CRUSADER COINAGE
WITH GREEK OR LATIN
INSCRIPTIONS

Throughout the crusades the great eastward movement of armies and pilgrims was accompanied by a heavy and persistent flow of money. This we can judge from the ill-recorded evidence of hoards deposited in the area of the crusading states, and, more generally, from the profound economic and monetary changes in both western Europe and the Levant, of which the crusades were the apparent cause. Each of the crusader states in Syria and Palestine issued in due course its own currency—three of the four on a substantial scale—and other minor and more ephemeral currencies were issued by Frankish authorities in the area from time to time. The direct monetary consequences of the crusades, therefore, were not negligible.

On the other hand, the princes who led the First Crusade came from lands in which money did not yet play a major economic role, a fact reflected in contemporary assessments of the importance of things. Financial matters do not therefore figure largely in the accounts of the

The principal work on the coinage of the crusades is Gustave Schlumberger, Numismatique de l'Orient latin (Paris, 1878-1882; repr. Graz, 1954). This was founded upon and superseded the pioneering work of F. de Saulcy, Numismatique des croisades (Paris, 1847). Schlumberger's work is one of the great classics of nineteenth-century numismatic scholarship, and it is still the indispensable handbook for the study of the coins of the crusades, but two factors have made it out of date. The progress of research in Byzantine and related numismatics, particularly in the later period, has resulted in the removal to the Byzantine sphere of several coins which Schlumberger attributed to the Franks; and the discovery in recent years of much new material (the result of growing world-wide interest and trade in coins) has made coins abundant which Schlumberger thought rare and has produced some altogether new ones.

Schlumberger's book covered the whole of the Latin east. If this chapter were to cover the monetary background of every Christian state to which attention has been given in the volumes of A History of the Crusades, it would have had to go even further to treat the coinages, for example, of the emerging Spanish kingdoms or of the Teutonic Knights in the Baltic. Even to have covered the coins of the Latin east in the generally accepted sense, including Lusignan Cyprus, the knights of the Hospital at Rhodes, the Genoese in Chios and Lesbos (Mytilene),
chroniclers. Since, moreover, no mint records of the crusader states are extant, we are largely dependent upon the numismatic evidence, on the surviving coins and the circumstances of their survival, for our knowledge of the circulating medium among the crusaders, and how it changed in the two centuries from the Council of Clermont to the fall of Acre.

There were, as far as we know, no coins struck by the crusaders while they were actually on their way to Jerusalem. Armies have a constant need for money, but they rarely mint it for themselves, and never do so when they are on the move. The money that the crusaders had, therefore, they either took with them, often exchanging it on the way, or received by way of subsidy from the Byzantine emperor, or looted, or acquired in the form of ransom payments.

A. The Money They Took with Them

Before they started on the expedition, the princes made estimates of the traveling money which they would need.¹ Peter the Hermit col-

and the Franks in Greece and the Latin empire of Constantinople, would have involved a complete revision of Schlumberger and the writing of a work on a scale comparable to that of the original.

It has been thought best therefore to limit the scope of this chapter to the money and coinage of the crusaders in the strictest sense, namely to the Latin states in Syria and Palestine from the First Crusade until 1291. This leaves scope for a brief but reasonably complete and illustrated catalogue of the coins known to have been minted by the Franks in those states.

For information outside the scope of this chapter, but relating to the monetary background of areas treated in volumes II and III of A History of the Crusades, the reader is referred to Jacques Yvon's contributions on the Latin Orient, published in the second volumes of the International Numismatic Commission's Survey of Numismatic Research 1960-65 (Copenhagen, 1967) and 1966-71 (New York, 1973).

Important public collections of coins of the crusaders are to be found in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, in the Department of Coins and Medals of the British Museum, London, in the American Numismatic Society, New York, and in the Israel Museum, Jerusalem.

The author is grateful to those curators of public collections and private owners who have allowed him access to their cabinets. He particularly wishes to thank Mr. John J. Slocum, who has given him not only that privilege, but generous advice and hospitality as well. However, it must also be recorded that there is important material which is so far unpublished and which the author has not seen. In the present state of crusader numismatics many of the attributions in the catalogue may have to be revised in the light of fuller knowledge. For information on some sizeable financial transactions during the Third Crusade the reader is referred to the “Acre Archive” in Sotheby's Sale Catalogue of Western Manuscripts, London, 23rd June 1987, pp. 28-35, which was published too late to be incorporated in this chapter.

¹ William of Tyre, Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, 1, xvii (RHC, Occ.,
lected gifts from the devout princes of Christendom to minister to the necessities of the poor and needy during their pilgrimage. The wagon containing this entire treasure was carried off by Bulgarian raiders as the pilgrims were on their way to Constantinople.  

Raymond of Aguilers gives a list of the coins that the crusaders principally used among themselves: “Pictaviini, Cartenses, Manseie, Lucenses, Valentine, Mergoresi et duo Pogesi pro uno istorum” — the billon deniers of Poitou, of Chartres, of Le Mans, of Lucca, of Valence, of Melgueil, and of Le Puy, these last being worth one half the value of the others.

It is instructive to compare this list, which accords, so far as it goes, with the western coins of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries which turn up in stray finds in Syria and Palestine, with the roll of the leaders of the crusade and the coins which they and their followers used in their homelands. Although there were no kings among them, most of the leaders from France exercised the jus monetae. Within the empire this right was not so widely distributed at that time, but the leaders from Germany and Italy also were closely connected with those who did exercise rights of coinage.

These then are the coinages which the leaders issued or with which they were associated at home:

Godfrey of Bouillon and Baldwin of Boulogne: The dukes of Lower Lorraine as such did not issue coins, nor did Godfrey strike any for his territory of Bouillon. In France, however, their father Eustace II struck a scanty coinage as count of Boulogne, and possibly their brother Eustace III did also.

Bohemond, Tancred, and Richard of the Principate: None of these princes issued coins in southern Italy. However, Robert Guiscard, father of Bohemond and grandfather of Tancred, and Roger Borsa, Bohemond’s half-brother, issued extensive coinages in copper and some gold coins also. Their uncle, Roger, struck a similar coinage as count of Sicily.

1. 47). William’s statement may amount to no more than an intelligent man’s belief that no one would go on a crusade without a little forethought about the probable cost. Doubtless most crusaders’ forward financial planning consisted in laying hands on whatever cash they could get.

2. Ibid., I, xxi (RHC, Occ., I, 55).
3. Raymond of Aguilers, Historia Francoruni qui ceperunt Jerusalem, xxvi (RHC, Occ., III, 278). Another MS reads: “... Manseie, Lucenses, Valanzani, Melgorienses, ...”
Raymond of Toulouse: Raymond passed as the richest of the crusading leaders. The actual coinage of Toulouse in the name of Raymond himself was not very extensive, but his overlordship included many other mints. The most important of these was undoubtedly that where he exercised the right of coinage as count of Melgueil. 6 Two who took service with Raymond were also possessors of mints of their own. Gaston of Béarn inherited from his father Centulle the mint of Morlaas, which struck (always in the name of Centulle) the most prolific currency in Gascony. 7 Gerard of Roussillon was the heir to a somewhat sparser coinage. He succeeded to the county of Roussillon in 1102, and deniers are extant bearing his name; these are mentioned by the name of roselllos in a charter of 1112. 8

Robert of Flanders: The coinage of the counts of Flanders dates from the end of the tenth century, but it was not yet of great extent or importance by 1100. The various coins of Robert himself, and those struck by his countess Clementia of Burgundy as regent during his absence on the crusade, are known in only a few examples. 9

Robert of Normandy: The coinage of Normandy had much degenerated by 1100. The light and much-debased Norman denier was of only local importance by that time, and was supplemented even in Normandy by the heavier and more highly valued deniers of neighboring Maine and Anjou. 10

Adhémar of Monteil, Bishop of Le Puy: The anonymous coinage of Le Puy was extensively used in Auvergne. These coins, which were of low intrinsic value, passed at one half the value of the denier of Melgueil. The vernacular expression pougeoise came in due course to signify a fractional coin, both among the Franks in the east and in the kingdom of France. 11

6. Ibid., II, 286. The coinage of Melgueil remained in the hands of the counts of Toulouse until 1215, when as a consequence of the Albigensian Crusade it was granted by Innocent III to the bishop of Maguelonne.
7. Ibid., II, 160.
10. Poey d'Avant, op. cit., I, 26-32. For the coins of Anjou and Maine see ibid., I, 199-216.
11. Ibid., I, 337-342.
Hugh of Vermandois: The single specimen of a denier in the name of Hugh is of doubtful authenticity. There is, however, a series of anonymous deniers of Saint Quentin, the principal city of the county of Vermandois, some of which date from this period;\(^\text{12}\) this was a coinage of moderate importance. Hugh's brother, Philip I, issued a fairly extensive coinage as king of France.\(^\text{13}\)

Stephen of Blois: The coins of Stephen's county of Chartres and the related issue of his county of Blois formed one of the most important currencies in France at the end of the eleventh century.\(^\text{14}\)

Baldwin of Hainault: No coins are known for Baldwin as count of Hainault, but he struck a few pieces at Saint Omer, as claimant to the county of Flanders. They are as rare as the coins of Robert.

