
AYSE ÇAYLAK TÜRKER, *Byzantine Coins in Çanakkale Museum. Research into the Early Christian and Byzantine Periods on the Valleys that Reached the Hellespont*. Cham: Springer Nature 2025. XI, 298 pp. including 108 plates. – ISBN 978-3-031-99582-8 (print edition); 978-3-031-99583-58 (e-book)

• MARTIN DENNERT, Philipps-Universität Marburg
(martin.dennert@uni-marburg.de)

AYSE ÇAYLAK TÜRKER, Professor of Early Christian and Byzantine Art History at the University of Çanakkale and the author of this book, conducted archaeological surveys under the name “Survey of Early Christian – Byzantine Period on the Valleys that Reached the Hellespont” in the Troad and the Gelibolu peninsula, in the modern Turkish province of Çanakkale, from 2008 to 2018. She has already published numerous preliminary reports on her field observations and discoveries.¹ In particular, she has presented a comprehensive volume on Byzantine architectural sculpture from the area.² As part of her research project on the historical geography of the Troad, she also catalogued the Byzantine coins in the Çanakkale Museum

1. See the list pp. 1–2 n. 3–4. To be added AYSE ÇAYLAK TÜRKER, Middle Section of the Hellespont and Abydos during the Byzantine Period. In: Çanakkale Merkezi Değerleri Sempozyumu, 25–26 Ağustos 2008. Bildiri Kitabı. Çanakkale 2008, pp. 665–682; EADEM, Byzantine Ambos from Hellespont. In: FABIO CODEN (ed.), *L’arredo liturgico fra oriente e occidente (V–XV secolo)*. Frammenti, opere e contesti. Milan 2022, pp. 74–83; EADEM, Corinthian Capitals from the Hellespontus. In: MARCUS GWIADZA – ALESSANDRO POGGIO – DAGMARA WIELGOSZ-RONDOLINO (eds), *Marble in the Early Byzantine Eastern Mediterranean: Use, Aesthetics, and Social Significance* (Polish Archaeology in the Mediterranean 32/1). Warsaw 2023, pp. 54–77 [<https://doi.org/10.37343/uw.2083-537x.pam32.1.03>]; EADEM, Byzantine Glazed Pottery from Thracian Chersonessos: Karainebeyli – Hisarlık. In: ZEYNEP KOÇEL ERDEM – REYHAN ŞAHİN (eds), *Thrace through the Ages: Pottery as Evidence for Commerce and Culture from Prehistoric Times to the Islamic Period*. Oxford 2023, pp. 348–361; EADEM, Late Roman-Byzantine Pans from Üstünlü Harbor in the Hellespont. In: ALBERTO GARCÍA PORRAS et al. (eds), *XIII Congreso Internacional sobre Cerámica Medieval y Moderna en el Mediterráneo (AIECM3)*. Madrid 2024, pp. 721–726 [<https://doi.org/10.63114/6a655d16>].

2. AYSE ÇAYLAK TÜRKER, *Byzantine Architectural Sculpture in Çanakkale (Research in the Early Christian and Byzantine Periods on the Valley that Reached the Hellespont 1)*. Ankara 2018. – Many of the historical data on specific sites in the book under review can already be found identically in this book, with the same errors.

(the central museum of the province) in 2008 and 2009. This museum was relocated and renamed the Troy Museum in 2018.

In the book, the author aims not merely to present the coins in the museum (p. 11: “Instead of introducing the coins with only catalogue information, which is common in numismatic studies”), but also to contextualise them within the Byzantine settlement history of the area. This is a very welcome approach and differs significantly from coin catalogues of other Turkish museums, which do not provide any information about the findspots at all.³ Her aim is therefore not simply to publish a museum catalogue, but to place the coins in a historical and geographical context. The book must be judged by this standard.

Chapter 1 (pp. 1–9) gives a short introduction, 1240 Byzantine coins were catalogued, of which almost half (596) are from hoard finds. Chapter 2 (pp. 11–61) is intended as the core of the text of the book, linking the history of settlement with coins. The very short chapter 3 (pp. 63–65) presents some conclusions. The longest chapter 4 (pp. 67–178) is the catalogue of the coins. The book concludes with 108 plates (pp. 178–285), a glossary (pp. 289–291), and the bibliography (pp. 293–298).

The book initially makes a positive and professional impression, but this quickly fades once you engage with its content more seriously. The following examples, taken from all sections of the book, illustrate this point.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Reading the first two pages and from the rest of the book, one gets the impression that the author is the only scholar who has studied the historical topography of the Byzantine Troad in recent years. However, this does not reflect the current state of research. For example, members of the German Troy excavation (2006, 2009),⁴ BEATE BÖHLENDORF-ARSLAN in the context of extensive surveys of the southern Byzantine Troad from 2006 to

3. For example, CEREN ÜNAL, Manisa Müzesi Bizans Sikkeleri. Manisa 2012; ZELİHA DEMIRALP GÖKALP, Malatya Arkeoloji Müzesi-Bizans Sikkeleri Kataloğu. İstanbul 2014; ZELİHA DEMIRALP GÖKALP, Kütahya Müzesi Bizans Sikkeleri. Ankara 2017; KASIM OYARÇIN – MERVE PAYVEREN, Erzurum Arkeoloji Müzesi Bizans Sikkeleri (2005–2017), TÜBA-KED 24, 2021, pp. 69–92; CEREN ÜNAL – VERA GURULEVA, Trabzon Müzesi Trabzon İmparatorluğu Sikkeleri. İstanbul 2022.

4. GEBHARD BIEG – BILLUR TEKKÖK – RÜSTEM ASLAN, Die spätromische Besiedlung der Troas. Ein Überblick. *Studia Troica* 16 (2006) pp. 147–170; GEBHARD BIEG – KLAUS BELKE – BILLUR TEKKÖK, Die mittel- bis spätbyzantinische Besiedlung innerhalb des Nationalparks ‚Troia und die Troas‘. *Studia Troica* 18 (2009) pp. 163–197.

