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VV: *Vizantiiski Vremennik*
The dissertation explores the nature of the early Byzantine frontier on the Lower Danube both from a historical and an archaeological perspective. The main thesis is that the frontier is a multifaceted concept which cannot be encapsulated into a single definition as most students of the frontier question have done so far. Instead, the same frontier can act both as a political/military frontier of exclusion and as a cultural frontier where ideas, fashions, and people can circulate more or less freely.

The nature and extent of cultural contact can be properly understood only through the study of Byzantine artifacts found beyond the political frontier. Rather than being a comprehensive treatment of all categories of imports, the dissertation addresses a selected number of diagnostic items which lend themselves to a versatile analysis due to their wide distribution, variety of types, and multiple implications in the realm of social, economic, and religious development of the frontier area and the regions beyond. Such artifacts are amphorae, lamps, jewelry, and coins. Among these artifacts early Byzantine coins represent one of the most interesting, yet unexplored media whereby the Empire and barbaricum connected at multiple levels.
The study of numismatic evidence clearly points to the fact that economic, cultural, and political borders are not coterminous and the Empire’s influence can be traced far beyond its administrative limits. One of the main arguments is that economic frontiers existed inside the Empire as well, due to economic fragmentation and different levels of prosperity and integration. The dissertation challenges some of the previous interpretations of early Byzantine coins found beyond the frontier by arguing that an ethnic interpretation of finds is problematic. Drawing on anthropological studies, I also argue that symbolic and ritual functions should be taken into account along with the economic role of coins, usually overemphasized in previous scholarship. At a deeper level, the dissertation aims to contribute to the methodology of using numismatic evidence as the primary source of a monograph which attempts to weave numismatics, archaeology, and history into a homogeneous narrative.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

André Piganiol closed his Empire Chrétien with two sentences destined to become famous in the following decades: "La civilisation romaine n’est pas morte de sa belle morte. Elle a été assassinée."¹ Half a century ago the frontier question was not really a question at all. The "decline and fall" of the Roman Empire was the dominant interpretation and had been in place since the days of Edward Gibbon. Frontiers loomed large in this fatalistic scenario according to which wave after wave of uncivilized barbarians managed to throw Europe into the Dark Ages. And yet there were important signs announcing a major historiographic shift. The articulation of Late Antiquity as an independent field and an unprecedented turn towards the study of social and economic phenomena forever changed our understanding of ancient frontiers. The Anglo-American school of Late Antique studies, the French "Annales School," and indeed, the creation and expansion of the European Union have brought a renewed interest in frontiers as well as new and exciting vistas for the study of cultural contact between different cultures and civilizations.

However, only certain areas of the Roman frontier, which stretches on three continents, have been thoroughly researched in the past decades. This is certainly the case of western parts of the Roman Empire, which received great attention because of the need to reassess the transformation of the Roman world and the transition to the Middle Ages. The early Byzantine frontier in North Africa has long been a central focus of historians interested in the transition from the Vandal to the Byzantine, and later Arab, domination. In the Near East our understanding of the role and function of the

oriental frontier with Persia is still very much influenced by the seminal thesis of Benjamin Isaac and the subsequent works built on his concept of an open frontier. On the other hand, there is a conspicuous gap in English-language scholarship on the evolution of the Lower Danube frontier in Late Antiquity, especially in what concerns the cultural contact between the Empire and barbaricum. With few exceptions, scholars have focused their attention on the military and political history of the region and archaeological research mostly targeted the Late Roman network of fortifications built to protect the provinces of the Balkans.

Three major arguments develop from the main themes covered by this dissertation, the Early Byzantine frontier, the monetary economy of Early Byzantium, and the role of Byzantine money in barbaricum. By looking at the Danube from a historical and archaeological perspective I argue that the frontier can be perceived as a political and military border of exclusion, due to its strategic advantages as a natural obstacle, but also as a cultural frontier open to the circulation of ideas, objects, and people. Communities living beyond the frontier competed for access to Byzantine goods and one of the main hypotheses is that several other cultural frontiers can be identified beyond the classical antithesis, Empire vs. "barbarians". Nevertheless, the circulation of ideas, fashions, and people across the Danube was closely related to the militarized nature of the frontier. In this case inclusion and exclusion are complementary rather than antithetical notions. Second, I argue that the monetary economy of Early Byzantium was far more diverse than previously envisaged and coin circulation in militarized frontier regions such as the Danube had less to do with the existence of markets and more with the needs of the garrisons. Finally, the analysis of coin finds
reveals the non-economic function of Byzantine money outside the Empire. The social value of Byzantine coins resides in their direct association with the Roman way of life and the emulation of Roman practices. Against previous interpretations, I will argue that coins had little or no monetary function.

The overarching goal of this dissertation is to contribute to the methodology of using numismatic evidence as the primary source of a monograph which attempts to weave numismatics, archaeology, and history into a homogeneous interdisciplinary narrative. The main objectives are threefold. The first is to bring into focus the Danube frontier in Late Antiquity, a region which remained largely unexplored by western scholarship until the last decade, and to compare it with the frontier in the East in order to draw some conclusions about the role of the periphery in Early Byzantium. The second is to employ a comparative framework for the study of the Early Byzantine monetary economy, by analyzing coin finds from the Balkans, Anatolia, and Syria-Palestine. Finally, I will strive to demonstrate that the circulation of Byzantine artifacts and especially coins found beyond the Danube frontier is connected with the multicultural nature of the Late Antique frontier and was driven by chiefly non-economic motivations.

Above everything, this dissertation is an invitation to dialogue between archaeologists, anthropologists, historians, and numismatists. A common thread of all chapters is the realization that only by pulling together various strands of information, often the province of quite diverse disciplines and specializations, can we build a nuanced and multifaceted narrative of frontier history. The reader will not find a brand new theoretical framework for analyzing frontiers and cultural contact but a long
overdue fusion between concepts and definitions which often seemed mutually exclusive in previous scholarship. Indeed, the frontier in its complexity and chameleonic nature defies total encapsulation by any one model.

The sources which form the basis for discussion in the following chapters were drawn from archaeology, written accounts, and ethnographic research, as well as from my own research in numismatic collections from various museums and the field work undertaken since 2001 in the Late Antique Capidava, an important fortress on the Lower Danube frontier. The nature of the evidence characterized by a slender body of texts about *barbaricum* and incomplete or sometimes non-existent archaeological evidence forced me to change the geographic scope of each chapter depending on the major themes addressed. More abundant sources concerning the frontier policies of Early Byzantium invites broader parallels between the Lower Danube frontier and more distant peripheral regions such as Arabia or Transcaucasia. To the contrary, the archaeological record is much more diverse in quantity, quality, and indeed regarding the methods and questions which concerned various archaeological schools. The cultural diversity is all the more baffling as the main concern here has been the study of societies living outside the Empire, which did not benefit from the relative institutional standardization of Byzantine settlements. On the other hand, coins are perhaps the most standardized and well distributed Byzantine artifact and this fact alone afforded a comparison between distant regions such as the Carpathian Basin, the Lower Danube, the Northern Black Sea steppe, and Transcaucasia.
In chronological terms the dissertation covers the final period of Late Antiquity or the spätere Spätantike as Peter Brown termed it. More exactly it covers the period from the late fifth century to the late seventh century. The weight of the dissertation rests on the "long sixth century", from the accession of Anastasius to the reign of Heraclius, which roughly corresponds to the renewal of the Byzantine frontier on the Danube and its ultimate demise, respectively. To be sure, both dates are flanked by important transitional periods. The historical framework of the project begins with the dissolution of the Hunnic power in the Danube region followed by the recovery of the Byzantine Empire in the Balkans reaching its zenith under Justinian. At the other end we witness a more dramatic transition marked by the de facto retreat of the Empire from the northern Balkans during the reign of Heraclius and the important cultural transformations preceding the creation of the Bulgar state in 680.

The dissertation has a thematic structure. The second chapter follows the parallel evolution of Byzantine history, archaeology, and numismatics since their antiquarian beginnings in the Age of Enlightenment. The main argument is that numismatics rarely converged with other disciplines as historians perceived numismatics as an arcane field, while numismatists rarely ventured out of their narrow field of enquiry. The accumulation of material at unprecedented speed in the past few decades makes this a pressing matter. Although it would be pointless to belabor differences of approach resulting from material unavailable to earlier scholars, the methodological rift between disciplines is a long-standing issue which deserves highlighting in order to identify adequate solutions in the future. Indeed, the social and economic history of Early Byzantium as reflected in
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handbooks and treatises can benefit from the inclusion of numismatic evidence in the larger narrative, something that still remains a desideratum.

The third chapter is a reinterpretation of the Early Byzantine frontier. The historiography of the past few decades has described frontier rivers as primarily facilitating communication and cultural contact, and less as borders of exclusion. On the other hand archaeologists continue to emphasize the military dimension of frontiers. To be sure, this is a direct result of the lack of proper conversation between historians and archaeologists. Under the spell of the postmodernist turn the former have emphasized the cultural, intellectual, and symbolic dimensions of frontiers, while the latter remained entrenched in the traditional focus on fortifications and lines of defense. The chapter is an attempt to re-emphasize the strategic role of frontier rivers such as the Danube during Late Antiquity. By doing so it is necessary to intrude upon several of the major and still outstanding questions of Byzantine history. What was the Byzantine worldview regarding frontiers? How was it different from the early Roman period? A careful study of accounts referring to various frontier regions of the Empire reveals enduring literary topoi but also an ongoing concern to use rivers as political frontiers able to act as convenient barriers against “barbarians”.

The fourth chapter is an archaeological interpretation of the Danube frontier as an interface between the Empire and barbaricum based on a variety of Byzantine goods found outside the Empire. Exhaustiveness is neither claimed nor achieved. The chapter discusses a selected number of diagnostic items that lend themselves to a multifaceted analysis due to their wide distribution, variety of types, and multiple implications in the realm of social, economic, and religious realities of the frontier area and the regions.
beyond. The study of archaeological evidence clearly points to the fact that economic, cultural, and political borders are not coterminous and the Empire’s influence can be traced far beyond its administrative limits. The surge of Byzantine artifacts across the frontier, such as amphorae, lamps, brooches, and buckles, points to different channels of distribution and particular preferences associated with the creation of identity and social prestige in relation to Byzantium. The distribution of Byzantine artifacts north of the Danube substantiates the claim that the river was not the only frontier. Consequently, communities living in the shadow of the Empire should not be lumped together under the broad label "barbarians".

The fifth chapter is a reinterpretation of the role of money in the Early Byzantine economy, by demonstrating that current views have been shaped by parallel developments in anthropology and economic history half a century ago. Drawing on anthropological and economic theory a ‘substantivist’ position has dominated English-language scholarship, with Michael Hendy being its most prominent advocate. Although the role of the state in the distribution of coin and the regulation of the monetary economy cannot be denied, this chapter takes a more balanced approach, one of the main contentions being that some of the tools and theoretical underpinnings of formal economics can be applied to the study of ancient economic systems. Working under the assumption of a relative uniformity, scholars have drawn sweeping conclusions regarding the monetary economy of Byzantium. In reality, a close comparative analysis of coin circulation in the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Near East reveals a great degree of variation, which also informs the way in which we should address the flow of Byzantine coins beyond the frontier. Local developments rather than a standardized policy from
Constantinople dictated the evolution of the monetary economy. Unlike large coastal settlements on the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, frontier settlements were not dominated by a "market economy," in the Late Antique version of the concept. Coin circulation in frontier fortresses was closely linked with the presence of garrisons who received regular payments.

The sixth chapter is an attempt to re-evaluate the function of Early Byzantine coins beyond the frontier by analyzing their distribution on a wide geographic area from Central Europe to the Caucasus. While precious metal coins have been connected with political payments, current interpretations of Byzantine copper coins found outside the frontier are chiefly economic. Given the fiduciary nature of Byzantine bronze coins the question therefore ineluctably arises as to how they could act as monetary media of exchange outside the Empire. Previous arguments have been couched in preconceived notions regarding the Early Byzantine monetary economy, on one hand, and the tendency to view parts of barbaricum as following the same conditions applicable to the Empire, on the other. Drawing on anthropological parallels for the use of monetary instruments by "primitive" societies I argue that coins served mainly non-economic purposes. From an economic, but non-monetary, perspective coins were more attractive for their intrinsic value as raw material for the production of jewelry. As one moves farther from the border, the non-economic value of coins as amulets, souvenirs, and objects of prestige increases.

A note on terminology is required. Historical periodization can be notoriously confusing and the Late Antique period makes no exception. Depending on region, language, and intellectual tradition Roman, Late Roman, Early Byzantine or Byzantine
may be used as labels for the period covering the sixth and seventh centuries. Archaeological terms such as Roman-Byzantine or even Late Byzantine in Near Eastern archaeology, Early Medieval or Late Migration for cultures outside the Empire only add to the general confusion to which the non-specialist may easily succumb. In the following chapters only Roman and Early Byzantine will be used, the former for general cultural characteristics (e.g. Roman way of life, Roman tradition) and the latter for chronologically-sensitive contexts and in relation to the fact that sixth-seventh-century coinage is universally described as Early Byzantine. Latin terminology has been employed for names or the English equivalent long established in scholarly works (e.g. Anastasius, Justinian) and Latin or Greek terms for coinage, reflecting the evolution of the terminology during Late Antiquity (e.g. solidus, hexagrammon). Copper will be used most frequently to designate the low-value Byzantine coinage, although the metal itself is a copper-alloy, sometimes described as "brass" in the numismatic literature, where the terms are used interchangeably.

For the sake of brevity, barbaricum will be used to designate regions outside the Empire, although no cultural uniformity must be expected. Throughout the dissertation regions beyond the frontier are sometimes labeled "Gepidia," "Avaria," or "Sklavinia," but their boundaries are hard to define in the ever-changing world of barbaricum. On the other hand, the term "barbarians" will be used sparingly and only in abstract contexts, lest the reader be left with the impression that various ethnic groups may be lumped together under the same cultural umbrella. Finally, modern geographic terminology had to be brought to a common denominator by dropping the term designating the administrative unit (e.g. Județ in Romania, Občina in Slovenia, Oblast in Ukraine, etc.)
given the different administrative division of the countries covered by the inventory of coin finds.
CHAPTER 2
RECONCILING THE ‘STEP SISTERS’: EARLY BYZANTINE HISTORY, ARCHAEOLOGY, AND NUMISMATICS

2.1 A Circuitous Road: Byzantine History, Archaeology, and Numismatics in Western Scholarship from Du Cange to World War 2:

The incorporation of numismatic evidence as a meaningful element of the historical narrative about early Byzantium is a more recent development of the last few decades. The wealth of numismatic material brought to light by archaeological excavations conducted in various parts of the early Byzantine Empire in the past decades has enriched the existing corpus of early Byzantine coins and attracted scholars’ attention on this type of primary source. Although there are still many unexplored areas and much unpublished material, for Asia Minor in particular, economic historians can no longer ignore the numismatic evidence as an indication of how the Empire functioned during the long sixth century and how it interacted with populations and polities beyond its frontiers. However, many historians who use material culture still feel uncomfortable using the numismatic evidence and fitting it into the larger narrative.

What is at stake here is the dialogue between numismatists, archaeologists, and historians, on one side, and developments within each discipline, on the other. The interest in Byzantine economic studies, where a numismatic discussion is likely to fit, is essentially a post-war development, although older general histories of Byzantium often included a chapter on economy, trade, and finance. The branch of Byzantine numismatics itself underwent a slow development and the antiquarian phase was left behind only in the twentieth century. The interest in Byzantine coins as currency, i.e. as an instrument of the Byzantine economy and administration, grew around the time when the historical discipline itself turned from a focus on political narrative to social and
economic developments and, more importantly, with the publication of the first major archaeological reports. Therefore, in order to explain the marginal role of money in the historiography of the early Byzantine period one needs to go back in time to the very beginning of the discipline and follow the parallel developments of Byzantine history, archaeology, and numismatics. Western scholarship and general histories of Byzantium have to be treated separately from national scholarship in countries whose territory was once part of the early Byzantine Empire or whose relation with Byzantium has a bearing on the national history, such as Hungary, Romania or Russia, to name a few.

Surprisingly, the first true Byzantinist, Charles Du Cange (1610-1688), had an interest in coins and among his numerous works there is also a valuable numismatic treatise, *De imperatorum constantinopolitanorum seu inferioris aevi vel imperii uti vocant numismatibus*, first included in his dictionary of Medieval Latin,¹ and later published as a separate work.² The Age of Enlightenment, unfortunately, did not bring a real progress in the field and the example set by Du Cange, who approached Byzantine history using various tools such as genealogy and numismatics, was not readily followed. The eighteenth century was instead dominated by a derogatory view of Byzantium as a decadent society described by Voltaire as an "histoire horrible et dégoutante de brigands obscures,"³ and in quite similar terms by Montesquieu and later
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² C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *De imperatorum constantinopolitanorum seu inferioris aevi vel imperii uti vocant numismatibus* (Romae: Typis J. Mariae Salvioni, 1755).

by Hegel. Decline is what Gibbon himself was working on his monumental history. Out of six volumes there is barely one paragraph about the reorganization of mints and a footnote on the exchange rate between silver and gold. Economy itself has only a marginal place in his work. Clearly Gibbon's interests lay elsewhere and he turned out to be extremely influential during the nineteenth century, his work being translated into most European languages. Nonetheless, as part of the encyclopedic fervor dominating the Age of Reason, a number of important contributions were made to the study of ancient and medieval numismatics, Byzantine coins being included in the larger frame of ancient coinage in the works of Anselmo Banduri, Girolano Tanini, and Joseph von Eckhel.

The nineteenth century saw the first major catalogues of Byzantine coins. French scholarship has been in the forefront of these important developments. N. D. Marchant began to reassess some of the attributions previously made by Du Cange and Domenico Sestini and also added a number of new types followed by historical commentary. However, the first attempt at classifying the Byzantine series we owe to Félicien de Saulcy, who was also the first to suggest that the study of Byzantine coinage

---


should begin with the Anastasian reform of 498. The beginning of the Byzantine period in numismatic terms is thus very different from the historical one, which usually placed the beginning of the Byzantine age proper either with the reign of Constantine and the founding of Constantinople, or sometime in the seventh century, when the imperial administration collapsed in the Balkans and the Near East. However, Anastasius' momentous reform, which was almost never left unnoticed in general histories of Byzantium, as we shall see, remains to this day the standard numismatic date for the beginning of the Byzantine period. This demonstrates once again the great complexity of this historical period, presently known under the generic name Late Antiquity, and also the difference between historians and numismatists, who often operate with distinct periodizations.

The nineteenth century is also the time when large collections began to be assembled. Byzantine numismatics, like archaeology, was still in its antiquarian phase. The collection of M. Soleirol formed the basis of the general catalogue previously published by de Saulcy, but the most important work in this respect would become Justin Sabatier's *Description générale des monnaies Byzantines* (1862), which remained the standard catalogue for almost half a century. This is also the first attempt at a comprehensive study, since Sabatier did not just rely on his personal collection, or even French collections alone, but also consulted numismatic collections
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8 F. de Saulcy, *Essai de classification des suites monétaires Byzantines* (Metz: Lamort, 1836), xi.


from London, Vienna, Berlin, and Copenhagen. Sabatier arranged the currency of the Byzantine period in his catalogue by "metals" and also included market prices, which bespeaks his intention to facilitate its use by collectors. Nevertheless, Sabatier also included a historical commentary with references to works such as M. G. Finlay's *Greece under the Romans* (1st ed 1844), which he seemed to prefer to de Ségur's *Historie de Bas Empire*, and clearly alluded to the necessity of using the numismatic evidence for a better understanding of Byzantium's general history.\(^{11}\) Within this frame it does not seem surprising that Sabatier ignored de Saulcy's decision to start the Byzantine series with Anastasius and instead chose to go back to the reign of Arcadius, arguing that the division of the Roman Empire after the death of Theodosius I should be taken as the moment when Byzantine history starts. In other words, Sabatier deliberately rejected the perfectly plausible numismatic division between Roman and Byzantine made by de Saulcy in favor of a purely historical chronology.

Nineteenth century scholars varied when it came to assigning the early Byzantine period either to antiquity or to the Middle Ages. T. E. Mionnet included the Byzantine series at the end of his popular *De la rareté et du prix des médailles romaines*,\(^{12}\) which went through several editions during the nineteenth century, while the well-known Danish scholar Christian Jürgensen Thomsen published the Byzantine coins from his large collection of ancient and medieval coins in the second part entitled *Les monnai...*
George Finlay, whose *History of Greece* proved to be extremely influential in the nineteenth century, regarded it as a gradual process of transformation, beginning with the reign of Heraclius and ending with the accession of Leo the Isaurian (A.D. 717). However, the transformation continued at different levels and a purely Greek monarchy was established as late as the reign of Alexios I Comnenos. What is interesting about Finlay’s argument is the fact that it relies on coinage. In this respect Finlay supersedes even twentieth century historians and it should be noted that Finlay embarked on a much larger task than the history of Byzantium, his massive seven volume work covering the history of Greece from the Roman conquest to 1864. Finlay argued for a transition from the Roman (Latin) to the Byzantine (Greek) period by looking at the way coin legends evolved in time. He noticed that Anastasius introduced Greek numerals as indications of value on his copper currency and thus began a slow and gradual process whereby Latin was replaced by Greek on the imperial coinage. This process finally came to an end with the accession of Alexios I, described by Finlay as the first Emperor of the East who was entirely Greek. Finlay’s knowledge of numismatics was indeed remarkable. The reader of his 30 page appendix on coinage will soon find out that Finlay had a good command of the numismatic literature with references to all the important works of the previous centuries, Du Cange, Tanini, Marchant, de Saulcy, Sabatier, and even the special study of Friedländer and Pinder on
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14 Some of his academic interest in monetary history might have derived from the fact that he was also a collector and he even donated a few interesting Byzantine pieces to the British Museum, Finlay, *A History of Greece*, 445-46, n. 6.
the coinage of Justinian I.\textsuperscript{15} He also displayed a very good understanding of economic phenomena seen through coinage, such as the debasement of the copper coinage during the sixth century and the importance of the changing exchange rate between the three metals, gold, silver, and copper.

On the continent, the great Byzantine scholar of the late nineteenth century was Gustave Schlumberger, who made major contributions in the fields of Byzantine history, archaeology, numismatics, and sigillography.\textsuperscript{16} Although he was mostly interested in the later Byzantine period, his scholarly work is a fine example of multidisciplinary preoccupations. However, Schlumberger is an exception and most historians were quite unaware of developments in the field of Byzantine numismatics.\textsuperscript{17} Charles Diehl, who wrote an important history of the Justinianic age, does not comment on the monetary policy of the Empire in the sixth century, although he had some interest in economic history. He discusses commerce in particular, but only long-distance trade in luxury items, which is best documented in written sources such as Cosmas Indicopleustes.\textsuperscript{18}

In 1906 Warwick Wroth, curator at the British Museum, was deploring the lack of dialogue between Byzantine historians and numismatists:

\begin{flushend}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} J. Friedländer and M. Pinder, \textit{Die Münzen Justinians} (Berlin: Nicolaischen Buchhandlung, 1843).
\item \textsuperscript{17} Another major exception is Karl Krumbacher whose comprehensive bibliographies on various disciplines dealing with the Byzantine period included an excellent section on Byzantine numismatics, both general and special studies since the time of Du Cange, for which see. K. Krumbacher, \textit{Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches}, vol. 2, 2nd ed. (Munich: Beck, 1897; reprint New York: Burt Franklin, 1958), 1128-32.
\item \textsuperscript{18} C. Diehl, \textit{Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au Vi\textdegree{} siècle}, 2 vols, 1st ed., 1901 (New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), 533-45.
\end{itemize}
\end{flushend}
In the case of Byzantine numismatics, on the other hand, the present number of workers is infinitesimal, and it is hard to find the ideal union of numismatic experience and of general Byzantine scholarship.\textsuperscript{19}

Wroth himself embarked on the important task of publishing the large collection of Byzantine coins in the British Museum. The catalogue published in 1906 largely superseded the work of Sabatier and remained the standard reference for more than half a century.\textsuperscript{20} This effort, however, remained without any significant echo in scholarly histories of Byzantium written in the following decades. Nevertheless, developments in the field of Byzantine numismatics are visible in the work of J. B. Bury, the author of one of the first histories of the Late Roman Empire. Much like Sabatier, Bury chose to begin his history with the reign of Arcadius. The influence of Byzantine numismatic studies, still in their infancy, was limited, since Bury did not discuss monetary history at all in his initial work on the Later Roman period, published in 1889.\textsuperscript{21} A much improved edition appeared in 1923 when Bury made room for a short numismatic discussion of the Anastasian reform of 498 and the expansion of the mint system under Justinian, for which he cited Wroth’s catalogue.\textsuperscript{22} It appeared that historians would no longer shy


away from a numismatic incursion into the economic history of the early Byzantine period.

I. I. Tolstoy's catalogue published between 1912 and 1914 added to the slowly growing body of western scholarship. His splendid collection became a major reference for Byzantine numismatic studies in the first half of the twentieth century, although his decision to publish it in Russian rendered it somewhat inaccessible to western scholars. Nevertheless, it is surprising that A. A. Vasiliev did not even mention Tolstoy in the otherwise useful historiographical introduction to his *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Although he included a detailed section on Byzantine studies in Russia, Vasiliev made no reference of Tolstoy's contributions in the field of Byzantine history, archaeology, and numismatics. Moreover, his section on Byzantine periodicals and general references does not mention any works on numismatics or sigillography, although a good number of important works had by then already been published.

The first decades of the twentieth century also witnessed the first important publications of excavation finds by western archaeological teams in Greece, Turkey, and Palestine. The excavations at Constantinople, Corinth, Sardis, Ephesus,
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24 For a detailed biography of Tolstoy, see V. V. Guruleva's introduction to I. I. Tolstoy, *Byzantine Coins, 10th issue* (Bernaul: Den', 1991), i-xvi.

25 He did mention, however, Krumbacher's monumental work as a bibliographic resource for different branches of Byzantine studies, including numismatics; see Vasiliev, *History*, 42.


Priene,30 Pergamum,31 Jerusalem,32 Scythopolis,33 and Gerasa34 yielded an important number of coins. However, only occasionally did publications include a historical interpretation of coin finds. In the introduction to the catalogue of coins found in Corinth in 1925, Alfred Bellinger pleaded for the historical significance of coins found during excavations arguing that "coins reflect the life of the common people, which is generally too vulgar to have been noticed in the formal histories."35 The publication of hoards witnessed a rapid development in the interwar period and the most important contribution is undoubtedly Sawyer McA. Mosser's attempt at a corpus of Byzantine coin hoards. His work constituted a great research instrument above anything else, since the historical interpretation was almost lacking, the study consisting of an inventory followed by bibliographic references.36 Nevertheless, his most important achievement was that of bringing together a large body of material scattered in dozens of local journals, less accessible to western scholars.

The works of Bury and Vasiliev, mentioned above, were just two of the general scholarly histories of Byzantium published in the first decades of the twentieth century.

30 K. Regling, Die Münzen von Priene (Berlin: Mann, 1927).
35 Bellinger, Catalogue of the coins, vii.
Historians such as Diehl, Nicola Turchi, and Jan Romein approached the Byzantine period from different angles, and although economic history is not completely lacking, there is almost nothing about monetary economy. In addition to scholarly works, it is perhaps worth mentioning that histories of Byzantium written for a general audience would not even discuss economic issues, political narrative being their major focus.

That historians did not have a strong foundation to rely on for a numismatic discussion can be seen in their frequent appeals to presentist comparisons. R. Byron did not include a detailed discussion of the Byzantine monetary system in his *Byzantine Achievement*, but instead he argued that "the Byzantines conducted a finance of almost modern dimensions." Along similar lines, A. Andreades, in one of the first attempts at discussing price levels and their evolution in Byzantium, compared wheat prices and interest rates with those of modern Greece. Despite this climate, one has to look with appreciation at Fritz Heichelheim 's massive ancient economic history. Written in a heavy German style and somewhat lacking the proper structure for such an ample undertaking, Heichelheim's work has often been ignored. However, his detailed section on money, "Geldverhältnisse, Zins und Kapital," included many insightful comments


40 A. Andreades, "De la monnaie e de la puissance d'achat des métaux précieux dans l'empire byzantine," *Byzantion* (1924): 7-50.

on salaries, prices, and inflation, relying especially on Egyptian papyri, the bread and butter of many present discussions about the role of money in early Byzantium.\footnote{Two recent examples are J. Banaji, 	extit{Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity: Gold, Labour, and Aristocratic Dominance} (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), and P. Sarris, 	extit{Economy and Society in the Age of Justinian} (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).}

\textbf{2.2 Post-War Developments: Searching for Common Ground}

Works on Byzantine history, archaeology, and numismatics increased with astonishing rapidity in the decades after the war. V. Laurent's \textit{Bulletin de numismatique byzantine} is perhaps the best reflection of the early developments. Laurent went far beyond the scope of a purely historiographical update of works in the field of Byzantine numismatics. Divided into nine sections, his study offered a complete picture of the problems touched by the discipline, such as the historical significance of coins, questions of metrology, imitations, hoards and hoarding behavior, and circulation inside and outside the Empire's borders. Even more important, his extensive bibliographies arranged by topic gathered less accessible publications from Eastern Europe as well as reports of recent finds.\footnote{V. Laurent, "Bulletin de numismatique byzantine (1940-1949)," \textit{REB} 9 (1951): 192-251.} In a sense, this \textit{tour de force} came as a response to Gyula Moravcsik's earlier appeal, urging the collection and publication of numismatic and sigillographic material as important sources for Byzantine history.\footnote{G. Moravcsik, "Les tâches actuelles de la byzantinologie," \textit{Byzantinoslavica} 10 (1949): 1-10.} By the mid 1950s the great Hungarian Byzantinist was already noticing an important shift in Byzantine studies from an emphasis on political history towards a greater interest in social and economic relations.\footnote{G. Moravcsik, "L'état et les tâches de la byzantinologie," \textit{Byzantinoslavica} 16 (1955): 17, "Le point de gravité des recherches historiques byzantines se déplace d'ailleurs sous nos yeux: de l'histoire extérieure (politique) de Byzance elle se transfère de plus en plus à l'histoire intérieure (économico-sociale)." See also the collection of studies edited by N. Baynes and H. Moss which included contributions on economic development.} Ernst Stein's \textit{Histoire du Bas Empire} was part and parcel of this
new tendency. His treatment of Byzantine monetary issues in the sixth century is, however, restricted to the policy conducted by Peter Barsymes and the effects of the depreciation of the copper coinage.\textsuperscript{46} To his credit, Stein cited not only Wroth but also the Ratto sale catalogue,\textsuperscript{47} which remains to date the most important single sale of Byzantine copper coins and whose dissemination in the 1930s had greatly increased the popularity of the Byzantine coin series.

George Ostrogorsky published in 1940 his \textit{Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates}, which went through several revised English editions in the following decades and soon became one of the standard histories of Byzantium. In the introduction to the second English edition he advocated the importance of numismatic and sigillographic sources:

The evidence of coins and seals has much to contribute towards the solution of all kinds of problems, especially those relating to the internal history of Byzantium, and is indeed often decisive. Numismatic material is indispensable for any study of the currency and economic history on the one hand, and of the symbolic representation of imperial authority on the other. [...] All the same, in spite of remarkable progress, general knowledge of this important source material does indeed lag far behind the needs of scholarship.\textsuperscript{48}

However, Ostrogorsky was mostly interested in political history, so that the section on the Late Roman period, 324-601, contains little information about economy, while the

\begin{flushleft}


\end{flushleft}
monetary history itself is covered by a short description of the Anastasian reform of 498 and its general implications.\textsuperscript{49}

Ostrogorsky's pessimistic remark about the branch of Byzantine numismatics lagging far behind the needs of scholarship is yet another example of the lack of dialogue between historians and numismatists. In 1968 Joel Malter was able to assemble a bibliography of c. 300 titles of works in the field of Byzantine numismatics published between 1950 and 1965.\textsuperscript{50} Without being comprehensive, his effort shows the extent to which interest in this topic developed after World War II. Much of this interest was due to a parallel development in Late Roman and Early Byzantine archaeology. An ever increasing number of reports and monographs were being published, many of which included special sections on coin finds, and even book-length studies, which was the case for large metropoleis like Antioch, Athens, and Sardis.\textsuperscript{51} In a series of seminal early articles, Philip Grierson, arguably the greatest Byzantine numismatist of the last century, laid out the benefits as well as limitations of coins as source material, but what transpired unequivocally from his assessment was the need to integrate the growing

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 65. However, see Ostrogorsky's influential study about cities during the "Dark Age," in which the numismatic evidence played a crucial role, Ostrogorsky, "Byzantine Cities in the Early Middle Ages," DOP 13 (1959): 45-66. His article is a piece of a larger polemic concerning the survival of cities, which involved prominent Byzantinists like A. Khazdan and P. Grierson, all of whom relied heavily on the presence or absence of coin finds in order to support their arguments, for which see A. P. Khazdan, "Vizantijskie goroda v VII-XI vv," Sovestkaja archeologija 21 (1954): 164-83; P. Grierson, "Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire 498-c. 1090," in Moneta e scambi nell'alto medioevo (Spoleto: Presso La Sede del Centro, 1961), 445-46.


body of numismatic material, excavation finds and hoards, into the larger narrative about early Byzantium.\textsuperscript{52}

The stage had been set for more ambitious goals, such as a better understanding of the early Byzantine monetary circulation in certain areas of the Empire. Michael Metcalf, who was a pioneer in this respect, pointed to the conceptual distinction between Byzantine coinage and Byzantine currency, which also meant a shift from the study of the former, as a purely numismatic enquiry, to an emphasis on the latter, which deals with money and its functions integrated into a larger historical framework. The eastern Mediterranean was the focus of early studies,\textsuperscript{53} no doubt because of the larger number of published single finds and hoards,\textsuperscript{54} and also because of the existence of a larger body of complementary literary sources, which allowed for a more nuanced interpretation of the numismatic material.\textsuperscript{55} Nevertheless, Metcalf's comparative analysis of coin circulation in Sirmia and Slavonia unveiled the great potential of such studies in the Balkans as well.\textsuperscript{56} Although many single finds and


\textsuperscript{54} For a comprehensive bibliography, see H.-C. Noeske, Münzfunde aus Ägypten I. Die Münzfunde des ägyptischen Pilgerzentrums Abu Mina und die Vergleichsfunde aus den Diocesen Aegyptus und Oriens vom 4.-8. Jh. n.Chr, vol. 1 (Berlin: Mann, 2000), 34-71.


\textsuperscript{56} D. M. Metcalf, "The Currency of Byzantine Sirmia and Slavonia," Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik
hoards were being published, especially in Bulgaria, the linguistic barrier remained a major deterrent for most western scholars.

When A.H.M. Jones published his magisterial *Later Roman Empire* there was already enough information to rely on in order to integrate the numismatic evidence into an economic survey of the Late Roman period. Nevertheless, Jones had little interest in archaeology, which he famously ignored in his work, while he relied almost exclusively on written sources.\(^{57}\) Consequently, his discussion of monetary issues was restricted to comments about salaries, prices and the standard of living as it transpired from literary sources, as well as discussions pertaining to the exchange rate between copper and gold and its economic implications.\(^{58}\) In the English-speaking world scholarship would still pay tribute to this tradition of writing the monetary history of early Byzantium based almost exclusively from literary sources, even though the increasing number of finds from excavations called out for closer scrutiny.

Michael Hendy's monumental work *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c. 300-1450* is perhaps the perfect embodiment of this type of approach.\(^{59}\) Although he
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58 Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 435-448; Surprisingly, as a young scholar Jones had an interest in coinage, being involved in the publication of finds from the excavations conducted in the hippodrome of Constantinople in the 1920s (see above, n. 28). He further encouraged the use of the numismatic evidence arguing that "by the classification of coins they [numismatists] have made a substantial contribution to history, especially in the area and periods where the literary evidence is scanty or untrustworthy." See A. H. M. Jones, "Numismatics and History," in *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*, ed. R. A. G. Carson and C. H. V. Sutherland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956), 13.

made use of site finds and hoards he did so only as an ancillary to his main arguments derived from written sources. Nonetheless, Hendy’s approach of Byzantine monetary economy had more historical depth than any previous study and it remains to date the monetary study most widely cited by historians. In fact, Hendy pointed to the time-honored division between numismatist and historian in the introduction to his influential book. In his view, both were responsible for the lack of proper dialogue. The numismatist rarely ventured out of his narrow numismatic enquiry, while the historian was reluctant to accept the historical conclusions drawn by looking at the numismatic evidence, if he did not dismiss the discipline of numismatics altogether as arcane and focused on minute details, irrelevant to the larger narrative. Hendy noted:

In any case, the effect of these several tendencies and divisions - current tendencies in the study of numismatics, inherited divisions in the study of history, and a general division between numismatists and historians - has been little short of disastrous for the study of the Byzantine monetary economy as a whole.60

The English translation of Aikaterina Christophilopoulou’s Byzantine History introduced the western readers to the standard view of Byzantium in Greek scholarship, which placed greater weight on material culture. This emphasis was clearly reflected in her introduction on the sources of Byzantine history, which included a section dedicated to numismatic finds and a short bibliography comprising standard catalogues, general handbooks, site finds and hoards.61

---

60 Ibid., 11. His observation echoes a similar criticism made by P. le Gentilhomme some forty years earlier: “Si la numismatique, entendue dans son sens le plus large, peut se définir comme la science de la monnaie dans ses rapports avec l’histoire, cette science se limite trop souvent, par la faute de numismates, à la connaissance descriptive de la monnaie, considérée comme un document archéologique plutôt que comme un moyen d’échange,” P. le Gentilhomme, “Le monnayage et la circulation monétaire dans les royaumes barbares en occident (VIIe-VIIIe siècle),” RN 7 (1943): 45.

Under the influence of the *Annales* school, French scholarship on Early Byzantium had a larger emphasis on social and economic history and the life of the common people using a variety of sources. Évelyne Patlagean's well known book *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance, 4e-7e siècles* is a good example of the integration of the numismatic evidence into the narrative about social life in early Byzantium.\(^{62}\) Patlagean used both literary sources, especially saints' lives, and excavation finds to describe the social and economic conditions of the period. Unlike other historians, Patlagean had an excellent knowledge of the literature pertaining to Byzantine coins. She acknowledged the importance of site finds for estimating the economic prosperity of a region and seemed more interested in the functions of money beyond state related affairs, which was the primary focus of English scholarship. Her interpretation of finds used a historical lens as she explained the scarcity of coins by looking at invasions or demographic changes caused by earthquakes and the sixth century plague.

By that time, the standard catalogues of Wroth and Tolstoy had been largely superseded by the publication of the large collections in Washington (1966-8) and Paris (1970), which opened a new era in terms of the methodology behind the study of Byzantine coinage.\(^{63}\) Both works included detailed numismatic and historical introductions and also references to general works, single finds, and hoards. Relying on


the major public collections, public sales, but also excavation finds, Wolfgang Hahn created a corpus of Early Byzantine coins with a rich introduction on iconography, and the nature of coin production and distribution. The number of excavation reports itself multiplied in the last quarter of the twentieth century. A full treatment is beyond the scope of this chapter, but the steady increase in find reports and studies can be followed in a number of specialized bibliographic updates. Almost every archaeological monograph included a separate chapter on coins, but unfortunately very few went beyond the basic cataloguing of coins followed by a number of general observations. Sometimes this was due to the still insufficient number of finds which did not allow for a full treatment of the numismatic material in the context of the site itself or of an entire circumscribed region. This situation can be disconcerting for the historian interested in including such finds in his/her narrative. Nevertheless, historians can rely on a larger number of analytical studies written in the past few decades either in English
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65 Numismatic Literature, issued by the American Numismatic Society strives to gather new contributions in the field of numismatics; the Byzantine section offers a good indication of the number and variety of recent finds. Relevant bibliographies can also be found in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, and in Survey of Numismatic Research, published with the occasion of the International Numismatic Congress, usually held once every seven years. For a useful annotated bibliography, see also J. L. Malter, Byzantine Numismatic Bibliography, 1966-1994 (Encino, CA: Malter Galleries, 1995).

or in another international language, drawing on the significant number of single finds and hoards accumulated in almost every region.\(^{67}\)

Despite such developments, even historians who use material culture in their work still feel uncomfortable handling the numismatic evidence. Above all it is still unclear what type of economic functions were performed by coins and how exactly they can assist economic historians in mapping regional, inter-regional and even international trade.\(^{68}\) Scholars who do engage with this type of source material usually do it from an indirect angle, by extracting the role of money in the early Byzantine state from written sources, rather than referring to the body of numismatic finds from excavations.\(^{69}\) In the previous decades, this type of exercise had already inspired an approach to money as a means of state expenditure to its main beneficiaries, the army and the administration.\(^{70}\) Nevertheless, it is encouraging to see that economic histories
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\(^{69}\) Banaji, Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity; Sarris, Economy and Society.

\(^{70}\) Hendy, Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy; R. Delmaire, Largesses sacrées et res privata:
of Byzantium, such as the monumental three-volume work edited by Angeliki Laiou, include important sections on monetary production and circulation which rely on both literary and archaeological sources. Moreover, the fact that Cécile Morrisson, a professional numismatist, is the co-author of a recent monograph on the Byzantine economy is yet another indication that coins will become more visible in the Byzantine economic landscape.

2.3 Coins Beyond Frontiers: The Use and Abuse of the Numismatic Evidence in National and Regional Studies

Unlike western scholarship, national and local histories had a more contextualized approach to the numismatic material, although interest in the Byzantine period grew much later. Typically, in the countries whose territory was once part of the Byzantine Empire or whose proximity to Byzantium can be seen in the material culture, the antiquarian phase is less prominent than in the West. Except for Tolstoy, whose major collection was partly acquired from Western sources, there is no catalogue of Byzantine coins published in Eastern Europe, Turkey or the Near East. Historical conditions, namely the birth of modern states and decolonization explain why interest in the Byzantine period as a part of national history came into focus only in the twentieth century, and in some cases, only in the past few decades. Nevertheless, if western scholars, whose enquiries encompassed vast geographic regions, were primarily looking to answer questions on a macro scale, at the local level, where Byzantine history was intimately entwined with a nation's past, the questions posed were of a

---


different nature. Unable to rely on a satisfactory body of written accounts, historians have been forced to turn to material culture for answers. In many cases, as we shall see, the numismatic material played an important part in constructing theories about local economic development, social organization, and the establishment of chronologies for cultural diffusion. In other words, coins had a more concrete application as local historians were trying to pull together all the possible sources to reconstruct a piece of the nation's past.

The presence of Byzantine coins outside the Empire's borders was itself of little interest to western scholars if it did not contribute to a better understanding of their own local history. Byzantine coins were being used either for dating purposes, to illustrate the transition to the beginnings of the early medieval coinages, especially in the Merovingian and Visigothic realms, or as catalogues of museum collections meant to illustrate the monetary history of a region or, more often, local antiquarian initiatives since the Age of Enlightenment.


75 M. le Gentilhomme, "Le monnayage et la circulation."

In Turkey, the Byzantine period never really captivated the interest of local historians, despite the fact that Anatolia represented the Byzantine heartland and was thus one of the most promising regions for archaeological research. Aside from the ongoing research of western archaeological teams in Asia Minor, which resulted in the publication of an important number of Byzantine coins, single finds and hoards, there is only one major Turkish publication, the coins found during the excavations at Side, a major museum collection, and an unpublished dissertation about the early Byzantine coins from Pisidian Antioch.

In what concerns the Empire’s eastern frontier there is only recent concern with economic relations in Arabia, the main results being expected from the major international archaeological project *Limes Arabicus*, and an interest in the history of

---

77 See above n. 28-31, and below, Chapter 5.


79 O. Tekin, *Yapı Kredi Koleksiyonu, Bizans sikkeleri* (İstanbul: YKY, 1999).


the Arab foederate tribes, which created a buffer zone between Persia and Byzantium.\textsuperscript{82} In the region of Transcaucasia, however, the interest in Byzantine finds grew quite early as Georgian and Armenian historians were trying to understand the intricate history of the country during the sixth century when both the Byzantine and the Sasanian empires were trying to gain control of this important strategic region, regarded as a buffer zone between the two powers. The Byzantine influence is most visible in Georgia, where the kingdom of Lazica had been under the cultural, economic, and political influence of Byzantium during Late Antiquity. Coin finds published by Georgian numismatists have been used by historians in conjunction with written sources to illustrate this influence in major Lazi centers, such as Vani, Pitsunda, Archaeopolis, and Kutaisi.\textsuperscript{83} Furthermore, the publication of museum collections, composed of coins found locally has offered a body of material which allows for statistical analysis and comparison with other regions.\textsuperscript{84} In Armenia the heavier influence of Sasanian Persia resulted in fewer Byzantine coin finds. Consequently, hoards have a mixed composition, of coins issued by Byzantium and Sasanian Persia, whose interests collided more heavily in Armenia.\textsuperscript{85}


\textsuperscript{85} The Byzantine coins have been published by Khatchatur Musheghian in a series of works starting from the 1960s, Kh. Musheghian, \textit{Denezhnoe obrashchenie Dvina po numizmaticheskim dannym} (Erevan: Izdatel'stroyv Akademii Nauk Armianskoj SSR, 1962); Musheghian, \textit{Denezhnoe obrashchenie v Armenii v v. do n.e.-XIV v.n.e.}) (Erevan: Izdatel'stroyv Akademii Nauk Armianskoj SSR, 1983); Kh. Musheghian, \textit{The
Unfortunately, with publications from sites in eastern Turkey still insufficient,\textsuperscript{86} it is hard to gain a more complex understanding of economic relations on the Transcaucasian frontier and historical narratives still rely heavily on written sources.\textsuperscript{87}

The region north of the Danube and of the Black Sea, which is the main focus of this book, has produced by far the largest number of early Byzantine coins to be found in \textit{barbaricum} and it is also the region with the most interesting historiography on the use (and abuse) of the numismatic evidence. Very often ideology has played its part in the interpretation of coin finds along ethnic lines as the Soviet, Romanian, Bulgarian, and Hungarian archaeological schools have struggled to substantiate different theories by looking at the same body of evidence.

In Romanian scholarship a general interest in Byzantine coin finds dates back to the interwar period,\textsuperscript{88} but the first scholarly attempt at analyzing the Byzantine coin finds north of the Danube came only a few decades later.\textsuperscript{89} In an ideological climate emphasizing notions such as autochthony and cultural continuity, C. Preda explained the significant presence of early Byzantine coins north of the Danube border by the

\textit{Numismatics of Armenian History} (Erevan: Anahit, 1997); Kh. Musheghian et al., \textit{History and Coin Finds in Armenia: Coins from Ani, Capital of Armenia, 4th c. BC-19th c. AD} (Wetteren: Moneta, 2000); Kh. Musheghian et al., \textit{History and Coin Finds in Armenia: Coins from Duin, Capital of Armenia, 6-7th c.} (Wetteren: Moneta, 2000).\

\textsuperscript{86} For eastern Turkey there is only one unpublished catalogue of the finds from the important fortress of Melitene by Zeliha Demirel Gökalp whom I thank for allowing me to study the manuscript, Z. Demirel Gökalp, \textit{Malatya Arkeoloji Müzesi bizans sikkeleri kataloğu}.

\textsuperscript{87} Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, \textit{History and Coin Finds}, 17-28; For an example of an exclusively written-source approach, see M. Whittow, \textit{The making of Byzantium, 600-1025} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 194-220.

\textsuperscript{88} I. Minea, “\textit{Influența bizantină în regiunea carpato-dunăreană până la sfârșitul secolului al XII-lea în baza monedelor răspândite},” \textit{BSNR} 27-28 (1933-1934): 97-114.

\textsuperscript{89} I. Dimian, “\textit{Câteva descoperiri monetare bizantine pe teritoriul RPR},” \textit{SCN} 1 (1957): 189-216.
cultural integration of this territory into the Byzantine world. Coins were thus given the same economic function as the one performed in the Empire and the existence of a true monetary economy was predicated upon this principle. In addition, for the sake of historical unity, the author disregarded any regional variations and particular cultural conditions in various parts of today's Romania, e.g. proximity to Byzantium in the south, Gepid and Avar influence in the west, Slavs in the east. This fundamental notion of a rather uniform Romanized population has led to the interpretation of coin finds as evidence of a "civilized" society which tried to avoid contact with barbarian invaders migrating from the East, while at the same time maintaining strong ties with the Byzantine world. Regardless of the region under discussion, numismatists and historians relying on the numismatic evidence have tried to prove that the existence of early Byzantine coins and other imports indicate the presence of a sedentary Romanic population. Although the existence of a genuine monetary circulation in regions that were not part of the Empire has been rejected in recent studies, it is still unclear what were the functions performed by early Byzantine coins once they crossed the political border of the Empire.


In the steppe north of the Black Sea and northern Caucasus, early Byzantine coin finds were mainly used by Soviet archaeologists to date burial assemblages and to build relative chronologies for early medieval artifacts. In a seminal early article A. K. Ambroz had argued that the dating of burials based on coins should not take into consideration the date when the coin was issued, since coins arrived in the region much later and at least a hundred years must be added in order to reach the approximate date of the burial. This was not treated as a mere hypothesis but as a true axiom that needed to be applied to every case and it was mainly rooted in the fact that early Byzantine coins were sometimes found together with later Islamic coins. However, since it was not founded on a careful study of the monetary circulation, his rather arbitrary "delay" principle influenced his huge chronological sequence that covered the territory from the Ural Mountains to the Middle Danube. Such an interpretation of the numismatic finds has thus created a large gap between the chronology of the Black Sea region and the one established by the Hungarian archaeologists working on the Avar period, who have criticized Ambroz's principles.

Aside from chronological issues, there have been very few attempts to determine the economic significance of coins found in the region. In her monograph about the monetary circulation in the north-western Black Sea region Elena Stoliarik
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95 V. V. Kropotkin, Ekonomicheskie sviazi Vostochnoi Evropy v I tysyacheletii nashei ery (Moskow: Nauka, 1967).
concluded that a sedentary population maintained a small-scale monetary economy, but also suggested that copper coin finds should be treated separately from gold coins, which performed different functions. A corpus of Byzantine coin finds on the territory of the former U.S.S.R. was attempted by V. V. Kropotkin in 1962 but unfortunately it has been seldom updated in the last decades.

The Middle Danube region was another major recipient of early Byzantine coins. Starting from the second half of the sixth century the rise of the Avar khaganate as the most important power in the Transdanubian "Barbaricum" brought a huge quantity of gold coins in the form of political payments sent from Constantinople. Based on the written sources, historians have advanced the figure of six million solidi (c. 83.000 pounds) for the total amount of gold paid to the Avars until the failed siege of Constantinople in 626. A major question in Hungarian historiography is what happened to this huge accumulation of gold, given that the number of surviving solidi is rather small. Another central debate is the transition from the early to the middle Avar period, which relies heavily on the nature of the numismatic evidence. As early as 1955...

---


Gyula László had suggested that the cultural changes were brought about by the arrival of a new group in Pannonia in 670-680 led by Kuber after the Bulgars had been forced westwards under the pressure of the Khazars. The theory was further developed and refined by István Bóna who sustained the immigrationist thesis by looking at coin hoards from the Carpathian basin and the overall reduction in coin finds towards the end of the seventh century. Although it has been largely refuted since then, the numismatic evidence remains one of the central points of debate, as well as the existence of striking cultural parallels in Ukraine for the Middle Avar period.

Numismatic evidence is therefore one of the key elements in reconstructing a piece of the nation's past in countries touched by the Byzantine influence. The stakes are even higher for regions outside the Empire's borders, which received little attention in written sources and mostly related to the Empire's external politics, be it warfare or diplomatic action. The student of social and economic relations in the marginal regions of the Empire and beyond has to make extensive use of the archaeological evidence in order to make sense of the societies living in the shadow of the Empire and their relations to Byzantium. It is precisely to the nature of frontiers and the archaeological


evidence that we need now turn before addressing the role and functions performed by Byzantine coins in the Byzantine world and beyond.
CHAPTER 3
THE EMPIRE’S FRONTIER ON THE LOWER DANUBE

3.1 The Frontier Question in Late Antiquity

For more than a century historians have struggled to define the concept of frontier in Roman history and, paradoxically, one of the major challenges has not been related to understanding ancient perceptions on their own terms, but to manipulate and negotiate modern concepts of borders and boundaries which stood against a proper understanding of what frontiers meant in the Roman world. Running the risk of falling into the trap of presentism, a number of scholars based their argumentation on implicit or explicit comparisons with modern frontiers. Nineteenth century efforts to redraw the map of Europe based on nationalistic views of political, cultural, and linguistic separation have prompted historians to rethink the notion of Roman frontiers by projecting modern concepts to ancient contexts.¹ The ensuing debate among specialists in Roman history and archaeology shaped two schools of thought. The main point of debate has been the very nature and definition of the Roman frontier. Students of the Roman frontier had to grapple with an unwieldy question: was the Roman frontier a linear barrier separating two worlds or was it an area of economic, cultural, and religious contact? Is there more than one definition of Roman frontiers? For the later Empire the answer to this question is fundamental for shaping our understanding of the relations between the Empire and barbaricum.

The idea of frontier as a line of demarcation between different civilizations had already been put forward by Edward Gibbon in the eighteenth century and it underlay nineteenth century thinking, influencing scholars like the American historian Frederick

Turner. Even to this day, in almost any study dealing with the conceptualization of Roman frontiers, it is *de rigueur* to introduce the topic by citing Turner's seminal work. Most importantly, he argued that the westward expansion was the driving force behind American development, while the frontier itself represented the meeting point between savagery and civilization.\(^2\) Such ideas had been a source of inspiration for prominent Roman historians writing in the first half of the twentieth century. In 1908, Theodor Mommsen defined the *limes* as a double defensive line, having the shape of a strip of land with an inner and outer border.\(^3\) A few decades later, Andreas Alföldi famously described the Danube and the Rhine as "moral barriers" separating Roman civilization from barbarians,\(^4\) a strong echo of another well-known defensive line, the Great Wall of China, described by Owen Lattimore as separating the Chinese civilization from the barbarian "outer darkness."\(^5\) Alföldi's essay opened the first edition (1949) of a series of conferences dedicated to the study of Roman frontiers (*Limeskongresse*), held periodically to this day, in which historians and archaeologists present their work on different sections of the Roman and early Byzantine *limes*.\(^6\) The results of this prestigious conference perpetuate the concept of a linear fortified border, as the
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6 The term itself, *limes*, is a modern adaptation of the Roman term which had a different connotation, for which see especially B. Isaac, "The Meaning of the Term *Limes* and *Limitanei*," *JRS* 78 (1988): 125-47.
program of the conference has only recently begun to include studies on aspects unrelated to military strategy, such as the role of economy, religion, and group identity.⁷

Surprisingly, the most influential, yet controversial, thesis has come from Edward Luttwak, a modern military strategist during the Cold War era. His "Grand Strategy" of the Roman Empire, and more recently, his "Grand Strategy" of the Byzantine Empire, has championed the view of a rational, pragmatic, and well-informed frontier policy, which adapted to external threats.⁸ According to Luttwak, the frontier strategy of the late Empire was characterized by an in-depth defense system, based on a network of fortifications able to absorb the shock of barbarian invasions. Perhaps the greatest achievement of his episodic incursions into Roman history has been the body of scholarship produced to refute his arguments.⁹ In doing so, scholars involved in the frontier debate have reshaped and refined the notion and function of Late Roman frontiers.¹⁰ In the light of recent interest in social, economic, and religious issues,
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¹⁰ B. Isaac wrote the most influential rebuttal of the Grand Strategy concept, which led to a rethinking of the entire limes concept, from a military standpoint; see Isaac, The Limits of Empire.
military strategy has become a secondary concern.\textsuperscript{11} The role and function of "frontier societies" looms large in recent studies, as part of a larger intellectual shift, which stresses the transformation of the Roman world in which \textit{romanitas} and \textit{barbaritas} blend together in a formative process.\textsuperscript{12}

There was more to Turner’s frontier theory than his distinction between savagery and civilization. Despite the peculiarity of the American frontier, the versatility of his model resides in the ability to define frontiers as non-static cultural areas, which fits, in a limited sense, the "transformation" theory.\textsuperscript{13} The pendulum swing in the recent historiography has a main thrust and a number of subsidiary channels. Although the frontier question is far from being solved, it is now widely accepted that Late Roman frontiers were neither static lines of defense, nor barriers holding back barbarian tides.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{itemize}
  \item In the last two decades collective volumes on the topic of late ancient and medieval frontiers have started to include separate sections on intellectual and religious frontiers, see for example A. Rousselle, ed. \textit{Frontières terrestres, frontières célestes dans l’antiquité} (Paris: Diffusion De Boccard, 1995); Mathisen and Sivan, \textit{Shifting Frontiers}; O. Merisalo, ed. \textit{Frontiers in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the Third European Congress of Medieval Studies (Jyväskylä, 10-14 June 2003)} (Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération internationale des instituts d’études médiévales, 2006).
  \item \textit{The Transformation of the Roman World}, a massive project sponsored by the European Science Foundation, had a major role in shaping this new approach back in the 1990s. That it soon became the leading paradigm is evinced by recent volumes on the same topic, see for instance R. W. Mathisen and D. Shanzer, ed., \textit{Romans, Barbarians, and the Transformation of the Roman World. Cultural Interaction and the Creation of Identity in Late Antiquity} (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).
  \item The most prominent difference would be the fact the Roman government played the major role in shaping the frontier, whereas in the case of the American frontier frontiersmen were the main agent; for a brief discussion see I. Kopytoff, "The Roman Frontier and the Uses of Comparison," in \textit{Frontières d’empire. Nature et signification des frontières romaines}, ed. P. Brun et al. (Nemours: Édition de l’Association pour la Promotion de la Recherche Archéologique en Ile-de-France, 1993), 144.
  \item Mathisen and Sivan, \textit{Shifting Frontiers}; Pohl, et al., \textit{The Transformation of Frontiers}; F. Curta, ed., \textit{Borders, Barriers, and Ethnogenesis. Frontiers in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages} (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005); Isaac, \textit{The Limits of Empire}; C. Whittaker, \textit{Frontiers of the Roman Empire. A Social and Economic Study} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994). This interpretation is not unanimously accepted. Derek Williams maintained that once the Empire reached a military stalemate in all directions it had to accept \textit{de facto} its territorial limit and to conduct the frontier policy based on the principle of an empire enclosed by perimeter barriers, see D. Williams, \textit{The Reach of Rome. A History of the Roman Imperial Frontier 1 \textsuperscript{st} - 5\textsuperscript{th} Centuries AD} (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996), 299. Other recent titles still convey the notion of linearity, see for example P. Parker, \textit{The Empire Stops Here. A Journey along the Frontiers of the Roman World} (London: Jonathan Cape, 2009). In addition, Mark Graham has
\end{itemize}
The theory of the frontier as a homogeneous contact zone which included regions on both sides of the military installations was developed by C. R. Whittaker in a series of seminal works. According to this interpretation, borders and boundaries are two distinct notions, which need to be treated by using distinct methodological tools. While borders refer to political and military edges of society, boundary studies address the interaction at the frontiers and the social transformation produced by long periods of contact, leading to the creation of the frontier as a unique area, with a different outlook than the core regions of the Empire.

While convincingly arguing against the notion of linear frontiers, either natural or artificial, historians have largely overlooked the subtleties of the evolution of frontiers from the early Roman period to the early Byzantine. There is also a marked tendency to generalize conditions throughout the Roman world based on research focusing mainly on the northern frontier of the Western Empire. Although Roman ideology may have remained unchanged in terms of an *imperium sine fine*, with an added Christian dimension in Byzantium, the reality on the ground changed dramatically. The endemic civil war of the third century and the collapse of the tetrarchic system in the fourth


17 For the Byzantine ideology on frontiers, see recently G. Dagron, "Byzance et la frontière. Idéologie et réalité," in *Frontiers in the Middle Ages*, 303-18.
century transferred the military initiative to various barbarian tribes and the Empire was often forced to fight on several fronts. Conquering new territories or subduing new peoples was no longer as high a priority as preserving the Empire and keeping the barbarians at bay. Consequently, unlike early historians, writers of the late Empire referred to frontiers and the loss of territories (as opposed to conquering peoples). The often cited account of the fourth-century anonymous author of *De rebus bellicis* is a case in point.

Above all it must be recognized that wild nations are pressing upon the Roman Empire and howling about it everywhere, and treacherous barbarians, with the cover of natural places, are assailing every frontier [...] Among the measures taken by the State for its own advantage there is also the effective care of the frontier-works which surround all the borders of the Empire. Their safety will be better provided for by a continuous line of forts constructed at intervals of one mile with firm walls and very powerful towers.  

Based on this new ideology emperors often received praises for protecting the Empire. Constantius I was held in high regard in a panegyric because he "reached the Rhine unexpectedly and protected that whole frontier", while another panegyric mentions the camps of cavalry units and infantry *toto Rheni et Histri et Eufrate limite restituta* by the Tetrarchy.  In the sixth century, Procopius spoke of the defenses with which Justinian "surrounded the farthest limits of the territory of the Romans," and of "all the fortifications whereby this Emperor preserved the Empire, walling it about and frustrating the attacks of the barbarians on the Romans."  

---

The sixth-century historian Agathias was fully aware of the meaning of territorial losses in his own time when he referred to the shameful defeat of Julian in Persia "confining thereafter the extent of his Empire within new frontiers, whittling away its far-flung corners." Especially the border with Persia, the archrival and the ideological antithesis of Rome, became increasingly important in the later centuries. Procopius showed that the need for establishing a firm frontier had a long tradition: "[...] it was forbidden in the treaty which the Emperor Theodosius once concluded with the Persian nation, that either party should construct any new fortress on his own land where it bordered on the boundaries of the other nation." As a matter of fact, during the sixth century frontier forts such as Dara in Mesopotamia became central in the military and diplomatic relations between Byzantium and Sasanian Persia. The capture of the fortress by the Persians literally drove Emperor Justin II insane.

### 3.2 The Early Byzantine Frontier on the Lower Danube: *Topos* and Reality

A discussion of the Early Byzantine frontier on the Lower Danube, which will be the focus of the following pages, raises again the issue of rivers as frontiers of...
exclusion. If Alföldi’s "moral frontier" is no longer tenable, the role of rivers as primarily facilitating transport, communication, and supply is equally problematic. A middle ground between these opposing views has been proposed by Martijn Nicasie and Mark Graham who looked at river frontiers from different standpoints, but reached a similar conclusion, that rivers had both a symbolic and a practical role of separation. More often than not historians engaged in the frontier debate operate with multiple definitions of the frontier or tend to emphasize specific facets of this decidedly versatile concept. One major achievement of the past decades is the differentiation between political and cultural (including social and economic) frontiers. Depending on such angles, the same natural frontier can act as a cultural frontier of inclusion and at the same time play the role of exclusion in the shape of a fortified border.

The Danube frontier is an excellent case for testing such assumptions against the available literary and archaeological evidence. Several scholars have argued that the Danube did not represent the logical frontier of the Empire in strategic terms. The argument proceeds on the premise that if the Danube had been the natural frontier, then it would have been strategic to maintain that line. Instead, Emperor Trajan

25 C. M. Wells, The German Policy of Augustus (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 24; Isaac, The Limits of Empire, 410-3; Whittaker, Frontiers of the Roman Empire, 171. Historians often cite Lord Curzon’s 1907 lecture on frontiers as a historiographic foundation for their claim that rivers connect rather than separate; see Lord Curzon, Frontiers. Romanes Lecture (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1908), 21. On that same page, however, Lord Curzon also states that rivers provided “a convenient line of division, easily capable of defence” and specifically referred to the cases of the Rhine and the Danube in the Roman period.

26 M. J. Niacasie, Twilight of Empire. The Roman Army from the Reign of Diocletian until the Battle of Adrianople (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1998), 123-5; Graham, News and Frontier, 56-72. See also Parker, The Empire Stops Here, 4. For the role of water defenses see recently N. Christie, “From the Danube to the Po: the Defence of Pannonia and Italy in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries AD,” in The Transition to Late Antiquity, 570-73. For the Danube frontier, see recently C. S. Sommer, "Why there? The Positioning of Forts along the Riverine Frontiers of the Roman Empire," in The Army and Frontiers, 103-14.
established a new province, which took many legions to defend and had to be abandoned in the third century.\textsuperscript{27}

Although the Danube was by no means a definitive frontier, from a Roman perspective it was still considered the legal frontier of the Empire as late as the seventh century when the administration of the northern Balkans virtually collapsed.\textsuperscript{28} The Danube offered clear strategic advantages and we have plenty of information to show that they were exploited both by Romans on the right bank, and barbarians on the left bank. Since the establishment of the province of Moesia, Rome regarded the Danube as a line separating them from the peoples living north of the river, especially the Dacians, whose inroads south of the Danube are described by Annaeus Florus:

"whenever the Danube froze and bridged itself \textit{[gelu Danuvius iunxerat ripas]}, under the command of their King Cotiso, they used to make descents and ravage the neighboring districts."\textsuperscript{29} A similar reference to the frozen river is made on Trajan's column, in the depiction of the heavily armed Dacian and Sarmatian cavalry crossing the frozen Danube for the Dacian counteroffensive in the winter of 101.\textsuperscript{30} This view is strengthened by the fourth-century writer Libanius who mentioned the raids of the "Scythians" which

\textsuperscript{27} Whittaker, \textit{Rome and Its Frontiers}, 34-5.


he "could not bear to look upon", praying that "the ice on the Danube should not be frozen solid, to be sufficient for their crossing."\textsuperscript{31} To be sure, the situation remained unchanged in the sixth century when Agathias was writing about the successful invasion of the Cutrigurs in 559:

As usual, with the approach of winter, the river froze to a considerable depth and the ice was already hard enough to be crossed on horseback. Whereupon Zabergan, the leader of the Cotrigurs galloped across the frozen waters with a huge force of cavalry and crossed over without difficulty into the territory of the Romans.\textsuperscript{32}

Such descriptions indirectly reveal that the unfrozen river was perceived as an efficient if not entirely reliable barrier,\textsuperscript{33} which became especially convenient in Late Antiquity, when the offensive stance of the Empire on the Lower Danube had drastically diminished.

The role of the river as a communication artery cannot be denied, especially during the existence of the trans-Danubian province of Dacia and also later,\textsuperscript{34} but it would be a mistake to ignore the strategic value of the river in regulating access from and to the left bank.\textsuperscript{35} The strategic importance of the Danube was not lost on Late Roman historians writing about frontiers, although propagandistic purposes, either

---


\textsuperscript{32} Agathias, \textit{Historiae}, V, 11, ed. R. Keydell; trans. J. D. Frendo, 146.

\textsuperscript{33} Contra Isaac, \textit{The Limits of Empire}, 413, who turns the argument on its head by suggesting that such accounts prove that the Danube was not an efficient natural barrier.


\textsuperscript{35} It is important to note that a new age of expansion in the late tenth century brought the Byzantines back to the Danube, where some of the old fortifications were reused and the river was once again guarded by the imperial fleet, see A. Madgearu, "Dunărea în epoca bizantină (seculele X-XII): o frontieră permeabilă," \textit{Revista Istorică} 10, no. 1-2 (1999): 41-55.
positive or negative, should be taken into account. In the geographical introduction to his *Historiarum adversus paganos* Orosius described the territory which the "Danube separates from the land of the Barbarians in the direction of Our Sea."\(^{36}\) Interestingly, the river's role of separation echoed Seneca's own understanding more than three centuries earlier of the fact that "the Danube separates what is Roman from what is Sarmatian" as he ridiculed the "boundaries of mortals."\(^{37}\) In addition, Zosimus noted that according to the peace terms imposed on the Goths by Valens, "the barbarians were forbidden to cross the river or ever again to set foot inside the Roman borders,"\(^{38}\) while Jerome lamented that the Danube frontier had been shattered by barbarian invasions (*fracta Danubii limite*), after which "Rome had to fight within her own borders not for glory but for bare life".\(^{39}\) During the dark days of the Hunnic domination at the Danube Attila managed to extend his control south of the river and according to Priscus of Panium he moved the frontier to Naissus, "which he had laid waste and established as the border point [chorion] between the Scythian and the Roman territory."\(^{40}\) Later he re-acknowledged the Danube as the proper frontier as he vowed to "keep the peace on the same terms" and to "withdraw from the Roman territory bordering on the Danube."\(^{41}\)

---


The status-quo remained quite unchanged in the sixth century when Procopius was writing that the Danube "clearly forms the boundary between the barbarians, who hold its left bank, and the territory of the Romans, which is on the right."\(^{42}\)

It is no less true that most accounts either refer to situations when the Danube was crossed by barbarians or constitute opportunities to praise some emperor for securing the border, which indirectly suggests that it had been crossed quite often in the past. However, this is not an attempt to determine whether the frontier was successfully defended at all times, but to make the case that the river created a serious problem for groups trying to cross into the Empire.

In addition, a chain of fortifications built on the right bank was meant to supplement the strategic value of the natural barrier.\(^{43}\) At least one of their purposes was very clear to contemporaries, even as they looked back to the state of the frontier before the onslaught of the Huns:

The Roman emperors of former times, by way of preventing the crossing of the Danube by the barbarians who live on the other side, occupied the entire bank of this river with strongholds, and not the right bank of the stream alone, for in some parts of it they built towns and fortresses on the other bank.\(^{44}\)

---


\(^{43}\) Moreover, the fortifications on the Danube were supplemented with walls and towers placed at the outlets of the tributaries into the Danube to prevent circulation upriver, see F. Curta, *The Making of the Slavs* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 184. The fact that the river itself and the adjacent fortifications were a convenient frontier line is evidenced by a Byzantine return to the Danube in the tenth century, for which see E. Condurachi et al., "Nouvelles recherches sur le Limes byzantin du Bas-Danube aux X\(^{e}\)-XI\(^{e}\) siècles," in *Proceedings of the XIlth International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Oxford, 5-10 September 1966*, ed. J. M. Hussey et al. (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967), 179-93.

No doubt Procopius had in mind Justinian's recent *renovatio imperii* and the complete overhaul of the Danube frontier in the first half of the sixth century, including the control over a few strategic bridgeheads on the left bank, such as Litterata and Recidiva, mentioned in the Novella XI of 535. The importance of the river and the adjacent fortifications can be clearly seen in Menander's description of the Avar campaign against the Sclavenes, ordered by Tiberius II Constantine in the summer of 578. The Avar horsemen were ferried into the Empire and escorted along the right bank of the Danube only to cross the river again to attack the Slavic tribes living in eastern Wallachia. It clearly follows that the right bank was safer and easier to protect and more suitable to stage various military maneuvers.

Rivers also had a symbolic meaning for the Romans as boundaries that should not be crossed, with the Rubicon being the classical example, or as natural frontiers between two peoples, acting as neutral territory. This can be deduced from the fact that peace negotiations were sometimes held symbolically close to an important river. Romans had met the Persians on the Euphrates for negotiations in the first century, in the fourth century Valentinian negotiated with the Alamans on a ship in the middle of the Rhine, while Valens met Athanaric on the Danube. After the dissolution of the Hunnic empire, the sons of Attila came to Emperor Leo I to ask that Romans and Huns should meet at the Danube for a peace treaty, "in the old manner" (*to palaion ethos*), and

---


establish a market. No doubt Priscus had in mind the fourth-century precedent with the Goths playing the role of the barbarian. In the sixth century the Avars having reached "the banks of the Scythian Hister" and threatening to invade the Roman province, sent envoys to Constantinople requesting stipends from Emperor Justin II. Finally, in the early seventh century Georgios Pisides contemplated the role of the Danube against the threat of the Avars in the same vein as sixth-century historians had, the river being described metaphorically as a "boundary to savagery" and "a fence and a new wall." The border between symbolical and practical was easy to cross and the Danube often became a convenient separation line:

Until now the river provided by unwritten (natural) law a border (to the Empire), (nonetheless) how much damage has the state suffered from the wicked barbarians ! On the one hand, they always tried to break through the established frontier, on the other hand, the power of the Romans prevented them from invading our land.

Especially when the Empire was not strong enough to assert its influence north of the river, the Danube was specifically indicated as the northern border of Byzantium.

Such was the case in the treaty sealed by Emperor Maurice with Baian, the khagan of the Avars, according to which "the Ister was agreed as intermedium between Romans

---


51 Georgios Pisides, *Bellum Avaricum*, 30-40, ed. and trans. Pertusi, 177-78 and For a discussion of this particular work of Pisides, see P. Speck, *Zufälliges zum Bellum Avaricum des Georgios Pisides* (Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik, Neugriechische Philologie und Byzantinische Kunstgeschichte der Universität, 1980). However, these particular lines (30-40) concerning the Danube frontier received little historical attention. For a brief mention see Patoura, "Emporio kai synallages," 399, n. 7.
and Avars." Indeed, the Empire was sometimes in the strategic position of initiating offensive expeditions north of the Danube. However, the very fact that the Empire was able to embark on such expeditions only twice during the sixth century shows that the Danube was not necessarily the desired frontier, but certainly the more convenient and affordable one at that time. One could even argue that the few expeditions north of the Danube did not bring anything good in the long term, but rather caused additional trouble for the frontier provinces. After a few years of successful Roman incursions north of the river led by Chilbudios, during which "not only did no one succeed in crossing the Ister against the Romans, but the Romans actually crossed over to the opposite side many times", in 533 the general was killed in battle and the result was that "the river became free for the barbarians to cross at all times just as they wished and the possessions of the Romans were rendered easily accessible." It took more than six decades for the Romans to venture again north of the Danube. This time, after a series of successful expeditions, Petrus, Emperor Maurice's brother, was ordered to spend the winter in enemy territory in 602, which led to a general mutiny ending with the deposition of Maurice and added chaos at the Danube frontier. On the rare occasions when the Empire was on the offensive beyond the Danube, the main reason for action


53 The early Byzantine fleet, well attested until the seventh century, played an important role at the Danube, for which see O. Bounegru and M. Zahariade, Les forces navales du Bas Danube et de la Mer Noire aux IVe VVe siècles (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1996), 108-9.


55 Theophylact Simocatta, Historia, VIII, 6, ed. de Boor and Wirth, 293-95. The idea that the Danube limes finally collapsed in 602 has been long refuted, see A. Barnea, "Einige Bemerkungen zur Chronologie des Limes an der unteren Donau in spätromischer Zeit," Dacia 34 (1990): 283-90. However, the old dating of
was not a desire to annex new territories but to pacify the region by retaliating against the barbarian groups who were often crossing into the Empire for plunder.

The river itself was of course insufficient for keeping the frontier under control. A dense network of fortifications was meant to supplement the strategic value of the natural obstacle. The program of reconstruction in the Balkans was initiated most probably before Justinian, who was responsible for taking it to an unprecedented scale. The defensive nature of the frontier fortifications is made apparent by the shape of the towers and the fact that in many cases walls were thickened and elevated.56 The strategic planning which presupposed the existence of three layers of fortifications in the Balkans, whose existence was confirmed by archaeology, was meant to block the access to Constantinople and the large towns of Greece.57 A massive program of fortifications in the Balkans and at the Danube, such as the one implemented by Justinian, does not necessarily go against the current definition of the frontier as an area including not only a fortified natural or artificial border, but also the supporting frontier provinces and regions beyond the border. However, this is a cultural definition of frontiers rather than a political one.

---


Some historians believe that the permanent contact between different 
populations gradually led to the creation of a homogeneous and distinct cultural area at 
the frontier. The applicability of such a definition to the Danube frontier in the sixth 
century will be tested against the archaeological evidence in the next chapter. Suffice it 
to say at this point that the Byzantine administration itself did not see this region as 
entirely homogeneous and a clear difference was made between the Danubian 
provinces and the lands stretching north of the river. According to Procopius, Justinian 
reorganized the Danube frontier "wishing, as he did, to make the Ister River the 
strongest possible line of first defense before them and before the whole of Europe". In 
addition he covered the Balkans with a network of fortifications claiming that "each 
farm either has been converted into a stronghold or lies adjacent to one which is 
fortified." This must have created a clear sense of separation from what was 
happening north of the Danube, despite the existence of a number of bridgeheads on 
the left bank. Moreover, Edict 13 from 538 stipulated that officers unwilling to assist in 
the collection of taxes in Egypt would be punished by being sent north of the Danube to 
defend the border, and this was undoubtedly meant to be a severe punishment.

58 See especially Whittaker, Frontiers of the Roman Empire, 223.

alone, as a natural obstacle (rather than a barrier), was of course insufficient for the proper protection of 
the Balkans. This is clearly implied in the advice that Priscus received from the Emperor Maurice, urging 
him to protect the Danube because "the barbarians would not remain quiet unless the Romans kept a 
very strict guard on the Ister," Theophylact Simocatta, VI, 6.2, ed. de Boor and Wirth, 230; trans. Whitby 
and Whitby, 167.


61 Corpus Iuris Civilis, Edict 13 (538 A.D.), ed. Schoell and Kroll, 785, "[…] universa cohors e regione 
mota in loca quae ultra Istrum sive Danubium sunt transferatur, ut illis limitibus custodiae causa 
adhaearet." The banishment of criminals or even higher ranked officials fallen into disgrace to peripheral 
regions seems to have been common practice, as evidenced by the case of Petra in Palaestina Tertia in 
the sixth century, for which see Z. T. Fiema, "Late-antique Petra and its Hinterland: Recent Research and 
New Interpretations," in The Roman and Byzantine Near East. Volume 3: Late-antique Petra, Nile Festival
3.3 Putting the Danube into Perspective: The Early Byzantine Frontier in the East

The Empire does not seem to have had a "Grand Strategy" at the frontier, in the manner described by Luttwak. The lack of a standardized policy, however, should not lead to the opposite conclusion that different frontiers of the early Byzantine state had very little in common in terms of scope and organization. More often than not it was local geography and the challenge of dealing with very different populations that shaped the Byzantine response at the respective frontier. At a time when the Empire was relying on a dense network of fortifications in the Balkans and at the Danube, in the East the *Limes Arabicus* was being stripped of any military function and ultimately abandoned.

The thorough exploration of the Arabian limes in central Jordan and in the Dead Sea region has yielded important evidence regarding the function of the frontier in the sixth century and is a useful point of comparison with the Danube frontier. Unlike fortresses at the Danube, the forts of the Arabian frontier show no evidence of coin circulation after c. 550 and other categories of finds point to the conclusion that they had been abandoned in the second half of the sixth century. Out of sixteen forts studied by

---


The comparison between different frontier regions during Late Antiquity has gained more ground in the recent past, see for example J. Crow, "Amida and Tropaeum Traiani: a Comparison of Late Antique Fortress Cities on the Lower Danube and Mesopotamia," in *The Transition to Late Antiquity*, 435-55; Comparisons between the Roman frontiers and frontiers from other historical periods is also a worthy exercise, for which see recently Wilmott, "Towers and Spies," 127-33; P. Mayerson, "The Saracens and the *Limes,*" BASOR 262 (1986): 39; S. L. Dyson, "The Roman Frontier in Comparative Perspective: the View from North America," in *Frontières d'empire*, 149-57, as well as his earlier article, S. L. Dyson, "The Role of Comparative Frontier Studies in Understanding the Roman Frontier," in *Actes du IXe Congrès international d'études sur les frontières romaines, Mamaia 6-13 sept. 1972*, ed. D. M. Pippidi (Bucharest/Cologne: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România/Böhlau, 1974), 277-83. For a more skeptical view of comparative methods, seen from an anthropological perspective, see Kopytoff, "The Roman Frontier," 143-48.
T. S. Parker and his *Limes Arabicus* team, only three yielded early Byzantine remains, while none of the observation towers yielded any early Byzantine pottery.\(^{63}\)

It has already been established that *Strata Diocletiana* leading from the Euphrates to Damascus and the old *Via Nova Traiana* leading to Aila on the Red Sea served the double purpose of controlling and monitoring traffic and ensuring the rapid redeployment of troops towards the front in Mesopotamia. Watchtowers played a major part in policing the frontier trunk road, and the lack of evidence of sixth-century occupation automatically leads to the conclusion that the proper functioning of the military border was no longer possible. To the south, however, the frontier south of Jebel Druz shows signs of occupation at least until the end of the sixth century, while the "soldiers" archive from Nessana mentions the transfer of troops in the region towards the end of the century.\(^{64}\) In addition, papyrological evidence from sixth-century Petra alludes to the presence of troops that received the regular *annona*.\(^{65}\) West of the Dead Sea, at En Boqeq and Upper Zohar, the coin circulation ended c. 550, much like in the case of El Lejjun, studied by Parker.\(^{66}\) Nonetheless, the pottery found in the two Palestinian forts shows some sort of occupation up to the Ummayad period. As a rule, more and more settlements produced sixth- and seventh-century pottery assemblages as one proceeds westward of the frontier road. On the other hand, no specifically

---


\(^{65}\) Fiema, "Late-Antique Petra," 230.

military items have been found at Upper Zohar and the conclusion of the excavator was that the fort appeared to be a temporary campsite, as seemed to be the case with many settlements in the region.  

In the northern sector, along the Euphrates, the fortifications were meant to block the passage towards northern Syria and Mesopotamia, and that was clearly aimed against the Persian threat. The Euphrates had been the main defensive line against the Parthians since the early Empire and Procopius described in detail the careful work of fortifying and securing this region. A general pattern of defending the frontiers emerges from the panegyrical work of Procopius but in reality it was the escalation of hostilities on various fronts that eventually made the evolution of early Byzantine frontiers quite different. As we have seen, the *Limes Arabicus* lost its strategic function around 550 at the latest. Although, the date dovetails quite nicely with the claim made by Procopius that Justinian demobilized the *limitanei*, it was in fact a much longer process going back to the fifth century. What Procopius failed to tell us in his diatribe against Justinian is that the emperor abandoned the *limes* for both economic and military reasons. The system was not able to fight efficiently against frequent raids of the Lakhmids and it was also a big burden on an increasingly impoverished imperial

---

67 Parker has recently suggested that the two forts were built to offer some protection for the fertile lands to the west; they might stand as indirect evidence that the defensive line across Negev did no longer exist at the beginning of the sixth century, see S. T. Parker, "The Roman Frontier in Southern Arabia: A Synthesis," in *The Army and Frontiers*, 150.


69 Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, II, ed. Haury and Wirth, vol. 4, 45-82. For the role of the Euphrates, see Nicasie, *Twilight of Empire*, 134 with n. 51.

treasury. With a bold and radical move, the limes system was replaced with a Ghassanid superphylarchy, which was expected to be more efficient and less costly.\(^1\)

Indeed, the state of affairs at the Danube was rather different. Not only that the coin circulation did not end during the reign of Justinian, but the frontier garrisons seem to have been strengthened by Justin II, whose opposition to securing peace through external payments is well-known. Most fortresses remained functional until the last decade of the sixth century or even later, although the success of the frontier system with its in-depth defensive layers is more problematic, especially if we believe Agathias’ claim that Zabergan’s Cutrigurs proceeded towards Constantinople in 559 after “finding the area deserted and advancing unsupported.”\(^2\)

What seems even more interesting is the role of the buffer areas located in the immediate proximity of frontiers which, on many occasions, were part and parcel of the frontier policy. Looking at the northern frontier of the Western Roman Empire, Lotte Headeger has offered a model of interaction which supposes the existence of three interrelated structures: a Roman system (the peripheral provinces), a system of client kingdoms acting as a buffer zone between Rome and the Germanic tribes, and the independent Germanic system. The buffer zone maintained strong connections with the Empire, which can be seen in the large quantity of Roman artifacts and coins. It is known from literary sources that the Ghassanids in Arabia and the petty kingdoms of Transcaucasia represented such buffer zones between early Byzantium and the Sassanid Empire, although the material evidence for these regions has not yet been

\(^1\) For the role of the Ghassanids, see Shahid, Byzantium and the Arabs, vol. 1, 35-42.

\(^2\) Agathias, Historiae, V, 11, ed. R. Keydell; trans. J. D. Frendo, 146.
fully explored. In order to gain a proper understanding of interaction on the frontier it is important to test for the existence of such a buffer zone north of the Danube against the archaeological evidence.
CHAPTER 4
CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS ON THE LOWER DANUBE FRONTIER AND BEYOND:
AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

4.1 The Cultural Background

After abandoning the trans-Danubian province of Dacia the political and military frontier retreated on the Danube, which became once again a convenient line of separation and protection against external threats. Indeed, early Byzantium held its position on the Lower Danube for more than three centuries after Emperor Aurelian decided the tactical retreat south of the Danube between 271-275. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that the Danube would never constitute a cultural frontier of exclusion. A major communication artery in the second and the third century after the Empire conquered Dacia, the Danube continued to facilitate contact between its two banks as attested by fourth-century peace negotiations between the Romans and the Goths who insisted on maintaining access to Roman goods through trade points along the Lower Danube. The river acted as an interface between Byzantium and barbaricum not only for customary items required by the tribal aristocracy, but also for items prohibited from export like precious metals, weapons, and goods like oil and wine, whose flow north of the Danube could not be prevented.¹

Although cultural interaction on the Danube frontier should not be necessarily seen as part and parcel of the Empire's policy toward the populations from Barbaricum, the desire for Roman goods was often exploited for political gain. Despite the lack of any written records attesting the regularization of trade in the sixth century, similar to the ones available for the fourth and fifth centuries, it is safe to assume that the issue did

not escape Justinian’s thorough administrative overhaul of the Lower Danubian provinces. Much of the exchange was probably conducted through the Byzantine bridge-heads on the northern bank of the Danube which could have acted as trade ports. At least part of the trading was also the result of individual pursuits, with Byzantine merchants looking to make a profit by bringing coveted Byzantine items to communities in *barbaricum*, or mercenaries, traders, or prisoners from such communities being in closer contact with the Empire. The early Byzantine government was unable to monitor such traffic so as to exclude any cultural contact through private initiative and there is little indication that such a separation was ever intended in the first place.

Although interaction took place, the regions north and south of the Danube were by no means developing similar cultures during the long sixth century (Figure 4-1). The dissolution of the Chernyakhov culture and the subsequent chaos brought by the Hunnic onslaught in the fifth century led to increased cultural fragmentation in *barbaricum*. The imperial machine regained momentum toward the end of the fifth century and repaired most of the damage produced by the Huns in the Danubian provinces. North of the river, however, the situation was quite different and the remnants of the Hunnic confederation could not achieve the homogeneity and spread of the Chernyakhov cultural horizon. In this climate of political and cultural confusion a number of cultural traditions came to be recycled, though they had never been totally abandoned, relying on a mix of Roman provincial, Carpic, Sarmatian, and Chernyakhovian influences.
Surprisingly, in the case of pottery, which is the most common artifact found in the frontier region, there is not much borrowing from contemporary wheel-made pots produced in the Danubian provinces. A study based on the ceramic assemblage from Iatrus on the Lower Danube has shown that the ceramic types typical for the frontier fortresses on both sides of the Danube did not influence the ceramics produced in barbaricum. Different regions in barbaricum, even the ones closest to the Danube, display distinct patterns of ceramic production. In most cases, the ceramic shapes in the lands north of the Danube follow the different cultural traditions developed by the mosaic of populations that dominated the region at one time or another since the early Roman period. For example, at Botoșana, in Moldavia, there is a clear dichotomy between the hand-made pottery of so-called Slavic tradition and the wheel-made pottery which clearly follows a Roman tradition, while in other settlements from Bukovina the study of ceramic assemblages has led to the conclusion that the region was already dominated by Slavic influences in the sixth century. Moreover, several additional influences can be traced to the Chernyakhov tradition and the Carpathian barrow culture in settlements from Bukovina such as Rashkiv and Kodyń.

The co-existence of hand- and wheel-made pottery is best exemplified by the finds from Dulceanca in Wallachia. The most significant indication is the fact that both types were clearly produced together, as evidenced by a kiln found in the settlement.

---


4 Teodor, "Ceramica de uz comun," 95-97.
Dulceanca I, where a large wheel-made bowl was associated with eleven hand-made pots.\textsuperscript{5} To be sure, almost half of the ceramic assemblage from Dulceanca was produced using the fast wheel, while in the close vicinity, at Sfințești, wheel-made pottery is predominant, including some gray gritty pots typical for the Byzantine frontier fortresses.\textsuperscript{6} The pottery becomes more "Roman" as one moves from east to west, into the territory of the former province of Dacia. For instance, the storage capacity of the ceramic containers from Gropșani seems to follow the Roman system.\textsuperscript{7} Moreover, Ipotești, in western Wallachia represents a cultural horizon clearly dominated by wheel-made pottery whose initial phase has been traced back to the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth.\textsuperscript{8} Clearly the regions west of the Olt, which were once part of the province of Dacia had a closer connection to developments from the Empire.

The ceramic assemblages from the area of modern Bucharest show a perplexing diversity of types and influences given their close proximity. The pottery from Ciurel sometimes considered to be early Slavic has been attributed recently to a Chernyakhov tradition, the tall pots from Cățelu Nou resemble the shapes characteristic to the culture of the Carpi who dominated Moldavia in the second and third centuries. At Străulești-Lunca we encounter one of the rare occasions when the Byzantine influence can be

\textsuperscript{5} S. Dolinescu-Ferche, \textit{Așezările din secolele III și VI în sud-vestul Munteniei. Cercetările de la Dulceanca} (Bucharest, 1974), 90.

\textsuperscript{6} Dolinescu-Ferche, \textit{Așezările din secolele III și VI} , fig. 174-175.


Figure 4-1. Early Byzantine frontier provinces and regions in barbaricum referred to in the text (with dotted line the former province of Dacia).
traced on the local production of wheel-made pottery. In addition, the "Slavic" cemetery from Sărata-Monteorou, by far the largest in central and south-eastern Europe, boasts a series of ceramic urns, whose shape have been recently ascribed to a local tradition despite the funerary ritual, which is believed to be early Slavic.

In what concerns the dating of the complexes, two coins of Justinian found at Bucharest-Străulești-Măicănești suggest a dating of this and other contemporary settlements toward the middle of the sixth century, although the archaeological context of the coins invites caution. A common characteristic is the higher concentration of wheel-made pottery in the first half of the sixth century, although this tends to become a circular argument as dating often relies on the proportion between hand- and wheel-made pottery. The assumption is that forms became more simplified in the course of the sixth century as the Slavic influence became more pronounced and hand-made pottery started to dominate the ceramic assemblages. This tendency was not exclusive to the Lower Danube region. A similar process seems to have been at work in Cyprus where good quality ceramics co-existed with an increasing number of hand-made cooking vessels, which was seen as an adaptive response to the changing social and economic realities.

---


10 Teodor, "Ceramica de uz comun," 133-34.

11 Both coins were found outside the sunken-featured buildings, in the so-called "cultural layer." See M. Constantiniu, "Șantierul arheologic Băneasa- Străulești," CAB 2 (1965): 182 and 189, fig. 93.