The coins therefore which Raymond of Aguilers mentions correlate tolerably well with the coinage traditions of the leaders of the crusade. The coins in his list which remain to be accounted for are the coins of Poitou, of Lucca, and of Valence.

The deniers of Poitou were one of the most plentiful coinages of France; the Poitevin mint of Melle was supplied from Carolingian times by the silver mine there.\(^\text{15}\) The Poitevin connection with the crusade was always strong, and of course the count of Poitou, William of Aquitaine, was a leader of the abortive crusade of 1101.

The deniers of Valence were, with those of Vienne (also frequently found in Syria and Palestine), one of the principal currencies of the Rhône valley.\(^\text{16}\) Valence lay on the main route which would be followed

15. Ibid., II, 1–30.
16. Ibid., III, 7. For the coins of Vienne see ibid., III, 36. The association of deniers of Valence with the Latin east is discussed in D. M. Metcalf, “Coins of Lucca, Valence, and Antioch,” Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik (1968–1969; published 1972), pp. 433–470. Deniers of Valence were also present in the Barbarossa hoard recently discovered in Cilicia; see Wolfgang Hess in Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst, 3rd ser., XXXV (1984), 252–254. Information on this hoard, which was probably deposited by German crusaders accompanying the emperor Frederick Barbarossa on the Third Crusade, has become available too late for inclusion in the text of this chapter. It will be published in detail by Dr. Ulrich Klein of the Württembergisches Landesmuseum, Stuttgart.

The biggest single element in the hoard, which is entirely of silver, is made up of pfennigs of Philip of Heinsberg, archbishop of Cologne, and coins of similar standard struck by Frederick himself at his mint at Aachen. A significant portion consists of episcopal issues from Strasbourg and the Lotharingian bishoprics of Metz and Toul, and pfennigs struck at the archbishop of Salzburg's mint at Friesach in the eastern Alps. There is a useful contribution from the Swa-
by any pilgrim of northern or central France making the pilgrimage by way of Provence or Italy. It will be recalled also that the cleric Bernard of Valence became the first Latin patriarch of Antioch.

The mint of Lucca was one of the four imperial mints of Italy, and the only one situated in Tuscany. Its significance for the crusades is that it supplied the coinage for Pisa, which under the direction of its archbishop Daimbert was the first of the Italian maritime communes to give naval and economic support to the movement.

Briefly therefore it can be stated that of the coins mentioned by Raymond of Aguilers, the pictavini were contributed originally by the Poitevins, the cartenses by the followers of Stephen, the mansei by Robert's Normans, the lucenses came with the fleet, the valentinenses and pogesi with the Provençals and those who traveled down the Rhône valley, and the mergoresi were originally brought by the followers of Raymond of Saint Gilles. All are found in Palestine and Syria.  

There is nothing in the chronicler's list to represent the home coinage of the Lorrainers and the Flemings on the one hand or of Bohemond's Normans on the other. To some extent this may reflect the fact that Raymond of Aguilers was with the Provençal army, but the surviving coins confirm his account. It must be assumed that these others brought less of their own money with them, which would have made them more heavily dependent upon subsidies. In Bohemond's case we may note that his kinsfolk's coinage in southern Italy was mostly copper, which does not usually travel, being reckoned rather worthless far from home.

What the Normans did bring with them, however, was a generation's experience of Byzantine money and minting practice in the outer marches of the empire. Moving in effect from one Byzantine frontier area to another, at Antioch and Edessa (where they were an important element in count Baldwin's following) they were quick to resume the striking of coins on their own. Their coins, though of the local pattern, were yet not so different from those to which they were accustomed in Italy.

---

B. The Money They Encountered en Route

The specie which the crusaders first met in quantity was Byzantine coin acquired in the form of subsidies. William of Tyre records how at Constantinople duke Godfrey, one of the leaders less well provided with funds from his own land, received from the emperor Alexius as much gold coin as two men could carry on their shoulders and ten measures “de aereis denariis”. Fulcher of Chartres, in what may be another account of the same episode, tells us that after the capture of Nicaea “jussit imperator de auro suo et argento atque palliiis pro ceribus nostris dari, peditibus quoque distribui fecit de nummis suis aeneis, quos vocant tartarones.” These coins were the copper tetartera, which were placed at the lowest point in the scale of Alexius’s newly reformed coinage.

The monetary reforms of Alexius have only recently been elucidated. His coinage embodied a far more sophisticated monetary system than any which the Franks, except probably Bohemond’s Normans, had experienced before. It was based upon the gold hyperpyron, 20½ carats fine. The fractional pieces were an electrum coin, valued at one third of the gold, and a billon piece, the aspron trachy or staminon, valued at one forty-eighth. The copper tetartera were in the system below these three, but their precise value in relation to them has not been established. In the frontier areas, some of the pre-reform coinage of earlier emperors, which included gold coins substantially less pure than the hyperpyron, was still in circulation along with the reformed coinage.

In describing the cost of living during the siege of Antioch in the winter of 1097–1098, the anonymous historian of the First Crusade mentions that the price of a donkey was eight purpurati (hyperpyra) “qui appreciabantur cxx solidis denario rum”. This quotation of an exchange rate which is equivalent to 180 deniers for one hyperpyron, or to 3 3/4 deniers for one billon aspron trachy, implies that an exchange market was already well established. However, the first actual record of an exchange transaction between crusaders and Byzantines dates not from the First Crusade but from the Second. Odo of Deuil records

18. William of Tyre, II, xii (RHC, Occ., I, 89).
the bewilderment of his economically untutored countrymen when they were first confronted by the intricacies of the Byzantine coinage. He also suggests that they were given a very bad rate of exchange against their own money. Indeed it would not be surprising if the Franks were cheated from time to time by the Byzantine money-changers. However, when in 1147, under the walls of Constantinople, the pilgrims received one copper *staminon* (by which name Odo must intend the billon *aspron trachy* of the reformed coinage) for two of their deniers, instead of having to give five deniers as they had done at the imperial frontier and as they were to do again as they crossed Anatolia, it appears that they were treated by the emperor Manuel to an especially favorable rate. In any case they got a better bargain than their grandfathers had at Antioch fifty years earlier.

Underlying Odo's complaint, which is couched in rather obscure language as if the chronicler himself did not really grasp what the issue was, there appears to have been a complete misapprehension on the part of the Franks as to the nature of Byzantine subsidiary coinage. Their own deniers were worth their intrinsic value and no more. The Byzantine billon on the other hand was worth one forty-eighth of a hyperpyron not intrinsically but because a powerful government was to maintain that as its value, which was a much more advanced monetary concept.

At least no misunderstanding arose in the valuation of gold, to the use of which the crusaders took readily, although gold coin was not generally available in their homelands. As they moved east they encountered Byzantine gold of both the reformed and the pre-reform coinage. In William of Tyre's story of count Baldwin II of Edessa, who pledged his beard and tricked his Armenian father-in-law, Toros, into redeeming it for him, the ransom price is stated in gold *michaelita*; the debased gold *nomismata* struck by Michael VII. Later, when Baldwin as king of Jerusalem was ransomed for a sum of one hundred thousand of these coins, William described them as the principal currency of those regions. It was only much later, when Baldwin III was married to Theodora, niece of the emperor Manuel, in 1158, that William mentioned the hyperpyron as making up part of the bride's dowry.

The coinage of the Saracens when the Franks first encountered it was in as much disarray as their political system. Like the coinage of the Byzantine empire it was based upon gold, the silver having been drawn away, presumably by the high value given to it in Latin Christen-
dom, as much as a century before the First Crusade. The most plentiful Islamic gold coinage in the area consisted of dinars struck by the eleventh-century Fatimid caliphs at mints in Egypt and Syria. The Franks became accustomed to give and to receive these coins, to which they gave the name besanti sarracenati, in ransom payments and tribute. In due course they themselves came to strike imitations of them.

The only coins struck by the emirs and atabegs with whom the crusaders first came into immediate contact were copper pieces for local circulation. There is no evidence that the Franks used these in their own transactions, but it is to be noted that the very first coins that the Frankish leaders struck in their own names were likewise copper coins of low value for local use.

C. The Coins Minted by the Crusaders

The actual minting of coins by the crusaders themselves was instituted shortly after their settlement in the east and continued, with some intermission, until their expulsion nearly two centuries later. Their minting operations may be divided broadly into three phases. The first phase, a period of crude quasi-Byzantine copper coinage in the northern states of Edessa and Antioch, began a year or two after the First Crusade and ended soon after the eclipse of the Normans at the “field of blood” in 1119. The second phase, a period of typically Frankish denier coinage at Antioch, Jerusalem, and Tripoli, ran from about 1140 until after Hattin. The last phase, characterized by new monetary experiments and some proliferation of minting authorities, lasted from the Frankish revival until the extinction of the Latin settlements in 1291.