2015,⁵ and, last but not least, KLAUS BELKE in the context of the *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* (2020),⁶ have studied this field extensively. However, none of these works are cited in this book, nor in her monograph from

5. BEATE BÖHLENDORF-ARSLAN, Der Landkreis Ayvacık in byzantinischer Zeit. In: A. AKDEMİR et al. (eds), *Ayvacık Değerleri Sempozyumları*, 25–31 Ağustos 2008. Çanakkale 2008, pp. 105–116; EADEM (with OĞUZ KOÇYİĞİT), Çanakkale İli Bayramiç, Ezine ve Ayvacık İlçelerindeki Bizans Dönemi Yerleşmeleri 2006 Yılı Yüzey Araştırmaları. In: VEYSEL TOLUN (ed.), *Çanakkale-Troas Arkeoloji Buluşması V*. Çanakkale 2008, pp. 93–100; EADEM, Çanakkale İli, Bayramiç, Ezine ve Ayvacık İlçelerindeki Bizans Dönemi Yerleşmeleri / Byzantinische Siedlungen in den Landkreisen Bayramiç, Ezine und Ayvacık (Provinz Çanakkale), Arkeoloji ve Etnografya Dergisi 8 (2008) pp. 1–14; EADEM, *Byzantinische Siedlungen in der südlichen Troas: Kampagne 2007, Araştırmaları Sonuçları Toplantısı* 26, 2 (2009 [2010]) pp. 311–326; EADEM, *Byzantinische Siedlungen in der südlichen Troas: Kampagne 2008. Araştırmaları Sonuçları Toplantısı* 27, 2 (2010 [2011]) pp. 145–166; EADEM, *Byzantinisches Leben im Naturraum Troas: Ballungsraum vs. Einöde*. In: FELIX PIRSON (ed.), *Manifestationen von Macht und Hierarchien in Stadtraum und Landschaft*. Istanbul 2012, pp. 277–298; EADEM, 2009 Yılında Ezine, Bayramiç ve Ayvacık İlçelerinde Bizans Dönem Yerleşmeleri / Byzantinische Siedlungen in der südlichen Troas (Ezine, Bayramiç, Ayvacık), *Survey-Kampagne 2009. Araştırmaları Sonuçları Toplantısı* 28, 1 (2011 [2012]) pp. 261–281; EADEM, 2010 Yılında Ezine, Bayramiç ve Ayvacık İlçelerinde Bizans Dönemi Yerleşmeleri / Byzantinische Siedlungen in der südlichen Troas (Ezine, Bayramiç, Ayvacık), *Kampagne 2010. Araştırmaları Sonuçları Toplantısı* 29, 2 (2012 [2013]) pp. 431–452; *Surveying the Troad: Byzantine Settlements and its Pottery*. In: JOANITA VROOM (ed.), *Fact and Fiction in Medieval and Post-Medieval Ceramics in the Eastern Mediterranean*. Turnhout 2015, pp. 47–89; EADEM, *Leben in der Provinz. Ländliche Siedlungen in der spätantiken und byzantinischen Troas*. In: FALKO DAIM – JÖRG DRAUSCHKE (eds), *Hinter den Mauern und auf dem offenen Land – Leben im Byzantinischen Reich*. Mainz 2016, pp. 63–87; EADEM, Çanakkale İli, Ezine, Bayramiç ve Ayvacık İlçelerindeki Bizans Yerleşmeleri 2012 ve 2013 Yılı Araştırmaları, Araştırmaları Sonuçları Toplantısı 32, 2 (2015 [2016]) pp. 111–130; EADEM, Çanakkale İli, Ezine, Bayramiç ve Ayvacık İlçelerindeki Bizans Yerleşmeleri 2014 Yılı Araştırmaları, Araştırmaları Sonuçları Toplantısı 33, 1 (2016 [2017]) pp. 339–360; EADEM, Çanakkale İli, Ezine, Bayramiç ve Ayvacık İlçelerindeki Bizans Dönemi 2015 Yılı Araştırmaları, Araştırmaları Sonuçları Toplantısı 34, 2 (2017 [2018]) pp. 257–284; EADEM, *Changes in Settlements and Economy of the Southern Troad (Turkey) from 4th to 15th Centuries AD*. In: BEATE BÖHLENDORF-ARSLAN – ROBERT SCHICK (eds), *Transformations of City and Countryside in the Byzantine Period*. Mainz 2020, pp. 61–71; EADEM, *Die Häfen der südlichen Troas (TR) in der Spätantike und byzantinischen Zeit*. *Skyllis* 20 (2020) pp. 44–53; EADEM, *Behind the Walls and in the Countryside. Reconstructing Byzantine Settlements and Their Environments in Anatolia: The Case of the Southern Troad*. In: NIKOS D. KONTOGIANNIS – TOLGA B. UYAR (eds), *Space and Communities in Byzantine Anatolia. Papers from the Fifth International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium*. Istanbul 2021, pp. 73–93.

6. KLAUS BELKE, *Bithynien und Hellespont (Tabula Imperii Byzantini 13)*. Vienna 2020; quoted below as TIB 13.

2018.⁷ Failing to cite a large number of easily accessible scientific literature violates all the rules of scientific work. Even worse, ignoring the results of this research and only taking into account one's own research leads to insufficient results.

