

PART I

CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE STAMPS

THE stamps to which this study is devoted are found on more than one hundred silver objects of the early Byzantine period. Before examining the stamps themselves, some remarks on the method of working the silver are in order, though this is a subject which will not be treated in detail.⁵

While knowledge of the methods and tools used for this work is incomplete, it is clear from the marks left on the silver that a rotating device like the lathe was employed. A small hole, generally termed the centering point, appears exactly in the center of many pieces. Frequently there is evidence that the back was hammered with tools of different shapes, and H. Maryon has shown⁶ how the relief on some objects was chased on a thick sheet of silver entirely from the front. L. A. Matsulevich observed that certain objects having deep relief, like the mythological plates in the Hermitage, are nevertheless smooth on the reverse, with no indication of how the relief was achieved, and he suggested that in such instances the object was made of two separate thin sheets of silver joined together after the front one had been worked by the artist. Examination of other silver objects supports this view and one of the Cyprus plates in New York (no. 61) may be cited as an example. In this plate, the reverse of the relief shows clearly on the back of the plate within the circle of the footring, but outside the footring the surface is quite smooth. The plate is bordered by a rolled rim, achieved by carrying the edge of the bottom sheet of silver over the top sheet. This method sometimes permitted another design to be incised on the back of the plate outside the footring (e.g. no. 9). Many objects, however, are obviously made of only one sheet of silver, for example, the Riha paten (no. 20) on which the relief was beaten from the back so that the design of the entire obverse surface can be seen on the reverse. Chalice, candlesticks, and vessels of complicated form were fashioned of a single, thin sheet of silver.

As was pointed out in the Preface, examination of the vessels in the Hermitage by Smirnov and Matsulevich yielded the fact that the stamps were applied before the decoration was completed, and this conclusion is supported by the

⁵ A good bibliography for ancient silver metallurgy will be found in R. J. Forbes, *Metallurgy in Antiquity* (Leiden, 1950). The following are among the pertinent references: J. Percy, *Metallurgy: The Art of Extracting Metals from Their Ores. Silver and Gold* (London, 1880); H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, IV (Leipzig, 1887); Walters, pp. x-xiii; F. von Bissing, "Zur Geschichte des Silbers und des Electrons," *Acta Orientalia*, IV (1925), pp. 138-141; H. Carpenter and J. M. Robertson, *Metals* (London, 1939); *A History of Technology* (ed. Charles Singer and others, Oxford, 1954-1956), vols. I, II.

⁶ H. Maryon, "The Mildenhall Treasure, Some Technical Problems," *Man. A Monthly Record of Anthropological Science*, XLVIII (1948), pp. 25-27, 38-41; *idem*, "Metal Working in the Ancient World," *AJA*, LIII (1949), pp. 120-124; also *The Mildenhall Treasure* (British Museum Handbook, London, 1955), pp. 15-19.

BYZANTINE SILVER STAMPS

investigation of additional silver objects in the present study. The stamps on the Riha flabellum (no. 21), for instance, must have been applied before the feather decoration of the back surface was traced, for the decoration cuts into the corner of the cross stamp and the working of it has erased part of the cross. On no. 35 rings incised on the base have clearly cut off parts of the stamps. In the case of the chalices—the Tyler Chalice (no. 8) is a good example—the stamping instrument seems to have been applied after the silver had been cut but before the base was finally fashioned, since it would have been virtually impossible for the stamping to have been placed so deep in the base, after it had been finished, without danger of both disfiguring the stamp and denting the base. On many objects, the area around the centering point is worn and parts of the stamps are erased (no. 38) or the centering point itself has broken a stamp (no. 44). Moreover, on the plates with an incised niello design (e.g. no. 42) the wreath in the center may break through the stamps on the reverse.

Among forty-seven stamped vessels which the writer was able to examine personally, thirty-seven give every indication that the stamps were applied before the vessel was finished;⁷ three seem to have been stamped after the decoration was complete;⁸ and in seven instances⁹ there is no clear indication one way or the other. If the vessels studied by Matsulevich are added to these, the total number is increased by at least twenty-seven.¹⁰ Matsulevich considered most of his examples to have been stamped before the object was completed, although he does not specify in each case how this conclusion was reached. In many other instances either the reproduction is sufficiently clear to indicate when the stamps were applied, or an adequate description of the stamps is available.¹¹ The preponderance of objects stamped before being decorated is such as to warrant the conclusion that it was customary to stamp the vessel before it was completed, and the stamps may thus be considered as a *terminus post quem* for the finished vessel. In those few examples where this rule was not observed, special circumstances prevailed.

At this point it should be added that the vessel was roughly shaped before it was stamped. The significance of this fact will be considered below in connection with the purpose of the stamps and the administrative system of controls. For the time being it is enough to note that the stamps were applied in such a way as to fit the shape of the base of a particular vessel (e.g. the oblong base of no. 75) and not necessarily bunched in groups as was the custom for circular plates (e.g. nos. 6 or 57); in the case of chalices, they were applied before the base had been finally fashioned, though certainly after the sheet of silver had been cut, for they are disposed around the inside lip of the base (see *supra*).

⁷ Nos. 8, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 52, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70, 80, 85, 87, 90, 91, 92.

⁸ Nos. 89, 99, 103.

⁹ Nos. 2, 4, 28, 47, 78, 88, 98.

¹⁰ Nos. 1, 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, 23, 26, 30, 31, 36, 51, 55, 56, 57, 67, 68, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 84, 94, 95, 100.

¹¹ Stamps applied before the object was decorated: nos. 12, 17, 18, 22, 27, 32, 40, 41, 42, 43, 49, 74, 83, 96, 97. Stamps applied after the object was decorated: no. 101. Examples where the reproduction is not sufficiently clear to indicate when the stamps were applied: 3, 5, 11, 29, 48, 50, 69, 71, 81, 82, 86, 93, 102.

CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

Stamps were thus applied to silver vessels at some point during the process of manufacture, after the ultimate use of the refined silver had been determined and the vessel shaped but before the decoration was finally completed.

We turn now to the stamps themselves and consider their development from their first appearance to the time when they fell into disuse.

A. SILVER BULLION, GOLD BARS, AND GRAFFITI. THE SQUARE STAMP

The practice, still in use today, of stamping vessels made of precious metal with an official sign indicating their fineness, and thereby setting them apart from objects made of more ordinary materials, represents a comparatively late development in the history of the use of gold and silver. Indeed, the stamps or marks to be described here are the earliest essays in this practice. In very ancient times there was apparently no control over the quality of metal used by the gold- or silversmith, nor any mark to identify the maker. In the classical Greek era the names of craftsmen were scratched on red- or black-figured vases, and as early as the fifth century B.C. individual artists' names may have been inscribed on silver and gold vessels as well.¹² The custom of thus inscribing an object with the name of the artist may have had both practical and social or psychological significance; it may have reflected the status achieved by the craftsman in Greek society, but in the case of precious metals it must also have served to guarantee the quality of the metal. Early in the classical period, moreover, indications of weight are found scratched on the bottoms of such vessels.¹³ This practice served as a more positive evidence of quality, and graffiti of this type continue to be found on vessels long after the classical period. The custom is undoubtedly connected with that of using gold and silver vessels (either whole or broken into fragments for bullion) as currency for such purposes as the payment of debt or tribute.¹⁴ From the second century B.C. actual stamps inscribed with the maker and workshop were used on terracotta and bronze objects.¹⁵ No doubt this development occurred in the cheaper media because the objects were manufactured in great quantity in large workshops, and it would have been too laborious to sign them individually; but no stamps have been found on gold or silver objects of a date earlier than the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., and the earliest of these stamps are on gold and silver ingots, rather than on shaped vessels.

¹² G. M. A. Richter, in *AJA*, XLV (1941), p. 388; cf. Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, I (Paris, 1887), p. 805, note 263.