THE FIRST PHASE

The coinage of the first phase is limited to Edessa and Antioch. All the coins are made of copper and are struck on thick flans. They run

27. See George C. Miles, _Fatimid coins in the Collection of the University Museum, Philadelphia, and the American Numismatic Society_ (ANS, NNM, no. 121; New York, 1951).
in series, starting with clean blanks, but thereafter overstruck one on the other. The inscriptions are in Greek at Edessa, in Greek or Latin at Antioch. It appears that the weight of the coins was not particularly important, since the weight range within each issue is very large.

We cannot tell which were the very first coins minted in the name of the leaders of the crusade. There are coins of both Edessa and Antioch which, on numismatic evidence, must date from before 1104. From their general aspect it seems clear that they were struck more for the use of the native population than for the Franks.

Edessa, of course, was not conquered from the Turks, but was taken over from its Armenian ruler by Baldwin of Boulogne’s coup d’état. Its inhabitants, according to William of Tyre, were native “Chaldaeans” and peaceful Armenians ignorant of the use of arms and familiar only with the business of trading. The Armenian rulers of the city had not, however, struck coins.

We cannot tell whether the decision to issue coins there was taken by Baldwin I or Baldwin II. Documentary evidence is lacking. The numismatic evidence, so far as it goes, would tend to put the initial date after rather than before 1100, the year when Baldwin I departed to become king of Jerusalem. Yet the decision to institute a coinage accords rather well with what we know of Baldwin I—his thirst for sovereignty and his single-minded intention to acquire and efficiently to administer a state in the Levant. Since Edessa, of all the crusading states, was the least dislocated by the shocks of the crusade, it is not impossible to envisage the issue of coins there before 1100.

There is nothing very Frankish about the first Edessene coins. By numismatic convention they are called folles, by analogy with the Byzantine copper coins of the period immediately before Alexius’s reform, which they much resemble. In weight, in general aspect, and presumably in purpose, though not in type, they also resemble copper coins issued at this time by Turkish atabegs and emirs ruling neighboring districts of northern Syria. They weigh mostly 6½ to 8½ grams, and they proceed in a succession of issues, each overstruck on a previous one.

This practice of overstriking was normal in the Byzantine empire at this epoch, and is also found in the copper coinage struck by Bohemond’s kin in southern Italy. We do not know the reason for it.

29. William of Tyre, XVI, iv (RHC, Occ., I, 708).
It cannot be because there were no facilities for making fresh blanks, since in the case of Edessa, at least, the first coins of each series are struck on fresh blanks. Presumably it was an economy measure, since the value of the coins was not high and the issues were frequently changed. From our point of view, the advantage of the practice is that it enables us to set out the issues in the correct order and to date them approximately, but the coins are hard to decipher, and the overstrikes make the later issues quite hideous.

There were at least seven issues (nos. 1–7) and probably more in the early years, though some of these are represented now by only a handful of surviving specimens. The first (pl. I, no. 1) was struck on clean blanks and in a wholly Byzantine style. It is identified as a coin of Baldwin by the reverse inscription—ΒΛΛΑΝ in the angles of a jeweled cross.

There follow one more issue in Baldwin’s name (pl. I, no. 2) and three (pl. I, nos. 3–5) in the name of Richard of the Principate, Bohemond’s cousin, who was regent of Edessa from 1104 to 1108 when Baldwin II was a prisoner of the Turks. The inscriptions are in Greek. Baldwin’s coin reads ΧΒΒΚ in the angles of a cross, initials which may be taken to signify Χριστος βοηθει Βολδουνω κωμη. Richard’s legends are all variations on the theme Κωρις βοηθει Ρικαρδω, Lord save Richard. A touch of Frankishness begins to creep in with the design of Richard’s third (pl. I, no. 5): the circular inscription around the cross is common on western deniers of this period but unknown on the Byzantine coinage.

The next issue (pl. II, no. 6) is anonymous. It could be Richard’s or Baldwin II’s. The type, however, is interesting: it is the first appearance on the crusader coinage of an armed knight. The only precedent for this figure, so characteristic in our eyes of these military states, and destined to become, in one aspect or another, one of the classic types of the Latin coinage in Syria, is a coin of count Roger of Sicily which dates from about twenty years before. Richard’s followers in Edessa would have been familiar with the Sicilian coin, and the adoption of this type at Edessa may be ascribed to Italo-Norman influence.

Incidentally, what little we know of Richard (his rapacity toward his Edessene subjects is almost all that is recorded of him) gives us a possible clue as to the purpose of these frequent type changes, three at least in three years. It seems likely that they were some kind of reve-

32. Sambon, op. cit., no. 876.
nue device: we may suppose that coin was called in at intervals and a fee charged for its reissue in a new form.

About the year 1110 the last of the large Edessene coins was struck, a piece (pl. II, no. 7) reverting to a more Byzantine style with a jeweled cross on the obverse and count Baldwin’s name and title in Greek written across the field on the reverse. There was then a change. The weight of the Edessene coinage was reduced to an average 4½ grams and a new series was begun on clean blanks. All these issues (pl. II, nos. 8–11) bear the name Baldwin and the image of the count in armor. The first and most sophisticated shows the count holding a cross in his hand and the inscription ΒΑΛΔΟΥΙΝΟΙ ΟΥΛΟ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ, Baldwin servant of the Cross. The later issues, all overstruck, are somewhat cruder. On none of them does Baldwin have a territorial title, but they must come from Edessa, since their source is always northern Syrian. The weight reduction may reflect the ruler’s desire to bring his coinage into line with that of Antioch.

There are no coins which can be ascribed with any certainty to the counts Joscelin. The last coins of Edessa, as our knowledge stands at present, belong to a curious issue (pl. II, no. 12) nearly all the surviving specimens of which appear to come from a single hoard, as yet unpublished. They are of copper, but may be alloyed with a little silver. They apparently come in two distinct weights, though the standard of each is so erratic as to admit the possibility that all are of one denomination. The inscription is in Greek: ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ ΝΙΚΑ, the Cross conquers, and ΒΑΛΔΟΥΙΝΟΙ ΧΟΜΠ, count Baldwin. They are struck with neat dies, but on blanks which are often rough and some of which may bear traces of a Kufic inscription.

In most aspects, especially in their Greek inscription, their absence of territorial title, and their erratic weight standard, these still belong to the first phase of crusading coinage. In other respects, however—in the thin fabric of the lighter ones, the circular inscription around the cross, and the possible presence of silver in the alloy—they look forward to coins of the second phase. With one possible exception, they are the only Edessene coins to point to this transition.

The exception, a doubtful one, is represented by a single unprovenanced and broken coin (pl. II, no. 13). This, although not certainly part of the Edessene series, is probably best considered here, since it appears to link the last coinage of count Baldwin with the period after he became king of Jerusalem. It is a billon coin and it has a Greek inscription on either side: +ΒΑΛΔΟΥΙΝΟΙΣ ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ in five lines and ΙΧ ΣΟΤ ΝΙΚΑ disposed in the angles of a cross. The title
clearly points to a date after Baldwin’s becoming king of Jerusalem, but the fabric and the language of the inscription suggest that it should be ascribed to one of the northern Frankish states. Metcalf and Willis classify the piece without comment as a coin of Antioch struck by Baldwin during his years of regency in the principality (1119–1126). However, the coin may equally well belong to Edessa, to the eighteen-month interval between Baldwin’s consecration as king at Easter 1118 and his investiture of Joscelin with that county in the late summer of 1119. That the coin was struck in the kingdom of Jerusalem is possible but unlikely.

In considering the coinage of Antioch we must recall that the city on the Orontes, unlike Edessa, was once an imperial mint. However, as there is no evidence that the mint was reopened when the city was recovered by Byzantine arms in 969, the issue of coinage there by the crusaders is probably independent of that earlier tradition and should be interpreted as an assertion of sovereignty on their part. The Antioch mint seems never to have been a bone of contention between the prince and the emperor in the long dispute about the prince’s status and Byzantine overlordship. It was not, however, until well into the reign of Roger of Salerno that the coins gave the ruler any title; before that their only territorial reference was the image of St. Peter, first patriarch and patron saint of Antioch, which appeared on five of the first eleven issues.

All the early copper coins of Antioch are of the light but erratic weight standard of the later armed-man coins of Edessa. There are some rare issues among them, but as a rule they are more plentiful than those of Edessa. The order of the principal issues is reasonably clear and is established by the pattern of overstrikes. Four issues of Tancred (nos. 16–19) as regent for Bohemond I are followed by three of Roger (nos. 20–22) and maybe two of Bohemond II (nos. 15?, 23).