This chapter also reveals another core problem with the book, namely that long passages consist purely of lists of data without any analysis at all. Of the 1240 coins 596 are from hoards. P. 3 presents the five coin hoards from the area in the museum in short, table 1.2–1.6 according to emperors. P. 3–7 now counts in words all coins, from hoards and stray finds, according to time period, emperors, metal, units and mints in extenso, suddenly stopping with the late Byzantine period, which is only mentioned in one sentence: “Of the 471 coins of the late Byzantine period, 42 are gold coins, 352 are billon coins, and 77 are copper coins.“ Table. 1.7 and 1.8 applies the same criteria only for the coins from stray finds but this time in tabular form. But what is the reader supposed to do with this accumulation of data? No attempts are being made to use the coins as sources for questions regarding history or monetary history. However, it will be demonstrated later that conclusions can indeed be drawn from this statistical analysis, especially with regard to the hoard finds.

A final core problem also emerges in this chapter: There is no explanation as to why only coins from the reign of Anastasius I (491) onwards are considered. The reviewer is fully aware that this is the conventional starting point for catalogues of Byzantine coins, taking into account the Anastasian coin reforms. While this is perfectly fine for coin collection catalogues, for questions of settlement history, this date is completely irrelevant. The 5th century was a time of economic prosperity in Asia Minor.⁸ The settlements in the Troad flourished both before and after 491, actually from archaeological data it is mostly not possible to distinguish between the second half of the 5th century and the first half of the 6th century.

The methodical problems not addressed go deeper, however: The book obviously does not take into account the coins from excavations in the Troad, which are also in the museum. The coins from the old excavations in Troy are mentioned on p. 24;⁹ those from the more recent excavations are only

7. There with one exception, BEATE BÖHLENDORF-ARSLAN – MARTIN DENNERT, Spolien in der Moschee und im Han von Çardak (Troas). *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 59 (2009) pp. 337–358.

8. See INE JACOBS (ed.), *Prosperity and Production in the Theodosian Period (Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 14)*. Leuven – Walpole, MA 2014.

9. After ALFRED R. BELLINGER, *The coins (Troy Supplement 2)*. Princeton 1961.

briefly mentioned due to an insufficient bibliography, as they are unpublished. The same applies to the coins from the excavations at Alexandria Troas; neither the excavation is mentioned nor any coins from there. Only 5 coins are listed under Alexandria Troas, and surprisingly, 36 are listed separately under Dalyan, the village bordering the Alexandria Troas area (p. 22). However, the catalogue curiously lists only 3 coins originating from Alexandria Troas and 20 coins from Dalyan, totaling 23. For the Smintheion and Assos see below p. 7#. Without including the far larger number of coins from excavations, however, the isolated scattered finds from these places are of no major settlement-historical value.

According to the information given in the catalogue, a find location is only specified for 293 out of the 644 coins not from hoards, meaning for less than 50 %. However, this raises the serious question of whether such a small number from such a large region (the province of Çanakkale covers approximately 9.817 km²) allows for statistically significant conclusions to be drawn at all. What makes matters even worse, the indication or lack of indication of find locations cannot always be trusted, as some examples will show in the following.

Chapter 2 The Hellespont and Its Vicinity in the Byzantine Period as the Findspots of the Coins

As already mentioned, this chapter aims to bring geography, history and the numismatic finds into context which would be desirable and of the greatest interest. The author divides her research region into two geographical areas: the Biga Peninsula and the Gallipoli Peninsula.¹⁰ The latter is commonly known (mostly from modern history), but the former is not. The Biga Peninsula (Turkish Biga Yarımadası) corresponds to the ancient historical region of the Troad. It makes no sense whatsoever to replace this well-known term with a Turkish geographical term in a historical study. Strangely enough, the author does not use the term Troad once in her book. Authors often tend to distance themselves from older opinions, but they should then also provide arguments as to why. One possibility would be to use the name of the Byzantine province of Hellespontos, which comprised most of the Troad.¹¹ However, the author uses Hellespont only in a geographical sense for the strait, the ancient name for what we call today

10. For the places on the Gallipoli peninsula the author did not use ANDREAS KÜLZER, *Ostthrakien (Eurōpē)* (Tabula Imperii Byzantini 12). Vienna 2008.

11. See TIB 13, p. 1065 s.v. Troas (2).

commonly the Dardanelles.¹² To avoid the term Troad the author uses instead the complicated term “settlements and road network on the valleys reaching the Hellespont”. According to her “valleys form a natural road” and “valleys form road networks” (p. 12). If one argues in this way, the author should demonstrate that either the rivers were navigable or the roads follow the river valleys. Both was not the case: the only river which might have been partly navigable is the Skamandros, but this is debated,¹³ and the roads did not follow the rivers.¹⁴ The northern part of the region is excluded without explanation, along with important cities such as Parion and Pegai. According to this catalogue, there are no Byzantine coins from these places in the museum, but at Parion, for example, many Byzantine coins have been found and published.¹⁵

The chapter follows the geographical subdivision of the area according to the valley systems defined by the author. Most of them are accompanied by maps, but these are of very limited use because the sigla used there are nowhere explained in the text and for most places mentioned it is not possible to locate them on the maps. For each area or settlement, the geographical setting is mentioned, then sometimes followed by more or less detailed information on the history. Less frequent archaeological finds are mentioned. Even when the author has published on the pottery or the architectural sculpture from a particular place herself, this is often not cited. This is followed by a purely sequential list of the number of coins from from there by emperor.

In the following I will comment on some selected passages:

pp. 15–17: Skepsis. The author cites Sepp 1893¹⁶ as a source for Saint Cornelius of Skepsis. She obviously never consulted this book; otherwise, she would have noticed that it is not about the ancient city of Skepsis and Saint Cornelius, but rather the philosophical doctrine of Pyrrhonism (Pyrrhonic

12. See TIB 13, pp. 598–599 s.v. Hellespontos (1).

13. See TIB 13, pp. 1004–1005 s.v. Skamandros (2); for inland navigation also TIB 13, 303–304, for the Dardanelles itself as local waterway TIB 13, 302.