If the Empire’s influence is rarely seen in sixth century ceramics produced in
*barbaricum* many early Byzantine fortresses in the frontier region have yielded a variety
of hand-made pots, typical for the regions north of the Danube (Figure 4-2). The
 ceramic types are not restricted to the well-known Penkovka and Prague groups usually
associated with the Antes and the early Slavs, respectively. The inventory of hand-
made pottery includes shapes deriving from the pre-Roman tradition or influenced by
the Sarmatic or Germanic groups settled in the frontier region. Based on such
influences, fortresses located in the same province show major differences in the hand-
made pottery assemblages found on the site. In Scythia the majority of shapes from
Dinogetia, Beroe, and Halmyris belong to the Penkovka type, while at Capidava the
Sarmatic tradition is much more powerful. Since hand-made pots appear at a great
number of sites from the northern Balkans, the hypothesis that the garrisons were partly
recruited from *barbaricum* or a multi-ethnic environment gains more credibility.


The diverse traditions behind the production of hand-made pottery, as in the cases presented above, might suggest that the "barbarians" themselves, recruited to defend the Empire’s frontier, belonged to different cultural backgrounds. To be sure, there is a risk in ascribing the hand-made pottery to outside groups alone. The example from Cyprus warns us that more profound social and economic transformations are likely behind the decline of ceramic production and the shift toward a more localized production of hand-made pottery.\textsuperscript{16} The archaeological context in which the hand-made pots have been found at Capidava in Scythia, for instance, presents us with a perplexing association of such "inferior" types with a large quantity of regular Roman amphorae and cooking wares. The complex, which was destroyed probably in the late 570s, reflects such cultural changes, in which the new recruits from \textit{barbaricum} may have compounded the general economic decline of the Empire.\textsuperscript{17}

The apparent lack of dialogue between the regions south and north of the Danube in the case of sixth-century ceramics can be ascribed to the more conservative nature of ceramic production and the greater resistance in replacing traditional ceramic shapes. In addition, a variety of objects could fill the need to follow "fashions" from the frontier provinces. Indeed, in order to look more "Roman", populations in \textit{barbaricum} chose to imitate different categories of items like amphorae, lamps, buckles, and brooches, or to import them directly from the Empire. A closer investigation of the main categories of imports and imitations will shed more light on the nature of cultural contact in the frontier region, and the factors favoring or limiting its extent. Cultural contact could

\textsuperscript{16} A similar interpretation has been long suggested as a possible explanation for the appearance of hand-made pots at Beroe, see Vîlceanu and Barnea, "Ceramica lucrată cu mâna," 216-17.

mean commerce in some cases although trade remains an elusive activity on the sixth-century Danube frontier. The exact goods offered by "barbarians" in return for Roman products are very hard to identify in the archaeological record due to their perishable nature. A far more promising avenue by which to explain the circulation of Byzantine artifacts is a closer examination of the movement of people in the context of the political, diplomatic and military developments in the frontier region, documented both by archaeological and literary sources.

### 4.2 Categories of Imports and Imitations in barbaricum

For lack of a better term imports will be defined here as any object produced in the Empire and brought to the territories beyond the Danube *limes* through economic or non-economic channels, either as basic goods or luxury/prestige items. Besides coins, which will be discussed in a separate chapter, ceramics (amphorae, lamps), metal items (fibulae, buckles, jewelry), and a number of Christian objects that run across these categories constitute the main types of imports found north of the Danube by archaeologists.

Much has been made of the presence of such objects in *barbaricum* in an attempt to demonstrate the intensive nature of relations between the Empire, its former trans-Danubian province of Dacia, and the region east of the river Olt and east of the Carpathians, which had been exposed to Roman culture for a long time.\(^{18}\) Since many

---

such interpretations were connected more with certain ideological purposes than a balanced and impassionate assessment of hard evidence, it is necessary to commence with a survey of the main categories of Byzantine artifacts and their geographic distribution in barbaricum.

As already demonstrated, the Danube was the desired political frontier, but it did not act as a cultural frontier of exclusion, as objects, ideas, and fashions traveled more or less freely north and south of the river. Rather than being a comprehensive treatment of all categories of imports, the following sections address a selected number of diagnostic items that lend themselves to a multifaceted analysis due to their wide distribution, variety of types, and multiple implications in the realm of social, economic, and religious realities of the frontier area and the regions beyond. To be sure, such an approach might obscure the diversity of items that found their way north of the Danube during the long sixth century. Various small finds of Byzantine origin, usually pieces of jewelry, sometimes made of precious metal have been found in barbaricum, but the lack of context reduces their usefulness for answering the type of historical questions which interest us most. Although most of the objects have been published, sometimes repeatedly and with additional comments, especially in the case of artifacts with religious significance, the archaeological context is most of the time unknown. The main categories of imports mentioned above are themselves not free of such problems but there are, however, sufficient finds in secure contexts to allow for certain historical interpretations and conclusions.

In addition, aside from genuine imports from the Danubian provinces or more distant corners of the Empire, it is important to note the presence of local imitations of
almost all categories of imports as well as metallurgical tools as evidence of local production. Although these are not Byzantine objects per se they can still be treated as indirect evidence of contact with the Empire. The unavailability of imports to meet the demand or the the lack of means to procure genuine Byzantine imports make such imitations relevant for a better understanding of the circulation of both Roman goods and the ones modeled after the original prototypes.

4.2.1 Amphorae

The early Byzantine amphora is one of the most common artifacts found in frontier fortresses from the northern Balkans, being primarily related to the state-controlled annona system designed to supply the frontier garrisons. Unfortunately, very few sites have so far benefited from quantitative studies of well-stratified ceramic assemblages. Based on the available archaeological monographs, the amphora occasionally accounts for almost half of the ceramic remains from a site. In most cases either LR1 or LR2 is the most frequent type. This is hardly the case north of the river,

---

19 Amphora types Late Roman 1 (LR1) and Late Roman 2 (LR2) are the most common finds in ceramic assemblages from fortresses of the northern Balkans. For the role of the LR2 amphora on the Danube frontier see O. Karagiourgou, "LR2: a Container for the Military annona on the Danubian border?" in *Economy and Exchange in the East Mediterranean during Late Antiquity. Proceedings of a conference at Somerville College, Oxford – 29th May, 1999*, ed. S. Kingsley and M. Decker (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001), 129-66.

in *barbaricum*. With the exception of the major bridge-head of Sucidava, the rural settlements in *barbaricum* have produced only a small quantity of amphora fragments (Figure 4-3). From an economic standpoint it is surprising that a high density of amphora finds can be seen not only in the close proximity of the Danube, but also a few hundred kilometers to the north, in Moldavia. The territory of the former province of Dacia has also produced a significant number of amphora finds, which along with other categories of imports discussed below, points to easier access to goods from the Empire. As for the region west of the river Olt, it is a common caveat in archeology that blank spots on a map can often point to unexplored areas (or unpublished material) rather than to a real difference in distribution. Nevertheless, it has to be asked whether such amphorae with a large circulation in the Danubian provinces performed a similar function in *barbaricum*. If such containers were indeed related to *annona militaris*, their scarcity or absence in *barbaricum* can be explained by the lack of any military presence beyond the bridge-heads established on the northern bank of the Danube. Moreover, the few finds of LR1 and LR2 north of the river are closer to what can be described as evidence of trading activity than the amphorae found in the Lower Danube fortresses, which were state controlled shipments and not the result of commerce properly speaking. Unlike dress accessories, discussed below, amphorae were too large to

---

count as "souvenirs" and could not be displayed (i.e. worn) as objects of prestige. On the other hand, access to oil or wine from the Empire could, of course, enhance one's social status.

An economic function can also be ascribed to amphora finds from the western edge of the Balkans, in Slovenia, where a good number of sites of the frontier region, such as Adjovski gradec, Crnomelj, Križna gora, Vranje, Kranj (Carnium), and Koper (Capris/Justinopolis, on the Adriatic coast) produced a conspicuously large quantity of spatheia customarily produced in the Western Mediterranean.²¹ Similar channels of distribution might be responsible for finds of spatheia from Kölked-Feketekapu, an Early Avar settlement on the right bank of the Middle Danube. This is also reflected in Zsuzsanna Hajnal's conclusion that the nature of the imported material from Kölked-Feketekapu suggests a route coming from the Western Balkans and even Italy, rather than the usual provenance from the Lower Danube provinces and the western Black Sea region.²² Kölked-Feketekapu seems to be at a crossroads in that respect, since it also yielded LR1 and LR2 amphorae. These types are also found in burial assemblages of the Middle Avar period from the region between the rivers Tisza and the Danube, such as Tiszavasvári and Kunbábony.²³ These and other finds of amphorae in "Avaria" are associated with ceramics produced in the western Black Sea area, which arrived after the collapse of the Danubian frontier system, since most of the finds are


²² A eulogy flask with no analogies in the eastern Balkans adds weight to this proposition, see Z. Hajnal, "Késő antik jellegű kerámia a Kölked-Feketekapui avar kori telepről 2005," Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungaricae (2005): 477-80.

associated with material securely dated to the Middle Avar period. Tivadar Vida has suggested that such amphorae represent a symbol of prestige for the Avar nobility who received such items in their burial assemblages, but they also reflect the nature of the relations between the Empire and the Avar khaganate.

A similar interpretation was recently suggested for the fragments of amphorae found in settlements belonging to the so-called Ipotești-Cândesti and Botoșana cultures, south and east of the Carpathians, respectively. Andrei Măgureanu argued that the presence of amphorae must be connected to a local elite that chose to display its economic power through such artifacts imported from the Empire. Indeed, some amphora fragments have been retrieved from houses that stand out as being larger and richer, as it is clearly the case of the building B10 at Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan, where fragments of several imported amphorae were associated with a local imitation of an early Byzantine amphora, a ladle used to pour metal, and a mold used to produce jewelry. Although the outstanding house at Soldat Ghivan displays the largest number of amphorae to be found in a single building north of the Danube, there are other

---


25 The practice of including amphorae in burials is not restricted to the Avar khaganate; an early Byzantine amphora was found in an inhumation grave (M 21) from Kushnarenkovo (Bashkortostan, Russia) together with amber beads, bronze and silver fibulae, and a buckle, for which see V. F. Gening, "Pamiatniki u s. Kushnarenkovo na r. Beloi (VI-VII vv. n.e.)," in Issledovaniia po arkeologii luzhnogo Urala, ed. R. G. Kuzeev, N. A. Mazhitov, and A. Kh. Pshenichniuk (Ufa: Institut istorii, iazyka i literatury AN SSSR, Bashkirskii filial, 1977), 102, fig. 9/1.


27 S. Dolinescu-Ferche and M. Constantinescu, "Un établissement du VIe siècle à Bucarest (Découvertes de la rue Soldat Ghivan)," Dacia 25 (1981): 320, with fig. 17/16 and 323, fig. 19/1.
sunken-featured buildings in the same settlement that provide artifacts that could very well have played the role of prestige items, such as fibulae or even the hand-made lamp found in the building B5, an artifact rarely found in barbaricum. Since any artifact imported from the Empire could in principle bear a certain social value, what is at stake here is the relative value of amphorae among other imported items. Following this line of thought it is worth mentioning that Soldat Ghivan is just one of the sixth-century settlements in Bucharest to provide such finds. Indeed, no less than five other locations in Bucharest have yielded amphora fragments, of which only the sunken-featured building L15 from Străuleşti-Măicăneşti can be compared with the one at Soldat Ghivan, being larger than the other houses. The inventory, however, is less spectacular, although it boasts three storage jars of 100 liters each.

The presence of metallurgical implements at Soldat Ghivan (B10) can also be traced in other settlements as well, south and east of the Carpathians, at Dulceanca (B2) and Gutinaş (L4), respectively. In both cases amphora fragments are associated with scrap pieces of bronze and in the case of Dulceanca, the sunken-featured building B2 also produced a stone mold for jewelry. Moreover, their association of amphora fragments with brooches or buckles in houses from Dulceanca, Olteni, and Hansca

---


seems to suggest a higher social status for their owners. However, in many instances amphora fragments are found in inconspicuous buildings, while some of them do not preserve a record of their original archaeological context, making it hard to determine whether the amphora, and more precisely its content (wine, oil), had a higher symbolic value for those communities in relation to other categories of imports.

Amphora finds are not restricted to the region north of the Danube. A LR1 was found as far east as Klimovka on the upper Volga, the easternmost find of early Byzantine amphorae. A number of Pontic amphorae belonging to the type Kuzmanov XVI/Scorpan IX are known from the region of Kiev. A distribution of amphorae in barbaricum based on typology has already been attempted and it clearly shows that most finds north of the Black Sea, especially on the Dnieper, belong to a series of


32 For the possible content of LR1 and LR2 amphorae, see Karagiorgou, "LR2: A Container," 146-49.


34 Kiev: A. M. Shovkoplias, "Ranneslavianskaia keramika s gory Kiselevki v Kieve," in Slaviane nakanune obrazovania Kievskoi Rusi, ed. B. A. Rybakov (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1963), 140 fig. 2/1; O. M. Prikhodiuk, Arkheologichny pamiatki seredn'ogo Pridnyprov'ia VI-IX st. n.e. (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1980), 130; 63 fig. 44/9. Svetl'ne: Shovkoplias, "Ranneslavianskaia keramika," 140. Klimovka: V. V. Priimak, "Kulturnye transformatssii i vzaimovliiania v Dnieprovskom regione na iskhode rimskogo vremei i v rannem Srednevekov'e," in Doklady nauchnoi konferentsi, posviashchennoi 60-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia E. A. Gorilunova (Sankt Petersburg, 14-17 noiaibra 2000 g.) (Sankt Petersburg: Petersburgskoe vostokovedenie, 2004), fig. 3B.
amphorae produced in the Pontic area, which could suggest trading connections with the Empire, possibly through the Crimea. In contrast, the region north of the Lower Danube produces mostly finds of LR1 and LR2, the typical *annona* containers found in the frontier fortresses of the Danube frontier, especially after the creation of *quaestura exercitus* in 537, which brought under the same administrative umbrella some of the production centers of these amphora types. The apparent scarcity of imported amphorae from the first half of the sixth century in the Crimea and the northern Balkans points to major difficulties in supplying the Danube frontier and was probably one of the main reasons for the creation of this peculiar administrative division. Such developments can explain the dearth of LR1 and LR2 containers north of the Black Sea, while their presence north of the Danube can be related to the Justinianic reforms and the short-lived prosperity of the Danube frontier.

Among the amphorae found north of the Danube two appear to be local imitations. One of them was already mentioned, the fragment from the B10 building at Bucharest - Soldat Ghivan, found in association with a Byzantine imported amphora, while the second was found at Bratei in Transylvania, in the sunken-featured building B5, also associated with an imported amphora. Such imitations strengthen the hypothesis that imported amphorae represented one way in which communities in

---

35 Curta, *The Making of the Slavs*, 244, fig. 37.


37 Swan, "Dichin (Bulgaria)," 263.

*barbaricum* imitated the Roman way of life, while their owners gained local prestige for being able to procure oil or wine from the Empire.

### 4.2.2 Lamps

Byzantine lamps constitute one of the most important, yet insufficiently explored, categories of imports in *barbaricum*. They were traditionally associated with the Roman way of life and often connected to Christian practice, which demanded such liturgical items. 39 Clay lamps provide the greatest diversity and potential for a study of geographical distribution, but bronze lamps are also important due to their higher value and their excellent parallels in the Byzantine world. The Christian bronze lamp from Luciu on the left bank of the Danube, the only such find outside the former province of Dacia, has to be mentioned for its perfect resemblance with lamps found at Archar and Athens, in the Balkans, while the Christian lamp from Tápiógyörgye in "Avaria" has good analogies in Dardania at Kalaja, in Asia Minor at Ephesus, and in Crete. 40 Other fifth-to-sixth century bronze lamps have been found in the former province of Dacia, at Dej, Lipova, Moigrad (Porolissum), and Reșca (Romula), most of which have a Coptic

---

39 A. Diaconescu, "Lămpi târzii și paleobizantine din fosta province Dacia," *EN* 5 (1995): 255-99, remains the only synthetic treatment of this category of artifacts, valuable for its contribution to the typology of lamps found in *barbaricum*.

origin. This does not necessarily mean that they were imported directly from Egypt, as such finds are quite frequent in Greece as well.

The largest percentage of clay lamps was produced in the Balkans. They are usually referred to in the literature as "Danubian lamps" because they are mostly found in settlements of the Lower Danube provinces (Figure 4-4). However, it seems that some types were either produced or had prototypes in Constantinople as evidenced by numerous finds from the excavations at Saracâne in Istanbul. Although this is the most common type of lamp found in Barbaricum, "Danubian" lamps are not showing up in the quantity we would expect given their high frequency in almost every fortress of the frontier region.

The lamp from Bumbești in Oltenia, dated to the sixth century, has a perfect analogy at Constanța (Tomis) (Figure 4-20/5-6). Here, and also to the south along the Black Sea coast, at Krânevo, as well as on the Danube, at Sacidava, molds for this type have been unearthed proving the local production of these lamps in the Eastern

---

41 Gudea and Ghiurco, *Din istoria creștinismului*, 143-47. Many similar lamps found their way in western museums, such as the Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum zu Mainz or the British Museum. For a comprehensive list of analogies, see recently M. Xanthopoulou, *Les lampes en bronze à l’époque paléochrétienne* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010).

42 For the typology, see especially Iconomu; Kuzmanov; Hayes. In the classification created for the lamps found on the Yassi Ada shipwreck, Danubian lamps are found under the label “Balkan type”, see K. D. Vitelli, "The Lamps", in G. E. Bass and F. H. van Doorninck, Jr., *Yassi Ada. Volume I. A Seventh-Century Byzantine Shipwreck* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1982), 196-99. The name was also adopted by scholars from the Balkans, for which see K. Kostova and D. Dobreva, "Roman, Late Roman and Early Byzantine Lamps from National Archaeological Reserve "Deultum-Debelț", in *Lychnological Acts 2. Trade and Local Production of Lamps from the Prehistory until the Middle Age. Acts of the 2nd International Congress on Ancient and Middle Age Lightning Devices (Zalău-Cluj-Napoca, 13th-18th May 2006)*, ed. C. A. Roman and N. Gudea (Zalău/Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2008), 164. For their frequency in the northern Balkans, see for example Capidava where local lamps account for 66 percent of the total number of finds, see Opris, *Ceramica romană târzie*, 167, fig 10. A high proportion (over 50 percent) was also noted for the late occupation levels at Halmyris, for which see Topoleanu, "Ceramica ", 244, table 8.

43 Hayes, type 11-12.

44 Diaconescu, "Lâmpi târzii și paleobizantine," pl. V/1 and the analogy from Tomis at pl. V/2.
Balkans, although a similar type is known from Anemurium in Cilicia. Very similar lamps have been found at Noviodunum, Durostorum, Halmyris, Dinogetia and Veliko Turnovo, while a late seventh-century lamp with a cross at the base of nozzle has been found during excavations at Saraçhane, showing the longevity of this design.

Another Danubian lamp was found at Alba-Iulia (Apulum) and represents one of the most popular types of the period, its main characteristic being the handle in the form of a human head. Alexandru Diaconescu considered that the closest analogies are to be found in the Danubian provinces, as was to be expected for this category of lamps. Indeed, lamps with human-shaped handles have been found at Adamclisi, Capidava (Figure 4-17/1), Oltina, Dunăreni, Beroe, Halmyris, and Tomis in Scythia, Novae and Iatrus in Moesia Secunda, and Mokranjske Stene, Romuliana and Aquis in Dacia Ripensis. The circulation of this type was not restricted to the Lower Danube region


47 Hayes, type 16, no. 134. Lamps with cross on the nozzle have been labeled "North African" by Kuzmanov, but similar types are found among the Attic lamps from the Athenian agora. It is well known that Greek lamps of the Early Byzantine period were inspired by African types, so that similar lamps produced in the Balkans could have followed the same practice, see Kuzmanov, type XXXVI; Perlzweig, no. 2933. See also below, n. 70.

48 Diaconescu, "Lămpi târzii și paleobizantine," pl. VI/ 1a-d.

since similar examples appear further to the east, in the Crimea and to the west in Pannonia.\textsuperscript{50} However, the specimen from Alba-Iulia departs from the common design of the lamps mentioned above, most of which display short strokes on the rim, so typical for "Danubian" lamps. Instead, we find a zigzag pattern with small globules reminiscent of the popular lamps produced in Asia Minor during the fifth and sixth centuries and sometimes imitated in the northern Balkans.\textsuperscript{51} Anatolian influences on the specimen from Apulum should not be surprising, since lamps with human-shaped handles have been found in Constantinople, which was perhaps one of the main destinations of this particular type, as well as at Sardis.\textsuperscript{52}

The lamp discovered at Orșova (Dierna) is yet another typical find from the Lower Danube area, boasting a handle in the shape of a ram's head with analogies in Scythia, at Tomis (Figure 4-17/2), Capidava, Histria, and Halmyris, to name just a few.\textsuperscript{53}
A similar lamp was found at Sucidava, the most important Byzantine settlement on the left bank of the Lower Danube, in Oltenia. Several lamps of Balkan type have been found there, among which a few lamps with cross-shaped handle, a very popular type on the Lower Danube during the early Byzantine period. One of them was found in the early Byzantine church together with coins dated 587/8 and 596/7, which securely dates the *terminus post quem* of this type to the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century. Similar lamps with different cross shapes and designs on the handle have been found throughout the northern Balkans, at Halmyris (Figure 4-17/3), Tomis, Capidava, Novae, Aquis, Kovilovo Grad, and on the northern bank of the Danube, at Drobeta. The type is also present in abundance in Constantinople, which might indicate a possible center of production, especially since the type appears among finds from Anatolian sites, such as Amorium.

---

55 Tudor, "Sucidava IV," fig. 11/d.
Another common group of lamps circulating during the sixth century has a palmette or leaf-shaped handle, and sometimes a stylized "Tree of Life". Models displaying a superior craftsmanship have been found in Asia Minor, suggesting a possible source of inspiration for their Danubian counterparts. One specimen with a handle in the shape of an upright sprig from Sucidava has good analogies at Tomis (Figure 4-17/4) and Halmyris in Scythia and Saraçhane in Istanbul, while a second specimen resembles finds from Histria, Novae, Sadovec and Shumen, some of them associated with sixth-century coins.

One last "Danubian" lamp found in Barbaricum, at Feldioara-Războieni in Transylvania (Figure 4-17/5), has a perfect analogy at Tomis in Scythia and belongs to the type with grapevine motifs, whose prototype might have been an earlier lamp from Asia Minor (Figure 4-17/6), sometimes found in the border province of Scythia (Adamclisi, Sacidava and Halmyris) and also imitated in Greece during the sixth century. A similar design on a lamp found at Caričin Grad in Dacia Mediterranea, a

---

58 Miltner, type IX. Such lamps are often found in Samos; for their typology see N. Poulou-Papadimitriou, "Lampes paléochrétiennes de Samos," Bulletin de correspondance hellénique 110, no. 1 (1986), fig. 53. Amorium: Gill and Şen, "Roman and Early Byzantine," fig. III/8 ns. 39-41 and figs. III/25 and III/26. For various hypotheses regarding the origin of this type, see P. Dyczek, "Lamps of the 3rd-6th Century AD from the Civil Architecture in Sector IV at Novae," in Lychnological Acts 2, 76.


61 Diaconescu, "Lâmpi târzii și paleobizantine," pl. V/5a-c; for the analogy with Tomis see pl. V/6.

62 Miltner, type X. Also on lamps from a large hoard found at Anemurium, for which see Williams and Taylor, "A Byzantine Lamp Hoard," 81, form II, type 15.

sixth-century foundation, and on lamps from the Yassi Ada shipwreck proves that the type remained popular for a long time.\textsuperscript{64}

The second major category of lamps described here were either imported from Asia Minor or borrowed motifs from the most popular models produced in the Byzantine heartland and circulated in the Balkans during the early Byzantine period (Figure 4-5).

Only one such lamp has been found north of the Danube, at Sucidava, on the left bank of the river, while in \textit{barbaricum} proper no sixth century lamps from Asia Minor have been reported to date. The lamp found at Sucidava belongs to the most common type, with its main characteristic being the small globules on the rim.\textsuperscript{65} An attempt was made to divide this type into two chronological groups: first lamps with a round shape and no channel towards the nozzle, dated to the late fifth and early sixth century, and second lamps with a more elongated shape and a small channel from discus to nozzle, dated to the later sixth century (Figure 4-17/7).\textsuperscript{66} Such a division finds a possible confirmation in the finds from the early seventh-century shipwreck from Yassi Ada where only the later type has been found.\textsuperscript{67} As it is, the specimen from Sucidava belongs to \textit{Hayes} type 2, dated to the later sixth century. As a matter of fact, most lamps with globules on the rim imported from Asia Minor or imitating this popular design found in the Danubian

\textsuperscript{64} Caričin Grad: Bjelajac, "La céramique et les lampes," 189, type V, pl. XXII/5. Yassi Ada: Vitelli, "Lamps", 190, L1, and fig. 9/2.

\textsuperscript{65} D. Tudor, "Sucidava III. Quatrième (1942), cinquième (1943) et sixième (1945) campagnes de fouilles et de recherches archéologiques dans la forteresse de Celei, département de Romanatj," \textit{Dacia} 11-12 (1945-1947), fig. 20/4.

\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Hayes}, 82.

\textsuperscript{67} Vitelli, "Lamps", 193, L12, and fig. 9-3.
provinces belong to Hayes type 2. Molds found at Halmyris in Scythia prove that the type was imitated and produced locally. It is, therefore, highly probable that the specimen from Sucidava did not come from Asia Minor but from a closer production center in the northern Balkans.

Another important category of lamps is constituted by original lamps imported from North Africa or imitations produced in Greece or in the Danubian region (Figure 4-6). A quick look at the map reveals the fact that North-African models found in barbaricum were almost as popular as the common "Danubian" types found in great numbers in the Byzantine provinces of the northern Balkans. North-African lamps type Hayes 2B/ Atlante X, most typical for the sixth century, have been found at Turda (Potaissa) (Figure 4-17/8), Alba-Iulia (Apulum) and Reșca (Romula), three former urban

---


69 Topoleanu, Ceramica, 211-4. Similar lamps from Caričin Grad, a sixth century Justinianic foundation, have been described as local imitations, for which see Bjelajac, "La céramique et les lampes," 188.

70 Many such lamps are Attic products, for which see Perlzweig, pl. 38 sq., or Corinthian, for which see Bronner, types XXVIII-XXXIII. Several such imitations were found in a villa urbana from Nea Anchialos in a context dated with coins from Justinian I, see P. Lazaridis, "Nea Anchialos," Archaiologikon Deltion 20 (1965), pl. 393B. Another lamp combining African and Anatolian motifs was produced in the region of Stobi, in Macedonia, see Glumac, "Glinene svetiljke," 216, n. 6. A number of locally-produced African imitations have been found at Novae, on the Lower Danube, for which see recently Dyczek, "Lamps of the 3rd-6th Century," 74. A mold for African lamps was found at Dinogétia, for which see I. Barnea, Les monuments paléochrétiennes de Roumanie (Vatican: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Christiana, 1977), 241.
centers of the Roman province of Dacia (Figure 4-20/5-6).\textsuperscript{71} North-African lamps are more often found in the Western Balkans,\textsuperscript{72} although a number of finds have been recorded at Tomis, Capidava, Dinogetia, Halmyris, Adamclisi, and Novae, some of them being local imitations (Figure 4-17/9).\textsuperscript{73} However, no direct parallels can be found between the type of lamps found in \textit{barbaricum} and the lamps from Scythia, which might indicate that the Western Black Sea region was not the main supplier of such items, but probably the Aegean or the Dalmatian coast.\textsuperscript{74} Nonetheless, in the central and western Balkans we find closer typological parallels, such as the African lamp type \textit{Atlante} X found at Caričin Grad in Dacia Mediterranea, which finds an excellent analogue at Koper (Capris), on the Adriatic coast. Moreover, it is closer to the lamps with \textit{Chi-Rho} (☧) insignia on the discus, the main type found north of the Danube.\textsuperscript{75} A lamp type \textit{Atlante} VIII A1a found at Tomis has a good analogy at Siscia (Sisak), which testifies once again to the importance of sea routes in the diffusion of North African lamps being imitated on a large scale in Greece throughout the sixth century. Many of the types commonly found in the Danube region have analogies at Delphi, where a late sixth century cemetery has produced a large quantity of well-preserved imitations of African lamps, for which see P. Petridis, \textit{La céramique proto-byzantine de Delphes: une production et son contexte} (Athens: Ecole française d’Athènes, 2010), 85-92.


\textsuperscript{72} For finds of African lamps in the Adriatic region, see Pröttel, \textit{Mediterrane Feinkeramikimporte}, 69-81; B. Vikić-Belančić, \textit{Antičke svjetiljke u Arheološkom Muzeju u Zagrebu} (Zagreb: Arheološki Muzej, 1976). For the distribution of African lamps type \textit{Atlante} VIII and X in the Danube region, see recently V. Părău, "La diffusione delle lucerne nordafricane dei sec. IV-VI D. C. nelle ex-provincie central e sud danubiane. La lucerna del tipo \textit{Atlante} VIII–X con chrismon," in \textit{Lychnological Acts} 2, 197-206, and pl. 135.


\textsuperscript{74} African lamps were being imitated on a large scale in Greece throughout the sixth century. Many of the types commonly found in the Danube region have analogies at Delphi, where a late sixth century cemetery has produced a large quantity of well-preserved imitations of African lamps, for which see P. Petridis, \textit{La céramique proto-byzantine de Delphes: une production et son contexte} (Athens: Ecole française d’Athènes, 2010), 85-92.

models. Original models imported in towns close to the sea coast were imitated in the Danube region or in the heart of the Balkans, where genuine imports were more difficult to procure. A perfect example is offered by two similar lamps, type *Atlante* X C2 with palm on the discus, one being a genuine import found at Dionysopolis on the Black Sea coast and the other a local imitation from Kozloduy, in Dacia Ripensis.

Well-known for their Christian symbolism, the African lamps brought to the former province of Dacia might be related to the long-distance circulation of Christian artifacts. A route from Italy or through the Adriatic is very probable, given the high density of finds in the western Balkans, as well as on the Middle Danube. The lamps could have traveled by sea with larger cargoes from North Africa, such as *spatheia* often found in the Adriatic region, and then redistributed on land routes and rivers to regions beyond the frontier. The lamps found in Scythia, on the other hand, were more easily brought via the Black Sea and the Aegean together with Greek imitations, such as the specimen found at Tomis. Lamps imitating North-African models are also present north of the

---


77 For both lamps, see Kuzmanov, 42, no. 302 and 303.

78 For possible routes of distribution see Părău, "La diffusione delle lucerne," pl. 136-140. For the role of the Adriatic in the diffusion of western imports, see V. Vidrih Perko, "Seaborne Trade Routes in the North-East Adriatic and their Connections to the Hinterland in the Late Antiquity," in *L'Adriatico dalla tarda antichità all'età carolingia*, ed. G. Broglio and P. Delogu (Rome: All'Insegna del Giglio, 2005), 49-77.

79 Barnea et al., *Culturna bizantină în România*, 169, n. 331. The image on the discus has been described as a rabbit but in fact it is a stag, a common depiction on African lamps type *Atlante* X C2. For a close parallel see Ennabli, *Lampes chrétiennes de Tunisie*, pl. XX/391. Imitations of this type have been found in Chersonesus, for which see Chrzanovski and Zhuravlev, *Lamps from Chersonesus*, 162-64, ns. 102-103.
Danube, at Drobeta, and further to the north at Sarmizegetusa. A route from the Western Black Sea was not the only way in which such objects could find their way north of the Danube, since they could have easily arrived directly from Greece or from one of the Danubian provinces.

Palestinian lamps are among the most exotic finds in the Lower Danube region, but also very desirable ones because of their connection to the Holy Land (Figure 4-7). Few such lamps are reported among finds from the Balkans, but it may well be that some are either misattributed or dated to an early period. Alexandru Diaconescu has re-dated the specimens found in barbaricum based on the typology established for lamps found in Syria-Palestine. Thus, two lamps found at Gherla and Ploiești belong to the so-called "candlestick" type produced in the Holy Land from the sixth century onward (Figure 4-17/10). A third lamp, found at Răcari, in the former Roman castrum, has a more problematic attribution (Figure 4-20/7-8). Although it has been assigned to the early "Jerash" type, the typological parallels from Palestine are less convincing.

80 Drobeta: Barnea et al., Cultura bizantină în România, 172, n. 353, very similar to a lamp from Athens, for which see Perlzweig, n. 2591. Sarmizegetusa: Diaconescu, "Lămpi târzii și paleobizantine," pl. IV/2a-b. A third Greek lamp was found at Apulum, being a typical product of Athens and Corinth, see Ibid., pl. VI/4a-c. Greek imitations after African lamps are also common in Bulgaria, for which see Kostova and Dobrev, "Roman, Late Roman, and Early Byzantine," pl. 121, and in Serbia, see J. C. Rubright, "Lamps from Sirmium in the Museum of Sremska Mitrovica," in Sirmium III. Archaeological Investigations in Syrmian Pannonia, ed. V. Popović and E. L. Ochsenschlager (Belgrade: The Archaeological Institute, 1973), pl. V/56.


82 Ibid., pl. VIII/1a-c.

83 T. Scholl, "The Chronology of Jerash Lamps: Umayyad Period," Archeologia 42 (1991): 65-84. Diaconescu associated the Răcari lamp with Scholl’s type IV, subgroup 2 (fig. 7), but the analogy is dubious since the type boasts handles ending with zoomorphic heads, impossible to verify in the case of the Răcari lamp whose handle is now missing. The pattern on the rim is also different. Finally, the dating of this type to the second half of the seventh century is yet another reason to look elsewhere for parallels, since it is highly unlikely that Umayyad lamps were exported north of the Danube in the late seventh century. The lamp from Răcari is in fact much closer to Kuzmanov type XXXII, who recognizes the
A certain degree of skepticism is also warranted by closer analogies from the Balkans, with similar "barge-shaped" lamps having been found at Karasura, Haskovo, Iambol, Deultum, and Beroe (Stara Zagora) in Bulgaria, but also in Dobrudja and southern Russia. The dating to the sixth century is not certain as they may well belong to an earlier period. Indeed, some of them might constitute local imitations of Syro-Palestinian late antique models in the shape of a boat with a tall and curved handle, although Anatolian influences may also be present in the decoration.

Handmade lamps have been largely neglected although they are an excellent indicator of the degradation of Roman life in urban centers of the early Byzantine provinces and an example of imitatio in the case of lamps produced in barbaricum (Figure 8). Indeed, handmade lamps have been found on the last phase of occupation at Caričin Grad, where a modified Roman brick was transformed into a makeshift lamp, and at Sacidava on the Danube where a handmade cup was used for this purpose. A third lamp, still in the form of a "Getic" cup, was found in a cremation grave from Nalbant in the northern part of Scythia. The decline of urban production toward the end of the sixth century is

---


85 For a recent typology, see Kostova and Dobreva, "Roman, Late Roman, and Early Byzantine," 164-66, with a dating spanning the entire Late Antique period.


probably responsible for the existence of such improvised lamps in the frontier provinces of the Balkans. As for the handmade lamps produced in Barbaricum, most of them are found in Wallachia east of the river Olt. An important contrast becomes apparent: imported lamps manufactured in various centers of the Empire concentrate in the former province of Dacia, while handmade lamps are most often found in Wallachia. All handmade lamps have been found in sunken-featured buildings in sixth-to-seventh-century contexts, none of which suggesting a particularly high social status.  

The lamps from Bratei, Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan (Figure 4-17/12), and Cândești have a similar shape and constitute attempts to imitate early Byzantine lamps. Interestingly, good analogies for these lamps can be found at Dunaújváros (Intercisa) and Kőlked-Feketekapu (Figure 4-17/11), in Avaria, while no such lamps can be found in-between, from Bratei to the Middle Danube, the demand for lamps being satisfied through imports from the Empire.  

Given the rather unprepossessing nature of the buildings in which handmade lamps have been found, their production can be explained as a need to find a convenient alternative to early Byzantine lamps, unavailable (or unaffordable) in barbaricum.

A few conclusions emerge from the survey of lamps found in barbaricum. The geographical distribution of the Balkan, or so-called Danubian, lamps indicates that in all cases the finds are coming from the territory of the former province of Dacia. Not a
single imported lamp has been found in the core areas of the Ipotești-Cândești and Botoșana cultures, which might suggest that lamps (which needed vegetable oil) were treated there as luxury items, rather than basic commodities, as was the case in frontier fortresses south of the Danube. In fact, with the exception of the Palestinian "candlestick lamp" found at Ploiești and the bronze lamp from Luciu, all other lamps concentrate in the former province of Dacia and most often in former urban centers, such as Sarmizegetusa, Potaissa, and Apulum. It has also been suggested that lamps should be associated mainly with Christian liturgy and the significance of light in Christian symbolism.\textsuperscript{90} Indeed, many lamps bear Christian symbols, especially the ones of North African inspiration and some of those produced in the Balkans. Nevertheless, a number of cheaper alternatives were available for liturgical purposes, so the lamp, a typical Byzantine import, must have possessed an important social value beyond its practical use or religious symbolism. The fact that few or no lamps are found in the regions east of the former province of Dacia does not necessarily disprove the existence of a Christian population in contact with the Empire. It may be that communities from this region used other types of artifacts to express their religious identity and to emulate the Roman way of life, as we shall soon find out.

Concerning the origin of the Byzantine lamps exported to \textit{Barbaricum}, one cannot be more precise than making a general attribution to one of the provinces adjacent to the Lower Danube. Indeed, some authors have suggested closer

\textsuperscript{90} Diaconescu, "Lămpi târzii și paleobizantine," 289.
connections to the province of Scythia, but such artifacts were probably more easily distributed through bridge-heads on the northern bank of the Danube, especially Sucidava, where a good variety of "Danubian" lamps have been found. Many African and Anatolian models were imitated locally and sometimes molds have been found as direct evidence of local production centers, but most of the time it is the local clay that betrays the practice of imitation along with a stylistic simplification or alteration of the original models. Nevertheless, North African and Palestinian lamps found in barbaricum, as well as the Coptic liturgical lamps made of bronze, stand a greater chance of being genuine long-distance imports, which testify to the existence of trading routes to the Western and Eastern Mediterranean, in which the former province of Dacia was still included. The Western connection was probably interrupted more rapidly, since after ca. 550 African Fine Ware becomes rare even on parts of the Dalmatian coast, a traditional recipient of African imports during Late Antiquity. This must have surely affected the supply of goods from the Western Mediterranean, which had been arriving north of the Danube probably through the mediation of intermediary trading ports in the western Balkans.

---

91 A. Madgearu, *Rolul creștinismului în formarea poporului român* (Bucharest: All, 2001), 78. Contra, Diaconescu, "Lămpi târzii și paleobizantine," 286, who argued that Scythia might be too far to exert a significant influence over the former province of Dacia.

92 Sucidava had been an important transit point for goods going north of the Danube since the fourth century, Poulter, *Nicopolis ad Istrum*, 42-43.

93 J.-P. Sodini, "The Transformation of Cities in Late Antiquity within the Provinces of Macedonia and Epirus," in *The Transition to Late Antiquity*, 330. A possible decline in production in North Africa is testified by the increased presence of eastern imports, such as LR1, for which see J. A. Riley, "The Coarse Pottery," in *Excavations at Sidi Khrelish, Benghazi (Berenice)*, ed. J. A. Lloyd, v. 2 (Tripoli: Department of Antiquities, 1979), 121, fig. 2. In central and southern Greece there seems to be a persistence of African imports as late as the seventh century, for which see recently Petridis, *La céramique protobyzantine*, 126-27.

4.2.3 Molds and Metallurgical Tools

The nature of metallurgical activity north of the Danube has long captured the attention of scholars trying to assess the cultural influence of the Empire in barbaricum. Molds in particular have been considered one of the most fascinating, yet unwieldy types of imports. Indeed, the very notion of import attached to molds is under serious doubt as many of them could have been produced outside the Empire, together with other metallurgical implements which are often found in association in archaeological contexts (Figure 4-9). It is imitatio rather than genuine import in many cases, with some of the items produced with the molds being of Byzantine inspiration, mostly small pieces of jewelry and ornaments (Figure 4-18/3). The technique itself, pseudo-granulation and lost-wax casting in particular, might have been borrowed from the Empire. Moreover, as we shall soon find out, many of the items were in fact produced for further "exporting" somewhere else in barbaricum. The task of the

postromană până la slavi (Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint, 2000), 80, arguing that the territory north of the Danube was isolated from the western world due to the presence of Gepids and later Avars.


researcher trying to make the most of the molds under study is to go beyond the mere
description of the objects as seen on the molds themselves and actually attempt to
trace them in the archaeological record. More often than not, objects resembling the
ones carved on a mold are completely unknown in the region where the mold was
found, which has important implications for our understanding both of the production
and the circulation of such items.

The question of craftsmen is also somewhat problematic, as many scholars
would have us believe that Byzantine itinerant craftsmen had a crucial role in the
metallurgical production in barbaricum. Much has been made of the account of
Procopius who suggested that many merchants and craftsmen were fleeing the country
because of the many abuses which reduced them to poverty. Leaving aside the fact that
the Secret History, a vitriolic Kaiserkritik of epic proportions, should rarely be taken at
face-value, Procopius does not even refer specifically to the Danube region, but to the
East:

And in the other cities practically the whole population found itself suddenly
reduced to begging. For the mechanics and the hand-workers were naturally
compelled to struggle with hunger, and many in consequence changed their
citizenship and went off as fugitives to the land of Persia.97

The account was conveniently truncated in an early seminal study and later adopted
uncritically to suggest that such craftsmen may be the ones responsible
for the presence of molds north of the Danube.98 Such itinerant craftsmen may
very well have operated north of the Danube, attracted by a larger demand for jewelry of
Byzantine inspiration or commissioned to produce certain types of items. The ethnicity

98 Teodorescu, "Centre meșteșugărești," 92, n. 50; Teodor, "Ateliers byzantins," 190; Ciupercă and Măgureanu, "Unele observații," 152.
of such craftsmen is, however, impossible to know in the absence of any solid evidence regarding their activity. There is reason to believe that local production was perhaps more important than the presence of itinerant specialists. Although the buildings where metallurgical implements have been uncovered look no different than the ordinary sunken-featured residences so common in barbaricum, the association of molds with crucibles, ladles, scrap metal, and specific tools such as tweezers and carvers point to the existence of local metallurgical activity. To be sure, there is less evidence of centralized production of jewelry in specialized workshops. Rather, it seems to be a household activity or at least not restricted to a single workshop in the community, judging by the fact that in settlements like the ones at Botoșana, Davideni, Seliște, Budureasca, and Zimne, metallurgical implements and molds in particular have been found in several residences.  

The notion that the presence of molds is essentially associated with the frontier region and a stronger influence of Byzantium is weakened or even altogether disproved by the presence of such artifacts on a huge geographical area from the Volga region to Central Europe. To be sure, there is a larger concentration of molds in the territories adjacent to the frontier, while molds used to produce certain objects, such as crosses, are usually found in this area. By contrast, a considerably smaller number of molds have been found in the Byzantine provinces of the Balkans, which begs the question of

---

whether metallurgical production using molds was an essentially "barbarian" technology. The answer must be negative, since many types of Byzantine jewelry and ornaments were being produced using the same technique, while production itself is well attested in towns like Sadovec, Caričin Grad, and Adamclisi.\textsuperscript{100} It may well be that molds, as part of organized imperial workshops, were carefully discarded or removed and are thus harder to trace in the archaeological record.

The few molds found in the Balkans offer precious clues to the connection between metallurgical activity on the frontier and what was transmitted beyond, in \textit{barbaricum}. There is in fact very little to connect the "fashions" in the two regions, as only a few of the items appearing on molds from the Empire can be found on molds from \textit{barbaricum}. The triangle-shaped pendant from the mold found in the late sixth century occupation level at Adamclisi in Scythia has good parallels at Budureasca 3, Bernashivka, and as far north as Loosi in Estonia (Figure 4-20/21-22),\textsuperscript{101} while the belt buckles and belt ornaments carved on the molds found at Caričin Grad resemble to some degree artifacts found in burial assemblages from Kerch and Lucistoe, although the fashion itself can also be traced in the Avar khaganate.\textsuperscript{102} The pyramidal earring pendants from a mold found near Oescus have good analogies in Early Avar


assemblages (earrings type Deszk) but also in the steppe north of the Black Sea.103
Similar connections with Avaria can be traced on the mold found accidentally at Gorna Sekirna, which boasts a model for earrings imitating the shape of twisted wires, with analogies at Kölked-Feketekapu.104 The granulated column pendants found on the mold from Argamum represent a widespread type of ornamentation found on molds across barbaricum (Figure 4-20/15-16). Pseudo-granulation, a typically Byzantine technique, can be found on very similar molds from Budureasca 4 (Figure 4-18-1/2), Cristuru, Bucharest - Străulești, Bernashivka (fig. 18/6) and in simplified forms on molds from Russia, dated from the sixth to the eleventh century.105 Finally, the mold for Maltese crosses from Sadovec represents a special case as both molds and actual crosses are found north of the Danube. Molds designed to produce Byzantine crosses have been found at Olteni, Celei, Izvoru Dulce, Davideni, Botoșana (fig. 18/4), Bucharest-Străulești, Sânmiclăuș, and Hansca.106 With two exceptions, all molds from this

---


category are found outside the former province of Dacia, which stands in sharp contrast with the distribution of Byzantine lamps with Christian motifs, very common on the territory of the former province and rather rare south and east of the Carpathians. However, it should be noted that the few molds found in a good archaeological context are not associated with any other Christian artifacts.

The molds, the finished products, as well as the typical metallurgical implements are not restricted to the frontier region and the near Barbaricum, but seem to have a lot in common with similar artifacts found on a very wide geographical area. The mold from Bucharest-Străulești designed to produce small granulations has clear analogies not only at Budureasca and Davideni, but also at Bernashivka in Ukraine and at Supruty and Kuzhendeevsky in Russia, where they have been found in graves applied on clothing and not on pieces of jewelry.\(^\text{107}\) The dating of such items is very loose as they are sometimes found in later medieval contexts showing the longevity of such ornaments, which should not be surprising due to their basic shape. The interesting file carved on a mold from Budureasca 5 has very good parallels both in Avaria at Vác-Kavicsbánya and at Zimne in Ukraine,\(^\text{108}\) while tweezers similar to the one from Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan have been found at Bancerovsko and Usugorsk in Russia.\(^\text{109}\) The rare occurrence of molds made of bone is recorded at Costești in Moldavia, but also

\(^{107}\) For Bucharest-Străulești, Budureasca, and Davideni, see above n. 105-106. Supruty and Kuzhendeevky: Tavlinceva, "K voprosu o metallicheskom," 112, fig. 3/1-3.


at Zimno and Pastyrske in Ukraine, while crucibles and ladles, some of which display extremely similar shapes, can be found in most early medieval metallurgical complexes in Central and Eastern Europe, from the Czech Republic, to the Baltic and the Upper Volga region.

Perhaps the most interesting observation resulting from the geographical distribution of metallurgical implements (Figure 4-9) is the fact that many of the more elaborate items produced with the molds have clear analogies in the Avar world. Several molds from Budureasca and the mold from Vadu Săpat were used to produce items such as punched appliqués, pendants, belt ornaments, and earring components, identifiable in the archaeological repertoire of the Early and Middle Avar milieu. In addition, some of the molds found east of the Carpathians, at Costești, Cucuteni, Răcoasa and Râdeni have recently been re-dated based on analogies with artifacts belonging to the Middle Avar period. What is then the explanation for the presence of molds used to produce objects of Avar inspiration but Byzantine technique? Molds from barbaricum as well as those from the frontier region of the Empire have a strong connection with the presence of troops and a militarized society. However, the fact that molds found in the extra-Carpathic region point to a strong connection with the Avar khaganate is a good indicator of a diminishing influence of the Empire in the territories north of the river, especially in the seventh century when the Danube ceased to be the political frontier of the Empire in the Balkans.


4.2.4 Brooches and Buckles

4.2.4.1 Fibulae with bent stem

Among the various imports of Byzantine origin brought to the lands north of the Danube during the long sixth century, fibulae are by far the most diverse group from a typological perspective. The fibula with bent stem and its derivation, the cast fibula with bent stem, have a long reputation of resisting any attempt at creating a coherent and universally accepted classification based on style, size, and chronology. The earlier type seems to be the fibula with bent stem which the German archaeologist Syna Uenze has rightly associated with the fourth-century fibula with bent stem typical for the Sântana de Mureş-Chernyakhov culture known from sites excavated north of the Danube. ¹¹² Although there are certain missing links between the two types, namely specimens from the fifth century, the fibula with bent stem typical for the Justinianic and post-Justinianic period in the Balkans has a number of constitutive similarities with the fourth century version that cannot be ignored. To be sure, there are at least two major differences between the fourth-century fibula with bent stem and its sixth-century counterpart. Unlike the early forms, the sixth-century type is larger and has a U-shaped stem, which along with other stylistic details, notwithstanding a chronologically sensitive archaeological context, where available, safely dates it to the sixth century. ¹¹³ The second major difference lies in the distribution of the two types, as the sixth century fibula with bent stem is no longer a creation of the lands north of the Danube frontier, but a typical product of the frontier fortresses acquired in barbaricum as a Roman

¹¹² Uenze, Die Spätantiken Befestigungen, 146-54.
import. Consequently, the overwhelming difference in the number of finds in the Balkans compared to the regions outside the Empire’s borders comes as no surprise (Figure 4-10).

The chronology of the fibulae with bent stem raises several problems for the archaeologist trying to narrow it down to a more precise interval (i.e. first or second half of the sixth century). In the past two decades, the number of finds has increased five times but this spectacular growth of the corpus is due less to archaeological excavations and more to the intensive use of metal detectors, which often leaves museum curators with the frustrating task of making sense of important artifacts with no archaeological context to give them historical meaning. Even so, there are sufficient datable finds to allow for a tentative chronological attribution for the main categories of fibulae with bent stem.\textsuperscript{114} Syna Uenze has advanced a date in the first half of the sixth century for the fibula with bent stem, which was replaced in the second half of the century by its cast version.\textsuperscript{115} However, evidence from various regions of the Balkans, the Crimea, and also from \textit{barbaricum} clearly suggests a continuous use of fibulae with bent stem throughout the sixth century and perhaps even more intensely in the second half of that century. Unfortunately, there are no coin-dated fibula finds, although in at least two cases, Nea Anchialos in Macedonia and Histria in Scythia, fibulae with bent stem have been found in proximity of coins struck for Justin II (565-578), but no stratigraphical correlation can be made between the artifacts to secure the dating to the second half of the sixth century.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{114} F. Curta and A. Gândilă, "Sixth-Century Fibulae with Bent Stem," \textit{Starinar}, forthcoming, fig. 29.

\textsuperscript{115} Uenze, \textit{Die Spätantiken Befestigungen}, 149-51.

\textsuperscript{116} Nea Anchialos: Lazaridis, "Nea Anchialos," 326-334; pl. 394 β. For a discussion of the coin finds see
In a third case, a fibula with bent stem was found near a house in the Sadovec-Golemannovo kale fort, an area which also produced coin finds, the latest of which are issues of Justin II, but once again no secure correlation can be made between the fibula and the coins. Nevertheless, in several cases the archaeological context indirectly suggests a later dating than the one proposed by Uenze. Such a case is the assemblage in grave 112 in Stari Kostolac which includes the remains of a wooden bucket with iron handle and hoops, a practice unknown before the settlement of the Avars in Pannonia (ca. 570). At Bucharest - Militari a fibula with bent stem was found inside a sunken-featured building in association with fragments of handmade pottery typical for the second half of the sixth or the early seventh century. To be sure, there are also clear examples of specimens produced in the first half of the sixth century such as the fibula found in grave 155 in Suuk Su (Crimea). The fibula was associated with two bow fibulae of Zaseckaia’s class IVб2 dated to the first half of the sixth century. In the Balkans, a fibula from grave 100 in Stari Kostolac was associated with a shield-on-
-tongue buckle, which also suggests a dating within the first half of the sixth century.\textsuperscript{121}

Only \textit{ca.} ten percent of the total number of finds are from outside the Empire. This does not seem to affect the distribution of fibulae with bent stem in \textit{barbaricum} which covers a very large area from Lake Balaton to the Middle Dnieper. It does translate, however, in a much reduced variety of types compared to the Balkans where we encounter all variants and sub-variants of fibulae with bent stem. Out of twelve classes identified in a recent classification, only four are present in \textit{barbaricum}.\textsuperscript{122}

Whether or not the preference for certain classes reflects fashions outside the Empire is a matter of speculation, but a comparative analysis of the typological parallels among finds from \textit{barbaricum} and the Balkans, respectively, can shed some light on possible routes of distribution and areas of contact between the two worlds.

The largest category of finds belongs to the group of fibulae with the bow wider than the stem, with zig-zag ornament, which is, unsurprisingly, one of the most numerous classes of fibulae with bent stem from the Balkans. Most analogies are with finds from the provinces of Moesia II and Scythia, in the north-eastern Balkans. The more distant finds from the Dnieper region have clear analogies in the two frontier provinces. The specimen from Zvonets'ke (Figure 4-19/1) has a close parallel at Zdravkovec in Moesia II, the latter displaying surprisingly crude craftsmanship compared to the fibula from \textit{barbaricum}.\textsuperscript{123} The fibula from Igren', in the same Dnieper

\textsuperscript{121} Ivanišević et al., \textit{Les nécropoles de Viminacium}, 160. For the dating of shield-on-tongue buckles, see J. Cseh et al. \textit{Gepidische Gräberfelder im Theissgebiet II} (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 2005), 154.

\textsuperscript{122} For a recent typology see Curta and Gândilă, "Sixth-Century Fibulae."

region, has a common decoration found on several specimens from Scythia and Moesia II (Adamclisi, General Kantardzhievo, and Golesh), but also from Bucharest, north of the Danube. No precise details are known regarding the archaeological context, except for the fibula found at Adamclisi in the sixth-century settlement and the specimen from Bucharest found inside a clay oven in a sunken-featured building. Yet another site find is the iron fibula from Davideni, which has a good stylistic parallel at Pet Mogili in Moesia II, although the latter was made of copper alloy.

As we move closer to the frontier the parallels of finds from barbaricum come to include provinces west of Moesia II, Dacia Ripensis in particular, but also Dacia Mediterranea. Bucharest seems to have been at a crossroads in this respect, as a second fibula found in a neighboring settlement has good analogies at Stari Kostolac, Aquis, and Korbovo in the Iron Gates region, but also at Sucidava, the most important Byzantine bridge-head on the left bank of the Danube. A number of specimens of this class have been found at Pernik in western Bulgaria, which suggests that this particular variant was mainly produced in the diocese of Dacia. Interestingly, the specimen found in a female grave at Szolnok on the Middle Danube, the westernmost find of
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fibulae with bow wider than the stem and zig-zag ornament from *Barbaricum*, has no parallels in the Iron Gates region, being somewhat similar to a specimen from Venchan in Moesia II.\footnote{I. Bóna and M. Nagy, *Gepidische Gräberfelder am Theissgebiet I.* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 2002), 220; 376 pl. 102.8. Kharalambieva, “Dva tipa kusnoantichni,” 33, 34, 37 and 39; pl. III/6.}

The second largest group of finds from *barbaricum* is represented by fibulae with bows and stems of similar width. This is one of the most interesting groups with at least two finds having no close analogies in the Empire, the specimen from Hradyz’ke (Figure 4-19/2) on the middle Dnieper and the one from Keszthely in Hungary. The latter’s bow is somewhat similar with the fibulae from Kramolin at the border between Moesia II and Dacia Ripensis and Suuk Su in Crimea, but the connection is not secure and in fact both finds may have been produced in *barbaricum*.\footnote{Hradyz’ke: L. M. Rutkivs'ka, “Arkheologicheskie pamiatniki IV-VI vv. v raione Kremenchugskogo moria (Ukraina),” *Slovenská Archeológia* 27 (1979): no. 2, 358; 341 fig. 22/9. Keszthely: R. Müller, “Sági Károly temetőfeltárása a Keszthely-fenékpuszta erőd déli fala előtt,” *Zalai Múzeum* 9 (1999): 158 and 173 fig. 4/23.1. Kramolin: Koicheva and Kharalambieva, “Fibuli ot istoricheskiia,” 70; pl. VI/4. Suuk Su: Repnikov, "Nekotorye mogil'niki," 116-17; 146 fig. 111.} In addition, two fibulae found in Moldavia have loose analogies in the Balkans, the specimen from Davideni being a basic one with no decoration, very common in Moesia II, while the fibula from Moldoveni finds its closest parallel at Pernik in western Bulgaria.\footnote{Davideni: Mitrea, *Comunități sătești la est*, 121-122; 326 fig. 66/6. Moldoveni: I. Mitrea, “Cîteva fibule romano-bizantine descoperite în Moldova,” *SCIV* 24 (1973), no. 4, 663 and 665; 664 fig. 1/1. Pernik: Liubenova, “Selishteto ot rimskata,” 168-70; 171 fig. 110/5.} Interestingly, the fibula from Davideni was found in a sunken-featured building together with amphora fragments and a ladle, usually associated with metallurgical production, all suggesting that the owner had close ties to the Byzantine world.
The third class of fibulae with bent stem found in barbaricum features a trapeze-shaped stem as its most distinctive feature. Perhaps not accidentally such finds are most common in the Dnieper region, at Volos'ke and Hradyz'ke, both with parallels in north-eastern Bulgaria.\textsuperscript{131} A third specimen was found at Poian in Transylvania (Figure 4-19/3), somewhat resembling the shape of a specimen from the L'viv region in Ukraine and another one from Gabrovo, south of the Danube.\textsuperscript{132} The fibula from Poian is also important for establishing the chronology of this variant, being found in a house together with hand-made pottery and fragments of clay pans, which have been dated to the second half of the sixth century.\textsuperscript{133}

Finally, the last category of fibulae with bent stem found beyond the Empire's frontier displays a triangular bow section, which is also one of the most conspicuous similarities with the fourth-century fibula with bent stem. Only one such find has been recorded so far, at Kavetchina on the Dniester (Figure 4-19/4).\textsuperscript{134} The iron fibula from Kavetchina stands out as the longest known fibula of its class,\textsuperscript{135} but its basic shape, with no decoration, resembles several specimens from Bulgaria and Serbia, many of which, however, have been found on sites located west of Moesia II, the main supplier of fibulae with bent stem in barbaricum.


\textsuperscript{132} Gabrovo: Koicheva and Kharalambieva, "Fibuli ot istoricheskii," 69, fig. II/4.

\textsuperscript{133} Curta, \textit{The Making of the Slavs}, 296.

\textsuperscript{134} L. V. Vakulenko and O. M. Prykhodniuk, \textit{Slavianskie poselenii I tys. n.e. u s. Sokol na Srednem Dnestr} (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1984), 82 and 57 fig. 32/9.

\textsuperscript{135} Curta and Gândilă, "Sixth-Century Fibulae," forthcoming.
Prolonged production and circulation of such fibulae beyond the first half of the sixth century have important implications for their presence in barbaricum at a time when the northern Balkans became a major theater of military operations. Despite the fact that many of the finds have no known archaeological context, their association mainly with hilltop sites is unquestioned. Although the late fibulae with bent stem may have been fashionable in the Balkans as early as the first decades of the sixth century, the growing militarization of the frontier provinces in the later sixth century and the connection between fibulae with bent stem and frontier fortresses and settlements offers the necessary explanation for their popularity, which lasted until the fall of the Danube frontier in the first decades of the seventh century. The few finds with a chronologically relevant context from the lands north of the Danube suggest that fibulae with bent stem continued to be brought to barbaricum in the second half of the century. Their production may have ceased, or at least diminished, after the cast fibula with bent stem started to become more fashionable in the second half of the sixth century. However, there is sufficient reason to believe that both types were contemporary, if not equally popular, during the troubled decades announcing the end of the Byzantine domination on the Danube.

4.2.4.2 Cast fibulae with bent stem

The cast fibula with bent stem is often named "early Byzantine," "Roman-Byzantine," Danubian-Byzantine," or "cast fibula with fake spiral" (gegossene Fibel mit Scheinumwicklung). Indeed, its name in the literature derives from the fact that it is most often found in the frontier region of the northern Balkans, being a typical product of the military forts on the Danube and one of the most popular types of brooches in barbaricum as well (Figure 4-11). Establishing a firm typology and identifying production
centers have been the main objectives of archaeologists working with the cast fibulae with bent stem. Syna Uenze was the first to notice the heavy concentration of finds in the area of the Iron Gates of the Danube which pointed to an important production center in the region.\textsuperscript{136} This hypothesis was confirmed by the publication of the casts found in the Theodora Tower of the Late Roman fort in Drobota, which Adrian Bejan identified as an important production center on the northern bank of the Danube.\textsuperscript{137} The existence of such production centers north of the river might explain the popularity gained by this type of fibula in \textit{barbaricum}, although the prisoners taken from the provinces of the Balkans might have also contributed to its significant presence beyond the frontier.\textsuperscript{138}

However, a growing body of finds from the last decades has contradicted the earlier hypothesis that the cast fibulae with bent stem originated in the borderlands between Moesia II and Dacia Ripensis. Many finds from northern and northeastern Bulgaria and especially two specimens with unfiled edges from the region of Shumen led Anna Kharalambieva to the justified conclusion that such fibulae were in fact produced in several centers of the frontier provinces.\textsuperscript{139} A number of finds from central


\textsuperscript{139} A. Kharalambieva, "Production of Dress Ornaments in the Fortresses and Small Settlements in North Bulgaria during the Period from the 5th till the 7th Century AD," in \textit{The Roman and Late Roman City. The International Conference (Veliko Turnovo 26-30 July 2000)}, ed. L. Ruseva-Slokoska, R. T. Ivanov, and V. Dinchev (Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov", 2002), 393-97.
Bulgaria, as well as a mold designed to produce cast fibulae with bent stem found at Caričin Grad give additional weight to Kharalambieva's argument.\textsuperscript{140}

Due to the lack of standardization in the production of this type of fibula there is no consensus regarding the precise criteria for establishing a firm typology, and in fact none is completely satisfactory.\textsuperscript{141} Adrian Bejan distinguished four typological variants on the basis of stem decoration, while Đorđe Janković based his typology on the section of the bow as well as the length of the fibula.\textsuperscript{142} Unfortunately, Janković's classification is based mainly on the specimens found at Aquis (Prahovo) where he distinguished between fibulae produced locally and "barbaric" imitations. Equally limited is Dan G. Teodor's typology based solely on specimens found in \textit{barbaricum}, thus ignoring the far larger number of finds from the Danubian provinces.\textsuperscript{143} A more nuanced classification was attempted by Anna Kharalambieva who had access to the growing number of finds from north-eastern Bulgaria. Her five variants of cast fibulae with bent stem were based mainly on the shape of the bow: rectangular, trapeze, triangular, and semicircular and a peculiar type of stem ending in the shape of a cross.\textsuperscript{144} Igor Gavritukhin’s recent classification goes back to the criteria employed by Janković, using the section of the bow and the length of the fibula. By such means he distinguished three series named Drobeta, Varna, and Golemannovo, respectively, in order to account for three areas of


\textsuperscript{141} For an ample critique see recently, F. Curta and A. Gândilă, "Too Much Typology, Too Little History: A Critical Approach to the Classification and Interpretation of Cast Fibulae with Bent Stem, \textit{AB} 15, n. 3 (2011): 51-81.

\textsuperscript{142} Janković, "Pozdneantičnie fibuli VI-VII vekov," 173.


Finally, in a recent article, Andrei Măgureanu rejected previous typologies as based on inconsistent criteria and instead favored a classification entirely and solely based on decoration, thus distinguishing no less than fifteen groups.\footnote{Măgureanu, "Fibulele turnate romano-bizantine," 100-11.}

A refined chronology of the production and use of such fibulae is one of the most important results to come out of successive attempts to create a coherent typology. Syna Uenze has long established a direct connection between the sixth-century cast fibula with bent stem and the early fibula with bent stem, the latter being a dress accessory frequently found in assemblages of the third- to-fourth-century Săntana de Mureş-Chernyakhov culture.\footnote{Uenze, “Gegossene Fibeln,” 483.} As we have seen, such fibulae continued to be produced in the sixth century, and in all probability they were contemporary with cast fibulae. Indeed, most datable assemblages with cast fibulae with bent stem indicate a date within the second half of the sixth century, which seems to have been the "golden age" of such fibulae. Although it was supposed that production ceased around 600, Andrei Măgureanu has extended the chronology of the cast fibulae with bent stem into the first three decades of the seventh century, based on the finds from Kölked-Feketekapu. Such a proposition needs further confirmation in order to gain full credibility, especially since no evidence exists of cast fibulae with bent stem in well-
dated assemblages in the lands still under imperial control in the early seventh century. Moreover, while the presence of such fibulae in seventh century assemblages seems to suggest that they were still in use, their production in the northern Balkans was brought to an end by the collapse of the frontier in several stages from the last decade of the sixth century to the beginning of the seventh. Unfortunately, there is no way of refining the chronology at the level of variation in shape, length and decoration of the cast fibulae with bent stem. The largest group is represented by fibulae with no decoration on the bow or foot, which seems to be the standard type and possibly the longest in production. Local fashions seem to have been responsible for the appearance of several types of decoration on the bow and/or foot, some of which can be localized with some precision based on the geographic distribution of finds, but their exact chronology is impossible to determine.\textsuperscript{148}

While typological debates remain important as a tentative foundation for interpreting future finds, they are only marginal for our purposes here. They will be used only to identify those types that do not appear in \textit{barbaricum} as well as to highlight certain geographical patterns of distribution and the extent to which they differ from the situation observed in the Danubian provinces. Ultimately, there is no certainty that the order brought by modern scholars into the wide variety of types and sub-types and their subsequent distribution on a map reflect with any accuracy the intentions of sixth-century producers and users of cast fibulae with bent stem. One of the most interesting cast fibulae with bent stem found in \textit{barbaricum} is that from Davideni, which belongs to the group of fibulae with human faces on the bow (Figure 4-20/10). The find has been

\textsuperscript{148} Măgureanu, "Fibulele turnate romano-bizantine," 111-13.
interpreted as a badge of Christian identity under the assumption that the human faces
are portraits of saints. The prototype may indeed have been designed to portray
religious images but the symbolism was lost on many such fibulae which display a very
schematic decoration, such as the one from Chornivka in Ukraine, a more distant find
from barbaricum than the one from Davideni.149 Indeed, the fibula from Davideni might
have actually been produced in the frontier provinces of the Balkans, as the closest
analogies come from Pernik, where no less than four specimens of this type have been
found.150 That the fibula from Davideni had religious meaning cannot be completely
ruled out, but the archaeological context of house 51 where it was found in association
with fragments of wheel- and hand-made pottery, is not explicitly Christian. In addition,
no fibulae with cross-shaped foot have been found so far in barbaricum proper although
some may have been found on the northern bank of the Danube in the Iron Gates
area.151

Fibulae with a rectangular section of the bow are very common in the northern
Balkans especially in the provinces of Scythia and Moesia Secunda, but are rarely
found in barbaricum. One of the two known specimens in barbaricum is the one found
in house 25 from Borniş (Figure 4-19/5), in Moldavia together with a belt buckle of the
Sucidava class, typical of military assemblages from the frontier region, suggesting a
higher status of the owner.152 It is not improbable that the owner of the fibula from

149 Gavritukhin, "Fibuly vizantiiskogo," 239-40; 250 fig. 6/1.
150 Liubenova, "Selishteto ot rimskata," 172 fig. 112/4-7; 173 fig. 113/1-4.
151 D. Tănase and M. Mare, "Piese de port şi de podoabă din secolele III-VII în colecţia Pongrácz.
152 R. Popovici, "Două piese vestimentare din secolele VI-VII descoperite la Borniş-Neamţ," AM 12
(1988), 249-250; 250 fig. 1/1. The other specimen was found very far from the frontier, at Bukhlichskii
Borniş was a mercenary involved in the numerous military conflicts in the Danube region in the second half of the sixth century. The shape of the bow resembles specimens such as the ones found at Ibida and Vrenchan, but it is clearly an imitation produced in *barbaricum* with modifications like the absence of the fake spiral and the rectangular shape of the bent stem. Imitation seems to have been ordinary practice in *barbaricum*. The specimens from Bârlăleşti (Figure 4-19/6) and Zvonets'ke display multiple striations on the foot, a type of decoration produced only outside the Empire as no analogies are known so far from the imperial provinces of the Balkans. In that respect the fibula from Zvonets'ke comes closer to the genuine specimens from the Balkans due to the presence of the fake spiral which is differentiated from the ornamentation of the foot. In fact, the fibula from Bârlăleşti, more precisely the shape of its foot, resembles another imitation from *barbaricum*, the iron fibula with bent stem (not cast) from Davideni. It is possible that imitations were occasionally made after earlier local imitations, closer to home, rather than after new fashions from south of the Danube.

Fibulae with a semicircular section of the bow belong to the type most commonly found in the frontier region, with a correspondingly significant presence in *barbaricum* in a wide geographical area from the Middle Danube to the middle Dnieper region. Indeed, two fibulae have been found in Kölked in burial assemblages. One of them is a child burial (grave 492, cemetery A), the fibula being associated with bronze and iron chains

Khutor, near Petrikov, Mozyr region (Belarus), for which see V. S. Viargei, "Poseleniia prazhskoi kul'tury Belorusskogo Poles’ia," in *Problemy slavianskoi arkeologii*, ed. by Valentin V. Sedov (Moscow: Institut Arkeologii RAN, 1997), 35-36; 35 fig. 2/3.


154 Mitrea, *Comunităţi sânteşti la est*, 329 fig. 68/1.
as well as two silver earrings and glass beads with eye-shaped inlays. The second, a burial of a female, has a rich inventory including a silver fibula of the Cividale class, typical for the early seventh century, earrings, belt mounts, and strap ends, all made of silver. A good parallel for this practice can be found in the province of Scythia, where a child burial from Piatra Frecăței (grave E143) produced a pair of cast fibulae with bent stem in association with two silver earrings with star-shaped pendants and a large number of glass and lead beads (Figure 4-19/7). Three fibulae with a semicircular section have been found east of the Carpathians at Hansca, Borșeni, and Bacău, the latter being found in a typical association for the late sixth century, with handmade pottery and clay pans. No perfect analogies can be found south of the Danube, although their shapes are somewhat similar to many of the cast fibulae with semicircular section of the bow found in the frontier provinces at Novae, Kapitan Dimitrovo, or

155 A. Kiss, Das awarenzeitlich-gepidische, 132; 503 pl. 89/492.3; A. Kiss, Das awarenzeitliche Gräberfeld in Kőlked-Feketekapu B (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum/Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Régészeti Intézete, 2001), 35; pl. 30/40. An iron fibula of this type was found in Budapest, still in a burial assemblage, for which see M. Nagy, Awarenzeitliche Gräberfelder im Stadtgebiet von Budapest (Budapest Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum - MTA Régészeti Intézete, 1998), 29; pl. 33/21. A cast fibula with zig-zag ornament on the bow has been found at Hódmezővásárhely, associated with a belt buckle with rectangular plate with embossed decoration, for which see Bóna and Nagy, Gepidische Gräberfelder, 45; 346 pl. 72/2.

156 A. Petre, La romanité en Scythie Mineure (IIe-VIIe siècles de notre ère). Recherches archéologiques (Bucharest: AIESEE, 1987), 79 and pl. 145/239d. The association of glass beads with cast fibulae with bent stem is also documented in the large cemetery at Sărata Monteou (grave 763). Two other graves produced such fibulae, in one case, a cremation burial, the cast fibula with bent stem being found together with unidentifiable fragments of other fibulae, for which see U. Fiedler, Studien zu Gräberfeldern des 6. bis 9. Jahrhunderts an der unteren Donau (Bonn: Habelt, 1992), 80-83, figs. 11/8, 11/11, and 11/16.

Accres (Cape Kaliakra) (Figure 4-19/8).\textsuperscript{158} The fibula from Hansca has a closer parallel at Volos'ke, on the lower Dnieper, and could point to a connection between the two regions, since the fibulae from Bârlăleşti and Zvonets'ke also display major similarities.\textsuperscript{159}

Surprisingly, most cast fibulae with bent stem found in \textit{barbaricum} do not find their closest parallels in the Iron Gates area, which was initially considered to be the main area of production, but in the north-eastern Balkans, in the provinces of Moesia II and Scythia. This distribution also explains the larger number of finds in Moldavia, a region with an easier access to goods from the two Danubian provinces. It is no accident that frontier forts defending these provinces also produced the largest quantity of "non-Roman" hand-made ceramics, often attributed to outside populations, Slavs in particular, and dated to the second half of the sixth century and the beginning of the seventh. Since the golden age of the production and distribution of cast fibulae with bent stem seems to have been the second half of the sixth century, this dovetails nicely with other categories of finds. It suggests that the movement of mercenaries recruited from \textit{barbaricum} to man the garrisons on the Lower Danube may have been responsible for the distribution of cast fibulae with bent stem in the region east of the Carpathians.

\textbf{4.2.4.3 Sixth-to-Seventh-Century Bow Fibulae}

The stylistic variety of the Byzantine fibulae with bent stem which created so many problems to archaeologists trying to establish a firm typology turns into nightmare in the case of the so-called "Slavic" bow fibulae, whose diversity defies any attempt to


\textsuperscript{159} Prikhodniuk, \textit{Pen'kovskaia kul'tura}, 156; 142 fig. 74/9.
create a universally accepted classification. Given that additional finds have done nothing but increase that confusion, it is not surprising that the most influential classification is also the oldest. Joachim Werner's typology is based on the shape of the terminal lobe, either a human face or an animal head, and the firm conviction that the bow fibulae should be considered an ethnic badge of the early Slavs. For all its methodological shortcomings, Werner's typology is still employed by historians and archaeologists as a common foundation for further discussion of the bow fibulae, most of whom depart from Werner's system of classification to create a new typological arrangement no less subject to methodological pitfalls and arbitrary criteria. To be sure, Werner's classification as well as his interpretative framework came under attack soon after publication, but serious attempts to replace it have been made only in the past twenty years. Entire dissertations have been devoted to this topic by Liudmil Vagalinski and Christina Katsougiannopoulou, while Florin Curta has embarked on redefining each of Werner's classes in a series of articles. Despite the great efforts of
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Balkan historians to bring order to a very large and exasperatingly diverse body of finds, general consensus is yet to be reached.¹⁶⁴

Two major historical issues are at stake, aside from the taxonomical inclinations of archaeologists: the chronology and the ethnic attribution of the sixth-to-seventh century bow fibulae. Much of the debate surrounds the cultural links between the groups of fibulae found in the Dnieper region, the Crimea, the areas north of the Danube, and Eastern Prussia, a problem beyond the scope of this enquiry which aims to establish the nature of the relations between Byzantium and barbaricum before the fall of the Danube frontier. Nevertheless, the origin of the so-called Slavic bow fibulae, as well as their limited presence south of the Danube (compared to the north), raises some important questions related to the new fashions developing in the frontier region during the long sixth century (Figure 4-12). One of the issues is the stylistic origin of the "Slavic" bow fibula, which is clearly not an original creation of the sixth century. It is generally accepted that the late bow fibula derives from the East Germanic fibula of the late fifth century, with semicircular head and terminal lobes, itself depending on previous shapes combining Gothic (Chernyakhov) and Roman provincial elements. Its "Slavic" counterpart is no less a mix of "barbaric" and early Byzantine elements, which has led...

some scholars to conclude that the Crimea was a major center for the production of such fibulae, regardless of whether the Crimean Goths played a role in the creation of this type.\textsuperscript{165} Alternatively, it has been suggested that the main centers for the production of such fibulae should be located south of the Danube, based on the production of the earlier "Germanic" type in the frontier region, as well as the typical early Byzantine decoration patterns on some "Slavic" types, the naturalistic human faces in particular.\textsuperscript{166} Indeed, bow fibulae of a superior craftsmanship, which are often gilded, have been found in the Balkans at Lezhë, Liuliakovo, and Istanbul, all belonging to Werner's class IB. Such specimens are also recorded in \textit{barbaricum} (Figure 4-19/9), the most spectacular being the large fibula from Coșovenii de Jos, close to the Danube.\textsuperscript{167} In the absence of molds or workshops as direct evidence for the production of such dress accessories in the Balkans, stylistic criteria as well as finds of bow fibulae of a higher artistic complexity, of which subsequent "Slavic" types might have derived, remain the only criteria for attributing their origin to early Byzantine production centers in the Danube region. Out of the entire corpus of sixth- and seventh-century bow fibulae, only ca. fifteen percent have been found south of the Danube, and indeed the highest proportion is noted in the case of the types with human masks on the appendix, whose production was often located in the Balkans. By contrast, the production of bow fibulae in \textit{barbaricum} can be show with certainty after the find of prototypes at Felnac,


\textsuperscript{166} Petre, "Contribuția atelierelor romano-bizantine," 267-75; Teodor, "Fibule digitate din secolele VI-VII," 123.

Bucharest-Tei, and in Banat and especially after the spectacular find of 64 molds in a building from Bernashivka, one of which was designed to produce a type of bow fibula so far unknown among finds (Figure 4-18/5).168

Chronology is perhaps the only chance of bringing some order to the larger corpus of bow fibulae, given that their stylistic variation prevents any classification based on shape and artistic style.169 Unfortunately, more than half of the total number of bow fibulae found in Eastern Europe lacks any archaeological context. Being one of the artifacts which survived the great transformations of the early seventh century, which marked the Byzantine retreat from the Lower Danube, such a historical event cannot be used as a chronological benchmark for dating the "Slavic" bow fibulae. In addition, fibulae belonging to the same class are often found in different chronological contexts, i.e. before and after the fall of the Danube frontier. To make matters worse, each bow fibula is unique, with no identical pairs and therefore any chronological arrangement based on Werner's classes, or any classification for that matter, is difficult. For the same reasons, the usual method of extrapolating a secure dating of one specimen from a class in order to date the entire class cannot be employed in the case of "Slavic" bow fibulae. Analyzing each context on its own terms is perhaps the only acceptable course of action, even if the approach is not going to be completely satisfactory for answering broad questions regarding this category of artifacts. Given that many bow fibulae found
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168 E. A. Shablavina and B. S. Szmoniewski, "The Forming Model of the Kertch Type Finger-Shaped fibula," Sprawozdania Archeologiczne 58 (2006): fig. 5; Vinokur, Slov'ians'kyi iuveliry, 57, fig. 18.

169 In his 1950 contribution Werner dated all "Slavic" bow fibulae to the seventh century, but later he allowed for an earlier dating going back to the second half of the sixth century, for which see J. Werner, "Neues zur Frage des slawischen Bügelfibeln aus süd-osteuropäischen Ländern," Germania 38 (1960): 114-20. A more radical chronology was suggested by Uwe Fiedler based on similarities between the late fifth century "Germanic" bow fibulae and "Slavic" bow fibulae, which Fiedler dated to the sixth century, see Fiedler, Studien zu Gräberfeldern, 101.
south of the Danube are accidental or stray finds, there is no certainty that they had
been produced or worn before the Empire lost its administrative control over the
northern Balkans. To be sure, many of the "Slavic" bow fibulae found in a clear
archaeological context south of the Danube were almost certainly lost or deposited after
the fall of the *limes* in the Balkans (*ca* 615). Such is the case of the fibula type I B found
in grave 36 and the fibula type I C from the grave 32 at Lezhë in Albania, a cemetery
dated to the middle and especially the second half of the seventh century. A strikingly
similar specimen was found at Dubovac in Serbia, unfortunately a stray find, which
might also date from this period.\(^{170}\) The pair of fibulae class I C from grave 28 at Kruje,
also from Albania, can be dated to the same period based on its association with a
buckle of the Corinth class.\(^{171}\) A close analog is the fibula found accidentally at
Căprioara in northern Dobrudja (Figure 4-19/10), which might be contemporary with the
pair of fibulae from Kruje.\(^{172}\) The gilt fibula from Liuliakovo in Bulgaria resembles the
one probably found in Istanbul and by extension with the spectacular fibula from
Coșovenii de Jos, found together with silver earrings with star-shaped pendants, typical
for the seventh century.\(^{173}\) An even later dating should be accepted for the two class I C
fibulae from the hoard found at Kamenovo in northern Bulgaria, which also included a

and 21/2; D. Dimitrijević "O etničkim problemima Vojvodine u vreme doseljenja Slovena," in *Simpozijum
"Predslavenski etnički elementi na Balkanu u etnogenezi južnih Slovena", održan 24-26. oktobra 1968 u
Mostaru, ed. A. Benac (Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, 1969), 88 and fig. 1.
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\(^{173}\) S. Mikhailov, "Die Bügelfibeln in Bulgarien und ihre historische Interpretation," in *Archäologie als
Geschichtswissenschaft. Studien und Untersuchungen*, ed. J. Herrmann (Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1977),
317-18 and pl. 7; J. Werner, "Neues zur Frage des slawischen Bügelfibeln aus süd-osteuropäischen
pair of fibulae class I F, the only ones of this type found in the Danube region, but also a
strap end with scrollwork decoration, most typical for the Late Avar period (after
700). To be sure, an equally large number of fibulae can be dated with some certainty
before the fall of the Danube frontier. No doubt the safest dating is that of the I H fibula
found during excavations in the Danubian fortress of Iatrus, in the building 66/23N,
together with a sixth-century coin, whose exact dating is unfortunately unspecified in the
publication. The excavators have dated the complex to the last phase of the fortress
which also covers the first two decades of the seventh century. In addition, the pair of I
H fibulae found in the inhumation burial B 42 at Piatra Frecăței on the Danube has been
recently dated to the sixth century, based on the association with copper-alloy bracelets
typical for this period. A similar dating can be advanced for the fibula found in an
inhumation burial at Tulcea in northern Scythia, which was found together with a
ceramic pitcher and nine amber beads. Another coin-dated fibula was found at
Dervent, close to the Danube, having a terminus post quem 570/1, but the
stratigraphical association between the two artifacts is not secure. It belongs to
Werner’s class II A, as do a few other finds from the same region, the three stray finds
from Somova (Figure 4-20/11) and the specimen found during archaeological

I F was also found in an unknown location in Bulgaria, S. Mikhailov, “Rannosrednověkovní fibuly v
Bulgarii,” IAI 24 (1961): 43 and 41 fig. 3/1.

175 J. Herrmann, "Die archäologischen Forschungen des Zentralinstituts für Alte Geschichte und
44/b.

176 A. Petre, "Predvaritel'nye svedeniia v sviazi s khronologii megol'nika v Piatra Frecăței," Dacia 6
(1962): 226 fig. 12/1-b/1; F. Curta, "Werner's class I H," 67-68.

177 G. Simion, "Un nouveau groupe de fibule digitales découvertes dans la région du Dobroudja," Studia
antiqua et medievalia. Miscellanea in honorem annos LXXV peragentis Professoris Dan Gh. Teodor
oblata, ed. D. Aparaschivei (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 2009), 412, fig. 1.
excavations at Slava Rusă. All of them display a scrollwork motif whose quality of execution suggests an early date in the sixth century. An equally secure dating before the collapse of the frontier is offered by two settlement finds of class II C fibulae from Carevec (Figure 4-19/12) and Caričin Grad, both found together with fibulae with bent stem. Less certain is the dating of the pair of fibulae class I D found in an inhumation burial at Edessa in Greece, and associated with a buckle of the Syracusa class, whose dating spans the entire seventh century. A fibula of the same class was found in the early Byzantine settlement of Dinogetia in northern Scythia whose closest parallel is a fibula from Bashtanovka in Crimea, whose association with a Germanic rectangular buckle with eagle head dates it to the second half of the sixth century.

Although not much can be said about the bulk of the finds of "Slavic" bow fibulae from the Balkans, it is clear that their presence spans a long period of time, from before and certainly continuing after the fall of the military frontier on the Lower Danube. Recent distribution maps as well as inventories of finds show that most of the "Slavic" bow fibulae known until now from Eastern Europe dated ca. 500 have been found in


barbaricum making it a typical dress ornament of the populations beyond the frontier. The multi-ethnic nature of the frontier region explains the presence of such items in the northern Balkans. A female dress accessory, the "Slavic" bow fibula was probably worn by the wives of mercenaries recruited from barbaricum to defend the provinces of the Lower Danube. Whether or not such fibulae were an exclusive social and ethnic marker of "foreigners" from barbaricum, they were clearly not as popular in frontier forts as they were north of the Danube, judging by the number of finds in both regions, and they certainly did not surpass the popularity of the fibulae with bent stem (including the cast ones).

Identifying the bow fibula as the ethnic badge of a certain ethnic group, as Werner has suggested by attributing them to the Slavs, has become increasingly difficult if not altogether impossible since the corpus of finds has come to include a variety of contexts, many of which are unrelated to what archaeologists traditionally describe as early Slavic. The map reveals a greater concentration of finds in the north-eastern Balkans, in the provinces of Moesia II and Scythia, where a larger quantity of Penkovka and Korchak ceramics has been found, usually associated with the Antes and the Slavs, respectively. Is this an additional piece of evidence to suggest that the Slavs were in fact the main ethnic group using bow fibulae? The answer must be negative, since many of the contexts are not otherwise indicative of what may be viewed as Slavic material culture. Bow fibulae have been found in early Byzantine settlements such as Dinogetia, Slava Rusă, Iatrus, Carevec, but also at Caračin Grad in Dacia Mediterranea and even further west at Butrint in Albania. An interesting concentration of finds may be observed in the Iron Gates region, on both sides of the river, an area
under constant Avar pressure, especially after the fall of Sirmium (582). An even larger number of specimens have been found in inhumation burials at Adamclisi, Tulcea, and Piatra Frecâtei in Scythia and Viničani, Edessa, and Sv. Erazmo in Macedonia, as well as in a number of cemeteries from Crimea.\(^{182}\) One might argue that perhaps Slavs recruited to defend the frontier provinces adopted local customs including the practice of inhumation, but such finds are also reported north of the Danube. To be sure, "Slavic" bow fibulae are sometimes found with cremations such as those of the large cemetery at Sărata Monteoru, but also in inhumation graves, such as those from Bratei, Seliște, Dănceni, and Pruneni.\(^{183}\) Found in a variety of contexts, associated with the Slavs, Avars, Gepids, and the early Byzantine fortresses and cemeteries in the Balkans, the sixth-to-seventh-century bow fibula can be hardly described as an ethnic badge. It was, however, a fashionable dress accessory on both sides of the river around the time when the Byzantines lost control of the frontier, but even more so in regions far removed from the Danube, in the Dnieper region and in Mazuria.

---


4.2.4.4 Byzantine buckles

The great variety of types and variants noticed in the case of fibulae is also shared by sixth-to-seventh-century Byzantine buckles found in the frontier region and beyond (Figure 4-13). This category of artifacts is, however, less homogeneous and only a few types have been studied and classified. While a large number of buckles of basic shape and no decoration found in barbaricum are often named Byzantine, their dating largely depends on the archaeological context of their find. Many of them may well be local products, possibly imitations, but their connection with contemporary buckles from the Danube region is uncertain. There are, however, at least four well-established types in the literature, dated to the sixth and seventh centuries, which will constitute the main basis for assessing the role of Byzantine buckles in the regions north of the Lower Danube.

The most widespread category of Byzantine buckles north of the Lower Danube is by far the Sucidava class, with a number of spin-offs known as Beroe in the literature, named so after the sixth-century cemetery excavated at Piatra-Frecăței in Scythia.\(^{184}\) The type was defined by Joachim Werner in 1955 based on finds from Sucidava, the most important Byzantine bridge-head on the left bank of the Lower Danube, which he dated to the second half of the sixth century.\(^{185}\) Much like in the case of fibulae, the early 1990s brought a renewed interest in the typology of the Sucidava class of Byzantine buckles. Syna Uenze and Dan G. Teodor introduced new classifications,

\(^{184}\) A. Madgearu, "The Sucidava Type of Buckles and the Relations between the Late Roman Empire and the Barbarians in the 6th Century," AM 21 (1998): 217-22. For specimens found at Piatra-Frecăței see Petre, La romanité en Scythie Mineure.

while Vladimir Varsik, Uwe Fiedler, and Alexandru Madgearu published new studies and inventories of finds. The most recent inventories are a good indicator of the increasing number of finds of Sucidava-Beroe buckles, many of them the result of the use of metal detectors, a mixed blessing affecting the archaeology of north-eastern Bulgaria in particular. Students of early Byzantine buckles can now rely on a large inventory of ca. 150 buckles from the Middle and Lower Danube regions, almost half of them having been found in sixth-century settlements. In addition, a number of Sucidava buckles are recorded in Western Europe, as far as Normandy, evidencing the popularity and wide circulation of this type. The large concentration of finds in the northern Balkans clearly indicates a local production of the Sucidava class of buckles, although their presence in Constantinople, in Asia Minor and as far as Palmyra in Syria led some scholars to conclude that multiple workshops existed for the production of this popular type. While this seems plausible, it is equally possible that Sucidava buckles


189 Madgearu, "The Sucidava Type," 218.
were brought to these regions by troops transferred from the Balkans to theaters of operation in the Near East, especially in the second half of the sixth century.

The production of Sucidava buckles probably took off sometime in the first decades of the sixth century, as suggested by specimens found in association with coins. At Mokranjske Stene in eastern Serbia a Sucidava buckle was found together with a coin of Anastasius, while at Izvor, close to Pernik in western Bulgaria, a similar buckle was associated with a *follis* minted for Justin I.\(^{190}\) Further south, at Nea Anchialos a buckle of the Sucidava-Beroe II sub-type was found together with a coin of Justinian.\(^{191}\) In all three cases the association is not direct, in that the buckles and the coins were not found within the same assemblage. Instead, the coins simply date the "layer" in which the buckles were found. Indeed, in all cases the buckles might date from a later period since the coins remained in circulation during the entire sixth century. At any rate, Sucidava buckles are mostly associated with early Byzantine hilltop sites from the frontier region along the Danube, from Belgrade through Aquis, Oescus, Novae, Durostorum to Dinogetia in northern Scythia and the larger towns of the western Black Sea coast, Histria, Tomis and Odessos.\(^{192}\) There is a consensus that the production of Sucidava buckles ended with the Byzantine control of the Danube at the beginning of the seventh century, which indirectly links this fashion with the presence of garrisons defending the Byzantine frontier in the Balkans.

\(^{190}\) Varsik, "Byzantinische Gürtelschnallen," 78; Daskalov and Trendafilova, "Kolanut v iuzhnodunavskite," 9.

\(^{191}\) Lazaridis, "Nea Anchialos," pl. 394.

\(^{192}\) Daskalov and Trendafilova, "Kolanut v iuzhnodunavskite," 10, fig 1.
Sucidava buckles were also fashionable outside the Empire, but unlike other categories of artifacts there is a conspicuous scarcity of finds in Wallachia and Moldavia, the traditional recipients of imports from the Empire. Aside from the Byzantine bridge-heads from the left bank of the Danube, Dierna, Drobeta, and Sucidava, none of the settlements that produced a significant number of finds of amphorae or fibulae yielded Byzantine buckles of the Sucidava class, or any other type for that matter. In Moldavia three finds have been recorded so far, including a settlement find from Borniș (house 25), which seems to be a local imitation rather than a genuine import (Figure 4-20/17-18), a specimen from an inhumation grave at Dânești, and another from a sixth-century settlement from Ștefan cel Mare (house 17). Given the great density of finds in the provinces of Scythia and Moesia II, the scarcity of Byzantine buckles in the corresponding regions across the Danube appears even more perplexing. The same people who were so eager to obtain Byzantine artifacts such as fibulae, crosses, and various types of jewelry appear to have been totally uninterested in expressing their identity or enhancing their social prestige by wearing Byzantine buckles.