The first of Tancred’s coins (pl. III, no. 16) shows a bust of St. Peter, neatly engraved, and a reverse inscription in Greek, Lord save thy servant Tancred. Such use of the local patron saint is found in the provincial coinage of the Byzantine empire; St. Theodore appears on the

35. The inscription allows the hypothesis that this is a coin of Baldwin I, the first Latin emperor of Constantinople, whose seal, with the same legend, is engraved on the title page of Renéier Chalon, Recherches sur les monnaies des comtes de Hainaut (Brussels, 1848). However, the fabric of the coin is quite unlike that of Byzantine coins at the time of the Latin conquest.
coining of Trebizond at just this time. The parallel is strikingly reinforced by the similarity in appearance of Theodore on the Trebizond coins to the bust of Tancred himself as he appears on his second issue (pl. III, no. 17) at Antioch. This portrait has sometimes been said to show Tancred wearing a turban, and therefore to demonstrate how quickly the crusading princes adopted oriental manners. The prototype of the Greek soldier-saint is a more convincing explanation of Tancred’s bizarre appearance.

Tancred’s third issue (pl. III, no. 18) has the reverse inscription ΔSVT for Domine Salvim Fac Tancredum, the Latin transcription of the invocation Κύριε Βοήθεια which is found on coins of both Antioch and Edessa. On account of its Latin legend this coin was once ascribed to the principality of Galilee, which Tancred held as a fief of Godfrey of Bouillon before 1100. That ascription is still sometimes made, but it cannot be correct since the coins have been found with others at Antioch and take their due place in the succession of overstrikes, forming the undertype of coins of Roger and of Tancred’s last issue (pl. III, no. 19), a coin of conventional Byzantine aspect with a bust of Christ on the obverse and Tancred’s name in Greek on the reverse.

Roger made three successive issues of copper coins, the first two (pl. III, nos. 20, 21) with Greek inscriptions, the third (pl. III, no. 22) with a Latin one. All share the essentially Byzantine iconography of the early crusader coins, but the first two bear images not used by Roger’s predecessors, the Virgin orans and St. George slaying the dragon. The St. George coin is chiefly remarkable for its reverse legend, which sets out Roger’s title as prince of Antioch. It is the only coin of the first phase to state a territorial title, and it may possibly be interpreted as an example of the assertiveness characteristic of usurpers.

The problems of the early coinage of Antioch center upon the attribution of coins in the name of Bohemond. One of these indeed (pl. III, no. 23), a coin with the reverse inscription BAIMYNΔOC set in the angles of a cross, is not difficult, since it occurs overstruck on coins of Roger. This must therefore be ascribed to Bohemond II and, since it follows hard on Roger’s coins, to the early part of his reign before his arrival in the east in 1126 to take up his inheritance. This close se-

37. For a rehearsal of the role of this coin as evidence for the rapid orientalization of the crusaders see Raymond C. Smail, Crusading Warfare 1097–1193 (Cambridge, Eng., 1978), p. 41, note 1.
quence is an incidental but not weighty argument against the attribution of the BAΛΔΟΥΙΝΟC ΔЄΠΙΟΤΗΣ coin (pl. II, no. 13) to this period at Antioch.

Two other coins bearing the name Bohemond or an abbreviation of it are more difficult to place. One of these (pl. III, no. 14) shows a bust of St. Peter on the obverse and the letters BHMT in the angles of a floriate cross on the reverse. Schlumberger ascribed it to Bohemond I.39 The main arguments for giving so early a date to this rather scarce coin are its primitive style and the arrangement of the brief inscription about the cross, like that on Baldwin’s first coin of Edessa (pl. I, no. 1). There is also the negative argument that this coin is not found overstruck on Tancred’s coins. However, it would be reassuring if a specimen could be found overstruck by one of Tancred’s issues.

For the other coin in Bohemond’s name (pl. III, no. 15) there is even less on which to build a hypothesis. It exists in a single specimen, unpublished until now. On the obverse we find St. Peter again, but neatly engraved in the style rather of Tancred’s first issue (pl. III, no. 16) than of the coin (no. 14) just considered. The reverse inscription is in Latin: BO[AMV]NDVS SERVVS XPĪ. The coin is overstruck, but the type is not identifiable.

This may be the immediate predecessor of Tancred’s first issue, or it may come just after that issue, in which case Tancred’s first St. Peter coins must be put back to before Bohemond’s release from his Danish mendid prison in 1102. That, however, would suppose that there was a plentiful issue (no. 16) by Tancred during his first regency, an interlude of two years from which this coin (no. 15) is the sole survivor, and then a resumption of prolific coinage (nos. 17–19) by Tancred with his second regency in 1104. It makes more sense to suppose that all Tancred’s issues followed hard upon each other.

It is tempting, in the absence of further evidence, to relate the new coin to Tancred’s first St. Peter coin, which it so much resembles in iconography, in style, and in the meaning, if not the language, of the inscription. However, even if new evidence is discovered which makes it necessary to ascribe it after all to Bohemond II after 1119, still this piece, the most uncompromisingly Latin of all the coins of the first phase, interestingly reinforces the two points which must strike anyone who examines the early coinage of the crusaders. One is the close parallel with the coinage of the Normans in southern Italy, which is also an overstruck coinage in copper given to insouciant alternation between Greek and Latin. The second point is the genuine religious

39. Schlumberger, Numismatique, p. 43.
fervor which these coins transmit, counterbalancing to some extent the evidence of the crusaders’ boundless rapacity which emerges from some accounts of the crusade: Lord save thy servant Tancred; Baldwin the servant of the Cross; Bohemond the servant of Christ. We are accustomed to the appearance of the saints in the iconography of later medieval coinage, and the Κύριε βοήθεις invocation is found on the coins of the Byzantine emperor and on the seals, though not the coins, of the Normans in Italy. But even if their inscriptions do contain an element of ostentatious humility which may have had a political purpose, these coins, with their absence of territorial title, are still impressive. There is something in them of that spirit which allegedly prompted Godfrey of Bouillon to refuse a crown in the city where his God had worn a crown of thorns.

THE SECOND PHASE

During the twelfth century the coinage of western Christendom consisted almost entirely of silver or billon deniers (denari, pence, or pfennige) issued at various weights and fineness by different feudal authorities. One of its characteristics was a tendency to crystallize into what are known to numismatists as “immobilized types”—forms and designs remaining essentially unchanged for decades or even centuries. The principal coinages of France and those of the imperial mints of Italy were prime examples of this.

Coinage in western Christendom was the king’s monopoly if he could enforce it, but if not, not. In France the jus monetae was still widely distributed, a legacy of the breakdown of political cohesion in late Carolingian times. A number of coinages, notably those of the counts of Anjou and Champagne in the north and those of the counts of Toulouse and dukes of Aquitaine in the south, were more important than the king’s own, but royal authority was gradually strengthened, and by the end of the century royal coinage was predominating. In Germany, on the other hand, the imperial prerogative was weakened and dispersed, so that by 1200 the imperial mints were at best competing as equals with those of the great feudatories, notably the ecclesiastical servants of the empire and the secular lords of the march. In northern Italy coinage, to begin with, was largely restricted to the

imperial mints—Pavia, Milan, Verona, and Lucca—but increasingly the communes either asserted or were granted their own minting privileges. Only in England, in southern Italy, and in the Spanish kingdoms was the right of coinage more or less exclusively held in royal hands.

Among the crusaders coinage was not exclusively royal insofar as the *jus monetae* was vested in all four rulers of the Latin states. They, however, kept it to themselves, permitting even less encroachment by their barons during the twelfth century than did the king of England. Nor did the privileges and immunities granted to the Italian communes within certain cities extend to the operation of a mint. Yet otherwise, in monetary as in political affairs, the principal outside influences in the Latin states came from France and the maritime communes of Italy.

It is not in itself surprising that twelfth-century Frankish princes should have issued silver and billon coinage. That rulers in Syria and Palestine should do so, however, implied an important reversal of the economic and monetary trends of nearly two centuries. Such coins were quite exceptional in that part of the world, and their appearance there was a sign that in the wake of the crusaders’ conquest silver, the valued currency of the west, was drawn eastward. This was either because the west was sending heavy subsidies for their support, or because the Latins established in their new lands economies which, in monetary terms, were an eastward extension of the system already operating in the west. Probably both causes were at work, but they worked slowly; if the crusading princes did not start to issue silver coinage on a regular basis before about 1140, this was because until then there was little silver about. Even when regular silver coinage was established, it was accompanied by far more subsidiary issues of copper coinage than was ever normal in the west.