14. For the road network see TIB 13, pp. 262–295 with the schematic map on p. 263.

15. KASIM OYARÇIN, *Sikke Buluntuları Işığında Parion’da Orta-Geç Bizans Dönemi* [The Middle-Late Byzantine Period in Parion in the Light of Coin Finds]. In: VEDAT KELEŞ et al. (eds), *Cevat Başaran'a 60. Yaş Armağanı / Essays for Cevat Başaran's 60th Birthday Occasion*. Ankara 2018, pp. 451–468; KASIM OYARÇIN, *The Early Byzantine Period of Parion in Light of Numismatic Data*. In: VEDAT KELEŞ (ed.), *Propontis ve Çevre Kültürleri / Propontis and Surrounding Cultures*. İstanbul 2020, pp. 619–628.

16. SIMON SEPP, *Die philosophische Richtung des Cornelius Celsus. Ein Kapitel aus der Geschichte der pyrrhonischen Skepsis*. Freising 1893.

scepticism) and the Roman author Aulus Cornelius Celsus. Everything in her text is a retelling based on secondary sources, without consulting the primary sources.¹⁷ However, these passages are made even more problematic by the fact that no distinction is made between hagiographic literature and historical sources. DARROUZÈS is cited as source for the city of Skepsis under the name of Hagios Kornelios at the “Council of Kadıköy”.¹⁸ Apart from the fact that there was never a “Council of Kadıköy”, only a Council of Chalcedon, Notitia 7 has nothing to do with the Council of Chalcedon. On the contrary, DARROUZÈS notes that this see was represented under the name of Skepsis. In reality Skepsis only took up the name of its patron saint at the end of the 9th century.¹⁹ The Notitiae attest the name Hagios Kornelios from the 10th century on.²⁰ Also, the interpretation of the inscription on the lintel of the Mosque at Behramkale/Assos which is originally from Skepsis, is misleading. The work was not “dedicated to Anthime” (i.e. Anthimus) but dedicated by him.²¹

pp. 18–19: Bayramiç. “... we predict that it was an important settlement during the Byzantine period”. Until today there is not the vaguest trace of any older settlement there. The spolia used there are most probably from nearby Skepsis (as mentioned p. 15²²), but here they are suddenly used as proof for a settlement on the spot. Also Bayramiç, cited as “findspot” of ten coins must be questioned, as it is the modern market town where the peasants from the surrounding villages bring their goods and probably there finds for sale.

17. FRANÇOIS HALKIN, *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*. 3Brussels 1958, pp. 125–126 no. 370y, 370z, 371. English translation and introduction TONY BURKE – WITOLD WITAKOWSKI, *Acts of Cornelius the Centurion*. In: TONY BURKE – BRENT LANDAU (eds), *New Testament Apocrypha: More Noncanonical Scriptures 1*. Grand Rapids 2016, pp. 337–361. See also *The Menologion of Basil II*. Ed. and transl. by CHARLES KUPFER. Cambridge, Mass. – London 2025, pp. 192–193 no. 125.

18. JEAN DARROUZÈS, *Notitiae episcopatuum ecclesiae constantinopolitanae*. Paris 1981, 75.

19. First time attested at the Council of Constantinople 879, GIOVANNI DOMENICO MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* 17. Venice 1772, 377 C.

20. DARROUZÈS (n. 18) 492 index s.v. Hagios Kornelios.

21. See ANDREAS RHOBY, *Byzantinische Epigramme auf Stein* (Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung 3). Vienna 2014, pp. 575–579 no. TR36 fig. LXXV; BEATE BÖHLENDORF-ARSLAN – MARTIN DENNERT, *Moscheen, Brunnen und Friedhöfe in der südlichen Troas: Vom Umgang mit Spolien in osmanischer Zeit*. In: ARMIN BERGMEIER (ed.), *The Spoliated Past. Heritage, Antiquarianism, and Byzantine Material Culture Across Time and Space*. Wiesbaden 2025, pp. 179–181 fig. 7–8.

22. See also TIB 13, pp. 1006–1007 s.v. Skepsis.

p. 22: The Tuzla Valley. The first lines are almost identically repeated from p. 18. Strangely, the author does not mention that the village of Gülpınar is located at the site of the ancient sanctuary of the Smintheion²³ and that Behramkale is the site of the ancient city of Assos.²⁴ At both sites Byzantine coins have been found during excavations; at the Smintheion in 2019 even a hoard of 68 gold coins of Justinian I and II was discovered.²⁵ Apart from this, Assos has no geographical connection with the Tuzla Valley at all.

p. 24: 21 coins from Tevfikiye (the village next to Troy) and Beşiktepe are mentioned. Putting these two places together makes no sense, they are 12 km apart and totally separate Byzantine settlements. Even stranger, adding the numbers for each emperor given in the text, one ends up with 17 coins but counting the coins in the catalogue from Tevfikiye/Troy (8 coins, no. 31, 125, 210, 347, 350, 576, 605, 631) and Beşiktepe (5 coins, no. 202, 536, 537, 573, 577) there are only 13 coins from these two villages. In addition, in the text coins from emperors are named, which do not show up in the catalogue.²⁶ Matters get worse, as in an older article, the author depicts three coins according to her from Tevikiye:²⁷ one can be identified as no. 347, one (inv. 5449) is no. 352 without findspot and one is not included in the catalogue at all. The text does not mention the fact that a Byzantine settlement was excavated at Beşiktepe and published. In this settlement almost exclusively coins dating to the period of the Latin Kingdom were

23. ZEYNEP CİZMEL ÖĞÜN, Smintheion Kazıları Sikke Buluntuları. *Anadolu/Anatolia* 26 (2004) pp. 25–37.

24. HAROLD W. BELL, Coins from Assos. In: J. T. CLARKE – F. H. BACON – ROBERT KOLDEWEY, *Investigations at Assos*. London 1902–1921, pp. 310–311 (late antique and Byzantine coins ending with Romanus IV); the coins from the newer Turkish excavations are unpublished.