The same is true for the other three important classes of Byzantine buckles which can be dated to before the fall of the Danube frontier: Salona-Histria, Pápa, and Syracuse. The first two classes have the same function, that of attaching a small

---


purse to the belt, the difference between the two being the presence of a pair of stylized animal heads on the Pápa type. The production of Pápa buckles postdates the Salona-Histria type, from which it derives, although both may have been in use around year 600. Their presence in similar, Early Avar assemblages in Környe (M 66, M 106, and M 109) and Kölked-Feketekapu (M 223, M 259, M 385, M 425, and M 647) substantiates this hypothesis. In addition, both types of buckles have been found in the large "Slavic" cemetery from Sărata Monteoru (M564 and M 1/1943) (Figure 4-20/18-19). In the early Byzantine provinces of the Balkans Salona-Histria and Pápa buckles display the same pattern of distribution as the Sucidava type, although Pápa buckles are so far missing from the provinces of Dacia Ripensis and Moesia I. Unlike Sucidava buckles, whose popularity brought them to Western Europe, the circulation of Pápa and Salona-Histria buckles was restricted mostly to the Middle and Lower Danube regions and the Crimea, where they are common finds in all the major sixth-to-seventh-century cemeteries. We are facing the same paradox, with finds concentrated in "Avaria," the north-eastern Balkans, and the Crimea, while they are almost completely absent north of the Danube in Wallachia and Moldavia. This is even more surprising since a workshop for the production of Salona-Histria buckles has been found at Drobeta on the

_Tulcea-Jurilovca, 3-5 octobre 2005_, ed. M. Mănucu-Adameșteanu (Bucharest: AGIR, 2006), 348-52 and pl. V. For the distribution of Syracusa and Pápa buckles outside the Balkans, see Schulze-Dörrlamm, _Byzantinische Gürtelschnallen_, 176, fig. 62 and 226, fig. 82.

Környe: A. Salamon and I. Erdély, _Das völkerwanderungszeitliche Gräberfeld von Környe_ (Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, 1971), 24, pl. 19 (Salona-Histria) and 20, pl. 9/6 (Pápa); Kölked-Feketekapu: Kiss, _Das awarenzeitlich-gepidsche_, 75-76, pl. 57 (Salona-Histria) and 165-66, pl. 102 (Pápa). In both cases the Salona-Histria buckles were associated with reused Late Roman coins (Valentinian I-Gratian).

196 Uenze, "Die Schnallen," fig. 1/6 and 5/35.
left bank of the Danube, which could have easily facilitated the distribution of such buckles further north in *barbaricum*.\(^{197}\)

The production of the last type of buckle under discussion, known as Syracuse in the literature, took off close to the time when the Empire was losing control of the Danube frontier. Finds of Syracusa buckles in the Balkans are scarce compared to the other three types and only a few are known from the provinces of Moesia II and Scythia, where the Empire retained some influence in the first decades of the seventh century due to the presence of the fleet in the Black Sea. Indeed, most of the finds are from coastal settlements such as Mesembria, Odessos, Accres, and Histria. Although V. Varsik included this type in the Mediterranean-Dalmatian group, the largest density of finds can be found in Crimea, where almost every cemetery excavated yielded buckles of the Syracuse class. It is no less true that among all early Byzantine buckles the Syracuse type is the most widespread, with finds reported as far as Britain, North Africa, and Iran. The large number of finds in the Middle Danube region compared to the Balkans shows that Syracuse buckles, and perhaps other types of Byzantine buckles as well, might not have originated from the Lower Danube region but from the Dalmatian coast or even the Crimea, given the wide political influence of the Avars in *barbaricum*.

The impressive density of finds of Byzantine buckles of all types in the regions controlled by the Avars, the Middle Danube, the Tisza valley, and Transylvania has been explained in the context of the political and diplomatic contacts between the Empire and the early Avar khaganate.\(^{198}\) Since most buckles were associated with

---

\(^{197}\) Bejan, "Un atelier metalurgic," pl. VI.

\(^{198}\) A. Madgearu, "A Buckle of Păpa Type Found in the Early Byzantine Fortress Halmyris (Murighiol, Tulcea County)," *Peuce* 15 (2003), 171-72; Varsik, "Byzantinische Gürtelschnallen," 89.
weapons in Avar and Gepid graves they were most probably pieces of military equipment, although occasionally they are found in female graves.\textsuperscript{199} If the majority of finds of Sucidava buckles are from the frontier provinces, Salona-Histria and Pápa buckles were equally popular in \textit{Barbaricum}, the latter type being more often found in "Avaria" than in the Danubian provinces. The concentration of Pápa buckles in the regions under Avar control has led to the conclusion that they were locally produced outside the empire, perhaps by Byzantine craftsmen working for the Avars.\textsuperscript{200} In reality, none of the sixth-to-seventh-century Byzantine buckles can be associated with a certain ethnic group since they have been found in a variety of contexts, inhumation and cremation, male and female graves, hilltop settlements from the frontier region, towns on the Black Sea coast, as well as away from the frontier region, in Asia Minor. Such contexts have been associated with the Byzantines, the Slavs, the Avars, the Gepids, and the Crimean Goths, making these buckles elements of military fashion on a wide geographic area. Indeed, the Avars extended their influence from the Middle Danube to the steppes north of the Black Sea. However, the scarcity of such buckles south and east of the Carpathians may be seen as a form of resistance to the Avar domination, a conscious rejection of some of the items that identified Avar warriors toward year 600. The Avar influence is undeniable in Transylvania where the Gepids under Avar rule in the Mureş valley and westwards to the confluence with the Tisza river were culturally and politically more assimilated into the Avar confederation than communities in Wallachia and Moldavia.

\textsuperscript{199} Kölked-Feketekapu: Kiss, \textit{Das awarenzeitlich-gepidische Gräberfeld}, 75-76, pl. 57 (M 425); Kiss, \textit{Das awarenzeitliche Gräberfeld}, 144, fig. 43 (M 457).

4.3 Christianity North of the Danube

Christianity is one of the major cultural interfaces connecting the frontier provinces with the regions north of the Danube. A series of monographs written in the past decades have established an almost unchallenged narrative of the process of Christianization in barbaricum and especially in the territory of the former province of Dacia.²⁰¹ However, this common wisdom was recently contested based on a different interpretation of the archaeological evidence. The main contention is that the existence of Christian artifacts in barbaricum should not be seen as direct evidence for the existence of a Christian population. Items such as flasks, lamps and crosses may have not arrived north of the river for religious considerations but more probably as items required by local elites, part of the cultural process described as imitatio imperii.²⁰² Indeed, the number of potential liturgical items such as the bronze lamps found in the former province of Dacia is unfortunately insufficient to argue in favor of the existence of a strong Christian community, since most of them are chance finds with no archaeological context to give them more meaning. Moreover, the absence of any documented churches dated to the sixth century adds to this uncertainty. It has been repeatedly suggested that sixth century churches north of the Danube could have been made of wooden structures or other perishable materials, impossible to trace in the

²⁰¹ Barnea, Les monuments paléochrétiens; Gudea and I. Ghiurco, Din istoria creștinismului; D. G. Teodor, Creștinismul la est de Carpați. De la origini și pînă în secolul al XIV-lea (Iași: Editura Mitropoliei Moldovei și Bucovinei, 1991); N. Zugravu, Geneza creștinismului popular al românilor (Bucharest: Institutul Român de Tracologie, 1997); Madgearu, Rolul creștinismului.
archaeological record. While this hypothesis cannot be completely ruled out, the lack of any documented churches remains problematic, especially since such examples exist in barbaricum, the most spectacular being the basilica and extramural cemetery at Fenekpuszta, on the western shore of Lake Balaton. The basilica with three apses from Fenekpuszta has good analogies in the Lower Danube frontier region, which begs the question as to why such religious buildings are so far missing from the region north of the Danube.

The rarity of Christian inhumation burials north of the Danube is also striking. With the exception of the burial assemblages from Moldoveni, Săbăoani, Secuieni and Dănești (all in Moldavia) which have been interpreted as Christian because of their West-East orientation and a number of Byzantine grave goods, other inhumation graves south and east of the Carpathians cannot be described as Christian with any certainty. As a matter of fact, sixth-century cemeteries from barbaricum display a large variety of practices, which prevent us from drawing any meaningful conclusions at this time. Nevertheless, the lack of any notable inhumation cemeteries to contrast with large cremation cemeteries such as the one at Sărata-Monteoru adds to the uncertainty regarding the dominant religion north of the Danube or the nature of its practices.

---

203 Teodor, Creștinismul, 82; Barnea, Les monuments paléochrétiens, 27; Madgearu, Rolul creștinismului, 82; Zugravu, Geneza creștinismului, 337; Protase, Autohtonii în Dacia, 77.

204 R. Müller, Die Gräberfelder vor der Südmauer der Befestigung von Keszthely-Fenékpuszta (Budapest/Leipzig: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Régészeti Intézet/Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur, 2010).

205 Teodor, Creștinismul la est de Carpați, no. 17, 26, 31, and 32. The religious symbolism of the fibula with cross-shaped motifs from the grave at Moldoveni and of the Sucidava buckle from Dănești is uncertain. A similar grave, found at Dancheni in Moldova, contained two "Slavic" bow fibulae, glass beads and a hand-made pot, for which see Rafalovich, "Dancheni," 25-27.
What cannot be denied for the sixth century, however, is the absolute increase in the number and diversity of objects bearing Christian symbols found north of the Danube, many of which are imports from the Empire. While most Christian objects dated to the fourth and fifth centuries concentrated in the former province of Dacia, the "long sixth century" (ca. 500 to ca. 620) witnessed a dramatic increase in such finds in Wallachia and Moldavia. The lack of any documented missions from Byzantium leaves out any potential explanation based on an official policy of Christianization. Since the Empire used missions as a political device during the Justinianic age in various peripheral areas such as the Caucasus, Yemen, and Nubia, we can only conclude that the Empire had little to gain politically from such initiatives north of the Danube.

As previously argued, the Christianization of Slavs or Avars was not taken into consideration by sixth-century emperors, which comes in sharp contrast with fourth-century interests in the area when Ulfilas was preaching the Gospel to the Goths.

Novella XI regarding the archbishopric of Justiniana Prima (Dacia Mediterranea) remains the single most important official document regarding the sixth-century religious policies in the Danube region. The creation of an archbishopric at Justiniana Prima

206 Madgearu, *Rolul creștinismului*, pl. II and V.


210 Corpus Iuris Civilis, Novella XI, 3.94, ed. R. Schoell and W. Kroll, vol. 3 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), 94. Historians have also drawn attention to a later account of Theophanes Confessor mentioning the help offered by a Christian Gepid during a campaign north of the Danube in 593. Since no Gepids were living
was part of Justinian’s program of administrative reform meant to reshape the ecclesiastical hierarchies and administrative apparatus. According to Novella XI the jurisdiction of the new archbishopric of Justiniana Prima extended north of the Danube to include the Byzantine bridge-heads of Litterata and Recidiva. Scholars have often used this account to suggest that the archbishop of Justiniana Prima was also charged with the welfare of the Christian population living north of the Danube, well beyond the area controlled by the Danubian fortresses mentioned in the official document. A similar role was envisaged for the bishoprics of Scythia whose authority would have extended beyond the Danube, deep into barbaricum. This can hardly be the case with such a highly unstable frontier as the Lower Danube. Even if any such initiatives were present they were short-lived and soon curtailed by the growing insecurity in the region toward the middle of the sixth century. The lack of any evidence of attempts to institutionalize Christianity north of the river, marked by the absence of churches, as noted, warrants a

---

211 V. Velkov, Cities in Thrace and Dacia in Late Antiquity (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1977), ch. 2.

212 The location of Recidiva is still controversial with some scholars identifying it as Arcidava or even Sucidava, the most important Byzantine settlement on the northern bank of the Danube, while more recently it has been located at Stari Dubovac. See D. Tudor, Oltenia romană (Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1978), 466; Barnea, “Sur les rapports,” 56; A. Madgearu, “The 6th Century Lower Danubian Bridgeheads: Location and Mission,” EN 13 (2003): 297. For the location of Litterata (Lederata) see A. Jovanović, “The Problem of the Location of Lederata,” in Roman Limes on the Middle and Lower Danube, ed. P. Petrović (Belgrade: Archaeological Institute, 1996), 69-72.

high degree of skepticism as to the precise influence of Byzantine bishoprics in the regions beyond the Danube.

Nevertheless, the presence of an unprecedented number of Christian objects still requires a more satisfying explanation. While their presence cannot be ascribed to a coherent policy of Christianization, they might be part of the Empire's desire to encourage *imitatio* in *barbaricum*, and more precisely to Justinian's ecumenical ambitions, which might have taken different forms. Justinian's frontier policy in the Balkans included not only the program of fortification, but also alliances with the Lombards, the Antes and the Utigurs. It is quite probable that Justinian's strategy of bringing the populations north of the Danube closer to the Empire included such cultural tactics. A recent inventory of Christian objects shows a great variety of items showing up north of the Danube even very far from the frontier.⁹¹⁴ Lamps, flasks, pectoral crosses, and molds for the production of crosses represent the most frequent and also the most interesting Christian objects imported or produced in *barbaricum* (Figure 4-14).

former province of Dacia, many of which bear Christian symbols. The bronze liturgical lamps are particularly interesting, as are some of the "Danubian" and African clay lamps, most of them found in formerly Roman urban centers. Very few lamps have been found south and east of the Carpathians, while the often cited lamp from Luciu, close to the left bank of the Danube, is more probably part of the booty taken from one of the Roman fortresses in Scythia. Unfortunately, the scarcity of lamps coming from a clear stratigraphical context makes any religious interpretation purely impressionistic.

---

A quick look on the map will reveal different patterns of distribution. I have already pointed to the large concentration of early Byzantine lamps in the territory of the from the Holy Land and Egypt, especially Menas flasks, seem to have been popular north of the Danube if one considers the finds from Moigrad (Porolissum), Dierna (Orșova), and Szombathely. Menas flasks are very common in Italy and the Dalmatian coast, but also north of the Alps in the Rhine region, although the local provenance of some of the finds is not always certain. The flasks from Szombathely, Moigrad, and perhaps that from Dierna may have arrived from the west, the Dalmatian coast being the most probable source, although a route from Constantinople cannot be completely ruled out. Four Menas flasks have been found at Tomis and Capidava, but Scythia seems a less probable supplier of such items to barbaricum. Nevertheless, conspicuous differences in the pattern of distribution remain important for understanding the variety of preferences and fashions in barbaricum. If Christian lamps are rarely found outside the former province of Dacia, pectoral crosses are very often found in Wallachia and Moldavia (Figure 4-15). Most of them are Maltese


Figure 4-15. Distribution of crosses (circle) and molds for the production of crosses (square).


crosses usually made of copper or lead, such as the ones found at Davideni, Rașcov, Ruginoasa, Valea Voievozilor, and in "Avaria", at Balatonfüzfő-Szalmássy and Székkutas.\textsuperscript{219} It seems that the parallel between the Middle Danube region, on one hand, and Moldavia and Wallachia, on the other, which was made apparent by the study of hand-made lamps is also valid for Maltese pectoral crosses, with the former province of Dacia following a different pattern. Unlike lamps, many crosses have been found in a clear archeological context, in association with other sixth-century artifacts and sometimes with molds used to produce such crosses. Molds for Maltese crosses have been found at Botoșana, Davideni, Bucharest - Străulești-Lunca, Sânmiclăuș, and Olteni and they clearly point to local production of such items.\textsuperscript{220} Unlike the genuine Byzantine imports found in "Avaria," north of the Lower Danube the unaffordable Byzantine crosses were replaced by cheaper local imitations. However, these were mass produced as evidenced by the large number of molds, as well as actual crosses found north and south of the Danube.\textsuperscript{221} How can we distinguish between \textit{imitatio imperii} and genuine adherence to the Christian creed? Crosses were but one of many items and ornaments produced with molds found in \textit{Barbaricum}, while the totality of Byzantine imports finding their way north of the Danube does not indicate a special

\textsuperscript{219} For recent discussions, see F. Curta, "New Remarks on Christianity Beyond the Sixth- and Early Seventh-Century Frontier of the Empire," in Keszthely-Fenékpuszta im Kontext spätantiker Kontinuitätsforschung zwischen Noricum und Moesia, ed. O. Heinrich-Tamáška (Budapest/Leipzig: Marie Leidorf, 2011), 305-09; A. Madgearu, "Semnificația purtării crucilor pectorale descoperite la nord de Dunăre în secolele VI-VII," \textit{AM} 30 (2007): 129-36; F. Curta, \textit{Limes and Cross}, 58-62. Similar crosses are often found south of the Danube, see Curta, "Before Cyril and Methodius," 185 and fig. 8.5. There are many Avar-period crosses from Hungary usually found in female graves, of which the lead crosses are the closest analogies for the ones found in Romania, see Garam, \textit{Funde byzantinischer Herkunft}, 64, fig. 6 and pl. 40.

\textsuperscript{220} Dănilă, “Tipare de turnat,” 559-60.

\textsuperscript{221} For finds of crosses in the frontier region, see Curta, "Before Cyril and Methodius," fig. 8.1-8.8.
preference for Christian objects. On the contrary, some of the common dress accessories from the Balkans which bear Christian symbols are rare or nonexistent among finds north of the Danube, the most important being the Sucidava buckles with cross-shaped open-work decoration, fibulae with bent stem with Christian inscriptions (Minna, Amin, Maria, etc.) and cast fibulae with bent stem with cross-shaped foot.

Christian symbols on local hand-made pottery have also been connected with the religion of local communities in Barbaricum, especially south and east of the Carpathians.\textsuperscript{222} Recent attempts to classify the incisions made on local pots were met with mixed conclusions and a certain degree of skepticism regarding their religious significance.\textsuperscript{223} To be sure, crosses appear not only on traditional pots whose shape can be traced back even to the pre-Roman period, but also on typically Slavic wares of the so-called Praga-Korchak type found in the sixth-to-seventh-century settlements from Cucorăni and Suceava-Șipot in Moldavia.\textsuperscript{224} Moreover, swastikas and other symbols appear on hand-made pottery from Bucharest and Dulceanca in Wallachia, and they might have had a totally different cultural symbolism than the iconography associated with Christianity.\textsuperscript{225} What is particularly important about this practice, which seems to be so common in Barbaricum, is the fact that it occurs only on hand-made pottery. Despite

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{222} For a recent inventory see Madgearu, \textit{Rolul creştinismului}, 127-33, 135-7.
\item \textsuperscript{223} E. S. Teodor and I. Stanciu, "About Crosses on Wet Clay as Cultural Markers," EN 19 (2009): 129-55; Madgearu, \textit{Rolul creştinismului}, 83-4. Previous publications offered a more optimistic interpretation, for which see especially Teodor, \textit{Creştinismul la est}, 82-84.
\item \textsuperscript{224} Teodor, \textit{Creştinismul la est}, fig. 14/4 and 15/1, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{225} Dolinescu-Ferche, \textit{Aşezările din sec. III şi VI}, fig. 70/1; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu, "Un établissement du VI\textsuperscript{e} siècle," fig. 9/6.
\end{itemize}
recent attempts, its cultural symbolism related to identity formation is far from being fully understood.\footnote{226}{Teodor and Stanciu, "About crosses," 141.}

The absence of churches, despite the existence of liturgical objects such as the lead \textit{ampulla} from Iași, the bronze bowl for holy water found at Periam (Timiș County), or the more controversial bird-headed distaff from Craiova, suggests that Christianity was adopted at the individual level and not in an institutionalized form.\footnote{227}{Iași: V. Macarie, "Un vaz bizantin de cult descoperit la Iași," \textit{SCIVA} 32, n. 2 (1981): 299-302; Periam: M. Rusu, "Paleocreștinismul nord-dunărean și etnogeneza românilor," \textit{Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie} 26 (1983-1984): 61 n. 83; Craiova: Popilian and Nica, "Așezarea prefeudală," 154 with analogies from the Danubian frontier region. Bird-headed distaffs, some probably used as dress-pins are common in the northern Balkans, for instance at Novi Banovci, Popina, Prahovo, Mokranjska Stena, Donje Butorke, Kladovo, Iatrus, Sadovec, Goleche, and also in Avaria at Szekszárd-Bogyiszlő, for which see Z. Vinski, "Arheološki spomenici velike seobe naroda u Srijemu," \textit{Situla} 2 (1957): 70, n. 56; Janković, \textit{Podunavski}, pl. XVIII; Uenze, \textit{Die spätantiken}, pl. 6-1-5; G. Gomolka-Fuchs, "Die Kleinfunde vom 4. bis 6. Jh. aus Iatrus," in \textit{Iatrus-Krivina II. Ergebnisse des Ausgrabungen 1966-1973} (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982), pl. 64/286; G. Atanasov, "De nouveau sur la localisation de la forteresse Bas-byzantine St. Ciril en Scythie Mineure," in \textit{Prinos lui Petre Diaconu la 80 de ani}, ed. I. Cândea et al. (Brăila: Istros, 2004), fig. 6; Garam, \textit{Funde byzantinischer Herkunft}, pl. 41/3. They have been often associated with the heresy of Bonus, although there is no consensus regarding their use and symbolism. A dress-pin bearing the inscription BONOSA was found at Keszhely-Fenékpuszta horreum (grave 5), for which see Ibid., pl. 41/3.} Conversion to Christianity or adherence to at least some Christian traditions firmly in place since the fourth century was most likely not synonymous with a full adherence to Christian norms and precepts, since inhumation seems to have been practiced only on a small scale north of the Danube. Few of the key liturgical artifacts invoked for the Christianization of \textit{barbaricum} have a good stratigraphical context, while others were acquired from private collectors and their original provenance is seldom known. Crosses and molds for crosses are often found north of the Danube, most of the time in a good archaeological context, but the distinction between cultural \textit{imitatio} and true belief is hard to discern. Local elites north of the Danube may have very well expressed their status through
common items such as bronze or lead crosses. Settlement patterns north of the Danube have very little to offer in terms of spectacular residences, while gold and silver objects, with or without religious symbolism, are extremely rare finds.

Indeed, some individuals or communities living in the shadow of the Empire might have decided to adopt the religion of Byzantium, but the decision was taken at a personal level and actual practices might have departed from the official canons, as they sometimes did south of the Danube. Objects with religious designation arrived north of the Danube, either as prestige objects for local elites or as Christian artifacts for believers, some of whom may have been Christian prisoners from the Empire, allowed to practice their religion while in captivity. Some of the items produced in provinces far from the Danube, such as the North-African lamps or Egyptian ampullae could also show social and economic connections with regions such as Dalmatia or the northern Balkans or even a direct access, through pilgrimage, in case of Menas flasks. Communities from the former province of Dacia had been exposed to Christianity since the fourth century and important foundations were already in place. The large number of Roman prisoners taken north of the Danube could have also facilitated cultural exchange and further exposure to the Empire's religion, although their exact contribution is hard to assess. At any rate, Christianity was hardly a general phenomenon in sixth-century barbaricum and it will take solid archaeological evidence to change this conviction.

---

228 Pace Madgearu, "Semnificația purtării crucilor," 132.

4.4 Conclusion: Contact and Separation on the Lower Danube Frontier

The study of written and archaeological sources pertaining to the Lower Danube frontier during the long sixth century presents an ostensible paradox. Often used as a rhetorical device by sixth-century writers, the Danube was presented as the main line of defense which capable emperors were able to hold against barbarian tides. No attempts were made to conquer regions north of the river, except for efforts to re-establish a number of bridge-heads which had the strategic mission of acting as a spearhead in *barbaricum* and perhaps facilitating trade. By contrast, archaeologists have revealed a long chain of fortifications rebuilt in the first half of the sixth century, leaving the impression that the Empire had a clear priority in the Northern Balkans: to prevent a massive crossing of the Danube that could endanger Constantinople and to discourage small bands of raiders set on plundering the frontier provinces.

The role of the Danube fleet, recently re-assessed by Florian Himmler,\(^\text{230}\) adds a new layer to the strategic system devised by the Empire. The Danube was truly "the first line of defense" in the words of Procopius, neither metaphorically, however, nor as a natural barrier, but through the fleet monitoring the river. Indeed, very little room was left for cultural contact, or at least this is the daunting impression left by the multi-layered system whereby the Empire tried to secure its frontier in the Northern Balkans. Despite such precautions, a wide variety of objects of early Byzantine origin found their way north of the Danube throughout the sixth century, a paradox which needs further explanation. Whether imports in the economic sense of the term or prestige items procured by the local aristocracy, the large quantity and diversity of Byzantine artifacts

testifies to the fact that the Danube did not prevent the crossing of objects and people. The Danube was by no means an "Iron Curtain" as the Empire had neither the strength nor the energy to insure a clear separation from barbaricum. To be sure, allowing cultural contact with communities outside the frontier was a double-edged sword. The ever increasing need for Byzantine imports seen as prestige objects inevitably led to a series of plunder expeditions which exposed the weakness of the defense system devised by Justinian, whose theoretical virtues would soon be tested by invading Cutrigurs, Slavs, and Avars.

What makes the Lower Danube a particularly interesting frontier is the fact that the lands north of the river do not fall under the standard definition of Barbaricum, as much of the region had been a Roman province for more than 150 years. With all the controversy regarding the level of Romanization and the demographic impact of the Roman retreat on the Danube in the last quarter of the third century, it is impossible to question the fact that the region was deeply permeated by Roman culture. Romanized communities sought to maintain a certain degree of Roman life, which explains the desire to acquire Roman objects from the Empire. This provincial society was not the only one seeking Roman goods. The fourth-century Chernyakhov culture, whose degree of homogeneity is impressive given its presumed multi-ethnic background, developed in the shadow of the Empire and the high priority given to commercial relations in treaties between Late Roman emperors and the Goths is a case in point. Moreover, on the eve of the dissolution of their father’s empire, Attila’s sons decided that their chief priority was to convince Emperor Leo I to resume trading relations with
the Huns, indirect evidence of the fact that access to Roman goods was crucial for securing and maintaining power in *barbaricum*.

The Empire was slow to recover from the dark days of the fifth century but with the reign of Anastasius we witness the first major attempt to re-establish a firm imperial control on the Lower Danube. Facing a much more divided political landscape north of the river, the Empire lacked a partner for negotiations at least until the arrival of the Avars, which may in part explain the lack of information regarding the regulation of trade on the Danube frontier during the sixth century. Out of this historical background, leading back to the abandonment of Dacia by Emperor Aurelian, emerged the communities which would be the main recipients of Byzantine goods in the sixth century. Some of them lived in the former province of Dacia, now mostly under the control of the Gepids whose political relations with Constantinople remained precarious, while others were located south and east of the Carpathians, a buffer zone between the Empire to the south, Gepids and later Avars to the west, and Slavs, Antes, and Cutrigurs to the east. This region was an important reservoir of manpower and potential recruits for manning the garrisons defending the fortresses of the Lower Danube rebuilt by Justinian. In addition, the advice given by the author of the *Strategikon* repeatedly refers to grain and food supplies as one of the major resources to be taken from the lands north of the Danube. There was undoubtedly a mutual interest in maintaining cultural contact. The presence of Byzantine goods in this large region between the Middle Danube and the steppes north of the Black Sea reflects both the desire to maintain a life style that depended heavily on emulating Roman ways and the political developments in the region, with the Avars slowly recreating the scenario of the fifth
century by draining the Empire's wealth towards Pannonia in exchange for an unsettled peace.

Influenced by the discourse of sixth-century writers, historians have often viewed this frontier region in terms of a long struggle between "Romans" and "barbarians" with different names but similar agendas. In reality, the frontier provinces of the Balkans had been a multi-ethnic environment long before the arrival of the Slavs and Avars in the sixth century. The shared Roman culture did not lead to a complete assimilation through the process of Romanization. Various traditions going back to the pre-Roman period could still be traced on sixth-century hand-made pottery found in the Lower Danube provinces. Especially after the 530s when the Empire found itself engaged in wars on multiple fronts, the defense of the Balkans witnessed a great shortage of manpower, which Justinian tried to overcome by forging alliances with various groups, such as the Antes or the Utigurs, or by manipulating conflicts within barbaricum. The easiest way to become "Roman" was to serve in the garrisons stationed on the frontier. Here much of Roman identity revolved around wearing a certain military costume and living in a fortress where life depended on the arrival of the state-controlled annona, wine and oil received in standardized containers, mostly amphorae known as LR1 and LR2. These are precisely the artifacts most often found in the lands north of the Danube: fragments of amphorae, oil lamps, and dress accessories associated with the military environment of the Lower Danube frontier (Figure 4-16). Being Roman on the sixth-century Danube frontier was a fluid concept, a negotiated identity whose main coordinates revolved around serving in Roman garrisons, adopting the provincial life style and perhaps adhering to Christianity.
While some of these items may have been purchased directly from one of the trade centers on the Lower Danube, the most probable candidates being the Byzantine bridge-heads on the left bank of the Danube, many Byzantine items reflected the circulation of people and the specific tastes of each area. Historians have tended to lump together regions from barbaricum conveying a false sense of homogeneity in their contacts with Byzantium. In reality, their access to various categories of goods from the Empire depended on a series of conditions, such as distance from the frontier, the availability of certain goods in specific areas of the frontier, itself lacking a perfect homogeneity or standardization, and of course the social fabric of communities in Barbaricum, which might have placed different values on artifacts of Roman origin.

In light of such preconditions, it comes as no surprise that amphorae are commonly found in the close proximity of the Danube, north of Sucidava, the main Byzantine possession on the left bank of the river. However, no Byzantine fibulae or buckles are found in this region, although they were readily available from Sucidava or from any one of the Byzantine forts in the Iron Gates area. The only possible conclusion is that communities in Oltenia had no interest in expressing their identity in such manner or adopting fashions connected to the military hilltop sites on the Lower Danube.

By contrast, amphorae are often found in Moldavia, some 150 miles away from Dinogota, the closest Byzantine fortress, which implies that communities east of the Carpathians placed a great value on gaining access to wine and oil, the main products transported in amphorae. The same communities sought to procure Byzantine dress accessories such as fibulae with bent stem and cast fibulae with bent stem, as well as
Figure 4-16. Main categories of Byzantine artifacts found in *barbaricum*: amphorae (circle), clay lamps (square), fibulae (triangle), buckles (star), Christian objects (cross).
Byzantine buckles of the Sucidava class. This region permeated by Slavic culture in the second half of the sixth century emulated the early Byzantine provincial way of life more than any other region in the lands north of the Lower Danube. Many of the mercenaries recruited by Byzantium to defend the fortresses of the province of Scythia, whose presence can be seen in the hand-made pottery found there, may have originated in the communities from Moldavia. Such mercenaries brought home Roman fashions mostly related to a military environment, typical for the Lower Danube region, and increased the demand for Roman goods and the social value placed on such artifacts. Some of them came to be produced locally as testified by the significant number of molds and metallurgical implements found in the region, including molds used to produce crosses, a possible sign that Christianity was important for creating a social identity based on Roman values.

Between Oltenia, the land closest to the Lower Danube, and Moldavia lies a region of mixed cultural influences best seen in the local ceramics briefly discussed at the beginning of this chapter. Interestingly, there are no known settlements closer than twenty miles from the Danube. The existence of a buffer zone in the Danube valley could be ascribed to the Empire’s policy to discourage frequent crossings of the Danube or the creation of power centers too close to the military frontier. The cultural profile of the area is dominated by the controversy regarding the role of the Slavs, the great cemetery from Sărata-Monteoru, and the mosaic of settlements in Bucharest which produced diverse ceramic shapes and settlement patterns, but also an important number of Byzantine imports betraying close ties to the Byzantine world. Almost all categories of Byzantine artifacts can be found in those settlements evincing an easy
access to goods, which can be explained by their relative proximity to the Danube (ca. 50 miles). The metallurgical activity of the region is also impressive with no less than six settlements in Bucharest yielding metallurgical tools; meanwhile, several settlements on the Buzău valley and the Subcarpathian hills, Budureasca in particular, were also notable for their metallurgical activity.

Yet another region with strong local particularities is the territory of the former province of Dacia, especially Transylvania. Here, the stronger Roman tradition going back to the days of the Roman occupation was coupled with another defining trait, a stronger domination of the Hunnic confederation in the fifth century and of the Gepids and Avars in the sixth. Romanian historians, in particular, have insisted on the great transformations produced by the Huns whose domination of the Middle Danube brought an end to cultural contacts of Dacia with the western Roman world and eventually led to a reorientation toward Constantinople. However, the break with the West was a much longer process connected with developments in the western provinces during the first half of the fifth century, a scenario in which the Huns were but one episode, albeit the most notorious. In fact, a reorientation toward Constantinople could not have happened during the Hunnic domination with chunks of the western Balkans under the direct control of Attila. Once the Hunnic storm passed, the former province of Dacia resumed its cultural contacts with the West, favored by the reconquest of Italy by Justinian. Some of the items virtually unknown in other parts of barbaricum discussed here, such as bronze lamps, Menas flasks, genuine North African lamps may have arrived in Dacia through the mediation of the Adriatic ports. Crosses or molds for the production of crosses, so often found south and east of the Carpathians are absent from the former
province of Dacia. Common Byzantine dress accessories appear in Gepid and early Avar contexts and generally follow cultural trends from the Middle Danube and Tisza valleys, where pieces of military equipment of Byzantine origin are found in association with artifacts typical for Central Europe or following fashions from the eastern corners of the Avar khaganate, whose influence extended to the lands north of the Black Sea. Transylvania clearly followed a different pattern compared to Wallachia or Moldavia.

Sometimes cemeteries excavated in this region offer a glimpse of the wealth of the early Avar center in Pannonia. Grave inventories combine Byzantine and Eastern elements, an exquisite taste which the Avar aristocracy was able to afford after the Empire sent an estimated total of ca. 80,000 pounds of gold in the form of tribute.

The movement of people and perhaps the activity of Byzantine merchants north of the river insured a steady flow of Byzantine items in barbaricum. Such items had an important social value in the lands north of the Lower Danube, but it is important to note that not all categories of goods typical for the frontier settlements have been found in barbaricum. Roman glass, an accessory of the military elite, was perhaps too fragile to be transported north of the Danube. Moreover, various types of jewelry and dress accessories are missing in Barbaricum, which seems to suggest that communities beyond the frontier received only a number of basic items, lead and copper crosses instead of silver, buckles and fibulae made of iron or copper alloy, and the most common ceramic containers in which soldiers received their rations. Oil lamps were not so easy to come by, although they are found in abundance in frontier fortresses. Sometimes communities from Barbaricum, except the ones from the former province of Dacia, had no alternative but to manufacture crude hand-made imitations. Silver and
gold objects are extremely rare and the ones recorded do not have a clear archaeological context and might constitute the result of plunder in the Balkans. To be sure, precious metal objects are also scarce in the frontier provinces, where Justinian introduced a special administrative unit, *quaestura exercitus*, in a desperate attempt to feed the northern Balkans, which housed many garrisons but possessed few resources.

Many of the Byzantine imports found in *barbaricum* are therefore nothing but a fragmentary reflection of the *annona militaris*, which took on a different meaning after crossing the frontier. The existence of economic exchange on the frontier and beyond cannot be ruled out, but the Danube as a contact zone presupposed a more important set of relations, especially those of a non-economic nature. The movement of objects documented by archaeological means nicely dovetails with sixth-century accounts documenting the movement of people, Heruli, "Huns," Slavs and Antes recruited in the Roman army and large numbers of prisoners taken from the provinces of the Balkans into captivity north of the Danube. This two-way street of Romans forcibly taken to *barbaricum* and "barbarians" serving in the Roman army and presumably in frontier garrisons produced a largely non-economic kind of cultural contact, whose material remains are the Roman objects found in *Barbaricum*, the non-Roman objects found in frontier provinces, as well as the multi-cultural influences traceable on several categories of objects discussed in this chapter.

The frontier region understood as the Danube with its military installations, supporting provinces, and lands north of the river was by no means homogeneous. Basic items of little value in the frontier fortresses took on a special social significance once they crossed into *barbaricum*. Settlement patterns are in sharp contrast, the
fortified hilltop sites of the Balkans being replaced by defenseless open settlements in the lands north of the river. The ceramic production in barbaricum did not follow contemporary shapes from the Empire. Instead, it relied on traditional pots, some of them going back to the Roman provincial types of the first centuries AD. Christianity was present north of the Danube but in modified forms, which departed from the traditional canons regarding burial rites and rituals and the practice in churches, so far missing in barbaricum. All these convey an image of a group of societies living in the shadow of the Empire but adopting only certain cultural practices, a decision shaped by the political situation of the region and the degree to which the Danube could function both as a military frontier and as a cultural interface between the Empire and the world beyond.

Unfortunately none of the categories of imports studied in this chapter is chronologically sensitive as to allow for a step-by-step analysis of the evolution of cultural contact in the frontier region. Coins are the only type of Byzantine artifact which can offer a precise dating, being inscribed with the regnal year of the ruling emperor. Coins are also the most frequently found artifact of Byzantine origin in barbaricum and can answer multiple questions regarding their economic role in facilitating cultural contact between Byzantium and the lands north of the Danube, as well as their non-economic functions in barbaricum. However, a brief overview of the monetary economy of the early Byzantine Empire is needed before attempting to understand the role of coins outside the empire and this will be the next topic of our discussion.
Figure 4-17. Early Byzantine lamps and imitations: Danubian lamps (1-5), Anatolian lamps (6-7), North African lamp (8), imitation after North African lamp (9), Palestinian lamp (10), hand-made lamps (11-12).
Figure 4-18. Sixth-to-seventh-century molds.
Figure 4-19. Sixth-to-seventh-century fibulae: fibulae with bent stem (1-4), cast fibulae with bent stem (5-8), bow fibulae (9-12).
Figure 4-20. Byzantine artifacts in *barbaricum* and parallels from the Empire: Coptic bronze lamps (1, 2); North African (3, 4), Danubian (5, 6) and Palestinian (7, 8) clay lamps; fibulae with bent stem (9, 10), bow fibulae (11, 12), cast fibulae with bent stem (13, 14), molds (15, 16, 21, 22); Sucidava buckles (17, 18); Pápa buckles (19, 20).
CHAPTER 5
CENTER AND PERIPHERY: COIN CIRCULATION IN EARLY BYZANTIUM

5.1 The Role of Money in the Early Byzantine Economy

The nature of exchange in ancient societies is one of the most time-honored and scholarly fruitful debates of the past century. Although the discussion initially focused on the classical period, students of the emergent fields of Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium made the debate their own as they were trying to shed new light on the role of trade and to determine the prevalent form of exchange in the Mediterranean world from the fourth to the seventh century. It has become de rigueur to introduce the topic by referring to the now classical opposition between two major schools of thought, the neoclassical and the institutional in academic economics, the substantivist and the formalist in anthropology, the "primitivist" vs. "modernist" in history (or "minimalist" vs. "maximalist"), and the way in which it shaped various humanistic disciplines, including history, archaeology and anthropology. The debate itself has lost momentum in the past decades and it is doubtful that a strictly dichotomous discourse is going to further our understanding in any dramatic way.¹ The growing archaeological record and with it, its weight in the general narrative about Late Antiquity, has no doubt influenced the way in which students of the period chose to handle theoretical and methodological models.

However, a brief introduction into the larger historiographical issues surrounding the

¹ For an early critique, see G. Dupré and P.-P. Rey, "Reflections on the Pertinence of a Theory of the History of Exchange," in The Articulation of Modes of Production, ed. H. Wolpe (London: Routledge, 1980), 128-60. In anthropology the debate was declared dead by Barry Isaac at the beginning of the 1990s but it managed to cast a much longer shadow, see B. L. Isaac, "Retrospective on the Formalist-Substantivist Debate," in Research in Economic Anthropology 14, ed. B. L. Isaac (London/Greenwhich CT: Jai Press Inc., 1993), 231, n.1: "At present, the only anthropologists who still try to address their work to that old debate are the few archaeologists who have not looked at the subfield since graduate student days in the 1960s or 1970s [...]." The debate is still very much alive although many of the original coordinates have been reshaped; for a recent review, with applications to the Roman economy as well, see M. E. Smith, "The Archaeology of Ancient State Economies," Annual Review of Anthropology 33 (2004): 73-102.
nature of exchange and the role of the market with its monetary instruments is needed in order to situate current theories regarding the role of money in Early Byzantium in their proper scholarly context.

Although the scholarly debate most often referred to is essentially a product of the past century, sociological and anthropological theories of exchange have their roots as far back as the eighteenth century, Adam Smith being one of the central figures. The so-called substantivist approach of the post-war period is often attributed to Karl Polanyi who articulated the theory as well as its opposition to the formalist stance, but his position owed a lot to Max Weber’s thinking especially in what concerned the role of money in pre-capitalist societies.² Essentially, and this is where the disciplines of history and anthropology converge, substantivists claim that an economy dominated by concepts such as supply, demand, and profit applies to formal economics and cannot be projected on pre-capitalist societies in which social conditions qualified what by modern standards seem like rational decisions. Social motivations (and obligations) rather than economic self-interest defined the pre-modern world. Although the historical debate surrounding the nature of ancient economies had been around since the days of Karl Bücher and Eduard Meyer in the late nineteenth century,³ substantivist ideas


floating in several humanistic disciplines were soon picked up by historians of the classical world, the most influential voice being that of a series of remarkable Cambridge historians. Moses Finley’s *Ancient Economy* is perhaps the most radical embodiment of the conviction that the overwhelmingly agrarian ancient economy cannot be treated by employing modern tools. His disdain for archaeology and its potential contribution led to a sometimes cynical view of the economic possibilities of ancient states dominated by war and imperialism rather than by concerns for developing a market economy. By extension, coinage was seen as strictly non-fiduciary as states had no coherent monetary policies, while minting was never the result of economic pressure from the market. As so often happens when borrowing theoretical models from neighboring disciplines, historians ended up by throwing out the baby with the bathwater and many Roman historians jumped in the "primitivist" boat reshaped by Finley. They sometimes ignored the fact that the Roman economy had reached a far greater complexity than the societies usually studied by anthropologists or the ones reflected in literary sources mirroring an aristocratic perspective.

The application of such views on Late Antiquity had already been developed by A. H. M. Jones whose monumental work on the social and economic conditions of the

---


5 See however the critical review article of M. W. Frederiksen, "Theory, Evidence and the Ancient Economy," *JRS* 65 (1975): 165-71. Much more recently and based on archaeological evidence largely unavailable to Finley, see K. Greene, "Technological Innovation and Economic Progress in the Ancient World: M. I. Finley Reconsidered," *Economic History Review* 53, no. 1 (2000): 29-59. Another problem was the fact that historians drew inspiration mostly from the very early stage of the substantivist/formalist debate in anthropology, when the major theoretical propositions were being articulated, without carefully following subsequent developments. As early as the 1960s it became obvious that a purely substantivist position had much less applicability than Polanyi envisaged a decade earlier (below, n. 9). Eventually, historians of the ancient world would acknowledge this fact independently after taking stock of the growing archaeological evidence which revealed a much more diverse economic landscape. This is, however, a recent development of the last decade (below, n. 16).
Late Roman Empire came out of the same intellectual mold. A similar distrust of material evidence sealed the fate of the Late Roman economy, whose trajectory was seen as depending almost exclusively on state dirigism. The influence of Finley and Jones on subsequent generations of English-language historians cannot be overestimated. This is also reflected in the treatment of ancient coinages and their exact function in the political and economic mechanism of ancient states. The role of money was of course one of the main topics of discussion, if not altogether the key to establishing the nature of ancient exchange patterns. Although early coinages featured as the third type of exchange in the hierarchy developed by Polanyi and Dalton, their all-purpose function was not recognized by anthropologists of the substantivist school, but merely their role as a series of specialized instruments of exchange.\(^6\) Plenty of ethnographic evidence of redistribution, reciprocity and gift exchange put together by a series of distinguished anthropologists and sociologists going back to Marcel Mauss and Bronislaw Malinowski, ensured that the "primitivist" view of instruments of exchange prevailed over the anachronistic use of terms such as all-purpose money. Referring to the Roman monetary system, historians and numismatists who drew on such substantivist theories rejected the existence of all-purpose money based on the failure of the Roman economy to display all the features recognizable in its modern counterpart. Michael Crawford's take on the Roman Republican coinage found its equally brilliant correspondent in Michael Hendy's comprehensive treatment of the literary sources pertaining to the monetary economy of the Late Roman and Byzantine

Empire. Largely ignoring the physical evidence of excavation finds and hoards, Hendy’s model of monetary policies in Byzantium is perhaps the most revealing testament of the overwhelming influence exercised by Jones’s intellectual legacy. He argued that the use of money was strictly related to the needs of the state. The primary mechanism behind the distribution of coin was the military and the public post, while most of the energies gravitated around the needs of Constantinople. The circulation of coin was superficial, Hendy going as far as to say that coinage was relatively little used.

Indeed, historians who placed greater emphasis on the archaeological evidence tended to have a less monolithic approach to ancient economies seen as being governed by a series of dynamic forces often deriving from state-controlled activity, but allowing for private initiative and a more or less developed private sector. This time, however, such developments in the treatment of the Roman and Late Antique economy were less the product of influence coming from other disciplines and had more to do with the growing body of evidence resulting from systematic excavations. To be sure, in anthropology the Polanyist school of economic thought, which came as a much needed reaction to modernist interpretations no doubt influenced by the first age of globalization in the early twentieth century, was vigorously criticized for its rigidity and doctrinaire nature by the new generation of formalists. Drawing on the work of early formalists such as Raymond Firth, D. M. Goodfellow, and Melville Herskovits, formalists of the second

---


half of the twentieth century emphasized the need to test the usefulness of formal economics tools based on the specificities of the socio-cultural entities studied, but maintained the position that economization and maximization represent a universal type of behavior.  

The formalist version of ancient economies developed by historians of the ancient world is perhaps less "modernist" than often assumed. Although Mikhail Rostovtzeff, one of the first and most enthusiastic advocates of an ancient economy mirroring many of the principles encountered in modern economic thinking, was perhaps too quick to find sophisticated mechanisms behind ancient economic decision-making, his approach clearly opened the way to a more nuanced enquiry which relied heavily on the archaeological evidence. However, few students of the "modernist" school ever intended to project purely capitalist concepts on ancient economic realities. The ever-growing archaeological record has improved our understanding of short- and long-distance circulation of goods, although it is not yet clear where one draws the line between state-controlled shipments, circulation between estates and commerce properly speaking. Nevertheless, even "primitivist" historians of the Cambridge school

---


10 To be sure late nineteenth century historian Eduard Meyer was equating fifth century BC Greece with sixteenth century Western Europe, for which see I. Morris et al., "Introduction," in *Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*, ed. W. Scheidel et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 2.


12 There is an abundant literature on the topic of trade and commerce in Late Antiquity. For early influential contributions which also take into account the archaeological evidence, see C. R. Whittaker,
could no longer accept the static model proposed by Finley and were forced to work within a more flexible paradigm, to be sure still essentially part of the same orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{13} The contributions of Keith Hopkins are perhaps the best exemplification of such developments.\textsuperscript{14} Later studies of the use of credit and banking in the Roman world, the general contribution of archaeology, as well as attacks on the "consumer city" theory, one of the major pillars of the Finleyan economic model, channeled the discussion back to the idea of a developed pre-capitalist economy in the Roman Mediterranean world.\textsuperscript{15}

Indeed, any interpretation depends on a series of prior assumptions and this is very much true in the case of coin finds and their treatment as evidence of either market-controlled circulation or state-directed payments. It is however significant to note that a recent \textit{Economic History of Byzantium}, a massive collective enterprise bringing together contributions by archaeologists, historians, and numismatists, testifies that

\textsuperscript{13} Hopkins argued that the views of Jones and Finley amounted to a "new orthodoxy" in the field of ancient economic history; see K. Hopkins, "Introduction," in \textit{Trade in the Ancient Economy}, xi.


trade, finances and coin circulation can no longer be forced to fit the primitivist/modernist model but a much more complex paradigm, yet to be fully articulated, which draws its inspiration from both.\(^{16}\)

Without witnessing a revolutionary turn in the historiography of the topic, as many "primitivist" claims are hard if not impossible to refute with the current evidence,\(^{17}\) a shift towards a more flexible interpretation of the Roman economy is evident in recent scholarship.\(^{18}\) Economic historians and archaeologists are now much more comfortable

---


\(^{17}\) For a recent defense of the Finleyan approach, see P. F. Bang, *The Roman Bazaar. A Comparative Study of Trade and Market in a Tributary Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), esp. 17-36 for the theoretical underpinnings.

\(^{18}\) Many refer to these new developments as a more "optimistic" view of the Roman economy but I have deliberately avoided the term for being too charged with a nineteenth century evolutionist flavor. The turn itself, however, is very real. Economist Peter Temin went as far as to say that the early Roman economy can be described as an integrated market economy, and many of his arguments are compelling, see P. Temin, "A Market Economy in the Early Roman Empire," *JRS* 91 (2001): 169-81. For recent views on trade and commerce in Late Antiquity, see also J. Durliat, "Les conditions du commerce au VI\(^{e}\) siècle," in *The Sixth Century: Production, Distribution and Demand*, eds R. Hodges and W. Bowden (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 89-117; B. Ward-Perkins, "Specialized Production and Exchange," in *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume XIV: Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors*, A.D. 425-600, ed. A. Cameron et al. (New}
speaking about Roman and Byzantine markets than they were two decades ago. A shift toward a modernist vision of the Mediterranean economy is evident in recent scholarship, without entailing a return to the traditional approach of Rostovtzeff. In fact, the most important outcome of the long-lasting debate in economic history has been the adoption of a moderate interpretative framework that legitimates the discussion of markets and "interdependent markets" with respect to the Late Antique economy, but still successfully avoids the trap of presentism.\textsuperscript{19} The re-conceptualization of the modernist approach can be briefly characterized as an attack on the overwhelming dominance of the state in economic affairs, an added emphasis on private initiative based on the archaeological research of the past few decades, and a much more critical assessment of ancient sources displaying the senatorial disdain for trade and profit-making which conceal and obscure the diverse conditions of the marketplace.

To be sure, numismatists who are generally more concerned with the physical evidence than with theoretical models drawn from anthropology or sociology have always tended to feel more comfortable when treating coin finds as money rather than exploring its limitations or even non-economic functions. The adoption of a sophisticated statistical apparatus in the past three decades which brought order into an ever growing body of evidence from site finds and hoards, as well attempts to calculate ancient coin production added a scientific flavor to numismatic studies, bringing them even closer to

---

the tools of formal economics. No doubt the early Byzantine monetary system had a great deal of sophistication, but even a cursory survey of the actual conditions of the sixth and seventh centuries will immediately reveal that advocating the existence of a monetary policy in the modern sense of the term would be totally anachronistic. On the other hand, early Byzantine administrators were building on a very long monetary history and relied on a complex system inherited from the Roman Empire. Many of the regions under Byzantine control in the sixth century boasted an uninterrupted tradition of handling coins which spanned over a millennium of Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman monetary history. It has been recently suggested that the level of monetization reached by the Byzantine economy was around 46 percent, which means that coinage permeated the early Byzantine society at multiple levels. This did not necessarily reflect market transactions as the same author advanced a figure between 42 and 57 percent for the quantity of coin represented by taxes alone. It immediately becomes evident that taxation (as the main form of revenue) and administrative and military salaries (as the main form of disbursing coin) constituted both the main reason for issuing coinage and the most important channels of circulation in terms of the scale and value involved. It comes as no surprise that numismatists and economic historians have devoted much of their energy to aspects related to state finance and the ways in which ancient sources can help us understand Early Byzantine fiscal practices. On the other hand,

---


22 The literature is, again, very abundant. Several contributions from different intellectual traditions must be cited for their comprehensive treatment of the topic: I. E. Karayannopoulos, Das Finanzwesen des
differentiating between the reasons why states issue coinage in the first place and why and how coinage actually circulates is a crucial methodological distinction which must be kept in mind at all times.23

Traditionally early Byzantine coinage has its starting point in 498 with the reform of Anastasius, which was essentially a successful overhaul of the bronze currency. The new system, however, inherited the stable gold coinage whose main features had been introduced by Diocletian and Constantine the Great two centuries earlier. Its resilience derived both from the fact that its intrinsic value was equal to its nominal value and from a careful regulation of its production and circulation.24 The Anastasian reform of the bronze coinage and its subsequent evolution in the sixth and seventh centuries are of crucial importance for a proper understanding of the function performed by low-value currency in the early Byzantine financial and economic system.25 Although the petty currency accounted for a small fraction of the total value of coins in circulation, dominated by the gold solidus, it bears upon the larger debate regarding the fiduciary


23 For the concept see C. J. Howgego, Ancient History from Coins (London/ NewYork: Routledge, 1995), 33-38. See also E. Lo Cascio, “How did the Romans View their Coinage and its Function?” in Coin Finds and Coin Use in the Roman World, ed. C. E. King and D. G. Wigg (Berlin: Mann, 1996), 282: “The character of coinage as a creation of the state for the satisfaction of its needs does not necessarily imply that it was not used extensively as a means of exchange, nor considered by its users as accomplishing in the first instance this function.”


25 For the role of money in Byzantium see the more recent overview by Morrisson, “Byzantine Money,” 909-66. For the evolution of the monetary system ca 500-700, see also K. Harl, Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 BC to AD 700 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 191-203.
nature of pre-modern coinages, a bone of contention among numismatists and economic historians for many decades and by extension a topic relevant to the primitivist-modernist polemic.\textsuperscript{26}

The reform of 498 has been universally acclaimed as a successful measure against the decline of the petty currency during the decades preceding the accession of Anastasius.\textsuperscript{27} It has not been sufficiently stressed, however, that the new coinage was revolutionary in many respects. Not only did it ensure that the value of the bronze coinage would not relapse to its state from the final decades of the fifth century, but for the first time in the monetary history of the Mediterranean world, the nominal value of each denomination featured prominently on the reverse. It is significant to note that the usual propagandistic imagery of the reverse was almost entirely replaced by the large numeral representing the value, flanked by other purely official markings such as the mint, the officina, and after 538, the date. In terms of design there is hardly a closer correspondent to modern coinages than the bronze currency introduced by Anastasius in two stages during his reign, in 498 and 512, respectively.


The new system was obviously designed to regain the confidence of the population and be used according to its nominal value. Can the new bronze coinage be understood as token coinage or at least as leaving room for manipulations leading to a nominal value higher than the intrinsic one? The evidence of texts, single finds, and hoards point to an affirmative answer although many scholars working within a primitivist paradigm would rather stick with the "metallist" point of view. To be sure, the view of a strictly non-fiduciary nature of bronze coinage has permitted reconstructions of the exchange rate between the copper folli and the gold solidus during the sixth and seventh centuries, which would otherwise be impossible to estimate given the scarcity of written evidence regarding monetary policies. But there is something more important at stake than losing the ability to create tables reflecting fluctuations in the ratio between gold and copper. The relation between gold coinage and taxation has been discussed at length, as well as its role in the monetization of landlocked areas deep in the hinterland where people still had to acquire gold coins to pay their taxes, although they did not have easy access to an urban market, nor perhaps the need to use money on a daily basis. While the role of gold seems clear, not the same can be said about the copper coinage. Based on official regulations, taxes could only be paid in the most stable and reliable form of currency, which was obviously the gold solidus. Taxes owed to the state

---

28 Initial popular reaction was negative, bordering on violent, Anastasius being accused of extreme avarice and of "hating all the poor," for which see Sarris, *Economy and Society*, 201; A. D. Lee, "The Eastern Empire: Theodosius to Anastasius," in *The Cambridge Ancient History, vol XIV*, 55.


did not always amount to multiples of one solidus and sometimes its fractions, the semissis and the tremissis, were themselves insufficient for settling the debt in gold only. Sixth-century Byzantium lacked a silver coinage, other than ceremonial pieces with no real economic function. The reasons most often discussed are the scarcity of silver in the Byzantine Empire at a period which coincided with the greatest wealth of silver plate, possible export to Persia which relied almost exclusively on a silver coinage, and perhaps the insufficient difference between the ratio of coined metals and the market ratio. This basically meant that there was not any kind of denomination to fill the gap between the tremissis and the follis (40 nummia), which might be as wide as the difference between 40 nummia and 8000 nummia at the exchange rate advanced by numismatists for the later sixth century. In cases when the gold coinage alone could not be used to pay the exact amount due, the taxpayer was forced to add a gold fraction and whatever went beyond the required sum was returned in copper coin, folles and lower denominations at the current exchange rate between the solidus and the follis. In most cases the majority of taxpayers, either urban dwellers hiring out their labor or peasants selling their produce or their labor, had to produce a quantity of gold coin in order to pay their taxes, a process which often involved taking a larger sum of bronze coin to official money-changers (zygostatai) in order to acquire the much needed gold.

This rather straightforward circuit, which of course reflects nothing but the standard scenario devised by the Byzantine authorities, leaves room for speculation regarding the ways in which the transaction took place. Plenty of evidence exists

---


regarding the careful inspection of gold pieces to make sure that they conformed to the official weight and to insure that whatever sum needed to be paid matched the corresponding quantity of gold expected from full-weight *solidi* (72 *solidi* to the pound). Again this entailed further calculations and further disbursing of copper coin as change. The crux of the matter is the way in which the sum of copper coins was calculated. If it was weighed, as the logic of the non-fiduciary thesis would imply, then we would expect a careful regulation of coins in circulation to insure that they corresponded to the official weight, which was itself a reflection of the exchange rate between the *solidus* and the *follis*. Although the sixth century enjoyed the most complex system of low-value currency since the days of the early Roman Empire, it was far less stable in time and serious fluctuations in weight can be noticed over the long sixth century (*ca* 498-616). Eventually, the Anastasian system of denominations would gradually collapse from the reign of Heraclius onward. However, the evidence of hoards from various regions of the early Byzantine Empire clearly demonstrates that the coin pool towards the end of the sixth century included coins of the same denomination but of very different weight. One could handle a sum of coins which could include a *follis* of Anastasius from the first

---

33 Weighing gold coins seems to have been the norm as evidenced by the large number of Late Roman and Early Byzantine *exagia* known in museum collections and from excavations. The latter are particularly significant as they provide precious information regarding the context in which weights were used. For sixth century *exagia*, see especially M. M. Fulghum and F. Heintz, "A Hoard of Early Byzantine Glass Weights from Sardis," *AJN* 10 (1998): 105-20; C. Filipova, "Rannovizantiiski merki za tejest ot c. Bistritsa, Dupnishko," *Numizmatika, sfregistika i epigrafia* 3 (2006): 185-90; A. Minchev, "Early Byzantine Weights Found in Northeastern Bulgaria and Some Notes on their Production, Distribution and Use," in *Acta Musei Varnensis, VII/1, Numismatic, Sphragistic and Epigraphic Contributions to the History of the Black Sea Coast*, ed. I. Lazarenko, vol. II (Varna: Zograf, 2008), 7-40; G. Custurea, "Ponduri antice și medievale descoperite recent în Dobrogea," *Pontica* 42 (2009): 671-82. Abuses are also known, including the use of heavier *exagia* by tax collectors, mentioned in *C.Th XI.8.4*. In order to prevent corruption Novella 128 from 545 encouraged taxpayers to request the official weights of the *comes sacrarum largitionum*. For a discussion of such practices, see Delmaire, *Largesses sacrées*, 518-19; Hendy, *Studies*, 332; C. Morrisson, "Weighing, Measuring, Paying: Exchanges in the Market and the Marketplace," in *Trade and Markets in Byzantium*, 386-89. For the practice of weighing *solidi*, see recently Carlä, "L’oro nella tarda antichità," 99-116.
reform weighing around 8g together with large folles of Justinian weighing over 20g and later coins of Justin II, Tiberius II, and Maurice weighing around 11-12g, all displaying the large "M" indicating the nominal value of 40 nummia.

The clear implication is that bronze coins were counted rather than weighed in transactions with the state (and elsewhere), based on a fragile consensus that the face value should prevail. Moreover, there would be no need for five different denominations of the bronze coinage if coins were to be weighed during what would arguably be the most important transactions of the annual cycle, the payment of taxes. The denominational system was obviously geared toward the market, which would soon collapse if weighing coins were to be the preferred method of payment. The written sources, fragmentary though they are with respect to money, almost always refer to numbers when discussing the petty currency. Thus we learn that a worker digging a well received five folles a day for his labor, bread was sold for 1 follis in Constantinople, Procopius criticized Justinian for allowing the number of folles to one solidus to fluctuate, while Psellos mentioned that small change was to be numbered and not weighed like bullion, testifying that the practice was maintained later in Byzantium. In addition, there is no way of accepting two different functions of the copper coinage, a "metallistic" one for dealings with the state (weighing) and "nominalistic" in market transactions (counting). In such a case, the strategy of sellers and buyers would be to hold on to the heavier specimens in order to use them for the payment of taxes, while the owner of the well from the account of John Moschus would try to pay his worker in

\[\text{34 For a brief discussion see Harl, Coinage in the Roman Economy, 285-89. For detailed lists of prices and wages, see C. Morrisson and J.-C. Cheynet, "Prices and Wages in the Byzantine World," in Economic History of Byzantium., 815-78. For weighing vs counting see recently Morrisson, "Weighing, Measuring, Paying," 379-98, esp. 379-89 for Late Antique practices.}\]
lighter coins, for similar reasons. Similarly, the state would withdraw from circulation those specimens which did not conform to the standard and ran the risk of being hoarded according to Gresham’s law.

In conclusion, both the literary and the archaeological evidence points to the fiduciary nature of the petty coinage and to the fact that the term *Gewichtsgeldwirtschaft* refers only to gold coinage. The significant number of heavy coins of Justinian in late sixth-century hoards discussed elsewhere clearly shows that we are dealing with a fiduciary coinage in the pre-modern sense of the term, which allows for a certain overvaluation dependant on the confidence of the population as well as on the government’s ability of coercion. This does not mean that the confidence of the population once acquired after half a century of insignificant changes in the aspect of the bronze coinage could never be lost again. There is ample evidence of crisis in the second half of the sixth century when the short-term effects of the plague and the long-term effects of waging war on several fronts translated into rampant inflation. Economic historians often employ Fisher’s quantitative theory of money to explain inflationary mechanisms, but the matter might be settled quite simply by referring back to the needs of the state. A crippled demographic base of recruitment and taxation after the plague coupled with the increased militarization of frontiers meant that more money was needed to pay the troops and to meet higher prices. Excess of expenditure over income accounted for the issue of fresh coin as did the rate of attrition through hoarding, casual loss, or export across the frontiers. The type of response adopted by the administration

---

35 Carlà, *L’oro nella tarda antichità*, 476.

when faced with a crisis, namely lowering the weight of the coins, bespeaks the "nominalist" function of the coinage, as clearly more and more coins were needed, understood as units of 40 *nummia* and its fractions, in other words understood as numbers not as quantity (bullion). Since the supply of metal was limited, now more than ever the Byzantine administration needed to overvalue its currency in order to meet the new challenges. That the attempt was not entirely successful, we know from the fact that heavier specimens were eventually withdrawn from circulation at the end of the century in the attempt to standardize the currency while gaining additional metal for striking fresh coin.

The breakdown of the Anastasian system and the subsequent simplification of the copper currency are attested by both written and archaeological sources. The crisis accelerated in the second decade of seventh century and fractions of the *follis* below the half-*follis* became rare. To be sure, the process had been under way, albeit at a slower pace, since the mid-sixth century when the *nummus*, the lowest denomination of the early Byzantine system, disappeared almost completely from circulation, as attested by hoard evidence.\(^{37}\) *Pentanummia*, however, continued to be issued in considerable numbers at least until the reign of Maurice. The collection of the miracles of St Artemius describes a man who gathers all the small change he dropped on a street of Constantinople around 640. He managed to retrieve all the coins down to the last half-*follis*, which would suggest that this was the smallest denomination available.\(^{38}\) While the excavations from Saračhane and Kalenderhane have shown that this was not


entirely accurate, it certainly illustrates the situation in provincial towns.\textsuperscript{39} The breakdown of the currency system led to a simplification of urban market transactions as people could no longer rely on a steady supply of lower denominations.

The early Byzantine administration dealt with a very fragile balance of revenue and expenditure and any serious disruptions could throw the entire fiscal system into collapse.\textsuperscript{40} Multiple crises starting from the 540s leave the impression of a long agony but also illustrate the resilience and the capacity to adapt, if not always successfully, to the new conditions. This much can be seen from the manipulation of the copper coinage, discussed above, but also from the introduction sometime in the 540s of a series of officially sanctioned light weight \textit{solidi} worth 20, 21, 22, and 23 \textit{siliquae}, respectively.\textsuperscript{41} The exact purpose of this coinage has been a longtime preoccupation of numismatists and historians, various theories being advanced such as trade, external payments, and internal regulations, but it seems that the latter is more likely closer to reality, namely the need to account for the worn \textit{solidi}, which no longer corresponded to the official weight.\textsuperscript{42}


\textsuperscript{40} Corippus’s comparison of the treasury with a stomach feeding the body is a perfect allegory, for which see \textit{In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minori} II, ed. and trans. A. Cameron (London: Athlone Press, 1976), 55.

\textsuperscript{41} The date of the introduction of light weight \textit{solidi} is debated, see Hendy, \textit{Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy}, 493 (after 538/9); Delmaire, \textit{Largesses sacrées}, 521-22 (547-550); \textit{MIBE}, 12 (538-542); Carlà, \textit{L’oro nella tarda antichità}, 381 (546-547).

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{MIBE} 12; Carlà, \textit{L’oro nella tarda antichità}, 385. Constantine Zuckerman also favors an internal explanation for the use of light weight \textit{solidi}, but argues that these were meant to pay \textit{donativa} and other types of irregular largesse, see C. Zuckerman, \textit{Du village à l’empire}, 88. For older interpretations, see H. L. Adelson, \textit{Light Weight Solidi and Byzantine Trade during the Sixth and Seventh Centuries} (New York, American Numismatic Society, 1957). Regarding old gold coins in circulation and the legislation, see Hendy, \textit{Studies}, 366; Banaji, \textit{Agrarian}, 70-75; Harl, \textit{Coinage in the Roman Economy}, 196. Interestingly,
The introduction of the silver *hexagrammon* by Heraclius is another similar example. As noted, silver had been a ceremonial coinage during the sixth century, although silver coins were mostly issued on the standard of the *siliqua* or the *miliarensis* and their fractions. Many displayed meaningless *vota* inscriptions typical for the Late Roman coinage, some featured the inscription TP (*tropaion*), clearly alluding to their purpose as awards, while others were nothing but token pieces featuring a large K on the reverse to be distributed around May 11 when Constantinople was celebrated. The role of silver changed dramatically in the early seventh century during the equally dramatic events that forced Heraclius to seize the silver plate of the church in order to strike a brand new coinage. Hexagrams were intended for paying salaries at 50 percent of the former rate, while taxes would continue to be collected in gold, a clear intention to increase the state revenue during a time of deep crisis.

Michael Hendy has argued that no less than 3/8 of the budget was used to pay the army and the administration. The budget itself was around 5-6 million *solidi*, the highest estimate for the Empire during the Justinianic age. Military payments are of utmost importance for understanding the particularities of coin circulation in the highly militarized frontier regions of the sixth century. Soldiers’ income included both regular

---

43 *MIBE*, 27, 33 and 52: *MIBEC*, 26 and 39. Banaji, *Agrarian Change*, 44, argued that *miliarenses* were used to pay construction workers, but this does not seem convincing.


and irregular items. The annual salary was theoretically paid in gold but there are sufficient grounds to argue that at least in part it was paid in bronze. The ration-allowance (*annona*) and fodder-allowance for cavalr

y men (*capitus*) had been commuted in coin (*adaeratio*) by Anastasius, and amounted to 4 *solidi* for the former and 4-5 *solidi* for the latter.\(^{46}\) The evidence of military site finds and hoards as well as the output of mints supplying frontier regions show that bronze coin was issued in high quantities to satisfy the needs of the army.\(^{47}\) During the revolt against Phocas and later during the war with Persia, Heraclius opened temporary mints in the East with the clear purpose of supporting the army. The case of Cyprus is perhaps the most revealing.\(^{48}\) In addition, Wolfgang Hahn has identified and classified a series of anomalous issues labeled *moneta militaris imitativa* under the plausible assumption that they were issued by mobile mints traveling with the army in order to cover the need for coin when official issues were not available in sufficient quantity.\(^{49}\) Such semi-official imitations largely correspond to the weight and style of the regular coinage and their presence among finds from the Danube region seems to justify Hahn’s proposition.\(^{50}\) The fact that salaries were partly paid in bronze, which the soldiers needed for small transactions, explains the inflation of the petty currency in the second half of the sixth century when

\(^{46}\) Ibid., 646.

\(^{47}\) See for instance the activity of Thessalonica mint for which see D. M. Metcalf, *The Copper Coinage of Thessalonica under Justinian I* (Vienna: Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1976), 8. Further evidence from Illyricum, discussed in the following section, substantiates this hypothesis.

\(^{48}\) D. M. Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus 491-1191* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 2009), 163.

\(^{49}\) *MIB II*, 49-51, 58, and 74.

frontier provinces of both the Balkans and the East came under constant pressure. It is less safe to argue that irregular distributions were also paid partly in bronze, although the archaeological evidence seems to point in that direction at least for the Danube region.\textsuperscript{51}

The most important distributions were the \textit{donativum} on imperial accession (\textit{augustaticum}) which consisted of five \textit{solidi} and a pound of silver during the early sixth century and nine \textit{solidi} on the accession of Tiberius II,\textsuperscript{52} and quinquenial \textit{donativa} amounting to five \textit{solidi} per man.\textsuperscript{53} It is often argued that the latter was suppressed by Justinian, based on the testimony of Procopius, but the gold output of the mint of Carthage displays five-year spikes as late as the reign of Maurice as do the copper coin finds from the Danube frontier during the second half of the sixth century, clearly evidencing the fact that the quinquenial \textit{donativum} was not permanently discontinued.\textsuperscript{54}

In 596 Maurice modified the payment of salaries (\textit{rogai}) and \textit{donativum} (\textit{epidosis}) by distributing it one-third in coin and the other two-thirds in equipment and weapons after he had already attempted to reduce the \textit{donativum} by 25 percent in 587.\textsuperscript{55} These

\textsuperscript{51} Five-year spikes in coin finds from the Danube frontier may reflect distributions of \textit{donativa} in copper, see A. Gândilă, "Early Byzantine Coin Circulation in the Eastern Provinces: A Statistical Approach." \textit{American Journal of Numismatics} 21 (2009): 208, fig. 3. Other irregular gifts (\textit{dora}) of gold distributed to deserving soldiers who distinguished themselves in battle are discussed by Delmaire, \textit{Largesses sacrées}, 554.

\textsuperscript{52} Hendy, \textit{Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy}, 177 argues that the pound of silver was commuted into gold at the exchange rate between the two metals. Silver, however, could have been distributed in the form of plate as suggested by a scene described by Corippus in which Senators received silver plates filled with gold coins with the occasion of Justin II's consulship, for which see see \textit{In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris IV}, 109-111, ed. and trans. A. Cameron (London: Athlone Press, 1976).

\textsuperscript{53} Calculated at 750000 \textit{solidi} for the age of Justinian based on the size of the army; see Hendy, \textit{Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy}, 177.


\textsuperscript{55} Theophylact Simocatta, \textit{Historia}, III, 1.2 and VII, 1.2, ed. C de Boor and G. Wirth (Stuttgart: Teubner,
measures reveal the great stress placed on the imperial treasury by the need to finance war on two fronts. They also explain the reaction of the soldiers and of the population at large. The latter cared less about the imperial treasury left empty by Tiberius II’s irrational largesse and mocked Maurice with appellations such as "Maurice the Marcianist" alluding to the emperor’s parsimony, while the former staged a coup leading to his deposition in 602.56 Fluctuations in the production of copper coinage at Constantinople, Nicomedia, and Cyzicus were a direct reflection of political and economic crisis in the final decade of the sixth century.57

Despite the wealth of information which the study of low-value currency can contribute to a well-rounded discussion of the early Byzantine economy, historians have seldom ventured beyond the analysis of the gold coinage, and even here rarely leaving the confines of the written sources to address the archaeological evidence. The assumption, which pervades Michael Hendy’s influential study as well as more recent works, is that copper coinage had an insignificant value and, as such, did not contribute much to the overall value of transactions involving coinage. This type of macro-scale analysis emphasizes quantity and value at the expense of other variables such as frequency and integration. To be sure, copper coinage was used only in small-scale transactions, serving the needs of the urban market and to a lesser extent that of monetized rural spaces, but at the same time low-value currency reflected the daily

1972), 110 and 245-46. For a discussion, see Gândilă, "Heavy Money," 370; P. Yannopoulos, "Inflation, dévaluation et reevaluation à la transitions des mondes romain et byzantin," in Histoire économique de l'antiquité: bilans et contributions de savants belges présentés dans une réunion interuniversitaire, ed. T. Hackens and P. Marchetti (Louvain-la-Neuve: Séminaire de numismatique Marcel Hoc, Collège Erasme, 1987), 129. Delmaire disagrees with the reading of rogai as salaries, see Delmaire, Largesses sacrées, 559, with n. 81.


57 Gândilă, "Early Byzantine Coin Circulation," 183-86.
activity of the majority, rather than the dealings of a wealthy minority or official business such as the payment of salaries and the collection of taxes. The fact that the combined value of copper coin finds from excavations conducted in the past century amount only to the value of a few hundred solidi should not deter us from a sustained effort of understanding the role and function played by petty currency in the sixth-century economy, which can be characterized by a dualism between the circulation of gold through official channels and the much more dynamic marketplace dominated by high-frequency transactions involving copper coins. Indeed, a careful comparative study of coin finds in urban centers and rural settlements of the early Byzantine Empire, as well as the search for patterns of coin production and circulation through the study of hoards and large public and private collections can be brought to bear on the larger issue of trade, markets, and economic integration.

5.2 Coin Production, Coin Circulation and the Nature of the Evidence

The numismatic evidence, whether in the form of hoards, site finds, accidental finds or museum collections is fragmentary and not without methodological problems. Hoards can tell us a lot about the lifespan of coins in circulation and sometimes they

58 For an engaging discussion of daily exchanges in the marketplace, see recently B. Pitarakis, “Daily Life at the Marketplace in Late Antiquity and Byzantium,” in Trade and Markets in Byzantium, 399-426.

59 For the dual nature of the early Byzantine monetary economy, see Carlà, L’oro nella tarda antichità, 474. Commercial areas or “shops” have been excavated in many urban centers of the early Byzantine Empire. In cases where the coin finds have been published, such as Sardis, Scythopolis, Berytus, and Tomis, a common characteristic is the significant number of smaller denominations of the follis, which clearly points to the high frequency of low-value transactions. To be sure, in most of these cases we are probably dealing with a mix of commercial, industrial and residential structures. For the finds, see M. D. Weishan, “Appendix 1: Conspectus of Mints,” in J. Stephens Crawford et al., The Byzantine Shops at Sardis (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 126-28; G. Bijovski, “The Coins.” In S. Agady et. al, “The Bet Shean Archaeological Project,” in What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem. Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster, ed. L. V. Rutgers (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 507–12; Butcher, “Archaeology of the Beyrut Souks,” 7-304; G. Poenaru Bordea et al., Monnaies Byzantines du Musée de Constanța (Roumanie) (Wetteren: Moneta, 2004).
can provide accurate snapshots of the variety of coins in circulation in a certain time and place. Unfortunately, only a small percentage of hoards are found during archaeological excavations, many being the result of chance find during agricultural works, construction work, and the use of metal detectors. Museum curators thus often find it difficult to establish the original number of coins in such hoards and the exact circumstances and context of the find. Site finds are much more useful for establishing patterns of coin loss over time, but a large enough sample is needed in order to reach statistically meaningful results, while at the same time similar samples must be available from other sites in the same region as well as further afield for comparison purposes. Moreover, few sites have been completely excavated. By necessity, the available numismatic evidence reflects the state of research as well as the function of the complexes thus far excavated, which may have a residential, economic, or religious function to name just a few. Finally, museum collections are often the result of amalgamating the types of evidence mentioned above, usually containing a high percentage of coins with unknown provenance, in the case of large museums (e.g. British Museum), or with an uncertain provenance within a given region, in the case of local history museums from regions which were once part of the early Byzantine Empire. While acknowledging the nature and limitation of the sources, there is still much to learn from carefully navigating various types of numismatic evidence which can tell us a lot about the social, political and economic conditions of the early Byzantine Empire.

Museum collections in particular hold great promise for gaining some understanding of fluctuations in coin production during the long sixth century. Although the collection and recording of Byzantine coins has been a longtime preoccupation of
European scholars and intellectuals which led to the creation of large private and public collections, their value has been rarely recognized and modern numismatists have been too ready to dismiss them as irrelevant for answering broader historical questions. As early as the first half of the nineteenth century antiquarians and collectors became interested in developing means of organizing and systematizing the Byzantine coin series. The chief concern was to create "suites monétaires", an attempt to gather all the known coin types issued by the Byzantine state. The pioneering works of de Saulcy and Sabatier in the nineteenth century had been an important starting ground for the subsequent catalogue of the collection published by Count Tolstoi between 1908 and 1911. However, the standard work for more than fifty years would become the catalogue of Byzantine coins in the British Museum. What made it atypical for this early period was the decision to publish an entire collection, whose purpose would be twofold: to fill the gaps in the Byzantine coin series and to provide scientific access to an entire collection, including duplicates.

The breakthrough made after the publication of the major collection at Dumbarton Oaks, assembled through mass purchases, opened a new era in terms of the methodology behind the study of Byzantine coinage. Alfred Bellinger and especially Philip Grierson embarked on the task of reassessing many of the old datings

---

60 F. de Saulcy, Essai de classification des suites monétaires Byzantines (Metz: Lamort, 1836); M. Soleirol, Catalogue des monnaies byzantines qui composent la collection de M. Soleirol (Metz: Lamort, 1853); Sabatier, Tolstoi. Equally important are Théodore Mionnet’s second volume of De la rareté et prix des médailles romaines 2nd volume, 2nd ed. (Paris: De Bure, 1827), the second part of Christian Thomsen’s collection, K. Erslev, Catalogue de la collection de monnaies de feu Christian Jürgensen Thomsen. Seconde partie: Les monnaies du moyen-age, tome I (Copenhague: Imprimerie de Thiele, 1873), as well as the contribution to the classification of Justinian’s coinage I by J. Friedländer and M. Pinder, Die Münzen Justinians (Berlin: Nicolai, 1843).

61 BMC.

62 DOC I.
and attributions in what became a seminal work for our understanding of the early Byzantine coinage. Cécile Morrisson went a step further by cataloguing the old and important collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, enriched with the donations of leading scholar-collectors such as Gustave Schlumberger. Equally significant have been the major private collections of Byzantine copper coins made available to the scientific world, such as those of Rodolfo Ratto and George Bates. Creating a corpus of all known Byzantine coin finds, as the latter has pleaded for in the introduction to his catalogue, might prove to be an illusory endeavor if we take into account the large number of coins currently on the market. Nonetheless, the number of coins in national or local museums from the Balkans, Turkey or the Middle East has greatly increased in the past fifty years due to extensive archaeological research, often performed by international teams of scholars at Apamea, Sardis, Berytus and Caesarea Maritima to name a few of the most important. In addition, the collections assembled by museums and universities in Western Europe contribute to the wealth of Early Byzantine coins available for study. The difficult task of assembling all known Byzantine coin types was attempted by Wolfgang Hahn in his series Moneta Imperii Byzantini. However, few initiatives have been taken towards a statistical understanding of the monetary


64 Most important are the collection of the Hunter Coin Cabinet in Glasgow, J. D. Bateson and I. G. Campbell, Byzantine and Early Medieval Western European Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet (London: Spink, 1998), the collection Köhler-Osbarh from the Duisburg Museum, KOD, the collection of the University of Göttingen, A. S. Sommer, Katalog der Byzantinischen Münzen (Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2003), and the collection of the Bottacin Museum in Padova, B. Callegher, Catalogo delle monete bizantine, vandale, ostrogote e longobarde del Museo Bottacin, vol. I (Padova: Comune di Padova, Musei e biblioteche, 2000).

65 MIB.
circulation at the scale of the entire empire, although the use of quantitative tools was promoted and employed for assessing local provincial patterns in coin circulation.

The use of statistical tools in Byzantine numismatics is largely a post-war development. The growing interest in elaborate means of quantification lies both in the need for a more complex method of analyzing the increasing number of coins and in the introduction of computer-based programs which facilitated such an approach. Mathematical tools have always been employed in numismatics; by necessity, coins needed to be counted and classified based on chronological and typological criteria, but no attempt was made to analyze them statistically. D. M. Metcalf has been a pioneer in this respect. His study of Byzantine coins in Sirmia and Slavonia represents the first elaborate attempt to use statistics in order to understand the Early Byzantine coin circulation in that region. It also represented an opportunity to make use of comparative statistics, which permitted a number of generalizations at the scale of the Eastern Empire, based on the evidence available from the excavations at Corinth, Athens,

---


Antioch, and Sardis. Starting from the early 1980s one can observe an explosion of studies employing more or less sophisticated statistical tools. The main impetus had been provided by the organization of a Round Table dedicated to the use of statistics in numismatics, in which reputed numismatists and professional statisticians collaborated for a better implementation of statistics in numismatic research.

The work diversified and the aims turned more ambitious, to analyses of metrology and calculations of mint output. Again, D. M. Metcalf should be mentioned for his role as a pioneer. His work on particular early Byzantine issues, the Anastasian small module coins and the Justinianic coinage from Thessalonica, represent early attempts to determine Byzantine mint output. However, calculations of mint output based on die studies have not moved too far for the Byzantine series. Aside from the work of D. M. Metcalf, calculations have been attempted by W. E. Metcalf and Cécile Morrisson for small issues such as the joint reign solidi of Justin I and Justinian I and gold issues of Carthage, respectively. The sheer size of the Byzantine base coinage has prohibited scholars from attempting any such calculations and the situation will probably remain the same in the foreseeable future. Consequently, students in the field

---


of Byzantine numismatics have been less engaged in the lively debate of the last two
decades centered on the question of mint output.\textsuperscript{74} Steps have been taken, however, to
understand the metrology of the multi-denominational system of Byzantine coinage. The
publication of the large collections of Dumbarton Oaks and Paris provided the
opportunity for metrological calculations based on large samples. In addition, Henri
Pottier contributed a seminal book for the metrological study of Byzantine coinage but
also for the monetary circulation in Syria, based on comparative statistics.\textsuperscript{75}

In the past two decades statistic methods in Byzantine numismatics have been
used in almost any study dealing with a substantial sample of coins, either hoards or
stray finds. The coin hoards from the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Middle East were
processed mainly using a statistical apparatus. One should mention here a substantial
article by Florin Curta on hoards from Eastern Europe with a thick appendix of statistical
results, the monumental trilogy of Hans-Christoph Noeske on the Byzantine coin
circulation in Egypt and the Near Eastern provinces, of which the last volume comprises
a few dozen graphs derived from statistical calculations, and the collaborative work
coordinated by Cécile Morrison, V. Popović, and V. Ivanišević on the coin hoards found
in the Balkans and in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{76} At the same time, studies of stray and single finds from

\textsuperscript{74} W. Esty, "Estimating the Size of a Coinage," \textit{NC} 146 (1986): 185-215; Buttrey, "Calculating Ancient
Coin Production," 335–351; T. V. Buttrey, "Calculating Ancient Coin Production II: Why it Cannot Be
Done, \textit{NC} 154 (1994): 341-52; T. V. Buttrey and S. E. Buttrey, "Calculating Ancient Coin Production,
in the Roman Empire} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994) with an extensive review by W. E.

\textsuperscript{75} Pottier, \textit{Analyse d'un trésor}. See more recently H. Pottier, "Nouvelle approche de la livre byzantine du

\textsuperscript{76} F. Curta, "Invasion or inflation? Sixth-to-Seventh Century Byzantine Coin Hoards in Eastern and
Southeastern Europe," \textit{Annali di Istituto Italiano di Numismatica} 43(1996): 65-224; \textit{Münzfunde; Trésors}. 
major archaeological sites have included statistical analyses of recent finds and also previously published material.\(^{77}\)

The purpose of the following sections are twofold: first, it attempts to identify general fluctuations in the production of base-metal coinage, based on the evidence of the major public collections and secondly, it draws a series of comparisons between coin finds in the major geographical units of the Eastern Empire. This study deals exclusively with copper coins issued in the major Eastern mints, Constantinople, Thessalonica, Nicomedia, Cyzicus, and Antioch. The reasons behind this decision are both technical and practical; most of the Early Byzantine coin finds originate in the eastern part of the empire, from the Danube to the Eastern Mediterranean provinces, while the monetary system itself was not standardized throughout the Empire. Egypt was largely self-sufficient, Italy and the African mint at Carthage had different rhythms of coin production than the Eastern mints, and the ratio between gold and copper seems to have had regional particularities.\(^{78}\) Therefore, in order to ensure the accuracy of statistical parameters and ultimately of the historical conclusions drawn from this material, Western provinces, including North Africa were left out. In quantitative terms, this means working with more than 10,000 bronze coins located in five major collections


\(^{78}\) MIB.
(hereafter ‘Collections’) and another c. 8,000 from the major urban centers of the Eastern Empire.\textsuperscript{79}

The single finds resulting from systematic archaeological research are unevenly distributed over the geographical area under consideration. The material from the Balkans is by far the most abundant, followed by the Near East, where numerous Syro-Palestinian sites have been excavated. Chris Lightfoot has sketched the current state of the Byzantine research in Anatolia and drew attention to the lack of interest for Byzantine archaeological layers in favor of the presumably more sophisticated classical period.\textsuperscript{80} Recent research by Zeliha Demirel Gökalp has proven that the Turkish archaeological museums preserve a wealth of Early Byzantine coins found in Anatolia, which awaits publication.\textsuperscript{81} Although a few tentative steps have been taken towards a broad understanding of coin circulation in the Balkans and the Middle East,\textsuperscript{82} little has been done with respect to gathering the numismatic material for an in-depth

\textsuperscript{79} The collections under consideration are Dumbarton Oaks and the Whittemore collection (\textit{DOC}), Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (\textit{BNP}), the collection of the British Museum (\textit{BMC}), the collection Köhler-Osbar in Duisburg (\textit{KOD}), and the vast collection of the American Numismatic Society (\textit{ANS}), still unpublished. They were chosen based on size and on the preponderance of copper issues, including numerous duplicates. The collections of Tolstoi and Ratto are not included in the statistical analysis, as the former published a type catalogue and the latter a sale catalogue and therefore neither was interested in including duplicates. Even if they remain outside the scope of this study, such collections retain a statistical significance for the understanding of mint output by looking at the varieties they were unable to find in their desire to assemble the entire Byzantine coin series.


\textsuperscript{81} I wish to express my gratitude to Zeliha Demirel Gökalp for allowing me to consult her unpublished PhD dissertation and two other unpublished catalogs of the Byzantine coins from the Malatya and Bolu museums.

comparative analysis, partly because of the still insufficient evidence. The case of the border province of Scythia is a unique situation, given that Romanian numismatists have constantly published comprehensive catalogues of recent finds and museum collections,\textsuperscript{83} bringing the total number of Early Byzantine coin finds to a dazzling figure of more than 3,000 specimens.

The relevance of site finds has been a debated issue. Philip Grierson has argued that the structure of site finds tends to favor the smaller coins because they were easily lost and not retrieved and thus they cannot offer a completely reliable image of the circulation.\textsuperscript{84} What seemed acceptable at the time when Grierson was suggesting such an interpretation of site finds is no longer tenable in the light of the material coming from the Balkans, Anatolia and the Near East. His conclusions were chiefly based on the major centers of the early Byzantine Empire, Corinth, Athens, Sardis, Antioch, and Constantinople where excavations had yielded a large number of small denominations.

The idea that small coins were more easily lost due to their size seemed perfectly reasonable both because of the structure of finds and a sort of natural logic suggesting that the smaller the coin (and the lesser the value) the higher the probability of it being

\textsuperscript{83} See the chronicles of the recent finds compiled by B. Mitrea and G. Poenaru Bordea from \textit{Dacia}, "\textit{Découvertes de monnaies antiques et byzantines en Roumanie}" along with the ones regularly published in \textit{Pontica} by Gh. Papuc, R. Ocheşeanu, G. Custurea, A. Vertan and G. Talmaţchi under the title "\textit{Cronica descoperirilor monetare din Dobrogea}". While the coins published in the Romanian journals were mainly single finds resulting from archaeological research, in Bulgaria such articles were devoted exclusively to hoards, see T. Gerasimov's series "\textit{Kolektivni nahodki na moneti}" from \textit{Izvestiia na Arkheologicheskiia Institut}.

\textsuperscript{84} P. Grierson, "Circulazione monetaria e tesaurizzazione," in \textit{\textit{La Cultura bizantina, oggetti e messaggio: moneta ed economia}}, ed. A. Guillou (Rome: L’erna di Bretschneider 1986), 42. But see before, Metcalf, \textit{The Origins of the Anastasian Currency}, 94, who argued that "folles […] stand the same chance of being lost".
lost.\(^{85}\) This, however, does not help to explain why more than 80 percent of the coins coming from archaeological excavations in the Balkans and some Anatolian and Near Eastern sites are *folles* and half-*folles*.\(^{86}\) The argument that excavators missed the smaller coins cannot be a valid explanation given the wealth of 4\(^{th}\)-5\(^{th}\) century material recovered from the same archaeological sites, many coins being half the size of a Byzantine *pentanummium*. We must therefore accept the possibility that people were primarily losing coins based on availability, not size.

Setting a pattern of the coins in circulation might be regarded as an endeavor both daunting and risky. While assessing the mint output based on die studies may be a fruitful approach for rare specimens or gold/silver issues, it is hardly a viable course of action in for the circulating base metal coinage. Even if the method was profitable it could only point to the *potential* number of issues. The real number is effectively connected to minute mechanisms of the Byzantine monetary economy, whose purpose clearly was not to use dies until worn-out, but to control the market through a regulated inflow of fresh currency, to pay the army and the administrative apparatus, and to insure the collection of taxes. The lively debate initiated during the last decades has pointed to variables in determining mint output, which ultimately compromised the value of this method as a definitive tool in assessing absolute coin volumes.\(^{87}\) The devastating criticism of T. V. Buttrey in a period when such applications were flourishing has

---

\(^{85}\) This interpretation held as a general applicable rule is still advocated, especially for sites in the Middle East. See more recently Sheedy, "Byzantine Period Coins," 5.


