Stephanos may have had an untoward effect on Constantine's security, as Attaleiates noted.⁷⁷ This sequence of events appears to emphasise the relative instability in the years following the death of Basil II, with challenges to Constantine IX from two army commanders. Attaleiates goes on to describe that Constantine had then to face a naval war against the Rus'; an external threat thus followed hard on two internal ones.⁷⁸ Kaplanis argues that another external threat, the war against the Pechenegs (c. 1046/7-53), could explain the debasement

sebastophoros Stephanos, celebrated a triumph along the public thoroughfares, and was illustriously elevated to the highest position beside the emperor. Attaleiates 2012, [5], 2, 32-3.

⁷⁴ Attaleiates 2012, [5], 2, 32. The use of the dative 'παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ' indicates 'beside the emperor' or 'by the emperor'.

⁷⁵ Ed. Tsamakda 2002, 249; and Fol.224V, fig. 532.

⁷⁶ Psellos 1966, [89], 199.

⁷⁷ 'But good fortune that comes from imperial favor is highly unreliable. He too [Stephanos] was slandered for plotting against the emperor and was exiled, his property was confiscated, and he was forced to take the tonsure. One of his closest associates, accused of being the one upon whom Stephanos would bestow the imperial power, was not long afterward deprived of his sight.' Attaleiates 2012, [5], 2, 33

⁷⁸ Attaleiates 2012, [5], 2, 33.

which took place during Constantine's reign.⁷⁹ Some 800,000 Pechenegs crossed the Danube and despite Constantine's efforts could not be dislodged. Constantine was forced to accept their presence and made peace, but at a cost.⁸⁰ The war was the most costly faced by the Byzantines since the campaigns of Basil II; Kaplanis suggests that as a result Constantine was forced into debasement, and rejects the argument that the debasement was due to an increase in transactions in an expanding economy.⁸¹

Whether these threats influenced Constantine's re-introduction of military images on Byzantine coinage after an interval of over three centuries is difficult to determine, as precise dating of his coinage is difficult; it is possible,⁸² although the Class IV nomisma with a military symbol is from later in the reign. (**Fig. 11.**)⁸³ However, the insecurity of Constantine's early reign may be indicated by the timing of the triumph after the defeat of Maniakes, which fits into a pattern in which victory celebrations are concentrated in the early years of an emperor's reign. This pattern is seen from 743 to 1071, when eleven out of a total of thirty-two such celebrations took place in the first three years of an emperor's reign,⁸⁴ an indication that such early years could be insecure and likely to prompt displays of imperial power. A similar

⁷⁹ Kaplanis 2003, 784-87.

⁸⁰ Attaleiates records that Constantine bestowed on the Pechenegs 'Roman gifts and titles.' Attaleiates 2012, [7], 17, 77.

⁸¹ Kaplanis 2003, 785-87.

⁸² The miliaresion featuring the Virgin on the obverse and Constantine in armour and holding a sword on the reverse could be linked to the revolt of Tornikios in front of the walls of Constantinople in September 1047. DOC 3.2, 736.

⁸³ BICC coin no B5349. **See fig. 11.** DOC 3.2, 734-5. The Class IV histamenon featuring Constantine holding a sword on the reverse, with a large star in each of the left and right fields, is probably dated to 1054-55. These stars could refer to the huge explosion which gave rise to the Crab Nebula, and which was visible in the sky from July 1054 to April 1056. Such a date would place this coin after the end of the Pecheneg war; could Constantine have been attempting to reinforce his military image after a costly war and forced debasement?

⁸⁴ McCormick 1986, 188 and fn 224.

principle and assertion of power applies in an attempt to defuse political opposition by instigating trials for heresy in the early years of a reign.⁸⁵

The Role of Coin Design in Projecting Imperial Themes of Power

If emperors needed to project their power early in a reign, early issues of coins could be a useful tool.⁸⁶ Coin design in the form of images and inscriptions has been used from early times to project the power of the ruler of that territory, and this function may be seen in both Greek and Roman coins. Thus the superb silver tetradrachm of King Philip II of Macedonia (359-336 BC), from the mint of Pella/Amphipolis, shows on the obverse the laureate head of Zeus, and on the reverse a youth with a palm branch riding a magnificent pacing horse. **(Fig. 1.)**⁸⁷ An equally dramatic example, but from Rome, is provided by an orich sestertius of the emperor Trajan (AD 98-117). The obverse shows a laureate bust of Trajan, with an *aegis* on his left shoulder. The inscription reads IMP. CAES. NERVAE. TRAIANO. AVG. GER. DAC. P.M. TR.P. COS. V.P.P. On the reverse Trajan, riding a galloping horse, spears a Dacian kneeling on the ground. The inscription reads S.P.Q.R. OPTIMO. PRINCIPI. S.C. **(Fig. 2.)**⁸⁸ The importance of Roman coins as a means of projecting imperial power is confirmed by the defacement of coins of a former emperor by a successor. Calomino records that as part of the process of *damnatio memoriae* coins could have the portrait of a former

⁸⁵ Angold 1995, 468. In a later century, Manuel I (1143-80) instigated a number of trials for heresy in the early part of his reign, particularly with trials of persons accused of being Bogomils; they included two Cappadocian bishops, and a monk (Niphon) who spoke in their defence. Such persecutions appear to have decreased after 1150. Magdalino 1993, 276-8, 392. I am grateful to Dr Alan Harvey for advice in this area.

⁸⁶ Penna 2002, 127.

⁸⁷ BICC: coin no G005. The coin has no inscription. **See fig. 1.**

⁸⁸ BICC: coin no R1104. **See fig. 2.**

emperor removed; his name erased; be countermarked or overstruck; or even withdrawn and melted down to allow re-minting in the name of his successor.⁸⁹

Portraiture of a ruler thus helped to make that ruler a symbol of the state, and reinforced a claim to rule. Coin design evolved to expand that claim, which Howgego designated 'themes of power'. These themes could imply the divinity of a ruler; the right to rule; legitimacy to rule, and of heirs to succeed; and the benevolence of the ruler.⁹⁰ These implications of the themes of power are discussed in the following pages. Byzantine emperors did not follow the tradition of ancient Roman emperors by portraying themselves as divine; Byzantine emperors saw themselves rather as God's representative on earth, or as a military commander under God. Byzantine emperors did however take over from Roman emperors the concept of their right to rule the world, demonstrating this by the symbol of the globus cruciger. The globus cruciger was a very common symbol on Byzantine coinage, and appeared early, e.g. on the solidus of Justin II (565-78). (**Fig. 3.**)⁹¹ It is of particular interest that this coin, exhibiting in the main pagan figures, with Victory crowning Justin on the obverse, and the figure of Constantinople or Victory on the reverse, should have as a clear Christian symbol, held by Constantinople/Victory, the globus cruciger. The inscriptions read: obverse:

⁸⁹ Calomino 2016, 14-15.

⁹⁰ Howgego 1995, 77.

⁹¹ BICC: coin no B1134. **See fig. 3.** DOC I, 198-9, coin nos 2 (AD 566), 4g (AD 565-78), and 5d (AD 565-78); plate XLIX, coin nos 2, 4g, 5d.

DNI VSTI NVS PP AVI. Reverse: VICTORI A AVCCCH. In exergue: CONOB (Constantinopolis Obryzum: Constantinople fine/refined/ pure gold).⁹²

An emperor might claim legitimacy to rule through his descent, actions, and character. Descent could be emphasised by portraying the emperor with a famous predecessor: Constantine VI (780-97) was portrayed on the obverse of his Class I follis with his mother Irene. On the reverse appear busts of his ancestors, Leo III (717-41; Constantine VI's great grandfather and founder of the Isaurian dynasty); Constantine V (741-75; grandfather of Constantine VI); and Leo IV (775-80; father of Constantine VI). The inscriptions read (with minor variations): obverse: SIRINIAVF' MI THR'. Reverse: CONSTANTINOS R'b'.⁹³ The willingness of an emperor to obey the law was an important action in claiming legitimacy.⁹⁴ Character could be symbolised by reference to specific virtues: as noted, military virtues had come to be seen as part of the imperial character, and were starting to be alluded to on coins by the use of military symbols. Given that hereditary succession in Byzantium was never routine, the right of an imperial child to succeed his father had to be secured, and emperors were sometimes portrayed on coins with their designated heir. Thus Basil I (867-86) was portrayed on the reverse of his Class I solidus, minted 868-79, in the company of his son Constantine. They appeared as two facing busts, with the bearded Basil in the senior position on the viewer's left, and Constantine, smaller and beardless, on the right. Between them they hold a patriarchal cross. The inscription is: b ASILIOSET CONSTANT' AVGG' b.

⁹² It is curious that despite its ubiquity on coinage, the globus cruciger is suggested to have been a notional object, not forming part of the imperial regalia, nor appearing in written sources. Grierson 1973, DOC 3.1, 131.

⁹³ BICC: coin no B4598. DOC 3.1, 340-1, coin nos 1.1-8; plate XII, coin nos 1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7.

⁹⁴ Dagron 2003, 19.

The obverse shows Christ seated on a throne, with his right hand raised in blessing. The inscription reads: +IhSXPSREX REGNANTIUM ^{*95}

The final element in an emperor's claim to rule, noted in the list on page 26 above, was benevolence. The imperial portrayal of benevolence may be seen in several ways on Byzantine coinage. It was implied for centuries by the stability of the coinage – the solidus maintained its fineness for some five centuries, and debasement started only in the eleventh century. This concept of benevolence can be seen in another context in that the emperor could signal his protection in times of threat, e.g. for Thessaloniki, which was more exposed to external threats than Constantinople. This theme of protection from threat is present on the earliest coinage of the Byzantine empire. A gold solidus of Anastasios I (491-518) issued early (491-8) in his reign provides an example of an emperor projecting the imperial ideal and his power. **(Fig. 4.)**⁹⁶ On the obverse is a three-quarter bust of Anastasios, with a strongly military appearance. Rather than a crown he wears a helmet with a plume, and a small diadem with ties. His chest is covered by a tunic and cuirass. In his right hand he holds a spear behind his neck. Covering his left arm and part of his chest is a shield, on which is portrayed a horseman spearing an enemy lying on the ground. The inscription reads: DNANASTA SIVSPEPPAVC (Domino Nostro Anastasius Perpetuus Augustus: Our Lord/Ruler Anastasius Continuous/Lasting Majestic/August) The full-length figure of Victory is shown standing and facing left on the reverse. She is winged, wears an ankle length

⁹⁵ BICC: coin no B4759 (labelled wrongly as Romanos I.) DOC 3.2, 487-8, coin nos 2a.1, 2a.2; plate XXX, coin nos 2a.1, 2a.2.

⁹⁶ BICC: coin no B0001. **See fig. 4.** DOC I, 5-6, coin nos 3a-3j, 4a-4c, 5a, 5b; plate 1, coin nos 3b, 3e, 3g, 3i.1, 4a. Distinctive Byzantine coin issue from Constantinople is generally agreed by numismatists to have begun with the reign of Anastasios I.

dress, and holds a tall voided cross. There is a star in the right field. The inscription reads: VICTORI AAVCCC [] (Majestic/August Victory), and in the exergue: CONOB.

This image of Anastasios has a marked military element both in terms of dress and weapons, for the helmet dwarfs the diadem, and he carries a spear and shield. The horse and rider image on the shield is an ancient one, symbolising the victory of good over evil, or the arrival of divine aid. It may represent the Roman development of the Danubian Rider, which appeared on gems, rock reliefs and votive tablets mainly in Roman provinces north of the Danube. On Roman coins the figure of a horseman killing a foe on the ground, and which once covered the whole flan, gradually evolved from the reign of Constantius II (337-61) into a much smaller figure on a shield.⁹⁷ Overall the effect is created of a warrior emperor, a strong and worthy figure, who in the inscriptions is not only 'Our Lord/Ruler', but is described in the same terms as Victory: Majestic/August. Victory too appears as a large, dominant figure.

The particular interest in these images is the combination of pagan and Christian elements. Whilst the obverse has no Christian features, the reverse shows the cross, and the wings of Victory have a distinctly angelic appearance.⁹⁸ Overall, the impression created is one of power and nobility, but also of quality: CONOB acts as a guarantee of the fineness of the gold. The weight of the coin is 4.39g, and is hence likely to be 22 to 23½ carat. A measure of the value attached to such coins, and which can be seen as an

⁹⁷ Saxby 2009, 37-40.

⁹⁸ The star may be a mint mark, or indicate a specific year.

endorsement of Anastasios' projection of power is that imitations exist, which have been found far from Constantinople: a sixth-century imitation from the Astana cemetery near Turfan, north west China, is known.⁹⁹ Whilst it is clear that it is a copy of the solidus of Anastasios, it is cruder in workmanship and weighs only 0.85g, but its existence emphasises that Anastasios appears to have projected the imperial image and power not just within the Byzantine empire, but to people far distant, probable evidence of the efficacy of the design.

The combination of pagan and Christian symbols was gradually superseded by wholly Christian iconography. The late sixth and entire seventh centuries saw the cross used as the main religious type. The first issue of Christ as a main type at this time is seen on a solidus of Justinian II, dating from his first reign of 685-95.¹⁰⁰ This coin is a powerful invocation of Christ in the projection of imperial power: a majestic representation of Christ takes over the obverse; Justinian has his own image relegated to the reverse, but signals his commitment by holding not the small cross of the globus cruciger, but by grasping a large cross.¹⁰¹ This was however to be an isolated type, and no more types with Christ were struck in the immediately succeeding years; the

⁹⁹ Georganteli and Cook 2006, 54, fig. 41b.

¹⁰⁰ BICC: coin no B4380. DOC II.2, 578-80, coin nos 7a.3, 7c.2, 7e.2, 7h; plate XXXVII coin nos 7a.3, 7c.2, 7e.2, 7h. Obverse inscription: IHSCHRISTOS REX REGNANTIVM. Reverse inscription: DIIVSTINI AN VSSERV CHRIITI CONOP.

¹⁰¹ The earliest use of Christ on a Byzantine coin was atypical, where He was shown between Anastasios I and Ariadne, on the reverse of the solidus commemorating their marriage. Previously, this position had been occupied by the senior emperor, but in the absence of one, Christ was substituted. The reverse inscription reads: FELICITER NVbTIIS. The obverse features Anastasios in military dress, carrying a spear in his right hand and a shield in his left. The obverse inscription reads: DNANASTAS IVSPERPAVC. Grierson 1973, DOC 3.1, 146 and Grierson 1966, DOC I, 4-5, coin no 2; plate I, coin no 2. BICC: no specimen.

start of Iconoclasm in the 720s ended the type until it was revived in 843 by Theodora, the wife of Theophilus (829-42).

The image of the Virgin was introduced to the coinage by Leo VI (886-912) where she appears on the obverse of the Class I solidus, dated to 886-908, with Leo on the reverse.¹⁰² A dramatic use of the Virgin, possibly to reinforce the legitimacy of John Tzimiskes (969-76) is seen in the contrast between the iconography employed by this emperor and his predecessor, Nikephoros II Phokas (963-69). The Class II histamenon, and tetarteron of Nikephoros,¹⁰³ and the Class I and II histamena and tetartera of John Tzimiskes¹⁰⁴ both show on the obverse Christ Pantocrator, but on the reverse the depiction of the Virgin differs. Whereas Nikephoros holds the cross together with the Virgin, John displays the Virgin as either crowning or blessing him.¹⁰⁵ Further, John employs the *Manus Dei* to emphasise his right to rule. These changes could suggest that after the murder of Nikephoros John was using this specific iconography to emphasise the legitimacy of his succession and his right to rule.

It has been seen that coin design provided a convenient and widely circulating means of projecting imperial themes of power, but it was not the only means; imperial dress, ceremonial and displays formed additional ways of projection.

¹⁰² Obverse inscription: +MARIA+, with MR and θ γ in field. Reverse inscription: LEONENX.W baSILE γSROMWN. BICC: no specimen. DOC 3.2, 512, coin nos 1a, 1b.1-1b.3; plate XXXIV coin nos 1a, 1b.2.

¹⁰³ Inscription: obverse: +IhSXΓSREXREGANTIhM; reverse : NICHFOP'CεbASIL'AγGGbR'. BICC: coin no B4928. DOC 3.2, 583-5; coin nos 4.1-4.14; 5.1-5.4; plate XLI, coin nos 4.1, 4.2, 4.10.

¹⁰⁴ Inscription: obverse: +IhSXISRεXREGNANTIUM; reverse: +θEOTOC'bOHθ'IW δεSP. BICC: coin no B4951. DOC 3.2, 592-6; coin nos 1a-1c; 2.1, 2.2; 3.1-3.9; 4a, 4b; 5a; 6a.1-6a.7, 6b, 6c; plate XLII, coin nos 1a, 1b, 1c, 2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 4b, 5a, 6a.3, 6b, 6c.

¹⁰⁵ Strictly, as only God can crown the emperor, the action is probably that of blessing.

The Role of Dress, Ceremonial, and Displays in Projecting Imperial Themes of Power

That imperial dress was an element in the projection of power may be inferred by Psellos' comments on Basil II.¹⁰⁶ Basil II does not appear to have used his dress to project his power, but Psellos' recording of the rejection by Basil of these trappings of power and his lack of ostentation suggests that such trappings had been used by other emperors, indicating the value of clothing in the projection of imperial power. Of such individual items of imperial dress, the crown (along with purple boots) was undoubtedly the most significant, and one type of crown (the *toupha*) had military connotations. The crown was a symbol of the power of the emperor and was the most important item of the coronation insignia.¹⁰⁷ Whilst a crown represented a display of authority, its component parts could show varying symbolism whose interpretation can yield information on individual emperors.

The contrast between two crowns, one featuring Constantine IX (1042-55), and one Michael VII (1071-78) is instructive, and illustrates the differing virtues promoted by individual emperors. The crown of Constantine IX may have been a gift from Constantine to King Andrew of Hungary.¹⁰⁸ The crown features ten enamel plaques, which include portrayals of the imperial family.¹⁰⁹ Constantine is represented in civilian dress, and carrying no weapons; his symbol of authority is the labarum. By contrast Michael's

¹⁰⁶ 'Basil abjured all self-indulgence. He even went so far as to scorn bodily ornaments. His neck was unadorned by collars, his head by diadems. He refused to make himself conspicuous in purple-coloured cloaks, and he put away superfluous rings, even clothes of different colours....[and] cheerfully stripped off the proud contraptions of monarchy.' Psellos 1966, [22], 39, 40.

¹⁰⁷ Parani 2003, 27.

¹⁰⁸ Parani 2003, 27-8 and fn 64.

¹⁰⁹ Talbot Rice 1959, 320-21, plate 134. Parani 2003, 27-8.

depiction on the Holy Crown of Hungary has a clear military element, and was a gift from Michael to King Géza (1074-77).¹¹⁰ The ten enamels feature Christ; the archangels Michael and Gabriel; the warrior saints George and Demetrios; St Cosmas and St Damian; the emperor Michael; his son and co-emperor Constantine; and King Géza of Hungary.¹¹¹ There are elements of hierarchy and authority: the archangels Michael and Gabriel, St George and St Demetrios all look towards Christ at the front of the crown and at a higher level. Michael VII appears at the back of the crown above his son and King Géza.¹¹² Constantine is placed on his father's right (viewer's left), a highly honoured position and more senior than the position to the left of Michael (viewer's right), occupied by Géza. The sense of authority is reinforced by St George, St Demetrios and Michael VII being armed. Géza is armed, but his inferior status is emphasised by his crown circlet and cruciform sceptre, indicating Byzantine *patrikios* status, i.e. a member of the highest aristocracy, but belonging to the court dignitary class, whose status was in decline.¹¹³

The ascription of inferior status to Géza fits well with the underlying rationale of the iconography: only Michael and Christ have a round arched plaque, emphasising Michael's closeness in status to Christ. From a Byzantine viewpoint the gift of an emperor's portrait honoured the recipient,

¹¹⁰ Kazhdan 1991, 555.

¹¹¹ Wessel 1969, 111; Evans and Wixom 1997, 187; Kalavrezou 1994, 241-59.

¹¹² This arrangement of Christ at the front of the crown and the emperor at the back finds a parallel in coinage, when Christ appears on the obverse and the emperor on the reverse.

¹¹³ Wessel 1969, 112-13. Kazhdan 1991, 1600. Kazhdan notes that from the eighth to the tenth centuries the rank of *patrikios* was accorded to the most important governors and generals, but that it decreased in importance thereafter until it disappeared at the start of the twelfth century.

but also subordinated him to the donor.¹¹⁴ Further, the donor Michael, who from Psellos' description preferred the world of learning to the world of action,¹¹⁵ had himself portrayed on the crown as a warrior, associated with the warriors St George and St Demetrios. It would appear to be significant that the depiction of Michael with a sword emphasises his association with the power and might of the Christian faith, whilst his depiction with St Cosmas and St Damian provides a link to a pacific element of healing.

In noting the details of these crowns two points emerge. Because the portraits on the plaques are small, they would only have been visible at close range. Further, in the invocation of authority, it is probable that this function would have related more to the overall impression of the magnificence of the crown than to its detail. The emphasis on status demonstrated by the position and detail of the ruler portraits on the Holy Crown of Hungary was intended more to signal the superiority of Michael VII to King Géza than to impress observers at a distance. Thus, while at a distance the overall appearance of the crown would have played a role in King Géza's projection of power, the detail of the crown served to reinforce Géza's subordination to Michael.

If then an emperor's crown was employed to invoke authority it would be part of the overall effect on a ceremonial occasion. Such a ceremonial extolling of imperial status was witnessed by Liudprand of Cremona on a visit to the court of Constantine VII (913-59), c. 950. Liudprand describes the

¹¹⁴ Wessel 1969, 16.

¹¹⁵ 'Nothing pleased him more than reading books on all kinds of learned subjects, studying literary essays, pithy sayings, proverbs; he delighted in elegant compositions, subtle combinations of words, changes of style, coining of new words, poetic diction; but, above all else, he cultivated a love of philosophy, of books that enrich the spiritual life, of allegory and its interpretation.' Psellos 1966, 369.

automata before and around the Byzantine emperor's throne, which included mechanical birds in trees, as well as lions that roared, and beat the ground with their tails.¹¹⁶ But perhaps more impressive than these automata was the elevation of the emperor on the throne,¹¹⁷ and the importance of the emperor's clothing does not appear to have been missed by those responsible for organising the ceremony; Liudprand states that the emperor's clothing had changed. Change in clothing would be much more easily discernible by onlookers than subtle details in crown decoration. The whole appears to have been designed to demonstrate dramatically the power and status of the emperor, and although the automata are not mentioned again after the tenth century, the elevated throne, and changing of clothes remained central elements of court ritual.¹¹⁸ The emperor's appearance upon a high platform (the artificially lit *prokypsis* ceremony) on the dark nights of Christmas and Epiphany was particularly dramatic, even if automata were not involved.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Liudprand of Cremona 1993, 6, [5], 153. Liudprand's description makes clear that the birds were in a tree before the throne, while *The Book of Ceremonies* (Book II, chapter 15, [R569], 569, 2012.) refers specifically to the birds being on the throne as well as in the trees, and also to the animals on the throne; in these three instances the preposition used is ἐν, followed by the dative.

¹¹⁷ 'The throne itself was so marvellously fashioned that at one moment it seemed a low structure, and at another it rose high into the air. It was of immense size. So after I had three times made obeisance to the emperor with my face upon the ground, I lifted my head, and behold! the man whom just before I had seen sitting on a moderately elevated seat had now changed his raiment and was sitting on the level of the ceiling. Liudprand of Cremona 1993, 6, [5], 153. In another reference to thrones *The Book of Ceremonies* states simply 'The gold thrones on which the emperors sat were in the middle of the great Hall of the Magnaura', giving no more detail. Book II, chapter 15, [R593], 593, 2012.

¹¹⁸ Trilling 1997, 230, refers to the court's 'reality of power' which underlay symbolism. Use of a similar display in the thirteenth century shows its continuing effectiveness. Theodore II, elevated on his throne and holding a sword, appeared dramatically from behind a curtain when receiving Tatar ambassadors in Asia Minor. Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 408-9; Macrides cites Pachymeres I, 187.22-189.25.

¹¹⁹ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 144.1-146.5.

The effectiveness of such displays would depend to a large extent on the number of people witnessing them; this number would be affected by the location. A triumph taking place along the streets of Constantinople would be witnessed by more people than would be present at a reception within the palace. In terms of power these court rituals would have concerned the relationship between the emperor and the governing class.¹²⁰ Spectators, in the sense of the people of Constantinople, would see the emperor surrounded by these officials in processions from one place to another in the city. There would have been a sense of awe, heightened by the singing of the factions.¹²¹ Further, such an event would be seen by a large number of the inhabitants of Constantinople, but not by those living in other parts of the empire. It was possible for an emperor to set up murals and/or inscriptions extolling his actions in the capital and in other cities; such representations appear to have been well-known, at least from the eighth century, e.g. the reference to Constantine V (741-75) by Epiphianos.¹²² In a later century Basil II was recorded as using inscriptions on city fortifications, with the aim of enhancing his military reputation, but details of these are uncertain.¹²³ Besides inscriptions, emperors could use portraits in public places to extol themselves. As an example, Andronikos I (1183-85) erected a large portrait of himself very

¹²⁰ Cameron 1987, 131. As access to the throne and to office was relatively open, Cameron calls the court ceremonial 'self-generating and self-reinforcing'.

¹²¹ Cameron 1987, 129. But a victory celebration required careful planning: in the triumph of Constantine IX noted above the wisdom of giving an army commander the emperor's usual place in the procession was questionable.

¹²² 'Rather, they should have declared their [the emperors'] acts of courage, their victories over enemies, their subjugation of barbarians, which many [artists] have depicted in pictures and murals, to preserve the record of events, inciting beholders to affection and zeal.' Epiphianos, cited by McCormick 1986, 136 and fn 17.

¹²³ Lauxtermann 2003 (a), 210; Lauxtermann 2003 (b), 339-52.

close to the Church of the Forty Martyrs, an act recorded by Choniates.¹²⁴ But the reign of Andronikos was short, and, after the overthrow of Andronikos by Isaac II, portrayals of Isaac II appeared instead, depicting Isaac with Christ and the Virgin, and with an angel cutting the bowstring of the bow with which Andronikos had been armed. These portrayals were placed 'above the portals of churches'.¹²⁵

Whilst it has been noted that imperial power could be projected via dress, ceremonial, inscriptions and murals, these methods had inherent limitations. In particular, there was variation in the number of people who would see such displays; whilst numbers would vary from the more intimate court setting to the crowds who would witness a triumph, a large number of people in the empire would not be exposed to the imperial message by the methods discussed above. Possibly the form which would reach the widest audience would be inscriptions and murals, but even these were probably concentrated in large settlements. An ideal medium for transmitting the imperial message was one that circulated widely to all members of society; one capable of carrying images and inscriptions which could be changed at will; and easy to produce in large quantities. Coinage was the one medium that fulfilled these requirements, and coins too reflected the milieu in which they circulated, which may be seen in the exclusion of images of Christ from the coinage with the coming of Iconoclasm in the early eighth century.¹²⁶ The

¹²⁴ Choniates 1984, [332], 183; [333], 184. Choniateas suggests that Andronikos was comparing himself to David. As noted earlier in the chapter David was held to have succeeded to the throne as God's elect, not by inheritance; this made him an attractive model to usurpers. This portrait is discussed in more detail in the context of the reign of Andronikos and his coinage in chapter 4.

¹²⁵ Robert of Clari 2005, 56.

¹²⁶ Grierson, DOC 3.1, 146.

milieu of the later tenth and the eleventh centuries is characterised by a growing emphasis on military prowess and noble birth, as has been noted above in *Digenes Akritis*, and military symbols started to appear again on coins during the reign of Constantine IX. In conveying an imperial message coins had several other advantages: they were in circulation on a regular basis, passing through many hands. Whilst murals and inscriptions which extolled the imperial virtues might have had a similar degree of exposure to the public, most people would have been more likely to have seen the imperial image on coins. Further, if triumphs were celebrated in the capital, there would have been many people in other parts of the empire who would not have seen them, but coinage would have circulated to all parts of the empire.

The Byzantine economy was fundamentally monetized, with all denominations of coin, but particularly gold and copper, being handled regularly by all subjects. Payments to the army were made in gold. Penna records that the salaries of the *strategoi* of the six major themes in the ninth/tenth centuries (Anatolikon, Armeniakon, Thrakesion, Opsikion, Boukellarion, and Cappadocia) varied from twenty to forty litres of gold, and that the *strategoi* of smaller themes received five litres (360 coins). Soldiers in the ranks received twelve gold coins a year.¹²⁷ Metcalf notes that from the 1180s gold was perhaps used mainly for military and for prestige payments.¹²⁸ The Catalan Grand Company in the early fourteenth century appears to have

¹²⁷ Penna 2002, 110-11, citing Treadgold, W. 1982, *The Byzantine State Finances in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries*, 367-8.

¹²⁸ Metcalf 1979, 122.

been paid mainly in gold.¹²⁹ Gold coins were also used mainly to pay taxes and in large transactions; as the state discouraged tax payments in silver and bronze such coins were available for commercial transactions.¹³⁰ Gold coins were fed into the economy mainly by government expenditure on wages for the army and civil service. Money passed to landowners and peasants as payment for food. Soldiers, officials and landowners could change gold coins into smaller denominations at money-changers, who in turn could sell gold coins to citizens, or back to the state. The Byzantine state legislated against the export of precious metals.¹³¹ The Byzantine system contrasted with the western, in that money supply was state-generated, facilitating expenditure and taxation. In western medieval states money supply was generated mainly by minting private bullion.

The Byzantine silver coinage stood somewhat apart from the gold and copper elements; in the early empire silver was treated as a relatively independent element, with some prejudice against its use.¹³² Sums were expressed as silver by weight and settled with a mixture of coins, plate and ingots. Silver was redefined by Herakleios in 615 with his introduction of the hexagram, which was struck in volume until the end of the century, when a gold-copper basis was resumed. In the next century the silver coinage showed signs of innovation, and of communication with the non-Byzantine world. A new type of silver coin, the miliaresion, was introduced by Leo III

¹²⁹ Baker 2003, 310-11, citing Pachymeres *De Michaelis et Andronico Palaeologis*, vol. II, ed. I. Bekker (1835), V.13 p.397; V.14 p.420; V1.4 p. 485, V.21 p. 420; V1.16 p.507.

¹³⁰ Kaplanis 2003, 790.

¹³¹ Kaplanis 2003, 775-6.

¹³² It is possible that in the early empire the mint price of silver was too low and fluctuations of its price relative to gold made it difficult to mint except on a token basis. Grierson 1999, 12-13.

(717-41), and contained elements derived from both Islamic and Byzantine sources. While the thin flan, epigraphic character, and triple border of dots were Muslim in inspiration, the imperial inscription over the field on the obverse, and the cross on steps with the inscription *IhSuS XRISTuS NICA* on the reverse resembled Byzantine lead seals of the same period. The module and general appearance were similar to the Umayyad dirhem, itself derived from the Sasanian *drachma*. Some miliaresia were overstruck on cut-down dirhems. The miliaresion competed with, and in effect copied, the dirhem, being thin and large, with no ruler portrait, and with a religious inscription around the cross.¹³³

In the first century of its existence there were no miliaresia in the name of a single emperor, probably because they were ceremonial issues, struck for distribution to the public when a co-emperor was appointed. Miliaresia entered the currency on a regular basis from the reign of Theophilos (829-42), and were then struck by each emperor on his accession, and the design was maintained until the beginning of the tenth century.¹³⁴ In the tenth century the miliaresion became more elaborate, with the bust of Christ, and then of the emperor being incorporated in the cross on the reverse. The miliaresion was not maintained in the reforms of Alexios I in 1092 but was replaced by a billon trachy, whose silver content fell to only 2% by the end of the reign of Andronikos I (1183-5). Silver made a comeback in the fourteenth century: Andronikos II introduced the basilikon, which demonstrated again communication with another state, being copied from the silver ducat of

¹³³ Laiou and Morrisson 2007, 85.

¹³⁴ DOC 3.1, 62, 231-32.

Venice. The 1330s and 1340s saw the introduction of the stavraton, another silver coin with non-Byzantine influence, being modelled on the Neapolitan or Provençal double *gigliato*, on which the cross was prominent.¹³⁵ This was struck until the end of the empire.

Conclusions

The question of whether the use of coins to project imperial power represents propaganda has been influenced by some negative aspects which became attached to propaganda in the twentieth century. In general, Byzantine numismatists have had fewer reservations in regarding coinage as a form of propaganda than have Roman numismatists. It is difficult to believe that the design of Byzantine coinage was not deliberate. The importance of the precision of Byzantine ritual, as witnessed by *The Book of Ceremonies* and by Pseudo-Kodinos, as well as factors such as the strictly observed protocol of seniority applied to figures on coins make it very unlikely that coin design would have been left solely to mint operatives.

Military types were reintroduced to Byzantine coinage in the eleventh century, at a time of increased emphasis on noble bravery and aristocratic values. The projection of imperial power may have been necessary because of external threats from neighbouring rulers, and internal threats from the military aristocracy. The strength of the military aristocracy is illustrated by the epic *Digenes Akritis*. Such aristocratic strength and the threat of usurpation meant that the reign of a Byzantine emperor often began with insecurity; the experience of Constantine IX, as described in the primary sources, provides

¹³⁵ Grierson 1999, 13-17.

an example. Constantine's reintroduction of military symbols to the coinage could have been prompted by the need to assert his authority: coins circulated widely and were therefore an ideal medium for the projection of imperial power.

Coin images and inscriptions have been used from early times to project themes of power for the ruler. Coin design evolved to include the right to rule; the legitimacy to rule, and of heirs to succeed; the benevolence of the ruler; and, for ancient Roman emperors, although not Byzantine emperors, the divinity of the ruler. The early coins of Anastasios I, from whose reign Byzantine coinage first dates, include military symbols such as weapons and armour, and the figure of the horseman on the emperor's shield. These military symbols disappeared in the early eighth century and were absent from the coinage for three centuries, being reintroduced by Constantine IX.

Dress, ceremonial and images were other methods of projecting imperial power. Two crowns, one featuring Constantine IX (1042-55), and one Michael VII (1071-8), which were gifts to other rulers, are examples of the the role of dress in such projection. The accounts in *The Book of Ceremonies*, Liudprand of Cremona, and Pseudo-Kodinos make clear that ceremonial was a projection of imperial power. Objects such as the Barberini ivory, and illustrated manuscripts such as the Madrid Skylitzes represent the use of images in imperial power projection, while the use of an imperial portrait of Andronikos I (1183-5) in public was noted by Choniates. None of these methods would have reached such a wide audience as the coinage.

2. MILITARY SYMBOLS ON BYZANTINE COINS FROM 1042 TO 1453

Methods of Study

The great majority of the Roman and Byzantine coins in the collection of the Barber Institute are bequests from two collectors: Geoffrey Haines (1899-1981) and Philip Whitting (1903-88). The Haines bequest (mainly Roman) dates to 1968, and the Whitting bequest (mainly Byzantine) to 1970. Both bequests were accompanied by information about the collections, but the forms of this information differ. Geoffrey Haines catalogued his collection in list form, giving the date purchased, the price, the type of coin, and the ruler, with further information on file cards. Philip Whitting catalogued his collection in comprehensive detail, giving the date purchased, diameter, weight, die axis, descriptions of images on obverse and reverse sides, inscriptions, concordances with the British Museum collections, and comments. These comprehensive features in the Whitting catalogue proved particularly useful in cases where the image and/or inscription on a coin was worn. Although a catalogue of the coin collection of the Barber Institute has not been published, the coins have been catalogued, and the great majority photographed, with the results recorded on FileMaker Pro and available to students.

From the data gathered it was possible to assess the different types of military symbols which appear; the number of coin issues bearing military symbols for each emperor; usually the mint issuing the coin; and the date of issue, although the date within a reign could not always be located precisely. It was also possible to calculate the percentage of military issues of the total number of coin issues for each emperor who issued coins with military symbols, and for each mint. Such data could also be amalgamated over

reigns, to enable overall comparisons between specific periods, particularly between 1042-1204, 1204-61, and 1261-1425.¹³⁶ This data is incorporated and discussed in chapters three to six.

When analysed the data gathered showed that military symbols on coins 1042-1425 comprised four groups:

- i. The mounted emperor.
- ii. Martial figures, comprising the military saints St Demetrios, St George, St Theodore Tiron, St Theodore Stratelates, and the Archangel Michael. These martial figures may accompany an emperor, or may appear alone.
- iii. Military items of dress of figures on the coin. These military dress items comprise protection for all parts of the body. When the emperor wears military dress, or carries a weapon, he is designated as the armed emperor.
- iv. Weapons carried by the emperor and martial figures listed at (ii) comprise a sword, a spear, and a shield. These weapons appear in varying combinations, and either the emperor or an accompanying figure, or both, may be armed.

The Mounted Emperor¹³⁷

The mounted emperor was a symbol seen on Roman coins, where it occupied the whole flan up to the reign of Arcadios (395-408), Roman emperor in the east. Arcadios appears on a bronze coin from Antioch in a right profile bust on the obverse, with the inscription [] [] ARCADI. On the reverse Arcadios is

¹³⁶ As noted in chapter 1, whilst 1425 marked the end of the reign of Manuel II, coins with military symbolism ceased production c. 1394/5.

¹³⁷ This section provides a short introduction to the mounted emperor. A full discussion of the significance of this symbol, its origins, influences upon it, and occurrences, will be found in chapter 6.

seen unarmed and riding (but not galloping) right, and with his right hand raised. The inscription is GLORIA ROMANORUM, with ANTB in the exergue. **(Fig. 5.)**¹³⁸ By contrast, the horse and rider figure on early Byzantine coins was much smaller, occupying only the emperor's shield; the symbol represented a rider killing a foe on the ground. This rider/foe image was similar to the ancient pagan one, which was subsequently adopted by the Roman empire, and was a symbol of power; it was also believed to have apotropaic properties, being used on amulets.¹³⁹ In the eighth century the last appearance of a shield bearing a horse and rider symbol was on the silver ceremonial issue of Leo III (717-41), from Constantinople, where Leo appears on the obverse wearing a helmet, cuirass, and holding a spear in his right hand across his shoulder, with the shield held in his left hand. **(Fig. 6.)**¹⁴⁰ Equestrian figures were then absent from Byzantine coins until they reappeared during the reign of Andronikos III (1328-41), **(Figs. 7, 8, 9.)**¹⁴¹ when there were several important departures from the eighth-century use of an equestrian figure. The image on the stamenon of Andronikos III is of the emperor himself, either alone, or else with a similarly mounted St Demetrios on the reverse, and these images occupy the whole flan.¹⁴²

Given the importance of the horse, it is surprising that the mounted emperor did not reappear on coins until the fourteenth century. The status of

¹³⁸ BICC: coin no LR375. **See fig. 5.** Pearce 1933, IX, 69C1.

¹³⁹ For a discussion of this earlier use see Saxby 2009, 56-60.

¹⁴⁰ BICC: coin no B4517. **See fig. 6.** DOC 3.1, 251, 253-4; coin nos 20a, 20b, 21; plate II, coin no 20a, 21.

¹⁴¹ No specimen BICC or DOC; see LPC, 242-43, figs. 13, 14, 15. **See figs. 7, 8, 9.**

¹⁴² Riding figures can be seen on coins from Trebizond, and represent the emperor, e.g. Alexios II (1297-1330) and St Eugenios. Bendall 2015, 52, coin no 51. However such figures are unarmed and St Eugenios was not a military saint. Riding representations of emperors form part of the discussion in chapter 6.

the horse was ancient: as early as c. 4500-4200 BCE Indo-Europeans from the Pontic-Caspian steppes had started riding and the horse was regarded as far more than a work animal and food source – it has been called 'a potent symbol of divine power for the speakers of Proto-Indo-European'.¹⁴³ Simply being mounted was significant: from ancient times the horse had been a symbol of political, economic and military power.¹⁴⁴ Early pagan representations of mounted figures, sometimes with and sometimes without enemy figures on the ground are known, e.g. the monumental rider statues that appeared in Greece in the sixth century BCE;¹⁴⁵ the Thracian Rider;¹⁴⁶ Horus in Egypt;¹⁴⁷ and the Danubian Rider.¹⁴⁸

Similar iconography may be found in Jewish tradition, where Solomon (ruled c. 962-922 BCE) was portrayed as a rider in military dress spearing a female demon, Obyzouth.¹⁴⁹ This image was believed to have had apotropaic powers and was frequently found on amulets, of which the earliest surviving example is believed to date to the third century CE.¹⁵⁰ As the use of amulets spread among Christians the legend identifying Solomon was used less, with the mounted figure becoming anonymous.¹⁵¹ The mounted figure was designated as the 'Rider Saint' by Bonner,¹⁵² and as the 'holy rider' by

¹⁴³ Anthony 2007, 91.

¹⁴⁴ Fol and Mazarov 1977, 18.

¹⁴⁵ Mackintosh 1995, 38.

¹⁴⁶ Hoddinott 1981, 169-75.

¹⁴⁷ Johnston 1992, 308.

¹⁴⁸ Johnston 1992, 312-13.

¹⁴⁹ Russell 1995, 40.

¹⁵⁰ Bonner 1950, 221.

¹⁵¹ Although representations of riders in various forms date from pre-Christian times not all scholars accept that there may be developmental links between the different types; Walter is reluctant to admit that such pagan representations can be seen to be antecedents of subsequent Christian representations of riding figures. Walter 2003, 121-23.

¹⁵² Bonner 1950, 211, 302-08.

Vikan.¹⁵³ Mounted figures as symbols of power appeared early in the Byzantine context: a wall painting dated to the sixth or seventh century, and portraying the mounted figure of St Sissinios spearing the female demon Alabasdra, occurs at the monastery of St Apollo at Bawit in Egypt.¹⁵⁴ Somewhat later, St Theodore Tiron and St George are shown together, both mounted and spearing a serpent or a dragon, in a ninth-century wall painting in Yilanli kilise.¹⁵⁵ It is probable that mounted figures of warrior saints did not appear *de novo* in the middle empire, but represented the influence of, or development from, earlier representations of other mounted figures.¹⁵⁶

The importance attached to horseriding, and the attention to detail in Byzantine equestrian protocol and status are noted by Pseudo-Kodinos.¹⁵⁷ He provides several examples of this importance, e.g. each year at Easter the emperor renewed the equipment of the imperial horses and the used equipment was given to the *komes*.¹⁵⁸ And just as the clothes of an official were an indication of rank and status, so were his horses and their equipment. Pseudo-Kodinos describes in minute detail such equipment belonging to the despot, including spurs, spur-straps, saddle, caparison, stirrups, bridle and saddle cover.¹⁵⁹ A similar exactitude is seen also in the protocol for dismounting: only members of the imperial family could ride past the gate of the palace courtyard. The emperor would occasionally permit the patriarch, as

¹⁵³ Vikan 1984, 75. Vikan also points out that some Byzantine amulets portray Christ's entry to Jerusalem. Vikan 1984, 75, fn. 57.

¹⁵⁴ Maguire et al 1989, 27.

¹⁵⁵ Walter 2003, 272.

¹⁵⁶ For pre-Christian types see Saxby 2009, 21-24; 37-40.

¹⁵⁷ Byzantine equestrian protocol and status are discussed in detail in the section on Pseudo-Kodinos in chapter 6.

¹⁵⁸ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [169, 170], 76, 11-14.

¹⁵⁹ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [144, 145], 39-41.

a mark of favour, to enter the courtyard on horseback.¹⁶⁰ The use of equestrian images in other media, e.g. as emblems on headpieces in the hierarchical differentiation of officials, is further evidence that makes the late appearance of the equestrian emperor on coins anomalous.¹⁶¹ The mounted emperor had appeared also on imperial banners;¹⁶² and on round shields.¹⁶³

The eventual reappearance of horse and rider iconography on the coinage is linked by Morrisson to the advent of equestrian representations of warrior saints in church paintings in the southern Morea in the thirteenth century.¹⁶⁴ Whereas formerly the depictions were of standing saints, there was a change to equestrian representations during the Latin overlordship. Gerstel has suggested two reasons for this change: that the mounted saint could represent an indigenous response to Latin threats, and that the change could have resulted from the influence of the chivalric tradition of the Franks creating emulation.¹⁶⁵ It should be noted, however, that rider figures had also appeared on crusader, Seljuk, Armenian, and Trapezuntine coins, and these influences on Byzantine coinage are discussed in chapter six.

¹⁶⁰ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [281], 256, 4-5.

¹⁶¹ On headpieces, the symbol of the riding emperor was used by a group of officials from the *megas droungarios tes vigles* to the *protoierakarios*. The *skaranikon* of this group was of gold-yellow silk embroidered with gold wire. The front showed an image of the enthroned emperor; the back the mounted emperor. However, images of *skaranika* which survive show only the emperor enthroned, or as a bust, and not mounted. Macrides speculates that Pseudo-Kodinos' source for the *skaranikon* derives from a time different to the surviving images. Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 59-65; table V 465-7; and 334; plates 13, 22.

¹⁶² Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [196], 128.4-129.1.

¹⁶³ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [273], 242.8-10. Pseudo-Kodinos records: 'When the emperor wears his crown, whether at the promotion of a patriarch or a despot or on any other similar occasion, it is customary for four of the most eminent court title holders of the state to stand by him, two on each side, wearing gold *epilourika* and red *skaranika*, each holding in his hands a round shield depicting the emperor on horseback, and a lance which has gilded wood.' Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [273], 242, l. 4-10.

¹⁶⁴ Morrisson 2007, 189. This reappearance is discussed in detail in chapter 6.

¹⁶⁵ Gerstel 2001, 270-73.

The Military Saints and the Archangel Michael

A small group of military saints appear on Byzantine coinage: St George, St Demetrios, St Theodore Tiron and St Theodore Stratelates: the Archangel Michael is a further military figure who appears. Like St George and St Theodore Tiron/Stratelates, Michael was credited with killing a dragon.¹⁶⁶ The military saints formed a distinct group in the early church, whose powers included the defence of cities and the provision of help to armies. Some, but not all, of the warrior saints were martyrs, and some had served in the Roman army. Demetrios was described originally as a martyred deacon, and became a military saint several centuries after his death. As a military saint Demetrios was sometimes represented with St George, wearing similar arms and armour.¹⁶⁷ At first the warrior saints did not have a distinct iconography, and were portrayed in civilian dress, carrying a cross. There are few early examples of them in military uniform, and even then their status appears to depend on whether they wear the *chlamys*.¹⁶⁸ St George was represented on a sixth-century cross in military uniform, but the Forty Martyrs, freezing to death, wear loincloths.¹⁶⁹

There is no reliable evidence for the martyrdom of St George, but he had a sanctuary at Lydda (Diospolis in Palestine), and the earliest pilgrim's

¹⁶⁶ Bartlett 2013, 396.

¹⁶⁷ Bartlett 2013, 380.

¹⁶⁸ While there are suggestions that the *chlamys* had lost its military status early in the empire Walter refers to the decoration of the Rotunda of St George in Thessaloniki, a building which was converted to a church in the fifth century. There three of the figures are said to be soldiers, and all wear the *chlamys*; the remainder are civilians, of whom none wears the *chlamys*, suggesting that when this decoration was carried out, the *chlamys* was recognised as a military garment. Walter 2003, 270.

¹⁶⁹ Musurillo 1972, 354-61.

account of the sanctuary dates to c. 530.¹⁷⁰ His cult spread rapidly to Constantinople, where nine churches were dedicated to him, and there were also many other churches dedicated to him outside that city. It is easy to understand the appeal which St George would have had to soldiers. Theodore of Sykeon committed Domniziolos, nephew of the emperor Phokas (602-10) to the protection of St George, and the saint was said to have saved Domniziolos' life when his army was ambushed by the Persians.¹⁷¹ Soldiers were not the only group associated with the cult of St George, but emperors also, who from around the reign of Nikephoros Phokas (963-69) onwards were expected to show martial qualities; St George appeared with Basil II in the frontispiece of Basil's Psalter.

Given these factors, the appearance of St George on coinage should not be surprising; perhaps it is surprising that he did not appear there until the reign of John II (1118-43). In this sense it may then be possible to see a further significance in the introduction of St Demetrios on the coinage by Alexios I: once a military saint had been introduced, there was a precedent for introducing others. St George is portrayed in military dress on the aspron trachy nomisma of John II.¹⁷² However, in cycles of his life which appeared on wall paintings and icons George was nearly always portrayed in civilian dress. This dress has been related to representations showing George in his youth, or during his martyrdom, and for these times of their lives it was traditional for

¹⁷⁰ Walter 2003, 111-12.

¹⁷¹ He was also credited with rescuing captives of the Bulgarians and Saracens; with preserving the life of a soldier's horse; and with saving a soldier from an assassin. Walter 2003, 117, 120-21. Walter cites *Vie de Théodore de Sykeon*, ed. and trans. A.-J. Festugière, Brussels 1970; vol. II (trans.), 100-01, 268-9.

¹⁷² This coin is described in chapter 3.

warrior saints not to be represented in military dress.¹⁷³ By portraying George in military dress on the aspron trachy nomisma John II could have been associating himself with the authority of a warrior saint regarded as popular and powerful; and this was additional to the invocation to Christ enthroned on the obverse, and His symbol of the cross on the reverse.

In this group of major warrior saints, all had importance in terms of military status, or appeal to a particular group in the population, or an association with a specific important city. The appearance of St Demetrios on the coinage of Thessaloniki was to be expected: he had a longstanding association with the city, and the city had great strategic importance to the Byzantines. In St George's favour was his high status overall amongst the warrior saints, and his association with both Thessaloniki and Constantinople. St Theodore Tiron could have been viewed as having been a soldier, albeit one whose service in the ranks might not have appealed to members of the military aristocracy when they sought the patronage of a warrior saint. The military aristocracy, seeking a patron more fitting to its members' social standing, had turned to St Theodore Stratelates, whose cult had developed despite the fact that he was fictitious.¹⁷⁴

While the Archangel Michael was the first of these military figures to appear on coins in the eleventh century, he appeared on seals as early as the sixth century, albeit in non-military dress. Nesbitt and Oikonomides provide details of a seventh-century seal from Germia, while noting that the range

¹⁷³ Walter 2003, 138.

¹⁷⁴ Walter 2003, 59-66; Kazhdan 1984, 51; Grotowski 2010, 111. Pairing of saints in this way was not unknown; St Sabas the Goth and St Sabas Stratelates had been similarly paired. However the miracles of St Theodore Stratelates were less well-documented than the miracles of St Theodore Tiron. Haldon 2016, 8, 43.

could be from the sixth to the eighth century. The obverse features Michael standing and holding a long cross in his right hand; there is no inscription. The reverse has the inscription [Τ]ῷ[ν] Γερμίων. The seal may have belonged to the church of Germia, as Michael was its patron saint, with a famous shrine there.¹⁷⁵ Michael's first appearance on seals in military form, carrying a sword and spear, dates to the late tenth/early eleventh centuries.¹⁷⁶ Whilst it is not possible to pinpoint the exact date of this change, it would appear to be relatively close to the appearance of the armed emperor on coins, as represented by Constantine IX. The seal of John nobelissimos, protovestiaros and grand domestikos of the Schools of the Orient, features an armed St Michael on the obverse. He appears standing, holding a drawn sword on his right shoulder with his right hand, similar to Isaac I on his Class II histamenon.¹⁷⁷ (**Fig. 16.**) The obverse inscription on the seal is Ὁ ἀρχ(ά)γγελος Μιχ(α)ήλ ὁ Χονιάτ[ης]. The reverse consists of an inscription Κ(ύρι)ε β(οή)θ(ει) Ἰω(άννη) νωβελλισίμ(ω), (πρω)τ(ο)βεστιαρ(ίω) (καὶ) μ(ε)γ(ά)λω δομεστίκ(ω) τῶν σχ(ο)λῶ τῆς Ἀνατολ(ῆς). The owner could have been John Komnenos, the brother of Isaac I, or the protovestiaros John; the evidence for each is noted by Nesbitt and Oikonomides.¹⁷⁸ From then Michael appeared more commonly in military form on seals, although these appearances form a minority, being 10/285 (3.5%) for the eleventh century; 6/88 (6.8%) for the late eleventh/early twelfth

¹⁷⁵ DO Seals vol. 4, 17-8, seal no 5.2.

¹⁷⁶ Cotsonis 2005, 438, 440. Laurent 1982, seal no 196.

¹⁷⁷ BICC: coin no B5367. **See fig. 16.** DOC 3.2, 762, coin nos 2.1-2.8; plate LXIII, coin nos 2.1, 2.4, 2.5.

¹⁷⁸ Nesbitt and Oikonomides DO Seals vol. 3, 174-5, seal no 99.6.

centuries; and 3/34 (8.8%) for the twelfth century.¹⁷⁹ The portrayal of Michael in the imperial *loros* was much more popular; office holders in the civil administration would appear to have been the most likely group to have used Michael on their seals.¹⁸⁰

The Archangel Michael's first appearance on a coin was on a nomisma histamenon of Michael IV, dated 1034-41.¹⁸¹ On the reverse the archangel wears the *chlamys* and stands on the left. The emperor stands on the right, wearing a crown and *loros*; he is crowned by the *Manus Dei*. The two figures hold between them the labarum with their right hands. The inscription is + MIXA HL ΔΕΣΠΟΤ. On the obverse Christ is portrayed, bearded and nimbate, wearing a tunic and *himation*. His right hand is raised in blessing and his left holds a book. The inscription is + ΙΗΣΥΣΙΣΡΕΧ RESNANTΙΗΜ (*sic*). It has been noted that the *chlamys* had gradually lost its military character, and by the sixth century it had come to be seen as part of court costume. The archangel thus appears here as the namesake of the emperor, and as invocation of the emperor's authority, by handing him the labarum. If this coin was issued from Thessaloniki it would probably have

¹⁷⁹ Cotsonis 2005, 445.

¹⁸⁰ In the total of 484 seals of the Archangel Michael in the database of Cotsonis, 195 were used by office holders in the civil administration. Cotsonis 2005, 447.

¹⁸¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 3.2, 726, coin no 2; and plate LVIII, coin no 2. The mint attribution of this very rare coin, whether Constantinople or Thessaloniki, is uncertain. Grierson states that there is 'no formal evidence' that Thessaloniki possessed a mint at this time. (DOC 3.1, 81.) Hendy argued that as Thessaloniki was the headquarters for Michael IV's Bulgarian campaign, a mint would have opened there. (Hendy 1970, 187-97.) In the same paper Hendy also argues that Harald Hardrada, who fought in Michael's Bulgarian campaign, would have acquired a number of these coins, which then returned to Scandinavia with him. A silver penny, with identical iconography to the nomisma histamenon of Michael IV, was issued subsequently by Sven Estrithson, the king of Denmark. In addition, Grierson pointed out that Hendy had noted that Alexios I struck a coin almost identical to Michael IV's nomisma histamenon at Thessaloniki during the first Norman war. This would suggest that Michael's type must have had a special connection with Thessaloniki. (DOC 3.2, 722.) However, none of these points provide certain proof which would exclude Constantinople as the mint of Michael's nomisma histamenon, although on this coin Michael is styled 'despot', but on his nomisma histamenon from Constantinople as 'basileus'. (DOC 3.2, 724-6.)

related to this city being the headquarters for Michael IV's Bulgarian campaign in the last year of his life.¹⁸² Certainly Michael IV did not go so far as to re-introduce military dress and weapons to the coinage, but the interval before such reintroduction did occur was very short.

Coins represented only one medium on which images of the warrior saints might be found: they appeared also on seals of the military aristocracy, and on banners of the imperial court. In particular, their appearance on imperial banners is an indication of the status accorded to this elite group of saints. Pseudo-Kodinos provides details of these banners, one of which featured St Demetrios, St Prokopios, St Theodore Stratelates, and St Theodore Tiron.¹⁸³ Out of a total of twelve imperial banners, one featured the Archangel Michael (the 'Archgeneral'), and another St George on horseback. St George is the only one of the five warrior saints mentioned in this context to merit his own banner, and on banners he appears as the only warrior saint to share with the emperor the status of being mounted, although on coins only St Demetrios shares this status with the emperor. A further imperial banner featured the emperor on horseback, and the *megas doux* also had a banner which featured the emperor on horseback.¹⁸⁴

Of the warrior saints appearing on the banners described by Pseudo-Kodinos only St Prokopios does not appear on coins also. There does not appear to be an obvious reason why this should be so, although as there are few icons of Prokopios and as he appears usually in the company of other

¹⁸² Grierson DOC 3.2, 722.

¹⁸³ This last banner, if in cloth, could have placed the four saints in the spaces between the arms of a painted or embroidered cross; or could have been a wooden or metal cross with incised images of the saints, and been fixed to a pole. Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [196], 126.10-130.9; 128.2-3 and fn 325; 339-41.

¹⁸⁴ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [167], 70.11-72.1; 339.

warrior saints it is possible that he was less popular. Further, there appears to be no evidence that his apotropaic powers in battle were exercised regularly, and no *eulogia* has survived.¹⁸⁵ Prokopios was not originally a soldier,¹⁸⁶ but this would not seem to be a valid reason for his absence from coins, as St Demetrios and St George also lacked a military background and military connections were invented for both saints at later dates. Prokopios may not have had ties with a particular location, or social group. He was executed in Caesarea and was originally associated with that city, which was reduced to ruins by the reign of Alexios I (1081-1118), the time when St Demetrios became the first warrior saint to appear on Byzantine coins. If the city associated with St Prokopios no longer existed, could this have led to his exclusion from coinage, on the grounds that the destruction of the city might have been viewed as a lack of his effectiveness? In addition, unlike Thessaloniki, Caesarea had never had a mint.¹⁸⁷

Military Items of Dress

Items of military dress reappeared on Byzantine coinage during the reign of Constantine IX (1042-55) after an absence of over three centuries, during which interval the emperor was portrayed in civilian dress, wearing the *loros* or *chlamys*, and a crown; he would often be portrayed holding the *globus cruciger*, the cross, or the *labarum*. Even Basil II, probably the emperor with the greatest military reputation, was portrayed in this way. It is of note that

¹⁸⁵ Walter 2003, 99. Walter sees the cult of St Prokopios as official, whilst St Demetrios' cult was personal.

¹⁸⁶ Grotowski 2010, 61 and fn 16.

¹⁸⁷ Thessaloniki possessed a mint and a strong association with St Demetrios. St Theodore's sanctuary was at Euchaita, which had no mint and was occupied by Turkish forces by the late eleventh century. (Angold 1984, 94-7.)

when Constantine IX reintroduced military symbols the iconography did not reflect the last use of such symbols under Leo III (717-41), where early issues from Constantinople 717-20 displayed a distinctly triumphal aspect. The silver ceremonial issue of Leo III showed on the obverse Leo wearing a helmet with plume and cross, and holding a spear across his shoulder with his right hand. His left held a shield with a horse and rider device. The inscription is δ NDLEON PAMUL. The reverse shows a cross on three steps and a base, with the inscription VICTORIA AV γ U and CONOB. (**Fig. 6.**)¹⁸⁸ A follis and half follis in copper show on the obverse the same apparent type and inscription, but wear is such that Grierson states that the device on the shield is unclear.¹⁸⁹

In contrast to this overt militarism of Leo III the first coin of Constantine IX to display a military image is discreet; on the Class IV nomisma histamenon from Constantinople (1054?-55) only the hilt of Constantine's sword is visible. (**Fig. 11.**)¹⁹⁰ By contrast Constantine's portrayal on the miliaresion from Constantinople 1042-55 is more military, with his sheathed sword being more obvious. (**Fig. 12.**)¹⁹¹ This inscription runs from obverse to reverse and reads 'O Lady, preserve the pious Monomachos.' This portrayal of Constantine does not have the same triumphal element as the earlier use of military iconography by Leo III. Constantine's portrait is less formal, and,

¹⁸⁸ BICC: coin no B4517. **See fig. 6.** DOC 3.1, 251, coin no 20a; plate II, coin no 20a.

¹⁸⁹ Grierson refers to another identical coin, not at Dumbarton Oaks but in the British Museum, where the device on the shield appears to be the chi-rho. The reverse shows a cross, with the inscription M, ANNO, XX and CON (follis); and K, ANNO, XX (half follis). BICC: no specimen. DOC 3.1, 253-4, and fn 26; coin nos 24 (follis), 25 (half follis); plate III, coin nos 24, 25.

¹⁹⁰ BICC: coin nos B5348, B5349. **See fig. 11.** DOC 3.2, 742, coin nos 4a.1-3, 4b, 4c; plate LIX, coin nos 4a.1, 4a.2, 4a.3, 4b, 4c. See chapter 3 for a full description of this coin.

¹⁹¹ BICC: coin nos B5354, B5355, B5356. **See fig. 12.** DOC 3.2, 745-6, coin nos 7a.1-7, 7b.1-3; plate LIX, coin nos 7a.1, 7a.3, 7a.5, 7b.2, 7b.3. See chapter 3 for a full description of this coin.

linked to his appeal to the Virgin, could conceivably relate to an event in his reign, such as when Leo Tornikios rebelled and appeared before the walls of Constantinople in September 1047.

The exact features of military dress in these portrayals on coins, armour for the upper body, arms, and legs are described below.¹⁹² The main item of armour, providing protection for the upper body, was the corselet (cuirass). This could be one of three types: scale (or lamellar) armour (θώραξ φολιδωτής, *thorax pholidotes*); soft armour, usually a textile such as felt or silk (λωρίκιον ψιλόν, *lorikion psilon*); or chain armour – probably a mailshirt (λωρίκιον ἀλυσιδωτόν, *lorikion alysidoton*).¹⁹³ Illustrations of warrior saints are valuable for the information they give on Byzantine armour, as there is virtually no archaeological evidence. Care is needed however in interpreting such portrayals as there was a tradition of portraying saints in obsolescent armour.¹⁹⁴

Where fine detail on coins can be discerned, and the emperor or companion warrior saint is portrayed wearing armour, it is of the scale type. Scale armour consisted of several different types of corselet, in conjunction with armour for other body parts; there are occasional references to two corselets being worn.¹⁹⁵ The corselet could consist of scale armour, or could be a lamellar cuirass (*klibanon*). Scale armour was formed of overlapping

¹⁹² It should be noted that because of wear on coins it is not always possible to determine the detailed features of such protective clothing. In such cases this account follows the convention of using the general term 'military dress' or 'military tunic'.

¹⁹³ Grotowski 2010, 127-8 and 128 fn 9.

¹⁹⁴ Thus depictions which show the 'muscle'd cuirass should be treated with care, as this type of armour probably ceased to be produced in the sixth century. Grotowski 2010, 132.

¹⁹⁵ Kinnamos 1976, book IV, 143. Manuel I 'donned double breastplates' when he entered Antioch in 1159.

scales on a textile or leather backing. The scales were arranged with the rounded ends upwards, and overlapped from below (an earlier arrangement), or from above (the later arrangement). With time the size of the scales diminished. The *klibanion* was made of plates of metal, leather, or horn, of larger size than the scales of scale armour. The coverage of *klibania* varied, with some consisting only of the breast and back, while others had shoulder guards, sleeves and skirt.¹⁹⁶ There were probably two designs of *klibanion*: one with the lamellar rows separated by leather strips; and one with no strips (solid-laced).¹⁹⁷ The type with leather strips had a vertical overlap of the plates of approximately one half, greatly increasing the resistance to weapons, as well as being more flexible.¹⁹⁸

A late eleventh/twelfth century development of the corselet was the quilted variety, which was made from felt (κέντουκλον, κένδουκλον, or πῖλος, *kentouklon*, *kendouklon*, or *pilos*), or linen pickled in wine and salt, or sheep's wool or cotton, or leather. Grotowski refers to this form of corselet as a *neurika* or *lorikion psilon*, and states that from the twelfth century the *neurika* became depicted as a quilted kaftan with diagonal stitching in the form of diamonds or rhomboids. In this form the *neurika* is seen particularly in portrayals of St Demetrios.¹⁹⁹ Grotowski notes that the *lorikion* could be a mail-shirt but applies the further term *zaba* to it; Parani does not use the term *zaba*. Grotowski goes on to suggest that this item was little portrayed because

¹⁹⁶ Dawson 1998, 42.

¹⁹⁷ Grotowski 2010, 133-51.

¹⁹⁸ Dawson 1998, 45.

¹⁹⁹ Grotowski 2010, 153. There is a possibility of confusion in terminology, as Parani does not use the term *neurika* and refers to the *lorikion* as mail body-armour.

it was unpopular in the Byzantine army.²⁰⁰ There are suggestions that garments made in cloth were worn by troops in rear formations, and are only rarely shown in depictions of warrior saints.²⁰¹ Choniates makes reference to such armour, but in relation to a western leader – Conrad of Montferrat. In referring to Conrad's action against Alexios Branas, who rebelled against Isaac II in 1186 or 1187, Choniates noted the strength of Conrad's armour.²⁰² It is not clear from Choniates whether such armour was also used by the Byzantines; Parani does not mention Conrad's armour but does record a padded or quilted felt or silk garment without a specific name, and worn under armour by the Byzantines.²⁰³

Protection for Other Body Parts

A common accompaniment to the cuirass as depicted on coins is the short skirt of loose strips, designed to protect the groin and upper thighs, and known as *πτέρυγες* (*pteryges*, 'fringes' or 'feathers'). It was at first made of felt, and evolved into one to three overlapping layers with the ends of the *pteryges* cut to a 45 degree angle; later the skirt became shorter.²⁰⁴ This item receives little or no attention from the standard numismatic authorities. Grierson refers to the *miliaresia* of Constantine V, Michael VII and Nikephoros III as showing the emperors wearing scale armour, but does not describe it further, and makes no mention of the protection provided for the groin and

²⁰⁰ Grotowski 2010, 157.

²⁰¹ Grotowski 2010, 151-54.

²⁰² 'He [Conrad] fought then without a shield, and in lieu of a coat of mail he wore a woven linen fabric that had been steeped in a strong brine of wine and folded many times. So hard and compact had it become from the salt and wine that it was impervious to all missiles; the folds of the woven stuff numbered more than eighteen.' Choniates 1984, [386], 212.

²⁰³ Parani 2003, 117 and fn 70.

²⁰⁴ Grotowski 2010, 162-3.

thighs.²⁰⁵ Hendy refers to the upper body being protected by a 'breastplate', and 'short military tunic' e.g. as worn by St Demetrios on an aspron trachy nomisma of Manuel I from Thessaloniki,²⁰⁶ but it is uncertain if this tunic also comprises the skirt worn by the saint. Armour which provided protection for the shoulder and upper arm is not described by Hendy. The nomismata of Manuel I noted show the shoulders and upper arms particularly clearly. It will be seen that the shoulder is protected by a spherical piece of armour (μῆλα, *mela*), whilst projecting down from this are a series of 'feathers' which protect the upper arm similarly to the *pteryges* protecting the groin and thighs.²⁰⁷

The classification of clothing which was worn under armour is less clearcut. There are numerous references in the Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue volumes 4.1 and 4.2 to an item called the 'short military tunic' (θοιμάτιον στρατιώτικον or επιλώρικον, *thomation stratiotikon* or *epilorikon*). This tunic is well illustrated in the Psalter of Basil II where the emperor wears a purple tunic beneath scale armour.²⁰⁸ Grotowski refers to a tunic worn under armour as the *himation* or περιστηθίδια (*peristethidia*). Warrior saints are portrayed wearing this garment in a variety of colours: white, blue, and red. This tunic would have been expected to have been at least one finger thick, which would have protected the wearer from chafing by his armour, and would also have

²⁰⁵ Grierson 1973, DOC 3.1, 126.

²⁰⁶ BICC: coin nos B5781, B5784. DOC 4.1, 304, coin nos 9.1-7; 4.2, plate no XIII, coin nos 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7. On DOC coin nos 9.6 and 9.7 this skirt is shown especially clearly, reaching to the knees and consisting of a series of hanging strips.

²⁰⁷ Grotowski 2010, 170-1.

²⁰⁸ See Talbot Rice 1959, 27, plate XI.

provided extra protection from blows by an assailant.²⁰⁹ Such a garment would thus appear to differ in thickness, colour, and decoration from the one worn by Basil II noted above, although it is probable that Basil's was a ceremonial version.

In discussing the short military tunic, and particularly its colour, Hendy notes that in 1083 Gregory Pacourianus, the Grand Domestic of the West, made a gift of four imperial *epilorika oxykastora* to the monastery of Theotokos Petritzonitissa (Bachkovo).²¹⁰ Hendy's main point is to note that the colour of these garments was purple, i.e. the same as he believes to have been the colour of the short military tunic worn by emperors. It is not however clear that the short military tunic and the *epilorikon* were identical. In discussing the latter (syn. *epanoklibanion*, *epithorakion*) Grotowski makes clear that as worn by the warrior saints the *epilorikon* was worn over armour, whereas it has been noted above that the short military tunic was worn under armour. Further, while the *epilorikon* was rare in portrayals of warrior saints, it did form part of imperial ceremonial attire.²¹¹ It would seem that unlike the short military tunic worn under armour as noted by Hendy, the *epilorikon* was a surcoat worn over armour, and served to deceive an enemy, by disguising armour.²¹² It is clear from the drawing of Ss George and Theodore on horseback on the 'Freiburg Leaf' in the Augustiner-Museum, Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany, that their surcoats are cloaks over armour, not tunics

²⁰⁹ Grotowski 2010, 175-6. The derivation of *περιστηθίδια* from *στῆθος* ('chest') indicates a garment covering the upper part of the body.

²¹⁰ Hendy DOC 4.1, 1999, 161 and fn 71.

²¹¹ Grotowski 2010, 177-9, and fn 198.

²¹² Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 59, fn 86.

under it.²¹³ There is also the possibility that the *epilorikon* could have been adopted by the Crusaders from the Byzantines, and that the Crusaders eventually displayed coats of arms on the garment.²¹⁴ Parani refers to the *epilorikion* protecting armour from sun and rain, and to the lavish decorations of imperial *epilorikia*.²¹⁵

On coins where the emperor or a warrior saint wears armour, it appears that the most common form of leg covering is a boot which reaches to the knee.²¹⁶ These evolved from a two-part covering for the lower leg, consisting of boots reaching to just above the ankle, combined with protection for the calves and fronts of the knees (γονυκλάρια, *gonuklaria*). These are shown in a steatite icon of St Theodore Stratelates.²¹⁷ Such leg protection was replaced by the long boot, although as this appears to reach to below the knee, there would have been no protection for the knee.²¹⁸ There is evidence that emperors setting out on campaign removed their shoes and replaced them with long boots, and on return from campaign removed their boots and put on shoes.²¹⁹ Other items of footwear worn by the emperor or by an accompanying warrior saint are more difficult to distinguish on coins, particularly because of wear. Occasional examples are found where short boots covering the ankles are seen. On the aspron trachy nomisma of John II

²¹³ Grotowski 2010, plate 58.

²¹⁴ Grotowski 2010, 178-9 and fn 203.

²¹⁵ Parani 2003, 118-20.

²¹⁶ e.g. on an aspron trachy nomisma Type N from Magnesia of John III, DOC 4.2, 497, coin no 33.2; plate XXXII, coin no 33.2. BICC: no specimen.

²¹⁷ Evans and Wixom 1997, 157-8 and plate 104.

²¹⁸ These boots are shown on the figures of St Theodore Stratelates and St George on a tenth-eleventh century ivory triptych in the Museo Sacro della Biblioteca Apostolica in the Vatican. Grotowski 2010, plate 22.