¹³ Signs of weight are found so frequently on silver objects that it is hardly necessary to refer to specific examples. A discussion of the significance of this practice is found in Grünhagen, pp. 65-67.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66; Pacatus, *Panegyricus Theodosio Augusto dictus (Panegyrici latini)*, Teubner ed. [1874], p. 294, XII:26; *Cod. Theod.*, VII:xxiv:1; XII:vi:13; XIII:ii:1.

¹⁵ J. Déchelette, *Les vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule Romaine*, I, II (Paris, 1904); F. Oswald and T. Davies Pryce, *An Introduction to the Study of Terra Sigillata, Treated from a Chronological Standpoint* (London, 1920), with full bibliography and appendix of potters' names, pp. 273-276; for more recent bibliography, see M.-T. Lenger, "Timbres amphoriques trouvés à Argos," *BCH*, LXXIX (1955), pp. 484-508; for bronze objects, Th. Schreiber, *Die alexandrinische Toreutik* (Leipzig, 1894), p. 395; H. Willers, *Die römischen Bronzebeimer von Hemmoor* (Hannover-Leipzig, 1901), *passim*; A. Radnóti, *Die römischen Bronzegefässe von Pannonien* (Budapest, 1938), pl. xvii.

In contrast to the marks previously considered, the stamps on bullion are not only inscribed with an individual name and perhaps the place of origin or the workshop, but also bear an indication of their official character. The busts of three emperors occur in a stamp on a silver ingot found near Hanover. They have been identified as Valentinian III (who came to the throne in A.D. 425), Galla Placidia, and Theodosius II (d. A.D. 450) and thus date the stamp between 425 and 450.¹⁶ The same ingot also bears a stamp containing a seated Tyche holding a scepter and a sphere, and an inscription identifying the figure as the city of Rome. On gold bars from Transylvania are stamps containing the busts of Theodosius the Great (A.D. 379-395), Honorius, and Arcadius.¹⁷ Among the stamps on these bars is one with the seated figure of a Tyche identified by inscription as the city of Sirmium. Silver ingots found in England and Ireland bear the inscription EX OFFI(CINA), or a variant thereof, followed by a proper name.¹⁸ These inscriptions, busts, and city goddesses suggest that the stamps were not applied by a private individual but by some bureau of control established to regulate traffic in the precious metals, and that they represent, therefore, a form of government authority. The individual names inscribed in the stamps on these bars are not likely to be the names of craftsmen, but rather of officials whose duty it was to guarantee the quality and weight of the metal. It is known that metal in bulk was evaluated by weight for purposes of tax payment,¹⁹ and the stamps on the bars thus represent an official guarantee of unadulterated metal. It was probably inevitable that as the power of the central government became stronger, its control in financial matters should extend to all forms of traffic in the precious metals.

The stamps on vessels from the fourth and fifth centuries represent the next step in this development. Only five such stamps are known, one on each of an equal number of vessels (nos. 81-85). They are all of a similar type, square or slightly rectangular, and contain a seated Tyche²⁰ similar to those on the gold and silver bars. This Tyche again lends the stamp an official character, for it is unlikely that the silversmith would have been allowed to depict the local divinity on a stamp bearing his personal signature and serving his own private purposes. Moreover, the stamp on no. 81 is inscribed in Greek with the words

¹⁶ Willers, *op. cit.* pp. 232-233, pl. XI: 1a; Sir Arthur Evans, "Notes on the Coinage and Silver Currency in Roman Britain from Valentinian I to Constantine III," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 4th Ser., XV (1915), pp. 488-519, esp. p. 496; M. Rosenberg, *Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen*, I (Frankfurt a. M., 1922), p. XXX, fig. 7; Grünhagen, p. 66. Sir Arthur Evans assigns the imperial busts to Theodosius I and his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, and dates the bars accordingly at the end of the fourth century. More recent opinion favors a fifth-century date.

¹⁷ Willers, *op. cit.*, p. 229, pl. XIII: 1f. Rosenberg, *op. cit.*, p. XXIX, fig. 6; Sir Arthur Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 490. These busts have also been associated with Valentinian I (Emperor of the West from A. D. 364 to 375), his brother Valens (Emperor of the East in 364-378), and his son Gratian (named Co-Emperor in 367) (F. Kenner, "Römische Goldbarren mit Stempeln," *Archaeologisch-Epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn*, XII [1888], pp. 1-24; see also, *ibid.*, pp. 66-73).

¹⁸ Sir Arthur Evans, *op. cit.*, pp. 508-519; Walters, pp. 31, no. 118, 52, no. 196; *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXV (1945), p. 91.

¹⁹ See note 14, and Amm. Marc., XX:iv:18; *Cod. Just.*, X:lxxii:5; X:lxxviii; see also *Le livre du Préfet*, II:8 (ed. Jules Nicole, Geneva, 1893), p. 24.

²⁰ Only no. 85 is too damaged to show the figure distinctly.

ΑΒΑΛΑΤΟΣ ΣΦΡΑΓΙΣΕΝ. The Tyche on this stamp closely resembles the figure on a coin struck by Valentinian II (A.D. 383–392) and may be dated in the late fourth century.²¹ The inscription leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader that the concern was not with the person who made the vessel but with the one who stamped it; in other words, with the quality of the metal as guaranteed by the stamp of Abalatos, and not with the artistic merits of the vase. The inscription is in Greek, moreover, which suggests an Eastern rather than a Western origin for the vase, and, as Zahn pointed out, the name Abalatos is in itself Eastern. The stamp on no. 82 is also inscribed in Greek and is in most respects like that on no. 81. The Tyche in the stamp on no. 83 is different only in that she is represented in profile; she holds an unidentifiable object and a scepter and her left foot rests on a prow. A similar goddess in profile with globus crucifer and a scepter is found on coins from Constantinople in the reign of Theodosius II (A.D. 408–450).²² As the bowl was found with coins of Theodosius II and Valentinian III (d. 455), it may reasonably be dated in the first half of the fifth century, a little later than the stamps on nos. 81 and 82. Laffranchi has shown that the representation of Constantinopolis on coins from this period can be distinguished from that of Roma by the fact that she has her left foot resting on a prow.²³ Since this feature appears in the representation on the stamp and since, moreover, the stamp is inscribed with the letters CONS, there can be no doubt that it was applied in the capital. The stamp on no. 84 may be related to the one on no. 83 and dated accordingly; the stamp on no. 85, although in very bad condition, seems to resemble that on no. 81.

Of these five surviving stamps, three bear marks of Eastern origin and may be reasonably closely dated; the remaining two are scarcely legible. So far no stamps at all have been found on gold vessels, but this is probably due to the fact that few such vessels have survived; some may well have been stamped in this period.^{23a} Nor were all silver vessels stamped. Numerous objects have come down to us from the fourth and fifth centuries without any such marks. These five are the only extant examples of such an early date documented in this way; at the same time their stamps survive as the first indication of a form of official control of the traffic in precious metals other than for coinage purposes. This was a kind of public assurance that became a permanent fixture only in the later middle ages.

B. IMPERIAL STAMPS

To the reign of Anastasius I (A.D. 491–518) belong the first stamps in the series called "Imperial." This term is used because the reigning emperor's

²¹ R. Zahn, "Spätantike Silbergefässe," *Amtl. Ber.*, XXXVIII, no. 10 (1917), cols. 263–304, see esp. cols. 271–277 and 292–296.

²² Ratto, pl. IV, nos. 153–155, 169–179, and *passim*.

²³ L. Laffranchi, "Un nuovo medaglione aureo di Teodosio I e la figura di Constantinopolis," *Studi di numismatica*, I (1940), pp. 69–82; *idem*, "Appunti di critica numismatica. I. La data finale della personificazione di Costantinopoli ed i medaglioni aurei del tempo Teodosiano," *Numismatica*, VII (1941), pp. 33–39.

