It seems appropriate to begin with a clarification of the chronological period in question. The Hungarian Conquest period, a generally accepted label in Central European archaeological studies, has not gained currency in the English-speaking world. In a strict historical sense, the period spans the arrival and settlement of the ancient Hungarian tribal alliance in the Carpathian Basin between 895 and 902. Such a brief period, however, can hardly be studied or interpreted archaeologically. The term ‘Hungarian Conquest period‘ is therefore used to denote a 70 to 150 year time-span, in part owing to the above consideration, and in part to the nature of the archaeological evidence. In this paper, I shall focus on the Byzantine jewellery of this period, i.e. the 10th century. The first problem is the determination of what should be regarded as ‘Byzantine‘ since it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between genuine Byzantine pieces and copies of Byzantine products made in the workshops of various fringe cultures. While the same difficulties are encountered in the Late Antique to Early Byzantine period as well, scholars studying 6th–7th century Byzantine jewellery and the archaeological heritage of the Avars settling in the Carpathian Basin are in a slightly better situation because, in addition to finely crafted pieces from the Empire, there are also several series of more simple, mass-produced types. The 6th–7th century extent of the Byzantine Empire too offers important clues because an ornament type known from North Africa, Syria, Asia Minor, and the Balkans can be more confidently identified as ‘Byzantine‘ than the 9th–11th century jewellery types known solely from the Balkans and the fringes of the Empire. Adding to the uncertainties of identification is a peculiar feature of the Byzantine period accepted the traditional view that exceptionally well-crafted pieces should be interpreted as genuine Byzantine prototypes. Those medieval wall paintings that survived the stormy centuries of Balkan history, most of which portray members of the aristocracy, show ladies wearing finely crafted Byzantine earrings. Suffice it here to mention the late type of crescentic earrings worn by the Lady Desislava on a fresco of the Bojana Monastery. It is not mere chance that I spoke of an ‘awareness‘ of Byzantine prototypes: scholars of Early Medieval Balkan archaeology constructed a rather peculiar model of interpretation, according to which they discussed Slavic jewellery and their Byzantine models without presenting the actual Byzantine prototypes. This can in part be explained by the then rather poor extent to which excavation reports were published, making the search for good parallels from the heartland of the Byzantine Empire fairly difficult. It must also be borne in mind that scholars of the period accepted the traditional view that exceptionally well-crafted pieces should be interpreted as genuine Byzantine products, while simpler bronze variants were their local copies. This approach contributed to the identification of simpler Byzantine jewellery types worn as part of everyday costume, whose overwhelming majority was brought to light in the Balkans and the Carpathian Basin, as Slavic products. In other words, simple, trinket-type Byzantine jewellery was, in this sense, appropriated by Slavic research and defined as a Slavic ethnic marker.

It seems instructive to briefly discuss the weakness of this approach. While there is no apparent rationale for not identifying the jewellery items recovered from Slavic burials as ‘Slavic‘, one of the main problems in this respect is that very little is known about the region’s ethnic make-up during the period in question. (To which we may add that the same holds true for several other regions too.) Slavic research holds that the collapse of the Byzantine times in the lower Danube region in the late 6th and early 7th centuries and the settlement of various Slavic groups in the Balkans meant that the regions over which Byzantium lost her former control automatically and immediately became Slavic, and thus the possible presence of other groups in these regions was not even considered, even though the descendants of the Late Antique population obviously remained in their homeland in most places. Due to the lack of reliable research in this field, very little is known about the rate of admixture between the newly arriving Slavic groups and the Late Antique population, or its extent by the 9th–10th centuries in various Balkan regions. The lack of cremation burials in the Balkans, regarded as a distinctively ‘Slavic‘ element, is very striking (one of the most typically Slavic Balkan cemeteries is known from Olympia in Greece,
and another, later, burial ground has been excavated at Kašić[23]; at the same time, the 9th–11th century cemeteries across the Balkans interpreted as Slavic share numerous similarities with the inhumation burials characterised by ‘reduzierte Beigabensite’ typical of the descendants of the Late Antique population from the 5th century onwards in other regions. The exclusive interpretation of the post-7th century material as Slavic in the Slavic states of the northern Balkans, designed to integrate the archaeological material into the national past, is problematic because this approach not only obscures the colourful tapestry of the period, but also creates a virtually insurmountable obstacle to the better understanding of the broader cultural context. The issue of how the jewellery labelled ‘Slavic’ relates to simple Byzantine jewellery has never been explored; instead, the problem has been written off by speaking of the local bronze copies of Byzantine adornments in gold and silver, which in effect obscures the obvious fact that the greater part of the Byzantine Empire’s population was made up of poor people, who wore simple bronze jewellery as part of their everyday costume.19