It may be that some of the earliest silver coins struck by the crusaders were in fact imitations of western coins. It has been argued that some of the cruder and later varieties of the *denaro* of Lucca, the *lucensis* of Raymond of Aguilera’s catalogue, were actually struck by the Pisans, and that some may even have been minted in the Holy Land, where various hoards of them have been found. The existence of a denier of Chartres from an eastern source and with a retrograde inscription possibly adds a little more weight to this theory that the first silver minted by the crusaders consisted of copies of the coins which they had brought with them. It raises, however, the important juridical

41. Metcalf, *loc. cit.*

42. This coin, which is unpublished, is in the author’s collection.
question whether they were issued by the Latin princes or minted sub rosa by the Italian communities.

The first deniers of Frankish type and bearing the name of a crusading prince are apparently coins of Bertrand (Bertram) of Tripoli (pl. VIII, no. 65). A very rare anonymous coin of the same type and with the same reverse legend (pl. VIII, no. 66) is also ascribed to Bertrand. Since Bertrand died in 1112, the coins ascribed to him are outliers, struck quite early during what we have called the first phase of crusading coinage and antedating all other Frankish deniers by at least twenty-five years. They cannot therefore be fitted into any neat pattern of monetary development in the Latin states, and they are the more extraordinary in that Pons, Bertrand's more active and longer-lived successor, apparently struck no coins in twenty-four years. Bertrand's coins, which are closely related in type to those which he struck as count of Toulouse before he left for Tripoli in 1109, are represented by only a handful of surviving specimens.

Regular coinage of silver deniers seems to have begun more or less contemporaneously in Antioch and Jerusalem about 1140. The new phenomenon appears to reflect two facts: a steady enough inflow of silver to sustain coinage of this kind and the presence of a Frankish population big enough to demand it.

At Antioch the denier coinage was instituted by Raymond of Poitiers some time after his marriage in 1136 to Constance, the successor of Bohemond II. His issue came after a period of some fifteen years in which there was either no coinage at all, or at most some irregular issues of anonymous copper coinage of thin fabric but otherwise of primitive aspect (pl. IV, nos. 24–26), which may be ascribed to these years on the somewhat inadequate ground that they fit in badly almost anywhere else.

Raymond's new coins (pl. IV, no. 27) have on the obverse a neat profile bust and the circular inscription RAMVNDVS; the reverse simply gives the name of the city ANTIOCHIE around a short cross. A profile portrait was quite exceptional in French coinage at that date, but normal in England, whence Raymond was summoned to Antioch in 1136, and also in Navarre and Aragon, kingdoms bordering on his native Aquitaine.43

Several varieties of Raymond's denier have been noted.44 It was evi-

43. Another possible prototype for the profile portrait is the head of St. Maurice as it appeared on the deniers of Vienne.
dently struck over quite a long period, and maybe at varying fineness. A copper coin (pl. IV, no. 28) is also ascribed to Raymond.

Raymond was succeeded in 1149 by his son Bohemond III. To him are ascribed a series of deniers (pl. IV, no. 30) bearing the name BOAMVNDVS with a profile portrait similar to that on Raymond's coins in the last phase of their evolution. Their reverse inscription reads ANTIIOCHIA, a change in spelling which may be helpful for the classification of the anonymous copper coinage (pl. IV, no. 29; pl. V, nos. 35–36). The bare-head deniers of Bohemond continued in issue for some fourteen years, during which there was a gradual deterioration in their execution.45

About 1163 the bare-head coins were replaced by a new issue whose principal feature was a profile bust wearing chain-mail and a helmet marked with a cross. The form of this helmet, with its prominent nasal, is very similar to that shown in two well-known illustrations of crusaders in action dating from about 1170, the mural in the Templar church at Cressac (Charente) and the miniature plan of Jerusalem in a manuscript in the Royal Library, The Hague.46 As a coin type, however, this armed bust is unprecedented.

The helmet deniers (pl. IV, no. 31; pl. V, nos. 33, 38, 39) remained in issue as an immobilized type until the 1220's. At least eight distinct issues have been noted and their relative chronology established, although their precise order is not beyond dispute.47

Both the bare-head and the helmet deniers were accompanied by sporadic issues of minor coinage in copper or very debased billon of varying types (pl. IV, nos. 29, 32; pl. V, nos. 34–37, 40). By a misleading convention these have also been labeled deniers. It is much more likely that they were fractional pieces, mailles or poygouises, forming part of a comprehensive monetary system.

King Fulk struck a plentiful coinage in his home county of Anjou.48 His followers from France no doubt carried large numbers of deniers angevins to Palestine, where they figure prominently among the finds of Frankish coins.49 Fulk, however, struck no coins of his own as king

48. Poey d’Avant, op. cit., I, 204.
49. Metcalf, “Some Hoards and Stray Finds . . . ,” p. 145. See also the story quoted in vol-
of Jerusalem, and quite possibly struck no coins in Jerusalem at all.

If he did, there are two issues of coins which could be ascribed to him, though both are anonymous. One of these (pl. VII, no. 58) features a church steeple symbolically towering over two flanking minarets; on the other (pl. VII, no. 60) a patriarchal cross is set between two palm branches and stars. Both are scarce, but the recent discovery of a fractional maille or obole for each (nos. 59, 61) suggests that they were normal and regular issues and not just temporary or emergency strikings. Their weight of about one gram for the deniers and some of their stylistic features suggest a fairly early date, and their provenance, where this is known, suggests that they circulated in the Latin kingdom. However, their rarity and the near-indecipherability of their inscriptions are more suggestive of the tail-end of a coinage than the beginning of one. Their placing here in the coinage of the crusades is very tentative.\footnote{50}

More characteristic of the confident beginning of a new coinage by a vigorous political power are deniers and oboles with the obverse inscription REX BALDVINVS and the Tower of David on the reverse (nos. 41–44). These are among the most plentiful of all crusader coins, and it says much for the intractability of crusading numismatics, without documents or satisfactory hoard evidence, that it is not even certain whether they were introduced by Baldwin II or Baldwin III. The more generally held opinion is that the initiative was Baldwin III’s, but it may be that they were started by Baldwin II and continued as an immobilized type through the reigns of Fulk and Baldwin III. If this second alternative proved to be the case, the anonymous coins (nos. 58–61) described in the last paragraph would probably have to be pushed further back in time, making them almost contemporary with the rare deniers of Bertrand of Tripoli (pl. VIII, no. 65).

The Baldwin coins are divided into two classes, one of coarser style (pl. VI, nos. 41, 42) and another of neater workmanship (pl. VI, nos. 43, 44) whose letter-forms incorporate many annulets and curlicues. The very earliest deniers, of coarse workmanship, read D\textsuperscript{E} h\textsuperscript{I}ERV\textsuperscript{SALEM} instead of D\textsuperscript{E} IERV\textsuperscript{SALEM} on the reverse.\footnote{51}


Amalric continued the issue of deniers and oboles, and some of his coins also have the same curious letter-forms as we find on some of the Baldwin pieces. Amalric’s coins (pl. VI, nos. 45, 46) read AMALRICVS REX; on the reverse the Tower of David is replaced by a schematic representation of the church of the Holy Sepulcher. They continued as an immobilized type probably until well after Saladin’s conquest of Jerusalem in 1187. It would be surprising in the light of normal medieval practice if Baldwin IV had reverted to the Tower of David type of his namesake and uncle. The hoard evidence, such as it is, contradicts this idea.

The last coins of the Latin kingdom before Hattin are copper coins in the name of Guy (pl. VI, no. 49). The type is interesting: a crowned facing bust of the king on the obverse and a domed building on the reverse. Schlumberger identified this building as the Templum Domini (the Dome of the Rock), since its form is quite distinct from the church of the Holy Sepulcher as shown on the Amalricus deniers, while it approximates closely to the Dome of the Rock as it appears today and as it is represented alongside the Holy Sepulcher and the Tower of David on the reverse of the royal seals of the kings of Jerusalem. However, the building on Guy’s coin has an opening in the roof, which was a feature of the Holy Sepulcher but not of the Dome of the Rock. Representations of all these buildings are conventional rather than realistic, and the Holy Sepulcher in particular is shown in a wide variety of forms in documents of the period. The assumption must be that the building more sacred to the crusaders was intended in this instance.

It has usually been assumed that the mint for the coinage of the kingdom was at Jerusalem itself. Yet the existence of two quite distinct styles for the Baldwin deniers points to the possibility of two mints. Acre and Tyre have been proposed in place of the capital, but the question is still quite open. More recently Beirut has also been suggested as the possible mint of an enigmatic late-twelfth-century issue of anonymous copper coins which bear the inscription TVRRIS DAVIT and were once attributed to the siege of Jerusalem in 1187 (pl. VI, no. 48); these coins, which have the Tower of David on the obverse and an eight-

53. I am indebted to the Rev. John Wilkinson for this observation.
54. This question is discussed in Metcalf, “Coinage of the Latin Kingdom,” loc. cit.
pointed star on the reverse, show characteristics of both Tripoli and the Latin kingdom.