^{23a} Cf. J. Heurgon, *Le trésor de Ténès* (Paris, 1958), pp. 22, 28 (stamp on gold fibula).

portrait and/or his name, written either in full or in monogram form, appear on one or more of the stamps on each of the vessels concerned. The series extends from the reign of Anastasius to that of Constans II (A.D. 641-668). Like the busts on stamps of gold and silver bars, these devices lend the stamps an official character that in itself suggests governmental authority.

The stamps of the reign of Anastasius I occur on five silver vessels (nos. 1-5) and are of five different shapes: round, hexagonal, triangular, square, and oblong with an arched top. This last shape, which also occurs throughout the rest of the Imperial series, will be designated hereafter simply by the adjective "long." Four stamps are found on each vessel under Anastasius and among these at least one of the standard shapes is repeated twice. Vessels nos. 1, 2, and 3 each have two round stamps, one hexagon, and one triangle. The round stamps on no. 1 appear to be identical, containing a bust of the Emperor circumscribed in Latin DN ANASTASIVS PP AVG, a form used commonly on his coins.²⁴ The hexagon and the triangle contain monograms of the "box type." This kind of monogram is formed by grouping subsidiary letters around one central letter form, and it is so termed to distinguish it from the "cross type" that was developed later in the sixth century. Rosenberg has attempted to read the worn monogram in the triangle, while the one in the hexagon is barely distinguishable; in any case, it is clear that neither can be read as the name of Anastasius. Both monograms are circumscribed by different and unrelated individual names in Greek characters. The stamps on the plate of Paternus, no. 2, are similar in form to those on no. 1, except for two significant changes: although both round stamps contain the bust of the Emperor and one of them is inscribed with his name in Latin, the second is inscribed with an individual name in Greek characters, MHNNA, much like the hexagon and the triangle of no. 1; moreover, in the hexagon is a monogram which can be read to give the name of the Emperor in a form used on his coinage:²⁵ NI . This box-type monogram also served for Justinian (*infra*, p. 13), for the letters may be so arranged as to read either name, but in this case, as in nos. 4 and 5, the association with the inscribed name of the Emperor in the accompanying stamp assures the identification. On the same plate, no. 2, the triangle contains a box-type monogram different both from that of the Emperor and from the one in the triangle of no. 1; it may be read to give the name $\text{I}\omega\text{ANNOV}$. The hexagon and the triangle are inscribed with the names of individuals in Greek characters, bearing no relation to the names in the stamps of no. 1. The stamps on no. 3 are like those on nos. 1 and 2 in type, except that both the round ones are inscribed with individual Greek names; the name of the Emperor is not to be found, and the box type monogram $\text{I}\omega\text{ANNOV}$, corresponding to the monogram in the triangle of no. 2, occurs along with the busts in the round stamps, as well as in the triangle. These stamps are assigned to Anastasius I on the basis of their relationship to the stamps on nos. 1 and 2. On object no. 4, a new shape

²⁴ Wroth, I, p. 1 ff.

²⁵ Wroth, I, p. 7, no. 59, pl. II: 2; cf. E. Kitzinger, "The Sutton Hoo Ship-Burial. V: The Silver," *Antiquity*, XIV (1940), p. 42.

CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

is introduced, the long stamp. It is repeated twice, along with two identical hexagons, and contains the bust of the Emperor and his name previously found in the round stamp; it contains also a monogram different from those previously observed, and not yet deciphered. In the hexagon is the monogram of the Emperor, similar to the one in the hexagon of no. 2, and the name ΘΩΜΑ. Finally, no. 5 shows two long stamps, one hexagon and a square, the latter being the only instance of a square among the stamps of Anastasius. The long stamp resembles those on no. 4, containing the bust and name of the Emperor in Latin, and again a different box-type monogram. Although in form the hexagon is similar to the hexagons already described, in this instance it contains a monogram which is not that of Anastasius. His monogram is found instead in the square stamp, where it is circumscribed by a name in Greek.

The portrait of the Emperor thus occurs in one or another of the stamps on each vessel. In all but one of the stamps the bust is shown full face and wearing a diadem with a trefoil ornament. This portrait is similar to that used later for Justinian I (Table I: Type 1, see *infra*), and will be referred to again. In the round stamp on no. 2, which is inscribed with the Emperor's name, the bust is wearing a plumed helmet rather than a diadem with a trefoil ornament. This portrait type corresponds to contemporary coin portraits of the Emperor Anastasius, a fact which suggests that this stamp may be earlier than the stamps with the "Justinianic" portrait. The stamps on at least three objects show, in addition to the monogram of the Emperor, another and different monogram which will be termed the "secondary monogram." Circumscribing the portraits and the monograms are proper names, and there is a tendency to replace the name of the Emperor, which is in Latin, with that of an individual in Greek. These names and monograms are inscribed in the same way on stamps throughout the Imperial series; that is, the forms remain the same, although the persons to whom they refer constantly change, and a discussion of their meaning is reserved for the end of this section so as to include the entire series. Apart from the recurring patterns described, no very consistent development can be traced among the stamps on these first five objects. There are four on each object, but they occur in different combinations. Coming as they do after the isolated square stamps of the fourth and fifth centuries, they imply the establishment of a new system of control of silver under the direct authority of the Emperor Anastasius; but their lack of uniformity suggests that this system had not yet assumed a fixed character.

The stamps of Anastasius were the forerunners of a new system of control marks introduced in the reign of Justinian I (A.D. 527-565), a system which was established so securely that it survived, with very few changes, for one hundred and fifty years. During this period, five different standard shapes were generally applied to each silver vessel; four of these, the round, the long, the square, and the hexagon are similar to their counterparts under Anastasius; in addition, a new shape, a stamp in the form of a cross was introduced. All are inscribed in Greek characters. Occasionally one shape may be repeated on the

same vessel and another omitted, but the total number remains the same. In some instances, only four stamps are visible,²⁶ and it is possible that where this is the case the fifth stamp was worn away or destroyed while the decoration of the vessel was being finished.²⁷ This may also have happened to three objects—nos. 71, 74, 79—where only one stamp can be seen. On the other hand, some of these objects belong to a period when the Imperial system of stamping was breaking down,²⁸ and the irregularity may be a further sign of the disorganization of controls. On five objects, nos. 44, 54, 55, 64, 65, more than five stamps are visible. In each case one or more of the extra stamps are very much worn and it can be shown that no. 54, at least, and probably no. 55, were stamped on two different occasions,²⁹ which suggests a similar explanation for nos. 44, 64, 65. The overwhelming majority of the objects concerned, however, have five stamps each. Altogether there are *seventy-five* objects with Imperial stamps (nos. 6–80), exclusive of the stamps from the reign of Anastasius. Two of these are inadequately published (nos. 79, 80). The following description concerns the stamps on the remaining seventy-three objects.³⁰ Two sets of stamps are found on nos. 17, 54, and 55, which increases the number of stamp *groups* to seventy-six.³¹ Each of the five shapes of stamps will be considered as it developed throughout the entire series.

The round stamp contains the bust of the ruling emperor circumscribed by the name or title of an individual in Greek characters.³² These “portraits” are similar to the busts on the stamps of Anastasius. Their resemblance to contemporary coin types, first observed by Matsulevich, was used by him in *Byzantinische Antike* to date the principal objects with which he deals. Matsulevich described five main types of busts; today we can distinguish eight different types, each of which can be compared with a representative coin type. They cover the reigns from Anastasius I to Constans II, and are described and illustrated in Table I.

The busts of Type I are similar to the busts on coins struck by Justinian I (A.D. 527–565) in 538/39 and after. This bust is also frequently found on the coins of Justin II (A.D. 565–578).^{32a} It is true that the coin type is of a military character, showing the emperor full face and wearing helmet and armor,

²⁶ Nos. 17, 18(?), 34(?), 61, 69, 75. For documentary references to the five stamps, see p. 26f. The suggestion has been made that four stamps may have been used on silver of inferior quality. That this is *not* the case is proved by Rutherford J. Gettens and Claude L. Waring, “The Composition of Some Ancient Persian and Other Near Eastern Silver Objects,” *Ars Orientalis*, II (1957), p. 89, nos. 17–24, where it is shown that silver with four stamps is of as good a quality as silver with five.