²¹⁹ Grotowski 2010, 195-6, citing George the Monk, *Georgi Monachi Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, Lipsiae 1904, 2, 670.9-16.

from Constantinople, the figure of St George on the reverse can be seen clearly to be wearing such short boots. (**Fig. 10.**)²²⁰ It is possible that the difficulty in distinguishing forms of legwear on coins, other than long boots, has led to a lack of comment; neither Grierson nor Hendy discuss footwear in any detail.²²¹

Some depictions of warrior saints show leg and footwear other than long or short boots. The calves can appear covered by a long length of cloth wound around them, covering the feet as well, or tucked into short boots.²²² This might be a reference to the emperor binding his calves with linen cloth on Easter Sunday,²²³ where the linen would represent the shroud, and hence the death of Christ. Wrapping the legs in cloth, and wearing bast sandals (σέρβουλα, *serboula*) was associated with farmers and shepherds, and could thus be a reference to humility, but such sandals also gave rise to military sandals (*campagi militares*). *Campagi* were parade wear, worn by the emperor and officials, and secured by crossed straps around the calves.²²⁴ Whether it was ever possible to say that such leg and footwear was depicted on coins is uncertain, given the wear on available specimens. Essentially only long and short boots can be distinguished on coins.

The constraints on identification of leg protection and footwear apply also to trousers. The emperor may be depicted only as a bust, adding a

²²⁰ BICC: coin no B5629. **See fig. 10.** DOC 4.1, 261-3, coin nos 8c.3, 8d.3; 4.2 plate IX, coin nos 8c.3, 8d.3.

²²¹ Grierson DOC 3.1, 125-6; Hendy DOC 4.1, 158-61.

²²² Grotowski 2010, plate 25 c, d.

²²³ *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, 638, 12-13, [II 40]. Grotowski 2010, 198-9.

²²⁴ Grotowski 2010, 202-3, and plate 40.

further constraint to identification.²²⁵ Whilst warrior saints have been depicted in other media as wearing trousers tucked into boots, such a feature is difficult to detect on coins. St Nestor can be seen clearly to be wearing trousers in a fresco in the *katholikon* of the Hosias Loukas Monastery Phokis.²²⁶ Even if trousers were distinguished by patterns it is unclear these would be visible on coins in the way that patterns of scale armour are. Patterned trousers were worn by emperors from the tenth century: Constantine Porphyrogennetos records that military trousers (τουβία, *toubia*) should be worn by an emperor on campaign; that they should have silk stripes, and be embroidered with eagles or hornets.²²⁷ It is probable that where warrior saints are depicted wearing trousers the latter are based upon trousers worn by Byzantine soldiers.

Forearm protection is another item where the details are not easy to determine on coins, again due to wear, the small space available to the die-sinker, and the possibility that the forearms are masked by other clothing, e.g. a cloak. Forearm protection is difficult to distinguish even in larger illustrations. In the *Madrid Skylitzes* metal scale armguards appear to protect the forearms of the troops of Leo Tornikios besieging Constantinople.²²⁸ There are however believed to be no portrayals of warrior saints with such metal forearm protection. It has been suggested that metal armguards were replaced by

²²⁵ e.g. on the tetarteron noummion in bronze from Thessaloniki of Alexios III St George is portrayed on the obverse in bust. BICC: coin no B5948. DOC 4.1, 415-6, coin no 5a.10; DOC 4.2, plate XXIV, coin no 5a.10.

²²⁶ Grotowski 2010, plate 25d.

²²⁷ Constantine Porphyrogenitus ed. Haldon, 1990, 108.239-110.241. Grotowski 2010, 207-8 and fn 314. The meaning of *toubia* changed with time, from leggings worn by men to ribbons tied on horses' legs. This change is misunderstood by Grotowski. See Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [270], 236.8-10; 358.

²²⁸ Tsamakda 2002, plate 545 [fol. 230v, top].

μανικέλλια (*manikellia*), comprised of stitched layers of cotton and silk, and possibly reinforced with layers of metal or other hard materials.²²⁹ It is not clear from Grotowski's description which part of the arm was protected by *manikellia*. Parani makes clear that the long sleeves of a tunic worn beneath armour would have been made in padded or quilted felt or silk, and would have protected the forearms.²³⁰

As well as a practical function armour also had a symbolic aspect, which is summarised in the following paragraphs, whilst the iconography of the emperor alone, or accompanied by a warrior saint, and wearing armour on coins is considered in chronological sequence in chapters three to six. One aspect of the significance of armour is illustrated well in the entry of Manuel I into Antioch in 1159. Reginald, prince of Antioch, was to walk holding the stirrup of the emperor's horse, whilst Baldwin III (1129-63; king of Jerusalem from 1143 to 1163), rode unarmed in the procession, and at some distance from Manuel.²³¹ The emperor was also accompanied by a large group of Varangians. But with an eye to safety as well as demonstrating imperial power, Manuel put on double breastplates while celebrating a triumph.²³² This triumphal aspect of armour was part of Manuel's projection of power, and would have been recognised as such by the Byzantines. But the Crusaders could have recognised a different interpretation of armour, where armour is

²²⁹ Grotowski 2010, 186.

²³⁰ Parani 2003, 117.

²³¹ Kinnamos 1976, Bk IV, 142-43.

²³² [Manuel] 'donned double breastplates, induced thereto by the inexhaustible strength of his body. Over these he put a garment decorated with precious stones, not inferior in weight to what was underneath, and a crown and other things customary for the emperor. I can wonder at this, that after he had celebrated a triumph in the way in which he usually did one at Byzantion, and had reached the church of the apostle Peter, he nimbly dismounted from his horse and, when he was going to remount, he leapt up with a bound, just as if he were entirely unarmed.' Kinnamos 1976, Bk IV, 143.

seen as a sacred burden, and almost as a penance. Choniates refers to a speech by Conrad III (1093-1152), the king of Germany (1138-52), and leader of the German contingent on the Second Crusade.²³³ For the Crusaders in this case it is possible to see armour possessing a spiritual quality, as well as the temporal quality implied by the projection of power. The Crusaders, even when not imputing a spiritual quality to armour, emphasised its practical nature, by urging the Byzantines to abandon the ostentation of gold and to put on iron.²³⁴ In a broader context further spiritual aspects of armour are that it is symbolic of man's insignificance compared to God, and also that armour cannot protect against the fear of death, whilst at the same time armour and arms can symbolise Christian virtues.²³⁵ Armour was used by Byzantine emperors both as symbol and as signal, to indicate to soldiers to prepare for a campaign, or to inform citizens that the emperor was at war. This signal was given by displaying armour (*λωρίκιον*, *lorikion*), and arms in the form of a sword (*σπαθίον*, *spathion*) and shield (*σκουτάριον*, *skoutarion*) at the Chalke gate.²³⁶

Spiritual links to the temporal aspects of armour are illustrated well in the frontispiece of the Psalter of Basil II. (**Fig. 13.**)²³⁷ Whilst in the whole of Basil's coinage there is no military iconography, either of dress or weapons, in

²³³ 'We, the wellborn, the grandees, the renowned in glory and wealth, the lords of many nations are ever-wrapped in military attire as though it were unwanted bonds, and we tolerate it in our sufferings as did Peter, the greatest of Christ's disciples, who was maltreated of old by being bound in double chains and guarded by four quaternions of soldiers.' Choniates 1984, [68], 40.

²³⁴ Choniates 1984, [477], 262. Brand 1968, 192-3.

²³⁵ Grotowski 2010, 180-1.

²³⁶ Constantine Porphyrogennetos 1990, 96, 54-59. Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 135, fn 348. Grotowski 2010, 180 and fn 211.

²³⁷ Talbot Rice 1959, plate XI, and 318. **See fig. 13.** Evans and Wixom 1997, 186 (plate cropped). Dawson 1998, 49-50.

this Psalter illustration there is a frontal portrayal of the standing Basil, wearing scale armour covering his upper body, *pteryges* on his upper arms, and with the cuffs and hem of his tunic edged with gold. The spiritual element is linked closely to this military iconography, for on the viewer's left the Archangel Michael hands a spear to Basil. In Basil's left hand is a sheathed sword, and he is crowned by the Archangel Gabriel, on the emperor's left. Above Basil's head is a nimbate bust of Christ, who in his right hand holds a crown suspended over the crown on Basil's head, and in his left hand the Gospels. Basil is flanked by the busts of six warrior saints: St Theodore Tiron, St Demetrios, and (probably) St Theodore Stratelates below the Archangel Michael; and St George, St Prokopios, and St Mercurios below the Archangel Gabriel. The inscription on Basil's right reads 'Basil trusting in Christ' and that on his left 'King of the Romans the new' (i.e. the second.) Basil stands on a small platform (*suppedion*) and at his feet are eight prostrate figures, in *proskynesis*. The illustration is accompanied by a verse which describes the scene.²³⁸

The visual impact is powerful: Basil, in a dominating position, crowned and armed by Christ, Michael and Gabriel and accompanied by warrior saints, towers over the supplicants. Basil is larger than the other figures; the relative variation in scale is compared by Nelson that on the Barberini ivory, where the central imperial figure is much larger than the accompanying figures. There is a further variation in proportion in that the heavenly space is larger in the Psalter illustration; Christ is not simply confined to the mandorla as in the Barberini ivory, but extends his hand holding the crown towards Basil. In the

²³⁸ For a translation of the verse see Sevchenko, I. 1982, 272.

Psalter too the archangels present the crown and lance to Basil, and military saints occupy the position on the left which on the ivory is filled by an officer.²³⁹ It is impossible to interpret the Psalter illustration as anything other than a striking demonstration of the power of a Christian emperor, carrying a sword and wearing armour.²⁴⁰ Whether the frontispiece refers to a specific campaign is more difficult to determine; dating it to Basil's final triumph over the Bulgars has been rejected on two grounds,²⁴¹ that the principal captives in the victory parade in 1019 were Bulgar women, whereas the figures beneath Basil's feet are all men;²⁴² and that Basil is wearing the *stemma*, the crown of imperial rulership, not the *toupha*, the crown of an emperor celebrating a triumph. Parani interprets Basil's portrait as the depiction of a military emperor engaged in a continual struggle against the empire's enemies, rather than as a celebration after a successful campaign.²⁴³ She emphasises the importance of Basil's spear, presented to him by the Archangel Michael, and notes that Basil's sword is sheathed, being held in an unrealistic way for use. Parani sees the sword as symbolic of imperial authority and justice, whilst the spear is the emperor's fighting weapon.

Given Basil's reputation as a soldier demonstrated by the frontispiece, it may be asked why he did not reintroduce military imagery on his coinage, particularly as the coinage underwent many changes during his reign which would have afforded opportunities for such reintroduction. The reasons may

²³⁹ Nelson 2011/12, 172-73.

²⁴⁰ 'Nothing could more clearly express the concept of military might sanctioned by divine power.' Angold, 1984, 4.

²⁴¹ Stephenson 2003, 54-6.

²⁴² Skylitzes 2010, 43, [365], 344. Stephenson suggests that these figures represent not Bulgarians but a range of Basil's enemies. Stephenson 2003, 55.

²⁴³ Parani 2013, 152-3. Dawson emphasises Basil's solid-laced *klibanon*, a garment associated with war, rather than an imperial triumph. Dawson 1998, 49-50.

relate to the strength of Basil's faith; his character; and the coin issues and financial aspects of his reign. Basil's faith is noted by Psellos, who records that at the battle of Abydos (989) against the rebel Bardas Phokas Basil clasped an icon of the Virgin whilst awaiting the attack, regarding the icon as his 'surest protection'.²⁴⁴ Basil then commemorated his victory with the issue from Constantinople of a special miliaresion in silver which featured the Virgin on the obverse.²⁴⁵ The inscription praises the Virgin, but is markedly abbreviated and difficult to understand. In full it would read:

Obverse: Θεοτόκε βοήθει τοῖς βασιλεῦσι.

Reverse: Μήτηρ Θεοῦ δεδοξασμένη ὁ εἰς σε ἐλπίζον οὐκ ἀποτυγχάνει.

Although Basil did not reintroduce military symbolism to his coinage, he did reintroduce another relevant symbol after a break of some five centuries. His Class IV histamenon features a crown, a motif of power and victory, suspended over Basil's head.²⁴⁶ The crown could represent the culmination of Basil's two-year campaign in Asia Minor, when he returned in triumph to Constantinople in 1001. Basil's use of a non-military symbol to celebrate his victories contrasts with the use of military symbols by Constantine IX in the face of threats. Basil's character was not flamboyant: a remark by Psellos has been noted above (see p. 31). In a further comment Psellos notes that when Basil took part in processions or received governors in audience he wore a robe of purple, dark in hue and with only a 'handful of gems'.²⁴⁷ This lack of

²⁴⁴ Psellos 1966, [16], 36.

²⁴⁵ BICC: coin no B4985. DOC 3.2, 631, coin nos 19.1-19.4; plate XLVII, coin nos 19.1-19.4.

²⁴⁶ Grierson DOC 3.2, 606, 619-20, coin nos 4a.1-4d. BICC coin no B4969.

²⁴⁷ 'Meanwhile Basil took part in his processions and gave audience to his governors clad merely in a robe of purple, not the very bright purple, but simply purple of a dark hue, with a handful of gems as a mark of distinction. As he spent the greater part of his reign serving as a

ostentation would fit with the imperial image on Basil's coins. Basil was also in the sequence of emperors from 969 to 1059 for whom all coins in copper were struck not in the names of individual emperors, but as 'anonymous folles'. Further, mint activity during Basil's reign was confined to Constantinople and Cherson; no coins were minted in Thessaloniki. It will be noted in later chapters that when the mint in Thessaloniki was active its output was more likely to feature military iconography than the outputs of other mints.

Differing financial circumstances between the reigns of Basil II and Constantine IX might also help to explain why the reintroduction of military symbolism took place under the latter emperor. The series of conquests of Basil resulted by his death in restoration to the Empire of extensive territories which had not formed part of it since the seventh century. Whilst the wars involved in such conquests were costly, Basil's successes repaid the expense by territorial increase and booty. At the time of his death in 1025 Basil was said to have left in the treasury 14.4 million gold coins.²⁴⁸ By contrast, Constantine IX faced one particularly serious threat in the winter of 1046/47 when 800,000 Pechenegs crossed the Danube, and remained on Byzantine soil, despite campaigns against them from 1048-53.²⁴⁹ Whereas Constantine's Class I nomisma had a mean gold content of 90.6% (range 87.3-94.5%), the Class IV had a mean of 81.6% (range 76.0-86.8%).²⁵⁰ The Class IV is dated tentatively to c.1054-55, the same time that Constantine was

soldier on guard at our frontiers and keeping the barbarian marauders at bay, not only did he draw nothing from his reserves of wealth, but even multiplied his riches many time over.' Psellos 1966, [31-32], 45-46.

²⁴⁸ Laiou and Morrisson 2007, 53-4.

²⁴⁹ Kaplanis 2003, 784-5.

²⁵⁰ Kaplanis 2003, 771.

employing particularly aggressive tax-collecting methods.²⁵¹ Is it possible that Constantine chose this Class IV nomisma on which to portray himself with a sword precisely because of his action in debasing the nomisma, and hence as a way of emphasising his authority?²⁵² Constantine's actions may be contrasted to Basil II: while the gold content of Basil's nomisma fell slightly over his whole reign this is not thought to have been deliberate. Basil may not have introduced military symbolism to this coins because there was no monetary prompt. The lack of military imagery on Basil's coins could thus be explained by these factors.

Weapons of the Emperor and the Warrior Saints

Military imagery returned to Byzantine coins in the reign of Constantine IX, and the range of weapons depicted on coins over the next four centuries comprised sword, spear and shield. In this period the sword was sporadically an attribute of the emperor on coins from the reign of Constantine IX (1042-55) onwards. **(Fig. 11.)**²⁵³ From the reign of Alexios I (1081-1118) onwards the sword gradually became more common on coins, where it came to reflect more its importance in imperial ceremonial. Ceremonial weapons had long been important in Byzantium, being mentioned in *The Book of Ceremonies* when Basil I and his son Constantine returned from a campaign against the Paulician sect in Tephrike and Germanikeia in 879. Basil wore a belted sword and a caesar's diadem, and Constantine a gold lamellar cuirass, a belted

²⁵¹ Attaleiates 2012, 9, [50], 88-90, para. 5. DOC 3.2, 734-6.

²⁵² BICC: coin nos B5348, B5349. **See fig. 11.** DOC 3.2, 742, coin nos 4a.1, 4a.2, 4a.3, 4b, 4c; plate LIX, coin nos 4a.1, 4a.2, 4a.3, 4b, 4c.

²⁵³ e.g. BICC: coin nos B5348, B5349. **See fig. 11.** DOC 3.2, 742, coin nos 4a.1-4a.3, 4b, 4c; plate LIX, coin nos 4a.1, 4a.2, 4a.3, 4b, 4c.

sword, and held a gold lance decorated with pearls in his hand.²⁵⁴ The use of the sword in imperial ceremonial is mentioned at a number of points in Pseudo-Kodinos: for example, every day, when the emperor comes out of his chamber, the *megas domestikos* stands at the door, holding the emperor's sword.²⁵⁵ The sword also featured in the *prokypsis* ceremony, performed on Christmas Eve and Epiphany in the palace courtyard. The emperor would ascend the wooden *prokypsis* structure, with curtains closed. When the curtains opened the emperor appeared brightly illuminated to court officials, clergy and guards, while the cantors chanted. A sword, held hilt-upwards by the *archontopoulon*, and a large candle, held by the *lampadarios*, were displayed with the emperor, but neither of these persons was visible to the audience.²⁵⁶ The importance of the sword is shown further when by the tenth century two swords were included in the emperor's baggage train: one for ceremonial use and one for fighting.²⁵⁷

Given the narrow range of arms carried by the emperor and by warrior saints on coins, it would appear that the depicted arms are of considerable significance, and it may be asked what reasons prompted their selection. In the Bible the sword is a symbol with multiple, possibly opposing, functions: it symbolises punishment (of the chosen people or of all humankind), or support. Examples of the punishment role in the Old Testament include: 'And I

²⁵⁴ *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, [R500; HC 745], 500.

²⁵⁵ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [189], 118.8-10. The *megas domestikos* was in charge of the whole army; he also enjoyed the unique privilege of being able to unfurl his banner whenever he wished, even before the imperial banners. Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [248], 205.1, 10-14.

²⁵⁶ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [203], 144.3-5.

²⁵⁷ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 349-50 and fn 207. *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, Appendix, [R468; HC208], 468. Hendy, DOC 4.1, 173-5.

will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of my covenant;²⁵⁸ and: 'And my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword.'²⁵⁹ An example from the New Testament is: 'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I come not to send peace, but a sword.'²⁶⁰ However, examples of support can also be found;²⁶¹ and a sword can symbolise the word of God.²⁶²

Thus if the sword is an attribute of God, it could also be seen as an attribute of an emperor, who was God's representative on earth. St Theodore Tiron was depicted handing a sword to Manuel I on a mural now no longer extant, but which was located above the gate or entrance to the house of Leo Sikountenos in Thessaloniki.²⁶³ The mural depicted the Virgin, with a medallion of Christ on her breast, crowning Manuel, who was positioned beneath her. Manuel was portrayed as preceded by an angel, and with St Theodore Tiron handing him a sword.²⁶⁴ A warlike symbolism is suggested for the sword, rather than a ceremonial/governing connotation, for the sword is handed to the emperor by a warrior saint, and not by God, an arrangement similar to the frontispiece of the Psalter of Basil II, where the emperor is handed a spear by an archangel. From the description of the mural it would

²⁵⁸ Leviticus 26, 25.

²⁵⁹ Exodus 22, 24.

²⁶⁰ Matthew 10, 34.

²⁶¹ 'For they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them: but thy right hand, and thine arm, and the light of thy countenance, because thou hadst a favour unto them.' Psalms 44, 3.

²⁶² 'For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.' Hebrews 4, 12.

²⁶³ Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, fol. 36r; Mango 1986, 226.

²⁶⁴ 'Also present is the horseman Tiro, Christ's martyr, who rides in front of you when you battle the enemy, who instructs your hands in military contest and places in them a whetted sword.' Mango 1986, 226; English translation of Lampros 1911, 43-4.

appear that the hierarchy of figures in the mural implies that the sword is a gift from God.²⁶⁵

The symbolism of the sword is treated succinctly by Pseudo-Kodinos. In a section where he lists the significance of the attributes of the emperor, such as the crown, for the sword he notes: 'by the sword [he shows] authority'.²⁶⁶ The symbolism of the sword is however complex, and it would appear that the authority associated with the sword can have both secular and sacred connotations. Magdalino has pointed out an apparent reference to the secular power of the imperial sword as recorded by Choïrosphaktes' *ekphrasis* of the palace bath constructed for Leo VI (886-912).²⁶⁷ Lines 33 to 36 mention the imperial sword:

Ἰδίως θεάν Γεούχου
ἐπὶ τὴν πρόκογχον ὄψει,
ρόδῆν φύσιν φοροῦσαν
ξίφος ἐν χεροῖν κρατοῦσαν.

See especially the sight of the earth-ruler on the proconch, wearing a rosy appearance, and holding a sword in his hands.²⁶⁸

Magdalino sees in this *ekphrasis* not simply a description of the building and its decoration, but 'a coordinated celebration of the emperor's wisdom and cosmic kingship'.²⁶⁹

Magdalino identifies Leo's sword as a secular symbol, but notes that other aspects of the *ekphrasis* demonstrate religious significance. This dual symbolism is expected, for the animals and birds portrayed are suggested to have several interpretations. Whilst the depictions of the emperor in the poem

²⁶⁵ The sword, as a gift from God, is a symbol of justice, the emperor's authority to dispense justice, and of just punishment. Parani 2013, 150-51.

²⁶⁶ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [202], 141.

²⁶⁷ Magdalino 1988, 97-118.

²⁶⁸ Magdalino 1988, 116, 33-36.

²⁶⁹ Magdalino 1988, 104.

could identify him as created in the image of God to rule over other men, another interpretation is possible, since doors are an important feature of the poem. Could the emperor with a sword then represent an angel with a flaming sword at the gate of Paradise?²⁷⁰ Further, although not mentioned by Magdalino, it has been noted above that the sword can symbolise the word of God.²⁷¹ Thus the sword in the *ekphrasis* can be interpreted in terms of both secular and sacred authority. As the paintings in the bath-house are interpreted as having multiple meanings, with the lion being brave and the snake being wise, but also with both being dangerous, it is possible that the sword likewise may have more than one meaning.²⁷²

However the sword was not always interpreted as coming from God, and signifying God's approval. The action of Isaac I in portraying himself on his Class II histamenon²⁷³ holding a drawn sword (see chapter three) produced comments from a number of contemporary writers, one of whom was Skylitzes Continuatus.²⁷⁴ Thus a portrayal of the emperor with a sword could be subject to differing interpretations; whilst the sword could be interpreted as a gift from God, for contemporary observers it could appear as the appropriation of a symbol of divine aid for temporal use. Whilst on this Class II histamenon Christ is portrayed on the obverse, Isaac is portrayed on

²⁷⁰ Magdalino 1988, 106. Genesis 3, 24: 'So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the Garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.'

²⁷¹ See above and Hebrews 4, 12.

²⁷² Psalms 91, 13: 'Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.'

²⁷³ BICC: coin no B5366. DOC III.2, 762, coin nos 2.1-2.8; plate LXIII, coin nos 2.1, 2.4, 2.5.

²⁷⁴ 'Komnenos, girding himself in the imperial office, in the manner in which was said, and exhibiting the repute of manliness and experience of military nobility, is forthwith represented as a sword bearer on the imperial nomisma, not ascribing the whole to God but to his own strength and experience in war.' Skylitzes Continuatus 1968, 103. 3-4.

the reverse on his own, and there is no attempt to provide a continuity between the two faces, as there is on the miliaresion of Constantine IX, where the Virgin on the obverse and Constantine on the reverse are linked by an inscription. (**Fig. 12.**)²⁷⁵ The separation of Christ and Isaac by placing them on separate faces of the coin may be contrasted to the description of the mural of Manuel I (see above) which indicates that the Virgin, Christ, St Theodore Tiron, and Manuel were all depicted on one panel, and that the sword was being handed to the emperor by St Theodore.²⁷⁶ It is therefore possible that the image of Isaac alone on his histamenon could have prompted the suggestion that he was acting in a hubristic manner, using the sword for his own purposes, by ascribing his accession to his own efforts, rather than as a gift from God. A further point of detail in relation to form is that of the sword itself: whereas both Constantine IX on his miliaresion and Isaac I on his Class I histamenon were portrayed with a sheathed sword, on the Class II histamenon Isaac appeared with a drawn sword. (**Figs. 15, 16.**)²⁷⁷

The spear (*dibellion*) is a weapon associated with both the emperor and the warrior saints. Whether or not the association was continuous from the time of ancient Rome is not easy to determine, but in ancient Rome the spear was a symbol of the highest military and civilian authorities. Twelve spears with tassels (*iubae*) instead of metal heads were carried before the

²⁷⁵ BICC: coin nos B5354-56. **See fig. 12.** DOC 3.2, 745-56, coin nos 7a.1-7a.7, 7b.1-7b.3; plate LIX, coin nos 7a.1, 7a.3, 7a.5, 7b.2, 7b.3.

²⁷⁶ Similarly in the frontispiece of the Psalter of Basil II Christ, the Archangels Michael and Gabriel, the warrior saints and the emperor are all depicted together.

²⁷⁷ Class I histamenon: BICC: coin no B5365. **See figs. 15 and 16.** DOC III.2, 761, coin nos 1.1-1.4; plate LXIII, coin nos 1.2, 1.3. These coins and their symbols are discussed in chapter 3.

ruler until the fifth century AD, and possibly longer.²⁷⁸ Ammianus Marcellinus, in describing the triumphant entry of Constantius (337-61) into Rome mentions spears with golden heads.²⁷⁹ When Leo I (457-74) was acclaimed emperor at the Hebdomon by the army and civil and ecclesiastical dignitaries, including the archbishop of Constantinople, he seized a lance and shield, put on the *chlamys* and a diadem and was then acclaimed by the crowd, who prostrated themselves.²⁸⁰ There is a clear reference to the spear of Constantine VII (913-59), who in 956 celebrated a triumph after the capture of Abu'l 'Aas'ir, the cousin of Sayf ad-Daula, the emir of Aleppo. During this triumph the captive was placed under Constantine's feet and subjected to a ritual trampling (*calcatio*), whilst at the same time the spear of the emperor was held against the captive's neck.²⁸¹ The spear is also mentioned in *The Book of Ceremonies*, which refers to 'the imperial spear which has the pennon on top with the precious, life-giving and victory-giving cross', and which is carried by the emperor's head groom.²⁸² The spear also features prominently in the frontispiece of the Psalter of Basil II, where the Archangel Michael hands it to the emperor.

That a lance was used as a symbol of victory may be seen in the impaling the heads of enemies on a lance. When George Maniakes' revolt against Constantine IX was defeated, Maniakes' head was carried on a lance

²⁷⁸ Grotowski 2010, 329-30.

²⁷⁹ 'And behind the manifold others that preceded him he was surrounded by dragons [i.e. imperial standards], woven out of purple thread and bound to the golden and jewelled tips of spears, with wide mouths open to the breeze and hence hissing as if roused by anger, and leaving their tails winding in the wind.' Ammianus Marcellinus 1956, *The History*, Vol. 1, XVI, 10,7, p. 249.

²⁸⁰ Dagron 2003, 60-1; PLRE II, 1980, 663-4.

²⁸¹ McCormick 1986, 162. *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, Book II, chapter 19, [R610], 610, 13-16.

²⁸² *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, Book II, chapter 19, [R608], 608, 11.

in the procession organised to celebrate the victory.²⁸³ The significance of the spear is shown by the spear claimed to have pierced the side of Christ being preserved in the Great Palace in Constantinople; there is evidence that it was still there at the time of the Fourth Crusade. Robert of Clari described the 'many rich relics' contained within the Holy Chapel of the Palace (the church of the Blessed Virgin of the Pharos), and noted 'the iron of the lance with which our Lord had His side pierced'.²⁸⁴ The spear is included as part of the emperor's regalia by Pseudo-Kodinos, and the *dibellion* is defined as 'a spear that has two pennons attached to it'.²⁸⁵ The *dibellion* does appear on the coinage, but only rarely.²⁸⁶ On these coins the *dibellion* is held by the emperor, and thus it differs from the shield, for the emperor does not usually hold a shield on coinage in the later empire; a shield is usually held by an accompanying warrior saint. Given that on certain feast days the *dibellion* was carried before the emperor without the usual accompanying shield, the *dibellion* may be of greater significance than the shield.

The shield was of symbolic significance in the Byzantine world for three reasons: in its biblical context; as a symbol on coins; and in the proclaiming of an emperor. The Bible contains references to God's use of a shield.²⁸⁷ A shield was borne by the emperor on some Roman and early Byzantine coins

²⁸³ Psellos 1966, 198, [6] 87-8. See also the *Madrid Skylitzes*, 532, fol.224v. (Tsamakda 2002.)

²⁸⁴ Robert of Clari 2005, 103. For further information on the relics, see Mesarites ed. Heisenberg, 1907, 30.33-31.2.

²⁸⁵ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 105-6, [183], 104, 11-3; 106-7, fn 233.

²⁸⁶ One example is recorded in DOC: 4.1, 175; 4.2, 594, coin nos 31a.1, 31a.2, and plate XLIII, coin nos 31a.1, 31a.2. However these coins are worn and the details are not clear. BICC: no specimen.

²⁸⁷ 'Plead my cause, O Lord, with them that strive with me: fight against them that fight against me. Take hold of shield and buckler, and stand up for mine help.' Psalms 35, 1-3. St Paul also uses the term 'the shield of faith'; Epistle to the Ephesians 6, 36.

where it carried a design, particularly of a horse and rider, with the rider killing a foe on the ground. As a symbol on Byzantine coins the shield/horse and rider was abandoned in the early eighth century. A shield started to reappear on coins in the reign of John II (1118-43), but without the horse and rider symbol. The shield had an obvious imperial significance in that it formed part of the emperor's regalia, as noted by Pseudo-Kodinos.²⁸⁸ Parani sees the ceremonial use of the imperial shield as symbolising the emperor as defender of the empire and its people, through his military achievements and piety.²⁸⁹

The third indication of the significance of the shield was the rite, derived from the army, of acclaiming a new emperor by raising him on a shield, a rite used from the time of the early empire.²⁹⁰ Acclaiming an emperor in this manner possibly originated amongst the Germanic tribes in the first century AD and was adopted by the Roman army, utilising the shield as a convenient device.²⁹¹ With the accession of Anastasios in 491 this action had become incorporated into the Byzantine proclamation/coronation ritual.²⁹² Thus it is possible when considering the importance of the shield as an imperial attribute that its early significance related to the shield-raising rite, and that later use reflected this historical aspect. The proclamation of Nikephoros Phokas in 963 appears to have included raising him on a

²⁸⁸ 'The *skouterios* carries the *dibellion* and the shield of the emperor, not only at the *prokypseis*, but also wherever the emperor goes outside.'

'The *skouterios* stands in front of these banners and carries the *dibellion* – there is only one – and the imperial shield.' Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [183], 104.11-12; [196], 130.3.

²⁸⁹ Parani 2013, 148.

²⁹⁰ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [255], 216.5-13.

²⁹¹ Walter 1977, 161-2.

²⁹² *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012. I, 92, [cod. 101], R423, 423, 5-8.

shield.²⁹³ A further example of the rite is given by Psellos, who records that during the Bulgarian rebellion in 1040 its leader Peter Delyan was raised on a shield,²⁹⁴ and also that the rebel Leo Tornikios was raised on a shield and proclaimed emperor in 1047, suggesting that the practice was extant at this time, unless the comment is a metaphorical one. The details of five shield-raising ceremonies have been collated by Walter.²⁹⁵ These comprise Julian in 361, recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus and Zosimus; Anastasios in 491 (Peter the Patrician); Justin I in 518 (Peter the Patrician); Justin II in 556 (Corippus); and Andronikos III in 1325 (John Kantakouzenos and Pseudo-Kodinos). Macrides in her edition of Pseudo-Kodinos has cited several further references to shield-raising: Phokas in 602 (Theophanes); Theodore II in 1254 (Akropolites, and Pachymeres); Michael VIII in 1259 (Akropolites, and Pachymeres).²⁹⁶ It would appear therefore that instances of raising on a shield occurred on a number of occasions across a long span of Byzantine history, although this does not prove that the ceremony was in use throughout this period.

Kazhdan believes that the rite of shield-raising was revived close to the time of Isaac I's introduction of a drawn sword to Byzantine coinage (1057-9).²⁹⁷ There are a number of illustrations of shield-raising. A miniature in the *Leo Bible* shows two figures on a shield held by a group of men. The figure of the emperor is suggested to be Romanos, the son of Constantine VII, being

²⁹³ *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, [R434], 434. Dagron 2003, 72-3. Macrides 2013, 418-9. The word 'shield' is not used in this line in *The Book of Ceremonies*, but 'raise him up' is, and Dagron and Macrides accept that this refers to raising on a shield.

²⁹⁴ Psellos 1966, [40], 110 209.

²⁹⁵ Walter 1977, 162-6.

²⁹⁶ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 217 fn 620, 418.

²⁹⁷ Kazhdan 1984, 51.

crowned as co-emperor by the patriarch at Easter 945. The emperor and patriarch wear Byzantine dress, but the epigraphy refers to the Old Testament figures of Nathan crowning Solomon.²⁹⁸ Further illustrations of the rite, dated to the twelfth century, are two marble roundels, each depicting an emperor (possibly Isaac II or Alexios III), standing on what appears to be a shield. No other figures are shown. Each emperor holds a labarum on a long shaft in his right hand and a globus cruciger surmounted by a patriarchal cross in his left.²⁹⁹

Details of shield-raising are given by Pseudo-Kodinos:³⁰⁰ the new emperor was seated on the shield and raised high, to be visible to the army and to the crowds in the Augusteon. The front of the shield was held by the patriarch and the father of the emperor being proclaimed; the sides and back of the shield were held by despots and *sebastokratores*. If there were no representatives of the latter two groups then the 'highest and most noble' of the court title holders were employed as substitutes, and also in the case where no father of the emperor was present. There are some points about the ceremony where uncertainty exists. Walter has queried how the dignitary crowning the emperor could do so unless he too were standing on the shield, and has pointed out the discrepancy between illustrations of the ceremony and the lack of detail in descriptions in texts.³⁰¹ In the *Madrid Skylitzes* there is a miniature depicting the proclamation and raising on a shield of the rebel Leo

²⁹⁸ Walter 1977, 143-5, 169-70, plate 1. *Leo Bible*, Vatican regin. graec. 1, f. 285v (9).

²⁹⁹ Peirce and Tyler 1941, 3-9.

³⁰⁰ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [255-6], 216.5-13.

³⁰¹ Walter 1977, 165.

Tornikios in 1047.³⁰² Here Tornikios appears crowned and alone on the shield, implying that he has been crowned before the raising by two men in civilian dress; at the point shown he appears to have been raised to a point only just off the ground. Such detail cannot however be confirmed by the brief comment in Psellos.³⁰³ However the illustration in the *Madrid Skylitzes* appears to be the only illustration of a Byzantine historical figure being raised on a shield; in other illustrations (e.g. in Byzantine Psalters), the figures being raised are from the Old Testament.³⁰⁴

The involvement of army personnel in shield-raising may have varied in different periods, but their participation in the later empire is suggested by the account of Akropolites of the proclamation of Michael VIII (1259-61).³⁰⁵ It would appear that the ceremony underwent change over time and Macrides, in her commentary on Pseudo-Kodinos, has pointed out that aspects of the ceremony evolved so that by the time of Pseudo-Kodinos it was under the *aegis* of the church.³⁰⁶ Such aspects included the transfer of raising on a shield from the proclamation ceremony to the coronation ceremony in Hagia Sophia. The location changed also, to the gallery of the patriarchate, the *triklinos* called the Thomaites, along the eastern side of the Augusteon, and

³⁰² Tsamakda 2002, fig. 544, [fol. 230r], and 280-1.

³⁰³ 'The ceremony of proclamation was performed as far as circumstances allowed, with Leo dressed in magnificent robes and raised on the shield.' Psellos 1966, [6], 104, 209.

³⁰⁴ Tsamakda 2002, 280.

³⁰⁵ 'Those in office and the other, better men of the armies seated him on the imperial shield and proclaimed him imperially.' Akropolites 2007, [77], 346. The term 'better men' presumably refers to those who were high-ranking officers, i.e. numbered among the *megistanes*, not soldiers in the ranks. Macrides 2013, 421.

³⁰⁶ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 421.

there was a change of personnel, for as noted above, church dignitaries participated in raising the shield.³⁰⁷

Conclusions

Equestrian figures were absent from Byzantine coins for some six hundred years, between c. 720 and the reign of Andronikos III (1328-41). The form of the equestrian emperor adopted by Andronikos resembled that of a type used by the fourth-century Roman emperor in the east, Arcadius (395-408), in that it filled the whole flan. By contrast, the equestrian figure used by Leo III in the eighth century was a small one, which occupied only the shield held by the emperor. Military figures and attributes were reintroduced to the coinage from 1042 onwards, some three centuries before the reintroduction of the riding emperor. Such military figures comprised a small group, which included the Archangel Michael, St George, St Demetrios, St Theodore Tiron and St Theodore Stratelates. The Archangel Michael was the first of these figures to appear on coins in the eleventh century, appearing unarmed on a nomisma histamenon of Michael IV (1034-41).³⁰⁸ The archangel did not appear on coins again until the reign of Isaac II (1185-95), when he appeared armed on a nomisma histamenon from Constantinople, and this introduction heralded his appearance with increasing regularity. The military saints appeared also on imperial banners and the seals of the aristocracy.

³⁰⁷ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013,[255], 214.13-9; 215 fn 614.

³⁰⁸ The mint was either Constantinople or Thessaloniki; it is difficult to be certain of the mint attribution. Michael first appeared on seals in non-military guise in the sixth century and first appeared armed on seals in the late tenth/early eleventh centuries. Cotsonis 2005, 438, 440.

Military dress, and specifically upper body armour, was reintroduced to Byzantine coins by Constantine IX (1042-55). Coins usually allow the presence of armour to be seen, particularly on the upper body, but not necessarily the detail, which can be obscured by coin wear. Thus the range of protection for body parts which is described in the literature cannot always be appreciated on coins. The emperor and warrior saints carry a limited range of weapons on coins: sword, spear, and shield. It is noted that all three weapons have a religious, as well as a martial, significance.

3. REINTRODUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MILITARY SYMBOLISM ON COINS 1042 TO 1143

The Barberini ivory (c. sixth century) is the epitome of the projection of imperial power. The equestrian emperor forms the central and largest of its five panels, and the ivory revolves around this dominant figure, identified as Anastasios I by Talbot Rice; or as Justinian I by Cutler. (**Fig. 14.**)³⁰⁹ The status of the emperor is accentuated by the higher relief of his carving, and by the space occupied, which is much larger than that of Christ above. The emperor holds a spear, point down, in his right hand, and behind the spear is a figure in a Phrygian cap, representing an Asian prisoner. The figure of Terra appears beneath the emperor's horse supporting the emperor's right foot with her right hand. To the viewer's right of the emperor is a winged Victory, who may have held a wreath in her right hand, now broken off. The left panel consists of a consul in military dress, presenting a winged Victory holding a wreath to the emperor; the right panel is missing. The upper panel features a bust of Christ, whose right hand blesses while the left holds a cross. Christ is flanked by two winged figures which Talbot Rice identifies as Victories, rather than angels; the ivory thus features both Christian and pagan imagery. The supremacy of the emperor is emphasised further by the lower panel, in which figures bring tribute of an elephant, two lions, ivory and other goods.

The form of assertion of imperial power as depicted on the Barberini ivory may also be seen on Byzantine coins both contemporary with the ivory,

³⁰⁹ Talbot Rice 1959, 291 and plate 19; Cutler 1991, 254. The Louvre also considers Justinian I as more likely. www.louvre.fr/en/oeuvre-notices/leaf-diptych-emperor-triumphant See fig. 14.

and for the succeeding two centuries. Thus emperors could appear with military symbols on their coins from Anastasios in 491 until c.720, when coins with such symbols as the armed emperor, and a horseman on the emperor's shield, were last issued under Leo III. The riding figure on the emperor's shield was the successor to the figure of the riding emperor which by contrast filled the whole flan; Arcadios, emperor in the east (395-408) was the last emperor to appear on horseback on the whole flan. **(Fig. 6.)**³¹⁰ The absence of the armed emperor type lasted some three centuries until the reign of Constantine IX (1042-55), and a further three centuries elapsed before Andronikos III (1328-41) reintroduced riding figures. The reign of Manuel II (1391-1425) marked the last use of any military symbols on the coinage.³¹¹ The coinage of the era covered by the present thesis (1042-1453) was thus preceded by one period (c.720-1042) with an absence of military symbols; and ended with a period (c. 1394/5-1453) with an absence of military symbols. In both periods of absence of military symbolism there was a preponderance of religious symbolism on coins.

Before considering the remilitarisation of the coinage by Constantine IX, it may therefore be asked what factors were involved in the disappearance of military symbols c.720? The disappearance of military symbols in the eighth century was reviewed by the author in his MA dissertation.³¹² In that dissertation it was noted that in the sixth and seventh centuries the trend in symbols on Byzantine coins was a decrease in pagan imagery, and a gradual increase in Christian imagery. An angel began to

³¹⁰ e.g. BICC coin no LR375. See fig. 5.

³¹¹ As noted above, coins issues with military symbolism ceased c. 1394/5.

³¹² Saxby 2009, 55-62.

replace the pagan Victory under Justin (518-27). The cross first started to replace the angel under Tiberios II (578-82), and became a regular type on the reverse under Herakleios (610-41). The figure of Christ as a main coin type appeared in the first reign of Justinian I (527-65) and continued to be used in his second reign (685-95). The coming of Iconoclasm in the 720s ended this use of the image of Christ on coins, and it was not revived until the reign of Michael III (842-67). However, it is clear that from 491 to 705 the use of pagan symbols declined, and the use of Christian symbols increased.

The increasing use of Christian symbols was a reflection of a belief in the power of Christ. Prokopios, writing of the equestrian statue of Justinian I (527-65) in the Augusteum in Constantinople, recorded:

And in his left hand he holds a globe, by which the sculptor signifies that the whole earth and sea are subject to him, yet he has neither sword nor spear nor any other weapon, but a cross stands upon the globe which he carries, the emblem by which alone he has obtained both his empire and his victory in war.³¹³

Brown contrasts the power believed to be conferred by Christ on emperors with the later concept of Christ as 'an unassuming teacher of brotherly love and non-violence', a concept which Brown sees as a 'modern sentimentality'.³¹⁴ Brown describes the power of Christ as seen by the early Byzantines:

They [hands] were raised to a God of utter power – to a God who, in his own time, had raised the dead and had more than once in the long history of the Jews destroyed entire empires and might do so again, if provoked. Far from imposing on a humble church an imperial grandiosity that was alien to its own true nature, Constantine and his successors enjoyed the full support of Christians in seeking out a visual language for Christ that at last did justice to His imagined stupendous power.³¹⁵

³¹³ Prokopios 1940, I, ii, 5.

³¹⁴ Brown 2008, 52.

³¹⁵ Brown 2008, 52.

Given these beliefs and the comments of Prokopios it is not surprising to find Christian symbols replacing military symbols on coins in the sixth and seventh centuries.

The power ascribed to Christ was echoed in the power ascribed to the Virgin; the cult of the Virgin was well-developed by the late sixth and early seventh centuries. The power of the Virgin is seen in the Akathistos, which records this power as well as being an account of the Incarnation and a hymn in praise of Mary. The people and clergy of Constantinople were traditionally believed to have sung the Akathistos in the Blachernai church during a nocturnal vigil of thanksgiving on August 7th 626, after Herakleios had lifted the Persian siege. In the words of the second prooemium of the Akathistos:

To you, our leader in battle and defender,
O Theotokos, I, your city, delivered from sufferings,
Ascribe hymns of victory and thanksgiving.
Since you are invincible in power,
free me from all kinds of dangers.³¹⁶

Thus the Akathistos praises the Virgin for her possession of absolute power in military terms, in addition to her usually ascribed virtues of humility and freedom from sin. Iconoclasm prevented the appearance of the Virgin on coins until the reign of Leo VI (886-912), as it had also retarded the appearance of Christ on coins.

The other noticeable influence of Iconoclasm on coin design is the increased use of the cross. The gold coinage of Leo III (717-41) features Leo on the obverse, with a cross on his crown and the globus cruciger in his right hand; the reverse features the cross on steps.³¹⁷ Where Constantine V (741-

³¹⁶ Peltomaa 2001, 3. Peltomaa believes that this verse was added in 626, after much of the hymn had been composed by 451.

³¹⁷ e.g. DOC 3.1, 241, coin no 1b; 3.2 plate 1, coin no 1b. BICC: no specimen.

75) appears on the reverse of Leo III's gold coins he too is depicted with a cross on his crown and with the globus cruciger.³¹⁸ These coins of Leo III thus feature a minimum of three depictions of a cross, and sometimes four. Neither Leo nor Constantine wears military dress. There has thus been a move away from portraying the emperor as a warrior, armed and in military dress, to a ruler inspired by Christ. With the disappearance of the shield featuring a horse and rider held by the emperor equestrian images also disappeared from the coinage. The elimination of this image, pagan in origin, indicated the strength of Christianity in the empire, and the coinage was not remilitarised until the reign of Constantine IX.³¹⁹

Constantine IX's concave Class IV histamenon from Constantinople shows Christ on the obverse, with the inscription +IhCXICRCXRCSNANTIhM.³²⁰ On the reverse is a facing bust of the emperor, bearded, wearing a jewelled chlamys with a collar piece and crown with cross and pendilia. In his right hand he holds the globus cruciger, and in his left a sword.³²¹ The sword is not conspicuous, as it is sheathed, and Constantine's hand grasps the top of the sheath so that little more than the hilt is visible. **(Fig. 11.)**³²² In the field are two large stars, and the inscription reads: +CΩNSTANT NOSbASILEUSRm. The fineness and concavity of this coin suggest an issue date at the end of the reign. The fineness of Constantine's histamena declined from a range of 94.5% to 90.0% for the

³¹⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 3.1, 243, coin no 4a.1; 3.2 plate 1, coin no 4a.1.

³¹⁹ For discussion, see chapter 2.

³²⁰ The 'CS' in this inscription actually represent 'EX'; Grierson notes that in this inscription the letters are often badly deformed. DOC 3.2, 877.

³²¹ Data for the numbers of coins with military symbolism for each emperor are analysed at the end of chapter four, enabling an overview of the period 1042 to 1204.

³²² BICC: coin nos B5348, B5349. **See fig. 11.** DOC 3.2, 742, coin nos 4a.1, 4a.2, 4a.3, 4b, 4c; plate LIX, coin nos 4a.1, 4a.2, 4a.3, 4b, 4c.

Class I to 82.0% to 81.5% for the Class IV, whilst at the same time the concavity of these coins increased. As the Class IV histamenon is the least fine and most concave it is probably dated to c.1054/55.³²³ Hendy believes that the stars represent the appearance of a supernova in the constellation Taurus, giving rise to the Crab Nebula;³²⁴ this phenomenon was visible from July 1054 to April 1056. Whilst this event is not recorded in Byzantine primary sources, and two eclipses of the sun, which are recorded,³²⁵ are too short to correspond to a supernova, the evidence of the stars, the fineness and the concavity appear to suggest a late issue date.

The military element is more marked on the Constantinopolitan miliaresion, where on the reverse Constantine stands facing, wearing scale armour, cloak, and crown with cross and pendilia. His left hand holds the hilt of a sword whose sheath rests on the ground; his right hand holds a long cross. (**Fig. 12.**)³²⁶ On the obverse the Virgin stands, orans and nimbate. The inscription, unusually running continuously from obverse to reverse, reads (obverse): MP ΘV +ΔΕΠΙΟΙ ΝΑCΩZ ΟΙC; and (reverse): ΕVCΕΡΗ ΜΟΝΟΜΑΧΟΝ ('O Lady, preserve the pious Monomachos'.) This forms a dodecasyllabic stichos, similar in form to those found on seals of elite persons and featuring the Virgin. It also emphasises Constantine's elite patronym over

³²³ DOC 3.1, 40.

³²⁴ DOC 3.2, 734-6.

³²⁵ Grumel 1958, 465.

³²⁶ BICC: coin nos B5354, B5355, B5356. **See fig. 12.** DOC 3.2, 736, 745-46, coin nos 7a.1 to 7a.7, 7b.1 to 7b.3; plate LIX 7a.1, 7a.3, 7a.5, 7b.2, 7b.3. DOC dates this miliaresion to 1042-55. Grierson states that it could have been struck when the rebel Leo Tornikios appeared at the walls of Constantinople in September 1047, but that this is 'conjecture'. However, as the miliaresion was the vehicle of particular innovations, it should be treated as a possibility. As the dating of the Class IV histamenon is likely to have been at the end of the reign, an early date of issue of the miliaresion would make it the vehicle of reintroduction of military symbolism to the coinage, in line with its innovative role.

his imperial name. This spatial arrangement of the inscription has the effect of linking the Virgin and Constantine and emphasises his devotion to her. This use of the dodecasyllabic stichos on a coin appears to be unique, and like the stichos on seals was an appeal for the protection of the Virgin. The tenth-century seal of Epiphanios, archon of Dememtrias, features on the obverse a rosace and a circular inscription between two borders of dots reading: +Μ(ῆτ)ερ Θ(εο)ῦ φύλατ(τε) τὸν σὸν οἶκ(έτην). The reverse consists of the inscription: +Ἐπιφανίω ἄρχοντι Δημητριάδος. The obverse inscription is correctly dodecasyllabic, but the reverse inscription is hypermetric.³²⁷ A seal which like the miliaresion of Constantine features an image of the Virgin on the obverse belonged to Peter, the metropolitan of Thebes, and may date to the 1070s. On the obverse the Virgin is pictured holding the infant Christ in front of her, and with the inscription: Μ(ήτη)ρ Θ(εο)ῦ ἡ ἐπίσκε {π} ψις. The reverse inscription is dodecasyllabic, reading: +Μ(ήτη)ερ Θ(εο)ῦ, σκέποις με τὸν Οηβῶν Πέτπον.³²⁸

There is thus a link between the inscription on Constantine's miliaresion and these seals of elite persons in that the form is dodecasyllabic, and that the appeal is to the Virgin. It is also of note that in the inscription he refers to himself as 'Monomachos', rather than his imperial name. Constantine came from a distinguished family, but was not a member of the military aristocracy; he drew support from commercial families in Constantinople, and

³²⁷ DO Seals 2, 54-5, seal no 12.1. Nesbitt and Oikonomides note the lack of coherence between the obverse inscription (in the accusative) and the reverse inscription (in the dative) and suggest that this may be due to metrics.

³²⁸ DO Seals 2, 1994, 61, seal no 21.2. Nesbitt and Oikonomides note that the engraver incorrectly carved an O instead of a Θ in the reverse inscription, and added an unnecessary π in the obverse inscription.

later alienated the military aristocracy.³²⁹ With such a clear reference to battle in his patronym it is possible that his name influenced his adoption of military symbols on his coinage,³³⁰ for the reintroduction of military symbolism to the coinage can be viewed in the circumstances of Constantine's reign, which was characterised by external and internal conflict. Externally there were attacks by the Rus', the Turks, the Pechenegs; and in Sicily by the Normans. Internally Constantine faced serious revolts by George Maniakes in 1043, and by Leo Tornikios in 1047, and after these revolts had been put down Constantine celebrated triumphs. The triumph following the revolt of Tornikios was recorded as being 'greater than any of those which won renown in the past'.³³¹ There is also a comment by Psellos that may be significant, which appears not to have been considered previously in relation to Constantine's coinage. Psellos wrote that Constantine needed to be convinced of the dangers around him, regarding himself as protected by God, and that he told the emperor, 'Everyone who goes to war carries a shield and sword. The soldier's head is protected by a helmet, while a breastplate covers the rest of his body'.³³² It is thus possible that Constantine could have heeded the advice of Psellos by incorporating arms and armour on his miliaresion. Such symbols could have been a means of offsetting his unwarlike figure, for he never led an army in the field, but given that his reign saw fourteen rebellions he nevertheless reigned for thirteen years.³³³

³²⁹ Brand and Cutler 1991, 504.

³³⁰ I am indebted to Brian McLaughlin for this insight.

³³¹ Psellos 1966, 198-99, 220.

³³² Psellos 1966, [133-34], 225.

³³³ Cheynet 1990, 57-65.

Constantine does not appear to have been depicted with any military symbols in media other than coins. Whilst there is a crown which bears a portrait of Constantine, it is believed to be a gift from him to King Andrew I of Hungary (1046-60), rather than a crown worn by Constantine. The crown consists of ten enamel plaques; the plaque featuring Constantine shows him holding the labarum, but no weapons.³³⁴ In two other extant portrayals Constantine appears unarmed: in the mosaic depicting him with the empress Zoe, in Hagia Sophia;³³⁵ and in the Codex Sinait. gr. 364.³³⁶ The Codex contains the 45 Homilies of St John Chrysostom and has two miniatures; one of St Matthew handing his gospel to Chrysostom, and one of Constantine IX with Zoe and her sister Theodora. Constantine holds a sceptre in his right hand and the *akakia* in his left. Zoe and Theodora each hold a sceptre in their left hands; their right hands rest on their chests. Constantine, Zoe and Theodora all wear crowns and each has another crown suspended above their heads.

The use of military types increased on the coins of Isaac I (1057-59).³³⁷ The obverse of the Class I histamenon portrays Christ on a backless throne; his right hand is raised in blessing and his left hand holds a book. On the reverse Isaac stands facing, wearing scale armour; in his right hand he holds the labarum, and in his left a sheathed sword. **(Fig. 15.)**³³⁸ The obverse

³³⁴ The other plaques feature the empress Zoe; the empress Theodora; three depict dancing figures; a female representation of Humility; a female representation of Truth; St Peter; and St Andrew. Talbot Rice 1959, 320-21, plate 134; Evans and Wixom 1997, 210-12, plate 145; Parani 2003, 27-8.

³³⁵ Spatharakis 1976, 101-02; plate 67.

³³⁶ Spatharakis 1976, 99-101; plate 66.

³³⁷ Theodora (1055-56) and Michael VI (1056-57) did not issue any military types.

³³⁸ BICC: coin no B5365. **See fig. 15.** DOC 3.2, 761, coin nos 1.1-1.4; plate LXIII, coin nos 1.2, 1.3

inscription reads +IhSXISNCX RCNANTIhM ('Jesus Christ Kings of Kings'); and the reverse +ICAAKIOC RACIAE VCPΩM. This portrayal is similar to the miliaresion of Constantine IX. On Isaac's tetarteron the iconography is similar, but a globus cruciger replaces the labarum; the sword in the left hand is sheathed.³³⁹ The inscription is as that on the Class I histamenon.

However the iconography of the Class II histamenon appears more martial. Whilst the obverse, like the Class I histamenon and the tetarteron, shows a figure of Christ with his right hand raised in blessing and his left holding the Gospels, and with the same inscription, the appearance of Isaac differs. The emperor stands facing, with scale armour, cloak, and crown with pendilia as before, but with his right hand he holds a drawn sword over his right shoulder, whilst his left hand holds the scabbard pointing to his left . (**Fig. 16.**)³⁴⁰ The effect of the scabbard's angle suggests that Isaac has just drawn the sword; inscription: +ICAAKIOC RACIAEVCPΩM. Grierson provides a succinct argument on whether the Class I or Class II histamenon came first, suggesting on evidence of the decoration on the Gospel book cover that Class I preceded Class II. However, he admits that it is possible that the Class II came first, causing offence (see below), and was then replaced by the less aggressive Class I.³⁴¹ Grierson did not consider initially another possibility: that Class I came first, and that continuing internal opposition might have prompted Isaac to project his power more dramatically by issuing Class II,

³³⁹ BICC: coin no B5368. DOC 3.2, 763, coin nos 3.1-3.3; plate LXIII, coin nos 3.2, 3.3.

³⁴⁰ BICC: coin no B5367. **See fig. 16.** DOC 3.2, 762, coin nos 2.1-2.8; plate LXIII, coin nos 2.1, 2.4, 2.5.

³⁴¹ DOC 3.2, 760.

with the sword drawn, but in a later work he did consider this possibility.³⁴²

This image of the emperor carrying a drawn sword was not only dramatic, but completely new. Unlike the Class I histamenon where only Isaac's left hand held a sword, and his right the labarum, the traditional symbol of authority, on this Class II histamenon both hands were occupied with sword and scabbard.

Isaac's use of a drawn sword image was significant because contemporary historians commented on it; references to coinage are very rare in primary sources. Attaleiates recorded, 'He even had himself depicted on his coins with a drawn sword, and this was the beginning of his reign and its accomplishments'.³⁴³ This comment appears to be descriptive, but the tone of Skylitzes Continuatus is more critical:

Komnenos, girding himself in the imperial office, in the manner in which was said, and exhibiting the repute of manliness and experience of military nobility, is forthwith represented as a sword bearer on the imperial nomisma, not ascribing the whole to God but to his own strength and experience in war.³⁴⁴

This passage appears to be realistic, in acknowledging the experience of Isaac in war, but makes clear that his success was not due to experience alone; rather, Isaac should have ascribed success to God. It may be asked therefore if Isaac sought deliberately to be provocative in his coin design, or whether his action was unwitting, and in this context the comments of Matthew of Edessa should be noted:

Komnenos gave the order to strike coins in his name, and where he was represented with a sword on his shoulder, 'For', he said, 'it is with my sword that I won the crown.' He offended God by these proud words, and committed quite a few other actions which rendered him guilty to Christians.³⁴⁵

³⁴² Grierson 1982, 200.

³⁴³ Attaleiates 2012, 12, [60], 1, 109.

³⁴⁴ Skylitzes Continuatus 1968, 103, l. 1-4.

³⁴⁵ Matthieu d'Edesse 1858, II, LXXIX, 8-9. Dulaurier's French translation of the original Armenian reads: 'Comnène donna l'ordre de frapper des monnaies en son nom, et où il était représenté avec un glaive sur l'épaule, <<car, disait-il, c'est avec mon épée que j'ai conquis la couronne>>. Il offensa Dieu par ces paroles orgueilleuses, et commit bien d'autres actions qui

However a more recent translation of the Armenian original renders the passage differently:

Comnenus ordered money to be minted in his name and he be represented on the coin with a sword strapped on his shoulder, with the caption: "By the sword I gained control of the imperial throne." Comnenus was not liked because of these words and also because he committed various perfidious acts against the Christians.³⁴⁶

This translation has no mention of offending God, and in a footnote Dostourian, citing the *Cambridge Medieval History*, states that Isaac's portrayal of himself carrying a sword was not the chief factor in opposition to himself, but rather his zeal and haste in reform, which antagonised powerful figures in the church and in the civil bureaucracy.³⁴⁷ The possibility of offending God was also touched upon by Zonaras, who, whilst not stating specifically that Isaac had offended God nevertheless implies that Isaac did not acknowledge help from God in his success:

Komnenos established himself in his rule; he ascribed this success [good fortune] to himself and not to God and it is clear that he minted [incised] himself sword in hand on his nomisma; he all but shouted that 'This helped me to imperial rule, not something else'.³⁴⁸

Morrisson has emphasised that the authors commenting on Isaac may have misunderstood his actions in portraying himself with a drawn sword. She notes that Skylitzes Continuatus was 'moved by political reasons', whilst Matthew of Edessa came from an area distant from Constantinople, and was thus less familiar with Byzantine tradition. She points out further that the Archangel Michael, with an unsheathed sword, had appeared on a seal which

le rendirent coupable envers les chrétiens.' I have translated the first two words in the second phrase 'et où' literally but they could presumably be translated alternatively as 'on which'.

³⁴⁶ Dostourian 1973, vol 1, part II, 5, 146.

³⁴⁷ Dostourian 1973, vol 2, part II, 5, fn 12, 589. *Cambridge Medieval History* 1936, IV, I, 322. It is ironic that Isaac should have antagonised members of the church's hierarchy in such a short time, given that Skylitzes records that the first persons to acclaim Isaac were the patriarch of Constantinople, and the patriarch of Antioch. Skylitzes 2010, 464.

³⁴⁸ Zonaras 1897, III, 665, l.20 and 666, l.1-3.

commemorated his miracle at Chonai; this symbol was popular with the Byzantine army.³⁴⁹

However, even with differences in interpretation, the importance of four authors deliberately commenting on the imagery of this Class II histamenon is notable, and suggests that the coin might be seen as representing a redefinition of the balance of power between God and the emperor. Given the rarity of references to coinage in the primary sources these references appear significant: Kazhdan suggests that the image of Isaac with a drawn sword represents a radical change from the traditional imperial image.³⁵⁰ The imperial ideal itself was changing at this time, for while at the beginning of the tenth century it comprised piety, spiritual fortitude, righteousness, chastity, and intelligence, by the middle of the eleventh century military prowess and noble origin had been added, with military prowess being accepted more readily than noble origin.³⁵¹ The drawn sword could have been seen as an attribute of the army, and Isaac's background was of the military aristocracy, a group whose power was increasing in the eleventh century, while the imperial ideal was evolving simultaneously.³⁵² The aristocracy coming to power was a heterogeneous mix of military and bureaucratic families; some reforms of Isaac were in fact opposed by bureaucratic factions.³⁵³

There may have been a further link between Isaac and the army in that it has been suggested that the custom of proclaiming an emperor by raising him on a shield (see chapter 2) was noted again in the mid-eleventh century.

³⁴⁹ Morrisson 2013, 80-2; Nesbitt and Oikonomides 1996, seal nos 99.6-7, 174-5.

³⁵⁰ Kazhdan 1984, 50.

³⁵¹ Kazhdan 1984, 51-52.

³⁵² Kazhdan and Epstein 1985, 104-16.

³⁵³ Cheynet 1990, 475-80. Brand and Cutler 1991, 1011-12.

Kazhdan and Epstein refer to 'this ritual, a mark of the bond between a ruler and his army'. However the authors do not state whether or not Isaac was acclaimed in this way.³⁵⁴ Kazhdan has also recorded that the revival of proclaiming an emperor by raising him on a shield appears to be nearly contemporary with Isaac's issue of coinage where he carried an unsheathed sword,³⁵⁵ and Psellos records that the rebel Leo Tornikios was acclaimed by raising on a shield in 1047.³⁵⁶ That the custom persisted is shown by two marble roundels, dated to the twelfth century, each of which show a Byzantine emperor, possibly Isaac II or Alexios III, standing on a shield.³⁵⁷ It should also be noted that while shield-raising symbolised the superior status of the emperor in terms of authority, it would also have been viewed in Christian terms as a reference to the raising of Christ.³⁵⁸

The combination of military dress and sword, seen on the coins of Constantine IX and Isaac I, was not utilised by Constantine X (1059-67),³⁵⁹

³⁵⁴ Kazhdan and Epstein 1985, 113 -14.

³⁵⁵ Kazhdan 1984, 51. Current thinking differs from Kazhdan and sees that shield-raising probably did not undergo a 'revival' in the eleventh century, but was used during a long period of Byzantine history, without necessarily being in constant use; see chapter 2.

³⁵⁶ Psellos 1966, [4], 40, 110; and [6], 105, 209. Psellos notes a second case, admittedly Bulgarian rather Byzantine, where Peter Deljan was proclaimed ruler in 1040 by raising on a shield.

³⁵⁷ Peirce and Tyler 1941, 3 – 9. Kazhdan states that the discs on which the emperors stand are probably shields; Kazhdan 1984, 51. Surprisingly, more recent accounts of shield-raising do not mention the roundels, e.g. Grotowski 2010, 251-2.

³⁵⁸ 'The raising of the emperor, whether on a shield or on a platform or in the royal box of the Hippodrome, symbolized his superior place on the ladder of authority, just as it recalled the raising of Christ', Cameron 1979, 34.

³⁵⁹ The lack of military imagery on the coins of Constantine X might be a reflection of his belief in diplomacy, not war (Psellos 1966, [17], 339); his reliance on persons around him; and a lack of serious competitors. Constantine created his brother John Caesar, (Psellos 1966, [26], 342) and made his wife Eudokia Makrembolitissa Augusta. He also associated his sons Michael (VII) and Constantius with him as Augusti. It is notable that on Constantine's Class I follis, where he and Eudokia appear on the reverse, Eudokia occupies the senior position on the viewer's left. (BICC B5391. DOC 3.2, 774-6, coin nos 8.1-8.32.)

nor by Romanos IV (1067-71).³⁶⁰ The combination, and in a similar style, appeared again on coins of Michael VII (1071-78), and of Nikephoros III (1078-81). On the Class II miliaresion from Constantinople Michael is portrayed on the reverse in crown and pendilia, with a breastplate and military dress, holding a long cross in his right hand, while his left hand rests on a sheathed sword. On the obverse the Virgin appears standing, nimbate and orans. (**Fig. 17.**)³⁶¹ Inscription (obverse): +ΘΚΕΡΟΗΘΕΙ ΤΩC ΩΔΟΛΛΩ, and reverse: +ΜΙΧΑΗΛ ΡΑCΙΑ ΟΔΚΑ. Military symbols appeared on no other coins of Michael. In media other than coins, his portrayal on the Holy Crown of Hungary depicts him with a sheathed sword, and this crown also depicts the warrior saints St George and St Demetrios.³⁶² A further depiction of Michael VII occurs on an enamel plaque on the Khakhoulis Triptych, but on this plaque there are no military symbols.³⁶³ Michael, with his interest in books and

³⁶⁰ The constitutional position of Romanos IV was complicated. Constantine X died in May 1067, leaving his wife Eudokia as empress and regent for their three sons, Michael (VII), Constantius, and Andronikos. Eudokia had made a solemn promise to Constantine not to remarry, but nevertheless married Romanos Diogenes on January 1st 1068, which made him emperor, effectively until his defeat at Manzikert in August 1071. Despite Romanos being emperor Eudokia and Michael VII appeared to regard Romanos as only the regent for the sons of Constantine X. A sense of the position of Romanos may be seen in the order of precedence demonstrated on his histamena, where Michael VII (in the senior position), Andronikos and Constantius appear on the obverse, with Romanos and Eudokia on the reverse, with Christ between them. (BICC B5424. DOC 3.2, 789-91, coin nos 1.1-1.10, 2.1-2.9.) Such constraints could indicate that Romanos had less control over the coinage than he might have had. It is possible that had he appeared armed this could have been interpreted as a threat to the sons of Constantine X. Attaleiates records that Romanos 'was surrounded by his stepsons who shared his throne, or rather, one must say, by those who were lying in wait for him'. (Attaleiates 2012, 17, 1, l. 5-7.)

³⁶¹ BICC: coin nos B5467, B5468. **See fig. 17.** DOC 3.2, 811-12, coin nos 7a.1-7a.3, 7b.1-7b.2; plate LXVII, coin nos 7a.1, 7a.2, 7b.1. It is of interest that this appearance of the armed emperor, after an absence between 1059-71, should occur again on the miliaresion, the coin associated with innovation.

³⁶² Talbot Rice 1959, 320-21 and plate 134; Kalavrezou 1994, 241-59; Evans and Wixom 1997, 187; Parani 2003, 27-8; Brubaker 2009, 36-8. The crown was a gift from Michael to King Géza of Hungary, so the portrayals of Michael on it would not have been intended to invoke his authority over his Byzantine subjects, but to insinuate his superior status over Géza to the Hungarians. See discussion in chapter 1.

³⁶³ The plaque forms the top part of the enamel decoration on the central part of a large icon cabinet. Wessel 1969, 115.

philosophy, was ill-equipped to manage the threats around him,³⁶⁴ when the empire was being pressed by the Seljuks, Serbs, Normans, and by nomadic tribes from across the Danube.³⁶⁵ Internally, Michael was called upon to face eleven revolts in seven years,³⁶⁶ and by the spring of 1078 Michael had abdicated in favour of Nikephoros Botaneiates.

Nikephoros III faced similar problems of authority as his predecessor, with the Turks plundering as far as the Asian suburbs of Constantinople; and with internal rebellions focussed around Nikephoros Bryennios, Nikephoros Basilakes, Nikephoros Melissenos, and the Komnenoi. Nikephoros's short reign of three years was marked by eight revolts against him.³⁶⁷ Nikephoros's use of military symbolism on his only coin with such symbols is very similar to that of his predecessor. On the Class II miliaresion from Constantinople the Virgin appears standing, orans and nimbate on the obverse, with the inscription +ΘKEROHΘ' TCΩΔOVΛΩ. On the reverse Nikephoros is seen standing, wearing a crown with cross and pendilia, breastplate and scale armour, and with a long cross in his right hand and a sheathed sword with its point on the ground in his left. Inscription: +NIKHΦΔEC TΩROTAN'. (**Fig. 18.**)³⁶⁸ A further debasement of the coinage occurred during the reign of Nikephoros, necessitated by his extravagance towards his followers; the 'gold'

³⁶⁴ Psellos 1966, [4], 369.

³⁶⁵ Psellos 1966, 367 n. 1.

³⁶⁶ Cheynet 1990, 76-85.

³⁶⁷ Cheynet 1990, 85-90.

³⁶⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 3.2, 830, coin nos 7a, 7b.1, 7b.2; plate LXIX, coin nos 7a, 7b.1, 7b.2. **See fig. 18, coin no 7a, BZC.1956.23.229.** This coin maintains the status of the miliaresion in displaying the symbol of the armed emperor.

coinage became low quality electrum, with a fineness rarely above nine carats,³⁶⁹ and in addition official salaries were reduced.

Conclusions: In surveying the period 1042-81 four emperors (Constantine IX, Isaac I, Michael VII, and Nikephoros III) were depicted on their coins with military symbolism of both dress and weapons. There are a number of similarities between the issues of these emperors: all wear armour; all carry a sword; all wear a crown with cross and pendilia; and all place the Virgin or Christ on the obverse. Two notable differences are that only Isaac portrays himself with a drawn sword as well as with a sheathed sword, and only Isaac places these military symbols on his *histamena*; the other three emperors place them on their *miliaresia*.³⁷⁰ The drawn sword of Isaac is of significance, and unusually produced comments from contemporary commentators; it was clearly a more martial image than one with a sheathed sword. There may be significance in the dress of the four emperors, as well their weapons: all wear armour, but all four also wear a crown rather than a helmet, which appears to suggest that overall, despite the armour, ceremonial dress was also needed to emphasise imperial power.³⁷¹ These four emperors do however represent a well-defined group in Byzantine coinage following the reintroduction of military symbolism, and their successors would build on this reintroduction to expand such use.

³⁶⁹ DOC 3.2, 821-22.

³⁷⁰ The preponderance of the *miliaresion* as the vehicle of the armed emperor is notable, being utilised by three of these four emperors. It reinforces the innovative and communicative role of the *miliaresion*.

³⁷¹ Similarly, in the *Madrid Skylitzes*, Basil II is portrayed carrying a shield and lance, but wears a civilian headdress rather than a helmet. Tsamakda 2002, 223-24, miniature 478, fol. 195v, fig. 467.

Development of Military Symbols

The range of military personnel and weapons on coins developed during the reign of Alexios (1081-1118). Alexios reformed the denominations of the coinage in 1092, and the coinage is referred to as 'pre-reform' (1081-92) and 'post-reform' (1092-1118). The coinage of the very early part of his reign is referred to as 'transitional', marking the transition from Nikephoros III to Alexios I. It should be noted that the question of mint activity in the early part of Alexios' reign is not straightforward, and forms a continuation of the uncertainties attached to mint activity at Thessaloniki in the eleventh century. Whilst the nomisma histamenon featuring Michael IV and the Archangel Michael (see above) is attributed to Thessaloniki in the Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue,³⁷² DOC then attributes no coins to Thessaloniki for any emperor from Zoe and Michael V (1041-42) to Nikephoros III (1078-81). An issue of signed copper folles under Nikephoros III might be assigned to Thessaloniki, but Grierson did not consider the evidence strong enough to alter the attribution from Constantinople.³⁷³ In allocating some coins of the early reign of Alexios I to Thessaloniki (see below), Hendy has to argue for the Thessaloniki mint being opened when Alexios passed through the city in September 1081, on his way to engage the Normans.³⁷⁴ Whilst the presence of St Demetrios on these coins of Alexios would support the Thessalonian connection, absolute proof is lacking.