The most extraordinary of all the coins of Jerusalem (if coins they be) are gold pieces struck in the names of Baldwin and Amalric,\(^{56}\) and possibly even Fulk. They do not fit into the neat pattern of typically Frankish coinage of the second phase. Indeed they fit into no normal numismatic pattern whatsoever, since they survive only in fragmentary form.

A reconstruction of the fragments, some of which are segmental while others are irregularly shaped bits, points to coins of about the size of a dinar. One side has a hexagram and the legend CIVITATIS : HIERVSALEM; another side has a star device and the legend +SIGNVM BALDVINI REGIS. There are variant inscriptions, one of which seems to include the name AMALRICVS, while another suggests FVLCONIS. This is the only gold which bears the name of a crusading ruler or principality. The practice of cutting up coins in order to make fractional values was not abnormal elsewhere in the twelfth century, but this is the only instance in which the complete pieces do not survive. We may speculate whether they were struck specifically in order to be cut up, and if so, why. As the fragments have almost always been found in groups, it is unlikely that they were intended for scattering as alms.

The twelfth-century coinage of Tripoli was less prolific and less rich than that of Antioch or Jerusalem. It was, as we have seen, exceptional in its early beginnings with the scanty coinage of count Bertrand. Thereafter there was no identifiable coinage for thirty years. Even then, when Jerusalem and Antioch began their heavy coinages of silver, Raymond of Tripoli (we cannot even be sure whether it was Raymond II or Raymond III) made only sporadic issues of small copper and very debased billon coins (nos. 67–69). Only one issue of reasonably fine deniers (no. 70) appears to have been made before 1187, and that was by no means plentiful.

The principal characteristics of the Tripolitan coinage are the large number of anonymous issues and the heavy Provençal influence in the choice of designs. What appears to be the earliest coin of Raymond of Tripoli, a copper pougeoise (perhaps) of very erratic weight (pl. VIII,

56. J. D. Brady, "A Firm Attribution of Latin Gold Coinage to Twelfth-Century Jerusalem," ANS, Museum Notes, XXIII (1978), 133. This covers only some of the fragments, of which more have since become available. A good selection is in the collection of the American Numismatic Society, New York.
no. 67), has a short cross pattée with an annulet at each end of the cross; a cross resembling this was adopted for the arms of the count of Toulouse. Another early piece (pl. VIII, no. 68), of very debased billon or copper, has on it a paschal lamb with a processional cross. This type was first used by Alfonso Jordan on coins which he struck as count of St. Gilles (1112–1148); a similar coin of Alfonso Jordan’s successor Raymond V (1148–1194) has been found near Tripoli. Finally, the type of the crescent moon and star (no. 69; pl. VIII, no. 70), which was to become the Tripolitan type par excellence and was used for the only good deniers of Raymond III, was closely related to deniers struck by Raymond V of Toulouse and St. Gilles for his marquisate of Provence. The confusing duplication of names as of coin-types is itself a measure of the continuing relationship between Tripoli and the Midi.

One more design commonly found on the coins of Tripoli is the city gate or castle. This, which is not unlike the Tower of David but has a door in it, was presumably derived from the count’s seal, which in common with the seals of many other barons had a representation of a tower on the reverse.

The castle coins (pl. IX, nos. 73, 75) are all anonymous, as also are some of the crescent and star coins (pl. VIII, no. 72). It has been assumed that these must have been struck during one of the periods when the count was in captivity, and Raymond III’s long imprisonment from 1164 to 1171 is especially cited as their probable date of issue. Probably those years, when there were heavy issues at Jerusalem and Antioch, were also a period of minting activity at Tripoli, but there is no reason especially to associate the anonymous issues with Raymond’s absence. Anonymous coinage was commonplace in the Levant as in the west in the twelfth century, and in an age of immobilized types, when even the death of a ruler did not necessitate the removal of his name from the coinage, still less need his name be removed because he was confined in a Saracen prison.

In the years before Saladin’s conquest only one baron of the Latin kingdom, the lord of Sidon, appears to have struck a coinage of his own. There are some rare deniers rather doubtfully attributed to Gerard (fl. 1153–1164) (pl. XI, no. 94). More certainly attributable are almost equally scarce deniers of his son Reginald (pl. XI, no. 93), which

58. The coin (ibid., no. 3718) is in Mr. Slocum’s collection.
59. Ibid., II, 255.
60. Schlumberger et al., Sigillographie, p. 59.
bear his name RENALDVS and a castle on one side, an arrow on the other. The castle doubtless derived from Reginald's seal; the arrow was a canting symbol devised for Sidon (Saiète—sagitta). These coins probably date from before Hattin, since Reginald lost his barony in the same campaign as Guy of Lusignan lost his kingdom. However, he was subsequently regranted part of his fief by Saladin, and his coins therefore may possibly date from the obscure period which elapsed between this recovery and his death about 1204. Whichever date is correct, and whether he usurped or was granted the right of coinage, his action shows how the barons were encroaching upon the royal power in those years; yet the fact that his was the only baronial mint to be established so early shows in a sense how respected the regalian right still was, in spite of the incapable hands in which it rested for much of the time.

A list of baronies allegedly enjoying minting rights was compiled by Schlumberger. This was based upon a misreading of the Assises, which were in any case too late to be a reliable authority. The right of coin referred to in that document was the right to the use of a lead seal, not the right to a mint.

THE THIRD PHASE

Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem, by taking away so much of the territory of the Latin states, profoundly altered their economy. Thereafter they appear as precarious but wealthy maritime communities, necessarily concentrating on commerce but engaged also in some industry and specialized agriculture. They enjoyed a final hectic prosperity during the years of political détente with Saladin's successors, until the approach of the Mongols ruined the commerce of the hinterland on which they depended economically, and the rising power of the Mamluks extinguished them altogether.

Their prosperity was an extension of the increasing economic activity of the whole of Latin Christendom. In this expansion the lead was taken by Italy, and in no field so obviously as that of monetary change and development. The old quasi-imperial coinages of north-
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62. Schlumberger, Numismatique, p. 108. The argument that Schlumberger was mistaken in this was first advanced by Raoul Chandon de Briailles, "Le Droit de coins dans le royaume de Jérusalem," Syria, XXIII (1942-1943), 244-257.
ern Italy declined in importance as minting rights were granted to the communes, among them Genoa in 1139 and Pisa in the reign of Frederick Barbarossa. The coinage of Venice in particular grew in scope and importance, and in 1201 Enrico Dandolo introduced the silver *grosso* of 24 *denari* in order to facilitate the heavy payments for material and wages which the republic was making in the course of fitting out the Fourth Crusade. A monetary development which was crucial to the advance of the commercial revolution in Europe was thus directly linked to the history of the crusades.

Within a few years many other Italian communes, Genoa, Pisa, and Ancona among them, followed Venice's lead in the issue of larger multiple coins. Finally in 1252 Genoa and Florence began to mint gold, a sign that the eastward flow of silver which had marked the earlier phase of the crusades was now matched by a counterflow of gold.

The principal characteristic of French coinage during the same period was the increasing extension of the royal money at the expense of the feudal, a change which was largely brought about by the policy of Philip Augustus; it was in Philip's royal currency, the *livre tournois*, that major financial business was transacted during the Third Crusade. Not all the feudal coinages were eclipsed, however, and those which survived were, if anything, more plentiful and more vigorous than before. Among them were those of some notable crusaders: the Poitevin and Aquitanian deniers of king Richard I, the deniers of Provins and Troyes struck by count Henry of Champagne and his successors, the coins of Hugh IV, duke of Burgundy, and those of Hervey of Donzi, count of Nevers. The coins of Provins and Troyes, which were the currency in which the business of the Champagne fairs was transacted, would have enjoyed a wide circulation in any case, but the abundance of the others may well be connected with the financing of crusading expeditions.


69. *Ibid.*, I, 314. The correlation between those who struck feudal coins in France and those who went on the Third and Fifth Crusades is treated in Cox, *op. cit.* For the German coins that were taken on the Third Crusade see note 16. Two notable German crusaders whose coins are present in the Barbarossa hoard are the emperor Frederick himself and bishop Godfrey of Würzburg.
The introduction of heavy silver and gold coinage in France was the work of Louis IX, who in 1266 instituted the silver *gros tournois* and the gold *écu.* Louis's monetary reform illustrates the curious interaction of the Latin states with France in monetary matters, since about the same time Bohemond VI of Tripoli and Antioch introduced a silver *gros* of the same weight and fineness as the *gros tournois*. The appearance of the *gros tournois*, with its concentric circles of inscription, also seems to derive from that of coins circulating in the east with which Louis and his crusading companions would have been familiar.

