




Paweł Lachowicz (Wrocław)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2536-5220>

THE TITLE HIERARCHY OF THE LAST KOMNENOI AND THE ANGELOS DYNASTY – FROM *SEBASTOHYPERTATOS* TO *SEBASTOKRATOR**

Abstract. The system of dignities introduced by Alexios I Komnenos was an answer for the need of a new reformed title hierarchy, adequate for aristocratic model of exercising power. It served as a clear manifestation of the special privileged position of emperor's kinsmen. The titles granted to those relatives and affines can be traced accurately up to the reign of Manuel I. So far, however, little space has been devoted to the analysis of that system during the Angelos dynasty.

It is often generally assumed following Niketas Choniates testimony, that the title hierarchy in the late 12th century suffered certain loss of value or inflation. It is worth taking a closer look at this process, on the example of the titles traditionally granted to the closest family members, at the courts of Andronicus I Komnenos and the Angeloi. I would like to focus particularly on those dignities, that at the time of the Komnenoi were given to the emperor's siblings and his sons-in-law – from *sebastohypertatos* to *sebastokrator*. That part of the title hierarchy was much closer to a ruler, making it easier to trace.

The basic problem encountered by researchers of this period is the small number of sources, not allowing for full reconstruction of the title hierarchy. However, very limited information found in the written sources can be complemented by aristocratic lead seals, which often included the dignity of their owners.

From such an analysis emerges a picture of a steady evolution of the Komnenian system. The emperors of the late 12th century adjusted court dignities to need at hand. Yet that process doesn't seem to diminish significantly the value of the highest titles.

Keywords: Byzantine aristocracy, Komnenos, Angelos, titles, *sebastokrator*, *kaisar*, *panhypersebastos*, *sebastohypertatos*

The status of the extended Komnenos family in 12th-century Byzantine society was based not only on the wealth, lands and privileges accumulated in their hands. In comparison with the Latin West, the Byzantine society was much less

* This article is an extended and revised version of a paper presented during the Third Colloquia Ceranea International Conference in Łódź in April 2021.

hierarchical. Without a firm border between commoners and the powerful, elements such as fame or prestige at the court were equally important aspects of one's position¹. One of the ways of expressing these aspects of social prominence were honorary dignities granted by the emperor. They functioned as a crucial element of one's status alongside the actual administrative offices in the bureaucratic or military structure of the state.

In the actions of the emperors of the Komnenian dynasty, one can see a clear understanding of the important role that manifestations of power and prestige played in building the elite position of the ruling family in Byzantine society. The ceremonial took on an even more public character, which can be seen in the return to the custom of triumphs, or in a special ceremonies such as *prokypsis*². Court ranks became one of the central determinants of the position in the dynastic "clan". The internal hierarchy of this particular structure of aristocrats bound by blood to the Komnenoi was based on titles that were expanded and revised. That in some way "overwrote" the previous hierarchy from the 11th century³.

So far, the most complete and coherent picture of titles granted during the time of Komnenos "clan" hegemony has been presented by Lucien Stiernon. He distinguished eight levels of hierarchy, characteristic for the 12th century⁴. The highest position of emperor, was followed by *sebastokrator*, *gambros* (including people with titles from *panhypersebastos* to *sebastohypertatos*), emperor's cousins (including people with the title *protosebastos*), *sebastos*, *nobilissimos*, *kouropalates* and *proedros*. The last three are not part of the Komnenos "clan" which I understand as a structure strictly based on consanguinity⁵. They were granted to very prominent

¹ D. NICOL, *The Prosopography of the Byzantine Aristocracy*, [in:] *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. M. ANGOLD, Oxford 1984, p. 80.

² P. MAGDALINO, *The Triumph of 1133*, [in:] *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium. In the Shadow of Father and Son*, ed. A. BUCOSI, A. RODRIGUEZ SUÁREZ, London–New York 2016, p. 62–63; M. JEFFREYS, *The Komnenian Prokypsis*, Pa 5, 1987, p. 38–53.

³ P. FRANKOPAN, *Kinship and the Distribution of Power in Komnenian Byzantium*, EHR 122, 2007, p. 7; M. ANGOLD, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204. A Political History*, London–New York 1997, p. 128; P. MAGDALINO, *Court Society and Aristocracy*, [in:] *The Social History of Byzantium*, ed. J. HALDON, Oxford 2009, p. 226.

⁴ L. Stiernon published a series of four articles concerning byzantine titles in 12th century: L. STIERNON, *Notes de prosopographie et de titulature byzantines. Constantin Ange (pan)sébastohypertate*, REB 19, 1961, p. 273–283; IDEM, *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. Adrien (Jean) et Constantin Comnène, sébastes*, REB 21, 1963, p. 179–198; IDEM, *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. A propos de trois membres de la famille Rogerios (XII^e siècle)*, REB 22, 1964, p. 184–198. In context of this article, particularly interesting is the last one that includes a full stratification of Komnenian rank hierarchy: IDEM, *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. Sébaste et Gambros*, REB 23, 1965, p. 222–225.

⁵ The so-called "clan" of the Komnenoi that *de facto* ruled the empire in 12th century is a structure that I understand as an extensive and hermetic group of allied aristocratic families, concentrated around the ruling dynasty and linked with them through blood-relations or marriages. I explain-

aristocrats without genealogical connection with the ruling dynasty. The French Byzantinist, apart from distinguishing and organizing the title precedence of the Komnenian era, also pointed out some rules that emperors usually followed when assigning such dignities to members of the court. These ranks were granted for life and could only be taken away as a part of banishment or total infamy. Rare but not unusual were promotions from lower rank. One of the examples is John Rogerios Dalassenos raised from the position of *panhypersebastos* to *kaisar*⁶. On the other hand, there seem to be no cases of degradation from higher to lower ranks with the only exception to this rule being Bela (Alexios) who's rank was lowered from *despotes* to *kaisar*⁷. Some titles like *kaisar* or *panhypersebastos* between 1100 to 1180 were only granted to one person at the same time. They could be passed on to someone else only in the case of vacancy⁸.