\(^{87}\) See above, n. 20.
precisely the merit of pointing to problems with this model. Although the discussion was centered on Greek and Roman coinage, his arguments were generally applicable to any ancient coin series. The skepticism regarding figures drawn for gold and silver series turns into total despair in the case of copper issues characterized by large die-populations and high wear factors due to intensive circulation.\textsuperscript{88} Even if we could take advantage of the fact that most of the copper coins were dated with the regnal year starting with 538 and could hypothetically determine the mint output for a certain type based on the number of surviving dies, we would still be nowhere near having a large understanding of the phenomenon of coin production. What would be needed, and is unfortunately illusory, is the absolute numbers for the variety of denominations, mints, officinae and dates in a given period.

The only approach capable of spawning relevant statistical figures, insofar as they could be determined with our current body of knowledge, is the one based on the coin sample at our disposal. The representativity of museum collections first came into discussion as a central argument in the 1950s when scholars were trying to make sense of the transformations that brought the once prosperous empire into a "Dark Age". Using the numismatic material from the British Museum Alexander Kazhdan argued that the number of bronze coins decreased dramatically towards the end of the seventh century and remained at a low level for the next two centuries.\textsuperscript{89} George Ostrogorsky, on the other hand, using the same material from the British Museum, showed that the gold coinage, which he took to be more important than the base currency, in fact

\textsuperscript{88} See also Hendy, \textit{Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy}, 7–8.

witnessed an important numerical increase during the same period. Furthermore, he introduced new data in the equation by analyzing two other major collections, the ones in Leningrad and Washington. What is important here is not the debate per se, but the fact that the evidence provided by the largest collections of Byzantine coins was brought into question as a valid argument. Shortly after that, Philip Grierson, perhaps the highest authority in Byzantine numismatics at the time, completely refuted the concept that such collections can ever project a realistic picture of the monetary mass in circulation at any given time. His position, reiterated in the following decades, was founded on the assumption that collectors contributing to what were to became the major public collections were driven by a general desire to gather full series of issues. The numerous types of solidi introduced by the emperors of the house of Heraclius thus explained the abundance of seventh century gold coins in the major collections. Although he was mainly discussing gold in his attempt to respond to the claims made by Ostrogorsky, Grierson in fact drew a general conclusion regarding the statistical representativity of public collections: "Les grandes collections, malgré le nombre considérable des pièces qu’elles possèdent, ne constituent donc pas un échantillon représentatif de la masse monétaire à un moment donné."

What was never taken into account, however, is the large body of sixth century material, namely copper issues, available in such collections, many of the common types being represented by dozens

93 Ibid., 39.
of duplicates. Such coins elude the parameters set by the reputed Byzantinist for the gold series. Constantina Katsari has recently made a similar argument regarding the representativity of museum collections for statistical studies. Her focus was on Roman provincial bronze coins and her conclusion was that "museum curators did not discriminate greatly against particular types of bronze provincial coins, although in the past they may have shown a preference for certain types of silver and gold coinages."  

The major collections included in the present analysis have the advantage of being heterogeneous with respect to geographical sources of origin. Each of them in fact reunites smaller collections gathered at different times and in different places, and it is reasonable to suppose that they cover the entire eastern empire, albeit perhaps unequally so. The museums usually kept records of their purchases, visible in the catalogues' footnotes or more extensively in introductions revealing the historical background of the collection. Nevertheless, it is hard to trace back the mechanics of gathering a particular collection. It is rather a "detective's quest" and one is often faced with the perspective of going back in time as far as the age of Enlightenment. Famous contributors have been recently honored by scholars and more information on their life and collections is brought to light. However, first hand accounts on finding places are hard to obtain even for current acquisitions given the discretion of many collectors and

---


95 P. Grierson in *DOC* I, xiii–xviii.

their providers, let alone for those almost a century old.97

Another methodological issue involves the so-called "collector behavior" and is related to a more significant issue, namely that of establishing whether the sample of coins in various collections is representative for the total mass of coins produced in ancient times. To what extent can we safely trust the statistical results based on specimens from private collections? How much is the collectors' preference for certain specimens going to color the big picture? A few arguments presented below point to the fact that a collector's/curator's choice, although inherently present, does not have a dramatic effect on the type of material selected for this analysis.

This study is devoted exclusively to copper issues, which softens the effect of selectivity. By eliminating gold coins which are always more carefully selected and more rigorously arranged in a collection, we are left with a bronze series subject to a more random selection.98 One wonders how much selectivity there could have been in the creation of the Swiss collection purchased for Dumbarton Oaks which amounted to over 10,000 coins, mostly copper. The collector did not keep a personal record of the coins, and therefore any suggestion that such a collection had a clear direction in terms of its


structure is problematic.\textsuperscript{99} The often huge number of copper coins in such collections suggests quantity and randomness as a major characteristic besides the basic desire to gather as many different types as possible.\textsuperscript{100}

Furthermore, some collectors were not even specialized in Byzantine coinage.\textsuperscript{101} Perhaps the best example in this regard is the collection Köhler-Osbahr from the Duisburg Museum, in which the entire Byzantine series represents less than 5 percent of the 70,000 coins collected by Dr. Köhler, which included ancient, medieval, and modern coins. The collection is particularly strong in Greek, German, and Asian coinage. Numismatics itself was just one focus of his collecting interests, as Dr. Köhler assembled a very diverse collection of jewelry and minor arts covering a huge time period, from 3000 B.C. to the modern age. Ralf Athoff, who published the catalogue of Byzantine coins, confirmed the fact that Dr. Köhler had no special interest in the Byzantine coins, whose purchase was less a process of systematic selection than a need to cover this important historical period in his huge collection.\textsuperscript{102}

Each large collection contains an important number of duplicates. Doubtless some selection occurs on the part of museum curators. The large collection at Dumbarton Oaks was subjected to the removal of the poorly preserved duplicates when the collection was published, but the state of preservation itself is often governed by

\textsuperscript{99} P. Grierson in \textit{DOC} I, xvi.

\textsuperscript{100} O’Hara in Bonham’s sale catalogue of Dec. 1980, 5, discussing an important collection of Byzantine gold and silver coins: “The collection of four hundred coins has been formed over many years on the basis of academic interest, rarity, style and chronology, rather than as so frequently happens in these days of ‘investment portfolios’ amassing rows of identical coins of somewhat dubious quality.”

\textsuperscript{101} Many of the collectors who donated their Byzantine coins, such as E. T. Newell, de Salis, Köhler, and H. C. Lindgren had only a marginal interest in Byzantine coins.

\textsuperscript{102} I am grateful to Ralf Althoff from the Kultur- und Stadthistorischen Museum Duisburg for the valuable information provided on this important collector.
statistical principles. How curators define a duplicate is also important. For the purpose of this study a duplicate signifies a coin of the same denomination, date, mint, officina regardless of other variations pertaining to the use of different dies. Especially when large collections are involved curators may choose to define a duplicate as a coin struck with the same die(s), but this rarely occurs in the case of common coppers.

The unpublished collection of the American Numismatic Society (hereafter ANS) meets the criteria for a statistically acceptable sample. The collection numbers more than 5000 early Byzantine coppers from the eastern mints dated between 498 and 616 and is primarily the result of donations en masse in the last decades. In this area duplicates were never cleaned, removed, sold, or exchanged regardless of their condition, as long as they were legible. The major donations of bronze coins of this period are Lindgren (1984), Milrod (1984, ex George Bates), Clark (1972), Wales (1983) and Newell (1944), of which only the group belonging to E. T. Newell can be characterized as a sample selected with quality and workmanship as the main criteria, but not necessarily rarity. Therefore, most coins are in mediocre condition at best and include numerous duplicates, which suggests a high degree of randomness. Most of the

---

103 The ANS collection is by far the largest; by comparison, the collection at Dumbarton Oaks, which is the second largest, has only ca. 2800 pieces.

104 H. C. Lindgren is best known for his collection of Roman provincial coins from Asia Minor, sold at public auctions. A few hundreds of the Early Byzantine coins donated to the ANS have an identical green patina and similar dirt incrustations which suggest that they were part of a large hoard. The age structure of the group is typical for the large hoards found in Syria, containing numerous pre-538 issues, very few dated coins of Justinian and a closing date in the first decades of the seventh century. This group of coins was excluded from the statistical analysis of the ANS collection.

105 Bates, A Byzantine Coin Collection.

106 As a collector E. T. Newell is, of course, best known for his splendid collection of Greek coins, now at the ANS.
few purchases made by the ANS date to the early 1970s and the acquisition records point to a price range of $1–$2.5 per coin.

Only Eastern mints are included in the study, leaving out the more desirable and sought-after Western mints. Sixth-to-seventh century Byzantine coppers from mints such as Constantinople, Nicomedia, Thessalonica, Cyzicus, and Antioch are the most common and cheap coins on the market since the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{107} Mass purchases of such cheap types are typical for major collectors. Quality is not always an issue; all collections under scrutiny have poorly preserved specimens even from the most common types. They include specimens on which details such as the regnal year, the officina, or the mint mark are no longer legible. A large number of smaller denominations, less appealing to the collector’s eye, represent an important percentage of the group, which suggests quantity not quality as a criterion. The hundreds of duplicates themselves point to the largely random nature of these collections.

Admittedly, as Philip Grierson has argued on several occasions,\textsuperscript{108} some collectors intended to gather all the known (and hopefully unknown) types that they could find. However, the mere fact that none of them was able to achieve this ultimate goal, coupled with the fact that all of them seem to have been very successful at gathering the same particular issues (certain regnal years, mints, officinae, etc.) points to the fact that some types were more readily available than others. The fact that different

\textsuperscript{107} As early as the mid-nineteenth century Sabatier was pricing the Justinianic folli\textit{s} from the East at 2–10 francs while a folli\textit{s} from the Western mints ranged from 20 to 50 francs. The criterion is not so much style but degree of rarity and this considerable difference in evaluation evinces that collectors of Byzantine coins were already having a rough quantitative image of the Byzantine coin series and were therefore able to determine the degree of rarity for each type. Tolstoi’s estimations, Ratto’s sale catalogue with prices realized, and David Sear’s \textit{Byzantine Coins and their Values} (1987) confirm this difference of appeal up to this day.

\textsuperscript{108} Grierson, ”Byzantine Coinage as Source,” 323–24; Grierson, ”Circulazione monetaria,” 39.
collectors had the same success with some types and shared a similar failure in finding others indicates a fluctuation in coin production which inevitably translates into the varying numbers of coins available today.

Furthermore, there is a striking resemblance between the five major collections in terms of structure and consequently, of statistical results (Figure 5-4). What counts in the end is the observable similarity of these collections, even when they are tested at the detail level of annual fluctuations. We do not have sufficient information on each of the major collectors in order to make meaningful comparisons, but even so it is very unlikely that they all shared the same collecting behavior. Finally, and most importantly in many respects, the archaeological evidence confirms the general pattern of annual fluctuation. Unfortunately, the only samples comparable in size with the large museum collections are the single finds from the province of Scythia and a number of large circulation hoards from the Near East.\(^\text{109}\) By necessity, the analysis has to follow the nature of the evidence. The age structure of the Near Eastern hoards makes them suitable for an analysis of the second half of the sixth century, for which the material is abundant (Figures 5-1 and 5-2). On the other hand, the coins from Scythia are less useful for a close analysis of the last quarter of the century when the region was menaced by the attacks of the Slavs and Avars, but offers a good sample for the preceding decades (Figure 5-1). The comparison between the collections and the finds

from Scythia and the Near East offers a high degree of correlation and is perhaps the crux of the demonstration regarding the randomness of museum collections.\textsuperscript{110} Even more, Figure 5-2 clearly shows that collectors did not limit their collecting behavior to the classical "one coin of each type". The first years of the reign of Heraclius shown here by way of example suggest that the museum collections follow the pattern of the single finds and hoards and not the variety of types. Obviously, both the single finds from Scythia and the hoards from the Near East represent a type of evidence that was never subjected to selection in the hands of collectors and museum curators. Such statistical similarities indirectly ascertain the acceptable degree of randomness in the large collections under consideration.

5.3 A Comparative Approach to Early Byzantine Coin Circulation: The Balkans, Anatolia, and Syria-Palestine\textsuperscript{111}

The present analysis is not an attempt to determine the absolute number of coins produced by a certain mint or in a certain year. The graphs highlight the fluctuations in the quantity of fresh currency produced each year and therefore it has nothing to do with calculating the entire coin population in circulation at a given date. The evidence of hoards shows that coins issued by Anastasius were still circulating during the reign of Heraclius. Due to factors such as loss, hoarding, wear, and state policy of withdrawing certain issues, no precise calculations can be made in this respect.

\textsuperscript{110} The spikes observable on Figure 5-1 on coins from Scythia dated from 568 to 571 is explained by the significant number of coins issued at Thessalonica, a phenomenon best illustrated by Fig. 4.

\textsuperscript{111} Unpublished catalogues of the Byzantine coins from the Isparta and Bolu museums and lists of coin finds from Pisidian Antioch and Melitene, repeatedly referred to in the following section, were kindly provided by Zeliha Demirel Gök ałp from Anadolu University.
Figure 5-1. Percent of nummia per year of reign (Justinian I and Justin II). A) Justinian I, Constantinople mint, B) Justin II.
Figure 5-2. Percent of nummia per year of reign (Maurice and Heraclius). A) Maurice, Antioch mint, B) Heraclius (610-617).
Figure 5-3. Early Byzantine coin finds: major sites and local museums.
Figure 5-4. Percentage of nummia per year of reign (498-616).
Figure 5-5. Percent of nummia per year (538-616).
Figure 5-6. Coins per year of reform. A) Nummia, B) Solidi.
Private and public collections, single finds and hoards need to be employed as complementary types of numismatic evidence, moving away from the sterile debate over which is the more capable of spawning an accurate reflection of coin production and circulation in ancient times. Large collections, provided that they were amassed with an acceptable degree of randomness, can provide important indications about the rhythm of production. It has been often shown that site finds, if they amount to a statistically relevant sample are useful for observing the evolution of coin circulation in time in a circumscribed geographical area. Comparative analyses of site finds in a broader region provide a better understanding of the monetary economy in a larger unit of analysis, such as an administrative province, as it has been shown for Scythia, Pisidia, and Arabia.\footnote{Marot, Las monedas del Macellum; Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 301-30; Gökalp, "Yalvaç ve Isparta."} Finally, the evidence of circulation hoards, which has been privileged by prominent Byzantinists and numismatists, usually informs us about the circulating medium at a certain time and in a certain place. Again, comparison is needed, in the sense of the exemplary analysis done by Henri Pottier and Hans-Christoph Noeske for the Near East\footnote{Pottier, Analyse d’un trésor; Münzfunde.} and the team of scholars coordinated by Cécile Morrisson for the Balkans,\footnote{Trésors.} in which ideally a number of contemporary hoards concealed in the same geographical area are available for study.

In the next sections the discussion will be based on several chronological and thematic parameters ranging from general to detail: \textit{nummia} year of reign (Figures 5-4, 5-8, and 5-9), quantity of \textit{nummia} year of reform (Figure 5-6),\footnote{A conversion into \textit{solidi} based on the ratios proposed by Wolfgang Hahn (see below, n. 133) is} quantity of \textit{nummia}
year-by-year (for the period 538-616) (Figure 5-5), mints (Figures 5-10 to 5-23), and
denominations (Figures 5-24 to 5-36). Obviously, the collections differ in size. In order
to make the comparison possible, a common denominator had to be provided and
therefore all the numbers are percents from a given total, e.g. within each collection, the
percentage represented by the number of nummia from the reform period 538-542 out
of the total number of reforms from 498 to 616 (taking into account the time span of
each reform), or the percentage of the volume of nummia from 565/6 out of the total
quantity of nummia from Justin II's reign, in each collection. The chosen time span, 498-
616, opens with the reform of Anastasius and ends with the abrupt decline in coin
circulation after 616 in several major centers of the Eastern Empire.  

The province of Scythia provides us with a number of coins that parallels the size of the large public
collections and represents the only substantial sample of coins with a secure
geographical provenance and usually with a clear archaeological context. For
comparison purposes, hoards and various site finds or local museum collections from
the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Near East will be used throughout the following
discussion, the main criterion for inclusion being the total number of Early Byzantine
coins available for study (Figure 5-3).

provided in Figure 5-6, which gives a more accurate picture of the purchasing power of the base coinage
in the early Byzantine period.

116 Wastage rates are sometimes included in the analysis when long periods of circulation are involved.
For the methodology and applications to Roman coinage see especially Duncan-Jones, Money and
Government, ch. 14. However, the extrapolation of modern wastage rates to ancient coinages remains of
somewhat dubious value. Moreover, Fig. i does not reveal any clear signs of wastage for the dated series
of Justinian from Constantinople (27 years). Stray finds from Scythia, which are the direct result of
wastage (i.e. casual losses) should theoretically contain a higher number of coins from the early regnal
years (as a result of longer circulation) than circulation hoards, which should reflect the effects of wastage
at the time when the hoards were concealed (i.e. fewer coins from the early regnal years).
5.3.1 The Reform of Anastasius and the Pre-538 Coinage

In 498 Anastasius introduced a new system for the copper currency, one that would put an end to the crisis of the fifth century, which rendered the petty currency almost worthless. However, as shown by Fig. 2a, the number of small-module coins struck after the reform does not seem to be very high, if compared with the quantity issued after a second reform in 512. In geographical terms, a larger number of small-module issues can be found in the Danube area and, to an even larger extent, in a number of urban centers in Syria-Palestine – Jerusalem, Pella, Gerasa, Beth She’an (Scythopolis), and especially Berytus where a unique situation can be noted. In Anatolia, urban centers such as Sardis, Sagalassos, Side, Pisidian Antioch, and

---

117 For the reform of Anastasius and its impact see above n. 27.


Melitene point to a rather reduced impact of the reform in the first period. To return to the special case of Berytus, almost 70 percent of the total number of Early Byzantine coins is represented by small-module issues. Berytus might well have represented an idiosyncratic circulating micro-medium, a semi-closed monetary environment which might have encompassed a larger area of Phoenice, but it does, nevertheless, raise an important question regarding the withdrawal of these coins from circulation, once a new reform in 512 doubled the weight of the copper coin. As Kevin Butcher showed in his discussion of the Anastasian coins from Berytus, many of the small module specimens were found in layers dating from the reign of Justinian, which means that the small coins were still in circulation at that time. It is hard to determine with any


122 The evidence of hoards seems to point in the same direction. Several hoards containing a large
certainty their precise relation to the Anastasian and later, Justinianic, heavy standard. An analogy with a seventh century measure might reinforce a hypothesis established in the past decades. Special marks were placed on the reformed heavy coins introduced by Constantine IV (M on half-\textit{folios}, K on $\frac{1}{4}$ \textit{folios}) indicating that the new coins were worth twice as much as the old, smaller ones.\textsuperscript{123} Although no such clear marks are present on the heavy coins of Anastasius, the small-module issues might have remained in circulation based on the same rationale of using them for a different face-value.\textsuperscript{124} To be sure, these small and ephemeral issues remained in circulation throughout the sixth century as testified by hoards found in the Eastern Empire\textsuperscript{125}. Despite their small size, such coins remain outside the danger of "Gresham’s Law", as the state did not have to fear that the circulation of the newly introduced heavier specimens might be disrupted by the existence of those lighter issues, as long as their face-value was halved. The reuse of late Roman, early Roman and even Greek coins, number of small module \textit{folios} were found in collapsed buildings associated with the earthquake of 551. Butcher, "Archaeology of the Beyrut Souks," 283-86; P. Beliën, "A Hoard of Byzantine \textit{Folles} from Beirut," \textit{NC} 165 (2005): 314-2; G. Abou Diwan, "Un trésor monétaire de Beyrouth. A propos de la circulation des monnaies d’Anastase au VI\textsuperscript{e} siècle," \textit{NC} 168 (2008): 303-20.


\textsuperscript{124} See Mecalf, \textit{The Origins of the Anastasian Currency}, 41-43, followed by Pottier, \textit{Analyse d'un trésor}, 227-30, who suggested that the countermarks often found on small module coins from the Middle East are a sign that the state was attempting to regulate the use of the pre-reform coins. The reduction of the face value was also accepted as a plausible hypothesis by P. Grierson, \textit{Byzantine Coins} (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), 60, and W. Hahn and M. Metlich, \textit{Money of the Incipient Byzantine Empire} (Vienna: City Press, 2000), 30. Recently, Abu Diwan challenged this common wisdom by pointing to the abnormal circulating pattern of Berytus, which raises important questions regarding the uniform implementation of the monetary reforms throughout the Empire, Abu Diwan, "Un trésor monétaire," 316-17.

\textsuperscript{125} In the Balkans and Anatolia out of 36 hoards containing coins of Anastasius, 7 include small module types. The latest of these hoards, Caricin Grad 1952, ends in 595/6, testifying to the longevity of the small-module coins of Anastasius, \textit{Trésors}, 299. In the Near East small-module coins occur occasionally in large hoards ending in the seventh century such as Tel Bissé, Baalbek, Khirbet Fundaqumya and "Northern Syria:" \textit{Münzfunde}, vol. II; "Lebanon:" M. Kruszynski, "A Group of Byzantine Coins from Lebanon." \textit{Notae Numismatiae} 3-4 (1999): 221-42. This evidence clearly contradicts Noeske’s supposition that the small-module series was immediately withdrawn in 512, \textit{Münzfunde}, vol. I, 150-51.
based on a similar size and weight is not uncommon in the large centers of the empire and is also testified by hoards containing such specimens.

The Collections confirm the high proportion of coins issued in Constantinople, over 75 percent in all cases, the rest being struck at the sub-metropolitan mint of Nicomedia (Figure 5-11). There is a fairly balanced proportion of folles and half-folles both in the Collections and in the samples found during archaeological excavations, while the ¼ folles are themselves well represented (Figure 5-25). This phenomenon shows that the divisionary system was functional and smaller denominations were used frequently in minor transactions. The Collections, however, hardly contain any specimens of the smallest denomination, the nummus, found especially in Greece (Athens, Corinth, Kenchreai), Anatolia (Sardis, Sagalassos), and Palestine (Caesarea Maritima, Beth She'an, Ramat Hanadiv, Hammat Gader) and to a much lesser extent in the Balkans and at the Danube border. The retrieval of large numbers


of minimi accumulated in special circumstances, like the water basins at Ramat Hanadiv and Hammat Gader, or the hoards found in Palestine, Greece, Dobroudja, and in Istanbul,\textsuperscript{130} might signal the fact that we are largely underestimating the sheer quantity of petty coins still in circulation deep into the sixth century.\textsuperscript{131} The contrasting image offered by Sardis awaits more information coming from other centers in Western Anatolia in order to determine whether this is a particular case or a more general phenomenon. Philip Grierson explained the paucity of minimi at Sardis by the negligence of the excavators,\textsuperscript{132} but recent research in Anatolia, at Melitene and Pisidian Antioch shows that minimi are generally scarce.

The period 512-538 is homogeneous in many respects, largely due to a stable ratio between the gold solidus and the copper \textit{follis}, most probably 1:360.\textsuperscript{133} Figure 5-1 points to an important increase in coin production during this period, although not a continuous one, the reign of Justin I usually providing a larger number of finds than the first decade of Justinian's reign. In the larger framework of the long sixth century,


\textsuperscript{131} See also the case of Gerasa where Teresa Marot has shown that late Roman coins are still present in sixth-century archaeological contexts, Marot, \textit{Las monedas del Macellum}, 304.

\textsuperscript{132} P. Grierson, "The Interpretation of Coin Finds," \textit{NC} 5 (1965): xi.

\textsuperscript{133} The ratio between solidus and \textit{follis} has been taken from Hahn's \textit{MIB I}, 27, \textit{MIB II}, 14-17, and \textit{MIB III}, 16. A consensus is yet to be reached regarding the calculation of this ratio and different propositions have been made in the past decades: J.-P. Callu, "Le tarif d'Abydos et la reforme monétaire d'Anastase," in \textit{Proceedings of the 9th International Congress of Numismatics, Berne, September 1979}, ed. T. Hackens and R. Weillier (Louvain-la-Neuve: Association internationale des numismates professionnels, 1982), 731-40; Pottier, \textit{Analyse d'un trésor}, 252; C. Morrisson, "Monnaie et prix a Byzance du V\textsuperscript{e} au VII\textsuperscript{e} siècle," in \textit{Hommes et richesses}, 248; Morrisson and Ivanšević, "Les émissions des VI\textsuperscript{e}-VII\textsuperscript{e} siècles, 51; Hendy, \textit{Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy}, 478.
however, the coins minted between 512 and 538 stand at a lower point than the post reform coinage of Justinian and the inflationist peak reached during the reign of Justin II.

The larger quantity of coins from Justin I has already been noticed in the Eastern Mediterranean, although it is hardly a general phenomenon and the evidence is still too scant to permit a conclusion in this respect. The phenomenon is conspicuous in the province of Scythia, where all the major sites without exception reveal a peak reached during the reign of Justin I. This is by no means characteristic for the Balkan area as a whole. The neighboring province of Moesia II offers a contrasting image with a high occurrence of coins of Anastasius. A similar contrast is found in Greece in the cases of Corinth and Athens, while in the western Balkans, there is a fairly balanced proportion of the two periods, with somewhat higher numbers for Justin I (Figure 5-8). In Anatolia the evidence available from Sagalassos, Sardis, Side, Amaseia, Amastris, Pisidian Antioch, and Melitene offers a mixed picture (Figure 5-9) and so does the

---


135 Butcher, "Archaeology of the Beyrut Souks," 103, fig. 75. Almost half of the sites tabulated by Butcher provide a larger quantity of coins from Anastasius without the possibility of discerning between different provincial patterns of supply.

136 Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 2008, 322, table 3 and 4, where ten major sites are compared.

137 S. Mihailov, "Vidovete nominali v monetoto obrashtenie na bizantiiskite provintsii Scitiiia i Vtora Miziiia (498–681 g.),” in Numismatic, Sphragistic and Epigraphic Contributions, 281, table 4.


evidence from Cyprus, at Paphos, Salamis and Curium. The major Syro-Palestinian sites seem to be more correlated, with the notable exception of Berytus (Figure 5-8). Overall, the apparent contrast between neighboring areas in the Balkans and Anatolia in particular suggests local patterns of circulation rather than a controlled macro-economic policy.

The Collections suggest a slight decrease in coin production during the reign of Justinian I, prior to his major reform in 538 (Figure 5-6). The archaeological evidence indicates that such a phenomenon is very clear in the Balkans and to a large degree in Anatolia, but seems to be somewhat irregular in the Near Eastern sites, where, without a clear distribution according to provinces, we find all three possible situations – the prevalence of coins from 518-527 (Pella), a balanced proportion (Gerasa, Nessana), and a larger number of coins from 527-538 (Caesarea Maritima, Hama, Antioch) (Figures 5-8 and 5-9). Aside from these fluctuations, the Eastern provinces yield the highest volume of finds dated to the pre-538 period. This characteristic is confirmed by the structure of the hoards found in the area, which contain a good


142 Bates, Byzantine Coins, 28-44; Ireland, Greek, Roman and Byzantine, 102-05; Ireland and Ateşoğlu, "The Ancient Coins in Amasra," 133.


number of pre-reform coins, even if most of these hoards were concealed after 600.\textsuperscript{146}

As a general observation the quantity of Justinianic pre-reform issues depends on the influence of the mint of Antioch, which is rather insignificant in the Balkans and most Anatolian sites (Pisidian Antioch and Amaseia being two major exceptions) (Figure 5-14).

According to the structure of the Collections, Constantinople was the most important mint during the period 512-538. Its influence, however, gradually diminished in favor of the Antioch mint, which greatly increased its output during the first decade of Justinian’s reign, even surpassing Constantinople. The mint of Nicomedia retained a secondary role, while Cyzicus and Thessalonica, re-opened by Justin I have only a modest output at this time (Figures 5-12, 5-13, and 5-14). The mints issued especially folles and, somewhat surprisingly, a large number of \textsuperscript{\textfrac{1}{8}} folles, particularly during the reigns of Anastasius and Justin I and to a lesser degree at the beginning of Justinian’s reign. Except for this latter period, the \textsuperscript{\textfrac{1}{2}} follis was struck in smaller quantities. The role of the \textsuperscript{\textfrac{1}{4}} follis appears to have been less significant during this period and it seems that, in most cases, it was the large number of \textsuperscript{\textfrac{1}{6}} folles which fulfilled the role of small change on the market (Figures 5-26, 5-27, and 5-28).

This phenomenon is less visible in the Balkans, where, with the exception of Ahtopol (Agathopolis),\textsuperscript{147} on the Black Sea coast, and of Constantinople,\textsuperscript{148} the urban


centers and border fortresses yielded a very small number of \( \frac{1}{8} \) folles. Especially in Scythia, the balanced proportion between folles and \( \frac{1}{2} \) folles indicates that the latter was the only fraction required on a market where the intensity of small transactions was relatively low.\(^{149}\) In the western Balkans, the proportion of folles was overwhelming, which could indicate that the severe disruption of urban life in the fifth century had long-term consequences.\(^{150}\) In Anatolia the most substantial evidence comes from Sardis, as usual, where the \( \frac{1}{8} \) follis represented the main denomination in the period following the reform of 512, but its volume gradually decreased in the following decades prior to 538 in favor of the follis. At Amasya, Amastris, Side, Melitene and Pisidian Antioch the pattern of denominations resembles the situation in the Balkans where the main role is played by the follis, followed by the \( \frac{1}{2} \) follis. In the Near East we find once again a mixed picture. It can be argued that the smaller denominations are more present in the Oriental provinces, especially in Antioch where the \( \frac{1}{8} \) follis is prevalent in this period, but also in other major sites like Caesarea Maritima, Nessana, and Berytus.\(^{151}\) As already mentioned, another characteristic is the high presence of minimi in Beth She’an, Rammat Hanadiv, and Hamat Gader. In the last two cases most of the coins were found in the tunnel of a spring and a large bath complex, respectively, which might be less reflective of the real structure of denominations in circulation and more the habit of throwing small coins into the water as a symbolic offering.\(^{152}\) In Syria II, at Hama

\(^{149}\) Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 318, table 5.

\(^{150}\) Spahiu, "Monedna bizantine," 366-77; Radić and Ivanišević, Byzantine Coins, 92-125; see also at the Iron Gates of the Danube, Janković, Podunavski deo oblasti Akvisa, 66 table 3.

\(^{151}\) Evans, The Joint Expedition, 180-88; Bellinger, "Coins from Jerash," 72; Butcher, "Archaeology of the Beirut Souks," 263.

\(^{152}\) See the discussion by Barkay, "The Coins of Horvat," 415-17.
(Epiphania), in Palaestina II, at Pella, and in Arabia, at Gerasa the structure resembles the one seen in the Balkans and in Anatolia, with very few small denominations (Figures 5-26, 5-27, and 5-28). A constant feature of the Oriental provinces is the larger role played by the Antioch mint than in Anatolia or the Balkans (Figures 5-12, 5-13, and 5-14). However, in centers like Pella, and especially Nessana, very far from Antioch, in Palaestina III, the mint of Antioch was less influential.153

5.3.2 The Post-Reform Coinage of Justinian I

The four-year period following the reform of 538 is one of the most intriguing. It is also the only point at which the five major collections under scrutiny present a higher quantitative variation. Although there certainly was a dramatic increase in output immediately after the reform, we can also accept that a certain bias existed in favor of collecting the eye-catching, impressively large folles of Justinian. This is highly visible in the cases of DOC and BNP (Figure 5-5). Interestingly, the coin finds from Scythia, where no collector’s choice is involved, share this high peak reached in the period 538-542. In all cases, including Scythia, the numbers point to a continuous decrease in mint output during the next two reform periods in the reign of Justinian, 542-550 and 550-565 (Figure 5-6).154 The economy was not able to sustain a constant high output of heavy folles, whose introduction in the first place must have relied on both economic and propagandaistic agendas.155 It is significant in that respect that the majority of coins both in the Collections and in Scythia are comprised of folles, in a proportion usually higher

---

153 Walmsley, "Coin Frequencies," 337, table 4; Bellinger, "Coins," 71-72; at Nessana the influence of Alexandria, geographically much closer than Antioch, is more visible among the Early Byzantine coin finds.

154 For a possible explanation of this phenomenon see Pottier, Analyse d’un trésor, 241-42.

155 Gândilă, "Heavy Money," 363-402.
than 70 percent (Figure 5-29). The situation changed dramatically in the second half of the 550s when a huge number of ¼ folles flooded the market (Figure 5-31). They were issued by the mint of Constantinople, but in even higher numbers by Nicomedia and Cyzicus. It is hard to determine what caused this sudden shift. It seems to correspond to a wider set of measures taken by Justinian in the last years of his reign. According to the present information, Nicomedia and Cyzicus stopped minting folles and ½ folles after 561 and concentrated almost exclusively on striking ¼ folles, while Thessalonica abandoned its idiosyncratic denominational system and began issuing ½ folles in 562. These measures might have been caused by a need of small denominations after the market had been overwhelmed by a high number of folles for two decades. Furthermore, the ⅛ folles produced in high numbers between 512 and 538 began to be issued in lesser quantities after 538. The increased production of ¼ folles can be observed in all the regions of the Eastern Empire. At Noviodunum, on the Danube, 57 percent of the coins from 550 to 565 are ¼ folles; at Tomis, on the Black Sea, they represent 75 percent; at Corinth, 73 percent; at Sardis in Lydia, almost 70 percent of the finds, and at Antioch, 55 percent (Figure 5-31). Even when very few coins are reported for this time interval we find ¼ folles among them. Such is the case at Capidava on the Danube, Sagalassos and Side in Anatolia, Curium and Salamis in Cyprus, Berytus, Gerasa, Caesarea Maritima, Hammat Gader, Rammat Hanadiv, Dibon in the Near East.157

156 MIBE, 56-62.

The mint of Constantinople gradually reduced its output in favor of Nicomedia, Cyzicus, and especially Antioch during the last reform period, 550-565 (Figure 5-17). Thessalonica still had a secondary role largely restricted to supplying the area of the western Balkans (Figure 5-17). \(^{158}\) A geographic anomaly can be noted in the case of the Antioch mint: for reasons that are not clear, Antioch is extremely present in the collections of the museums in Amasra and Amasya, while closer to Antioch, at Side the Syrian mint is less well represented. In the Near Eastern provinces, as was to be expected, Antioch plays a more important role, although still up to half the total number of coins came from the central mint in Constantinople. \(^{159}\) The mint of Antioch appears to have served primarily the needs of the city but its influence was far-reaching as shown by the cases of Amasra and Amaseia. The higher presence of coins from Antioch in urban centers located close to the sea, such as Caesarea in Palestine and Amastris on the Black Sea could point to the distribution of coins through commercial activities.

The monetary reform of 538 raises a number of interesting issues regarding the use and function of the large copper coins in a monetary system in which the mass of coins in circulation was up to 25 percent lighter. Even more problematic in the

---

158 Radić and Ivanišević, *Byzantine Coins*, 122; Ivanišević, "Vizantijski novac," 92; Spahiu, "Monedna bizantine," 376-77. The mint is rather under-represented in Greece proper and D. M. Metcalf has explained its geographical distribution by restricting its role to military expenditure at the Balkan border, Metcalf, *The Copper Coinage*, 8.

circulating scheme of the "long sixth century" is the role of such heavy specimens after the weight-standard of the copper coin began to slide until it was finally established at half the weight of the Justinianic large *follis.*

160 "Bad money drives out good" was an economic principle well understood in early Byzantium. The reform of Constantine IV, briefly mentioned above, is a case in point. If the small-module *follis* of Anastasius posed no serious circulating problems, the state would certainly have been interested in recalling the large coins of 538-542, either by coercion or by discouraging potential hoarding by temporarily raising their market value until they could be withdrawn from circulation. Certainly this represents only a logical, yet speculative, scenario and the actual process of withdrawing certain issues remains obscure in any detail. The complexity of the early Byzantine monetary economy should be neither under- nor over-estimated by adding a presentist flavor to its functionality. Both single finds and hoards suggest that the state had a good control over its major urban centers and was less able to impose its economic policies at the periphery. The intensive excavations at Saraçhane and Kalenderhane in Istanbul have yielded close to 500 coins dated 491-616 and not a single one of them was a heavy *follis* or a half-*follis* of Justinian. In Antioch, out of more than 2300 Early Byzantine coins, only two *folles* and four half-*folles* are dated to 538-542. Large cities where imperial mints were located, as in Constantinople and Antioch, certainly had more tight control of what circulated in their urban areas.

In the Balkans, both hoards and single finds point to an abundance of such heavy coins and, more significant, their persistence until the last decade of the sixth

160 *BNP* I, 61.
century. In Scythia, coins from 538-542 represent more than 10 percent of the entire group of Early Byzantine coins, while the proportion is much higher in Moesia II and in the north-western Balkans, in Serbia.\(^{161}\) It is interesting that the major urban centers of Scythia - Tomis, Histria, and Noviodunum, yielded a smaller number of large *folles*, while none of the four hoards found at Histria contains such coins.\(^{162}\) On the fortresses defending the Danube frontier the situation is different. At Durostorum, 40 percent of the coins of Justinian are heavy issues from 538-42.\(^{163}\) A small hoard recently found at Capidava contains coins up to Tiberius II, and yet one third are heavy *folles* of Justinian. The coins were kept in a small textile container and were found overlapped on the floor of a room destroyed by fire. The lack of intentionality allows a glimpse of an ordinary purse of coins probably handled by a soldier on the Danube frontier in the early 580s.\(^{164}\) Such examples suggest that the process of withdrawing the heavy series was more readily applicable in the major centers where state control was stricter.

Nevertheless, the coin hoards from the Balkans, as a general characteristic, contain heavy specimens as late as the 580s, as testified by such finds across the peninsula, in Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Romania.\(^{165}\) It is significant that, with one exception (Veliki Gradac), no such coins seem to appear in any of the hoards concealed in the 590s, a possible sign that the big coins of Justinian had been almost completely

---


\(^{163}\) Unpublished collection of the National History Museum of Romania in Bucharest.


\(^{165}\) *Trésors*; most significant hoards are Koprivec, Zhalad, Adamclisi 1908, Athens 1908, and Eleusis 1893.
removed from circulation by the end of the century.\textsuperscript{166} Another phenomenon might suggest that the 590s represented a time of intensive withdrawal of heavier issues, namely the overstriking of Maurice \textit{folles} on previous Justinianic \textit{folles}, after the flan was trimmed to meet the demand of the new weight standard. Several public collections\textsuperscript{167} and catalogues of site finds and hoards\textsuperscript{168} contain such overstruck specimens. Most of them date form the early 590s and correspond to the period when the Justinianic large \textit{folles} disappear from hoards in the Balkans. Such a late date of withdrawal might be related to the difficulty encountered by Justin II and Tiberius II in collecting the taxes from the border provinces of the Balkans, which received particular mention in the legislation of 566 and 575.\textsuperscript{169} The collection of taxes was also an opportunity to regulate the circulating mass, and a disruption of this system could have delayed the process of calling in the heavy Justinianic coinage. We may also use a later account from Theophanes Confessor who argued that the imperial treasury could no longer sustain the regular payment of the troops, so the state was forced to cut $\frac{1}{4}$ of the salaries in 587.\textsuperscript{170} The decision to resize and overstrike larger issues, thus gaining...

\textsuperscript{166} Trésors; hoards ending in the 590s: Reselec, Rakita, Sofia, Histria (5 hoards), Caričin Grad 1952, Bosman, in the Empire, and Horgešti, Movileni, and Unirea, north of the Danube, in \textit{barbaricum}.

\textsuperscript{167} Sommer, \textit{Katalog der byzantinischen Münzen}, 59, n. 288; \textit{DOC}, 307, n. 33e2; \textit{BNP}, 185, n. 16; \textit{BMC}, 160-161, n. 138, 139; \textit{Ratto}, 51, n. 1105; \textit{KOD}, 111, n. 123. The ANS collection contains fourteen overstruck coins from this period, of which ten clearly show Justinianic undertypes. An even larger number of coins, of every denomination have trimmed planchets indicating a revaluation exercise.


\textsuperscript{170} See the discussion by Yannopoulos, "Inflation, dévaluation et réévaluation" 129.
additional metal and insuring the payment of troops in "new" coin, can be ascribed to the difficult financial situation mentioned in the written sources.

In Anatolia the big coins are less present than in the Balkans but still represent an important proportion of the total number of Early Byzantine coins. Excavations at Side, Pergamum, and Sagalassos have yielded a number of specimens while the local museums in Bolvadin, Amasra, and Amasya also contain heavy folles dated 538-542. There is also variation: at Pisidian Antioch 25 percent of the coins are heavy issues while at Melitene they represent only 3 percent, to provide only the two extremes. Much like the Balkans, the hoards concealed in the 590s lack any large coins of Justinian.171

There is an apparent scarcity of such coins in the Near East. D.M. Metcalf has long suggested that the post-reform coinage of Justinian was not introduced in Palaestina and Arabia. Philip Grierson ascribed their scarcity to their withdrawal from circulation, while Henri Pottier and Cécile Morrisson have pointed to the downfall in circulation between 538 and 565 and suggested that wars and natural disasters were important factors explaining this situation.172 More recently P. J. Casey attempted a closer analysis of the post-reform coinage by looking at the evidence coming from site finds and hoards across the Eastern Empire. His point of departure was a written source, Procopius's Secret History, in which the Byzantine historian claimed that Justinian stopped paying the limitanei on the Eastern frontier. Seeking to assess the veracity of this statement by analyzing the numismatic and archaeological evidence

171 Unfortunately the information comes from a single major source, Sardis, where at least 4 hoards (found 1913, 1958, 1961, and 1968) ending after 590 are relevant for this discussion. Another hoard, from Anemurium in Isauria, ends in 602 and has no coins prior to 578. See Tresors.

from Syria-Palestine, Casey concluded that such circumstances may indeed explain the virtual absence of post-reform coins from Palestine, but are less compelling in the case of Syria.\footnote{173} Finally, disregarding the evidence from the Balkans and Anatolia, Noeske has recently suggested that the post-reform coinage was struck in limited quantities and was unsuited for the circulating medium of the Near Eastern provinces due to its heavy weight standard.\footnote{174}

Although coins dated 538-542 are indeed conspicuously hard to find, some nonetheless have been reported at Jerusalem, Caesarea Maritima, Antioch, Berytus, Pella, and Nessana in six different provinces of the Near East.\footnote{175} Coins issued during the remainder of Justinian’s reign, 542-565 were more common and they have been found in almost all excavations conducted in the region, and in a number of hoards.\footnote{176} It is thus fair to conclude that the post reform coinage did penetrate into the Oriental provinces, perhaps in smaller quantities than in the Balkans. This contrast should not be exaggerated, however, if we take into consideration the level of urbanization in the two regions. As noted, the major towns in Scythia yielded fewer

\footnote{173} J. Casey, “Justinian, the limitanei, and Arab-Byzantine relations in the 6th c.,” JRA 9 (1996): 220.

\footnote{174} Münzfunde, vol. I, 152-53.


heavy coins and a tighter control of the coins in circulation can certainly be envisaged in a highly urbanized region like Palestine, for instance.

Antioch, the mint whose chief purpose was to serve the major Syrian city and its vicinity, issued coins in this period in especially high numbers starting from the late 540s (Figure 5-17), of which only a small percentage reached more distant parts of the Empire such as the Balkan provinces. Coins minted in Constantinople and Nicomedia are extremely common among finds in the Near East and, judging by their increased output immediately after the reform in 538, it is hard to imagine that the coins were artificially kept out of the Eastern provinces. Doubtless catastrophic events such as the plague, the Persian invasions starting from 540, the Samaritan revolt in 555, and major earthquakes such as the one of 551 affected the circulation, but a long term disruption of the influx of new coinage seems rather improbable. The argument advanced by Casey might be acceptable for the frontier region only, but is unsuited for explaining the coin circulation in urban centers unrelated to any frontier business. As a matter of fact, although Casey’s central argument concerns Palestine, his comparative table includes only one, remote, Palestinian center, Nessana, notwithstanding his discussion of the hoards, concealed late in the sixth or early in the seventh century and consequently less relevant for the discussion. The urban record is still decidedly thin, but in the light of the new evidence, mostly but not completely inaccessible to Casey, it is more plausible

---

177 The mint of Antioch ceased minting coins in years 14-15 of Justinian’s reign when the city was sacked by the Persians and in Justinian’s regnal years 17, 18, and 19 because of the Great Plague. See DOC, 143. For a list of the major earthquakes in Palestine see K. W. Russell, “The Earthquake Chronology of Palestine and Northwest Arabia from the 2nd through the mid-8th Century A.D.,” BASOR 260 (1985): 37-59. However, once the crises were overcome, the mint was reopened.

178 Casey, “Justinian, the limitanei, and Arab-Byzantine Relations,” 217.
to suggest that the heavy specimens did circulate in the area, but were more efficiently withdrawn from circulation at a later period.

I have shown that the big coins disappeared from hoards in the Balkans in the last decade of the sixth century, although the process might have started even earlier. It is hard to say if the Oriental provinces followed the same pattern, largely because the major coin hoards from this region, with the exception of Rafah and a "North Syrian hoard", have a closing date after 595. The hoard of Rafah included a "closing coin" dated 573/4, but despite the early date of closing it contains no post-reform coins of Justinian. The "North Syria Hoard", however, ended in 584/5 and had 16 post reform coins out of a total of 60 pieces, namely more than 25 percent of the entire hoard. Almost half the coins from this hoard were issued in Antioch so it might be safe to conclude that it was formed in the region and not brought from a more distant province of the Empire. The hoard found in the synagogue of Meroth in Palestine is particularly interesting for this discussion. It was found in a secret chamber where the treasury of the synagogue was kept and represents a slow and gradual accumulation throughout the sixth century and into the seventh. The hoard contains 55 copper coins of Justinian of which 16 are post-reform issues, meaning almost 30 percent of the total. Six of the post-reform coins belong to the heavier standard. Because of its special nature, as an "open" savings hoard, fresh coins were constantly fed into the treasury

179 Münzfunde, 634-39; Todd, "A Late Sixth-Century Hoard," 176-82.


181 I owe this information to Gabriela Bijovsky from the Israel Antiquities Authority whom I thank once again for allowing me to study the still unpublished catalogue of the coins from the Meroth hoard.
and many were never taken out. This is probably the reason why these heavy *folles* escaped the process of withdrawal. It also confirms once again the presence of the post reform coinage of Justinian in Palestine, possibly in much greater numbers than we are inclined to believe, based on the surviving specimens from site finds and later hoards. It seems so far that a policy of withdrawing the heavier issues was implemented in the Near East even earlier and more efficiently compared to the Balkans and even Anatolia. This would explain the pronounced scarcity of the big coins among finds in Syro-Palestinian sites, given the fact that they circulated for a shorter period.

The fact that the large coins were withdrawn from circulation can also be indirectly reinforced by the unusual number of pierced coins.¹⁸² Without attempting to be comprehensive, I assembled the most significant instances where pierced *folles* of Justinian have been signaled, both in public collections¹⁸³ and among site finds from the major geographical areas of the Eastern Empire, the Balkans,¹⁸⁴ Anatolia,¹⁸⁵ and the Near East.¹⁸⁶ Significantly, most of the coins were pierced at 12 o’clock, above the

---

¹⁸² Pierced coins from the following decades, 542-616, are seldom found in public collections or among site finds. An interesting case was signaled at the early Byzantine church from Khirbat al-Karak, where several tombs contained holed sixth century coins possibly pointing to a habit of wearing coins as pieces of jewelry, P. Delougaz, "Coins," in P. Delougaz and R. C. Haines, *A Byzantine church at Khirbat Al-Karak* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 51 and plate 46.

¹⁸³ *MIB* I,112, plate 22; Sommer, *Katalog der byzantinischen Münzen*, 38, no. 106, plate 2; several specimens in *BNP, DOC* and in the *ANS* collection, the latter including a gold plated piece; *Ratto*, 26, no. 495 and 30, no. 583; *KOD*, 56, no. 333, plate XV; Bateson and Campbell, *Byzantine Coins*, 13, no. 13, plate 2; E. Arslan, *Catalogo delle monete bizantine del Museo Provinciale di Catanzaro* (Catanzaro: Amministrazione Provinciale di Catanzaro, 2000), 38, no. 14, plate III.


emperor’s head, which suggests that the coins were worn as pendants. One specimen from Pella is holed six times and was probably sewn to a textile garment. Many were found in a clear archaeological context and therefore the hypothesis that such coins might have been found and pierced at a much later date is not plausible. The sheer number of cases itself points to a period closer to the time of their striking. No less than 7 percent of the total number of folles dated 538-542 in the Dumbarton Oaks and the ANS collections were pierced, so this is hardly an isolated phenomenon from a later period. It is unlikely that such coins, once demonetized, would be taken out of the necklace and reintroduced in circulation. It is more probable that such large coins began to be transformed into pieces of jewelry only after the entire series was officially withdrawn from circulation. Although it is not entirely impossible for the two phenomena to coexist, the symbolic value of the coin turned into a pendant is much more powerful when the hundreds or thousands of similar pieces were no longer showing up in local market transactions. Furthermore, the owner of such a coin would have acknowledged its special nature only after Justin II had introduced a follis half its weight. The big coins of Justinian were therefore highly regarded by the common people and perhaps reminded them of an ambitious age of military achievements and building programs, both lacking in the decades when such coins were probably being pierced.

5.3.3 Inflationary Tendencies and Decline (565-616)

The reign of Justin II witnessed a dramatic increase in coin output with a peak reached in the interval 570-575, after a general tendency of accretion during the first five years. The prominent peak from 574/5 might be artificially produced by the inclusion of numerous types described by Hahn as Moneta Militaris Imitativa, which bear the regnal year 10 (type MIB 89-93). The last years of reign mark a sharp downfall in coin
production, which coincided with the adoption of Tiberius as co-regent (Figure 5-5).

These fluctuations in coin output derived from the study of the Collections are paralleled by the numerous finds for Scythia, where the massive contribution of the mint of Thessalonica forced a more dramatic increase until 570 (Figure 5-7).

Numismatists have long drawn attention to the inflationist tendencies of the reign of Justin II, in direct relationship with the devaluation of the follis, which went down from 216 folles/ solidus to 525 and then 720. The huge volume of coins issued during this period is sometimes interpreted as a sign of crisis not of economic prosperity or increasing commercial activities.\footnote{G. Poenaru Bordea, “Problèmes historiques de la Dobroudja (VIe-VIIe siècles) à la lumière des monnaies byzantines traitées par des méthodes statistiques,” in PACT 5, 374-75.} This is undoubtedly the reflection of Justinian’s prodigal policy of expenditure on warfare and buildings, as well as of demographic decline caused by natural disasters such as large epidemics and intensified seismic activity. However, this was by no means a crisis of catastrophic proportions. The monetary economy remained fairly stable until 616, at least if we judge by the follis/ solidus ratio, and Tiberius II Constantine was ambitious enough to attempt a return to the Justinianic standard. Moreover, the difference in mint output between the previous reform period (550-565) and the reign of Justin II as a whole was higher than the difference in purchasing power (Figure 5-6). This means that the volume of coins produced superseded the theoretical level of inflation triggered by the devaluation of the follis. This can be interpreted either in economic terms suggesting that a certain level of prosperity still existed, or in relation with the military situation of the Empire and the need to pay the army. The high level of coin output might have also been related to the policy of withdrawing the heavy coins of Justinian, which was a more or less successful
process, as we have seen. At any rate, such a procedure would have provided both the means (raw material) and the need to issue a large quantity of fresh coins.

The mint of Constantinople was the most active in the first reform period, 565-570, covering approximately 40 percent of the total coin output. An important development was the importance gained by Thessalonica and its \( \frac{1}{2} \) fories issued in great numbers during these years (Figure 5-18). A few major changes occurred in the second reform period, 570-578, when Constantinople, while still the major supplier, was closely followed by Antioch, which increased its output probably due to the conflict with Persia. Cyzicus became more important after a period of low activity, while Thessalonica drastically reduced its output for reasons discussed in the following section (Figure 5-19). More than half the coins issued during the reign of Justin II were fories. The \( \frac{1}{4} \) follis was less present, a sign that the monetary policy sustained by Justinian in his last years of reign was discontinued. The mint of Antioch alone continued to issue \( \frac{1}{4} \) fories in significant quantities.\(^{188}\) The decline in the production of smaller denomination is considered a general characteristic of the second half of the sixth century,\(^{189}\) but this is not entirely accurate. Although \( \frac{1}{4} \) fories were indeed rather scarce, the production of \( \frac{1}{6} \) fories maintained and even surpassed the levels of the preceding decades (Figure 5-32). Their presence in urban settings, as it will be shown below, is an indication of a still vibrant monetary economy (Figure 5-32).

There was a sudden influx of coins in the Danubian provinces after Justin II’s decision to abandon the policy of regular payments sent to the northern barbarians in

\(^{188}\) See also the observations of Pottier, *Analyse d’un trésor*, 186.

\(^{189}\) Ibid., 150.
order to secure the border. It is very probable that such a shift implied the arrival of additional troops to be stationed in the border fortresses along the Danube. The enlarged garrisons brought about an increased number of coins and this phenomenon is clearly visible in fortresses such as Noviodunum, Dinogotia, Capidava, Durostorum, Aquis, Viminacium, and Sirmium.\footnote{Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 322, table 4; Janković, Podunavski deo oblasti Akvisa, 66, annex 3; Ivanišević, "Vizantijski novac," 93-94; V. Popović, “Catalogue des monnaies Byzantines du musée de Srem,” in Dj. Bošković, et al, Sirmium VIII (Rome-Belgrade: École Française de Rome – Institut Archéologique de Belgrade, 1978), 181-85.} This is not only a frontier-related phenomenon. Numerous finds from this period have also been reported in major urban centers, such as Corinth (and Kenchreai), Athens, and Tomis, and to a lesser degree in rural areas,\footnote{Bellinger, Catalogue of the Coins, 46-47; Edwards, Corinth VI, 125-27; Mac Isaac, "Corinth: Coins," 135-36; Hohlfelder, Kenchreai, 68-71; Thompson, The Athenian Agora, 68-69; Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 322-23, table 4; E. Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La monnaie dans l’espace rural byzantin des Balkans Orientaux – un essai de synthèse au commencement du XXI\textsuperscript{e} siècle," Peuce 14 (2003): 383-84.} which gradually become isolated from the urban monetary economy. The extensive mint output at Thessalonica explains the large number of coins in the provinces of the Balkans. Thessalonica was especially influential in the western half of the peninsula, in Greece, Albania, and Serbia\footnote{Edwards, Corinth VI, 125-27; Hohlfelder, Kenchreai, 68-71; Thompson, The Athenian Agora, 68-69; Spahiu, "Monedna bizantine," 378-81; Radić and Ivanišević, Byzantine Coins, 132-35. See also the composition of hoards found in these areas: Trésors.} and to a lesser degree in the east, at Odurtsi, Agathopolis and in the region of Shumen.\footnote{Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 323, table 5; Iordanov, Koichev, and Mutafov, "Srednovekoviiat Ahtopol," 72, table 4; Zhekova, Moneti i monetno obrashtenie, 79.}

Although the evidence for Anatolia is still insufficient for broad generalizations, there is strong indication of a general increase in the volume of coins during the reign of Justin II. Apparently surprising from a geographical standpoint, Thessalonica was a major supplier of coins at Sardis, where, at least in the first stage, 565-570, the coins

---


192 Edwards, Corinth VI, 125-27; Hohlfelder, Kenchreai, 68-71; Thompson, The Athenian Agora, 68-69; Spahiu, "Monedna bizantine," 378-81; Radić and Ivanišević, Byzantine Coins, 132-35. See also the composition of hoards found in these areas: Trésors.

struck by the Macedonian mint cover almost 35 percent of the finds (Figure 5-18).\textsuperscript{194} This seems to be a general characteristic of towns from western Anatolia, close to the coast, judging by the similar finds from Pergamum, Ephesus, and Side,\textsuperscript{195} whereas further to the west the proportion dwindles, comprised 15 percent at Pisidian Antioch, while no coins of Thessalonica have as of yet been recorded at Amaseia, Pessinus, and Melitene.\textsuperscript{196} Surprisingly, no such coins were found in the region of Bolu and Amasra close to the Black Sea, so we are still far from establishing a clear pattern. Coins from the second half of the reign are abundant at Melitene, which was a strategic position in the Armenian campaigns organized by Tiberius, now co-emperor with Justin II.

In the Near Eastern provinces the heavy influx of coins from Justin II has been often noted, especially because of the contrast with the post reform period of Justinian I, less prominent among finds. The number of finds is conspicuously high at Gerasa in Arabia and in Palaestina at Pella, Hammat Gader, Caesarea Maritima and to a lesser extent at Jerusalem and Nessana.\textsuperscript{197} Although they are fairly well represented at Antioch, Hama, and Apamea,\textsuperscript{198} no coins of Justin II have been reported among the admittedly small group of finds from Bālis,\textsuperscript{199} and they have a generally weaker

---

\textsuperscript{194} Bates, \textit{Byzantine Coins}, 54-55.


\textsuperscript{196} Ireland, \textit{Greek, Roman and Byzantine}, 105-06; de Wilde, "Monnaies au Musée de Pessinonte," 107; Devreker, "Les monnaies," 195-96.


presence in the rural settlements from Syria, such as Çatal Hüyük and Déhès\textsuperscript{200}, which parallels the situation observed by Ernest Oberländer-Târnoveanu in the case of the eastern Balkans.\textsuperscript{201} This also accords with the observations made by Clive Foss for rural settlements in Syria where the archeological evidence suggests a period of decline after 550.\textsuperscript{202}

The large number of coins from Justin II at Gerasa has been described by Alfred Bellinger as the most salient feature of the Early Byzantine coin finds in this important city of the "Decapolis".\textsuperscript{203} The situation was rightly ascribed to the high presence of coins from Nicomedia, partially confirmed by the subsequent finds from the "Macellum". No clear explanation is given for this peculiar development.\textsuperscript{204} Dealing with a similar situation at Pella, Kenneth Sheedy has suggested that it might reflect a new deployment of troops in the East for another episode of the war with Persia in the early 570s (Figure 5-8).\textsuperscript{205} There is no such parallel at Antioch, but indeed at Apamea, the number of coins

---


\textsuperscript{201} Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La monnaie dans l’espace rural," 348.


\textsuperscript{203} Bellinger, \textit{Coins from Jerash}, 13.


\textsuperscript{205} Sheedy, "Byzantine Period Coins," 49.
from Nicomedia is overwhelming.\textsuperscript{206} Such an explanation is, however, weakened by a similar situation noticed in two distant sites, Amaseia and Pisidian Antioch, where although no invasions are recorded, the mint of Nicomedia had an unusually significant presence (Figure 5-18).\textsuperscript{207}

The Collections point to a high output of \textit{pentanummia} during the reign of Justin II (Figure 5-32). This is indeed confirmed by finds in Constantinople and Pessinus where more than 75 percent of the finds were 5-\textit{nummia} pieces;\textsuperscript{208} at Tomis, Sardis, and Antioch they represented approximately one third of the total, while in Greece they cover less than 20 percent (Figure 5-32).\textsuperscript{209} The cluster of small change in large urban centers points to a necessity of the market, which seems to have been less strongly felt in small towns and fortresses and even less so in rural contexts. Less than 15 percent of the coins found in Scythia were \textit{pentanummia}, while in Moesia Secunda they amounted to a mere 4 percent.\textsuperscript{210} No such coins are recorded among the published finds from Albania, Amaseia, Melitene, Caesarea Maritima, Pella, and Gerasa to name only the most important.\textsuperscript{211}

\textsuperscript{206} Balty, "Monnaies byzantines des maisons," 240-44.

\textsuperscript{207} Ireland, \textit{Greek, Roman and Byzantine}, 105-06.


In 579 Tiberius II, now sole ruler, attempted an ambitious reform designed to celebrate his consulship. The weight of the *follis* was lifted to a Justinianic standard and the Collections as well as the numerous finds from Scythia indicate a high mint output for this special series (Figure 5-5). His measure, no doubt popular with the masses, was short-lived and most likely was never intended as a true reform meant to re-establish the heavy standard of Justinian. Albeit less spectacular, the heavier *folles* introduced by Maurice in 602 with the occasion of his consulship testifed to the irregular nature of these special issues.

As usual, the mint of Constantinople issued more than half the coins put in circulation, followed by Antioch and Nicomedia. The mint of Thessalonica is ranked higher than Cyzicus, probably because of the increasing military activity at the Danube border (Figure 5-20). The production of the peculiar 30 *nummia* introduced by Tiberius II was perhaps less impressive than the Collections would let us believe. This scarcer denomination was likely to attract the collectors’ attention which explains their heavy presence in the Collections, on average amounting to 10 percent of the entire number of coins attributed to Tiberius II (Figure 5-33). Scythia offers a more realistic proportion, with the 30 *nummia* accounting for less than 4 percent.¹²

In the three major regions of the Eastern Empire the influx of coins issued by Tiberius II was characterized by a high degree of variation. At the Danube border it appears that the coins of Tiberius II made little impact as can be seen in the catalogue of finds from Dinogetia, Capidava, Aquis, Viminacium, and the Belgrade museum.²¹³ On

---


the western sector of the *limes* the coins from Thessalonica played an important role, and indeed in Greece, at Corinth and Athens, where close to 40 percent of the coin finds were issued by the Macedonian mint.\(^{214}\) The mint of Antioch became more important in the Balkans, and it is possibly a sign that some troops were brought from the eastern front, despite Tiberius’ tendency to concentrate on the war with Persia.\(^ {215}\) There is a generally higher number of coins of Tiberius found on the Black Sea coast, Histria, Callatis, and Accres Castellum being a few major examples.\(^ {216}\) Another characteristic of the Balkan settlements is the fact that in most cases when the coin circulation dropped during the reign of Tiberius II it never recovered in the following decades, a sign of the gradual disintegration of urban life in the area.

Very few coins have been found in Constantinople, at Saracchane and Kalenderhane,\(^ {217}\) and a similar situation may be seen in the northern part of Anatolia judging by the coins from the museums in Amasya and Bolu, as well as in Pisidia at Antioch, Sagalassos and in the area of modern Isparta.\(^ {218}\) Sardis and Melitene, far apart on the map of Anatolia, share the same tendency and it seems so far that only Side provides a larger number of coins from Tiberius II (Figure 5-9).\(^ {219}\) Jumping to the island of Cyprus one notices a contrasting image: at Salamis and


\(^{218}\) No coins of Tiberius can be found among the four excavation reports from Sagalassos mentioned in n. 120.

Curium the number of coins of Tiberius II was conspicuously high given his short reign.²²⁰ Considering that Caesarea Maritima in Palestine has yielded a similarly high number of coins from this period, we can advance a provisional hypothesis that the coins of Tiberius II circulated more intensively on sea routes.²²¹

The observation regarding the circulation of smaller denominations made for the reign of Justin II remains valid for the short reign of Tiberius II (Figure 5-33). Aside from a few urban centers such as Constantinople, Antioch, Tomis, Corinth, Pisidian Antioch, and Sardis the 10 and 5 nummia pieces become scarcely used across the Eastern Empire (Figure 5-33). Antioch and Constantinople remain the main mints issuing small denominations, no doubt partly because of the local needs of the two metropoleis.

During the reign of Maurice the value of the copper follis remained stabilized at 600 folles per solidus. The Collections point to a general decrease in mint output during the last two decades of the sixth century, when only two peaks reached in 589/90 and 602 resemble the quantity of coins issued by Justin II (Figure 5-5). The first peak owed partly to the high output of Antioch. During regnal year 8 the old type inherited from Tiberius II continued to be struck along with the new type introduced by Maurice, which increases the total number of coins from this year. The other peak, in 602, coincided with the consulship assumed by the emperor. A special type was struck for this special occasion having the emperor represented in consular robes instead of with the usual military cuirass. A large number of coins were issued in a very short time interval, which explains why many specimens were overstruck on previous issues. It also points to a


crisis of raw material for striking fresh coins, a typical phenomenon in the first two decades of the seventh century.

The outstanding feature in mint activity is the high output of Antioch throughout the period, sometimes surpassing the production of Constantinople (Figure 5-21). The intense military activity which characterized the reign of Maurice is an important factor in explaining this phenomenon. The high number of troops involved in the war against Persia in the 580s and in the Balkans in the 590s increased the demand for fresh coins. The major role of Antioch even after the eastern front was closed, coupled with the unusually low output of Constantinople in the last years of the sixth century when the Empire was waging war against the Slavs and Avars is somewhat perplexing. Between 7 and 22 percent of the coins of Maurice in the northern Balkans, including the Danube fortresses were issued in Antioch. Especially in the western sector of the Lower Danube the coins from Antioch have been found in larger numbers. Conversely, in towns located on the Black Sea coast, such as Tomis, Callatis, Accres Castellum and Agathopolis, very few such coins have been found.\(^{222}\) This is also true for the coins found in Constantinople, at Kalenderhane and Saraçhane (Figure 5-21).\(^{223}\)

It is unlikely that the mint of Antioch was ever commissioned to ensure the payment of troops stationed in the Balkans. It is more probable that the coins were brought by the large number of troops transferred by Maurice after the war with Persia was brought to an end. This does not help explain the low activity of the mint of Constantinople especially between 597 and 602 (excepting the consular type in 602)


when the war against the Avars was in full motion. Michael Whitby considers that the emperor’s decision to leave the troops stationed north of the Danube for the winter of 602 had specific military purposes, contra Theophylact who suggested that financial considerations were behind this decision.\textsuperscript{224} Although multiple factors might have been at play, the low mint output of Constantinople and also Nicomedia, Cyzicus, and Thessalonica point to a serious financial crisis which must not be underestimated, despite the emperor’s expenditure with the occasion of his consulate.

The coin finds from the Balkans concentrate on the eastern part, in the provinces adjacent to the Black Sea. The payment of the troops stationed in the Danubian fortresses seems to have been a serious problem. The numerous finds from the province of Scythia show a high level of coin loss for the regnal years 5 and 10, which seem to coincide with the distribution of the quinquennial \textit{donativa} to the troops. One would have expected a similar peak in 597 as well, which is hardly the case.\textsuperscript{225} Its absence was due to the low activity of the mints of Constantinople, Nicomedia, Cyzicus and Thessalonica, already mentioned, and coincided with some serious military setbacks at the Danube frontier, which was menaced by the Avars who reached as far as Tomis, the capital of Scythia, besieged in 597-598.\textsuperscript{226} The low ebb in coin production during the last five years of the century indicates that military payments in the Balkans

\textsuperscript{224} Whitby, \textit{The Emperor Maurice}, 165-69.

\textsuperscript{225} Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 311.

were delayed; discontent was certainly building up in the frontier garrisons and would eventually turn into rebellion in 602.\textsuperscript{227}

Especially the mint of Thessalonica, whose coinage was a major source of payment for the troops stationed on the Danube, reduced its output dramatically during the last years of the sixth century. The activity of this mint has been a debated issue in the last decades and it is primarily connected with the dating of the siege of Thessalonica.\textsuperscript{228} Figure 5-7 represents a comparison between the coins from the Collections (336 coins) and the finds from Scythia (248 coins). The trend is clearly similar, while the peculiarities of Scythia are marked by the high peaks of 568/9/70 and 574/5, which are consistent with the situation in Serbia: the collection of the National Museum in Belgrade provides forty-six specimens from Justin II of which eighteen are dated 569/70 and thirteen, 574/5.\textsuperscript{229}

The year-by-year fluctuations bring forth even more interesting observations about the Thessalonican mint output after 578. D. M. Metcalf maintained that 580 was a critical moment when the mint activity was virtually paralyzed.\textsuperscript{230} The graph below partly confirms Metcalf’s assertion with respect to the mint’s influence in the Balkans around year 580, although a few specimens are available in the Belgrade collection as well as in Scythia. While this might be true for the Balkans (579-582 provides a striking difference in the comparison chart), the major collections provide 6 specimens from

\textsuperscript{227} See above n. 55.


\textsuperscript{229} Radić and Ivanišević, Byzantine Coins, 132-35.

\textsuperscript{230} Metcalf, "Avar and Slav Invasions," 142.
580/1 and less for the next three years. Therefore, one can conclude that Metcalf’s statement is true as a local feature and not necessarily a problem of mint output.

The same goes with the theory introduced by Vladislav Popović who supposed that the mint activity at Thessalonica virtually ceased in 585/6, and yet we find four specimens in the Collections and no less than five (only single finds included) in Scythia.\(^{231}\) The most critical period in the mint’s activity occurred toward the turn of the century, 597-600, and is a more general phenomenon of the monetary economy. The statistical value of coin finds of Maurice in Anatolia is usually double the value established for the Balkans (Figures 5-8 and 5-9). The frequent invasions and the general devastation of the Danube provinces were certainly among the major reasons for this striking difference. Much like in the Balkans, however, the numerous coin finds from urban sites like Sardis, Amaseia, Pisidian Antioch, Side, and Malatya usually form a continuous sequence until 595.\(^{232}\) The scarcity of coins from the later years and the similarity with the Balkans force us to conclude that economic reasons affecting the mint output should be held responsible for this situation and not military activity, pervasive in the Balkans, but almost inexistent in most of Anatolia. Another distinctive characteristic was the significant influence of the Antioch mint in Anatolia. At Amaseia and Melitene around 50 percent of the coins were struck in Antioch, while the average for most of the towns for which we have sufficient information was more than 20 percent.
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\(^{231}\) Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 320.

\(^{232}\) Bates, Byzantine Coins, 67-78; Ireland, Greek, Roman and Byzantine, 106-07; Atlan, 1947-1967 yılları Side, 84-86.
Figure 5-7. Thessalonica mint (565-602) (percent of coins per year).
Two prominent exceptions are Sardis and Amasra where the mint of Antioch was less significant or not present at all. In both towns, however, the coins from Thessalonica represented an important proportion of the group, suggesting different channels of coin distribution in Anatolia, not necessarily based on geographic location (Figure 5-21). The collection of the archaeology museum in Bolu (ancient Claudiopolis), in the ancient province of Bithynia, far from Antioch, has no coins of Maurice from Thessalonica, but many from Antioch, amounting to 30 percent of the total. This is a general characteristic of the collection for the entire sixth century. Jumping to the island of Cyprus we notice a combined influence of Antioch and Thessalonica at Salamis and Curium, no doubt because of the maritime dimension of both the towns and the mints.

In Syria-Palestine the proportion of coins issued by Maurice was slightly higher than in Anatolia. Antioch itself provided a high number, due to the presence of the mint in the city and its influence was also felt in the vicinity, if less overwhelming, at Hama, Déhès, Apamea, and Çatal Hüyük. Southward, on the coast, at Berytus and Caesarea, a large number of coins from Antioch were recorded among finds, perhaps a sign of commercial activities and also in towns from the Palestinian inland, such as Jerusalem and Nessana. The large coin hoards found in the Near Eastern provinces testify to the fact that Antioch played a more important role in this region, compared to

---

234 Callot, Salamine de Chypre, 48-51; Cox, Coins from the Excavations, 80.
the Balkans and Anatolia. The decline in coin circulation was now felt in some previously prosperous towns, most importantly at Pella and Gerasa. Kenneth Sheedy has explained this situation by the impoverishment of the two centers, while Alan Walmsley has suggested that state consignments ended in this period. It is hard to make any generalizations at the scale of the entire province of Arabia or Palaestina II since the coin samples for most settlements are too small to observe any clear tendencies in coin circulation. It should be noted, however, that in most cases finds from Maurice Tiberius are present.

The lower denominations continued to be struck in limited numbers and their use was generally restricted to the urban economy (Figure 5-34). Both the Collections and site finds point to a sharp decline in the production of ⅛ folles, which remained abundant only among the finds from Constantinople and to a lesser degree at Sardis and Ephesus. The ¼ follis is found in a wider variety of settlements, in major urban centers such as Tomis, Pisidian Antioch, Salamis, and Antioch, and occasionally in rural settlements like Déhês, in Syria.

A new increase in coin output may be observed during the reign of Phocas, which is another reason to reconsider the merits of his reign (Figure 5-6). Historians in the past have relied perhaps too heavily on written sources biased against Phocas to

237 Münzfunde, vol. II; Trésors.
238 Sheedy, "Byzantine Period Coins," 52.
239 Walmsley, "Coin Frequencies," 345.
241 Isvoranu and Poenaru Bordea, "Monede bizantine de la Tomus," 153, table 3; Callot, Salamine de Chypre, 51; Waage, Antioch-on-the-Orontes, 159-60; Morrisson, "Les monnaies," 279.
describe his reign in overly negative terms. The Collections prove that his coinage was abundant, although it must be noted that a good proportion of his copper coinage was made of overstrikes, usually on coins of Maurice. This is not so much a case of damnatio memoriae as a direct result of a shortage of copper building up in the course of the sixth century as a consequence of inflation, hoarding, and casual loss. Chiefly folles were overstruck and mainly in Constantinople, Nicomedia, and Cyzicus. Based on the evidence of the Collections, the overstruck group represents on average c. 25 percent of the total, while the carefully published finds from Sardis reveal that c. 22 percent of the folles of Phocas were overstruck.\textsuperscript{242} The mint of Antioch is excluded from these calculations because it rarely overstruck its issues.

Except for the collection in Paris\textsuperscript{243}, there is a general tendency of decline in mint output in the last regnal years, probably because of the turmoil created by the Heraclian revolt. The mint of Antioch continued to be the second most important after Constantinople and its output was related to the new offensive initiated by the Persian king after the deposition of Maurice. Surprisingly, the two major mints were closely followed by Cyzicus, which became extremely active after having a minor role throughout the sixth century (Figure 5-22).

The military conditions in the Balkans worsened after the rebellion of 602. Although the thesis of the collapse of the Danube limes in 602 is no longer tenable,\textsuperscript{244}

\textsuperscript{242} Bates, Byzantine Coins, 67-78.

\textsuperscript{243} The collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale shows a prominent peak in 609/10, apparently inexplicable (Figure 5-5). A closer examination of the coins’ provenance reveals the fact that all coins belonged to the collection Schlumberger; most of them were minted in Antioch and were purchased in Aleppo by the French scholar and might be part of a hoard.

numerous fortifications, particularly on the western sector, were severely affected. There is a marked difference in coin circulation among the settlements on the border, such as Capidava, Novae, Aquis, and Viminacium, where few or no coins of Phocas were found and towns further away from the military operations, such as Tomis, Accres Castellum, Corinth, Athens, and Constantinople itself, where the volume of finds marked a visible increase compared to the reign of Maurice (Figure 5-8). A very similar tendency may be observed in Anatolia, where most of the urban settlements have yielded a large number of finds from Phocas (Figure 5-9). One major exception is Melitene situated close to the front line after the Persians had occupied the main strategic towns in Upper Mesopotamia. The mint of Antioch, less visible in the Balkans, covered more than 30 percent of the coins found in Anatolia, an important increase compared to the reign of Maurice. As expected, the finds from the Near Eastern provinces showed an even more pronounced influence of Antioch, especially at Gerasa and Caesarea, probably itself a sign of the threat posed by the Persian armies (Figure 5-22). However, the influence of Antioch stopped being so pervasive in the Near East. At Hama, Jerusalem, and Nessana, where Antioch had always been an important


247 Bellinger, Coins from Jerash, 114-16; Marot, Las monedas del Macellum, 481-83; Ariel, "The Coins," 143; Evans, The Joint Expedition, 195-96.
supplier of fresh coins, no such finds have been reported.\textsuperscript{248} This is not only a matter of distribution but also a problem of coin supply, since in many towns from Syria-Palestine, unlike what we have seen in the Balkans and Anatolia, the volume of fresh coins stagnated or decreased during the reign of Phocas (Figure 5-8). The extreme scarcity of coins from Thessalonica, which had been a minor but steady supplier of coins since the reign of Justin II, was possibly another sign of decline. The low number of smaller denominations adds to this picture of downfall in coin circulation (Figure 5-35). Besides Antioch no other urban center in Syria-Palestine provides such issues.\textsuperscript{249} The rare hoard of small change found in Aleppo could originate from the circulating medium of the great Syrian metropolis.\textsuperscript{250} By comparison, Tomis and Odartsi in the Balkans, Sagalassos, Pisidian Antioch, and Sardis in Anatolia, and Salamis in Cyprus\textsuperscript{253} continued to receive lower denominations, $\frac{1}{4}$ folles and even $\frac{1}{8}$ folles.

It is often thought that the long reign of Heraclius marked the end of Antiquity. The empire lost its eastern provinces to the hands of the Arabs and its influence in the Balkans under the repeated attacks of Slavs and Avars. By necessity, this comparative analysis has to end with the first decade of Heraclius’ reign, when the coin circulation dropped in Scythia, our main element of comparison with the Collections. The first years

\textsuperscript{248} Thomsen, “The Graeco-Roman Coins,” 62; Ariel, “A Survey of Coin Finds;” Bellinger, "Coins," 73-74. See, however, the group of coins purchased in Jerusalem in 1963 in which 30 percent of the coins of Phocas were minted in Antioch, Metcalf and Payne, "Some Byzantine and Arab-Byzantine Coins," 209.

\textsuperscript{249} Waage, \textit{Antioch-on-the-Orontes}, 161-62.


\textsuperscript{251} Ivoranu and Poenaru Bordea, "Monede bizantine de la Tomis," 153, table 3.


\textsuperscript{253} Callot, \textit{Salamine de Chypre}, 52-53.
of his reign were characterized by an abundant coinage with a high peak reached in 612-614 (Figure 5-5). This coincided with an important change in iconography, the frontal bust of the emperor being replaced with the standing figures of Heraclius and his son Heraclius Constantine. One could argue that the successive changes in iconography were the reason why the Collections possess so many coins from this time interval. This is not the case, however, since the abundant material from Anatolia and Syria shows a very similar peak in the same years and was, of course, unaffected by selection in the hands of collectors or museum curators (Figure 5-2).254

Even from these early years of reign, the complexity of the early Byzantine monetary system began to break down slowly. The mint of Antioch was closed, never to be reopened for regular issues, while the mints in Cyzicus (615/6) and Nicomedia (618/9) were temporarily shut-down. The multi-denominational system ceased to be functional, after the mints stopped issuing \( \frac{1}{6} \) folles and concentrated c. 90 percent of their activity on the production of folles (Figure 5-36). Over 90 percent of the coins from the first six years of reign are overstruck, especially the ones belonging to the 2nd type of Grierson’s classification.255 The "conversion" of large quantities of coins issued by Maurice and Phocas affects the quantitative estimation for these two reigns. To give one example, the number of undertypes of Phocas in DOC would increase by 30 percent the total number of folles issued during the reign of Phocas.

The Balkans witness a severe downfall in coin circulation in the second decade of the seventh century. Leopard spots of Byzantine control usually located around urban
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254 Bell, Sardis, 82-95; Bates, Byzantine Coins, 95-109.

255 DOC II/1, 226.
centers from the Black Sea coast or Danubian fortresses still held by the Empire continued to receive fresh coins. With the exception of Durostorum, the number of coins found at Capidava, Sacidava, Novae, and Viminacium are too meager to represent anything but the last payments sent to the small garrisons still holding the Empire’s position at the Danube. Urban life continued its course to some extent at Tomis and Callatis and especially at Corinth and Athens, to name the most important centers (Figure 5-8), but later in the century the eastern Balkans were menaced by a new and long lasting enemy of the Byzantine state, the Bulgars. Most of the coins found in the Balkans were issued either in Constantinople and Nicomedia, while Cyzicus and Thessalonica have a negligible presence (Figure 5-23). As expected, most of them are folles, over 80 percent on average, and half-folles; ¼ folles are lacking, even among finds from Constantinople (Figure 5-36).

In Anatolia we encounter a totally different distribution. The coins of Heraclius are among the most common Early Byzantine coins found during excavations or in local archaeology museums. In statistical terms they usually represent between 20 and 40 percent of the total number of finds, which is in sharp contrast with the picture offered by the Balkans. Excavations at Sardis and Side yielded a particularly high number of finds (Figure 5-9), while the coins preserved in the Bolu and Isparta museums point to a
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massive influx of coins in the respective areas.\textsuperscript{258} It should be noted however that the abundance of coins in these early years predated the Persian invasion, which initially affected the south-eastern part of Anatolia but soon had an impact on the Byzantine heartland where the Persians sacked Caesarea, Ancyra, and Sardis and took the island of Rhodes.\textsuperscript{259} The abundance of early Heraclian issues is most striking in the islands, in Cyprus,\textsuperscript{260} at Salamis, Curium, and Paphos and on Samos\textsuperscript{261} in the Aegean, where an impressive number of coins have been recovered from the Tunnel of Eupalinos, among which some rare $\frac{1}{4}$ \textit{folles}. The developments in Cyprus have been ascribed to an increased strategic importance of the island after Antioch was occupied by the Persians, which might also explain the ephemeral presence of an official mint on the island.\textsuperscript{262}

The first decades of the seventh century brought an unprecedented series of invasions led by the Persians and later Arabs which sealed the fate of the Byzantine provinces in Syria-Palestine. The increased number of hoards testified to the growing insecurity in the area after 602.\textsuperscript{263} Site finds, however, provide us with a mixed picture.


\textsuperscript{259} C. Foss, "The Persians in Asia Minor and the End of Antiquity," \textit{The English Historical Review} 90 (1975): 721-47.


Relatively few early coins of Heraclius found their way into Antioch and Apamea, the two major cities of the region, the finds being two or even three times fewer than in Anatolia, somewhat resembling the situation encountered in the northern Balkans. Surprisingly, at Hama the finds were much more numerous and correspond with an unexpected period of reconstruction late in the sixth century. In Palestine we notice a sensible increase in coin finds, at Caesarea, Jerusalem, and Pella, but they are by no means characteristic to the region as a whole (Figure 5-9).

5.4 Conclusion: Money in the Early Byzantine World

The statistical validity of large collections of Early Byzantine coins can no longer be overlooked. The comparison of five major collections with the numerous finds from the province of Scythia and the hoards from the Near East has revealed a number of quantitative similarities, which need to be addressed. The purpose of analyzing museum collections from a statistical perspective is not to provide us with absolute figures. Unfortunately the statistical tools often used in numismatics are far more sophisticated and precise than the sampled evidence, which is most of the time fragmentary and problematic. There are too many lacunae in our knowledge of the monetary policies conducted by Early Byzantium to attempt any definitive propositions.

264 Waage, Antioch-on-the-Orontes, 162-64; Balty, "Monnaies byzantine des maisons," 240-45.
The nature of the evidence and the inherent methodological limitations are an invitation to caution. Any statistical results will need to be confirmed and re-confirmed by future evidence before attempting any conclusive remarks. Relative fluctuations can, however, be discerned at this point and the large number of copper coins in the major museum collections offer a solid base on which to re-construct the rhythm of mint output and from which to draw a number of general remarks. Accounting for variation in the volume of output is of course insufficient and much more needs to be done in the realm of interpretation, of explaining such fluctuations. Such an understanding cannot be accomplished only by studying the de-contextualized coins from the public collections. Archaeological excavations in the Balkans, Anatolia, and the Near East offer the most promising perspectives for understanding regional patterns in a comparative fashion. Nonetheless, the high correlation of the major collections of Early Byzantine coins remains instrumental for a better understanding of annual coin production. Where significant site finds are available they should be analyzed against this pattern and if anomalies (i.e. local particularities) are spotted they need to be explained within a geographical and historical framework. Many interpretations based on political/military events need to be reassessed, because "abnormal" levels in coin circulation can not be properly detected and understood without basic knowledge of the "normal" pattern. It will soon become apparent that low points on the statistical curve of a region are very

---

often reflections of coin production and distribution at the center and less the result of provincial developments alone.\textsuperscript{270}

I have shown in the previous sections that, in spite of the still insufficient evidence, the analysis can be undertaken at the inter-regional level, which is undoubtedly the most appropriate course of action, enabling us, at least provisionally, to examine, understand, and explain regional peculiarities and different levels of monetization and economic integration. Studying coin circulation in a single province without reference to the circulating medium in other corners of the Empire can lead to false generalizations and unreliable interpretations of the numismatic material. The coin finds from a major urban site will not inform us sufficiently about the coin circulation in the whole province, while the finds from a province will not be necessarily relevant for an entire region. Therefore, I have tried to paint, perhaps in overly broad strokes, a comparative triptych of the Early Byzantine coin circulation, with one panel devoted to the Balkans and two complementary ones for Anatolia and Syria-Palestine in the hope that future studies will soon correct and improve this provisional effort. The broad outlines drawn for Anatolia, and to a certain extent for the Near East, are subject to change as new information surfaces. At least in the northern Balkans the current body of evidence is large enough to ensure the stability of present analyses although, of course, at the level of detail the overall scheme will certainly require minor adjustments. The common features observed in many urban centers of the Near Eastern provinces are likely to endure, although new data is expected to color the grey areas in the big

\textsuperscript{270} The activity of provincial mints should be part of the general explanation regarding local particularities. Indeed the mint of Thessalonica will heavily influence the coin distribution in the western Balkans, while the mint of Antioch will have a similar effect in Syria (Figures 5-10 to 5-23). Given the different channels of distribution, towns from Syria and Macedonia will certainly differ to some extent in their circulation patterns.
picture and perhaps to bring more homogeneity in what seems like a very diverse landscape. Anatolia is by far the most sensitive region to future developments and constitutes the most promising avenue to test both the uniting and the distinctive features of the coin circulation in the major geographical units of the Eastern Empire.

There can be no discussion about the function of early Byzantine coins beyond the frontier before a proper understanding of its role in the Byzantine economy as well as the reflection of that role in finds from different provinces, and indeed, various frontier regions of the empire, as illustrated by the previous sections. Although the time-honored debate surrounding the nature of the Roman and Early Byzantine economy has not been settled, an important observation seems to have gained important ground in the past decades, namely the definition of the economy in terms of a mosaic of interconnected markets. Embracing such a proposition also entails a redefinition of terms such as "center" and "periphery," to the extent that each market can be described in such terms. At the macro-level we can still talk about Constantinople as the center draining many of the economic resources of the empire and the militarized frontiers which placed an overwhelming pressure on state finances. Nevertheless, zooming-in on a specific province or region occasions a small-scale reflection of this picture. The coin finds from the provinces of the eastern Balkans, some of them bordering on both the Black Sea and the Danube, reveal the existence of local centers and peripheries. Large coastal towns such as Tomis, Histria, and Varna were better connected to the Aegean and by extension to the Eastern Mediterranean world. Perhaps as a direct consequence of this connectivity such urban centers had a much more developed market reflected in the high frequency of small change (¼ and ⅛ folles) found accidentally or during
systematic excavations. The same cannot be said about military settlements on the
Danube characterized by the predominance of higher denominations (*folles* and \( \frac{1}{2} \) *folles*).

Similar highly monetized centers may be identified along the coasts of the
Aegean and the Mediterranean as well as in the hinterland at reasonably close
distances to the sea. The latter were sometimes both large towns and administrative
centers (e.g. Scythopolis, Sardis), but in all these cases the high percentage of small
denominations of the *follis* is an indication of low-value market transactions. The
existence of separate markets, sometimes in isolation, is clearly suggested by the case
of Berytus, whose monetary economy is overwhelmingly dominated by small-module
*folles of Anastasius*, which otherwise disappeared from circulation in most other
regions. The fact that Berytus is a coastal site, rather than a remote landlocked town,
makes this case even more remarkable. Although connected to the larger
Mediterranean exchange system as testified by other categories of finds, Berytus kept
an idiosyncratic coin pool for reasons which have not been sufficiently explored. At a
larger scale, it resembles the circulation of large-module coins of Justinian in the
Balkans until late in the sixth century, at a time when they were conspicuously absent in
centers from Syria-Palestine. Different patterns of coin circulation in different centers of
the Mediterranean world do not necessarily bespeak the lack of integration or contact,
but rather a deliberate policy which may reflect both local decision-making and larger
state policies. To be sure, the presence of the military and the duality between large civil
settlements and military fortresses had an important impact on the monetary economy,
the quantity and type of coins in circulation. Unfortunately, we know more about the
vertical circulation of coinage to and from the imperial fiscal offices in the form of taxes and salaries than we do about the horizontal transmission between regional economic centers and their circumscribed peripheries, either rural settlements or military fortresses. When such information is available, it becomes clear that we are dealing with different degrees of monetization depending on the type of settlement and we cannot escape the conclusion that outside the confines of large urban centers, exchange facilitated by coinage would have been one, often not the dominant, manner in which exchanges took place.²⁷¹

In what concerns the monetary economy of frontier regions our best source of information is the Danube frontier where we encounter the largest number of excavated sites and, unsurprisingly, the highest density of coin finds. Recent research on the *Limes Arabicus* has revealed an unusually low number of sixth-century coin finds, while sites in northern Syria and eastern Turkey have been insufficiently explored to provide a clear picture of the economic conditions at the border with Sassanid Persia. The economy of the Balkans in the sixth century as well as the nature of coin finds point to an artificial coin circulation, far from the monetary economy usually invoked by numismatists and historians.²⁷² Coin finds from hill-top sites of the Danube valley reflect military payments rather than the volume of market exchange, although the latter is notoriously hard to quantify. Given the collapse of large-scale agricultural production in the Balkans, state-controlled *annona* was the main form of supplying the Danube frontier. Provinces of the heartland included in *Quaestura Exercitus*, the peculiar

²⁷¹ For the use of coins in rural settlements, see especially the essays in Lefort et al., *Les villages dans l'Empire byzantin*.

²⁷² For the economic conditions, see Poulter, “Cataclysm on the Lower Danube,” 223-53.
administrative unit created by Justinian, had the task of sustaining the frontier provinces bordering on the Black Sea. On the other hand, soldiers received part of their regular salaries as well as irregular payments such as the quinquennial *donativum* in bronze coin, or at least had the option of obtaining copper coins in exchange for gold, an operation facilitated by official money-changers. It is, therefore, safe to assume that some low-value transactions took place, but they seldom involved the use of low denominations and they were probably erratic in nature rather than part of a coherent system fitting the typical town-countryside model. It may be that sites on the Danube had access to a wider variety of goods cheaper to transport on the river and even to imports channeled through larger towns on the Black Sea coast, as evidenced by the presence of imported ceramics. Some of these transactions might have involved the use of bronze coins. All things equal, the striking resemblance between the statistical curve of site finds from well-researched provinces of the Balkans such as Scythia and Moesia Secunda, points to constant military payments including five-year spikes which can be ascribed to quinquennial *donativa*. This similar pattern of coin loss reveals the insularity of monetary exchanges in the northern Balkans and the low speed of coin circulation. The fact that most coins issued in Carthage have been found in settlements from the Black Sea coast testifies to the existence of long-distance contacts and confirms the economic diversity of coastal towns, as well as the lack thereof in hill-top military sites of the Danube valley. The coin samples are characterized by the overwhelming presence of coins issued at Constantinople, in the case of provinces from the diocese of Thracia, and the importance of the Macedonian mint of Thessalonica in settlements from Illyricum.
Archaeologists, numismatists, and economic historians interested in questions of cultural contact between the early Byzantine Empire and communities living north of the Danube based their interpretation of coins found beyond the frontier against a preconceived assumption that the Byzantine provinces of the Balkans had a developed monetary economy. In their view, this market economy based on money often extended north of the Danube to include territories which the Empire intended to include in its sphere of political, economic and cultural influence. The presence of coin finds beyond the frontier is undeniable, but the range of functions performed, which will be explored in the next chapter, goes beyond the monetary value and indeed the use of Byzantine coins as money beyond the Danube frontier of the Empire is perhaps the least significant of the roles it played in barbaricum.
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6.1 General remarks

To the modern scholar ancient coinage presents two unique qualities: standardization and high frequency. Unlike the bewildering variety of artifacts ordered by archaeologists according to somewhat artificially defined classificatory schemes, coinage needs no such arrangements. Byzantine money has already been classified by the issuing authority into different denominations, mints, and dates. Apart from local imitations of Byzantine coins, the same money circulating in the Empire can be found outside the frontier. To be sure, the function performed by Byzantine coins differed from place to place and from one context to another, but the distribution of coin finds on a map affords the same kind of observations whether those coins have been found inside or outside the political borders of the early Byzantine Empire. Indeed, such comparisons are most welcome, as communication routes and directions of circulation can be deduced by analyzing the mints responsible for striking the coins found in a certain area. Much of the argument of the following sections is based on geographical and chronological analyses of finds in their respective historical and archaeological context. These may include clusters of small change in one region, the predominance of gold coins in another, the high-frequency of "exotic" mints in certain areas, or comparisons between the age structure of single finds and hoards.