The excavations in Corinth begun in the 1890s, yielding the cast variants of 9th–11th century north Balkan jewellery types, brought an important caveat regarding the weaknesses of this approach.20 It became painfully clear that the search for the everyday variants of Byzantine jewellery did not call for the discovery of hitherto unknown prototypes of so-called Slavic jewellery because they could be found among the ‘Slavic’ jewellery from south-east Europe and the Carpathian Basin. Admittedly, the publication of the finds and findings of the excavations in Corinth in the 1905s was an exception, rather than the rule. This is still one of the main obstacles faced by current research. The publication of 9th–11th century burials and settlements lying in the heartland of Byzantium lags far behind that of the sites in the Carpathian Basin and the Balkans.21 It is therefore hardly surprising that archaeologists working in the Balkan states sought analogies to their finds where they had the best chances of finding them, namely in Central Europe – and the Carpathian Basin in particular – where systematic archaeological exploration had begun in the last third of the 19th century. By the late 19th century, Hungarian archaeologists had classified the enormous quantities of artefacts recovered from burials and cemeteries, and had distinguished two archaeological cultures or, better put, two archaeological horizons for the period in question: one typified by what were regarded as ‘typical ancient Hungarian graves’ characterised by weapons, costume accessories of precious metal, and horse burials, the other by humble commoners’ burials, erroneously labelled the Bjelo Brdo culture.22 The interpretative framework constructed at the time had a lasting impact on the research of the Conquest period.

A lively debate emerged on the ethnic background of the Bjelo Brdo culture at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, with most of the period’s leading scholars agreeing that the culture represented the archaeological heritage of the Slavs.23 This interpretation was rooted in the widespread romanticising and ethnocentric thought of the 19th century. Even the best minds in Hungarian archaeology were unable to conceptualise the humble grave goods of the Bjelo Brdo culture as the archaeological heritage of the ancient Hungarians. As Ferenc Pulszky24 declared in 1891, ‘the ancient Hungarians were conquerors and not craftsmen, and thus their jewellery was made by their servants and prisoners-of-wars, and the local population found here, in a period when art was on the decline’.25 This line of thought excluded even the possibility that the commoners of the Conquest period could ever be identified. In order to better understand the background to the ethnic interpretation of the Bjelo Brdo culture, we must reach back to the works of Sophus Müller, a Danish archaeologist, who had argued for the Slavic origins of S-terminalled lock-rings, one of the most common finds of the Bjelo Brdo culture.26 His arguments for regarding this jewellery item as an ethnic marker of the Slavs were accepted by most European scholars at the time. József Hampel’s monumental synthesis on the archaeology of the Conquest period,27 a variant of which was also published also in German,28 blended Pulszky’s national romanticism and Müller’s ethnocentric views. He attributed the Reihengräberfelder of the Bjelo Brdo culture to the Slavs of the Carpathian Basin. The identification of the S-terminalled lock-rings with the Slavs coincided with the basic interpretational framework of emerging Slavic archaeology: in an article appearing in 1894, Professor Lubor Niederle of Prague, regarded as the founding father of Slavic archaeology,29 too argued that these lock-rings should be seen as ethnic markers of the Slavs.30 Niederle’s views were widely accepted among the archaeologists and historians of the Slavic-speaking lands.31