An electrum/silver histamenon of 1081/82 from Thessaloniki which features on the obverse a bust of Christ, bearded and nimbate, and holding

³⁷² DOC 3.2, 726.

³⁷³ DOC 3.2, 641-43.)

³⁷⁴ DOC 4.1, 129, 189. This thesis follows DOC 4.1 in its mint attribution of these early coins of Alexios I, but accepts that such attribution is not certain.

the Gospels in his left hand. The inscription reads []KERO ΛΛΕ[]ΙΩ IC XC.³⁷⁵ On the reverse are full length figures of St Demetrios on the left, with the emperor on the right. The saint is beardless and nimbate, and wears a military tunic, breastplate and sagion; he holds a sword in his left hand. Alexios wears a stemma, divitision, collar-piece and jewelled loros, the costume seen frequently on coins where the emperor is not wearing military dress. Both figures hold between them a labarum with a long shaft. The inscription reads: .ΔΙ|ΜΙ|Τ|Ι Δ|Ε|C|Π|Τ|Η. A substantive issue of histamena with a similar design in billon was minted in two variants: variant one, dated to 1082-87, is identical to that described, except that St Demetrios and Alexios hold a patriarchal cross on two steps, with a globule at its base. The obverse and reverse inscriptions are identical to the electrum variety.³⁷⁶ Variant two is dated to 1087-92, and the obverse design is as the electrum variety, but with a difference in the inscription: +KERO ΛΛΕ[]. On the reverse the figures again hold a patriarchal cross on two steps with a globule at its base, and St Demetrios carries a sword as previously; the variation lies in the loros of the emperor, which here has a jewelled end. Inscription: Δ|Μ Δ|C|C|Π|Τ|Η. (**Fig. 20.**)³⁷⁷

³⁷⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.1, 204-05, coin nos 4.1, 4.2; vol. 4.2, plate I, coin nos 4.1, 4.2. Hendy emphasises that the term 'transitional coinage' strictly applies to the short-lived histamenon issue of 1081-82, from Constantinople. Whilst the Thessalonian histamenon would be contemporary with this metropolitan issue the design of the Thessalonian coin echoes the histamenon of Michael IV, where the Archangel Michael hands the labarum to Michael. Hendy states that he refers to the 1081-82 histamenon of Alexios from Thessaloniki as 'transitional' to conform to the conventions of standard terminology. Hendy, DOC 4.1, 188-90.

³⁷⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.1, 205, coin nos 5a.1, 5a.2, 5a.3; 4.2, plate I, coin nos 5a.1, 5a.2.

³⁷⁷ BICC: coin no B5532. **See fig. 20.** DOC 4.1, 206, coin nos 5b.1, 5b.2, 5b.3, 5b.4; 4.2, plate I, coin nos 5b.2, 5b.3, 5b.4.

On a silver alloy concave lightweight miliaresion, dated to 1081-92 from Constantinople, the obverse features the Virgin, nimbate and orans, and wearing the maphorion and tunic, with the inscription +ΘΚΕΡΟΗΘΕΙ ΤΩCΩΔΟVΛΩ ΜΡ ΘV.³⁷⁸ On the reverse Alexios appears standing; he wears the stemma; a short military tunic and breastplate; and sagion. In his right hand he holds a cross on a long shaft, and in his left a sheathed sword, with its point on the ground. Between the emperor and the cross is a pellet. The inscription reads +ΛΛΕ[Ι]ΩΔΕC ΠΟΤΤΩΚΟΜΝ. A 1/3 miliaresion from Thessaloniki, and also dated to 1081-92, features on the obverse the half figures of St Demetrios to the left, and Alexios to the right.³⁷⁹ The saint is beardless and nimbate, and while his dress is not clear, it probably consists of a breastplate, tunic, and sagion. The emperor wears stemma, divitision, collar-piece and jewelled loros, and receives from St Demetrios a cross on a long shaft. The inscription is ΗΜΗΔCΟΙΓΛΟ ΛΛΕ[Ι]ΩΔΕCΠ. The reverse has no image, simply the inscription +ΧΕ ΡΟΗΘΕΙ ΛΛΕ[Ι]Ω ΔΕCΠΟΤΗ ΤΩΚΟΜΝΗ ΝΩ arranged vertically.

All these issues which feature military symbols appeared before the currency reforms of 1092, and only one issue after this date features military images: a lead tetarteron noummion from Thessaloniki, dated to 1092/93. The obverse features full-length figures of St Demetrios on the left, and John II on the right. John is beardless, and wears civilian dress; the saint wears

³⁷⁸ BICC: coin no B5529. DOC 4.1, 210, coin nos 10.1, 10.2, 10.3; 4.2, plate II, coin nos 10.2, 10.3. It is again noteworthy that the miliaresion is the only coin chosen for Alexios to appear as the armed emperor. On his other coins featuring military symbolism Alexios appears unarmed: the military component is provided by St Demetrios.

³⁷⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.1, 211-12, coin nos 13.1, 13.2; 4.2, plate II, coin no 13.2.

breastplate, military tunic, and sagion. In contrast to the depictions of this saint noted above, on this coin he carries his sword in his right hand, and holds a labarum with a long shaft in his left hand; John grasps this labarum with his right hand; inscription: ΔΙ ΙΩΔΕCΠΤ. The reverse features Alexios in civilian dress, with Irene; they hold between them a cross with a long shaft; inscription: +ΑΑΕ[ΙΙ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ.³⁸⁰ As a comparison between the mints of Thessaloniki and Constantinople (see below) it should be noted that a tetarteron noummion in lead was also issued at Constantinople in 1092/93, and while the reverse iconography is identical to that of Thessaloniki the obverse features Christ on the left holding the labarum with John, who is in civilian dress. The inscriptions are: obverse [] ΙΩΔΕCΠΟΤ with IC XC in the upper field; reverse: ΑΑΕ[ΙΙ]Ω ΕΙΡΗΝΗ.³⁸¹

The difference in iconography between coins from Thessaloniki and from Constantinople is perhaps not surprising, for Thessaloniki would have been the more vulnerable had the Normans broken through at the start of Alexios' reign. As St Demetrios was the patron of Thessaloniki the support of the saint could possibly have been seen as important for Alexios in his campaign against the Normans.³⁸² The design linking Alexios I and St

³⁸⁰ BICC: coin nos B5610, B5611. DOC 4.1, 234-35, coin nos 37.1, 37.2, 37.3, 37.4, 37.5, 37.6; 4.2; plate VI, coin nos 37.1, 37.2, 37.6.

³⁸¹ BICC: coin no B5571. DOC 4.1, 231, coin nos 32.1, 32.2, 32.3, 32.4, 32.5, 32.6; 4.2, plate VI, 32.1, 32.2, 32.3. These lead issues highlight inconsistencies in classification. The Constantinopolitan specimens at Dumbarton Oaks listed by Hendy vary in weight from 4.22 to 4.7g, and are labelled tetartera. By contrast the Barber Constantinopolitan specimen (B5571) weighs 4.0g but is labelled a half-tetarteron. The Dumbarton Oaks Thessalonian examples range from 3.33g to 6.16g, and are labelled tetartera, but similar Thessalonian specimens at the Barber Institute are both labelled half-tetartera but B5610 weighs 6.76g and B5611 3.93g.

³⁸² It has been suggested that through the generosity of Leontius, the prefect of Illyrium, Thessaloniki was granted a relic of Demetrios early in the fifth century, and that a basilica was built there. This could have eclipsed the first sanctuary built to Demetrios in Sirmium, and Sirmium was sacked by Attila in 441 and destroyed by the Avars in 582, leaving Thessaloniki as the sole sanctuary. Vickers 1974, 344-45, 348-50.

Demetrios persisted throughout the pre-reform period of Alexios' coinage in Thessaloniki, whereas in Constantinople there were more differences between the early and later pre-reform issues. The persistence of this design may reflect the association between St Demetrios and Thessaloniki. It could also relate to the devotion of Alexios to St Demetrios: the image on these coins of the saint offering support to Alexios has been described by Hendy as 'striking and meaningful'.³⁸³ In summary, the coinage of the very difficult first years of Alexios' reign features a number of issues with military symbolism, and apparently with more examples from Thessaloniki than from Constantinople.

Alexios I's use of military images on his coinage, and the timing of these, might be related to threats to himself (in terms of legitimation) and the empire (in terms of invasion). Within the coin issues of Alexios discussed some features, such as the military dress worn by Alexios, the sword, and the labarum, have all been noted above as having been used by previous emperors. However, a new symbol was introduced by Alexios, the warrior saint Demetrios, and this appears to be highly significant. The warrior saints were envisaged and represented as armed soldiers. The evolution of their images depended on the militarisation of their roles: from civic official to soldier; from soldier in the ranks to general; from fighting on foot to fighting on horseback, and their miracles involved giving assistance to armies and the defence of cities. The portrayal of warrior saints developed from similar

³⁸³ Hendy DOC 4.1, 190. Anna Comnena 1969, 168.

images on pre-Christian amulets and coins, and in media such as wall paintings in churches.³⁸⁴

St Demetrios was thus a significant symbol on the early coinage of Alexios, appearing in military dress on coins dated 1081-92, and being recognised as a warrior saint around the time of the First Crusade (1097-1104), after there was evidence of his military portrayal on a Cappadocian monument dated to 1060-61.³⁸⁵ A resemblance between the images of St Demetrios handing the labarum to Alexios I³⁸⁶ and the archangel Michael handing the labarum to Michael IV³⁸⁷ has been noted by Hendy, but there are several points here which may be added.³⁸⁸ Hendy tends to underestimate the significance of the first appearance of a warrior saint on a Byzantine coin: whilst it is true that the archangel Michael was featured on an earlier coin of Michael IV from Thessaloniki (1034-41), Michael was not a warrior saint, but an archangel.³⁸⁹ The archangel Michael may have been portrayed in other media in the company of warrior saints, but St Demetrios was still the first of the warrior saints to feature on a coin. Further, in his portrayal with the emperor Michael IV the archangel Michael wears the *chlamys*, which was part of court costume, having lost its military character by the sixth century, but in St Demetrios' portrayals with Alexios I the saint is dressed as a soldier, with a

³⁸⁴ Maguire et al 1989, 25–28.

³⁸⁵ Walter 2003, 77.

³⁸⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.1, 204 – 05, coin nos 4.1, 4.2; vol. 4.2, plate I, coin nos 4.1, 4.2.

³⁸⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 3.2, 726, coin no 2; plate LVIII, coin no 2. Inscription obverse: +IhSXISREX RESNANTIhM; reverse: +MIX[]HL ΔESIOT.

³⁸⁸ Hendy 1999 DOC 4.2, 189, 190.

³⁸⁹ Walter comments that Michael 'never figures in echelons of warrior saints, but he had become important to the Byzantines as leader of the celestial army.' Walter 2003, 293.

military tunic, and breastplate.³⁹⁰ In addition, the archangel Michael is not armed, whilst St Demetrios carries a sword. These differences emphasise the military symbolism and significance of the coins of Alexios I over those of Michael IV. The resemblance between the figures of the archangel and St Demetrios is relatively superficial; the detailed differences in their portrayals appear more significant. The use of St Demetrios in this context might reflect the seriousness of the threats both to Thessaloniki and to Alexios. Because of its location, and the possibility of approach via the Strymon and Vardar valleys, Thessaloniki was closer than the capital to invasion routes, and thus also had the role of an advanced supply base.

There is a further factor of note on these coins: the posture of St Demetrios differs from that of the archangel Michael, in that St Demetrios is portrayed turning towards Alexios as he hands him the labarum, whereas Michael looks straight ahead. A similar posture is seen on those coins where St Demetrios, in handing a patriarchal cross on a long shaft to Alexios, again turns towards the emperor. **(Fig. 20.)**³⁹¹ There appear to be variations here in that St Demetrios is portrayed as turning most markedly where he hands on the labarum, and slightly less so where he hands on the patriarchal cross, but this variation is not noted by Hendy. In his earlier work Hendy notes that the portrayal of the saint is not frontal, but that he is 'represented laterally'.³⁹² This is not strictly correct as St Demetrios is not portrayed sideways on as Hendy suggests, but is partly turning towards Alexios. Further, in this earlier work

³⁹⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.1, 204–06, coin nos 4.1, 4.2; vol. 4.2, plate I, coin nos 4.1, 4.2.

³⁹¹ BICC: coin no B5532. **See fig. 20.** DOC 4.1, 205 – 06, coin nos 5a.1, 5a.2, 5a.3, 5b.1, 5b.2, 5b.3, 5b.4; 211–12, coin nos 13.1, 13.2; 4.2, plate 1, coin nos 5a.1, 5a.2, 5b.2, 5b.3, 5b.4; plate 2, coin no 13.2.

³⁹² Hendy 1969, 45.

he notes a similar use of such iconography in a Norman copy of a Byzantine original, the silver alloy scyphate ducat of Roger II of Sicily (1130-54) which features on the reverse King Roger on the viewer's right, and his son Roger, duke of Apulia, on the left.³⁹³ The king is frontal and the duke turns to him. The king is in civilian dress and holds the globus cruciger in his left hand; the duke wears a military tunic and breastplate, and holds a sword in his right hand, whilst between them they hold a patriarchal cross on three steps. On the obverse is a bust of Christ, bearded and nimbate, and holding the Gospels in his left hand.

The resemblance of this Sicilian coin to the Byzantine coins discussed here is clear; it appears to be a copy of a Byzantine original, which could be expected for two reasons. Firstly, the original *trachea nomismata* would have been circulating in an area of conflict; and secondly Roger's Sicily was open to Byzantine influence, having imitated Byzantine iconography, as in the church of the Martorana in Palermo, founded by George of Antioch, where Roger is depicted as an emperor crowned by Christ. It is not in visual terms the Sicilian copy differs from the Byzantine original, for on both the figure on the viewer's left turns to the figure on the right; the difference lies in the representation of precedence, for the left is the position of honour.³⁹⁴ Thus the Sicilian copy presents Roger's son in a senior position to his father, and, as the son turns to his father, he has also the turning posture associated with a senior figure, as St Demetrios has in turning to Alexios.

³⁹³ BICC: no specimen. MEC 1998, 14, 120-1; plate 15, coin nos 212, 213. Hendy 1969, 42-43, plate 45.11.

³⁹⁴ DOC 3.I, 109.

Hendy tends not to recognise these subtleties, which, with the omission of any note in his 1999 work, suggests that by then Hendy underestimated the significance of St Demetrios turning to Alexios in handing him the labarum or patriarchal cross. The effect of this posture is a more dynamic portrayal: the emperor appears not only with St Demetrios, but to be receiving the labarum or the cross from him, possibly reflecting the seriousness of the threat to Alexios. The coins on which St Demetrios hands on the labarum are dated to 1081/82, at the very beginning of the reign of Alexios, and could be interpreted as a legitimisation issue. In the designs of the saint handing on a patriarchal cross, the coins are dated to 1081–92, years characterised by external threats. The years 1082/83 in particular were further marked by bitter fighting against the Normans: Anna refers to Alexios being wounded; having suffered an 'intolerable defeat'; with 'the loss of so many noble comrades'.³⁹⁵

On the post-reform tetarteron noummion in lead from Thessaloniki, where John II and St Demetrios are shown holding the labarum, it is noteworthy that the saint does not turn towards John.³⁹⁶ Thus by the time of this issue (1092/93), when the threat to Alexios had decreased, the extra reassurance of the saint turning to the emperor was not needed.³⁹⁷ Alexios' forces had won a decisive victory over the Pechenegs at Levunium (Thrace) in the spring of 1091, and the action of Alexios in being prepared to disinherit

³⁹⁵ Anna Comnena 1969, 156.

³⁹⁶ BICC: coin nos B5610, B5611. DOC 4.1, 234–35, coin nos 37.1, 37.2, 37.3, 37.4, 37.5, 37.6 ; 4.2, plate VI, coin nos 37.1, 37.2, 37.6.

³⁹⁷ The need for reassurance finds a parallel in the suggestion that emperors were traditionally concerned about legitimisation early in their reigns, resulting in the celebration of a greater number of triumphs early in a reign. McCormick notes that in the period 718–1055 eleven of thirty-two imperial victory celebrations occurred within the first three years of the start of an emperor's exercise of power. McCormick 1986, 188.

Constantine Doukas and to install John II as junior emperor could confirm Alexios' stronger and more secure position. Alexios' position was strengthened further between 1092-4 by a series of deaths in the Seljuk ruling family which created weakness and disruption, favourable to Alexios.³⁹⁸

Placing the numismatic evidence in context, it needs to be remembered that from 963 to the late eleventh century, no saintly figure except St Demetrios had appeared on coins.³⁹⁹ Prior to this, from 717 to 963 the only saint to feature on a Byzantine coin was Alexander, who was shown crowning the emperor Alexander (912-13) on the reverse of a gold solidus from Constantinople. Obverse inscription: +IhSXRSEX REgNANTIuM and reverse: +ALEXAnd ROSAVguSTOSROM'.⁴⁰⁰ However the St Alexander depicted here was a fourth century bishop of Constantinople, and not a military saint. The status of Demetrios from the ninth century onwards was summarised as being 'a saintly martyr whose principal task was to protect the city of Thessaloniki and its inhabitants'.⁴⁰¹ Thus as the protector of the city St Demetrios had the same function as the Virgin Mary had in respect to Constantinople; this would have conferred a high status on the saint, which is confirmed by the collection of miracles attributed to St Demetrios.⁴⁰²

St Demetrios' status is emphasised by his iconography on the coins of Alexios I, in that on one type he hands to Alexios the labarum, a Christian and

³⁹⁸ Stephenson 2000, 103, 175. But Anna Komnene makes it clear that Alexios still faced threats from the family groupings around him – see below.

³⁹⁹ There was an isolated appearance of the archangel Michael with the emperor Michael IV (1034-41).

⁴⁰⁰ BICC: coin no B4836. DOC 3.1, 174, 524 – 25, coin nos 2.1, 2.2; 3.2, plate XXXV, coin nos 2.1, 2.2.

⁴⁰¹ Walter 2003, 68, 91.

⁴⁰² Lemerle 1979-81, I: §§ 176-317; 44-46, 83ff. Demetrios is described as *hyperhymnetos*, *panhymnetos*, and *hypermachos*, terms specifically associated only with God and the Theotokos. Koder 1986, II, 523-38 (at 526-28). Macrides 1990, 193 and fn 28, 29.

military symbol of authority, and on another he hands to Alexios the cross, the supreme symbol of Christianity. In employing such iconography Alexios was linking himself to Thessaloniki, and confirming the high status of St Demetrios, using a depiction that had been used in other media. This depiction could be interpreted as enhancing the status of St Demetrios, and by association strengthening a beleaguered emperor, at a time of great uncertainty. Further proof of the status of St Demetrios can be inferred by comparison with another coin series. The lead tetarteron noummion from Thessaloniki, on the obverse of which St Demetrios holds the labarum with John II has been discussed above. On the equivalent lead tetarteron noummion from Constantinople of the same date (1092/93), the iconography is virtually similar, except that the obverse shows John II holding the labarum not with St Demetrios, but with Christ.⁴⁰³ This sharing of a function between the saint and Christ has the effect of emphasising the exceptional status and regard accorded to St Demetrios. In addition to this evidence there was an important personal link between St Demetrios and Alexios I. Anna Komnene's report shows that when Alexios was campaigning against Bohemund in the Larissa area in 1083, Alexios apparently saw St Demetrios in a dream.⁴⁰⁴ After an

⁴⁰³ BICC: coin no B5571 (half-tetarteron). DOC 1999, 4.1, 231, coin nos 32.1, 32.1, 32.3, 32.4, 32.5, 32.6; 4.2, plate VI, coin nos 32.1, 32.2, 32.3.

⁴⁰⁴ Anna Comnena 1969, 167 fn 15, 169. 'When the sun went down he retired to his bed after working all day. He had a dream. It seemed that he was standing in the sanctuary of the great martyr Demetrius and he heard a voice say: 'Cease tormenting yourself and grieve not; on the morrow you will win.' He thought that the sound came to him from one of the ikons suspended in the sanctuary, on which there was a painting of the martyr himself. When he awoke, overjoyed at the voice he had heard in this dream, he invoked the martyr and gave a pledge, moreover, that if it was granted to him to conquer his enemies, he would visit the shrine and dismounting from his horse some stades from the city of Thessalonica he would come on foot and at a slow pace to pay homage.'

This dream corresponds to the hagiographical/iconic type described by Magdalino in which a heavenly figure interacts directly with the dreamer. Here, St Demetrios announces the defeat of Bohemund, the great enemy of Alexios. Magdalino 2014, 130, 132, 142.

ambush followed by further fighting, Bohemund was eventually forced to withdraw, and 'the emperor returned in triumph to Constantinople'.⁴⁰⁵ This incident could have given Alexios a special regard for St Demetrios, and influenced a decision to use an image of the saint on coinage, but if the dates given are correct, then the introduction of some of these coins could have preceded Alexios' dream.⁴⁰⁶ However, it is possible that if Alexios really dreamed about St Demetrios, he could have had a pre-existing special regard for the saint, and that this regard was reflected in the iconography of the coins which featured St Demetrios.

The significance of the introduction of the symbol of St Demetrios to the coinage may be illustrated as well by the action of Alexios in having his son John crowned emperor, and by the timing of the event. John was crowned emperor in autumn 1092; the ceremony probably took place on September 1st, and contemporary Neapolitan documents provide evidence for this.⁴⁰⁷ This would have been the second stage of a two-stage process, whereby in the first stage John would have been proclaimed co-emperor at the time of his baptism (he was born on September 13th 1087), and then crowned full emperor in the autumn of 1092.⁴⁰⁸ The event was marked by the issue of Alexios I's post-reform coinage, on a new denominational pattern. A

⁴⁰⁵ Anna Comnena 1969, 173.

⁴⁰⁶ Hendy dates those featuring St Demetrios, i.e. the transitional coinage of Thessaloniki to 1081/82; variant 1 to 1082-87; and the one-third miliaresion to 1081-92. DOC 4.1, 204-12.

⁴⁰⁷ *Regii Neapolitani Archivi monumenta* vol. V, 146, no 457, November 1092, refers to this latter date as being the twelfth year of Alexios' reign and the first of John's. 174, no 467, September 1093 refers to September 1093 as being the thirteenth year of Alexios' reign and the second of John's. See also Stankovic 2016 14-7. The volume edited by Bucossi and Rodriguez 2016 covers many aspects of John's reign.

⁴⁰⁸ This two-stage process is described by Ruth Macrides: Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 421-24 and especially fn 171. Further, September 1st 1092 was not only the start of the new indictional, and hence financial, year, but also the start of a new indictional cycle. Grumel 1958, 256. This would therefore make this date a strong probability.

series in lead allowed assimilation of the debased nomisma tetarteron, abandoning its precious metal denomination altogether, and using the shape, fabric, and size thus freed up to replace the copper follis of the preceding period.⁴⁰⁹ Thus to mark a decisive break the 'coronation' issue of the tetarteron was in lead, probably at 1/288 of a nomisma.⁴¹⁰

The coins of these years are of interest in that they were the last of any coins of Alexios I which bore a military image, and further that this military image was on a coin which featured John II, Alexios I and Irene. It has been suggested that the pre-reform coinage of Alexios I featuring military imagery was issued at a time of upheaval and weakness both for Alexios and the empire. Alexios could have perceived a potential weakness at the time of crowning John II emperor, for around this time Constantine Doukas, who had been co-emperor and treated with great generosity by Alexios, appeared to become less favoured.⁴¹¹ Thus, the coin issue which features St Demetrios handing the labarum to John II on the obverse, with Alexios and Irene on the reverse, could be seen as attempting to persuade the people of Thessaloniki that John was the legitimate heir. This would, of course, depend on the city being a secure mint at this time; the lack of definite proof on the activity of this mint has been noted.⁴¹² The authority of Alexios to rule had been asserted by the image of St Demetrios handing him the labarum noted above: it would be

⁴⁰⁹ DOC 4.1, 198.

⁴¹⁰ BICC: coin no B5571 [labelled half tetarteron]. DOC 4.1, 198, 231, coin nos 32.1-32.6; 4.2, plate VI, coin nos 32.1, 32.2, 32.3.)

⁴¹¹ Anna would have been placed under her care when she was betrothed to Constantine. Mullett (1984, 206) cites Buckler (*Anna Comnena* 1929, 40-42) in support of this date of removal, but notes that the evidence is 'slightly shaky'.

⁴¹² See p. 101 above.

natural to use similar iconography to emphasise the right of John to rule with and to succeed his father.

The coin issue from Thessaloniki showing St Demetrios handing the labarum to John II might have indicated concern on the part of Alexios I that John might not have been accepted by the people, especially as Constantine Doukas had lost his right to the throne. Constantine's right had been considerable: he was the son of Michael VII (1071-8), was porphyrogenitus, and had been engaged to Anna Komnene, with whom he had shared imperial acclamations. The need to assert the legitimacy of John II by a coin issue from Thessaloniki could have been reinforced by a geographic factor: Constantine Doukas owned land at Serres, which was relatively close to Thessaloniki. Constantine could therefore have been expected to enjoy the support of the local people, more than the emperor's son from Constantinople. It is clear that there were plans for an attempt on the life of Alexios when he stayed with Constantine on the latter's estate in Serres, for Anna Komnene devotes a long passage to the incidents, although there appears to be no suggestion of complicity on the part of Constantine.⁴¹³ Nikephoros Diogenes, however, played a key role. In early 1094 Alexios I had camped en route to Serres, and during the night Diogenes, armed with a sword, approached the sleeping emperor, but his nerve failed him and he delayed his attempt.⁴¹⁴ When Alexios arrived in the area of Serres Constantine Doukas invited him to stay on his estate, and prevailed upon him to extend his stay.⁴¹⁵ When Alexios

⁴¹³ These incidents occurred from February to June 1094. Anna Comnena 1969, 283, 289.

⁴¹⁴ Anna records that Alexios slept with doors unlocked, and with no guard outside; she attributes the deterrence of Diogenes to 'some divine force'. Anna Comnena 1969, 278.

⁴¹⁵ 'When he arrived in the area of Serres, Constantine Ducas the porphyrogenitus, who was accompanying the emperor, invited him to stay on his personal estate, a delightful place with

had taken his bath Diogenes, again armed with a sword, entered the house looking for Alexios, but was intercepted by Tatikios; Anna's comment is relevant: 'Taticius saw him [Diogenes] and because he had known for a long time what Nicephorus was planning, pushed him away.'⁴¹⁶ Thus there is evidence that Diogenes had been a threat to Alexios for a period of time.

The death of Constantine Doukas might add weight to the suggestion that the image of St Demetrios handing the labarum to John II on a tetarteron from Thessaloniki, dated to 1092/93, was an attempt to assert John's legitimacy. Although the end of Constantine Doukas is uncertain, it is believed that he died c. 1095. Constantine was reported to be in poor health in 1094, and 'died soon after this', and certainly before 1097.⁴¹⁷ Constantine's death by 1097 at the latest is attested by the fact that this is the earliest time at which Nikephoros Bryennios is referred to as *gambros*.⁴¹⁸ Constantine's death would clearly have removed from the scene a powerful rival to John II, and would thus have lessened the need to assert the legitimacy of John II to rule. If this is accepted, it might provide a reason why Alexios did not issue any further coinage bearing military imagery from Thessaloniki after the early 1090s, for Constantine, the local rival to John II, would have been dead.

a good supply of cold, drinkable water and apartments big enough to receive an emperor as a guest. Its name was Pentegostis. Alexius accepted the invitation and stayed there. He wanted to leave on the following day, but the porphyrogenitus would not hear of it: he begged him to stay on, at least until he had recovered from the fatigue of his march and washed off the dust of travel in the bath. A costly banquet had in fact already been prepared in his honour. Once more Alexius let himself be persuaded. Nicephorus Diogenes, still lusting for power, carefully awaited the chance to kill the emperor with his own hands....' Anna Comnena 1969, 279.

⁴¹⁶ Anna Comnena 1969, 279. In a further reference (p. 281) Anna records the history of Diogenes' disaffection. It has also been suggested that Diogenes, son of Romanos IV, was affected by discontent over the loss of Asia Minor and Alexios' lack of action in that region.

⁴¹⁷ Mullett 1984, 206.

⁴¹⁸ Nicéphore Bryennios, *Histoire*, ed. P. Gautier 1975, 24; cited by Mullett 1984, 206.

The post-reform coinage of Alexios I, issued from 1092 to 1118, contrasts with that of the pre-reform period (1081-1092) in that while post-1092 the emperor is portrayed with symbols of power such as the labarum-headed sceptre and the labarum there is a complete absence of military symbolism such as weapons, armour, and St Demetrios.⁴¹⁹ After 1093 a broad pattern may be seen, which applies across different mints and different denominations, where the obverse mainly features Christ, and the reverse mainly features Alexios, in non-military dress and carrying the labarum or the labarum-headed sceptre. In the post-reform period there appears to be a renewed emphasis on Christian symbolism, prompting the question why there should be an absence of military images, given the upheaval caused by events such as the First Crusade (1097-1104), a second Norman invasion (1105-07), and, almost until the end of the reign, war with the Turks.

It should be noted that this earlier period, during which all the military issues of Alexios occur, also saw the majority of the rebellions against his rule. Eleven rebellions are recorded during 1081-92; three in 1091-93; one in 1094 (that of Nikephoros Diogenes – see above); but only six between 1095 to 1118.⁴²⁰ It may not be possible to prove a firm link between the frequency of rebellions in the early reign and the issue of coins with military images, but there is clearly the suggestion of such a possibility. It is also possible that earlier in a reign, and hence at a younger age, an emperor might have behaved in a more bellicose manner; such behaviour could possibly be more

⁴¹⁹ The issue in lead from Thessaloniki, dated 1092/93, and featuring John II, St Demetrios with sword, Alexios I, and Irene, has been discussed above.

⁴²⁰ Cheynet 1990, 90-103.

likely to provoke rebellion, or prompt the issue of coinage with military iconography.⁴²¹

In trying to understand the lack of military iconography on the post-reform coinage, perspective is important. War with its eastern neighbours was hardly unusual for the Byzantine empire: if this was a factor in the production of military issues of coins then it could have influenced different emperors in different ways: not all produced such issues. The reign of Alexios differed from that of his predecessors not in wars with the Seljuks, but in the passage of the First Crusade. But here again perspective is important: what was the reaction of Alexios before and during the crusade, i.e. at the time the coinage was being issued? There is some suggestion that the Crusade was not a surprise to Alexios.⁴²² However it is possible that by the time that any request of Alexios to the pope had become reality, with thousands of westerners at the walls of Constantinople, then an element of threat must have been apparent. Certainly the Crusader leaders had to swear fealty to Alexios over the holiest of relics, including the True Cross and the Crown of Thorns. Swearing an oath on relics was a western, not a Byzantine, practice and in his account of the Fourth Crusade Robert de Clari mentions the swearing of oaths over relics by the Crusaders on a number of occasions.⁴²³ In eastern Christendom oaths were sworn only on the Gospels or the cross.⁴²⁴ In requiring the Crusader leaders to swear fealty over the True Cross and the

⁴²¹ A possible link between youth and bellicosity was raised by Magdalino in relation to Manuel I. Magdalino 1983, 334.

⁴²² 'There seems to be general agreement that Urban II would not have preached the crusade if Alexios I had not asked for help against the Turks. It is also fairly evident that when the second, and main, wave of the crusade left Constantinople for Asia Minor in the spring of 1097, it was an army under Byzantine imperial command.' Magdalino 1996, 6.

⁴²³ Robert de Clari 2005 XXIV, p.45; XXIX, 49; LXVIII (twice), 85; and XCIV, 113.

⁴²⁴ Bartlett 2013, 312.

Crown of Thorns Alexios appeared to be aware of the sensibilities of both sides, but by using two objects of such importance there was extra insurance, indicative of potential danger.

But despite all the upheavals of the First Crusade Alexios did not need to issue any coins with military images during its passage, indicating that military issues in the pre-reform period could have been prompted mainly by dynastic threats, as much as by external threats. There is also a possibility that the projection of imperial power on the post-reform coinage was a function of the new coinage itself, in that the new series of coins, with more and carefully calculated denominations, was better suited to the needs of trade and the collection of taxes. Thus if some of the earlier coinage of Alexios featured military imagery to project imperial power, the later coinage reflected the achieved power of Alexios in that it facilitated the economic basis of that power.

When portrayals of Alexios in other media are considered it is surprising that there are so few surviving images, and also that in other media there are no surviving military portrayals of Alexios. The nearest to a military portrayal is known only from its description in a poem of Nicholas Kallikles, a court doctor who attended Alexios on his deathbed. The poem appears to refer to a mural executed posthumously in the golden chamber of the Great Palace. Kallikles' poem describes the grief of John, and references in this passage indicate Alexios being victorious over Norman, Pecheneg/Cuman, and Turkish opponents, but without indication of his appearance or dress.⁴²⁵

⁴²⁵ 'The child (bewails) his parent, the lord his lord, John, alas, mourns the great Alexios. I see sweet mourning and sorrowful joy, the parent both victorious and deceased. He (John) is divided, but inclines to grief. He sees the Celtic shield thrust aside, and rejoices but little, for

The work appears in fact to have been a legitimization exercise for John II, who had left Alexios' deathbed at the Mangana to secure the Great Palace, and who faced family opposition in the succession. In another lost painting which is alluded to in a literary source⁴²⁶ Manuel I (1143-80) appeared with his father John II (1118-43), his grandfather Alexios I (1081-1118), and Basil II (976-1025). There is no mention of the dress of the emperors, and the painting was in the refectory of the monastery of St Mocius, but Alexios is referred to as 'the slayer of the Persians', suggesting the possibility that he might have been depicted as a soldier.

Further Development of Military Symbolism

The use of military symbolism on the coinage underwent further developments during the reign of John II (1118-43). These developments occurred in four areas: firstly of personnel portrayed; secondly of the mints involved; thirdly of the length of time during the reign for which the symbols were used; and fourthly in the expansion of the range of military symbols portrayed. The first development saw the introduction of a further warrior saint, St George, to the coinage, and the second saw this symbol of St George issued not only from Thessaloniki, as that of St Demetrios had been, but from both Thessaloniki and Constantinople. The third development was seen in the phase of the reign during which military symbols were employed. It has been seen that such symbols were employed only during the first part of

the mingled grief for his father dulls the edge of his joy. The howling of the Paristrian dogs is nowhere (to be heard), the twang of the Persian bowstring has died down....' L. Sternbach, 1904. 'Nikolai Callicles carmina', *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnasci, Wydział filologiczny* (Krakow), 2nd series, 21, 338-40; cited by Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 126-27.

⁴²⁶ Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, fol. 46r; Mango 1986, 226-27. Mango notes that Basil is referred to as 'the Lord Basil, the Bulgar-slayer'. Spatharakis 1976, 210.

the reign of Alexios I, but during the reign of John II it is probable that military symbols were in use during the whole of the reign. This more extended use appears to be more like that seen during the reign of Constantine IX.⁴²⁷ The fourth development which appeared on the coinage of John was an expansion in the range of weapons employed, with the reintroduction of the spear and shield, not seen on Byzantine coinage for some four centuries after their last appearances under Leo III (717-41).

Military types appear almost immediately in one series (1118-22) at the start of John's reign. The aspron trachy nomisma in electrum from the mint of Constantinople shows on the obverse the figure of Christ, bearded and nimbate, seated on a backless throne, and raising his right hand in benediction while he holds the Gospels in his left hand; inscription: IC XC. The reverse shows full-length figures of John on the left and St George on the right; between them they hold a patriarchal cross. John is in civilian dress, but St George wears a military tunic, breastplate, and sagion and holds a sheathed sword in his left hand; inscription: ΙΩ|ΔCC|ΠΟ|ΤΗ|Ο Α|ΓΓ|ΡΩ| ΓΓ.⁴²⁸ An identical iconography, with minor variations in the inscriptions, is seen on an aspron trachy nomisma from Thessaloniki, except that the saint and the emperor hold the labarum rather than a patriarchal cross.⁴²⁹ There are subtle differences in style, e.g. in the legs of John and St George, and in the pendilia of John's crown, which reinforce Hendy's suggestion that although these two

⁴²⁷ Several other emperors who employed military symbols on their coins did not reign long enough for a pattern of issue to be discerned, e.g. Isaac I, Nikephoros III.

⁴²⁸ BICC: coin nos B5627, B5630, B5632, B5635. DOC 4.1, 261-63; coin nos 8a.1; 8b.1-8b.3; 4.2, plate IX, coin nos 8a.1, 8b.1. Variants probably continued in production until 1143. The reverse inscription is columnar.

⁴²⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.1, 248, 263-64; coin nos 8e.1-8e.3; 4.2, plate IX, coin nos 8e.1, 8e.2.

types are similar production was by two different mints.⁴³⁰ In addition, this coin continued in production until 1143. In a further early aspron trachy nomisma in billon from Constantinople the obverse features the Virgin on a backless throne, holding on her breast the beardless, nimbate head of Christ; and with the inscription MP ΘV. On the reverse John is portrayed wearing a military tunic and sagion, and holding the labarum in his right hand and the globus cruciger in his left; inscription: ΙΩ|ΔCC|ΠΟ|ΤΗ|ΤΩ|Π ΦV|ΡΟ|ΓC|ΝΗ|Τ.⁴³¹

This aspron trachy nomisma series is relevant to the present study for two reasons: it appears that not only under Alexios I, but also under John II military types appeared very early in the reign; and it marks the introduction of St George to Byzantine coinage. John, despite initial success at the time of his accession also faced internal and external threats in the first part of his reign. Anna Komnene was involved in a plot; it is possible that this was motivated not only by resentment of her brother, but also by his promotion of John Axouch.⁴³² Externally, John faced threats from the Turks; Kinnamos relates that Laodikeia had been lost to them and the whole Maeander valley was threatened.⁴³³ Campaigns in 1119 and 1120 and particularly the recapture of Sozopolis helped to restore the balance in John's favour.⁴³⁴ However John was unable to exploit this success, since in 1122 Russian nomads penetrated the Danube defences, and a subsequent battle with them

⁴³⁰ Hendy 1999, DOC 4.1, 248. Donald and Whitting 1971, 75-84. These details are not mentioned by Hendy, but add weight to his evidence which mentions the absence of the Thessalonian type from the Nicosia (I) Hoard.

⁴³¹ BICC: coin nos B5642 to B5645. DOC 4.1, 264-65, coin nos 9.1-9.3; 4.2, plate IX, coin no 9.2. The reverse inscription is columnar.

⁴³² Axouch was a Turk who had been taken captive at Nicaea by crusaders, and subsequently given to Alexios I. He became a childhood friend of John II and when John became emperor he promoted Axouch to the post of grand domestic. Choniates 1984, 7.

⁴³³ Kinnamos 1976, 14 [p 5].

⁴³⁴ Kinnamos 1976, 15 [p 6].

was closely fought and required intervention by the Varangians to assure victory.⁴³⁵ In addition to these threats, John experienced troubled relations with the Venetians; all this suggests that John, in his early reign, faced threats in both external theatres and the internal sphere. Given these threats it is not surprising to find the employment of military types on his early coinage; it appears to conform to a possible trend noted above to find such types at times when the empire and the emperor were under threat.

The aspron trachy nomisma series is of interest secondly because it introduced St George to Byzantine coinage, the second military saint to appear in this medium. George, along with Demetrios, and Theodore Tiron/Theodore Stratelates, formed a group of the most popular military saints, as is seen on a twelfth-century steatite icon, probably from Constantinople. **(Fig. 49.)**⁴³⁶ The great importance of George is confirmed by Pseudo-Kodinos: in court ceremonial the banner of St George was carried separately from one portraying Ss Demetrios, Prokopios, Theodore Tiron and Theodore Stratelates.⁴³⁷ The appeal which St George would have had to the army is marked, as a number of his acts involved help to soldiers. However, the link with St George involved not only soldiers, but emperors as well, who were expected to show martial qualities from the reign of Nikephoros Phokas (963-69) onwards.⁴³⁸ St George was one of the saints with whom Basil II was depicted in the frontispiece of Basil's Psalter. The depiction also included Ss

⁴³⁵ Kinnamos 1976, 16 [p 8].

⁴³⁶ Evans and Wixom 1997, 300-01, fig. 203. **See fig. 49 of this thesis.**

⁴³⁷ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 126.10, 128.1-4. Although Pseudo-Kodinos is a fourteenth century text, it appears that some similar types of banner were known from the second century. 'The *drakonteion* is a type of banner known from the second century', 129, fn 328.

⁴³⁸ Kazhdan 1984, 47-8.

Demetrios, Theodore Tiron, Theodore Stratelates, Prokopios and Mercurios.⁴³⁹

On a Type B half tetarteron noummion from Thessaloniki dated between 1118 to c.1122 St Demetrios appears on the obverse, wearing a tunic, breastplate and sagion, with a spear in his right hand and a shield in his left; inscription: O[ΔH]MH T[PI]OC . On the reverse John appears in civilian dress, holding a labarum-headed sceptre in his right hand, and the globus cruciger in his left; inscription: +ΙΩ ΔCC. (**Fig. 21.**)⁴⁴⁰ This portrayal of St Demetrios with a spear and a shield has the effect of increasing the martial element, as in the use of military symbols under Alexios I the saint carried a sword but no shield. The significance of the spear's importance extends back to ancient Rome, and Pseudo-Kodinos noted that the spear was part of the imperial regalia.⁴⁴¹ A tenth-century association of the spear and military saints can be seen in the ivory triptych of the Forty Martyrs in the Hermitage. On the wings of the triptych several saints holding spears are portrayed.⁴⁴² The spear forms an important symbol in the frontispiece of the Psalter of Basil II, where the Archangel Michael is portrayed handing it to Basil. However it is not possible to relate exactly the short spears with which the warrior saints are

⁴³⁹ Talbot Rice 1953, 26, 318, fig. XI.

⁴⁴⁰ BICC: coin nos B5682 B5683, B5684, B5685. **See fig. 21.** DOC 4.1, 272-74, coin nos 17.1-17.13; 4.2, plate X, coin nos 17.9, 17.10, 17.11. In the Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue there is an error in the account of these coins, as the weapon in the right hand of St Demetrios is described as a sword. A careful study of the examples in the Barber Collection (B5682, B5683, B5684, B5685) shows that this statement is not correct, as the shaft of the spear can be seen extending below the saint's right hand, which the hilt of a sword would not. This may be seen particularly clearly on coin number B5685. As these four coins were part of Philip Whitting's bequest to the Barber Institute there is further evidence in the entries for these coins in Whitting's original catalogue. There he records that for B5682 (Whitting 5972), B5683 (Whitting 3520), B5684 (Whitting 3521) and B5685 (Whitting 3522) the weapon is a spear, and not a sword.

⁴⁴¹ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, [183], 104-07, 11-3.

⁴⁴² Parani 2003, 140 and plate 101.

portrayed to the pole arms used in the Byzantine empire.⁴⁴³ Essentially, the appearance of the spears of the warrior saints may be due to artistic convention, or they may represent shortened versions of two types of lance (*kontarion* and *dory*) used by the Byzantine army. In overall terms it is probably more important to assess the rationale of John's reintroduction of this symbol to the coinage than to attempt to relate the symbol to an actual weapon in use.

The Type B half-tetarteron which features St Demetrios with spear and shield is dated in the probable range of 1118-22.⁴⁴⁴ By contrast the Type A half-tetarteron is dated, in two versions, to the whole of the reign.⁴⁴⁵ The Type A, however, does not feature military imagery: the obverse features the standing figure of Christ, bearded and nimbate, wearing tunic and *kolobion*, and with the Gospels in his left hand; inscription: IC XC. The reverse shows John in stemma, divitision, and chlamys, with a labarum-headed sceptre in his right hand and globus cruciger in his left; inscription: +IΩΔCC ΠΙΟΤ. If the dates ascribed by Hendy are correct, then the military version (Type B) of this coin was issued only for the first four years of the reign, whilst the non-military (Type A) versions were issued for the remainder of the reign. Is it possible to see in this a response by John to the internal and external struggles of his early reign? This also fits the pattern observable over the reigns of several previous emperors whereby there was a gradual growth of military symbols

⁴⁴³ For a full discussion of this see Grotowski 2010, 318-34.

⁴⁴⁴ DOC 4.1, 272.

⁴⁴⁵ BICC: coin nos B5678, B5679, B5680, B5681. DOC 4.1, 271-2; coin nos 16a.1-16a.5 [1122-c.1137] and 16b.1-16b.6, 16c.1-16c.3 [1137-c.1143]; 4.2, plate X, coin nos 16a.5, 16b.6.

employed on the coinage, but against this must be set the use of St George on the coinage over the whole of John's reign.

The significance of the shield in Byzantine iconography is discussed in chapter 2. Unfortunately it is not possible to discern any pattern except a row of studs on the shield of John's Type B half tetarteron, because on both the Barber Institute and the Dumbarton Oaks specimens most of the shield is off the flan. In addition, Barber Institute coins B5682, B5684 and B5685 are clipped; as are the coins illustrated in the Dumbarton Oaks catalogue (17.9, 17.10, 17.11). The reappearance of the shield on Byzantine coins has the effect of reuniting this symbol with another of military origin, the spear, but the twelfth century iconography, unlike that of the eighth century, places both these symbols in the hands of St Demetrios, not the emperor. And whereas previously on the coinage of Alexios I St Demetrios carried a sword, on the coinage of John the addition of a shield has the effect of increasing the defensive element in the representation. The shield to the Byzantines was a powerful symbol of faith and the protection of God against evil: Choniates, noting the successes of the Seljuks during the reign of Manuel I addressed God to 'Take hold of shield and buckler and rise to our aid'.⁴⁴⁶ Further, the shield was also regarded as an image of earthly power, being both a symbol of the army and also of the latter's influence at the Byzantine court. The display of a shield and items of armour at the Chalke gate were signals that an armed expedition was being assembled.⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴⁶ Choniates, 1984, 66, [117]. He was quoting Psalm 34.2.

⁴⁴⁷ Grotowski 2010, 252, 254.

What is clear on this coin of John is that St Demetrios appears alone, instead of with the emperor, as on the coins of Alexios. This could indicate that the issue was directed primarily towards Thessaloniki and its surrounding area, as St Demetrios was identified strongly as the protector of the city and its inhabitants. This suggestion is reinforced by the fact that the saint carries both shield and spear. Where John appears on coins in the company of a warrior saint the latter is St George: it is possible that if John had been emphasising his legitimation, then this would have been provided by St George, with his links to Constantinople, rather than by St Demetrios.

One further feature of the coinage of John II was that military types not only appeared very early in the reign, but some continued in production up to John's death in 1143. Thus the aspron trachy nomisma from Constantinople which featured Christ on the obverse and the emperor with St George on the reverse (see above) continued to 1143, in variant form; in particular the patriarchal cross held by St George and John was later shown resting on three steps, rather than on a small globe as at first. **(Fig. 10.)**⁴⁴⁸ An aspron trachy nomisma from Thessaloniki which featured John and St George also continued in production up to 1143 (see above).⁴⁴⁹ The significance of these extended issues is considered in a wider context below, which incorporates portrayals of John in other media.

The relative shortage of contemporary written accounts of John II's reign is paralleled by a lack of portrayals of him in media other than coins. A mosaic (the John panel) in Hagia Sophia is a rare exception, although this is a

⁴⁴⁸ BICC: coin nos B5629, B5631, B5633, B5634, B5636. **See fig. 10.** DOC 4.1, 262-63 coin nos 8c.1- 8c.9 and 8d.1-8d.5; 4.2, plate IX, coin nos 8c.1, 8c.3, 8c.6, 8d.1, 8d.2, 8d.3.

⁴⁴⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.1, 248, 263-64, coin nos 8e.1-8e.3; DOC 4.2, plate IX, coin nos 8e.1, 8e.2.

non-military portrait, as is the portrait of John with his son Alexios in the Vatican Library.⁴⁵⁰ A likeness of John may appear in a painting in the church of Panagia Kosmosoteira, founded by Isaac Komnenos in 1152. Portraits of four warrior saints occur in pairs on the north and south walls, and all have faces strongly resembling members of the Komnenos family. St Theodore Stratelates on the south wall resembles John II,⁴⁵¹ while St Theodore Tiron resembles Alexios I, St Merkourios Isaac, and St Demetrios Andronikos. Ousterhout calls Bakirtzis' suggestion of an elision of identities by facial features 'controversial', but accepts that it is a possibility.⁴⁵² A surviving text describes a now lost mosaic of John II mourning the death of his father Alexios I. It is not clear what imagery was employed in this mural; the whole may have comprised a series showing Alexios triumphant over the Normans, the Pechenegs, and the Turks; Alexios deceased; and John in mourning.⁴⁵³ Could John's motive for the portrayal of himself in this mural have been similar to the motive for the portrayal of himself in military costume on his early coinage? There was opposition within John's family to his succession; he took precipitate action on the night of his father's death, and he needed to assert his authority early in his reign. Choniates describes a plot which was centred around Nikephoros Bryennios against John during the first year of his reign. He attributes its failure to the 'customary sluggishness and languor' of Bryennios, but implies that the plot could have been successful, had the plotters struck quickly at night, as John was encamped at Philopation, a site

⁴⁵⁰ Talbot Rice 1959, plates XXIII and 164; p. 66; Vatican Library Ms. Urb. 2 (reproduced in Peirce and Tyler 1941, plate 23).

⁴⁵¹ Bakirtzis 2001, 85-7.

⁴⁵² Ousterhout 2016, 151.

⁴⁵³ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 127.

used for horseracing or polo, and situated outside the walls of Constantinople.⁴⁵⁴ John's need to demonstrate that the 'dynastic legacy belonged to him' and to atone for his failure to honour his dying father is mentioned by Magdalino and Nelson; a prominent mosaic cycle could have achieved this.⁴⁵⁵

If there is such a link in terms of motive it needs to be remembered that John continued the use of military iconography on his coinage throughout his reign, and his deathbed speech has a military tone:

This army [i.e. the Roman], with God as its leader and me as his subordinate commander, they [i.e. the Turks and Arabs] have come to dread; many cities submitted to us, and forthwith we are installed as masters and they are now governed by our decrees. May the Lord God grant me, the supreme commander of the Christian commonwealth, an inheritance of his kingdom....⁴⁵⁶

Thus twice in a short space John makes specific reference to himself as a military commander associated with God, and defines his relationship with God in strongly military terms. It may be seen therefore that John was an emperor associated with military imagery (numismatic, mural, and literary) throughout his reign. If such military portrayals in the early part of his reign were linked to legitimation it must be asked if there is evidence of further threats at later times in his reign. Six revolts against John have been documented;⁴⁵⁷ these occurred fairly evenly throughout his reign, and one, comprising the effectively independent rule of Constantine Gabras in Trebizond, extended from 1126 to 1140.

Further, in the middle part of his reign John campaigned around Kastamon in 1132, and it is significant that John revived the imperial triumph

⁴⁵⁴ Choniates 1984, 8, 417 fn 25; Guillard 1969, 1, 167, 546; 2, 72.

⁴⁵⁵ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 128.

⁴⁵⁶ Choniates 1984, 25.

⁴⁵⁷ Cheynet 1990, 103-06.

in 1133; a group of encomia written for John date from the same time as this triumph.⁴⁵⁸ Whilst this triumph occurred in the later part of John's reign, there may have been earlier threats to John, in that rivalry between John and his brother Isaac caused the latter to be exiled from 1130 to 1138.⁴⁵⁹ Prodomos commented on Isaac's son John, after the latter had again defected to the Turks.⁴⁶⁰ If John II's triumph of 1133 had a strong political element outweighing any military success, for the Danishmendids had recovered Kastamon in 1133, this could reflect further threats to John, and two plots to put Isaac on the throne had occurred during John's Danishmendid campaigns.⁴⁶¹ In relation to triumphs McCormick has noted the principle of the importance of political requirements, albeit in an earlier period.⁴⁶² There appear to have been particularly careful preparations for the 1133 triumph. The procession probably followed a route from the Acropolis gate to Hagia Sophia, not taking in the older and longer route along the Mese. Such a shorter route would have had the advantage of concentrating the decorations and crowd into a smaller area, and making it easier to walk for the elderly and infirm Patriarch, John IX Agapetos. The route selected also took the

⁴⁵⁸ Magdalino 1993, 419-20. Magdalino cites the authors of these encomia as Theodore Prodromos, ed. W. Hörander, *Theodoros Prodromos, historische Gedichte*, Wiener Byzantinische Studien, II (Vienna 1974), nos 1-21, 24; Michael Italikos, ed. P. Gautier, *Michel Italikos, lettres et discours*, Archives de l'orient chrétien, 14 (Paris 1972), pp. 245-70; Nikephoros Basilakes, ed. A. Garyza, *Nicephori Basilicae orationes et epistolae*, (Leipzig 1984), pp. 49-74.)

⁴⁵⁹ Magdalino 1993, 423.

⁴⁶⁰ 'O wild olive branch of the cultivated olive root, and unfortunate scion of a most fortunate stock, the only thorn bush in this orchard's many trees, and only senseless member of a sensible kin.' Cited by Magdalino 1993, 423-24 as Prodromos, *Hist. Ged.* 1974, no 19. 132ff, 162-65.

⁴⁶¹ Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, II, 230-2; cited by Magdalino 2016, 63.

⁴⁶² McCormick 1986, 188: 'It is at any rate clear that in medieval Byzantium, as in the later Roman empire, victories and victory celebrations could owe as much to the political requirements of the moment as to any real military significance of the operations they honored.'

procession very close to the state orphanage, refounded by Alexios I. This benefaction would have signalled the piety and benevolence of the Komnenoi.⁴⁶³ John emphasised his humility by giving up his place in a newly-constructed chariot to an icon of the Virgin, and by walking in front of the chariot.⁴⁶⁴

Thus if there were a need of reinforcement against continuing threats in the later part of John's reign, it is less surprising to find military images on the coinage throughout the whole of his reign. A similar reinforcement is seen in the encomia composed for John. These encomia are biased towards warlike, rather than peaceful, virtues: they celebrate leadership; glory in bloodshed and conquest; present conflict as just; and associate John's victories and territories as extending to the ends of the earth.⁴⁶⁵ In this context it should be noted that the numismatic military iconography which persists throughout the reign links John with a warrior saint (George); with a symbol of authority (the labarum) or a symbol of Christianity (the patriarchal cross); and with Christ himself, who appears on the obverse. All these symbols prefigure and reinforce John's deathbed speech where he identifies himself as a military commander under God. The milieu in which John and those around him operated should also be noted: militarism was inherent in the Anatolian and Thracian aristocracies, whose families found their hero in Digenes Akritis (see chapter 1), the ballads of whose exploits were compiled into a single romance

⁴⁶³ Magdalino 2016, 56-7.

⁴⁶⁴ Magdalino 1993, 240-42. Magdalino also notes the comment of Prodromos: 'Which former emperor ever did such a thing?' Prodromos, *Historische Gedichte* ed. W. Hörandner, Vienna 1974, no 4-6, esp. 6; cited by Magdalino.

⁴⁶⁵ Magdalino 1993, 419-20.

around 1100.⁴⁶⁶ John's projection of power could thus have been influenced by his antecedents, as well as by the members of his immediate family (in terms of legitimation), and by the events of his reign. It would appear possible that this potent combination could have induced John to reinforce the projection of his authority not just in the early stages, but continuing until the end of his reign.

Conclusions

The expansion in the use of military symbolism in the period 1081-1143 by the emperors Alexios I and John II comprised several important features. In particular it saw the introduction of images of warrior saints, firstly St Demetrios, and then St George, on coins. The range of weapons employed increased, with the spear and shield being introduced. Military imagery appeared early in the reigns of Alexios I and John II, but only in John's reign did production continue throughout the reign. Dynastic causes appeared to be important in early parts of the reigns, while external factors appeared important in the later parts of reigns. A further development was that such issues featuring military symbolism were no longer produced by Constantinople alone, but also by Thessaloniki. The coin issues with military symbols in the period 1081-1143 were minted in a wider variety of metals from those of the period 1042-81.

⁴⁶⁶ Magdalino 1993, 420-21, 481.

4. DEVELOPMENT OF MILITARY SYMBOLISM ON COINS 1143 TO 1204

Chapter three has described the reintroduction of military symbolism to Byzantine coins by Constantine IX and the use of such symbols until 1143. Chapter four discusses the further development of military symbolism from 1143 to 1204. With an output of coins from Thessaloniki from 1081 onwards the numbers of coins with military symbols increases and enables a more detailed comparative analysis, presented at the end of this chapter. The main developments in military symbolism seen on the coinage of Manuel were the introduction of St Theodore, another warrior saint new to the coinage, and the presence of not one, but two figures armed with swords on a coin.

Manuel was the younger brother, and was with his father John and the army in Cilicia when John died. Isaac, Manuel's elder brother, was in Constantinople at this time, but it was believed that Manuel could manage the safe return of the army. Aside from the possibility of such family tensions, there were also external threats early in the reign. These threats comprised the passage of the French and German armies of the Second Crusade (1147-49); and the raiding of the coastal areas of Greece, Athens, Corinth and Thebes by Roger II of Sicily from 1147, after Manuel had had to withdraw troops from these areas, to monitor the passage of the Crusade.⁴⁶⁷

The coinage of Manuel I is complex, regarding the uncertainty of both mints and dating, and these aspects are discussed below. Whilst Hendy attributes several of Manuel's coin issues to Thessaloniki, Metcalf has noted the shift of minting away from the city from the second quarter of the twelfth

⁴⁶⁷ Magdalino 1993, 51.

century.⁴⁶⁸ Given this uncertainty archaeological evidence assumes particular importance, and Touratsoglou believes that Hendy has given insufficient weight to such evidence in DOC 4.1.⁴⁶⁹ The account below describes the six coins of Manuel with military symbolism in a proposed chronological sequence linked wherever possible to archaeological evidence, and then discusses possible dates and mints.

A half-tetarteron in bronze (DOC Type B, light standard) shows on the obverse St George, beardless and nimbate, wearing tunic, breastplate, and *sagion*, and carrying in his right hand a spear, and in his left a shield, on the obverse. Other than an outer ring of studs no detail can be distinguished on the shield; the inscription reads Ο ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΣ. On the reverse is a bust of Manuel, bearded and wearing stemma, divitision, collar-piece, and loros. He holds a labarum-headed sceptre in his right hand, and a globus cruciger in his left; inscription ΜΑΝΟΒ ΗΛ ΔΕCΠΙΟΤ.⁴⁷⁰

On another half-tetarteron in bronze (DOC Type C, light standard) the obverse features a bust of Christ, bearded and nimbate, and holding a scroll in his left hand; inscription ΙC ΧC. Manuel is shown full-length and bearded on the reverse, wearing dress which appears to be stemma, breastplate, short military tunic, and possibly *sagion*. He holds a sceptre cruciger in his right hand, and the globus cruciger in his left; inscription ΜΑΝΟΒΗΛ ΔΕCΠΙΟΤΗ.⁴⁷¹

⁴⁶⁸ DOC 4.1, 289-339. Metcalf 1979, 109.

⁴⁶⁹ Touratsoglou 2002, 394-8.

⁴⁷⁰ BICC: coin nos B5823 (clipped), B5825 (off flan), B5826 (clipped), B5827. DOC 4.1, 337, coin nos 23.1-23.7; 4.2, plate XVI, coin nos 23.1, 23.3, both worn. Hendy lists this as from an uncertain Greek mint, and dated 1152-c 1160(?).

⁴⁷¹ BICC: coin nos B5817 to B5822. DOC 4.1, 338-39, coin nos 24.1-24.19; 4.2, plate XVI, coin nos 24.2, 24.3. Hendy attributes this to an uncertain Greek mint with a date of c. 1160-c.1167(?).

On a half-tetarteron in bronze (DOC Type B, heavy standard), the obverse features a bust of Christ, bearded and nimbate, with a scroll in his left hand; inscription IC XC. Manuel is seen full-length on the reverse; his dress appears to be stemma, breastplate, short military tunic, and sagion. In his right hand he holds a sceptre cruciger, and in his left the globus cruciger; inscription MANOVHA ΔΕΠΙΟΤΗ.⁴⁷²

A tetarteron noummion in bronze (DOC Type A, heavy standard) possibly from the mint of Thessaloniki, is dated to 1152 – c.1160(?). The obverse features St George, identified by the inscription ΟΑ|Γ|Ε ΩΡ|Γ|Ο|Σ, and not St Demetrios, who might have been expected on a Thessalonian coin. The saint appears as a bust, beardless and nimbate, wearing tunic, breastplate, and *sagion*; he carries a spear in his right hand and a shield in his left.⁴⁷³ On the reverse is a bust of Manuel, bearded and wearing stemma, divitision, collar-piece, and loros. He holds a labarum-headed sceptre in his right hand, and a globus cruciger in his left; inscription MANOV HA ΔΕΠΙΟΤ.⁴⁷⁴

An aspron trachy nomisma in electrum (DOC Type C) features on the obverse a full-length figure of Christ, bearded and nimbate, holding the Gospels in his left hand; there is a star in each right and left field, and the

⁴⁷² BICC: coin no B5816. DOC 4.1, 334-35, coin nos 21.1-21.3; 4.2, plate XVI, coin nos 21.2, 21.3. N.b. in 4.1, p 335, Hendy states that the coins illustrated in 4.2 are numbers 21.1 and 21.3, but in 4.2, plate XVI they are given as 21.2 and 21.3. Hendy attributes this coin to Thessaloniki, dated to c.1160-c.1167(?).

⁴⁷³ The shield has an outer rim of studs but it is not possible to discern any other clear pattern on either the Barber Institute or Dumbarton Oaks specimens. On only one Barber Institute coin [B5791] is the shield mainly on the flan, but this coin is so worn that no pattern on the shield can be distinguished. The four Dumbarton Oaks coins illustrated in that catalogue are either worn or the shield is mainly off the flan.

⁴⁷⁴ BICC: coin nos B5786 to B5793. DOC 4.1, 329-31, coin nos 18.1-18.23; 4.2, plate XVI, coin nos 18.4, 18.6, 18.17, 18.18. Hendy attributes this coin to Thessaloniki, with a date of 1152-c.1160(?).

inscription is IC XC. On the reverse Manuel is seen on the left, in civilian dress, but holding a sheathed sword in his right hand. The figure on the viewer's right is St Theodore, in his first appearance on a Byzantine coin. He stands, bearded and nimbate, wearing a military tunic and breastplate, and holding a sheathed sword in his left hand; inscription: MANOVHA O|ΘE|O|Δ|Ω|P|O|Σ. This coin represents another development in the use of military symbols with the introduction of St Theodore being coupled with each figure having a sword. The emperor and the saint hold between them a patriarchal cross on a long shaft; the emperor with his left hand and the saint with his right, above that of the emperor. (Fig. 22.)⁴⁷⁵

On an aspron trachy nomisma in electrum (DOC Type C) from Thessaloniki, and possibly dated to c.1160-c.1167(?), the obverse features the Virgin nimbate seated on a backless throne, holding the beardless nimbate head of Christ on her breast; inscription MP ΘV. The reverse shows Manuel on the left, in civilian dress, and the nimbate St Demetrios on the right, wearing a military tunic and breastplate. They hold between them the labarum on a long shaft, with the saint's right hand being above Manuel's left. Manuel holds the *anexikakia* in his right hand. The inscription is MANOVHΛΔEΠIOTH O|Δ|H|M|H|TPI|O|Σ.⁴⁷⁶

Attempting to determine the origin and dating of these coins is not easy. Metcalf has noted that although the Corinth hoard (May 1938) consisted

⁴⁷⁵ BICC: coin nos B5701, B5702, B5703. **See fig. 22.** DOC 4.1, 298-300, coin nos 4a.1-4a.3, 4b.1-4b.3, 4c.1-4c.4 and 4d; 4.2, plate XII, coin nos 4a.3, 4b.2, 4c.4, 4d. Hendy attributes this coin to Constantinople, with a date of c.1160-c.1164(?). The inscription is partly columnar.

⁴⁷⁶ BICC: coin nos B5781, B5784. DOC 4.1, 304-05, coin nos 9.1-9.7; 4.2, plate XIII, coin nos 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7. Hendy attributes this coin to Thessaloniki, and dated to c.1160-c.1167(?). The inscription is partly columnar.

of thirty hyperpyra, from which he calculated an overall output of some 1.5 million hyperpyra, the Lindos hoard suggested the output of electrum to have been only 'moderately large'.⁴⁷⁷ Penna notes five hoards from the Corinth region which were concealed during the reign of Manuel, while excavations from 1896-1995 have revealed 1683 coins of Manuel, mainly bronze terartera or half-terartera.⁴⁷⁸ In reviewing this evidence Penna suggests that it is possible that the two half-tetartera in bronze (DOC Types B and C, light standard) could be dated to the first decade of Manuel's reign. Whilst in two hoards from Corinth the Type A half-tetarteron in bronze (non-military) is found, Penna suggests that these two hoards represent burial in haste before the Norman invasion of 1147.⁴⁷⁹ The Kalentzi/1928 hoard contains Types A, B, and C, but also a coin of Guglielmo, prince of Norman Sicily, struck around 1149. This suggests that Types B and C were circulating at the end of the 1140s or even possibly the early 1150s. The Sparta/1926 hoard consisted solely of Types C, and is believed to have been found in an ancient c theatre, which collapsed during an earthquake between 1144 and 1148. This would make 1148 the *terminus ante quem* for Type C. However, Penna cautions against linking Manuel's bronze coinage in chronological phases, but suggests that there are probably parallel issues of different workshops of the same mint.⁴⁸⁰

This suggestion of Penna's might apply to the bronze half-tetarteron (DOC Type B, heavy standard), particularly because of Hendy's very tentative

⁴⁷⁷ Metcalf 1979, 107, 109.

⁴⁷⁸ Penna 1996, 279.

⁴⁷⁹ Penna 1996, 281. Metcalf notes that in excavations in Corinth and Athens Types A and B occur in roughly equal proportions, but in hoards tend to be much more unequal. Metcalf 1964, 252.

⁴⁸⁰ Penna 1996, 282-3.

dating of c.1160-c.1167(?). Likewise, Hendy's attempted dating of the bronze tetarteron (DOC Type A, heavy standard) is very tentative, as 1152-c.1160(?).⁴⁸¹ Penna's suggestion of parallel issues would fit with her suggestion that most tetartera from Corinth excavations appear to come from the Thessaloniki mint, or Hendy's 'uncertain mint in southern Greece'.⁴⁸² There is a possibility that this uncertain mint could be Thessaloniki.⁴⁸³ However, there is uncertainty over the mint responsible for the DOC Type A heavy standard tetarteron. Whilst Hendy attributes it possibly to Thessaloniki, Morrisson notes that Georganteli makes a strong case for tetartera of Manuel with a bust of St George to be attributed to Constantinople, since these tetartera are not found in excavations in Thessaloniki but are found frequently in Thrace, an area whose coinage was usually supplied from Constantinople.⁴⁸⁴ Philip Whitting and Geoffrey Haines, the original owners of the Barber specimens, classified these coins in their personal catalogues with marked variations, indicating the uncertainty involved.⁴⁸⁵ The large numbers of tetartera and half-tetartera in these hoards and stray finds appear to

⁴⁸¹ Hendy DOC 4.1, 334-5, 329-31.

⁴⁸² Penna 1996, 287.

⁴⁸³ Touratsoglou 1989, 371-3.

⁴⁸⁴ Morrisson 2007, 176 and fn 10, cites a personal communication from Georganteli. This archaeological evidence appears to be significant in determining the mint, as it does not appear that iconography can provide a definite answer. St George was introduced to the coinage by John II on nomismata with virtually identical iconography from both Constantinople and Thessaloniki. (For details see this thesis p. 120.) Thus as the saint had appeared on the coinage from both mints prior to Manuel's reign, it is uncertain which mint could have been more likely to have issued Manuel's tetarteron featuring St George. Further, as the half-tetarteron Type B light standard is identical to the Type A heavy standard, could this be from Constantinople also, rather than Hendy's 'uncertain Greek mint'?

⁴⁸⁵ B5786 (Whitting no 3533): Thessaloniki.

B5787 (Haynes 1403): Constantinople.

B5788 (Whitting 5649): Thessaloniki.

B5789 (Haynes 2197): Constantinople.

B5790 (Whitting 5645): Constantinople.

B5791 (Whitting 5648): Thessaloniki.

B5792 (Whitting 0593): not listed.

B5793 (Whitting 2375): uncertain Greek mint.

suggest that these coins were the only means of making commercial transactions in urban centres in the Peloponnese. The state might thus have produced higher value coins for regions with relatively high price structures and small value coins for areas with relatively low price structures.⁴⁸⁶

Information from the Lindos hoard (1902) and the Nicosia hoard (1920s) have been used to date the aspron trachy nomisma Type C (the presumed third coinage) in electrum from Constantinople. In this series the first coinage is identified by Manuel's lack of beard; and the second by its reverse type being very similar in detail, style and fabric to the first coinage.⁴⁸⁷ As the Type C appears in the Lindos hoard, but the first and second coinages do not, it is probably the third coinage, which Hendy dates to c.1160-c.1164(?).⁴⁸⁸ The other aspron trachy nomisma in electrum with military symbolism of Manuel is one which differs somewhat from the Constantinopolitan Type C. On this other coin St Demetrios replaces St Theodore on the reverse, and the fabric differs in being thinner, more deeply convex/concave, and with smaller dies. It does not occur in the Lindos hoard, but twenty-one specimens were found in the Nicosia (1) hoard, compared to none of the metropolitan Type C. In addition accounting evidence, dateable to c. 1170, from the monastery of Iviron on Mount Athos, refers to a coin named a 'dimitraton'. Hendy suggests that this would appear to be a Type C aspron trachy nomisma in electrum being minted in Thessaloniki, and dates it to c.

⁴⁸⁶ Penna 1996, 285-6.

⁴⁸⁷ Hendy 1969, 124-5.

⁴⁸⁸ DOC 4.1, 281, 298-300. The Lindos hoard contained 79 coins of the aspron trachy nomisma Type C; 20 of Type D; and 105 of Type E. Hendy 1969, 182-4, 361, 372. The Nicosia hoard 2 coins of the aspron trachy nomisma first coinage; 8 of the second; but none of Type C.

1160-67(?).⁴⁸⁹ Whilst these coins of Manuel which feature military symbols have some uncertainty regarding mints and dates their iconography makes clear that they were destined for Greece.

The main development in military symbolism seen on the coinage of Manuel is the introduction of St Theodore, who was recognised in two guises – St Theodore Tiron (the 'Recruit'), and St Theodore Stratelates (the 'General').⁴⁹⁰ St Theodore Tiron's cult developed with his portrayal as an army recruit who burned down a pagan temple and was subsequently martyred, but the fictitious cult of St Theodore Stratelates developed with his portrayal as a general. That Stratelates' cult was becoming popular at the end of the tenth century may be understood with the then increasing power and influence of the military aristocracy: Theodore Stratelates, as a general, fitted more comfortably with that group than did Theodore Tiron.⁴⁹¹ On the aspron trachy nomisma of Manuel featuring St Theodore the name Theodore appears, but without indication whether he is Tiron or Stratelates. Hendy opted for Stratelates, because of his forked beard, Tiron usually being portrayed with a single-pointed beard.⁴⁹² A portrait of Manuel with St Theodore Tiron, with whom Manuel may have had a special affinity, is considered below.

⁴⁸⁹ Hendy 1969, 125-6, 372. DOC 4.1, 282, 304-5.

⁴⁹⁰ Walter 2003, 44-66. Haldon notes that the miracles of St Theodore Stratelates were less well-documented than the miracles of St Theodore Tiron. The accounts of miracles described for Tiron are longer and more detailed than accounts for Stratelates. Haldon 2016, 66-82 (Tiron); 121-2 (Stratelates).

⁴⁹¹ Haldon notes that the behaviour of St Theodore Stratelates to the emperor Licinius is 'not dissimilar' to the behaviour of Digenes Akritis to the visiting emperor. Haldon 2016, 8, 115-6; Jeffreys 1998, G.4, 129, l. 1032-41.