There is no doubt that Alexios I Komnenos at the beginning of his reign had to pursue a very flexible policy and use *ad hoc* measures. Some of the decisions in retrospect turned out to be detrimental for the state. Yet one has to take into account particularly difficult time that was the end of the 11th century. The emperor had to improvise and look for any opportunity if he wanted to establish his new dynasty. In line with this philosophy, new court titles were most likely created to support Alexios' new family policy. The old court hierarchy lost some of its value and importance, especially during the reign of Nicephorus III⁹. This fact was used to build a revised hierarchy in which the emperor's family played the central role.

A good example of adapting policy to the needs at hand is the way in which the rank of *sebastokrator* was created¹⁰. Alexios' older brother – Isaac Komnenos, due to his age and experience, could potentially aspire for the throne. Certainly there are no indications of conflict between these brothers at any point, however rivalry

ed that more elaborately in my previous publication: P. LACHOWICZ, *Power and Aristocracy – Transformation and Composition of the Komnenos "Clan" (1081–1200) – A Statistical Approach*, SCer 10, 2020, p. 144–153.

⁶ K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών*, vol. I, Θεσσαλονίκη 1984, p. 350. Other examples include Nicephorus Bryennios raised from the rank of *panhypersebastos* to *kaisar* and Isaac Komnenos (son of Alexios I) raised from the rank of *kaisar* to *sebastokrator*. Both by the emperor John II Komnenos.

⁷ *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, rec. A. MEINEKE, Bonnae 1836 [= CSHB, 23.1] (cetera: KINNAMOS), p. 287.

⁸ See above. The case of John Rogerios Dalassenos is one of the examples that can support this hypothesis. He was raised to the rank of *kaisar* only after the death of its previous bearer – Nicephorus Bryennios. There are more examples of such practice in the period of 1100–1180. It is apparent that titles of *kaisar*, *panhypersebastos*, *protosebastohypertatos* and *sebastohypertatos* were given only to one person at the same time.

⁹ *Nicéphore Bryennios Histoire*, IV, 1–2, rec. P. GAUTIER, Bruxelles 1975 [= CFHB, 9], p. 257–259; J. SHEA, *Politics and Government in Byzantium. The Rise and Fall of the Bureaucrats*, London 2020 [= NDBS], p. 158–159.

¹⁰ *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, III, 4, 1, vol. I, rec. D.R. REINSCH, A. KAMBYLIS, Berlin 2001 [= CFHB. SBe, 40] (cetera: KOMNENE), p. 95.

and tensions inside aristocratic families were a common occurrence in Byzantium. These factors had to be taken into account by the emperor even in case of a loyal brother such as Isaac. It was expected that he should be honoured properly to compensate for his secondary position. However, since the title of *kaisar* was already granted to Nicephorus Melissenos – another pretender to the throne, Isaac had to receive an even higher dignity that would be appropriate for older brother¹¹. The solution was to create a new title, the aforementioned *sebastokrator*, which was the highest dignity right after the emperor. It was a sensible decision. A mark of the emperor's political awareness and pragmatism.

The rank hierarchy after the death of Manuel I still remains a mystery to a large extent. The problem stems from the much smaller number of sources available to historians for the period after 1180. First of all, there are no synodal lists, which were an indispensable help in reconstructing the precedence of aristocrats at the imperial court. Written sources often focus on the functions performed by historical figures, omitting the court titles. Abundant poetic material written by court literati becomes rather sparse by the end of the century. These gaps in knowledge can be filled by the few seals containing the dignity of its issuer. The most well-known passage from source material that directly describes the change in the honorary titles system is included in Niketas Choniates' most famous work – *Chronikē diēgēsis*. A short remark that seems to be the basis of all conclusions regarding this issue¹². This Byzantine historian writes, criticizing the incompetent rule of Alexios III Angelos, that dignities again were sold to commoners, just as in the 11th century. According to his account, the title of *sebastos* was granted even to the lower *strata* of society: merchants and townspeople¹³. While this passage is one of the most specific descriptions of title inflation in the late 12th century, one can trace that process as early as 1120s.

Three sons of John II received the title of *sebastokrator*, which was previously reserved to only one person. Andronicus, Isaac and Manuel are praised by Theodoros Prodromos as a venerable triad of *sebastokrators*¹⁴. At the same time, both younger brothers of emperor John held the same dignity. Was that situation one of the factors that led to long rivalry with Isaac Komnenos? Nothing is known for sure, as we don't have enough information¹⁵. It is noteworthy however, that in the Chora monastery restored by him, he chose to describe himself simply as a son of

¹¹ B. SKOULATOS, *Les personnages byzantins de l'Alexiade. Analyse prosopographique et synthèse*, Louvain 1980, p. 241.

¹² P. MAGDALINO, *Court Society...*, p. 226–227.

¹³ *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, vol. I, rec. I.A. VAN DIETEN, Berolini 1975 [= *CFHB*, 11] (cetera: CHONIATES), p. 483–484.

¹⁴ THEODOROS PRODROMOS, *Historische Gedichte*, IX, a 21–22; X, b 22–23; c 24, rec. W. HÖRANDNER, Wien 1974 [= *WBS*, 11], p. 245, 250–251.

¹⁵ CHONIATES, p. 32. Choniates does not explain precisely reasons for Isaac's animosity towards John II.

Alexios I, completely omitting the title of *sebastokrator* as if it was not significant enough to mention¹⁶. This process of dropping official ranks in favour of genealogical adjectives such as *gambros*, *adelphos*, *exadelphos* etc., is observable during the reign of Manuel I and was already described in scholarly works¹⁷.

Choniates' comment on the fall of court ranks significance shows only the rear end of that long and progressive inflation of court titles. Given that the dignity of *sebastos* was a Hellenized form of the word *augustus* and as such was reserved exclusively for the most illustrious persons at the court, it is striking that from the mid-11th to the late 12th century it lost so much of its value¹⁸. In face of these facts it might be tempting to assume that this process touched on the whole hierarchy of titles to the same extent. However, while *sebastos* has indeed lost its high rank, the situation of higher titles cannot be generalized in that way. Top layer of the hierarchy has to be perceived separately as its own entity, more rigid in its principles and therefore less prone to changes. *Sebastohypertatos* and following it higher ranks were reserved to a much smaller circle of aristocrats. The main focus of this article is to check to what extent said inflation affected that group in the years 1180–1204.