The counterpart of these important monetary changes in the west was the reappearance of silver coinage and the relative decline of gold in the east. This was heralded by Saladin's resumption of silver coinage at Damascus in 1174–1175. The Selçukids (Seljuks) of Rûm took it up in 1185–1186, and the Christian kings of Cilician Armenia some fifteen years later. The Nicaean coinage of Theodore Lascaris (1202–1222) was predominantly silver, while that of Trebizond was exclusively so from the reign of Manuel I (1238–1263). Only in Egypt did the older pattern persist, with a plentiful coinage of gold dinars and little else until the end of the Ayyûbid dynasty in 1252.

Quite apart therefore from the political upheaval caused by Saladin's conquest, important changes were to be expected in the currency of the Latin states. Nevertheless, for a few years the coinages of Antioch and Tripoli at least continued with little alteration. Both principalities persisted with their "immobilized" coinages, Antioch with the helmet deniers and Tripoli with the star deniers. On the latter the barely perceptible substitution of BAMVNDVS (pl. IX, no. 74) for RAMVNDVS (pl. VIII, no. 71) marked Bohemond of Antioch's assumption of power soon after the death of Raymond III in 1187. De-
niers of Bohemond, as later abbreviated to BAMVND' (pl. IX, no. 76), are the most abundant of all Tripolitan issues. As some of the later helmet deniers of Antioch are also among the commoner varieties of that common type, it seems that both coinages were issued with renewed vigor after 1200. At Antioch an issue of helmet deniers in the name of Raymond Roupen (pl. V, no. 38) signals the years of his control there from 1216 to 1219.

In the kingdom of Jerusalem, Saladin’s conquest and the removal of king Guy temporarily destroyed the juridical basis on which the coinage had been produced until then. Gradually, however, the kingdom was reconstituted; the extent to which the royal coinage too was reconstituted depends upon the interpretation which is put upon the Holy Sepulcher deniers in the name of Amalricus (pl. VII, no. 52).

We have seen that these coins probably continued in issue as an immobilized type through the reigns of Baldwin IV and Baldwin V. It is reasonable to suppose that, like the helmet deniers of Antioch, they continued still longer, possibly until the 1220’s. The best argument for this is that hoards deposited in the 1220’s contain large numbers of them. The theory is also supported by the fact that certain coins of John of Brienne (pl. VII, no. 55) are of the same type.

Apart from the Holy Sepulcher deniers, the coins of the Latin kingdom struck after 1187 are rather scanty. Some are anonymous. At one time it was argued that the TVRRIS DAVIT coppers (pl. VI, no. 48) were siege pieces struck at Jerusalem after Hattin but before Saladin took the city, but it has been pointed out that they were struck over a longer period than that theory would allow. They do appear, however, to have been struck somewhere in the Latin kingdom in the closing years of the twelfth century, as does an anonymous billon denier (pl. VI, no. 47) with a patriarchal cross on the obverse which reads MONETA REGIS and REX IERL’M. The ascription of this one, however, to the crusaders’ encampment before Acre, when the kingdom was in dispute between Guy of Lusignan and Conrad of Montferrat, is possibly too fanciful. Anonymous coinage at this period is not so exceptional that we must necessarily ascribe it to a time of political vacuum. It is probably safer to assume that, when political conditions were critically uncertain, no coins were issued at all.
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The first coins which can be given a definite place in the renascent kingdom are copper *pougeoises* in the name of Henry of Champagne (pl. VI, nos. 50, 51). These show his modest feudal title, COMES HENRICVS, and, exceptionally for Frankish coins, the denomination and the mint: PVGES D'ACCON. Two issues are extant, a fairly plentiful one with fleur de lis reverse (pl. VI, no. 50) and a rare one, represented now by a single specimen, with a hexagram in place of the fleur (pl. VI, no. 51). Both of these motifs are found on the French feudal coinage, but neither, curiously enough, in Henry's own county of Champagne.  

There are three issues of coins in the name of John of Brienne (nos. 53–55), the last coins struck for the Latin kingdom in the king's name. All are exceptional in one way or another. Two of John's issues are datable. These are billon deniers with a crowned facing bust and the prominent mint name of Damietta (pl. VII, nos. 53, 54). John occupied Damietta in 1219. He was at pains to assert his regalian rights there against the papal legate, Pelagius, and his authorization of these coins probably had as much to do with that struggle as with economic requirements. Nevertheless, the coins would have been useful for paying an army which had been campaigning in the Nile delta for eighteen months, and the bullion for them presumably came from the captured city.

The other coin of John (pl. VII, no. 55) has no mint-name, and the type is the conventional Holy Sepulcher of the Amalricus deniers. The importance of this piece lies in its weight, which at 2.70 grams is about three times that of the average denier. Fortunately another and even rarer coin (pl. VII, no. 56) of the same type and weight (but without John's name) gives us the denomination. This coin was a *dragma* or *dirhem*, in one sense a forerunner of the dirhems that were to be struck at Acre with Arabic inscriptions, but in another sense the first silver

---

II, 70) is both specific and circumstantial: Balian of Ibelin and the patriarch, acting in concert, ordered that the Holy Sepulcher be stripped of its silver covering and that this silver be coined for payment to the knights and sergeants defending the city. Sabine, "Numismatic Iconography of the Tower of David and the Holy Sepulchre," *Numis. Chr.*, 7th ser., XIX (1979), 129, marshals the arguments for ascribing an identifiable and separate issue of coins to this event, but his article, although informative on the iconography of the coins in question (no. 62), falls short of proving the case. There is no reason to suppose that special coins were struck. Indeed, the authorities might be thought to have had other preoccupations than the designing of a new coinage, and it is more likely that the mint went ahead with coins that it was already equipped to make, namely *Amalricus* deniers. However, either way, it is curious to reflect that some of these coins may be made of silver taken from the very monument that figures on the reverse.

82. But not at all exceptional for Arabic coins.

83. The hexagram (star of David) coin is published by Spaer, "Two Rare Crusader Coins," p. 185, who also discusses the origin of the motifs of both issues.
grosso of the Latin Orient. It was struck only some ten or fifteen years after Enrico Dandolo's Venetian grosso, and antedated almost every other such coin in Italy.

A curious parallel to John's dirhem, unpublished until now, is found in the coinage of Tripoli. This is a coin of the BAMVND' star type (pl. IX, no. 77), of fine silver and probably weighing, when struck, 84 something over two grams, or about the same as a Venetian grosso. This coin cannot be dated surely within twenty years, but a date before rather than after 1240 seems likely. Wherever it is finally put, it confirms the view that the late "economic" phase of the Latin states was a time for monetary experiment.

It has sometimes been maintained that in the years after 1187 the regalian rights of the kings of Jerusalem were much weakened and that the "Livre au Roi", 85 which appeared to reassert those rights, was in fact expressing a nostalgic yearning for conditions which were gone for good. 86 One reason given for this is the proliferation of baronial coinage in these years. The evidence does not support this argument. There was no wholesale usurpation of the royal monopoly of minting. A strict examination of the baronial coins reduces the number of issuing baronies to three—Beirut, Tyre, and Sidon.

The coinage of Beirut (nos. 84–88) consists of deniers in the name of John of Ibelin and anonymous copper pieces which, to judge from their appearance, are probably contemporary. 87 The obverse type of all of them is a castle or city gate, doubtless taken, like the similar type for Reginald of Sidon and the counts of Tripoli, from the lord's seal. 88 John's coinage was no brief emergency issue: there are two distinct deniers with minor varieties of each, and they are at least as well minted as any other coins of the Latin kingdom. It is an attractive theory to associate this coinage with John's dispute with the emperor Frederick, but deniers of both types are found in the Kessab and Tripolis hoards, both of which are associated with the Fifth Crusade, and

84. The only known surviving coin, which is in the author's collection, is badly chipped. It weighs 1.90 grams, but an original weight of 2.00–2.20 grams is a fair estimate.
85. Livre au Roi, xvi (RHC, Lois, 1, 617). The passage reads: "nul hom ne deit aver port, euvenore ne monee labourant, fors li rois, par dreit ne par l'assize." The minting of coins was a crime punishable by loss of fief.
87. But this was not Schlumberger's judgment; see Numismatique, p. 118. Nos. 84, 85, and 88 are shown on pl. X.
are thought to have been deposited about 1221. Surprisingly, therefore, since John of Brienne was a strong king who knew his rights and his relations with John of Ibelin were not bad, this coinage seems to have begun and maybe ended some years before the lord of Beirut became heavily engaged in constitutional disputes with his suzerain. Whatever the cause of its issue, the Beirut coinage was not continued by John’s successors.

The coinage of Tyre is all very late. Philip of Montfort was granted the lordship in 1246 by Henry I of Cyprus acting as regent of the kingdom; Philip was succeeded by his son John in 1270. By the time Philip was invested with Tyre, the lordship accounted for half the total area of the Latin kingdom, and the king's regalian rights were indeed of less account than they once were.