⁴⁹² Hendy 1969, 438. Walter 2003, 65.

The reason for the introduction of St Theodore to the coinage appears uncertain, except in terms of the suggestion that Manuel had a particular devotion to him. It is just possible to envisage a speculative reason: Theodore Styppeiotes was *epi tou kanikleiou* and in 1159 was accused of conspiring against Manuel. Styppeiotes had been close to Manuel: his punishment was more severe than usual, in that he lost not only his eyes but also his tongue.⁴⁹³ Choniates records that Styppeiotes was a victim of false accusations made by John Kamateros, the logothete of the drome.⁴⁹⁴ If Manuel came to believe that Styppeiotes had been an innocent victim of a plot, it is just possible he could have attempted to make acknowledgement by portraying himself with a namesake of Styppeiotes, St Theodore, on the aspron trachy nomisma issued in Constantinople c.1160-c.1164(?). The introduction of a new saint and increase in the number of swords carried contribute to a pattern of increasing militarisation of symbols on the coinage, which began under Alexios I and continued under John II.⁴⁹⁵

There are records of several representations of Manuel in media other than coins, even where originals no longer exist. A lost picture of Manuel and St Theodore Tiron together is known from Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, fol. 36r. This portrait was commissioned by *sebastos* Andronikos Kamateros for the entrance to his house. Manuel was shown being crowned by the Virgin, with an angel preceding him, St Theodore Tiron handing him a spear, and St Nicholas guarding his rear. Part of the inscription read 'Also present is the

⁴⁹³ Cheynet 1990, 108.

⁴⁹⁴ Choniates 1984, 63-5.

⁴⁹⁵ Kazhdan notes the increasing depiction of military saints on Comnenian coins but does not refer to the increasing number of swords being featured on these coins. Kazhdan 1984, 51.

horseman Tiro, Christ's martyr, who rides in front of you when you battle the enemy, who instructs your hands in military contest and places in them a whetted sword.⁴⁹⁶ Manuel might indeed have had a particular affinity with St Theodore Tiron, although as the latter was an Anatolian saint the inscription could have been a reference to Manuel's Anatolian campaigns. The reference to St Nicholas, who had been a bishop, a patron of mariners, and a model of charity, is more obscure.⁴⁹⁷ St Nicholas was the patron saint of Myra, but in 1087 his relics were stolen by Italian sailors and taken to Bari, of which town he also became patron.⁴⁹⁸ Whilst Bari had fallen to the Normans in 1071, Magdalino notes that the town was important to the rear which Manuel had to cover while he was campaigning in the east.⁴⁹⁹ Magdalino has pointed out further that as Andronikos Komnenos commissioned this portrait, the ultimate choice of figures, and the thinking behind this, were his.⁵⁰⁰ There are also references to a second, apparently similar portrait of Manuel on the gate of the house of Leo Sikeliotas, where Manuel is shown as the 'slayer of alien peoples', and accompanied by Moses, Joshua, and either angels or military saints.⁵⁰¹

Further, some deeds of Manuel appeared to be recorded in the monastery built in honour of the Mother of God by the *pansebastos* George, the Grand Hetaeriarch, of the Palaeologus family.⁵⁰² Some feats of Manuel

⁴⁹⁶ Mango 1986, 226. Magdalino 1993, 471-72.

⁴⁹⁷ Magdalino 1993, 476.

⁴⁹⁸ von Falkenhausen and Kinney ODB 1991, 256.

⁴⁹⁹ Magdalino 1993, 476.

⁵⁰⁰ Magdalino 1993, 476.

⁵⁰¹ Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, fol. 22v. Mango 1986, 225-26. Magdalino 1993, 472. Mango cites Sp. P. Lampros, *'Μαρκιανὸς κῶδιξ 524'*, *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 8, 1911, 43.

⁵⁰² Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, fol. 108r (ed. Lampros, pp. 148 ff.), cited by Mango 1986, 227.

were portrayed in the vestibule: his action against Iconium in 1146; the 'countless captives' whom he took from the 'Ishmaelites'; his actions against the Hungarians; and his enslavement of the Serbs.⁵⁰³ Manuel's same expedition against Iconium is referred to in a description of a gold vessel noted in Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, fol. 180r, on which Manuel is shown 'frightening, pursuing and utterly defeating the chief of the Persians, armed for battle, together with the countless host of the Iconians; and how it was that having chanced upon untold thousands invisibly hidden in mountain ravines, he alone cut through their line by manfully wielding his spear here and there.'⁵⁰⁴ Manuel also featured in paintings showing his success against Stefan Nemanja, Grand Zupan of Rascia, who was brought as an imperial vassal to Constantinople, after being defeated by Manuel in 1172. Eustathios of Thessaloniki describes how artists had created paintings showing Stefan as a rebel, campaigning against Manuel, but only to be defeated and enslaved.⁵⁰⁵

Manuel is known to have celebrated a number of triumphs, one of which was in 1152 after his victory over the Hungarians and Serbs. Manuel was expert in his innovative use of ceremonial to emphasise his imperial authority,⁵⁰⁶ and Choniates' account makes a clear acknowledgement of the stage-management which was employed.⁵⁰⁷ It may be possible to detect a

⁵⁰³ But Mango 1986, 228, n. 223 points out that Manuel did not enjoy 'any marked success' against Iconium. This could be another example of inflated imperial success claims as noted in chapter 1.

⁵⁰⁴ Mango 1986, 228.

⁵⁰⁵ Cited by Mango 1986, 225. Ed. T. L. F. Tafel, *De Thessalonica eiusque agro dissertatio geographica* (Berlin, 1839, reprint London 1972), p. 419.

⁵⁰⁶ Magdalino 1993, 245-46.

⁵⁰⁷ 'Decked out in magnificent garments far beyond the fortune of captives, the newly captive Hungarians and captured Serbs enhanced the procession's grandeur. The emperor provided these adornments so that the victory might appear most glorious and wondrous to citizens and foreigners alike, for these conquered men were of noble birth and worthy of admiration.'

similar type of stage-management in Manuel's use of military images on his coinage. It appears that Manuel did not use such images for legitimation at the start of his reign, despite the fact that his elder brother Isaac could have been a focus of opposition; this would appear to suggest a degree of confidence on Manuel's part. But in 1152, when Manuel was shrewd enough to manage his triumph in the way described, it might be possible to see his use of St George on coins in a similar light: as a possible means of reinforcing the aura of success. The issue of such coins into an area of conflict where Manuel had engaged with the Serbs and Hungarians would have emphasised Manuel's power, particularly as the coins associated him with St George, a warrior saint with a cult among both the Byzantines and the Serbs. In reinforcing an aura of success Manuel could have been building on the reputation of his father, John II, as a soldier and leader, but also creating the impression of his superiority to his father. Manganeios Prodromos, an encomiast of Manuel, recorded that he was 'a wonderful fighter, just like a common soldier. How incredible, frightening and wondrous a prodigy!'⁵⁰⁸

Manuel's ability to display imperial power was also in evidence when he made peace with Kiliç Arslan II, the Seljuk sultan of Ikonion (c.1115-1192; ruled 1155-92) and entertained him in Constantinople in 1161 with banquets, horse-races, and boats set alight with Greek fire. Manuel's throne, in gold and with 'a great quantity of ruby and sapphire stones..... nor could one count the

He turned this triumphal festival into a marvel and presented the prisoners of war not in a single throng but in groups presented at intervals to deceive the spectators into imagining that the captives parading by were more numerous than they really were.' Choniates 1984, 54.

⁵⁰⁸ Manganeios Prodromos 2.139-40; unpublished translation by E and M Jeffreys, cited by Stephenson 2000, 237.

pearls'⁵⁰⁹ was so high that at first the sultan declined to sit in Manuel's presence, but eventually sat on a 'low stool, very humble alongside the lofty throne'.⁵¹⁰ An agreement was concluded which Kinnamos makes appear most favourable to Manuel.⁵¹¹ After successes in Dalmatia Manuel decreed another triumph in 1165, and processed from the citadel to Hagia Sophia; in a further demonstration of his power and success Manuel should have ridden in a 'chariot of pure gold' - that he did not do so was explained by Kinnamos as part wariness of ostentation and part due to the unrest of the horses when harnessed.⁵¹² But Manuel's skill in the projection of imperial power appears to have been only one part of his character: William of Tyre describes in him a humility which clearly made favourable impressions on those with whom he came into contact. William describes how when Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, was thrown from his horse when hunting and broke his arm, Manuel knelt down by him and 'attentively ministered to him', demonstrating his knowledge of medicine.⁵¹³

There is a surviving portrait of Manuel in which he is portrayed standing on the viewer's left, alongside his second wife, Maria of Antioch;⁵¹⁴ he wears a crown with a ruby and pendilia, skaramangion and loros, and in his right hand he holds a labarum-headed sceptre, decorated with blue stones. Maria wears a more elaborate crown, a pearl-decorated collar, a golden loros and a blue- and red-patterned gown; in her left hand she holds a sceptre whose top

⁵⁰⁹ Kinnamos 1976, ch. 205, 156.

⁵¹⁰ Kinnamos 1976, ch. 206 and 207, 157.

⁵¹¹ Kinnamos 1976, ch. 207, 158.

⁵¹² Kinnamos 1976, ch. 249, 187.

⁵¹³ William of Tyre 1943, 280.

⁵¹⁴ Codex Vat. Gr. 1176, fol. 11r, Spatharakis 1976, 208-10, figs. 155, 156, 157. The manuscript contains the five acts of the Council of 1166.

contains red and blue stones. Whilst clearly not a military portrayal, this miniature does feature a labarum-headed sceptre as a symbol of authority, and so appears to have political purpose. Further, if there is a relative lack of portrayals of Manuel in media other than coins, it is important to remember that when the emperor was not present physically, people were reminded of his existence by his portraits on banners, in public places, in churches, in the *oikoi* of the powerful, and particularly on coins. In making this point Magdalino points out that such representations could be considered as 'icons'.⁵¹⁵ Thus the survival of coins from Manuel's reign is of particular importance given the dearth of images surviving in other media.

Manuel's reign was long and eventful. It has been stated that 'few Byzantine emperors ever sat so securely on their throne'.⁵¹⁶ But with hindsight it is clear that his successors would inherit mixed fortunes. Manuel's defeat by the Turks at Myriokephalon in 1176 was a turning point in the struggle between the two powers; within six years Dorylaion and Kotyaion were in Turkish hands, a considerable weakening of Byzantine defences. But in overall terms a greater disadvantage attached to the fact that when Manuel died in 1180 his son and successor Alexios II (1180-83) was only eleven years old.

It is questionable whether Alexios II issued any coinage; the types of Manuel probably continued to be issued, and the Barber Institute Collection and the Dumbarton Oaks Collection contain no specimens attributed to Alexios II. Metcalf does not believe that any *histamena* were struck in Alexios'

⁵¹⁵ Magdalino 1993, 312-13. Magdalino places 'icons' in inverted commas.

⁵¹⁶ Angold 1984, 193.

name, but on the basis of excavations at Athens and Corinth thinks that some folles attributed to Alexios I should be re-attributed to Alexios II or III,⁵¹⁷ but the brevity of his account and lack of detail are not wholly convincing. Similarly, his suggestions that evidence from the Brauron hoard from Attica might indicate the production there of two unpublished types of tetartera under Alexios II is rather speculative.⁵¹⁸ O'Hara would allocate six copper coins from an Antioch excavation report to Alexios II, but the evidence is weak: essentially that of the letter 'M' on one coin which O'Hara designates as part of 'Komnenos', rather than 'Manuel'; and the use of 'REX' with the cross on steps.⁵¹⁹ O'Hara suggests the use of 'REX' as being the western equivalent of '*basileus*' would fit with an area with a large western population such as Antioch, but Hendy has pointed out that if a western equivalent of '*basileus*' had been required, '*imperator*' would have been the word of choice.⁵²⁰ Further, if Alexios II did issue a coinage it could be asked why only a tiny number of coins from a provincial mint survive. There is a connection with Antioch, in that the city was the home of Alexios' mother Maria, but this does not explain the lack of coinage from Constantinople: if Alexios II had issued a coinage, it would surely have been from the capital. On the basis of the available evidence it is unlikely that Alexios did issue any coinage, and thus it is presumed that the coinage of Manuel continued to be used.

The record for Alexios II is sparse in other media. Despite his youth Alexios was described with martial attributes at an early age: in an address to

⁵¹⁷ Metcalf 1965, 88, 108, 118, 122.

⁵¹⁸ Metcalf essentially admits this by using the word 'tentative'. Metcalf 1965, 122.

⁵¹⁹ O'Hara 1989, 111-13.

⁵²⁰ Hendy DOC 4.1, 341.

the Patriarch Michael III which Kazhdan dates to 1177 Eustathios describes how closely Alexios resembles his father.⁵²¹ Thus even at the age of eight Alexios has put on armour, wielded a spear, and hunted boars and bears. It is however difficult to be certain how accurate this is, for later Kazhdan refers to the point that 'panegyric convention overshadows true observation'.⁵²² It is noteworthy that in a surviving portrait of Alexios II he is shown beardless and in civilian dress.⁵²³ A text cited by Magdalino and Nelson refers to a portrait (now lost) of Alexios II in the company of his father Manuel I and grandfather John II, but this text gives no details of dress.⁵²⁴

Andronikos Komnenos came to the throne late in life and ruled for only two years (1183-5). The siege of Thessaloniki by the Normans (6–24 August 1185) coincided with the end of his reign and when the city fell Andronikos was dethroned and killed. The siege of Thessaloniki is of particular interest in that it produced a siege coin, the only issue of Andronikos' reign which features military symbolism, and is therefore a direct link between conflict and military symbolism. The coin is a very rare Type B tetarteron noummion dated to July/August 1185. (**Fig. 23.**)⁵²⁵ The obverse features St George, beardless and nimbate, wearing a breastplate, and holding a spear in his right hand and a shield in his left. This shield features a lys, which is the earliest

⁵²¹ Kazhdan and Franklin 1984, 126-27, citing Escorial Y-10-II, fol. 169v and 170.

⁵²² Kazhdan and Franklin 1984, 191.

⁵²³ Mutin. gr. 122, f. 293v; Spatharakis 1976, fig. 117c.

⁵²⁴ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 146–47. The text is Sp. Lampros "*Ὁ Μαρχιακὸς νοσ Κῶδις*" 524, *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων*, 8 (1911), 3–57, 123–92, fol. 37r-v.)

⁵²⁵ BICC: coin no B5844. **See fig. 23.** Dumbarton Oaks: no specimen. The Barber coin is reproduced in the Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue: 4.1, 353, coin no (7); 4.2, plate XVIII, coin no (7). It should be noted that the DOC is incorrect in stating that this coin is copper: it is bronze. The inscription is partly columnar.

appearance of this motif on Byzantine coinage.⁵²⁶ Andronikos appears on the reverse in non-military dress, holding the labarum in his right hand, and globus cruciger with patriarchal cross in his left. The *Manus Dei* is present in the upper right field. The obverse inscription is O|ΛΓΙ|O|ΣΓ|E ΩP|Γ|Σ and the reverse ANΔP.NIK.C [ΔE CΠOΘHC?].

It is difficult to determine why the lys should have been adopted as a symbol on a coin at this date, although there is some evidence of its use on buildings in Thessaloniki: two marble arches, dated to the tenth or twelfth century, and which could have been part of a ciborium, were found in the basilica of St Demetrios in Thessaloniki, and part of their decoration consists of two plant motifs, both of which resemble a lily.⁵²⁷ The lys could therefore have been known as an attribute of St Demetrios; a stone relief decorated with a lily is believed to have existed in the upper wall between the lower city and the acropolis in Thessaloniki, and may also have been associated with St Demetrios.⁵²⁸ A further possible link between the lys and St Demetrios is the missing decoration of the top of the ciborium of St Demetrios. Morrisson speculates that the decoration could have been a lys supporting a globe.⁵²⁹ There could thus be a local precedent for the use of the lys, and there would appear to be a further significance to the adoption of the lys in that its use on the shield on this tetarteron noummion creates a combination of a military with a non-military symbol. The symbol which appeared on the shield on earlier Byzantine coins was that of a horseman spearing a foe on the ground, which

⁵²⁶ DOC 4.1, 344.

⁵²⁷ Bakirtzis 2002, 184 and fig. 3.

⁵²⁸ Morrisson 2007, 185 and fn 62.

⁵²⁹ Morrisson 2007, 184-5; Evans and Wixom 1997, 77-8.

had clear military and/or apotropaic connotations. If with Thessaloniki under siege this symbol was replaced by a lys, it is reasonable to assume that the lys must have been viewed as a powerful symbol in its own right. The combination of a lys and a shield could be interpreted as a reference to the defence of Thessaloniki, but it is difficult to be certain whether or not the lys was a reference to St Demetrios, or to the city. Morrisson has pointed out that a symbol whose meaning would have been obvious to users at the time the coin was minted, and which did not need to be expressed in words, can subsequently not be obvious to scholars in the twenty-first century.⁵³⁰ The lily became a more common symbol on Thessalonian coinage during and after the reign of John Doukas (1237-42), under the control of his father, the blind former emperor Theodore Komnenos Doukas (1224/6-30).⁵³¹

That the lys may have had a different significance is recorded by Grierson, who notes that the lys was associated with the cult of St Tryphon, the patron of Nicaea, where a miracle of a lily flowering when placed in the saint's shrine occurred on the saint's festival on February 1st each year.⁵³² As St Tryphon was a civilian saint the lys on a Thessalonian siege coin was unlikely to represent a link to Nicaea. The lys may therefore have derived from another source, the lily found on the reverse of Florentine coins, particularly the gold florin, and familiar in the Aegean area.⁵³³ Against this must be set the point that if this explanation accounts for the presence of the lys on Thessalonian coins, it would not account for the use of the lys on buildings in

⁵³⁰ Morrisson 2007, 173. Essentially Morrisson suggests a link between the symbol of the lys and St Demetrios and/or Thessaloniki, but admits lack of final proof.

⁵³¹ Morrisson 2007, 184.

⁵³² Grierson, DOC 5.1, 92.

⁵³³ Grierson, DOC 5.1, 77, 81, 92.

the city; the latter would argue for a Thessalonian, not Florentine, origin for the symbol. Therefore the lys may well illustrate Morrisson's point of the use of a symbol whose meaning has become obscured with time.

St George had been depicted previously on coins from Thessaloniki, e.g. the tetarteron of Manuel I (see above). Given the very strong association of St Demetrios with the city it may appear unusual that at such a critical point as the Norman siege in 1185 the image of St George should be preferred, unless the lys was an attribute of St Demetrios, which would then have made this coin an invocation to both saints. The two saints were often paired after the tenth century, and could be portrayed side by side on horseback. Further, pilgrims carried away the *myron* of St Demetrios from his basilica in lead ampullae (*koutrouvia*), which were decorated with an image of St Demetrios on one side, and with an image of St George or St Nestor on the other.⁵³⁴ St George was therefore clearly revered in Thessaloniki in conjunction with St Demetrios, so that the appearance of St George with a symbol of St Demetrios together would not have been unusual. The combination would have represented a saint with a strong local appeal (St Demetrios) coupled with a saint with a broader popularity (St George), who was more widely depicted in Byzantine art than any other saint; the precedence of his banner in court ceremonial has been noted above.

St George would also have appealed to the differing nationalities who were defending Thessaloniki: Eustathios comments on their range, which

⁵³⁴ Bakirtzis 2002, 183; Evans and Wixom 1997, 169, no 118.

included Serbians, Alans, Iberians, Germans, and Bulgarians.⁵³⁵ The presence of Alans and Serbs amongst the defenders may be of particular significance: George's martyrdom was depicted in churches, especially in Georgia and Serbia.⁵³⁶ The Byzantines did not distinguish between Alans and Georgians, and St George also enjoyed strong links with Georgia: the earliest account of his rescue of a princess occurs in an eleventh-century Georgian manuscript.⁵³⁷ Thus it could have been that St George would have appealed particularly to these groups, and the incorporation of St George on the Type B tetarteron could have had significance for those Serbs defending Thessaloniki, as the Serbian king Stefan Nemanja (reigned c. 1165/68–96), had a devotion to the saint.⁵³⁸ However Eustathios creates the impression that because of David Komnenos' failings, the city was doomed.⁵³⁹ The Type B tetarteron noummion is dated to July/August 1185,⁵⁴⁰ immediately after the fall of Dyrrachium on June 24th and covering the period of the siege of Thessaloniki from August 6th to 24th. As there is some suggestion that St George had come to be seen as more of a protection against conquerors than as a help in battle⁵⁴¹ there is also the possibility that the choice of St George might have had an element of resignation or fatalism.

As noted, this Type B tetarteron noummion is the only coin of Andronikos with military symbolism, and its date has a strong association with

⁵³⁵ Eustathios 1988, 88–89, 92–95, 120–21. Whilst the defenders would not have been paid in base metal coinage they would presumably have seen the coins in everyday transactions.

⁵³⁶ Kazhdan and Sevckenko ODB, 835.

⁵³⁷ Walter 2003, 140–42.

⁵³⁸ Walter 2003, 132–33. Whilst it is true that several cases of St George helping Serbian rulers cited by Walter occurred after the siege of Thessaloniki in 1185, it appears that the first instance of help occurred before this date.

⁵³⁹ Eustathios 1988, [9], 10–13.

⁵⁴⁰ DOC 4.1, 344, 353.

⁵⁴¹ Walter 2003, 134.

the siege of Thessaloniki, rather than any conspiracy against Andronikos himself.⁵⁴² His coins in general tend rather to emphasise what he saw as his legitimacy to rule, in that he appears mainly in the company of Christ, who crowns him. When portraying himself in media other than coins Andronikos erected a portrait of himself very close to the Church of the Holy Forty Martyrs, and prompting Choniates to record:

Outside, near the perforated gates of the temple facing north in the direction of the agora, he set up a huge painted panel of himself, not arrayed as an emperor or wearing the imperial golden ornaments, but dressed in the garb of a laborer, of turquoise color and slit all around and reaching down to the buttocks; his legs were covered up to the knees in white boots, and he held a huge curved sickle in his hand, heavy and strong, that caught in its curved shape and snared as in a net a lad, handsome as a statue, with only his neck and shoulders showing forth.⁵⁴³

Choniates states that with this portrait Andronikos was signalling that he had deposed Alexios II and then married Alexios' eleven year old wife Agnes (Anna), the daughter of Louis VII of France.⁵⁴⁴ It seems unusual that Andronikos, a member of the powerful Komnenos family, should portray himself as a labourer, although given his disloyalty to Manuel, Andronikos may have felt himself an outsider. Eastmond has recently re-examined and re-interpreted Choniates' description, seeing it as irony and inversion to subvert Andronikos' power.⁵⁴⁵ Eastmond notes that the dress of Andronikos in the portrait may be a reference to David, who was frequently portrayed as a

⁵⁴² Cheynet 1990, 116-9.

⁵⁴³ Choniates 1984, 183, 194. Choniates records further public portraits of Andronikos, referring to 'his portrait found on walls and panels'. It is possible that the sickle had a connotation of punishment: in the revolt of John Komnenos against Alexios III Kazhdan and Franklin refer to the 'sickle of punishment' which derives from the Septuagint version of Zechariah 5, 1-4. Kazhdan and Franklin 1984, 245. But it is possible too that the 'huge curved sickle' was not a sickle at all, but a sword. Brand points out that an emperor wishing to impress an urban mob would not have portrayed himself with an agricultural instrument, and also that its position would make sense only if it were a sword. On this latter point we have to rely on the word of Choniates, but Andronikos might have used a curved sword to identify himself with the eastern part of the empire, having at one time been governor of Pontos. Brand 1968, 329 fn 51.

⁵⁴⁴ Choniates 1984, [332], 183.

⁵⁴⁵ Eastmond 2013, 121-43.

shepherd boy in Byzantine art and that there was a longstanding association between emperors and David in Byzantine art and culture. However, Eastmond goes on to state that 'It is impossible to gauge the degree to which a specific allusion [to David] was intended in Andronikos' case'.⁵⁴⁶ Magdalino has pointed out that Komnenian emperors had represented themselves as David, but also as Digenes Akritis, Odysseus, and Alexander.⁵⁴⁷

Isaac II introduced further developments in the use of military symbols on the coinage. The Archangel Michael appeared on all Isaac's issues that bore military imagery, whereas previously there had only been one isolated appearance of the archangel, on a nomisma histamenon of Michael IV, most probably because of their shared name. Isaac's devotion to the cult of the Archangel Michael was well known. On the nomisma hyperpyron from Constantinople (1185–95) the Virgin, nimbate and seated on a throne, holding the beardless nimbate head of Christ on her breast, is seen on the obverse; the inscription MP ΘV. The reverse features Isaac standing on the viewer's left; he wears stemma, divitision, collar piece and loros, and holds a sceptre cruciger in his right hand. The Archangel Michael stands to the right, in military tunic, breastplate and sagion, and between them is a partially sheathed sword which they hold hilt upwards, Isaac with his left hand and Michael with his right, above Isaac's hand; this is the first time in the period covered by this thesis where the sword is held in this way on a coin. The

⁵⁴⁶ Eastmond 2013, 134, 137.

⁵⁴⁷ Magdalino 1993, 481.

Manus Dei appears in the upper central field, and the inscription reads ICAAKIOC ΔΕCΠ X|AP or OA|XMI X|M. (Fig. 24.)⁵⁴⁸

The aspron trachy nomisma in electrum from Constantinople (1185–95), but not that in billon, also features military iconography. Whilst the obverse features a similar image and inscription to that on the nomisma hyperpyron, the reverse shows Isaac on the left, in civilian dress, holding a sceptre cruciger in his right hand and *anexikakia* in his left. On the right the Archangel Michael, beardless and nimbate, wearing a military tunic, breastplate and sagion, blesses Isaac with his right hand, whilst his left holds a jewelled sceptre. The inscription is ICAAKIOCΔΕCΠ X|AP|X|MI.⁵⁴⁹

The tetarteron noummion from Thessaloniki (1185–95) also shows the Archangel Michael, but here on the obverse, beardless and nimbate, and wearing divitision, collar-piece and loros, and holding in his right hand a spear (or possibly a jewelled sceptre: wear makes it difficult to be precise) and in his left the globus cruciger; the inscription reads O|X X AP|MI. Isaac appears on the reverse, holding a sceptre cruciger in his right hand, and *anexikakia* in his left, with the inscription ICA|AKI|OC ΔE|CΠO|THC.⁵⁵⁰ Similar iconography, on both obverse and reverse, is seen on a half-tetarteron (c.1185), where the object held in Michael's right hand is a *spathobaklion*, with a trifoliate fleuron top. There is no obverse inscription and the reverse inscription is I|CA KI. The

⁵⁴⁸ BICC: coin nos B5865, B5866. See fig. 24. DOC 4.1, 370–73, coin nos 1b.1–1b.10, 1c, 1d.1–1d.7; 4.2, plate XIX, coin nos 1b.1, 1b.3, 1b.4, 1b.5, and plate XX, coin nos 1c, 1d.1, 1d.4, 1d.5, 1d.6. The reverse inscription is partly columnar.

⁵⁴⁹ Hendy refers to Isaac as 'crowned' by Michael, but the point has been made that only Christ could crown the emperor; Michael's action here is thus to bless him. BICC: coin nos B5867, B5868, B5869, B5870. DOC 4.1, 373–77, coin nos 2a.1–2a.15, 2b.1–2b.7, 2c.1–2c.9; 4.2, plate XX, coin nos 2a.1, 2a.10, 2a.13, 2a.14, 2a.15, 2b.1, 2b.2, 2c.1, 2c.7, 2c.9.

⁵⁵⁰ BICC: coin nos B5920, B5921. DOC 4.1, 390–91, coin nos 5a.1–5a.3, 5b.1–5b.2, 5c.1–5c.3, 5d.1–5d.3; 4.2, plate XXI, coin nos 5a.3, 5c.2. It should be noted that on coin no 5a.3 Michael appears to hold a *spathobaklion* (a staff signifying high rank) in his right hand, but DOC does not record this; there was obviously variation in this object in the series.

Barber Institute Collection ascribes this to Thessaloniki but the Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue to an uncertain Greek mint.⁵⁵¹

Given the power attributed to the Archangel Michael, Isaac's devotion to him is not surprising, especially as Isaac's surname of Angelos provided a significant link to the archangel.⁵⁵² It should be noted too that on the coinage of previous emperors who portrayed themselves with a warrior saint, e.g. Alexios I,⁵⁵³ the object held between the two figures was a labarum, or a patriarchal cross. Isaac II is the first emperor to portray himself with a warrior figure where the object held between them is not only a sword, but a sword partly unsheathed, and held hilt upwards. In the sequence of emperors portrayed on coinage with warrior saints or the Archangel Michael the nomisma hyperpyron of Isaac II represents not just military symbolism, but an *increasing* degree of military symbolism. Holding the sword hilt upwards may have been borrowed from ceremonial, where there are depictions of the sword held in this manner. On Isaac's coin the sword is held with the horizontal part of the hilt at shoulder level, and it is clear that in depictions of swords held hilt upwards there are variations in the level of the sword, and the manner in which it is held. In the ninth-century miniature in Par. gr. 510, f. 239r, which shows Theodosios I receiving the resignation of Gregory of Nazianos, the two bodyguards on the emperor's left each hold a sheathed sword hilt upwards, and resting on the left shoulder, with the horizontal part of

⁵⁵¹ BICC: coin no B5922. DOC 4.1, 391, coin no 6; 4.2, plate XXI, coin no 6. Both the Barber specimen and DO coin no 6 show that the object in the archangel's right hand is a *spathobaklion*, but Hendy labels this a 'jewelled scepter'.

⁵⁵² The address to Isaac by Michael Choniates, the bishop of Athens, where he honours Isaac's sword, which played such a major role in his accession, is also significant. Macrides 1994, 276-77. It is of interest to note the approval given to Isaac II and his sword when compared with the disapproval accorded to Isaac I with his sword noted in chapter 3.

⁵⁵³ See p. 104.

the hilt at scalp level.⁵⁵⁴ In another ninth-century miniature, Par. gr. 510, f. 440r, two bodyguards each with a sheathed sword hilt upwards on the left shoulder attend St Helena at the Discovery of the True Cross.⁵⁵⁵ By contrast, in a fourteenth-century depiction of Theodosios I receiving the resignation of Gregory of Nazianos (Par. gr. 543, f. 288v), a courtier holds an unsheathed sword hilt upwards behind the emperor, with the horizontal part of the hilt at scalp level.⁵⁵⁶

Parani distinguishes between the sword positions resting on the shoulder in Par. gr. 510, f. 239r and Par. gr. 510, f. 440r from Par. gr. 543, f. 288v, where the sword is held aloft. She suggests that the change in position occurred during the reign of Manuel I, an emperor skilled and innovative in his use of ceremonial. Holding the sword aloft enhanced the emperor's military attributes and the military nature of the portrayal.⁵⁵⁷ The sword was also held aloft in the *prokypsis* ceremony. Manuel I was credited with creating this ceremony, although final proof is lacking.⁵⁵⁸ It is clear that the sword could be held hilt upwards in several different ways, which became more dramatic over time.

Isaac's use of military symbols on his coinage may have been influenced by the dramatic manner in which he came to the throne. Andronikos had ordered Stephen Hagiochristophorités to arrest Isaac, but Isaac killed Stephen, and then made for Hagia Sophia to seek asylum, but

⁵⁵⁴ Brubaker 1999, fig. 27, and 133-4 for a description.

⁵⁵⁵ Brubaker 1999, fig. 45.

⁵⁵⁶ Parani 2003, plate 97.

⁵⁵⁷ Parani 2003, 146-7 and fn 230. See also Magdalino 1993, 237-48 and Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 159-60.

⁵⁵⁸ Parani 2003, 146-7 and fn 230, fn 232

where he was acclaimed by the mob and crowned.⁵⁵⁹ In terms of his accession not only the dramatic events which preceded the seizing of the throne by Isaac, but also competition from other aristocratic families, such as the Palaiologoi, Kantakouzenoi, and Branas might have prompted Isaac to issue the nomisma hyperpyron which featured on the obverse the Virgin, as the patron and defender of Constantinople, and with the Archangel Michael holding a sword with Isaac, who was being crowned by the *Manus Dei*, on the reverse. The combination of such figures on the coin, and the power associated with them, could be viewed as a legitimization issue, but it should be remembered that the issue cannot be dated precisely. But with the exception of his accession it is not easy to set the coinage of Isaac in the possible context of specific events of his reign, since the coinage cannot be dated more accurately than from 1185 to 1195. Isaac's reign saw seventeen conspiracies against him.⁵⁶⁰ Choniates attributed these conspiracies to the 'feeble manner' in which Isaac governed the empire,⁵⁶¹ but putting this number into context Isaac was able to reign for ten years, whilst Andronikos I had faced nine rebellions in two years.⁵⁶²

If it is not possible to link specific events to specific coin issues, because of a lack of dating evidence, two distinguishing features of Isaac's coinage may nevertheless be noted: all his issues with military symbolism feature the Archangel Michael, and St Demetrios does not appear on any of

⁵⁵⁹ Choniates recorded: 'With sword drawn..... he mounted his horse and raised his sword hand against the head of Hagiochristophorités.' And: 'Isaakios rode at full speed towards the Great Church by way of the thoroughfare Mesé. As he passed through the agora, he shouted out to all that with this sword (for he was still carrying it naked in his hand) he had killed Stephen Hagiochristophorités.' Choniates 1984, [342], 188-89.

⁵⁶⁰ Cheynet 1990, 120-9.

⁵⁶¹ Choniates 1984, [423], 233.

⁵⁶² Cheynet 1990, 114-9.

his coins. Regarding the first point, from the eleventh century onwards there had been only one previous appearance of the Archangel Michael on a coin, the nomisma histamenon from Thessaloniki of Michael IV (1034-41).⁵⁶³ In view of their shared name this is perhaps not surprising, and Michael IV (standing unusually on the right) and the archangel hold a labarum between them; this issue has been linked to Michael's campaign against the Bulgarians in 1041, which had Thessaloniki as its headquarters. By contrast, on the nomisma hyperpyron of Isaac where he and the archangel hold a sword between them, Isaac is in the expected position on the left, but the mint was Constantinople and not Thessaloniki. This is noteworthy, in that military symbols are found more commonly on coins from Thessaloniki than from Constantinople, as will be seen in the next chapter. However, as this coin shows Isaac and the archangel holding the sword hilt up, in a ceremonial fashion, the image could imply a legitimisation element. The aspron trachy nomisma in electrum from Constantinople shows on the reverse Isaac being blessed by the Archangel Michael, but the latter wears military dress. On the tetarteron noummion and half-tetarteron from Thessaloniki, the archangel occupies the obverse on his own, with no military attributes except an object which may be a spear, or possibly a sceptre. Although the use of the archangel on coinage had been rare before Isaac's reign, its use by the latter is understandable, in both general and specific terms. In general the significance of Michael as leader of God's army has been summarised by

⁵⁶³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 1973, 3.2, 721-22, 726, coin no 2; plate LVIII, coin no 2.

Walter.⁵⁶⁴ In specific terms, Isaac had a devotion to the archangel which is witnessed by his restoration of the church of Michael at Anaplous on the Bosphorus, using marble extensively and installing in it paintings and mosaics of the Archangel gathered from the surrounding area. This contrasts with his destruction of the house of the Mangana dedicated to St George.⁵⁶⁵

The second distinguishing feature of Isaac's coinage is the absence of St Demetrios on coins from Thessaloniki. Given the strength of the association of St Demetrios with this city, his absence during a whole reign is unusual, as Thessaloniki was of continuing strategic importance. The city had fallen to the Normans of Sicily in 1185; Isaac appointed Alexios Branas and the Byzantine forces under this experienced general had defeated the Normans, but problems in neighbouring areas continued, particularly with the Bulgarian leaders Peter and Asan, who were disaffected with Isaac. Choniates relates that Peter and Asan took the unusual step of recruiting St Demetrios to their cause, with the aim of helping the Bulgars and Vlachs to shake off the Byzantine yoke.⁵⁶⁶

The departure of St Demetrios from Thessaloniki, was also predicted by Eustathios.⁵⁶⁷ The importance of St Demetrios to the Byzantines is shown

⁵⁶⁴ 'What is rarely evident in the Old Testament but constantly recalled in the New is that the world is in the power of demonic forces. All believers in Christ and his mission are committed to combating these forces, with whom the struggle will continue until the end of time. They are not alone in this combat; God's army under the leadership of the archangel Michael will finally overcome the Dragon.' Walter 2003, 13.

⁵⁶⁵ Choniates 1984, [442], 242-43.

⁵⁶⁶ Choniates 1984, [371], 205: 'In support of this cause, Demetrios, the Martyr for Christ, would abandon the metropolis of Thessaloniki and his church there and the customary haunts of the Romans and come over to them to be their helper and assistant in their forthcoming task.'

⁵⁶⁷ 'First among these were the dreams of virtuous men, which even Holy Scripture knows to be an indication of the things that are to come. These began to advise us of the things which we were about to suffer.....These same men actually saw in a vision that the *Myrobletes* was absent from the city.....Then again and again we cried aloud, 'Come to save us, so that the

by Isaac's action in entering (possibly in 1186) the house of the Bulgarian leader Peter Asan and removing an icon of St Demetrios, thus symbolically reclaiming the saint for the Byzantines.⁵⁶⁸ There does not appear to be any other evidence in the primary sources that might provide more information on the absence of St Demetrios from Isaac's coinage. The idea that the saint was perceived to have deserted Thessaloniki and thus was not placed on coins is a possibility, but seems unlikely, for if St Demetrios had been represented on Isaac's coins, it might have helped to re-assert his return to the city and the Byzantine cause. A further threat to Isaac came from the Vlachs, who, during the Third Crusade (1189-92), offered support to the German forces for an attack on Constantinople. It is however not possible to see any certain link between the coinage of Isaac and events of the Third Crusade, as the coinage can only be dated to the whole of the reign, and not to any specific year.

The numismatic portrayals of Isaac with a sword have a parallel in a painting (now lost), which was described by Theodore Balsamon.⁵⁶⁹ Given the dramatic events by which Isaac seized the throne, it is reasonable to link Balsamon's description of the painting to his accession. Isaac's portrayal would have appeared to contemporary onlookers as imperial, for he appeared on horseback, wearing a crown, and carrying a sword. Isaac presented

nations may never say, "Where is the protector of their city?" ' But he did not listen to our prayers, and removed himself from us.' Eustathios 1988, [127, 128], 140-1.

⁵⁶⁸ Horna, K. (ed.) 1903, *Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon*, Wiener Studien 25, 192. Cited by Stephenson 2000, 290 and fn 39.

⁵⁶⁹ 'So as you see Angelos carrying his sword, and, indeed, Angelos wearing his crown, praise him for his sword and his crown: the one has upheld the state of the Ausonians, the other has severed the tyrants' heads.' Ed. K. Horna, 'Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon', Wiener Studien, 25 (1903), 200-01; and Lampros, "Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς Κῶδιξ" 524, 131ff. Cited by Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 152.

himself not just as one who had rid the people of a tyrant, but also as a man whose martial qualities put him in the tradition of emperors fit to rule, and to defend the empire at a time of external threat. For viewers of this lost portrait of Isaac there could have been a resonance with the great equestrian statue of Justinian, still standing in the Augusteum in the twelfth century, but Isaac's reign came to an end in April 1195 when an aristocratic group under the command of his elder brother Alexios overthrew and blinded him.

A series of factors coalesced during the reign of Alexios III (1195-1203) and ultimately produced disastrous results. According to Choniates these factors concerned his extravagance;⁵⁷⁰ his alienation of the population; and the increasingly hostile attitude of the Latins. This last was compounded by Pope Innocent III, and complicated by the presence in Italy of Alexios, the son of Isaac II.⁵⁷¹ The coinage of Alexios III from Thessaloniki features military iconography of a type similar to that of previous emperors. On a tetarteron noummion in bronze, dated 1197–1203, the obverse features St George, beardless and nimbate, wearing tunic, breastplate and sagion, and carrying in his right hand a spear which rests on his left shoulder; his left hand rests on the hilt of his sword; inscription: Ο|ΓΕ|ΩΡ Γ|Ι|ΟC. Alexios appears on the reverse as a full-length figure, wearing stemma, divitision and chlamys; he holds the labarum with his right hand and a globus cruciger with his left; inscription: ΑΑΕ[]ΙΟC ΔΕCΠΟΤΗC. **(Fig. 25.)**⁵⁷² The half-tetarteron in bronze from Thessaloniki consists of two types (A: 1195–97?), and B (1197–1203?).

⁵⁷⁰ Choniates 1984, [484], 265, 295.

⁵⁷¹ Choniates 1984, [536-37], 294-95; [539-40], 296.

⁵⁷² BICC: coin nos B5948, B5949, B5950, B5951. **See fig. 25.** DOC 4.1, 415–17, coin nos 5a.1–5a.15, 5b.1–5b.4, 5c, 5d.1–5d.2; 4.2, plate XXIV, coin nos 5a.1, 5a.2, 5a.10, 5b.1, 5b.2, 5c.

Type A features St George on the obverse; he appears beardless and nimbate, wearing tunic, breastplate and sagion. He holds in his right hand a spear, which rests on his left shoulder, and in his left the hilt of his sword. Inscription: .Ο|ΓΕ|ΩΡ Γ|Ι|ΟC. On the reverse Alexios is seen full-length, wearing stemma, divitision and chlamys, and holding the labarum in his right hand and globus cruciger in his left. The *Manus Dei* is seen in the upper right field, and the inscription reads ΑΛΕ[]ΙΩ ΔΕCΠ.⁵⁷³ The Type B differs in some small details, in that the obverse shows St George as previously, but with a shield in his left hand.⁵⁷⁴ The Dumbarton Oaks' specimens listed as Type B show a further variation in that St George holds a spear in his right hand, but resting on his right shoulder; and a shield in his left hand; the inscription is as Type A. The emperor appears as before on the reverse, with labarum in his right hand, but the globus cruciger in his left has a patriarchal cross. The *Manus Dei* is not present in the Type B from either the Barber Institute or Dumbarton Oaks Collections. The inscription reads ΑΛΕ[]Ι ΔΕCΠΙΟΤΗ or ΑΛC[]ΙΩ ΤΩΚΟΜΝΗΝΩ.⁵⁷⁵ St George's shield on coins from both the Barber Institute and Dumbarton Oaks shows an outer edge of studs, but it is not possible to make out the design in the centre.

The tetarteron noummion and half-tetarteron (Types A and B) from Thessaloniki are closely related to each other in their iconography. On the obverse there is a minor difference in the object which St George holds in his left hand; the inscriptions are identical. On the reverse there is another minor

⁵⁷³ BICC: coin no B5952. DOC 4.1, 418, coin nos 7.1–7.6; 4.2, plate XXIV, coin nos 7.1, 7.3.

⁵⁷⁴ BICC: coin no B5953.

⁵⁷⁵ DOC 4.1, 418–19, coin nos 8a.1–8a.3, 8b.1–8b.2, 8c.1–8c.2; 4.2, plate XXIV, coin nos 8a.1, 8b.2.

difference in the object held by Alexios in his left hand and whether or not the Manus Dei is present. The reverse inscriptions show minor variations. These depictions of St George and the emperor strongly resemble those on the tetarteron noummion of Andronikos I, apart from differences in the emperor's names in the inscriptions, and whether the title ΔΕCΠΙΟΤΗC is given in full, or abbreviated. This would suggest that the type was carried forward from Andronikos I to Alexios III, but it should be noted that there does not appear to be a similar action with the types on the aspron trachy nomisma of John II and the Type B tetarteron noummion of Andronikos I, both of which feature St George, but in differing iconographies.⁵⁷⁶

The Bulgarian wars continued under Alexios III and so it is not surprising to find that military imagery continues on coins from Thessaloniki, a city closer to any fighting than Constantinople. Alexios also continued the use of St George on such coins, a practice which started with John II. Whilst it might be expected that military imagery is concentrated again on the coinage of Thessaloniki, it is more unusual to find that although Alexios' coinage from the capital does not feature weapons or armour, there is an innovation in that the emperor is shown with St Constantine in a number of series. It should be noted that the coin issues featuring St Constantine and Alexios do not depict either figure in military dress, and nor does either carry any weapon. Because of this, and the fact that St Constantine was not regarded as a warrior saint, these issues should not be regarded as military ones according to definitions applied in this thesis.

⁵⁷⁶ Isaac II's coins with a military element featured the Archangel Michael, and not St George.

A possible explanation for the production of such coins, which date to 1195-97, might be that their date corresponds to the time when Alexios was stripping treasure from churches, and this circumstance might explain the use of the St Constantine image. Alexios needed funds to pay off the demands of Henry VI of Germany, who had taken control of Sicily and then turned his attention to Byzantine territory further east.⁵⁷⁷ The Byzantine population refused to pay a new tax (the *Alamanikon*) to finance this payment to Henry. Thus Alexios moved to strip the imperial tombs in the church of the Holy Apostles; these yielded seventy hundredweight of silver and some gold, all of which was melted down. The tomb of Constantine the Great was only just saved, when Alexios realised that he had sufficient plunder.⁵⁷⁸ This incident could provide a link to the depiction of St Constantine on Alexios' coinage: if the coinage followed the plundering Alexios could have been attempting to defuse criticism of tomb-stripping by showing his veneration of Constantine. If the coins were issued before the tomb-raiding, and Alexios' veneration was apparent, he might have felt able to strip the tombs with impunity. In the event, the death of Henry VI in September 1197 obviated the need: the proceeds were never despatched.

The coinage of Alexios, while straightforward in terms of sequence, is nevertheless important, because representations of Alexios are so rare in other media; there appears to be no literary evidence of imperial portraiture for him.⁵⁷⁹ Other than his portrayals on coinage, the sole likeness is a drawing

⁵⁷⁷ Choniates 1984, [454], 249; [476], 261.

⁵⁷⁸ Choniates 1984, [478, 479], 262 – 63.

⁵⁷⁹ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 169.

on the margin of a folio (f. 293v) in the Codex gr. 122 (a.S. 5.5).⁵⁸⁰ These drawings show only the faces of the emperors; Alexios wears a crown with pendilia, a jewelled collar and has a square-cut beard. Thus his sole extant military images appear on his coins.

In the space of eight years Alexios faced nineteen conspiracies,⁵⁸¹ and he fled Constantinople in July 1203 after the arrival of the Fourth Crusade and a short siege. The Barber Institute Coin Collection contains no coins attributed to the joint reign of Isaac II Angelos and Alexios IV (July 1203 to February 1204); nor to the reign of Alexios V (1204). In the Dumbarton Oaks Collection Hendy identifies a tetarteron noummion in copper or bronze of the joint reign of Isaac II and Alexios IV, but this does not exhibit military iconography. He also suggests that there was extensive coining of electrum trachea at the end of the reign of Alexios III and that such coins constituted the precious-metal coinage of the succeeding joint reign; these coins would have been used as payment to the crusaders.⁵⁸² Hendy identifies no coinage for Alexios V.⁵⁸³

Comparative Analysis of Military Types 1042-1204

The coin types with military symbolism discussed above, and in chapter 3, may allow a comparative overview. By calculating the number of coin types with military symbolism as a percentage (mean) of the overall number of types for each emperor and each mint comparisons may be made between emperors and between mints. The coin issues of Constantine IX, Isaac I,

⁵⁸⁰ Formerly Mutin. gr. 111 D, S14, in the Biblioteca Estense in Modena. It contains drawings of every Roman and Byzantine emperor from Augustus to Constantine XI. Spatharakis 1976, 172, 179, and fig. 117f.

⁵⁸¹ Cheynet 1990, 129-40.

⁵⁸² DOC 4.1, 421-24.

⁵⁸³ DOC 4.1, 425-26.

Michael VII and Nikephoros III are all from the mint of Constantinople. The coin issues of Alexios I, John II, Manuel I, Andronikos I, Isaac II and Alexios III are from the mints of Constantinople or Thessaloniki, with occasional issues from unidentified mints,⁵⁸⁴ but it should be remembered that the mint distribution of coins between Constantinople and Thessaloniki is not always clear in the twelfth century. Because of this lack of certainty the figures in the analysis below should be viewed with caution, but it is hoped that they might provide a tentative overview.

Alexios I issued four coin types from mints other than Constantinople or Thessaloniki (one possibly from Philippopolis and three from an unidentified mint). None of these four types have military symbolism. Manuel I issued four coin types, two of which have military symbolism, from unidentified mints. Andronikos I issued one coin, without military symbolism, from an unidentified mint, and Isaac I issued one coin, with military symbolism, from an unidentified mint. These coins from unidentified mints are noted in the text, but in view of the very small numbers of military issues involved and the lack of mint identification, the comparative analysis below relates to the mints of Constantinople and Thessaloniki. Manuel I also issued a tetarteron noummion in bronze which Hendy suggests may be from Thessaloniki, while Georganteli has made a case for this coin being from Constantinople (see p. 137). Because of this uncertainty this coin has also been excluded from these calculations.

⁵⁸⁴ These ten listed emperors issued coins with military symbolism; emperors who did not mint military types are excluded, in accordance with the convention of this thesis.

The combined outputs of the mints of Constantinople and Thessaloniki for the emperors issuing military types 1042-1204 is summarised below, and for each emperor show the proportion of military types as a percentage (mean) of the overall number of types.

Constantine IX	2/8	25.0%
Isaac I	3/4	75.0%
Michael VII	1/15	6.6%
Nikephoros III	1/9	11.1%
Alexios I	5/41	12.2%
John II	4/17	23.5%
Manuel I	3/20	15.0%
Andronikos I	1/7	14.3%
Isaac II	3/5	60.0%
Alexios III	3/8	37.5%
Total	26/134	19.4%

Whilst the mean for the whole period is 19.4%, there are higher individual means: 75% of Isaac I's coins featured military symbolism, although the overall number of issues (4) was small. The reign of Isaac II saw a mean of 60.0%, and the reign of Alexios III a mean of 37.5%. Although the overall numbers of issues for these two emperors are small, it might be reasonable to see the increasing threats to the empire from 1185 to 1204 as being reflected in this increase in military symbolism. To understand further such effects from 1081 onwards the combined figures for Constantinople and Thessaloniki

above are analysed separately, as there was an output from Thessaloniki from that year. These data are presented below.

Constantinople

Alexios I	1/23	4.3%
John II	2/7	28.6%
Manuel I	1/14	7.1%
Andronikos I	0/4	0%
Isaac II	2/4	50.0%
Alexios III	0/5	0%
Total	6/57	10.5%

Thessaloniki

Alexios I	4/18	22.2%
John II	2/10	20.0%
Manuel I	2/6	33.3%
Andronikos I	1/3	33.3%
Isaac II	1/1	100%
Alexios III	3/3	100%
Total	13/41	31.7%

This further analysis suggests that the output of military issues was considerably higher from Thessaloniki (31.7%) than from Constantinople (10.5%). Alexios I, Manuel I, Andronikos I, Isaac II and Alexios III all issued more military types from Thessaloniki than from Constantinople; only John II issued more military types from Constantinople than from Thessaloniki. The data for Thessaloniki also show a relatively steady increase in military types

over time, increasing from 22.2% under Alexios I to 100% under Alexios III. By contrast, the data for Constantinople show much more variation, rising and falling throughout the period.

Analysis of specific military figures (the armed emperor, St George, St Demetrios, the Archangel Michael, and St Theodore) for Constantinople 1042-1204 and for Thessaloniki 1081-1204 has also been undertaken, and the combined results appear below.⁵⁸⁵

Armed emperor	12/134	8.9%
St George	6/134	4.5%
St Demetrios	6/134	4.5%
Archangel Michael	4/134	3.0%
St Theodore	1/134	0.7%

When Constantinople and Thessaloniki are analysed separately the results are as shown below.

Constantinople

Armed emperor	11/93	11.8%
St George	1/93	1.1%
St Demetrios	0/93	0%
Archangel Michael	2/93	2.1%
St Theodore	1/93	1.1%

⁵⁸⁵ The number of symbols adds to greater than the number of military issues because more than one symbol can appear on one coin.

Thessaloniki

Armed emperor	1/41	2.4%
St George	5/41	12.2%
St Demetrios	6/41	14.6%
Archangel Michael	2/41	4.9%
St Theodore	0/41	0%

These data provide a contrast between Constantinople and Thessaloniki in that the armed emperor is most frequently used for Constantinople (11.8%) but the least used for Thessaloniki (2.4%). St Demetrios is the most popular military figure on Thessalonian coins (14.6%), but St Demetrios does not appear at all on Constantinopolitan coins. St George is more popular in Thessaloniki (12.2%) than in Constantinople (1.1%), as is the Archangel Michael (Thessaloniki 4.9%, Constantinople 2.1%).

Conclusions

From 1081 to 1204 the mint at Thessaloniki was active, and a mean of 31.7% of these coins displayed military symbols, compared to 10.5% with military symbols from the mint at Constantinople for the same period. Thessaloniki thus developed at an early date the practice of producing more military issues than Constantinople, and the percentage of military issues increased steadily at Thessaloniki from 22.2% to 100% between 1081 and 1204. By contrast, the percentage of military issues from Constantinople varied from zero to 50% from 1081 to 1204, and Alexios III had no military issues from the capital, but only from Thessaloniki. It should be remembered that there is uncertainty

about the mint distribution of coins between Constantinople and Thessaloniki in the twelfth century, and these conclusions should be viewed with caution. The higher number of military issues from Thessaloniki may be related to the city's location, which placed it in greater danger to invaders from the west and north west than Constantinople. During the reign of Manuel I in particular Thessaloniki was an important supply base as well as a mint. However it should be noted that none of these issues with military symbolism from Thessaloniki was in gold, so would not have been used to pay troops. The target audience therefore could have been the civilian population, perhaps as a form of reassurance.

Between 1081 and 1204 St George featured on 12.2% on coins from Thessaloniki, but on only 1.1% of coins from Constantinople. St Demetrios featured on 14.6% of coins from Thessaloniki but on none from Constantinople, for the same period. However the armed emperor appeared on 2.4% of coins from Thessaloniki but on 11.8% of coins from Constantinople between 1081 and 1204. The use of St George on coins circulating in an area of conflict had merit, because of his appeal not only to the Byzantines, but also to the Serbs; his figure, and not that of St Demetrios, who appears to be represented by a symbol only, features on a siege coinage of Thessaloniki, issued by Andronikos I when the city was attacked by the Normans in July/August 1185.⁵⁸⁶ This siege coinage of Andronikos is linked to a specific external event of his reign, whereas for other emperors it

⁵⁸⁶ Andronikos was overthrown in early September 1185. Choniates 1984, [352], 194; DOC 4.1, 343-4.

may not be possible to specify a date for a coin issue, but only a range during a reign, as with Isaac II.

The coinage of 1081 to 1204 also marks a time when certain military symbols became more prominent on the coinage. Although the Archangel Michael appears on only a small number of coins in this period (2.1% from Constantinople and 4.8% from Thessaloniki), some of these representations are striking. The archangel appears on a nomisma hyperpyron of Isaac II where he and the emperor dramatically hold a partially sheathed sword hilt upwards between them. Being in gold, such coins could have been used to pay Isaac's army. The sword becomes more prominent in another manner on an aspron trachy nomisma of Manuel I where two figures, the emperor and St Theodore, are both armed with a sword. In a further innovation this coin represents the first appearance of St Theodore on a Byzantine coin. From 1081 to 1204 military symbolism on coins was thus developed by emperors, with the introduction of new military figures, and an increased emphasis on weapons.

5: MILITARY SYMBOLISM ON COINS 1204-61

Introduction

This chapter analyses military symbolism on coins from 1204-61, and notes the differences in numbers between the military issues of 1204-1261 from those of 1042-1204. From 1204 to 1261 the mints of Nicaea, Magnesia, Thessaloniki, and Arta issued 178 coin types, of which 87 (48.9%) featured military symbolism.⁵⁸⁷ The Latin imitative coins consist of 36 types, of which 14 feature military symbolism (38.9%). If these imitative coins are included in the overall totals there are 101 military types out of 214 (47.2%). If the figures of Protonotarios are used for Epeiros (10 military types out of 15), instead of Hendy (4 military types out of 7), these overall figures become 107/222 (48.2%).

The period 1204-61 saw more frequent changes of coin types, probably on an annual basis, than 1042-1204. Whereas between 1042 and 1204 there were 144 coin issues, as noted in chapter 4, between 1204 and 1261 there were 178 coin issues.⁵⁸⁸ An increase in the proportion of military types for 1204-61 would therefore be expected, and such an increase was seen, with military types increasing from 29 (1042-1204) to 107 (1204-61).⁵⁸⁹ The magnitude of this increase suggests that the increased number of military types 1204-61 was due not simply to an increased overall number of types,⁵⁹⁰

⁵⁸⁷ Michael I Komnenos Doukas (c.1204-c.1215) and Theodore Komnenos Doukas (c. 1215-30) of Epeiros issued only one coin each, neither with military symbolism, and their outputs are therefore excluded from calculations, to conform to the convention used for 1042-1204.

⁵⁸⁸ In chapter 4 it was noted that the figure of 144 includes ten issues from unidentified mints which were excluded from analysis for this reason.

⁵⁸⁹ In chapter 4 it was noted that this figure of 29 includes 3 issues from unidentified mints which were excluded from analysis for this reason.

⁵⁹⁰ With an annual change of types an increase in the number of different types employed might have been expected.

but to an increase in the proportions of military types to non-military types. Because of the much larger number of coin issues post-1204, and hence a larger number of issues with military symbolism, a change has been made in presentation in the text for the post-1204 period compared to the pre-1204 period. Thus coins post-1204 with military symbolism are presented in list format, at appropriate points in this chapter, rather than incorporating details of individual coins in the text. Chapter 6 (post-1261) applies a similar list-type presentation.

The reason for this increase in the total number of types 1204-61 is not certain, but it has been suggested that the cause may have been fiscal, relating to the fact that certain denominations (particularly copper) underwent an annual change of type. There is no Byzantine evidence available concerning such practice, but evidence is provided from neighbouring Sicily when ruled by Charles of Anjou (1265-85), a contemporary of Michael VIII. In Sicily there was a regular distribution to each administrative area of new denari, of an increasingly inferior quality, and acceptance of these new types was mandatory; gold coin had to be tendered in exchange.⁵⁹¹ If such a system operated in Nicaea, Thessaloniki and Epeiros post-1204 it would explain the annual change of types. Although a large number of types were created by an annual change, each issue of coins of the successor states was on a far smaller scale than coin issues of the pre-1204 period. The implication of this small scale for numismatic scholarship is that many issues are known only through a small number of specimens, or even single specimens. Further, the annual change in types makes for difficulties in dating the coins, which in turn

⁵⁹¹ Grierson, DOC 5.1, 63.

can produce problems in attempting to relate specific types to specific events. Such difficulties are noted below where they occur.

The output of coins with military symbolism from the successor states represents a distinct phase between the military symbolism seen pre-1204 and post-1261. The mean figure for 1204-61 was more than double the proportion for the period 1042-1204 (21.6%) and was also greater than the proportion for 1261-1425, when there were 151 military types from a total of 371 (40.7%). Coin issues for the period 1204-61 represented the highest proportion of military types for all the years from 1042 to 1425, and were distinguished also by the highpoint of the use of the armed emperor symbol, and by a change in precedence of the warrior saints portrayed.

The armed emperor has been defined by his depiction with a sword, and/or the wearing of military dress. The emperor's depiction with a sword may be in one of three ways: on his own; jointly with a warrior saint, where the two figures hold one sword; or with a warrior saint where each figure holds a sword. Several coins, e.g. the Thessalonian Type D aspron trachy nomisma in billon of John III, show the emperor clearly wearing military dress (short military tunic, breastplate, and sagion), but not carrying a sword; this dress has been counted as an armed emperor symbol. The armed emperor symbol appears on four coins of Theodore I, two from the mint of Nicaea and two from the mint of Magnesia, and he is accompanied by St Theodore on each of these. On John III's coins from Magnesia John appears armed on ten occasions; four times alone and six times accompanied by a warrior saint. On one coin John wears a military tunic and carries a sword in each hand. From the empire of Thessaloniki the emperor appears armed twice on the coins of

Theodore Angelos; twice on the coins of Manuel Komnenos Doukas; three times on the coins of John Komnenos Doukas;⁵⁹² and once on a coin of John III, where he wears military dress but is unarmed. From Epeiros the armed emperor is seen once on a coin of Manuel Komnenos Doukas and once on a coin of Michael Komnenos Doukas.

The significance of the armed emperor symbol may be analysed further by assessing the relative importance of this figure in relation to the military issues of 1204-61. The armed emperor appears on 7 of 14 (50.0%) Latin imitative coins with military symbolism, and on 14 of the 30 coins (46.7%) featuring military symbolism from Nicaea. For Thessaloniki there are 8 coins with the armed emperor in a military total of 53 (15.1%). For Epeiros there are 2 coins with the armed emperor in a military total of 4 (50%).⁵⁹³ Nicaean emperors employed the armed emperor symbol much more frequently than the emperors in Thessaloniki, even when the proportion of military types is much higher (67.9%) from Thessaloniki than from Nicaea (32.3%). This shows that for Thessalonian coins the military element was much more likely to be a military saint or the Archangel Michael, whereas for Nicaea the military element was divided approximately equally between the armed emperor and a military saint or the Archangel Michael. As all Nicaean coins featuring the armed emperor were issued by Theodore I and John III these two emperors would appear to have been strongly interested in projecting their military power personally, by depicting themselves armed with a sword. By contrast,

⁵⁹² And with two other possible appearances, where lack of detail owing to wear does not allow certain identification and which have therefore been excluded from data calculations.

⁵⁹³ In the coins listed by Protonotarios but not accepted by Hendy as being from Epeiros the armed emperor does not appear.

Thessalonian emperors relied much more on warrior saints and the Archangel Michael to provide the military element. But these were the penultimate appearances of the armed emperor symbol, and post-1261 the armed emperor appeared only under Michael VIII, and after four appearances from Constantinople the symbol disappeared. The emperor reappeared in another guise of power as the riding emperor on the coins of Andronikos III, and this symbol appears to be the successor to the armed emperor (see chapter six).

The second distinguishing feature of the period 1204-61 noted above is a change in the precedence of the warrior saints who often accompany the emperor. St Theodore makes seven appearances on the Nicaean coins of Theodore I, and six appearances on the Nicaean coins of John III. However St Theodore appears only once under Theodore II, and not at all under John IV (1258-61) and Michael VIII (1259-61).⁵⁹⁴ Unsurprisingly St Demetrios is given precedence on coins from Thessaloniki, appearing nine times for Theodore Angelos, compared to St Theodore's single appearance; the name association with the saint does not appear to have been of such significance to Theodore Angelos as it was to Theodore I. St Demetrios appeared fourteen times for John Komnenos Doukas, compared to St Theodore's four times. On the coins of John III from Thessaloniki St Demetrios appears nine times but St Theodore not at all. The trend of decline in the popularity of St Theodore and increase in popularity of St Demetrios on coins was to continue after 1261.

One common feature of the periods 1042-1204 and 1204-61 appears to be that coin issues from Thessaloniki could display military symbolism more

⁵⁹⁴ John IV issued no coinage in his name; Michael VIII issued coinage from Magnesia 1259-61 and styled himself '*despotes*'; a synonym for emperor, on these coins. St Theodore appears once in the Latin imitative series.

often than other Byzantine mints. From 1204 to 1261 Thessaloniki issued 53 military types out of a total of 78 (67.9%); Nicaea issued 30 military types out of a total of 93 (32.3%); and Epeiros 4 military types from a total of 7 types (57.1%), but 66.6% if the figures of Protonotarios are used instead of those of Hendy. This suggests that the coinage of Thessaloniki was of a more warlike character than the coinages of Nicaea and Epeiros, and showed a continuation of a trend noted for 1042-1204 when the mints of Thessaloniki and Constantinople were compared. By pre-1204 standards production of coins with military iconography surged in Thessaloniki post-1204. In the period 1081-1204, when the mint at Thessaloniki was active, military issues as a percentage of total coin issues were less at Thessaloniki than Constantinople under only one emperor, John II, when the proportions were Constantinople 28.6% and Thessaloniki 20.0%. For Alexios I, Manuel I, Andronikos I, Isaac II, and Alexios III military issues from Thessaloniki greatly outnumbered those from Constantinople. Thus for these emperors from 1081 to 1204 the total number of types issued by the mint in Constantinople was 57, of which only 6 (10.5%) were military types. By contrast, for the mint of Thessaloniki in the same period, there was a total number of issues of 41, of which 13 (31.7%) were military types. Further proof of the increasingly warlike iconography of Thessalonian coins is seen when the periods 1081-1204 and 1204-61 for Thessaloniki alone are compared.⁵⁹⁵ Military issues represented 31.7% of the Thessalonian output from 1081-1204 but 67.9% from 1204-61, when the doubling of the output of military types at Thessaloniki confirmed the

⁵⁹⁵ Strictly, in the latter period coins were issued from c.1225 to 1258.

overall trend of a much higher percentage of military issues from Thessaloniki than Constantinople for the whole period 1081-1261.

The Latin imitative issues consist of twenty-three types from Constantinople, of which eleven (47.8%) have military symbolism; six types from Thessaloniki, of which one (16.6%) is military; and seven types of the small module trachea, of which two (28.6%) are military. Overall there are fourteen military types from a total of thirty-six (38.9%). It is surprising to note that the proportion of types with military images is higher from Constantinople than from Thessaloniki – a reversal of normal Byzantine practice. This figure of 38.9% is less than the percentage of Byzantine coin types from the successor states with military symbols (Thessaloniki 67.9%; Epeiros 57.1%, or 66.6% with Protonotarios' figures), but greater than for Nicaea.⁵⁹⁶ For the imitative series the armed emperor appears on seven coins out of thirty-six (19.4%). This compares with proportions for the same symbol of 50.0% (Epeiros); 46.7% (Nicaea); 15.1% (Thessaloniki).

The Latin Imitative Coinage

Choniates records that the Latin occupiers destroyed the statue of Hera in the Forum of Constantine in Constantinople, melting it down and then minting coins with the metal obtained.⁵⁹⁷ He also describes the destruction of other statues. However there are no such surviving coins which bear the names of Latin emperors. It is believed that the coins issued by the Latins must

⁵⁹⁶ This assumes that all the mint attributions of Hendy in DOC 4.2 are correct.

⁵⁹⁷ Choniates 1984, 357, [648-49], l. 12-13 re Hera.

therefore have been imitations of older Byzantine coins.⁵⁹⁸ Latin coin issues had three sources: during the period 1204-61 in Constantinople there were twenty-three types of the large module aspron trachy nomisma in billon, and of these twenty-three types (types A to W) eleven (B, G, J, L, M, N, O, P, Q, V, W) feature military imagery.⁵⁹⁹ Latin coin issues from Thessaloniki 1204-24 consist of the large module aspron trachy nomisma in billon, with three types, none of which have military imagery. There were also for 1204-24 three types of a half-noummion in base metal, of which one features military imagery. Thirdly there was a small module aspron trachy nomisma in billon, issued from 1204 until an unknown final date, and comprising seven types, of which two featured military iconography.⁶⁰⁰

The comparatively low proportion of military types in the Latin imitations is somewhat unexpected, given that these coins were issued at a time of conflict. Post-1204 the crusaders had made little impact outside Constantinople, except in lower Thrace. Initially Latin efforts to subdue Byzantine territory were limited to the Balkans, while action was delayed in Anatolia, allowing Theodore Laskaris to consolidate there. Whilst the Balkans were subdued relatively easily the Latin forces were then left divided between the Balkans and Anatolia. The Byzantine revolt in Thrace in 1205 saw Baldwin defeated and captured, and whilst in 1211/12 Henry of Flanders campaigned in Anatolia, by 1225 the Latin empire had been reduced to a few cities in lower Thrace, plus the Nicomedian peninsula. The Latin loss of Thessaloniki left Nicaea in a powerful position. The fourteen coins with military symbolism

⁵⁹⁸ Stahl 2001, 197, 206.

⁵⁹⁹ Full details are given in DOC 4.2, 673-89 and plates XLVIII –LIV.

⁶⁰⁰ DOC 4.2, 690-97, plates LII – LIV.

are listed below, and following this section their dating and circulation are discussed further. Coins of uncertain attribution are excluded from this list.⁶⁰¹

Aspron trachy nomisma (billon), large module, Constantinople:

Type B obverse: Christ on backless throne, holding Gospels in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: emperor in non-military dress holding sword in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. M|A|N|O|V|H|A Δ|E|C|Π|O|T|H|C (or Π|O|P|Φ|V|P|O|Γ|E|N).⁶⁰²

Type G obverse: Virgin seated on throne with back; holds head of Christ on breast. MP ΘV

Reverse: emperor on l. (non-military dress) and saint in military tunic on r. Emperor holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand; saint holds jewelled sceptre in l. hand; they hold labarum on long shaft between them. M|A|N|O|V|H|A (Δ|E|C|Π?).⁶⁰³

Type J obverse: archangel (?Michael) in military tunic, holding jewelled sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l.

Reverse: emperor in non-military dress with sword over r. shoulder and globus cruciger in l. hand. N|W|K Δ|E|C|Π|O|T|H|C⁶⁰⁴

⁶⁰¹ DOC 4.2, 702-3.

⁶⁰² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 674-5, coin nos 2.1-2.10; plate XLIX, coin nos 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8.

⁶⁰³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 677, coin nos 7.1-7.4; plate XLIX, coin nos 7.1, 7.4.

⁶⁰⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 679, coin nos 10.1-10.5; plate L, coin nos 10.2, 10.4.

Type L obverse: Christ seated on backless throne; r. hand blesses, l. holds Gospels. IC XC

Reverse: emperor (non-military dress) with labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and sword in l. K|N|O|C⁶⁰⁵

Type M obverse: Archangel Michael in military tunic with sword on r. shoulder and globus cruciger in l. hand. XP|XM

Reverse: emperor (non-military dress) with labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. []|[]|I Δ|E|C|Π|O|T⁶⁰⁶

Type N obverse: Virgin orans. MP ΘV

Reverse: emperor (non-military dress) on l. and St George on r. in military tunic and breastplate, holding sword in l. hand. They hold patriarchal cross on three steps between them. IW|Δ|E|C|Π|O|T|HC O|Γ|E⁶⁰⁷

Type O obverse: Christ standing; blesses with r. hand and l. holds Gospels. IC XC

Reverse: emperor in military dress with labarum in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. IW|Δ|C|C|Π TW|Π|O|P|Φ|V⁶⁰⁸

Type P obverse: bust of Christ with scroll in l. hand. IC XC

⁶⁰⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 680, coin no 12; plate no L, coin no 12.

⁶⁰⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 680, coin no 13; plate no L, coin no 13.

⁶⁰⁷ BICC: B6546. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 680-1, coin nos 14.1-14.7; plate no L, coin nos 14.3, 14.4, 14.7.

⁶⁰⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 681-3, coin nos 15.1-15.16; plate no L, coin nos 15.5, 15.7, 15.14.

Reverse: Archangel Michael in military tunic and breastplate with sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. X|A X|M⁶⁰⁹

Type Q obverse: Virgin seated on throne with back; holds head of Christ on breast. MP ΘV

Reverse: Archangel Michael (non-military dress), holding ? labarum in r. hand and ? globus cruciger in l. X|M⁶¹⁰

Type V obverse: saint in military tunic with spear in r. hand and shield in l. O AΓIOC

Reverse: seated emperor (non-military dress) with labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. KOMNHNOC⁶¹¹

Type W obverse: cross on base. IN|CK

Reverse: emperor in military tunic and breastplate, with spear in r. hand and globus cruciger in l.⁶¹²

Half-tetarteron noummion (base metal), Thessaloniki:

Type C obverse: Christ standing; blesses with r. hand, holds Gospels in l. IC XC

⁶⁰⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 683-4, coin nos 16.1-16.4; plate L and LI, coin nos 16.4, 16.6, 16.7, 16.10.

⁶¹⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 684, coin no 17; plate LI, coin no 17.