25. Preliminary report DAVUT KAPLAN et al., 2019–2020 Smintheion/Gülpınar Kazı ve Onarım Çalışmaları. In: 2019–2020 Kazı Çalışmaları. Ankara 2022, p. 533.

26. None of the four coins of Theodore II Ducas-Lascaris (no. 612–615) come from there; no. 125 (Maurice) comes from Tevfikiye, but Maurice is not mentioned in the text.

27. AYŞE ÇAYLAK TÜRKER, *Bizans Döneminde Çanakkale Boğazı ve Yerleşim Modelleri: Skamander Vadisi*. *Anadolu ve Çevresinde Ortaçağ* 4 (2010) pp. 68, 89 fig. 21.

found.²⁸ For the remains of Byzantine Troy/Ilion Rose should be cited fully.²⁹

p. 26: İntepe (Erenköy). According to the text 4 coins come from there, one of Heraclius and three anonymous folles. In the catalogue only the coin of Heraclius is to be found (no. 159) with this findspot. Two of the anonymous folles were depicted by the author in another article³⁰ and can thus be identified as no. 357 (inv. 5487) and no. 430 (inv. 5488), however, neither of them has a location specified. According to the subsequent inventory number 5489, no. 431 is likely the fourth coin from İntepe.

p. 28: Dardanos. The complete passage on the church history of Dardanos is a copy and paste from one of the authors older articles,³¹ including the names “J. W. NESBIT – J. OIKONOMIDES” instead of J. NESBITT – N. OIKONOMIDES.³²

p. 30: Kepez. In an article by the author four coins from Kepez are mentioned,³³ in the book surprisingly five, now adding an anonymous folles of group B (1030/35–1042). In her catalogue (p. 113) 32 examples of this type are listed, but none with the findspot Kepez. Browsing through the catalogue, only three coins from Kepez can be found: no. 83. 181. 387. The coin in her article fig. 19, 4 with the findspot Kepez is no. 378 in the book, but without mentioning a findspot. If one sees the inaccuracies earlier mentioned in this review one begins to wonder to what extent information about find locations and the number of coins found in one place can be trusted at all.

28. URS PESCHLOW, Zur byzantinischen Keramik [vom Beşik-Tepe]. Archäologischer Anzeiger 1984, pp. 183–186, coins p. 186; BEATE BÖHLENDORF, Die glasierte byzantinische Keramik des Beşik-Tepe (Troas). Studia Troica 7 (1997) pp. 363–444, coins p. 397; BEATE BÖHLENDORF-ARSLAN, Wohnen auf dem Beşiktepe (Troas): Einige Bemerkungen zur Architektur einer kleinen byzantinischen Siedlung. In: MUSA KADIROĞLU – ERHAN ÖZTEPE (eds), Patronus. Festschrift für Ahmet Coşkun Özgünel zum 65. Geburtstag. Istanbul 2007, pp. 37–44, coins pp. 40–41; see TIB 13, pp. 362–364 s.v. Achilleon.

29. CH. BRIAN ROSE, Von Konstantin bis Mehmet II. Ilion in byzantinischer Zeit, In: Troia. Traum und Wirklichkeit. Stuttgart 2001, pp. 280–281 with full references to older bibliography; see TIB 13, pp. 620–624 s.v. Ilion (1).

30. ÇAYLAK TÜRKER (n. 27) p. 94 fig. 33; in the text p. 74 even 11 Byzantine coins from İntepe are mentioned (!).

31. AYSE ÇAYLAK TÜRKER, A Byzantine Settlement in Kalabaklı Valley in the Hellespontus: Kepez. Höyük 5 (2014) p. 75 n. 34.

32. The same mistake in the bibliography p. 295, but here followed by J. NESBITT – N. OIKONOMIDES.

33. ÇAYLAK TÜRKER (n. 26) p. 69 fig. 19, 1–4.

p. 30: Atik Hisar. For this major castle from the period of the Laskarids BELKE should be cited.³⁴

pp. 32–34: Abydos. Neither the important Byzantine office of the kommerkiarios of Abydos³⁵ nor the comprehensive book by LEVENIOTIS 2017 is mentioned.³⁶ The extremely awkwardly worded sentence “The architectural data about the structures mentioned in the written data failed to survive up to the present time” could be shortened to “No Byzantine structures have been found”. The church mentioned after an inscription from around 989 interpreted hypothetically by JANIN for Abydos was not build there but in Pisidia, where the inscription was found.³⁷

p. 43: Madydos. “Of the metropolitans of Madytos, Cerularius is referred to as the founder of the separation between eastern and western churches in the publications on the ecclesiastical history”.³⁸ Michael Cerularius died in 1059, he was never metropolitan of Madydos and Madytos was only promoted to metropolis under Constantine X Dukas. Instead, Cerularius was patriarch of Constantinople from 1043 to 1058. He also did not die in Madydos, as stated here, erroneously referring to Michael Psellos,³⁹ who does not mention the place.⁴⁰ Furthermore, the statement that Cerularius is “referred to as the founder of the separation between eastern and western

34. KLAUS BELKE, Gâvur Hisarı, eine byzantinische Burg in der Troas. In: WOLFRAM HÖRANDNER – JOHANNES KODER – MARIA A. STASSINOPOLOU (eds), Wiener Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik. Beiträge zum Symposium Vierzig Jahre Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien, im Gedenken an Herbert Hunger (Wien, 4.–7. Dezember 2002). Vienna 2004, pp. 72–82; TIB 13, pp. 692–694 s.v. Kremaste; with a very different view of the castle.