²⁷ See nos. 20, 21, 22, 49.

²⁸ See *infra*, pp. 12, 31, 33.

²⁹ See the entries for nos. 54 and 55 in the Catalogue.

³⁰ Rosenberg published about forty-five of the seventy-three objects. The additional numbers are given in note 4.

³¹ Although the distinctions between the two sets on nos. 54 and 55 are open to question on minor points because several of the stamps are badly worn, these uncertainties do not affect the following argument and for the sake of convenience the two objects are considered as bearing two independent sets of stamps each, as does no. 17. The additional stamps on nos. 44, 64, and 65 are too worn to be considered independently.

³² On no. 78 there is a round stamp of the normal kind and, in addition—a single exception to the rule—a round stamp containing a monogram; see pp. 12, 21.

^{32a} Cf. Wroth, I, pls. IV: 11, 12 (Justinian); XI: 1 (Justin II).

whereas the stamp type is of a civilian character, showing the emperor in a cloak and wearing a diadem; but there are close analogies between the two types: the helmet on the coins is surrounded by a diadem having a frontal ornament with three small projections; this trefoil-like arrangement is found also in the silver stamps and in both cases the circular ornament which supports the trefoil may be omitted and the projections depicted widely separated, losing all relation to the original design.^{32b} The bust in the stamps is nimbed and while the nimbus does not occur on the obverse of normal solidi, the emperor may occasionally be nimbed on coins even in the sixth century.³³ A variant of Type 1 occurs in a stamp from the reign of Anastasius on the plate of Paternus, no. 2. This stamp shows the Emperor helmeted and in three-quarter view. Such a bust is found on Byzantine coins beginning with the early fourth century and is used consistently until the time of Justinian I.³⁴ It is found regularly on the coins of Anastasius; but most stamps of Anastasius show the full-face type and anticipate by several years the adoption of that type for the coinage of Justinian in 538/39.³⁵

Type 2 is similar to Type 1, except that the diadem with trefoil ornament is replaced by a crown with a small, circular, raised ornament in front. The bust corresponds to a coin type adopted by Tiberius II Constantine (A.D. 578–582). On these coins the same crown appears either with a helmet or supporting a cross, and so it continued under Mauricius Tiberius (A.D. 582–602).^{35a} Moreover, on some coins Tiberius II is shown wearing, instead of his armor, a paludamentum like that worn by the bust in the stamps.³⁶ The stamps concerned may thus be dated in the reigns of Tiberius II or Mauricius. There is also, however, one bust of this kind in a stamp belonging to the reign of Justin II (no. 27), that is, to a period when it had not yet appeared on the coins. This is another instance where the stamp type anticipates the development in coinage. Type 3 is similar to Type 2, but is even closer to the coin types of Tiberius in that the Emperor is without nimbus and the crown has a circular ornament supporting a cross. Types 1, 2, and 3 cover the sixth century, the only significant change being in the headgear of the emperor. This small distinction was, indeed, noticed by Matsulevich,³⁷ but he had no evidence to show how the different types overlapped the several reigns. Moreover, in the stamps of this period, except for Type 3 (of which there is only a single example), the busts are nimbed

^{32b} This omission is normal on coins of the sixth century, but the complete design appears regularly on coins of the late fifth century.

³³ Cf. a coin from the joint reign of Justin I and Justinian, showing the two Emperors seated and *en face*: Wroth, I, pl. iv: 5, 6. A nimbed figure of the emperor is also found on rare silver coins from Constantinople: Sabatier, I, p. 178, nos. 7, 8, pl. xii: 6, 7; Wroth, I, p. 29, nos. 26, 27; pl. v: 1, 2.

³⁴ J. Maurice, *Numismatique constantinienne*, I (Paris, 1908), p. 151, no. 5, pl. xiv; Sabatier, I, pls. iii ff.; Ratto, no. 40ff.

³⁵ Wroth, I, p. xci. Wroth regards this full-face type as an innovation made by Justinian and considers it to be a portrait of this Emperor. Its earlier use in the stamps by Anastasius suggests that it was not an individual likeness of either Emperor but, rather, a formal type-portrait adopted by Anastasius and used by his successors.

^{35a} Cf. Wroth, I, pls. xiii: 17 (Tiberius II, ornament with cross); xvii: 3 (Mauricius, ornament with helmet).

³⁶ Wroth, I, p. 110, nos. 38, 39; pl. xiv: 7, 8.

³⁷ *Byz. Ant.*, p. 82.

and for this reason Matsulevich classed *all* nimbed portraits in the sixth century. Type 3 shows that the nimbus may be dropped before the end of the sixth century, while, on the other hand, it appears again on stamps from the seventh century.

Type 4a introduces two innovations: the bust is nimbed, but the crown worn by the emperor does not have pendants and the portrait is bearded. The beard of Phocas (A.D. 602–610), as it was portrayed on normal coin issues in the East,^{37a} was distinctively long and pointed. It is as recognizable on the stamps as on the coins of this Emperor. The only distinction between Type 4a and Type 4b is that the nimbus is omitted in the latter; so the relationship between the coin and the stamp types becomes even closer.

Types 5–7 all belong to the Emperor Heraclius (A.D. 610–641). Type 5 continues in the tradition of the Phocas portrait except that Heraclius' beard is short, if indeed there is a beard at all.³⁸ The crown has pendants of the sixth-century type and is surmounted by a circular ornament. This type corresponds to the effigy of the Emperor on his coins 610–613, except that in the usual coin type he wears a helmet, or, if he does wear a crown, its ornament is surmounted by a cross.³⁹ The portrait is nimbed. Type 6 occurs most frequently on the stamps of Heraclius and corresponds to coin types from the years 613–629/30.⁴⁰ On the stamps this type occurs with minor variations. In all of them the Emperor is dressed in a cloak; he wears a bushy beard, cropped hair and a crown. In Type 6a he is nimbed and on the front of the crown there is a circular ornament recalling earlier types in the series. Type 6b is similar to Type 6a, except that the nimbus is omitted. In Type 6c the ornament on the crown is embellished with a cross, as it normally is on contemporary coins. Type 6d, which shows the ornament on the crown surmounted by a trefoil decoration,^{40a} occurs only twice in the Imperial series, and both times in the long stamp. It is nimbate. Type 7 portrays Heraclius as he appears on his coins between 629/30 and 641.⁴¹ In the stamps, as on the coins, the Emperor wears a crown with a cross; he has a long beard with rather formidable mustaches and no nimbus.

Type 8 belongs to Constans II (A.D. 641–668). It differs from the bust of Heraclius in the distinctive shape of the face and in the fact that the Emperor carries a globus crucifer. This bust corresponds to the coin portrait of

^{37a} Cf. Wroth, I, pl. xx: 4, 5.

³⁸ In the year of his accession, A.D. 610, Heraclius shaved his beard which had previously been long and bushy: Georgius Cedrenus, *Historiarum compendium*, I (Bonn, 1838), p. 714. The information agrees with the portrayal of the Emperor on coins from the first two or three years of his reign (see *infra*) and it helps support our chronological grouping of the silver stamps of the reign of Heraclius, since those with an effigy of this type appear at the head of the sequence on other grounds also.

³⁹ Wroth, I, p. 211, no. 205, pl. xxv: 1; Grierson, *Num. Chron.* X, p. 69, 38a, pl. iv. For the dating of these coin types and excellent illustrations, see Grierson, "Solidi of Phocas and Heraclius: the Chronological Framework," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 6th Ser., XIX (1959), pp. 131–154. Unfortunately, this article appeared too late to be referred to throughout this text.

⁴⁰ Wroth, I, p. xxiv; pl. xxiii: 4, 8.