⁶¹¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 688-9, coin nos 22.1-22.4; plate LI, coins nos 22.1, 22.2.

⁶¹² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 664-7, 689, coin nos 23.1-23.11; plate LII, coin nos 23.1, 23.2, 23.3, 23.7 (clipped).

Reverse: emperor standing in military tunic and breastplate, with spear (?) in r. hand and globus cruciger in l.⁶¹³

Aspron trachy nomisma (billon), small module:

Type B: obverse and reverse as large module Type B (Constantinople).⁶¹⁴

Type G: obverse and reverse as large module, First Coinage, of Theodore I Laskaris, Nicaea.⁶¹⁵

Whilst Hendy's classification of these types is neat, it may not represent all their complexities, as recognised by Metcalf.⁶¹⁶ Some of Hendy's conclusions may lack definite proof, such as his allocation of the small module Latin series types A –G to Venice. Although the type A circulated widely in large numbers, Touratsoglou and Baker point out that final proof of a Venetian attribution will require extensive die and metallurgical studies, and proof that such a coinage was compatible with Venetian colonial policy.⁶¹⁷ Metcalf makes a similar point regarding Hendy's attribution of the large module types to Constantinople and Thessaloniki.⁶¹⁸ It is worth noting also that of the six imitative types (large module A, B, C) and the three half-tetartera A, B, and C which Hendy attributes to Thessaloniki, only the half-tetarteron type C

⁶¹³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 668-9, 694, coin nos 29.1, 29.2; plate LII, coin nos 29.1, 29.2.

⁶¹⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 670-72, 696, coin nos 31.1-31.4; plate LIII, coin nos 31.2, 31.4 (clipped).

⁶¹⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 670-72, 697, coin nos 36a, 36b, 36c.1, 36c.2; plate LIII, coin nos 36c.1, 36c.2.

⁶¹⁶ Metcalf has referred to the disadvantages of this tendency of Hendy to conform facts to a tidy pattern. Metcalf 2000, 397.

⁶¹⁷ Touratsoglou and Baker 2002, 219.

⁶¹⁸ Metcalf 2000, 400.

features military symbolism. This is a much lower figure than this thesis has found for other Thessalonian series, and could suggest that Hendy's attribution could be open to question.⁶¹⁹

The complexity of attribution of these imitative coins is shown further in the suggestion that there may be variations in mint within a series. Thus for the large module series Touratsoglou attributes types A, B, and C to Constantinople, and with a latest issue date of 1219. He attributes types D-V to a Bulgarian mint, because of hoard evidence in eastern Macedonia and Bulgaria, and their dating to 1230 onwards, corresponding to a highpoint in Bulgarian power.⁶²⁰ Hendy has emphatically rejected the suggestion of a Bulgarian mint.⁶²¹ Metcalf too argued for a Bulgarian origin for these coins, noting the proportions of types D-T in the hoards below, and arguing that it is hard to imagine these proportions being imported.

Tri Voditsi: 14%

Dorkovo: 14%

Preslav: 18%

Ustovo, Postallar and Mogilitsa: 19%

By contrast, types D, O, and P were found in only very small numbers in the Istanbul bazaar, although there were more from Kalenderhane Camii, and were absent from Corinth finds. Some Bulgarian coins might have found their

⁶¹⁹ DOC 4.2, 690-4. Morrisson also suggests that Hendy's allocation of Latin imitatives to Thessaloniki requires more evidence. Morrisson 2007, 177.

⁶²⁰ Touratsoglou 2002, 401-2.

⁶²¹ DOC 4.2, 664.

way to Constantinople, but wholesale export of types F-N, and Q-T, struck in millions, from Constantinople to Bulgaria, is improbable.⁶²²

Touratsoglou attributes the small module series to Constantinople and Thessaloniki, with type A being issued before 1208 and type G before 1219, but with type F between 1219 and 1244.⁶²³ Hendy has proposed that this series formed a Venetian coinage for Romania.⁶²⁴ The difficulty of mint attribution for these small module coins is further shown by suggestions of involvement of other mints: Achaia (Grierson), or Thebes (Oeconomidou).⁶²⁵

The scale of issues of Latin imitatives is clear, as Metcalf refers to the high proportions of small module types found in hoards. He notes also the sample of seventy-nine trachea, of scarce types (D-V), which contained seventy-six reverse dies, implying a total of millions, and for the common types (large module A-C) of hundreds of millions.⁶²⁶ The circulation area of the imitative coinage appears to have been wide: Metcalf sees the occurrence of post-1204 trachea in the Balkans and Aegean as being partly in terms of forced payments, or supply procurement for the army, with the small module type G being struck in Asia Minor.⁶²⁷ The imitatives struck at Constantinople appear to be very early, as in Bulgarian hoards type A (large and small modules) appears in the currency before any coins of Theodore I are added. However the types attributed to Thessaloniki (A, B, C large and D, E, F small)

⁶²² Metcalf 1979, 127-9. Type D was also found in two hoards (Asenovgrad and Pazardzhik) in the Maritsa valley, which are otherwise dated by Latin type A or coins of Theodore I. The Makhala Pissaratsi hoard also contains type D, and is similar, apart from the addition of a few coins of twenty to thirty years later.

⁶²³ Touratsoglou 2002, 401.

⁶²⁴ DOC 4.2, 670-2.

⁶²⁵ Grierson 1982, 172. Oeconomidou: Byzantina 1985, 13, 997.

⁶²⁶ Metcalf 1979, 120.

⁶²⁷ Metcalf 1979, 123. Metcalf notes that type G and its larger counterpart form up to 10% of Balkan hoards.

do not appear in the currency of Bulgaria before c. 1210, and after this rarely exceed 20% of imitatives as a whole in hoards. In the Corinth excavations the proportions of imitatives among stray finds are the same as in Bulgarian hoards.⁶²⁸

Minting of the Latin imitative series appears to have been intense for the first ten years of occupation, but then decreased. Type A (large and small) probably preceded the trachea of Theodore I, but types B and C appear late in the hoard sequence, with B occurring only in metropolitan hoards – Troad, Istanbul B, and Yenimahalle.⁶²⁹ A comparison of the outputs of imitative coins from Constantinople and Thessaloniki may be made by comparing the proportions of Constantinopolitan large module A, B, and C and small module A, B, and C with Thessalonian large module A, B, and C and small module D, E, and F. Assuming these twelve types comprise 100%, the Thessalonian percentage in Balkan hoards varies between 5-30% (20% for later hoards). Interestingly, the proportions are much higher for hoards from two islands; Thira (72%) and Amorgos (80%), although Yenimahalle is also 69%. Such distances from Thessaloniki mark a degree of uncertainty on the origin of the coins.⁶³⁰ In hoards containing both Constantinopolitan and Thessalonian issues, the Thessalonian proportions are:

'Kazani' I: 22%

'Kazani' II: 31%

'Kazani' III: 19%

⁶²⁸ Metcalf 1979, 123. Metcalf sees between two-thirds and three-quarters of early thirteenth-century issues circulating in Greece and Bulgaria as being struck in Constantinople.

⁶²⁹ Metcalf 1979, 126-7. Yenimahalle consisted largely of large module imitatives.

⁶³⁰ Metcalf 1979, 135-6. Other distant hoards where Thessalonian issues predominate are Lom A and B, Tuolovo, and Dumbarton Oaks II. This suggests some uncertainty whether the Latins minted at Thessaloniki. Metcalf 1979, 136-7.

'Kazani' IV: 32%

Neapolis: 32%

Thrace: 18%

Veroia: 26%

Vrasta: 38%

Whatever the output, or lack of it, under Latin occupation, from the start of the Doukas regime in 1224, Thessaloniki adopted an annual basis of coin production, resembling Constantinople from c. 1225, and a binary one from 1237. The range of coins expanded a little until 1246, when it shrank, and Theodore II appears to have closed the mint in 1255/56, which did not reopen until the reign of Michael VIII.⁶³¹ Metcalf, however, notes the activity of the Thessalonian mint as evidenced by the Arta hoard, hidden just after the recapture of Constantinople in 1261. Compared with the hoards of Tri Voditsi and 'Peter and Paul' with their imitative coins, Arta consisted mainly of Thessalonian issues, not obsolete coins, approximately half being coins of Michael VIII.⁶³²

Coin Issues with Military Symbolism from the Empire of Nicaea

Alexios V left Constantinople on the night of April 12/13th 1204 and Constantine Laskaris, the brother of the future emperor of Nicaea, Theodore Laskaris, became emperor.⁶³³ Theodore Laskaris had been imprisoned when Alexios III fled Constantinople in July 1203, but had escaped by January

⁶³¹ DOC 4.2, 130.

⁶³² Metcalf 1979, 137-8.

⁶³³ Choniates 1984, [571], 314.

1204, and had then fled to Nicaea at the fall of Constantinople.⁶³⁴ Theodore Laskaris was proclaimed emperor in Nicaea in 1205 and was crowned there in 1208.⁶³⁵ Under Theodore I coins were minted at Nicaea and Magnesia; the mint at Nicaea probably functioned during the period 1205-12, before production was moved to Magnesia for the remaining years of Theodore's reign, 1212-21.⁶³⁶ The coins produced by these mints are characterised by small runs of electrum and billon coins only, and by annual changes in design.

Theodore I's early reign was marked by conflict: Akropolites records that in 1205 alone Theodore 'engaged in no small number of battles' and also refers to the 'straitened circumstances' of Theodore's early reign.⁶³⁷ Akropolites notes the provinces which were under Latin control and also that after 1204 there was opposition from local Roman commanders, with Theodore I facing threats from Theodore Morotheodoros (Mankaphas) of Philadelphia; Sabbas Asidenos of Sampson; and David Komnenos of Trebizond. But despite these conflicts, Akropolites notes that Theodore I became master of Kelbianon, the whole of the Maeander, Philadelphia, and Neokastra.⁶³⁸ Theodore I's actions against David Komnenos took place over a longer period (1205-12); Akropolites states that Theodore 'brought to terms'

⁶³⁴ The imprisonment of Theodore Laskaris is noted by Choniates in *Orationes et Epistulae*, ed. J.-L. van Dieten, Berlin 1972, 126.29- 127.1, and 131.7-8; cited by Macrides in Akropolites 2007, 82 fn 509. See also Oikonomides 1992, 22-8. Robert of Clari records the flight of Theodore Laskaris to Nicaea, 2005, 100. For the fall of Constantinople see Mesarites, *Epitaphios*, ed. A. Heisenberg, Munich 1923, 'Neue Quellen', I, 46-8; cited by Macrides in Akropolites 2007, 114 fn 3.

⁶³⁵ Akropolites 2007, 119, and 83. Robert of Clari states wrongly that Theodore was acclaimed emperor before leaving Constantinople, 2005, 100.

⁶³⁶ DOC 4.2, 456-66.

⁶³⁷ Akropolites 2007, §7, 119, 120.

⁶³⁸ Akropolites 2007, §7, 119-20. Kelbianon was situated in the upper Kaistros valley and was the southeastern limit of Theodore's territories in this area. Akropolites 2007, § 15, fn 16.

Herakleia and Amastris with their surrounding lands.⁶³⁹ Manuel Maurozomes, who had allied himself with the Seljuk Turks, and had raided in the area around the Maeander river, was also defeated by Theodore I. The degree of instability was such that Theodore in 1208-10 ordered both clergy and laymen to swear fidelity to him.⁶⁴⁰

In addition to these actions against him Theodore also faced ongoing opposition from Alexios III, after the latter's flight from Constantinople in July 1203.⁶⁴¹ But despite his flight Alexios appears never to have relinquished his imperial ambitions; he travelled to Thessaloniki but was expelled because he was, according to Akropolites, planning rebellion. Alexios joined with Iohannites (Kaykhusraw) the Seljuk sultan, and the sultan's army met Theodore's army at Antioch-on-the-Maeander (June 1211); Kaykhusraw was killed and Alexios died in captivity at the monastery of Hyakinthos.⁶⁴² Akropolites suggests that overall the battle was equivocal because of Theodore's losses, but that military action on the eastern front died down, enabling him to concentrate on the Latin threat in the west.

As Theodore I engaged in a number of military operations on several fronts the high proportion (7/10, 70%) of his coins with military symbols is thus not surprising. These seven coin types feature a concentration of military symbolism: St Theodore appears seven times (twice on the obverse and five times on the reverse), and Theodore I appears as the armed emperor five

⁶³⁹ Akropolites 2007, §11, 132; see fn 1, 134 for a note on the timing of these actions. See also Choniates 1984, [626], 343, and [640],[641], 351-52.

⁶⁴⁰ Oikonomides 1967, 122-24.

⁶⁴¹ Akropolites 2007, §2, 107. Akropolites notes that Alexios was believed to have said, 'David was saved by fleeing'. This is another example of an emperor assuming a Davidic persona: see Andronikos I in chapter 4.

⁶⁴² Akropolites 2007, §8, 123-24; § 9 and 10, 129-32.

times, all on the reverse and always accompanied by St Theodore. It is however difficult to date this coinage accurately: most of the coins can be dated only in a range of 1208-21, and on this basis those featuring St Theodore appear to be spread across the reign.⁶⁴³ It appears not unreasonable to suggest that the great uncertainty post-1204 and Theodore I's extensive and ongoing campaigning could be associated with the high percentage of his coins with military images.

The number of examples of Theodore's coinage which survive is small. The Barber Institute Collection contains relatively small numbers, and Hendy confirms a similar state in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection.⁶⁴⁴ Nicaea produced an aspron trachy nomisma in electrum in three types, of which Type A (1208, probably a coronation issue) and Type B (1208-12?) have military iconography. Type C is non-military.

Type A obverse: St Theodore on l. with Virgin on r., with shield (?) between them. OA|ΘCO|ΔΩ|PO|C MP ΘV

Reverse: emperor on l., crowned by Christ. Emperor holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and patriarchal cross on three steps in l. hand.

Θ|EO|ΔΩ|POC KO|MN|HNOC O ΛA|CK|AP|HC⁶⁴⁵

⁶⁴³ DOC 4.2, 456-66.

⁶⁴⁴ DOC 4.2, 452-53.

⁶⁴⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 456, coin nos 1.1, 1.2; plate XXVII, coin nos 1.1, 1.2. DOC labels coin nos 1-4 as Nicaea in the text but as Magnesia in the plate. This coin is of note in that it appears to be the prototype for the Type G aspron trachy nomisma (small module) in the Latin imitative coinage (DOC 4.2, 697). Whilst Types A to F of this small module series appear to imitate large module coins of the Latin imitative series from Constantinople and Thessaloniki, Type G is the only type imitating a type of Theodore I Laskaris. Hendy has speculated that if the Latin small module type G is a copy of Theodore I's type A (which appears more likely than vice-versa), then this action could have been the stimulus for the monetary clause in the treaty between Theodore and Jacopo Tiepolo, which forbade each from copying the other's Byzantine-style coinages. This suggestion would be reinforced if the

Type B obverse: Christ, bearded and nimbate, seated on throne with back; holds Gospels in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: Emperor on l., holding sheathed sword point down in r. hand. St Theodore on r., holding sheathed sword point down in l. hand. They hold long shaft surmounted by star between them. ΘEOΔΩΡΟCΔΕCΠΟΤ Ο, ΘEOΔΩΡΟC
(Fig. 26.)⁶⁴⁶

Magnesia produced a Type D aspron trachy nomisma in electrum from 1212-?1221.

Type D obverse: bust of Christ, beardless and nimbate, holding scroll in l. hand. IC|O|EM|AM XC|NOVHA

Reverse: emperor on l., holding sheathed sword point down in r. hand. St Theodore on r., holding sheathed sword point down in l. hand. They hold patriarchal cross on three steps between them. ΘEOΔΩΡΟCΔΕC Ο, ΘEOΔΩΡΟC⁶⁴⁷

treaty, dated to 1219, had been a renewal of one signed in 1214, for in 1214 Theodore's type would have still been the main Nicaean issue in circulation. Hendy has suggested further that Venice may have been responsible for striking all the Latin small module types. (DOC 4.2, 670-1.) Touratsoglou and Baker summarise the discussions on this latter idea but suggest that further studies are required before such a conclusion can be drawn. Touratsoglou and Baker 2002, 219.

⁶⁴⁶ BICC: coin nos B6072, B6073, B6074, B6075, B6076, B6077. **See fig. 26.** DOC 4.2, 457, coin nos 2.1 - 2.4; plate XXVII, coin nos 2.1, 2.3.

⁶⁴⁷ BICC: coin no B6078. DOC 4.2, 458-59, coin nos 4.1 to 4.8; plate XXVII coin nos 4.1, 4.2, 4.6.

The aspron trachy nomisma in billon from the mint of Nicaea consists of three types: A, B, and C, of which Type A (1205-12?) and Type C (1212-21?) feature military symbols.

Type A obverse: Virgin seated on backless throne holding nimbate head of Christ on breast. MP ΘV

Reverse: Emperor on l. wearing stemma, divitision and loros, holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand. St Theodore on r. holding spear on shoulder in l. hand. ΘEOΔΩPOC O A ΘEOΔΩPOC⁶⁴⁸

Type C obverse: full-length figure of Christ, holding Gospels in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: emperor on l.; holds *anexikakia* in r. hand and sword hangs to l. of waist. St Theodore on r.; holds spear on shoulder in l. hand and sword hangs to r. of waist. They hold labarum between them. (ΘEOΔΩPOC O ΘEOΔΩPOC?)⁶⁴⁹

The billon trachea from Magnesia consist of four types (D, E, F, G), all of which have a possible date of 1212-21. Types D, E, and G feature military symbols.⁶⁵⁰

Type D: design and inscription as Type D in electrum from same mint (see above).⁶⁵¹

⁶⁴⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 459-61, coin nos 5a.1-5a.8, 5b.1-5b.6, 5c.1-5c.5, 5d, 5e; plate XXVII coin nos 5a.2, 5a.4, 5b.1, 5b.3.

⁶⁴⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 463, coin nos 7.1, 7.2; plate XXVIII, coin no 7.2.

⁶⁵⁰ Type E is now believed to be a coin of John III, and not Theodore I. DOC 4.2, 454, 465, coin no 9.

Type G obverse: St Theodore, bearded and nimbate, holding spear over shoulder with r. hand and shield in l. $\text{O A}|\Gamma|\text{I}|\text{O C} \quad \text{Θ E}|\text{O} \Delta \Omega|\text{P O}|\text{C}$

Reverse: emperor holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. $(\text{Θ E O} \Delta \Omega \text{P O C} \quad \Delta \text{E C} \Pi \text{O T H C} \quad \text{O K O M N H N O C}?)$ Only $\Delta|\text{C C}|\Pi$ visible.⁶⁵²

The high proportion of military issues (70.0%) in the coinage of Theodore I was not matched by his successors. John III, whilst issuing a large number of types, produced only 19 military issues in a total of 63 (30.2%). Theodore II issued only 3 military types from a total of 14 (21.4%) and Michael VIII with John IV 1 from 6 (16.6%). John III faced a series of revolts, an early one being of two of the brothers of the emperor Theodore I, the *sebatoskratores* Alexios and Isaac. Alexios and Isaac, having left for Constantinople as fugitives after Theodore's death, appear to have joined forces with the Latins, and to have fought against John at the battle of Poimaneon in 1223/24, where John was victorious. Alexios and Isaac were captured and blinded; the site of John's victory was recorded by Akropolites as 'the church of Michael, Archangel of the Heavenly Forces'.⁶⁵³ John issued two coins featuring the Archangel Michael, an aspron trachy nomisma in electrum (Type H) and an aspron trachy nomisma in billon (Type A) from Magnesia. These types cannot be dated more accurately than as being within

⁶⁵¹ BICC: billon version only coin no B6078. DOC (electrum) 4.2, 464, coin nos 8.1-8.3; plate XXVIII, coin no 8.1.

⁶⁵² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 466, coin nos 11.1, 11.2; plate XXVIII, coin nos 11.1, 11.2.

⁶⁵³ Akropolites 2007, §22, 166-67, and 168 fn 2 and 3.

the whole reign from 1221 to 1254, but it is just possible that they might have been issued in the wake of this particular victory of John.

This difficulty in dating the coinage of John III makes it impossible to relate specific coins to specific periods of unrest. Such unrest indicates the importance of Nicaea as the greatest rival to Epeiros, but Akropolites' use of terms such as 'revolt' and 'conspiracy' result from his assumption that Nicaea and the Nicaean emperors were the legitimate successors after 1204. Akropolites details unrest during the decades of John's reign; in 1224-25 Alexander and Isaac Nestongos led a conspiracy, in alliance with a range of members of great families: Phlamoules, Tarchaneiotes, Synadenos, Stasenos, and Makrenos. They were arrested when John learned of the plot, and Isaac Nestongos and Makrenos each suffered blinding and amputation of a hand. Others were imprisoned for various periods; Andronikos Nestongos escaped from captivity (Akropolites hints at complicity by John III) and went into exile.⁶⁵⁴

The early 1230s saw John III facing opposition from the Latins and from Leo Gabalas, caesar of Rhodes. Opposition by the Latins saw the emperor John of Brienne leaving Constantinople and capturing Keramides and Pegai, only to return to the capital, having been countered by John III's resourcefulness.⁶⁵⁵ Both Akropolites and Blemmydes comment on the action against Gabalas; Akropolites states that John III had to take action because of 'rebellion' by Gabalas, but Blemmydes states that Gabalas' case was that he had inherited his position and could ally with the emperor if he chose, but was

⁶⁵⁴ Akropolites 2007, §23, 169-71.

⁶⁵⁵ Akropolites 2007, §30, 190.

not required to take orders.⁶⁵⁶ The expedition against Gabalas was led not by John III but by Andronikos Palaiologos and appears to have ended in stalemate, as in 1234 Gabalas signed a treaty with the Venetians, but in 1235 Gabalas was fighting alongside John III against the Latins.⁶⁵⁷ The incident indicates further military activity in John III's reign; such activity was still ongoing in the winter of 1252-53, even though the Bulgarian and Muslim fronts were quiet. Akropolites refers to 'revolt' and 'conspiracy' by Michael II Komnenos Doukas of Epeiros at this time, after he and John III had concluded a treaty, dated variously to 1248-50.⁶⁵⁸ John was successful in his campaign around Vodena, and Michael sued for peace, giving up a number of towns, including Prilep, Veles, and Kroia. Michael rebelled again against later emperors.

In relation to Thessaloniki John III was assisted by a group of men who were pro-Nicaean and described by Akropolites as 'notable', and who had conspired against the despot of Thessaloniki, Demetrios Komnenos Doukas, in 1246. This group comprised Spartenos, Kampanos, Iatropoulos, Koutzoulatos, Michael Laskaris, and Tzyrithon and members of it were responsible for advising Demetrios not to meet John III and thus not to make obeisance to him. John camped with an army near Thessaloniki and some inhabitants opened a gate, enabling John's forces to occupy the city. Demetrios was confined to the fortress of Lentiana.⁶⁵⁹ John began issuing

⁶⁵⁶ Akropolites 2007, §27, 185. Blemmydes 1988, [XI], 23, 106.

⁶⁵⁷ Akropolites 2007, §28, 187-88 and fn 3.

⁶⁵⁸ Akropolites 2007, 2007, §49, 249-51; §49, 251.

⁶⁵⁹ Akropolites 2007, §45, 237-38; §46, 242.

coins from Thessaloniki and Demetrios' single coin issue from Thessaloniki is noted below in the section on Thessaloniki.

John III minted coins at Magnesia from 1221 to 1254 and at Thessaloniki from 1246 to 1254. All the coin issues of John III which feature military iconography are in electrum (aspron trachy nomisma), billon (aspron trachy nomisma), and copper or bronze (tetarteron noummion), metals associated with more widely circulating coins.⁶⁶⁰ These issues are dated to the years 1221-54, but cannot be allocated to specific years, although probably the frequent changes of type were made on an annual basis. The types are identified alphabetically. John III's coins from Thessaloniki are considered in a subsequent section.

John's coinage from Magnesia shows a marked contrast with that of Theodore I, in the number of issues with military symbolism and also in the variety of military symbols. Whilst 70% of the coinage of Theodore I incorporated military symbols, the coinage of John III from Magnesia consists of 63 types, of which 19 (30.1%) feature military symbolism. This overall total includes one coin originally ascribed to Theodore I but since reclassified to John III.⁶⁶¹ The total does not include a coin of Theodore II, also reclassified by Hendy to John III, for reasons discussed below.⁶⁶² Thus John III issued a much lower proportion of coins with military symbolism, but within this range employed a much greater variety of military figures; John III's coins exhibit the widest range of military figures of all successor state issues. Whereas

⁶⁶⁰ The hyperpyron nomisma series in gold from Magnesia, dated 1227-c.1232, has no military iconography.

⁶⁶¹ DOC 4.2, 454, 465, coin no 9.

⁶⁶² DOC 4.2, 525-26, coin no 12.

Theodore I utilises only St Theodore and himself as military figures, John displays himself, the Archangel Michael, St Theodore, St George, and St Demetrios. The personages featured on the 19 military types of John III are.⁶⁶³

St Theodore: 6/63 (9.5%)

St George: 5/63 (7.9%)

Armed emperor (alone): 4/63 (6.3%)

Armed emperor (with warrior saint): 6/63 (9.5%)

Archangel Michael: 2/63 (3.2%)

St Demetrios: 2/63 (3.2%)

On these coins of John a hierarchy exists within the military saints and the Archangel relating to their position on the coin. It may be argued that the figure appearing on the obverse has a status analogous to Christ or the Virgin, who are often placed there. If this is so, then St George, who appears four times on the obverse, and only once on the reverse with the emperor, would appear to have a higher status than St Theodore, who appears only once and on his own on the obverse, but five times on the reverse with John. St Demetrios features only twice, but both these appearances are on the obverse; similarly, the Archangel Michael is seen twice on his own on the obverse, but never on the reverse. Even when we look at the frequent appearances of St Theodore on the coins of Theodore I, the saint appears

⁶⁶³ The total below is greater than nineteen because some coins feature more than one figure.

twice on the obverse (once on his own, once with the Virgin), but five times on the reverse alongside the emperor. It is possible that the military personages on John's coins reflect a need for him to project his power, for John appears armed on ten types, either alone or accompanied by a warrior saint, most frequently St Theodore, followed by St George; the personages on the coins of John III relate to John and his military campaigns. It is clear from Akropolites that John campaigned extensively, but also that John had more than his fair share of luck.⁶⁶⁴

In terms of military dress, both Theodore I and John III employ the military tunic, breastplate and sagion on figures on their coins, and the range of weapons with which the saints or emperors are armed is similar between the two emperors, both employing sword, spear, and shield. A contrast between Theodore I and John III is that while Theodore I carries a sword on several issues, he is less likely to be portrayed in armour than John. On two issues John III wears a short military tunic, breastplate and sagion, and carries a sword, while on one of these issues he is portrayed with a sword in each hand. The portrayals of St Theodore are generally similar under both Theodore and John, with the saint in short military tunic and breastplate, and armed with a sword or spear. One issue of John III differs from Theodore I in that whilst St Theodore's dress remains the same he carries a sword in his hand, resting on his shoulder, and a shield in his left hand.

⁶⁶⁴ 'For he became master of many towns and many lands instantly, without war occurring, or anyone falling in battle, or shedding of blood.' Akropolites 2007, §44, 231. Akropolites' assessment of John after his death was equivocal – see §52, 271. Akropolites probably wrote looking back from the 1260s or 1270s.

Aspron Trachy Nomisma Series of John III in Electrum

Type C obverse: Christ, bearded and nimbate, seated on backless throne and raising r. hand in blessing, l. hand holding Gospels. IC XC

Reverse: emperor on l. holding sheathed sword point down in r. hand. St Theodore on r. holding sheathed sword point down in l. hand. They hold long shaft surmounted by star between them. ΙΩΔΕCΠΘ TIC O,O EOΔΩP⁶⁶⁵

Type D obverse: bust of Christ, beardless and nimbate, holding scroll in l. hand. IC|O|E|MM XC|N|OVH|Λ

Reverse: emperor on l. holding sheathed sword point down in r. hand. St Theodore on r. holding sheathed sword point down in l. hand. They hold patriarchal cross on three steps between them. ΙΩ[] OΛΓIOCΘEOΔΩPOC⁶⁶⁶

Type H obverse: Archangel Michael, nimbate; appears to hold sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l.

Reverse: emperor holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and patriarchal cross on three steps in l. ΙΩ ΔΕCΠOΘHC O ΔOVKAC. Only O|Δ|[]|K|Λ visible.⁶⁶⁷

Type J obverse: Christ, bearded and nimbate, standing on dais, holding Gospels in l. hand. IC XC

⁶⁶⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 492, coin no 22; plate XXXI, coin no 22.

⁶⁶⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 492-93, coin nos 23a, 23b; plate XXXI, coin nos 23a, 23b.

⁶⁶⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 495, coin no 27; plate XXXI, coin no 27. Visible part of inscription would appear to be columnar.

Reverse: emperor standing on l. holding sheathed sword point down in r. hand. St Theodore on r., holding sheathed sword point down in l. hand. They hold patriarchal cross on globe between them. ΙΩ ΔΕCΠΙΟΤΗC ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟC⁶⁶⁸

Type N obverse: Virgin, nimbate and seated on backless throne; holds nimbate, beardless head of Christ on breast. Palm branch and two Xs superimposed on either side of throne. ΜΡ ΘΥ

Reverse: emperor in military dress standing on dais; holds labarum in r. hand and sheathed sword point down in l. *Manus Dei* upper r. field. ΙΩ|ΔΕC|ΠΙΗΤ|C ΟΔΟY|ΚΑ|C⁶⁶⁹

Type P obverse: bust of Christ, holding scroll or Gospels in l. hand. ΙC ΧC

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor on l.; with nimbate St George on r. holding spear in l. hand. They hold sheathed sword point up between them. (ΙΩ|ΔΕC|ΠΙΟ|Τ?) ΓΕ|ΩΡ|Γ⁶⁷⁰

Aspron Trachy Nomisma Series of John III in Billon

The aspron trachy nomisma series in billon consists of 22 types, of which 11 (50%) feature military iconography. These figures include one aspron trachy

⁶⁶⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 495-96, coin no 29; plate XXXI, coin no 29.

⁶⁶⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 497, coin nos 33.1, 33.2; plate XXXII, coin nos 33.1, 33.2. This coin bears a double signum of a palm branch and two sets of interlocking Xs. The latter also appears as the obverse design of the John's Type A tetarteron and on both coins John is in military dress. Hendy notes that it is possible that both coins might conceivably be dated to 1246 or 1247.

⁶⁷⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 498, coin nos 34 bis, 34 ter; no illustrations.

nomisma in billon originally classified by Hendy to Theodore I. This is a higher proportion of military types than the same denomination in electrum where there were 6 military types in a total of 17 (35.3%).

Type A obverse: three-quarter figure of Archangel Michael, holding in r. hand sword on shoulder, with globus cruciger in l. hand. Δ X

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor on l., with *anexikakia* in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. Crowned by Christ, who holds Gospels in l. hand. ΙΩ| Δ|Ε|C|Π|Ο IC XC⁶⁷¹

Type B obverse: St George, nimbate, holding spear in r. hand and shield in l.

Ο|Α|Γ|Ι|Ο C ΓΕ|ΩΡ

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor on l., holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. Christ on r. crowns emperor, and holds Gospels in l. hand. ΙΩΔΕ (**Fig. 27.**)⁶⁷²

Type H obverse: full-length standing figure of Christ Chalcites with r. hand raised in blessing and l. holding Gospels. IC|X|ΛΛ XC|ΚΙ|ΤΗ

Reverse: emperor in non-military dress holding sheathed sword point down in l. hand. Ι|Ω| Ο|Δ|Ο V|Κ|Α|C⁶⁷³

⁶⁷¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 499, coin nos 35.1-35.3; plate XXXII, coin nos 35.2, 35.3.

⁶⁷² BICC: coin nos B6094, B6576. **See fig. 27.** DOC 4.2: 499, coin no 36; plate XXXII coin no 36.

⁶⁷³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 502, coin nos 42.1, 42.2; plate XXXIII, coin no 42.1.

Type K obverse: full-length figure of St Demetrios, nimbate, holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. OA|ΔI|MH TPI|OC

Reverse: emperor seated on throne with back; holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. ΙΩ ΔΕΠΙ ΟΔΟΥΚΑ⁶⁷⁴

Type M obverse: Christ standing with Gospels in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Constantine on r. holding half-sheathed sword point down between them. ΙΩ Ο, ΚΩ or ΙΩ Ο ΚΩ⁶⁷⁵

Type N obverse: three-quarter figure of Virgin. ΜΡ ΘΥ

Reverse: emperor on l., holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand. St Theodore on r., holding spear in l. hand. They hold sheathed sword point down resting on shield between them. ΙΩ ΟΔ|Θ|Ε|Δ⁶⁷⁶

Type O obverse: St George, nimbate, holding spear on shoulder in r. hand and shield in l. ΟΔ ΓΟΡ

Reverse: half-length figure of John holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. ΙΩΔC CΠ Ο ΔΟΥΚΑC⁶⁷⁷

Type P obverse: half-length figure of St Theodore, nimbate, holding sword on shoulder in r. hand, and shield in l. Ο|Α|Γ|Ι|ΟC Θ|Ε|Ο|Δ|Ω|Ρ|Ο

⁶⁷⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 503-04, coin nos 45.1, 45.2; plate XXXIII, coin no 45.2.

⁶⁷⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 504, coin nos 47.1-3; plate XXXIII, coin nos 47.1, 47.2.

⁶⁷⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 505, coin nos 48a-c; plate XXXIII, coin nos 48a, 48b.

⁶⁷⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 505, coin nos 49.1, 49.2; plate XXXIII coin no 49.2. The signum of K and a half-moon is found on the nomisma hyperpyron (DOC 13b) of John, and on his electrum trachy Type O (DOC 34a, b). Hendy very tentatively suggests that this could indicate a date of 1249, the year when John campaigned to recover Rhodes from the Genoese. The half-moon represents 1249, but K 1241. DOC 4.2, 480.

Reverse: emperor holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and patriarchal cross on globe in l. ΙΩ ΔΕCΠΟΤΗC Ο ΔΟΥΚΑC⁶⁷⁸

Type Q obverse: three-quarter figure of St Demetrios, nimbate, holding sword on shoulder with r. hand and shield with l. ΟΑ|Δ|Η ΜΙ|ΤΡΙ|C

Reverse: standing emperor holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. *Manus Dei* in upper r. field.]ΙCΟΔΟΥΚΑC (**Fig. 28.**)⁶⁷⁹

Type T obverse: St George, nimbate, holding spear on shoulder in r. hand and shield in l. ΟΑ|Β|ΓΟΡ|Β

Reverse: emperor seated on throne with back. R. hand holds hilt of sword and l. sheath which rests across knees. ΙΩ ΙΔΟΥΚ⁶⁸⁰

An aspron trachy nomisma in billon classified originally as Type E of Theodore I from the mint of Magnesia, and possibly dated to 1212-21, has been subsequently reclassified by Hendy to John III.

Obverse: Christ Emmanuel, beardless and nimbate, holding scroll in l. hand.

ΙC|Ο|ΕΜ|ΜΑ ΧC|ΝΟΒ|ΗΑ

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Theodore on r., holding shaft with star at top and kite-shaped shield at base between them. Emperor holds labarum-

⁶⁷⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 506, coin nos 50a, 50b.1, 50b.2, 50c; plate XXXIII coin nos 50a, 50b.1, 50b.2, 50c.

⁶⁷⁹ BICC: B6572. **See fig. 28.** DOC 4.2, 506, coin no 51; plate XXXIV coin no 51.

⁶⁸⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 507-08, coin nos 54.1-54.3; plate XXXIV, coin nos 54.1, 54.3.

headed sceptre in r. hand. St Theodore holds spear on shoulder in l. hand.

ΙΩΔΕCΠOTHC OΑΘEOΔΩPOC? (Only Δ|E|Π|T visible.)⁶⁸¹

Tetarteron Noummion Series of John III in Bronze

John III's tetarteron noummion series in bronze from Magnesia (dated 1221-54) consists of 7 types, of which 2 (28.6%) have military iconography.

Type A obverse: square of four interlaced bands, decorated with pellets.

Reverse: John in stemma, short military tunic, breastplate and sagion; holds drawn sword on shoulder with l. hand, and sheath in r. ΙΩΔΕCΠO|TH|C O ΔOV|KA|C (**Fig. 29.**)⁶⁸²

Type C obverse: St George, beardless and nimbate, holding spear on shoulder in r. hand and shield in l. OΑ ΓOP

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor, holding labarum in r. hand and *anexikakia* in l. ΙΩΔΕCΠO|THC O|ΔOV|KA|C (**Fig. 30.**)⁶⁸³

The reign of Theodore II Doukas Laskaris (1254-58) was short but eventful; he undertook two campaigns against the Bulgarians and secured a peace with them in 1257. Theodore captured the fortress of Prilep in 1255,

⁶⁸¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 454, 465, coin no 9; plate XXVIII, coin no 9.

⁶⁸² BICC: B6097. **See fig. 29.** DOC 4.2, 508-09, coin nos 56.1-56.5; plate XXXIV, coin nos 56.1, 56.2, 56.3.

⁶⁸³ BICC: coin no B6101. **See fig. 30.** DOC 4.2, 509-11, coin nos 58.1-58.12; plate XXXIV coin nos 58.9, 58.11, 58.12.

only to lose it to Michael II in 1259.⁶⁸⁴ Theodore alienated several groups, particularly the aristocracy, by his preference for appointing men of ability rather than of noble birth. By reducing payments (*rhoga*) to army mercenaries Theodore created another source of opposition, since he apparently enjoyed access to large amounts of money. Pachymeres records that John III had stored large sums at Magnesia and that Theodore had created a store of his own at Astytzium on the Scamander.⁶⁸⁵ The creation of a treasury at Astytzium may have coincided with the closure of the mint at Thessaloniki, for Theodore II issued only a single coin from Thessaloniki and this coin is noted in the section below on Thessaloniki.

Theodore's coinage from Magnesia consists overall of 14 types, of which only 3 (21.4%) feature military symbolism. Hendy relocates the Type D trachy (a military type) in billon to John III, but does not give reasons for this.⁶⁸⁶ Against Hendy's decision it should be noted that on this coin the names of Theodore and St Tryphon appear together in the reverse inscription (see below in the coin description) and that there is no mention in the inscription of John. Further, Theodore minted three other coins featuring St Tryphon, whereas John III minted no other coins with this saint. For these reasons the coin is placed under Theodore II in the current study.

Theodore had a devotion to St Tryphon so it is not surprising that the saint should appear on Theodore's coins; he built a church dedicated to Tryphon in Nicaea and established a school in the church. Further,

⁶⁸⁴ Akropolites 2007, §54, 281; and §58, 288-89; §59, 291-94; §72, 332-33.

⁶⁸⁵ Pachymeres 1984, vol. I, §23-25, 68-71, 97-103.

⁶⁸⁶ DOC 4.2, 480, 516, 525-26, coin nos 12.1-12.6; plate XXXVI, coin nos 12.4, 12.5; 699, coin nos 1.1, 1.2; plate LIV, coin nos 1.1, 1.2.

Theodore's campaign of 1255/56 in which he crossed the Hellespont and marched to Adrianople was strongly influenced by a dream in which St Tryphon appeared to Theodore and encouraged him.⁶⁸⁷ Of Theodore's overall total of fourteen coin issues, four feature St Tryphon; in addition to the Type D trachy in billon noted above the saint appears also on the following coins from Nicaea: Type II aspron trachy nomisma in electrum (1255/56); Type III aspron trachy nomisma in electrum (1256/57); Type B aspron trachy nomisma in billon (1255/56). However on these three coins St Tryphon wears the civilian dress of tunic and kolobion, and is unarmed.⁶⁸⁸ The Type D trachy noted above is undated. The Type B trachy is of interest in that its date corresponds to the date of Theodore's campaign in the west (1255/56), and the issue of this coin has been linked to this campaign, even though St Tryphon does not appear in military guise on the Type B.⁶⁸⁹

St Tryphon does appear in military dress on the Type D trachy, and the campaign of 1255/56 could provide a clue to this issue. The transformation of St Tryphon on the Type D trachy is unusual, as it makes him appear as a military saint, in a short military tunic and breastplate, yet St Tryphon was a civilian martyr: he receives no mention in Walter's 2003 study of the warrior saints and Grierson also states that he was a civilian martyr.⁶⁹⁰ Whilst it is not surprising to find Tryphon on a coin of Theodore II from Nicaea, as he was the patron saint of Nicaea and Theodore had a devotion to him, it is curious that he should be given military status, and also that this status should be seen on

⁶⁸⁷ Akropolites 2007, 88; §55, 283, 284 fn 7.

⁶⁸⁸ BICC: no specimens. DOC 4.2, 520-524; Type II coin nos 6.1-4; Type III coin nos 7.1-5; Type B coin nos 10a.1, 10a.2, 10b; plates XXXV coin nos 6.1, 6.3, 6.4 and XXXVI coin nos 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 and 10a.1, 10b.

⁶⁸⁹ Akropolites 2007, §55, 283-84 and fn 7.

⁶⁹⁰ DOC 5.1, 77, 81.

only one coin. If a comparison is sought with figures of martyrs on seals Tryphon occupies a very minor position, as in one collection he appears on only two seals from the sixth century to the fifteenth century, and is classified there as a civilian martyr, rather than as a military saint.⁶⁹¹ Although this Type D trachy is undated it is possible to speculate that this coin dates to 1255/56 as St Tryphon is in military dress; it could then be the coin related to Theodore's campaign in the west, rather than the Type B.

Theodore II minted a hyperpyron nomisma in gold and a tetarteron noummion in bronze, but these series did not feature military imagery. The coins with military imagery are summarised below.

Type 1 aspron trachy nomisma in electrum (Magnesia 1254/55) obverse: full-length figure of Christ, holding Gospels in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: emperor on l., holding sceptre cruciger in r. hand. On r. is military saint (? Demetrios), in military tunic, breastplate, and sagion, holding spear on shoulder in l. hand. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ Ο ΑΥΓΑΣΤΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΤΡΗΣ (ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ Ο ΑΥΓΑΣΤΟΣ ΔΗΜΑΤΡΗΣ?) but only ΩΡΟΚΕΙΧΗ ΟΙΚΤΡ visible.⁶⁹²

Type C aspron trachy nomisma in billon (Magnesia 1254/55?) obverse: St Theodore holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. Ο ΑΓΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ

⁶⁹¹ Cotsonis 2005, 397, 428.

⁶⁹² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 520, coin nos 5.1, 5.2; plate XXXV coin nos 5.1, 5.2. The full inscription is Hendy's reconstruction, but only the letters in the two columnar groups are visible.

Reverse: emperor holding labarum in r. hand and globus with patriarchal cross in l. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΕCΠΟΤΗΣ ΟΛΑΚΚΑΡΙC or Ο ΔΟΥΚΑC but only Θ|Ε|Ο|[]Ω|ΡΟC|[]C ΠΟ|ΤΗ|Ο|[]ΑC visible. (**Fig. 31.**)⁶⁹³

Type D aspron trachy nomisma in billon (Magnesia 1254-55) obverse: Christ holding scroll in l. hand. IC XC Ο ΕΜΜΑΝΟΥΗΛ, but only ΟΕ|ΜΜ Α|Ν visible.

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Tryphon on r. Emperor holds labarum in r. hand. Saint in short military tunic, breastplate and sagion holds sceptre in l. hand. They hold a lys on a long shaft between them. The inscription contains the letters ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΕCΠΟΤΗΣ Ο ΔΟΥΚΑC Ο ΑΓΙΟC ΤΡΥΦΩΝ but only ΤΡΥ|Φ|ΔΕ|Π visible. (**Fig. 32.**)⁶⁹⁴

Following the death of Theodore II in 1258, which left Theodore's son John as a minor, Akropolites describes how Michael Palaiologos (Komnenos) obtained the imperial throne.⁶⁹⁵ Michael consolidated his position after defeating Michael II of Epeiros and his allies William II of Villehardouin, prince of Achaea, and Manfred, the Hohenstaufen king of Sicily, at the battle of Pelagonia in 1259. By 1260 Michael VIII was in a strong enough position to consider an attack on the Latins in Constantinople, although he abandoned this after a preliminary attack on Galata.⁶⁹⁶ But by 1261 the city was in

⁶⁹³ BICC: coin no B6108. **See fig. 31.** DOC 4.2, 524-25, coin nos 11a.1, 11a.2, 11b.1, 11b.2; plate XXXVI coin nos 11a.1, 11a.2, 11b.1.

⁶⁹⁴ BICC: B6106. **See fig. 32.** DOC 4.2, 525-26, coin nos 12.1-12.6; plate XXXVI, coin nos 12.4, 12.5.

⁶⁹⁵ Akropolites 2007, §76 and 77, 343-51.

⁶⁹⁶ Akropolites 2007, §80,81, 356-65; , §83, 367-68.

Michael's hands, and at the end of that year Michael had John IV blinded.⁶⁹⁷

Michael VIII's short reign at Nicaea produced 6 coin issues, of which 1 (16.6%), an aspron trachy nomisma in silver dated to 1259-61 featured military symbolism, and whose details are:

Obverse: Archangel Michael with sword on shoulder in r. hand. Object in l. hand unclear. X|M

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor on l. and St George on r. Emperor holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand and saint holds sword or shield (details unclear) in l. hand. They hold labarum on globe between them. X|MΔE OA|ΓOP (**Fig. 19.**)⁶⁹⁸

The coin issues of Michael VIII post-1261 are discussed in chapter 6.

Conclusions: A mean of 32.3% of the coins issued by the rulers of the empire of Nicaea from c. 1205/8 to 1261 featured military symbolism; this represents the lowest proportion for the successor states. The rulers of Thessaloniki from c. 1225/7 to 1258 produced an output of coinage of which 67.9% featured military symbolism, and the rulers of Epeiros from c. 1204 to 1248 an output of which 57.1% featured military symbolism. Despite the rulers of Nicaea facing opposition because Nicaea was the greatest rival to Epeiros, the proportion of Nicaean coins with military symbolism declined with each

⁶⁹⁷ Akropolites 2007, §85-88, 375-84.

⁶⁹⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 532, coin no 2; plate XXXVII coin no 2. **See fig. 19, coin no 2, BZC.1969.74.**

successive emperor. Theodore I minted 70% of coins with military symbolism, but this proportion decreased to 30.2% under John III; to 21.4% under Theodore II; and to 16.6% under John IV with Michael VIII. But co-existing with this relative decline in military types there was an expansion in the range of military symbols employed. John III employed a wide range of military figures, including St Theodore, St George, St Demetrios, and the Archangel Michael. The figure of the armed emperor, either alone or accompanied by a military saint was particularly prominent amongst the military types of John III. One anomaly was found on a coin of Theodore II, which represented St Tryphon as a warrior saint, in short military tunic, breastplate and sagion, despite his usual persona as a civilian martyr.

Coin Issues with Military Symbolism from Thessaloniki⁶⁹⁹

The 1230s saw conflict between the brothers Theodore Komnenos Doukas (Angelos) and Manuel Komnenos Doukas. Theodore, despite having been blinded by Asan during imprisonment after the battle of Klokotnitsa (1230), regained control of Thessaloniki in 1237, expelling Manuel and installing his own son John as emperor. Manuel raised an army and ruled Pharsala, Larissa, and Platamon; he became reconciled with Theodore and their other brother Constantine, although this involved Manuel in repudiating his truce with the Nicaean emperor John III.⁷⁰⁰

When comparing coin data for Thessaloniki from 1081 to 1204 and from 1224 to 1258 there is a contrast which relates to the specific military

⁶⁹⁹ Strictly, Thessaloniki was not an empire 1204-61, although Hendy uses the term. DOC 4.2, 541.

⁷⁰⁰ Akropolites 2007, §26, 182; §38, 206-07.

personages featured on the coins. For 1081 to 1204 the following symbols with the number of their appearances as a proportion of the total number of issues from Thessaloniki for this period are:

St Demetrios: 6/41 (14.6%)

St George: 5/41 (12.2%)

Archangel Michael: 2/41 (4.9%)

Armed emperor: 1/41 (2.4%)

For 1224 to 1258 these figures are (omitting any figures of uncertain identity):⁷⁰¹

St Demetrios: 35/78 (44.9%)

Archangel Michael: 9/78 (11.5%)

Armed emperor: 8/78 (10.2%)

St Theodore: 6/78 (7.7%)

St George: 1/78 (1.3%)

Thus post-1204 images of St Demetrios, the Archangel Michael, and the armed emperor increased, and a further military saint, St Theodore, began to appear while the use of St George decreased. Post-1204 the dominance of St Demetrios is marked: he makes up over half of the total appearances of named military personages. Given the very close association of the saint with

⁷⁰¹ The totals for individual figures add to more than fifty-three because some coins feature more than one military figure.

Thessaloniki this is perhaps not surprising, and this association is made more prominent by the image of the saint and emperor holding a model of the city. This image on coins dates to the recovery of Thessaloniki by Theodore Komnenos-Doukas: Akropolites relates that with this event Theodore 'appropriated the insignia of imperial office'.⁷⁰²

The predominance of St Demetrios on Thessalonian coinage may relate to his involvement in actions of the Bulgarians against Thessaloniki and has been noted above in chapter four. John, ruler of the Bulgarians, had laid siege to Thessaloniki, but had died in the autumn of 1207: Akropolites notes that he died of pleurisy, but 'some said' that St Demetrios could have been involved;⁷⁰³ Robert of Clari credits St Demetrios with the death of John.⁷⁰⁴ John's brothers, Peter and Asan, had attempted to appropriate the cult of St Demetrios in 1186, building a church to him at Trnovo and publicising the story that St Demetrios had deserted the Greeks.⁷⁰⁵ But the idea that St Demetrios had been responsible for the death of John would have helped to refute Peter and Asan's story.⁷⁰⁶ The preponderance of images of St Demetrios on the coinage after this incident could therefore have served the same purpose, emphasising that St Demetrios had not left the people of Thessaloniki, and could account for the great increase in his appearances, to some extent at the expense of St George. That continuing refutation of the Bulgarian story may have been necessary is shown by the fact that John II Asan (1218-41) placed images of St Demetrios on his own coinage,

⁷⁰² Akropolites 2007, §21, 162 and 163 fn 2.

⁷⁰³ Akropolites 2007, §13, 140.

⁷⁰⁴ Robert of Clari 2005, 127.

⁷⁰⁵ Choniates 1984, 371.4-17.

⁷⁰⁶ Ruth Macrides, Akropolites 2007, 143, fn 19.

indicating an ongoing Bulgarian link to the saint. Both types of coin known for Asan, a hyperpyron nomisma and an aspron trachy nomisma, feature St Demetrios. On the reverse of the hyperpyron Asan is crowned by St Demetrios and on the reverse of the aspron trachy the tsar and the saint hold between them a long shaft with a star on top. The obverse of both types feature Christ. Both these types have been dated to a possible range of 1230 to 1241, and the possible mint of Ochrida.⁷⁰⁷

As well as the possible Byzantine need to reclaim St Demetrios there might be a further reason for his extensive appearances on coinage, relating to the rivalry between the Komneno-Doukai and the emperors of Nicaea. Blemmydes records that when he was on a book-finding mission in Thessaloniki he received much help from the authorities who were 'under no obligation to obey the Emperor's decrees, their power not deriving from him nor being subordinate to him, as they were all autonomous and independent'.⁷⁰⁸ If the Komneno-Doukai wished to continue to assert this independence St Demetrios could have been a good symbol to employ on the coinage. The importance of the wider role of the cult of St Demetrios and its longstanding nature, particularly his myron, should not be underestimated; it has been suggested that a collection of seventh-century miracles of the saint has the effect of emphasising that 'St Demetrios is for Thessalonica what the Mother of God is for Constantinople'.⁷⁰⁹

⁷⁰⁷ BICC: coin nos B6049-62, but poor quality makes discernment of detail difficult. DOC 4.2, 641-43, coin nos 1, 2.1-2.23; plate XLVII, coin nos 1. 2.2, 2.18.

⁷⁰⁸ Blemmydes 1988, §63, 79-80.

⁷⁰⁹ Ruth Macrides 1990, 194-96 and particularly 193, and fn 28, 29.

In general terms the preponderance of military images on Thessalonian coins could also reflect the differences between Thessaloniki and Nicaea in their relationships with the Latins in Constantinople. Rulers in Nicaea (e.g. Theodore Laskaris) were more inclined to use diplomacy in dealings with the Latins, in contrast to rulers in Thessaloniki, such as Theodore Komnenos Doukas (?1225/7-30); the result of this was enhanced stability in Nicaea.⁷¹⁰ The stability of Nicaea was reflected in its currency: Pachymeres records that neither John III nor Theodore II Laskaris debased the currency, which indicates economic stability. He goes on to condemn later emperors, such as Michael VIII, for debasement.⁷¹¹

Theodore Komnenos Doukas (also called Angelos) gained control of Thessaloniki from the Latins in 1224.⁷¹² Akropolites states that Theodore 'appropriated the insignia of imperial office when he gained control of Thessaloniki', and that he was known as emperor in late 1224/early 1225.⁷¹³ His coinage consists of an aspron trachy nomisma series in electrum; an aspron trachy nomisma series in billon; a terarteron noummion series in base metal, and a half-tetarteron series in base metal. These coins provide a good example of the tendency noted for coin issues from Thessaloniki to have more military symbols than coins of other mints. Although Theodore

⁷¹⁰ Nicol refers to Thessaloniki being 'built in a blaze of war and glory'. Nicol 1993, 21.

⁷¹¹ Pachymeres 1984, vol. 2, §25-26, 493-94, 621-25. Pachymeres' statement is not strictly correct. John III issued two coinages of hyperpyra at eighteen/sixteencarats, but the hyperpyra of his twelfth-century predecessors were of twenty and a half/nineteen and a half carats. Thus by comparison John's hyperpyra were debased. DOC 4.2, 475.

⁷¹² Akropolites 2007, 162. For the date Macrides cites Richard of San Germano, *Ryccardi de Sancto Germano notarii chronica*, ed. C. A. Garufi, RIS, VII, 2, Bologna 1937, 119-20; 'La reprise de Salonique par les Grecs en 1204', *Actes du VI congrès international d'études byzantines*, I, Paris 1950, 141-6; and Sinogowitz, B. 'Zur Eroberung Thessalonikes in Herbst 1224', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 1952, 45, 28. Macrides in Akropolites 2007, 163 fn 2.

⁷¹³ Akropolites 2007, 162, 172, and 177 fn 17.

Komnenos Doukas' reign was short his coinage consisted of a total of 15 types, of which 12 (80%) displayed military iconography. These twelve are dominated by St Demetrios who appears on nine types. St Theodore appears on one type, the Archangel Michael on one type, and the armed emperor on two types.⁷¹⁴

The nine portrayals of St Demetrios have a number of common features: in all nine he appears as bearded and nimbate, and wears military tunic, breastplate and sagion. In six of the nine the saint and the emperor appear together whilst in three the two figures are on opposite sides of the coin. The arms carried by St Demetrios are a sword (four portrayals); a spear and shield (four); and no arms (one). On four types the saint and emperor hold an object between them: on two representations a cross in a circle; and on two a patriarchal cross-crosslet. On one coin St Demetrios presents Theodore with a walled city with three towers. The image of the triple-towered castle signified both the city and the empire of Thessaloniki. Kontogiannis argues that Theodore Komnenos Doukas adopted the symbol of the triple-towered castle from western coinage, and specifically from the coinage of Hohenstaufen Italy.⁷¹⁵ On types which do not show an object between the two figures the emperor holds a sceptre cruciger in his right hand and the *anexikakia* in his left hand in two instances, and a sceptre in his right hand with the globus cruciger in his left in two instances.

Where Theodore Komnenos Doukas appears with the Archangel Michael the walled city motif is used again, with Michael handing it to the

⁷¹⁴ These figures add to more than twelve as one coin features more than one military figure.

⁷¹⁵ Kontogiannis 2013, 717, 732-41.

emperor. Michael wears a divitision and loros, and holds a jewelled sceptre in his left hand; Theodore wears a stemma, divitision and loros, and holds a labarum-headed sceptre in his right hand. The image of the emperor with St Theodore features the cross in circle held between them, but here the emperor, in stemma, divitision, and loros, holds a sheathed sword, point down, in his right hand. St Theodore wears a military tunic, breastplate, and sagion and holds a shield in his left hand. In the single case of the emperor being armed, but with no military saint present, he wears a stemma, divitision, loros and sagion, holding in his right hand a sheathed sword and in his left the *anexikakia*. He is crowned by Christ. A summary of these issues is given below.

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Silver

Type A (1224/25?), obverse: Christ seated on throne; blesses with r. hand, holds Gospels in l. IC XC

Reverse: emperor on l., and St Demetrios on r., holding cross-in-circle between them. Saint holds sword over shoulder with l. hand.

ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟC ΔΟΥΚΑ Ο ΑΓΙΟC ΔΙΜΗΤΡΙΟC⁷¹⁶

Type B (1227?), obverse: full-length figure of Virgin Hagiosoritissa, orans. MP

ΘΥ ΗΑΓ|Η|ΟC ΩΡ|ΗΤ|ΗC|Α

⁷¹⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 550, coin nos 1a.1, 1a.2, 1b, 1c; plate XXXVIII coin nos 1a.2, 1c.

Reverse: emperor on l., and St Demetrios on r., presenting walled city to emperor. *Manus Dei* upper centre field. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟCΔΕCΠΟ Ο ΑΓΙΟC ΔΙΜΙΤΡΙΟC (**Fig. 35.**)⁷¹⁷

Type C (1225/26?), obverse: Virgin seated on throne with back; holds head of Christ on breast. ΜΡ ΘΥ

Reverse: emperor on l., crowned by Christ. Emperor holds sheathed sword in r. hand, *anexikakia* in l. IC XC ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟC ΔΟΥΚΑC (**Fig. 33.**)⁷¹⁸

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Billon

Type A (1224/25?), obverse: bust of Christ Emmanuel. IC|OE|MM|A XC|NOV|HA

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Demetrios, in short military tunic, breastplate and sagion, holding between them cross-in-circle. Saint holds sword over shoulder with l. hand. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟCΔΟΥΚ ΟΑΓΙΟC ΔΙΜΙΤΡ⁷¹⁹

Type B (1227?), obverse: Christ seated on backless throne. IC XC

Reverse: emperor on l., crowned by St Demetrios. Saint holds sheathed sword in l. hand. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟCΔΕC ΠΟΤ ΟΑΓΙΟCΔΙΜΙΤΡ ΠΙ⁷²⁰

⁷¹⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 551, coin nos 2a.1, 2a.2, 2a.3, 2b, 2c; plate XXXVIII, coin nos 2a.2, 2c. **See fig. 35, coin no 2a.2, BZC.1960.88.4206.**

⁷¹⁸ BICC: coin no B6117. **See fig. 33.** DOC 4.2, 552, coin nos 3a.1-3a.3, 3b, 3c; plate XXXVIII coin nos 3a.2, 3c.

⁷¹⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 553-55, coin nos 4.1-4.20; plate XXXVIII coin nos 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5.

⁷²⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 555-56, coin nos 5a.1-5a.4, 5b, 5c, 5d.1, 5d.2; plate XXXVIII coin nos 5a.1, 5a.3, 5a.4, 5b.

Type C (1228/29?), obverse: Virgin seated on throne with back, and holding head of Christ on breast. MP ΘV

Reverse: emperor in non-military dress on l. with St Theodore, holding between them cross-in-circle. Emperor holds sheathed sword in r. hand; saint holds lance in l. hand. ΘEOΔΩPOCECIT OAGIOCΘEOΔΩP (**Fig. 34.**)⁷²¹

Type D (1226/27?), obverse: Christ seated on backless throne. IC XC

Reverse: emperor on l. being given walled city by Archangel Michael. *Manus Dei* upper centre. ΘEOΔΩPOCΔOYK X|M⁷²²

Type F (1227/28?), obverse: St Demetrios seated on backless throne. Holds sword hilt in r. hand with sheath in l. across knees. O|AΓ|IO|C ΔH|M|PI|TPI|OC

Reverse: half-length figures of emperor on l., and Virgin, holding between them patriarchal cross with globe at base. Emperor holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand. *Manus Dei* upper l. field. ΘEOΔΩPOCΔEC. MP ΘV (**Fig. 36.**)⁷²³

Tetareron Noummion in Bronze

Variety A (1227?), obverse: inscription only:

+ΘEOΔ

ΩΠOCENXΩ

TΩΘΩΠICTOC

BACIAEVCKAI

⁷²¹ BICC: coin no B6118. **See fig. 34.** DOC 4.2, 556-57, coin nos 6.1-6.5; plate XXXIX coin nos 6.1, 6.3, 6.4. Saint holds shield instead of lance on DO specimens.

⁷²² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 557-58, coin nos 7a, 7b.1, 7c, 7d.1, 7d.2; plate XXXIX coin nos 7a, 7b.1, 7b.2.

⁷²³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 558-59, coin nos 9.1-9.7; plate XXXIX coin nos 9.1, 9.2, 9.6. **See fig. 36, coin no 9.2, BZC.1960.88.4147.**

ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ

ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝΟ

ΔΟΥΚΑΚ

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Demetrios on r. holding patriarchal cross-crosslet on three steps between them. Emperor holds *anexikakia* in l. hand, saint holds sword on shoulder in r. hand and shield in l. hand.

ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟC ΔΕC ΠΟΤ ΑΓΗΟC ΔΗΜΗΤΡΟC⁷²⁴

Variety B (1227/28?), obverse: inscription only, differing from A:

+ΘΕ

ΟΔΩΡΟC

ΔΕC ΠΟΤ

ΗC ΟΔΩΒ

ΚΑΚ

Reverse: type as variety A. (**Fig. 37.**)⁷²⁵

Type B (1224/25?), obverse: St Demetrios holding spear over r. shoulder in r. hand, and shield in l. hand. Ο|ΑΓ|ΗΟ|C Δ|Η|Μ|ΤΡ

Reverse: emperor holding sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l.

ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟC ΚΟΜΝΗΝΟC⁷²⁶

⁷²⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 562, coin no 11; plate XL coin no 11.

⁷²⁵ BICC: coin no B6121. **See fig. 37.** DOC 4.2, 562-63, coin nos 12.1-12.6; plate XL coin nos 12.1, 12.3, 12.5, 12.6.

⁷²⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 563, coin no 14; plate XL coin no 14.

Type C (1225/26?), obverse: St Demetrios holding spear on shoulder in r. hand, and shield in l. (Can also be spear in l. hand and shield in r.)

Ο|ΑΓ|ΗΟ|C Δ|ΗΜ|ΤΡ

Reverse: emperor holding globus cruciger in r. hand and labarum-headed sceptre in l. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΟΔΟΥΚΑΣ⁷²⁷

Manuel Komnenos Doukas, unlike his brother Theodore, avoided capture at Klokotnitsa and gained control of Thessaloniki with the help of the Bulgarian tsar John Asan II, whose daughter Manuel had married. Manuel had no coronation and ruled as despot from 1230 to 1237, but still issued coinage; the coins issued by him from Thessaloniki refer in their inscriptions to Manuel as *despotes*. Manuel would appear to have been keen to exert his authority, as his rule was not secure: Akropolites refers to the rivalry between Manuel and his brother Theodore, and how an ambassador of John III referred mockingly to Manuel as '*basileus* and *despotes*'. Akropolites refers also to Manuel's use of red ink.⁷²⁸ That such projection of power by Manuel was necessary is confirmed by the later actions of Theodore who after his release by Asan returned to Thessaloniki, gained control, and banished Manuel.⁷²⁹

Manuel's coinage consisted of an aspron trachy nomisma series in electrum and an aspron trachy nomisma series in billon, together consisting of 9 types, of which 7 (77.7%) feature military iconography. On these seven, the

⁷²⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 564, coin nos 15a.1-15a.4, 15b.1-15b.3. Plate XL coin nos 15a.1, 15a.2, 15a.3, 15b.1.

⁷²⁸ Akropolites 2007, §26, 182. The ambassador was referring to Manuel's given title of *despotes*, and his adopted behaviour of a *basileus*.

⁷²⁹ Akropolites 2007, §38, 206-07.

Archangel Michael appears four times, St Demetrios twice, the armed emperor twice, St Theodore once, and an unidentified warrior saint twice.⁷³⁰

The Archangel Michael generally wears a military tunic, breastplate and sagion, but on one representation wears divitision and loros. St Demetrios wears his usual dress of military tunic, breastplate and sagion. The single portrayal of St Theodore shows him in a tunic, and carrying no weapons. Manuel does not appear in military dress, but holds a sword with the Archangel Michael on one coin and with a warrior saint (probably St Demetrios) on another. Manuel is portrayed in stemma, divitision and loros on eight issues, and in stemma, divitision and chlamys on the ninth.

The weapons when carried by these military figures are typical ones. St Demetrios carries a spear or sword; one of the unidentified saints carries a spear, whereas the other unidentified saint holds a sheathed sword with Manuel. The Archangel carries an unsheathed sword on one type and on another a sword which he is unsheathing. In one representation Michael is unarmed, but holds the labarum with Manuel. On one type Michael holds an unsheathed sword with Manuel and a labarum-headed sceptre in his left hand. St Theodore appears unarmed. In his unarmed representations Manuel carries the usual imperial attributes; the exception is when he holds a palm-frond in his right hand. On a single type he and St Demetrios hold between them a model of a walled city, representing Thessaloniki. This type is the most strongly military of Manuel's coinage. It features not one, but two, military figures – the Archangel and St Demetrios – and both wear military dress and

⁷³⁰ This total is greater than seven because several coins feature more than one military figure.

carry a sword. Further, Michael is portrayed as unsheathing his sword. As the city of Thessaloniki is represented on the reverse, it is possible that the whole could be interpreted as a symbol of the support being sought by Manuel.

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Silver

Type B (1230-37), obverse: Virgin seated on backless throne; holds head of Christ on breast. MP ΘV

Reverse: full-length figures of Manuel (on l.) and Archangel Michael, holding sheathed sword between them. Ruler holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand; Michael holds labarum-headed sceptre in l. hand. MANOUHΛΔECII X|AP or X|M (**Fig. 38.**)⁷³¹

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Billon

Type A (1230-37), obverse: St Demetrios, holding spear in r. hand and unidentified object in l. O|AΓI|OC Δ|HM|IT|POC

Reverse: ruler (on l.), holding sceptre cruciger in r. hand and *anexikakia* in l.; crowned by Christ who holds Gospels in l. hand. MANOUHΛΔEC IC XC (**Fig. 39.**)⁷³²

Type B (1230-37), obverse: Virgin seated on throne with back; holds head of Christ on breast. MP ΘV

⁷³¹ BICC: coin no B6124. **See fig. 38.** DOC 4.2, 570-71, coin nos 2.1-2.3; plate XL coin nos 2.1, 2.2, 2.3. The Virgin literally holds the head, not a bust, of Christ.

⁷³² BICC: coin no B6122. **See fig. 39.** DOC 4.2, 571-72, coin nos 3a.1-3a.3, 3b, 3c.1-3c.3; plate XL coin nos 3a.2, 3c.1.

Reverse: full-length figures of Manuel (on l.) and Archangel Michael, holding between them labarum on long shaft. Michael wears tunic and ? sagion.

MANOYHΛΔEΠOT X M XAP⁷³³

Type C (1230-37), obverse: bust of Virgin orans. MP ΘV

Reverse: full-length figures of Manuel (on l.) and ? St Demetrios, handing him globus with patriarchal cross. Manuel holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand; saint, in divitision and chlamys, holds spear in l. hand. MANOYHΛΔEC O A | (ΔIM|ITPIOC?) Π|OC (**Fig. 40.**)⁷³⁴

Type D (1230-37), obverse: half-length figure of Archangel Michael, in divitision and loros; holds sword on shoulder in r. hand. X|AP X|M

Reverse: full-length figures of ruler (on l.) and St Constantine, holding between them patriarchal cross on three steps; each holds palm-frond (ruler in r. hand; saint in l.). MANOYHΛΔEC OKΩNCTANTINOC or MANOYHΛΔEC O A Γ IOCKOCT⁷³⁵

Type F (1230-37), obverse: bust of St Theodore, wearing tunic. E|A|O|Θ|O A |Ω

Reverse: half-length figures of ruler (on l.) and military saint (possibly Demetrios), holding between them sheathed sword, point down. *Manus Dei* in upper central field, crowning Manuel. MANOYH A O A⁷³⁶

⁷³³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 572-73, coin nos 4a.1-4a.5, 4b.1-4b.3, 4c.1, 4c.2; plate XLI coin nos 4a.4, 4b.1, 4c.1.

⁷³⁴ BICC: coin no B6125. **See fig. 40.** DOC 4.2, 573-74, coin nos 5.1-5.5; plate XLI coin no 5.1. Part of the reverse inscription (ΔIM|ITPIOC) is unclear.

⁷³⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 574-75, coin nos 6.1-6.4; plate XLI coin nos 6.1, 6.2, 6.3.

⁷³⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 575-76, coin nos 8.1, 8.2; plate XLI coin no 8.1.

Type G (1230-37), obverse: full-length figure of Archangel Michael. R. hand unsheaths sword, sheath in l. X|AP X|M

Reverse: ruler on l. with St Demetrios, both seated on backless throne, holding between them model of Thessaloniki. Manuel holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand. Saint holds sword over shoulder in l. hand.

MANOYHΛΔEC(ΠOT)I ΠOΛIC|ΘECCA|AON|IKH (**Fig. 43.**)⁷³⁷

John Komnenos Doukas, who was emperor 1237-42 and despot 1242-44, issued a remarkable variety of coinage, particularly in terms of his relatively short reign. He issued in total 38 types in three series, of which 23 (60.5%) featured military symbolism. Of the twenty-three, eight were lightweight variations with obverse and reverse types very similar to other issues on heavier flans. Type X, series III, is present in the Dumbarton Oaks catalogue as a reverse image only.⁷³⁸ It appears according to Hendy to feature a military saint, but the lack of detail in the illustration is such that the saint cannot be identified, nor can his dress be determined; this coin is therefore not included in the current analysis. Within the twenty-three military images there are five personages who appear armed or in military dress, and their appearances number:⁷³⁹

St Demetrios: 14/38 (36.8%); and 3 other uncertain appearances.

⁷³⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 576-77, coin nos 9.1-9.6; plate XLI coin nos 9.1, 9.4, 9.5. **See fig. 43, coin no 9.1, BZC.1956.23.4216.**

⁷³⁸ DOC 4.2, 596, coin no 37; plate XLIII coin no 37. BICC: no specimen.

⁷³⁹ These appearances add to more than twenty-three because some coins feature more than one military personage.

St Theodore: 4/38 (10.5%).

Archangel Michael 2/38 (5.3%); and 1 uncertain appearance.

Armed emperor: 3/38 (7.9%).