35. See JOHN NESBITT – NICHOLAS OIKONOMIDES, Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art. Vol. 3. Washington 1991, pp. 73–81 with seals also from other dignitaries of Abydos.

36. GEORGIOS A. LEVENIOTIS, Η Αβύδος του Ελληνοπόντου και η περιοχή της. Thessaloniki 2017.

37. HENRI GRÉGOIRE. Byzantion 4 (1927–28) p. 698; KLAUS BELKE – NORBERT MERSICH, Phrygien und Pisidien (Tabula Imperii Byzantini 7). Vienna 1990, p. 205 s.v. Bardaēta; TIB 13, p. 355 s.v. Abydos.

38. Quoting for this statement ADRIAN FORTESCUE, The Orthodox Eastern Church, 2004, p. 195 as source. FORTESCUE (reprinted from 1907) does not state anything like this; he writes “While he was being taken, strongly guarded, to Madytos he died”, not, that he died at Madytos.

39. Michael Psellos 7, 65, here quoted in the English translation as “E. R. A. SEWTER, Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. USA 1966, 315”.

40. See FRANZ TINNEFELD, Michael I. Kerullarios, Patriarch von Konstantinopel (1043–1058). Kritische Überlegungen zu einer Biographie. Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 39 (1989) pp. 122–123 with n. 170; he probably died in Abydos.

churches” is also not correct and is of no importance for Madytos anyway.⁴¹ pp. 46–61 (with the wrong page heading “other findspots”): a table with the findspots of the coins, a mere concordance between the catalogue numbers, the inventory numbers of the museum, and the find locations, is of no real value as all the data can be easily found in the catalogue. If at all, it should have been positioned after the catalogue.

The author fails to differentiate between primary sources and secondary literature when discussing historical facts and figures. The utilization of sources is often arbitrary and the literature employed is frequently unreliable and outdated. The list of errors, misunderstanding and omissions could easily be extended indefinitely. It is strongly recommended that the reader rather refers to the information provided by KLAUS BELKE in the *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* for any historical data relating to the places mentioned in this book, who cites all sources and the secondary literature, including all known archaeological data.

A final word about style: Aside from the tedious, repetitive lists of coins, denominations, and emperors, the language of the book is not very inviting. Phrases like “it is asked”, “it is considered”, “it is known”, “it is learned”, “it is mentioned”, “it is recorded”, “it is seen”, “it is stated”, “it is suggested”, “it is thought”, “it is understood” are repeated over and over again. This language also reveals the author’s lack of knowledge in dealing with sources and scientific literature.

Chapter 3 Conclusion

The “abstract” at the beginning of this two-page section is repeated word-by-word on p. 64. Its second paragraph repeats a paragraph from p. 1, and the third paragraph is almost identically to one on p. 3. “For this evaluation, 14 periods can be identified.” However, no explanation is given to the reader for this: for what reasons and for what purpose? Using the formula introduced by METCALF, the author produces a table (p. 65) with “information about the fluctuations in the coin circulation”. But what does this mean for the history of Byzantine settlements in the Troad, either in general or in specific locations?

Chapter 4 Catalogue

The catalogue comprises the longest part of the book and is definitely also the most important part. It will endure as a fundamental work and final

41. TIB 13, pp. 501–504 s.v. Madytos.

catalogue of the Byzantine coins in the Çanakkale Museum. The coins are classified according to the Dumbarton Oaks catalogue, sometimes a little too superficial.⁴² However, more could have been achieved here. For the coins up to the year 720 the much more detailed chronology of HAHN's *Moneta Imperii Byzantini* is to be preferred,⁴³ and for the coins from 1081 to 1261 the book by MARCHEV – WACHTER,⁴⁴ with many new variants, should have been cited. Citations of coin catalogues from other Turkish museums or the book by SEAR, which is aimed at coin collectors, are provided inconsistently and do not add any scientific value.

As demonstrated above, the presence or absence of references to places where individual coins were found in the catalogue cannot always be trusted, which must be considered when interpreting the information in the text.

Plates

Almost all coins are depicted on the plates, only 23 are missing.⁴⁵ Coins with images are marked with * in the catalogue, however, there are some errors.⁴⁶ The plates in the printed version of the book are almost worthless as many of the images are barely legible. This has nothing to do with the quality of the original photos,⁴⁷ but more with the quality of printing, the book is published as "print-on-demand".

Glossary

This book, which is aimed at an academic audience, explains terms that do not require any explanation, such as "chiton", "chlamys", "christogram", "mint" etc., on two and a half pages.

Bibliography

Here all titles are given abbreviations, but these are not used throughout the book. Instead, the full titles are always repeated to unnecessarily in-

42. E.g. p. 163 only quoting "DOC 5/2, Pl. 14"; p. 164 "DOC 5/2, Pl. 16".

43. WOLFGANG HAHN, *Moneta Imperii Byzantini* 1. Vienna 1973; 2. Vienna 1975; 3. Vienna 1981.

44. VALENTIN MARCHEV – ROBERT WACHTER, Catalogue of the late Byzantine coins 1081–1261. Vol. 1. Veliko Tarnovo 2011.

45. An image of no. 583 can be found in ÇAYLAK TÜRKER (n. 27) p. 88 fig. 17.

46. No. 493, 498 and 827 have a * but are not on the plates; no. 540 and 561 have no * but are on the plates. – One coin is mislabelled: pl. 38 bottom two are labelled no. 438; the left one is no. 438, the right one no. 439.