^{40a} Cf. Wroth, I, pl. xxiii: 11, where the crown has a similar ornament.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pl. xxiii: 9, 10–12.

CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

Constans II between 641 and 651/2, in which the Emperor also carries a globus crucifer.⁴²

The busts in the round stamps can thus be associated with coin types from the reign of Anastasius I to Constans II, and on this evidence alone the entire series can be attributed to the sixth and first half of the seventh century. In the case of stamps from the seventh century the emperors portrayed can be identified fairly readily, but in the sixth century only three slightly different portrait types were used for the stamps throughout five reigns and the dating of an object on grounds of the portrait alone is correspondingly vague. Frequently the bust in the round stamp is too badly worn to be distinguished, or the round stamp may be entirely missing. Although a similar portrait is found in the long stamp (to be discussed presently), in cases where neither bust is clear the most positive criterion for dating lies in the imperial monogram in the square and hexagonal stamps.

The square and hexagonal stamps are similar in kind and may be considered together. Each contains a monogram in the center and a name or title in Greek letters around the periphery. The hexagon generally has, in addition, a mark of religious character, either a cross (e.g., no. 37) or a nimbed bust (e.g., no. 56). On two objects (nos. 45, 46) the nimbus is crossed and thus indicates that the bust portrays Christ. In two other stamps (nos. 72, 73) the bust appears to be winged. In one instance only is this general arrangement varied: the hexagon of no. 77, contains a large bust of a saint and a circumscribed name, but no monogram.⁴³ In no instance is the name inscribed in the square the same as that in the hexagon and there seems to be little relationship between them; but it is of great importance that the monogram in the square very frequently spells the same name as the monogram in the hexagon. Table II illustrates how frequently this occurs. From the beginning of the reign of Justinian I, to the end of the reign of Constans II there are thirty-one stamp groups in which the monograms in both the square and the hexagon are at least partially legible.⁴⁴ Among these thirty-one groups (or sixty-two stamps), only six instances (or twelve stamps) occur in which the monogram in one stamp is not the same as in the other (nos. 28, 29, 36, 41, 76, 78). It follows that there is generally a relationship between the monograms in question, and wherever one is not legible it is most likely to have been the same as the other.

Furthermore, again in the great majority of cases, this monogram spells the name of an emperor, and specifically the emperor (or one of the emperors) with

⁴² Wroth, I, p. 255, note 1; pl. xxx: 12-15. In the round stamp of no. 75 the Emperor has a fairly short, full beard, which, according to Wroth, was worn by Constans II from ca. 646-651/2. It is difficult to judge whether or not the busts in the round stamps of nos. 76 and 77 are bearded, but it is possible that they are without beard and thus belong to the years 641-ca. 646. The round stamp on no. 78 is hardly distinguishable. *

⁴³ The religious character of these stamps is discussed in A. Alföldi and E. Cruikshank, "A Sassanian Silver Phalera at Dumbarton Oaks," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 11 (1957), p. 244.

⁴⁴ Neither monogram is legible on nos. 18, 24, 53, 71, 74. Only one monogram, either in the square or the hexagon, is legible on nos. 6, 10, 14, 16, 17A, 17B, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 35, 40, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54A, 54B, 55B, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 75. No. 77 is also excluded since the hexagon does not contain a monogram.

* On no 78a it appears to be short.

whom the bust in the round stamp is associated. Among the seventy-six stamp groups, there are seventy-one in which at least *one* of the two stamps, either the square or the hexagon, is legible, and sixty-seven times out of seventy-one, at least *one* of these monograms reads the name of an emperor. This is a substantial proportion of the total number. It points to the conclusion that the monograms in the square and the hexagon are, as a rule, not only identical, but both also spell the name of the emperor portrayed in the round stamp.

In all, there are only eight exceptions to this rule and they are marked on Table II in dark ink.⁴⁵ On only one object (no. 77) does neither stamp contain a monogram with the name of an emperor. These stamps belong to the reign of Constans II, when the system of controls was deteriorating.⁴⁶ The same circumstance explains the irregularities on nos. 75, 76, and 78. No explanation for the irregularities among the stamps on nos. 28, 29, 36, and 41 is entirely satisfactory. Nos. 28 and 29 belong to the reign of Tiberius II. It is suggested that, since his reign lasted only four years, the stamping system may not have become fully organized during so brief a period. In one of the stamps on no. 29 the monogram of Justin II seems to have been re-used. Also, among the stamps of Tiberius the monogram of Constantine occurs, and the same monogram appears again in the hexagonal stamps of nos. 36 and 41, where the accompanying square stamps bear the monograms of Phocas and Heraclius respectively.⁴⁷ Whatever the reason for these minor variations, the fact remains that, taking the entire group of square and hexagonal stamps, there is an evident relationship between their monograms and the portrait of the emperor in the round stamp, a relationship which has not been sufficiently recognized in the past. The monogram has occasionally been connected with the emperor when the portrait in the round stamp was clear, but it has not usually been used as a guide to the date of an object. Yet, since the monogram in the square and hexagonal stamps generally agrees with the portrait in the round stamp, it follows that in cases where the portrait is not recognizable, the object may frequently be dated by the monogram alone.

Monograms like those of Phocas and Heraclius can hardly be read to yield any other name, but other monograms are not so easily interpreted. Once it is established that the squares and hexagons contain as a rule an imperial monogram, we are justified in choosing among several possible readings one which corresponds to the name of an emperor. For example, the monogram ϠϠ could

⁴⁵ Nos. 28, 29, 36, 41, 75, 76, 77, 78. Nos. 1 and 5, also marked in dark ink, are excluded since they belong to the reign of Anastasius; on nos. 11, 12, 13, 25, 37, 38, 39, there are slight variations in the monograms in question, but they do not affect the present discussion. In every case they involve only a variation in the form of monogram or in the spelling of the emperor's name (see also note 54).

⁴⁶ See *infra*, pp. 31, 33.

⁴⁷ In the case of no. 28, the monogram in the hexagon reads Constantine and it is possible that the monogram in the square spells the Emperor's first name. It is known that Tiberius assumed the name Constantine on his accession (Wroth, I, p. xx, note 3). Some of the coins of Tiberius are inscribed with his first name on one side and his second on the other (Wroth, I, pp. 106-107). A similar explanation applies to no. 41 from the reign of Heraclius, for this Emperor named his son, Heraclius Constantine, co-Emperor in 613 (see no. 94; Grierson, "Solidi of Phocas and Heraclius; The Chronological Framework," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 6th Ser., XIX [1959], p. 142). There seems to be no equally valid reason for the use of this monogram by Phocas for the hexagonal stamp on no. 36.

CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

read either MAPKOV or MAVPIKIOV, but the latter reading is undoubtedly the correct one. In this manner, it is possible to decipher monograms that have not previously been read. Along with the portrait in the round stamp, Table I gives the monogram (or monograms) of each emperor as it appears on his stamps.

The monogram $\text{N}\check{\text{X}}$, or $\text{N}\check{\text{X}}$, was assigned by Matsulevich and Rosenberg to either Anastasius or Justinian, since it contains all the letters of both names: NACTIOV. Indeed, it was certainly shared by both Emperors, for it can be seen not only on the coins and stamps of Anastasius, but also on capitals of St. Sophia,⁴⁸ St. John at Ephesus,⁴⁹ and, possibly, S. Vitale in Ravenna,⁵⁰ where it refers to the Emperor Justinian. There is another form of this monogram that could refer to either name and which, as it is found in the stamps, has been assigned to both Anastasius and Justinian. The only difference between it and the first monogram lies in the fact that an additional line is used to form the letter A: $\text{N}\check{\text{X}}$. This type is widely represented in the churches of Justinian and occurs on the brass collars and capitals of St. Sophia far more frequently than does the first.⁵¹ It is found again on the capitals of the church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus⁵² and of St. Irene.⁵³ The church of St. Sophia was built in the years from 532 to 537, and presumably the capitals on the columns of the nave, on which both monograms occur, were put in place toward the beginning or middle of this period. The second monogram must have been in use well before the church was finished, or at least by *ca.* 536. Other variations of the first monogram were used by Justinian in his churches, but the second type was the form most commonly employed. On silver, it occurs only in stamps which can be attributed on other grounds also to the reign of Justinian rather than to that of Anastasius. For these reasons the monogram can probably be considered a variation instituted by Justinian alone and not shared by his predecessor.