Unnamed military saint: 1/38 (2.6%)

The dress of these figures is broadly conventional. St Demetrios is portrayed in military tunic, breastplate and sagion, as is St Theodore. John, in his armed persona, wears a military tunic and sagion, and possibly a breastplate, although this last detail is not clear. The Archangel Michael wears divitision, loros and sagion. The arms carried by this group are again conventional. St Demetrios carries a sword on four coins; a spear on one, and a shield on one. In his portrayal with a spear he holds a patriarchal cross in his other hand, in conjunction with the emperor. On two coins St Demetrios appears unarmed, holding a patriarchal cross with the emperor on one coin and a cross within a circle on another. St Theodore carries a spear and shield on one coin and a sword on another. The Archangel Michael is portrayed with a sword, despite his non-military dress. On the two coins on which the emperor appears in military dress he carries the labarum and globus cruciger on one and a triple-towered castle (a model of Thessaloniki) on the other. The issues with military iconography are summarised below.⁷⁴⁰

Whilst it is easy to note the variety of John's coinage it is much harder to account for this variety, particularly in relation to the shortness of his reign, and the lack of information about it. Akropolites emphasises his 'piety and

⁷⁴⁰ The Barber Institute Coin Collection contains only five coins for John Komnenos Doukas. Unfortunately the obverses, and, to a lesser extent, the reverses of B6129 and B6130 are so damaged that it is impossible to decipher the types. Thus only two Barber Institute coins are listed below. The fifth specimen B6586 is a non-military type.

reverence and temperance'; his attendance at all-night prayers; and his daily hearing of the liturgy.⁷⁴¹ The same author suggests the young age of John and as confirmation of his youth he is always portrayed as beardless on his coins. Akropolites records that John's father Theodore, who had been blinded after the defeat at Klokotnitsa in 1230, eventually regained control of Thessaloniki, but then named John as emperor. However, although Theodore gave John the red shoes and red ink, Theodore retained management of public affairs and the administration of John's business in his own hands.⁷⁴² John would probably have been restricted further in his rule by his demotion to despot in 1242 by John III Vatatzes of Nicaea, as this would appear to have removed his right to issue coins. The sheer number of types in Series III would however point to minting continuing after 1242.⁷⁴³

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Billon: Series I (possible date 1237-42)

Type A obverse: St Demetrios seated on backless throne. Γ|OA|ΔH

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor (on l.) and Virgin holding between them cross within circle. ΙΩΑϞ⁷⁴⁴

⁷⁴¹ Akropolites 2007, §42, 223.

⁷⁴² Akropolites 2007, §38, 206-07.

⁷⁴³ Hendy DOC 4.2, 581-82. Hendy has suggested this was because the series was produced by a Venetian community in Thessaloniki, in order to prevent that community from breaking a treaty of 1219, as part of which Theodore I Komnenos and Venice agreed that neither side would issue coinage in imitation of the other. Thus in 1246 the Venetian community in Thessaloniki could not issue coinage imitating that of John III, and may have elected to continue issuing imitations of coins of John Komnenos Doukas. Hendy's contention is made implausible by the work of Touratsoglou and Baker on the Venetian *grosso* and its circulation: they point out that there was a rising output of this coin from the Venice mint in the second half of the thirteenth century. Touratsoglou and Baker 2002, 219-22.

⁷⁴⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 583, coin no 1; plate XLII, coin no 1.

Type B obverse: St Theodore, holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. Lys in field. Γ|OA|Δ|ΘEO

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor (on l.), crowned by St Demetrios. Emperor holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and *anexikakia* in l. Saint holds sword in l. hand. ΙΩΑΝΗCΔEC CΠT OΔE[⁷⁴⁵

Type C obverse: Virgin, holding head of Christ on breast, seated on backless throne. MP ΘV

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor in military dress, holding labarum in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. ΙΩΑΝΝ[⁷⁴⁶

Type D obverse: bust of Christ, holding scroll in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: half-length figures of emperor (on l.) and St Demetrios, holding patriarchal cross between them. ΙΩΑΝΙCΔCCΠO (sic) OΛΓΙOCΔI MIT⁷⁴⁷

Type E obverse: half-length figure of St Theodore, holding sword over shoulder with r. hand; ? sheath in l. OA|ΘE|Ω Δ|Ω|P|S

Reverse: half-length figures of emperor (on l.) and St Demetrios, holding between them cross within circle (emperor with l. hand; saint with both). ΙΩΔCCΠO OA Δ HMHT⁷⁴⁸

⁷⁴⁵ BICC: coin nos B6127, B6128. **See fig. 41.** DOC 4.2, 583, coin nos 2.1-2.3; plate XLII coin nos 2.1, 2.2.

⁷⁴⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 584, coin no 3; plate XLII coin no 3.

⁷⁴⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 584, coin no 4; plate XLII coin no 4.

⁷⁴⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 584, coin no 5; plate XLII coin no 5.

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Billon: Series II (possible date 1237-42)

Type A obverse: half-figure of St Demetrios; holds sword over shoulder with right hand; sheath in l. OA Δ|HM|H

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor blessed by Virgin. Emperor holds labarum on long shaft in r. hand; *anexikakia* in l. ΙΩΑ ΜΡ|ΘV⁷⁴⁹

Type B obverse: eagle with outstretched wings, head turned to l.

Reverse: half-length figure of emperor (on l.) and St Demetrios, holding between them patriarchal cross on three steps. Saint holds spear in l. hand. ΙΩΔ[ΟΑΔΙΜ⁷⁵⁰

Type C obverse: St Demetrios seated on backless throne; holds sword in r. hand, sheath in l. OA ΔH

Reverse: half-length figure of emperor with sceptre cruciger in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. ΙΩΑ ΕCΠ⁷⁵¹

Type D obverse: half-length figure of Archangel Michael, holding sword over shoulder with r. hand, and globus cruciger in l. X M

Reverse: emperor seated on backless throne; holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand and *anexikakia* in l. ΙΩΔNNIC ΔECΠIOΘHC⁷⁵²

⁷⁴⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 585, coin nos 7.1, 7.2; plate XLII coin nos 7.1, 7.2.

⁷⁵⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 586, coin no 8; plate XLII coin no 8.

⁷⁵¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 586, coin no 9; plate XLII coin no 9.

⁷⁵² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 586, coin nos 10.1, 10.2; plate XLII coin nos 10.1, 10.2.

Although Type F is stated in DOC to feature an unidentified military saint there is no specimen in BICC to which it can be compared and the lack of detail in the DOC specimen is such that it has been excluded from the present study.⁷⁵³

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Billon: Series III (Small Module)

Types A-K are dated 1237 to ?1242; and Types L-Y are dated 1237 to an uncertain end-date in the Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue. As some of the types are similar to some already described, reference is made to the descriptions above where appropriate.

Type A: as Series I, Type A.⁷⁵⁴

Type B: as I.B.⁷⁵⁵

Type C: as I.C.⁷⁵⁶

Type D: as I.E.⁷⁵⁷

Type F: as II.A.⁷⁵⁸

Type G: as II.B.⁷⁵⁹

Type H: as II.C.⁷⁶⁰

Type I: as II.D.⁷⁶¹

⁷⁵³ DOC 4.2, 587, coin no12; plate XLII coin no 12.

⁷⁵⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 588, coin nos 14.1, 14.2; plate XLIII, coin no 14.2.

⁷⁵⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 588, coin nos 15.1-4; plate XLIII, coin no 15.3.

⁷⁵⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 588, coin nos 16.1-3; plate XLIII, coin nos 16.1-2.

⁷⁵⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 589, coin nos 17a.1-2, 17b; plate XLIII, coin no 17a.2.

⁷⁵⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 589, coin nos 19.1-2; plate XLIII, coin no 19.2.

⁷⁵⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 589, coin nos 20.1-2; no illustration.

⁷⁶⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 590, coin nos 21.1-2; plate XLIII, coin no 21.2.

⁷⁶¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 590, coin no 22; plate XLIII, coin no 22.

Type K obverse, variant A: bust of Archangel Michael (?), in non-military dress, with sword in r. hand. Variant B: full-length figure of Archangel Michael (?) in military dress, with sword in r. hand.

Reverse both A and B: full-length figure of emperor on r., with nimbate military saint handing him letter B on long shaft. ΙΩΔCCΠ ΙΩΔCC (*sic*)⁷⁶²

Type L obverse: head of four-winged cherub.

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor (on l.) and military saint (? Demetrios), holding between them ? cross on long shaft, or ? sword. Saint holds sword over shoulder with l. hand. ΙΩ ΟΛΙ⁷⁶³

Type M obverse: wing or winged object.

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor (on r.) and military saint (? Demetrios), holding between them ? cross on long shaft or ? sword. Saint holds spear in r. hand. No inscriptions.⁷⁶⁴

Type N obverse: radiate patriarchal cross. IC|NI ΧΚΛΑ

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor (on l.) and military saint (? Demetrios), holding between them castle with two towers representing Thessaloniki.⁷⁶⁵

Type Q obverse: radiate cross.

⁷⁶² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 590-91, coin nos 24a, 24b; plate XLIII coin nos 24a, 24b. This inscription is reproduced as printed in DOC; the comment (*sic*) is Hendy's.

⁷⁶³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 591-92, coin nos 25a.1-25a.6, 25b; plate XLIII coin nos 25a.1, 25a.6, 25b.

⁷⁶⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 592, coin no 26; plate XLIII coin no 26.

⁷⁶⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 592-93, coin nos 27a, 27b.1, 27b.2, 27c; plate XLIII coin no 27b.2.

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor in military dress, holding sword over shoulder with r. hand and castle with three towers (Thessaloniki) with I. ΔΕ (Fig. 44.)⁷⁶⁶

Type Y obverse: full-length figure of St Demetrios holding sword over shoulder with r. hand; shield in l. ΟΑΓΗΟCΔΗ ΜΗΤΡΙΟC

Reverse: full-length figure of emperor, holding labarum on long shaft in r. hand, and *anexikakia* in l. ΙΩΑΝΝΗC ΔΕCΠΙΟΤΗCΟΚ⁷⁶⁷

One further coin with military symbolism has been described for Thessaloniki before the Nicaean takeover of 1246, an aspron trachy nomisma in billon dated 1244-46, attributed to Demetrios Komnenos-Doukas, who succeeded his brother John as despot, until Demetrios' overthrow in 1246.

Obverse: bust of Christ, holding scroll in l. hand. IC XC ΟΕΜΜΑΝΟΥΗΑ

Reverse: full-length figure of Archangel Michael holding labarum on long shaft in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. Χ|ΑΡ Χ|Μ (Fig. 42.)⁷⁶⁸

The coin issues of John III from Thessaloniki consist of two denominations: the aspron trachy nomisma in electrum (probable date 1249/50-54), and the more extensive series of the aspron trachy nomisma in

⁷⁶⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 594, coin no 30; plate XLIII coin no 30. **See fig. 44, coin no 30, BZC.1960.88.4264.**

⁷⁶⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 596, coin nos 38.1-38.3; plate XLIII coin nos 38.1, 38.2.

⁷⁶⁸ BICC: coin no B6131. **See fig. 42.** DOC 4.2, 597-98, coin nos 1a.1, 1a.2, 1b.1, 1b.2, 1c; plate XLIV coin nos 1a.1, 1b.2, 1c.

billon (dated 1246-54).⁷⁶⁹ Of an overall total of 15 types for the two denominations 10 feature military iconography (66.6%). Of the military figures portrayed the series is dominated by St Demetrios.⁷⁷⁰

St Demetrios 9/15 (60.0%) (Includes one coin with St Demetrios on the reverse and St George on the obverse.)

St George 1/15 (6.6%) (Coin has St George on obverse and St Demetrios on reverse.)

Archangel Michael 1/15 (6.6%)

Armed emperor 1/15 (6.6%)

Where St Demetrios is the sole saint he appears three times on the obverse and five times on the reverse. In all eight sole appearances St Demetrios has a uniform portrayal: he is always beardless and nimbate; wears a short military tunic and breastplate on all types, and a sagion on seven out of eight types. He is similarly dressed, and wearing a sagion, on the coin he shares with St George. On these coins the emperor generally wears stemma, divitision and loros (or chlamys instead of the loros), except on the billon Type D where he is in military dress. Details of the coins are summarised below. Events in the reign which could have influenced John's coinage have been noted above in the section on Nicaea.

⁷⁶⁹ Hendy DOC 4.2, 601-04.

⁷⁷⁰ This total adds to more than ten as some coins feature more than one military figure.

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Electrum (Dated 1249/50-54?)

Type A obverse: bust of Christ holding Gospels in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor and St Demetrios, holding between them castle with three towers. Emperor holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand; saint holds sword with point down in l. hand. ΔΠ ΙΩ Γ|ΟΛ|Δ|Μ|Τ⁷⁷¹

Type B obverse: Virgin seated on throne with back; holds beardless, nimbate head of Christ on breast. ΜΠ ΘV

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor and St Demetrios, holding labarum between them. ΙΩ ΟΑ⁷⁷²

Aspron Trachy Nomisma in Billon

Type B (1246-48/49?) obverse: Archangel Michael, nimbate, holding sword on shoulder in r. hand, r; globus cruciger in l. AP X|M

Reverse: emperor seated on backless throne, and holding sceptre cruciger in r. hand and *anexikakia* in l. Wing in l. field; *Manus Dei* in upper r. field.

ΙΩ ΔΕC|ΠΟ|ΤΗ|C⁷⁷³

Type D (1249/50-54?) obverse: St Demetrios with sword in r. hand and sheath in l. across knees. Γ|ΟΛ|ΔΗ|ΜΗ ΤΠ|ΙΟC

⁷⁷¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 604, coin no 1: no illustration.

⁷⁷² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 604, coin no 2; plate XLIV, coin no 2.

⁷⁷³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 606-07, coin nos 4.1-4.6; plate XLIV coin nos 4.2, 4.4.

Reverse: emperor in short military tunic, breastplate and sagion. Holds labarum in r. hand and *anexikakia* in l. $\text{I}\Omega \quad \text{O}|\Delta|\text{OV}$ (**Fig. 45.**)⁷⁷⁴

Type E (1249/50-54?) obverse: bust of St Demetrios, holding sword on shoulder in r. hand. $\Gamma|\text{OA}|\text{I} \quad \text{TPI}|\text{O}|\text{C}$

Reverse: emperor holds labarum in l. hand. $\text{I}\Omega \quad \text{O}|\Delta|\text{OV}|\text{K}$ ⁷⁷⁵

Type F (1249/50-54?) obverse: Virgin seated on backless throne, holding beardless, nimbate head of Christ on breast. Lys on either side. $\text{MII} \quad \Theta\text{V}$

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor and St Demetrios, holding patriarchal cross between them. $\text{I}\Omega|\Delta\Pi|\text{T} \quad \text{O}|\Delta|\text{M}|\text{T}$ ⁷⁷⁶

Type G (1249/50-54?) obverse: bust of Christ with Gospels in l. hand. $\text{IC} \quad \text{XC}$

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor and St Demetrios, as on aspron trachy nomisma in electrum, Type A. $\Delta|\Pi \quad \text{I}\Omega \quad \Gamma|\text{O}\Lambda \quad \Delta|\text{M}|\text{T}$ ⁷⁷⁷

Type H (1249/50-54?) obverse: full-length figure of Virgin, orans. $\text{MII} \quad \Theta\text{V}$

Reverse: full-length figures of emperor and St Demetrios, holding between them labarum surmounting triangular decoration. $\text{I}\Omega|\Delta\Pi|\text{O}\Delta|\text{K} \quad \text{OA}|\Delta|\text{I}|\text{M}|\text{T}$ ⁷⁷⁸

⁷⁷⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 607-08, coin nos 6.1-6.5; plate XLV coin nos 6.4, 6.5. **See fig. 45, coin no 6.4, BZC.1960.88.4260.**

⁷⁷⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 608, coin nos 7.1-7.3; plate XLV coin nos 7.1, 7.3.

⁷⁷⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 609, coin nos 8.1-8.4; plate XLV coin nos 8.1, 8.3.

⁷⁷⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 610, coin nos 9.1-9.6; plate XLV coin nos 9.1, 9.4.

⁷⁷⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 611, coin nos 10.1-10.5; plate XLV coin nos 10.1, 10.4.

Type I (1249/50-54?) obverse: bust of St George, holding spear in r. hand over l. shoulder; and shield in l. hand. Γ|OΑ|ΓΕ|Ω P|ΓΙ|O|C

Reverse: half-length figures of emperor and St Demetrios, holding between them cross-in-circle surmounting triangular decoration on long shaft.

Δ|Π|T IΩ Δ|M|TP (**Fig. 46.**)⁷⁷⁹

Type J (1249/50-54?) obverse: full-length figure of St Demetrios with spear in r. hand, shield in l. O|Δ|M TPI|O|C

Reverse: half-length figure of emperor holding labarum in r. hand, globus cruciger in l. Ω O|A⁷⁸⁰

Theodore II issued a single coin, an aspron trachy nomisma in billon, from Thessaloniki, probably in 1254/55, prior to the mint's closure in 1255:⁷⁸¹

Obverse: large cross with floreate ends.

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Demetrios on r., holding spear on shoulder in l. hand. They hold model of walled city between them.

Λ|K|O|ΛA|CKA|PI|C ΘEOΔ|ΩP O|Δ|M|T|P (**Fig. 47.**)⁷⁸²

⁷⁷⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 612-13, coin nos 11.1-11.9; plate XLV coin nos 11.1, 11.5. **See fig. 46, coin no 11.1, BZC.1960.88.4110.**

⁷⁸⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 613, coin nos 12.1-12.5; plate XLV coin nos 21.1, 12.4.

⁷⁸¹ The closure of the mint was probably related to Theodore's creation of a treasury at Astytzium on the Scamander, which would have been well placed to forward funds to an emperor campaigning in the Balkans. DOC 4.2, 515, 615. Hendy cites Pachymeres 1835, I, 54 but gives no line reference.

⁷⁸² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 616-17, coin nos 1.1-1.6; plate XLVI, coin nos 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6. **See fig. 47, coin no 1.1, BZC.1960.88.4115.** Hendy calls the held object a castle with three towers, but Morrisson is surely correct in calling it a model of a walled city, i.e. Thessaloniki, where a similar image appears on a coin of Manuel Komnenos-Doukas. Morrisson 2002, 179.

Conclusions: For the period 1204 to 1261 Thessaloniki continued the trend established pre-1204 of issuing a higher proportion of coins featuring military symbolism compared to other mints. From 1204 to 1261 68.3% of all coin issues from Thessaloniki featured military types. The lowest proportion was from John Komnenos Doukas (60.5%); Theodore Angelos (80%), Manuel Komnenos Doukas (77.7%), Demetrios Komnenos Doukas (100%), John III (66.6%) and Theodore II (100%) were all higher. John Komnenos Doukas issued a great variety of coinage in a short reign and these issues featured a range of military figures including St Demetrios, St Theodore, the Archangel Michael and the armed emperor. The armed emperor was not as popular a symbol in Thessaloniki as in Nicaea; the most popular symbol in Thessaloniki was St Demetrios and his popularity increased steadily in this period, until he appeared on 60% of the coins of John III. This increase in the appearances of St Demetrios on coins may reflect a general surge in his popularity, but his popularity extended further afield, as the Bulgarian tsar John II Asan also placed St Demetrios on his coins. It is possible that the increased number of appearances of St Demetrios on Thessalonian coins could have been a response to Bulgarian attempts to appropriate the cult of St Demetrios.

Coin Issues with Military Symbolism from Epeiros

Having rulers in Nicaea, Thessaloniki, and Epeiros post-1204 increased the potential for conflict. Michael II Komnenos Doukas (c.1236-c.1268) is notable for several rebellions against the emperor in Nicaea: despite a treaty and marriage alliance with John III, Michael II revolted in 1251-52, compelling

John to campaign against him in 1252-53.⁷⁸³ Their conflict indicates the ongoing tension between Nicaea and Epeiros, as the treaty had conferred the title of despot on Michael, and an aspron trachy nomisma in billon shows on the reverse John crowning Michael. In 1252-53 Michael took Prilep and some other territory, but could not consolidate his gains, and accepted again the authority of John III. Later Michael II was involved again in hostilities against Nicaea, in a grouping with the Serbs, Germans, and Latins against Theodore II (1254-58), and after the latter's death against Michael VIII and John IV. Michael II was defeated decisively at Pelagonia in 1259 by Nicaean and western forces under Michael VIII Palaiologos.⁷⁸⁴ In 1262 Michael VIII sent an army under the despot John Palaiologos to Epeiros, but Michael II held on until 1263 when he submitted, accepting imperial rule in southern Epeiros and Thessaly. Whether two military issues of Michael II from Epeiros can be dated to this later time is difficult to determine; Hendy classifies their issue c. 1236 to c. 1268.⁷⁸⁵

Hendy records a small number of coin issues from the mint of Arta in Epeiros post-1204, but other authorities, e.g. Protonotarios, suggest a higher number.⁷⁸⁶ These coins are listed and discussed below. For Michael I Komnenos-Doukas (c. 1204-c. 1215) Hendy and Protonotarios list an aspron trachy nomisma in electrum, but with non-military symbolism.⁷⁸⁷ Protonotarios lists a second trachy for Michael I which is identical to the first, except that

⁷⁸³ Akropolites 2007, §49, 249-51.

⁷⁸⁴ Akropolites 2007, §49, 249-51; §80, 356-7.

⁷⁸⁵ DOC 4.2, 629-31.

⁷⁸⁶ Hendy DOC 4.2, 623-31. Protonotarios 1983, 83-99.

⁷⁸⁷ Emperors minting no coins with military symbolism are excluded from analysis according to the convention used in this thesis.

Michael has a forked beard.⁷⁸⁸ Theodore Komnenos-Doukas (c. 1215-30 at Arta) issued a trachy in electrum without military symbolism, but listed by both Hendy and Protonotarios.⁷⁸⁹ Protonotarios suggests that Theodore issued a further six coin types from Arta, of which five featured military symbolism, with details as below.⁷⁹⁰ Hendy accepts that these are coins of Theodore, but believes them to be pre-coronation issues from Thessaloniki.⁷⁹¹ As four of these five coins with military symbolism listed by Protonotarios feature St Demetrios, which could suggest a link to Thessaloniki, Hendy's argument for a Thessalonian origin could be persuasive.

4) Trachy d'argent, obverse: Christ seated on throne. IC XC IC AK
Reverse: Theodore (non-military dress) on l. and St Demetrios (military dress) on r., with sword in l. hand. They hold cross-in-circle on shaft between them.
ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΟΥΚΑΣ Ο ΑΓΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ⁷⁹²

5) Identical, except that two dots replace IC and AK on obverse.⁷⁹³

6) Trachy de bronze, obverse: Christ Emmanuel, bust. IC|O|MA XC|ENU|HA
Reverse: Theodore (non-military dress) on l., and St Demetrios (military dress) on r.; sword in l. hand. They hold between them cross-in-circle on shaft. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΟΥΚΑΣ⁷⁹⁴

⁷⁸⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 623, 627, first trachy: coin nos 1.1, 1.2. Protonotarios 1983, 87-8, first trachy: coin no 1; second trachy coin no 2.

⁷⁸⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 623-4, coin no 1. Protonotarios 1983, 88-90, coin no 3.

⁷⁹⁰ Numbering, descriptions and inscriptions are as published by Protonotarios 1983, 90-2.

⁷⁹¹ Hendy, DOC 4.2, 624.

⁷⁹² Protonotarios 1983, 90. BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 545-50, coin nos 1a.1, 1a.2; plate XXXVIII, coin no 1a.2. See p. 218 of this thesis.

⁷⁹³ Protonotarios 1983, 90. BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 545-50, coin no 1b.

7) Trachy de bronze, obverse: Christ seated on throne. IC XC

Reverse: Theodore (non-military dress) on l. and Archangel Michael on r., handing castle with three towers to emperor. ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΟΥΚΑΣ Χ|Μ⁷⁹⁵

8) Non-military symbols.

9) Démi-tétartèron de bronze, obverse: bust of St Demetrios. Ο|ΑΓ|ΗΟ|C
Δ|ΗΜ|ΤΡ

Reverse: Theodore (non-military dress) with globus cruciger in r. hand and labarum in l. ΘΕ|Ο|Δ|Ω|Ρ|Ο|C Δ|Ο|Υ|Κ|Α|C⁷⁹⁶

Protonotarios suggests that the letters AK on coin no 4⁷⁹⁷ indicate the mint of Arta; Oikonomídou also discusses this possibility. Hendy believes that AK refers to a treasury or mint official and further dismisses Arta as a 'one-horse town'; he describes the coins numbered (4) to (9) by Protonotarios as fitting well into the pre-coronation sequence of issues of Theodore from Thessaloniki.⁷⁹⁸ One detail which Hendy does not mention is that the symbol of the Archangel Michael presenting a building with three towers to the

⁷⁹⁴ Protonotarios 1983, 91. BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 545-9, 553-5, coin nos 4.1-4.20; plate XXXVIII, coin nos 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5. See p. 219 of this thesis.

⁷⁹⁵ Protonotarios 1983, 91. BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 545-9, 557-8, coin nos 7a-7d.2; plate XXXIX, coin nos 7a.1, 7b.1, 7b.2. See thesis p. 220.

⁷⁹⁶ Protonotarios 1983, 91. BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 545-9, 564, coin nos 15a.1-15b.3; plate XL, coin nos 15a.1, 15a.2, 15a.3, 15b.1. See thesis p. 222.

⁷⁹⁷ And no 11: see below. Protonotarios 1983, 91. Oikonomídou 1992, 97.

⁷⁹⁸ Hendy DOC 4.2, 545-9, 623-4. Hendy does however refer to his proposed sequences and dates as 'tentative'. In this context it should be noted that the Arta hoard was described by Hendy as being 'overwhelmingly Thessalonican', and Bendall and Donald note that the hoard contained coins of Theodore Komnenos-Doukas. This might add weight to Hendy's contention that Thessaloniki, rather than Arta, was the source of the coins numbered (4) to (9) by Protonotarios. Hendy DOC 4.2, 625, fn 14. Bendall and Donald 1974, xii. Protonotarios 1983, 90-1.

emperor is a symbol associated with Thessaloniki. Hendy and Protonotarios agree that Manuel Komnenos-Doukas issued one coin from Arta:

Aspron trachy nomisma (electrum), c. 1230-36, obverse: bust of Christ Emmanuel, holding scroll in l. hand. IC|ΩE|MA XC|NOV|HA

Reverse: full-length figures of ruler on l. and saint, holding labarum on long shaft with triangular decoration between them. Ruler wears non-military dress; holds sheathed sword point down in r. hand. Saint holds sheathed sword point down in l. hand. MANOYHΛΔEΠOT OAC⁷⁹⁹

Both authors also agree that Michael Komnenos-Doukas issued three coin types from Arta, of which a trachy in electrum has non-military symbolism, and two trachea in billon have military symbolism.⁸⁰⁰ The two billon trachea are:

Type A aspron trachy nomisma c. 1236-68, obverse: bust of Christ with scroll in l. hand. IC XC

Reverse: full-length figure of Michael II in non-military dress on l., crowned by Archangel Michael. They hold between them sheathed sword point down.

Ruler holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand. MIXAHΛ⁸⁰¹

⁷⁹⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 628, coin no 1; plate XLVI coin no 1. The DOC description is incorrect regarding the hands holding the swords, referring to the ruler holding a sword with his l. hand, and the saint with his r. hand. Protonotarios 1983, 92-3, coin no 10.

⁸⁰⁰ DOC 4.2, 624, 628, coin no 1 (non-military). Protonotarios 1983, 93-4, coin no 11. It is noteworthy that the obverse inscription of this coin contains the signum AK, as on the electrum trachy of Theodore Komnenos-Doukas noted above. The date of Michael II's trachy is uncertain (c. 1236-8), but there is just a possibility that if the letters AK represent a mint official, then that official could have transferred from Thessaloniki to Arta. DOC 4.2, 624, 628. Protonotarios 1983, 93.

⁸⁰¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 629, coin no 2.1, 2.2; plate XLVI coin nos 2.1, 2.2. Protonotarios 1983, 94-5, coin no 13.

Type B aspron trachy nomisma, c. 1236-68, obverse: half-length figure of Archangel Michael, holding jewelled sceptre in r. hand and unidentified object in l. hand (coin broken). AP M

Reverse: full-length figure of ruler on l., crowned by Virgin. Ruler holds in r. hand sceptre cruciger, and in l., *anexikakia*. MIXAHΛOΔΟΥ⁸⁰²

Hendy lists an aspron trachy nomisma in billon, attributed to John III (emperor) and Michael II (despot), under Epeiros, but suggests that it was minted in Thessaloniki. Protonotarios lists this coin as probably being from Epeiros. Its details are:

Aspron trachy nomisma, 1246-48, obverse: half-length figure of Archangel Michael, holding in r. hand jewelled sceptre and in l., globus cruciger.

X|AP X|M

Reverse: full-length figure of John on r. crowning Michael on l. as despot. John holds sceptre cruciger in l. hand. Despot wears *stematogyron* and holds palm-frond in r. hand.]A[ΙΩENX[⁸⁰³

Hendy lists two further billon trachea under the same attribution, but both have non-military symbolism. Protonotarios lists these two coins (his nos 16 and 17) as probably being from Epeiros, but accepts that Thessaloniki is also

⁸⁰² BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 629, coin no 3; plate XLVI coin no 3. Protonotarios 1983, 94, coin no 12.

⁸⁰³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 4.2, 630, coin nos 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, variety A; plate XLVII coin nos 1.1, 1.2. Protonotarios 1983, 96, coin no 15. Ruth Macrides dates this coin from 1246 onwards. Akropolites 2007, 97, §49, 251.

possible.⁸⁰⁴ Protonatarios gives a probable attribution to Epeiros for one further bronze trachy:

Obverse: bust of St Demetrios (military dress); spear on r. shoulder. O A Δ

Reverse: two figures holding patriarchal cross. Anepigraphic.⁸⁰⁵

Conclusions: From the above it will be seen that there is some uncertainty between Hendy and Protonotarios in coins which they attribute to Epeiros. By the convention of this thesis Hendy lists 7 coins which are analysed, of which 4 have military symbolism (57.1%). By the same convention Protonotarios lists 15 coins which are analysed, of which 10 have military symbolism (66.6%).

Portraits of Rulers of the Successor States in Other Media

There appears to be a dearth of illustrations for a number of rulers of the successor states: both Spatharakis and Mango list none for Theodore Komnenos Doukas (Angelos), Manuel Komnenos Doukas, John Komnenos Doukas, Demetrios Komnenos Doukas, Michael I Komnenos Doukas, and Michael II Komnenos Doukas.⁸⁰⁶ Of the other rulers it appears that the most portrayals are of Michael VIII, although of these it appears that only one of those recorded could have possessed a military element, i.e. a statue before

⁸⁰⁴ DOC 4.2, 624-5, 630-1, coin nos 2 (variety B); 3a, 3b (variety C). Attribution of varieties A and B to John III and Michael II has been confirmed by Bendall 1996, 3-5. Protonotarios 1983, 96, coin nos 16, 17. Coin no 16 has been found in excavations at Arta. Oikonomidou et al 1992, 116.

⁸⁰⁵ Protonotarios 1983, 95-6, coin no 14. Hendy does not appear to list an equivalent for Epeiros or Thessaloniki.

⁸⁰⁶ Spatharakis 1976, Mango 1972.

the church of the Holy Apostles, representing Michael VIII presenting a model of Constantinople to the Archangel Michael. It is not known if the emperor or archangel appeared armed.⁸⁰⁷ The lack of imperial military representations other than on the coinage thus makes coins a particularly useful reference point.

Spatharakis reproduces six portrayals of Michael VIII in media other than coins, but all are non-military depictions.⁸⁰⁸ In the same way Spatharakis reproduces images of Theodore I (fig 119c) and John III (fig 119d); Theodore II (figs 108, 111b, 113b, 119a); and John IV (fig 119f), but none of these have any military features.⁸⁰⁹ A relatively standard portrayal seems to have evolved which showed the emperor wearing a crown, *skaramangion*, and holding in his right hand the sceptre cruciger and in his left the *akakia*. Such portraits are seen for Michael VIII and for Theodore II.⁸¹⁰

Conclusions

The years from 1204 to 1261 saw a marked increase in the use of military symbolism on coins, with the proportion of military issues reaching 48.9% of the overall total of issues, compared to the proportion of 21.6% for the years 1042 to 1204. Thessaloniki minted more military issues (67.9%) than Epeiros

⁸⁰⁷ This statue is known through Pachymeres' description of the earthquake of 1296, which caused damage to the church and statue. Pachymeres 1999, 259.26-29, 261. 1-5, [B. II, 234, 13-18].

⁸⁰⁸ Spatharakis 1976, fig. 19, Sinait. gr. 2123, f. 30r. Fig. 59, Leningrad Cod. Gr. 118, f. 22r. Fig. 109, Monac. gr. 442, f. 174r. Fig. 112a, Codex Mb 13, p. 247, University Library, Tübingen. Fig. 114a, after Wolfius. Fig. 119g, Mutin. gr. 122, f. 294r.

⁸⁰⁹ Spatharakis 1976, figs 119d, 119a, 119f all Mutin gr. 122, f. 294r. Fig. 108, Monac. gr. 442, f. 7v. Fig. 111b, Cod. Mb 13, f. 15r., University Library, Tübingen. Fig. 113b, after Wolfius.

⁸¹⁰ Spatharakis 1976, fig 108, Monac. gr. 442, f. 7v; fig 111b, Cod. Mb. 13, f. 15r; fig 113b, after Wolfius.

(57.1%), on Hendy's figures, but virtually equal (66.6%) on Protonotarios' figures for Epeiros. The outputs from Thessaloniki and Epeiros both contained a higher proportion of types with military symbols than the output from Nicaea (32.3%) between 1204-61. These years also saw the highpoint of the use of the symbol of the armed emperor; and amongst the warrior saints the portrayal of St Demetrios increased but the portrayal of St Theodore declined.

The close links between a specific saint (St Demetrios), and Thessaloniki do not appear to be reflected in links between any other specific saint and Nicaea, nor between any other specific saint and Epeiros. According to Hendy, Epeiros issued only four coins with military imagery from 1204 to 1261 and these consist of three portrayals of the Archangel Michael (two from Michael II Komnenos Doukas and one from John III/Michael II), and one of an unidentified military saint (possibly St Demetrios) from Manuel Komnenos Doukas. These types could therefore appear to be associations of name. Protonotarios lists a higher output from Epeiros than Hendy, some of which feature St Demetrios, although it could be argued that such coins might belong to Thessaloniki. A similar association by name may be seen with some emperors from Nicaea. Thus Theodore I issued seven coins with military iconography and all seven featured St Theodore. Theodore II issued three coins with military symbols; one featuring St Theodore; one St Tryphon (depicted as a military saint) and one an unidentified warrior saint (probably St Demetrios). Michael (with John IV) issued one coin which featured both the Archangel Michael and St George.

In summary it would appear that the coin issues with military iconography for 1204-61 differ in their associations. Military types from

Thessaloniki would appear to have a strong connection to the city itself. Military types from Epeiros are rather less common, and are part of a limited number of overall types, but appear in their choice of military personages to relate more to the emperor than to any specific location. Nicaea had the lowest proportion of coins with military iconography for this period and again these seem to relate to emperors, e.g. Theodore I for whom all seven military types feature St Theodore. It may well be that despite the number of military types issued by John III, the percentage of military types issued by Nicaea, i.e. the lowest for all the successor states, reflected the greater stability there. It is perhaps not altogether surprising that prior to 1204 Thessaloniki, with its more exposed position, issued more military types than Constantinople. On this basis, in the turbulent years after 1204 a surge in production of military types in Thessaloniki might have been expected.

6: MILITARY SYMBOLISM ON COINS 1261-1425

Introduction: Mints and Proportions of Military Types

This chapter analyses military symbolism on coins issued from 1261 to 1425, and compares the differences in frequency of military issues of three historical periods: 1261 to 1425;⁸¹¹ 1204 to 1261; and 1042 to 1204. From 1261-1425 there were 371 coin issues, of which 151 (40.7%) featured military symbolism. This 40.7% represents a lower frequency than that of 48.9% for the period 1204-1261. The total number of issues (371) for 1261-1425 is an increase of 108.4% over the total number of issues (178) for 1204-1261. By contrast the number of military issues only increased from 87 (1204-61) to 151 (1261-1425), a comparatively lower increase of 73.6%, confirming the trend of a decline in the percentage of military issues from 1261 to 1425. The frequent changes of coin types in general, noted above for 1204-61, continued in the years 1261 to 1425.⁸¹²

The recapture of Constantinople in 1261 marked a change in mint organisation and also in the issue of coins with military symbolism. From 1261 to 1453 Constantinople functioned as a mint, and Thessaloniki minted coins over most, but not all of the time, until the late fourteenth century.⁸¹³ Post-

⁸¹¹ 1425 has been taken as the endpoint in data analysis as John VII, John VIII and Constantine XI did not issue coins with military symbolism, and have therefore been excluded to conform with the convention of this thesis, but an important equestrian portrayal of John VIII on a medal is considered in this chapter. Whilst the reign of Manuel II ended in 1425, his issues of coins with military symbolism ended earlier, in 1394/95, when Class 1 of his coinage (the 'heavy' series) ceased production. The succeeding Class 2 coinage (the 'light' series) contained no coins with military symbolism. DOC 5.1, 214.

⁸¹² These frequent changes of type tended to affect mainly the copper coinage.

⁸¹³ Baker suggests that the mint at Thessaloniki may have shown a late burst of activity during 1382-87, producing two types of copper coins under Manuel II, but in the name of his father, John V. Manuel had been appointed governor of Thessaloniki in 1369; had been proclaimed co-emperor in 1373; and had operated against the Turks from Thessaloniki 1382-87. One of these coins (a copper follis) is represented at the Barber Institute (B6457, B6458);

1261 the mint at Thessaloniki is not easily understandable. Its geographic location exposed it to attack by Serbian and Ottoman forces and it was occupied briefly by the latter in 1387, and again from 1392-1403. In 1423 the Byzantines handed over the city to the Venetians and it fell finally to the Ottomans in 1430. It is difficult to determine mint activity over this period. Minting did not occur during the Zealot occupation of 1342 to c.1350, but there was a late surge 1382-87. Whether minting took place after 1392, and between 1403-23 is uncertain. Morrisson states that there was no minting after the final Ottoman conquest. There is further uncertainty in identifying the mint's output, particularly of copper. Morrisson has emphasised the importance of hoard evidence (Salonica, Pella and Serres) in this respect, and the fact that these hoards indicate that the copper circulated in a relatively restricted area.⁸¹⁴

The Salonica hoard was found near Thessaloniki in the late 1930s and consists of 73 coins. It was dated by Longuet to c.1360, but Bendall suggested 1342, the outbreak of the Zealot revolt.⁸¹⁵ Bendall published details of two other hoards; one in 2001 of over 330 coins, of Michael VIII and Andronikos II, Andronikos II alone, and Andronikos II and Michael IX.⁸¹⁶ Bendall dated this hoard to the late 1320s. In 2007 he published details of a hoard of thirty-five copper coins, all but three being of Andronikos II.⁸¹⁷ The Pella hoard consisted of eight coins, of Andronikos III, John V and Anna of

LPC 170.3. The other coin is represented at neither the Barber Institute nor at Dumbarton Oaks; LPC 256.1 Baker 2006, 408-09.

⁸¹⁴ Morrisson 2007, 192; 189-90.

⁸¹⁵ DOC 5.1, 16. Longuet 1960, 244-66. Bendall 1984b, 143-57.

⁸¹⁶ Bendall 2001, 268-9.

⁸¹⁷ Bendall 2007, 305.

Savoy, dated by Shea to the late 1350s, and by Grierson to c. 1360/5.⁸¹⁸ The Serres hoard was found in the mid-1980s forty miles east-northeast of Thessaloniki and consists of thirty-four coins from Andronikos III, John V, plus two blanks.⁸¹⁹

Magnesia might have continued production post-1261, but this is uncertain; production at Philadelphia was intermittent, with its mint probably active in the later thirteenth century, and definitely active in the 1330s.⁸²⁰ The reign of Michael VIII saw a relatively high proportion of military types (51 out of 87, 58.6%), reflecting the practice of 1204 to 1261, but after the death of Michael there was a more variable output of military types. Even though Andronikos II issued a very large number of types overall (152), only 47 of these (30.9%) exhibited military symbols. For Andronikos III the proportions were 23 out of 42 (54.8%); for John V 25 out of 77 (32.5%); and for Manuel II 5 out of 13 (38.5%).

The total numbers of military issues 1261-1425 resemble more the period 1042-1204, rather than the pattern for 1204-61, although there were variations within the reign of John V. Even so, there were higher proportions of military issues from 1261-1425 than from 1042-1204. The closest resemblance to the percentage of military issues 1261-1425 appears to be for the Empire of Nicaea 1204-61. The essential overall trend is for a gradual increase in the number of military issues, starting in 1042 and reaching a peak during 1204-61; there is then a relatively steady number of military issues 1282-1425. Within the whole, there are two marked individual spikes

⁸¹⁸ Shea 2015, 311-14. DOC 5.1, 16. Nicol and Bendall 1977, 87-102.

⁸¹⁹ Shea 2015, 11-13.

⁸²⁰ Grierson 1999, DOC 5.1, 57.

representing the reign of Isaac I, and the empire of Thessaloniki. What is noticeable is the absence of military issues at the end of the empire in the fifteenth century, when the image of Christ appears routinely on coins; trust in God replaces the invocation of military figures such as St Demetrios. This is comparable to the cessation of military imagery on coins and its replacement with images of Christ or the Virgin in the early eighth century. It is difficult to make a comparison between coins and seals with regard to the number of military figures appearing on them in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as only a very small number of seals is available for study; it appears that the production of seals dropped precipitately after the twelfth century.⁸²¹

Military Symbolism on Coins from the Thirteenth to the Mid-Fourteenth Centuries

Two points are raised by the apparently wide diversity of military types on the coins of Michael VIII. The first relates to dating: as Michael reigned for over twenty years, how accurately is it possible to date these issues? The second relates specifically to those images featuring the Archangel Michael, and how much their presence owes to name association with the emperor. The dating of Michael's hyperpyra appears relatively straightforward. The very rare Type I from the mint at Magnesia is dated to 1259-60; Type II was probably minted at Magnesia in 1260, and at Constantinople in 1261-62. Type III was produced at Constantinople for the rest of the reign, up to 1282.⁸²² The dates of the silver trachea can be divided into early and late. The early comprise Class I

⁸²¹ Cotsonis 2005, 388-89, 393-97.

⁸²² Grierson, DOC 5.1, 106-08.

(Magnesia, 1258/59 (?); Class 2 (Magnesia, 1259/60); and Class 4 (Constantinople, 1261/62).⁸²³ The later issues with military symbolism comprise Class 8 (Constantinople, 1272/73); and Class 9 (Constantinople, 1274/75).⁸²⁴ The large number of copper trachea of Michael VIII is probably due to there having been an annual issue of this denomination, but it is very difficult to divide the types more precisely than early or late. Thus issues where Michael appears alone may be dated to pre-1272, and those where Michael VIII and Andronikos II appear together, after the coronation of Andronikos in 1272, are dated to post-1272.⁸²⁵ The post-1272 issues consist of relatively few classes: Classes 33-36 (Constantinople), and Classes 62-65 (Thessaloniki). Michael's tetarteron from Thessaloniki appears to be of uncertain date.⁸²⁶

The second point raised above is the number of coins of Michael VIII displaying the Archangel Michael as the military element, either alone or in addition to other military elements, e.g. the presence of a warrior saint such as St George or St Demetrios. Further, on some coins where the archangel is the sole military element the image consists of the archangel on the left with the emperor kneeling in front of him, and with Christ enthroned on the right. It is difficult to see if the archangel is in military dress or is armed in such representations, but overall, if all 22 images of the Archangel Michael in the whole coin series of Michael VIII are examined, the archangel is in military dress, or carries arms in 11 (50.0%); is not in military dress, or is unarmed in

⁸²³ Class 15, Magnesia or Thessaloniki, 1261/62, and Class 16, Magnesia or Thessaloniki, 1272/73, are not included in the current analysis because of the uncertainty regarding the mint.

⁸²⁴ Grierson, DOC 5.1, 114-15.

⁸²⁵ Grierson, DOC 5.1, 116-17.

⁸²⁶ Grierson, DOC 5.1, 121-25.

6 (27.3%); and in 5 (22.7%) wear on the coin makes the image unclear. These data show that the representation of the archangel on the coins of Michael VIII is much more warlike than his representation on seals, although the two are not strictly comparable in date: in one published series the Archangel Michael appears on 34 twelfth-century seals, of which on only 3 (8.8%) does he wear military dress.⁸²⁷ It is reasonable to suggest, however, that by the thirteenth century the Archangel Michael was being portrayed much more as a warrior figure: Michael VIII, in his *typikon* for the monastery of the Archangel Michael on Mount Auxentios refers to the Archangel Michael as 'the supreme commander'.⁸²⁸ Thus in the current study, where on the coins of Michael VIII the sole military element is the Archangel Michael, such coins have been counted as representing a military image, particularly as previous use of the archangel's image in the thirteenth century (see chapter 5) is linked clearly to a military context. The overall impression created by these coins of Michael VIII featuring the Archangel Michael is that such images are being used by the emperor as a form of name association with the archangel, in the same way that Michael IV did in an isolated case.⁸²⁹

When the totals of military images on all coin issues produced under Michael VIII are calculated to include these specific images of the Archangel Michael, and where uncertain mint attributions are excluded, then the proportions of coins with military images for individual mints appear as below.

⁸²⁷ Cotsonis 2005, 445.

⁸²⁸ Michael VIII Palaiologos 2000, 1229.

⁸²⁹ BICC no specimen. DOC 3.2, 726, coin no 2; plate LVIII, coin no 2.

Constantinople:	23/47	46.9%
Thessaloniki:	26/30	86.7%
Magnesia:	2/7	28.6%
Philadelphia:	0/3	0%
Overall:	51/87	58.6%

This provides another example of military iconography being most prevalent from Thessaloniki: the very high proportion of coins from this mint with military imagery during Michael VIII's reign (86.7%) is even higher than the proportion during 1204-61 (67.9%). Further, the military proportion from Constantinople during Michael's reign (46.9%) is higher than the military proportion from Nicaea during 1204-61 (32.3%).

Given the trend noted previously for military issues to be more common from Thessaloniki than from Constantinople, it is not surprising to see this pattern repeated in Michael's trachea series in copper, where military issues from Thessaloniki number 25 out of 29 (86.2%), whilst for Constantinople the figures are 18 out of 34 (52.9%). For other denominations the military proportion of silver trachea from the capital was 4 out of 11 (36.4%). It is uncertain whether silver trachea were issued from Thessaloniki; types 15 and 16 could be from Thessaloniki or Magnesia and have thus been excluded from calculations. The silver trachy Type 10 is included in the total of eleven silver trachea from Constantinople but is not classified as a military type because it is impossible to determine whether or not the object held by the

emperor is a sword.⁸³⁰ Military issues of silver trachea from Magnesia are 2 out of 3 (66.6%), but this is from a low overall total, as are the hyperpyra from Constantinople (2 out of 3, 66.6%), and the tetarteron from Thessaloniki (1 of 1, 100%).

The data may also be examined to determine the number of appearances by military personages as a percentage of the total number of issues across all mints.⁸³¹

Archangel Michael:	22/87	25.3%
St Demetrios:	20/87	23.0%
St George:	9/87	10.3%
Unidentified military saint:	3/87	3.5%
St Theodore:	3/87	3.5%
Armed emperor:	4/87	4.6%
Armed cherub:	1/87	1.1%

In terms of precedence on the obverse or reverse the Archangel Michael appears twelve times on the obverse (Constantinople seven times; Thessaloniki four times; Magnesia once), and ten times on the reverse (Constantinople six times; Thessaloniki three times; Magnesia once). By contrast St Demetrios makes sixteen appearances on the obverse (Constantinople once; Thessaloniki fifteen times) and only four on the reverse (Thessaloniki four times). It is perhaps not surprising that the archangel and

⁸³⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 114, coin no 38; 5.2 plate 3, coin no 38.

⁸³¹ The totals for individual appearances add to more than the total number of coins with military iconography because some coins feature more than one military figure.

St Demetrios should be in such dominant positions, and that the archangel and St Demetrios make an almost equal number of appearances. The name association with the archangel appears to have been very strong for Michael VIII, but Michael also had a great devotion to St Demetrios, calling him 'my great defender', and refounding the monastery of St Demetrios Kellibara c.1261.⁸³²

The copper trachea from Thessaloniki and Constantinople comprise nearly the same overall numbers and provide a convenient means of comparison. Coinage from Thessaloniki was limited to the trachea series in copper numbering twenty-nine; and the single rare tetarteron in copper. Appearances by military personages on the Thessalonian copper trachea series appear below.⁸³³

St Demetrios:	19/29	65.5%
Archangel Michael:	6/29	20.7%
St George:	2/29	6.9%
Armed emperor:	2/29	6.9%
St Theodore:	1/29	3.4%
Unidentified military saint:	1/29	3.4%

Thus for these issues from the mint of Thessaloniki alone, where the figures for St Demetrios are 65.5% and for the archangel 20.7%, the prevalences of military personages across all mints noted above are reversed. Whilst this

⁸³² Michael VIII Palaiologos 2000, vol. 3, 1246, [11], l. 2.

⁸³³ The totals for individual appearances add to more than the total number of coins with military iconography because some coins feature more than one military figure.

figure for the archangel is considerably lower than that for St Demetrios, it is still higher than the figures for St George (6.9%) and St Theodore (3.4%).

For Constantinople the figures for appearances of military personages on copper trachea are:

Archangel Michael:	9/34	26.5%
St George:	4/34	11.8%
St Demetrios:	2/34	5.9%
Unidentified military saint:	2/34	5.9%
Armed emperor:	2/34	5.9%
St Theodore:	1/34	2.9%
Armed cherub:	1/34	2.9%

The figures for copper trachea for Constantinople show that although the Archangel Michael is dominant over St Demetrios, the percentage of appearances for the archangel is 26.5%, less than half that for appearances of St Demetrios in Thessaloniki. The percentage for St Demetrios in the copper trachea series from Constantinople is only 5.9%, which can be interpreted as having the effect of emphasising the strength of the St Demetrios/Thessaloniki link. What may appear unexpected is that the link between St George and Constantinople noted for earlier emperors is relatively weak in the reign of Michael VIII (11.8%). Essentially these figures show the dominant position of the Archangel Michael on military issues in Michael VIII's coinage from the capital; although St George appears more frequently than St Demetrios their appearances added together are still less than the appearances of the archangel.

The strong link between the emperor and the Archangel Michael is illustrated further in two ways: in the gold coinage, and in a public statue. The Type II hyperpyron, issued firstly at Magnesia in 1260, and then in Constantinople 1261-62, features the Archangel presenting the emperor to Christ (see details below). The Type III hyperpyron, minted at Constantinople until 1282, showed the same image on the reverse, whilst the obverse showed the Virgin within the walls of Constantinople.⁸³⁴ The imperial/archangelic link was seen also in the column which Michael VIII erected towards the end of his reign, to the right of the church of the Holy Apostles, and adjacent to the church of All Saints, which was alongside and to the north-east of the church of the Holy Apostles.⁸³⁵ At the top of the column was a very large bronze statue of the Archangel Michael; Michael VIII was portrayed as a smaller figure, kneeling at the archangel's feet, probably in a position resembling *proskynesis*, and presenting a model of Constantinople to the archangel for its protection.⁸³⁶ The statue could have been created in part by using parts from older statues, rather than being cast *de novo*,⁸³⁷ but

⁸³⁴ Type II: BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 106-12, coin no 1; 5.2 plate 1, coin no 1. Type III: BICC: coin nos B6138 – B6148. DOC 5.1, 106-12, coin nos 2-16; 5.2, plate 1, coin nos 2-12, plate 2, coin nos 13-16.

⁸³⁵ Thomov 1998, 83; Talbot 1993, 258. Talbot states that the column was in front of the main door of the church of the Holy Apostles. This location is based on the description of Zosima the Deacon: 'In front of the great church doors stands a very high column. A terrible angel stands on the column, holding the scepter of Constantinople in its hand. Emperor Constantine stands opposite it, holding Constantinople in his hands and offering it to the protection of this angel.' Talbot cites Zosima from Majeska, *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, Washington D. C. 1984, 184-6. Mango believes that Zosima was mistaken in his siting and that the column could not have been in front of the main door of the church of the Holy Apostles. Mango 1993, X, 12.

⁸³⁶ It is of interest that the motif of Michael VIII holding a model of Constantinople is found also on one of his coins, a copper trachy. This trachy features a bust of Christ on the obverse and on the reverse the seated figure of the emperor holding a labarum-headed sceptre in his right hand, with the model city in his left. This coin is dated to the 1260s or 1270s. BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 120, coin nos 84, 85; 5.2, plate 6, coin nos 84, 85.

⁸³⁷ Thomov 1998, 83; Mango 1993, 11-15.

Melvani refers to the casting being 'probably carried out by an Italian workshop'.⁸³⁸ The column was badly damaged in the earthquake of 1296.⁸³⁹

The location of this column at the church of the Holy Apostles is significant as this church was the site of burial of Byzantine emperors up to 1028, after which emperors were usually buried in churches which they had founded. By establishing a link with the imperial past Michael VIII, a usurper, may have been seeking legitimization for his rule.⁸⁴⁰ Moreover, in erecting this column Michael was reviving a form of monumental art seen last in the early seventh century. The usurper Phokas (602-10) erected the last statue of this type, which stood near the Bronze Tetrapylon, east of the church of the Forty Martyrs.⁸⁴¹ The column of Michael VIII differed from practice in the early empire, where the focus was on the emperor, by placing the focus on the archangel.⁸⁴² This revival of a late Roman practice is important, as it is a forerunner to the revival of another Roman practice, that of representing the emperor on horseback on coins. The riding emperor reappeared some fifty years later, on the coins of Andronikos III.⁸⁴³

That Michael VIII's coinage should contain 58.6% of military issues is perhaps not surprising, given the internal and external opposition that he faced. Such danger was already present in the late 1250s. The Byzantine empire faced instability in the east, where the Mongols had attacked the Seljuks. In the west the despot Michael II had taken Albanon, Prilep and

⁸³⁸ Melvani 2013, 13-4.

⁸³⁹ Pachymeres 1999, 259.26-29, 261. 1-5, [B. II, 234, 13-18].

⁸⁴⁰ Thomov 1998, 86.

⁸⁴¹ Thomov 1998, 80.

⁸⁴² Talbot 1993, 259.

⁸⁴³ See p. 303.

Ochrid in 1257, and had allied himself with Manfred, the king of Sicily, through the marriage of Manfred and Helen, Michael's daughter.⁸⁴⁴ Michael Palaiologos sent his brother John to fight against Michael II in late 1258 and John defeated Michael II in the area of Pelagonia in 1259.⁸⁴⁵ This relief was short-lived, for Michael II was subsequently joined by his son John and they expelled the Nicaean forces from Arta, and from Ioannina; Akropolites refers to 'the beginning of bad times for Roman affairs'.⁸⁴⁶ Further pressure was created by the Latins who demanded in 1259 that Michael Palaiologos should surrender Thessaloniki, and lands between that city and Constantinople.⁸⁴⁷ The coronation of Michael Palaiologos took place on a date between August 15th and December 25th 1261,⁸⁴⁸ and John Laskaris, the legitimate heir, was blinded on Michael's orders on December 25th 1261.⁸⁴⁹ Between this date and 1265-66 Andronikos, the son of Michael VIII, was proclaimed co-emperor.⁸⁵⁰ Following the blinding of John IV, the Patriarch Arsenios excommunicated Michael and the emperor was not received back into the church until 1267. The marked religious/military iconography of Michael's Type II and Type III hyperpyra may relate to this period of excommunication.⁸⁵¹ Michael's deposition of Arsenios in 1264⁸⁵² produced particular opposition. Quite separately, he faced hostility from Epeiros. Externally Michael was opposed

⁸⁴⁴ Akropolites 2007, [76], 343-44.

⁸⁴⁵ Akropolites 2007, [80], 356-57.

⁸⁴⁶ Akropolites 2007, [82], 365.

⁸⁴⁷ Akropolites 2007, [78], 351-52.

⁸⁴⁸ Macrides 1980, 14 fn 6. This was Michael's second coronation, the first having taken place in Nicaea in 1259. Pachymeres 1984, vol. 1, 145.11-149.12, [B103-05].

⁸⁴⁹ Pachymeres 1984, 255.23-257.26, [B191.13-192.8].

⁸⁵⁰ Macrides 1980, 37-8, fn 137. Pachymeres 1984, vol. 2, 501.8-505.5, [B392-94].

⁸⁵¹ See p. 252.

⁸⁵² Macrides 1980, 17 fn 16.

by the Seljuks in Asia Minor, and by Constantine Tich of Bulgaria, whose wife was the daughter of Theodore II Laskaris. A further area of threat, which continued throughout his reign, was Michael VIII's relationship with the papacy. Early in his reign Michael had proposed a resumption of diplomatic relations to Urban IV but by 1267, three years after the death of Urban, the treaty of Viterbo left Michael opposed by the new pope Clement, the kingdom of Sicily, and the Prince of Achaia.

The coinage of Michael VIII is summarised below and consists of hyperpyra in gold, trachea in silver, trachea in copper, and a tetarteron in copper. The hyperpyra have three types, of which two (II and III) feature military iconography. Types II and III were issued from Constantinople, except the very earliest issues of Type II, which probably came from Magnesia.⁸⁵³ The features of Types II and III are:

Type II obverse: Virgin seated on throne. MP ΘV

Reverse: Archangel Michael standing on l. presents emperor kneeling before him to Christ seated on throne on r. IC XC⁸⁵⁴

Type III obverse: Virgin within walls of Constantinople. MP ΘV

Reverse: Archangel Michael presents emperor to Christ. (As Type II.)

MA|M|ΔEC Π|OTI IC XC (**Fig. 50.**)⁸⁵⁵

Variant reverse: as Type III but Christ holds Gospels in l. hand.⁸⁵⁶

⁸⁵³ DOC 5.1, 106.

⁸⁵⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 106-12, coin no 1; 5.2 plate 1, coin no 1.

⁸⁵⁵ BICC: coin nos B6138 – B6148. **See fig. 50.** DOC 5.1, 106-12, coin nos 2-16; 5.2, plate 1, coin nos 2-12, plate 2, coin nos 13-16. Reverse inscription is partly columnar.

Silver Trachea of Michael VIII

Michael's silver trachea consist of seventeen types, of which three were minted in Magnesia; eleven in Constantinople; two in Magnesia or Thessaloniki, and excluded from calculations in the current study because of this uncertainty; and one in Philadelphia.⁸⁵⁷ The silver trachea featuring military iconography appear below.

Magnesia

Class I obverse: Archangel Michael in military dress standing with sword in r. hand and shield in l. X|M

Reverse: emperor in non-military dress standing on l. with St George in military dress on r., holding labarum between them. X|M|ΔE OA|ΓΩ⁸⁵⁸

Class 2 obverse: Virgin holding medallion of Christ, and seated on throne.

MP ΘV

Reverse: emperor in non-military dress holding *akakia* in l. hand standing on l.

Embraced by Archangel Michael (dress unclear) on r. X|M|ΔEC|ΠO|TIC AR

X|M⁸⁵⁹

⁸⁵⁶ BICC: coin nos B6149 – B6153. DOC 5.1, 106-12, coin nos 17-25; plate 2, coin nos 17-25.

⁸⁵⁷ The current study bases calculations for Michael VIII on a total of fifteen silver trachea.

⁸⁵⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 114, coin no 26; 5.2, plate 2, coin no 26.

⁸⁵⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 114, coin no (27), Bendall/Donald coin no 3; plate 2, coin no (27).

Constantinople

Class 4 obverse: Virgin seated on throne, holding medallion of Christ. MP

ΘV

Reverse: Archangel Michael standing on l. presents emperor kneeling in front

of him to Christ seated on throne on r. X|M|Δ|E|C|ΠOT|I|C IC XC

ΟΠ|ΑΛ|ΟΛ⁸⁶⁰

Type 6 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael holding sword over r.

shoulder. AX X|M

Reverse: emperor crowned by Christ. X|M|ΔEC|ΠO|T O|Π|A|Λ⁸⁶¹

Type 8 obverse: St George standing with spear in r. hand and shield in l.

O|E|ΘΔ|Γ|Π ΓΩP|Γ|O|C

Reverse: Michael VIII and Andronikos II blessed by Archangel Michael. MX⁸⁶²

Type 9 obverse: empty throne with instruments of Passion. M/TH MI/CA

Reverse: emperor with unidentified military saint holding staff with star.⁸⁶³

⁸⁶⁰ BICC: coin no B6154. DOC 5.1, 114, coin nos 29-32; 5.2, plate 3, coin nos 29-32.

⁸⁶¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 114, coin no 34; 5.2, plate 3, coin no 34.

⁸⁶² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, coin no 36; 5.2, plate 3, coin no 36.

⁸⁶³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 114, coin no 37; 5.2, plate 3, coin no 37. The empty throne is a reference to the 'Prepared Throne' made ready for Christ at the Second Coming. A symbol on the obverse could refer to the Council of Lyons, for which imperial delegates set out in 1274. DOC 5.1, 89, 113.

Copper Trachea

The copper trachea of Michael VIII were minted in Constantinople; Thessaloniki; Magnesia (no military types) and Philadelphia (no military types). The military types appear below.

Constantinople

Type 5 obverse: bust of Christ. IC XC

Reverse: emperor standing on l. and holding labarum with Archangel Michael.

X|M|Δ|E|C|ΠO|TS⁸⁶⁴

Type 8 obverse: Virgin standing. MP ΘV

Reverse: emperor standing on l. with St George on r., holding labarum between them. (**Fig. 51.**)⁸⁶⁵

Type 9 obverse: St Demetrios holding spear and shield. O|A|ΓI|S ΔH|M|TP|S

Reverse: emperor on l. crowned by Virgin. X|M|Δ|E M ΘV|O|Π|Δ|E|OΓ (**Fig. 52.**)⁸⁶⁶

Type 10 obverse: bust of St Demetrios with spear and shield. OA|I|Δ MTP

Reverse: half-figure of emperor with Archangel Michael above. X|M|Δ O|Π|Δ⁸⁶⁷

⁸⁶⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 119, coin nos 56-57; plate 4, coin nos 56, 57.

⁸⁶⁵ BICC: coin no B6161. **See fig. 51.** DOC 5.1, 119, coin nos 64, 65; 5.2, plate 4, coin nos 64, 65.

⁸⁶⁶ BICC: coin nos B6162-65. **See fig. 52.** DOC 5.1, 119, coin nos 66-69; 5.2, plate 5, coin nos 66-69.

Type 11 obverse: half-figure of St George with spear and shield. O|A|ΓI|S
ΓE|ΩPT|I|S

Reverse: emperor holding patriarchal cross with St Constantine.

X|M|ΔE|CΠ|OT O|ΠA|Ω|Γ|I (**Fig. 53.**)⁸⁶⁸

Type 12 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael. X|M

Reverse: emperor on l. holding labarum with St Theodore. X|M OA|Γ|E⁸⁶⁹

Type 13 obverse: Archangel Michael with spear in r. hand.

Reverse: emperor holding patriarchal cross with St George. X|M OA|Γ|..⁸⁷⁰

Type 14 obverse: St Theodore with spear in r. hand, resting on l. shoulder.

O|AΓI|O|S Θ|EOΔ|PO|S

Reverse: emperor on l. crowned by Christ. X|M IC XC|OΠ|A|A|O|S⁸⁷¹

Type 15 obverse: throne with instruments of Passion. M|TH MI|CΔ

Reverse: emperor and military saint with sword in l. hand holding staff with star between them. A|⁸⁷²

Type 19 obverse: Virgin orans. MP ΘV

⁸⁶⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 119, coin no 70; 5.2, plate 5, coin no 70.

⁸⁶⁸ BICC: coin no B6166. **See fig. 53.** DOC 5.1, 119, coin nos 71-72; plate 5, coin nos 71-72.

⁸⁶⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 119, coin nos 73-76; plate 5, coin nos 73-75; no illustration of 76.

⁸⁷⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 119, coin nos 77-78; 5.2, plate 5, coin nos 77, 78.

⁸⁷¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 119, coin nos 79-81; plate 5, coin nos 79-81.

⁸⁷² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 119, coin no 82; 5.2, plate 5, coin no 82. Reverse inscription obscured.

Reverse: emperor seated on throne, with sword across knees. X|M|Δ|E|C|Π
O|ΠA|ΔE|O|Γ|S (**Fig. 54.**)⁸⁷³

Type 20 obverse: cherub holding two spears. Inscriptions illegible.

Reverse: emperor seated on throne, holding labarum-headed sceptre and
akakia.⁸⁷⁴

Type 23 obverse: Archangel Michael with sword and patriarchal cross. X|M

Reverse: emperor seated holding sceptre cruciger and globus cruciger.⁸⁷⁵

Type 25 obverse: Virgin seated on throne holding medallion of Christ. M Θ

Reverse: emperor standing holding drawn sword. X|M|ΔEC|ΠO|T|S
O|ΠA|ΔE|OΛ|OΓ|S (**Fig. 48.**)⁸⁷⁶

Type 26 obverse: St George standing; holds spear in r. hand and shield in l.

O|A|Γt Γ|E|ΩP

Reverse: emperor standing; holds labarum and *akakia*. X|M|ΔEC|ΠO|T
OΠ|A|ΓE|O|Λ|Γ⁸⁷⁷

Type 27 obverse: Archangel Michael standing with spear in r. hand and shield
in l. X|M or X|A|P|Γ X|M

⁸⁷³ BICC: coin nos B6167-68. **See fig. 54.** DOC 5.1, 120, coin nos 91-95; plate 6, coin nos 91-95.

⁸⁷⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 120, coin nos 96-99; plate 6, coin nos 96-99.

⁸⁷⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 120, coin nos 104-05; 5.2, plate 7, coin nos 104-05.

⁸⁷⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 120, coin no 109; 5.2, plate 7, coin no 109. **See fig. 48, coin no 109, BZC.1960.88.4342.**

⁸⁷⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 120, coin nos 110-13; 5.2, plate 7, coin nos 110-13.

Reverse: emperor standing with labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and *akakia* in l. X|MI|ΔE|CΠ|O|T|S O|ΠA|Λ|E|O|Λ|O|Γ|S⁸⁷⁸

Type 28 obverse: Archangel Michael standing holding spear over r. shoulder, shield in l. hand. X|M.

Reverse: emperor standing holding trilobed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. X|M|Δ|Π O|ΠA|Λ|E|O|Λ|Γ|C⁸⁷⁹

Michael VIII and Andronikos II (1272 and Later)

Type 34 obverse: Archangel Michael holding trilobed sceptre and globus cruciger. X|M

Reverse: two emperors standing holding globus with cross of four pellets between them.⁸⁸⁰

Michael VIII Copper Trachea from Thessaloniki

Type 37 obverse: St Demetrios seated on throne with sword across knees.

Γ|OA|ΔH M|TPI|OC

Reverse: emperor standing on l., crowned by Archangel Michael. O|Π|A|Λ
X|M⁸⁸¹

⁸⁷⁸ BICC: coin no B6172. DOC 5.1, 120, coin nos 114-22; 5.2, plate 7, coin nos 114-19.

⁸⁷⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 120, coin nos 123-24; 5.2, plate 8, coin nos 123-24. Rest of obverse inscription illegible.

⁸⁸⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 121, coin nos 200-02; 5.2, plate 12, coin nos 200, 201; plate 13 coin no 202. Reverse inscription obscured.

⁸⁸¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 121, coin nos 136-43; 5.2 plate 8, coin nos 136-39; plate 9, coin nos 140-43. Part of reverse inscription obscured.

Type 38 obverse: St Demetrios with sword over r. shoulder, shield in l. hand.

Γ|OA|ΔI MH|TPI|OC

Reverse: emperor on l. holding cross with Archangel Michael. (**Fig. 55.**)⁸⁸²

Type 39 obverse: Archangel Michael holding spear in r. hand and ? shield in l. hand. X|M

Reverse: emperor on l. with St Demetrios holding haloed cross between them.

M|X|ΔEC|Π... OAG|ΔHM|H|TP|I|O|C⁸⁸³

Type 41 obverse: St Demetrios with sword across knees, seated on throne.

O|A|ΔV M|TPI

Reverse: emperor on l., crowned by Christ. MIXAHΛΔECΠOTICOΠ...

IC|XC⁸⁸⁴

Type 42 obverse: Archangel Michael standing with trilobed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. MX

Reverse: emperor crowned by Virgin. ΔECΠO⁸⁸⁵

Type 43 obverse: patriarchal cross with stars in upper quarters; lys in lower quarters.

⁸⁸² BICC: B6176. **See fig. 55.** DOC 5.1, 121, coin nos 144-46; 5.2, plate 9, coin nos 144-46. No reverse inscription visible.

⁸⁸³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 121, coin nos 147-50; 5.2, plate 9, coin nos 147-50.

⁸⁸⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin nos 133-35; 5.2, plate 8, coin nos 133-35.

⁸⁸⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin no 151; 5.2, plate 9, coin no 151.

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Demetrios on r. holding between them model city surmounted by lys. Emperor holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and saint holds spear in his l. MIXAHΛ ΔΕCΠ ΔΗΜ (**Fig. 56.**)⁸⁸⁶

Type 44 obverse: cross with star in each quarter.

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Demetrios on r. holding model city between them. Emperor holds labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and saint holds spear in l. X|M|Δ|E|C|Π O|AΓI|Δ|I⁸⁸⁷

Type 45 obverse: winged patriarchal cross on steps.

Reverse: emperor on l. with St Demetrios, holding sword between them; saint holds spear in l. hand. MIXAHΛ ΔΕCΠO OΔΗΜ⁸⁸⁸

Type 46 obverse: St Demetrios standing.

Reverse: emperor crowned by Virgin.⁸⁸⁹

Type 47 Obverse: bust of Virgin orans. MP ΘV

Reverse: emperor on l. with military saint on r. holding between them patriarchal cross. With l. hand saint holds sword or spear over l. shoulder.

XMΔΠ OAG...⁸⁹⁰

⁸⁸⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin nos 155-58; 5.2, plate 10, coin nos 155-58. **See fig. 56, coin no 155, BZC.1960.88.4382.**

⁸⁸⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin nos 159-60; 5.2, plate 10, coin nos 159-60.

⁸⁸⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin no 161; 5.2, plate 10, coin no 161.

⁸⁸⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, no specimen or illustration.

⁸⁹⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin nos 131-32; 5.2, plate 8, coin nos 131-32.

Type 49 obverse: St Demetrios standing with spear and shield. ΟΓΑ|ΔΗ
ΜΗ|ΤΡΙ|Ο/Σ

Reverse: emperor seated. ΠΑ|ΛΕ|ΟΛ|Γ⁸⁹¹

Type 50 obverse: St George holding spear and shield. Γ|ΟΑ|ΓΕ|ΟΡ Γ|Ι|Ο|Σ

Reverse: emperor seated holding labarum-headed sceptre and *akakia*.

Χ|ΜΙ|ΔΕ|C ΠΟ|ΤΙ|ΟΠΑ|ΛΕ|ΟΛ|ΟΓ|ΟC⁸⁹²

Type 52 obverse: St Demetrios holding small cross. Γ|ΟΑ|ΔΗΜ Η|ΤΡΙ|Ο|C

Reverse: emperor holding labarum, and globus with patriarchal cross.

ΜΙΧΑΗΛΔΕCΠΟ⁸⁹³

Type 53 obverse: St Demetrios seated with sword across knees. Γ|ΟΑ|Δ|Η
ΜΗ|ΤΡΙ|Ο|C

Reverse: emperor standing holding patriarchal cross and *akakia*.

ΜΙ|Ο|ΠΑΑ|Ε|Ο(?) ΔΕC|ΠΟ (**Fig. 57.**)⁸⁹⁴

Type 54 obverse: bust of St Demetrios holding small cross. Γ|ΟΑ|ΔΗΜ
Η|ΤΡΙ|Ο|C

Reverse: emperor with wings standing holding labarum and globus cruciger.

ΜΧ or Χ|Μ⁸⁹⁵

⁸⁹¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin nos 162-64; 5.2, plate 10, coin nos 162-64.

⁸⁹² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin nos 165-68; 5.2, plate 10, coin nos 165-68.

⁸⁹³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 122, coin nos 169-70; 5.2, plate 11, coin nos 169-70.

⁸⁹⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, coin nos 174-75; 5.2, plate 11, coin nos 174-75. **See fig. 57, coin no 174, BZC.1960.125.1672.**

⁸⁹⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, coin nos 171-73; 5.2, plate 11, coin nos 171-73.