47. The quality of the images in the pdf-version of the book is mostly better; this part can be downloaded for free at <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/bbm:978-3-031-99583-5/1>.

flate the footnotes.⁴⁸ The bibliography shows many oddities and inconsistencies: the alphabetical order is not always maintained, authors are sometimes listed with, sometimes without their full first names, and the author's writings are listed under A. ÇAYLAK TÜRKER and A. Ç. TÜRKER. There are numerous misspellings (some of the worst P. FIRISCH [instead of P. FRISCH]; F. WINKELMANS [for F. WINKELMANN]). Some titles cited here are never used in the book: PAPADOPOLI 1893; ÜNAL 2017⁴⁹; WROTH 1908 (better so, the old catalogue of the Byzantine coins in the British Museum should not be cited anyway).

Michael Psellus is cited as "E. R. A. SEWTER, Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. USA 1966". Byzantine (Dukas 1956) and foreign-language authors (GALLAND 1973⁵⁰; HEYD 1975⁵¹; NICOL 1999⁵², NICOL 2000⁵³; PITCHER 1999⁵⁴; RAMSAY 1981⁵⁵, TEXIER 2002⁵⁶ and TOURNEFORT 2005⁵⁷) are quoted in Turkish translation, which should not happen in an English-language book, even by a Turkish scholar. In any case, citing the date of the Turkish translation instead of the original edition distorts its position in the history of science.

In many cases, completely outdated literature is cited. A nice example is p. 28 n. 36, quoting FLEURY 1843 as source for "Bishop Petrus attended the Council of Kadıköy" (sic!). This is the English translation of the church history of the French scholar CLAUDE FLEURY (1640–1723).⁵⁸ However, there is only mentioned a bishop Dioscorus of Dardanus⁵⁹ after an old edi-

48. Only exceptions p. 12 n. 3; 18 n. 21; 64 n. 2.

49. These two titles obviously remained because the book was originally advertised under the title "Byzantine and Venetian Coins in Çanakkale Museum".

50. Journal d'Antoine Galland pendant son séjour à Constantinople (1672–1673). Publié et annoté par CHARLES SCHEFFER. Paris 1881.

51. WILHELM HEYD, Geschichte des Levantehandels im Mittelalter. Stuttgart 1879.

52. DONALD NICOL, The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261–1453. London 1972.

53. DONALD NICOL, Byzantium and Venice. A study in diplomatic and cultural relations. Cambridge 1988.

54. DONALD EDGAR PITCHER, An historical geography of the Ottoman empire. Leiden 1972.

55. WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor. London 1890.

56. CHARLES TEXIER, Asie Mineure: description géographique, historique et archéologique des provinces et des villes de la chersonnèse d'Asie. Paris 1862.

57. JOSEPH PITTON DE TOURNEFORT, Relation d'un Voyage du Levant. Lyon 1717.

58. The Ecclesiastical History of M. l'abbé FLEURY, from A.D. 429 to A.D. 456. Translated by JOHN HENRY NEWMANN. Vol. 2. London 1843, p. 201.

59. He is mentioned by the author one sentence earlier but with bibliography in n. 35

tion of a letter of Synesios. The new edition has Darnis, and this is located in the Libyan desert.⁶⁰ As evidence for bishop Petrus at Chalcedon, the author also cites the English translation of the council acts, which would have been better and sufficient, except that all the page references are incorrect.⁶¹ The use of old books is sometimes absurd: FORTESCU 2004 is a reprint of a book from 1907, a book no serious church historian would ever cite today.⁶² TORREY 1854 is not by TORREY but the English translation of the church history of the German scholar AUGUST NEANDER from 1830.⁶³ This book of 768 pages is cited on p. 29 n. 62 without a page number for Lampsacus which is not mentioned in this book at all. Citing ancient bibliography is intended to create a false impression of erudition, which is completely unnecessary.

Chances missed

As already mentioned, the book also includes five coin hoards. The coins from the hoards are simply listed, without any commentary. The information is scattered at three locations. No attempt is made to place them in a historical context.

Hoard 1 Bayramiç-Saçaklı, 20 coins dating 1143–1195 (p. 3 table 1.2. 141–144)

Hoard 2 Bayramiç-Hacıköy, 70 coins dating 565–1204 (2 Justin II, 1 Heraclius, the rest 11th to early 13th century) (p. 4 table 1.3. 144–151)

Hoard 3 Bayramiç-Palamutoba, 345 coins dating 1143–1215 (4 table 1.4. 19–20. 151–162)

Hoard 4 Yenice-Koruköy, 28 coins dating 1259–1303 (p. 4 table 1.5. 26. 162–164)

Hoard 5 Kemel, 132 coins dating 1137–1328 (p. 5 table 1.6. 35. 164–176)

where he is not mentioned at all.

60. Synesios, ep.66, 149–150 (ed. ANTONIO GARZYA – DENIS ROQUES. Vol. 3. Paris 2000, pp. 178–179 with apparatus criticus).

61. Correct RICHARD PRICE – MICHAEL GADDIS (transl.), *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. Liverpool 2005, vol. I p. 127 no. 214; vol. II p. 8 no. 176; p. 40 no. 157; p 79 no. 62; p. 95 no. 144; p. 108 no. 261; p. 123 no. 178; p. 211 no. 194; p. 225 no. 196; p. 237 no. 206; vol. III p. 80 no. 94.

62. ADRIAN FORTESCU, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*. London 1907.

63. AUGUST NEANDER, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche*. Band 2, Hamburg 1830; *General history of the Christian religion and church*. Translated from the German of Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER by JOSEPH TORREY. Vol. 2. Boston 1854.