Let's start the analysis of that problem by examining the situation just before the death of Manuel I. At that point in time we can identify only one *sebastokrator* – Alexios Komnenos¹⁹. He was one of the illegitimate sons of the emperor, recognized later by Manuel. Noteworthy is almost complete absence of people with titles attributed to sons-in-law. By 1180 all of the emperor's brothers-in-law and previous bearers of those ranks were already dead. Those titles were most likely vacant for a long period. That was until the marriage of Maria Komnene, Manuel's daughter, with Renier of Montferrat. Since Maria was the eldest and only legal daughter of the emperor, her husband in accordance with the usual custom, received the title of *kaisar*, just as John Rogerios Dalassenos (husband of the eldest daughter of John II) and Nicephorus Bryennios (only after the death of Alexios I)²⁰. It's worth mentioning that when Maria Komnene was previously engaged to Hungarian prince Bela (Alexios), he did not receive the title of *sebastokrator*, which would equate him with the emperor's illegitimate son. Instead, Manuel devised a new title – *despotes*, which elevated the position of the would-be son-in-law and heir²¹.

¹⁶ K. LINARDOU, *Imperial Impersonations: Disguised Portraits of a Komnenian Prince and his Father*, [in:] *John II Komnenos...*, p. 157–158.

¹⁷ P. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993, p. 182–183; IDEM, *Court Society...*, p. 230.

¹⁸ L. STIERNON, *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. Sébaste...*, p. 226–227; N. KANEV, *Byzantine Rank Hierarchy in the 9th–11th Centuries*, SCer 8, 2018, p. 162–164.

¹⁹ K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. II, p. 482.

²⁰ L. STIERNON, *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. A propos...*, p. 188–189.

²¹ KINNAMOS, p. 215; N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *Pictorial Propaganda in XIIth c. Constantinople*, [in:] *Society, Culture and Politics in Byzantium*, ed. IDEM, Aldershot 2005, p. 97.

Yet, when Bela returned to Hungary, Maria's husband did not receive that title but the one of *kaisar*, because by that time empress gave birth to long awaited successor – Alexios.

The death of Manuel Komnenos and the regency period initially did not bring any significant changes in this matter. The accession to the throne of Andronicus and the death of Alexios II marks the first period when one can observe some changes in the Komnenian title hierarchy. However, the new emperor in this respect was not a revolutionary. His actions did not break with the order established by his grandfather at the end of the 11th century. During his short reign, he followed the same patterns of dynastic policy as his predecessors²². The differences come from the circumstances of his reign. Andronicus did not have a large family. His only brother lived outside the empire²³. His sisters remained either irrelevant at the court or were already dead by that time²⁴. All his attention was therefore focused on the offspring who he tried to establish as successors, after the annihilation of the dynastic line of John II Komnenos. Here too circumstances didn't favour Andronicus. He only had three legal descendants, and none of them were *porphyrogennetoi*²⁵. He had two sons: Manuel and John. Having only one legal daughter, Maria, he was also, greatly limited in his capabilities of creating family alliances with the aristocracy.

Titles awarded to his children did not deviate from the rules adopted in the empire so far. The eldest son, Manuel, received the title of *sebastokrator*, probably as a form of compensation for not being appointed as successor²⁶. The younger son and designated heir John Komnenos was co-emperor and although there are no specific references to his title, we could assume with some probability that he was granted the position of *despotes* – a title reserved for successors²⁷. The dignity of *sebastokrator* at least for some time also belonged to illegitimate son of Manuel – Alexios Komnenos granted to him definitely before 1180. When Andronicus deprived him of his sight, he was also stripped of any rank²⁸.

²² J.-C. CHEYNET, *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)*, Paris 1990, p. 433.

²³ John Komnenos was the first son of *sebastokrator* Isaac Komnenos. He abandoned the Byzantine Empire and spent his life in Sultanate of Ikonion, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 35–36.

²⁴ The date of death of Maria and Anna, two sisters of Andronicus, is unknown. They don't appear in the sources past 1180, cf.: K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. I, p. 488, 492.

²⁵ That was rather unfavourable situation. The special status of *porphyrogennetos* gave a person stronger claim to the throne. The Komnenian dynasty paid special attention to this custom, as it's indicated by the number of dynasty members born in purple, at that time, cf.: P. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel...*, p. 244.

²⁶ Manuel was not designated as successor, because of AIMA prophecy that led Andronicus to believe that his younger son – John (Ioannes) should be the heir to the throne, cf.: C. BRAND, *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968, p. 68.

²⁷ There is a certain *passus* in Niketas Choniates where the author suggests that sons of Andronicus Komnenos received some wealth and dignities taken away from previous owners, but we have no further information about it, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 257.

²⁸ CHONIATES, p. 309.

Andronicus' daughter Maria was married to a certain aristocrat – Theodoros Synadenos, perhaps, as Konstantinos Varzos suggests, in 1182²⁹. It was not a long lasting relationship. Not long after, Synadenos died in mysterious circumstances³⁰. It cannot be determined if Andronicus was involved in this case or not. Soon enough Maria was married again, this time with a certain Romanos *doux* of Dyr-rachion. This marriage did not last long either and most likely ended abruptly with his death during the coup d'état of Isaac Angelos in September 1185³¹. Were Maria's spouses granted any title during their short marriage? Unfortunately, we do not have any evidence in that regard. Even the exact identity of Romanos is unknown. We can only presume that, following the logic of previous emperors, they could have received the title of *kaisar*, which was vacant at that time after the deaths of Maria Komnene (daughter of Manuel I) and Renier of Montferrat.

Andronicus had two other, illegitimate children. His daughter – Eirene Komnene married the already mentioned illegitimate son of Manuel, so for some time she enjoyed the title of *sebastokratorissa* before she was banished by her father³². The younger child – Alexios, reached legal age of 15 only in 1185, so he probably did not receive any dignity before the fall of his father's regime³³.

The title of *panhypersebastos* was given to Constantine Makrodoukas who was a husband of Anna – sister of Andronicus' mistress Theodora Komnene Vatatzes³⁴. He wasn't *de iure* his brother-in-law, since Theodora wasn't formally a wife of the emperor but that clearly wasn't an obstacle. That's all information available in regards to that layer of ranks, in the discussed two year long period. There are no references to any *proto-/sebastohypertatos* found in sources, meaning that these titles were most likely vacant.