In geographic terms, the nature of the numismatic evidence invites a much broader discussion. Although the Lower Danube remains the main geographic unit of analysis, the functions performed by Byzantine coins cannot be properly understood without venturing into the regions flanking it to the west, the Carpathian Basin, and to
the east, the northern Black Sea region and by extension Transcaucasia. An excursion of such geographic magnitude was not feasible for the entire archaeological record pertaining to the Byzantine influence outside the frontier, due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence, the level of publication, and indeed the cultural variety of the contexts in which Byzantine artifacts are found (Chapter 4). Coins, however, have been fairly well published, in quantitative if not always qualitative terms, in the wide region from the Baltic to the Caspian Sea (Figures 5-10 to 5-23). The dilemma posed by the cultural variety inevitably encountered in such a large geographic area is somewhat vindicated by the homogeneous distribution of similar samples of Byzantine coin finds, which facilitates comparison. The proximity to the Byzantine Empire and to important war theaters is another major characteristic shared by the three regions discussed in this chapter, the Lower Danube, Transcaucasia, and the Carpathian Basin. Regular political payments, occasional imperial gifts, ransom for POWs and VIPs or simply plunder in the Byzantine provinces are the most important documented means through which coins traveled across frontiers.

The contexts in which Byzantine coins have been found, singly or in hoards, and their usefulness for the integration of the numismatic evidence into the broader historical narrative requires some clarification. The inventory of Byzantine coin finds from barbaricum includes some 1200 single finds and a few more thousands in hoards, but few have been found in a clear archaeological context (Appendix B, Table B-15). Single finds from the frontier region of the Empire usually resulted from systematic excavations in coastal towns and frontier fortresses, but the nature of the settlements in Barbaricum, much smaller and usually unfortified makes them vulnerable to destruction during
agricultural works and their identification by archaeologists is quite problematic.

Consequently, very few coins have been found in settlements, and out of those rare occasions very few boast a good stratigraphic context. However, the fact that coin finds usually cluster along major river valleys or in the proximity of known settlements remains important for drawing a number of general conclusions regarding their circulation. Furthermore, many coins which ended up in museums of modern countries far from the borders of the Byzantine Empire, may not have been found locally, but collected from Byzantine provinces. Byzantine coins in England are the most notorious example but the controversy regarding coins from the National Museum in Budapest, closer to the Empire, illustrates some limitations of the numismatic evidence.\(^1\) Whenever possible, unprovenienced coins must be judged against finds from secure contexts or confirmation should be sought in a wide frequency of similar finds from the same area.

On the other hand, more than half of the hoards have been dispersed, either divided between finders or otherwise lost in unknown circumstances (Appendix B, Table B-16). This poses serious methodological problems for the researcher who tries to place their loss in a historical context, as the date of concealment is always approximated based on the date of the earliest coin in the assemblage. Unless there is a large concentration of hoards in a small region, such as the case of the string of incomplete hoards from Bohemia ending in the reign of Justinian I, such incomplete finds offer very few certainties. Furthermore, few hoards have been found during archaeological
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excavations. Such hoards like the ones found at Magraneti, Pityus, and Archaeopolis in Georgia or Hrosová in the Czech Republic are important exceptions. In addition, for the majority of the hoards it is uncertain whether the accumulation was created by gathering coins from that same region or constituted a homogeneous group of coins brought from elsewhere, usually from the Empire.

A number of general observations can be drawn from the statistical analysis of early Byzantine coin finds in *barbaricum* (Figures 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, 6-4, and 6-5). The largest number of finds are issues of Justinian I, but his reign is also the longest. By taking into account the length of each reign the highest percentage of finds goes to Justin II, followed closely by Justin I (Appendix B, Tables B-1 and B-13). All types of Byzantine coins are found in *Barbaricum*, gold, silver, and copper, but in varying proportions depending on emperor and region. The fewest gold coins are those struck for Justin I and Justin II, while the largest concentration of gold can be placed in the seventh century, although an important peak is also reached during the reign of Justinian (Appendix B, Tables B-2 and B-3). The largest number of gold coins can be found in the Carpathian Basin and the neighboring regions, on the territory of the Avar Khaganate in particular, where many Avar-age cemeteries have yielded Byzantine *solidi*. Before the Avar age, the largest concentration of finds is represented by coins of Anastasius found in coastal areas of the Baltic and the Adriatic and by *solidi* and *tremisses* of Justinian found in Central Europe. In many cases across the vast region from Central Europe to the Caucasus, gold coins were pierced or modified to be used as jewelry.
Figure 6-1. Sixth-seventh-century Byzantine coin finds in *barbaricum*.
Figure 6-2. Mints

Figure 6-3. Denominations
Figure 6-4. Byzantine gold, silver, and bronze hoards in *barbaricum*.

Figure 6-5. Sixth-seventh-century Byzantine gold coins in *barbaricum*
Almost 80 percent of the silver coins are seventh-century hexagrams, most of which are from the reign of Heraclius. Almost 50 percent of the hexagrams are issues dated 625-629. This should not be surprising as the largest number of hexagrams comes from Transcaucasia and date from the time of Heraclius' counteroffensive against Persia in the 620s. In fact this region boasts the highest percentage of silver coins out of the total number of early Byzantine coins, 17 percent. This may seem rather unimpressive, but it should be remembered that sixth-century silver was strictly ceremonial and is rarely found in barbaricum or the Byzantine provinces alike. Nevertheless, sixth-century silver is quite frequent in Transcaucasia, given the rarity of these pieces and most of them date from the reign of Justinian, as do the few pieces found in the Carpathian Basin.

Overall copper coins account for the majority of finds in barbaricum and this is no different from our picture of coin circulation in the Empire. Over 65 percent of the finds are copper coins and the proportion is somewhat distorted by the fact that gold predominates in the Carpathian Basin (Appendix B, Table B-2). The largest concentration of copper coins is to be found in the Lower Danube region (ca. 85 percent), the closest to a heavily militarized frontier. The largest concentration of copper was reached during the reign of Justin II (over 90 percent) but the frequency remains high throughout the long sixth century until the accession of Heraclius, after which copper coins account for less than a third of coin finds. Explanations should be sought not only in barbaricum and in circumstances related to the fall of the frontier in the Balkans, but also in Byzantine monetary policies and in fluctuations of mint output. The great advantage of copper coins, aside from their sheer number, is the fact that they are
dated by regnal year (Appendix B, Table B-4). The chronological breakdown of finds in barbaricum reveals a great concentration of coins issued between 512 and 538, which unsurprisingly corresponds with a period of great monetary stability in the Byzantine Empire. The best represented, however, is the coinage of 538-542, featuring the large folles of Justinian, apparently very popular outside the Empire. A general decline can be noticed after 578, while coins after 620 are rare throughout barbaricum.

The distribution of coins based on the issuing mint usually reflects the proximity to the large network of mints maintained by early Byzantine emperors, as well as the general importance of individual mints. Unsurprisingly, the central mint in Constantinople accounts for over 55 percent of the finds, followed by Nicomedia and Antioch (Appendix B, Table B-5). The Syrian mint is particularly influential in Transcaucasia, although it is far from being exotic in the Lower Danube region as well. The importance of provincial mints increased in the second half of the sixth century and in many contexts Thessalonica, Nicomedia, and Antioch surpass Constantinople. Western mints opened after Justinian’s reconquista are more frequent in Central Europe, whose connections with the western Mediterranean were stronger. Finally, the breakdown by denomination reveals an overwhelming dominance of the follis (over 65 percent), while the small change used in low-value transactions at the marketplace in the Empire, dekanummia (1/4 follis) and pentanummia (1/8 follis), accounts for ca. 10 percent of the finds from barbaricum (Appendix B, Table B-6).

It does not take much effort to notice that the flow of Byzantine coins during the sixth and seventh centuries was anything but linear. What are, then, the explanations for the chronological and spatial distribution of Byzantine coins in barbaricum? What are
the local and broader historical circumstances that influenced the availability of Byzantine coins beyond the frontier? What was the function of money and how were Byzantine coins used by communities living in the shadow of the Empire? These are some of the main questions addressed in the following sections along with some attempts to clarify methodological issues regarding the use of the evidence. The distribution of gold, silver, and copper coins as well as wider historical implications require a separate discussion of coin finds from the three culturally interrelated regions: the Lower Danube, Transcaucasia, and the Carpathian Basin.

6.2 Geographical and Chronological Patterns of Coin Finds in barbaricum

6.2.1 The Land of Bronze: The Lower Danube

From a strictly numismatic point of view the Byzantine coin series begins with the reform of Anastasius in 498. Consequently, numismatists discuss the significance of Byzantine coin finds outside the Empire by taking into account the flow of coins beyond the frontier from the reign of Anastasius onward. However, such a periodization seems artificial if we consider certain historical processes long in motion when Anastasius implemented his monetary policy. At least three major stages need to be taken into account, without necessarily extrapolating historical realities in place centuries before our main chronological focus. The first is the withdrawal of the Roman army and administration from the trans-Danubian province of Dacia by Aurelianus. As a result, the cultural distinction between the territory of the former Roman province and the regions east and south of the Carpathians, which were never part of the Roman Empire, slowly became more blurred in the following centuries (Figure 4-1). Coin finds of the fourth century still concentrate in the area of the former Roman towns in Transylvania and Oltenia but in the sixth century this is no longer the case. Notwithstanding the Byzantine
bridge-heads in Oltenia and Banat, coin finds in Moldavia and Wallachia are in fact more abundant in the sixth-to-seventh centuries. The second stage, which brought a certain degree of cultural uniformity to the region, is the development of the so-called Sântana de Mureș-Chernyakhov culture, a mixture of Roman, Germanic, Sarmatian and other local, sometimes pre-Roman, influences. The fourth century, the period of its greatest extent and flourishing coincides with renewed Roman ambitions on the Lower Danube and beyond. The imperial policy is reflected in the peace treatises with the Goths, which also include provisions regarding trade and commerce often used by historians and numismatists to explain the presence of Late Roman coins north of the Danube. The third important stage is the cultural and political transformation of the region under the domination of the Huns. The terms most frequently associated with the Hunnic storm in the Balkans and the Carpathian Basin are devastation, collapse, social, economic, and demographic decline. Indeed, there is a sharp decline in the coin flow north of the Danube in the first half of the fifth century but this also coincides with a more general decline of the Late Roman monetary system, reflecting a deeper internal weakness of the Empire at the turn of the fifth century.²

Historically speaking a discussion of cultural contact in the Lower Danube region during the sixth century must begin with the transitional period from the dissolution of the Hunnic confederation to the accession of Anastasius. This is also the transition from

the Late Roman monetary system to the new copper coinage introduced by Anastasius. The second half of the fifth century was marked by an almost complete breakdown of the low-value currency system as a direct consequence of long-term political and economic crisis. From an archaeological point of view the effects of the Hunnic onslaught north of the Danube are still hard to gauge. Fatalistic scenarios aside, both elements of continuity and major cultural change must be considered. The Gepids inherited the Hunnic domination in the Tisza basin and by extension in Transylvania and Banat, but no coherent political unit existed in the Lower Danube region. This is partly why we lack precise information about economic and religious initiatives of sixth-century emperors in the region, as the Empire lacked a political partner of the magnitude of the Gothic and Hunnic confederations, at least until the rise of the Avar khaganate in the last quarter of the sixth century. Nevertheless, historians often emphasize cultural continuity north of the Danube in order to explain the use of early Byzantine coins by making reference to a practice acquired centuries before by communities either living in the shadow of the Roman Empire or, indeed, part of the Roman Empire, in the case of Dacia. Such longue durée processes must be taken with caution as they often rely on brush strokes hiding rather than revealing important particularities and developments measured in decades rather than centuries. As a result of the major transformations of the late third to the late fifth century many of the cultural coordinates in place before the third century crisis, or even later during the Constantinian dynasty, were no longer dominant or even traceable on the accession of Anastasius. The Empire was not only struggling to re-establish the frontier on the Danube but the Balkans often appear to archaeologists as a dense network of fortifications which lacked any support from the
countryside and had to rely on official *annona* sent from elsewhere under the administrative auspices of peculiar units such as *quaestura exercitus*. Urban life can be found almost exclusively on the coasts of the Black Sea and the Aegean and the direct implication is that much of the monetary economy in the Northern Balkans reflects soldiers’ salaries and their expenditure rather than a real market. Yet historians and numismatists continue to speak about intensive trade and coin use in *barbaricum* based on the assumption that the mere presence of coins must reflect a resuming of such activities in the sixth century.

A survey of sixth-to-seventh century coin finds is necessary in order to understand fluctuations in coin supply and ultimately the function of early Byzantine coins outside the Empire (Figures 6-6, 6-7, 6-8, 6-9, and 6-10). Early Byzantine bronze coins are dated with the regnal year of the ruler, which allows for a very precise analysis of coin circulation in time, but also conceals a number of methodological pitfalls to which many historians and numismatists have often succumbed. One of the most common is the assumption that coins arrived in a region immediately after they were issued, accompanied by a second logical fallacy stating that coins issued in a certain year could not end up in a given region decades after their issuing date. To be sure, the chronological sequence of coins in hoards suggests a steady release of fresh coin disbursed in the form of payment to soldiers defending the fortresses of the Balkans, but
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Figure 6.6. Early Byzantine coin finds north of the Lower Danube (numbers on the map refer to numbers in Appendix A.2).
Figure 6.7. Early Byzantine coin finds north of the Black Sea (numbers on the map refer to numbers in Appendix A.2).
Figure 6-8. The chronology of early Byzantine coin finds from the Danube frontier and *barbaricum*.
Figure 6-9. Mints and denominations in *barbaricum* (Lower Danube and Black Sea) (Abbreviations in Appendix B, Tables B-4 and B-6).

Figure 6-10. Mints and denominations in the Byzantine bridge-heads (Sucidava, Drobeta and Dierna) (Abbreviations in Appendix B, Tables B-4 and B-6).
their free circulation prohibits any statement regarding the time when they were lost in *barbaricum* other than establishing a *terminus post quem*. The degree of wear which constitutes an important indication of prolonged circulation of a coin before its loss cannot be assessed in most cases, unfortunately, because coins are seldom illustrated in publications. This takes away some of the power of numismatic evidence, but the reward is a much more responsible use of coins as a primary source for dating archaeological complexes and for assessing social and economic phenomena. Hoards closed in the seventh century often include early sixth-century issues and, notwithstanding the normal attrition rate, coins of sixth-century emperors remained in circulation for many decades. The early post-reform coinage of Anastasius (498-512) is perhaps an exception as its weight standard was doubled in 512 making it anomalous and susceptible to being withdrawn from circulation after this date. The fact that some late sixth-century hoards from the Balkans still contain such early issues is an invitation to caution in generalizing the nature of its successful withdrawal soon after 512. In any case, only two early issues are so far known in *Barbaricum*, found east of the Carpathians, one *follis* from Slobozia Mare (Cahul, Moldova) not far from the Danube and a *follis* from the area of Bârlad (Vaslui, Romania). As both finds are relatively close to the Byzantine province of Scythia one would be tempted to ascribe their presence to the emperor’s reconstruction efforts on the Danube frontier, well-documented by
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archaeological sources. The other two early reform issues of Anastasius have been found at Drobeta, the important Byzantine bridge-head in the Iron Gates region. A well-known inscription from Ratiaria, if indeed dating from the reign of Anastasius, confirms the emperor’s strategic interest in the region. Based on the numismatic evidence it has been suggested that reconstruction efforts in the Danube region had been initiated as early as the reign of Marcian (450-457), but the process of restoration was indeed a long one and was hindered by renewed conflict with the Ostrogoths in the 480s and by the revolt of Vitalianus during the reign of Anastasius.

Mint output during the experimental stage which preceded the final reform of 512 was low compared to the following decades and the rarity of finds in barbaricum reflects the low number of finds in the Empire, for instance in the province of Scythia whose coin finds have been published in an exemplary fashion since the 1970s. The post-512 coinage of Anastasius is in fact more abundant in barbaricum than it is in the Danubian provinces of the early Byzantine Empire. Most finds concentrate in the region close to the Danube, being so far absent from northern Moldavia. Interestingly, two half-folles

---

10 Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranziția de la anticitate," 53.
have been found in Transylvania, at Gherla (Cluj, Romania) and Dorobanți (Arad, Romania), the latter from an inhumation grave. The coin was found in a pot attributed to the Gepids.\textsuperscript{12} Such a connection might be supposed for the barbarous imitation of a \textit{follis} bearing the name of Anastasius and found at Drobeta. Such imitations are known in Serbia and Bulgaria deep into the hinterland and almost all use pre-538 coin types as models, a fact indicating that they were produced in the first decades of the sixth century.\textsuperscript{13} This period coincides with the Gepid domination of the western Balkans but also with the presence of the Heruli whose cultural mark in the region has received increased attention in the past few years.\textsuperscript{14} Gold coins were also imitated, a \textit{tremissis} of Anastasius being found at Viminacium on the right bank of the Danube, perhaps issued at Sirmium where the Gepids opened a mint.

The post-reform coins of Anastasius found in \textit{barbaricum} along the Lower Danube, in the Carpathian Basin, and north of the Black Sea as far as Kiselivka Hill in


Kiev might constitute an immediate echo of the Emperor’s successful overhaul of the monetary system, but it is equally possible that some of the coins were brought to these regions and lost under his successors Justin I and Justinian I, sometime before 538 when Justinian operated another major monetary reform, or even later (Appendix B, Table B-13). We can be even less certain about the chronology of gold coins of Anastasius found in Barbaricum, as Byzantine gold was more stable than the low-value currency and Roman legislation itself encouraged the use of solidi issued by former emperors. Consequently, the solidi found at Bucharest-Măgurele and Craiova (Dolj, Romania), less than 50 miles from the Danube, may well reflect later sixth-century subsidies or plunder expeditions in the provinces of the Balkans.

The period from 512 to 538 covering the final regnal years of Anastasius, the reign of Justin I, and the first decade of Justinian’s reign is characterized by unprecedented monetary stability. Issues of Justin I are well represented in the Byzantine bridge-heads of Sucidava and Drobeta, but also in the Roman castrum at Pojejena (Caraș-Severin, Romania) and at Dierna (Orșova), mentioned by Procopius among the fortresses reclaimed by the Empire on the right bank of the Danube. Unfortunatelty most of the information for the latter comes from private collections of coins acquired from the area of ancient Dierna rather than from systematic


archaeological excavations. Three coins of Justin I have been found at Răcari (Dolj, Romania), a former Roman castrum, including a pentanummium, a rare denomination in Barbaricum, which suggests a direct connection with the Byzantine provinces of the Balkans where such coins were more common. A dekanummium of Justin I was found in the castrum at Pojejena, which was tied to the defense system of Moesia Prima. More pentanummia of Anastasius have been found at Vadul lui Isac (Cahul, Moldova) and Kherson (Kherson, Ukraine) and might indicate similar connections with Byzantine Scythia and Crimea, respectively. A similar pentanummium issued after the reform of 512 was found at Domnești (Argeș, Romania) and was probably lost by someone traveling on the communication route along the Argeș river, linking the Lower Danube with the Carpathians. The Argeș river valley and its main tributaries is a region rich in finds from the first decades of the sixth century. Coins of Justin I and Justinian I issued before the reform of 538 have been found in the area of modern-day Bucharest, where several sixth–century settlements have been excavated, some of them yielding coin finds of Justinian (Străulești-Măicănești, St. Nicolae-Șelari, and Dâmăroaia). Coins of


20 E. S. Stolarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation in the North-Western Black Sea Region in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Periods: Late 3rd century – Early 13th Century A.D. (Odesa: Polis Press,1993), 132, no. 2; Ibid., 133, no. 9.


Justin I and Justinian dated between 522 and 538 have been found at Ulmeni (Călărași, Romania) close to the mouth of Argeș river. The large number of finds from Ulmeni which also include issues of Justin II as well as the fact that the general area displays a heavy concentration of late sixth-century issues (e.g. Oltenița, Prundu) are reasons to suspect that the coins from Ulmeni were in fact part of a dispersed hoard.²³

If coins of Anastasius did not travel very far from the Danube, coins of Justin I and early issues of Justinian are found in greater number in northern Moldavia in the Siret-Prut interfluve but also in the highland region of the eastern Carpathians. This is also a region of high concentration of Late Roman amphorae and intensive metallurgical activity, whose beginnings might date from this period (Figures 4-3 and 4-9). Two folles of Justinian from 527-537 have been found during archaeological excavations in the large settlement of Botoșana, in two sunken-featured buildings.²⁴ In other cases, there is no stratigraphic context but the accidental find of coins together with sixth-century pottery indicates the existence of small settlements. Such situations were encountered at Sărățeni (Vaslui, Romania) and Cârja (Vaslui, Romania) where coins of Justin I were found in association with remains of hand-made pots.²⁵ In the same region, but closer to the Danube, at Cudalbi (Galați, Romania) was found a small hoard of copper coins hidden in a ceramic container, ending with issues of Justin I. Its interpretation as

²³ Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 159-162; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 332.

²⁴ D. G. Teodor, Civilizaţia romanică la est de Carpaţii în secolele V-VII (așezarea de la Botoșana-Suceava) (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1984), 61, fig. 30/1-2 and fig. 31/6-8.

²⁵ D. G. Teodor, Descoperiri arheologice și numismatiche la est de Carpații (Bucharest: Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, 1997), 64, no. 156 and 144, no. 619.
reflecting the first Slavic attacks on the Danube frontier should be taken with caution.\textsuperscript{26} Gold coins of Justin I are so far unknown in the region between the eastern Carpathians and the Dnieper while the two gold coins of Justinian I found at Borolea (Botoșani, Romania) and Iași (Iași, Romania) have been published with insufficient details and cannot be dated more precisely within Justinian's long reign.\textsuperscript{27} A \textit{solidus} and a \textit{tremissis} of Justin I have been found in Wallachia and in Oltenia, respectively.\textsuperscript{28} A \textit{solidus} from Găești (Dâmbovița, Romania) dated between 527 and 538 was found accidentally and might already signal a center of power in the region not far from the large cemetery at Sărata Monteoru, if indeed the coin was lost in the first half of the sixth century.\textsuperscript{29} Imitations of Late Roman amphorae and hand-made lamps imitating Byzantine prototypes suggest that access to Byzantine goods played an important role in the creation of social identity and rank (Figure 4-8).

A number of patterns emerge from the distribution of coin finds dating from the first decades of the sixth century. The region west of the river Olt, in the former province of Dacia, was heavily influenced by the presence of Byzantine outposts on the left bank of the Danube and coin was distributed along the valleys of rivers Olt and Jiu through the mediation of the Byzantine fortresses on the Danube. In Wallachia, Moldavia, and the north-western Black Sea steppe the flow of coin was dictated by developments in the provinces of Moesia Secunda, Scythia and the Byzantine possessions in Crimea at

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{27}] Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranzitia de la antichitate," 61, n. 63; Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 15 and 220, no. 76.
\item[\textsuperscript{28}] Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 224, no. 181.
\item[\textsuperscript{29}] Ibid., no. 46 and 51.
\end{itemize}
a time when the Empire was re-establishing its domination in the northern Balkans through diplomatic action or reconstruction and entrenchment on the Danube. Most of the Byzantine coins crossing the Danube were copper issues from the central mint in Constantinople, which is also typical for the Balkans at a time when the early Byzantine monetary system was still in its infancy. Three coins of Justinian from Antioch were found not far from the Danube frontier and reflect communication routes in the Black Sea or perhaps the movement of soldiers from one theater of operation to another, if the coins were brought to the Danube region at a later date, when hostilities between the Byzantine Empire and Sasanian Persia were resumed. The finds of gold coins which concentrate in the Danubian plain may reflect the payment of soldiers and mercenaries but also plunder in the early Byzantine provinces or diplomatic gifts sent to petty chieftains north of the Danube. It is tempting to link these finds to the state of the frontier as described by Procopius who lamented the death of the capable general Chilbudios in 533, after which "the river became free for the barbarians to cross at all times just as they wished and the possessions of the Romans were rendered easily accessible."

It must be mentioned that most gold coins from the territories north of the Danube are Justinianic *solidi* struck before 550, the majority being issues from 527-538. This might constitute a strong indication that they were lost sometime in the second quarter of sixth century.

Finds of dated coinage of Justinian (538-565) display a remarkable series of contrasts. Previous interpretations rested on preconceived scenarios about the historical development of the Lower Danube region in which the numismatic evidence

---

had to play its designated role, as we shall soon find out. The first and most obvious observation one can make by looking at the distribution of finds in time (Figure 6-8; Appendix B, Table B-4) is the unusual concentration of coins dated between 538 and 545, especially issues struck on the heavy standard employed after the reform (538-542), which can be noticed in all regions discussed.\(^{31}\) The heavy coins of Justinian, whose role in the Byzantine economy was discussed elsewhere,\(^{32}\) were extremely popular in barbaricum and account for almost 18 percent of all early Byzantine copper coins found between the Iron Gates of the Danube and the Dnieper.\(^{33}\) The thirty find spots are not evenly distributed on the map, the largest number of finds being recorded in Moldavia and in the north-western Black Sea region where Justinian sought the alliance of the Antes.\(^{34}\) Some of the coins were found close to the Danube and can be connected to coin circulation in the Byzantine settlements in Oltenia while others were lost very far from the Danube, at Băiceni (Botoșani, Romania) and Zolotonosha (Cherkasy, Ukraine) on the Middle Dnieper.\(^{35}\) Constantinople remained the most important mint but the presence of issues from Nicomedia and Cyzicus increased
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\(^{31}\) Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 338. His argument that coins from 527-538 are more abundant in Wallachia than later issues of Justinian is not valid since it does not take into account that the period covers eleven years while coins after 538 are dated with the regnal year and statistical calculations are made on a one-year basis.


\(^{33}\) The only hoard closed in this period is the small accumulation from Stary Biliary (Odesa, Ukraine), with the closing coin dated 542/3, for which see E. S. Stoliarik, "Klad vizantiiskikh bronzykh VI v. iz Starye Biliary, Odessskoi oblasti," in *Severnoe Prichernomor'e: materialy po arkheologii: sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, ed. G. A. Dzis-Raiko (Kiev: Nauk dumka, 1984), 136-38 with pl. 1-2.


testifying to the growing complexity of the monetary system which had relied almost exclusively on the central mint in the previous decades.

This unprecedented increase in the number of finds from barbaricum came to an abrupt end ca 545 and there is a conspicuous hiatus in finds from 548-554. The coin flow picked up again from 555-560 and a final decline occurred until the end of Justinian’s reign, marked by several gaps between 560 and 565 (Appendix B, Table B-4). Historians and numismatists have explained this situation relying on two preconceived notions: the first is the already mentioned assumption that coins must have arrived north of the Danube close to the time when they were issued and almost never at a later date, while the second is the tendency to explain fluctuations in coin supply by reference to military events and the arrival of new ethnic groups, Slavs in particular. Recent analyses of the coin flow to barbaricum during the age of Justinian have linked the sharp decline in the second half of his reign to successive incursions of Slavs, Bulgars, and Cutrigurs in the diocese of Illyricum and Thrace and the permanent settlement of the Slavs east and south of the Carpathians. Again, scholars did not allow for the possibility of a later arrival of coins and preferred to explain the gaps by searching for clues in the written sources for events taking place in those years devoid of coin finds in barbaricum. Archaeological evidence was adduced in support of this historical explanation but the use of coins to date complexes often made the arguments erroneous.
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36 F. Curta, The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, ca. 500-700 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 176 linked this gap with Justinian’s fortification program in the Balkans, but the hypothesis, which remains plausible, was based on an exaggerated interruption of the coin flow (545-560).

appear circular.\textsuperscript{38} In reality the explanation is quite different and has nothing to do with events in \textit{barbaricum}. The chronological gaps correspond to low points in mint output traceable in finds from the Balkans and from other corners of the Early Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{39} Coin finds in \textit{barbaricum} mirror fluctuations in output at the imperial mints and the supply of fresh coin to the frontier fortresses. Whether or not Slavic groups settled in the Danubian plain around 550 continues to be debated by historians and archaeologists of the Early Middle Ages but coins have little to offer toward a successful resolution of this historiographic question. The only meaningful observation is that whatever changes occurred in the ethnic background of the region, the connection to the Byzantine Empire, reflected in coin finds, was not broken until the Danube itself ceased to be under direct Byzantine rule.

The heavy coins of Justinian from 538-542 and by extension, to 550 were popular not only in \textit{barbaricum} but also in the Byzantine outposts from the left bank of the Danube, as testified by numerous finds resulted from archaeological excavations at Sucidava.\textsuperscript{40} Some of the soldiers defending the garrisons of the Byzantine bridge-heads in \textit{barbaricum} were probably recruited from the region north of the river and they helped distribute Justinian's coins on the much wider geographic area from which they hailed. Chilbudios himself, the general celebrated by Procopius for his victories north of the Danube, had a non-Roman origin and it is safe to assume that many of the soldiers under his command were also foreigners, in the general sense of the term. Sucidava


\textsuperscript{39} Gândilă, “Early Byzantine Coin Circulation,” 208, fig. 3.

\textsuperscript{40} V. Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 226-27, no. 11-17.
also produced a significant number of *dekanummia*, a low denomination typical for low-value market transactions. Such denominations are rare in *barbaricum* and always worth highlighting. The three *dekanummia* from Calafat (Olt, Romania), Cioroiu Nou (Dolj, Romania) and Ulmeni (Călărași, Romania) were found close to the Danube, but this is not a general rule if we consider the finds from Bacău and Tecuci in Moldavia.\(^{41}\) The imperial mints issued high quantities of *dekanummia* in the last decade of Justinian’s reign, which explains the gaps noticed in finds from *barbaricum* in this period, given the preference for heavier coins, usually *folles*. Again, chronological gaps can be explained by reference to monetary policies in the Empire rather than by highlighting military events on the Danube frontier, which supposedly hindered the circulation of coin across the river. Two *dekanummia* (Bacău and Calafat) were minted in Rome, an important fact pointing to a great diversification of mints in the age of Justinian, and renewed, probably military, connections to Italy. Mints other than Constantinople account for more than 45 percent of the finds of Justinian north of the Danube and north-west of the Black Sea (Appendix B, Table B-7). One *pentanummium* from Parutyne (Mykolayiv, Ukraine) was issued by the Crimean mint in Cherson, while a half-*follis* from Salona was found at Drobeta in the Iron Gates of the Danube, possibly signaling the movement of troops during the Gothic wars in Italy.\(^{42}\) Procopius informs us of Justinian’s effort to increase the strength of his army by recruiting from *barbaricum* for his campaigns in the west, and the presence of western mints north of the Danube


seems to confirm his account. Some of the gold coins of Justinian dated before 550 as well as the rare silver *miliarenes* from Oltenia and Banat may constitute stipends and gifts sent by Justinian to buy the loyalty of certain groups from the area dominated by Heruli and Gepids.

With the accession of Justin II we witness a heavy influx of Byzantine coins north of the Danube but also a drastic change in the imperial attitude toward barbarian groups. The new emperor decided to discontinue diplomatic payments and rely instead on internal resources for securing the Danube frontier, an attitude best encapsulated in Agathias’ *Cycle*: “let no barbarian, freeing himself from the yoke-strap that passes under his neck, dare to fix his gaze on our King, the mighty warrior.” As a result the Danube region became highly militarized and the direct consequence is an absolute increase in the number of coin finds from frontier fortresses of the Balkans. The policy was coordinated with the imperial mints, Thessalonica being commissioned to strike huge quantities of half-*folles* to pay the troops. The balance of power in *barbaricum* was also shifting with the arrival of the Avars in Pannonia ca 568 followed by the swift subjugation of the Gepids and the Slavs. Against this background the increase of coin quantity in the

---


46 Gândilă, ”Early Byzantine Coin Circulation,” 179.
northern Balkans was also felt in *barbaricum*. Potential changes in the ethnic structure of the communities living north of the Danube cannot be traced in the numismatic evidence as coins seem to have followed the same paths as they had in the first half of the sixth century. The large production of half-*folles* by Thessalonica is reflected in finds from Sucidava and Drobeta on the Danube’s left bank and by extension in Banat and Oltenia, but also as far as northern Moldavia at Cucorâni (Botoșani, Romania) where a coin was found in a sixth-century settlement.\(^{47}\) The year-by-year distribution of finds displays two major spikes corresponding to years 570 and 575, a clear reflection of the quinquennial *donativa* promptly distributed to the garrisons defending the frontier. In this respect there is no significant difference between the chronology of finds from *barbaricum* and those from the Danubian provinces or the Byzantine bridge-heads on the northern bank of the river. The only difference is the higher frequency of coins issued in Nicomedia, mostly *folles*, in *Barbaricum*, compared to those from Thessalonica, dominant in frontier fortresses of the Balkans, as we have seen. The explanation lies in the preference for higher denominations in *Barbaricum*, *folles* of Nicomedia and Constantinople being favored against half-*folles* of Thessalonica. The military nature of coin circulation in the Byzantine outposts north of the Danube is also testified by the presence at Drobeta of coins issued by mobile mints, the so-called *Moneta Militaris Imitativa* and of issues of Antioch at Sucidava pointing to the transfer of troops to the Balkans.\(^{48}\) The constant presence of Antioch among finds throughout the sixth century (over 6 percent, Figure 6-9; Appendix B, Table B-7) might be also related

\(^{47}\) D. G. Teodor, *Teritoriul est-carpatic în veacurile V-XI e.n.: contribuții arheologice și istorice la problema formării poporului român* (Iași: Junimea, 1978), 23 and fig. 16/5.

\(^{48}\) Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 124, n. 17; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 227, no. 32; Vîlcu and Nicolae, "Monede bizantine," 303, no. 22.
to finds of Palestinian lamps and other devotional objects from the Holy Land in *Barbaricum*, but a military explanation seems more plausible at this point.

Recent attempts to make a distinction between Oltenia, Wallachia and Moldavia based on the chronology of finds from Justin II are not convincing.\textsuperscript{49} The assumption that certain gaps in finds from Wallachia testify that the Slavs were disturbing cultural contact between local communities and Byzantium cannot be substantiated by reference to a still very small coin sample, substantial enough to make general remarks about a large geographic area from northern Serbia to southern Ukraine but too thin to trace annual developments in smaller regions.\textsuperscript{50} A common characteristic is the scarcity of gold coins of Justin II. Only one find is recorded, a *solidus* from Mănăstioara (Dâmbovița, Romania). Another *solidus* is a Gepid imitation found at Reșca (Olt, Romania), while three other gold coins were found in unknown locations in historical Banat and might be connected to the Middle Danube region.\textsuperscript{51} The rarity of gold coins from Justin II might have something to do with the emperor’s policy to check the flow of gold outside the frontier. The virtual absence of gold from Justin II despite the accounts of contemporary writers describing the wealth brought by the Slavs north of the Danube

\textsuperscript{49} Oberländer-Târnoveanu, “Barbaricum apropiat,” 348-49.

\textsuperscript{50} For the role of the Slavs, see M. Comșa, “Socio-Economic Organization of the Daco-Romanic and Slav Population on the Lower Danube during the 6\textsuperscript{th} - 8\textsuperscript{th} centuries,” in *Relations Between the Autochthonous Population and the Migratory Populations on the Territory of Romania*, ed. M. Constantinescu, Ş. Pascu, and P. Diaconu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1975), 171-200; S. Dolinescu-Ferche, “La culture Ipotești – Ciurel – Cîndești (Ve-VII\textsuperscript{e} siècles). La situation en Valachie,” *Dacia N.S.* 28 (1984): 117-47.

after plunder expeditions remains a mystery.\textsuperscript{52} Gold issues of his predecessors may have been part of the booty but an explanation for the lack of coins of Justin II based on a supposed low gold mint output during his reign is improbable given the high frequency of his coins in gold coin hoards from the Balkans.\textsuperscript{53} Political developments in the region, however, left their mark in the form of copper coin hoards whose number increases on both sides of the Danube. The only hoard from \textit{barbaricum} echoing these events was found at Gropeni (Brăila, Romania) and was closed sometime after 577. Contemporary hoards were hidden along the Danube from west to east at Veliko Orašje (578/9), Veliko Gradište (580/1), Boljetin (577/8), Tekija (578/9), Slatinska Reka (575/6), Axiopolis (578/82) and Capidava (579/82).\textsuperscript{54} These hoards as well as several others from the hinterland dating from the last years of Justin II’s reign and from the reign of Tiberius II into the early 580s can be connected with increased warfare in the region, marked by Slavic incursions in the Balkans and retaliation of the Byzantines allied with the Avars. The account of Menander the Guardsman shows that insecurity on the Danube frontier was increasing and the contribution of the Avars to the destruction of the Slavic center of power in eastern Wallachia ca 579 did nothing but increase the Avar influence north

\textsuperscript{52} E.g. John of Ephesus, \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica}, VI, 25, ed. E. I. Brooks (Louvain: Ex Officina Orientali et Scientifica, 1936), 248-49. Gold coins account for only ca. nine percent off all finds from Justin II in the entire studied region from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian Sea (Appendix, Table 1).

\textsuperscript{53} Almost all gold coin hoards hidden in the Balkans in the last quarter of the sixth century contain issues of Justin II. In one hoard from Thessalonica 85 out of 115 coins were issues of Justin II, while the proportion is lower, around one-third of the hoard in most other cases, but still high enough to prevent any suggestion of a low mint output during his reign. For the hoards, see \textit{Trésors}, no. 19, 65, 82, 103, 117, 151, and 244-246. Moreover, the collection of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest includes many gold coins of Justin II, for which see A. Vilcu, \textit{Les monnaies d’or de la Bibliothèque de l’Académie roumaine. II. Monnaies Byzantines} (Wetteren: Moneta, 2009), 49-54, no. 87-117.

of the Danube. The hoard from Gropeni, hidden on the left bank of the Danube is a reflection of these events, but cannot tell us much about Byzantine coins from barbaricum. Most probably, given the proximity to the Byzantine frontier, the hoard from Gropeni represents a sum of money brought from the province of Scythia, hidden "closer to home" in the context of the conflict between Byzantines, Avars, and Slavs, and never retrieved.

The period between 577 and 582 is marked by several gaps in the chronology of finds from barbaricum but this partly reflects the state of the Danube provinces affected by insecurity and warfare. Most of the coins of Tiberius II have been found in Byzantine fortresses at Sucidava, Drobeta and Ostrovu Banului (Mehedinți, Romania) or very close to the Danube, at Giurgița (Dolj, Romania). Many are issues of Thessalonica, the mint responsible with sustaining the war effort in Illyricum. The pentanummium from Drobeta proves that low-value exchanges were still taking place despite the political and economic crisis and the inflationary tendencies of Justin II’s monetary policy. Only two finds can be placed with certainty outside the sphere of the Byzantine bridge-heads on the left bank of the Danube, two folles from Buzău and Bacău, respectively.

56 A recent attempt to argue that only the coins of Justin II from the Gropeni hoard were brought from the Empire, the earlier ones being from the local stock, is unconvincing, see Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 346. Another hoard, found in Bucharest before WW2 in unknown circumstances, ends with coins from 580-581, but it is uncertain whether the hoard is complete. See Trésors, no. 350.
solidus from Coada Izvorului (Dâmbovița, Romania) found in mint state may be part of a nineteenth century hoard, and could have been brought north of the Danube after one of the numerous plunder expeditions lamented by contemporary writers. We know for certainty that warfare in the Danube region, which led to the loss of Sirmium to the Avars in 582, did not stop the circulation of Byzantine goods north of the river.

Increased warfare in the northern Balkans in the last quarter of sixth century brought a large quantity of Byzantine cast fibulae with bent stem and buckles in Barbaricum, which are typical for the military hilltop fortresses of the Danube provinces. The frontier region was also responsible for the development and spread of the the so-called "Slavic" bow fibulae, a fashion that can be traced on both sides of the Danube. In addition, a steady influx of fresh coin to barbaricum can be noticed until ca. 600 with a short gap in 584-586 and 600-602. Coins from the last years of Maurice's reign are generally scarce even in the Danubian provinces, the case of Scythia being the best documented.\textsuperscript{59} It is most likely a problem of mint output in this period, as Antioch seems to have been the most active and the Syrian mint is never dominant in finds from the Balkans and by extension, in barbaricum.\textsuperscript{60}

Many finds of coins issued during the reign of Maurice have been recorded on the left bank of the Danube from the Iron Gates to the mouths of the river. Such coins found at Ostrovu Mare, Gogoșu, Goicea, Orlea, Zimnicea, Prundu, Fetești, Novosils'ke and Vasylivka may be related to the Avar offensive in the 580s and the Byzantine counteroffensive which included a number of incursions north of the river, led by general

\textsuperscript{59} Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 320, table 1.

\textsuperscript{60} It has been argued that the impact of the Byzantine campaigns against the Slavs in Wallachia led to the interruption of relations with Byzantium, but the presence of coins of Phocas and Heraclius in the same region makes this hypothesis improbable, see Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 354.
Priscus and by the emperor’s brother Petrus, between 594 and 602.\textsuperscript{61} Both Drobota and Sucidava remained important military outposts throughout Maurice’s reign. Coin finds are recorded until 599, when Sucidava probably fell under the attacks of the Avars. The finds include gold coins, a \textit{tremissis} at Sucidava and a light weight \textit{solidus} of 20 \textit{siliquae} at Drobota, both coins probably reflecting military payments sent to the local garrison.\textsuperscript{62} An unusual concentration of light weight \textit{solidi} of Maurice can be noticed in the province of Scythia at a time when the Avar khagan was in Anchialus negotiating an increase of the tribute to 100,000 \textit{solidi} but preparing to plunder the rich towns along the Black Sea coast.\textsuperscript{63} Three coins minted in Antioch found north of the Danube may signal the movement of troops after the conflict with Persia was brought to an end and Maurice focused his energy on the northern Balkans. One issue of Antioch and another of Thessalonica have been found at Buzău, while two \textit{solidi} are recorded in the region of Wallachia where several Slavic political centers are mentioned by Theophylact Simocatta.\textsuperscript{64} Coins of Maurice were also found far from the Danube frontier, at Vășcăuți (Orhei, Moldova) and Pavlivka (Odesa, Ukraine).\textsuperscript{65} The early Byzantine monetary


\textsuperscript{62} Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 132, n. 70; Vilcu, \textit{Les monnaies d’or}, 60, no. 148.

\textsuperscript{63} For the context, see Whitby, \textit{The Emperor Maurice}, 142-43. For the coins, see Vilcu, \textit{Les monnaies d’or}, 10.


\textsuperscript{65} Nudel'man, \textit{Topografiia kladov i nakhodok}, 83, no. 14; Stoliarik, \textit{Essays on Monetary Circulation}, 140, no. 59.
economy was slowly breaking down in the Balkans, a process also felt in *barbaricu*
where only one denomination below the half-*follis* is so far recorded, a *dekanummium*
found at Bârlad in Moldavia.\(^{66}\)

More than two decades of warfare in the northern Balkans left a trail of hoards
found on both sides of the Danube in different contexts, but hidden and lost under the
same circumstances. The Avar offensive from the mid 580s led to the concealment of
several copper and gold hoards in the Danubian provinces, at Koprivec, Provadiia,
Adamclisi, Zulud, Zaldapa, Slava Rusă, and Sadovec.\(^{67}\) The geographic distribution of
finds shows that the diocese of Thracia was most affected by these attacks coordinated
by the new Avar khagan in alliance with the Slavs led by Ardagast.\(^{68}\) No echo of this
hoarding frenzy can be traced north of the Danube, unless the hoard from Trojanul in
Wallachia was closed early in Maurice’s reign.\(^{69}\) The hoard is an unusual combination of
Late Roman coins with early Byzantine *dekanummia* and *pentanummia* of Justinian,
Justin II, and Maurice. The coin of Maurice cannot be dated with precision but the entire
accumulation fits the pattern of small change used on a daily basis in market
transactions in one of the large towns of the Black Sea coast or the Aegean.

The next group of hoards dating to the last decade of sixth century are connected
with the Byzantine campaigns north of the Danube aimed at destroying the Slavic
centers of power in Wallachia and southern Moldavia and at re-establishing the balance
of power in the Middle Danube region by checking the expansion of the Avars. Although

\(^{66}\) Oberländer-Târnoveanu and Popușoi, “Monede bizantine,” 229, no. 5.

\(^{67}\) *Trésors*, no. 47, 52, 61, 63, 79, 82 and 240-245.

\(^{68}\) Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice*, 140-45.

\(^{69}\) *Trésors*, no. 364.
most of the late hoards on the Danube frontier are from Illyricum (Bosman, Reselec and Rakita), the hoards from barbaricum were found across the province of Scythia. The hoard from Unirea (Călărași, Romania) hidden after 594/5 was found on the bank of the Danube and appears to be connected with the Byzantine early counteroffensive led by Priscus in Wallachia in 593. The second hoard was found quite far from the Danube, at Horgești (Bacău, Romania) and was concealed after 597/8 in circumstances related to the same military events in barbaricum. The hoard itself is a collection of metal objects, a copper-alloy pitcher, a bronze chain, and scrap pieces of bronze, perhaps gathered hastily by a refugee. Alternatively, it may be the result of plunder during this decade of insecurity.

Although a treaty in 598 was establishing the Danube as the natural frontier agreed between the Avars and the Byzantines, war resumed and the rebellion of 602 against Maurice was staged at a moment when the Byzantine army was camped north of the Danube. Archaeological research in the past decades has confirmed the survival of certain sections of the frontier well after the rebellion of 602. In fact the new emperor Phocas sealed a new treaty with the Avars in 604, agreeing to increase the annual tribute to 140,000 solidi. Although Phocas transferred the troops to the East to engage the Persians, no serious invasions occurred in the Balkans until the reign of Heraclius. The Danube remained de facto the frontier between Avars and Byzantines

70 Trésors, no. 238, 239 and 260.
71 Ibid., no. 366. For the context, see Whitby, The Emperor Maurice, 156-61.
72 Trésors, no. 355.
73 Whitby, The Emperor Maurice, 161-65.
74 Theophanes, Chronographia, a. 6096, ed. C de Boor (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883), 292.
until ca 615 when the Balkans were left undefended in the face of new attacks of Avars and Slavs. The Persian conquest of Jerusalem in 614, the loss of Egypt in 619, and the destruction of the large towns of the Byzantine heartland in Asia Minor taxed the remaining resources of an already impoverished Empire. The abandonment of the Danube frontier was nothing but an inevitable consequence. Byzantine coins continued to cross the Danube without major interruption until 615, which is another confirmation of the fact that some Byzantine fortresses on the Lower Danube were still defended. No coins after 599 have so far been recorded at Sucidava and it is possible that its role as a military outpost ended after the Avar attacks in the last decade of sixth century. Drobota, however, continued to receive Byzantine bronze coins well into the seventh century, as did a number of fortresses on the right bank, such as Novae, Durostorum, Capidava and Noviodunum, to name just a few. Interestingly, no issues of Phocas have been recorded among coin finds from Drobota, a long gap being noticed between 599 and 612, possibly pointing to early initiatives of Heraclius to strengthen his position in the Iron Gates sector of the frontier after a decade of decline. Most of the strategic points in the western sector of the frontier had already been lost.


and apparently never recovered judging by the interruption of coin circulation in important fortresses such as Aquis, Viminacium, Ratiaria, and Singidunum.\textsuperscript{77}

Most coins of Phocas found in barbaricum are half-folles, a proportion noticed for finds from Scythia as well,\textsuperscript{78} but since very few display the date we can no longer follow the annual influx of coins north of the Danube. Given the steady annual supply between 610 and 615 it can be supposed that the same was true for the reign of Phocas (602-610). Very few finds are recorded in Oltenia and Banat, the destruction of the Byzantine \textit{limes} in Moesia Prima and Dacia Ripensis and the proximity to the Avar center of power being the main reasons for reduced cultural contact with communities living north of the Danube. Coins of Phocas are more abundant in Wallachia and Moldavia, usually close to the Danube, at Oltenița, Gropeni, Salcia, and Iuzhnoe but also further to the north, in the Prut-Dniester interfluve.\textsuperscript{79} Renewed efforts to re-establish the Byzantine control on the Danube can be placed at the beginning of Heraclius’ reign when payments were once again sent to the garrison stationed at Drobeta and perhaps at Dierna as well.\textsuperscript{80} This policy was also felt in Barbaricum, a significant number of finds being recorded in Oltenia in the traditional area of influence of the Byzantine bridge-heads north of the Danube. All coins are copper issues dated between 610 and 616 when the


\textsuperscript{78} Gândilă, "Some Aspects," 318, table 5.


\textsuperscript{80} Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 138, n. 111 and n. 121.
Danube frontier was still functional. Two *solidi* have an unknown finding place in Oltenia but we are better informed about gold coins from regions of *barbaricum* across the diocese of Thracia and north of the Black Sea. The power centers of the Slavs in southern Moldavia were the main recipients of gold coins as testified by the *solidi* found at Buzău and Cotești (Vrancea, Romania).\(^{81}\) A small hoard of *solidi* from Udești (Suceava, Romania) in northern Moldavia dated 616-625 belonged to a local "big man," judging by the archaeological context in which the coins have been found.\(^{82}\) The smaller communities in Moldavia continued to receive Byzantine copper coins. Two *folles* of which one is an issue of 619-620, a late date even for the provinces of the Balkans, were found together with sixth-seventh century pottery remains at Comănești (Bacău, Romania).\(^{83}\) A hoard found at Movileni (Galați, Romania) on the bank of Siret river was hidden shortly after 614 and has the typical structure of a sum of money withdrawn from circulation from one of the frontier provinces, including a number of *dekanummia* commonly used in the urban marketplace.\(^{84}\) The most probable origin is one of the frontier towns of Scythia still guarding the lower sector of the Danubian limes in the second decade of seventh century, as testified by the numismatic evidence.\(^{85}\)

Three *solidi* found in burial assemblages in the region of Kirovohrad in central Ukraine are later issues from the third decade of seventh century and signal the major

---

\(^{81}\) Oberländer-Târnoveanu and Constantinescu, "Monede romane tîrzi,” 311, no. 32; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Societate, economie și politică,” 320, n. 46.


\(^{83}\) Teodor, *Teritoriul est-carpatic*, 23, fig. 16/6-7.

\(^{84}\) *Trésors*, no. 358.

\(^{85}\) Gândilă, "Some Aspects,” 311-12.
political transformations following the retreat of the Byzantine Empire from the northern Balkans. At a time when Heraclius was desperately looking for allies against the Avars and Persians who assaulted the walls of Constantinople in 626, the steppe north of the Black Sea became very important for the balance of power in the region. The rising influence of the Bulgars in the Pontic region brought a large quantity of Byzantine coined gold and silver or jewelry and plate found in a number of spectacular seventh-century burials and hoards. Diplomatic relations between the Byzantine Empire and the "Old Great Bulgaria" in the 630s, as described by Nikephoros and John of Nikiu, were concluded when Heraclius honored Kubrat with the title of patricius. The most prominent archaeological reflection of such diplomatic contacts is the rich burial from Malo Pereschepyne (Poltava, Ukraine), which many historians attribute to Kubrat himself. The treasure included some 70 Byzantine gold coins, the majority being light weight solidi of 20 siliquae struck for Heraclius and Constans II, the latest issues being dated no later than 646. Most of the coins were either pierced or mounted into sets. The gold hoards from Kelegei (Kherson, Ukraine), Maistrov (Zaporizhia, Ukraine), Dnipropetrovs'k (Dnipropetrovs'k, Ukraine), and Zachepylivka (Poltava, Ukraine),

---


belong to the same cultural horizon of wealth accumulated through political payments sent to the regions north of the Black Sea by Heraclius and Constans II.\textsuperscript{89}

Although the Empire had retreated from the Danube, the relations with the territories north of the river were not completely interrupted. The decline of the Avar khaganate after the failed siege of Constantinople in 626 and the Byzantine retrenchment after the initial shock of the Arab storm in the East permitted a more active policy in the Balkans. The few bronze coins of Constans II in \textit{barbaricum} were found not very far from the Danube, at Reșca in Oltenia, Novaci in Wallachia, and Bârlad in Moldavia, while a \textit{solidus} was found at Curcani (Călărași, Romania).\textsuperscript{90} Based on their dating, the coins were probably lost in the 650s-660s. The specimen found at Novaci is an issue of Carthage, which should not appear surprising. Several seventh-century coins issued in mints from Italy and North Africa have been found in the north-eastern Balkans.\textsuperscript{91} A hoard found at Tomis on the Black Sea coast included three coins from


Alexandria, one from Carthage and another from Rome, dating from the reigns of Heraclius, Constans II and Constantine IV.\textsuperscript{92} If the hoard from Tomis can be connected with the major campaign organized by Constantine IV against the Bulgars in 680, the hoard from Obârșeni (Vaslui, Romania) in *barbaricum* was concealed in the late 650s and included issues of Alexandria, Carthage and Syracuse, which account for more than one-third of the total number of coins in the hoard.\textsuperscript{93} This suggests that Constans II was already making efforts to re-establish a foothold in the northern Balkans by transferring troops and resources from the west. Theophanes informs us that the emperor staged a major campaign against the Slavs in the Balkans in 658 and his political ambitions, never to materialize, might have included a much wider area up to the Danube, the traditional frontier of the Empire.\textsuperscript{94} At least the Black Sea coast was still firmly in Byzantine hands until 680 judging by coin finds between Tomis and Akhtopol and so was perhaps Durostorum on the Lower Danube, although the often invoked hoard of silver coins in fact dates to the sixth century.\textsuperscript{95} Late seventh-century emperors

---

\textsuperscript{92} *Trésors*, no. 67.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., no. 359. A *follis* of Constans II from Syracuse was found further north at Pinsk in Belarus, for which see Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 38, no. 299.

\textsuperscript{94} Theophanes, *Chronographia*, a. 6149, ed. de Boor, 347.

\textsuperscript{95} Curta, "Byzantium in Dark-Age Greece," 124-35. For an updated catalogue of bronze coins, see S. Mihailov, "Seventh to Eighth Century Byzantine Bronze Coins from Northeastern Bulgaria," *Cultură și Civilizație la Dunărea de Jos* 26 (2008): 77-85. For Nesebur and Burgas, see recently Tenchova, "Monetna tsirkulatsiia," no. 2314-2350. For seventh-century coin finds in the region of Durostorum (Silistra), see Oberländer-Tânroveanu, "Monnaies byzantines," 97–127. The small silver hoard from Silistra was attributed to Constantine IV in the original publication and later included in the historical context of the campaign organized by Constantine IV against the Bulgars in 680. However, the two token *siliquae* date to the sixth century. F. Curta, "Invasion or Inflation? Sixth-to-Seventh Century Byzantine Coin Hoards in Eastern and Southeastern Europe," *Annali dell'Istituto Italiano di Numismatica* 43 (1996): 169; Somogyi, "New Remarks on the Flow," 113. For the redating to the sixth century, see *Trésors*, no. 56.
would continue to follow the same policy as testified by a *folliis* of Tiberius III (698-705) minted in Ravenna found at Berezeni (Vaslui, Romania). Most finds from this late period are located in southern Moldavia where the Empire was probably trying to find allies or recruits in order to re-establish its strategic position at the mouths of the Danube. In addition, the same general area produced a hexagram of Constantine IV found at Scurta (Bacău, Romania) and dated at the beginning of his reign.  

The most conspicuous development of the second half of the seventh century is the trail of hoards dating from the reign of Constantine IV which can be followed from southern Russia to Slovakia, with the largest concentration recorded in the Danubian plain in Romania. With the exception of the dispersed hoard from Drăgășani whose latest coin is a hexagram of Constans II, the other hoards of Byzantine silver found at Galați, Piua Petrii, Vârtop, and Priseaca have a closing date in the 670s and seem to belong to the same wide historical context. Since the date nicely dovetails with the events related with the migration of the Onogur Bulgars, most historians interpreted the finds as an illustration of the new power relations in the Lower Danube region. The large quantity of hexagrams reaching the territories north of the Danube was seen either as bribes and gifts for the Bulgars or stipends sent to Slavic centers at a time when Byzantine emperors were desperately trying to find allies against the rising influence of

---

96 Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 137.
the Bulgars.  The two interpretations are not mutually exclusive as the geographic location of the hoards indicates two different areas of concentration. The hoards from Galați and Piuia Petrii were found on the left bank of the Danube across the former province of Scythia. From the former provinces of the north-eastern Balkans we know about a potential hoard from Valea Teilor and three other single finds of hexagrams from the reign of Constantine IV. All these finds must be related to the presence of the Bulgars led by Asparuch in the area of the Danube Delta. On the other hand, the second area of concentration is some three hundred kilometers to the west, in Oltenia, the finds from Vârtop, Priseaca and Drăgășani being located in the same general area demarcated by the Danube to the west and Olt river to the east. They may indeed constitute military payments and gifts sent to power centers of mixed ethnic composition probably dominated by the Slavs, who constituted potential allies against the Bulgars. The same region produced a burial with a rich inventory, found at Coșoveni, which belongs to the same cultural horizon.

The creation of a Bulgar state in the Balkans after 680 marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the Lower Danube region. For more than two centuries from the dissolution of the Hunnic confederation to the arrival of the Bulgars, the Byzantine Empire maintained cultural ties with peoples and centers of power located beyond its military frontier on the Danube. Regardless of the ethnic background of communities in Barbaricum, some preserving elements of Roman provincial culture, others being mixed

---


99 Curta, “Byzantium in Dark-Age Greece,” 130, no. 72, 74, 78 and 79. Another hexagram was found at Burgas on the Black Sea coast, for which see Tenchova, “Monetna tsirkulatsiia,” 2343.

cultural groups forged under the domination of the Huns and later of the Avars, maintaining contact with Byzantium was crucial for the creation of social status. On the other hand, whether dealing with Gepids, Heruls, Slavs or Cutrigurs, the high-level priorities of the Empire were dictated by political expediency and the need to secure the frontier in the northern Balkans, most of the time through diplomatic payments (tribute, gifts, and bribes) or the ability to create tension in barbaricum by playing off one group against another. Coins are the most chronologically accurate testament of these efforts in the Lower Danube region and together with other categories of finds can offer a broad picture of cultural contact in the frontier region and beyond.

6.2.2 The Land of Silver: Transcaucasia

From a certain perspective the Lower Danube and the Transcaucasus seem to share many features. Both were deemed strategically important by the Byzantine Empire and for good reason. The Lower Danube guarded the access to the provinces of the Balkans and to Constantinople itself which could be reached both by land and by sea. It also controlled access to important trade routes leading north to the Baltic Sea. As a consequence, emperors of the early sixth century saw fit to rebuild some of the old Roman fortifications on the northern bank of the Danube in order to use them as outposts in barbaricum. Quite similarly, Transcaucasia guarded the Caspian Gates through which nomad raiders from the north could launch plunder expeditions into Asia Minor (Figure 6-11). The same passes were linking eastern and western trade routes including the Silk Road.101 As a reflection of similar agendas fortresses such as

Sucidava and Drobeta on the Lower Danube found their strategic equivalents at Pityus and Sebastopolis on the north-eastern Black Sea coast. The political fragmentation of the region into a mosaic of tribes inhabiting the southern foothills of the Caucasus, subjected to the Lazian king, might not have been very different from the confederacy of clients established by the Gepids and the Avars in the Danube region. Sources, however, are far more abundant for Transcaucasia. For it is the nature of the evidence that sets these two frontier regions apart. Stakes were much higher in Transcaucasia as the whole region became the main theater of operations for both Byzantium and Persia, and indeed often the main bone of contention in peace negotiations between the two superpowers.\textsuperscript{102} The political and diplomatic priorities of Byzantium are always reflected in the amount of space and energy that contemporary writers were willing to devote to the description of foreign peoples. If the Empire launched only two major campaigns north of the Danube during the sixth and seventh centuries, Lazica, Iberia, and Armenia saw continuous decades of warfare which feature prominently in the works of Procopius, Menander, and Agathias. The ideological conflict between two archenemies in a region fraught with centuries-long political and cultural competition was more fascinating than obscure events taking place in the post-Hunnic \textit{barbaricum} north of the Danube.

Considering the differences between the Lower Danube and the Transcaucasus, the presence of Byzantine and Sasanian coins in Georgia and Armenia has slightly different historical coordinates, although in both cases preserving imperial interests was the main priority. For reasons which have more to do with modern history and

\textsuperscript{102} For a recent overview, see B. Dignas and E. Winter, \textit{Rome and Persia in Late Antiquity: Neighbours and Rivals} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
scholarship another major difference between the two regions regards the recording and preservation of numismatic evidence. Although the region, Georgia in particular, produced a number of copper coin finds comparable to that yielded by the Lower Danube, in few cases the information about the finding place has been recorded (Appendix B, Table B-2). Based on the geographic distribution of known finds we can responsibly speculate that most of the early Byzantine coins now in the Janashia Museum of Georgia were found in the western half of modern Georgia, on the territory of Late Antique Lazica (Figure 6-12).103 The chronological structure of coin finds largely corresponds to what we know about coin circulation in a number of Byzantine centers in eastern and north-eastern Anatolia, although we do not have at our disposal a large number of publications to match the corpus available for the Danube frontier (Figure 6-13, 6-14, and 6-15).104 On the other hand, the presence of rare sixth-century ceremonial silver *miliarenses* and the massive quantity of seventh-century hexagrams found in Transcaucasia truly identify this region as a "land of silver," although gold is by no means absent, as a testament of the political stipends sent by Byzantium. A chronological, sometimes year-by-year, analysis of coin finds is still possible and is

103 The main source of information about hoards and single finds of Byzantine coins in Georgia remains the work of Tamara Abramishvili, for which see especially T. Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis bizant’iuri monet’ebi* (Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1965); T. Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis bizant’iuri monet’ebi (1966-1984)* (Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1989).

matched by an almost equally precise sequence of events and developments recorded in contemporary accounts.

The first important observation is that the percentage of finds dating from 498-538, preceding Justinian’s monetary reform in 538, is double compared to the Lower Danube. Unsurprisingly, these are decades of consolidation in Lazica, under the renewed suzerainty of Byzantium. Traditionally the Roman Empire claimed control of the eastern Black Sea coast from Trapezus to Pityus and extended its political influence in the immediate hinterland, which in Late Antiquity would become the kingdom of Lazica. The eastern half of today’s Georgia, the ancient kingdom of Iberia, as well as Albania, to the southeast, were under Persian control. This balance of power, however, had already been upset in the second half of the fourth century when failure in the East and in the Balkans led to the humiliating death of two emperors, Julian and Valens, respectively. The Roman garrisons on the Black Sea coast fell under Persian sway, although Pityus (Bich‘vinta) and Sebastopolis (Sukhumi) were probably restored under Theodosius I.\(^\text{105}\) As regards Pityus, we at least know that it was the designated place of exile for John Chrisostomos in 407.\(^\text{106}\) Even if Theodosius II regained a foothold in Lazica, the Roman position was still weak and it relied mostly on religious ties with


Figure 6-11. Early Byzantine Transcaucasia (adapted after G. Greatrex and S. N. C. Lieu 2002, xxxii, map 5).
Figure 6-12. Early Byzantine coin finds in Trancaucasia (numbers on the map refer to numbers in Appendix A.2).
Figure 6-13. The chronology of early Byzantine coin finds from eastern Anatolia and Transcaucasia.
Figure 6-14. Mints and denominations in Transcaucasia (Abbreviations in Appendix B, Tables B-4 and B-6).

Figure 6-15. Mints and denominations in eastern Anatolia (Amasia and Melitene) (Abbreviations in Appendix B, Tables B-4 and B-6).
peoples of Transcaucasia who had converted to Christianity in the first half of the fourth century.\textsuperscript{107}

The kingdom of Lazica had strong ties with Sasanian Persia, something that sixth-century writers in Byzantium tried to conceal as the political climate of the region turned in their favor. It is revealing, however, that Lazian rulers were appointed by the Persian king, a practice which remained in place in the second half of the fifth century and until 522 when Lazica re-entered the Byzantine orbit. In a move typical for Transcaucasian politics in Late Antiquity the Lazian king Tzath decided to renounce his allegiance to Persia and throw in his lot with Byzantium. The Byzantine response was equally traditional: Tzath was baptized by Justin I, received a Byzantine wife, and returned to Lazica as a client king.\textsuperscript{108} The same decade saw the pacification of the Tzani, a troublesome tribe in the mountains of Pontus. Justinian built fortresses and churches in Tzanica, a strategic region securing access to both Lazica and Armenia. In addition, the Iberian king rebelled against the Persian encroachment in local religious affairs and reached for help from the Byzantine emperor. The Byzantine position in Transcaucasia had improved dramatically.\textsuperscript{109}

One of the most important documents of this period is Novella XXVIII from 535 in which Justinian boasted his submission of the Tzani and his suzerainty over the "Lazian Empire," a heterogeneous confederation which included the northern tribes of the


\textsuperscript{108} Greatrex and Lieu, ed., \textit{The Roman Eastern Frontier}, 80.

Suani, the Abasgii, the Apsilii, the Scymni, and the Misimiani. Among the cities mentioned are Archaeopolis (Nokalakevi) - the Lazian capital, Rhodopolis (Vartsikhe), Petra (Tzikhisdziri) - a Justinianic foundation in Lazica, as well as two settlements which the document classifies as fortresses (rather than towns) - Pityus and Sebastopolis, attached to the province of Pontus Polemoniacus. These developments find an excellent reflection in coin finds from this period. Although still adhering to the caveat that some coins might have arrived at a much later date after their striking, it is still safe to assume that many of the coins issued during these decades (498-538) arrived in Transcaucasia before Justinian’s reform of 538. Although Procopius credits Justinian with expanding and consolidating the Byzantine influence in Lazica, the large number of coin finds from his predecessors might reflect earlier efforts, at least since Tzath sided with the Byzantine Empire in 522. Both Pityus and Sebastopolis produced a significant number of finds from Anastasius, while a half-follis from Archaeopolis is actually an early reform issue from 507-512. Two coins of Anastasius found in Petra, Justinian’s brand new foundation, were probably lost later, although older settlements are known in the area of Tzikishdziri. In addition, one more coin was found at Batumi, possibly the location of ancient Portus Altus, strengthening the image of a Byzantine presence along


112 I. Tsukhishvili and G. Depeyrot, History and Coin Finds in Georgia: Late Roman and Byzantine Hoards (4th-13th c.) (Wetteren: Moneta, 2003), 22.
the Black Sea coast.\textsuperscript{113} The defection of Iberia to Justin I in 525 was followed by an extension of Byzantine ambitions to the south, in Armenia, where Dorotheus and Sittas had led successful campaigns in the years preceding the "eternal peace" sealed in 532.\textsuperscript{114} The large number of coin finds from Ani (Kars, Turkey) is probably a good indicator of the Byzantine military presence in Armenia.\textsuperscript{115}

The reign of Justin I which saw this major shift in political allegiance in Transcaucasia brought an even larger quantity of coin to Lazica, especially to the main Byzantine strongholds on the coast. Excavations at Pityus produced no less than 18 coins of Justin I of which seven are \textit{pentanummia}, pointing to the fact that the fortress was firmly connected to the Byzantine monetary system and perhaps to the trade network in the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, a hoard of 55 \textit{pentanummia}, all issues of Justin I, was found near the north wall during archaeological excavations in 1961.\textsuperscript{117} The hoard is unique in the Black Sea and the wider Eastern Mediterranean region and the coins were clearly intended for use at the marketplace. Copper coins of Justin I have been found not only close to the coast, at Sebastopolis and Archaeopolis, but also in the hinterland, at Kutaisi and Urbnsi.\textsuperscript{118} The specimen from Sebastopolis is an issue of

\textsuperscript{113} Abramishvili, \textit{Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984)}, 11, no. 29. For the location of Portus Altus, see Braund, \textit{Georgia}, 275. The Byzantine presence on the north-eastern Black Sea coast was also confirmed by a spectacular silver plate probably found in a fortress or cemetery in Abkhazia, for which see Y. Pyiatnisky, "New Evidence for Byzantine Activity in the Caucasus During the Reign of the Emperor Anastasius I," AJN 18 (2006): 113-22.

\textsuperscript{114} Greatrex and Lieu, eds, \textit{The Roman Eastern Frontier}, 94-96.

\textsuperscript{115} Mousheghian et al., \textit{History and Coin Finds in Armenia. Coins from Ani, Capital of Armenia (4th c. BC-19th c. AD)} (Wetteren: Moneta, 2000), 72, no. 19-23.


\textsuperscript{117} Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, \textit{History and Coin Finds in Georgia}, 72-73, no. 4.

\textsuperscript{118} Sebastopolis: Shamba, \textit{Monetnoe obrashchenie}, 78, no. 113. Archaeopolis: Abramishvili,
Antioch, a rare find in the Black Sea region, which points to the transfer of troops on the large theater of operations from the Caucasus to the Euphrates. The ceremonial silver heavy *miliarenxis* found at Zugdidi, close to the Lazian capital of Archaeopolis, is a clear reflection of diplomatic gifts necessary to cement the new alliance between Byzantium and Lazica.\(^{119}\) Four *solidi*, of which one has a known finding place at Gveso (Racha-Lekhumi and Kvemo Svaneti, Georgia), may reflect similar political payments dating from the early stage of the Byzantine presence in Lazica.\(^{120}\)

Such practices were continued and even intensified in the first decade of Justinian’s reign. His plans in Transcaucasia were far more ambitious. Although Lazica was never included in the provincial system, Justinian’s tendency to encroach upon the administrative and political structures of Armenia and Lazica made him extremely unpopular with the local princes. The Lazi confederation of clients was particularly fragile and relied on the loyalty of the northern tribes, which was hardly unequivocal. The Abasgi, the Apsilii, the Mismiani, and the Suani, whose main strategic purpose was to guard the two major passes of Klukhor and Marukha in the western Caucasus, were lavished with occasional gifts to insure their pro-Byzantine position. Later events would prove that their loyalty should not be taken for granted. In the 530s the Abasgi were

---

\(^{119}\) Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 40-41, no. 56. Ceremonial silver coins are a far more reliable chronological marker, since they were distributed by the emperor. They had no economic function and therefore it is likely that they arrived to their final destination immediately after they were issued. Contra Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, *History and Coin Finds in Georgia*, 25, who state that silver coins were intended for the foreign market.

converted to Christianity and their dual monarchy abolished.\textsuperscript{121} This decision did not come for free. Two ceremonial silver \textit{miliarensia} dated between 527 and 538 were found in Apsilia and Abasgia, at Akhali Atoni and Tsebelda, respectively, while a \textit{solidus} found in the fortress of Ch'khalt'a (Abkhazia) might date from the same period.\textsuperscript{122} A light \textit{miliarensis} from Sochi (Krasnodar, Russia) has a wider dating (537-565) but may belong to the same historical context.\textsuperscript{123} In addition, the Byzantine fortresses of the north-eastern coast became more integrated into the Mediterranean world judging by the quantity of amphorae found in settlements of the coast and the finds of coins from Antioch, Alexandria, and Carthage at Pityus and Akhali Atoni in Abkhazia.\textsuperscript{124} One of the \textit{folles} found at Pityus is an imitation typical of the Balkans and may have been brought by the “Bulgar” prisoners taken by Mundus and sent to Lazica and Armenia to defend


\textsuperscript{123} Kropotkin, \textit{Klady vizantiiskikh monet}, 22, no. 22.

the frontier. The coins from North Africa may well reflect trade but also the movement of people such as the Tzani who fought in Justinian’s army in Italy.

Justinian was also aiming further east in Iberia where a Byzantine presence can be felt in these decades, judging by the coin finds. Copper coins of Anastasius, Justin I, and Justinian have been found at K’rts’anisi, Nost’e, Rustavi, Dmanisi, and Mtskheta. A silver *miliarensis* pierced to be worn as a pendant was found in a grave from the Iberian capital of Mtskheta, possibly pointing to diplomatic gifts sent to Iberian rulers. Gold coins of Anastasius had already reached the region controlled by Alans who guarded the Dariel Pass (Alan Gates) and Justinian went a step further by securing the allegiance of queen Boa of the Sabir Huns won over “with gifts of imperial raiment and a variety of silver vessels and not a little money.” The money was well spent as the powerful queen defeated other Hunnic groups allied with the Persians. Byzantine diplomatic activity is also evident northwards on the Black Sea coast, towards the Taman peninsula and Bosporus. By 520 Bosporus was under the rule of Grod, the pro-Byzantine leader of the Huns who dominated the region in cooperation with the Tetraxite Goths. The study of burial assemblages from the region points to strong

---

125 Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis* (1966-1984), 16, no. 49. For the events, see Theophanes, *Chronographia*, a. 6033, ed. de Boor, 219. The episode was placed around 530 after the defection of Iberia and the subjection of the Tzani.


127 Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 44, no. 74.


129 Greatrex and Lieu, ed., *The Roman Eastern Frontier*, 82.
cultural ties between Bosporus and the northern Caucasus. Further internal turmoil in Bosporus was swiftly resolved by Justinian who sent an army across the Black Sea to retake the city in 534-535. Two *solidi* of Justin I found at Dzhiginka (Krasnodar, Russia) and Goryachi Klyuch (Krasnodar, Russia) may be related to these developments. The specimen from Dzhiginka is in fact a rare joint reign issue of Justin I and Justinian I struck in April-August 527. The ceremonial nature of the coinage was doubtlessly recognized by the owner who attached the coin to a gold necklace with precious stone pendants.

The successful Persian invasion of Byzantine Syria in 540 was not without consequences in Transcaucasia. Aliénated by Justinian’s policy and his corrupt officials who forced the Lazi to accept import duties and to support the Byzantine troops by ensuring the provision of supplies at low prices, king Gobazes turned to Chosroes for help. The Persians invaded Lazica and took the main Byzantine center of Petra, while the Byzantine garrisons from Abasgia withdrew from Pityus and Sebastopolis after razing the fortresses to the ground. Coins of Justinian found in the burned layer at Pityus confirm Procopius’ account. Sebastopolis was later rebuilt according to the same author who no longer mentions Pityus in his list, although coin finds from the second half of the sixth century prove that the fortress remained in use.

---


133 Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, *History and Coin Finds in Georgia*, 21, 25, associate the scarcity of finds
king tried to impose Zoroastrianism by force in his intention to burn the most important cultural bridge uniting Byzantium and Lazica. In addition, Lazica found itself isolated from the Black Sea network, which affected its economy. Soon enough Gobazes II realized that Chosroes was even less accommodating than Justinian and he decided to make amends and reach back to the Byzantine emperor. War resumed in Lazica in 547.

In his usual manner Justinian promised three *centenaria* of gold (21,600 *solidi*) to the Alans and the Sabir Huns to attack Persian Iberia. Three years of warfare did not settle the matter as the Persians still held Petra despite a number of victories won by the Byzantine-Lazian armies. Another episode occurred in 550, typical of Transcaucasian politics. Byzantine taxation and political intervention in Abasgia became so unpopular that the Abasgi asked Chosroes for help. The Persians advanced from Iberia then through Apsilia and restored the Abasgi monarchy under Persian suzerainty. In addition, a Lazi defector offered the Apsili fortress of Tzibile to the Persians.

Although Justinian finally recaptured and destroyed Petra in 551 and punished the rebellious Abasgi, the Persian army led by Mermeroes was in control of eastern Lazica and Suania. An assault on western Lazica was successfully repelled after Justinian transferred more troops to the Transcaucasus. The murder of king Gobazes II in 555 made the Byzantine position in Lazica even more tenuous as the Lazi withdrew their

from the second half of the sixth century at Pityus with a general decline in mint output throughout the empire, which is obviously wrong, and can be refuted by looking at finds from any Byzantine province from the Danube to Palestine.

---


135 Braund, *Georgia in Antiquity*, 300.

military support, followed by a well-timed Tzani revolt in 558.\textsuperscript{137} There are only three coin finds dated between 558 and 565, but like in the case of the Lower Danube the explanation has to do with mint output during these last years of Justinian’s reign.

Coin finds in Transcaucasia reflect increased warfare between 541 and 562 and the precarious position of Byzantium, which roughly corresponds with the dated coinage of Justinian (538-565).\textsuperscript{138} The heavy series of 538-542, which is so well represented in the Lower Danube region, was not equally popular in Transcaucasia. To be sure, the period 538-544 produced almost the same number of finds as the last two decades of Justinian’s reign (545-565). Coins from the early years after the 538 reform have been found in Armenia, at Ani and Vanadzor and in Abkhazia on the Black Sea coast at Pityus and Sebastopolis.\textsuperscript{139} The two important fortresses had been destroyed and abandoned in 541, as we have seen, but Procopius might have exaggerated this episode. At least at Sebastopolis five post-reform issues of Justinian have been retrieved, of which three specimens date from the 540s. To be sure, some of them might have been lost later, together with coins of Justin II.

The numismatic reflection of diplomatic initiatives during these decades of conflict left a few important traces in western Georgia. After the ill-timed murder of Gobazes II, Justinian saw fit to entrust general Soterichus with distributing 4 \textit{centenaria} of gold (28,800 \textit{solidi}) among barbarian tribes from the Lazian confederation. The

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 122; Braund, \textit{Georgia in Antiquity}, 308.
    \item \textsuperscript{138} Hoards of Sasanian drachms from Iberia (Tolenji, Dusheti and Urbnisi) concealed during these decades must be associated with the same events; see M. Tsotselia, \textit{History and Coin Finds in Georgia: Sasanian Coin Finds and Hoards} (Wetteren: Moneta, 2003), 49-57.
\end{itemize}
stakes were raised when the Misimians killed Soterichus and helped themselves to the money. A Roman army under generals Martin and John Dacnas punished the rebels and retrieved the gold. Indeed, gold was not in short supply in Transcaucasia. John Dacnas was entrusted with 400 pounds of gold to be distributed to worthy soldiers fighting in Misimia, just as a few years before when the Byzantine army was struggling to check Mermeroes’ advance into Lazica, Justinian had sent his pursebearer Rusticus to Lazica with gifts (dora) for the soldiers. The dispersed hoards of solidi of Justinian from Chkhorotsqu (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia) and Kobuleti (Ajaria, Georgia) may belong to this context. Two ceremonial silver miliarenses and one solidus found at Tsebelda may reflect Justinian’s efforts to strengthen the loyalty of the Apsilii at a time when their neighbors, the Misimians, had rebelled, the Abasgi had been barely pacified after their defection to Persia, and the Suani were yet to be punished after a similar defection in 552. Justinian was in fact diplomatically engaged on the entire northern Black Sea front as he was striving to convince the Utrigur Huns and the Tetraxite Goths to attack the Kutrigurs in 551. The hoard from Ilych in Krasnodar made

140 Agathias, Historiae IV, 12-20, for the episode and IV, 20.9, for the sum of money involved, ed. R. Keydell (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1967); trans. J. D. Frendo (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975), 113-22 .
141 Agathias, Historiae III, 2.3-4 and IV, 17.3, ed. Keydell; trans. Frendo, 69 and 118.
142 Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 124, no. 42; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 45, no. 444.
143 Voronov and Iushin, “Pogrebenie VII V. N. E. Ie S. Tsebel’da,” 103, fig. 43; Shamba, Monetnoe obrashchenie, 79, no. 115. For the Suani, see recently G. M. Berndt, “Shifting Frontiers in the Caucasus Mountains: The Suani,” in Shifting Cultural Frontiers in Late Antiquity, ed. D. Brakke, D. Deliyannis, and E. Watts (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012), 255-70; The Byzantine army used the fortresses of Apsilia as bases to attack Misimia, for which see Braund, Georgia in Antiquity, 310. For archaeological evidence from the region, see M. Kazanski, "Contribution à l’histoire de la défense de la frontière pontique au Bas-Empire," Travaux et Mémoires 11 (1991): 488-93.
of 140 third-to-fourth century gold issues of Bosporan kings and *solidi* of Justinian hidden in an amphora may reflect such efforts.\(^{144}\)

Peace followed in 562, after Dagistheus, *magister militum per Armeniam*, won a major victory at Phasis (Poti) near the Black Sea coast in Lazica. The theater of operations moved southwards into Armenia during the reign of Justin II. In 571 the Armenians revolted against the Persian *marzban* who tried to impose Zoroastrianism in the Armenian capital of Dvin and limit the religious freedom of Armenians long granted by Shapur III (383-388). Vardan, the leader of the Armenian rebellion received help from Justin II and managed to take control of Duin. In a manner typical of Transcaucasian politics, Iberia also revolted against Persia and between 572 and 574 the Roman armies advanced deep into Albania towards the Caspian Sea. The turn of events was so surprising that John of Biclar writing from distant Spain was convinced that "the emperor Justin made Armenia and Iberia Roman provinces."\(^{145}\) The reality was, however, quite different and by 580 Persia regained the initiative in Transcaucasus. The situation was so desperate for the Romans that Tiberius II was forced to recruit 15,000 "Germans" from the northern Balkans and send them to the East.\(^{146}\) The transfer of troops from the Balkans is suggested by the significant number of half-*folles* of Thessalonica found in

---


\(^{146}\) Greatrex and Lieu, ed., *The Roman Eastern Frontier*, 151.
Georgia, given that the Macedonian mint was supplying the troops from the Danube frontier (Appendix B, Table B-9). Coin finds of Justin II are abundant in Transcaucasia, especially copper issues. His coins were found during excavations at Ani and Dvin and the majority were struck by the mint of Nicomedia, which was probably commissioned to support the war effort in Armenia. Coins from Antioch were found at Vardenut (Aragatsotn, Armenia) and Vosketap (Ararat, Armenia), also present at Melitene, a major Roman base during this decade of conflict. On the other hand, things were quiet in Lazica and we can envisage a period of reconstruction and consolidation as testified by coin finds from Pityus, Archaeopolis, Kutaisi and from the many more specimens without a known finding place in Georgia. A hoard of copper coins from Archaeopolis spanning the reigns of Anastasius to Justin II might have been concealed during renewed insecurity in Lazica in 574-575. A half-follis from a mobile military mint striking coins imitating the mint of Rome was found at Akhaltsikhe (Samtskhe-Javakheti, Georgia) close to the

147 Thessalonica is less well represented in finds from Sinope, Amasia and Melitene, for which see Casey, *A Catalogue of Greek, Roman and Byzantine*, 79-86; Ireland and Ateşoğulları, "The Ancient Coins in Amasra," 132-35; Demirel Gökalp, "Malatya arkeoloji," forthcoming.

148 Mousheghian et al., *History (Ani)*, 74-75, no. 42-51; Mousheghian et al., *History and Coin Finds in Armenia: Coins from Duin, Capital of Armenia (4-13th c.): Inventory of Byzantine and Sasanian Coins in Armenia (6-7th c.)* (Wetteren, Moneta, 2000), 62, no. 19-24. Contra Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, *History and Coin Finds in Armenia*, 19, who believe that the mint of Nicomedia had lost its importance since the reign of Justinian I.


Mt’kvari river and confirms the movement of troops from the west.\textsuperscript{152} Pityus was perhaps the main base for such movements as another half-\textit{follis} of Tiberius II or Maurice from the military mint labeled "Rome" was found during archaeological excavations in the fortress.\textsuperscript{153} The find might be connected with the war effort in Albania and the revolt of Iberia supported by Justin II. A \textit{follis} of 570/1 found in Iberia at Dmanisi (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia) is perhaps related to the same events.\textsuperscript{154}

As we have already seen Justin II was not very fond of sending gold to barbarians. However, the balance of power in the steppe north of the Caucasus was changing dramatically. By the end of his reign the Turks had become the masters of this wide region after defeating the Sabir Huns, the Alans, and the Utrigurs.\textsuperscript{155} \textit{Solidi} of Justin II and his predecessors as well as a copper coin of Justin II have been found in the Alan cemetery of Kamunta (North Ossetia-Alania, Russia), a gold plated imitation was found in the cemetery from Mokraya Balka, and a \textit{solidus} of Justin II with a suspension loop was part of the inventory of a grave from Pechanka (Kabardino-Balkaria, Russia).\textsuperscript{156} An exceptionally rare find from Mokraya Balka, a light weight \textit{solidus} of 22 \textit{siliquae} from the joint reign of Justin II and Tiberius II (26 September 578 – 4 October 578), pierced twice, reminds of the find from Dzighinka, and probably has the

\textsuperscript{152} Abramishvili, \textit{Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984)}, 21, no. 73 with n. 114.

\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., 19, no 63.

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid., 20, no. 71 and pl. IV/71. A hoard of Sasanian drachms from Mtskheta may be related to the same events; see Tsotselia, \textit{History and Coin Finds in Georgia}, 61-64.

\textsuperscript{155} Kazanski and Mastykova, \textit{Les peuples du Caucase du Nord}, 150.

same significance. All these finds, as well as others from the Kislovodsk basin, may be part of the political and diplomatic context of the 570s when Justin II managed to finally punish the Suani who had switched sides in favor of Persia two decades earlier. Furthermore, the Romans captured the Suani king and brought him as a captive to Constantinople together with his royal treasure. No doubt, the protection of the Dariel Pass remained a major strategic priority for both Byzantium and Persia and this much can be deduced from the fact that both Byzantine and Sasanian coins and artifacts are found in such cemeteries. However, many gold coins date from the seventh century and it is impossible to ascertain that Justin II’s issues arrived in the region during his reign.

By the beginning of Maurice’s reign the Persians had restored their control over Iberia and Albania. For almost a decade war would continue with fierce battles in the southern sector of the frontier, quite far from the Caucasus. Nevertheless, the region remained strategically important in the larger scheme. In 589 Maurice paid the Iberians to invade Albania, trying to take advantage of the Persian weakness in the region after they were forced to transfer troops to the east to face an invasion of the Turks. A solidus of Maurice from Saskhari (Mtskheta-Mtianeti) may belong to this political

---

157 Rtveladze and Runich, “Novye nahodki,” 151 and fig. 1/1-2.
158 Y. A. Prokopenko, “Byzantine Coins of the 5th-9th Century and their Imitations in the Central and Eastern Ciscaucasus,” in Byzantine Coins in Central Europe Between the 5th and 10th Century, ed. M. Wołoszyn (Cracow: Polish Academy of Sciences, 2009), 545-550 and fig. 1.
161 Greatrex and Lieu, ed., The Roman Eastern Frontier, 171.
Returning general Bahram retaliated by launching a campaign against the Suani but his efforts were thwarted by a major defeat to the south, close to Araxes river. The subsequent rebellion of Bahram against Hormizd and the rightful heir Chosroes proved to be a decisive moment in the balance of power in Transcaucasia. Maurice’s successful campaign against Bahram and the restoration of Chosroes under the terms imposed by Maurice meant that Byzantium would gain unprecedented influence in the east. In exchange for "a massive sum of money in addition to the military alliance" the Persian king agreed to give up control of Persarmenia as far as Dvin and Lake Van and of Iberia as far as Tiflis. Relations with Persia remained good until the death of Maurice, especially since the emperor was determined to deal with the Avars in the Balkans while Chosroes II had to establish his rule in Persia.

Coins of Maurice are found in fair numbers in Transcaucasia, particularly issues from the 590s after the war with Persia was brought to an end. Coins from Antioch are particularly abundant in Armenia at Ani and in Georgia at Pityus and Kutaisi. Pityus continued to receive coins from Thessalonica in significant numbers signaling the continuous traffic from the Balkans. Two copper coins from 589/90 and 594/5 have been found in the most important centers of Iberia, at Mtskheta and Tbilisi, respectively, bespeaking the extension of Byzantium’s influence east of Lazica, according to the

---

162 Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 55, no. 131.
164 Whitby, The Emperor Maurice, 292-304.
165 Ani: Mousheghian et al., History (Ani), 75-76, no. 53-60. Pityus: Tsukhishvili, "Bich’vint’is bizant’iuri monet’ebi," 324-26, no. 54-57 and 610-11, fig. 54-57; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 23-24, no. 81, 83. Kutaisi: Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, History and Coin Finds in Georgia, 24, no. 6.
terms accepted by Chosroes. A small hoard found at Nekresi (Kakheti, Georgia) comprised of two silver Sasanian drachms and one siliqua of Maurice is another testament to the mixed Byzantine-Persian influence in Iberia. A silver light miliarenensis and three solidi have no recorded finding place, but they can be situated in the same historical context. Although peace was restored in Transcaucasia and the emperor diverted his attention to the Balkans, a consolidation of the Roman presence in Lazica must have remained an important priority. A hoard of 23 solidi found during archaeological excavations at Archaeopolis is extremely important for understanding Maurice’s military and diplomatic efforts in Lazica, not always recorded in written sources. Many of the solidi are die-linked which means that they were brought fresh from the mint. The fact that they were not regular solidi but light weight issues worth 23 siliquae, suggests a political payment sent to the Lazian capital. A copper hoard found in Ochamchire (Abkhazia, Georgia), whose context was unfortunately poorly recorded, contained some 58 bronze coins from Justin I to Maurice, the last issue being dated 601/2. Its concealment during the events following the death of Maurice seems plausible.

166 Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 125, no. 58; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 21, no. 74 and 23, no. 79.

167 Tsotselia, Coin Finds in Georgia, 142, no. 755.

168 Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 21, no. 75 and pl. IV/75; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 54-55, no. 130, 132 and 134.


War with Persia resumed during the reign of Phocas and would continue for more than two decades. The deposition and murder of Maurice and his family was the perfect excuse for Chosroes II, whose gratitude towards Constantinople was already growing thin in the decade after his restoration to the Persian throne. The main objective was to reconquer Armenia but as Persian forces advanced deep into Byzantine territory the road was open for a much more ambitious expedition in the Byzantine heartland. Phocas had already sealed a new deal with the Avars in 604 and was probably trying to gain the loyalty of Caucasian tribes judging by the finds of gold and silver coins from the area. A ceremonial siliqua was found at Ch’iatura (Imereti, Georgia), and a solidus at Dranda in Abkhazia. Grave finds from cemeteries such as Chmi and Kamunta in North Ossetia-Alania included soli of Phocas, sometimes pierced to be worn as jewelry. Two light siliquae of Maurice and Phocas, respectively, were found in a grave from Mokraya Balka, indicating that such payments were also sent north of the Caucasus. The Byzantine emperor was probably trying to compensate for the weak defense of the region, most of his troops no doubt having been moved to the main theater of operations in the south. It is important to note that no copper coins of Phocas are so far recorded on the eastern Black Sea coast, although there are indeed quite a few unprovenienced coins of Phocas in Georgian museums.