The monogram of Justin II $\text{N}\check{\text{X}}$ (IOVCTINOV) is identified here for the first time. It is similar to that of Anastasius and Justinian but lacks the A and thus cannot represent the name of either of these Emperors. Once, on no. 25, a variation occurs with an epsilon, which yields the reading

⁴⁸ Lethaby and Swainson, p. 293: F. 2.

⁴⁹ *Forschungen in Ephesos* (Österreichisches archäologisches Institut), IV, 3 (Vienna, 1951), p. 122, fig. 22, pls. xxviii: 1; xxx: 1, 2; xxxi: 1, 2; R. Kautzsch, *Kapitellstudien* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1936), pl. 36, no. 567 a, b.

⁵⁰ Diehl, *Ravenna* (Paris, 1928), p. 133; see also *Archaeologia*, XLV (1880), p. 425. This monogram exists in a slightly different form among the Justinianic capitals of Caričin Grad: Dj. Mano-Zisi, "Les fouilles de Caričin Grad en 1949-1952," *Starinar*, III-IV (1952-1953), p. 143, fig. 28.


⁵¹ See e.g. E. M. Antoniades, *Ekphrasis tes Hagias Sophias*, II (Athens, 1908), figs. 250, 302, 307, 313; Lethaby and Swainson, p. 293: C. 1, D. 1, D. 2, G. 1, H. 2, J. 1, K. 2, L. 1, M. 2, N. 1, O. 2. P. 2; E. H. Swift, *Hagia Sophia* (New York, 1940), p. 52, figs. 3, 4, p. 65, fig. 8.




⁵² J. A. Ebersolt and A. Thiers, *Les églises de Constantinople* (Paris, 1913), p. 47, fig. 24.

⁵³ W. S. George, *The Church of Saint Eirene at Constantinople* (Oxford, 1912), p. 21, fig. 7, pls. 16, 23. It is found also on a bronze weight of Justinian in the Louvre: Daremberg and Saglio, "Exagium," *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, II (Paris, 1892), p. 876, fig. 2850; H. Leclercq, in Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, IX^a (Paris, 1930), col. 1778, fig. 7145.

IOVCTEINOV.⁵⁴ This monogram is found in the squares and/or hexagons on seven silver objects (nos. 20–23, 25–27). The objects concerned, which include the well-known patens from Riha and Stuma and the plate with the bust of “Euthenia,” may be dated, therefore, within the thirteen years of the reign of Justin II (A.D. 565–578). It might be said that this monogram could also refer to Justin I (A.D. 518–527), but the secondary monogram is of the cross type, a type which, as will be shown, did not develop until after *ca.* 536. This circumstance, together with other factors to be considered later, places these stamps in the reign of the second Justin (see *infra*, p. 16 and note 67).

The monogram in the square stamp of no. 28, an object attributed on other grounds to Tiberius II Constantine,⁵⁵ is unfortunately not very legible. The monogram in the hexagon reads ΚΩΝCTANTINOV. It is known that Tiberius assumed this name on his accession.⁵⁶

The monogram of Mauricius  occurs on two silver objects (nos. 30 and 31) that have in the round stamp a bust of Type 2 (Table I). These two sets of stamps are exceptional in the Imperial series in that the imperial monogram is found in the long stamp, as well as in the square and hexagonal stamps.⁵⁷ Although the stamps are badly defaced, by combining all six examples a monogram that reads MAVPIKIOV can be pieced together.

The monograms of Phocas and Heraclius have been identified before and it is necessary only to observe that in stamps dating from the early part of Heraclius' reign his monogram differs slightly from the one that appears in the later stamps. On objects which on other grounds can be placed early in the sequence, the P in the monogram is combined with the H:  (“type b”). On stamps later in the sequence, the P is attached to the stem of the , and the resulting design is more balanced:  (“type a”). In two instances (the square stamps of nos. 69 and 70) the P seems to be entirely missing (“type c”).

Among the stamps of Constans II we have already observed irregularities; it would appear that this Emperor used a similar monogram to that of his predecessor in two hexagonal stamps (nos. 76, 78). His given name was, indeed, Heraclius.^{57a}

⁵⁴ For a similar spelling of the name of Justin, see *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, III, no. add. 4366.i³. A monogram very like the monogram of Justin II is found on certain “Vandalic” coins in the British Museum, which have been assigned to Anastasius I: W. Wroth, *Catalogue of the Coins of the Vandals, Ostrogoths and Lombards . . . in the British Museum* (London, 1911), p. 33. In this case it is probable that the monogram refers to Justin I.

⁵⁵ See Catalogue entry for no. 28.

⁵⁶ See note 47.

⁵⁷ See p. 15 *infra*. This monogram differs from the cross-type monogram used on Mauricius' coins (Sabatier, I, pl. xxvi: 20). For variations in the form of this monogram, see Tables I, II, and III.

^{57a} A monogram that reads “Constantine” and thus might refer to Constans II occurs in the long and cross stamps of no. 75 and in the cross stamps of nos. 76 and 77. The monograms in long and cross stamps are discussed *infra*. They do not generally refer to an emperor, and since Constantine is a common name, it would be rash to conclude that these stamps are an exception to the rule. If, on the other hand, these monograms do refer to the Emperor, they contribute to the unusual features that distinguish the stamps of Constans II (pp. 8, 12), and may be explained on the same grounds: namely, that the system of controls was deteriorating (pp. 31, 33).

The long stamp always contains a small bust, a monogram beneath it, and a name or title inscribed on the sides. The bust is generally identical with the one in the round stamp, and so may likewise be considered a means of establishing the date. Two objects, nos. 55 and 56, provide exceptions to this rule, since in these groups Type 6c occurs in the round stamp and Type 6a in the long. The long stamps on these objects and on no. 54 have another peculiarity: they have inscribed just below the bust the two letters X and Θ. Matsulevich suggests that these may be officina marks similar to those found on coins,⁵⁸ but since these irregularities are found on only three objects the question remains open. The monogram and the inscribed name in the long stamp will be discussed together with those on the cross.

The cross stamp contains only a name and a monogram. The name is inscribed at the ends of the arms of the cross and the arrangement of the letters is not uniform throughout. The earliest cross stamps, from the beginning of the reign of Justinian (nos. 6-14), are of a rather crude shape with square, blunt arms of equal length, though on nos. 10, 12, and 13 the arms have a slight flare. All the letters of the name are upright and must be read first from top to bottom and then from left to right.⁵⁹ In somewhat later examples from the reign of Justinian and in some of those from the reign of Justin II, the name is still read in the same way but the arms of the cross are decidedly flared.⁶⁰ This type of cross stamp also occurs under Mauricius (nos. 30, 31) and even in the reign of Phocas (no. 34). As early as the reigns of Justin II and Tiberius II (nos. 27, 28), however, the form more frequently adopted is one in which all the letters are placed upright, if read from the center of the cross clockwise around the arms. All but one of the cross stamps from the reign of Phocas, and all those from the reign of Heraclius, are of this type. The shape of the cross and the arrangement of the letters may thus be used within broad limits as a means of dating an object.

The monograms in the long and cross stamps (Table III) are, in all but four examples, identical with each other. The four exceptions to this rule, which involve two pairs of identical stamps, are marked on the table in dark ink. As has been noted above, the long stamp of nos. 30 and 31, repeats, for unexplained reasons, the monogram of the emperor in the accompanying square and hexagonal stamps. On nos. 70 and 71, it is the cross stamp that has a monogram resembling that of the emperor.⁶¹ On all the other stamps in question the monogram differs from that of the emperor, and in order to distinguish it from the latter it will be termed the "secondary" monogram.