This overview of the title hierarchy at Andronicus' court shows that despite his unprecedented, brutal and highly pragmatic politics he was not a revolutionary in terms of dynastic policy and court titles management. Far from it, in his actions one can see that he was following the patterns set by his predecessors. His management of high court dignities does not differ drastically from the previous times. The new emperor elevated his immediate family to the highest ranks, and his activities were concentrated on building a new, faithful aristocratic group, in place of the previous one centred around Manuel's family. The circumstances faced by the new emperor were different from those of his predecessors. Elite dignities still played essential role on his court and there are no signs of inflation in that short

²⁹ K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. II, p. 533.

³⁰ EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKI, *The Capture of Thessaloniki. A Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, ed. et trans. J.R. MELVILLE JONES, Canberra 1988 [= BAus, 8] (cetera: EUSTATHIOS), p. 28.

³¹ J. DUDEK, "Cała Ziemia Dyrracheńska" pod panowaniem bizantyńskim w latach 1005–1205, Zielona Góra 1999, p. 165.

³² CHONIATES, p. 309.

³³ EUSTATHIOS, p. 64.

³⁴ CHONIATES, p. 313–314.

period. Andronicus Komnenos at least in that regard pursued the same policy as his grandfather and high court ranks still maintained its elite and strictly consanguineal character³⁵.

Table 1

The upper part of the title hierarchy of Andronicus I Komnenos (1183–1185)

<i>Despotes</i>	John Komnenos?
<i>Sebastokrator</i>	Manuel Komnenos Alexios Komnenos (son of Manuel I)
<i>Kaisar</i>	Theodoros Synadenos? Romanos <i>doux</i> of Dyrrachion?
<i>Panhypsebastos</i>	Constantine Makrodoukas
<i>Proto-/Sebastohypertatos</i>	Vacant?

The coup of Isaac Angelos in September 1185 is a clear turning point not only in the political history of the empire, but also in the title hierarchy of the court. It is important to underline that Isaac, being an adversary of Andronicus and his allies, did not support his family and clients. His victory led to a total defamation of the previous group in power³⁶. This meant that unlike the previous emperors of the Komnenian dynasty (including partially Andronicus Komnenos), there was no direct continuity between the aristocrats holding high court titles before and after 1185. All persons with the dignities of *sebastokrator*, *kaisar* and lower, have lost their position³⁷. The only exception seems to be Alexios Branas, who was not affected by this infamy. During the dramatic events that happened in Constantinople,

³⁵ The interpretation of Andronicus' motives and policy requires further research. His short, turbulent reign had a significant impact both on internal and external situation of the empire. For many years a persisting point of view on his actions was strongly dependent on biased testimony of Niketas Choniates and Eustathios of Thessalonika. Alexander Kazhdan saw Andronicus as a leader of anti-aristocratic group, cf.: А.П. КАЖДАН, *Социальный состав господствующего класса Византии XI–XII вв.*, Москва 1974, p. 264. Jean-Claude Cheynet contradicted this idea, cf.: J.-C. CHEYNET, *Pouvoir...*, p. 433.

³⁶ CHONIATES, p. 355–356.

³⁷ According to Choniates' narrative Branas was dispatched by Andronicus around summer of 1185. By September he was most likely still in Thrace and was not involved in the rebellion of the Angeloi, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 318, 358.

he was still in command of an army sent to stop Norman invasion and succeeded in driving them off the empire³⁸. Because of this, the newly crowned emperor was willing to turn a blind eye to his loyalty to the previous ruler, especially since Branas had an army under his command³⁹. Consequently, it can be assumed with a high degree of probability that Branas not only retained his position after the overthrow of Andronicus, but was even raised to a higher rank of *panhypersebastos* by Isaac II⁴⁰.

Other seals of Alexios Branas contain also the lower titles of the court hierarchy. Those dated to the reign of Manuel Komnenos specify the dignity of *sebastos* at that time⁴¹. The position of *protosebastos* attested by one of them was probably conferred on Alexios at a later date, but certainly before he was awarded the title of *panhypersebastos*. Titles were always awarded as a form of advancement on the social ladder of the empire. It can therefore be assumed that the seal with the title of *protosebastos* may date from the reign of Andronicus Komnenos⁴².

Aside from Branas, Isaac's assumption of power brought new people to court elite and titles were redistributed. The new emperor, in contrast to his predecessor, had a much larger family that at least in theory provided him a better base for the construction of a loyal party⁴³. He had five brothers. Four of them were blinded by Andronicus but still remained quite active at the court. He also had two married sisters and an uncle, John Doukas who was at the time the senior member of the Angelos family⁴⁴. Unsurprisingly he rewarded them with highest honours, but the choice of titles turns out to be quite puzzling.

³⁸ P. STEPHENSON, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*, Cambridge 2004, p. 287–288.

³⁹ Niketas Choniates describes Branas disposition towards Isaac as full of contempt. Just after the fall of Andronicus, when he was still in command of forces at the end of 1185 he revealed his imperial ambitions. Isaac decision of granting him the title of *panhypersebastos* could have been an attempt to ease the situation and improve relations with that subversive aristocrat, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 376–377.

⁴⁰ A single seal of Alexios Branas *panhypersebastos* is sometimes identified as coming from the years 1183–1185. This date doesn't seem to be correct. As it was mentioned earlier, during the reign of Andronicus I, the rank of *panhypersebastos* was already occupied by Constantine Makrodoukas and it seems very unlikely that Branas received the same title, especially since he was only distantly related to Andronicus, cf.: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/5256/> [20 IV 2021]; CHONIATES, p. 313–314. See also: J.-C. CHEYNET, *Pouvoir...*, p. 437.

⁴¹ <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3044/> [20 IV 2021].

⁴² <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/5899/> [20 IV 2021].

⁴³ The family of Isaac Angelos however proved to be unreliable and untrustworthy. Cf.: C. BRAND, *Byzantium Confronts...*, p. 96–97.

⁴⁴ John Doukas was the oldest child of *sebastohypertatos* Constantine Angelos, cf.: K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. I, p. 641.