171 Greatrex and Lieu, ed., The Roman Eastern Frontier, 186-87.
172 Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 24, no. 86 and pl. VI/86; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 43, no. 408.
174 Rtveladze and Runich, "Novye nahodki," 151-53 and fig. 1/3-5.
The conflict escalated at the beginning of Heraclius’ reign opening a dark period in Byzantine history. Within a decade the Persians conquered Egypt and brought a trail of destruction in Syria-Palestine and Asia Minor, while the Avars and the Slavs ravaged the Balkans. Heraclius contemplated moving the capital to Carthage but ended up by melting down church property to produce a brand new coinage, the hexagram, which he intended to use for paying the army and the administration at half the old rate.\textsuperscript{176} The Byzantine recovery started in Transcaucasia and was made possible not only by the emperor’s energetic reforms but also by the momentous alliance with the Turks who proved decisive in shifting the balance in Heraclius’ favor. After signing a new treaty with the Avars in 620 Heraclius transferred the troops from the Balkans to Asia Minor. A first major achievement was the sacking of Dvin in 624 but then the war moved to the north. Moses of Dashkura tells us about the diplomatic initiatives of Heraclius seeking to gain the loyalty of Caucasian tribes as he was struggling to outmaneuver three superior Persian armies.\textsuperscript{177} The deal with the Turks proved decisive as the nomads poured through the Caspian gates and invaded Albania in 626. Having joined his Turkish allies at Tiflis in the spring of 527 Heraclius proceeded to the south through Armenia to achieve a final and complete victory against Persia.\textsuperscript{178}

The coins of Heraclius found in Transcaucasia date mostly from this period of warfare. A first observation is the drastic reduction in the number of copper coins.\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{176} Greatrex and Lieu, ed., \textit{The Roman Eastern Frontier}, 187-97.
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid., 202-05.
\textsuperscript{178} J. Howard-Johnston, "Heraclius’ Persian Campaigns and the Revival of the Eastern Roman Empire, 622-630," \textit{War in History} 6, no. 1 (1999): 1-44.
\textsuperscript{179} Contra Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, \textit{History and Coin Finds in Georgia}, 24 who argue that copper coins of the seventh century “vanished in West Georgia.”
Pityus continued to receive copper issues at least until 630 but no other coins with a known finding place can be mentioned, although a dozen or more specimens are preserved in Georgian museums.\textsuperscript{180} There is only one significant find from the beginning of Heraclius’ reign, the dispersed hoard of Chibati (Guria, Georgia) which contained some 2,000 coins of which only 124 have been preserved.\textsuperscript{181} Much like the hoard of Maurice from Archaeopolis, which lies at a close distance to the northeast, most of the coins from Chibati are die-linked. The coins of Phocas cover almost 85 percent of the hoard, which is an important indication of the fact that the hoard was indeed concealed at the beginning of Heraclius’ reign rather than later. The hoard itself shows that both Phocas and Heraclius were interested in maintaining the support of Lazica. Moreover, their actions can be felt on a much larger front along the northern Black Sea coast, judging by the finds from Sennaya and Starodzhereliyevskaya in Krasnodar.\textsuperscript{182} Local imitations of Byzantine silver and gold coins of Phocas and Heraclius from the Kislovodsk basin reveal the existence of Byzantine diplomatic initiatives in the Northern Caucasus, as well the creation of social status in relation to Byzantium.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{180} Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 64-68, no. 188-194, 196-197, 199-204, 206-211 and 213-214; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 33, no. 127.

\textsuperscript{181} T. Abramishvili, "Bizant’iuri okros monet’ebi (Chibatis gandzi)," in Akad. S. Janashias sachelobis sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis moambe 25-B (1968): 159-76; Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, History and Coin Finds in Georgia, 75-79 and pl. 2-6. We might add a contemporary hoard of Sasanian drachms from Urbnisi (Shida Kartli, Georgia) concealed after 617, for which see Tsotselia, History and Coin Finds in Georgia, 77.

\textsuperscript{182} Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 22, no. 19a; Ibid., 22, no. 25.

Copper coins are more common at Ani and Dvin in Armenia, where Heraclius’ hexagrams are also abundant. Unsurprisingly the silver issues dated between 625 and 629 are most numerous in Armenia as this interval coincides with the Byzantine counteroffensive led by Heraclius and his Turkish allies.\textsuperscript{184} Most hoards of the period, however, were concealed in Georgia, where Heraclius conducted an aggressive diplomatic activity aimed at gaining the support of the local tribes. Moses of Dashkura informs us that Heraclius sent a letter to convince Caucasian princes to join his cause but a lot more than words was needed to build an alliance. It was also here that Heraclius bought the loyalty of the Turks after pledging to "satisfy the thirst of the savage, gold-loving people of long hair," in the words of the same chronicler.\textsuperscript{185} There are no gold coins in the region which can be dated to the 620s, aside from the \textit{solidus} from Didi Chqoni (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia) in Lazica.\textsuperscript{186} There are, however, many hexagrams found in Georgia, both single finds and hoards most of which concentrate in Persian Iberia rather than in Lazica. In Iberia Heraclius had to fight against Stephen I who remained in communion with the church in Constantinople but chose a political alliance with Chosroes II.\textsuperscript{187} Single hexagrams have been found in Iberia at Ak’ura (Kakheti, Georgia), Ch’andrebi (Shida Kartli, Georgia), Mtskheta


\textsuperscript{186} Abramishvili, \textit{Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis}, 64, no. 186.

\textsuperscript{187} Greatrex and Lieu, ed., \textit{The Roman Eastern Frontier}, 179 and 209.
(Mtskheta-Mtianeti, Georgia) and Ts’ints’karo (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia).\textsuperscript{188} Two small hoards found at Mtskheta and Sarachilo (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia) were concealed during the same events.\textsuperscript{189} A third hoard of the period found at Odishi (Samegrelo, Georgia) is another typical example of political payments sent to the Lazian center of power around Archaeopolis. The hoard includes two ceremonial \textit{siliquae} of Maurice as well as hexagrams of Heraclius dated 625-629, probably showing a slow accumulation of monetary gifts.\textsuperscript{190} Not all finds should be associated with the war effort against Persia, as several more Byzantine coins from Georgia are clearly dated after 630 when the war was successfully concluded. A \textit{solidus} from Ch’iora (Racha-Lekhumi) and a hexagram found in a grave from Zhebot’a (Mtskheta-Mtianeti) date from 632-635 and 635-637, respectively and a \textit{solidus} from Shilda (Kakheti) dates from 641.\textsuperscript{191} Two very large mixed silver hoards of Sasanian drachms and Byzantine hexagrams from Dedoplistskaro (Kakheti, Georgia) and Tbilisi, concealed sometime around 641 show that wealth in Iberia still relied on the dominant presence of Sasanian coins.\textsuperscript{192}


\textsuperscript{190} Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, \textit{History and Coin Finds in Georgia}, 81, no. 8 and plate 6 and 29, arguing that the coins represent a homogeneous group; Abramishvili, \textit{Sakartvelos sakhelmits’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984)}, 22, n. 120 and 22-31, no. 76-77, 88, 94-102, 119.

\textsuperscript{191} Ch’iora: Abramishvili, \textit{Sakartvelos sakhelmits’ipo muzeumis}, 64, no. 187; Zhebot’a: Ibid., 126, no. 74. Shilda: Abramishvili, \textit{Sakartvelos sakhelmits’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984)}, 25, no. 87 and pl. VI/87. Contra Somogyi, “New Remarks on the Flow,” 121 who argued that the flow of Byzantine \textit{solidi} to Lazica was interrupted after 613. Contra Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, \textit{History}, 28 who argued that no gold coins of Phocas and Heraclius were found in Iberia.

Similar developments can be traced to the south, in Armenia, where hoards of hexagrams have been found at İğdir (İğdir, Turkey), Dvin, and Grtchi (Tavush, Armenia). The first hoard from the Persarmenian capital of Dvin ends with issues dated between 638 and 641, but the bulk of the hoard is made of issues from 625-629. The second hoard from Dvin is another example of a mixed Sasanian-Byzantine hoard in which the Persian issues are numerically superior.\textsuperscript{193} Heraclius was well aware of the fact that Armenian loyalties were easily switched given the political climate of fragmentation which had characterized Armenia since the abolishing of the monarchy in 428.\textsuperscript{194} Heraclius had little time to enjoy his otherwise glorious victory over the great archenemy because a new power would soon capitalize on the weakness of the two Near Eastern empires. Epigraphic evidence shows that the last years of Heraclius’ reign witnessed an intense campaign to attract Armenian princes by granting them honorary titles.\textsuperscript{195} A \textit{solidus} found at Masis (Ararat, Armenia) dated to 641 might indicate that loyalties were bought with money, not only with titles, especially since the Arabs got dangerously close after a successful raiding of Dvin in 640.\textsuperscript{196}

The Arab conquest of Transcaucasia was already under way. Constans II and Constantine IV made great efforts to maintain a foothold in Georgia and Armenia


through a combination of diplomacy and warfare when internal turmoil in the Caliphate offered good opportunities for action. Coin hoards from the 650s testify to the energetic activity of Constans II in Armenia especially after Muawiya offered very generous terms in 652 should Armenian nobles decide to switch sides. 197 Only one hoard was found in Georgia, in a burned layer from a seventh-century residence in Magraneti (Mtskheta-Mtianeti, Georgia), comprising an almost equal number of Sasanian drachms and Byzantine hexagrams. 198 The other four hoards were found in Armenia in the Mtkvari-Arax interfluve, north of Dvin, at Echmiazdin, Gyumri, Kosh and Stepanavan and can be connected with Constans II’s campaign of 654 and his general efforts to re-establish the Byzantine domination in Armenia. 199 Six single finds of hexagrams of Constans II are known from Transcaucasia, most of which were found in Georgia, rather than in Armenia as we would have expected based on the geographic distribution of hoards. Such coins were found both in Lazica at Zugdidi (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti) and Ch’orvila (Imereti) and in Iberia at At’ots’i (Shida Kartli) and Rustavi (Kvemo Kartli). 200 Bracteates struck on thin gold foil imitating solidi from 654-667 were found in a grave from Dzhaga (Karachayevo-Cherkesiya, Russia) evidencing continuing relations with tribes from Northern Caucasus. 201


199 Mousheghian et al., History, 164-65 and pl. 23-24; 170 and pl. 25; 179-80; 182-83 and pl. 25.


201 Rtveladze and Runich, "Nahodki indikatsii," 220-21 and fig. 1/5-6.
The Second Fitna following the death of Muawiya was promptly exploited by Constantine IV who invaded Cilicia, while the new dominant group of the northern steppe, the Khazars, invaded Armenia. Although the new caliph Abd-al Malik offered very good terms the Byzantine position in Transcaucasia remained precarious. Despite the efforts of Justinian II to buy the loyalty of Armenian and Albanian nobles in the same manner as his predecessors, by the end of the century the Caliphate extended its influence even farther to the north.\textsuperscript{202} Contrary to some opinions Byzantium did not lose control of the eastern Black Sea coast until the early eighth century.\textsuperscript{203} In 662 Constans II exiled monothelite heretics in Lazica, ecclesiastical centers were still in place at Phasis and Sebastopolis, while Smbat Bagratuni the leader of an Armenian revolt against the Arabs found refuge at Phasis in 705.\textsuperscript{204} A solidus of Justinian II from his second reign (705-711) was found at Shemokmedi (Guria, Georgia) not far from Phasis.\textsuperscript{205} Coin finds further substantiate this state of affairs. No hoards are known in Transcaucasia after 670 when the importance of the hexagram had already declined sharply, but single finds of solidi of Constantine IV, Justinian II, Leontius, and Tiberius III have been reported in Georgia and in the steppe north of the Caucasus as far as Serpovoe (Tambov, Russia).\textsuperscript{206} The finds concentrate in Lazica (Pityus, Gvank’iti,


\textsuperscript{204} Greenwood, "Armenian Neighbours," 346; B. Martin-Hisard, "La domination Byzantine sur le littoral oriental du Pont Euxin (milieu du VII\textsuperscript{-}VIII\textsuperscript{e} siècles)," Byzantinobulgaria 7 (1981): 144-46.

\textsuperscript{205} Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 37, no. 140 and pl. IX/140.

\textsuperscript{206} Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 73-74, no. 240-241 and 244-246; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 29, no. 125-126.
An interesting concentration of late seventh-century *solidi* can be found further to the north-east of the Sea of Azov (Rostov-na-Donu, Russia), on the River Don where several cemeteries have produced single and collective finds of *solidi* of emperors from Constans II to Justinian II’s second reign. The most spectacular are the graves from Podgornenskii and Salovo which seem to share a date at the turn of the eighth century, same as the single finds from Bol’shaia Orlovka, Romanovskaya, and Verbovyi Log. A connection of these finds with gifts sent by Byzantium to the Khazar allies seems inescapable.

### 6.2.3 The Land of Gold: The Carpathian Basin

Although the history of the Carpathian Basin in the sixth century is shaped by cultural and diplomatic contact with Byzantium, the ties with the Empire were much more volatile than those established in Transcaucasia and in the Lower Danube region. Distance is one factor, as concentrations of Byzantine artifacts, especially coins, are sometimes found 500 miles away from the nearest Byzantine province and might have

---


exchanged hands many times traversing a wide region populated by a mosaic of "Germanic" tribes (Figure 6-16 and 6-17). Most of the time, centers of power in Bohemia might not have had direct access to Byzantine wealth. Although this appears similar with the case of the Suani or Abasgi on the foothills of the Caucasus who received stipends through the mediation of Lazi kings, Byzantine ambitions were much more limited north of the Alps. The distribution of finds reveals four geographic areas of concentration: the Tisza basin and the Middle Danube, corresponding with the core areas of the Gepid kingdom and later the Avar Khaganate, the Drava-Sava interfluve, an important area of contact between the Empire and Barbaricum, the upper Danube region, and finally Bohemia at the confluence between the late Germanic and early Slavic worlds.

Another factor is chronology, in this case a somewhat arbitrarily defined unit of analysis but a good indicator of major trends and developments. From a historical perspective the flow of Byzantine coins, mainly gold, to the Carpathian Basin has at least to major stages, ca. 488-568 and ca. 568-680, respectively. The first stage can be divided into two phases, from 488 when Theodoric the Great took the Ostrogoths to Italy until 535 when Justinian launched his campaign in Italy and from 535 to 568 when the Avars settled in the Middle Danube region and the Longobards migrated to Italy. The second stage is dominated by the Avar hegemony of the Carpathian Basin and can also be divided in at least two different phases corresponding to the Early and Middle Avar periods, respectively, divided by the transition after the defeat beneath the walls of Constantinople in 626. More than anything, political developments in Italy and the western Balkans dictated the nature of contact between Byzantium and the peoples of
Figure 6-16. Early Byzantine coin finds in the Carpathian Basin (for Transylvania see above Figure 6-6) (numbers on the map refer to numbers in Appendix A.2).
Figure 6-17. Early Byzantine coin finds north of the Middle and Upper Danube (numbers on the map refer to numbers in Appendix A.2).
Figure 6-18. Early Byzantine gold, silver, and copper coin finds in the Carpathian Basin (491-680).
Central Europe during the sixth and seventh centuries, which often presupposed the typical combination of warfare and diplomatic maneuvers, including gifts, stipends and tribute.

The particular nature of the relation between Byzantium and regions often far from the frontier is best reflected in the ratio between gold and copper coins (Figure 6-18). Four to five times more Byzantine gold is to be found in Central Europe than in Transcaucasia or the Lower Danube region, at the expense of the base metal coinage (Appendix B, Table B-2). The absence of a hegemonic power in Central and Eastern Europe between the dissolution of the Hunnic confederation and the rise of the Avar Khaganate made the Carpathian Basin fertile ground for diplomatic initiatives. In the course of the sixth century Heruli, Lombards, and Gepids received political stipends and served as foederati or symmachoi in campaigns led by Byzantine emperors on three different continents. In addition, smaller and less homogeneous groups from Central Europe, which did not always draw the attention of contemporary chroniclers, were probably attracted by the chance to make one’s fortune in successful warfare. The age of Justinian in particular presented many such opportunities, closer to home in northern Italy and Dalmatia or further away in North Africa and in Persia. It comes as no surprise that Procopius complained about the blurring of the traditional distinction between Roman stratiotai and barbarian foederates.²⁰⁹

After the battle of Nedao (454), the Gepids became masters of the regions east of the Middle Danube, into Transylvania and southwards to the Lower Danube. At the same time the Ostrogoths were allowed to settle in Pannonia, but their contacts

extended further north. A large quantity of *solidi* reached Pomerania, the Baltic islands, and Scandinavia in the second half of the fifth century only to end abruptly after the reign of Anastasius on the Baltic coast of Poland and perhaps a few decades later in Scandinavia.\(^{210}\) Aside from a number of single finds of *solidi*, hoards of *solidi* ending with issues of Anastasius have been found in Poland at Karsibór, Malechowo, and Trąbki Małe.\(^{211}\) A hoard found at Karlino included *solidi* of Anastasius and also Scandinavian bracteates and jewelry.\(^{212}\) In addition, a large hoard 150 gold coins from Mrzezino, included 130 issues of Anastasius, original *solidi* and Ostrogothic imitations hinting at the fact that most of the gold was channeled to the Baltic through the mediation of the Ostrogoths, the main recipients of Byzantine subsidies.\(^{213}\) D. M. Metcalf’s hypothesis that the gold primarily illustrates commerce in furs on the Baltic is less convincing, although it may be part of the larger picture.\(^{214}\) On the other hand, Renata Ciołek was right to assume that Byzantine gold coins in Pomerania reflect contacts within the German world rather than direct connections to Byzantium.\(^{215}\)


\(^{212}\) Iluk, "Bałtycki epizod," 57.


\(^{214}\) D. M. Metcalf, "Viking-Age Numismatics, 1. Late Roman and Byzantine Gold in the Northern Lands," *NC* 155 (1995): 413-441

In fact there is an uninterrupted chain of gold *solidi* or *tremisses* of Anastasius and Justin I running from the Baltic to the Adriatic coast which can be connected with federate groups. Unsurprisingly, south of Poland the largest concentration can be found in the Czech Republic and can be associated at this time with Germanic settlements connected with the Longobard presence in Bohemia and perhaps also with the Thuringians on the Elbe. Few coins were found in archaeological context but at least the *solidus* from Lužice comes from a cemetery dating from the migration period, extending, however, later than the reign of Anastasius as testified by a *tremissis* of Justinian with a suspension loop found in another grave.\(^{216}\) A *tremissis* with suspension loop of Anastasius found at Chotusice in the nineteenth century may have also belonged to a destroyed grave.\(^{217}\) Four other single finds of gold from Anastasius and Justin I found in the Czech Republic and Slovakia indicate that the region became strategically important for Byzantium especially after the Longobards defeated the Heruli in 508 and positioned themselves as a potential adversary of the Ostrogoths in Italy.\(^{218}\)

The gold trail follows east and south into the territory ruled by the Gepids and the Ostrogoths, respectively. An early *solidus* of Anastasius from Balotaszállás (492-507), another *solidus* from the same period found in a grave from the Gepid cemetery in

---


\(^{217}\) Ibid., 367, no. C2.

Kiszombor and a ceremonial silver *miliarensis* from a Gepid grave in Szőreg (all in Hungary) indicate political payments sent to the Gepid center in the Tisza-Mureș interfluve or perhaps booty taken from Illyricum by the Gepids led by Mundo.\(^{219}\) A copper half-*follis* found together with Gepid pottery in a grave from Dorobanți (Arad, Romania) and another one found in unknown circumstances at Gherla (Cluj, Romania) might signal connections with fortresses from the Danube where such small change was handled.\(^{220}\) Finds extend to the west in Bosnia, Croatia and especially in Slovenia, closer to Italy, where four single finds of *solidi* and *tremisses* of Anastasius are known, possibly related to the Ostrogoths and the migration of various groups of Heruli after their defeat in 508.\(^{221}\) Bronze coins of Anastasius and Justin I are not absent from Central Europe, with finds recorded at Kolín and Předlánce (Czech Republic), Štúrovo (Slovakia), Staasdorf and Reisberg (Austria) and further west on the upper Danube, but they tend to concentrate in the western Balkans, south of the Drava or in the sector of the Roman *limes* between Belgrade and the Iron Gates, where such coins were more readily available from Roman fortresses.\(^{222}\)

---


\(^{222}\) Kolín and Předlánce: Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins of the Early Byzantine Coins," 367,
The age of Justinian brought the opening of an important war front in Italy and renewed political alliances meant to isolate the Ostrogoths and secure the frontier of the Balkans. Already in 526 the Longobards took over Pannonia and rapidly strengthened their position, perhaps with the tacit approval of Byzantium and by taking advantage of Theodoric's death and of subsequent instability in the Gothic kingdom.223 Securing the western Balkans as a bridge between Thracia, Illyricum, and Italy was of paramount importance for Justinian as war broke out in Italy in 535. Diplomatic initiatives targeted all the important groups from the Carpathian Basin, the Gepids, the Heruli, and the Longobards and it is possible that they all received stipends from Byzantium, especially since Justinian repeatedly exercised his ability to play off one barbarian group against another. A notable example is the emperor's decision in 547 to stop paying off the Gepids and instead to bestow on the Longobards lands in Pannonia and Noricum as well as "a very great amount of money" (chrema).224 His alliance with the Heruli settled in the area of Singidunum had already been sealed two decades before this event when the Herul king was baptized in Constantinople and left home with many gifts, not before Justinian reiterated his intention to call on the Heruli when their military assistance would be required.225

---


From an archaeological perspective the Heruli are still hard to trace. The same cannot be said about the Gepids who left a deep cultural imprint in the archaeological record of Transylvania and the Tisza valley, giving weight to Jordanes' identification of the region as "Gepidia." Justinian's relations with the Gepids fluctuated depending on the balance of power in Barbaricum, the emperor's agenda in the western Balkans, and the Gepids' own ambitions as they reconquered the important city of Sirmium in the 540s. Numismatic evidence points to subsidies sent by Justinian to the Gepid centers of power in Transylvania and Banat. Two light-weight solidi customarily used in political payments have been found at Gyula (Bekes, Hungary) and Banatski Karlovac (South Banat, Serbia), both dated 538-542. Three rare ceremonial silver pieces have been found at Gheorghe Doja and Lăureni, on the upper Mureș valley, and in an unspecified location in Arad County. The Mureș region was dominated by the important settlement of Morești, perhaps a Gepid center of power in Transylvania. As we have seen in the case of Transcaucasia such silver coins indicate diplomatic gifts, less

---


227 D. Tănase, "Pieze de aur din epoca migraţiilor în colecţia Muzeului Banatului din Timişoara," in Între stepă şi Imperiu. Studii în onoarea lui Radu Harboiu, ed. A. Măgureanu and E. Gál (Bucharest: Renaissance, 2010), 147, fig. 2/5a-b; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranzिţia de la anticltate," 69-70, n. 72.


valuable than the gold but more indicative of the emperor’s intentions as they had an exclusively ceremonial purpose. Four gold coins from Vădaș, Sângeorgiu de Câmpie, two other from unspecified locations in Mureș County and a solidus which was perhaps part of a large hoard found at Apalina strengthen the hypothesis of stipends received by the Gepids controlling this area.²³⁰ In addition, a large hoard (ca. 100 solidi and jewelry) attributed to the Gepids was found at Şeica Mică (Sibiu, Romania), but only 36 coins have been preserved with the most recent struck for Justin I.²³¹ To the west, in Banat a solidus of Justinian was found in a Gepid grave from Bočar (North Banat, Serbia).²³² Copper coins found occasionally in Transylvania were probably brought by those Gepids who served in the garrisons defending the Danube frontier or on other theaters as indicated by a 12-nummia piece from Alexandria found at Timişoara.²³³ The gold coins found in unknown circumstances at Beclean, Cetea, Oarda de Jos, Pecica, Şomcuta Mare and Vețel in other regions of Transylvania may reflect either direct payments from Byzantium or, more probably, redistributions in the Gepid kingdom, some perhaps resulting from a foedus signed in 552 in the eve of a new offensive in Italy.²³⁴


²³³ Lakatos, "Monede bizantine bizantine," 252, no. 44B.

Gepids, Heruli, and Longobards served in the Roman armies of Belisarius and Narses in Italy and some of the wealth accumulated in the service of the Empire is reflected in coin finds from their homelands. One method of tracing their movement is by looking at the mints issuing the coins found in the Carpathian Basin. Finds of coins from the Italian mints of Rome and Ravenna are recorded as far north as Poland. A quarter *siliqua* from Ravenna was found in an unspecified location in Slovenia and a *tremissis* comes from a grave in Rifnik (Šentjur, Slovenia). More silver Byzantine coins from Italy have been reported in Bavaria where the interests of Byzantium, the Franks, and the Ostrogoths colided during the age of Justinian. Bronze *dekanummia* from Rome were found at Sisak (Sisak-Moslavina, Croatia), Lovosice (Litoměřice, Czech Republic) and Przemyśl (Przemyśl, Poland). In addition, two 12-*nummia* pieces from Alexandria have been found at Osijek (Osijek-Baranja, Croatia) and Stillfried (Niederösterreich, Austria). Regardless of their ethnic background men from across Central Europe were attracted by warfare in Italy. The fact that many of these coins are small denominations, as are other finds from eastern mints such as the *pentanummia* found at Vienna and Osijek and the already mentioned *dekanummium.*

---


236 Drauschke, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 289 fig 14 and 294 fig. 18.


from Przemyśl (Przemyśl, Poland), points to the fact that their owners had access to urban markets.\(^{239}\) This is not to say that the large folles of Justinian, so popular in barbaricum north of the Lower Danube are absent in the Carpathian Basin. On the contrary, such coins are the most frequent Justinianic issues from Slovenia all the way north to Poland.\(^{240}\)

Soldiers fighting in Italy and perhaps political payments sent from Constantinople or redistributed in bilateral relations between different tribes in barbaricum are also reflected in single finds and hoards of gold coins. *Tremisses* which were the more popular gold denomination of Italy and the western kingdoms, unlike the case of Transcaucasia and the Lower Danube where they are rare finds, are well represented and their frequency increases as one moves westwards from the Middle Danube to Bavaria.\(^{241}\) Two hoards from Slovenia and Croatia, found at Vrh Pri Pahi and Sisak, respectively, included Byzantine issues as well as Longobard imitations after coins of

\(^{239}\) Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 343, no. 12b/1; Göricke-Lukić, "Justinijanov novac," 1151, no. 20.


Justinian, perhaps betraying the ethnic background of the owner. Other gold hoards concealed during the reign of Justinian have been found at Kötschach-Laas (Carinthia, Austria) and Zašovice (Třebíč, Czech Republic). The two *miliarensia* found at Rabka-Zdrój (Nowy Targ, Poland) have a ceremonial nature and they date from the initial stage of the war in Italy, although they may be also connected with developments in *barbaricum* occasioned by the migration of the Longobards southwards into Pannonia. Unfortunately not enough is known about the circumstances of the find but both coins were struck with the same pair of dies and probably represent a fraction of a larger payment, a homogeneous group of coins sent directly from the mint of Constantinople to their original recipient in *barbaricum*.

The density of finds in the Czech Republic, Bohemia in particular, is perhaps the most intriguing development of this period. Apart from six single finds of gold and copper coins, the region yielded no less than six hoards concealed during the reign of Justinian. Unfortunately, most of the hoards were found accidentally and were subsequently dispersed but the available specimens still offer a coherent picture of the coins handled in the region during the reign of Justinian. Except for the hoard from Žďár nad Sázavou all other hoards include ancient Roman coins aside from the early
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244 Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 504-05, no. 16 and 508, fig. 6-6-7. Another silver coin of Justinian was found in Poland at Chełm, but the exact circumstances of the find are uncertain; see Ibid., 500, no. 4.

245 An additional hoard found at Červený Hrádek was made of 20 coins of which only seven survive. The latest coin was struck for Justin I, but the hoard may in fact belong to the same horizon of hoards buried during the age of Justinian. See Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 368-69, no. C7.
Byzantine issues.\textsuperscript{246} The hoard from Hradec Králové includes a \textit{dekanummiun} from 540/1 and so does the hoard of 26 bronze coins from Prague, ending with a \textit{dekanummiun} from Carthage dated to the same year.\textsuperscript{247} Interestingly, the earliest coin in the hoard is a first century issue of Augustus. Only two coins have been retrieved from the hoard found at Žinkovy, but one is a \textit{dekanummiun} minted in Ravenna in the 540s.\textsuperscript{248} Finally, a hoard of 17 coppers from Turnov is made of small Late Roman AE4 pieces including a Vandal imitation, a small-module half-\textit{follis} of Anastasius and two \textit{dekanummiun} of Justinian.\textsuperscript{249} A few conclusions emerge from this enumeration. The owners of these small-value accumulations obviously had access to small change and perhaps deliberately selected small change for hoarding. Some have associated their deposition with ritual practice or with monetary transactions restricted to the elite, but neither seems plausible.\textsuperscript{250} Most of these hoards betray a western origin due to the presence of coins from Rome, Ravenna and Carthage. Contemporary hoards from North Africa and Italy are often large accumulations of small change reflecting the nature of the local monetary economy and it is conceivable that the similar but comparatively smaller hoards from the Czech Republic constitute groups of coins acquired by mercenaries hired in Justinian’s armies who fought in the west.\textsuperscript{251} An ethnic

\textsuperscript{246} Ibid., 380, no. M31.
\textsuperscript{248} Ibid., 369, no. C9.
\textsuperscript{249} Ibid., 362 and 371-73, no. C15.
\textsuperscript{250} Ibid., 365.
attribution of these finds is notoriously difficult and Czech scholars prefer the neutral label "late Germanic phase," although a more direct connection with the Longobards or groups associated with them is quite probable.\textsuperscript{252}

The rise of the Avar khaganate changed the balance of power in the Carpathian Basin. As early as 558 the Avars, still in the east, sent an embassy to Constantinople seeking an alliance and returned home with "cords worked with gold, couches, silken garment and a great many other objects."\textsuperscript{253} Such precious gifts turned out to be only the preamble of the literally tons of gold absorbed by the Khaganate after the Avars migrated to the Middle Danube just a decade later. A yearly tribute of 80,000 \textit{solidi} was agreed upon in 574 although Justinian might have sent additional subsidies between 558 and 565. An Avar offensive in the Balkans brought an increase of the tribute to 100,000 \textit{solidi} in 585 and again to 120,000 in 598. The treaty signed by Phocas in 604 may have incurred an additional increase of the tribute and so may have the negotiations conducted by Heraclius, who finally ended up agreeing to a staggering 200,000 \textit{solidi} in 623 when he desperately needed peace in the Balkans to stage his counteroffensive in Transcaucasia. Historians generally agree that some six million \textit{solidi} (ca. 25 tons of gold) were sent to Avaria between 568 and 626.\textsuperscript{254} Part of this gold was kept in the royal treasury of the khagan and some of the wealth accumulated in this period might have been seized by Charlemagne in 796. Einhard mentions "omnis pecunia et congesti ex longo tempore thesauri direpti sunt [...]," which might be taken

\begin{footnotes}
\item[252] Christie, \textit{The Lombards}, 65.
\end{footnotes}
as a reference to the Byzantine *solidi* accumulated in the Early Avar period. Some of the tribute, however, was distributed by the khagan to his warrior elite. Many coins were probably melted down to produce the spectacular jewelry often found in Avar-age cemeteries, while others ended up as "Charon’s obol" in graves, or were remodeled into finger rings or pendants.

Within a decade after their arrival in Pannonia, the Avars became the hegemonic power of the Carpathian Basin. Already in 566 the Longobard king Alboin renewed hostilities with the Gepids and achieved a decisive victory. The diplomatic initiatives related to this conflict would have long term consequences for the Danube region. Justin II first backed the Gepids on account of Cunimund’s promise to cede Sirmium to the Empire but his failure to deliver after an initial joint success against the Longobards resulted in a neutral stance of the emperor in the final stage of the conflict. The defeated Longobards were forced to seek the alliance of the Avars, themselves eager to gain a foothold in the western Balkans. The might of the Avars and possibly other political calculations led Alboin to Italy and it is perhaps now that the Longobards gained direct control over the important fortresses in Slovenia. Although Justinian granted them the entire region north of Dalmatia, the Byzantine copper coin finds from settlements such

---


as Rifnik, Ptuj, Sempeter, and Celje are more numerous in the period before 568 and are dominated by small change, *dekanummia* and half-*folles*, some from mints such as Rome and Salona, indicating a connection with the war effort. The hoard of *solidi* from Arnoldstein in Carinthia, which included imitations after *solidi* of Justinian and a light weight *solidus* of 22 *siliquae* from Ravenna, was probably concealed during the events leading to the Longobard conquest of northern Italy.258

The Gepid kingdom pulverized after Cunimund’s death on the battlefield, but Gepid cultural identity survived in a modified form under the rule of the Avars in Transylvania and under the Longobards in the west.259 Few gold coins of Justin II have been found in a clear Avar context, in graves from Șpâlnaca (Alba, Romania), Szentendre (Pest, Hungary) and Kőlked-Feketekapu (Baranya, Hungary) and provide only a *terminus post quem* for the dating of those complexes to the Early Avar period.260 Two times many more copper coins have been found in the region under the direct control of the Khaganate and Justin II is in fact the only Avar-age emperor whose copper coins are more abundant than the gold coins.261 This is the early stage of the Avar presence in the Carpathian basin marked by Justin’s refusal to continue paying the tribute, a policy maintained for a decade (565-575). On the other hand, the recent

---


259 On Gepid culture under the Avars, see R. Harhoiu, "Quellenlage und Forschungsstand der Frühgeschichte Siebenbürgens im 6.7. Jahrhundert," *Dacia* 43-45 (2001), 130-31 with the important cemetery from Bratei, for which see R. Harhoiu, "Where Did All the Gepids Go? A Sixth- to Seventh-Century Cemetery in Bratei (Romania)," in *Neglected Barbarians*, 209-44. See also Bóna, "Gepiden," 45. On German culture under the Avars, see A. Kiss, "Germanen im awarenzeitlichen Karpatenbecken," in *Awarenforschungen*, ed. F. Daim, vol. 1 (Vienna: Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte der Universität Wien, 1992), 35-134.

260 Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 56, no. 39, 79, no.66, and 87-88, no. 77. The cemetery from Szentendre also produced a *solidus* of Phocas, for which see Ibid., 88-89, no. 78.

recovery of Sirmium and the Gepid presence in Pannonia helped the distribution of copper coins to the north. Some of these coins are clearly connected with the military, such as the *follis* issued by a mobile military mint found at Carnuntum but also the half-*folles* of Thessalonica from Carnuntum and Tiszakeszi (Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Hungary) used to pay the soldiers defending the frontier in Illyricum.\(^{262}\) In addition, the prevalence of coins from Nicomedia rather than Contantinople is also revealing. The same dominance of issues from Nicomedia has been observed in other militarized frontier regions such as Transcaucasia and Arabia, but also in towns far from the major war theaters.\(^{263}\)

The arrival of the Avars did not completely disrupt connections between Central Europe and the Mediterranean world. A *dekanummium* from Carthage was found in Poland at Łódź showing little circulation wear, while *folles* from Nicomedia have been found at Sulejów (Poland) and in an unspecified location in Moravia.\(^ {264}\) In the Czech Republic a small hoard of silver and copper coins from Trajan Decius to Justin II (573/4) found at Bohouňovice continued the tradition of accumulations containing older Roman coins.\(^ {265}\) Intrestingly, no other hoards are recorded in Poland, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic until the seventh century. Although the indirect connection with Byzantium was never completely severed, a drastic reduction in coin finds can be noticed in the last quarter of the sixth century. Some scholars attributed this development to the arrival of


Slavic groups, but the hegemony exercised by the Avars is an equally plausible explanation, as the khagan had every reason to exploit the resources and the demographic potential of the region to his own benefit.\textsuperscript{266} On the western fringes of the Avar khaganate, however, the connection with the Mediterranean was not interrupted as testified by the finds of three \textit{dodekanummia} of Maurice and Phocas minted in Alexandria at Maria Saal and Vienna and two \textit{dekanummia} from Ravenna and Carthage, respectively, at Carnuntum (all in Austria).\textsuperscript{267}

Coin finds from the core regions of the Avar Khaganate confirm the flow of gold described by written sources.\textsuperscript{268} Graves from Kölked-Feketekapu, Tiszagyenda-Gői-tő, Pécs-Alsómakár-dülő, and Szentendre in Hungary produced gold coins of Justin II, Tiberius II, Maurice, and Phocas.\textsuperscript{269} Sometimes the coins are uncirculated (Szentendre) and many were used as \textit{oboli}, judging by their position in the grave, regardless of the social status of the deceased. The specimen from Tác-Gorsium is a hybrid imitation of \textit{solidi} of Tiberius II and Maurice.\textsuperscript{270} An imitation of Maurice was also found in


\textsuperscript{268} Territories in today’s Hungary, north-eastern Austria, south-western Slovakia, western Romania and Vojvodina in Serbia are considered to be part of the Avar khaganate proper. See Pohl, \textit{Die Awaren}, map 2.

\textsuperscript{269} Somogyi, \textit{Byzantinische Fundmünzen}, 56, no. 39, 57, no. 41/2, 87-88, no. 77 and 88-89, no. 78; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 279-280, no. 10 and 284-85, no. 15.

\textsuperscript{270} Somogyi, \textit{Byzantinische Fundmünzen}, 89-90, no. 80.
Transylvania at Rupea (Brașov, Romania) evidencing the extension of Avar influence to the east. Copper coins were usually deposited as oboli but they were also quite often part of waist purses as indicated by the burial assemblages from Jutas, Kőlked-Feketekapu, Egerlövő, and Várpalota in Hungary. They were found together with other small objects, but no other coins, so the existence of coin purses is out of the question. In other cases the coins were perforated to be worn on a necklace or perhaps attached to a piece of garment as indicated by the finds from Nyíregyháza-Kertgazdaság (a light weight solidus perforated twice) and Tác-Gorsium, but the fashion of using Byzantine coins as jewelry would become more popular on coins of the Heraclian house.

The proportion of surviving gold coins, most of them from burial assemblages and stray finds, does not correspond to the evolution of the tribute recorded by Byzantine writers. Based on the available information and allowing for an almost uninterrupted flow of gold according to the treaties, no less than 3.8 million solidi had already reached Avaria by 610. Even if we accept that payments were temporarily discontinued during years of intense warfare in the Balkans in the 580s but especially the late 590s when the Byzantine army was successful, still it is reasonable to suggest that 50 percent of the total amount of gold dispatched to the Avars had already been paid by the accession of Heraclius. How, then, are we going to account for the fact that the numismatic evidence from the core regions of the khaganate present us with a disproportionate ratio weighing heavily in favor of coins from the reign of Heraclius? A

272 Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 38-39, no. 21, 48-49, no. 33, 57, no. 41/1, and 93, no. 84.
273 Ibid., 67-68, no. 52
recent updated inventory of gold coin finds from Avaria confirms the fact that only 36 finds can be dated from the period between 565 and 610, while no less than 49 coins date from the reign of Heraclius. In fact no less than 29 coins date from 616-625 which corresponds to the highest level reached by the tribute.  

Starting from the second decade of the seventh century the Avars and Slavs ravaged the provinces of the Balkans and dealt a final blow to the already crumbling defensive system on the Lower Danube. There is no clear indication that internal developments led to the decision to keep the wealth received from Byzantium in monetary form. To be sure, the khagan had to maintain a sizable treasury, especially after the flow of gold from Constantinople was interrupted in 626, as the loyalty of the peoples under his suzerainty depended on gifts and displays of authority. The only important development is an increasing tendency to use Byzantine coins as jewelry (rings, pendants), rather than melting them down, a practice documented from Transylvania to the eastern Merovingian world. On the other hand, tribute was not the only means of gaining access to Byzantine gold. Plunder and ransom for prisoners paid in coin were important alternatives, albeit harder to quantify by the modern historian.

However, plunder in the Balkans cannot fully account for the overwhelmingly superior number of coins minted for Heraclius found in the Carpathian basin, especially


277 A nephew of Heraclius was ransomed for an unspecified sum of money (chremata), which probably brought additional gold to Avaria in the decades following the failed siege of Constantinople. For the episode, see Nikephoros, Breviarum, 21, ed. Mango, 70-71.
since many finds are light weight \textit{solidi} of 20 \textit{siliqua}e dated between 616-625, probably issued for external payments.\footnote{Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 235-36.} Petér Somogyi listed four other issues of light weight \textit{solidi} of 20 \textit{siliqua}e of Phocas and three \textit{solidi} of Maurice worth between 20 and 23 \textit{siliqua}e,\footnote{Ibid., 234.} which indicates that the practice was probably intensified after the peace of 584 when Maurice agreed to increase the tribute to 100,000 \textit{solidi}.ootnote{For the historical context, see Whitby, \textit{The Emperor Maurice}, 142.} Such finds best reflect the redistribution system in the Avar khaganate, but also in its wider area of influence, as testified by the finds from Bohuslavice (Hodonín, Czech Republic), Kšely (Kolín, Czech Republic), and Żółków (Jasło, Poland), as well as by a large hoard of some 300 \textit{solidi} found at Firtușu in Transylvania.\footnote{Bohuslavice and Kšely: Militký, " Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 360 and 376, no. C23-24; 361 and 381-82, no. M37. Żółków: Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 506, no. 19 and 511, fig. 6/14. Firtușu: Somogyi, \textit{Byzantinische Fundmünzen}, 137-38.} Some of the light weight \textit{solidi} from the core areas of the Khaganate were used as jewelry such as the specimens from the burial assemblages uncovered at Sânpetru German, Tiszavasvári-Kashalom-dűlő, Szendrő, Kiszombor-Tanyahalom-dűlő, and Hajdúdorog-Városkert.\footnote{Somogyi, \textit{Byzantinische Fundmünzen}, 43-44, no. 27 and 77, no. 65; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 274-275, no. 7, 283-284, no. 14, and 286-287, no. 17.}

In regions west of the Avar center of power western mints continued to play an important role, Italy being the most probable mediator of contacts with the central and eastern Mediterranean world. North African copper coins of Phocas and Heraclius minted at Carthage were found at Sisak, Carnuntum, and Ostrówek (Otwock, Poland), while \textit{dodekanummia} of Alexandria have been recorded at Carnuntum and Maria Saal
in Austria. A countermarked follis from Sicily and a *dekanummium* from Catania have been found Ptuj and Carnuntum, respectively. Finally, a rare half-*follis* minted at Alexandretta in Syria during the revolt of the Heraclii (608-610) was found in Slovakia at Štúrovo, but the exact circumstances of the find have not yet been published. A hoard was found at Kluk (Nymburk, Czech Republic) in a flooded sand quarry but only one specimen has been preserved, a half-*follis* minted at Carthage in 606-607. The practice of burying hoards of small change brought from a Mediterranean milieu would continue in Bohemia until the second half of the seventh century.

At least three major differences characterize coin finds from the Khaganate proper. First, no copper coin finds from western mints are so far known from the core areas of Avaria, although those are present in the Lower Danube *barbaricum* and further east in Transcaucasia. Only three gold coins issued by western mints are recorded in Avaria, but only the *solidus* of Constans II minted in Rome has a precise finding place as well as an archaeological context, having been found in a grave from the Avar-age cemetery of Hajdúnánás-Fürjhalom-járás (Hajdú-Bihar, Hungary). This is somewhat unexpected since the Avars raided as far as Cividale, sacked in 611,

---


285 J. Hunka, *Finds of Byzantine Coins from the 5th-10th Century From the Northern Part of the Carpathian Basin,* in *Byzantine Coins in Central Europe,* 397, table 1, no. 8.


287 Hajdúnánás-Fürjhalom-járás: Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen,* 272-273, no. 5. In addition, an unprovenienced *tremissis* of Maurice from Rome in the collection of the museum in Miskolc and a *solidus* of Heraclius from Ravenna in the National Museum in Budapest, for which see Ibid., 291-92, no. 22; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen,* 101-102, no. 91.
where they could have gained easy access to precious coins from western mints. Second, no certain hoards are known either, which places the Khaganate in sharp contrast with the surrounding areas. To be sure, there is some indication of gold coin hoards found in the nineteenth century at Bernecebaráti (Pest, Hungary), Kupusina (West Bačka, Serbia) and Bački Monoštor (West Bačka, Serbia), but they have been dispersed and no coins have been retrieved. Moreover, the available information suggests that none of them was later than 610. Given the large quantity of Byzantine gold pouring into the Avar khaganate, the absence of hoards in its core areas is quite perplexing. It is no less true that extremely few Avar settlements are known, most of the archaeological knowledge of the Avar period being derived from burial assemblages in which the deposition of large hoards is not customary. Finally, there is very little silver in Avaria, unlike the silver frenzy across Transcaucasia and the modest but still evident flow of hexagrams to the peripheral areas under the hegemony of the Avars.

Hexagrams of Heraclius are known from Sânnicolaul Mare (Timiș, Romania), Arad (Arad, Romania), Linz (Oberösterreich, Austria), and Szadzko (Stargard, Poland). Wherever they are found in great quantities silver pieces are connected with major theaters of war or with political payments sent to allies, which the Empire perhaps did not consider important enough to require gold subsidies.

The flow of Byzantine gold to Avaria dropped abruptly after 626, and despite the attempt of Attila Kiss to suggest that tribute continued to be paid in smaller amounts

---

after the failed siege of Constantinople, the numismatic evidence found in archaeological context indicates that the Avar khaganate no longer presented a serious threat for Byzantium. No coins struck between 625 and 655 have been found in archaeological context and the finds from burial assemblages dated from the second half of the seventh century indicate a drastically diminished flow of gold from Byzantium.\textsuperscript{291} Still, the renewed infusion of Byzantine coins after a few decades of partial interruption requires an explanation. Continuous, albeit reduced, tribute paid by Heraclius’ successors or the association with the migration of a Bulgar group into Avaria following the death of Kubrat are not satisfactory solutions.\textsuperscript{292} The most plausible so far has been Péter Somogyi’s suggestion that the shifting balance of power in the wide region between the Middle Danube and the Caucasus around 650 may have led to renewed diplomatic relations between Byzantium and the weaker Avar khaganate. The Avar embassy of 678 and the plausible assumption that Constans II and Constantine IV feared the growing power of the Onogur Bulgars provide sufficient grounds for this interpretation.\textsuperscript{293} Gold \textit{solidi} continued to be used as \textit{oboli} as testified by the graves from Gyenesdiás, Hajdúnánás-Fürjhalom-járás, and Kiskundorozsma in Hungary.\textsuperscript{294} The scarcity of coins in the period after 626 often led to the use of symbolic round-
shaped pieces of gold as oboli or the reuse of old Roman coins for this purpose as testified by burial assemblages from Hungary and Slovakia dating from this period.295

Before the final assault on the Byzantine capital or perhaps shortly after, the Slavs rebelled under the leadership of Samo, who took advantage of the long-term repercussions of the Avar defeat at Constantinople and established a 35-year-long reign over what is often described as "Samo's empire" stretching from the Elbe to the Middle Danube and the Drava.296 The gold coins and imitations after coins of Heraclius and Constans II found in the Czech Republic and Slovakia at Kšely, Kolín, Bohuslavice, Mostova, and Šaľa have been associated with Samo's ephemeral political entity.297 Seventh-century finds from Poland have also been associated with a Slavic population. The follis of Heraclius (613/4) from Grodzisko Dolne was found in a Slavic settlement, while the hexagram from Szadzko and the solidus from Żółków are accidental finds.298 The hoard of precious objects from Poštorná in Moravia which included jewelry of Byzantine inspiration, as well as other Byzantine finds from the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Poland suggest some level of contact with Byzantine culture.299

298 Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 500-01, no. 6 and 511, fig. 6/12; 505-06, no. 18 and 511, fig. 6/13; 506, no. 19 and 511, fig. 6/14.
299 For the Byzantine influence in Poland, see M. Wołoszyn, "Die byzantinischen Fundstücke in Polen. Ausgewählte Probleme," in Byzantium and East Central Europe, ed. G. Prinzing and M. Salamon
Two hoards from the Czech Republic, found at Hrozová and Poděbrady were concealed in the eve or soon after Samo’s confederation disintegrated. Slavic influence to the south, perhaps as far as Slovenia, explains the uninterrupted access to the Mediterranean. The structure of the hoards betrays a western origin. The small accumulation found during archaeological excavations on the left bank of the Hrozová river is made of four bronze coins, all issues from Carthage, including a Carthaginian issue of Zeugitania from the third century BC. The last coin is a rare follis of Constans II from Carthage, dated 662-667. Most probably the coins were brought as a homogeneous group from Tunisia, via Italy. Coins of Constans II including issues from western mints have been found in Slovenia, at Celje and Ptuj, and in Austria, at Neulengbach and Wiener Neustadt indicating a possible communication bridge linking the Mediterranean, Bohemia, and Moravia.

The hoard from Poděbrady, of which only seven coins have been preserved, includes only early Byzantine coins, from Justin II to Constans II (last coin 651-657), and displays an array of mints but mostly western, from Catania, Rome, and Carthage. Once again an origin in North Africa is quite conceivable. This may be related with Constans II’s attempt to take advantage of the First Fitna (656-661) and check the Arab expansion to the west, as he did in Transcaucasia. In fact the emperor established himself in Sicily in 663 and imposed heavy taxation on southern Italy and North Africa,


while at the same time trying to stabilize the political situation in Africa.\textsuperscript{302} Communities in Bohemia maintained a century-long connection with North Africa and Italy, undocumented by written evidence, and probably established in the context of Justinian’s western reconquista and the barbarization of his armies.

Finally, the hoard from Zemianský Vrbovok (Zvolen, Slovakia), concealed after 669-674, is not only the northernmost collective find of Byzantine silver but also a unique accumulation in many respects.\textsuperscript{303} It is the upscale version of the hoard of coins and scrap bronze concealed at Horgești in Moldavia at the beginning of the seventh century and can be compared only to the collections of Late Roman coins and scrap silver from Gudme in Denmark.\textsuperscript{304} Because of the association of coins with silver bowls, plate (Sassanian), jewelry, and scrap silver the hoard from Zemianský Vrbovok was attributed to a silversmith, perhaps Byzantine, who worked for the Avars and catered to the tastes of the barbarian elite.\textsuperscript{305} To be sure, the association of seventh-century Byzantine silver coins with silver jewelry is not unique to Zemianský Vrbovok. A contemporary but much larger hoard of hexagrams found at Priseaca in Oltenia included two star-shaped silver earings. However, most of the coins from Zemianský


Vrbovok are not hexagrams but *miliarenses*, ceremonial issues of irregular weight, two times lighter than the regular silver coinage. The coins are die-linked and uncirculated which confirms the supposition that they represent a diplomatic gift of freshly minted coins.\textsuperscript{306} One early *miliarensis* of Constans II was found in Georgia, the most important region for the distribution of Byzantine ceremonial silver pieces.\textsuperscript{307} The same region produced the two die-linked gold hoards found at Chibati and Nokalakevi, which represent homogeneous groups sent as payment from Constantinople, much like the collection from Zemianský Vrbovok. Much closer to Slovakia, another *miliarensis* of Constans II was found in a grave from Stejanovci (Vojvodina, Serbia).\textsuperscript{308} In addition, the Kiskőröš-type silver imitations after *miliarenses* struck for Constans II and Constantine IV prove that they had been widely known in the Avar khaganate.\textsuperscript{309} In conclusion, the hoard from Zemianský Vrbovok may indeed have belonged to a craftsman, but the coins were most probably part of an imperial largesse, which the recipient subsequently gave away as raw material for the production of jewelry and plate. The gift may have been occasioned by one of the Avar-Byzantine contacts preceding the embassy of 678 and it is quite probable that the hexagrams of Constans II and Constantine IV were random additions to the homogeneous group of *miliarensia* of Constans II sent to Avaria during the emperor’s lifetime.\textsuperscript{310}

\textsuperscript{306} *DOC* II, 19.

\textsuperscript{307} Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 70, no. 220 and pl. XIII/220.

\textsuperscript{308} Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 78-79, no. 68.

\textsuperscript{309} Ibid., 127.

\textsuperscript{310} Somogy’s suggestion that Constantine IV would give away as diplomatic gifts ceremonial issues of his predecessor is unlikely and might have been ill-received by the Avar envoys. See Somogyi, “New Remarks on the Flow,” 132.
6.3 Money and "barbarians": Same Coins, Different Functions

After discussing the historical contexts which facilitated access to Byzantine coins in *barbaricum* we should now turn to the other main problem, the function of money in societies living beyond the frontier of the early Byzantine Empire. It is a widely accepted postulate that money has no economic function beyond the political borders of the issuing authority. That is not to say that coins cannot perform any economic function whatsoever. It basically means that the state no longer guarantees the value of the currency, the exchange rate, and the enforcement of other regulations in place. This fact alone affects Byzantine money in different ways depending on the metal. Gold and silver coins were hardly the currency used on a daily basis at the marketplace. The main purpose of gold was to create a means for the payment of salaries and the collection of taxes, and of course, to serve as a medium of exchange in large-scale transactions. As we have already seen, the main purpose of silver, at least until the introduction of the hexagram in the seventh century, was ceremonial. It served no economic monetary function although it was loosely struck on the weight standard of the *siliqua* or the *miliarensis*. Consequently, we should not expect any monetary function of gold and silver Byzantine coins found in *barbaricum*. It is common knowledge that despite the Roman law prohibiting the export of precious coin, large quantities of coined gold were sent to *barbaricum* or to Persia in the form of political and diplomatic payments, almost never to return back to Byzantium. As already hinted in the previous sections Byzantine gold and silver coins were mainly used for non-economic purposes, as jewelry or raw material for the production of jewelry and dress accessories, and for the ritual deposition in graves.
The function of copper coins, however, is much more problematic. This was the currency most frequently circulated in the Byzantine provinces, being the main facilitator of small-scale transactions in urban markets. Although the highly militarized environment of the northern Balkans dominated by hilltop fortresses rather than urban agglomerations was not characterized by a "market economy," copper coins still performed their designated monetary function. The major question, therefore, is what happened to these coins once they crossed the Empire's frontier on the Lower Danube. Given the geographical density of finds in today's Romania and Moldova, most scholars have preferred an economic interpretation of these coins, part and parcel of what seemed to be an extension of the Byzantine monetary economy beyond the frontier. It is not surprising that most scholars working on this topic in the past decades have analyzed the presence of Byzantine copper coins almost exclusively in terms of an "intense monetary circulation" or at least an "active circulation" after the reform of Anastasius which brought an "economic impetus" in barbaricum.\(^{311}\)

Most of the time the use of small-value currency was ascribed to the local Romanic population, in place since the time of the Roman province of Dacia, as an ethnic antithesis to waves of migratory peoples who did not have the benefit of a time-

honored tradition of economic contact with the Roman Empire. Some scholars have
gone as far as to suggest that Byzantine coins were also used for internal trade, i.e.
horizontal exchanges between communities in Barbaricum apropiat, as opposed to
vertical dealings with Byzantium.\(^{312}\) Along these lines, coins were used for tracing the
arrival of new ethnic groups, interruptions in "coin circulation" signifying the disruption of
normal relations between the autochtonous population and the Byzantine Empire
provoked by peoples ignorant of monetary transactions.\(^{313}\) Although the
uncompromising thesis of a true coin circulation has been undermined in the past
decade, the larger paradigm has not been challenged.\(^{314}\) Lip service has been given to
alternative functions performed by Byzantine coins and to the realization that societies
of quite different ethnic background handled Byzantine coins, but such vistas have not
been properly explored.\(^{315}\)

Unfortunatelly Byzantine sources tell us little about the use of Byzantine coins in
\textit{barbaricum} and there is virtually no useful information about trade. Information about
the political organization and the social structure of societies in \textit{barbaricum} is
fragmentary at best and comes exclusively from Byzantine writers who filtered realities

\(^{312}\) Corman, \textit{Contribuții la istoria}, 99; Velter, \textit{Transilvania în secolele V-XII}, 35.

\(^{313}\) Teodor, \textit{Descoperiri arheologice și numismatiche}, 12; Oberländer, "Barbaricum apropiat," 332-58. For a
more nuanced interpretation see E. S. Teodor, "Ceramica așezărilor din secolul al VI-lea de la
Dulceanca," in \textit{Istro-Pontica: Muzeul tulcean la a 50-a aniversare, 1950-2000; omagiu lui Simion Gavriliă
la 45 de ani de activitate}, ed. M. Iacob, E. Oberländer-Târnoveanu, and F. Topoleanu (Tulcea: Consiliul
Județean, 2000), 330, n. 195 who argued that Slavs could also be interested in handling Byzantine coins,
only to conclude later that the interruption of the coin flow may be connected with the massive arrival of
Savic groups, for which see E. S. Teodor, "O frontieră incertă a lumii romane – Cîmpia Dunării de Jos în

\(^{314}\) See especially Oberländer, "La monnaie byzantine," 177-81; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 239-46.

\(^{315}\) Oberländer, "La monnaie byzantine," 182. For the function of Byzantine coins as raw material for the
production of bronze jewelry and dress accessories, see A. Gândilă, "Face Value or Bullion Value? Early
from *barbaricum* through their own cultural sieve. Archaeology can certainly shed more light on these issues, especially future research if conducted with such questions in mind. For the time being, however, the only avenue leading to a better understanding of the use of money by "barbarians" is the parallel with more recent traditional societies in contact with capitalist states using a carefully regulated currency. The methodological limitations of such an approach are readily apparent and difficult to overcome. Naturally, the economy of Europe from the Age of Discovery onward is quite different from the economy of the early Byzantine Empire. Moreover, the particular culture of each "primitive" society studied by anthropologists, which also translates in the way foreign currencies were perceived and adopted, invites to caution in pushing comparison beyond the level of generality.

Nonetheless, some similarities make this a worthwhile endeavor. Although Byzantine influence in *barbaricum* cannot be equated with the colonial administration of modern empires, the exposure of village societies to an alien economic system based on the use of money remains quite similar and might have elicited comparable general responses regardless of time and space. To be sure, territories in *barbaricum* were never directly administered by Byzantium. Several attempts by Justinian to encroach upon the internal autonomy of Armenia and Lazica ended in rebellion and no similar administrative ambitions can be traced in the northern Balkans aside from the settlement of various ethnic groups as *foederati* with the purpose of defending the frontier. As a result the use of money was never officially implemented, nor was taxation, although it was mentioned as one of the chief reasons for the defection of the Lazi in 541. Consequently, the role of Byzantine coins in *barbaricum* cannot be fully
equated with the function of money in "primitive societies" integrated in European colonial empires. However, much can be learned from the initial responses to the introduction of European currency in the earlier stages of contact predating the direct annexation or even in the early colonial period.

At the very least the comparison can be reduced to the shared denominator of cultural contact between monetized states and stateless non-monetized societies. There are three major topics able to provide important comparative insights into the possible functions performed by Byzantine coins in *barbaricum*: alternative "monetary instruments" used by traditional societies, the motivation behind the use of foreign currencies, and the morality of exchange mediated by money.

The fact that traditional societies did not use money with the physical resemblance and the general purpose function of western currencies does not mean that they did not employ other instruments of exchange. What makes them different from the European all-purpose money is their dual function as economic instruments and symbolic objects used in rituals and ceremonies. Their power was not so much derived from their intrinsic properties, although that was also important, as from their socially embedded value. This duality reflects the dichotomy between economic and

---


In the early modern period and in some places until the twentieth century, cowrie shells were used as the main medium of exchange. The cowrie (\textit{cypraea moneta}) cannot be fully defined as "international currency" despite the fact that it was widely used from Africa to Oceania because its value and exchange rate were locally determined based on idiosyncratic criteria seldom dictated by economic principles. Nevertheless, the use of such standardized objects as medium of exchange was facilitated by the development of long distance trade where a mutually accepted instrument was required. Cowries and beads introduced by Europeans played this role for the greater part of the modern period. Moreover, cowries should not be treated as an eminently primitive monetary instrument. The cowrie system knew various lower denominations, forgeries, agreed upon prices and exchange rates, as well as the dire consequences of inflation which could render large accumulations practically worthless.\footnote{C. A. Gregory, \textit{Savage Money: The Anthropology and Politics of Commodity Exchange} (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 1997), 236-42.} The most revealing example for the "modern" nature of cowrie-based transactions is the economy of Kapauku Pauans, who had a primitive monetary
economy, including credit, the dominance of profit-motivated transactions, and prices regulated by demand and supply.\textsuperscript{319}

Other monetary instruments included coins made of clay of different shapes, usually pierced, used by the Sao peoples in Camerun, Chad and Nigeria.\textsuperscript{320} Most of them were star-shaped and their value depended on the number of corners and whether they were pierced or not. Much like other primitive forms of currency such clay coins were also used as symbolic offerings.\textsuperscript{321} The Buduma in the region of Lake Chad, the Lamba from Congo and the Baruya from New Guinea used units of salt as their main medium of exchange.\textsuperscript{322} In Madagascar before the colonial period cattle was the main medium of exchange and means of storing wealth.\textsuperscript{323} The Kotoko from Chad used stone coins in the precolonial period, mainly sone axes and smaller pieces of stone as lower denominations.\textsuperscript{324} Rolled strips of cotton and a variety of iron objects were other acceptable monetary instruments in Central Africa.\textsuperscript{325} Cloth was the most important type of currency in Guiné the Cape Verde islands. Various agricultural products and cotton


\textsuperscript{320} For a comprehensive list of primitive money across the ages, see especially Einzig, Primitive Money, 29-308.


\textsuperscript{325} Lebeuf "Monnaies arcaïques africaines ", 72-80; Dorsinfang-Smets, "Les moyens d'échange," 102-03.
were used in the Andes as monetary instruments in the precolumbian period, while in Mesoamerica cocoa beans and large white cotton cloaks (*quachtli*) served this purpose.\(^{326}\) Even in the early colonial period cocoa beans and Spanish coins circulated side by side with regulated exchange rates between the two accepted monetary instruments.

The main motivation behind the use of foreign currencies was the demand for cash revenue, which forced cultivators to sell a portion of their crop as well as manufactured goods to raise money. Much like the case of Byzantine villages, in well-established colonial settings money was needed to pay taxes but in many other cases foreign money was the only form of payment one could use to purchase foreign goods needed in the household or to increase the social prestige of the owner.\(^{327}\) European coins introduced in Congo in the 1920s were used primarily to procure Western goods.\(^{328}\) The Azande saw money as a special type of instrument needed to get access to goods they could not produce themselves and almost nothing was spent on subsistence goods.\(^{329}\) The Hausa people in Nigeria first encountered western coins when traders from the Mediterranean coast of North Africa extended their business to the south. Payment had to be made in coin and the local elite had to raise cash in order


to buy western products such as weapons. To the Lhomi from Nepal money was useful for purchasing cooking oil, lamps, and medicine from the bazaar. In most cases however, coinage was not needed or was even banned from the purchase of food or other locally produced subsistence goods and the general impression is that nothing indispensable was bought with coins. In this sense the western goods procured by primitive societies resemble the luxury Roman goods acquired by barbarian elites to bolster their social standing.

One of the keys to understanding whether communities in barbaricum accepted Byzantine coins as a form of payment is to determine the level of trust needed for such transactions to take place. The value of the copper follis fluctuated a great deal in the sixth century, usually downwards, being constantly depreciated in relation to the gold solidus. Ethnographic parallels suggest that non-monetized village communities were reluctant to use money and preferred barter. It has been shown that for many Africans money was something eminently unsecure, something to get rid of before it becomes worthless. People as diverse as the Nepalese, the Nigerians, the Kwaio from Solomon Islands, and the Greek villagers from Ambéli on the island of Euboea distrusted money because of its unstable value and fiduciary nature.

---


Moreover, no issuing state wants to see its coinage drain outside the frontier, especially when it is not token coinage but essentially commodity-money. The Byzantine legislation prohibiting the export of precious-metal coins finds an interesting equivalent in modern concerns with the same issue. The natives in Madagascar got so fond of European silver that they accepted only monetary payments in exchange for their goods. Fearing that large quantities of silver will be lost European powers were desperately trying to discourage this practice complaining that “the silver 5 Franc pieces are diligently sought by the natives from Madagascar in exchange for their products which they would not sell, most often, unless they are paid in piasters which they bury with their dead or convert into ornaments and jewelry” as testified by a document from 1867. Such practices were sometimes a form of resistance to the ambitions of the colonial state, like the case of British West Africa where the Africans continued to melt down European money and use indigenous currencies instead.

In the initial phase of contact silver coins were acquired like any other European object and used as ornaments in necklaces or bracelets. The most common silver coins were piasters, reali ("pieces of eight"), and especially Maria Theresa thalers. Again the economic vs non-economic duality is present. The case of the Swahili pre-colonial

---


335 H. Fuller, "From Cowries to Coins: Money and Colonialism in the Gold Coast and British West Africa in the early 20th Century," in *Money in Africa*, 60. African nickel coins, which had a hole in the center, were used by carpenters and smiths as washers for nails and screws, see A. A. Lawal, "The Currency Revolution in British West Africa: An Analysis of Some Early Problems," in *Money in Africa*, 63.

Kilwa Islamic coinage is a case in point. The town of Kilwa Kisiwani on the Swahili coast minted its own coinage in the name of various sultans from the eleventh through the fifteenth century. Most of the coins were copper issues destined for local circulation but their function was not exclusively economic. Many were used as commemorative objects and some five percent of the coins were pierced indicating that they were used as pendants.337 This is strikingly similar to the figure of ca. seven percent calculated for the number of pierced folles of Justinian, probably used for the same purpose.338 On the other hand, monetary dealings with foreigners were done only in precious-metal coinage. Nicolas Mayeur, an eighteenth-century trader and traveler in Madagascar drew attention to the fact that the Merina are willing to accept "any coins provided they are of silver and have the proper weight," adding that "they may accept scrap or crafted silver but prefer it monetized and are even willing to lower their prices if they know that payment will be done in coin."339 The adoption of European coins as an accepted form of currency in Madagascar led to the practice of cutting the coins in halves and quarters and as small as 1/720 of the original size, in order to be used as lower denominations.340


Indeed, one of the most important functions of foreign coins in primitive societies on four different continents was that of jewelry or bullion for the production of bracelets, necklaces and earrings and sometimes jewelry played the role of monetary instrument. This practice is clearly reflected in Jacques Dez’s observations in Madagascar:

In this non-monetized country coins were originally integrated in the local system according to their intrinsic value not based on their monetary function. Coins were nothing else but objects to be bartered. They could be assembled to create dress sets or melted down to produce silver jewelry or silver blades to be deposited in royal coffins.

The use of metal in different forms and shapes as currency was well-known in Africa. Copper bars were used as currency in Niger, a fact recognized by Ibn Battuta who visited the region in 1352. Small wire-like objects (3-4cm long) called “fils à double tête” were used in political centers of the empires of Ghana and Mali between the eleventh and the fourteenth century and various copper ingots were used in the Copperbelt region of Central Africa. The Mongo from Congo used red copper cylinders or copper jewelry as media of exchange. In addition, the so-called Katanga crosses made of copper (weighing ca. 750g or more) were valued for the metal and

---


342 Dez, "Monnaie et structures traditionnelles," 181: "La monnaie à l’origine, dans ce pays qui ne connaissait pas la monnaie, sera également reçue comme devant être intégrée dans ce système, c’est-à-dire prise dans sa nature matérielle et non comme signe monétaire. Elle ne sera rien d’autre qu’un objet de troc, et les pièces de monnaie se retrouveront réunies en parure, ou fondues pour faire de bijoux d’argent, ou des lames d’argent qui seront déposées dans les cercueils royaux." It was said that king Radama, who died in 1828, was buried in a silver coffin made from fourteen thousand Spanish silver coins, weighing almost 375 kg and several other examples are known from the nineteenth century. See Chauvicourt and Chauvicourt, *Numismatique malgache*, 7.


melted down to produce copper jewelry. The smaller versions are often found in burial assemblages dating from the Early Modern period.\textsuperscript{345} Similarly, the Tiv people in Nigeria used three-foot brass rods as money, which they often melted down to cast jewelry.\textsuperscript{346} The Lhomi from Nepal melted down silver coins to produce bracelets or betls or used the coins as jewelry, sewing them on women’s hats or turning them into finger rings.\textsuperscript{347} The Fali from Cameroon used pierced French and English silver coins to adorn leather bands worn around their heads.\textsuperscript{348} The same social prestige was sought by villagers from Ambéli in Euboea who displayed their wealth by having a gold coin sewn on to the front of shoes to be worn on special occasions.\textsuperscript{349} Iconography is also important as testified by the case of the silver 5 Franc piece displaying Hercules and two muses (Trinity allegory) often used as pendant on silver necklaces worn by young men from Madagascar.\textsuperscript{350}

Finally, the morality of monetary exchanges goes back to Aristotle and is one of the main topics studied by anthropologists in relation to the use of money in primitive societies.\textsuperscript{351} It is undeniable that money carried a negative symbolism in many


\textsuperscript{347} Humphrey, "Barter and Economic Disintegration," 63.


\textsuperscript{349} Du Boulay, \textit{Portrait of a Greek Mountain Village}, 244.

\textsuperscript{350} Kus and Raharijaona, "Small Change in Madagascar," 47-48.

The traditional system of exchange in most village societies was some form of barter. In many cases this remained the preferred form of exchange even after the introduction of European money. Whether we are talking about the Lhomi of Nepal, the Merina of Madagascar or the east African farmers in Kenya barter was dominated by the idea of equal exchange, a morally acceptable and socially fulfilling means of acquiring subsistence goods.  

European money was seen as a potential threat to the social structures in place. Money served to depersonalize social relations, to simplify them and reduce their meaning. The case of Madagascar is perhaps the best documented. The Merina in Madagascar drew a clear distinction between unpaid work performed as community service (miasa) and wages received from foreigners (mikarama), the latter gaining a clearly negative connotation when they interfered with ancestral laws. For the peoples of the eastern coast "money is presented as having a power eminently corrosive, it is the main reason for the destruction of kinship, the binding solidarities of the village." As a consequence, those who were employed and received money wages from foreigners were excluded from the village community, becoming themselves strangers through their economic position.

---


356 Ibid., 164.
The same threat to the authority of the elders can be perceived in the function of money in Dande communities from Zimbabwe, who were slightly more liberal with the acceptance of coins so long as it did not destroy social traditions. The Kwaio from Solomon Islands are more conservative and refuse to allow the use of cash in prestige economy, drawing a clear distinction between European and traditional Kwaio practices. The means by which money was acquired was also important. In Kenya and Gambia, money obtained through theft, usury or by accident is considered "bitter money," boding ill for its owner.

Money was often "purified" to gain a neutral or even positive symbolism. In Madagascar money was often obtained as payment for agricultural products but it was spent on prestige-gaining activities such as building houses or honoring the ancestors by building funerary monuments. Another form of purification was the royal ceremony in which the king received tokens of deference (hasina) in the form of coins. In Fiji the traditional ritual of fundraising presupposed the purification of money through the ceremony of "drinking cash". Coins also had a magic symbolism, which was usually connected to the symbolism of precious metals, or to their apotropaic force, known from

---

357 D. Lan, "Resistance to the Present by the Past: Mediums and Money in Zimbabwe," in Money and the Morality of Exchange, 203.
358 Akin, "Cash and Shell Money," 113-26. The fear that money posed a threat to social structure was not universal. See for instance the case of the Kwanga from Papua New Guinea who did not draw an opposition between money and local media of exchange, K. Brison, "Money and the Morality of Exchange Among the Kwanga, East Sepik Province, Papua New Guinea" in Money and Modernity, 155-61.
359 Shipton, Bitter Money, 28, 72-73.
360 Althabe, "Circulation monétaire," 156.
ancient times.\textsuperscript{363} In Madagascar coins were used in rituals to insure immunity before appearing in court and were also used in purification rituals by being thrown into water before the ceremony of washing.\textsuperscript{364} In India silver rupee coins could symbolize deities and were kept in clay pots storing the spiritual wealth of the clan.\textsuperscript{365} In the Andes foreign coins are hoarded and buried into the ground constituting the treasure of the community, dug up and counted every year during a rain-calling ceremony (\textit{Chaopincha}).\textsuperscript{366} In Mexico, Central America and Columbia money was "baptized" to become officially acceptable.\textsuperscript{367} Common monetary instruments or specially designed ones were used as part of the traditional bride price in many primitive societies, such as Musanga shell disc money from Congo, but also on the Greek island of Euboea where gold coins were stored in chests to be given away as dowry.\textsuperscript{368}

What was the function of sixth-seventh century Byzantine coins in \textit{barbaricum}? Gold and silver coins clearly had no monetary role. They were stored for their intrinsic value and constituted objects of prestige, much like Roman coins in \textit{barbaricum} in the previous centuries.\textsuperscript{369} Hoards like the ones found at Chibati and Nokalakevi in Georgia,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{363} H. Maguire, "Magic and Money in the Early Middle Ages," \textit{Speculum} 72, no. 4 (1997): 1037-54.
\item \textsuperscript{364} Dez, "Monnaie et structures traditionelles," 182-83.
\item \textsuperscript{365} Gregory, \textit{Savage Money}, 71-72.
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Malo Pereschepyne in Ukraine and Zemianský Vrbovok in Slovakia indicate imperial gifts or political payments sent by Constantinople. The large number of gold coins found in burials and the frequency of *solidi* and *tremisses* pierced or modified to be worn as jewelry indicates that Byzantine coins played an important role in displaying social status in societies from *barbaricum*. Gold plated imitations of Byzantine *solidi* found in the Carpathian Basin and in the Ciscaucasia and produced for those who could not afford genuine pieces emphasizes the high demand for coins and underscores their non-economic function. Less than 200 gold coins have been found in the Carpathian Basin dominated by the Avars although perhaps other unproveniened coins from Central Europe museums can be added to increase the total. In any case, the number of surviving specimens is just a tiny fraction of the huge quantity of *solidi* sent to Avaria and reflects not only the usual survival rate of ancient coins but also the fact that many were melted down to produce jewelry.

The use of coins to produce jewelry in *barbaricum* has already been tested by finding correlations between the weight of coins and that of small pieces of jewelry, usually earrings with pendants and bracelets. However, such calculations are not always relevant or even required to demonstrate that coins were used as raw material. Goldsmiths cut coins as necessary to produce jewelry and ornaments as testified by the eighth-century workshop found at Beth She'an in Palestine where pieces of gold jewelry
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were found together with cut gold coins.\textsuperscript{372} The use of gold coins for such purposes is also confirmed by contemporary accounts. When discussing the external politics of Persia Theophylact Simocatta did not miss the chance to emphasize the Persians’ weakness who were compelled to send 40,000 gold \textit{solidi} every year to the Turks to keep them quiet. Lavished by such gifts "this particular nation had turned to great extravagance; for they hammered out gold couches, tables, goblets, thrones, pedestals, horse-trappings, suits of armor, and everything which has been devised by the inebriation of wealth."\textsuperscript{373}

Official payments from Constantinople were not the only means of distributing coins to \textit{barbaricum}. Plunder, ransom for prisoners, and enslavement of captives taken from the Byzantine provinces are the most important alternatives recoded by written sources. Additional possibilities, such as casual loss by mercenaries returning home, travelers or traders are other potential means by which coins arrived in \textit{barbaricum}. A clear distinction should be made between gold and copper coins when discussing such possibilities. Roman POWs and especially VIPs fallen in captivity were ransomed for gold coins without exception, when a monetary ransom is involved. In the fifth century the Huns required 9 gold pieces for each Roman POW.\textsuperscript{374} By 600 the Avars had much more modest demands when they requested one \textit{solidus} for each prisoner. The khagan was ready to bargain when Maurice refused the initial offer and lowered the sum to \( \frac{1}{2} \) \textit{solidus}, but according to Theophanes the emperor would not even agree to pay 4 \textit{keratia} (1 \textit{solidus} = 24 \textit{keratia}) so the khagan slew the prisoners angered at the

\textsuperscript{372} I owe this information to Gabriela Bijovsky, Israel Antiquities Authority, Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{373} Theophylact Simocatta, \textit{Historia}, III, 6.11, ed. de Boor and Wirth, 124; trans. Whitby and Whitby, 81.

Emperor’s avarice. An unspecified number of prisoners had been ransomed from the Goths in 517 against 1,000 pounds of coined gold (mille librarum auri denarios), the equivalent of 72,000 solidi. Important prisoners were worth much more. The "Bulgars" who invaded Scythia and Moesia sometime at the beginning of Justinian’s reign managed to capture Constantine, the commander of the Roman army. According to Theophanes, the emperor paid 1,000 gold coins to ransom his careless general, while Malalas, closer to the time of the event and perhaps better informed advanced the sum of 10,000 solidi.

Many ransoms of less conspicuous captives remained unrecorded and brought additional gold to barbaricum. That much can be inferred from the large number of Romans enslaved by the barbarians during their frequent inroads south of the Danube. These episodes became almost a topos in the writings of Procopius who always mentioned the combination of booty and prisoners taken by the "Bulgars", Kutrigurs, Antes, Slavs, and Gepids who invaded the Balkans during the reign of Justinian. Numbers are often exaggerated, such as the 120,000 prisoners taken by the "Bulgars" after one of their raids. Procopius mentions large numbers of prisoners, without providing figures, for the invasion of the Antes in the early 540s before they became
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375 Theophanes, Chronographia, a. 6092, ed. de Boor, 280.
377 Theophanes, Chronographia, a. 6031, ed. de Boor, 217; Malalas, Chronographia, 21, ed. Dindorf, 438.
378 On the topic of ransomed prisoners we still rely on E. Levy, "Captivus Redemptus," Classical Philology 38, no. 3 (1943): 159-76.
379 Procopius, Bella, VI, 4.6, ed. Haury and Wirth, vol. 2, 165.
allies of the Empire. Several Slavic invasions around 550 led to additional displacements of population north of the Danube. The Slavs took booty and enslaved "the young and the old alike" and later sacked Toperos on the Black Sea killing 15,000 men and enslaving tens of thousands of women and children. In the embassy sent by the Utrigurs to Justinian, thousands of Roman prisoners taken by the Kutrigurs are mentioned as an argument to convince the Emperor to give them the subsidies due to the Kutrigurs who by then were "wearing gold and had no lack of fine clothes embroidered and overlaid with gold." Justinian’s savvy diplomatic manoeuvres bore fruit when many Roman captives, tens of thousand taken by the Kutrigurs during their incursions, managed to take advantage of the war with the Utrigurs and returned home unharmed.

Procopius is not the only author to mention the multitude of Romans taken into captivity by barbarians. John of Ephesus informs us that the Slavs ravaged the Balkans for four years (581-584) took captives and got rich with the gold and silver plundered from the Romans. After the successful retaliation staged by Tiberius II in cooperation with the Avars, tens of thousands of Roman captives north of the Danube were set free by the Khagan. Menander’s account is at odds with what we otherwise know about

the Slavs’ attitude towards prisoners from the anonymous author of the *Strategikon* who tells us that prisoners were free to return home for a small ransom (*misthos*). Some of these prisoners who remained in "Sklavinia" of their own accord might be the "refugees" against whom the author of the *Strategikon* warns as they "have given in to the times, forget their own people, and prefer to gain the good will of the enemy." In the 680s we learn about a group of descendants of the Roman prisoners taken to the Avars who participated as warriors in Avar campaigns. They wanted to return to their homeland south of the Danube but they were perceived as half-Romans (Sermesianoi Bulgars) because they had long mixed with barbarians.^

Ransom paid for POWs and enslaved Romans taken to barbaricum may indeed account for some of the gold found beyond the frontier. A lot of wealth was concentrated north of the Danube if we are to believe sixth-century writers. Aside from these isolated cases patched together to create the picture of a wealthy society we can also rely on Menander’s explanation of the alternative agenda of Baian, the kaghan of the Avars, as he agreed to Tiberius II’s proposition to attack the Slavs located in eastern Wallachia. Baian was extremely upset that the Slavs had dared to refuse his suzerainty and he was anxious to put them in their place while hoping that "he would find the land full of
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gold, since the Roman Empire had long been plundered by the Slavs whose own land had never been raided by any other people at all." These descriptions are in sharp contrast with the archaeological evidence. Finds of silver and gold objects are extremely rare north of the Danube, while gold coins themselves are not very frequent. There is nothing to match the rich burial assemblages of the Avars. At least two episodes suggest that Slavs did handle Byzantine gold coins. Procopius informs us that the Gepids who controlled the crossing of the Danube taxed one *solidus* (*stater*) per head to ferry the Slavs across the river with the booty and prisoners taken from the Balkans.\(^{390}\) In addition, the "false Chilbudios" from the famous episode told by Procopius was bought "with gold" by the Antes from the Slavs.\(^{391}\)

Where is the wealth taken by the Slavs from Thrace and Illyricum? On one hand we may argue that the Avars did a thorough job and plundered "Sklavinia" taking all its riches. However, despite the fact that the Slavs entered the political orbit of the Avars and probably paid tribute they were also known to make inroads south of the Danube on their own. On the other hand, the successful campaigns led by the Byzantine army north of the Danube in the last decade of the sixth century led to an inversion of the roles. Now the Roman commander was the one proud to send to Constantinople booty and prisoners taken from "Sklavinia".\(^{392}\) In the western Balkans the campaign against the Avars occasioned a confrontation of the Gepids, in fact the slaughter of some 30,000 Gepids caught unawares as they were celebrating a feast. According to
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\(^{392}\) Theophylact Simocatta, *Historia*, VI, 8.7, ed. de Boor and Wirth, 237.
Theophylact at the end of the campaign 3000 Avars, 8000 Slavs and 6200 other
barbarians were taken prisoners, among them Gepids if we believe Theophanes, who
gives different figures. Moreover, in the eve of the mutiny which led to the deposition
of Maurice in 602, the soldiers vociferated against the idea to camp north of the Danube
because they were anxious to bring home the booty taken from the Slavs. It is hard to
determine whether such events ruined the Slavs so as to explain an archaeological
record lacking any luster. It may well be that the Slavic social structure did not rely so
heavily on the possession of gold which they gave away more easily than the Avars.

It seems that the Avars kept the gold in monetary form mostly to be included in
burial assemblages, much like the natives of Madagascar observed by the Marquis de
Mondevergue in 1868: "If they possessed any coins, they would bury them with their
dead." Although the picture might be distorted by the fact that Avar archaeology has
been almost exclusively devoted to the study of Avar-age cemeteries, the abundance of
Byzantine coins and their imitations in graves cannot be ignored. Although many were
used as oboli, almost 20 percent of the gold coins were pierced or otherwise modified to
be worn as pendants, perhaps reflecting a double role as jewelry and obolus.

Interestingly none of the copper coins found in Avar graves were pierced suggesting
that only gold coins served this function in "Avaria." The same can be said about burial
assemblages from the Caucasus, where genuine Byzantine solidi mounted to be work
as pendants are surpassed in number by imitations and bracteates made of thin gold-
plated foil, which clearly had a ritual function only. Interestingly, both in the Carpathian

393 Theophylact, Historia, VIII, 3.15, ed. de Boor and Wirth, 289; Theophanes, Chronographia, a. 6093,
ed. de Boor, 282: 3000 Avars, 800 Slavs, 200 Gepids, and 2000 other barbarians.

394 Chauvicourt and Chauvicourt, Numismatique malgache, 7 ("S'ils ont quelques pièces de monnaie, il
les enterrrent avec leurs morts").
basin and in the Caucasus this practice dates to the seventh century, at a time when the Byzantine Empire’s frontiers were constantly shrinking.

Gold coinage might not have been the only currency brought north of the Danube by "barbarians." Moreover, copper coins may have been among the personal possessions of the captives taken from the Balkans. The fact that many copper coins are stray finds along major river valleys suggests a lot of movement. Displaced Romans dropping low-value coins from their pockets are a good alternative to the multitude of traders envisaged in previous scholarship, for which we lack any information in the sources. We are on even more solid ground if we seek the explanation in Justinian’s politics of recruitment. We have already seen that Heruli, Gepids, and Cutrigurs were enlisted in Justinian’s armies operating on various fronts. The Antes became allies of the Empire after Justinian gave them the fortress of Turris in 545 and acted as foederates defending the frontier on the Lower Danube and the Delta. The non-Roman pottery found in frontier fortresses from Scythia may belong to Antes serving in Roman garrisons. Slavs also served in the Byzantine army as far as Italy and some attained a high rank in the Balkans, like Chilbudios whose campaigns north of the Danube in the late 520s and the early 530s were extremely successful and possibly Tatimer who served under Maurice. It is very likely that the garrisons of the Danube frontiers were ethnically mixed, as suggested by the archaeological evidence. Their identity as "Romans" was defined by their function in the Byzantine defense system and


of course by the regular payment received for their services.\textsuperscript{397} It cannot be doubted that many of the bronze coins handled in the hilltop sites placed along the Lower Danube belonged to "barbarians" settled on the frontier, who also contributed to the distribution of such coins in their homeland.\textsuperscript{398}

What was the function of Byzantine copper coins in \textit{barbaricum}? The theory that they primarily reflect trade between the Empire and communities beyond the frontier or even transactions between communities in \textit{barbaricum} is untenable. To be sure, there is no reason to believe that trade was nonexistent. Despite the fact that written sources have nothing to say on this topic, the \textit{Strategikon} in particular gives us precious clues as to what may have interested Roman military officials or even Byzantine traders who hoped to make a profit by supplying the army with provisions. The main preoccupation was to insure sources of supply while campaigning north or even south of the Danube. The author of the \textit{Strategikon} warns against the destruction of agricultural fields and argues for the protection of the peasants who can supply the army with food.\textsuperscript{399}

Although this advice probably referred to the Danubian provinces, the priorities remained the same when campaigning in \textit{barbaricum}. Even more so, the author emphasizes the care which should be given to the food provisions secured from raids of plunder in enemy territory.\textsuperscript{400} Moreover, it was strongly advised to gather all the


\textsuperscript{398} Almost a century has passed since Ernst Stein first drew attention to the demographic potential of tribes north of the Danube, for which see E. Stein, \textit{Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches, vornehmlich unter den Kaisern Justinus II u. Tiberius Constantinus} (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1919), 119-20.

\textsuperscript{399} \textit{Strategikon}, I, 9.9, ed. Dennis, 104.

\textsuperscript{400} \textit{Strategikon}, IX, 3.14, ed. Dennis, 314.
available food and bring it back to the Empire on pack animals and boats along the rivers flowing into the Danube.\textsuperscript{401}

Food shortage had been an endemic problem of the Balkans which Justinian’s administrative reform and the creation of the \textit{quaestura exercitus} did not solve. On the other hand, the Romans were not alone in seeking the agricultural products of the Danubian plain. The Avars were equally interested in insuring adequate supplies for the army. According to Michael the Syrian the khagan was ready to make a good offer to the people from "two Roman towns and other fortresses" urging them to "sow and harvest, we shall claim only half of your due," referring to the tax paid to the Byzantine state.\textsuperscript{402} The Avars were clearly interested in receiving tribute in kind, as suggested by the conditions imposed by the Avars on the Longobards in return for their help against the Gepids in the late 560s: "that the Avars received immediately one tenth of all the livestock that the Lombards possessed."\textsuperscript{403} The Avars also wanted control over the lands of the Gepids, Transylvania with its salt resources being especially attractive to pastoralists.\textsuperscript{404}

It has been suggested that Byzantine merchants paid with copper coin for the agricultural products acquired from \textit{Barbaricum}, while "barbarians" used the same coins

\textsuperscript{401} \textit{Strategikon}, XI, 4.32, ed. Dennis, 380.


to pay for manufactured products from the Empire. This view is widely shared but it suffers from preconceived ideas about the nature of exchange and the role of money. Ethnographic parallels have taught us that "primitives" were only inclined to accept coin if it was essentially commodity-money, which the Byzantine follis, with its fluctuating weight and exchange rate to the solidus was certainly not. There is every reason to believe that barter alone would have sufficed to facilitate exchange north of the Danube. Anthropological studies indicate that barter remained the most important form of exchange in primitive societies, even during the colonial period, and the nature of the sixth-century society north of the Danube as reflected in the archaeological record suggests that a market economy did not exist. Alternative media of exchange may have existed but none was preserved and it is possible that peoples in barbaricum used perishable materials for this purpose, if they used any monetary instruments at all. To be sure, Byzantine merchants may have used coins to pay for various products bought from the region close to the Danube, but much like the Merina from Madagascar, communities in barbaricum treated coins like any other Byzantine commodity. As in so many primitive societies coins were kept and melted down never to return to Byzantium. Much like the French authorities who complained that the silver 5 Franc pieces "disappeared" in Madagascar, the Byzantine government probably discouraged the private export of coin, especially when inflation struck and the supply of metal needed to issue fresh coins became limited.

405 Teodor, Romanitatea nord-dunăreană, 28.

Copper coins were not a good investment for communities in *barbaricum* unless they were located very close to the Danube and could be in permanent contact with the Byzantine fortresses on the other bank of the river. The only conceivable monetary transactions probably took place in Oltenia where the presence of a few Byzantine bridge-heads on the left bank made the dangerous crossing of the Danube unnecessary. Nonetheless, bronze coins have been found over a much wider area, sometimes very far from the Danube. Many were probably brought home by the soldiers who served in the Roman army or in the garrisons defending the Danube frontier. Their function is not hard to guess. "Big-men" or simply village chiefs, some of whom may have served in the Roman army or led plunder expeditions in the Empire, could only retain their prestige if the way in which they manipulated wealth served the needs of the community. In societies where prestige depended largely on access to Roman goods, coins were yet another type of import, to be worn as jewelry, to be given away as gifts or to be used in ceremonies and rituals.