The secondary monogram also provides valuable means of dating an object.

⁵⁸ "Arg. byz.," p. 300. Matsulevich also found the letter € below the bust in the round stamp of no. 77 (this would appear rather to be the clasp of the emperor's paludamentum, but the reproduction is not very clear). There may be a connection here with the Θ and the X and also the € which by the end of the eighth century replace the mint mark on coins (Wroth, II, p. 402 and *passim*).

⁵⁹ See nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, in which the inscriptions are clear.

⁶⁰ Nos. 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26?

⁶¹ In other instances the monograms in the long and cross stamps differ only in minor respects, i. e. in the placing of the letters or in the spelling of the name (e.g. nos 25 and 33). Compare the variations in the imperial monograms noted *supra* (notes 45 and 57).

In the first place, its form changes. Weigand observed⁶² that there were two types of monograms in use during the reign of Justinian, both of which are represented in St. Sophia. The first is the box type found in the stamps of Anastasius and used for the name of the Empress Theodora on at least one of the capitals of St. Sophia (532-537).⁶³ Shortly thereafter, a new form seems to have been adopted for Theodora, probably for the sake of convenience; in this type all the letters of the name are placed on the arms of a cross, with the Θ in the center.⁶⁴ This type, called the "cross" or "cruciform" type, is used consistently for Theodora on the capitals of St. John at Ephesus⁶⁵ and, in a slightly different (perhaps earlier) form, in St. Irene.⁶⁶ This appears to be the first occurrence of the cruciform monogram and, like the second of Justinian's box-type monograms, it may be dated shortly before St. Sophia was finished, that is, around A.D. 536. A similar change of type occurs in the secondary monograms in the long and cross stamps; on objects which on other grounds can be assigned to the reign of Justinian these monograms may be either of the box or cruciform type. After the reign of Justinian, on the other hand, this monogram is invariably cruciform. Since for the monogram of Theodora the transition occurred around A.D. 536, it is likely that the monogram in the long and cross stamps changed at about the same time. Thus the monogram that reads IOVCTINOV can be assigned to Justin II (A.D. 565-578) rather than to Justin I (A.D. 518-527), for on all objects where it occurs (nos. 20-27) the monogram in the long and cross stamps is of the cross type and is accordingly later than *ca.* 536.⁶⁷ Only the imperial monogram preserved the older form for a time; Justinian and the three succeeding emperors used the box type in the square and hexagon. Phocas, however, adopted the cruciform monogram, as did Heraclius.

Even more important for the dating of the stamps is the repetition of the secondary monogram in corresponding stamps on different objects. The full meaning of this monogram will be discussed below in connection with textual evidence for the control system underlying the stamps. At this point it should be observed merely that the recurrence of identical monograms makes it possible to form groups among objects within the reign of a single emperor (e.g. nos. 41-50). It may be suggested that in such cases the monogram refers to a single official and that therefore the stamps were applied at approximately the same time. Table III illustrates how frequently this repetition occurs, and in the Catalogue the objects are so arranged that the secondary monograms fall together in blocks (indicated by heavier dividing lines).

⁶² "Ein bisher verkanntes Diptychon Symmachorum," *JDAI*, LII (1937), p. 130; see also Dalton, *Arch.* 57, p. 167.

⁶³ Lethaby and Swainson, p. 293: E. 1, E. 2.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 293: F. 1 (B. 2 shows another variant of the cross type).

⁶⁵ *Forschungen in Ephesos*, IV, 3, pls. xxviii: 3, 4; xxix: 2; Kautzsch, *Kapitellstudien*, pl. 36, no. 567 c and e.

⁶⁶ George, *The Church of Saint Eirene at Constantinople*, p. 21, fig. 7; pls. 12, 16, 23.

⁶⁷ The assignment of these stamps to Justin II is further supported by other criteria: the imperial bust type, the relationships with stamps from the reigns of Justinian I and Tiberius II Constantine, the identification of the *comes sacrarum largitionum* (p. 29), and the shape of the cross stamp. The sum of these factors makes it impossible to ascribe the stamps to Justin I.

Since this method of dating is subordinate to that based on the imperial monograms, it is revealing that the consecutive groups thus formed never run counter to the sequence dictated by the latter; nor do these groups conflict with the order established on the basis of the imperial bust types or of the shape and form of the cross stamp. In only one instance is the secondary monogram repeated on objects from different reigns, and the objects involved (nos. 27 and 28) belong respectively to the reign of Justin II and to that of his successor, Tiberius II. If the same official is represented by the secondary monogram in both groups of stamps, it follows that he was in office during the reigns of both Emperors. The first object, then, belongs to the end of the reign of Justin II, and the second to the beginning of the reign of Tiberius II.

Finally, the individual names and titles inscribed in all five stamps suggest other means of dating and make it possible to place the stamped objects in a close chronological sequence within the imperial reigns and also within the groups formed by the secondary monograms. The inscriptions are generally common personal names. Although *CXOΛACTIKIC*, *ΠATPIKIC*, and *KOMITAC* resemble titles of officials, they are also used as personal names.⁶⁸ The same cannot be said, however, for *ΛAMΠΠOTATOC* and *CEBACTOC*, which occur several times in the stamps (nos. 19, 25, 27, 44-46, 51-54A). *Λαμπρότατος* corresponds to the Latin title of *clarissimus* and, while it had lost some of its importance in the sixth century, it still indicated very high rank indeed. It was, for example, accorded to consuls under Justinian. The title *Σεβαστός* was originally reserved for the emperor alone, and these stamp inscriptions seem to be the earliest evidence of its use for subordinate officials, although this became common practice in the ninth century.⁶⁹ No consistent relationship has been discovered between the inscriptions in the stamps on a single object. Table IV isolates these, and it is evident that although the same name may recur in two different stamps on the same object, for instance on no. 20, these repetitions do not occur in any regular pattern. Very often, however, the name inscribed in a stamp on one object recurs in the corresponding stamp on another. For example, the names in the round and cross stamps of no. 16 are found again in the round and cross stamps of no. 17. The name *CICINNIC* occurs at least seventeen times in the cross stamps from the reigns of Tiberius Constantine through Heraclius. Sometimes the repeated name figures on stamps that are identical too in all other respects. Nos. 27 and 28 have been mentioned above as sharing the secondary monogram in the long stamp; the name *ΙΩANNIC* and the imperial bust in the same stamp are apparently also identical. Evidently, the stamp, originally used in the reign of Justin II, was still applied in the reign of Tiberius. The implication here is that both the person designated by the secondary monogram and the person

⁶⁸ W. Pape, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Braunschweig, 1863-1870), I, p. 691; II, pp. 1148, 1468.