The title of *sebastokrator* was given to John Doukas – the emperor’s uncle and alternative candidate for the throne during the September insurrection in 1185⁴⁵. Again, it can be understood as a compensation for imperial title. Doukas had a righteous claim to the throne, as he was the oldest member of the Angelos family at that time and was well qualified for exercising power. The only reason that he was not chosen is because the people of Constantinople rejected him on account of his old age⁴⁶. Undoubtedly it was a reasonable decision to reward him with a high dignity and keep his actions in check, since as it is known he did not abandon his imperial ambitions⁴⁷. Apart from him next persons at the court raised to this rank were Isaac’s older brothers: blinded by Andronicus, Constantine Angelos Komnenos and the future emperor Alexios Angelos⁴⁸.

The situation becomes puzzling, however, in the case of Isaac’s three other brothers. John, Michael and Theodoros Angelos received the titles of *kaisar*, which is indicated by their seals⁴⁹. This would mean a complete break with the current policy of giving only one *kaisar* title to one person at a time and handing it over to another aristocrat at the time of the death of the previous bearer. In addition, this title up to that point in time was reserved exclusively for brothers-in-law or sons-in-law of the emperor. Isaac Angelos was the first ruler to abandon this custom. It seems that his fourth and fifth brother – Michael and Theodoros Angelos – never received the rank of *sebastokrator*.

Even more perplexing is the position of John Angelos. If the order of seniority of Isaac’s brothers is correct, then Constantine was the oldest one, followed by John, Alexios, Michael, Theodoros and lastly Isaac⁵⁰. As it was mentioned before, Alexios and Constantine received the rank of *sebastokrator*. In this case one can ask why John who was second in seniority was apparently granted just the title

⁴⁵ CHONIATES, p. 343.

⁴⁶ CHONIATES, p. 345; A. KALDELLIS, *How to Usurp the Throne in Byzantium: The Role of Public Opinion in Sedition and Rebellion*, [in:] *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*, ed. D. ANGELOV, M. SAXBY, New York 2016, p. 43–56.

⁴⁷ CHONIATES, p. 374. A recurring theme in the history of the Komnenos “clan” is the inheritance of imperial ambitions. Doukas claims were transmitted to his sons. Constantine Angelos rebelled against Isaac II Angelos and so did Michael Doukas Komnenos Angelos during Alexios III reign, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 435, 529.

⁴⁸ M. BACHMANN, F. DÖLGER, *Die Rede des μέγας δρουγγάριος Gregorios Antiochos auf den Sebastokrator Konstantinos Angelos*, BZ 40.2, 1940, p. 364; <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/86/> [20 IV 2021].

⁴⁹ There is one seal of *kaisar* John Angelos: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3051/> [20 IV 2021]; and one seal of *kaisar* Michael Angelos: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3050/> [20 IV 2021]. Theodoros is not attested as *kaisar*, however we can assume that he received the same rank as his other brothers, cf.: K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. II, p. 806.

⁵⁰ Isaac II Angelos is the only one from among his brothers with attested date of birth (September 1156). It is mentioned by Choniates, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 596. His younger siblings dates of birth can only be estimated, cf.: K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. II, p. 716.

of *kaisar*? The problem was addressed by K. Varzos, who assumed that he was later on raised to the rank of *sebastokrator*⁵¹. The motives that led Isaac II to that decision are enigmatic, especially since the written sources gives hardly any background about Angelos' brothers aside from Alexios and Constantine. To resolve this problem we shall have to wait for more evidence in form of seals or for reinterpretation of already available sources. Undeniably there were some quarrels among the Angeloi but their true nature will have to remain a mystery for the time being.

These are not the only problems that one faces in trying to analyze the title hierarchy of Isaac II. It is also known that the title of *kaisar* was held by Conrad of Montferrat due to his marriage to Theodora Angelina, the emperor's sister⁵². That was not for long, because shortly after the rebellion of Alexios Branas, Conrad left the Byzantine Empire. In the early years of Angelos' reign, the title of *kaisar* was also given to blinded Alexios Komnenos – Manuel's illegitimate son, already mentioned⁵³. About the same time, the husband of Isaac's sister – Eirene, was another person to be awarded the title of *kaisar*⁵⁴. His name was John Kantakouzenos – yet another aristocrat blinded by Andronicus Komnenos⁵⁵. Choniates' narrative shows that he received this title before Conrad of Montferrat left, which confirms that there was more than one *kaisar* at the same time⁵⁶. In such a situation it is hardly surprising that Conrad was dissatisfied with his position at the court of the Angeloi. As Choniates writes, he gained nothing from his affinity to the emperor, apart from the insignia appropriate for the *kaisar*⁵⁷. This comes as no surprise, because higher number of so well-endowed aristocrats meant that the title lost some of its prominence during that time. Behind prestigious name and ceremonial, there were no tangible benefits in the form of military or administrative offices. Conrad may not have received any financial benefits that were usually accompanying the title.

Isaac II Angelos had only two daughters – Eirene and Anna-Euphrosyne. However, unlike the emperors of the Komnenian dynasty, he pursued a slightly different matrimonial policy. His main focus was not put on great aristocratic families and the creation of interfamilial alliances. Instead, he paid much more attention to foreign policy and opportunities among the western neighbours of Byzantium.

⁵¹ K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. II, p. 725.

⁵² CHONIATES, p. 382–383.

⁵³ CHONIATES, p. 426.

⁵⁴ CHONIATES, p. 374–375.

⁵⁵ CHONIATES, p. 258; D. NICOL, *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Cantacuzenus) ca. 1100–1460. A Genealogical and Prosopographical Study*, Washington 1968 [= DOS, 11], p. 5–7.

⁵⁶ John Kantakouzenos was a commander during the first uprising of Peter and Asan before being replaced by Alexios Branas. That means he was already *kaisar* before Conrad of Montferrat left the Byzantine Empire, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 375–376.

⁵⁷ CHONIATES, p. 395; E. PILTZ, *Middle Byzantine Court Costume*, [in:] *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. MAGUIRE, Washington D.C. 1997, p. 41.