What is the evidence for the use of coins as raw material for the production of jewelry? We have already seen that gold clearly served this purpose, not only in *Barbaricum*, but also in the Empire, where coins could be mounted or melted down. Pierced coins, gold or copper, are also known from the early Byzantine provinces proving that the distinction between money and ornament is not as clear cut as some
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may think.\textsuperscript{409} Unsurprisingly, such coins are also found in \textit{barbaricum} and their number is probably higher for the copper coins, which are most often published without illustration and with insufficient details regarding their state of preservation. On the other hand we have already seen that metalwork was a widespread activity north of the Danube as testified by the large number of tools (crucibles and metallurgical ladles) and stone molds used for the production of copper jewelry. There is some archaeological evidence suggesting that coins were a constant and reliable source of copper. Very few coins have been found in a clear archaeological context. The old finds from the sixth-century settlements excavated in Bucharest have not been properly published and their association with other objects is unknown.\textsuperscript{410} The same can be said about the \textit{follies} found in the early medieval settlements from Alcedar-Odaia and Lopatna in Moldova where they were found together with Luka Raikovetskaia ceramics, but no stratigraphical information is available.\textsuperscript{411}

We are best informed about the two early \textit{follies} of Justinian found at Botoșana in Moldavia, very far from the Danube. The sunken-featured building no. 20 produced a \textit{follis} dated 527-537 in association with a crucible and a ladle used to pour the metal.

\begin{flushleft}\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{409} C. Morrisson, "Monnaies et pseudo-monnaies byzantines à motifs chrétiens: croyance ou magie?," forthcoming.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}\footnotesize
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}\footnotesize
\end{flushleft}
The coin was not cut or damaged but this was not absolutely necessary.\textsuperscript{412} Recent research at Nicopolis in the northern Balkans has revealed unusually large accumulations of Late Roman copper coins together with scrap metal collected for recycling and although none of the coins, which are smaller than the Early Byzantine pieces, were folded, cut or damaged, the association with metalwork is quite evident.\textsuperscript{413} No damage can be seen on coins from the hoard found at Horgeşti in Moldavia. The coins were hidden in a copper pitcher (ca. 1.3 kg) together with a copper chain (ca. 250g) and small scrap pieces of copper.\textsuperscript{414} It is quite obvious that we are dealing with an accumulation of metal rather than a collection of coins. Older coins were also collected to be recycled, such as the twelve Roman imperial bronze coins from Marcus Aurelius to Philip I found in the sixth-century settlement from Cățelu Nou near Bucharest or the bronze coin of Nerva found together with scrap pieces of bronze in the settlement from Ipoteşti (Olt, Romania).\textsuperscript{415} The mixed composition of copper-alloys of various

\textsuperscript{412} Cut or damaged Byzantine bronze coins have been found at Osijek (Croatia) and Pavlivka (Ukraine) but no archaeological context is available. A hexagram of Heraclius cut in half was found in a grave from Linz and a cut fragment of a \textit{solidus} struck for the same emperor was found in an Avar grave from Békéscsaba-Repülötér (Hungary). See Görice-Lukić, "Justinijanov novac," 1152, no. 28 and 1159, fig. 28 (Osijek); P. A. Karyshkovski, "Nahodki pozdrnerimskikh i vizantiiskikh monet v Odesskoj oblasti," \textit{Materiаły po arkeologii Severnogo Prichernomor'ia} \textit{7} (1971): 81, no. 10 (Pavlivka); Hahn, "Die Fundmünzen des 5.-9. Jahrhunderts," 459 (Linz); Somogyi, \textit{Byzantinische Fundmünzen}, 28-29, no. 8 (Békécsaba-Repülötér).


\textsuperscript{415} P. Roman and S. Dolinescu-Ferche, "Cercetările de la Ipoteşti (jud. Olt) (observaţii asupra culturii materiale autohtone din sec. al VI-lea în Muntenia)," \textit{SCIVA} \textit{29}, no. 1 (1978): 73-93. Some doubts have been raised regarding the dating of these complexes to the sixth century, for which see Curta, \textit{The Making of the Slavs}, 231-32.
Byzantine mints and denominations makes them unsuited for analyses of metal composition and comparison with copper-alloy artifacts.\textsuperscript{416} However, Krzysztof Dąbrowski has analyzed a few dozen Roman fibulae found in \textit{barbaricum} and concluded that they were produced by melting down early Roman coins.\textsuperscript{417}

Let me pull the strands of my argument together. Whether used as souvenirs, apotropaic amulets, jewelry, objects of prestige or simply raw material for the production of copper-alloy jewelry, Early Byzantine coins rarely returned to the Empire. If any transactions required the mediation of coins they were undertaken in Byzantine fortresses on the Lower Danube where peasants could come to sell their surplus. If Byzantine merchants venturing into the dangerous world of "barbarians" paid with coin for the products they acquired it was a unidirectional monetary transaction. The communities living in the shadow of the Empire bought coins like any Byzantine commodity because they needed the metal or simply because they were looking to use them as jewelry to adorn their clothes or to hang on necklaces. Other non-monetary and non-economic means by which Byzantine coins traveled across the frontier were related to the movement of people, "barbarian" soldiers returning to their village and hoping to achieve a higher status by bringing Roman exotica and souvenirs or Roman captives taken by barbarians together with their possessions.


\textsuperscript{417} K. Dąbrowski, "Nouvelles données concernant l'orfévrerie sur le territoire de la voïvodie d'Olsztyn (Pologne)," \textit{Archaeologia Polona} 19 (1980): 238-39.
Figure 6-19. First-to-third-century mummy portraits wearing coin necklaces and coin pendants (after Parlasca 1969, pl. 19/78, 34/142 and 56/226; Parlasca 1977, pl. 98/397).
Figure 6-20. Late nineteenth-century Algerian woman and her daughter wearing coin necklaces (1) and late twentieth-century Andeans digging up the community treasure made of old foreign coins and banknotes (2).
Figure 6-21. Pierced Spanish Reales from the New World used in Madagascar (after Chauvicourt and Chauvicourt 1968).
Figure 6-22. Bracelet and necklace from Madagascar made of early modern European coins (after Chauvicourt and Chauvicourt 1968, 9).
Figure 6-23. Byzantine *solidi* of Heraclius mounted into rings found in Austria at Emling and in Germany at Hausen and Großmehring (1-3) and necklace with a mounted *solidus* from the joint reign of Justin I and Justinian I from Dzhiginka, Russia (4) (after Wamser and Gebhard 2001, no. 183a; Steffgen et alii 1993, pl. 17; Somogyi 2011, 111, fig. 7; Kropotkin 1962, pl. 14).
Figure 6-24. Head jewelry from Madagascar made of early modern European coins (1), dress jewelry made of seventh-century Byzantine solidi from the Malo Pereschepyne hoard (2), and cut folles of Justinian from Haskovo (Bulgaria) (3) (after Chauvicourt and Chauvicourt 1968, 9; Kropotkin 1962, pl. 16; Tenchova 2011, pl. 47/845 and pl. 69/1135).
Figure 6-25. Early Byzantine gold (1-6), silver (11), and bronze (7-10, 12-13) coins from Hungary, Serbia, Romania, and Georgia, pierced, cut, and mounted to be worn as pendants (after Somogyi 1997, no. 3, 8, 17, 52 and 72; Abramishvili 1965, pl. V/74, pl. VI/81, pl. VIII/111 and pl. XI/175; Poenaru et alii, no. 753; Teodor 1981, fig. 14/2 Radič and Ivanišević 2006, pl. 20/318; Gusev 1995, 46, fig. 1/1).
Two interpretations have shaped our understanding of the role played by the Danube frontier in Late Antiquity. One relied faithfully on the evidence of contemporary writers who epitomized the river as the ideal boundary between civilized Romans and "barbarians," while the other clung on to the legacy of the former Transdanubian province of Dacia to claim that the Empire never completely lost its political influence north of the river during Late Antiquity. Both are correct, albeit not always for the reasons mentioned by their proponents. The external policy of an empire is rarely straightforward and unequivocal and Early Byzantium makes no exception. On one hand, Roman emperors were interested in securing the Balkans by closely guarding the river, on the other communication and contact with barbaricum was part and parcel of the frontier policy which included exchange, acculturation, and the recruitment of "barbarians" in the Roman army. There was no single and uniform frontier policy on the Danube but a larger repertoire of solutions depending on the balance of power in barbaricum and the Empire’s agenda at one time or another.

Undoubtedly, the Danube met the necessary preconditions to become a defensible frontier and was the most strategically advantageous line of separation in the ancient Balkans. This fact was recognized not only by the Roman Empire but also by its bellicose neighbors, whether Dacians, Goths, Huns or Avars. Roman emperors took the necessary precautions and complemented the natural virtues of the river with a strong fleet and a chain of fortifications running along its banks, but the functioning of this elaborate frontier system ultimately depended on the Empire’s capacity to maintain internal stability. Managing the cascade of crises between the fifth and the seventh
century often entailed the serious neglect of one frontier in favor of another and as a matter of fact the Balkans rarely ranked high in the Empire’s priorities list. In other words, it was not the systemic inefficiency of the Danube as a frontier that led to its ultimate failure but the way in which it was consciously managed by Late Roman emperors who had limited resources at their disposal.

When speaking about the Danube frontier we must distinguish between two different layers. The upper is high politics, the strategic priorities of the Empire which included the defense of Constantinople and the prosperity of Thrace and Illyricum, as well as political dealings with "barbarian" groups living north of the Danube. The lower layer is the individual experience of people living on the frontier and whose actions, which might be labeled as "private initiative," gave shape to cultural change in the frontier region and beyond. The former is shrouded in the rhetoric of contemporary writers while the latter can only be discerned by turning to the archaeological evidence. Often the archaeological record seems to be at variance with the written sources. The difference between the "Romans" who defend the frontier behind the thick walls of fortresses placed on the Danube and the "barbarians" bent on destroying the civilized world is purely situational. Events from the long sixth century have taught us that today’s "barbarians" are often the "Romans" of tomorrow who may well begin by plundering the provinces of the Balkans only to end up defending them later as foederati or symmachoi. The northern Balkans in Late Antiquity was clearly a multiethnic environment. Traffic and communication between the two sides of the river occurred naturally and the archaeological evidence shows that it was not prevented so long it was done peacefully and without upsetting the upper layer, that of high politics.
The Byzantine artifacts most frequently found in *barbaricum* are precisely those related to the militarized environment of the northern Balkans: fragments of LR1 and LR2 amphorae, the containers in which soldiers received their allowances of oil and wine, a variety of jewelry and dress accessories fashionable in the frontier fortresses, and Byzantine coins. Cultural influences were not unidirectional and were not spread uniformly in the frontier region and beyond. The stylistic evolution and geographic distribution of the so-called "Slavic" bow fibulae best illustrates cultural influences coming from outside the Empire. In fact, there are very few artifacts produced in the northern Balkans which can be described as reflecting just one cultural identity. Fashions developing on the sixth-century Danube frontier reflect the multiethnic background of their carriers and combine several cultural traditions relying on the Roman technology of producing jewelry and combining imagery derived from the cultures of the steppe and from "Germanic" styles.

Analyzing the distribution of Byzantine artifacts found in *barbaricum* is helpful in coming to grips with the widely different social and cultural complexities they encompass. Communities living outside the Empire emulated the Roman way of life by seeking access to the objects and goods most often encountered in the frontier region. Expressing ethnic and social identity in *barbaricum* was a process whose mechanics depended not only on relations with Byzantium but also on cultural contact and relations of power between groups within *barbaricum*. Distribution maps clearly reveal the fact that different Byzantine artifacts were preferred, although most of them reflect the *annona militaris* and soldiers’ expenditure in the frontier region. Finds of amphorae concentrate in Oltenia and Moldavia pointing to important regions for the recruitment of
soldiers. Oil lamps including bronze liturgical lamps are found almost exclusively in the territory of the former province of Dacia, while pectoral crosses are encountered predominantly south and east of the Carpathians, in Wallachia and Moldavia. Metallurgical activity and the production of bronze jewelry and dress-accessories of Byzantine inspiration was most intense in the Subcarpathian hills of Wallachia and Moldavia, which are also important regions for the distribution of Byzantine buckles and brooches. All these convey an image of communities living in the shadow of the Empire but adopting only certain cultural practices.

Numismatic evidence, or the lack thereof, has been seldom used to understand the complex nature of early Byzantine frontiers. Most often than not, coins played their designated role in the scenario emphasizing separation, in which coins were seen as the result of plunder, or in the one illustrating contact, with coins being the instrument of a local monetary economy. The first step, however, has been to establish a connection with the monetary circulation in the northern Balkans especially since the influx of newly minted currency into the circulating medium of the frontier provinces bears upon the age structure of finds from barbaricum. The monetary economy of Early Byzantium knew different levels of development depending on the type of settlement, which can be a large coastal town, a landlocked administrative center, a frontier fortress, or a small village. The Empire-wide analysis of coin finds has revealed the fact that outside the confines of large urban markets monetary transactions were just one of the ways in which exchange took place. In addition, hill-top military sites from the Balkans display a monetary circulation closely related with the payment of soldiers’ salaries and transactions which involved the state as the most important agent.
What exactly communities outside the Empire had to offer in exchange for Byzantine coins remains a matter for conjecture. In any case, trade was just one, certainly not the dominant, manner in which Byzantine coins arrived in barbaricum. In Transcaucasia, the Carpathian Basin, and the Lower Danube region gold and ceremonial silver issues are often the reflection of political and diplomatic payments made by Byzantine emperors to buy peace or to gain an ally in strategically sensitive regions. Many of these coins, redistributed to the local elite, found their way into burials often after having been turned into jewelry. Byzantine gold and silver coins were not used but worn and played a role in the display of social status. The Avars in particular chose to melt down Byzantine gold coins in order to produce spectacular jewelry which would play a similarly important social function.

The analysis of Byzantine coins from barbaricum in their historical and archaeological context has revealed the fact that we are not dealing with a "grand strategy" of the Byzantine Empire on the frontier. In fact we are dealing with many frontiers and many types of responses. Adaptation rather than rigid planning characterizes imperial action at the periphery. The distribution of early Byzantine coins from Central Europe to the Caspian Sea, in a wide geographic area on the northern and eastern frontier of the Empire, reinforces this conclusion. At least three major patterns of distribution can be distinguished: Transcaucasia, dominated by regular and ceremonial silver coinage, the Lower Danube region where copper coin finds are overwhelming, and the Carpathian Basin where gold issues predominate.

The explanation lies in the particular nature of each of these frontier regions, the strategic priorities of the Empire, and the strengths of its enemies in barbaricum.
and Iberia guarded the strategic passes in the Caucasus Mountains through which poured not only spices and exotica from the East but also nomadic raiders. The danger was deemed serious enough to require the joint action of the two great empires, the Byzantine and the Persian, in one of the rare instances of collaboration. Failure to control movement in the Caucasus exposed the Byzantine heartland and the Black Sea coast. Procopius was perhaps exaggerating when suggesting that the loss of Lazica could lead to a major invasion by sea towards Constantinople, but the danger itself was very real. Sixth-to-seventh-century Byzantine emperors took every precaution to secure this region. Gifts of silver and gold coins were sent to Lazi kings and to smaller Caucasian tribes in order to gain their loyalty and huge quantities of silver hexagrams were spent by emperors of the Heraclian dynasty to keep Transcaucasia in the Byzantine orbit.

Very little of this policy can be traced in the Lower Danube region. Unlike Transcaucasia where the frontier was quite volatile and depended primarily on people, on the Danube the frontier was quite material and relied on the heavily fortified southern bank of the river. Transcaucasia had many tribes but no coherent defense system, while the Lower Danube had many fortifications but few Romans to defend it, at least if we believe authors such as Agathias who lamented the state of the garrisons around 559. The high density of hill-top sites in the Danube valley indeed required many defenders, most of whom were recruited from barbaricum. People, rather than objects or goods were the greatest asset of the regions north of the river. The energy and resources invested in Transcaucasia insured that eastern Anatolia would not be invaded and depopulated by "barbarians." In the Balkans, however, such events were commonplace.
in the sixth century. The Danube was frequently crossed back and forth usually by small bands of raiders but sometimes by larger invading parties. Booty and thousands of enslaved Romans were taken north of the Danube. This continuous movement of people explains the large quantity of bronze coins available in the northern Balkans and by extension in barbaricum. Such coins did not have any monetary function outside the Empire except for isolated transactions in the region close to the Danube. Much like the gold coins, they were used as raw material for the production of bronze jewelry as testified by single finds, hoards, and numerous stone molds for small pieces of jewelry. Others were kept as souvenirs or amulets pierced to be worn as pendants.

The Carpathian Basin became once again a frontier of the Roman Empire after Justinian’s reconquest of Dalmatia and Italy. Large quantities of gold in the form of solidi were sent to the Gepids, the Longobards, and the Avars to name only the most powerful confederations. These allies and adversaries at the same time were of a different caliber than the Slavs, the Antes, and the Kutrigurs in the Danube and the western Black Sea region. For all intents and purposes the Middle Danube, the Drava, and the Sava rivers flowing from the Alps were lost to the Empire and no system of fortifications can be found there to help distribute Byzantine copper coins in barbaricum. Such coins are rare in the Carpathian Basin and in Central Europe and are mostly brought from Italy where prospects of enrichment through warfare attracted ambitious men from barbaricum.

Warfare and service in the Roman army are the common denominator of all three regions. Different circumstances, however, required different responses and Byzantine emperors of the sixth and seventh century had limited resources at their disposal to
manage frontiers stretching on three continents. Adaptation and, indeed, at times improvisation and quick reaction time were crucial survival skills at the periphery. Coins are an excellent testimony of such developments and together with other categories of artifacts can open a window to the world of barbaricum where individual agency and culturally constructed responses were often shaped in relation to Byzantium. Written accounts as well as the available archaeological evidence point to a complex society developing in the frontier region, drawing its cultural identity from multiple sources and blending Roman and "barbarian" influences. Communities living in the shadow of the Empire forged their own identity in relation with Byzantium but targeted only certain Byzantine practices. Identities were constantly renegotiated at the periphery in the ever-changing world of conflict and cooperation between Romans and "barbarians," whose very definition came to be blurred as the Empire grew weaker.
APPENDIX A
CORPUS OF EARLY BYZANTINE COIN FINDS IN BARBARICUM

A.1 Context

Creating an inventory of early Byzantine coin finds in barbaricum is far from being a straightforward task. A mere compilation from previous publications, while a worthwhile endeavor in other contexts, would only add to the confusion and misrepresentation of early Byzantine coin finds so pervasive in older literature. Undoubtedly, the proper course of action is to undertake the task of creating an updated inventory by critically assessing the merits of previous publications. Most of the time this involves verifying the attribution of each single find and hoard against the illustration by using the most recent reference catalogues. Most often than not such an exercise reveals important errors, which accumulated would distort not only the statistical analysis of coin finds in Barbaricum, but also the overall historical interpretation of the numismatic material.

Collecting information about the circumstances of each find is yet another difficult and often frustrating task. Being one of the most popular collectibles since the antiquarian age, precious pieces of information such as the archaeological context or even the finding place are now lost or uncertain. In most cases, the presence of unprovenienced coins in smaller local museums is usually a good indicator that the coins were found in that region. Larger collections housed in national museums can be more problematic. Many acquisitions were made from important collectors who built their collections while traveling in various parts of the former Byzantine Empire or by relying on auction houses, which rarely disclose their sources. The ideal case of a reliable archaeological context is recorded less frequently than one would expect, but
even a general geographic placement of the finds can still provide an overview of cultural contact in the frontier region and beyond, especially if used in conjunction with other archaeological sources.

The inventory covers a wide geographic area, from the Ore Mountains (separating Saxony from Bohemia) to the west, to the Caucasus Mountains to the east, and is meant both as a tool for future research and as a means of contextualizing the finds from the Lower Danube area. By necessity, the decision to include certain regions, while leaving out others, cannot be fully substantiated by historical processes taking place fifteen centuries ago. It often has to do with the state of research in each country and the material available for study, either published catalogues or still unpublished finds in East European museums. From a historical perspective, the decision to cover this particular area takes into account the major transformations of the sixth and seventh centuries, namely the rise of the Avar power in the Carpathian Basin, with its constellation of clients in the Lower Danube region and the steppe north of the Black Sea, and later the rise of the early Bulgar state in the Balkans. Tracing such developments from a historical and archaeological perspective requires a broad understanding of the political, military, and economic relations established between Byzantium and the outside powers through the lens of numismatic evidence, hoards and single finds.

On the other hand, the complex nature of the early Byzantine frontier can be clearly seen in the inventory of coin finds which also includes sites that may well have been under the full control of the early Byzantine army and administration at certain times during the sixth and seventh centuries. Such cases include the strategic
Byzantine bridge-heads located on the Lower Danube’s left bank, such as Drobeta and Sucidava, as well as important settlements on the eastern Black Sea coast, such as Pitiunt. In all cases, the large number of early Byzantine coins found on site strongly suggests an enduring imperial presence. While the Danube provided a convenient separation line in the northern Balkans, the political status-quo is less clear in the western part of the peninsula, Dalmatia in particular. Justinian's Gothic wars restored the imperial control over the eastern Adriatic coast, but it is difficult to approximate how far it extended inland. Unlike the case of the Lower Danube, drawing a line or identifying a natural barrier, for instance the Sava river, is far less convincing. To be sure, there is ample evidence for the presence of Byzantine goods in Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia, even far from the Adriatic coast, but for the purposes of this inventory all the finds from the "grey area" of the frontier have been included to provide a more nuanced picture of the frontier region and its cultural complexity.

Indeed, the level of publication differs widely from one region to another. Fortunately, a recent volume has brought together papers dealing with the presence of Byzantine coins in Central Europe, which offer an updated picture of the Byzantine influence in barbaricum.1 In addition, important catalogues have been published in the past decades bringing to light an important number of Byzantine coin finds from the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, Slovenia, Austria, and Hungary.2 The most time-

1 M. Wołoszyn, ed., Byzantine Coins in Central Europe Between the 5th and 10th Century (Cracow: Polish Academy of Sciences, 2009).

honored preoccupation with early Byzantine coin finds can be safely attributed to
Romanian numismatists and historians, no doubt because of the superior number of
finds from the Danube region, but also as a direct result of a historiographical inclination
toward the study of Late Roman and Early Byzantine cultural influence north of the
Danube. This particular interest insured a steady publication of finds followed by more
comprehensive catalogues and attempts to interpret the numismatic material in its
historical context. A large body of literature is indeed a mixed blessing, as the scholar
trying to put together an inventory of finds has to go back to the original publication of a
certain coin and then trace it in subsequent works in order to determine its full
attribution. This detective work often reveals a trail of errors, sometimes caused by the
state of the discipline at the time of the initial publication, other times by carelessness or
the lack of specialized knowledge of the Byzantine series. Most of the time this was due
to the fact that general catalogues of recent finds of Greek, Roman, and Byzantine
coins, usually published on an annual basis, included only brief descriptions and were
rarely supported by illustrations.

aus dem österreichischen Bereich der Avaria," in Die Awaren am Rand der byzantinischen Welt: Studien
du Diplomatie, Handel und Technologietransfer im Frühmittelalter, ed. F. Daim (Innsbruck:
Universitätsverlag Wagner, 2000), 45-66; W. Hahn, "Die Fundmünzen des 5.-9. Jahrhunderts in
Österreich und den unmittelbar angrenzenden Gebieten," in Die Geburt Mitteleuropas. Geschichte
Österreichs vor seiner Entstehung 378-907, ed. H. Wolfram (Vienna: Kremayr & Scheriau, 1987), 453-
464. Hungary: P. Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen Der Awarenzeit (Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag
Wagner, 1997); P. Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen der Awarenzeit. Einem Bestandaufnahme,

3 C. Preda, "Circulația monedelor bizantine în regiunea carpato-dunăreană," SCIV 23 (1972): 375-415; V.
M. Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine din secolele VI-VII în teritoriile carpato-dunărene," BSNR
au-delà de la frontière du Bas-Danube. Entre politique, economie et diffusion culturelle," Histoire et

4 Most significant is the chronicle of recent finds held periodically in Dacia by Bucur Mitrea and Gheorghe
Poenaru Bordea between 1958 and 1996 under the generic title "Découvertes monétaires en Roumanie,"
Many of the finds before the Second World War have been attributed by using the standard reference catalogues of the day, now largely obsolete, while in the greater part of Eastern Europe Sabatier’s 1862 catalogue continued to be used as a reference in regional museum journals well into the 1970s. The researcher trying to compile a catalogue of finds will often find the same coin republished three or four times, sometimes with full technical details, unfortunately rarely illustrated, or briefly mentioned in inventories of finds form a certain region or province. In some cases, the lack of dialogue between numismatists and archaeologists, amply addressed in chapter two, can be seen at work when the archaeological context is insufficiently explored by numismatists or when coins are misrepresented in archaeological reports and illustrations (e.g. Bucharest – Străulești-Măicănești). In order to avoid confusion, only the most recent or the most reliable publications will be cited for each find. On occasion, reference will be given to previous literature which misrepresented the respective find or ascribed it a different finding place, lest the reader is left with the impression that we are dealing with separate finds (e.g. Săbed/ Voiniceni/ Ceuașu de Câmpie). Fortunately, early Byzantine coin finds from present-day Romania have received special attention in the past decades, although the publications often cited previous titles without attempting a critical analysis.  

The review of early Byzantine coin finds from the former Soviet Union is a far more challenging exercise. The finds from southern Ukraine have been thoroughly

---

published or republished by Elena Stoliarik, although in many cases it proved to be a mere compilation based on previous works of P. O. Karyshkovskii, A. A. Nudel'man, and V. V. Kropotkin. To be sure, most attempts to address the question of Byzantine coin finds from the former Soviet Union still have to rely heavily on Kropotkin’s corpus, which is now half a century old, although it undoubtedly was an impressive achievement at that time. Unfortunately, a much awaited recent edition of his book turned out to be nothing but a French translation filled with mistakes. No attempt was made to revise and update the catalogue.

The state of publication in the Transcaucasian republics of Georgia and Armenia is completely different. Paradoxically, the large number of finds and the overall potential of the region which acted as a buffer zone disputed by the Sasanian and the Byzantine empires, did not insure a proper visibility in Western literature. Tamara Abramishvili’s catalogue of Byzantine coins from the National Museum of Georgia (1965) was the first major publication of a large national museum collection in Europe dedicated exclusively to the Byzantine series. The occasional attribution errors were vindicated by a thorough illustration of the coins, which allows us to perform the necessary corrections based on current reference catalogues. Many coins had a clear provenance while some were the result of archaeological excavations. Later publications of coin finds resulted from

---


systematic excavations at Pitiunt and Nokalakevi contributed to a better understanding of Egrisi during the early Byzantine period.⁸

The Georgian language, rarely accessible to Western scholars contributed to the obscurity surrounding these finds, which constitute a goldmine for the study of the Caucasus in Late Antiquity. Unfortunately, the meritorious intention of bringing the region to the attention of scholars through the publication of monographs in the Moneta series did not always yield the desired scientific results.⁹ Most of the publications constitute abridged English translations of works produced decades ago followed by uncritical and incomplete catalogue compilations of the previous literature, mainly Abramishvili’s contribution to the publication of Byzantine single finds and hoards from the 1950s through the late 1980s. The reader studying the inventory included in this chapter will notice many instances of confusion regarding the composition of hoards (e.g. Magraneti) and the finding circumstances of both hoards and single finds (e.g. Ochamchire). The similar initiative regarding the Byzantine coin finds from Armenia was slightly more successful and relied on Khatchatur Musheghian’s lifetime preoccupation with ancient and medieval coin finds in Armenia.¹⁰ Although not free of mistakes, the series provides precious numismatic material for the study of the Byzantine influence in Armenia in the sixth and seventh centuries.

---


¹⁰ Mousheghian et al., *History and Coin Finds in Armenia: Coins from Duin, Capital of Armenia, 6-7th c.: Inventory of Byzantine and Sasanian Coins in Armenia, 6-7th c.* (Wetteren: Moneta, 2000); Musheghian et al., *History and Coin Finds in Armenia: Coins from Ani, Capital of Armenia, 4th c. BC - 19th c. AD* (Wetteren: Moneta, 2000).
The following inventory is divided into sections for single find and hoards and is organized alphabetically by mentioning the finding place followed in parentheses by the main administrative unit and the country. Special mention was made for coins found in archaeological context or in the proximity of ancient sites. In addition, a number of standard abbreviations were used for gold (AV), silver (AR), and the most common copper (AE) denominations of the early Byzantine monetary system, M (40-nummia/follis), K (20-nummia, 1/2 follis), I (10-nummia, 1/4 follis), Є (5-nummia/1/8 follis) and IS (16-nummia), as well as the for the early Byzantine mints most influential in the area under discussion, CON (Constantinople), NIK (Nicomedia), KYZ (Cyzicus), TES (Thessalonica), and ANT (Antioch).

A.2 Inventory

A.2.1 Single Finds

1. AİUD (Alba, Romania).
   Phocas: solidus; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 247, no. 1B.

2. AĞHALI ATONI (Abkhazia, Georgia).

3. AKHALTSIKHE (Samtskhe-Javakheti, Georgia).
   Justin II: K, Rome (Moneta Militaris Imitativa), 565-572, found on the left bank of Mtkvari river, not far from Atskuri fortress, on the right bank; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 21, no. 73 with n. 114.

4. AK'URA (Kakheti, Georgia).

11 Numbers on the maps (Figures 6-6, 6-7, 6-12, 6-16, 6-17, and A-1) refer to numbers in the inventory. Finds whose authenticity is under serious doubt have been excluded from the maps.

12 Same coins as Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 45, no. 429 (Novi Afon); Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis, 124, no. 39-40 (Psirtkha).
27, no. 92.

5. **ALBA JULIA** (Alba, Romania).


Phocas: *solidus*, CON, 602-610; Ibid., 666.

6. **ALCEDAR** (Șoldănești, Moldova).

Heraclius: M, CON, 611-612, found in 1961 during archaeological excavations conducted by G. B. Fedorov inside the early medieval stronghold; Nudel'man, *Topografija*, 81, no. 1; I. A. Rafalovich, *Slaviane VI-IX vekov v Moldavii* (Kishinev: Shtiinca, 1972), 40, fig. 9/2.

7. **ALESHKINSKYI KHUTOR** (Kherson, Ukraine).


8. **ALEXANDRIA** (Teleorman, Romania).


9. **ALIMĂNEȘTI** (Olt, Romania).

Justin I: M, CON, 518-527; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 216, no. 2.

10. **ALKOVEN-EMLING** (Oberösterreich, Austria).


11. **ALMĂJ** (Dolj, Romania).

Heraclius: M, NIK, 612-613; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 3.

11a. **ALMĂJEL** (Mehedinți, Romania).


12. **AMGATA** (Karachayevo-Cherkesiya, Russia).


13. **ANI** (Kars, Turkey).\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{13}\) The coins are kept in the local history museum but there is no certainty that they were found in Alba Iulia. In fact one specimen from the same collection was found at Mănăstioara, Dâmbovița County, a few hundred kilometers away from Alba Iulia (below, no. 230).

\(^{14}\) All coins have been found during archaeological excavations conducted by Joseph Orbeli and Nicholas Marr before the First World War. Many coins had to be redated because of the frequent discrepancies in the catalogue between the description and the reference to *BMC.*
Justin I: M, CON, 518-522; M, CON, 522-527; C, CON, 522-527; K; Ibid., 72-73, no. 24-27.
Justinian I: 3 M, CON, 527-537; M, NIK, 527-538; M, CON, 539-540; M, CON, 542-543; M, ANT, 551-552; M, CON, 558-559; M, ANT, 559-560; 2 M, 538-565; K, 538-565; Ibid., 73-74, no. 29-41.
Justin II: M, NIK, 567-568; 2 M, NIK, 568-569; K, NIK, 573-574; 2 M, CON, 576-577; M, NIK, 577-578; M; 2K; Ibid., 74-75, no. 42-51.
Tiberius II: M, CON, 581-582; Ibid., no. 52.
Maurice: M, CON, 586-587; 3 K, CON, 590-591; M, ANT, 591-592; K, ANT, 594-595; M, ANT, 601-602; K; Ibid., 75-76, no. 53-60.
Phocas: K, KYZ, 603-604; M, ANT, 603-604; M, CON, 607-608; M, ANT; M; Ibid., 76, no. 61-65.
Heraclius: 2 hexagrammata, CON, 625-629; M, CON, 612-613; 3 M, 613-616; 12-nummia, Alexandria; Ibid., 77, no. 66-73.
Constans II: M, CON, 642-643; Ibid., 77, no. 74.
Sixth century: I; Ibid., 73, no. 28.

14. APALINA (Mureș, Romania).

15. APARHANT (Tolna, Hungary).
Justin II: M, CON, 572-573; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 268-269, no. 1/1.
Phocas: K, CON, 603-610; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 268-269, no. 1/2.

16. ARAD (Arad, Romania).
Justinian I: 3 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 5.
Justin II: M, NIK, 570-571; Ibid., 217, no. 6.

---

15 In the original publication, Ludita Winkler attributed the coin based on Sabatier’s catalogue, plate XII/3, which corresponds to *MIBE* 7 (542-565). The description, however, clearly points to a different type (*MIBE* 6, 537-542), which Sabatier did not illustrate in his 1862 reference catalogue. Winkler, whose specialty was not Byzantine coinage, cited as reference the closest resembling specimen available in Sabatier’s catalogue, which had been otherwise long obsolete by 1960. Surprisingly, Viorel Butnariu wrongly identified the coin as type *DOC* 3b (=*MIBE* 5), which is an issue of 527-537, the wrong dating being adopted in subsequent publications as well. See Winkler, "Despre," 440; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 4. It is also worth mentioning that Szatmári, an eighteenth-century collector, noted that the coin had been found "together with many others," which might imply the existence of a dispersed hoard.
17. ARADAC-MEČKA (Central Banat, Serbia).
   Maurice: M, NIK, 583-584, found in a grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 23, no. 1.

18. ARADUL NOU (Arad, Romania).
   Justin II: 1 AE; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 251, no. 31.

19. AREVSHAT (Ararat, Armenia).
   Justin II: M, NIK; Mousheghian et al., *History*, 168.

20. ARGETOAIA (Dolj, Romania).
   Phocas: M, CON, 602-610, found during archaeological excavations conducted by Grigore Tocilescu in 1905; B. Mitrea, "Découvertes récentes et plus anciennes de monnaies antiques et byzantines sur le territoire de la République Populaire Roumaine," *Dacia* 10 (1966): 412.

21. AT'OTS'I (Shida Kartli, Georgia).

22. BACĂU (Bacău, Romania).
   Justin II: M, CON, 574-575; Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 10.
   Maurice: M, CON, 599-600; Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 11.
   Maurice-Heraclius: M, CON; Ibid., 217, no. 12.

23. BAČKA PALANKA (South Bačka, Serbia).

24. BAČKO PETROVO SELO (South Bačka, Serbia).

25. BAD DEUTSCH-ALTENBURG/PETRONELL (=Carnuntum) (Niederosterreich, Austria).16

---

16 The high number of gold coins is unusual and given the fact that many were acquired from private collectors it may be possible that at least some of them were initially part of larger, now dispersed, hoards. Their finding place is also under question, for which see Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 47, n. 24; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 240, n. 8.

Justin I/ Justinian I: €, CON/NIK, 522-527 or 527-537; Ibid., 336, no. 1/1 and 347, fig. 6/1.

Justinian I: *solidus*, CON, 527-537; *solidus*, 537-542; 6 *solidi*, CON, 542-565; 3 *tremisses*, 527-565; €, ANT, 527-529; M, CON, 538-539; K, CON, 544-545; M, CON, 547-548; IS, TES, 538-552; 2 I, 527-565; 2 €, 527-565; Ibid., 336-38, no. 1/3-17 and 347-49, fig. 6/2-10.

Justin II: 2 *solidi*, 565-578; M, CON, 565-566; K, NIK, 570-571; M, CON, 575-576; K, TES, 575-576; M, NIK, 565-578; K, military mint, type 568-569. Ibid., 338, no. 17-23 and 349, fig. 6/11-12.

Tiberius II: *solidus*, CON, 578-582; Ibid., 339, no. 1/23a.

Maurice: 2 *solidi*, CON, 583-602; I, Ravenna, 586-602; Ibid., 339, no. 23b-c, 24 and 349, fig. 6/13.


Heraclius: *solidus*, CON, 616-625; *solidus*, CON, 629-632; *semissis*, CON, 613-641; *solidus* (gold plated imitation), after CON, 613-616; *semissis* (gold plated imitation), after Ravenna, 610-613; I, Catania, 614-615; 12-*nummia*, Alexandria, 610-641; I, Carthage, 610-641; Ibid., 339, no. 27-31 and 345, no. 17/1-2 with 351-52, fig. 6/23-24.

Constans II: *solidus*, CON, 662-667 (?); Ibid., 339, no. 32 and 349, fig. 6/15.

26. BĂICENI (Botoșani, Romania).

Justinian I: K, CON, 540-541, found in the sixth century settlement; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 14; D. G. Teodor, *Territoriol est-carpatic în veacurile V-XI e.n.: contribuții arheologice și istorice la problema formării poporului român* (Iași: Junimea, 1978), 23 and fig. 16/2.

26a. BÁJA (Bács-Kiskun, Hungary).


26b. BALATASZÁLLÁS (Bács-Kiskun, Hungary).


27. BALTA TOCILĂ (Buzău, Romania).


28. BALTA VERDE (Mehedinți, Romania).

Justin II: M, KYZ, 576-577; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 13.

29. BAKONYTAMÁSI-HATHALOM-PUZSTA (Veszprém, Hungary).
Maurice/Phocas: *solidus* (imitation), found in a grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 23-24, no. 1a.

30. **BANATSKA PALANKA-SAPAJA** (South Banat, Serbia).


31. **BANATSKA BRESTOVAC** (South Banat, Serbia).

   Justin II: 1 AE; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 31, no. 12.

32. **BANATSKA KARLOVAC** (South Banat, Serbia).


33. **BANATSKA NOVO SELO** (South Banat, Serbia).


34. **BARLAD** (Vaslui, Romania).


   Justin II: M, NIK, 570-571; Ibid., 229, no. 3.

   Maurice: K, CON, 583-584; I, CON, 582-560; Ibid., 229, no. 4-5.

   Phocas: K, CON, 602-610; Ibid., 229, no. 6.

   Constans II: M, CON, 642-643; M, CON, 656-657; Ibid., 230, no. 7-8.

35. **BÄRNBACH-MITTERNDORF** (Styria, Austria).


36. **BATINA** (Osijek-Baranja, Croatia).


37. **BATUMI** (Ajaria, Georgia).


38. **BEBA VECE** (Timiş, Romania).

---

17 Byzantine bridge-head on the Danube's left bank.

39. BECLEAN (Bistrița-Năsăud, Romania).
   Justinian I: 1 AV; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 247, no. 3.

40. BÉKÉSCSABA-REPÜLŐTÉR (Békés, Hungary).

40a. BÉKÉSGYULA (Békés, Hungary).
   Justinian I: light weight *solidus* (21 *siliquae*), CON, 537-542; D. Tănase, "Pieze de aur din epoca migrațiilor în colecția Muzeului Banatului din Timișoara," in Între stepă și Imperiu. Studii în onoarea lui Radu Harhoiu, ed. A. Măgureanu and E. Gáll (Bucharest: Renaissance, 2010), 147, fig. 2/5a-b.

   Maurice: *solidus*, CON, 583; Prohászka, "Altneue byzantinische Münzen," 103, no. 3.

41. BEREZENI (Vaslui, Romania).

42. BESKO (Sanok, Poland).

43. BICH’VINT’A-PITYUS (Abkhazia, Georgia).


---

18 *MIBE* 185a var. (CART instead of KART).

19 The *follis* is underweight (7.85g) and displays the mintmark NOC instead of CON.

20 Abramishvili does not provide any details regarding these finds from Pityus included in her 1989 catalogue of Byzantine coins in the Georgian National Museum, but they most probably date from archaeological excavations conducted after 1977, since they could not be identified (by weight or description) with any of the coins published by Izolda Tsukhishvili in 1977 (most of which also show up in Abramishvili’s catalogue with occasional reference to Tsukhishvili).
Justin II: M, CON, 565-566; K, NIK, 569-570; M, NIK, 574-575; M, CON, 576-577; Tsukhishvili, "Bich’vint’is bizant’iuri monet’ebi," 323-24, no. 50-53 and 609-10, fig. 50-53.

Tiberius II/ Maurice: K, Rome (military mint); Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 19, no 63.²¹

Maurice: M, NIK, 596-597;²² M, ANT, 596-597; M, CON, 600-601; K, TES, 585-586; K, TES, 602; K, TES; Tsukhishvili, "Bich’vint’is bizant’iuri monet’ebi," 324-26, no. 54-57 and 610-11, fig. 54-57; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 23-24, no. 81, 83.

Heraclius: M, CON, 613-616; M, CON, 615-624; 30-nummia, CON, 630-631(?); Tsukhishvili, "Bich’vint’is bizant’iuri monet’ebi," 326-27, no. 58-60 and 611, fig. 58-60.

Tiberius III: solidus, CON; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 127, no. 84.

44. BIECZ (Gorlice, Poland). Justinian I: M, 527-537; Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 497-98, no. 2 and 507, fig. 2 (possibly Constantinople mint, based on the illustration).

45. BILHOROD-DNISTROVS’KYI (Odesa, Ukraine). Justinian I: M, CON, 542-543, found in the area of the medieval fortress; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 137, no. 38.


49. BOBOKVATI (Ajaria, Georgia).²⁴ Early Byzantine: 72 coins; Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, History and Coin Finds in Georgia, 22.

²¹ Abramishvili attributes it to Justinian I, but the description clearly corresponds to the imitative series type MIBEC 73 (Tiberius II) or MIBEC 155 (Maurice).

²² Same coin as Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 23, no. 82, without mentioning the finding place.

²³ Same coin as Ibid., 22, no. 78-79 and pl. V/78, without mentioning the finding place.

²⁴ In 1983 archaeologist Nino Inaishvili acquired 72 early Byzantine coins from inhabitants of Bobokvati. A number of 36 coins were found together in a nursery garden, but there is no specific information about this potential hoard. The coins date from Anastasius to Maurice.
50. **Bočar** (North Banat, Serbia).  

51. **Bohuslavice** (Hodonín, Czech Republic).  

52. **Bolhrad** (Odesa, Ukraine).  

53. **Bol'shaia Orlovka** (Rostov-na-Donu, Russia).  

54. **Borča** (Palilula, Serbia).  
Justin II: K; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 30, no. 10.

55. **Borolea** (Botoşani, Romania).  
Justinian I: 1 AV, CON, 527-565; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 15.

56. **Boştanj** (Sevnica, Slovenia).  

57. **Botoşana** (Suceava, Romania).  
Justinian I: M, CON, 527-538, found in the sixth century settlement, in sunken-featured building 13; M, CON, 527-538, found in the sixth century settlement, in sunken-featured building 20; D. G. Teodor, *Civilizaţia romanică la est de Carpaţi în secolele V-VII (aşezarea de la Botoşana-Suceava)* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1984), 61, fig. 30/1-2 and fig. 31/6,8.

58. **Brădiceni** (Gorj, Romania).  
Justinian I: 1 AE; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranzitia de la antichitate," 68, n. 70.

59. **Braşov** (Brașov, Romania).  

60. **Bratei** (Sibiu, Romania).  

61. **Bratislava** (Bratislava, Slovakia).  
Justin I: M, CON, 518-527; J. Hunka, "Finds of Byzantine Coins from the 5th-10th Century From the Northern Part of the Carpathian Basin," in *Byzantine Coins in Central Europe*, 397, no. 4.
Constantine IV: *solidus*, CON, 674-681; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 31, no. 11.

62. BUCHAREST (Bucharest, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 527-537, found during archaeological excavations close to St. Nicolae-Șelari church; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 21; 1 AE, 527-538, found during excavations at Dâmăroaia; D. V. Rosetti, "Siedlungen der Kaiserzeit und der Völkerwanderungszeit bei Bukarest," *Germany* 18 (1934): 210. M, KYZ, 539-540, found in the area of St. Dumitru church; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 22; 1 AE, found during excavations on the Blănari Street; S. Morintz and D. V. Rosetti, "Din cele mai vechi timpuri și pînă la formarea Bucureștilor," in *București de odinioară în lumina săpăturilor arheologice* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică, 1959), 33-34.
   Justin II: M, CON, 566-567, found during works at "23 August" stadium; M, CON, 571-572, found on Cărpiniș st.; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 23-24.

63. BUCHAREST - MĂGUERELE (Bucharest, Romania).

64. BUCHAREST - OTOPENI (Bucharest, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 539-540; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 105.

65. BUCHAREST - STRĂULEȘTI-MAICĂNEȘTI (Bucharest, Romania).27

---

25 Butnariu mentions another find at the intersection of the Șelari with the Gabroveni Street--a coin belonging to the same type. But this is, in fact, the same coin found during excavations at St. Nicolae-Șelari. See Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 217, no. 21, citing Preda, "Circulația monedelor bizantine," 397, who mistakingly reported two distinct finds.

26 Probably the same coin mentioned by Constantiniu, "Elemente romano-bizantine," 668, n. 18.

27 Constantiniu, "Elemente romano-bizantine," 668, n. 18 and 676, fig. 8/1-3 with the reverse of a *follis* from Constantinople (527-538), fig. 8/1, the obverse of a post reform issue (538-565), fig. 8/2, and the reverse of a half-*follis* from Nicomedia (557-558), fig. 8/3. Fig. 8/1 and 8/2, due to the similar size of the coins, were mistakenly taken to represent the obverse and the reverse of the same coin, when in fact there are two different coins. None of the authors who included the coins from Bucharest - Străulești-Măicănești in their inventories took the time to verify the information cited or simply lacked the necessary expertise for an accurate attribution of the coins, which otherwise constitute a crucial find, one of the rare

66. BUDĂI (Taraclia, Moldova).
Anastasius I: M, CON, 512-517; Nudel'man, Topografiia kladov i nakhodok, 86, no. 36.

67. BUDAKALÁSZ (Pest, Hungary).
Heraclius: light weight solidus (20 siliquae), CON, 616-625; Somogyi, Byzantinishe Fundmünzen, 31-32, no. 13.

67a. BUDAPEST (Budapest, Hungary).

68. BUDUREASCA (Prahova, Romania).

69. BURLĂCENI (Cahul, Moldova).
Justinian I: 1 AE; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 135, no. 29.

70. BUZĂU (Buzău, Romania).
Justin II: Є, CON, 565-578; K, TES or KYZ, 567-568; K, TES, 572-573; Ibid., 319, n. 26, 29 and 30.
Tiberius II: M, CON, 581-582; Ibid., 319, n. 28.
Phocas: M, NIK, 605-606; Ibid., 319, 320, n. 28 and n. 31.
Heraclius: solidus, CON, 613-616; Ibid., 311, no. 32.
Constantine IV: hexagrammon, CON, 674-681; Ibid.," 17, no. 33.

71. CALAFAT (Dolj, Romania).
Justin II: M, CON, 568-569; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 224, no. 176.

72. CÂMPENI (Cahul, Moldova).

occasions when early Byzantine coins have been found during systematic excavations in sixth-century settlements. In fact, two of the coins had already been published and illustrated in an earlier article by the same author, Constantiniu, "Sanctierul arheologic Băneasa-Străulești," 189, fig. 93/1a-b, 2a-b and 3. A brief comparison of the illustrations from the two articles reveals the fact that the obverse from fig. 8/2 in the 1966 article finds its reverse at fig. 93/2b of the 1965 article.
73. CÂMPULUNG MUSCEL (Argeș, Romania).
   Justin II: M; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 32.

74. CARACAL (Olt, Romania).
   Justinian I: K, CON, 541-542; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranziția de la antichitate," 68, n. 70.
   Maurice: M, CON, 590-591; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 133, n. 74.

75. CAREI (Satu Mare, Romania).28
   Justin II: Є, 565-578; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 251, no. 33.

76. CÂRJA (Vaslui, Romania).
   Justin I: M, CON, 522-527, found together with sixth century-pottery; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 33. For the archaeological context, see Teodor, "Descoperiri arheologice și numismatice," 64, no. 156.

77. CĂZĂNEȘTI (Telenesti, Moldova).
   Early Byzantine: 1 coin; Nudel’man, Topografiia kladov i nakhodok, 82, no. 11.

78. ČELÁKOVICE (Prague, Czech Republic).

79. CELJE (Celje, Slovenia).29
   Justin II: K, TES, 574-575; Ibid., 226, no. 21.
   Constans II: M, CON, 642-645;30 12-nummia, Alexandria, 645-646; Ibid., 227, no. 29-30.

80. CEPTURA DE JOS (Prahova, Romania).
   Justin II: M, NIK, 569-570; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 29.

80a. ČEREVERIĆ (South Bačka District, Serbia).
   Heraclius: 1 AV, CON; Prohászka, "Altlrue," 104, no. 5.

81. CERNAT (Covasna, Romania).
   Justin II: K, 576-577; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 30.

82. ČESTEREG (Central Banat, Serbia).
   Maurice: solidus, CON, 584-602; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 32-33, no. 14.

28 Eighteen coins from the fourteenth century together with a fourth century Late Roman coin and the pentanumnumium of Justin II were brought to the museum in Oradea (Oradea, Romania) as a hoard found at Carei, but it is highly unlikely that the ancient coins were part of the medieval hoard.

29 Also published in P. Kos, Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Slowenien, vol. 2 (Berlin: Mann, 1988).

30 The coin appears as a solidus in Kos, "The Monetary Circulation," 227, no. 29, but is in fact a follis, cf. Kos, Die Fundmünzen, vol. 2, 58, no. 1547, with reference to MIB 162.
83. CETEA (Alba, Romania).

84. CH’ANDREBI (Shida Kartli, Georgia).
    Heraclius: *hexagrammon*, CON, 625-629; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 126, no. 71.

85. CHECEA (Timiș, Romania).
    Constans II: *semisissi*, CON, 642-668; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 143, n. 154.

86. CHELM (Chełm, Poland).
    Justinian I: 1 AR; Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 500, no. 4.

87. CHEMBURKA (Krasnodar, Russia).

88. CHEREPIN (Cherkasy, Ukraine).

89. CHERNOMORKA (Odesa, Ukraine).

90. CH’IATURA (Imereti, Georgia).
    Phocas: light *siliqua*, CON, 602-607; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984)*, 24, no. 86 and pl. VI/86.\(^{31}\)

91. CH’IORA (Racha-Lechkhumi, Georgia).

92. CH’KHALTA (Abkhazia, Georgia).
    Justinian I: 1 AV, found in the fortress; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 46, no. 477.

93. CHKHOROTSQUI (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia).\(^{32}\)

94. CHMI (North Ossetia-Alania, Russia).
    Maurice: *tremissis*, CON, 582-584(?), pierced twice, found in 1882 in a grave, during archaeological excavations conducted by D. Ia. Samokvasov; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 31, no. 142/1. Phocas: 2 *solidi*, CON, 602-610, one of the coins is pierced twice; Ibid., 31, no. 142/2-3.

95. CH’ORVILA (Imereti, Georgia)

---

\(^{31}\) Same coin as Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 61, no. 171 and pl. XI/171, but without mentioning the finding place.

\(^{32}\) Possibly same coins as below no. 522.
Constans II: 1 AR; Tsotselia, *Coin Finds in Georgia*, 149, no. 790.

96. CHOTUSICE (Kutná Hora, Czech Republic).

97. CIOROI NOU (Dolj, Romania).

98. CIŞMICHIOI (UTAG, Moldova).

99. COADA IZVORULUI (Dâmbovița, Romania).

100. COCIÓC (Ilfov, Romania).
   Anastasius I: M, 512-518; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 34.

101. COLIBAŞI (Cahul, Moldova).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 527-538; M, CON, 539-540; M, CON, 542-543; K, NIK, 538-539; Stoliarik, *Essays on Monetary Circulation*, 135, no. 23-26; Nudel’man, *Topografiia kladov i nakhodok*, 87, no. 45a-b. 34

102. COMĂNEŞTI (Bacău, Romania).
   Heraclius: M, KYZ, 612-613; M, CON, 619-620, found together with sixth-century pottery; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 35-36; Teodor, *Teritoriul est-carpatic*, 23, fig. 16/6-7.

103. CONŢEŞTI (Teleorman, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, NIK, 555-556; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 37.
   Justin II: M, CON, 571-572; C. Beda, "Descoperiri monetare antice și bizantine, jud. Teleorman," *CN* 3 (1980), 139.

104. CORNI (Botoșani, Romania).
   Justin II: M, ANT, 570-571; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, no. 38.

105. COROTNA (Slobozia, Moldova).

---

33 In the original publication Bucur Mitrea was less certain about the attribution to Anastasius preferring a wider dating between 512 and 538, for which see B. Mitrea, "Découvertes récentes de monnaies anciennes sur le territoire de la République Populaire Roumaine," *Dacia* 4 (1960): 591, no. 14.

34 The two coins published by Nudel’man in 1976 were accidental finds during works at a rural stadium by the Prut river during which a number of early medieval graves were destroyed. Among the finds collected from the site there was also a gold coin of Michael VII (1071-1078).
Justin I: K, KYZ or NIK, 518-527; Ibid., 304, no. 3, fig. 3.
Justinian I: M, ANT, 554-555; Nudel'man, Topografiia kladov i nakhodok, 85, no. 29.
K, TES, 564-565, no. 160, pl. VI.10; Mussorov and Nosova, "Nahodki vizantiiskih monet," 304-306, no. 1, fig. 4.
Justin II: K, TES, 573-574; Ibid., 306, no. 5, fig. 5.
106. COTEȘTI (Vrancea, Romania).
Heraclius: tremissis; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Societate, economie și politică," 320, n. 46.
107. COZLA (Caraș-Severin, Romania).
Justinian I: K, CON; Velter, Transilvania în secolele V-XII, 289, no. 30.
108. CRAIOVA (Dolj, Romania).
Anastasius I: 1 AV; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monetelor bizantine," 218, no. 39.
Justinian I: M, KYZ, 558-559; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranziția de la antichitate,
68, n. 70.
Maurice: M, CON, 587-588; K, TES, 588-589; Ibid., 133, n. 76.
Heraclius: M, CON, 612-613; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monetelor bizantine," 218, no. 40.
109. CRUȘOVIȚA (Caraș-Severin, Romania).
Phocas: solidus, CON, 607-609; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 33-34, no. 16.
110. CSÁRDASZÁLLÁS-BARÁTHALOM (Békés, Hungary).
Heraclius: tremissis; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 34-35, no. 17.
111. CUCORĂNI (Botoșani, Romania).
Justin II: K, TES, 574-575, accidental find in a sixth century settlement; Teodor,
Teritoriul est-carpatic, 23 and fig. 16/5.
112. CURCANI (Călărași, Romania).35
Constans II: solidus, CON, 662-667; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 357, n. 48 (date 659-668); A. Vîlcu, Les monnaies d'or de la Bibliothèque de l'Académie roumaine. II. Monnaies Byzantines (Wetteren: Moneta, 2009), 70, no. 193.36
113. DALJ (Osijek-Baranja, Croatia).

35 According to Oberländer-Târnoveanu both coins have the same registry number (înr. 1657) so we might be dealing with just one coin. Alternatively, they may be part of a dispersed hoard registered under a single entry in museum records.
36 Vîlcu expressed doubts that the coin was found in Curcani based on the fact that the coin belonged to a collector from Curcani who purchased coins from various other places, see Vîlcu, Les monnaies d'or, 13.
Justinian I: 2 M, CON, 527-538; M, NIK, 541-542, M, Carthage, 534-539; 212
nummia, Alexandria; Goricke-Lukić, "Justinijanov novac," 1150-1154, no. 6, 8, 26, 41, 43, 45.

114. DARŁOWO (Sławno, Poland).

115. DELACĂU (Anenii Noi, Moldova).
  Justinian I: M; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 136, no. 34.

116. DESZK (Csongrád, Hungary).
  Justinian I: 2 M, CON, 527-537; both coins found in the vicinity of an Avar-age cemetery; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 35-36, no. 18.

117. DIDI CH’O’ONI (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia).
  Heraclius: solidus, CON, 625-629; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 64, no. 186.

118. DMANISI (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia).
  Justin I: M, CON, 518-522; M, CON, 518-527, both found during archaeological excavations; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 42, no. 63; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 13, no. 36.
  Justinian I: M, CON, 527-537, found in 1969 during archaeological excavations; Ibid., 17, no. 54 and pl. III/54.
    Justin II: M, NIK, 570-571; Ibid., 20, no. 71 and pl. IV/71.
    Phocas: M, CON, 604-605; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 61, no. 174.

119. DOBRENI (Neamţ, Romania).
  Justin I: 1 AE; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Societate, economie şi politică," 316.

120. DOBROHOŠŤ (Dunajská Streda, Slovakia).
  Justin I: 1 coin; Fiala, "Byzantšké mince," 57, no. 1.

121. DOBRUN (Olt, Romania).
  Justinian I: M, NIK, 543-544; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 218, n. 42.

122. DOBRUŞA (Vâlcea, Romania).
  Justin II: M, NIK, 569-570; "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 219, no. 43.

123. DOLNÍ BOUSOV (Mladá Boleslav, Czech Republic).

124. DOMNEŞTI (Argeş, Romania).

125. DOMNEŞTI (Ilfov, Romania).

126. DOROBANȚI (Arad, Romania).

127. DOROHOI (Botoșani, Romania).
Justinian I/ Heraclius: several AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 219, no. 45.

128. DRĂGAICA (Buzău, Romania).

129. DRĂGOIEȘTI (Suceava, Romania).
Justin I: M, CON, 518-527; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 219, no. 47.

130. DRANDA (Abkhazia, Georgia).

131. DROBETA (Mehedinți, Romania).
Justin I: 6 M, 518-527; Ibid., 60-61, n. 63.
Justinian I: 5 M, CON, 527-538; K, CON, 527-538; M, NIK, 527-538; M, CON, 542-543; M, CON, 543-544; M, CON, 544-545; M, CON, 546-547; M, KYZ, 546-547; IS, TES, 542-547; K, Salona, 540-542; M, CON, 553-554; IS, TES; K, TES, 563-564; Ibid., 68, n. 70. IS, TES; E. Nicolae, "Descoperiri de monede antice și bizantine," *BSNR*, 88-89 (1994 - 1995): 273, no. 35. (art. pp. 269-274)
Justin II: K, TES, 564-565; K, TES, 567-568; 2 M, CON, 568-569; K, CON, 568-569; M, CON, 569-570; M, NIK, 569-570; K, TES, 569-570; M, CON, 570-571; K, TES, 570-571; M, NIK, 570-571; K, TES, 575-571; M, NIK, 575-572; K, TES, 574-575; M, CON, 575-576; M, NIK, 575-576; K, TES, 575-576; K, TES, 568-578; 2 €, CON, 565-578; €, NIK; 565-578; 2 K, TES, 565-578; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 124, n. 17.
Tiberius II: M, NIK, 580-581; €, CON, 578-582; Ibid., 129, n. 56.

---

37 Csallány provided a confusing attribution to Justinian I and then to Justin I, which was later corrected by B. Mitrea, "Descoperiri recente și mai vechi de monede antice și bizantine în Republica Populară Româna," *SCIV* 13, no. 1 (1962): 223.

38 Dated 527-538 in Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 219, no. 46.

39 Misidentified as a light weight *solidus* (20 siliquae) in Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 336 and 337, n. 15, with reference to *DOC* 3i.2 (full-weight *solidus*).
Maurice: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 583-602; M, CON, 582-583; K, TES, 582-583; M, CON, 588-589; M, ANT, 590-591; M, CON, 591-592; M, NIK, 592-593(?); K, TES, 594-595; K, TES, 595-596; M, ANT, 596-597; K, TES, 598-599; K, TES, 583-584. Ibid., 132, n. 70.

Heraclius: M, CON, 612-613; M, CON, 613-614; Ibid., 138, n. 111.

Tiberius III: M, CON, 700-701; Ibid., 147, n. 194.

132. **Dukla** (Krosno, Poland).

Justinian I: 1 AE; Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 500, no. 5.

133. **Dumitrești Gălății** (Iași, Romania).


134. **Dunaszekcső** (Baranya, Hungary).


135. **Dvin** (Ararat, Armenia).\(^{40}\)

Anastasius I: M, CON, 517-518; Mousheghian et al., *History*, 62, no. 16.

Anastasius /Justin I/ Justinian I: K; Ibid., 62-64, no. 17.

Justinian I: M, NIK, 527-538; Ibid., 62, no. 18.

Justin II: M, NIK, 566-567;\(^{41}\) M, CON, 570-571; M, CON, 572-573; 2M; Ibid., 62, no. 19-24.

Phocas: M, ANT, 603-604; Ibid., 62-63, no. 25.


Tiberius III: *solidus*, CON, 698-705; Ibid., 64, no. 52.

135a. **Dzhaga** (Karachayevo-Cherkesiya, Russia).


Constans II: 2 thin gold foil imitations (bracteates) after *solidi* dated 654-667, found in grave 42; Ibid., 220-21 and fig. 1/5-6.

Constantine IV: thin gold foil imitation (bracteate) after *solidus* dated 669-674; Ibid., 221.

136. **Dzhiginka** (Krasnodar, Russia).

Justin I: *solidus*, CON, 527 (joint reign of Justin I and Justinian I), attached to a gold necklace with precious stone pendants; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 21, no. 9 and fig. 14.

137. **Egerlővő** (Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Hungary).

---

\(^{40}\) All coins have been found during archaeological excavations in the ancient city of Dvin.

\(^{41}\) Two coins struck at Nicomedia in 566-567 are listed in the catalogue (no. 21-22) but the illustration on pl. I/21-22 (rubbing drawing and an actual photograph) shows that we are in fact dealing with one and the same coin.
Justin II: M, NIK, 572-573, found in a Gepid cemetery, grave 31; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 38-39, no. 21.

138. EISENSTADT (Burgenland, Austria).

139. ENDRÖD (Békés, Hungary).
   Constans II: miliarensis (imitation), 651-654; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 39, no. 22.

140. ENNS (Oberösterreich, Austria).

141. EPURENI (Vaslui, Romania).

142. FĂGEȚEL (Hunedoara, Romania).
   Tiberius II: 1 AE; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 247, no. 8.

143. FĂLCIU (Vaslui, Romania).
   Justin II: M, CON, 576-577, together with sixth-century pottery; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 219, no. 49; Teodor, Descoperiri arheologice şi numismatică, 88, no. 288.

144. FĂLTICENI (Suceava, Romania).

145. FETEȘTI (Ialomița, Romania).

145a. FREUNDORF (Niederösterreich, Austria).

146. FURSY (Kiev, Ukraine).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 527-537; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 33, no. 192.

147. FUZĂUCA (Rezina, Moldova).

148. GĂEȘTI (Dâmbovița, Romania).42
   Justinian I: solidus, CON, 527-537; 3 M, CON, 527-537; M, NIK, 527-537; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 219, no. 51-55.

---

42 Possibly part of a hoard.
149. GALIAT (North Ossetia-Alania, Russia).

150. GARNI (Kotayk, Armenia).
   Constans II: *hexagrammon*, CON, 648-652; M; Mousheghian et al., *History*, 178, no. 3-4.

151. GHEORGHE DOJA (Mureș, Romania).

152. GHERLA (Cluj, Romania).

153. GHINDAOANI (Neamț, Romania).

154. GHINDENI (Dolj, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 541-542; M, NIK, 556-557; Ibid., 219, no. 60-61.
   Justin II: K, NIK, 566-567; M, CON, 574-575; Ibid., 219, no. 62-63.

155. GIARMATA (Timiș, Romania).
   Justin II: M, NIK, 574-575; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 251, no. 35.

156. GIURGIȚA (Dolj, Romania).
   Tiberius II: K, TES, 578-579; Ibid., 219, no. 67.

157. GOGOȘU (Mehedinți, Romania).
   Maurice: M, CON, 597-598; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 133, n. 72.

158. GOICEA (Dolj, Romania).
   Justin II: K, NIK, 566-567; Ibid., 106, fig. 14/7.
   Maurice: M, CON, 583-584; Ibid., 106, fig. 14/6.

---

43 Lazăr also mentions a small silver coin, "probably from the sixth century," but does not provide any description or illustration so the attribution must be taken with caution.
159. GORNET (Prahova, Romania).

160. GORYACHI KLYUCH (Krasnodar, Russia).
   Justin I: solidus; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 21, no. 7.

161. GOVORA (Vâlcea, Romania).

162. GRODZISKO DOLNE (Leżajsk, Poland).
   Heraclius: M, NIK, 613-614, found in the early Slavic settlement; Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 500-01, no. 6 and 511, fig. 6/12.

163. GROSIENI (Brăila, Romania).
   Phocas: 1 AE; Preda, "Circulația monedelor bizantine," 402 with n. 59.

164. GRUMEZOAIA (Vaslui, Romania).

165. GURJAAJNI (Kakheti, Georgia).
   Constans II: solidus, CON, 642-644(?); Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 127, no. 76.
   Constantine IV: solidus; Tsotselia, Coin Finds in Georgia, 149, no. 793.

166. GVANK’ITI (Imereti, Georgia).
   Constantine IV: solidus, CON, 681-685; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 73, no. 242.

167. GVESO (Racha-Lechkhumi and Kvemo Svaneti, Georgia).
   Justin I: 1 AV; Tsotselia, Coin Finds in Georgia, 130, no. 692.

168. GYENESDIÁS (Zala, Hungary).
   Constans II: solidus, CON, 654-659, found in an Avar cemetery, grave 64; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 43, no. 26.

169. HAGIMUS (Căușeni, Moldova).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 527-537; Nudel’man, Topografiia kladov i nakhodok, 85, no. 30.

170. HAJDÚDOROG-VÁROSKERT (Hajdú-Bihar, Hungary).
   Heraclius: light weight solidus (20 siliquae), CON, 610-613, with suspension loop found in the Avar age cemetery, grave 1; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 43-44, no. 27.

171. HAJDÚNÁNAS-FÜRJHALOM-JÁRÁS (Hajdú-Bihar, Hungary).
   Constans II: solidus, Rome, 662-663, found in the Avar cemetery; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 272-273, no. 5.

---

44 Possibly same as Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 43, no. 399 (Constantine IV). Medea Tsotselia mentions two solidi of Constans II and Constantine IV, respectively, both found in 1948.
172. HARKÁNY (Baranya, Hungary).

173. HEDWIŻYN (Biłgoraj, Poland).
   Justin II: M, CON, 572-573; Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 501, no. 7 and 509, fig. 6/8.

174. HEREPEIA (Hunedoara, Romania).
   Justinian I: AE, CON, 538-539; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 248, no. 11.

175. HÓDMEZÖVÁSÁRHELY (Csongrád, Hungary).
   Justin II: *solidus*, CON, 567-578; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 45, no. 29.

176. HOGHIZ-UNGRA (Brașov, Romania).

177. HOLEŠOVICE (Prague, Czech Republic).

178. HORGÁ (Vaslui, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, ANT, 537-539; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 72.
   Justin II: K, TES, 569-570; Ibid., no. 73.

179. HORODENKA (Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine).

180. HROCHŮV TÝNEC (Chrudim, Czech Republic).
   Justin I: *solidus*, CON, 522-527, found in the area of the Roman settlement; Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 368, no. C6.

181. Huşi (Vaslui, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 541-542; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 74.
   Justin II - Heraclius: AE; Ibid., 220, no. 75.

182. IAŞI (Iaşi, Romania).
   Justinian I: 1 AV; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 76.

---

45 Possibly the same coin as no. 344 below (Rupea). In both cases the finding place is somewhat vague, between Hoghiz and Ungra and the area of Rupea, respectively. The three settlements are within a 5-10km radius. Moreover, in one of the early publications Kurt Horedt mentioned that the *solidus* from the area of Hoghiz and Ungra, which was described as an imitation based on the shape of the edge, belonged to H. Müller from Rupea. This notice might constitute the initial source of the confusion and we may in fact be dealing with one and the same find. See K. Horedt, *Contribuţii la istoria Transilvaniei în secolele IV-XIII* (Bucharest, Editura Academiei RPR, 1958), 106, no. 2.

46 Same as Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 39-40, no 23 (Făgăraş).

47 Both coins were found together with sixth century wheel- and hand-made pottery and a so-called "Slavic" bow fibula. See Teodor, *Descoperiri arheologice și numismatic*, 101, no. 363.
183. IDVOR (South Banat, Serbia).

184. IGRIȘ (Timiș, Romania).
   Heraclius(?): solidus, CON, found in an Avar grave; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 140, n. 142.

185. IUJNOE (Cahul, Moldova).
   Phocas: M; Nudel'man, Topografiia kladov i nakhodok, 86, no. 39 (Trubaevka).

186. IZMAIL (Odesa, Ukraine).
   Justin I: K, TES, 518-527; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 134, no. 15.

187. JÁSZAPÁTI (Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, Hungary).
   Heraclius: tremissis (imitation), found in the Avar-age cemetery, grave 264; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 47-48, no. 32.

188. JUTAS (Veszprém, Hungary).
   Phocas: M, NIK, 603-610, found in the Avar-age cemetery, grave 116; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 48-49, no. 33.

189. KAMUNTA (North Ossetia-Alania, Russia).48
   Anastasius I: solidus, CON, 507-518; 2 silver brateates, one with suspension loop; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 30, no. 138/1; Y. A. Prokopenko, "Byzantine Coins of the 5th-9th Century and their Imitations in the Central and Eastern Ciscaucasus," in Byzantine Coins in Central Europe, 545-46.
   Justinian I: solidus, CON, 537-542; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 30, no. 138/2.
   Tiberius II: solidus, CON, 578-582; Ibid., 30, no. 138/4.
   Maurice: solidus, CON, 582-584(?); Ibid., 30, no. 138/5.
   Constans II: solidus, CON, 654-659, pierced twice; found during archaeological excavations conducted by G. D. Filimonov; Ibid., 30, no. 139; 1 AR. Ibid., 30, no. 138/10.
   Early Byzantine: 1 AE, found during archaeological excavations conducted by G. D. Filimonov; Ibid., 30, no. 140.

190. KAPUSTYNTSI (Ternopil', Ukraine).
   Justinian I/ Justinian II: solidus; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 36-37, no. 261.

190a. KARCAG (Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, Hungary).

48 All coins, except the two specimens found during archaeological excavations, are late nineteenth century accidental finds from early medieval graves in Kamunta. Imitations of early Byzantine gold coins are also mentioned, with no further details, as well as gold bracteates of Anastasius and Phocas. The coins have been redated after MIB.
Constantine IV: *solidus*, CON, 674-681; Prohászka, "Altneue byzantinische Fundmünzen," 105, no. 7.

191. KHERSON (Kherson, Ukraine).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 541-542; Stoliarik, *Essays on Monetary Circulation*, 137, n. 44.

192. KICHERES (Zaporizhia, Ukraine).
   Justinian I: 1 AV; Ibid., 138, no. 46.

193. KIEV (Kiev, Ukraine).
   Anastasius I: M, found during archaeological excavations on the Kiselivka Hill; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 33, no. 184.
   Justinian I: M, found during archaeological excavations on the Kiselivka Hill; Ibid., 33, no. 184.

194. KISKUNDOROSMA (Csongrád, Hungary).
   Phocas: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 603-607; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 36-37, no. 19.
   Constans II: *solidus*, CON, 667-668, found in the Avar cemetery Daruhalom-dułó II, grave 21; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 273-274, no. 6.

194a. KISLOVODSK (Stavropol, Russia).
   Tiberius III: 5 gold plated silver imitations after *solidi* of Tiberius III, found on a slope near a plundered grave at Kugul, close to Kislovodsk; Rtveladze and Runich, "Nahodki indikatsii," 221 and fig. 1/8-10.

195. KISZOMBOR (Csongrád, Hungary).
   Anastasius: *solidus*, CON, 491-507, found in the Gepid cemetery, grave 40; Csallány, *Archäologische Denkmäler*, 174; pl. CXV/11.
   Phocas: *solidus*, CON, 603-607, found in the Avar cemetery O, grave 2; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 53-54, no. 36.
   Heraclius: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 616-625, with suspension loop, found in the Avar cemetery at Tanyahalom-dułó, grave 16; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 274-275, no. 7.

196. KLÁRAFALVA (Csongrád, Hungary).
   Phocas: *solidus* (imitation), found in the Avar-age cemetery, grave 30; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 54-55, no. 37.

196a. KLIN-YAR (Stavropol, Russia).

197. KLOSTERNEUBURG (Niederösterreich, Austria).
Justinian I: M, KYZ, 541-542; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 340, no. 2 and 350, fig. 6/17.

198. KOLÍN (Kolin, Czech Republic).49
   Justin I: 2 M, 518-527.
   Justin II: 1 AE.
   Constans II (?): solidus (?) (gold plated), found near "the pagan graves."
   Early Byzantine: 3 coins.

199. KÖLKED-FEKETEKAPU (Baranya, Hungary).
   Justinian I: IS, TES, 542-547, found in cemetery A, grave 354; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 56-57, no. 40.
   Justin II: solidus, CON, 568-578, found in cemetery B, grave 119; K, KYZ, 569-570, found in cemetery A, grave 253; Ibid., 56, no. 39 and 57, no. 41/1.
   Maurice: solidus, CON, 584-602, found in cemetery B, grave 119; Ibid., 57, no. 41/2.
   Heraclius: solidus, CON, 613-616, found in cemetery A, grave 29; Ibid., 55-56, no. 38.

200. KORETI (Imereti, Georgia).
   Heraclius: hexagrammon; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 126, no. 70.

201. KOSZALIN (Koszalin, Poland).

202. KRANJ (Kranj, Slovenia).
   Justinian I: tremissis, pierced; found in grave 43; V. Stare, Kranj. Nekropola iz časa preseljevanja ljudstev (Ljubljana: Narodni muzej, 1980), 107.

203. KRAȘNOPSIS (Cherkasy, Ukraine).
   Justin I: 1 coin; V. V. Kropotkin, "Novye nahodki vizantiiskikh monet na territorii SSSR," VV 26 (1965): 179, no. 80.

204. KRAȘNYI GORODOK (Tambov, Russia).

205. KRIŽNA GORA (Škofja Loka, Slovenia).50

206. KROMĚŘÍŽ (Kroměříž, Czech Republic).

---

49 The coins were found in the region of Kolin, but some of them might belong to a dispersed hoard given the unusually high number of finds. See Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 374-75, no. C19 and 378, no. C26.

50 Also published in Kos, Die Fundmünzen, vol. 1.
207. KŘSICE (Písek, Czech Republic).

208. K’RTS’ANISI (Tbilisi, Georgia).
   Anastasius I: M, CON, 498-512; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 39, no. 49.

209. KRYMSKAYA (Krasnodar, Russia).

210. KŠELY (Kolín, Czech Republic).
   Heraclius: *solidus* (gold plated silver imitation), CON, 625-629, pierced; light weight *solidus*, CON, 616-625, both coins found close to older-hill-fort period settlements; Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 360 and 376, no. C23-24.

211. KÚLA (West Bačka, Serbia).
   Phocas: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 603-607; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 58-59, no. 43.

212. KUNÁGOTA (Békés, Hungary).
   Justinian I: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 542-562, found in an Avar grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 59-60, no. 44.

213. KUNMADARAS (Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, Hungary).

214. KUNSZENTMÁRTON (Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, Hungary).51
   Constans II: *solidus*, CON, 662-667; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 61, no. 46.

215. KUP’YANS’K (Kharkiv, Ukraine).

216. KUTAISI (Imereti, Georgia).
   Justin I: M, CON; Ibid., 24, no. 2.
   Justinian I: 4 M, CON; €, CON; Ibid., 24, no. 3.
   Justin II: M, NIK; Ibid., 24, no. 4.
   Tiberius II: M, CON; Ibid., 24, no. 5.
   Maurice: M, NIK; 2 M, ANT; Ibid., 24, no. 6.
   Phocas: M, NIK; Ibid., 24, no. 7.

217. LĂCENI (Teleorman, Romania).
   Justin II: M, NIK, 568-569; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 78.

51 Same coin as Prohászka, "Altneue byzantinische Münzen," 103, no. 2 with finding place Békés (Békés, Hungary).
217a. LAK (Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Hungary).
218. LASKI (Białograd, Poland).
219. LASLOVO (Osijek-Baranja, Croatia).
220. LĂURENI (Mureș, Romania).
221. ŁĘCZE (Elbląg, Poland).
222. LENDORF (Carinthia, Austria).
223. LEU (Dolj, Romania).
   Justinian I: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 79.
224. LEUNTEA, (Căușeni, Moldova).
   Justin II: M, NIK, 570-571; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 139, no. 53.
225. LIENZ (Tyrol, Austria).
226. LINZ (Oberösterreich, Austria).
227. LIVEZEMI (Argeș, Romania).
228. LJUBLJANA (Ljubljana, Slovenia).
229. ŁÓDŹ (Łódź, Poland).
   Justin II: I, Carthage, 565-566; Woloszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 501-02, no. 9 and 509, fig. 6/9.
   Maurice: M, NIK, 583-584; Ibid., 502, no. 10 and 510, fig. 6/10.
230. LOKJANDARI (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia).
231. LOPATNA (Orhei, Moldova).

---

52 Also published in Kos, Die Fundmünzen, vol. 1.
Justinian I: M, CON, 539-540, found in association with Luka Rajkovetskaia ceramics; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 38, no. 293, fig. 17/26.

232. **LOUKA** (Most, Czech Republic).

233. **LOVCENAC** (North Bačka, Serbia).
Heraclius: light weight solidus (20 siliquae), CON, 616-625, found in a grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 62-63, no. 48.

234. **LOVOSICE** (Litoměřice, Czech Republic).

235. **LUŽICE** (Hodonín, Czech Republic).

236. **MAGDALENSBERG** (Carinthia, Austria).

237. **MĂGURA** (Vâlcea, Romania).
Justinian I: solidus, CON, 527-538; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 80.

238. **MAIAKI** (Odesa, Ukraine).

239. **MAJUR** (Sisak-Moslavina, Croatia).
Justin II: M, CON, 571-572; Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine," 178, no. 492.

240. **MAKHARADZE** (Guria, Georgia).
Maurice: 1 AE; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 125, no. 53.

240a. **MAKUKHVKA** (Poltava, Ukraine).
Heraclius: solidus, CON, 632-641, found together with gold objects, most likely in a grave; Kropotkin, "Novye nakhdoki," 178, no. 73.

241. **MĂNĂSTIOARA** (Dâmboviţa, Romania).

242. **MANTA** (Cahul, Moldova).
Justin I: M, CON, 518-522; Nudel’man, *Topografiia kladov i nakhodok*, 86-87, no. 42.

243. **MARATICE** (Uherské Hradiště, Czech Republic).

---

Possibly the same coin as no. 389 below (Stolniceni). The two settlements, Măgura and Stolniceni, are very close at 4km distance. See G. I. Petre-Govora, "Continitatea daço-română în nordul Olteniei în sec. IV-VII e.n. în lumina noilor descoperiri arheologice și numismatice," *Drobeta* 2 (1976): 114.
244. MARAZLIVKA (Odesa, Ukraine).
   Heraclius: *hexagrammon*, CON, 625-629(?); Stoliarik, *Essays on Monetary Circulation*, 141, no. 67.\(^{54}\)

245. MARIA SAAL (Carinthia, Austria).
   Heraclius: 12-*nummia*, Alexandria, 613-618; Ibid., 454.

246. MARIBOR (Maribor, Slovenia).
   Heraclius: M; Kos, "Monetary," 227, no. 27.

247. MĂRŞANI (Dolj, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, ANT, 554-555; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, n. 83.\(^{55}\)

248. MASIS (Ararat, Armenia).
   Heraclius: *solidus*, CON, 641; Mousheghian et al., *History*, 168-69.

249. MATEUŢI (Rezina, Moldova).
   Early Byzantine: 1 coin; Nudel’man, *Topografiia kladov i nakhodok*, 81, no. 4.

250. MEDIAŞ (Sibiu, Romania).
   Tiberius III: 1 AE; I. Dimian, "Cîteva descoperiri monetare bizantine pe teritoriul R.P.R.," SCN 1 (1957): 197.\(^{56}\)

251. MEHADIA (Caraş-Severin, Romania).

252. MEL’NYKY (Cherkasy, Ukraine).

253. MEZŐBERÉNY (Békés, Hungary).
   Heraclius: *solidus* (imitation), CON, 616-625, found in a grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 63-65, no. 49.

254. MIRCEŞTI (Vaslui, Romania).
   Phocas: K, TES, 602-603; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 82.

255. MISKOVICE (Kutná Hora, Czech Republic).

---

\(^{54}\) Stoliarik’s reference to Tolstoi (wrong plate, 51 instead of 48) and *BMC* is contradictory and points to several types of *hexagrammata*, but the most frequent ones display a K on the reverse and Heraclius Constantine as adult, which corresponds to type *MIB* 140, dated 625-629.

\(^{55}\) Possibly the same coin as no. 341 below.

\(^{56}\) No illustration was provided and the confusing attribution to *BMC*, pl. XL/8 (*solidus*) makes the identification irretrievably uncertain, despite the recent attempt of Péter Somogyi to speculate that the coin was an issue of Syracuse, for which see Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 257. Most other inventories took Dimian’s identification for granted. See Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 248, no. 14; Velter, *Transilvania în secolele V-XII*, 293, no. 83.

256. MITTERNDORF (Niederösterreich, Austria).

Justinian I: M, CON, 538-539; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 340, no. 4 and 350, fig. 18.

257. MOLDOVA VECHE (Caraș-Severin, Romania).

Justin II: M, CON, 570-571; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 125, n. 35.

257a. MOKRAYA BALKA (Stavropol, Russia).57


Justin II: light weight *solidus* (22 *siliquae*), CON, 578 (joint reign Justin II and Tiberius II), found in grave 114, pierced twice; fourée *solidus*, found in a grave; Ibid., 151, 153 and fig. 1/1-2.

Maurice: light *siliqua*, CON, 583-602, found in grave 113, pierced twice; Ibid., 151-52 and fig. 1/3-4.

Phocas: light *siliqua*, CON, 607-610, found in grave 113 together with the *siliqua* of Maurice mentioned above and four Sasanian drachms dated between 531 and 628; copper imitation of a silver light *miliaren시스*, found in grave 74; gold plated silver imitation of an obverse of a *solidus* (bracteate), found in a grave; Ibid., 152-53 and fig. 1/5; Rtveladze and Runich, "Nahodki indikatsii," 219 and fig. 1/1.58

Heraclius: gold imitation (bracteate), found in grave 117; Rtveladze and Runich, "Novye nahodki," 153.

258. MOKRONOG (Mokronog-Trebelno, Slovenia).


259. MOSTOVÁ (Galanta, Slovakia).60


260. MTSKHETA (Mtskheta-Mtianeti, Georgia).

---

57 Thirteen copper bracteates imitating Byzantine gold coins are described by Anna Ierusalimskaia in her monograph, A. Ierusalimskaia, *Die Gräber der Moščevaja Balka: frühmittelalterliche Funde an der nordkaukasischen Seidenstrasse* (Munich: Editio Maris, 1996), 199-201, no. 11-23 and pl. XLVI/fig. 109.

58 In addition, eleven imitations of *solidi* of Heraclius dated 613-625 have been found in a grave near Kislovodsk. The imitations were pierced twice and were found in the area of the skull indicating that they were perhaps decorating a hat or a cap. See Rtveladze and Runich, "Nahodki indikatsii," 219-220 and fig. 1/2.

59 Possibly the same coin as no. 411 below. Both are late nineteenth-century finds, see Kos, *Die Fundmünzen*, v. 1, 390-91, no. 221.1 and 223/1.2.

60 Previously the finding place was thought to be Horné Saliby, for which see Fiala, "Byzantské," 57-58, no. 5, fig. 1/4a-b.
Justin I: 1 coin, found in 1871 in grave during archaeological excavations conducted by F. Baiern; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 44, no. 424.

Justinian I: heavy *miliarenis*, CON, 527-537 (pierced), found in a stone grave during the archaeological excavations conducted by M. Berdzenishvili in 1961; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 44, no. 74.

Maurice: M, CON, 589-590, found in 1961 near Ninotsminda church during archaeological excavations conducted by M. Berdzenishvili; Ibid., 125, no. 58.

Heraclius: *hexagrammon*, found in 1937 during archaeological excavations; Ibid., 126, no. 67.


Constantine IV: M, CON, 669-674; Ibid., 37, no. 139.

261. MYHIYA (Mykolayiv, Ukraine).


262. NEAULOVU (Giurgiu, Romania).

Justin I: 1 AE, 518-527; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 84.

263. NEKHVOROSCHA (Poltava, Ukraine).

Early Byzantine: 1 AV (seventh century); Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 36, no. 251.

264. NEULENBACH (Niederösterreich, Austria).

Constats II: K, CON, 655-658; Winter, "Die byzantinischen," 340-41, no. 5 and 351, fig. 6/19.

265. NICKELSDORF (Burgenland, Austria).


266. NIZHNIY DZHERAKH (North Ossetia-Alania, Russia).


267. NOKALAKEVI (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia).


Justin I: 3 M, CON, 518-527; Ibid., 277-78, no. 13-15; M; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 44, no. 427.\(^61\)


---

\(^61\) Kropotkin mentions that the reverse is too worn to read the date on the coin, but Justin I's coinage was not dated with the regnal year so this may in fact be an issue of Justinian I or his successors.
Maurice: *solidus*, CON, 583-602, Ibid., fig. 8/2.62

268. NOST’E (Shida Kartli, Georgia).
Anastasius I: M; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 123, no. 23.

269. NOVACI (Giurgiu, Romania).
Constans II: K, Carthage, 651-656; Ibid., 220, no. 86.

270. NOVOSIL’S’KE (Odesa, Ukraine).


271. NYÍREGYHÁZA-KERTGAZDASÁG (Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg, Hungary).
Maurice: light weight *solidus* (23 *siliquae*), found in a grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 67-68, no. 52.

272. NYZHNYA DUVANKA (Luhansk, Ukraine).
Constantine IV: M, with brothers Heraclius and Tiberius; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 35, no. 233.63

273. OARDA DE JOS (Alba, Romania).

274. OBIŠOVCE (Košice-okolie, Slovakia).
Justinian I: several AV, possibly part of a hoard; Fiala, "Byzantské," 57, no. 4.

275. OCHAKIV (Mykolaiv, Ukraine).
Justinian I: 2 K, CON, 538-565; Ibid., 137, no. 40-41.

276. ODAIA (Şoldăneşti, Moldova).
Heraclius: M, CON, 614/5, found in 1960 during archaeological excavations in the early medieval settlement; A. Rikman and I. A. Rafalovich, "K voprosu o sootnoshenii cherniakhovskoi i ranneslavianskoi kul’tur v dnestrovsko-dunaiskom mezhdurech’e," *Kratkie Soobshcheniiia Instituta Arkheologii* 105 (1965): 49, fig. 3/4.64

---

62 Possibly same as the *solidus* mentioned by Tsotselia, *Coin Finds in Georgia*, 143, no. 762, but found in 1988.

63 The date 668-669 was provided by Kropotkin, himself relying on late nineteenth-early twentieth century literature. Without doubt the coin had been attributed using Sabatier’s 1862 catalogue which dated the joint issues to 668-669. Sabatier’s classification is now obsolete but in the absence of any recorded description of the coin it is impossible to re-attribute the specimen from Nyzhnya Duvanka.

64 Same coin, but found at Lopatna instead of Odaia, in I.A. Rafalovich, *Slaviane VI-IX vekov v Moldavii*
277. ODORHEIU SECUIESC (Harghita, Romania).
   Constantine IV: solidus, CON, 674-681; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 68-69, no. 53.

278. ÖFÖLDEÁK (Csongrád, Hungary).
   Phocas: solidus, CON, 607-609; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 69-70, no. 54.

279. OHABA-JIU (Gorj, Romania).
   Justinian I: solidus, CON, 537-542; Vîlcu, Isvoranu, and Nicolae, Les monnaies, 150, no. 442 and pl. 15/442.

280. OITUZ (Bacău, Romania).
   Maurice: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 99.

281. OK’AMI (Samtskhe-Javakheti, Georgia).
   Constantine IV: solidus, CON, 669-674; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 72, no. 239.

282. OLĂNEȘTI (Ștefan Vodă, Moldova).
   Anastasius I: M, CON, 498-518; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 133, no. 7.

283. OLARI (Olt, Romania).

284. OLTENIȚA (Călărași, Romania).
   Heraclius: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 88.

285. OL’VIOPOL (Mykolayiv, Ukraine).
   Justinian I: 1 AE; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 137, no. 43.

285a. OPAVA (Veľký Krtíš, Slovakia).

286. ORLEA (Olt, Romania). 66

---

66 Several other sixth-century coins found at Orlea were part of the coin collection of the local school teacher Constantin Iliescu: Justinian I (2 coins), Justin II (6 coins), Maurice (4 coins); unspecified sixth-century ruler (1 coin), for which see B. Mitrea, "Descoperirii recente și mai vechi de monede antice și bizantine în Republica Populară Româna," 474. By mistake, the coins from Orlea, a settlement close to Sucidava on the Danube’s left bank, were later placed at Orlea, Alba county, in Transylvania, for which see A.-M. Velter, "Unele considerații privind circulația monetară din secolele V-XII în bazinul carpațic (cu privire specială asupra teritoriului României)," SCIV 39, no. 3 (1988): 267, no. 72. As so often happens, the error gained further authority by getting cited in subsequent publications. In this particular case we are dealing with a double error as the coins were also misrepresented, gold coins instead of bronze, for which see Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 249, no. 17.
Anastasius I: M, CON, 512-517; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 220, no. 89.

Justin I: M, NIK, 518-527; Ibid., 220, no. 90.

Justinian I: M, CON, 527-538; M, CON, 538-539; K, KYZ, 555-556; Ibid., 220-21, no. 91-93.

Justin II: K, TES, 568-569; Ibid., 221, no. 94.

Maurice: K, CON, 582-583; Ibid., 221, no. 95.

287. OROLIK (Vukovar-Syrmia, Croatia).
   Tiberius II: K, TES, 581-582; Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine," 185, no. 597.

288. ORŞOVA (Mehedinți, Romania).
   Anastasius I: 1 AE; Velter, Transilvania în secolele V-XII, 296, no. 107.
   Justinian: solidus, CON, 537-542; tremissis, CON, 527-556; M, CON, 527-538; M, NIK, 543-544, broken; Ė, CON, 542-562; "Justinianov novac," 1149-54, no. 1-2, 7, 20, 28, 44.
   Heraclius: solidus, CON, 616-625; Ibid., 194, no. 703.

289. ORŢIŞOARA (Timiş, Romania).
   Heraclius: solidus, CON, 613-616; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 140, n. 136.67

290. OSIJEK (Osijek-Baranja, Croatia).
   Anastasius I: M, CON, 512-517; Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine Coins," 144, no. 21.
   Justinian: solidus, CON, 537-542; tremissis, CON, 527-556; M, CON, 527-538; M, NIK, 543-544, broken; Ė, CON, 542-562; "Justinianov novac," 1149-54, no. 1-2, 7, 20, 28, 44.
   Heraclius: solidus, CON, 616-625; Ibid., 194, no. 703.

291. OSTROVO (Central Banat, Serbia).
   Anastasius I: M; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranzitia de la antichitate," 56, n. 52.

292. OSTROVU BANULUI (Mehedinți, Romania).
   Tiberius II: 1 AE, found in the Early Byzantine fortification; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, 102.

293. OSTROVU CORBULUI (Mehedinți, Romania).
   Justin II: E; Nicolae, "Descoperiri," 272, no. 29.

294. OSTROVU MARE (Mehedinți, Romania).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 541-542; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, n. 103.
   Maurice: M, CON, 596-597; Ibid., 221, n. 104.

---

67 Initially published at the beginning of the twentieth century, the coin was identified as an issue of Constans II and Constantine IV, but after inspecting the coin, now in the collection of the Banat Museum in Timișoara, Ernst Oberländer-Târnoveanu has recently reattributed it to Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine. For the older literature, see Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 70-71. In his recent synopsis of finds the coin still appears as an issue of Constans II, for which see Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 236.