Apparently, the author missed one hoard: On p. 26 she mentions 16 gold coins from Kumkale, a village directly north of Troy, ranging from Leo III (1 coin), Constantine V (1), Nicephorus I (4), Michael I (1) to Leo V (2). This adds up to only 9 coins. By combining table 2.1, Findspots of the coins (p. 50), and the entries in the catalogue it is however possible to identify 17 gold coins with the consecutive inventory numbers 9757 to 9773, including Leo III (no. 171), Constantine V (no. 173–176), Leo IV (no. 177–179), Constantine VI (no. 182), Nicephorus I (no. 186–190), Michael I (no. 193) and Leo V (no. 194–195). Strangely, neither table 2.1 nor the catalogue gives a location for any of these coins. 17 gold coins from a close date range coming from one village cannot be a coincidence, these coins must be part of a small hoard. Outstanding, it is a hoard only of gold solidi. This hoard makes more than 70 % of all Byzantine gold coins up to the 9th century in the museum. Interestingly, the number of gold coins at the museum is very low, compared to other areas of Turkey.⁶⁴

Unfortunately, no details are given about the archaeological circumstances of the discovery of any of the hoards, especially whether they were found scattered in one place or hidden in a vessel. Hoard 1, 4 and 6 are relatively small and could be the content of a private purse. Hoard 6 from the time of Leo V (813–820) is outstanding, as no other hoard of this period is known and any historical interpretation would be speculative. Hoard 1, 2 and 3 were deposited in the early 13th century and all in a very small area north of the middle Scamander and Bayramiç. This likely points to a common reason for the burial of the hoards which might be connected with the fall of the Troad to the Latin Empire. Hoards 4 and 5 can clearly be connected with the final demise of Byzantine settlement in the Troad with the invasion of the Turks.⁶⁵ We know from Pachymeres that the inhabitants of the Ska-mandros area fled to the fortified acropolis of Assos in the southern Troad, which was finally captured in 1304.⁶⁶ More hoards from Western Asia Mi-nor can be dated to this period.⁶⁷ There are extremely few coins from the

64. For example, HASAN BUYRUK, *Adana Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Bizans Dönemi Altın Sikkeleri*. Ordu 2014, with 175 gold coins from Cilicia in the Adana museum (many with findspots).

65. Overview for this period given in TIB 13, pp. 209ff. with sources and bibliography.

66. Georges Pachymérès, *Relations historiques 4, Livres 10–13 (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae 24, 4)*. Ed. ALBERT FAILLER. Paris 1999, p. 480 f. B 438.

67. For hoards from the early 14th century linked to the events of the years 1303/04 and Catalan connections see JULIAN BAKER, *The acropolis of Pergamon in the winter of 1302–1303: the evidence of coins*. *Heritage Turkey* 44 (2020) pp. 44–45; JULIAN BAKER – LALE PANCAR, *A coin hoard from Ayasuluk and the arrival of silver gigliati*

Palaiologan period found in the Troas, the last coins are by Andronicus II. With very few exceptions, the Byzantine settlement in the area came to an end.

Isolated finds of coins without stratigraphic context from a place or region can certainly serve as evidence for studies on money circulation and monetary economics. An excellent example what can be achieved from coin finds is JULIAN BAKER's monograph on coinage in late Byzantine Greece, who was able to write a monetary history, combining finds from hoards, excavations and single finds.⁶⁸ Another recent example of carefully analysis of Byzantine coins from one site without addressing their stratigraphical value is the study of the coins from Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia by MAX RITTER.⁶⁹ He includes the coins of the 4th and 5th centuries and their problems in his commentary and addresses broader questions of coin circulation in Asia Minor. He also deals with the so-called "Coin Gap" of ca. 658/668–830 which can be seen also in the coins of this book (see the table p. 65), but is not addressed there. For the northern Troad, a recent article attempts to correlate coin finds with archaeological and historical data on conflicts and natural events in the early Byzantine period.⁷⁰

In summary, the book is a disappointment. It makes no important contribution to neither the historical geography of the Byzantine Troad nor to Byzantine numismatics. The history of Byzantine settlements in the Troad can only be written by considering all available evidence and sources, including historical, epigraphical, sigillographical, numismatic, and archaeological material. A monetary history of the Byzantine Troad would be desirable, but could only be achieved by accurately taking into account all

from Mediterranean Europe in early fourteenth-century western Anatolia. Anatolian Studies 71 (2021) pp. 157–170. See also JULIAN BAKER, Coin circulation in fourteenth-century Thrace and Constantinople according to the evidence of the hoards. In: OĞUZ TEKİN (ed.), Second international congress on the history of money and numismatics in the Mediterranean world. Proceedings. Istanbul 2018, pp. 485–504.

68. JULIAN BAKER, Coinage and Money in Medieval Greece 1200–1430 (The Medieval Mediterranean 124). Leiden – Boston 2021.

69. MAX RITTER, The Byzantine Coins Found at Pompeiopolis (Paphlagonia) during the Excavation Campaigns of 2010–16 and their Significance in the Anatolian Context, in: LATIFE SUMMERER – PERI JOHNSON – JULIA KOCH (eds), Contextualizing Pompeiopolis: Urban Development in Roman Anatolia from a Comparative Perspective. Berlin 2025, pp. 527–564.

70. VEDAT KELEŞ – KASIM OYARÇIN, The Effects of Conflicts and Earthquakes in the Troas Region on the Parion Coin Findings. In: Proceedings of the Fourth International Roman and Late Antique Thrace Conference "Conflicts and Catastrophes in Roman and Late Antique Thrace" (Burgas, 12th – 16th October 2020). Sofia 2024, pp. 105–113.

Byzantine coins found in the region, including those found in stray finds, hoards and excavations, as well as western medieval coins. This will only be possible once much more material has been published. Until then, this book can be considered as a small contribution to this.

Finally, a word about the publisher. It is completely incomprehensible how such a book could have passed peer review. If that was the case, then the reviewers' (definitively negative) judgement must have been ignored. Clearly, no editing of the text took place; otherwise, the numerous errors, inconsistencies, redundancies, and repetitions would have been noticed. It is most astonishing that this book was published by a renowned international academic publisher. And all this for the princely sum of 138 Euro.

Keywords

Byzantine numismatics; coins; coin hoards; Troad; Hellespontos