It was a more sensible approach considering very difficult situation on the empire's north-west flank after the death of Manuel I. Therefore, it is not surprising that Eirene was married to Roger III of Sicily, and later to Philip of Swabia⁵⁸. While Anna-Euphrosyne married the Ruthenian prince Roman the Great⁵⁹. Of course, the emperor's sons-in-law, being foreign rulers did not receive court titles in this case⁶⁰. Which means that the dignities of *panhypersebastos* and lower variants may have remained empty after the death of Alexios Branas. In any case, no further information exists about them during the period from 1185 to 1195.

Table 2

The upper part of the title hierarchy of Isaac II Angelos (1185–1195)

<i>Sebastokrator</i>	John Doukas Alexios Angelos Constantine Angelos Komnenos John Angelos (later period)
<i>Kaisar</i>	John Angelos (early during Isaac's reign) Michael Angelos Theodoros Angelos John Kantakouzenos Alexios Komnenos Conrad of Montferrat (1185–1187)
<i>Panhypersebastos</i>	Alexios Branas (1185–1186/7)
<i>Proto-/Sebastohypertatos</i>	Vacant?

The coup of Alexios Angelos in 1195 did not bring about great changes, at least in the group of the emperor's siblings. There is no indication that younger brothers were contesting the authority of the new emperor. It seems, therefore, that they retained their titles of *sebastokrator* and *kaisar*. The information available in the sources is very sparse. We don't know much about them aside from the fact that

⁵⁸ K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. II, p. 814; CHONIATES, p. 481.

⁵⁹ Regarding the marriage of Anna-Euphrosyne Angelina see especially: H. GRALA, *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mściślawicza*, SO 31.3–4, 1982, p. 115–127; A. MAIOROV, *The Daughter of a Byzantine Emperor – the Wife of a Galician-Volhynian Prince*, Bsl 72, 2014, p. 188–233.

⁶⁰ There are some exceptions to this rule. Venetian doge Domenico Silvio was according to Anna Komnene granted the title of *protosebastos* by Alexios I, cf.: KOMNENE, VI, 5, 10, p. 178. Another example is Stefan “the First Crowned” Nemanjić, cf.: note 56.

they were still alive at least until 1199⁶¹. However, this absence of data proves that none of Alexios' brothers caused issues, so the new emperor had no reason to strip them of their titles given by predecessor.

The title of *sebastokrator* was given to certain Isaac Vatatzes Komnenos, the first husband of Anna Angelina daughter of Alexios III. It was possibly also at this time that Stefan Nemanjić, the husband of Eudocia Angelina, received that rank⁶². Undoubtedly some elite value was lost in the process as the title was given now not only to children and siblings but also to emperor's sons-in-law. Yet still, it was reserved only for a very small group of those closely related and loyal to the ruler⁶³.

A noticeable change took place among the emperor's closest sons-in-law. He faced a serious dilemma that influenced his dynastic policy. He had no sons and no heir, so according to Byzantine custom, the eldest daughter was expected to continue the dynasty through her husband.

This troublesome situation forced Alexios to take close care when choosing appropriate candidates for successors. He rejected the claims of Manuel Kamytzes, John Doukas and numerous nephews to their discontent and married off his two older daughters – Eirene and Anna, to loyal aristocrats. The youngest Eudocia was already married to Stefan “the First Crowned” – grand prince of Serbia⁶⁴. Eirene was officially recognized as the heir of Alexios. According to the account of Nicephorus Gregoras, he ordered her to wear red shoes – the mark of imperial power⁶⁵. She and Anna were married twice. Originally, the husband of the eldest sister was Andronicus Kontostephanos, and the of the younger was the aforementioned *sebastokrator* Isaac Vatatzes Komnenos.

⁶¹ V. LAURENT, *Le sébastocrator Constantin Ange et le péplum du musée de Saint-Marc à Venise*, REB 18, 1960, p. 213; K. ΒΑΡΖΟΣ, *Η γενεαλογία...*, vol. II, p. 725–726.

⁶² Б. ФЕРЈАНЧИЋ, *Севастократори у Византији*, ЗРВИ 11, 1968, p. 167–169. Eudocia Angelina was married to Stefan “the First Crowned” before Alexios III became the emperor. I find it doubtful that Nemanjić was given the title of *sebastokrator* immediately after the marriage. Since Eudocia was a daughter of Alexios not Isaac Angelos, I find it much more plausible that the title of *sebastokrator* was given to her husband only after the coup in 1195.

⁶³ Niketas Choniates writes that Alexios V Doukas confiscated goods belonging to wealthy *kaisars* and *sebastokrators*. It is noteworthy that he specifically uses the plural form σεβαστοκράτορι and καίσαροι. Who were those people? Possibly close relatives and supporters of the Angeloi. In any case the plural form further confirms that the title of *kaisar* was no longer given to one person. Yet the fact that Alexios V confiscated their wealth to fill imperial treasury indicates that both titles remained very prestigious dignities connected with the most influential aristocrats of the empire, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 566.

⁶⁴ The marriage was arranged by Isaac II Angelos, cf.: CHONIATES, p. 531; V. STANKOVIĆ, *Stronger than It Appears? Byzantium and its European Hinterland after the Death of Manuel I Komnenos*, [in:] *Byzantium, 1180–1204. “The Sad Quarter of a Century”?*, ed. A. SIMPSON, Athens 2015, p. 43–45.

⁶⁵ *Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina Historia*, III, 4, vol. I, rec. L. SCHOPEN, Bonnae 1829 [= CSHB, 19] (cetera: GREGORAS), p. 69.

Around 1199, they were married again to Alexios Paleologos and Theodoros Laskaris⁶⁶. Paleologos, as the husband of the eldest daughter, received the highest honour in the form of the rank of *despotes*⁶⁷. As for Theodoros Laskaris, on one of the seals he presents himself as an ordinary *sebastos* holding the office of *protovestiarios*⁶⁸. This seal, however, does not seem to match the period following his marriage to the Emperor's daughter. It would be quite demeaning if he, as one of the most important persons in the state, bare this deprived of all value title, as Choniates points out. However, there is also a seal of Laskaris with the rank of *despotes*⁶⁹. It's doubtful that he enjoyed this illustrious position at the same time as Alexios Paleologos. Most likely the seal comes from a short period after the death of Paleologos in early 1203, but before Alexios III fled from Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade⁷⁰. For a brief time Theodoros was the true successor, which undoubtedly had influence on his later actions in Anatolia.