Type 55 obverse: St Demetrios with spear in r. hand and shield in l. O|A|Γ
ΔH|MH|TPI|O

Reverse: emperor standing holding cross in r. hand. Lys in r. field (not l. as
stated DOC.) X|M|Δ|E|C⁸⁹⁶

Type 56 obverse: St Demetrios standing with spear in r. hand and shield in l.
Γ|OA|ΔI MH|TPI|O|C

Reverse: three-quarter figure of emperor standing with labarum in l. hand and
lys in l. field. MIXΛVΛΔEC ΠOTICOΠAΛ⁸⁹⁷

Type 58 obverse: St Demetrios standing with spear in r. hand and shield in l.
Cross in r. field. O|AΓ|ΔI|MH TPI

Reverse: winged emperor holding patriarchal cross in r. hand; star in r. field.
X|A or Δ|EC|ΠO|TI⁸⁹⁸

Type 59 obverse: bust of St Demetrios.

Reverse: emperor holding patriarchal cross and ? standard.⁸⁹⁹

Type 60 obverse: bust of St Demetrios.

Reverse: emperor standing with model city and labarum, stars in field.⁹⁰⁰

⁸⁹⁶ BICC; no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, coin nos 176-79; 5.2, plate 11, coin nos 176-79.

⁸⁹⁷ BICC: coin no B6179. DOC 5.1, 123, coin nos 180-81; 5.2, plate 11, coin nos 180-81.

⁸⁹⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, coin nos 182-83; 5.2, plate 11, coin nos 182-83.

⁸⁹⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, no DO number; B-D UT5; PCPC 82; Sear 2315. No illustration.

⁹⁰⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, no DO number; PCPC 74; Sear 2316. No illustration.

Type 61 obverse: bust of St Demetrios.

Reverse: emperor standing with trilobed sceptre and *akakia*.⁹⁰¹

Michael VIII and Andronikos II 1272 and Later, Thessaloniki

Type 62 obverse: half-figure of St Theodore holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. O|AΓ|ΘE O|Δ|Ω|PO

Reverse: half-figures of Andronikos beardless on l. and Michael on r. holding up sword hilt between them. Both hold labarum-headed sceptre, Andronikos with r. hand and Michael with l. Bust of Archangel Michael above.

A|N|Δ|P X|M⁹⁰²

Type 63 obverse: bust of St Demetrios with sword over r. shoulder and shield in l. hand. O|AΓ|ΔI MITPIOC(?)

Reverse: bearded Andronikos on l. holding sceptre and globus cruciger, crowned by Michael on r., holding sceptre in l. hand. ANΔPONIKOC MX
AHΛΔECTI⁹⁰³

Type 64 obverse: bust of St George, holding sword over r. shoulder. Inscriptions illegible.

Reverse: Andronikos beardless on l. with Michael, holding patriarchal cross on steps between them; their free hands are on their chests.⁹⁰⁴

⁹⁰¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, no illustration.

⁹⁰² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, coin nos 212-15; 5.2, plate 13, coin nos 212-15. Nb on coin no 215 Michael holds sceptre with ball head.

⁹⁰³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, coin nos 216-18; 5.2, plate 13, coin nos 216-18. Obverse inscription worn.

Type 65 obverse: bust of Archangel Michael.

Reverse: Andronikos and Michael holding globus cruciger.⁹⁰⁵

Thessaloniki, Tetarteron

Obverse: bust of Archangel Michael, winged but not nimbate, holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l.

Reverse: half-figure of emperor holding labarum or labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. X|M Δ|E|C|ΠO|TI⁹⁰⁶

The long reign of Andronikos II (1282-1328) was marked by the issue of a very large number (152) of coin types. The number of military types (47, 30.9%) in this total was less than the percentage of military types issued by Michael VIII (51 of 87, 58.6%), and by Andronikos III (23 of 42, 54.8%). Placing these military types in the overall context of the reign of Andronikos II is problematical, because of difficulty in dating the issues. This applies to the years of both Andronikos' sole and joint rules; the presence of two emperors on the coins (either Andronikos II and Michael IX, or Andronikos II and Andronikos III), can provide help in dating, but even so leaves twenty-six years for the joint rule of Andronikos II and Michael IX, where coins can only be allotted to the whole period, rather than to specific years.⁹⁰⁷

⁹⁰⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, coin no 219; 5.2, plate 13, coin no 219.

⁹⁰⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 123, PCPC 88, no illustration. Inscriptions illegible.

⁹⁰⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 124-25, coin no 196; 5.2, plate 12, coin no 196.

⁹⁰⁷ There is a further complication in that confusion could also arise in relation to the coins of Michael VIII and Andronikos II. DOC 5.1, 128.

Andronikos II made substantial changes to the currency, particularly in the silver and copper denominations. The gold coinage remained generally similar to that of Michael VIII, but with considerable debasement. That this debasement was noteworthy at the time is shown by the comment of Pachymeres.⁹⁰⁸ As Andronikos reigned from 1282 to 1328, and Pachymeres died c. 1310, the debasement would have occurred during the first half of Andronikos' reign. Modern measurements show that the fineness of the hyperpyron declined from 14.8 carats (61.6%) under Michael VIII to 13.5 carats (56.6%) during the earlier part of the reign of Andronikos II; by the later part of Andronikos' reign further decline to 11.3 carats (47.2%) had occurred, confirming Pachymeres' statement.⁹⁰⁹

The gold coinage of Andronikos II consists of three types, none of which features military iconography. In the extensive reorganisation of the silver and copper coinage around 1294 the concave trachy in the silver series was replaced by the flat basilicon; there were also the very rare half-basilicon; and one-eighth basilicon (tornese).⁹¹⁰ The basilica comprise thirteen types, none of which display military imagery. The tornesi of Andronikos II consist of 9 types, of which 2 feature military images (22.2%).⁹¹¹ Andronikos continued the use of the copper trachy (stamenon), but the tetarteron was replaced by a larger flat coin, the assarion. The copper trachea from

⁹⁰⁸ 'After the death of this emperor [Michael VIII], at the beginning [of Andronikos' reign] the *nomisma* contained fourteen carats of solid gold as opposed to ten [of alloy], but now, in our time the relative amounts of solid gold and alloy are equal.' Pachymeres 1999, vol. 4, XII, 539-41, l. 3-11, [B493-94].

⁹⁰⁹ Grierson, DOC 5.1, 129.

⁹¹⁰ The silver basilicon was probably first struck in 1304, arising from the need to pay the mercenaries of the Catalan Company. DOC 5.1, 142. This is another example of the importance of the role of the Byzantine silver coinage in the field of innovation.

⁹¹¹ The Type 4 has not been classed as military in the present study as the illustration in LPC does not indicate any military symbols. LPC, 1979, 36.5.

Constantinople featuring only Andronikos II consist of 34 types, of which 15 have military imagery (44.1%). The copper trachea from Constantinople featuring Andronikos II and Michael IX comprise 21 types, of which 3 (14.3%) are military issues. The tetartera and assaria of Andronikos II from Constantinople comprise 25 types, of which none features military imagery.⁹¹² The trachea of Andronikos II from Thessaloniki consist of 47 types; 45 being of Andronikos alone and 2 of Andronikos II and Andronikos III. Of the 47 types, 27 have military images (57.4%); once again, coins from Thessaloniki have a higher proportion of military issues.

Because of the large number of types, and the annual change in types, it is only possible to give a broad outline of dates for Andronikos II's coins. In the sequences with military imagery, the silver tornesi are dated to post-1294.⁹¹³ The copper coinage, from both Constantinople and Thessaloniki, is dated to 1282-94 where Andronikos II appears alone, and to post-1294 where Andronikos and Michael IX appear together.⁹¹⁴ There are also two copper trachea from Thessaloniki dated to 1325-28, as they feature both Andronikos II and Andronikos III.⁹¹⁵ There is some evidence in the Constantinopolitan copper trachea series that there was a higher proportion of coins with military symbolism from 1282-94 (15 of 34, 44.1%) than from post-1294 (3 of 21, 14.3%). There is however an element of confusion here, as Michael IX died in

⁹¹² Twenty-four of these types are assaria and feature both Andronikos II and Michael IX, whilst Type 1 is a tetarteron, with Andronikos alone.

⁹¹³ DOC 5.1, 139-40.

⁹¹⁴ Shea has noted a number of characteristics of the Thessaloniki mint during the reign of Andronikos II. Quality of design and execution declined, and lower standards appeared to increase overstrikes. Changes of type appeared to occur at a greater frequency than annually; there is a possibility of a second mint in the western Balkans, or some of the types may be mules. Shea 2015, 278.

⁹¹⁵ DOC 5.1, 147.

1320. Whilst it is reasonable to date coins featuring Andronikos II and Michael IX to the years 1294-1320, those coins featuring Andronikos II alone could date not only from 1282 to 1294, but also from 1320 to 1325. Given that the last years of Andronikos' reign from 1321 onwards were marked by civil war about the succession, it is possible that some of the copper coinage bearing military symbolism of the sole reign of Andronikos II could date to after the death of Michael IX.

The early part of the reign of Andronikos II could have produced a predominance of military issues in the coinage, as problems began immediately.⁹¹⁶ Andronikos disbanded the Byzantine navy, which was an ill-advised move.⁹¹⁷ He imposed cuts on the army; by placing military iconography on his coinage Andronikos was giving symbolic reinforcement (but no more) to Byzantine power. To maintain Byzantine power Andronikos was forced to employ costly mercenaries like the Catalans, who were paid around one million hyperpyra. This sum represented more than the average annual income of the whole empire, and led to further debasement of the gold coinage to only 50% gold in 1304.⁹¹⁸ The expense of maintaining the Catalans involved tax rises; a new tax was imposed on wheat and barley.⁹¹⁹ The Catalans remained on Byzantine territory from 1303 to 1309, but after achieving success against Ottoman forces soon came to be an expensive liability, hated for their unlawful actions against local Byzantine populations.

⁹¹⁶ DOC 5.1, 126-7.

⁹¹⁷ Laiou 1972, 74-6, 114.

⁹¹⁸ Pachymeres 1999, vol. 4, XII, 539-41, l. 3-11, [B493-94].

⁹¹⁹ Pachymeres 1999, vol. 4, XII, 539, l. 1-3.

In overall terms what is perhaps surprising is that given the many serious problems which Andronikos faced in all phases of his reign, the overall proportion of his coinage with military symbolism should be only 30.9%. However, the trachea series of the sole reign of Andronikos II does exhibit a higher percentage of military symbolism, as these military types constitute 36.4% of the total from Constantinople, 55.3% from Thessaloniki, and 45.1% when issues from these mints are combined. Essentially the military symbolism is concentrated on the copper coinage, and the mint of Thessaloniki. Most of the overall forty-seven types which feature military images are in the trachea series from Thessaloniki and from Constantinople. St Demetrios and the Archangel Michael make up the majority of military figures in the data below.⁹²⁰

Archangel Michael:	19/152 (12.5%)
St Demetrios:	19/152 (12.5%)
Unidentified military saint:	5/152 (3.3%)
St Theodore:	4/152 (2.6%)
St George:	3/152 (2.0%)
Armed cherub:	1/152 (0.7%)

When these figures for the trachea are analysed by mint, the figures are as below.

⁹²⁰ These figures for individuals add to more than forty seven because of the appearance of more than one military figure on some coins.

Andronikos II – Trachea Only

	<u>Constantinople</u>	<u>Thessaloniki</u>	<u>Combined</u>
Archangel Michael	13/55 23.6%	4/47 8.5%	17/102 16.7%
St Demetrios	0/55 0%	19/47 40.4%	19/102 18.6%
St George	2/55 3.6%	1/47 2.1%	3/102 2.9%
St Theodore	3/55 5.4%	0/47 0%	3/102 2.9%
Unidentified	2/55 3.6%	1/47 2.1%	3/102 2.9%
military saint			
Armed cherub	0/55 0%	1/47 2.1%	1/102 1.0%
Total	20/55 36.4%	26/47 55.3%	46/102 45.1%

When comparison is made with Michael VIII's reign the coinage of Andronikos II features considerably less military imagery than the coinage of Michael. If the military issues of Andronikos II are examined by mint, the figures are:

Constantinople: 21/105 (20.0%)

Thessaloniki: 26/47 (55.3%)

The comparable figures for Michael VIII are:

Constantinople: 23/47 (46.9%)

Thessaloniki: 26/30 (86.7%)

The popularity of specific military figures is similar for both Michael VIII and Andronikos II, with the Archangel Michael and St Demetrios being dominant. The archangel and St Demetrios make the same number of appearances on the coins of Andronikos II whereas for Michael VIII the archangel is slightly more popular. The main points of difference between the series of Michael VIII and Andronikos II are that the armed emperor is seen on the coins of Michael but not on the coins of Andronikos; and that St George declines in popularity from 10.3% under Michael to 2.0% under Andronikos. For both Michael and Andronikos the Archangel Michael appears more frequently on coins from Constantinople than from Thessaloniki; and for both emperors St Demetrios appears more frequently on coins from Thessaloniki than from Constantinople. One contrast between the two emperors is the decline in popularity of the Archangel Michael in Thessaloniki: from 20.7% under Michael to 8.5% under Andronikos.

In considering the relative importance of obverse or reverse location of the military figures, for the total number of trachea from Constantinople (comprising coins of both Andronikos II alone and coins of Andronikos II and Michael IX jointly) the Archangel Michael appears nine times on the obverse and four times on the reverse. St Theodore's three appearances are all on the obverse, as are both of St George's. The two appearances of the unidentified military saint are, however, both on the reverse. The total number of trachea from Thessaloniki (comprising coins where Andronikos II appears alone, and two where he appears with Andronikos III) emphasise the status of St Demetrios. Not only does he appear more often than any other military personage, but of his nineteen appearances, sixteen are on the obverse. The

Archangel Michael, although appearing much less frequently than St Demetrios, also has the status of the obverse in three out of four appearances on trachea from Thessaloniki. The armed cherub in a single appearance is on the obverse, but the one appearance of St George and the one appearance of the unidentified military saint are both on the reverse. The coins with military symbolism are listed below.⁹²¹

Silver Tornesi (dated post-1294)

Class 6 obverse: Archangel Michael and emperor holding labarum.

Reverse: St Theodore standing with spear and shield. ΟΑΘΕΟΔ (?)⁹²²

Class 7 obverse: military saint and emperor holding labarum.

Reverse: military saint standing. Inscription obscure.⁹²³

Copper Trachea, Constantinople, Andronikos II Alone (dated 1282-94)

Class 1 obverse: Christ on low throne. IC XC

Reverse: Archangel Michael presents kneeling emperor to Christ seated on r.

A|N(?) IC XC⁹²⁴

⁹²¹ It should be noted that there are few coins of Andronikos II which feature military imagery in the Barber Institute Coin Collection, since the Barber examples are mainly from the gold series which does not have military imagery.

⁹²² BICC no specimen. DOC 5.1, 148, no coin no; 5.2, no illustration. The query about the inscription appears in the DOC description.

⁹²³ BICC no specimen. DOC 5.1, 148, no coin no; 5.2, no illustration. This coin's weight (0.75g) shows it to be a tornese. Its finding in the Pergamum excavations makes it virtually certain to be a coin of Andronikos II, not Andronikos III, as Pergamum fell to the Turks between 1302-30.

Class 2 obverse: head of Christ surrounded by four crosses and four stars.

ΑΝΔ

Reverse: Archangel Michael presents kneeling emperor to Christ seated on r.

(Fig. 58.)⁹²⁵

Class 6 obverse: Virgin Hagiosoritissa. ΜΡ ΘΥ Β Β or ΜΒ

Reverse: emperor standing with military saint. ΝΔ|ΙΚ|ΟC|Π Ο|Γ⁹²⁶

Class 7 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael with globus cruciger.

...ΑΝΔ...

Reverse: half-figure figure of emperor blessed by Virgin. Χ|Μ⁹²⁷

Class 8 obverse: Archangel Michael holding trifoliate sceptre. Γ|Α Χ|Μ

Reverse: half-figure of emperor blessed by Christ. Α|Ν|Δ ΙC ΧC Ο|Π|Λ⁹²⁸

Class 9 obverse: Archangel Michael; details unclear.

Reverse: emperor standing on l. handing ? cross to Venetian doge.⁹²⁹

Class 10 obverse: St Theodore holding spear or sword in r. hand and shield in

l. Ο|ΑΓ|Ο|C ΘΕ|ΟΔΟ|ΡΟ|C

⁹²⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, coin no 561; 5.2, plate 33, coin no 561.

⁹²⁵ BICC: coin no B6200. **See fig. 58.** DOC 5.1, 150, no coin no; 5.2, no illustration. LPC 38, coin no 7.

⁹²⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, coin no 567; 5.2, plate 33, coin no 567.

⁹²⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, no coin no; 5.2, no illustration. LPC 42, coin no 11.

⁹²⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, coin no 568; 5.2, plate 33, coin no 568.

⁹²⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, coin no 569; 5.2, plate 33, coin no 569. No obverse or reverse inscriptions.

Reverse: Archangel Michael standing on l. and emperor on r. holding labarum between them. A|N|Δ|PO|NI|K⁹³⁰

Class 11 obverse: St Theodore holding spear or sword in r. hand and shield in l. OA|Θ|E Δ|Ω|P|S

Reverse: Archangel Michael standing on r. holding trifurcate sceptre and emperor on l. holding cross sceptre; between them they hold labarum. ANΔP XM (**Fig. 61.**)⁹³¹

Class 14 obverse: St George with sword over r. shoulder and shield in l. hand. ΓOA ΓE|OPΓ|S

Reverse: emperor on throne with cross in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. Inscription illegible.⁹³²

Class 18 obverse: half-figure of St Theodore with sword over r. shoulder and scabbard in l. hand. OAG|Θ|OΔ|O P|O|C

Reverse: emperor holding labarum in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. +ANΔPONIKOC....ΠICΠAΛEOΛOI⁹³³

Class 19 obverse: Archangel Michael holding trifoliate sceptre in r. hand and globus in l. A|P|X... M

⁹³⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, coin no 570; 5.2, plate 33, coin no 570. For obverse DOC 5.1 gives object held as spear; DOC 5.2 as sword.

⁹³¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, coin nos 571-72; 5.2, plate 34, coin nos 571, 572. **See fig. 61, coin no 571, BZC.1977.22.**

⁹³² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 150, coin nos 575-76; 5.2, plate 34 coin nos 575-76.

⁹³³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 151, coin nos 579-80; 5.2, plate 34, coin nos 579-80.

Reverse: emperor holding cross in r. hand and globus in l.

..Α..ΔΡΝΙΚ...ΠΙCΤΙΟΠΑΑ⁹³⁴

Class 20 obverse: Archangel Michael holding trifoliate sceptre in r. hand and globus in l. Α|Ρ|Χ... Μ

Reverse: emperor holding cross in r. hand and *akakia* in l.⁹³⁵

Class 21 obverse: half-figure of St George with spear and shield.

Reverse: emperor with cross and globus cruciger.⁹³⁶

Class 30 obverse: half-figure of Virgin orans.

Reverse: emperor on l. holding cross with military saint to r.⁹³⁷

Class 34 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael with spear and globus cruciger.

Reverse: emperor standing with cross and globus cruciger.⁹³⁸

⁹³⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 151, coin nos 581-82; 5.2, plate 34, coin nos 581-82.

⁹³⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 151, coin no 583; 5.2, plate 34, coin no 583. No reverse inscription.

⁹³⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 151, no specimen; 5.2, no illustration.

⁹³⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 151-2, with details of Trnovo hoard classification; no specimen; 5.2, no illustration.

⁹³⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 152, with details of Trnovo hoard classification; no specimen; 5.2, no illustration.

Copper Trachea, Constantinople, Andronikos II and Michael IX (dated post-1294)

Class 10 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael with trifurcate sceptre and globus.

Reverse: two emperors holding patriarchal crosses.⁹³⁹

Class 11 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael with sceptre and globus.

Reverse: two emperors standing holding labarum between them.⁹⁴⁰

Type 14 obverse: Archangel Michael standing with sword.

Reverse: emperors standing with patriarchal cross. (**Fig. 59.**)⁹⁴¹

Copper Assarion, Constantinople, Andronikos II and Michael IX (dated post-1294)

Class 9 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael holding sceptre in r. hand and globus in l.

Reverse: bust of Christ blessing kneeling emperors. AVTOK ΠΩΜΕΟΝ IC
XC (**Fig. 60.**)⁹⁴²

⁹³⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 153, coin no 609; 5.2, plate 36, coin no 609. No inscriptions visible obverse or reverse.

⁹⁴⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 153, coin no 610; 5.2, plate 36, coin no 610. Inscriptions illegible on either side.

⁹⁴¹ BICC: coin no B6293: inscription not visible on either side. **See fig. 59.** DOC 5.1, 153, no specimen; 5.2, no illustration.

⁹⁴² BICC: coin nos B6320–21. **See fig. 60.** DOC 5.1, 155, coin nos 677-80; 5.2, plate 39, coin nos 677-80.

Copper Trachea, Thessaloniki, Andronikos II (dated 1282-94)

Class I obverse: wing holding cross.

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Demetrios on r. holding cross between them.

Saint has spear in l. hand. ANA OF ΔHM⁹⁴³

Class 2 obverse: half-figure of St Demetrios with sword in r. hand and shield in l. OA|Λ|ΔI MH|TP

Reverse: winged emperor standing with sceptre and globus cruciger. A|NΔ|N|I
(Fig. 62.)⁹⁴⁴

Class 3 obverse: half-figure of St Demetrios with sword in r. hand and shield in l. OA|Γ|ΔI MH|TPI|O|S

Reverse: emperor seated on throne holding globus with patriarchal cross and lily-sceptre. AN|ΔP|ON|I KΔ|IT|EV⁹⁴⁵

Class 4 obverse: half-figure of St Demetrios holding sword in r. hand and shield in l. OA|Γ|ΔI MH|TPI|O|S

Reverse: bust of winged emperor above city walls. (No inscription.)⁹⁴⁶

Class 5 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding cross with halo. O|A|ΔI

⁹⁴³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 717-20; 5.2, plate 41, coin nos 717-20. Reverse inscription blundered.

⁹⁴⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 721-28; 5.2, plate 41, coin nos 721-28. **See fig. 62, coin no 727, BZC. 1956.23.2868.**

⁹⁴⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin no (729); 5.2, plate 41, coin no (729).

⁹⁴⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 730-31; 5.2, plate 41, coin nos 730-31.

Reverse: emperor standing holding cross and sceptre. ANAPONIK...
...AOC⁹⁴⁷

Class 6 obverse: St Demetrios standing. O|A|Γ ΔI|MH|...

Reverse: emperor standing holding sceptre with cross in r. hand and globus
with patriarchal cross in l. A|N|... ΠA|O⁹⁴⁸

Class 7 obverse: bust of St Demetrios with sword in r. hand and shield in l.
Γ|OA Δ|HMH|TP|I|S

Reverse: half-figure of emperor with two lys. A|N|Δ|... Δ|ΠΓ|C⁹⁴⁹

Class 8 obverse: six-petalled flower.

Reverse: emperor on l. and St Demetrios on r. holding haloed cross between
them; emperor holds sceptre in r. hand and saint holds sword in l. (**Fig. 63.**)⁹⁵⁰

Class 9 obverse: St Demetrios standing with spear in r. hand and shield in l.

O|A|Γ|O|S Δ|H|M|TP|S

Reverse: emperor holding haloed cross in r. hand and *akakia* in l.

AN|ΔPO|NI|KO|S Δ|E|C|Π|O|T⁹⁵¹

⁹⁴⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 732; 5.2, plate 41, coin no 732.

⁹⁴⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin no 733; 5.2, plate 41, coin no 733.

⁹⁴⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 734-35; plate 42, coin nos 734-35.

⁹⁵⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 736-39; 5.2, plate 42, coin nos 736-39.
Reverse has 'meaningless circular legend'. **See fig. 63, coin no 736, BZC.1960.88.4491.**

⁹⁵¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 740-42; 5.2, plate 42, coin nos 740-42.

Class 10 obverse: St Demetrios holding sword in r. hand and shield in l.
OA...

Reverse: emperor standing and holding haloed cross in r. hand and labarum-headed sceptre in l. ANΔ|PONI|KOC ΔEΠIOT⁹⁵²

Class 12 obverse: two large Bs.

Reverse: emperor crowned by Archangel Michael. ANΔPONIKOC⁹⁵³

Class 13 obverse: two wings with star above.

Reverse: emperor standing on l. with St Demetrios on r. ANΔPONI (?)⁹⁵⁴

Class 14 obverse: cherub holding two spears.

Reverse: emperor holding cross in r. hand and *akakia* in l. AN|ΔPO|NI|K
Δ|ΠIT|Λ|EA (?)⁹⁵⁵

Class 18 obverse: Archangel Michael holding spear in r. hand and shield in l.

Reverse: Michael IX on l. and Andronikos II on r. holding patriarchal cross between them. ANΔPONIKOC MIXAHA⁹⁵⁶

Class 21 obverse: Archangel Michael standing half-left holding labarum in r.
hand and sword in l. +|A|+

⁹⁵² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 743-44; 5.2, plate 42, coin nos 743-44. Obverse has 'uncertain letters'.

⁹⁵³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin nos 749-50; 5.2, plate 42, coin nos 749-50. Reverse inscription blundered.

⁹⁵⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 157, coin no (751); 5.2, plate 43, coin no (751).

⁹⁵⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 158, coin nos 752-54; 5.2, plate 43, coin nos 752-54.

⁹⁵⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 158, coin nos 763-64; 5.2, plate 43, coin nos 763-64. Reverse inscription blundered.

Reverse: Michael IX on l. and Andronikos II on r. holding long cross between them and kneeling before Christ.⁹⁵⁷

Class 22 obverse: bust of St Demetrios holding cross on his chest. OA
Δ|HH|TII|C

Reverse: Michael IX on l. and Andronikos II on r. holding between them staff with large star above. ANΔPONIKOC ΔEΠ(?)⁹⁵⁸

Class 27 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. OA

Reverse: emperor standing holding patriarchal cross in r. hand and *akakia* in l. Star l. field.⁹⁵⁹

Class 33 obverse: bust of military saint with sword on r. shoulder. OA

Reverse: bust of emperor holding globus cruciger in each hand.⁹⁶⁰

Class 34 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. OA|Γ Δ|MH|TP

Reverse: emperor standing holding cross sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. Two stars l. field.⁹⁶¹

⁹⁵⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 158, coin nos 770; 5.2, plate 43, coin no 770. Reverse inscription fragmentary.

⁹⁵⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 158, coin nos 771-73; 5.2, plate 44, coin nos 771-73. Reverse inscription fragmentary.

⁹⁵⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 158, coin nos 786-88; 5.2, plate 44, coin nos 786-88.

⁹⁶⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 159, coin nos 809-10; 5.2, plate 45, coin nos 809-10.

⁹⁶¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 159, coin nos 811-15; 5.2, plate 46, coin nos 811-15. Two specimens of this coin type were found in the Salonica hoard of Longuet. Shea 2015, 299-300.

Class 38 obverse: bust of St Demetrios holding small cross to chest.

Ο|ΑΓ|Ι|Ο|Σ Δ|ΜΗ|ΤΡ

Reverse: emperor standing on l. holding cross-sceptre and being blessed by

Virgin on r. Μ|ΘV⁹⁶²

Class 40 obverse: Palaeologan monogram.

Reverse: half-figures of St George on l. and emperor on r. with sceptre on his

l. shoulder. ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΟC ΔΕCΠ (?)⁹⁶³

Class 41 obverse: no type.

Reverse: half-figures of military saint to l. and emperor to r. holding patriarchal cross between them; saint has spear in r. hand and emperor cross-sceptre in

l. ΑΝΔΡΟ ΝΙΚΟC (?)⁹⁶⁴

Class 43 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding sword and shield.

Reverse: winged emperor standing holding patriarchal cross and sceptre.⁹⁶⁵

Class 44 obverse: bust of St Demetrios holding spear over l. shoulder. Α

Δ|Η|ΤΡ

Reverse: winged emperor standing holding model city in r. hand and cross-

sceptre in l. Α|ΝΚ ΟC|ΑΠ⁹⁶⁶

⁹⁶² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 159, coin nos 825-32; 5.2, plate 46, coin nos 825-32.

⁹⁶³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 159, coin nos 833-39; 5.2, plate 47, coin nos 833-39.

⁹⁶⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 160, coin nos 840-44; 5.2, plate 47, coin nos 840-44. Reverse inscription blundered.

⁹⁶⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 160, coin nos 846-48; 5.2, plate 47, coin nos 846-48. No inscription.

⁹⁶⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 160, coin nos 849-51; 5.2, plate 47, coin nos 849-51.

Class 45 obverse: bust of Archangel Michael holding spear and shield.

Reverse: winged emperor standing holding model city in r. hand.⁹⁶⁷

Copper Trachea, Thessaloniki, Andronikos II and Andronikos III (dated 1325-28)

Class 46 obverse: bust of St Demetrios with spear and shield.

Reverse: bust of Christ blessing kneeling emperors holding long cross between them. ΑΝΔ ΑΝΔΡΟΝ (?)⁹⁶⁸

Class 47 obverse: bust of St Demetrios with spear and shield. ΟΑ Δ|ΕΜΗ|ΤΡ

Reverse: half-length figures of emperors holding long patriarchal cross.⁹⁶⁹

The reign of Andronikos III (1328-41) was characterised by continuing loss of territory in Asia Minor, particularly Nicaea (1331) and Nicomedia (1337). Andronikos enjoyed better fortune in Europe, defeating the Bulgarians at Rhodokastron (1331), and reclaiming Thessaly and Thessaloniki (1333); and Epeiros (1337). The reconquest of Thessaly made easier the defence of the northern part of the empire against Serbia. No gold coinage in the sole name of Andronikos III is known; on gold coins Andronikos always appears

⁹⁶⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 160, coin no 852; 5.2, plate 47, coin no 852. No inscription.

⁹⁶⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 160, coin nos 853-54; 5.2, plate 47, coin nos 853-54.

⁹⁶⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 160, coin nos 855-56; 5.2, plate 47, coin nos 855-56. This coin has also been attributed to Andronikos III and to John V and John VI. Grierson points out that the presence of two specimens in the Salonica hoard (Longuet nos 10, 12) would exclude the attributions to John V and John VI. Shea, in his work on the Salonica hoard, classifies this type as being of John V, based on examination of the inscriptions on examples in the DO collection. Shea 2015, 307. DOC 5.1, 160 and fn 47.

with another emperor, Andronikos II or John V. In addition, the export of gold to satisfy the demand for increased minting of gold coins elsewhere tended to decrease supplies of gold in Byzantium.⁹⁷⁰ Andronikos issued a silver coinage in a reduced weight because of a generalised shortage of silver; the basilica are divided into a heavy and light series. The coins of Andronikos III follow the post-1261 pattern of being virtually impossible to date to specific years, but only to the whole reign; the exception is a half-basilicon of the heavy series, dated to 1331/32. (**Fig. 65.**)⁹⁷¹ Andronikos III issued considerably fewer coin types than his predecessor, but Andronikos III's coins contain a higher proportion of military types (23/42, 54.8%) than Andronikos II (47/152, 30.9%). Of the overall number of issues of forty-two of Andronikos III twenty-three are from Constantinople and nineteen from Thessaloniki. Military issues comprise 11 from Constantinople (11/23, 47.8%), and 12 from Thessaloniki (12/19, 63.2%).

Of the military figures on the coins of Andronikos III St Demetrios appears most frequently, followed by the Archangel Michael, but St George makes only a single appearance. These figures and their mint distributions are given below.⁹⁷²

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Constantinople</u>	<u>Thessaloniki</u>	<u>Combined</u>
St Demetrios	9/23, 39.1%	8/19, 42.1%	17/42, 40.5%
Archangel Michael	1/23, 4.3%	3/19, 15.8%	4/42, 9.5%

⁹⁷⁰ Grierson 1999, DOC 5.1, 161.

⁹⁷¹ BICC: coin no B6350. **See fig. 65.** DOC 5.1, 161-72; 166 for half-basilicon.

⁹⁷² The totals of military figures add to more than twenty-three as on several coins more than one military figure is represented.

Riding emperor	--	4/19, 21.0%	4/42, 9.5%
St George	1/23, 4.3%	--	1/42, 2.4%

A major difference between military iconography on the coins of Andronikos II and Andronikos III relates to the frequency of appearances by St Demetrios and the Archangel Michael. The two appeared in equal proportions on the overall number of coins of Andronikos II, but with St Demetrios being predominant on issues from Thessaloniki and the archangel on issues from Constantinople. By contrast, for Andronikos III St Demetrios not only has the dominant position in terms of appearances, but also appears on virtually the same proportion of issues from Constantinople (9/23, 39.1%) as from Thessaloniki (8/19, 42.1%). The Archangel Michael has only four overall appearances, and in these appearances is seen more from Thessaloniki (3/19, 15.8%) than from Constantinople (1/23, 4.3%). When obverse/reverse locations are considered St Demetrios appears three times on the obverse and six times on the reverse for Constantinople, but seven times on the obverse and once on the reverse for Thessaloniki. The Archangel Michael appears only on the obverse for issues from Constantinople, and twice on the obverse and once on the reverse for issues from Thessaloniki. The single appearance of St George is on the obverse from Constantinople.

The return of a riding figure after an absence of some six centuries is the most striking feature of the coins of Andronikos III; the riding emperor appears four times on the reverse of coins from Thessaloniki. On one of these four (Type 14) St Demetrios also appears as a riding figure with a structure resembling a shrine in the right field. It may be speculated if this coin, or

indeed all four equestrian types, could relate to the reclamation of Thessaloniki (1333). Details of these four copper trachea are given in the list at the end of this section. These equestrian depictions of Andronikos III and St Demetrios show clear distinctions from the seventh-century equestrian images on Byzantine coins. When Andronikos III reintroduced the horse and rider image it was larger, filling the whole flan; previously the horse and rider image had been very small, occupying the shield held by the emperor, and thus was only a small part of the flan. The seventh-century image appeared to be a miniature version of an image from earlier Roman coins (where it occupied the whole flan) of an emperor spearing a foe on the ground, but without the enemy figure. The image introduced by Andronikos III resembles an enlarged version of the seventh-century shield image. It does not create an impression of a galloping horseman, but rather of one riding sedately; even St Demetrios does not appear to gallop on a coin of Andronikos III, although he does on coins of later emperors.⁹⁷³

The reintroduction of a riding figure by Andronikos III could have been influenced by external and internal factors. External factors could have included geography and chronology. Internal factors could have included the importance of horseriding, and the status attached to it in Byzantine protocol. In terms of external factors the Byzantine empire was part of a milieu, in both geographical location and chronology, in which riding figures of both rulers and saints appeared on coins. It is however difficult to decide if any of these potential influences (Crusader, Seljuk, Armenian and Trapezuntine) on the

⁹⁷³ Grierson's description of the rider's gait is succinct: 'ambling'. DOC 5.1, 69. The depiction of gait is discussed later in this chapter.

coinage of Andronikos III was predominant. In chronological terms, the reigns of Andronikos III and Alexios II of Trebizond were close, with some overlap at the end of Alexios' reign and the beginning of that of Andronikos. However geographically Constantinople and Trebizond were separated. Constantinople was closer to Crusader influence, but chronologically Andronikos III was more distant from this influence than his predecessors. Further, the use of the symbol of the riding emperor occurred much less on the coins from Constantinople and Thessaloniki than from those of Trebizond.

The historical background to the reintroduction of equestrian figures on Byzantine coinage is complex, and involves a number of states, including Trebizond, bordering the Byzantine empire. Whilst Morrisson and Gerstel concur in linking the reintroduction of a riding figure on Byzantine coins to equestrian images on thirteenth-century wall-paintings in churches of the Morea, it should be remembered that some non-Byzantine equestrian images on coins predate these paintings.⁹⁷⁴ Twelfth-century representations of riding figures are known from some Crusader and also some Seljuk coin types. The earliest of these would appear to be from Roger of Salerno (1112-19), who as regent for Bohemond II issued a copper coin from Antioch showing on the obverse a mounted figure of St George killing a dragon, with the inscription Ο ΓΕΩΡΓ. The reverse has a variable inscription, which can be blundered: ΠΟ[]ΕΡ ΠΡΟΚΗΤ[]⁹⁷⁵ This is one of the earliest images of St George and a dragon on a coin, although a standing St George appears on a coin of John II, dated to 1118-22, making these two representations of the saint very close in date. A

⁹⁷⁴ Morrisson 2007, 189. Gerstel 2001, 270-2.

⁹⁷⁵ Metcalf 1995, 28, plate 6, coin nos 95-101. BICC: no specimen. This representation of a mounted figure killing a dragon resembles the image on the emperor's shield on coins of the early Byzantine empire, except that on the shield it is a human and not a dragon who is killed.

riding figure is seen also on a fractional copper coin (type G) from Antioch, with a knight with lance riding r. or l. on the obverse, and on the reverse a cross with A N T O in the angles. This coin has not appeared in hoards, nor in the Antioch excavations. Metcalf describes it as 'problematic' and very difficult to date.⁹⁷⁶

The Orthodox population of the southern Morea was threatened by Frankish incursions between 1248 and 1262. Images of equestrian saints in churches close to the Latin-occupied Morea and the building of churches dedicated to warrior saints indicate a wish to protect rural Orthodox populations by powerful guardians. If fear generated by the Latin conquest of the Morea influenced the introduction of mounted saints in thirteenth-century church decoration, the style of such figures was also influenced by Crusader representations. The influence of Latin knights was already apparent in the twelfth century. Choniates relates how Manuel I jousted with Latin knights in Antioch in 1159.⁹⁷⁷ Manuel's appearance matches that of a group of six military saints, including St George, who appear in a thirteenth-century painted frieze of the Old Monastery at Vrontamas, in the format of a mock tournament.⁹⁷⁸

Crusader influence on the painting of equestrian saints takes the form of their pose, military equipment, and heraldic devices on their shields.

⁹⁷⁶ Metcalf 1995, 143-7, plate 19, coin no 483. BICC: no specimen.

⁹⁷⁷ Choniates 1984, [109], 62. 'He carried his lance upright and wore a mantel fastened elegantly over his right shoulder which left the arm free on the side of the brooch. He was borne by a war-horse with a magnificent mane and trappings of gold which raised its neck and reared up on its hind legs as though eager to run a race, rivaling its rider in splendor.'

⁹⁷⁸ Gerstel points out that whilst Manuel's jousting activities in distant locations may not have directly influenced the Vrontamas frieze, Frankish knights did engage in jousting in the Morea, and more than one thousand knights attended a contest on the Isthmus of Corinth in 1305. Gerstel 2001, 276.

Whereas previously equestrian saints had been portrayed confronting serpents, some in the Morea appear without serpents, and with the saint holding a lance-flag aloft or resting a spear point up on his shoulder. The rider's legs are extended forward in Latin fashion, referred to as 'parade format'.⁹⁷⁹ This format, having been adopted in the Morea, was repeated in smaller churches, e.g. St Nicholas near Geraki (1280-1300), close to Vrontamas, where St Demetrios is portrayed spear in hand in parade format. A similar portrayal of the saint is seen in the Monastery of the Forty Martyrs near Sparta; he wears a lamellar hauberk and long surcoat over elaborately-patterned leggings. A scarf is knotted around his horse's head. Such a courtly portrayal would appear to suggest Crusader influence.⁹⁸⁰ Another detail suggests that Byzantine artists in the Morea were aware of Crusader fashion. In St Nicholas, Polemitas, an equestrian St George wears a blunt scabbard, whereas for Byzantine fashion a longer scabbard might have been expected. The scabbard resembles a quiver, which had appeared in two Sinai icons, and suggests the penetration of such imagery to the Morea.⁹⁸¹

A further sign of Crusader influence is the use of heraldic devices to express the political and religious allegiance of saints, which became necessary when the Byzantines and Latins laid claims to the same group of saints. A device on a shield or costume might therefore distinguish the Orthodox from the Latin saint. The typical badge of the Orthodox saint in the Morea was a crescent moon, whereas the *castle tournois* was the Latin badge. This latter device appears on Frankish coins minted in the Morea (on

⁹⁷⁹ Gerstel 2001, 276.

⁹⁸⁰ Gerstel 2001, 277.

⁹⁸¹ Gerstel 2001, 277-8.

the reverse of the *denier tournois*).⁹⁸² These two devices are seen in a painting in the church of St John Chrysostom (c. 1300) in the Morea. An equestrian St George is portrayed with a crescent and star on his shield, whilst the shield of a Latin soldier features the *castle tournois*.⁹⁸³ The origin of the crescent symbol may be the crescent seen on the reverse of the anonymous bronze follis Class J, of Alexios I, minted in Constantinople, and found in large numbers in the excavations in Corinth and Athens. Grierson emphasises that the crescent should not be seen as an Islamic symbol, as its origin was Turkish, and was not adopted by the Ottomans until after the fall of Constantinople.⁹⁸⁴ If this is correct the use of the crescent on the shields of warrior saints in the Morea may reflect the influence of the last powerful Byzantine dynasty before Villehardouin's arrival.⁹⁸⁵

Besides the effect of the Crusaders, the Seljuk state was a further element influencing Byzantine coinage. The riding figure of an ruler, rather than a saint, appeared on Seljuk coinage in the late twelfth century, and was adopted subsequently on coins from Cilician Armenia and Trebizond in the thirteenth century, before appearing on Byzantine coins in the 1330s and 1340s. Geographically the Seljuk state was neighbour to other states which would use such an equestrian symbol. The Seljuk state was placed between the Byzantine empire to the north and west; Georgia to the north-east; Cilician Armenia to the south; and the Ayyubids to the south-east. After 1204 there

⁹⁸² Metcalf 1995, 253-86; plates 38-44.

⁹⁸³ Gerstel 2001, 278.

⁹⁸⁴ Grierson DOC 3.2, 637, 700-01; plate LXVIII, coin no J3. Gerstel 2001, 279.

⁹⁸⁵ Gerstel 2001, 279.

were also the adjacent empires of Nicaea and Trebizond.⁹⁸⁶ When Kilij Arslan divided the Seljuk empire in 1186 several of the princes who benefitted introduced equestrian figures to their coins. Malik Suleiman Shah (1188-92) issued copper coins which show him carrying a mace on his right shoulder and galloping to the right on the obverse and with an inscription on the reverse. The mint and exact date of these coins is unknown.⁹⁸⁷ Suleiman Shah as sultan (1200-03) struck silver and copper coins from Kaisarya and Konya. The silver dirhem features him with a mace on his right shoulder and galloping right on the obverse, with an inscription on the reverse. The dirhem is dated to 1201 from the mint of Kaisarya.⁹⁸⁸ Kaikhusraw I (1192-1200 and 1204-11) regained the throne after Suleiman's death and struck a similar coin in copper, but not in silver.⁹⁸⁹ Kaihkusraw's power in his early reign is emphasised by the bilingual tram of Armenia with a Seljuk reverse.⁹⁹⁰ Kaikhus II (1246-60) issued a silver dirhem with the obverse of a mounted archer facing right and a reverse with an inscription.⁹⁹¹

A riding figure appeared on the coins of Cilician Armenia, from the reigns of Hetoum I (1226-70) to Constantine IV (1365-73). The designs are broadly similar, being generally silver (trams or takvorins), and feature the king holding a sceptre and riding right on the obverse. The reverse features a lion walking left, with a cross behind it. The king's horse walks and the king turns to the viewer. Obverse and reverse feature a circular inscription in an

⁹⁸⁶ Broome 1985, 109.

⁹⁸⁷ Broome 1985, 112-13; figures 170, 171. BICC: no specimen.

⁹⁸⁸ Broome 1985, 113; figure 172. BICC: no specimen.

⁹⁸⁹ Broome 1985, 113. Plant 1980, 79. BICC: no specimen.

⁹⁹⁰ Broome 1985, 114-15; figure 179. See below.

⁹⁹¹ Broome 1985, 116; figure 181. BICC: no specimen.

outer ring.⁹⁹² Hetoum I's silver coin featuring a king on horseback appears to be the first of this type in Cilician Armenia. Bedoukian, like Hendy, suggests that the type was of Seljuk origin, noting the coins issued by Kilij Arslan (1156-88), sultan of Konya.⁹⁹³ Hetoum issued a series of such equestrian coins, which are distinguished by an inscription in Armenian on one side and in Arabic on the other. Bedoukian relates these coins to the years 1228-36, and to 1236-45, when Kaikobad and Kaikhusraw respectively were sultans of Konya. As such, the coins represented Hetoum's nominal acknowledgement of their suzerainty.⁹⁹⁴ The figure of the riding emperor continued to appear on the coins of most Cilician Armenian kings up and including Gosdantin (Constantine) IV (1365-73). In these designs the king was portrayed holding a sceptre, but Gosdantin I (1298-99) was portrayed with a sword.⁹⁹⁵

A further part of the background to the reintroduction of a riding figure on the coins of Andronikos III is seen in Trebizond. Hendy suggests that Alexios II of Trebizond (1297-1330) introduced the horse and rider symbol of St Eugenios and of the emperor from a Muslim source, but gives no details of this. He notes the use of the riding emperor by the Armenian king Levon II (1270-89) and suggests that Levon may have adopted it from a Seljuk source, or possibly from the bilingual (Armenian and Seljuk) coinage of Hetoum I (see above). Hendy does not mention that Hetoum employed the riding emperor symbol on his own silver trams.⁹⁹⁶ Although Alexios II of Trebizond (1297-

⁹⁹² E.g. BICC coin no AR220, silver takvorin of Constantine IV.

⁹⁹³ Bedoukian 1957, 219-30. Bedoukian 1979, 61, 84. Bedoukian cites W.Marsden, 1823, *Oriental Coins*, London, vol. 1, 88-90; plate VI, coin no LXXXIII.

⁹⁹⁴ Bedoukian 1979, 84. The agreement was mutually advantageous and enabled peace between the two countries for seventeen years, until the coming of the Mongols.

⁹⁹⁵ Bedoukian 1979, 63.

⁹⁹⁶ Hendy 1985, 523. Hetoum I tram BICC coin nos AR044-46.

1330) and Andronikos III (1328-41) were nearly contemporaries, it would appear that Alexios issued a coin depicting a riding emperor before Andronikos. Alexios minted a silver asper depicting on the obverse St Eugenios riding to the right with a cross over his right shoulder, and the inscription OA|EV ΓEN|. On the reverse Alexios rides to the right with a pearled sceptre over his right shoulder. The inscription is a monogram ΔP|au. The *Manus Dei* in the upper right field may date this coin to very early in the reign, as for previous emperors the *Manus Dei* had been associated with early, but not later, issues.⁹⁹⁷ If this type does indeed date to very early in the reign of Alexios, there could be a link with Constantinople, as Alexios was only fifteen at his accession, and was under the guardianship of Andronikos II (1282-1328), who interfered in most of the actions of Alexios. It is possible, then, that a hypothetical case could be made for Andronikos II having been responsible for this coin type. The equestrian figure of St Eugenios would probably have been familiar to the people of Trebizond, as it existed in art at least as early as the reign of Manuel I (1238-63), who was represented in a fresco in the monastic church of St Sophia as a standing figure wearing on his breast a medallion displaying a mounted St Eugenios.⁹⁹⁸ Such an inspiration could still however mean that the riding figure was adopted from Seljuk coinage, as it appeared there in the twelfth century.

The gait of the horses on Trapezuntine coins appears to indicate a steady pace. Although the asper declined in diameter, weight, and fineness over subsequent reigns, this type became standard under Andronikos III

⁹⁹⁷ Prior to the reign of Alexios II both St Eugenios and the emperor had been depicted standing. Bendall 2015, 18, 52; coin nos 51, 52, 53. BICC coin no ET 142.

⁹⁹⁸ Wroth 1911, LXXX-LXXXI; plate XXXVIII, coin no 2.

(1330-32), Manuel II (1332), Basil (1332-40), John III (1342-44), Michael (1344-49), Alexios III (1349-90), Manuel III (1390-1417), Alexios IV (1417-46), and John IV (1446-58).⁹⁹⁹ Equestrian figures thus became a much more common on Trapezuntine coins than on coins from Constantinople or Thessaloniki. Whilst St Eugenios had become the patron of Trebizond by the eleventh century, he was not a military saint.¹⁰⁰⁰

Besides artistic trends which could have influenced Andronikos III to reintroduce the riding emperor to Byzantine coinage, the links between the Palaiologans and Trebizond should also be remembered. Michael VIII had in 1267 married one of his daughters to David the Clever of Imereti, an immediate neighbour of Trebizond. Another of Michael's daughters, Eudokia, the half-sister of David, was married to John II Komnenos, emperor of Trebizond (1280-97), in 1282. John had angered Michael by referring to himself as 'emperor and *autokrator* of the Romans', but then gave up this claim, being styled subsequently 'emperor and *autokrator* of all the East, the Iberians, and the transmarine provinces'.¹⁰⁰¹ There were sound commercial reasons for links between Trebizond and the emperor in Constantinople, as goods coming from Constantinople and through the Straits were important to Trebizond, as well as kommerkion receipts from the Tabriz route.¹⁰⁰²

That the iconography of the rider should reappear so late on Byzantine coinage is unusual, for as detailed above, neighbouring powers had already

⁹⁹⁹ No coins are known for Irene (1340-41), Anna (1341-2), or David (1458-61). Bendall 2015, 56, 66.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Walter's work on the Byzantine warrior saints (2003) makes no mention of St Eugenios.

¹⁰⁰¹ This is an example of links being forged between a Palaiologan emperor and Trebizond. Nicol emphasises that Michael VIII's aim was to make a ruler of Trebizond acknowledge his dependence on Constantinople. Nicol 1972, 80-81.

¹⁰⁰² Bryer 1980, 341-42.

employed equestrian figures on coins. The Byzantine adoption of the motif on coins in the fourteenth century was suggested by Grierson to have probably been influenced by the asper of Alexios II of Trebizond (1297-1330) in the early fourteenth century, which features a riding emperor and a riding St Eugenios. The Byzantine coinage of Andronikos III would thus appear to be one of the last in the region to adopt equestrian types, with the exception of the issue by the Serbian tzar Stephen Dushan, dated c. 1345-55.¹⁰⁰³ If equestrian figures never died out in Byzantine representations they were nonetheless not as common as in the west, as is seen particularly on seals, where horseman types had been used, and where the figure of a mounted knight was used by the Latin emperors of Constantinople in the thirteenth century.¹⁰⁰⁴ Cotsonis describes an eighth-century Byzantine seal which features St Theodore as an equestrian figure, but notes that such mounted figures are not common.¹⁰⁰⁵ Gerstel notes a late twelfth-century seal of the sebastokrator Alexios Komnenos featuring an equestrian figure of St George on the obverse.¹⁰⁰⁶ She notes the rarity of Byzantine seals featuring equestrian figures but comments that from 1100 to 1250 seals depicting mounted warriors were the 'overwhelming choice' of western feudal lords. In a more recent confirmation of this western preference Mahoney refers to the seals of Baldwin I (r. 1204-05) and his younger brother Henry I, which feature an equestrian knight holding a sword and galloping right. She identifies these

¹⁰⁰³ Grierson DOC 5.1, 69-70.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Zacos and Veglery 1972, I, nos 112-14.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Cotsonis 2005, 449. At this time seals did not distinguish between St Theodore Tiron and St Theodore Stratelates: this distinction on seals did not appear until the tenth century.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Gerstel 2001, 269-70.

images as the specific seal iconography of western nobles.¹⁰⁰⁷ As has been seen, this western equestrian culture influenced Byzantium during the Latin occupation; whereas previously warrior saints were represented as standing figures on wall-paintings in churches on the borders of the Frankish Morea, they subsequently became equestrian figures during and after the Latin occupation, possibly reflecting fear of the occupiers by the indigenous population. Gerstel lists thirty-four Byzantine churches in the Morea which feature wall-paintings of equestrian saints.¹⁰⁰⁸ A similar transformation of saints from standing to riding figures had occurred earlier in Cyprus and the Holy Land when these areas came under the control of the Crusaders. Occasional earlier portrayals of riding warrior saints may be found in other border areas, particularly Cappadocia, suggesting that there was a tradition of seeking help from mounted figures in the defence of borders. Painted churches in Cappadocia, and churches in Georgia and Egypt, featured paintings of warrior saints on horseback, predating 1204.¹⁰⁰⁹

The transformation of an heroic figure, originally described as being on foot, into a mounted figure is seen also in the legend of Digenes Akritis. The Akritic oral cycle of ballads began in the tenth century, with Digenes represented as patrolling the frontier on foot. By the time the cycle came to be written down in the twelfth century he had been transformed into a rider.¹⁰¹⁰ The development of the legend was significant enough for Akritic figures to be represented on ceramic ware produced in the late twelfth and early thirteenth

¹⁰⁰⁷ Mahoney 2015, 140 and figures 13, 14.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Gerstel 2001, 281-85.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Gerstel 2001, 270-73; Stepanenko 2002, 70.

¹⁰¹⁰ Notopoulos 1964, 108-09, 123.

centuries from Corinth in the northern Morea. This pottery generally reflects the older tradition of Akritic-like warriors on foot, but a small number of pieces indicate the transition to a mounted figure: on four plates a rider killing a dragon is portrayed.¹⁰¹¹ Notopoulos believes that these figures must be Akritic, rather than St George or St Demetrios, because they wear the fustanella.¹⁰¹² It is not possible to make a specific identification of Digenes Akritis himself from these fragments, but there is clearly a generic link to Digenes amongst these Akritic figures, and they appear to form a stage in the transition from warriors on foot to warriors on horseback, in another medium to set alongside the transition seen in literary forms and in painting.

In the transformation from older to newer forms of riding figures there appears to have been a dual, and possibly contradictory response: Byzantine warrior saints continued to be evoked as protection against the threat of the Crusaders, but the new images given to the warrior saints had a more equestrian, i.e. western, form of expression. This western influence indicates the power of the Frankish chivalric tradition. Reference has been made to the increasing dominance of St Demetrios over other warrior saints and over the Archangel Michael on coinage (see p. 278-9 above). One of the effects of cultural exchange between Byzantine society and the Crusaders was that both sides laid claim to a similar group of saints. Immediately before the battle of Antioch in 1098 the Crusader army was reported to have seen 'a countless host of men on white horses', led by 'St George, St Mercurius and St

¹⁰¹¹ Nos 981, 983, 986, 1181. Notopoulos 1964, 120, and fn 49.

¹⁰¹² Notopoulos 1964, 113.

Demetrius', riding to assist them.¹⁰¹³ In this account St George is the leader named first, and the author refers later to a church near Ramleh 'worthy of great reverence, for in it rests the most precious body of St George'.¹⁰¹⁴ St George was regarded by the Crusaders as their patron and protector.¹⁰¹⁵ The Byzantines do not appear to have regarded the association between St George and the Crusaders as reason to disqualify him as a Byzantine protector, but his popularity on coinage decreased.

The increasing dominance of St Demetrios over St George on coins may be contextualised by reference to their appearances on seals. In his analysis of 7284 seals, dating from the sixth century to the late fourteenth/fifteenth centuries, Cotsonis notes that the Archangel Michael appears on 502 seals, St Theodore Tiron and St Theodore Stratelates on 446, St George on 445, and St Demetrios on 273.¹⁰¹⁶ Cotsonis' database shows that St George was clearly a more popular choice on seals than St Demetrios, and also that there was variation between the groups of seal users in their choice of military saint. Of those using St George 43.7% held office in the civil administration, 16.5% held military titles, and 32.4% could not be verified for title. By comparison, for those using St Demetrios on their seals, 30.1% were officials in the civil administration, 25.5% held military titles, and 27.4% could not be identified for title.

¹⁰¹³ *Gesta Francorum* 1979, 69, para 3.

¹⁰¹⁴ *Gesta Francorum* 1979, 87, para 1.

¹⁰¹⁵ Gerstel 2001, 267.

¹⁰¹⁶ Cotsonis 2005, 393-7; 388. Whilst the bulk of the appearances by these four military figures date from the sixth to the twelfth centuries, some occur later, up to the late fourteenth/fifteenth centuries. Seal production declined markedly after the eleventh century, due to a number of factors, including shortage of supply of lead and its increasing price, and the increasing use of wax seals.

In comparing the relative popularity of St George and St Demetrios on coins and seals the differing dates of the two media need to be remembered. Both saints appear most frequently on seals in the eleventh and late eleventh/early twelfth centuries.¹⁰¹⁷ As at this time of highest seal use St George was more popular than St Demetrios, but by the reign of Andronikos III St Demetrios was far more popular on coins than St George, a factor must be sought to explain this difference over time. Is it possible that the centres of cult for the two saints were influential? Cotsonis records that eighty-five seals featuring St George include geographic locations in their owners' titles, and of these 39 (45.9%) represent sites in Asia Minor. Of 73 seals featuring St Demetrios where inscriptions allow geographic reference, 46 (63.0%) are from Balkan regions, indicating that his cult was associated closely with the western part of the empire. St George was from Cappadocia, and his tomb was in Palestine; it would be natural that his cult would increase after the Byzantine reconquest of these areas in the tenth century.¹⁰¹⁸ However, by the fourteenth century these eastern areas had been lost by the Byzantines, and it is possible that a saint such as Demetrios, with his cult centred in the western empire, would be a more natural choice of military saint for the coinage than George, whose cult had originated in an area lost to the Byzantines.¹⁰¹⁹

¹⁰¹⁷ St George 11th century 217/445, 48.8%; late 11th/early 12th centuries 106/445, 23.8%. St Demetrios 11th century 145/273, 53.1%; late 11th/early 12th centuries 56/273 20.5%. Cotsonis 2005, 393-7.

¹⁰¹⁸ Cotsonis 2005, 461, 468.

¹⁰¹⁹ This possibility is reinforced by reference to St Theodore Tiron and St Theodore Stratelates on seals. In Cotsonis' database 79 of their seals include geographic regions in their inscriptions, and 47 of these (59.5%) are in Asia Minor. Cotsonis 2005, 457. As has been noted above, the popularity of the two St Theodores on coins also declined as the popularity of St Demetrios increased.

The noted lateness of the reappearance of the riding figure on coinage could have been influenced by the usual delay in the introduction of new iconography to coins. Morrisson concurs with Gerstel's suggestion that the reintroduction of equestrian images on coins had its origin in the early thirteenth-century wall-paintings in Morea, where the paintings would have acted to invoke powerful military figures to defend rural communities.¹⁰²⁰ The equestrian figures of St Demetrios and the emperor Andronikos III eventually started to appear on coinage from Thessaloniki;¹⁰²¹ subsequently, mounted figures appeared from Constantinople under John V.¹⁰²² In the Morea paintings the overall effect is closer to Crusader representations of equestrian figures, where the position of the horse's foreleg corresponds to that of the emperor's horse on coinage, with its gait appearing to be sedate rather than galloping.¹⁰²³

Internal evidence on the reintroduction of equestrian types to Byzantine coinage relates to the importance of riding in the imperial culture. It is surprising that the equestrian emperor type should appear so late on coinage, because the emperor had appeared in public on horseback since the early empire and was represented in various media in this way.¹⁰²⁴ This is demonstrated by the Barberini ivory of c. 500, the Bamberg silk, and the equestrian statue of Justinian I in the Augusteum. That an emperor was still expected to ride at the time of the very late empire is shown by the entry of

¹⁰²⁰ Morrisson 2007, 189; Gerstel 2001, 270-72.

¹⁰²¹ See p. 303.

¹⁰²² See p. 317.

¹⁰²³ e.g. the trachy of Andronikos III, LPC 242-43, coin no 15.

¹⁰²⁴ Riding figures had also appeared on Crusader, Seljuk, Armenian and Trapezuntine coins, which are discussed in this section.

Manuel II to Paris on June 3rd 1400, described by the chronicler of Saint-Denis: 'Imperator, habitum imperialem ex albo sibi a rege in itinere ablato, et super quem tunc ascendens agiliter non dignatus fuerat pedem ad terram ponere'.¹⁰²⁵ As a further example of the norm John VIII went to considerable lengths to insist that he be able to ride right up to his throne at the first meeting of the Council of Ferrara-Florence. When this could not be achieved the Council was suspended and a wall was broken through so that John could be carried to the throne without having to set a foot on the ground.¹⁰²⁶ John may have been asserting his imperial status, but there is the possibility that his action could have been partly or wholly prompted by illness. A contemporary account describes John as being 'tired and sick' whilst out riding and seeking shelter in Peretola, a village a few miles from Florence, as it was too late in the day to reach Florence. Giovanni de Pigli, a resident of Peretola, was approached by a member of the emperor's party with a request for shelter, and he relates that as John had lost the use of his legs, 'he came right up to our hall on horseback' and no one saw him dismount except members of his own party.¹⁰²⁷ This suggests that John's action in wanting to ride up to his throne at the Council may have had a medical reason, although it is possible that the reasons could have been both medical and an assertion of status.

Evidence of the status associated with horseriding is demonstrated by the protocol stating that mounted members of the imperial family were able to

¹⁰²⁵ *Chronique du religieux de Saint-Denis*, ed. L. Bellaguet, ii, 756, Paris 1840. Cited by R. Weiss, 'The Medieval Medallions of Constantine and Heraclius', *Numismatic Chronicle*, seventh series, vol. 3, 129-44, 1963.

¹⁰²⁶ Syropoulos 1971, 6.28, 326-29.

¹⁰²⁷ Setton 1958, 224 cites Giovanni de Pigli, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence, MS. 11, IV, 128, fols. 108v-110r = Bibl. Magliabecchiana, VI, 132.

enter the courtyard of the palace on horseback, while others would have to dismount; a boundary was established by the gate of the palace courtyard, which only the imperial family could cross on horseback. One exception was the patriarch who, after his promotion, was accorded the honour of dismounting inside the courtyard.¹⁰²⁸ *The Book of Ceremonies* also relates that there was a barrier beyond which only the imperial family might pass: the Saracens are referred to as having to dismount at the barrier of the Chalke.¹⁰²⁹ Choniates refers to Manuel I entering the gate beyond which only emperors are permitted to dismount.¹⁰³⁰ Imperial status was emphasised further by the designation of specific points for dismounting. According to the later account of Pseudo-Kodinos, the emperor and the imperial family dismounted at the *pezeuma*, deep inside the courtyard;¹⁰³¹ the *sebastokrator* at the *tetrastylon*; and the caesar 'near' the *tetrastylon*.¹⁰³² Mounting the horse was also an action emphasising imperial status: no less than three officials (the *komes*, the *protostrator*, and the *megas chartoularios*) assisted the emperor in mounting.¹⁰³³ Further evidence of the exclusivity of the courtyard is emphasised by a change introduced by Andronikos III: in order to humiliate his grandfather, Andronikos II, Andronikos III permitted washerwomen to enter and use the courtyard. Gregoras records that washerwomen could use the

¹⁰²⁸ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 256.3-5. Pseudo-Kodinos makes clear in his description that the patriarch was riding a horse, which itself indicates an increase in status for the patriarch over time, since *The Book of Ceremonies* refers to the patriarch as riding a donkey. *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, 612, [R612], 14-15.

¹⁰²⁹ *The Book of Ceremonies* 2012, 583, [583], 5-6.

¹⁰³⁰ Choniates 1984, 30, [51], 35-36.

¹⁰³¹ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 74.7, 198.5.

¹⁰³² Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 44.12-46.1, 46.9-10.

¹⁰³³ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 72.5-74.4.

courtyard 'whenever they wished to wash the garments of whomever they wished with running water'.¹⁰³⁴

The imperial privilege of remaining mounted whilst other persons had to dismount applied also when the emperor met another emperor and his entourage. Kantakouzenos describes the protocol whereby those persons in the entourage of each emperor dismount, whilst the emperors approach each other on horseback. The younger emperor removes his hat, bends, and clasps the hand of the elder emperor. He then kisses the elder emperor on the face.¹⁰³⁵ Some high-ranking friends of an emperor were occasionally accorded the honour of having those whom they met dismount for them; Choniates describes how John Axouch, the *megas domestikos* of John I Komnenos, was greeted in this way.¹⁰³⁶

In Byzantine protocol there were other locations where only the emperor was entitled to ride, as at the feast and procession of the Ascension. On this occasion the emperor was permitted to ride through the outer door of the Church of the All-holy Theotokos of the Spring into the atrium and to dismount there, whilst all other participants proceeded on foot.¹⁰³⁷ The honour of the emperor alone being able to ride when all other persons were on foot was seen also when the emperor was received by the Blues and Greens at the Chalke during the Feast of the Annunciation.¹⁰³⁸ Further, when the emperor went by carriage to inspect the granaries of the Strategion only

¹⁰³⁴ Gregoras I, 431.14-432.3.

¹⁰³⁵ Kantakouzenos, I, 167.21-168.3.

¹⁰³⁶ 'When John ascended the throne, Axuch was awarded the office of grand domestic, and his influence was greatly increased, consequently, many of the emperor's distinguished relatives, on meeting him by chance, would dismount from their horses and make obeisance.' Choniates 1984 7, [9.23-10.3].

¹⁰³⁷ *Book of Ceremonies* 2012, 109, [R109], 9-13.

¹⁰³⁸ *Book of Ceremonies* 2012, 168, [R168], 12-14.

his carriage and its horses were allowed inside the Hippodrome, the starting point of the journey to the granaries; the chariots and horses of the *archontes* were required to wait outside.¹⁰³⁹

The examples cited above demonstrate that a great deal of information on horse etiquette is given in *The Book of Ceremonies*, in Kantakouzenos, and with a particular wealth in Pseudo-Kodinos. This information is in considerable detail, even down to the weather: the emperor rides to the Blachernai to keep the vigil for the Dormition of the Virgin if the weather is bad, but travels by boat when fine.¹⁰⁴⁰ With similar attention to detail Kantakouzenos describes not only the protocol when emperors meet, but also the comparable protocol of the Serbs.¹⁰⁴¹ Given that the importance of horse etiquette was well-known, and further that it was described by Pseudo-Kodinos in relation to clothing and imperial ritual, the lateness of the reappearance of the riding emperor on Byzantine coins is surprising.

The emperor on horseback was portrayed on the backs of the *skaranika* worn by a group of officials, from the *megas droungarios tes vigles* to the *protoierakarios*. The enthroned emperor was portrayed on the fronts of these *skaranika*.¹⁰⁴² The image of the emperor on horseback was also used by higher ranking officials than the middle order group of officials represented by the *megas droungarios tes vigles* to the *protoierakarios*. The *megas doux*, as head of the navy, flew a banner which depicted the equestrian emperor.¹⁰⁴³

¹⁰³⁹ *Book of Ceremonies* 2012, 699, [R699], 11-12.

¹⁰⁴⁰ *Book of Ceremonies* 2012, 542, [542], 5-6.

¹⁰⁴¹ See p. 286. Kantakouzenos II, 261.13-262.13.

¹⁰⁴² Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 58, 13-14 and fn 84; 334; 352 and fn 224; 383. Some officials in this group wore the turban, and not the *skaranikon*.

¹⁰⁴³ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 70.11-72.1.

Another banner depicting the equestrian emperor was amongst a group of banners placed opposite the *prokypsis*.¹⁰⁴⁴ The riding emperor was also portrayed on shields. When the emperor wore his crown, on occasions such as the promotion of a patriarch or despot, four of the most eminent court title holders stood by the emperor, each holding a round shield featuring the equestrian emperor motif; and each of the four also held a lance.¹⁰⁴⁵

The importance of equestrian status is indicated further by the link between the colour of the footwear of the highest officials and the trappings of their horses. Both shoes and saddle of the despot were two-coloured (violet and white) and decorated with eagles made of pearls.¹⁰⁴⁶ The *sebastokrator* wore blue shoes, with eagles embroidered in gold wire on a red field, and his saddle was also blue with the same decoration of eagles.¹⁰⁴⁷ The shoe/saddle link is seen again for the *panhypersebastos* (yellow shoes and saddle), and for the *protovestiaros* (green shoes and saddle).¹⁰⁴⁸ These examples indicate that the horseback emperor was an important element of decoration on the costume of court officials and that horse fittings were closely linked to the costumes of officials. Such equestrian references in the fourteenth century also make it surprising that the image of the horseback emperor should have been absent for so long from coins, and only reappeared during the reign of Andronikos III.

The long gap between seventh- and fourteenth-century representations of a mounted figure on Byzantine coins does not, however, reflect that such a

¹⁰⁴⁴ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 130.7-8.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 242. 8-11.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 36.3-38.6.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 44.7-12.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 52.1-2 and 52.5-6.

gap necessarily existed for equestrian depictions in other media. Manuel I appeared in a painting on the gate of a house, accompanied by the Virgin, Christ, St Theodore Tiron, St Nicholas, and an angel. The description refers to 'the horseman Tiro, Christ's martyr, who rides in front of you'. If St Theodore was mounted then Manuel must also have been depicted on horseback.¹⁰⁴⁹ Magdalino and Nelson draw attention to a portrait of Isaac II, now lost, but known through a poem of Theodore Balsamon.¹⁰⁵⁰ They point out that although the equestrian depiction of the emperor disappeared as an official genre after Justinian I, the equestrian statue of Justinian stood in the Augusteum until the fifteenth century. Horse and rider motifs on the Bamberg silk of the late eleventh century, and on a bronze medallion from Cyprus, possibly of the twelfth century, are noted by Magdalino and Nelson.¹⁰⁵¹

The Bamberg silk was probably woven in honour of the victories of Basil II over the Bulgarians in 1014-18. It was found in the tomb of Bishop Gunther (d. 1065) in Bamberg Cathedral.¹⁰⁵² Magdalino and Nelson draw attention also to an eleventh-century steatite icon of St Demetrios on horseback and carrying a sword over his right shoulder.¹⁰⁵³ Further, a bronze medallion, which depicts an apparently imperial figure on horseback and dates to the last part of the twelfth century, has been described by Whittemore. He identifies the rider as Isaac Doukas Komnenos, who usurped

¹⁰⁴⁹ Mango 1986, 226, Cod. Marc. Gr. 524, fol. 36r.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 152-60. K. Horna, 'Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon', *Wiener Studien*, 25, (1903), 165-217; and Lampros, *Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς Κῶδιξ* 524, p. 131ff.

¹⁰⁵¹ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 156, fn 82.

¹⁰⁵² Wixom 1997, 436.

¹⁰⁵³ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 157 and plate XIII; steatite icon in the Kremlin Armoury, Moscow.

the title of *basileus* on Cyprus, and held it from 1184-91.¹⁰⁵⁴ Isaac is portrayed galloping left; he wears a crown, *skaramangion* and *loros*, and carries a labarum in his left hand. Whittemore suggested that the stimulus for such equestrian portraits was due to the influence of Crusader imagery, citing in particular rider portraits on coins from Trebizond as being influenced by the Crusaders during the Latin occupation.¹⁰⁵⁵ However, the authenticity of this medallion has been questioned: Magdalino and Nelson draw attention to misspellings in the inscription, although Whittemore accepts these inaccuracies.¹⁰⁵⁶ A further example of the use of horse and rider motifs is the Troyes casket.¹⁰⁵⁷ These examples suggest that mounted depictions of an emperor and a warrior saint had not disappeared on media other than coins. The novel and important feature of equestrian representations by Andronikos III was that they appeared on the base metal coinage.

The gait of the emperor's horse could be portrayed in several modes. A halted horse, not just a sedate gait, is seen in Pisanello's medal of John VIII, and in a preliminary drawing for the medal. (**Figs. 78, 79.**)¹⁰⁵⁸ The drawing was probably made at the time of the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-39) and the medal was probably engraved c. 1438-43. The obverse of the medal is a portrait of John, while the reverse shows two depictions of John on horseback. The image on the left of the reverse shows John from the rear, halted. The image on the right shows John halted before a tall cross, and

¹⁰⁵⁴ Whittemore 1954, 184-92.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Whittemore 1954, 190 and fn 40.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Magdalino and Nelson 1982, 156. Whittemore 1954, 187.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Wixom 1997, 204-6; Grabar 1971, 50, 61.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Medal: British Museum, Dept of Coins and Medals, George III, Naples 9. Drawing: Musée du Louvre, Département des Arts graphiques, M1 1062R; F. Reiset Gift. Georganteli and Cook 2006, 66-7. **See figs. 78 and 79.**

showing devotion in that his right arm is raised, with the hand at shoulder level, suggesting that he is making the sign of the cross; he would not be holding the reins at this high level. In the drawing his right arm is by his side. The drawing shows John mounted and facing right; it also features members of John's retinue and a horse's head.