⁶⁹ For *λαμπρότατος*, see E. Hanton, "Lexique explicatif du Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure," *Byzantion*, IV (1927-1928), pp. 100-102; L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris, 1949), p. 103. For *σεβαστός*, G. Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris, 1884), p. 581.

them apart from the Imperial series. These differences, which are listed in detail in the Catalogue,⁷³ suggest that the stamps represent another system of control, and the inscription ΘΕΟΝ[Π]ΟΛΕΟ[Σ] in the long stamp refers to the city of Antioch.⁷⁴ The stamps on the Dumbarton Oaks candlestick, no. 90, are similar to the stamps on the Baltimore lamp. The comparison of the individual stamps, made in the Catalogue, leaves no doubt that the stamps on both objects come from the same center and from the same period. The lamp was found with objects that are stylistically Syrian and have specifically Syrian inscriptions,⁷⁵ while the candlestick was found in Antioch. Thus the stamps may well indicate a control system set up in Antioch and based on the one that used Imperial stamps. The workmanship is crude in comparison with Imperial stamps and suggests provincial hands. But if the stamps reflect a local system at Antioch the controls there could not have functioned very efficiently or for very long since, among all the objects from Syria, only two have stamps of this kind. It is interesting to note that no. 98, a plate found with the "Hama treasure," also has stamps similar to, but not identical with, a more standard series (see *supra*, p. 19)

The plates from Valdonne (nos. 91 and 92), now in Paris, each bear five stamps undoubtedly inspired by Imperial types but very different from them. Since the plates were designed so that one could be fitted into the other, they are clearly a pair. Plate no. 91 has two cross stamps, two long, and one square, while no. 92 has two cross and three round. On no. 91 the cross stamps are simple, with a meaningless design, while on no. 92 they contain an illegible monogram. There are monograms also in the round stamps of no. 92. The square on no. 91 is inscribed with the name ARBALDO in Latin characters. The two long stamps of no. 91 contain identical busts in profile, with a palm branch. These stamps may be related to Merovingian coins of the mid-seventh century,⁷⁶

⁷³ See also Alföldi and Cruikshank, "A Sassanian Silver Phalera at Dumbarton Oaks," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 11 (1957), pp. 243-244.

⁷⁴ The name of the city was formally changed after the earthquake of A.D. 528: Mal., XVIII, p. 443; Procopius, *De aedificiis*, II: x, 2 (Loeb ed., 1940, p. 164: "... Ἀντιόχεια, ἡ νῦν Θεούπολις ἐπικέκληται . . ."). On the stamp the name is in the genitive (for the interchangeable use of omicron and omega compare, for example, the inscriptions in the cross stamps of nos. 41-43 and 54B-55).

⁷⁵ The lamp was found in 1910 with the "treasure from Hama," which also included nos. 13, 34, 89, 98. There is a strong probability that the "Hama treasure" is in fact part of the famous "Antioch treasure," including the "Chalice of Antioch" in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the smaller chalice, no. 80. No. 18, the chalice of St. Anne in Jerusalem, is alleged to have come from Kara, between Hama and Aleppo, which is also probably the actual find spot of the treasures of Hama and Antioch. For other pieces from the same location see Marvin Ross, "A Second Byzantine Silver Treasure from Hamah," *Archaeology*, III (1950), pp. 162-163. The problem of the discovery of these treasures is reviewed by J. J. Rorimer, "The Authenticity of the Chalice of Antioch," *Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene* (Princeton, 1954), pp. 161-168. While Mr. Rorimer argues that the two finds were separate, Bayard Dodge ("A New Explanation for an Ancient Treasure," *Al-Kulliya* [Journal of the American University of Beirut Alumnae Association (November, 1927)], in Arabic, pp. 34-44; and "The Chalice of Antioch," *Bulletin of the Near East Society*, III [1950], no. 5, pp. 3f., 6; no. 6, p. 10) recounts the finding of all the objects in one treasure. For other accounts see L. Woolley, in *Journal of Roman Studies*, XIV (1924), p. 281; and R. Mouterde, *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, XI (Beyrouth, 1926), pp. 361-367, especially pp. 363-365.

⁷⁶ M. Prou ("Les contre-marques mérovingiennes de la coupe de Valdonne (Bouches-du-Rhône)," *Revue Charlemagne*, I [1911], pp. 182-185) relates the profile head in the long stamp to portraits on Merovingian coins, in particular coins struck in Marseilles ca. 613-640. A. Héron de Villefosse, on the other hand (*Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de France* [1910], p. 256), has noted the branch

CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

and all are crude in execution. Their chief importance lies in the fact that, though contemporary with the Imperial series, they belong to a different system and a different area, as do the stamps from Carthage and Antioch.

A Sassanian phalera in Dumbarton Oaks (no. 99), on the other hand, has three stamps which could be examples of a later development of the Imperial system itself. The stamps are disposed symmetrically on the smooth parts of the human face which decorates the front of the object. Hence the design must at least have been planned before the stamps were applied. Moreover, this is the only object with all its stamps on the front rather than on the reverse, and this suggests that they were applied after the mask was finished; possibly even by different hands. Two round stamps contain a standing, orant figure of a female saint circumscribed with her name which is, unfortunately, not entirely legible. The third stamp, a hexagon, contains a small bust of Christ and is inscribed with the trisagion: ἄγιος, ἄγιος, ἄγιος. The date of these stamps is discussed in an article in the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* referred to in the catalogue. They have been assigned to the late seventh or early eighth century largely on the grounds of the religious element which is clearly present and which is evident also in stamps of the later Imperial series (nos. 45, 46, 77), as well as in those on the Baltimore lamp (no. 89) described above. Since a religious iconography appears likewise on coins of the late seventh century, a connection with the Imperial series—suggested also by the shapes of the stamps—should not be ruled out.

These stamps can be related to a group of five round stamps on a plate in the Hermitage (no. 100). The round stamp on the phalera resembles two of the stamps on the Hermitage plate which contain the standing figure of Christ with a crossed nimbus and one arm raised. The other three stamps on the plate contain a cruciform monogram. The recent cleaning of a plate in the British Museum, no. 78 (placed next to no. 77 which must be nearly contemporary), has disclosed stamps that clearly belong to the Imperial series, but among which there is also a round stamp with a cruciform monogram.* The stamps on the plate are dated in the reign of Constans II and the relationship between this round stamp and the stamps on no. 100 above is additional reason for placing the latter in the seventh century, toward or after the end of the Imperial series. A bowl found in Zalesie in the Ukraine (no. 101) also has five stamps on the reverse, neatly fitted into the tips of the leaves of the design in areas smooth enough to show the stamps clearly. They were, therefore, applied after the design was finished, as were the stamps on the Sassanian mask. The outlines are effaced, but there seems to be an identical cruciform monogram in each and thus they too may be related to the stamps on the Hermitage plate (no. 100). The stamps on no. 102 are again cross-shaped. They are of crude execution and contain designs which appear to be imitations of cruciform

See also no 78.1

in front of the head which is found only on coins from the mint of Banassac at about the same period, ca. 650 (M. Prou, *Les monnaies mérovingiennes de la Bibliothèque Nationale* [Paris, 1892], pl. xxx: 13; A. de Belfort, *Description générale des monnaies mérovingiennes* [Paris, 1892], nos. 722, 733-748, 753, 754, 763, 770).

monograms without meaning. These stamps, and those on no. 101, suggest provincial imitation of more refined examples, such as those on no. 100, and they may reasonably be dated in the same period. No. 103, a ewer in New York, has no stamps but is included in the Catalogue because it has on the reverse five engraved circles containing monograms. When read in sequence, these yield a religious phrase and they were clearly incised after the vessel was finished. The choice of five circles with monograms is not likely to have been fortuitous and is, indeed, indicative of the influence of stamps of this kind in some provincial center.

No two objects in the group just discussed (nos. 99-102) have exactly identical stamps, but the relationships that do exist among them, and between them and the last stamps of the Imperial series, suggest that they may all be dated after the Imperial series. They could represent a system of control in silver that developed either in a different locality, or in the same locality as the Imperial system after the latter had died out. In contrast to the parallel series of stamps on nos. 94-98, this group lacks indications of imperial authority.

A few Irregular stamps cannot be convincingly associated with any of those already described and have not been closely dated. These are found on a plate from Cesena (no. 86), a dish in London (no. 87), and a bowl in New York (no. 88) that came from the same treasure as the inscribed ewer mentioned above (no. 103). A coin found with the Cesena plate suggests a relatively early date for its stamps which are of indefinite shape and contain letters not completely deciphered. The *Chrism* in the stamp on the dish in London also points to an early date. A hexagonal stamp containing a monogram on the bowl in New York, no. 88, is related in shape and type to similar stamps in the Imperial series, but, unlike the Imperial hexagon, this stamp does not contain an inscription. The bowl is dated on stylistic grounds in the fifth or sixth century.