Lastly, there is the remaining issue of the titles *panhypersebastos*, *protosebastohypertatos* and *sebastohypertatos* during Alexios' rule. We do not have extensive knowledge in this regard. A single seal of Leo Sgouros is the only clue. It can be dated to the period before he was defeated by Boniface of Montferrat, but after his marriage to Eudocia Angelos⁷¹. Sgouros was granted by exiled Alexios III the dignity of *sebastohypertatos* – the lowest rank from those granted to sons-in-law. Could that be hinting that the higher one of *panhypersebastos* was occupied at that time? There is no satisfying answer to that question. Sgouros' seal can only prove the continuity of this title hierarchy at the beginning of 13th century⁷².

⁶⁶ CHONIATES, p. 508–509. The exact year of wedding ceremony is unclear. Three dates are considered in this case. It is possible that marriage of Angelos' sons-in-law (and directly following it rebellion of Ivanko) took place in 1198, cf.: Р. РАДИЋ, *Обласни господари у Византији крајем 12. и у првим деценијама 13. века*, ЗРВИ 24–25, 1986, p. 187–188; Г. НИКОЛОВ, *Самостоятелни и полусамостоятелни владения във възобновеното Българско царство, края на XII – средата на XIII в.*, София 2011, p. 129. Charles Brand dates it to 1199, cf.: С. BRAND, *Byzantium Confronts...*, p. 130. Jan-Louis van Dieten and Dimiter Angelov place that event even further, in the early 1200, cf. CHONIATES, p. 508; D. ANGELOV, *The Byzantine Hellene. The Life of Emperor Theodore Laskaris and Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge 2019, p. 19–20.

⁶⁷ <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/92/> [20 IV 2021]; <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/5593/> [20 IV 2021]; GREGORAS, III, 4, p. 69.

⁶⁸ G. SCHLUMBERGER, *Sigillographie de l'Empire byzantin*, Paris 1884, p. 672.

⁶⁹ <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3058/> [20 IV 2021].

⁷⁰ Theodore Skoutariotes notes that Alexios Paleologos died before the fall of Alexios III, cf.: *Ανάπτυξοις Σύνοψις Χρονική*, rec. K. SATHAS, Venetia 1894 [= BGM, 7], p. 450.

⁷¹ CHONIATES, p. 608.

⁷² G. SCHLUMBERGER, *Sigillographie...*, p. 698–699.

Table 3

The upper part of the title hierarchy of Alexios III Angelos (1195–1204)

<i>Despotes</i>	Alexios Paleologos (ca. 1199–1203) Theodoros Laskaris (1203)
<i>Sebastokrator</i>	John Doukas (until his death ca. 1200) Constantine Angelos Komnenos John Angelos Isaac Vatatzes Komnenos (1195–1196) Stefan “the First Crowned” Nemanjić
<i>Kaisar</i>	Michael Angelos Theodoros Angelos Theodoros Laskaris? (ca. 1199–1203)
<i>Panhypers Sebastos</i>	Vacant?
<i>Sebastohypertatos</i>	Leo Sgouros (1204)

The analysis of the rank hierarchy at the court of the last Komnenoi and the Angelos dynasty shows that it was undergoing progressive and noticeable transformation at the end of the 12th century. Emperors adapted the existing system to their immediate needs. However even in the face of these changes it is apparent that, the upper part of Komnenian rank hierarchy generally retained its elite status, suffering only minor loss of prestige. Even the allegedly inept administration of Alexios III did not change much in this regard. Selling of titles had no effect on the upper part of the hierarchy. In regards to that group, the Angeloi followed the same policy as his predecessors. The whole structure of Komnenian dignities, despite its decay and partial replacement by genealogical terminology, was still in use up to at least the beginning of 13th century. Close blood relations with emperor’s family and loyalty were still the most important qualities among the bearers of highest court titles.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Annae Comnenae Alexias*, vol. I, rec. D.R. REINSCH, A. KAMBYLIS, Berlin 2001 [= *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis*, 40].
- Anōnymou Sýnopsis Chronikī*, rec. K. SATHAS, Venetia 1894 [= *Bibliotheca Graeca Medii Aevi*, 7].
- EUSTATHIOS OF THESSALONIKI, *The Capture of Thessaloniki. A Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, ed. et trans. J.R. MELVILLE JONES, Canberra 1988 [= *Byzantina Australiensia*, 8].
- Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, rec. A. MEINEKE, Bonnae 1836 [= *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, 23.1].
- Nicéphore Bryennios Histoire*, rec. P. GAUTIER, Bruxelles 1975 [= *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 9].
- Nicephori Gregorae Byzantina Historia*, vol. I, rec. L. SCHOPEN, Bonnae 1829 [= *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, 19].
- Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, vol. I, rec. I.A. VAN DIETEN, Berolini 1975 [= *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 11].
- THEODOROS PRODROMOS, *Historische Gedichte*, rec. W. HÖRANDNER, Wien 1974 [= *Wiener byzantinistische Studien*, 11].

Seals

- Alexios Branas Komnenos, panhypersebastos*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/5256/> [20 IV 2021].
- Alexios Branas Komnenos, protosebastos*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/5899/> [20 IV 2021].
- Alexios Branas Komnenos, sebastos*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3044/> [20 IV 2021].
- Alexios Komnenos Angelos, sebastokrator*: <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/86/> [20 IV 2021].
- Alexios Komnenos Palaiologos, despotes gambros of the emperor (Alexios III), married to his first daughter the basilissa Eirene (type 1)*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/92/> [20 IV 2021].
- Alexios Komnenos Palaiologos, despotes gambros of the emperor (Alexios III), married to his first daughter the basilissa Eirene (type 2)*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/5593/> [20 IV 2021].
- Ioannes Angelos, kaisar*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3051/> [20 IV 2021].
- Michael Angelos, kaisar*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3050/> [20 IV 2021].
- Theodoros Komnenos despotes, husband of the emperor's daughter Anna*: <https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/boulloterion/3058/> [20 IV 2021].