Another frequent approach, even in the Balkans, was the analysis of archaeological assemblages from the perspective of modern nation-states, involving the projection of the modern state’s territory and the much-desired homogeneous nation back into the past, leading to the interpretation of the archaeological material as the heritage of an early nation-state.32 This approach disregarded the well-known multi-ethnicity of eastern and south-eastern Europe, and the shifting boundaries of Early Medieval state formations. Since one of the priorities of archaeological research was the identification of the ancestors of modern peoples, archaeologists were reluctant to distinguish Byzantine elements. It therefore came as a genuine shock when the excavations on Late Antique sites, such as Corinth, brought to light artefact types, which had previously been categorised as Slavic or Avar.33 The ongoing debate over the Avar or ‘barbarian’ belt buckles between the 1930s and the 1950s is very instructive in this respect.34 We should at this point recall that in her book published in 1952, Gladys Davidson listed many analogous finds to the trapezoidal Byzantine belt buckles, noting that she had received information on some of the unpublished pieces quoted by her from Professor Gyula László back in 1937 – the implication being that the buckles in question could be found both in the Carpathian Basin and in Istanbul, Samos, and Laurion.35 Davidson thus explored all possible options in her search for parallels in order to identify Byzantine types since the material culture of Byzantine daily life represented by these minor objects was virtually unknown.

A few years later, the interpretation of these buckles appeared to be resolved. Two articles published simultaneously in 1955, one by Dezső Csallány,36 the other by Joachim Werner,37 both came to the conclusion, albeit through a slightly differing approach, that these articles were Byzantine products. The two
expected to be followed in the satellite countries too. In the 1940s, the Soviet Union adopted and proclaimed Niederle's ideas, which as local, Balkan copies. A careful reading of his study reveals the dilemma he was grappling with. Discussing a variant of cast crescentic earrings, he noted that 'it is merely a question of time until variants made from precious metal are found in the more southerly regions of the Balkans'. Elsewhere, he remarked that 'the Byzantine origins of this type can hardly be rejected on the grounds that similar pieces have not been found in Byzantium'. Seeing that the bulk of the south-eastern European earrings known from the Carpathian Basin are represented by silver pieces and their cast bronze copies, Mesterházy interpreted them as Balkan imports, although he did suggest that some types were 'either imports among both the local and the Hungarian population, or pieces worn by the immigrant Slavic population'. It would appear that Mesterházy was unable to entirely break free of the Slav-centred interpretation of these artefacts. A few years later, he devoted a lengthy study to the 10th–11th century trade network of the Carpathian Basin, based in part on south-east European find types, affirming again that the pieces in this category should be regarded as imports, and specifically as the imports of Balkan goods inspired by Byzantine products.

Slavic archaeological research remained virtually unaffected by these new findings. The 1940s were marked by a particularisation of research, rather than by the broadening of the interpretative framework. Large-scale excavations were begun at Staré Mešto in Moravia, bringing to light an assemblage of finds speaking of a strong cultural impact from a broadly interpreted Byzantine Kulturkreis. While acknowledging the undeniably Byzantine traits, local scholars persistently emphasised the Great Moravian, i.e. Slavic nature of the finds. Similar tendencies could be noted in Yugoslavian research. The first typologies and typo-chronological syntheses were conceived in the tradition of the Slavic ethnocentric perspective. Suffice it here to quote but a single eloquent example. The Bjelo Brdo type jewellery (Pl. 1) in the Serbian title of Mirjana Ćorović-Ljubinković’s study became Slavic jewellery in the French summary. Countless similar examples can be cited. Lurking in the background again were the general political events of the period: in the later 1940s, the Soviet Union adopted and proclaimed Niederle’s Slavic archaeology as the official research policy, which was expected to be followed in the satellite countries too. The jewellery items, which were earlier described as ornaments found in Slavic graves, produced in workshops under Byzantine influence, were now axiomatically categorised as jewellery reflecting Byzantine influence and therefore Slavic pieces. The fact that the Hungarian Béla Szőke had convincingly demonstrated the Hungarian components and poly-ethnic nature of the Bjelo Brdo culture in 1962 had little effect. Even the more open-minded Slavic scholars continued to regard the culture as a predominantly Slavic phenomenon, while their more biased colleagues simply dismissed Szőke’s findings and conclusions as some ‘great Hungarian dream’. Interestingly enough, from this perspective Szőke’s study had little impact on Hungarian archaeological research since, even after the 1960s, Early Medieval archaeological research was dominated by a research perspective focusing almost exclusively on Eastern European finds and assemblages, without any apparent interest in the south-eastern European elements of the commoners’ culture. The few scholars studying these artefacts generally opted for the Slavic interpretation.