A halted horse, or one with a sedate gait, suggests that the emperor is approachable, and could signify that petitioning the emperor is possible. Several sources record how petitions could be presented to the emperor, in both military and civilian contexts. The military context is described by Constantine Porphyrogenetos.¹⁰⁵⁹ The emperor may ride out whilst on campaign, accompanied by a large retinue, including two *kandidatoi*, or *spatharioi*, who receive persons who approach and lead them to the emperor. The petitioners hand over their requests to the *kandidatoi*, who give them to another official, the 'master of petitions'.¹⁰⁶⁰ In the civilian context Theophilos (829-42) is recorded as riding through Constantinople every Friday and receiving petitions along the way.¹⁰⁶¹ Individual emperors may have adopted different procedures: Alexios I received petitions at Philopation whilst sitting.¹⁰⁶² Andronikos III did not enjoy mingling in crowds, so may not have received petitions in public.¹⁰⁶³ This raises the possibility that Andronikos may have portrayed himself on his coins on horseback, and with a sedate gait, to give the impression that he was approachable, even if he was not. This

¹⁰⁵⁹ Haldon 1990, 124.487-126. 496.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Macrides translation, 2004, 358. Haldon gives 'secretary of requests'; Haldon 1990, 126. 495-6.

¹⁰⁶¹ Regel 1891, 98.41.15-18. Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 76.15-78.2.

¹⁰⁶² Büttner-Wobst 1897, 111, 753, 1-12.

¹⁰⁶³ Gregoras 1, 565, 18-24.

suggestion is reinforced by the posture of Andronikos on these coins: when mounted he is portrayed as turning full face to the viewer, an unusual posture for a rider.¹⁰⁶⁴

Petitioning in a civilian setting is described by Pseudo-Kodinos, in a sequence known as *kabalikeuma*. The emperor rides out, accompanied by trumpeters, drummers, and horn players. The trumpets have a distinctive sound which signals that people can approach and present petitions to the emperor.¹⁰⁶⁵ The emperor is accompanied by a suite of 'in-train' horses, so that there is always a spare horse, in case of an unforeseen occurrence, or accident. Pseudo-Kodinos notes that this practice goes back to Theophilos.¹⁰⁶⁶ This description of a sequence for petitioning suggests that the emperor would have been riding in a sedate manner, so that a petitioner could have had some chance of approaching him; had the emperor been galloping this would have been impossible. Further, if the horse's gait on coins signifies approachability, it is possible that this is a reference to the approachability and humility shown by Christ in his entry to Jerusalem. Riding a horse rather than a donkey does not negate a reference to Christ's entry to Jerusalem: Vikan points out that a clay token depicting Christ's entry shows a horse.¹⁰⁶⁷

On coins, the gait of the horse is the essential difference between the depiction of an emperor and St Demetrios. The emperor's horse is depicted as walking, and where the emperor and St Demetrios appear together on

¹⁰⁶⁴ e.g. on his trachy, LPC 242-3, coin no 15.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 80.5-82.2.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, 76.15-78.9.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Vikan 1984, 75. For Christ as a 'holy rider' see p. 46/7 and fn 145 of this thesis.

three coins (one of Andronikos III, one of Andronikos IV, and one of Manuel II), both horses are walking. Only when St Demetrios appears alone on horseback is his horse depicted as galloping.¹⁰⁶⁸ These differences in gait reinforce the roles of the two figures: the approachability of the emperor, and the provision of assistance by St Demetrios. Although the horse of St Demetrios walks when saint and emperor are depicted together the strength of the saint and the approachability of the emperor are linked.

Gait may also indicate a connection with the arms carried by St Demetrios. Where St Demetrios rides on the same coin where the emperor rides, in contrast to when he rides alone, the saint is unarmed. These coins are: a trachy of Andronikos III;¹⁰⁶⁹ a tornese of Andronikos IV¹⁰⁷⁰ and a tornese of Manuel II.¹⁰⁷¹ However, where St Demetrios is the sole rider on a coin (i.e. the emperor does not ride on either obverse or reverse), in four portrayals out of five he brandishes a sword. The four armed portrayals are:

John V half stavraton¹⁰⁷²

John V half stavraton¹⁰⁷³

Manuel II half stavraton¹⁰⁷⁴

Manuel II Class IV tornese.¹⁰⁷⁵

¹⁰⁶⁸ On an assarion of John V St Demetrios appears on horseback on the obverse but there are no specimens of this coin in BICC, DOC or LPC. It is recorded in DOC and Sear but illustrated in neither. It is therefore impossible to determine the gait of the saint's horse on this coin. DOC 5.1, 186; Sear 2538.

¹⁰⁶⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, no specimen or illustration; LPC 242-43, coin no 15

¹⁰⁷⁰ BICC: coin no B6382. DOC 5.1, 209, coin nos 1258-60; 5.2 plate 66, coin nos 1258-60.

¹⁰⁷¹ BICC: coin no B6453. DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1598; 5.2, plate 80, coin no 1598.

¹⁰⁷² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 212, coin nos 1298-1300. 5.2 plate 69, coin nos 1298-1300.

¹⁰⁷³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 212, coin no 1301. 5.2 plate 69, coin no 1301.

¹⁰⁷⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 216, coin nos 1311-15. 5.2 plate 70, coin nos 1311-15.

¹⁰⁷⁵ BICC: coin no B6458. DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1601. 5.2 plate 80, coin no 1601.

Manuel II's Class V tornese¹⁰⁷⁶ has a similar equestrian portrayal of St Demetrios riding alone; but wear on the coin makes it impossible to determine if he carries a sword, and this has been confirmed by examination of the coin in the DO collection.¹⁰⁷⁷

In summary, where the mounted emperor is depicted on coins, his horse walks, and where St Demetrios appears with the emperor, or on the opposite side of the coin, the saint's horse walks also. St Demetrios' horse is portrayed as galloping when the saint is on his own without the emperor. A galloping horse is associated with a military saint: Stepanenko refers to an image of St George on a thirteenth-century Byzantine cup from Beriozovo where the saint's horse appears in a 'flying gallop'.¹⁰⁷⁸ When St Demetrios gallops he brandishes a sword; the riding emperor is unarmed. St Demetrios usually wears armour, although coin wear sometimes makes it difficult to distinguish items of dress. The military issues of Andronikos III are summarised below.

Basilica (Silver), Constantinople, Heavy Series

Class 2 obverse: Christ on high-backed throne, holding Gospels on knee. IC
XC

¹⁰⁷⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1602. 5.2 plate 80, coin no 1602.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Dr Jonathan Shea, personal communication.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Stepanenko 2002, 71.

Reverse: emperor (on l.) standing with St Demetrios, who holds cross on chest. A|N|ΔP|NI|KO|C Γ|O|A Δ|H|MH|TP|IOC (**Fig. 66.**)¹⁰⁷⁹

Half-basilicon obverse: St Demetrios standing with spear in r. hand and shield in l. O|A|ΓI|OS ΔH|MH|TP|OS

Reverse: emperor standing l. with hands raised to Virgin on r. M|P Θ|V A|N|Δ|N|K|S (**Fig. 65.**)¹⁰⁸⁰

Basilica (Silver), Constantinople, Light Series

Nb there are minor differences in class numbering between DOC 5.1 and 5.2 for this series, but coin numbers are identical. This account numbers classes as DOC 5.1.

Class 2 obverse: Christ standing with r. hand raised in blessing. IC XC

Reverse: St Demetrios standing l. holding cross on chest; emperor standing r.

ΔHMHTPIOC Γ|O|A ANΔPONIKOC (**Fig. 67.**)¹⁰⁸¹

Class 3 obverse: Virgin orans standing facing. MP ΘV

Reverse: St Demetrios standing l. holding cross on chest; emperor standing r.

ΔHMHTPIC Γ|O|A ANΔPNIKA¹⁰⁸²

¹⁰⁷⁹ BICC: coin no B6351. **See fig. 66.** DOC 5.1, 165, coin nos 858-63; 5.2, plate 48, coin nos 858-63.

¹⁰⁸⁰ BICC: coin no B6350. **See fig. 65.** DOC 5.1, 166, coin nos 867-68; 5.2, plate 48, coin nos 867-68.

¹⁰⁸¹ BICC: coin no B6353. **See fig. 67.** DOC 5.1, 165, coin nos 871-73; 5.2, plate 48, coin nos 871-73.

¹⁰⁸² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 165, coin no 874; 5.2, plate 48, coin no 874.

Class 4 obverse: Christ seated on high-backed throne; r. hand raised in blessing and l. holding book. IC XC

Reverse: St Demetrios standing l. holding cross on chest; emperor standing r. (Reverse inscriptions are incomplete variants of Class 3.)¹⁰⁸³

Tornesi, Billon, Constantinople

Class 3 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael facing holding trifurcate sceptre in r. hand and globus with pellets in l. OAM

Reverse: cross on base above crescent. IC XC¹⁰⁸⁴

Class 4 obverse: bust of Virgin. +ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΝ ΜΘ

Reverse: three-quarter figures of emperor on l. and St Demetrios on r. holding cross on chest. ΑΝΔΝ ΓΟΑ ΔΜΗΝ (**Fig. 69.**)¹⁰⁸⁵

Class 5 obverse: bust of Virgin. +ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΝ ΜΘ

Reverse: three-quarter quarter figures of St Demetrios on l. holding cross on chest and emperor on r. ΔΗΜ ΓΟΑ¹⁰⁸⁶

Stamena, Copper, (Concave), Constantinople

Class 1 obverse: St Demetrios in armour with spear in r. hand and shield in l.

¹⁰⁸³ BICC: coin no B6352. DOC 5.1, 165, coin nos 875-81; 5.2, plate 48, coin nos 875-81.

¹⁰⁸⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 167, coin nos 883-84; 5.2, plate 49, coin nos 883-84.

¹⁰⁸⁵ BICC: coin nos B6366-67. **See fig. 69.** DOC 5.1, 167, coin no 885; 5.2, plate 49, coin no 885.

¹⁰⁸⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 167, coin no 886; 5.2, plate 49, coin no 886.

O|A|ΓI|OS ΔH|MH|TPI|OS

Reverse: emperor standing with labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. AN|ΔP|NI|KO|S Δ|E|C|Π|O|T¹⁰⁸⁷

Class 2 obverse: St Demetrios in armour with spear in r. hand and shield in l.

O|A|ΓI|O|S ΔH|MH|TPI|OS

Reverse: cross fleury. ¹⁰⁸⁸

Assaria, Copper, (Flat), Constantinople

Class 1 obverse: half-figure of St George in armour holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. OA|ΓE ΩP|ΓI|S

Reverse: half-figure of emperor holding cross-sceptre in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. ANΔPNK (**Fig. 68.**)¹⁰⁸⁹

Trachea (Copper), Thessaloniki

Class 1 obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael holding sword over r. shoulder and shield in l. hand.

¹⁰⁸⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 168, coin nos 887-89; 5.2, plate 49, coin nos 887-89.

¹⁰⁸⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 168, coin nos 890; 5.2, plate 49, coin no 890.

¹⁰⁸⁹ BICC: coin nos B6363-64. B6365 is similar but emperor holds labarum-headed sceptre instead of cross-sceptre. **See fig. 68.** DOC 5.1, 168, coin nos 894-95; 5.2, plate 49, coin nos 894-95. Grierson notes that Bendall has argued that this coin belongs to Andronikos II/Michael IX, but does not accept this, although there is no hoard evidence which would prove definitive, including the CNG (Classical Numismatic Group) hoard. Grierson awards the coin to Andronikos III on a provisional basis, and this is accepted here. DOC 5.1, 168.

Reverse: emperor on l. crouching before Christ. ANΔ|PONI|KOC|ΔEC|ΠO|T
IC XC¹⁰⁹⁰

Class 2 obverse: bust of St Demetrios holding spear. OA

Reverse: Archangel Michael on l. blessing emperor holding two patriarchal
crosses. AM¹⁰⁹¹

Class 5 obverse: bust of St Demetrios with ? sword in r. hand. O|A Δ MH|TP

Reverse: emperor on low throne holding patriarchal cross in r. hand. B¹⁰⁹²

Class 6 obverse: half-figure of St Demetrios with spear in r. hand and shield
in l. Γ|A|I Δ|H|T

Reverse: emperor standing holding two patriarchal crosses.¹⁰⁹³

Class 7 obverse: St Demetrios seated with sword across knees. O|AΓ|IO
Δ|M|HT|P

Reverse: emperor holding lys in r. hand and cross-sceptre in l.¹⁰⁹⁴

Class 8 obverse: facing bust of Archangel Michael.

Reverse: winged emperor with haloed cross in r. hand and sceptre in l. B¹⁰⁹⁵

Class 12 obverse: bust of St Demetrios with spear on shoulder. B

¹⁰⁹⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin nos 913-17; 5.2, plate 50, coin nos 913-17.

¹⁰⁹¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin no 918; 5.2, plate 50, coin no 918. Rest of obverse and reverse inscriptions uncertain.

¹⁰⁹² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin nos 922-26; 5.2, plate 50, coin nos 922-26.

¹⁰⁹³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin nos 927-28; 5.2, plate 51, coin nos 927-28.

¹⁰⁹⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin no 929; 5.2, plate 51, coin no 929.

¹⁰⁹⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin no 930; 5.2, plate 51, coin 930.

Reverse: emperor riding r. holding sceptre. (**Fig. 8.**)¹⁰⁹⁶

Class 13 obverse: Palaeologan monogram. B

Reverse: emperor riding r. holding sceptre. (**Fig. 7.**)¹⁰⁹⁷

Class 14 obverse: St Demetrios in breastplate and military tunic riding r. holding ? labarum in r. hand.

Reverse: emperor riding r. B (**Fig. 9.**)¹⁰⁹⁸

Class 15 obverse: monogram and lattice pattern.

Reverse: emperor riding r. holding labarum-headed sceptre in r. hand. (**Fig. 71.**)¹⁰⁹⁹

Class 18 obverse: Palaeologan monogram. B

Reverse: St Demetrios on l. holding spear in r. hand and emperor holding labarum-headed sceptre in l. hand; they hold between them staff surmounted by lys. ΔΗΜΗ ΑΝΔΡ (?)¹¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁹⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, no specimen or illustration. LPC 242-43, coin no 14. No letters except B. **See fig. 8.**

¹⁰⁹⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, no specimen or illustration. LPC 242-43, coin no 13. No letters except B. **See fig. 7.** This type (Shea O), and another (Shea P) occur in the Salonica hoard of Longuet, and are linked by mules. Coin 37 has a P obverse and O reverse, while coin 38 has an O obverse and P reverse. Shea notes Bendall's argument that the relatively high quality flat flans indicated the mint's wish to launch successfully the assarion (replacing the trachy) early in the reign. However he states that this is only plausible if the mules are ignored, and suggests that the types may date to 1337, when Andronikos was in Thessaloniki prior to his campaign against Epeiros. Shea 2015, 308.

¹⁰⁹⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, no specimen or illustration. LPC 242-43, coin no 15. No letters except B. **See fig. 9.**

¹⁰⁹⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, no specimen or illustration. LPC 254-55, coin no 1, which describes the object held by the emperor as a sceptre cruciger, although in the illustration it appears clearly to be a labarum-headed sceptre. Grierson in DOC convincingly attributes this coin to Andronikos III, and this thesis accepts this attribution, but Bendall attributes it to Manuel II. No inscriptions. **See fig. 71.**

Class 19 obverse: bust of St Demetrios holding sword. A/O/Γ.....H

Reverse: emperor standing holding patriarchal cross in r. hand and globus cruciger in l.¹¹⁰¹

Conclusions: The issue of coins with military iconography in the period 1261 to 1341 is characterised by a number of features. Overall, the period saw a greater number of coin types issued than previously because emperors tended to change types on an annual basis. Such frequent changes have the effect of making dating of types difficult, and, in addition, the numbers of each type surviving may be small, as each type was issued only for a short time. The percentages of military types issued varied, but generally corresponded more to the earlier period of 1042-1204 than to 1204-61. Military types also tended to be concentrated on the base metal coinages. One consistent feature, observable from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, was that Thessaloniki issued a higher percentage of types with military iconography than Constantinople. Of individual military figures, the Archangel Michael and St Demetrios shared equal popularity at first, with St George and St Theodore being much less popular. By the mid-fourteenth century St Demetrios had become the dominant figure, eclipsing the Archangel Michael. The period witnessed the decline in appearances of the armed emperor, but was also marked by the reappearance under Andronikos III of a riding figure, either the

¹¹⁰⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin nos 936-40; 5.2, plate 51, coin nos 936-40. Grierson states that object held by emperor is a cross-sceptre, but it appears to be a labarum-headed sceptre.

¹¹⁰¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 171, coin no 941; 5.2, plate 51, coin no 941.

emperor, or in a further enhancement of his status, St Demetrios. When Andronikos III was portrayed on horseback on his coins he did not gallop, unlike St Demetrios. Such a sedate gait could have implied approachability for petitioning the emperor. The reappearance of a riding figure on Byzantine coinage occurred late compared to the use of riding figures on other coinage, e.g. Crusader and Seljuk, and to the use of mounted figures of warrior saints in wall- paintings in border areas of the empire.

Military Symbolism on Coins from the Mid-Fourteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries

John V's reign, one of the longest in Byzantine history (1341-91), was marked by major setbacks: by the time of his death over half of the empire's possessions in Europe had been lost. Many of the problems which John faced appear familiar, including religious differences with Rome and rivalry between Venice and Genoa. From a numismatic viewpoint John tended to issue fewer types of coins over time than his immediate predecessors, but these types form a complicated pattern in relation to the political events of the reign. Grierson divides the coin issues into six phases: ¹¹⁰²

- I. 1341-47: regency and civil war – Anna and John V.
- II. 1347-53: John V and John VI Kantakouzenos.
- IIIa. 1353-54: John VI Kantakouzenos.
- IIIb. 1354-57: Matthew Asen Kantakouzenos.
- IV. 1354-76: John V.
- V. 1376-79: Andronikos IV (usurper).

¹¹⁰² DOC 5.1, 173.

VI. 1379-91: John V.

For the whole reign there were 77 issues of coins, of which 25 bore military imagery (32.5%). In the separate phases noted above the military issues/total issues ratios are:

I. 6/11 (54.5%)

II. 3/20 (15.0%)

IIIa. 4/5 (80.0%)

IIIb. 1/1 (100%)

IV. 6/31(19.3%)

V. 2/4 (50.0%)

VI. 3/5 (60.0%)

The percentages of military types varied in different phases of the reign, and military types were relatively prolific during phase I and phase V. Phase I marked the accession of John at the age of nine years, with the regency of his mother, Anna of Savoy. This period saw civil war with John V and Anna being opposed by the Grand Domestic, John Kantakouzenos, who was crowned emperor at Adrianople in 1346 and who entered Constantinople in February 1347. Terms were arranged such that he and John V became co-emperors. All coins struck from 1341 to 1347 are attributed to John V and Anna, and not to John Kantakouzenos. Phase V constituted the usurpation by one of the sons of John V, Andronikos IV, from 1376 to 1379. While the percentage (50%) of military issues in phase V appears to be relatively high, it is from a low overall number of issues (four). A similar example of a low number of overall issues is seen in phase IIIa (five issues) and phase IIIb (one issue),

but with higher percentages of military issues. These phases also represented periods of civil unrest; whilst John VI ruled alone from April 1353 to February 1354 he was then forced to abdicate by John V in a coup. In December 1354 John V was forced to abdicate and Matthew Asen Kantakouzenos, the eldest son of John VI, became emperor. It is therefore not surprising to find a high number of military issues in times of such insecurity.

If the number of military issues for these phases noted above was well above the average for the reign as a whole (32.5%), two of the other three phases saw below average productions of military issues. Phase II (1347-53) saw the lowest military proportion (15.0%) for the whole of John's reign, and phase IV (1354-76) produced only slightly more military issues (19.3%). This is surprising in that the years 1347-53 and 1354-76 were times of continuing instability. 1347-53 were years marked for John V by continuing dynastic tensions from John VI and Matthew; by great shortages of money; and by plague in Constantinople in 1347-48. Despite Thessaloniki's recovery from the Zealots in 1350 its subsequent governance was problematic. The years 1354-76 saw two periods when John V sought help from the west, when he was absent from Constantinople: 1365-67, when visiting Hungary; and 1369-71 when visiting Rome. John V was weakened by the victory of the Turks over the Serbs on the Maritza in 1371 and in effect became a vassal of Murad in 1372. In 1376 Andronikos IV occupied Constantinople and imprisoned John V and Manuel II. Given the length of this entire phase (twenty-two years) it is unusual to note that despite the thirty-one types of coin issued there are

relatively few surviving examples.¹¹⁰³ The final phase (VI) of John V's reign from 1379 to 1391 produced 60.0% of military issues, almost double the mean of 32.5% for the whole reign. Phase VI saw further dynastic clashes between John V and Andronikos IV. The latter died in 1385 but his claim to power was assumed by his son John VII. One factor tending to decrease military issues during phase VI was that minting appears to have taken place solely at Constantinople, and not Thessaloniki, which traditionally produced more military issues.

Minting does not appear to have taken place at Thessaloniki in four phases of the reign of John V, i.e. IIIa, IIIb, V and VI. Despite this, phases IIIa, IIIb, and V contain higher than average proportions of military issues than the overall reign. It should be remembered however that all three of these phases consist of only small numbers of issues, and may therefore be atypical. Several of the periods of high frequencies of military imagery corresponded to times of civil war. Phase I with 54.5% of military issues corresponded to hostilities led by John VI supported by the Serbs and Turks against groupings including the Bulgarians and Venetians, in an attempt to dominate John V. Phases IIIa and b combined, with 83.3% of military issues, saw further hostilities between John V (with Bulgarian, Serbian and Venetian support) and John VI (with Turkish support). John V faced further civil war with Matthew Kantakouzenos in 1356. Phase V with 50.0% military issues was marked in 1376 by war between John V and Andronikos IV, with the latter having

¹¹⁰³ DOC 5.1, 192.

Genoese and Turkish support. In 1379 there were again hostilities with John V supported by the Venetians and Turks fighting Andronikos IV.¹¹⁰⁴

The military issues of John V are summarised below in terms of military personages, and then for these personages by mint.¹¹⁰⁵

St Demetrios	22/77	28.6% (includes five equestrian types)
Archangel Michael	4/77	5.2%
Riding emperor	3/77	3.9%
St George	1/77	1.3%

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Constantinople</u>		<u>Thessaloniki</u>	
St Demetrios	11/54	20.4%	9/20	45.0%
Archangel Michael	--		3/20	15.0%
Riding emperor	3/54	5.5%	--	
St George	1/54	1.8%	--	

	<u>Didymoteichon</u>		<u>Adrianople</u>	
St Demetrios	2/2	100%	--	
Archangel Michael	--		1/1	100%
Riding emperor	--		--	
St George	--		--	

¹¹⁰⁴ Treadgold 2006, 233.

¹¹⁰⁵ The total of these individual figures adds to more twenty-five because some coins feature more than one military figure.

When the position on obverse or reverse is examined St Demetrios appears thirteen times on the obverse and nine times on the reverse; this includes one coin where he appears on both obverse and reverse. For issues from Constantinople he features seven times on the obverse and four times on the reverse. For Thessaloniki these figures are obverse five times and reverse four times.¹¹⁰⁶ The Archangel Michael features three times on the obverse and once on the reverse, including one coin where he appears on both obverse and reverse. The riding emperor has one obverse appearance and two reverse.

It is clear from the overall figures that St Demetrios had become the predominant military personage on coins, confirming a trend which began under Andronikos II, and became established under Andronikos III. Whilst on the coins of Andronikos II the total number of appearances of St Demetrios and the Archangel Michael are nearly equal, on the coins of Andronikos III St Demetrios predominates, and this trend is strongly reinforced during the reign of John V. The Archangel Michael appears on only 5.2% of John V's coins, appearing to confirm that his higher number of appearances on the coins of Michael VIII relates to name association.

Another change from the reign of Michael VIII relates to the armed emperor image, which appeared on 5 types (5.7%) out of a total of 87 for Michael. This represented the last use of this image, as it did not feature on the coins of Andronikos II, Andronikos III, or John V. However, the riding emperor appears on 4 types (9.5%) from a total of 42 for Andronikos III, and 3

¹¹⁰⁶ The remaining appearances of St Demetrios are on coins from Didymoteichon.

times (3.9%) out of 77 types for John V. It would appear that the riding emperor type thus replaced the armed emperor type. A further equestrian symbol on John V's coinage is provided by St Demetrios, who appears riding five times. This image of St Demetrios demonstrates the lag in adopting on coins images used in other applications, as an equestrian St Demetrios had appeared on a lead seal dated to the late eleventh/early twelfth century.¹¹⁰⁷ Thus by the time of John V the main military element on coins was being provided by a warrior saint or an archangel, although the coins of John V hardly feature St George, and St Theodore makes no appearances at all.

These data may be analysed further by mint; it is then significant that while St Demetrios appears on a higher proportion of military issues from Thessaloniki, he makes more individual appearances on coins from Constantinople than from Thessaloniki. The Archangel Michael is seen on 15.0% of all issues from Thessaloniki, but on no issues from Constantinople. The riding emperor is confined to the capital and does not feature on any coins from Thessaloniki. The data for individual mints also confirms previous observations in that the proportion of military issues is markedly higher from Thessaloniki (60.0%) than from Constantinople (27.8%). Thessaloniki enjoyed considerable independence during the reign of John V, with Anne of Savoy as governor 1352-65, but the city fell to the Ottomans in 1387.

The increasing number of appearances by St Demetrios on coins from Constantinople may be considered in the context of his cult in that city. The saint had well-documented connections with Constantinople and it is perhaps surprising that his increasing popularity on coins, and hence his displacement

¹¹⁰⁷ Cotsonis 2005, 463.

of other warrior saints, should have had to wait until the fourteenth century. Walter has argued that the development of St Demetrios from noble saint to warrior saint occurred in Constantinople, not Thessaloniki, between the eighth and eleventh centuries.¹¹⁰⁸ St Demetrios was adopted by the great families of the capital, particularly the Komnenoi and the Palaeologi. Alexios I is said to have owned an icon of St Demetrios, and Manuel I is said to have moved a silver cover from the saint's tomb in Thessaloniki to the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople. George Palaiologos built a monastery to St Demetrios in the capital and this building was restored by Michael VIII, after the Latin occupation.¹¹⁰⁹ St Demetrios still remained firmly the saint of Thessaloniki;¹¹¹⁰ indeed, Walter concedes that in the thirteenth century there was an 'astonishing renewal' of his cult in Thessaloniki. Walter makes no mention of the surge in appearances on coins of St Demetrios in the thirteenth century, nor his rise to predominance on coins in the fourteenth century. These changes on coinage are understandable against the background of the renewal of the saint's cult, and the growing use of St Demetrios on Constantinopolitan coins can be understood as building on an interest already present; St Demetrios became pre-eminent among the warrior saints. The time taken for him to appear on coins from the capital perhaps reflects the slow adaptation of the coinage to images from other contexts.¹¹¹¹

¹¹⁰⁸ Walter 1973, 174.

¹¹⁰⁹ Walter 1973, 166-67.

¹¹¹⁰ Macrides 1990, 193.

¹¹¹¹ Morrisson suggests that those emperors who had previously reigned in Thessaloniki were more likely to employ the symbol of St Demetrios on their coins from Constantinople. Morrisson 2007, 189.

The increasing dominance of St Demetrios amongst military figures on coinage has been compared above to his appearances on lead seals (see p. 290-2.) For seals of the period prior to the twelfth century, St Demetrios was less popular than the Archangel Michael, St George and St Theodore; Cotsonis suggests that this was due to the concentration of the cult of St Demetrios in Thessaloniki. Thus the sphragistic evidence for St Demetrios is that the military aspect of the cult appeared first in the Thessaloniki area, and was associated with civil and military officials, and not with the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Constantinople. The military depiction of St Demetrios on seals became widespread in the eleventh century, and Cotsonis argues that this undermines the conclusion of Walter that the definitive establishment of Demetrios as a warrior saint did not occur until the thirteenth century.¹¹¹² Cotsonis also sees the sphragistic evidence as confirming that the military image of St Demetrios spread from his shrine at Thessaloniki and not from soldier emperors such as Basil II and the imperial portrait in Basil's Psalter.¹¹¹³

The lag in adopting the image of St Demetrios on coinage is clear and its history can be traced. An equestrian image of the saint is seen on a steatite icon which is now in the Kremlin Armoury. According to tradition this icon was given to Dimitrij Donskoj, the Grand Prince of Moscow (1350-89), after his victory at Kuliko field.¹¹¹⁴ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner dates the icon to the fourteenth century, although in an earlier paper Walter opted for a twelfth-

¹¹¹² Cotsonis 2005, 465. Walter 2003, 91. It should be noted that Walter argued for the later date in his 2003 work, after having previously supported an earlier date between the eighth and eleventh centuries. Walter 1973, 174.

¹¹¹³ Cotsonis 2005, 465.

¹¹¹⁴ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1985, 198-200.

century origin,¹¹¹⁵ and in a later paper Morrisson quoted an eleventh-century date.¹¹¹⁶ In the next stage of the spread of such equestrian figures Gerstel dates their appearance on wall-paintings in Orthodox churches on the borders of the Frankish Morea to the time of Latin rule. Further, some fifty churches in the Mani are believed to have been decorated with wall-paintings of equestrian warrior saints in the latter part of the thirteenth century, after the region had returned to Byzantine control. Riding saints continued to be added to church decorations in the area into the fourteenth century. These riding saints, who included St George and St Theodore as well as St Demetrios, were both a reaction to regional threats and also a reflection of Frankish chivalric culture.¹¹¹⁷ It is of interest that the idea that the equestrian warrior saints, and St Demetrios in particular, could provide protection for border regions has also been applied to Thessaloniki and Constantinople: when allowance is made for the normal delay in transferring such images to coins, these two cities had in effect become 'border cities'.¹¹¹⁸ Whilst Morrisson notes that the equestrian image of St Demetrios came to be chosen for coins from Constantinople as well as coins from Thessaloniki, she does not record the extent to which he came to dominate coinage which featured a warrior saint.¹¹¹⁹ The coins of John V with military images are listed below.

¹¹¹⁵ Walter 1973, 176 and fig. 12.

¹¹¹⁶ Morrisson 2007, 189 and fn 80, citing Bakirtzis, C. (ed.) *Αγίου Δημητρίου Θαύματα*, Athens 1997, colour plate 4.

¹¹¹⁷ Gerstel 2001, 270-1.

¹¹¹⁸ Morrisson 2007, 189.

¹¹¹⁹ Morrisson 2007, 189.

Phase I Silver Basilica, Constantinople

Class 1 obverse: St Demetrios on l. and Andronikos III standing, holding cross between them. ANΔPOINK Γ|O|A ΔHMHT

Reverse: John V standing with labarum in r. hand and globus cruciger in l. Above, bust of Christ. IC XC¹¹²⁰

Class 5 obverse: St Demetrios on l. and Virgin, standing. Δ|H|M|T|I Γ|Δ MΘ

Reverse: Anna and John V standing holding long cross between them. ANNA IΩENXΩ or I|U|N|U (sic)¹¹²¹

Phase I, Copper, Thessaloniki

Class 1 stamenon obverse: bust of St Demetrios holding spear in r. hand and shield in l. ΓO Δ/HM

Reverse: John crouching before Christ, who holds cross-sceptre over his l. shoulder.¹¹²²

Class 2 stamenon obverse: bust of Archangel Michael.

Reverse: Archangel Michael presenting kneeling emperor to nimbate figure holding spear (presumably St Demetrios).¹¹²³

¹¹²⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 178, coin no 944; 5.2, plate 52, coin no 944.

¹¹²¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 178, coin nos 1146-75; 5.2, plate 61, coin nos 1146-69, plate 62, coin nos 1170-75.

¹¹²² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 180, coin nos 1188-89; 5.2, plate 62, coin nos 1188-89. Longuet's Salonica hoard contains an example of this type: Longuet specimen 2; Shea type R, no 58. Shea 2015, 299, 302.

Class 1 assarion obverse: Archangel Michael standing.

Reverse: Andronikos III standing on l. and John V on r.¹¹²⁴

Class 2 assarion obverse: St Demetrios standing with spear in r. hand and shield in l.

Reverse: half-figures of John V standing on l. with Anna on r., holding long cross between them.¹¹²⁵

Phase II, Constantinople

Basilicon, silver, Class 7 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding spear and shield. ΛΗΜ/ΤΗ/Ρ/Ο

Reverse: John V and John VI standing, each holding an *akakia* and holding a third *akakia* jointly. ΚΝΚ Ι ΠΛΟ¹¹²⁶

Basilicon, silver, Class 8 obverse: emperor riding r. and holding cross-sceptre.

ΙΩC|XΩ|B O|ΠΛ|A

Reverse: emperor riding r. and holding cross-sceptre. ΙΩC|XΩ|E O|ΠΛΘ

(Fig. 72.)¹¹²⁷

¹¹²³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 180-81, coin no 1190; 5.2, plate 62, coin no 1190. Letters of inscription uncertain. N.b. in 5.1, 180 Grierson states that the reverse shows the emperor being presented to Christ, but corrects this in 5.2 plate 62.

¹¹²⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 181, coin no 1191; 5.2, plate 62, coin no 1191. No inscription. Longuet's Salonica hoard contains an example of this type: Longuet specimen 11; Shea type T, nos 61-65. Shea 2015, 299, 302.

¹¹²⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 181, 186, coin no 1192; 5.2, plate 62, coin no 1192. No inscription. Longuet's Salonica hoard contains an example of this type: Longuet specimen 10; Shea type S, nos 59, 60. Shea 2015, 299, 302.

¹¹²⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 185, no specimen or illustration, not in LPC.

¹¹²⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 185, no specimen. LPC 144-5, coin no 7. **See fig. 72.**

Assarion, copper, Class 5 obverse: St Demetrios riding r.

Reverse: two emperors standing holding large cross.¹¹²⁸

Phase IIIa, Silver Basilica, Constantinople

Class 1 obverse: Christ seated on high-backed throne. IC XC B|HN

Reverse: emperor standing on l. with St Demetrios, who holds cross on his chest. KTKZN Γ|O|A ΔHMTP¹¹²⁹

Class 2 obverse: Christ seated on high-backed throne. IC XC B|HN

Reverse: emperor standing on r. and St Demetrios on l. holding cross on his chest. ΔHMTP Γ|O|A KTKZN¹¹³⁰

Phase IIIa, Silver Basilica, Didymoteichon

Class 4 obverse: Christ seated on high-backed throne. IC XC B|HN

Reverse: emperor standing on l. with St Demetrios. +BNTU (?) Γ|Δ|O
OK..N..¹¹³¹

Class 5 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding spear and shield. M|TH|Π|O
Λ+

¹¹²⁸ BICC: no specimen. No inscription. DOC 5.1, 186, no specimen or illustration, nor in LPC. Sear 2538.

¹¹²⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 188, coin no 1205; 5.2, plate 63, coin no 1205.

¹¹³⁰ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 188, no specimen or illustration, nor in LPC.

¹¹³¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 188, coin no 1206; 5.2, plate 63, coin no 1206. Reverse inscription blundered.

Reverse: John VI standing on l. with John V on r., each holding labarum-headed sceptre; and holding *akakia* between them. ΚΝΚ Ι ΠΛΟ¹¹³²

Phase IIIb, Silver Half-Basilica, Adrianople

Obverse: half-figure of Archangel Michael above walls of city being blessed by Christ. ΧΜ or ΧC

Reverse: emperor standing. ΚΤΚΖΝ ΑCΝ¹¹³³

Phase IV: Politikon and Related Coins

Stamenon obverse: St George standing holding spear and shield. Ο|Α|Γ|Ο|S
Γ|Ε|Ω|Ρ|Γ|Ο|S

Reverse: emperor standing holding cross-sceptre and globus cruciger.

Ι|Ω|Ε|Ν|Χ|Ω|Τ|Ω|Θ|Ε Δ|Ε|C|Π|Ο|Τ|S¹¹³⁴

Copper assarion, Thessaloniki, obverse: emperor standing on l. holding sceptre in r. hand; St Demetrios with l. hand on his chest.

Reverse: Anna of Savoy standing under arch, surrounded by stars. (**Fig. 70.**)¹¹³⁵

¹¹³² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 189, no specimen or illustration, nor in LPC.

¹¹³³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 190-91, no specimen or illustration, nor in LPC. This coin is unusual in showing only a junior co-emperor, without a senior colleague, and may thus have been struck in 1355, when Matthew was at war with John V.

¹¹³⁴ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1: no entry. 5.2, plate 64, coin nos 1226-27.

¹¹³⁵ BICC: coin no B6583. No inscription. **See fig. 70.** DOC 5.1, 199, coin no 1230; 5.2, plate 64, coin no 1230.

Copper Assaria, Thessaloniki

Class 1 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding spear and shield; long cross on either side.

Reverse: emperor standing; haloed cross in r. hand and model of city in l. ¹¹³⁶

Class 2 obverse: double-headed eagle.

Reverse: standing figures of emperor on l. and St Demetrios; emperor holds sceptre cruciger in r. hand, with model city between the two figures.¹¹³⁷

Class 3 obverse: St Demetrios standing holding spear and shield. O|Γ/OA/O/C
ΔI|MH|TPI|OC

Reverse: St Demetrios (?) standing on l. shaking hands with emperor who holds model city in his l. hand.¹¹³⁸

Class 4 obverse: emperor standing on l. holding sceptre cruciger in r. hand and *akakia* or cross in l. In r. field is building (? shrine).

Reverse: soldiers on l. thrusting spears into St Demetrios seated on r. (**Fig. 73.**)¹¹³⁹

¹¹³⁶ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 203, no specimen or illustration; LPC 238, coin no 8. No inscription. (Not no 9 as stated by Grierson.)

¹¹³⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 203, no specimen or illustration; LPC 206, coin no 4. No inscription.

¹¹³⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 203; no specimen or illustration; LPC 256, coin no 1.

1139 BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 204-06, coin nos 1251-54; 5.2, plate 66, coin nos 1251-54. No inscription. LPC 262-63, coin no 5. **See fig. 73.** Grierson notes that the presence of a specimen in the First Belgrade Gate (Istanbul) hoard confirms its date to the later part of the reign of John V.

Phase V Andronikos IV

Follis obverse: Palaeologan monogram. +ANΔPONIKOVΔEΠIOTOV

Reverse: emperor and St Demetrios riding right, emperor with cross over r. shoulder. (**Fig. 74.**)¹¹⁴⁰

One-eighth stavraton obverse: St Demetrios riding r. ANΔPON IKOC

Reverse: emperor holding patriarchal cross sceptre.¹¹⁴¹

Phase VI 1371-91

Half-stavraton Class 1, obverse: mounted St Demetrios holding sword and galloping r. ΔMH|T

Reverse: bust of emperor holding sceptre cruciger in l. hand. Iω (**Fig. 64.**)¹¹⁴²

Half-stavraton Class 2, obverse: mounted St Demetrios holding sword and galloping l. H|M

Reverse: bust of emperor holding sceptre cruciger in l. hand. ...ΔEΠIOT...¹¹⁴³

Follaro obverse: St Demetrios standing with spear in r. hand and shield in l.

Δ|MH|TP

Reverse: bust of emperor with sceptre cruciger on l. shoulder. (**Fig. 76.**)¹¹⁴⁴

¹¹⁴⁰ BICC: coin no B6382. **See fig. 74.** DOC 5.1, 209, coin nos 1258-60; 5.2, plate 66, coin nos 1258-60.

¹¹⁴¹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 208-09, no specimen or illustration; LPC 152, coin no 2 and note.

¹¹⁴² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 212, coin nos 1298-1300; 5.2, plate 69, coin nos 1298-1300. Rest of reverse inscription blundered. **See fig. 64, coin no 1298, BZC.1960.88.4746.**

¹¹⁴³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 212, coin no 1301; 5.2, plate 69, coin no 1301.

The issue of coins with military iconography ended during the reign of Manuel II, who was associated co-emperor by John V in 1373, becoming sole emperor on the death of John. Manuel was absent from Constantinople from 1399 to 1403 whilst visiting Europe seeking aid from the west against the Ottomans; during this time John VII was the effective emperor. Despite Manuel's lack of economic and military strength he benefitted from the defeat of Bayezid at Ankara in 1402 and the subsequent civil war between factions after Bayezid's death in 1403.¹¹⁴⁵ Ottoman forces had tried to take Constantinople in 1394/95, and in 1422, but Manuel was able to hold out on both occasions. From late 1422 when Manuel suffered a stroke to 1425, the empire was effectively ruled by his son John VIII.¹¹⁴⁶ Manuel issued 13 types of coin, in groups which show a number of minor differences; 5 (38.5%) feature military symbolism. Manuel's coinage consists of heavy and light series. The heavy series was issued from 1391 to 1394/5, and consists of a variety of stavrata, half-stavrata, and one-eighth stavrata, all in silver; and copper folles. The light series, so-called because of a reduction in weight, was issued from 1394/5 to 1425 and comprises stavrata, half-stavrata, and one-eighth stavrata, all in silver; and copper follari. There was a gap from 1399 to 1403 during Manuel's absence, when John VII issued four types, none of which bore military iconography.

¹¹⁴⁴ BICC: B6457, B6458. DOC 5.1, 212, no specimen or illustration. LPC 170, coin no 3. **See fig. 76.** Baker suggests that this coin might be attributed to Thessaloniki, dated to between 1382 to 1387, and being produced by Manuel II in the name of his father John V. Manuel had been appointed governor of Thessaloniki in 1369, and was proclaimed co-emperor in 1373. Baker 2006, 408.

¹¹⁴⁵ Doukas 1975, [4-11], 92-95.

¹¹⁴⁶ Grierson 1999, DOC 5.1, 211.

Manuel's copper coinage provides difficulties in precise dating. Whilst a number of coins could be from the later part of his reign, Types 1 and 2 of the folles appear to be from early in the reign.¹¹⁴⁷ The Type I follis is of particular interest in featuring Manuel and St Demetrios riding right. (**Fig. 75.**)¹¹⁴⁸ In the inscription Manuel has the title *despotes*. This raises the possibility that *despotes* refers to the period of Manuel's governorship of Thessaloniki from 1382 to 1387, although there is a lack of information that Manuel minted coins in the city at this time.¹¹⁴⁹ An alternative date would be 1403, the date of the recovery of Thessaloniki after the Ottoman conquest of 1394.¹¹⁵⁰ The image of the emperor and St Demetrios riding together is very rare; besides this example of Manuel II the only other similar type known is that of Andronikos IV. This copper coin of Andronikos IV was issued during phase V (1376-79) of the reign of John V. (**Fig. 74.**)¹¹⁵¹ The issue of Manuel II and the issue of Andronikos IV can be distinguished by the inscription, either Manuel or Andronikos. Interestingly, each emperor is referred to as *despotes*. The gait of the emperor's horse and the gait of St Demetrios' horse appears to be steady on the types of both Manuel and Andronikos. A galloping horse is seen only where St Demetrios is depicted riding alone. Neither the emperor

¹¹⁴⁷ DOC 5.1, 223.

¹¹⁴⁸ BICC: coin no B6453. **See fig. 75.** DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1598; 5.2, plate 80, coin no 1598.

¹¹⁴⁹ DOC 5.1, 211. There is also uncertainty about Manuel's title of *despotes*. He held Thessaloniki as an appanage, but Thessaloniki was not strictly a despotate. Kazhdan, ODB, 614.

¹¹⁵⁰ In 1403 Thessaloniki was recovered from the Turks and became an appanage for John VIII (1403-8). The city was handed over to the Venetians in 1423 in the hope that they could better defend it. I am grateful to Dr Siren Celik for valuable suggestions about possible dates for this coin.

¹¹⁵¹ BICC coin no B6382. **See fig. 74.** DOC 5.1, 209, coin nos 1258-60; 5.2, plate 66, coin nos 1258-60.

nor St Demetrios appear to be armed when they ride together, either on the type of Manuel II or the type of Andronikos II.

In Manuel's five types of coin with military imagery the military element consists of St Demetrios, with four examples from Constantinople (4/12, 33.3%) and one from Thessaloniki (1/1, 100%). No other military figure is featured, apart from the emperor riding with St Demetrios on the copper tornese from Thessaloniki. In three of the five types St Demetrios is armed. In four of the five types featuring St Demetrios he also appears mounted, continuing a practice of the saint on horseback seen also on the coins of Andronikos III and John V. All the appearances of St Demetrios, and the one appearance of Manuel riding, are on the obverse. With these last Byzantine coins to display military iconography (neither John VIII nor Constantine XI issued coins with military symbolism), St Demetrios achieved total ascendancy; the Archangel Michael is not featured, nor are any military saints except St Demetrios. Manuel II relied entirely on St Demetrios in his appeals for military aid in the early part of his reign.

But despite this apparent popularity of St Demetrios, he appeared on the silver coinage of Manuel II for only a short time, from 1391 to 1394/5; or, if the Class I follis does date to the recapture of Thessaloniki, until 1403. When Manuel's light coinage was created after 1394/5 the image of St Demetrios was replaced by the bust of Christ, creating a type which was to be little changed until the end of the empire. St Demetrios, having come to dominance over all other military figures on the coinage, was thus eclipsed. Instead of invoking the help of St Demetrios, the coinage for the remainder of the reign

of Manuel II, and for the remaining years of the empire, invoked the help of Christ. The coins of Manuel II featuring military symbolism are listed below.

Half-Stavraton, Silver, Heavy Series, Constantinople

Obverse: St Demetrios with sword galloping r.

Reverse: bust of emperor holding sceptre cruciger in r. hand.

+MANOVHA..EN XΩTΩΘV(?)¹¹⁵² ΠICTOC BACIAEVC (**Fig. 77.**)¹¹⁵³

Copper Folles

Type I (Thessaloniki) obverse: emperor and St Demetrios riding r.

Reverse: Palaeologan monogram. +MANOH [ΛΔEC] ΠIOTIC (**Fig. 75.**)¹¹⁵⁴

Type 3 (presumed Constantinople) obverse: three-quarter figure of St Demetrios holding spear across chest with r. hand, and shield in l.

Reverse: bust of emperor with small patriarchal cross in r. and l. fields.

+MANOVHAENXΩTΩΘΩΠICT (sic)¹¹⁵⁵

Type 4 (Constantinople) obverse: St Demetrios brandishing sword and galloping r. *Manus Dei* in upper r. field.

¹¹⁵² This query is recorded in DOC 5.2, in the caption to plate 70.

¹¹⁵³ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 216, coin nos 1311-15; 5.2, plate 70, coin nos 1311-15. **See fig. 77, coin no 1311, BZC.1956.23.4743.** N.b. St Demetrios gallops right on 1311-12 but left on 1313-15.

¹¹⁵⁴ BICC: coin no B6453. **See fig. 75.** DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1598; 5.2, plate 80, coin no 1598.

¹¹⁵⁵ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1600 (from Bendall collection); 5.2, plate 80, coin no 1600.

Reverse: bust of emperor with pellet in l. field and Palaeologan monogram in r.; outer circle of pellets. (**Fig. 76.**)¹¹⁵⁶

Type 5 (Constantinople) obverse: St Demetrios riding r. with ? monogram or letters in field.

Reverse: bust of emperor holding sceptre cruciger in r. hand.

+MANOVHAENXΩTΩΘΩΠICTOC (sic)¹¹⁵⁷

In seeking reasons for the disappearance of military symbols from coins from 1394/5 onwards it may be asked what factors were involved. Christ became the sole spiritual power invoked on coins in the fifteenth century; the coin types of John VIII and the few coin types of Constantine XI are very similar, consisting of the bust of Christ on the obverse, and the bust of the emperor on the reverse. The Virgin does not appear on any of these coins; nor do any of the warrior saints. But if the power of Christ became the sole religious symbol on these late coins, does the coinage of John V and that of Manuel II offer any clues on the disappearances of the Virgin and of the military saints?

The Virgin appears on the coins of John V from 1341 to 1354, and her last appearance is on a stamenon dated to 1347-54;¹¹⁵⁸ she does not appear again on Byzantine coinage. From 1341 to 1347 the Virgin makes a series of significant appearances with St Demetrios, as well as conventional ones

¹¹⁵⁶ BICC: B6458. **See fig. 76.** DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1601; 5.2, plate 80, coin no 1601. No inscription. Baker has shown that this type was minted by Manuel II in the name of John V. Manuel was co-emperor from 1373 and operated out of Thessaloniki against the Turks 1382-87. Baker 2006, 408. **MOVE TO JOHN V?**

¹¹⁵⁷ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1602; 5.2, plate 80, coin no 1602.

¹¹⁵⁸ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 185, coin no 1198. 5.2, plate 63, coin no 1198.

where she blesses the emperor, or appears on her own. On the Class V silver basilica the Virgin appears on the obverse with St Demetrios, but she stands in the junior position, i.e. on the viewer's right.¹¹⁵⁹ This assignment of the junior position is highly unusual, as prior to these issues it was normal for the Virgin to occupy the senior position (on the viewer's left), unless she was portrayed as blessing the emperor with her right hand, which entailed her being on the viewer's right. Careful scrutiny of these appearances with St Demetrios show that she is not blessing him and standard Byzantine practice would have required her to be in the senior position.¹¹⁶⁰

Thus this Class V basilicon of John V suggests a diminished status for the Virgin, in marked contrast to the status ascribed to her in the Akathistos. The ascendancy of St Demetrios over all other warrior saints on coins has been noted above (see p.323): of the 77 coin types of John V St Demetrios appears on 22 (28.6%); the Archangel Michael on 4 (5.2%); and St George on 1 (1.3%). The status of St Demetrios in relation to the Virgin is enhanced in that he continues to appear on coins of the late fourteenth century, whilst the Virgin appears on no coins of John V post-1354. A tornese of the usurper Andronikos IV (1376-79) shows on the reverse the emperor and St Demetrios riding right,¹¹⁶¹ and St Demetrios continued to appear in the late reign of John V (1379-91); on a silver half stavraton he appears galloping on the

¹¹⁵⁹ BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 178-79, coin nos 1146-75. 5.2, plates 61 and 62, coin nos 1146-75.

¹¹⁶⁰ There is a solitary earlier example of this reversal of precedence on a half basilicon of Andronikos III where on the reverse the emperor stands in the senior position but is not being blessed by the Virgin in the junior position. St Demetrios appears on his own on the obverse. BICC: coin no B6350. DOC 5.1, 166, coin nos 867-68. 5.2, plate 48, coin nos 867-68.

¹¹⁶¹ BICC: coin no B6382. DOC 5.1, 209, coin nos 1258-60. 5.2 plate 66, coin nos 1258-60.

obverse.¹¹⁶² These coins of Andronikos IV and John V are the first where St Demetrios is depicted on horseback. Although the Virgin has disappeared from the coinage, St Demetrios now has the status of being mounted, the same status as the emperor in terms of conveyance, and this was maintained on the coins of Manuel II. St Demetrios and Christ are the only religious figures who appear on the coins of Manuel II. On two of the late coins St Demetrios appears riding alone on one, and riding accompanied by the emperor on one. (**Fig. 76.**)¹¹⁶³

The splendour of Justinian I on the Barberini ivory was noted at the start of chapter three; the contrast with the equestrian portrayal of Manuel II on his Class I copper tornese listed above could not be greater, either in imperial grandeur or craftsmanship. These final appearances of riding figures on Byzantine coins provide a marked contrast with the earlier depictions of riding figures in the seventh century. The fifteenth-century examples, although they fill the whole flan, are poorly executed and in base metal. The seventh-century examples fill only the shield held by the emperor, but are part of a carefully delineated assertion of imperial power on gold of high fineness.¹¹⁶⁴ Even St Demetrios did not survive on coins after 1394/5, when a bust of Christ comprises the sole religious type; this use of Christ could be a reflection of the immense power originally ascribed to Him in the early empire, and of the seriousness of the Ottoman military threat. The decline of the

¹¹⁶² BICC: no specimen. DOC 5.1, 212, coin nos 1298-1301. 5.2 plate 69, coin nos 1298-1301.

¹¹⁶³ Saint alone: BICC no specimen. DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1601. 5.2 plate 80, coin nos 1601-02. Saint with emperor: BICC coin no B6453. DOC 5.1, 223, coin no 1598. 5.2 plate 80, coin no 1598.

¹¹⁶⁴ e.g. the gold solidus of Tiberios III, BICC coin no B4439.

empire is mirrored in the coinage of John VIII, which consists of only four types, all of poor execution, and his stavraton is identical to that of Manuel II, except for the change of the emperor's name in the inscription. In summary, the sequence of the disappearance of military types on coins in the late empire shows the image of St Demetrios becomes dominant over the images of all other warrior saints, and then even over images of the Virgin, who disappears. Finally, the image of St Demetrios disappears, leaving the image of Christ as the only religious type. The few coins of Constantine XI are symbolic of that emperor's fate: almost alone, with only Christ to aid him.

Imperial Portraits in Other Media, 1261-1453

In terms of portraits which have survived there is a contrast between the period pre-1204 and that post-1261. In the earlier period it has been noted that in media other than coins there are a number of portraits of emperors in military costume, e.g. in the Psalter of Basil II. Pre-1204 too there are coin issues featuring military iconography. By contrast post-1261 the number of military representations on coins increases, but these are the only military representations, for in other media the emperor does not appear in martial forms. Thus whilst the coinage of Michael VIII, Andronikos II, Andronikos III, John V, and Manuel II all feature military iconography, in portraits in other media all these emperors are in civilian attire and do not carry weapons. Michael VIII had himself portrayed at the feet of the Archangel Michael on a bronze statue at the church of the Holy Apostles, and whilst the archangel would thus provide a military link, the description of the statue by Pachymeres does not mention the emperor being armed or in military dress. Pachymeres

describes the statue on a column, with the emperor at the feet of the archangel, and offering to him a model of Constantinople for protection by the archangel. In the earthquake of 1296 the archangel lost his head and the city slipped from the hands of the emperor; head and city fell to the ground.¹¹⁶⁵

The dress of Michael VIII, Andronikos II, Andronikos III, John V and Manuel II is similar in a number of their portrayals, in that the emperor wears a crown, *skaramangion*, *loros*, and often stands on a *suppedion*. Typically the emperor carries a sceptre cruciger in his right hand, held diagonally across his chest. In his left hand he holds the *akakia*. This form of portrayal is seen for Michael VIII in several different works.¹¹⁶⁶ Andronikos II is portrayed in the same way.¹¹⁶⁷ John V is shown similarly in a drawing by Fossati of a mosaic in Hagia Sophia, and although the top of the object held in the right hand cannot be seen the *akakia* held in the left hand is shown clearly.¹¹⁶⁸ John VI is well portrayed as president of a church council, again holding the sceptre cruciger in his right hand, and *akakia* in his left.¹¹⁶⁹ Manuel II appears, with the sceptre cruciger in his right hand and *akakia* in his left.¹¹⁷⁰ Michael VIII was portrayed on two *peploi* presented to the Genoese, probably in 1261. One *peplos* survives and one scene on it portrays Michael VIII being escorted to the church of St Lawrence, with the Archangel Michael also present. The second *peplos* depicted Michael VIII but does not survive. A third *peplos*

¹¹⁶⁵ Pachymeres 1999, 259.26-261.5, [B234].

¹¹⁶⁶ Spatharakis 1976, fig. 109, Monac. gr. 442, ff. 174r; and fig. 112a, Cod. Mb 13, p.247, University Library, Tübingen.

¹¹⁶⁷ Spatharakis 1976, fig. 110, Monac. gr. 442, ff. 175v; and fig. 112b, Cod. Mb 13, p. 252, University Library, Tübingen.

¹¹⁶⁸ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, plate 1; photograph Archivio di Stato del Cantone Ticino, Bellinzona, (Svizzera, Fondo Fossati no 364).

¹¹⁶⁹ Pseudo-Kodinos 2013, plate 2, Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

¹¹⁷⁰ Spatharakis 1976, figs. 175-76, Par. Suppl. Gr. 309, f. VI.

depicting Pope Gregory X leading Michael VIII to St Peter was sent to the Pope in 1274.¹¹⁷¹

Conclusions: The period 1341-1425 saw a continuing annual change of types, producing many coin issues, and a difficulty in precise dating. In terms of the specific interests of this thesis the percentage of military issues was less than in the earlier part of the fourteenth century, but higher than in the pre-1204 period.¹¹⁷² Until minting ceased at Thessaloniki the city produced a higher proportion of military issues than Constantinople. The trend of the increasing dominance of St Demetrios continued, and in particular his increasing popularity in Constantinople as well as in Thessaloniki. By the reign of Manuel II (1391-1425) St Demetrios was the only warrior saint appearing on coins, but his popularity there did not appear to be matched by his appearances on seals. Although lead seal evidence falls off markedly after the twelfth century, St Demetrios was less popular on seals than St Theodore, St George and the Archangel Michael. The status of St Demetrios was enhanced in that on the coins of Manuel II he also features as a mounted figure in four of his five appearances; in one of these four he is accompanied by the riding emperor.

¹¹⁷¹ Macrides 1980, 34-36. In a comprehensive review Hilsdale suggests that the silk functioned as a diplomatic gift given to seal an agreement which aimed to restore Constantinople to the Byzantines and to legitimate Michael VIII. The imagery is thus more subtle than the usual images of victory, and Hilsdale dates the silk to 1261, on the eve of the city's restoration to the Byzantines. Hilsdale 2010, 151-99. Toth concurs with the date and demonstrates the emphasis of Michael VIII's association with the Archangel Michael, in a study utilising literary and material evidence. Toth 2011, 91-109.

¹¹⁷² However, the more general background to these specific topics was markedly different between the two periods of 1261-1341 and 1341 to the 1390s. In the early part of the period 1261-1341 the Byzantine empire still extended from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, and included part of western Asia Minor and part of the Morea. But by the 1330s much of this territory had been lost, and after the abdication of John VI in 1354 the empire was more or less a vassal state, and under increasing strain resulting from the Ottoman advance into the Balkans. The second half of the 14th century too saw the Byzantine coinage declining from its traditional basis in gold to one of silver and copper, and its circulation area decreasing such that its main use was in Constantinople, and to some extent in Thessaloniki; Metcalf notes the lack of hoards or site-finds of Byzantine coins of this period in the Balkans. (Metcalf 1979, 333.)

But this was the last appearance of St Demetrios on Byzantine coins: after the 1390s invocations on coins were to Christ.

CONCLUSIONS

Military symbols appeared on Byzantine coins from 491 until the early eighth century, and again when the coinage was remilitarised from 1042 to 1425. Such types formed part of the imperial projection of themes of power, required because of external threats from other rulers, and internal threats from the military aristocracy, whose power was increasing in the eleventh century. Hereditary succession was never routine in Byzantium, and most emperors were not secure on the throne; revolution has been called a 'constitutional norm'.¹¹⁷³ Emperors sought to issue coins quickly once they had achieved the throne, as a means of consolidating their authority. Early in their reigns emperors also sought to project imperial power by triumphs. Whilst large numbers of the population would have witnessed triumphs in Constantinople, these spectacles would not have been seen everywhere. Such limitations of access did not apply to coinage, making it the ideal medium for the projection of power, over ceremonial, dress and portraits.

The design of Byzantine coinage, and especially the projection of imperial power, is argued here to have been deliberate, and not a random process left to mint operatives; ancient Greek and Roman coins offer precedents for deliberate intent. Further evidence in Byzantine terms is provided by *The Book of Ceremonies* and by Pseudo-Kodinos, as in both texts there is a wealth of information on the detail and precision of Byzantine ritual. Such attention to detail argues for coin design to have been equally deliberate: as an example, where several members of the imperial family

¹¹⁷³ Angelov 2006, 11. Angelov cites Beck for this term, and for a discussion of *Kaiseridee*: H.-G. Beck, *Das byzantinische Jahrtausend* 52-9, 78-86, Munich 1978.

appear together on a coin a strict order of seniority is applied, mirroring the attention to hierarchy, to order, in ceremonial. Deliberate efforts in coin design are occasionally recorded in the primary sources, and could indicate the use of coinage for what is now termed propaganda, although the word 'propaganda' is of seventeenth-century origin, and its negative aspects are an accretion from the later part of the twentieth century. 'Propaganda' is a term used loosely in relation to coin design and care is needed in its use. Information available on Byzantine coins offers a valuable source which can be used alongside the written records and imperial portrayals in other media. Penna envisages the imperial portrait on coins, in conjunction with a divine or saintly figure, as eloquent and powerful symbols of imperial power and purpose.¹¹⁷⁴ Military symbols on coins were reintroduced from 1042 by Constantine IX, who portrayed himself as the armed emperor. In this way Constantine may have heeded the advice of Psellos to protect himself by doing so metaphorically, portraying himself on his coinage in armour and carrying a sword. This discreet portrayal was altered radically by Isaac I's use of a drawn sword on his *histamenon*, an acknowledgement that military prowess had become part of the imperial ideal. The coins of Michael VII and Nikephoros III are broadly similar to those of Constantine IX and Isaac I in that all four emperors wear armour and carry a sword; all wear a crown with cross and pendilia, but not a helmet; and all four place Christ or the Virgin on the obverse.

¹¹⁷⁴ Penna 2002, 127-8.

The range of military types was expanded by the introduction of St Demetrios by Alexios I; of St George, a warrior saint with particular appeal to the army, by John II; of St Theodore by Manuel I; and of the Archangel Michael by Isaac II. St Demetrios appeared initially on coins from Thessaloniki, and St George, having appeared initially on coins from Thessaloniki, subsequently appeared from Constantinople also. Alexios I issued military types in the early part of his reign only, but John issued military types throughout his reign. Dynastic factors probably prompted the issue of military types early in an emperor's reign, while external factors were more relevant in later parts of a reign. The coins of John II showed a further development in the use of military symbols with the reintroduction of the spear and shield, not seen on the coinage since the reign of Leo III. This further remilitarisation of the coinage fits with John's deathbed speech, reported by Choniates, in which he twice refers to himself as a military commander under God.¹¹⁷⁵ Although Nikephoros III had produced one military type in billon, Constantine IX, Isaac I and Michael VII had utilised only gold and silver.

These military symbols contained a strongly religious element, encompassing not only saintly figures, but also including weapons which had religious significance. Weapons had further significance in being part of imperial ceremonial; the shield in particular was bound up with ritual, as there was a long history (not necessarily continuous) of the proclamation of an emperor by raising on a shield. Armour worn by the emperor, the Archangel Michael, and the warrior saints on coins comprised protection for all body parts, but the detail described in the literature is often not visible on coins,

¹¹⁷⁵ Choniates 1984, 25.

because of wear. Protection for the upper body appears more prominent than that for areas such as the legs despite wear, and can be designated as a 'military tunic'.

The remilitarisation of Byzantine coinage culminated with the depiction of the figures of the emperor and St Demetrios on horseback, during the reign of Andronikos III (1328-41). Their figures filled the flan, unlike the last equestrian figures on the coins of Leo III c. 720, where the riding figure occupied only the shield held by the emperor. Andronikos III's equestrian types resembled the types of Arcadios (395-408), Roman emperor in the east, in that they occupied the whole flan. Given the use of such images as the riding emperor on the headgear of high officials, and the extensive references to equestrian protocol in *The Book of Ceremonies* and Pseudo-Kodinos, it is surprising that the riding emperor did not reappear on Byzantine coins until the fourteenth century. The reintroduction of equestrian figures on Byzantine coins has been linked to the change in representations of warrior saints from standing to riding figures in church paintings in the southern Morea, but riding figures on Crusader, Seljuk, Armenian and Trapezuntine coins also appear to have been influential.¹¹⁷⁶ Ultimately, however, riding figures are pagan in origin, and their apotropaic properties had been incorporated in Christian amulets.

Coin design featuring military types may be compared between the mints of Constantinople and Thessaloniki but care is needed as there can be a lack of certainty over attributions, particularly in the twelfth century and post-1261. This should be remembered in relation to the data summarised below.

¹¹⁷⁶ Gerstel 2001, 270-71.

When the output of military types from Constantinople 1042-1204 and from Thessaloniki 1081-1204 are combined there are 27 military types from a total of 135 (20.0%). Michael VII issued the lowest percentage of military types (1/5, 6.6%), and Isaac I the highest (3/4, 75.0%). The reigns of Isaac II (3/5, 60.0%) and Alexios III (3/8, 37.5%) produced relatively high proportions of military types, possibly reflecting the greater threats to the empire from 1185 to 1204. Direct comparison of the output of military types from Constantinople and Thessaloniki was also possible from 1081-1204, when the capital produced 6 military types out of 57 (10.5%), but Thessaloniki 14 out of 42 (33.3%). The range for Constantinople was zero (Andronikos I and Alexios III) to 2 out of 4 (50.0%) for Isaac II, but with no clear overall pattern. An overall pattern was clear at Thessaloniki, where output of military types increased steadily from Alexios I (4/18, 22.2%) to Alexios III (3/3, 100%). These data add weight to the suggestion of Thessaloniki being at greater risk to invaders from the north west and west than Constantinople.

Coins produced at Thessaloniki were used to pay troops in Byzantine service, and this is reflected in the frequency of use of different military symbols on Thessalonian coins versus Constantinopolitan. St George (6/42, 14.3%) and St Demetrios (6/42, 14.3%) appear equally popular on coins from Thessaloniki 1081-1204, but St George appears on only 1/93 (1.1%) of coins from Constantinople and St Demetrios on none from Constantinople, 1042-1204. St George appears on the siege coinage of Andronikos I from Thessaloniki, reflecting the saint's appeal to the Serbs and Alans who formed part of the force defending the city. Another symbol, the armed emperor, was more commonly used in Constantinople (11/93, 11.8%) than in Thessaloniki

(1/42, 2.4%). The range of military symbols was expanded when Manuel I introduced St Theodore to his coinage, and the military element increased also as both Manuel and the saint were portrayed carrying a sword. Military symbols were expanded further when Isaac II introduced the Archangel Michael. His portrayal on a nomisma hyperpyron where he and Isaac hold a sword hilt upwards between them is particularly striking.

From 1204 to 1261 the mints of Nicaea, Magnesia, Thessaloniki and Arta issued a total of 178 Byzantine coin types, of which 87 (48.9%) featured military symbolism. This high overall total of types results from an annual change of types not seen before 1204. The mean of 48.9% of military types was higher than the mean for 1042-1204 (30/145, 20.7% or 27/135, 20.0% if unidentified mints are excluded), and for 1261-1425 (151/382, 40.7%). Between 1204 and 1261 (strictly c.1225-58) Thessaloniki issued 53 military types out of 78 (67.9%); Epeiros 4 out of 7 (57.1%); and Nicaea 30 out of 93 (32.3%). Military issues had represented 14 out of 42 (33.3%) Thessalonian issues from 1081-1204; the trend whereby Thessaloniki issued more military types than other mints was thus accentuated. Even if only 23/38 (60.5%) of the coins of John Komnenos Doukas had military symbols, the coins of Manuel Komnenos Doukas had 7/9 (77.7%), and those of Theodore Angelos 12/15 (80.0%). By contrast, in Nicaea the proportion of military types varied from 7/10 (70.0%) for Theodore I to 1/6 (16.6%) for John IV with Michael VIII. These differences reflect the more turbulent history of Thessaloniki; even though Nicaea faced opposition as the greatest rival to Epeiros it appeared more stable.

From 1204-61 coin issues with military symbolism were distinguished by the highpoint of the use of the armed emperor symbol, and a change in precedence of the warrior saints depicted. The armed emperor appears on 46.7% of military issues from Nicaea (14/30); on 15.1% from Thessaloniki (8/53); and on 50.0% from Epeiros ((2/4). These data reflect those of pre-1204, where the armed emperor was used more frequently in Constantinople than Thessaloniki. On Thessalonian coins 1204-61 the military element was much more likely to be a warrior saint or the Archangel Michael; on Nicaean coins the military element was divided fairly equally between the armed emperor and the Archangel Michael or a warrior saint. Post-1261 use of the armed emperor declined, but eventually reappeared in a successor guise as the riding emperor under Andronikos III. The warrior saints saw changes in precedence 1204-61, with St Theodore being more popular on Nicaean coins (14/93, 15.0%) than St Demetrios (2/93, 2.1%) and St Demetrios (35/78, 44.9%) being more popular on Thessalonian coins than St Theodore (6/78, 7.7%). The popularity of St Theodore in Nicaea appears to relate partly to name association: Theodore I issued seven coins with military symbols and all featured St Theodore. By contrast military types from Thessaloniki relate to the city itself and its protection, rather than to individual emperors. The military figures of the small number of military types from Epeiros relate more to the emperors than to the location. Imitative coinage, of which 14 of 36 types (38.9%) featured military symbolism, was issued by the Latin occupiers, but its circulation does not affect the conclusions of this study.

Frequent changes of coin type as noted for 1204-61 continued subsequently, and of the total of 371 coin issues for 1261-1425, 151 (40.7%)

featured military symbolism. The proportions of military types fluctuated with individual emperors, varying from 58.6% (51/87) for Michael VIII to 32.5% (25/77) for the whole reign of John V. Military types were generally concentrated on base metal coinages, and as previously Thessaloniki issued a higher proportion of coins with military symbols than Constantinople. During the reign of Michael VIII two military figures were of similar popularity: the Archangel Michael (22/87, 25.3%) and St Demetrios (20/87, 23.0%), but with the archangel being more popular on copper trachea from Constantinople (9/34, 26.5%) than St Demetrios (2/34, 5.9%). The opposite is seen on copper trachea from Thessaloniki with St Demetrios making 19/29 (65.5%) appearances, and the archangel 6/29 (20.7%). A similar trend is seen for Andronikos II's trachea series, with the archangel featuring on 23.6% (13/55) of issues from Constantinople, but on only 8.5% (4/47) from Thessaloniki. St Demetrios appeared on no coins of this series from Constantinople, but on 40.4% (19/47) from Thessaloniki. The armed emperor did not appear on the coins of Andronikos II, having made his last appearance under Michael VIII.

By the reign of Andronikos III St Demetrios had become dominant over the Archangel Michael, appearing overall on 17/42 issues (40.5%), which were divided almost equally between Constantinople (9/23, 39.1%) and Thessaloniki (8/19, 42.1%). Michael featured only on 4/42 (9.5%), with Constantinople being 4.3% (1/23), and Thessaloniki 15.8%, (3/19). A striking feature of Andronikos' coinage was the return of a riding figure, who filled the whole flan. Where Andronikos was portrayed mounted, his horse's gait was sedate, suggesting approachability for petitioning. When St Demetrios, in a further enhancement of his status, was mounted, he galloped. These

equestrian representations appeared late on Byzantine coins, compared to other coinage e.g. Seljuk, and to the use of mounted figures of warrior saints in wall paintings of churches in border areas. Such a late appearance on coins is also in contrast to the extensive Byzantine equestrian protocol, the status attached to the mounted emperor, and the use of such images on the headgear of high officials. Images of the riding emperor appeared also on the coins of John V (3/54, 5.5%), and by this point St Demetrios had become dominant over all other military figures on the coinage, appearing on 22/77 (28.6%), which includes five appearances on horseback. The Archangel Michael appeared on only 4/77 (5.2%). By the reign of Manuel II St Demetrios was the only saintly figure featuring on the coinage, and as an indicator of the highest status, he rides on four of his five appearances (5/13, 38.5%). In one of these four he and the emperor ride together.

In summary, two broad trends are seen. For emperors who placed military symbols on their coins, the percentage of coin types with military symbolism was 20.0% for 1042-1204, increasing to 48.9% for 1204-61 before decreasing to 40.7% for 1261-1425. Secondly, just as the variety of military symbols increased following their reintroduction, this variety, particularly amongst the warrior saints, decreased in the late empire. When the symbol of the riding emperor reappeared on coinage in the fourteenth century it was a reflection of past glories.