Secondary Literature

- ANGELOV D., *The Byzantine Hellene. The Life of Emperor Theodore Laskaris and Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108690874>
- ANGOLD M., *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204. A Political History*, London–New York 1997.
- BACHMANN M., DÖLGER F., *Die Rede des μέγας δρουγγάριος Gregorios Antiochos auf den Sebastokrator Konstantinos Angelos*, “Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 40.2, 1940, p. 353–405, <https://doi.org/10.1515/byzs.1940.40.2.353>
- BRAND C., *Byzantium Confronts the West, 1180–1204*, Cambridge, Mass. 1968.

- CHEYNET J.-C., *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)*, Paris 1990.
- DUDEK J., “Cala Ziemia Dyrracheńska” pod panowaniem bizantyńskim w latach 1005–1205, Zielona Góra 1999.
- FERJANČID B., *Sevastokratori u Vizantiji*, “Зборник Радова Византолошког Института” / “Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta” 11, 1968, p. 141–192.
- FRANKOPAN P., *Kinship and the Distribution of Power in Komnenian Byzantium*, “English Historical Review” 122, 2007, p. 1–34, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cel378>
- GRALA H., *Drugie małżeństwo Romana Mściławicza*, “Slavia orientalis” 31.3–4, 1982, p. 115–127.
- JEFFREYS M., *The Komnenian Prokypsis*, “Parergon” 5, 1987, p. 38–53, <https://doi.org/10.1353/pgn.1987.0009>
- KALDELLIS A., *How to Usurp the Throne in Byzantium: The Role of Public Opinion in Sedition and Rebellion*, [in:] *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*, ed. D. ANGELOV, M. SAXBY, New York 2016, p. 43–56.
- KANEV N., *Byzantine Rank Hierarchy in the 9th–11th Centuries*, “Studia Ceranea” 8, 2018, p. 153–165, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.08.09>
- KAŽDAN A.P., *Social'nyj sostav gosподstvujuščego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.*, Moskva 1974.
- LACHOWICZ P., *Power and Aristocracy – Transformation and Composition of the Komnenos “Clan” (1081–1200) – A Statistical Approach*, “Studia Ceranea” 10, 2020, p. 141–173, <https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.10.07>
- LAURENT V., *Le sébastocrator Constantin Ange et le péplum du musée de Saint-Marc à Venise*, “Revue des études byzantines” 18, 1960, p. 208–213, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.1960.1232>
- LINARDOU K., *Imperial Impersonations: Disguised Portraits of a Komnenian Prince and his Father*, [in:] *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium. In the Shadow of Father and Son*, ed. A. BUCOSI, A. RODRIGUEZ SUÁREZ, London–New York 2016, p. 155–182.
- MAGDALINO P., *Court Society and Aristocracy*, [in:] *The Social History of Byzantium*, ed. J. HALDON, Oxford 2009, p. 212–232, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444305906.ch9>
- MAGDALINO P., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511523182>
- MAGDALINO P., *The Triumph of 1133*, [in:] *John II Komnenos, Emperor of Byzantium. In the Shadow of Father and Son*, ed. A. BUCOSI, A. RODRIGUEZ SUÁREZ, London–New York 2016, p. 53–70.
- MAIOROV A., *The Daughter of a Byzantine Emperor – the Wife of a Galician–Vohynian Prince*, “Byzantinoslavica” 72, 2014, p. 188–233.
- NICOL D., *The Byzantine Family of Kantakouzenos (Cantacuzenus) ca. 1100–1460. A Genealogical and Prosopographical Study*, Washington 1968 [= *Dumbarton Oaks Studies*, 11].
- NICOL D., *The Prosopography of the Byzantine Aristocracy*, [in:] *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. M. ANGOLD, Oxford 1984, p. 79–91.
- NIKOLOV G., *Samostojateli i polusamostojatelni bladenija vāv vāzobnovenoto Bālgarsko carstvo, kraja na XII – sredata na XIII v.*, Sofija 2011.
- OIKONOMIDĒS N., *Pictorial Propaganda in XIIth c. Constantinople*, [in:] *Society, Culture and Politics in Byzantium*, ed. N. OIKONOMIDĒS, Aldershot 2005, p. 93–102.
- PILTZ E., *Middle Byzantine Court Costume*, [in:] *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. MAGUIRE, Washington D.C. 1997, p. 39–51.
- RADIĆ R., *Oblasni gospodari u Vizantiji krajem 12. i u prvim decenijama 13. veka*, “Зборник Радова Византолошког Института” / “Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta” 24–25, 1986, p. 151–290.

- SCHLUMBERGER G., *Sigillographie de l'Empire byzantin*, Paris 1884.
- SHEA J., *Politics and Government in Byzantium. The Rise and Fall of the Bureaucrats*, London 2020 [= *New Directions in Byzantine Studies*], <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780755601967>
- SKOULATOS B., *Les personnages byzantins de l'Alexiade. Analyse prosopographique et synthèse*, Louvain 1980.
- STANKOVIĆ V., *Stronger than It Appears? Byzantium and its European Hinterland after the Death of Manuel I Komnenos*, [in:] *Byzantium, 1180–1204. "The Sad Quarter of a Century"?*, ed. A. SIMPSON, Athens 2015, p. 35–48.
- STEPHENSON P., *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*, Cambridge 2004.
- STIERNON L., *Notes de prosopographie et de titulature byzantines. Constantin Ange (pan)sébastohypertate*, "Revue des études byzantines" 19, 1961, p. 273–283, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.1961.1262>
- STIERNON L., *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. A propos de trois membres de la famille Rogerios (XII^e siècle)*, "Revue des études byzantines" 22, 1964, p. 184–198, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.1964.1324>
- STIERNON L., *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. Adrien (Jean) et Constantin Comnène, sébastes*, "Revue des études byzantines" 21, 1963, p. 179–198, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.1963.1306>
- STIERNON L., *Notes de titulature et de prosopographie byzantines. Sébaste et Gambros*, "Revue des études byzantines" 23, 1965, p. 222–243, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rebyz.1965.1349>
- VARZOS K., *Ἱ genealogia tōn Komnīnōn*, vol. I–II, Thessalonikī 1984.

Paweł Lachowicz

University of Wrocław
Faculty of Historical and Pedagogical Sciences
ul. Szewska 49
50-139 Wrocław, Polska/Poland
hylehistorias@gmail.com