68 Same coin as Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine Coins," 152, no. 125.
295. OSTRÓWEK (Otwock, Poland).
   Phocas: €, Carthage, 602-606, possibly part of a dispersed hoard; Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 502-03, no. 11.

296. OTELENI (Iași, Romania). 69
   Justinian I: 1 AV; Preda, "Circulația monedelor bizantine," 405.
   Justin II: K, TES, 569-570; Mihăilescu-Bîrliba and Mihai, "Descoperiri monetare," 259, no. 3 and 258, fig. 4/3 (wrong date, 575-576).
   Phocas: K, CON, 603-610; Ibid., 259, no 4 and 258, fig. 4/4.

297. OZORA-TŐTIPOSZTA (Fejér, Hungary).
   Constantine IV: solidus, CON, 669-674, found in an Avar grave; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 71-72, no. 56.

298. PANCIU (Vrancea, Romania).
   Justin I: M, CON, 522-527; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 109.

299. PARUTYNNE (Mykolayiv, Ukraine).
   Justinian I: €, Cherson, 527-565; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 137, no. 42.
   Justin II: 1 AE, found in the ancient city of Olbia; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 139, no. 56.

300. PAVLIVKA (Odesa, Ukraine).
   Maurice: K, CON, broken in half; Karyshkovski, "Nahodki pozdnerimskikh," 81, no. 10.

301. PECHANKA (Kabardino-Balkaria, Russia).
   Justin II: solidus, CON, 565-578, with suspension loop; found in a grave; Kropotkin, Klad vizantiiskikh monet, 30, no. 132.

302. PECHENAYA (Kirovohrad, Ukraine).
   Heraclius: solidus, CON, 625-629 (MIB dating after Kropotkin’s reference to Sabatier’s catalogue), found in a male grave (mounted warrior); Kropotkin, Klad vizantiiskikh monet, 33, no. 196.

303. PECICA (Arad, Romania).
   Justinian I: solidus, CON, 542-552; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranziția de la antichitate," 69, n. 72.

304. PÉCS (Baranya, Hungary).
   Justinian I: tremissis (imitation); Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 346, no. 18 and 352, fig. 6/25.

---

69 Three coins were donated by a student from Oțeleni, but there is no certainty regarding their finding place. Some scholars have speculated that the coins were in fact found in the neighboring Byzantine province of Scythia, for which see G. Mânucu-Adameșteanu and E. Popușoi, "Monede bizantine descoperite la est de Carpați," AM 23-24 (2000-2001): 351.
Maurice: *tremissis*, CON, 583-602, found in the Avar cemetery at Alsómakár–dülő, grave 1; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 279-80, no. 10.
Phocas: *tremissis* (gold plated copper imitation), Ravenna, 602-607, probably from a grave from Gyárvařos; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 72, no. 57.

305. **PEISCHING** (Niederösterreich, Austria).
Heraclius: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 616-625; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 341, no. 6.

306. **PERENI** (Vaslui, Romania).
Justin II: 1 AE, NIK, 568-569; Mănucu-Adameneșteanu and Popușoi, "Monede bizantine," 357, no. 1, n. 67 and n. 68.

307. **PERIŞOR** (Dolj, Romania).

308. **PETEA** (Mureș, Romania).
Maurice: 1 coin; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 249, no. 18.

309. **PIATRA NEAMȚ** (Neamț, Romania).
Justinian I: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 111.

310. **PINȘK** (Brest, Belarus).
Constans II: M, Syracuse, 662-668 (*MIB* dating after Kropotkin’s reference to *BMC*); Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 38, no. 299.

311. **PITEȘTI** (Argeș, Romania).
Justin I: M, CON, 518-527; Poenaru Bordea and Dicu, "Monede romane tîrzii," 81, no. 117.
Justin II: M, NIK, 570-571; Ibid., 81, no. 119.
Phocas: K, KYZ, 603-604; Ibid., 81, nr. 120.
Heraclius: M, CON, 613-614; Ibid., 81, no. 121.

312. **PIUĂ PÆTRII** (Ialomița, Romania).
Justinian I: 4 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 112.

313. **PLOIEȘTI** (Prahova, Romania).

314. **POIANA-DULCEȘTI** (Neamț, Romania).
Justinian I: IS, TES, 538-552 (after *MIBE*), found in the area of the early medieval settlement (8th-9th c.); Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 116.

315. **POJEJENA** (Caraș-Severin, Romania).
Justin I: I, CON, 518-527, found in the area of the Roman *castrum*; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 117.
316. POPEȘTI (Râbnița, Moldova).
   Justinian I: M, CON; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 225, no. 208.

317. POPEȘTI (Iași, Romania).

318. POPEȘTI (Giurgiu, Romania).
   Maurice: K, CON, 582-583; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 221, no. 118.

319. POTPORANJ (South Banat, Serbia)
   Justin II: M, CON, 571-572; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 73, no. 57a.

320. PŘEDLÁNCE (Liberec, Czech Republic).

321. PŘEPEŘE (Přepeře, Czech Republic).

322. PRIGOR (Caras-Severin, Romania).

323. PRIGREVICA (West Bačka, Serbia).
   Heraclius: solidus, CON, 632-641; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 73-74, no. 58.

324. PRUNDU (Giurgiu, Romania).
   Maurice: M, KYZ, 593-594; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 121.

325. PRZEMYŚL (Przemyśl, Poland).
   Justinian I: M, CON, 540-541; I, after 546; I, Rome, 547-548 or 548-549; 1 AE; Woloszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 503, no. 12 and 507, fig. 6/3; 503-04, no. 13 and 508, fig. 6/4; 504, no. 14 and 508, fig. 6/5; 504, no. 15.

326. PtuJ (Ptuj, Slovenia).
   Heraclius: M, Sicily, 616-629(?); ibid., 227, no. 28.

327. PULST (Carinthia, Austria).

---

70 The coins of Anastasius, Maurice, and Heraclius have also been published in Kos, Die Fundmünzen, vol. 2. However, the descriptions were taken from a nineteenth-century inventory of finds and must be treated with caution. See F. Pichler, Repertorium der steirischen Münzkunde. II. Die Münzen der römischen und byzantinischen Kaiser in der Steiermark (Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky, 1867).

328. **PUTNA** (Vrancea, Romania)
   Justin II: M, KYZ, 574-575; Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 122.

329. **RĂCĂRII DE JOS** (Dolj, Romania).
   Justinian I: 2 AE; Ibid., 222, no. 126-127.
   Phocas (?): 1 AE; Ibid., 222, no. 128.

330. **RĂDĂUȚI** (Suceava, Romania).
   Justin I: 1 AE, Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 129.

331. **RĂMNICU VÂLCEA** (Vâlcea, Romania).
   Justin I: 1 AE, 518-527; Ibid., 61, n. 63.
   Justinian I: M, CON, 539-540; Ibid., 68, n. 70.
   Justin II: 2 AE; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 125, no. 32.
   Maurice: K, ANT, 594-595; Ibid., 133, n. 77.

332. **RĂNCĂCIOV** (Arges, Romania).
   Heraclius: K, TES, 610-611; Poenaru Bordea and Dicu, "Monede," 79, no. 95.

333. **RĂURENI** (Vâlcea, Romania).
   Justin II: M, NIK, 569-570; Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 133.

334. **RAVAZD** (Győr-Moson-Sopron, Hungary).

335. **RAZAS** (Ogre, Latvia).

336. **REISBERG** (Carinthia, Austria).

337. **REȘCA** (Olt, Romania).
   Justinian I: *solidus*, CON, 542-552; Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 131 (dated 538-545).
   Justin II: *solidus* (Gepid imitation); Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 143, n. 147. M, NIK, 568-569; Butnariu, "Răspândirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 132.
   Constans II: K, CON, 647-655; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 143, n. 150.

338. **RESKU** (Łobez, Poland).
339. Rifnik (Šentjur, Slovenia).

340. Rivne (Kirovohrad, Ukraine).
Heraclius: *solidus*, CON, 629-631 (dating based on the illustration); Stoliarki, *Essays on Monetary Circulation*, 141, no. 70 and fig. 14/3.

341. Rojište (Dolj, Romania).

342. Romanovskai (Rostov-na-Donu, Russia).
Constantine IV: *solidus*, CON, 681-685, found in a grave; Ibid., 90-91.
Leontius: *solidus*, CON, 695-698; Ibid., 90-91.

343. Rudioasa (Iași, Romania).
Maurice: 1 AE; Chirica and Tanasachi, *Repertoriul arheologic*, 354.

344. Rupea (Brașov, Romania). 71
Maurice: *solidus* (imitation); Velter, *Transilvania în secolele V-XII*, 298, no. 144.

345. Rustavi (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia).
Justin I: 1 AE, found in 1950 during archaeological excavations; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis*, 123, no. 33.
Constans II: 1 AR, found in 1949 during archaeological excavations; Ibid., 127, no. 77. 72

346. Săbede (Mureș, Romania). 73

---

71 See above, no. 176 (Hoghiz-Ungra).


73 This coin was most likely found at Voiniceni (Mureș district), below no. 486, and has a complicated history. In earlier publications the find from Săbed sometimes appears under a different name, Ceuașu de Câmpie, a larger neighboring village, which explains why later publications mention two different coins from two different finding spots, when in fact we are dealing with one and the same find. In addition, V. Lazăr mentioned a convex/concave gold coin with CONOB inscription (sic), found at Ceuașu de Câmpie, which he tentatively attributed to Justinian I, a decidedly dubious attribution which cannot be taken for granted, see Lazăr, *Repertoriul arheologic*, 91, XVIII.1. Moreover, the coin was attributed to Justinian I and later to Phocas, which increased the confusion, some recent inventories mentioning two solidi (one Justinian, one Phocas) having been found at Ceuașu de Câmpie and Săbed, respectively. See, Lakatos, "Monede bizantine bizantine," 247, no. 6A. and 6B; Velter, *Transilvania în secolele V-XII*, 289, no. 24 and 298, no. 146. To make this even more perplexing, A. Zrinyi suggested that the coin was actually found at Voiniceni instead of Săbed and the confusion was due to the close resemblance between the former

---

523

347. SADON (North Ossetia-Alania, Russia).

Phocas: *solidus*, CON, 602-610, found in 1929 during archaeological excavations conducted by E. G. Pchelina; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 31, no. 141a.

348. ŠALA (Šaľa, Slovakia).


349. SALCIA (Galați, Romania).

Phocas: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 134.

350. SÂLCUTĂ (Căușeni, Moldova).

Justin II: K, KYZ, 576-577; Nudel'man, "Topografiia kladov i nakhodok," 85, no. 31.

351. SANGEORGIU DE CAMPIE (Mureș, Romania).


352. SÂNNICOLAU MARE (Timiș, Romania).

Justinian I: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 142.

Heraclius: *hexagrammon*, CON, 615-625; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 140, n. 142.

353. SÂNNICOLAU ROMÂN (Bihor, Romania).

Justinian I: 1 AE; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 252, no. 40.\(^{74}\)

354. SÂNPETRU GERMAN (Arad, Romania).

Heraclius: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 616-625, found in the grave of an Avar mounted warrior; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 77, no. 65.

355. SÂRĂȚENI (Vaslui, Romania).

Justin I: M, CON, 518-522, together with sixth-century pottery; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 136.\(^ {75}\) For the archaeological context, see Teodor, "Descoperiri," 144, no. 619.


Possibly the same coin as no. 352 above (Sânnicolau Mare).

Reference to previous literature containing illustration sends to an eleventh-century *follis* of Roman III found at Sărăţeni. There is no mention of a sixth-century coin in the original archaeological report either, for which see G. Coman, "Cercetări arheologice cu privire la secolele V-XI în sudul Moldovei (stipa colinară Horincea-Elan-Prut),” *AM* 6 (1969): 288-90. In a later article Coman briefly mentioned the find from Justin I without providing any details, for which see G. Coman, "Noi cercetări arheologice cu privire la secolele V-XI în partea de sud a Moldovei," *Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis* 1 (1979): 93 and 94, fig. 13/1 (drawing); Teodor, *Descoperiri arheologice şi numismatiche*, 144, no. 619, attributes the coin to Justinian I instead of Justin I.
356. SASKHARI (Mtsheta-Mtianeti, Georgia).
   Maurice: solidus, CON, 582-602; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis, 55, no. 131.

357. SAVCI (Sveti Tomaž, Slovenia).

358. SCHÜTZEN AM GEBIRGE (Burgenland, Austria).
   Maurice: K, TES, 591-592; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 344-45, no. 15.

359. SCURTA (Bacău, Romania).
   Constantin IV: hexagrammon, 668-669; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 137.

360. SEBEȘ (Alba, Romania).76
   Justinian I: M, KYZ, 554-555, found in a garden; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 138; Velter, Transilvania în secolele V-XII, 299, no. 158.77
   Tiberius II: M, NIK, 580-581; Ibid., 296, no. 8 and 298, fig. 1/6.80

361. ȘEITIN (Arad, Romania).
   Heraclius: light weight solidus (20 siliquae), CON, 616-625(?); Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri,” 139, n. 127.81

362. ŠEMPETER V SAVINJSKI DOLINI (Žalec, Slovenia).82

---

76 Both Velter and Butnariu took the dating from the description provided in the original publication (regnal year 30=556-557). However, the illustration provided in that publication clearly shows a reverse displaying regnal year 28 (554-555, similar to DOC 51b). The mint is not clear and it appears both as CON and KYZ in different publications; the style points to the former. See I. Raica and I. A. Aldea, “Două monede bizantine descoperite la Sebeș,” Apulum 6 (1967): 627, fig. 2. Fleșer and Popa, "Monede bizantine,” 296, no. 4 (dated regnal year 37!).

77 Velter used the original publication without correlating the description with the illustration. The description indicated date 565-566 although it mentioned regnal year 3 (567-568), clearly visible on the illustration as well, for which see Fleșer and Popa, "Monede bizantine,” 296, no. 5 and 298, fig. 1/5.

78 Velter used the original publication without correlating the description with the illustration. The description indicated date 565-566 although it mentioned regnal year 3 (567-568), clearly visible on the illustration as well, for which see Fleșer and Popa, "Monede bizantine,” 296, no. 5 and 298, fig. 1/5.

79 Attribution was made after Wroth, pl. XI/15 (I, TES, 567-568), but regnal year C was mentioned, which corresponds to 569-570. The state of preservation and the poor quality of the illustration make the dating uncertain.

80 Same coin as Velter, Transilvania în secolele V-XII, 299, no. 162 and Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 222, no. 140, with a wrong attribution to Maurice (M, NIK, 601-602).

81 Same coin as Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, n. 149.

82 Also published in Kos, Die Fundmünzen, vol. 2.
Justin I: M, CON, 518-527; Ibid., 226, no. 8.
Justinian I: M, NIK, 538-552; Ibid., 226, no. 14.
Justin II: M, KYZ, 574-575; Ibid., 226, no. 20.

363. SENNAYA (Krasnodar, Russia).
Heracius: M, CON, 610-612; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 22, no. 19a.

364. ŞERBĂNEŞTI (Suceava, Romania).
Justinian I: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 150.

365. ŞERPENI (Anenii Noi, Moldova).
Justin I: K, CON, 518-527; Nudel'man, Topografiia kladov i nakhodok, 84, no. 25.

366. SERPOVE (Tambov, Russia).
Constantine IV: solidus, CON, 669-674; solidus, CON, 674-681; both pierced at the center; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 29, no. 126.

367. SFÂNTU GHEORGHE (Mureş, Romania).
Justinian I: 1 AV; Velter, "Unele considerații," 268, no. 163.
Phocas: 1 AV; Ibid., 268, no. 90.

368. SHABO (Odesa, Ukraine).
Justinian I: M, NIK, 527-538; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 137, no. 39.

369. SHEMOKMEDI (Guria, Georgia).
Justinian II: solidus, CON, 705-711; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 37, no. 140 and pl. IX/140.

370. SHEVCHENKIVKA (Odesa, Ukraine).
Maurice: K, TES, 584-585; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 139, no. 58.

371. SHILDA (Kakheti, Georgia).
Heracleus: solidus, CON, 641; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 25, no. 87 and pl. VI/87.

372. SIBIU (Sibiu, Romania).

---

83 Kropotkin described the coin as a follis of Heraclius and Constans II, but cited as reference Tolstoi’s catalogue, plate 46/56, which is in fact an early follis of Heraclius from Constantinople.

84 These may in fact be the coins from Voiniceni and Apalina as the original publication by Alexandru Popa cited by Velter does not explicitly mention St. Gheorghe in relation with the coins, but most likely refers to coins found in Mureş District which the author added to his general discussion about the archaeological evidence from the upper Mureş valley dating to the early Middle Ages. See A. Popa, "Academia Română și descoperirile arheologice de pe vâlul superioară a Mureșului," Marisia 6 (1976): 21. This confusion made its way into Velter’s subsequent book-length treatment of coin finds from Transylvania as well as into an inventory of archaeological finds from Mureş District whose author took Velter’s catalogue entry for granted, without verifying the original publication. See Velter, Transilvania in secolele V-XII, 299, no. 163-164; Lazăr, Repertoriul arheologic, 171.
373. SISAK (Sisak-Moslavina, Croatia).
   Anastasius I: *tremissis*, CON, 492-518; Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine Coins," 143, no. 2.
   Justinian I: *tremissis*, CON, 527-565; I, Rome, 542-547; Ibid., 149, no. 79 and 166, no. 329.
   Phocas: K, CON, 603-610; K, Carthage, 606-607; Ibid., 191, no. 670 and 194 no. 699.
374. SLOBOZIA MARE (Cahul, Moldova).
   Anastasius I: M, CON, 498-512; Nudel’man, "Topografiia kladov i nakhodok," 87, no. 46.
375. SOCHI (Krasnodar, Russia).
376. SOLT-TÉTELHEGY (Bács-Kiskun, Hungary).
   Heraclius: M, CON, 613-614; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 280-81, no. 11.
376a. SOMBOR (Vojvodina, Serbia).
377. ȘOMCUTA MARE (Maramureș, Romania).
   Justinian I: *solidus*, CON, 542-565; E. Chirilă and A. Socolan, *Tezaure și descoperiri monetare din colecția Muzeului județean Maramureș* (Baia Mare: Muzeul Județean Maramureş, 1971), 67, no. 9 with pl. IX/10 and pl. XI/2 (enlarged). 85
378. ȘPĂLNACA (Alba, Romania).
   Justin II: *solidus*, found in the Avar cemetery, grave 10; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 78, no. 66.
379. SPRĂNCENATA (Olt, Romania).
380. SRPSKI KRSTUR (North Banat, Serbia).
   Heraclius: *solidus*, found in a grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 58, no. 42.
381. ST. PAUL IM LAVANTTAL (Carinthia, Austria).
382. STAASDORF (Niederösterreich, Austria).

---

85 Although the enlarged illustration clearly shows a full-weight regular constantinopolitan issue (type *MIB* 7), the authors described it as an imitation after Ravenna (type *BMC* 37), an attribution accepted uncritically in subsequent publications, for which see Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 252, no. 43; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 151; Velter, *Transilvania*, 300, no. 172 (copper imitation !); I. Stanciu, "Gepizi, avari și slavi timpuri (sec. V-VII p. Chr.) în spațiul vestic și nord-vestic al României," *EN* 12 (2002): 222, no. 29.
Justin I: M, CON, 522-527; Ibid., 458.

383. STĂNEȘTI (Botoșani, Romania).
Justinian I: M, NIK, 547-548; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 145.

384. STAPAR (West Bačka, Serbia).
Constantine IV: 1 AV; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 78, no. 67.

385. STĂRCI (Argeș, Romania).
Anastasius I: K, CON, 512-517, possibly from a hoard; Poenaru Bordea and Dicu, "Monede romane tîrzii," 78, no. 85.

386. STARODZHERELIYEVSKAYA (Krasnodar, Russia).
Phocas: solidus, CON, 607-610 (after MIB), found in a grave; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiskikh monet, 22, no. 25.

387. STEINBRUNN (Burgenland, Austria).
Justinian I: solidus, CON, 537-542; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 345, no. 16 and 351, fig. 6/22.

387a. STEJANOVCI (Vojvodina, Serbia).
Constans II: miliarensis, CON, 659-668, found in a grave; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 78-79, no. 68.

388. STILLFRIED (Niederösterreich, Austria).
Justinian I: 12-nummia, Alexandria, 527-565; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 341, no. 7 and 351, fig. 6/20.

389. STOLNICENI (Vâlcea, Romania).86
Justinian I: 1 AV, found in the area of ancient Buridava; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 147.

390. STŘELICE (Brno, Czech Republic).

391. STUDENO (Postojna, Slovenia).87

392. STUDINA (Olt, Romania).
Justin II: 1 AE; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La râșcruce de vremuri," 125, n. 23.

393. ŠTURLIĆ (Cazin, Bosnia & Herzegovina).
Anastasius I: solidus, CON, 507-518; Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine," 143, no. 5.

394. ŠTÚROVO (Nové Zámky, Slovakia).
Justin I: Æ, on the Danube's bank; Fiala, "Byzantské mince," 57, no. 3.
Justin II: M, during excavations in the Neolithic settlement; Ibid., 57, no. 3.

---

86 See above, no. 237 (Măgura).
87 Also published in Kos, Die Fundmünzen, vol. 1.

395. SUCIDAVA (Olt, Romania).


Justinian I: solidus, CON, 527-538; tremissis, CON, 527-565; M, CON, 527-537; M, NIK, 527-538; M, CON, 538-539; K, CON, 538-539; K, NIK, 538-539; K, CON, 541-542; M, NIK, 541-542; M, KYZ, 548-549; I, CON, 552-553; M, CON, 558-559; I, CON, 562-563; I, CON, 550-565; I, NIK, 559-560; I, CON, NIK, 538-565; M; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 226-227, no. 7-23; Vîlcu and Nicolae, "Monede bizantine," 300-01, no. 4-11.


Maurice: tremissis, CON, 578-582; M, CON, 583-584; 2 K, CON, 583-584; K, TES, 583-584; M, CON, 585-586; K, CON, 585-586; K, TES, 585-586; M, ANT, 585-586; 2 M, CON, 586-587; K, CON, 587-588; M, NIK, 587-588; K, TES, 588-589; K, NIK, 598-590; 2 M, NIK, 590-591; M, KYZ, 590-591; K, CON, 591-592; K, CON, 592-593; K, CON, 596-597; M, KYZ, 598-599; 2 K, 582-602; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 227, no. 51-62; Vîlcu and Nicolae, "Monede bizantine," 305-07, no. 35-49; Vîlcu, Les monnaies d'or, 60, no. 148.

396. SUHULUCENI (Telenesti, Moldova).


397. SUKHUMI (Abkhazia, Georgia).

88 Stoliarik dated the coin 629-630 by making reference to Tolstoi 28-29 and BMC 93-94, which in fact corresponds to MIB 73, dated 610-613.

Justin I: M, ANT, 522-527; Ibid., 78, no. 113.


Constans II: *solidus*; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 126-27, no. 75.

Tiberius III: *solidus*, CON, 698-705; Ibid., 74, no. 247.

398. SULEJÓW (Łódź, Poland).

Justin II: M, NIK, 574-575, Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 505, no. 17.

399. ŞULETEA (Vaslui, Romania).


400. SULTANA (Călăraşi, Romania).

Sixth century: 1 AE; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 148.

401. ŞUŢEŞTI (Brăila, Romania).


402. SVETE GORE (Bistrica ob Sotli, Slovenia).89


403. SZADZKO (Stargard, Poland).

Heraclius: *hexagrammon*, CON, 625-637; Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 505-06, no. 18 and 511, fig. 6/13.

404. SZEGET (Csongrád, Hungary).

Constans II: *solidus*, CON, 654-659, found in grave 24 from Makkoserdő; *miliarensis* (imitation), CON; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 79-82, no. 69 and 71.

 Constantine IV: *solidus* (gold plated copper imitation), CON, 674-681 Ibid., 80-81, no. 70.

405. SZEGVÁR (Csongrád, Hungary).

Maurice: *solidus* (imitation), after CON, 584-602, found in a grave in Sápoldal; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 84-85, no. 75.

Heraclius: *solidus*, CON, 616-625, found the Avar cemetery at Oromdűlő, grave 761; *solidus* (imitation), after CON, 616-625, found in grave 855; *solidus*, CON, 616-625, found in grave 873; *solidus*, TES, 616-617, found at Sápoldal; Ibid., 82-87, no. 72-74 and 76.

406. SZEKSZÁRD-TÓSZEGI-DŰLŐ (Tolna, Hungary).

Tiberius II: *solidus* (imitation), after CON, 578-582, found in the Avar cemetery; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 282-283, no. 13/1.

---

89 Also published in Kos, *Die Fundmünzen*, vol. 1.
Heraclius: *solidus*, CON, 616-625, found in the Avar cemetery; Ibid., 282-283, no. 13/2.

407. **SZENDRÓ** (Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Hungary).

408. **SZENTENDRE** (Pest, Hungary).
Justin II: *tremissis*, CON, 565-578, found in grave 1 or 2; Somogyi, *Byzantinis Fundmünzen*, 87-88, no. 77.
Phocas: *solidus*, CON, 609-610, found in grave 3; Ibid., 88-89, no. 78.

409. **SZENTES** (Csongrád, Hungary).
Justin II: 1 *AE*, 572-573; Bóna, "Review of Somogyi," 295 (Szentes-Tés).
Heraclius: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 616-625, found in a grave; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 89, no. 79 (Szentes-Jaksor).

410. **SZÖREG** (Csongrád, Hungary).
Anastasius I: *miliarenensis*, found in the Téglagyár cemetery, grave XII; J. Cseh et al., *Gepidische Gräberfelder im Theissgebiet II* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 2005), 123.

411. **TÁC** (Fejér, Hungary).
Tiberius II/Maurice: *solidus* (forgery), obverse: Tiberius II; reverse: Maurice, CON, 582-583, found in grave 7, pierced, in the cemetery at Gorsium; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 89-90, no. 80.
Heraclius: *solidus*, found at Fővenypuszta; Bóna, "Review of Somogyi," 295.

412. **ŢÂNŢĂRENI** (Gorj, Romania).
Phocas: M, CON, 602-610; Ibid., 223, no. 158.

413. **ŢĂPALA** (Ialoveni, Moldova).

414. **ŢĂPLÁNY** (Győr-Moson-Sopron, Hungary).
Phocas: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 603-607; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 90-91, no. 81.

415. **ŢĂRGU OCNA** (Bacău, Romania).

416. **ŢAT** (Komárom-Esztergom, Hungary).
Heraclius: *tremissis* (imitation), after CON, 610-625; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 91-92, no. 82.

417. **ŢĂTĂREŞTI DE JOS** (Teleorman, Romania).
Justinian I: 1 *AE*; Preda, "Descoperiri," 293.

418. **TBILISI** (Tbilisi, Georgia).
Justin I: M, CON, 518-522 found on Gori street; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis* (1966-1984), 13, no. 35.
Maurice: M, CON, 585-586; M, ANT, 594-595, found on Gori street; Ibid., 21, no. 74 (Tiberius II) and 23, no. 79.

419. TECUCI (Galați, Romania).
  Justin: M, CON, 574-575; Ibid., 113, no. 82 and 121 fig. 9/3.

420. TERPEZIȚA (Dolj, Romania).
  Anastasius I: M, 512-517; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranzitia de la anticitate," 55-56, n. 51
  Justin: 1 AE; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 125, n. 28.

421. ȚIBUCANII DE SUS (Neamț, Romania).
  Justinian I: M, CON, 541-542; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 155.

422. ȚIGANEȘTI (Teleorman, Romania).
  Justinian I: M, KYZ, 540-541; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 156.

423. TIMIŞOARA (Timiș, Romania).
  Justinian I: M, CON, 543-544; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 252, no. 44A.
  Justinian I: 12-nummia, Alexandria; Ibid., 252, no. 44B.

  Maurice: solidus, CON, 582-583, found in the Gepid cemetery; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 284-285, no. 15.

425. TISZAKESZI (Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Hungary).
  Maurice: light weight solidi (20 siliquae), CON, 584-602; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 92-93, no. 83.

426. TISZAVASVÁR-KASHALOM-DULÓ (Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg, Hungary).
  Heraclius: 2 light weight solidi (20 siliquae), CON, 616-625, found in the Avar cemetery, grave 34; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 286-287, no. 17.

427. TOLISA (Posavina, Bosnia & Herzegovina).
  Justinian I: tremissis, CON, 537-542; Mirk and Šemrov, "Byzantine," 149, no. 84.

428. TONCIU (Mureș, Romania).

---

90 Dating based on the rubbing drawing provided by Teodor. The date cannot be read, but the coin belongs to the large module type issued between 538 and 542.

91 Teodor wrongly attributed the coin to Heraclius, although the rubbing drawing of the reverse, the only illustration provided, clearly shows the reverse of a follis of Justin II, type MIB 43d, with Chi-Rho above the large "M." In her monograph Elena Stoliarik imported both the illustration and the wrong attribution; see Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 140, no. 65 and fig. 16/4.
428a. TÖRÖKSZENTMIKLÓS (Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, Hungary).

429. TRAISMAUER (Niederösterreich, Austria).
   Justin II: M, CON, 568-569; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und karolingischen," 341, no. 8.

430. TRBINC (Mirna, Slovenia).92

431. TREBUJENI (Orhei, Moldova).
   Justin I: M, CON, 518-527, found in 1963 during archaeological excavations conducted by P. Byrnia; Nudel'man, Topografiia kladov i nakhdok, 83, no. 15; Ralafovich, Slaviane, 40, fig. 9/3.
   Justinian I: M, CON, found in the early medieval settlement; Ibid., 83, no. 16.

432. TRŽIČ (Tržič, Slovenia).

433. TSEBELDA-TSIBILIJUM (Abkhazia, Georgia).
   Justinian I: solidus, CON, 542-565; heavy miliarensis, CON, 527-537; 2 light miliarenses, 537-565; 2 M, CON, 527-537; M, ANT, 529-532, found during archaeological excavations at Tsibilium (settlement and cemetery); Lu. N. Voronov and V. A. Lushin, "Pogrebenie VII V. N. E. Le S. Tsebel'da v Abkhazii," Kratkie Soobshchenia 128 (1971): 103, fig. 43; Shamba, Monетne obrashtenie, 79-80, no. 115-120; Lu. N. Voronov and O. Kh. Bgazhba, Materialy po arkheologii Tsebel'dy (itogi issledovanii Tsibiliuma v 1978-1982 gg.) (Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1985), fig. 18/2-3 and fig. 113/47.

434. TSIKHISDZIRI (Ajaria, Georgia).
   Anastasius I: M; K, both coins found during archaeological excavations in the early medieval church; Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, History and Coin Finds in Georgia, 22.

435. TS'INTS'KARO (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia)
   Heraclius: hexagrammon, CON, 615-637; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis, 126, no. 66.

436. TSKHUMARI (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia).
   Anastasius I: solidus, CON, 491-507; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis, 38, no. 42.

437. TUDORA (Ștefan Vodă, Moldova).
   Heraclius: tremissis, CON, 610-613; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 141, no. 68 and fig. 14/4.93

438. TURCEȘTI (Argeș, Romania).

---

92 Also published in Kos, Die Fundmünzen, vol. 1.
93 Stoliarik cited DOC 54 (dated 613-641) as reference but the illustration of the specimen from Tudora points to an earlier issue from 610-613, type MIB 73.
Justin II: K, CON, 570-571; Ibid., 79, no. 97.

439. TURDA (Cluj, Romania).
Justinian I: solidus; Velter, Transilvania în secolele V-XII, 302, no. 190. 1 AE;
Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 249, no. 19.
Constans II: 1 AE; Ibid., 249, no. 19.

440. TYN NAD VLTAVOU (České Budějovice, Czech Republic).

440a. UCHKEKEN (Karachayevo-Cherkesiya, Russia).
Tiberius II: silver imitation; Rtveladze and Runich, "Novye nahodki," 153-54.

441. ULMENI (Călărași, Romania).\(^{94}\)
Justin I: K, CON, 522-527; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 159.
Justinian I: 2 M, CON, 527-538; M, ANT, 536/7-539; I, CON, 556-557; Butnariu,
Justin II: M, CON, 570-571; M, NIK, 574-575; Ibid., 223, 164-165.

442. ULMI (Giurgiu, Romania).

443. UMBRĂREŞTI (Galaţi, Romania).

444. Unknown location, Arad county, Romania.

445. Unknown locations, Armenia.
Heraclius: hexagrammon, CON, 615-625; Mousheghian et al., History, 199, no. 1.
Constans II: hexagrammon, CON, 648-652; Ibid., 199, no. 2.

446. Unknown locations, Banat, Romania/ Serbia.\(^{95}\)
Anastasius I: solidus, CON, 507-518; 3 M, CON, 512-517; M, CON, 517-518;
Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranziția de la antichitate," 56, n. 52.
Justin I: M, CON, 518-527; K, CON, 518-527; M, CON, 527; Ibid., 62, n. 65.
Justinian I: miliarensis, CON, 527-537; K, CON, 527-537; K, CON, 541-542; M, CON, 544-545; M, KYZ, 544-545; M, CON, 557-558; Ibid., 69-70, n. 72.

\(^{94}\) Possibly part of a hoard.

\(^{95}\) Coins from the collection of the Banat Museum in Timișoara. Most of the coins in the museum’s collection belonged to Zs. Ormós, who collected Byzantine coins from the area of Orșova and Moldova Veche in the nineteenth century, see Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 126. See also Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 247-54.
Justin II: 2 solidi, CON, 568-578; tremissis, CON, 565-578; Somogyi, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 292-294, no. 23-25. M, CON, 567-568; M, CON, 570-571; M, CON, 573-574; M, NIK, 575-576; 2 K, TES, 567-568; 3 K, TES, 569-570; 2 K, TES, 574-575; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 126, n. 41 and n. 44.
Maurice: M, CON, 586-587; M, KYZ, 597-598; Ibid., 133, n. 84.
Heraclius: light weight solidus (20 siliquae), CON, 616-625; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 27, no. 6; M, CON, 612-613; M, NIK, 613-614; M, CON, 615-624; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 138, n. 121.
Constans II: M, CON, 643-655; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 143, n. 151.

447. Unknown locations, Bosnia & Herzegovina/ Croatia/Serbia.
448. Unknown locations, Bucovina, Romania/ Ukraine.
Anastasius I/ Justin I: M, CON, 498-527; Ibid., 293, no. 4.
Justin I: M, CON, 518-527; K, CON, 518-527; Ibid., 293-94, no. 5-6.
Justinian I: M, CON, 527-538; M, ANT, 557-558; Ibid., 294, no. 7-8.
Justin II: M, CON, 575-576; K, CON, 574-575; M, NIK, 570-571; M, NIK, 575-576; M, ANT, 572-573; K, TES, 569-570; Ibid., 294-295, no. 9-14.
Maurice: 1 solidus, CON, 583/584-602; M, CON, 582/583?; M, CON, 591-592; K, CON 583-584; K, CON, 601-602; K, NIK, 584-585; M, ANT, 582-583; M, ANT, 595-596; Ibid., 295-296, no. 15-22.
449. Unknown location, Carinthia, Austria.
450. Unknown locations, Georgia.

96 The collections of the Zagreb Archaeological Museum and the National Museum in Belgrade include some 1350 Early Byzantine coins, most of them without proper information regarding the finding place. The bulk of the collections is probably made of pieces found in the provinces of Illyricum including the Adriatic coast. Based on the few specimens with a recorded finding place north of the Sava river, it can be speculated that some of the unprovenienced coins may have been found outside the theoretical administrative borders of the Early Byzantine Empire. This is more likely the case of the unprovenienced pieces from the museum in Osijek. Only the coins of Justinian I have been fully published so far, 57 pieces, of which 16 have a known finding place (this inventory no. 36, 113, 219, 290, 483). See, Goricke-Lukić, "Justinijanov novac," 1149-1155. For the collections in Zagreb and Belgrade, see Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine Coins," 129-258; Radić and Ivanisevic, Byzantine Coins, 51-153.

97 Coins from the collection of the Bucovina Museum in Suceava. Some of the coins might have been found at Callatis in the Early Byzantine province of Scythia during archaeological excavations conducted by Teofil Sauciuc-Săveanu in the 1920s -1930s, see Gogu, "Monedele bizantine," 285 with n. 8.

98 This entry is based almost exclusively on the two catalogues published by Tamara Abramishvili in 1965 and 1989, respectively. Some of the coins listed with no mention of the finding place in her 1965 catalogue were republished in the 1989 catalogue, this time with indication of provenience. The same might be true for other specimens, which were never republished with full details, although the finding place might be


Justinian I: 3 *solidi*, CON, 538-552 (one is pierced); light *miliarensis*, CON, 537-565 (pierced); 2 M, CON, 527-537; 2 K, CON, 527-537; Е, 527-537; M, Carthage, 527-537; 2 M, ANT, 531-537; 3 *centenionales*, Cherson, 537-552; IS, TES, 538-552; M, CON, 539-540 (pierced); M, ANT, 539-540; I, Carthage, 540-541; M, NIK, 541-542 (pierced); M, ANT, 546-547; M, KYZ, 547-548; M, ANT, 550-551; M, ANT, 551-552; M, CON, 554-555; M, ANT, 554-555; M, NIK, 555-556; M, ANT, 557-558; M, NIK, post 538; 4E, CON, 542-565; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis*, 43-50, no. 69-71, 73, 75, 77-104.

Justin II: *solidus*, CON, 567-578; M, KYZ, 567-568; K, TES, 568-569; K, TES, 569-570; M, NIK, 570-571 (pierced); K, KYZ, 570-571; M, CON, 571-572; 3 *solidi*, CON, 572-573; M, ANT, 572-573; M, CON, 574-575; K, CON, 574-575; M, CON, 575-576; 2 K, TES, 575-576; M; *Ibid.*, 50-52, no. 105-107, 109-120.


---

Recorded in museum accession records. In addition, in her 1965 book Abramishvili used the reference catalogues of the day – *BMC, Tolstoi* and even *Sabatier*, so the coins had to be redated and sometimes reattributed based on the more recent *MIB* corpus.

99 Found in Svanetia region.

100 The coins were found in an unknown location in Svanetia region and may belong to a dispersed hoard.

Constantine IV: *solidus*, CON, 669-674; 2 *solidi*, CON, 681-685; *hexagrammon*, CON, 674-681; Ibid., 73, no. 240-241, 243-244.

Justinian II: *solidus*, CON, 692-695; *solidus*, CON, 705-711; Ibid., 73-74, no. 245-246.

Early Byzantine: K; Abramishvili, Ibid., 61, no. 175.

451. Unknown locations, Hungary. 101


Justinian II: 1 AV; Prohászka, "Altneue byzantinische Münzen," 108, no. 16.

452. Unknown location, Krasnodar, Russia.

Constans II: 1 AR; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskkh monet*, 21, no. 2.

453. Unknown locations, Moldova.


Justinian I: 1 AE; Ibid., 87, no. 1.

Justin II: M, CON, 575-576; Ibid., 88, no. 2.

454. Unknown locations, Moravia, Czech Republic.


Late Roman / Early Byzantine: *solidus*; Ibid., 381, no. M35.

455. Unknown locations, Mureș County, Romania. 102


Justin II: K, TES, 575-576; Velter, *Transilvania în secolele V-XII*, 294, no. 98.


---

101 Unprovenienced coins from the collection of the National Museum in Budapest and other local museums in Hungary.

102 Two *solidi* of Justinian and Maurice, respectively, are illustrated in Zrinyi, "Repertoriul arheologic," pl. LXXV:b-c.

456. Unknown locations, North Ossetia-Alania, Russia.103

Justinian I: *solidus*.
Justin II: *solidus*.
Tiberius II: 1 AE.

457. Unknown locations, Oltenia, Romania.

Justin I: *tremissis*, CON, 518-527; M, 518-527; K, 518-527; K, 527. Ibid., 61, n. 63 and n. 64.
Justin II: 28 AE; Oberländeler-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 125, n. 24 and n. 33.
Tiberius II: M, NIK, 580-581; Ibid., 130, n. 62.
Maurice: K, CON, 582-583; K, NIK, 582-583; M, CON, 583-584; K, CON, 586-587; K, CON, 588-589; M, ANT, 590-591; K, KYZ, 592-593; K, CON, 595-596; K, TES, 599-600; Oberländeler-Târnoveanu, "La răscruce de vremuri," 133, n. 78.

458. Unknown locations, Slovenia.

Justinian I: *solidus*, CON, 527-537; *solidus*, CON, 542-565; ¼ *siliqua*, Ravenna, 537-552; Ibid., 582, no. 3-4 and 583, no. 2.

459. Unknown locations, former Tekovská stolica region, Slovakia.

Justin I: M; E; Fiala, "Byzantské mince," 57, no. 2.
Justin II: M; K; Ibid., 57, no. 2.

460. Unknown locations, Transylvania, Romania.

Justin II: *solidus*, CON, 567-578; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 76, no. 63.
Constantine IV: *semissis*, CON; Ibid., 75-76, no. 62.

461. Unknown locations, Wallachia, Romania.

Justin I: *solidus*, CON, 522-527; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 224, no. 181.

103 Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 31, no. 143.
Tiberius II: M, ANT, 581-582; Ibid., 351, n. 37.
Maurice: solidus, CON, 583-602; Ibid., 353, n. 40.

462. URBNISI (Shida Kartli).
Justin I: K, found in 1959 during archaeological excavations conducted by Nikoloz Berdzenishvili; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis, 123, no. 33a.

463. URICANI (Iași, Romania).
Justinian I: M, CON, 544-545; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 166.

464. UROI (Hunedoara, Romania).
Justinian I: M, KYZ, 541-542; found in the local cemetery; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 167.

465. URZICA MARE (Dolj, Romania).
Justinian I: M, ANT, 559-560; Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Tranziția de la antichitate," 68, n. 70.

466. VĂDAȘ (Mureș, Romania).\(^{104}\)
Heraclius: 2 solidi; Ibid., 250, no. 26.

467. VĂDASTRIȚA (Olt, Romania).
Justin I: solidus, CON, 518-527; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 224, no. 171.

468. VĂDEL LUI ISAC (Cahul, Moldova).
Anastasius I: Е, CON, 512-518; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 132, no. 2.

469. VALEA MARE (Dâmbovița, Romania).
Justinian I: K, ANT, 564-565; C. Preda, "Descoperiri," 294, no. 5.

470. VALEA STANCIULUI (Dolj, Romania).
Justin II: 1 AE, CON; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 168.

471. VALEA VOIEVOZILOR (Dâmbovița, Romania).
Justinian I: solidus, CON, 538-542; found on the bank of Ialomița river; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 169.

472. VAMEȘ (Galați, Romania).
Justin II: M, KYZ, 573-574; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 223, no. 170.

473. VANADZOR (Lori, Armenia).

\(^{104}\) In 1891 the National Hungarian Museum in Budapest acquired a "hoard" of Roman imperial denari and Late Roman, Early Byzantine and Byzantine gold coins spanning some one thousand years. Most probably the coins either belong to separate hoards or fragments of hoards and stray finds were mixed in this collection.
Justinian I: M, CON, 543-544; Mousheghian et al., History, 180, no. 2.

474. VARDENUT (Aragatsotn, Armenia).
Justin II: M, ANT, 576-577; Mousheghian et al., History, 167.

475. VARÍN (Žilina, Slovakia).
Justin I: tremissis, 518-527; Zábojník, "Antike Münzen," 413, no. 24.105

476. VÁRPALOTA (Veszprém, Hungary).
Heraclius: M, CON, 612-613, found in the "Gymnasium" cemetery in grave 229;
Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 93, no. 84.

477. VÂŞCĂUȚI (Orhei, Moldova).
Maurice: M, CON, 589-590; Nudel’man, Topografiia kladov i nakhodok, 83, no. 14.

478. VĂȘIEȘTI (Bacău, Romania).
Justinian I/ Tiberius II: 3 AE; Teodor, "Descoperiri arheologice și numismatice," 164, no. 733.

479. VASYLIVKA (Odesa, Ukraine).
Maurice: M, CON, 589-590; Ibid., 139, no. 57.

480. VERBOVÝI LOG (Rostov-na-Donu, Russia).
Justinian II: solidus, CON, 705-711, found in a grave; A. Naumenko and S. I.
Bezuglov, "Új bizánci és íráni importleletek a Don-vidék sztyeppéiről," Móra Ferenc

480a. VERKHNII CHIRYURT (Dagestan, Russia).
Maurice: 2 solidi, CON, one is pierced, both have loops attached, found in graves 6
and 17, respectively; S. V. Gusev, Severo-Vostochnyi Kavkaz v epokhu srednevekov’ia:
monety rasskazyvaiu (Moskow: Institut etnologii i antropologii RAN, 1995), 11-12, no.
1-2 and 46, fig. 1/1-2.
Heraclius: solidus, CON, 616-625, loop attached, found in grave 16; 3 solidi
(imitations), one is pierced, two have loops/lugs, found in graves 20, 40a, and 79a,
respectively; Gusev, Severo-Vostochnyi Kavkaz, 12-14, no. 3-5, and 7 and 46-47, fig.
1/3 and fig. 2/1-3.
Constans II: solidus (imitation), CON, 654-659, with welded lugs, found in grave 14;
Ibid., 14, no. 8 and 47, fig. 2/4.

481. VETEL (Hunedoara, Romania).
Justinian I: solidus, found in the early medieval settlement, no archaeological
context; Lakatos, "Monede bizantine," 250, no. 27.

482. VIENNA (Wien, Austria).
Justinian I: Ė, found in the Botanic Garden; Winter, "Die byzantinischen und
karolingischen," 343, no. 12b/1.
Tiberius II: M, CON, 578-579, found in a grave during archaeological excavations in
1910; Ibid., 342, no. 11.

---

105 Same coin as Prohászka, "Altneue byzantinische Münzen," 107, no. 15.
Maurice: 2 12 -nummia, Alexandria, 590-602; C, CON, 582-602.\(^{106}\) Ibid., 342-43, no. 11b/1, 12a, and 12b/2.
Heraclius: M, NIK, 625-629; Ibid., 342-43, no. 11b/2.

483. VINKOVCI (Vukovar-Syrmia, Croatia).
Justinian: M, CON, 539-540; M; Göricke-Lukić, "Justinijanov novac," 1150, no. 11 and 1155, no. 59.

484. VIRGEN-OBERMAUERN (Tyrol, Austria).

485. VLĂDENI (Ialomița, Romania).
Justinian I: M, CON, 541-542; Papasima, "Monede bizantine inedite," 280, no. 4.

486. VOINICENI (Mures, Romania).
Phocas: light weight solidus (20 siliquae), CON, 603-607; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 94, no. 85.

487. VOLGOGRAD (Volgograd, Russia).
Justinian I: 1 coin; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 29, no. 122.

488. VOLOS’KE (Dnipropetrovs’k, Ukraine).
Maurice: M, Cherson, 582-602, found during archaeological excavations at the mouth of river Sura; Kropotkin, "Novye nakhodki," 172, no. 28.

489. VOSKETAP (Ararat, Armenia).
Justin II: M, ANT; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 43, no. 386 (Shirazlu).

490. VRŠAC (South Banat, Serbia).
Justin II: solidus, CON, 568-578; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 94-95, no. 85a.

491. VYLKOVE (Odesa, Ukraine).
Justinian I: 1 AE; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 136, no. 31 (M, according to Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 35, no. 242).

492. VYNOHRADNE (Kherson, Ukraine).
Anastasius I: 1 AE; Stoliarik, Essays on Monetary Circulation, 133, no. 8.

493. VYSOKÉ (Žďár nad Sázavou, Czech Republic).
Justin II: K, ANT (?), 565-578; Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 381, no. M34.

494. WIENER NEUSTADT (Niederösterreich, Austria).
Constans II: M, Syracuse, 659/662-668; Winter, "Die byzantinischen," 341, no. 9.

495. YEREVAN (Yerevan, Armenia).
Heraclius: hexagrammon, CON, 625-629; Mousheghian et al., History, 197.

496. YOSYPIVKA (Kirovohrad, Ukraine).

\(^{106}\) Might be the same coin found in the Botanic Garden and attributed to Justinian I.

497. ZAGREB (Zagreb, Croatia).

Justin II: M, CON, 570-571; K. Simoni, "Zagreb i okolina u ranom srednjem vijeku," in *Arheološka istraživanja u Zagrebu i njegovoj okolici* (Zagreb: Hrvatsko Arheološko društvo, 1981), 155-56.\(^{108}\)

498. ZAIT (Căuşeni, Moldova).


499. ZAMÁRD–RÉTI–FÖLDEK (Somogy, Hungary).

Heraclius: light weight *solidus* (20 *siliquae*), CON, 616-625, found in grave 1392; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 95-96, no. 86.

500. ZATOKA (Odesa, Ukraine)

Justin II: K, KYZ; Stoliarik, *Essays on Monetary Circulation*, 139, no. 54.

501. ZELEMÉR (Hajdú-Bihar, Hungary).


502. ŽELOVCE (Veľký Krtíš, Slovakia).

Early Byzantine: 1 AV, found in the Avar-age cemetery (second half of the seventh century), grave 170; Zábojník, "Antike Münzen," 413, no. 28.

502a. ZHABOTIN (Cherkasy, Ukraine).


503. ZHEBOT’A (Mtskheta-Mtianeti, Georgia).

Heraclius: *hexagrammon*, CON, 635-637, found in a grave, during archaeological excavations; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 126, no. 74.

504. ZIMNE (Volyn, Ukraine).

Early Byzantine: 1 silvered imitation of a bronze issue, found during archaeological excavations in the early medieval settlement; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 31, no. 147; V. V. Aulikh, *Zymnivs’ke horodyshche- slovians’ka pamiatka vi-vii St. n.e. v Zakhidnii Volyni* (Kiev, "Naukova dumka", 1972), 20.

505. ZIMNICEA (Teleorman, Romania).

Maurice: M, CON, 588-589; Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 224, no. 175.

506. ZMIYNY ISLAND (Ostriv Zmiyiny, Ukraine).

Anastasius I: 1 AE; Stoliarik, *Essays on Monetary Circulation*, 132, no. 5;

---

\(^{107}\) The coin is pierced approximately at 12 o’clock on the obverse and was found in the area of the skull, a good indication that it had been worn as a pendant.

\(^{108}\) Same coin as Mirnik and Šemrov, "Byzantine Coins," 177, no. 488.
Justin I: Є, CON, 522-527; Ibid., 134, no. 16 and 256, fig. 21/1.
Justinian I: M, CON, 527-538; Ibid., 136, no. 32 and 256, fig. 21/2.
Constans II: M, Cherson, 654-668; Ibid., 141, no. 66 and 256, fig. 21/3 (Heraclius). 109

507. ŻÓŁKÓW (Jasło, Poland).
Heraclius: light weight solidus (20 siliquae), CON, 616-625; Wołoszyn, "Byzantine Fundmünzen," 506, no. 19 and 511, fig. 6/14.

508. ZÓLOTONOSHA (Cherkasy, Ukraine).
Justinian I: M, ANT, 539-540; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 37, no. 275.
Maurice: 1 coin; Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 37, no. 276. 110

509. ZSANA-CIPRUSSZÉK ( Bács-Kiskun, Hungary).

510. ZUGDIDÍ (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia). 41.85 42.5 8 0 3 13
Justin I: heavy miliarensis, CON, 518-527; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis, 40-41, no. 56. 111
Constans II: hexagrammon, CON, 648-652; 112 hexagrammon, CON, 659-668; Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 35-36, no. 133.

511. ŻYWIEC (Żywiec, Poland).

A.2.2 Hoards/ Collective Finds

512. ARNOLDSTEIN (Carinthia, Austria).

513. ARTSVABERD (Tavush, Armenia).
A hoard of 102 Byzantine silver coins was found in 1967 during agricultural works. The coins were hidden in a ceramic container. All coins are hexagrammata of Heraclius. Last coin: 635-637. Mousheghian et al., History, 193-94.

514. BAČKI MONOŠTOR (West Bačka, Serbia).
An unknown number of gold coins of Maurice, now lost; Somogyi, Byzantinische Fundmünzen, 26, no. 4.

109 Stoliarik attributed the coin to Heraclius but the rubbing drawing of the reverse provided by the author clearly shows an issue of Constans II from Cherson, type MIB 227.

110 Five other coins found at Zolotonosha are mentioned by Kropotkin, but no precise details are provided. There is no indication that they might have belonged to a larger hoard. The Justinian follis was found accidentally by a schoolboy who was digging a hole, at 40cm into the ground.

111 Same coin as Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 44, no. 408a, with attribution to Justinian I.

112 Same coin as Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis, 70, no. 222 and pl. XIV/222.
515. BERNECEBARÁTI (Pest, Hungary).
Accidental find of 17 gold coins, possibly from a grave, information is available only
29-30, no. 10.

516. BICH’VINTA-PITSUNDA (Abkhazia, Georgia).
A hoard of 55 *pentanumma*, all from the reign of Justin I, was found in 1961 during
archaeological excavations at Pitsunda, near the north wall XIII. Tsukhishvili and
Depeyrot, *History and Coin Finds in Georgia*, 72-73, no. 4.

517. BIELSKO-BIAŁA (Bielsko-Biała, Poland).
Hoard found accidentally in 1921. The 23 coins spanning the reigns of Vespasian
through Justinian II were hidden in a ceramic pot; the hoard is now lost and only a brief
description survives. Last coin: 685-695 or 705-711. Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische
Fundmünzen," 498-99, no. 3.

518. BOHOUŇOVICE I (Kolín, Czech Republic).
Accidental find of a small hoard containing silver and bronze coins from Trajan
Decius to Justin II. Last coin: 573-574. Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins,"
374, no. C17.

518a. BUCHAREST (Bucharest, Romania).
A small hoard of 12 copper coins from Justin II and Tiberius II found in 1929. No
details are known and the hoard may be incomplete. Last coin: 580-581. *Trésors*, 182,
no. 83 (same as 414, no. 350).\textsuperscript{113}

519. ČERVENÝ HRÁDEK (Kolín, Czech Republic).
Accidental find of a small hoard of 20 bronze coins of which only seven survive, from
368-69, no. C7.

520. CHEGEMSKY District (Kabardino-Balkar Republic, Russia).
In 1898 eight gold coins from Anastasius to Heraclius were acquired from a local
collector, along with two casts after a *solidus* of Constantine IV and an eighth century
*solidus*, respectively. The coins may have been part of a larger hoard. Kropotkin, *Klady
vizantiiskikh monet*, 30, no. 133.

521. CHIBATI (Guria, Georgia).
A large hoard of *solidi* was found by accident in September 1958. The coins were
hidden in a ceramic pot. Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 46, no. 475, citing the
initial 1959 report by D. G. Kapanadze, mentions 2000 coins of which ca. 800g had
been melted down. Only 124 coins were subsequently recovered by the Georgian
museum in Tbilisi. The most recent and detailed publication mentions 121 coins from
Tiberius II to Heraclius. Many specimens are die-linked. Last coin: 610-613. T.

\textsuperscript{113} The hoard was first mentioned by S. McA. Mosser, *A Bibliography of Byzantine Coin Hoards* (New
York: American Numismatic Society, 1935), 15 after a note received from Constantin Moisil stating that
the hoard had been found in Bucharest in 1929. Later, Moisil published the coins stating that the
provenience was unknown. The hoard was donated by an important collector in Bucharest, Constantin
Orghidan. See C. Moisil, "Creșterea colecțiilor cabinetului numismatic," *Creșterea Colecțiilor* 49-53
(1944): 112.
Abramishvili, "Bizant’iuri okros monet’ebi (Chibatis gandzi)," in Akad. S. Janashias sachelobis sakartvelos sachelmts’ipo muzeumis moambe 25-B (1968): 159-76; Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, History and Coin Finds in Georgia, 75-79 and pl. 2-6.

522. CHKHOROTSOU (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia).

Two solidi of Justinian, possibly belonging to a larger hoard, were found in the village of Chkhorotsku in 1952. Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis, 124, no. 42.

523. CUDALBI (Galați, Romania).

Accidental find of 28 bronze coins from Anastasius I and Justin I. The coins had been deposited in a ceramic pot covered with a stone slab to avoid spilling. Last coin: 522-527. Trésors, 414-15, no. 351.

524. DEDOPLISTS’KARO-TS’ITELITS’KARO (Kakheti, Georgia).

A large hoard of Sasanian and Byzantine silver coins was found accidentally during agricultural works in 1977. The hoard was initially dispersed but a large number of coins were subsequently retrieved, 1385 Sasanian drachms and ten hexagrammata of Heraclius. Last Byzantine coin: 637-641. M. Tsotselia, History and Coin Finds in Georgia: Sasanian and Byzantine Coins from Tsilelitskaro (AD 641) (Weteren: Moneta, 2002), 86-87.114

525. DNIPROPETROVS’K region (Ukraine).

A necklace with 72 Byzantine coins was found accidentally by a peasant during agricultural work which led to the destruction of a female barrow. Four coins have been described as imitations, while the necklace was described as being composed of 72 gold plated coins, which raises the possibility that all coins are imitations/forgeries. The prototype was described as a semissis of Constans II, in fact a light weight solidus of 20 siliquae of that emperor (dated 642-646 after MIB III). Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 38, 31, no. 149; K. V. Golenko, "Imitatsii solida VII v. Iz Podneprov’ya," Vizantiiskii Vremennik 11 (1956): 292-94.

526. DOLHEȘTI (Iași, Romania).

Accidental find of 20 Byzantine gold coins, of which some were attached to a gold necklace. The coins were found in 1902 at 1m into the ground among wide slabs of stone displayed horizontally, a possible indication of a grave. Teodor, Descoperiri arheologice și numismatic, 81, no. 255.115

---

114 For an early book-length publication of a portion of the hoard then available for study, see I. Dzhalagania, Monety klady Gruzii: klad sasanidskikh i vizantiiskikh monet iz Tsiteli Tskaro (pervaia chast’) (Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1980). Some coins were also mentioned in Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 26, n. 142 and 26-33, no. 90, 93, 106, 120-126.

115 Dan G. Teodor alone dates the coins to the fifth and sixth centuries. In the original publication Constantin Moisil mentioned twenty Byzantine gold coins without any indication of their dating. The current location of the coins is unknown and they were likely divided among finders back in 1902. Moisil himself received the information from the local priest. It is uncertain how Teodor suddenly advanced a dating to the fifth and sixth centuries more than eighty years after the original publication. Moreover, in his 1972 inventory Constantin Preda was noting that the date of the hoard is not known, for which see Preda, "Circulația monedelor bizantine," 400. For the original publication, see C. Moisil, "Monete și tezaure
527. DRĂGAȘANI (Vâlcea, Romania).
Hoard of *hexagrammata* found in unknown circumstances, only three *hexagrammata* of Constans II were retrieved. Last coin: 659-668. Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 230; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 131. n. 34 (for MIB attribution and dating).

528. DVIN (Ararat, Armenia).
A) A mixed hoard of Sasanian and Byzantine silver coins was found accidentally in a field close to Duin (1955). Most of the coins were subsequently acquired by the Yerevan Museum, in several stages which created some confusion regarding the exact number of coins in the hoard. The total seems to be around 300, approximately one third being *hexagrammata* of Heraclius, most of which are dated 625-629. Mousheghian et al., *History*, 107-08 and pl. 9.

B) A hoard of 115 *hexagrammata* of Heraclius and his co-regents was found close to the south-eastern wall of the cathedral (1947). Last coin: 638-641. Ibid., 131-33 and pl. 9.

529. ECHMIAZDIN (Armavir, Armenia).
A hoard of four Byzantine *hexagrammata* from Heraclius and Constans II with no details of the date or the circumstances in which it was found. Last coin: 648-652. Mousheghian et al., *History*, 170 and pl. 25.\(^{116}\)

530. ENGURE (Tukums, Latvia).
Accidental find of 43 coins, one of which (the latest) is a solidus struck for Anastasius I. V. Urtâns, *Senâkie depoziti Latvijā* (*līdz* 1200. g.)(Riga: Zinātne, 1977), 137.\(^{117}\)

531. FIRTUȘU (Harghita, Romania).
Accidental find of a large number of gold coins (ca. 300), now dispersed. Fourteen specimens have been preserved in two different museums. Last coin: *solidus* of Heraclius, 616-625. Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 40-42, no. 24.

532. GALAȚI (Galați, Romania).
Accidental find of 12 *hexagrammata* from Heraclius to Constantine IV. The hoard was found on the Danube’s bank together with ceramic fragments from the container where the coins had been deposited. Last coin: 674-681. *Trésors*, 168, no. 68; Somogyi, *Byzantinische Fundmünzen*, 128. n. 21 (for MIB attribution and dating).

533. GRCHI (Tavush, Armenia).

---

monetare găsite în România și în Ținuturile românești învecinate (vechiul teritoriu geto-dac),” *BSNR* 20, July-December (1913): 63, no. 24.

\(^{116}\) Another hoard of ca. 20-30 Byzantine silver coins of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine was found in Echmiazdin in 1908. A. Pakhomov was able to study only ten specimens. Since no information exists about the circumstances in which the second hoard was found it is possible that we are in fact dealing with one and the same hoard. For the early hoard, see Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 43, no. 387.

\(^{117}\) The coin of Anastasius was also mentioned by Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 39, no. 313.
A small hoard of 10-12 silver coins of Heraclius was found hidden in a ceramic pot (1942). Information was retrieved only for one specimen, a *hexagrammon* of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine, CON, 632-635. Mousheghian et al., *History*, 194-95.

534. GROPENI (Brâila, Romania).


535. GYUMRI (Shirak, Armenia).


536. HELLMONSÖDT (Oberösterreich, Austria).


537. HLINSKO (Chrudim, Czech Republic).

Accidental find of a group of seven silver and bronze coins from Vespasianus to Justin II deposited in a small ceramic vessel. Last coin: 572-573; Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 373-74, no. C16.

538. HORGEȘTI (Bacău, Romania).


539. HRADEC KRÁLOVÉ (Hradec Králové, Czech Republic).

Accidental find of a group of coins, of which only two survive; the early Byzantine specimen is a *dekanummium* of Justinian I, CON, 540-541; Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 370-71, no. C11.

540. HROZOVA (Bruntál, Czech Republic).

Small hoard of four bronze coins found during archaeological excavations on the left bank of the Hrozová River; all coins are from Carthage, the earliest being a Punic coin from the third century BC. Last coin: 662-667. Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 382, no. M38.

541. IĞDIR (Iğdır, Turkey).

A hoard containing an unknown number of *hexagrammata* of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine was found in Iğdir before the First World War. I. Tolstoi acquired

---

118 Mousheghian dated the latest coin of Constans II to 648-651/2 although reference is given to *MIB* 150, which corresponds to 654-659. The illustration provided on pl. 25/16 confirms that the coin indeed belongs to type *MIB* 150.

542. **IL’ICH** (Krasnodar, Russia).
Hoard found in 1975 during archaeological excavations at Il’ich in the Taman peninsula. The coins were found among amphora remains, possibly the container in which the coins had been deposited. The hoard includes 140 gold staters of third and fourth century kings of Bosporus as well as five *solidi* of Justinian I. Last coin: 542-565. N. A. Frolova and E. Ia. Nikolaeva, "Il’ichevskii klad monet 1975 g.,” *VV* 39 (1978), 173-79.

543. **KARLINO** (Białogard, Poland).

544. **KARSIBór** (Drawsko, Poland).
A hoard of 25 solidi, the latest of which was struck for Anastasius. R. Ciołek, "Znaleziska monet rzymskich z terenów Pomorza przechowywanie w zbiorach Muzeum Kulturo-Węgierskiego w Stralsundzie," *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne* 43 (1999): 176.

545. **KELEGEIA** (Kherson, Ukraine).
Accidental find of seven *solidi* from Heraclius and Constans II. The hoard was found in 1927 on the left bank of the Dnieper and included coins and jewelry made of gold and silver, fragments of silver plate, and fragments of two glass containers. One *solidus* of Heraclius is an imitation. A light weight *solidus* (22 *siliquae*) of Justinian I, found in the vicinity might have been part of the same hoard. Last coin: 641-646. A. I. Semenov, "Vizantijskie monety Kelegeiskogo kompleksa," *Arkheologicheskii sbornik Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha* 31 (1991): 121-30; Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 37, no. 268 (Kelegeyskiye Khutora). 119

546. **KHOTYN** (Chernivtsi, Ukraine).
Accidental find of three bronze coins from Anastasius I to Justinian I, which may have belonged to a larger hoard. I. Corman, *Contribuţii la istoria spaţiului pruto-nistrian în epoca evului mediu timpuriu (sec. V-VII d.Chr.)* (Chişinău: Cartdidact, 1998), 157, no. 2.

546a. **KISLOVODSK** (Stavropol, Russia).
A short note was published about "dozens of *folles* of Justinian I" found in Kislovodsk in the area of the furniture factory. G. Afanas’ev, "Na karavannoi trope," *Stavropol’s literaturno-khudozhestvennyi al’manakh* (1973), no. 3: 76.

547. **KLUK** (Nymburk, Czech Republic). 119

119 Possibly part of the Poděbrady hoard, below no. 569. Poděbrady and Kluk are neighboring settlements and both hoards were described as having been found in the sand. Moreover, in both cases the coins were acquired by the Poděbrady Museum in the late 1960s. There are, however, grounds to accept the existence of two different hoards at such a small distance given the high density of finds in the Central Bohemian Region, on both sides of the Elbe.
Accidental find of a group of coins, now dispersed, in a large flooded sand quarry; only one coin has been retrieved, Phocas, K, Carthage, 606-607; Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 375, no. C22.

548. KOBULETI (Ajaria, Georgia).
   A hoard of gold coins was found accidentally in a kitchen garden; four soli of Justinian I minted in Constantinopole were retrieved. Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 45, no. 444 (Smekalovka).

549. KÓNCZYCE MALE (Cieszyn, Poland).
   An unknown number of coins were part of the hoard, although it is possible that we are dealing in fact with two separate hoards; among the coins, a follis of Justinian I, now lost. Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 501, no. 8.

550. KOSH (Aragatsotn, Armenia).
   Accidental find of 52 or 54 hexagrammata of Heraclius and Constans II. Last coin: 648-652. Mousheghian et al., History, 164-65 and pl. 23-24.120

551. KÖTSCHACH-LAAS (Carinthia, Austria).

552. KUPUSINA (West Bačka, Serbia).
   A large hoard of solidi, from Zeno to Phocas, now lost. Trésors, 420, no. 357.

553. LUHANS’K (Luhans’k, Ukraine).
   Accidental find of an unknown number of gold coins of Justinian I on the premises of a factory in Luhansk. The find was recorded ca. 1899 in a private collection, but no other details are known. Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 35, no. 232.

554. LYMARIVKA (Luhans’k, Ukraine).
   Accidental find of a Sassanian silver bucket probably containing a hoard of gold coins, of which only one was mentioned, a "small" gold coin of Justin I. Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 35, no. 231.

555. MAGRANETI (Mtskheta-Mtianeti, Georgia).
   A mixed hoard of eleven Sasanian and four Byzantine silver coins of Heraclius was found in 1967 during archaeological excavations in a seventh century building destroyed by fire. Four more hexagrammata of Constans II were retrieved from the same building during the 1968 campaign and may well be part of the same hoard.121

---

120 Mousheghian dates the latest coins of Constans II to 647-648 although reference is given to MIB 144, which corresponds to 648-652. Illustration on pl. 24 confirms that the coins indeed belong to type MIB 144. The same holds true for the other finds of Constans II belonging to this type, such as the single find from Garni or the specimens from the Echmiadzin and Stepanavan hoards.

121 The coins of Constans II were not mentioned by Medea Tsotselia who preferred to treat them as two different hoards, see Tsotselia, History and Coin Finds in Georgia: Sassanian Coin Finds and Hoards (Weteren: Moneta, 2003), 74-75, with year 1968 instead of 1967 for the initial find; Tsotselia, Coin Finds in Georgia, 141, no. 749 and 148, no. 784, mentioning only three hexagrammata of Constans II with inaccurate reference to Abramishvili. The 1977 publication by Abramishvili, with full catalogue, illustration,
They belong to types *MIB* 144, 145, and 150, dated 648-652 and 654-659, respectively. T. Abramishvili, "Klad monet iz Magraneti," in *Numizmaticheskii sbornik: posviashchaetsia pamiati D. G. Kapanadze*, ed. V. A. Lekvinadze (Tbilisi: Metsniereba, 1977), 73-82 and pl. VII.

556. **MAISTROV** (Zaporizhia, Ukraine).

Accidental find of a few hundred gold coins of the Heraclian dynasty, hidden in a ceramic pot on an island on the Dnieper River; only one coin was retrieved, a *solidus*, CON, 632-639 (*MIB* dating after Kropotkin’s description). Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiiskikh monet*, 31-32, no. 159.

557. **MALO PERESHCHEPYNE** (Poltava, Ukraine).

In 1912 a large hoard of Byzantine and Sassanian gold and silver plate and jewelry was found near the village, in the area of an early medieval cemetery. The hoard also contained some 70 early Byzantine gold coins from Maurice to Constans II. The bulk of the hoard is made of light weight *solidi of 20 siliquae* of Heraclius and Constans II, with a dating no later than 646. I. V. Sokolova, "Monety Pereshchepinskogo kloada," in *Sokrovishcha Khana Kubrata*, ed. O. Fedoseenko (St. Petersburg: AO Slaviia, 1997), 17-41.

558. **MALECHOWO** (Sławno, Poland).

Hoard of 3 solidi, the latest of which was struck for Anastasius. Iluk, "Bałtyckie epizody," 57.

559. **MOVILENI** (Galați, Romania).


560. **MRZEZINO** (Puck, Poland).

Hoard of 150 solidi, accidentally found in 1795. 130 solidi were struck for Anastasius or were Ostrogothic imitations of solidi struck for that emperor. R. Ciolek, "Skarb złotych monet z Mrzezina (Gm. Puck) a zespół z Brzezina Gdańskiego," *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne* 42 (1998): 59-60.

561. **MTSKHETA** (Kartli, Georgia).


562. **NEKRESI** (Kakheti, Georgia).

and description of the archaeological context is perhaps the most reliable. The coins were also mentioned in her 1989 catalogue of Byzantine coins from the Georgian National Museum, for which see Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis* (1966-1984), 35-36, no. 132, 135-137.

⑩22 No. 111 is the same coin as the one published by Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis*, 65, no. 195 and pl. XIII/195, who does not mention the finding place. The remaining two *hexagrammata* from the Mtskheta hoard could not be identified in Abramishvili’s 1965 catalogue, as none of the weights or illustrations provided match the ones in the 1989 catalogue (no. 112-113).
A small hoard of three silver coins, two Sasanian drachms of Hormizd IV (579-590) and an issue of Maurice, was found during archaeological excavations conducted in Nekresi in 2003. Tsotselia, *Coin Finds in Georgia*, 142, no. 755.

563. NOKALAKEVI (Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, Georgia).
   A) A hoard of 23 light weight *solidi* (*23 siliquae*) of Maurice was found in 1930 during archaeological excavations at Nokalakevi. Most of the coins are die-linked. Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, *History*, 74, no. 5 and pl. 1; T. Ia. Abramishvili, "Nokalavekskii klad," *VV* 23 (1963): 158-165.
   B) A hoard of nine copper coins from Anastasius to Justin II was found during archaeological excavations in 1975. Tsotselia, *Coin Finds in Georgia*, 135, no. 715.123

564. OBÂRŞENI (Vaslui, Romania).

565. OCHAMCHIRE (Abkhazia, Georgia).
   In 1958 the Georgian State Museum acquired a group of 58 Byzantine coins which had been found hidden in a ceramic pot. The find itself, however, dated back to 1903 so the information is not entirely reliable. The eight early Byzantine coins date from the reigns of Justin I to Maurice. Last coin: 601-602. T. Abramishvili, "Ochamchireshi aghmochenili sp’ilendzis bizant’iuri monet’ebi;," *Akad. S. Janashias sachelobis sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis moambe* 24-B (1963): 57-59 and pl. I/1-6.124

566. ODIŞI (Samegrelo, Georgia).
   A hoard of 28 silver coins was found accidentally in 1966 together with remains of a ceramic pot; only 13 coins have been recovered, two *siliquae* of Maurice and eleven *hexagrammata* of Heraclius. Last coin: 625-629. Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, *History and Coin Finds in Georgia*, 81, no. 8 and plate 6; Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis* (1966-1984), 22, n. 120 and 22-31, no. 76-77, 88, 94-102, 119.

567. PIUA PETRII (Ialomiţa, Romania).
   An unknown number of *hexagrammata* were probably part of a hoard found before the Second World War at Piua Petri on the Danube’s left bank, across the early Byzantine fortress of Carium, located on the right bank, in the Byzantine province of Scythia. Information has been retrieved for three coins of Constans II and Constantine IV. Last coin: 668-673 (according to Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 357-58) or 674-681 (according to Somogyi, "New," 116). M. Pauker, "Monete antice şi

---

123 The coin finds resulted from archaeological excavations at Nokalakevi in the 1970s and early 1980s had been published already by Tamara Abramishvili, with no mention of a hoard (see above, no. 267). Moreover, no such hoard can be identified in the catalogue of Byzantine coins from the Georgian National Museum published in 1989 by the same author, Abramishvili, *Sakartvelos sakhelmts’ipo muzeumis* (1966-1984).

124 The 58 coins acquired by the museum most likely represented just a fraction of the initial hoard. In addition, the collection spans more than five centuries, from Justin I to Nicephorus III Botaniates and clearly does not resemble the traditional structure of Byzantine copper coin hoards. There is a conspicuous gap of some 300 years between the last Early Byzantine coin (Maurice) and the next one in the chronological sequence of the group (Leo VI), so we are most likely dealing with at least two different, and probably incomplete, hoards.

568. PLUMBUITA (Călărași, Romania).

Mixed hoard of some 35 copper coins from the second to the sixth century; the bulk of the hoard is made of Late Roman issues. Only two early Byzantine coins are part of the hoard, the latest being a dekanummium of Justinian, NIK, 556-557. *Trésors*, 423, no. 360.  

569. PODÉBRADY (Nymburk, Czech Republic).

Accidental find of a small hoard of bronze coins, now dispersed, seven coins have been preserved, from Justin I to Constans II. Last coin: 651/652-656/657; Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 376-77, no. C25.  

570. PODGORNENSKII (Rostov-na-Donu, Russia).

Collective finds in cemetery IV, during archaeological excavations.

A) In a grave dug into barrow 14: *solidus* of Constans II and *solidus* of Constantine IV (661-663). Naumenko and Bezuglov, "Uj bizânci," 247.

B) In a grave dug into barrow 2: Three *solidi* of Constantine IV, four *solidi* of Justinian II, and two *solidi* of Leontius (695-698). Ibid., 247-48.  

571. PRAGUE (Prague, Czech Republic).


572. PRISEACA (Olt, Romania).


573. RABKA-ZDRÓJ (Nowy Targ, Poland).

Two silver light *miliarenenses* of Justinian I, CON, 527-537, possibly belonging to a larger hoard have been found accidentaly during repair works on the road linking Rabka and Mszana Dolna; both coins belong to the same type and were struck with the same pair of dies, judging by the illustration. Wołoszyn, "Byzantinische Fundmünzen," 504-05, no. 16 and 508, fig. 6-6-7.  

574. RĂNCĂCIOV (Argeș, Romania).  

---

125 The coins were originally mentioned by Mina Pauker, but no reference to a hoard was made. She had acquired a larger group of coins found at Piua Petrii, including a hoard of Roman *denarii*, early Roman bronze coins, as well as Byzantine issues. Among them there were three *hexagrammata* attributed after Sabatier and often confused in subsequent publications mentioning these coins. They might indeed be part of a hoard, but this is only a matter of conjecture relying on the unusual presence of three *hexagrammata* on the same site.  

126 V. Butnariu expressed certain doubts regarding the hoard, arguing that the large number of ancient coins would be too unusual in a sixth-century hoard. However, a significant number of similar hoards found in the Balkans, as well as in *barbaricum* (Râncăciov) give sufficient credibility to the hoard found at Plumbuita. See Butnariu, "Răspîndirea monedelor bizantine," 200, 204.
Accidental find of some 200 silver and copper coins hidden in a ceramic pot. The hoard was dispersed and only nine coins have been studied, spanning some six hundred years, from Nero to Heraclius. Last coin: 610-611. Poenaru-Bordea and Dicu, "Monede romane tîrzii," 79.

574a. SALOVO (Rostov-na-Donu, Russia). 42.4666 47.145 8 0 3 13 574a
Collective find of three solidi, two of Leontius (695-698) and one of Tiberius III (698-705), in a grave dug in barrow 2 of the cemetery IV at Salovo. All coins are pierced at 12 o'clock above the emperor’s head. V. E. Flerova, "Podkurgannye pogrebenniia vostochnoevropeiskih stepei I puti slozhenia kul'tury Khazarii," in Stepi Evropy v epokhu srednevekov'ia. Khazarskoe vremia, ed. A. V. Evgelevskii (Donetsk: Institut Arkheologii NAN Ukrainy/Donetskii Nacional'nyi Universitet, 2001), 172-174 with fig. 4.

575. SARACHILO (Kvemo Kartli, Georgia).
A hoard of 10 hexagrammata of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine was found in the local church in 1979. All coins belong to the same type, dated 625-629. Tsukhishvili and Depeyrot, History, 82, no. 9 and plate 7 (Bolnisi); Abramishvili, Sakartvelos sakhelmts'ipo muzeumis (1966-1984), 26, n. 144 and 26-30, no. 91, 103-105, 107-110, 114-115.

576. SAUR MOGIL’SKYI (Donets'k, Ukraine).
A hoard of 50 gold coins of Justinian were found accidently at Beloyariv’ka, close to Saur Mogil’iskyi, during the extraction of stone, at 0.5m into the ground. All coins belong to the same type, light weight solidus of 20 siliquae, CON, 542-562. Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 36, no. 253 (Beloyarovka).

577. ŞEICA MĂCĂ (Sibiu, Romania).
Hoard found accidentaly in 1853 on the bank of Târnava Mare river comprising ca. 50-100 gold coins and gold jewelry (bow fibula and earing with polyhedral pendant). Only 36 coins have been studied, issues from Theodosius II to Justin I. Last coin: 518-527. P. Somogyi, "Der Fund von Kleinschelken (Siebenbürgen, 1856) im Lichte neuentdeckter Archivdaten," in Byzantine Coins in Central Europe Between the 5th and 10th Century, ed. M. Wołoszyn (Cracow: Polish Academy of Sciences, 2009), 417-48.

578. SERPOVOE (Tambov, Russia).
A hoard of twelve seventh century solidi was found in the Early Medieval cemetery, (grave 16, incineration). The coins were affixed on leather straps. Last coin: solidus of Constantine IV with Heraclius and Tiberius. Kropotkin, Klady vizantiiskikh monet, 29, no. 125.

579. SISAK (Sisak-Moslavina, Croatia).
An unknown number of coins accidentally found in or shortly after 1864. Only three coins have been preserved: a solidus of Justinian (CON, 542-565), and two Lombard imitations of a solidus and a tremissis of Justinian respectively. Ž. Demo, Ostrogothic Coinage from Collections in Croatia, Slovenia and Bosnia & Herzegovina (Ljubljana: Narodni Muzej, 1994), 227.

580. STARY BILIARY (Odesa, Ukraine).
Hoard accidentally found in 1982 on the shore of lake Adzhalykskiy; 9 AE from Justin I and Justinian I. Last coin: 542-543. E. S. Stoliarik, "Klad vizantiiskikh

581. STEPANAVAN (Lori, Armenia).
   An unknown number of silver coins were part of a hoard found accidentally in 1957. Only nine hexagrammata of Heraclius and Constans II have been retrieved. Last coin: 648-652. Mousheghian et al., History, 179-80.

582. SUKKO (Krasnodar, Russia).
   Hoard of 14 gold and 4 silver coins, of which only five solidi and two hexagrammata were retrieved, from Constans II and Constantine IV. The coins were found accidentally during work in a vineyard. Last coin: 669-674 (after MIB). K. V. Golenko, "Klad vizantiiskikh monet VII v., naidennyi bliz Anapy," VV 26 (1965): 162-165 with fig. 1.\(^{127}\)

583. TABILISI (Tbilisi, Georgia).
   A large hoard of ca 800 silver Sasanian drachms and Byzantine hexagrammata was found in the old part of Tabilisi; only 200 coins have been inspected by E. Pakhomov. The hexagrammata spanned the reign of Heraclius and included late issues of Heraclius and his sons, Heraclius Constantine and Heraclonas. Tsotselia, Coin Finds in Georgia, 140, no. 742.

584. TRABKI MALE (Gdańsk, Poland).
   A hoard of 43 solidi, one of which (the latest) was struck for Anastasius. Iluk, "Bałtycki epizod," 57.

585. TREBISAUŢI (Briceni, Moldova).
   Accidental find of 36 bronze coins from Justinian I. No details are known. According to the editor, all coins belong to the same type, dated 527-538. Stoliarik, "Novye nakhodki," 94, nr. 13.

586. TROIANUL (Teleorman, Romania).
   Hoard of ca. 100 bronze coins, found in unknown circumstances at the turn of the century, comprising Early and Late Roman issues, as well as five dekanummia and one pentanummium from the sixth century. Last coin: 582-602. Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Barbaricum apropiat," 337-38.

587. TURNOV (Turnov, Czech Republic).
   Group of 17 bronze coins found in unknown circumstances, spanning almost two centuries, from the Valentinian dynasty to the second half of the sixth century; last coin: 559/560-564/565. Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 371-73, no. C15.\(^{128}\)

---

\(^{127}\) Kropotkin suggested that we may be dealing with two different hoards, but his speculation was based solely on the supposed incompatibility between silver and gold coins in a single hoard. See Kropotkin, "Novye nakhodki," 168, no. 7.

\(^{128}\) The coins were discovered in the Turnov Museum collection in a bag labeled with the name Turnov and the year 1961, but no other details are known. They may indeed belong to a hoard as the chronological structure of the group does correspond to the typical hoards found in the region. However, some of the coins display a distinctive green patina and we might be dealing with at least two separate finds.
588. UDEŞTI (Suceava, Romania).

589. UNIREA (Călăraşi, Romania).
Accidental find on the left bank of the Danube, hoard composed of 33 coins from Justin II to Maurice. Last coin: 594-595. Trésors, 428-29, no. 366.

590. VĂRTOP (Dolj, Romania).
Two hexagrammata of Constans II and Constantine IV were found in 1939, possibly part of a larger hoard. B. Mitrea, "Découvertes monétaires en Roumanie, 1976 (XX)," Dacia 21 (1977), 380-81.

591. VRH PRI PAHI (Novo Mesto, Slovenia).
Accidental find (1940) of a hoard of gold coin deposited in a ceramic container. Information survives for three coins. Two of them are solidi of an unknown sixth-century emperor, the other is a Lombard imitation of a solidus of Justinian (560-574). Demo, Ostrogothic Coinage, 229-31.

592. ZACHEPYLIVKA (Poltava, Ukraine).

593. ZAŠOVICE (Třebíč, Czech Republic).
Late eighteenth century accidental find of a group of gold coins, now lost, only brief description is available for six specimens spanning the reigns of Zeno through Justinian I. Last coin: 538-542. Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 379-80, no. M. 29.

594. ŽDÁR NAD SÁZAVOU (Žďár nad Sázavou, Czech Republic).
Two bronze coins have been preserved from what might have been a larger hoard found accidentally before 1925. Last coin: 546-547. Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 380, no. M31.

595. ZEMIANSKÝ VRBOVOK (Zvolen, Slovakia).

596. ŽINCOVY (Plzeň-South, Czech Republic).

129 Butnariu dated the last coin in the hoard 610-613 while Oberländer-Târnoveanu and Gogu advanced a dating to 613-616, but a closer inspection of the illustration provided in Gogu’s article shows that we are in fact dealing with an issue from 616-625.
Accidental find in the Farský stream valley, only two coins survive which might belong to the hoard; the early Byzantine specimen is a *decanummium* of Justinian I, Ravenna, 540-547. Militký, "Finds of the Early Byzantine Coins," 369, no. C9.
Figure A-1. Early Byzantine coins in barbaricum (6th-7th centuries)
APPENDIX B
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF COIN FINDS IN BARBARICUM

Table B-1. Single finds by metal, percent of each, and number of coins per year of reign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>Gold AV</th>
<th>Silver AR</th>
<th>Copper AE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Coins /year of reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-2. Single finds from the main geographic regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Danube</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.01%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcaucasia</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16.86%</td>
<td>16.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpathian Basin</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>50.68%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-3. Single finds of gold coins in barbaricum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>Solidus (light weight 23 siliquae)</th>
<th>Solidus (light weight 21 siliquae)</th>
<th>Solidus (light weight 20 siliquae)</th>
<th>Semissis</th>
<th>Tremissis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>Solidus (light weight 23 siliquae)</th>
<th>Solidus (light weight 21 siliquae)</th>
<th>Solidus (light weight 20 siliquae)</th>
<th>Semissis</th>
<th>Tremissis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>76.95</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-4. Single finds of copper coins: number of coins (C) and nummia (N) per year of reign and mint (CON = Constantinople; TES = Thessalonica; NIK = Nicomedia; KYZ = Cyzicus; ANT = Antioch; ALX = Alexandria; CAR = Carthage; ROM = Rome; RAV = Ravenna; CAT = Catania; SYR = Syracuse; SAL = Salona; CHE = Cherson; MMI = Moneta Militaris Imitativa).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>ALX</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>RAV</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>SYR</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>CHE</th>
<th>MMI</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COINS/ NUMMIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498-512</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512-518</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518-527</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>2/60</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527-538</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>4/160</td>
<td>8/265</td>
<td>3/120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538-539</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5/140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539-540</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>3/100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-541</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541-542</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542-543</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543-544</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4/160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544-545</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>TES</td>
<td>NIK</td>
<td>KYZ</td>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>ALX</td>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>RAV</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>SYR</td>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>MMI</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545-546</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546-547</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547-548</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548-549</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549-550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551-552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552-553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553-554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554-555</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555-556</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556-557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557-558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558-559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559-560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560-561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561-562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562-563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563-564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564-565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565-566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566-567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567-568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568-569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569-570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570-571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571-572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572-573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573-574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574-575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575-576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576-577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577-578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565-578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-4. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>ALX</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>RAV</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>SYR</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>CHE</th>
<th>MMI</th>
<th>TOTAL COINS/ NUMMIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>578-579</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579-580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-581</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581-582</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578-582</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582-583</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583-584</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/140</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584-585</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585-586</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586-587</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587-588</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/60</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588-589</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589-590</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/120</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590-591</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/140</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591-592</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592-593</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593-594</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594-595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595-596</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596-597</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597-598</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598-599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599-600</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-602</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602-603</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603-604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604-605</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605-606</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606-607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607-608</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608-609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609-610</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602-610</td>
<td>8/190</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>4/55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

561
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>ALX</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>RAV</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>SYR</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>CHE</th>
<th>MMI</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 610-611 | 1/20 | 1/40 | 611-612 | 2/60 | 1/40 | 612-613 | 6/240 | 3/120 | 1/40 | 613-614 | 2/80 | 1/40 | 614-615 | 1/40 | 615-616 | 1/40 | 616-617 | 0 | 0 | 617-618 | 1/40 | 618-619 | 0 | 0 | 619-620 | 1/40 | 620-621 | 0 | 0 | 621-622 | 0 | 622-623 | 0 | 623-624 | 0 | 624-625 | 0 | 625-626 | 0 | 626-627 | 0 | 627-628 | 0 | 628-629 | 0 | 629-630 | 1/40 | 630-631 | 1/40 | 631-632 | 3/120 | 632-633 | 0 | 0 | 633-634 | 0 | 634-635 | 0 | 635-636 | 1/40 | 636-637 | 0 | 637-638 | 0 | 638-639 | 0 | 639-640 | 0 | 640-641 | 0 | 641-642 | 7/220 | 3/120 | 3/36 | 1/10 | 1/10 | 1/40 | 5/180 | 562

*Table B-4. Continued.*
Table B-4. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>ALX</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>RAV</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>SYR</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>CHE</th>
<th>MMI</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COINS/ NUMMIA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644-645</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642-645</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642-647</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645-646</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647-655</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651-656</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655-658</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656-657</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654-668</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662-668</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>3/120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668-669</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669-674</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697-705</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705-711</td>
<td>1/40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-5. Single finds of copper coins: mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ALX</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>RAV</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>SYR</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>CHE</th>
<th>MMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.85</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-6. Single finds of copper: denominations (M = follis; K = \( \frac{1}{2} \) follis; I = \( \frac{1}{4} \) follis; E = \( \frac{1}{6} \) follis; \( \Lambda \Gamma \) = 33 nummia; \( \Lambda \) = 30 nummia; IS = 16 nummia; IB = 12 nummia).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>( \Lambda \Gamma )</th>
<th>( \Lambda )</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.29</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-7. Single finds of copper coins found north of the Lower Danube: mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-7. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-8. Single finds of copper coins found north of the Lower Danube: denominations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>IS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>68.08</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-9. Single finds of copper coins found in Transcaucasia: mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ALX</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>SYR</th>
<th>CHE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table B-9. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>ALX</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>SYR</th>
<th>CHE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-10. Single finds of copper coins found in Transcaucasia: denominations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>ΛΓ</th>
<th>Λ</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-11. Single finds of copper coins found in the Byzantine bridge-heads of Sucidava, Drobeta, and Dierna from the northern bank of the Lower Danube: mints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>MMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-11. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>NIK</th>
<th>KYZ</th>
<th>TES</th>
<th>ANT</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>MMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>52.75</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-12. Single finds of copper coins found in the Byzantine bridge-heads of Sucidava, Drobeta, and Dierna from the northern bank of the Lower Danube: denominations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>IS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.66</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B-13. Single finds of copper coins per year of reform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Coins/year of reform</th>
<th>% Coins/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>498-512</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td>512-518</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>518-527</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>527-538</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>538-542</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>542-550</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550-565</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>565-570</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>570-578</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>578-580</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>580-582</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td>582-602</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>602-610</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>610-616</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B-14. Hoards of early Byzantine coins from barbaricum: finds of gold, silver and copper coins, mixed hoards of genuine Byzantine coins and imitations and Byzantine silver hexagrams and Sasanian silver drachms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>AV+AR</th>
<th>AR+AE</th>
<th>Mixed AV</th>
<th>Mixed AR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Danube</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Black Sea</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Black Sea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B-15. Hoards of early Byzantine coins from barbaricum: archaeological context, grave finds, hoards found in ceramic or metal receptacles, hoards which include old coins and hoards only partially retrieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Receptacle</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Older coins</th>
<th>Dispersed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Danube</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Black Sea</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table B-15. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Receptacle</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Older coins</th>
<th>Dispersed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Black Sea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-16. Hoards of early Byzantine coins from barbaricum: last coin in the hoard (numbers in parantheses refer to incomplete hoards).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last coin</th>
<th>Lower Danube</th>
<th>Eastern Black Sea</th>
<th>Northern Black Sea</th>
<th>Central Europe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin I</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10(7)</td>
<td>8(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>7(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>6(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>7(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius (610-625)</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius (625-641)</td>
<td>10(6)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>13(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine IV</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>2(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19(10)</td>
<td>18(12)</td>
<td>10(4)</td>
<td>28(16)</td>
<td>75(42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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