Two issues of coins are known for Philip (pl. X, nos. 89, 90) and two for John (pl. X, nos. 91, 92), all rare and rather ill-struck in copper. Three of them feature a portico with columns. At first sight this appears to be a throwback to an early Frankish coinage type, the so-called temple type of Charlemagne. In practice it is more likely that the building shown is the edicule of the Holy Sepulcher as restored in 1048.

The most extensive, and also the most puzzling, of the baronial coinages is that of Sidon (pl. XI, nos. 93–99). It is not plentiful, but it comprises several different types, most of which are difficult to date. As we have seen, Sidon’s coinage started early, but after Saladin’s conquest Reginald’s coinage probably ceased, and the city was not recovered by the Franks until 1227. Reginald’s heir, Balian, was closely associated with the royal government; he was appointed one of Frederick’s lieutenants in 1229, and held that position either alone or jointly until his death ten years later. At first he occupied a central position politically, mediating between Frederick and John of Ibe-

89. See Longuet, op. cit., p. 175, and Cox, op. cit., p. 55. There exist so few coins certainly struck in the Latin states in the years 1220–1230 that it would be possible to give a post-1225 date to both hoards, if that were necessary. However, the presence of seven coins of Henry I of Cyprus (1218–1253) in Kessab, and their absence from Tripolis, argues against the later date for Tripolis. It should be accepted therefore that the Ibelin coinage dates from the reign of John of Brienne.


lin's baronial party, but after 1235 he threw in his lot with his peers.

For some years after Balian's death his widow Margaret seems to have exercised authority at Sidon. In the only contemporary account of the coinage of Sidon, Joinville\(^93\) refers to it as the lady Margaret's currency. Her son Julian is credited with little political ambition. After he assumed control he found that the lordship's revenues were not enough to support its feudal obligations, and he turned Sidon over to the Templars in 1260.

It is probably safe to assume that the currency to which Joinville referred, in which Louis made his offering at the tomb of Walter of Brienne in Sidon in 1252, was the coinage of anonymous deniers of reasonably good billon which read D · E · N · I · E · R · D · E · S · E · E · T · E · and show an unidentified domed building on the reverse (pl. XI, no. 99). These are the only coins of Sidon plentiful enough to warrant Joinville's description of them as a proper currency, the only ones also which are fit for a king's offering.

From this it may be deduced that all the other coins (nos. 93–98) of Sidon are of poor quality. They survive for the most part in such bad condition, and their legends are so garbled, that we can identify them as from Sidon only by the arrow, which first figured on the coins of Reginald. The persistence of this device owes less to continuity than to the aptness of the pun on the city's name.

All conclusions about the coinage of Sidon must be tentative. It is unlikely that Balian would have resumed coinage in defiance of Frederick's regalian rights as long as he was actually a royal official giving even half-hearted support to Frederick's policies. It is unlikely therefore that any of these later Sidon coins were struck before about 1235. The appearance of the good billon deniers, which in fabric are rather like coins struck by Frederick himself in Sicily, is consistent with their having been minted some time during the two decades 1235–1255. The poor-quality arrow coins and the related issues may be subsidiary pieces dating from the same time, but they are more likely later, the monetary expression of Julian's financial difficulties.

The modest coinages of Beirut, Tyre, and Sidon comprise the whole story of baronial minting in the Latin kingdom. The attribution of coins to Toron stems from a misreading of certain Montfort coins of Tyre.\(^94\) A coin is published (pl. VII, no. 63) for the mint of Jaffa,\(^95\) but since it is anonymous and Jaffa was intermittently in the hands

---


\(^{94}\) Seltman, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

\(^{95}\) Schlumberger, *Numismatique*, p. 110.
of the crown, this must be assumed to be a royal issue until proved otherwise. The myth of a more substantial baronial coinage originated partly from these misattributions, but chiefly from Schlumberger’s misinterpretation of the Assises of Jerusalem and the long list of potential baronial mints which consequently appeared in his standard work on the subject.

Nevertheless, if the baronial coinages of the Latin kingdom in the thirteenth century seem scanty, they should be seen against a background of royal and princely coinage that is far from plentiful. There are no coins of the Latin kingdom in the name of Frederick or of his son Conrad, though Sicilian coins of both of them are common, many bearing the title of king of Jerusalem;96 and these, to judge from thirteenth-century finds, began to play a significant part in the monetary circulation of the Latin states at this epoch.97 The most important coinages minted at this time in Palestine were the coins with Arabic inscriptions struck at Acre. There are no coins of Antioch which can be said with certainty to come after the last of the helmet deniers, which date from not much after 1230.

At this late stage most of the circulating medium in what remained of the Latin states was provided from abroad. The increasing importance of Sicilian coinage in the area has already been mentioned. Among Italian coinages, those of Genoa and Venice were also much in evidence. The crusades of the brother and son successively of Henry III of England were the probable cause of the transfer of Henry’s fine silver pence to the area in fair numbers. Even the new coinage of Portugal, which was a port of call for crusaders coming by sea from northern Europe, found its way into the local circulation. Less surprisingly, the coins of Cyprus were introduced in increasing quantity. Almost no country of western Christendom goes quite unrepresented in the stray finds of coins of this period in the Latin east, but still France predominates, as it did from the time of the First Crusade.98

Yet the mints of the Latin states could still display surprising originality. One example of this is an anonymous gold dinar (pl. VII, no. 57) showing the Agnus Dei and an appropriate Latin inscription. Since the coin is not only anonymous, but also carries no indication of where it was minted, it is only because of the oriental provenance of the few surviving specimens that it can be attributed to the Latin states at all.99

96. Sambon, op. cit., V, 78, 12c.
98. Ibid., pp. 142–148.
99. This coin was published by Grierson, "A Rare Crusader Besant with the Christus Vincit
It was probably struck during the reaction against Arabic inscriptions and Islamic professions of faith on the coinage which took place after the visitation of Odo of Châteauroux and the ensuing strictures of Innocent IV.\textsuperscript{100}

The most vigorous revival of minting activity in these latter days of the crusading states occurred at Tripoli. After the plentiful issues of BAMVNDVS deniers (pl. IX, nos. 74, 76) and the solitary dirhem/\emph{gros} (pl. IX, no. 77) mentioned above, almost nothing was minted at Tripoli except possibly some anonymous pieces with garbled legends (no. 64) and some rare and debased deniers (no. 78; pl. IX, no. 79) whose late date is indicated by their French inscriptions. Then one of the last two counts, probably Bohemond VI, introduced a substantial \emph{gros} of fine silver weighing 4.20 grams (pl. IX, no. 80). The first issue of these coins was of entirely traditional Tripolitan type, with an eight-pointed star as the main feature of the reverse. On a second issue (pl. IX, no. 82), by Bohemond VII certainly (the regnal number is stated, for once), the star was replaced by a handsome castle.

The significance of these coins is that the \emph{gros} was of exactly the same weight as the French \emph{gros tournois}. The normal presumption would be that the greater prince influenced the lesser in a matter such as this, and that the Tripolitan coin was first issued some time after Louis's reform of 1266. This is still probable. However, the Tripolitan money differed from the French in that each issue was accompanied by an identical coin of half its weight (2.10 grams) (pl. IX, nos. 81, 83). We have seen that a coin of this weight, equal to that of a Venetian \emph{grosso}, was struck at Tripoli some years earlier (pl. IX, no. 77). Some of the initiative therefore certainly lay with the counts of Tripoli, and, once that point is granted, the possibility has to be taken seriously that the larger Tripolitan \emph{gros} was the prototype for the \emph{gros tournois} and not vice versa. This would involve counting the smaller coin as the \emph{gros} and valuing the larger one as a double \emph{gros}, a reversal of the conventional position.\textsuperscript{101}

So far as coinage is concerned, Tripoli is the only one of the Latin

\textsuperscript{100} See chapter XI, below.

\textsuperscript{101} It is a modern idea to conceive of these denominations as "double" or "half". Medieval practice was to refer to a certain value in money of account, such as \emph{gros} of 6 deniers or \emph{gros} of 12 deniers. Even so, the medieval mind might work by progression, either from the larger coin to the smaller or from the smaller to the larger. The history of the Tripolitan coinage suggests that this began with the smaller \emph{gros} and proceeded to the larger. The French on the other hand started with the \emph{gros tournois} and did not produce a smaller \emph{gros} until some twenty years later.
states which went down with its colors flying. The Aleppo hoard, which is thought to consist largely of booty carried off from the sack of Acre, was made up entirely of gold coins from western Christendom. Monetarily speaking, Acre at the close was a Frankish outpost and nothing more. But the castle coins of Bohemond VII, whose design, the castle and the cross, is so traditional to crusader coinage and so symbolic of crusading life, are among the finest of all the coins ever struck by the Franks in Syria and Palestine. They are also the last. Part of their beauty today lies in the fact that they mostly survive in fine condition. They were not in circulation for long before Tripoli surrendered to the onslaught of the Mamluks.