The breakthrough in this respect came in the 1990s, when Károly Mesterházy devoted two lengthy studies to two major groups of finds with south-east European connections, namely trapezoidal buckles and certain jewellery types, such as various types of earrings with four large and several smaller globular pendants, lock-rings, bracelets decorated with small loops of wire, crescentic earrings, and filigree decorated finger-rings (Pls 2–3). The title of his study is very telling: ‘Byzantine and Balkan finds from 10th–11th century Hungarian burials’. Mesterházy was apparently reluctant to determine which pieces could be regarded as genuine Byzantine products and which as local, Balkan copies. A careful reading of his study reveals the dilemma he was grappling with. Discussing a variant of cast crescentic earrings, he noted that ‘it is merely a question of time until variants made from precious metal are found in the more southerly regions of the Balkans’. Elsewhere, he remarked that ‘the Byzantine origins of this type can hardly be rejected on the grounds that similar pieces have not been found in Byzantium’. Seeing that the bulk of the south-eastern European earrings known from the Carpathian Basin are represented by silver pieces and their cast bronze copies, Mesterházy interpreted them as Balkan imports, although he did suggest that some types were ‘either imports among both the local and the Hungarian population, or pieces worn by the immigrant Slavic population’. It would appear that Mesterházy was unable to entirely break free of the Slav-centred interpretation of these artefacts. A few years later, he devoted a lengthy study to the 10th–11th century trade network of the Carpathian Basin, based in part on south-east European find types, affirming again that the pieces in this category should be regarded as imports, and specifically as the imports of Balkan goods inspired by Byzantine products. He supported this view by demonstrating that many pieces from the Carpathian Basin often share closer similarities with their counterparts from the Balkans than with each other.

A look at the finds from the Carpathian Basin from the perspective of the Balkans might contribute new hues to the overall picture painted by earlier research. In addition to searching for Balkan and Anatolian analogies to the finds, the identification of find types which lack a parallel might be useful too. Valeri Grigorov’s excellent study on 7th–11th century metal jewellery from Bulgaria provides a good starting point for this exercise. A closer look at his distribution maps indicates that there are hardly any 10th–11th century jewellery types which do not have their counterparts among the find assemblages from the Carpathian Basin. Even though Grigorov’s data for the Carpathian Basin are rather patchy, it is quite obvious that the various jewellery types have smaller concentrations in the Carpathian Basin than in the Balkans. Disregarding the various wire ornaments in the later 10th and

**Plate 1** Jewellery of the so-called Bjelo Brdo type
11th century find assemblages from the commoners’ cemeteries, the remaining jewellery articles are predominantly types which have strong affinities with south-east Europe. Knowing that an archaeological culture is not an entity per se, but a scholarly construct, its boundaries shift according to which artefacts or burial customs are – more or less justifiably or, conversely, arbitrarily – defined as its principal attributes and which are regarded as marginal phenomena. Current Hungarian research tends to relegate pieces with Byzantine and/or Balkan connections to the category of irrelevant attributes. Viewed from the Balkans, the Carpathian Basin is the northernmost extension of the south-east European cultural koiné, even if the finds from that region are mixed with types rare in the Balkans, which in a certain sense dominate the region’s material culture. The relative frequency of finds with south-east European affinities is especially striking if compared to the distribution of the typical artefacts of the neighbouring regions in the Carpathian Basin. The finds of the so-called Hacksilberfunde horizon and of the Köttlach culture, as well as the majority of the commodities obtained during the ancient Hungarians’ military campaigns, occur far less frequently in the material from the Carpathian Basin than certain Balkan finger-ring types. It is my belief that these south-east European find types should not be regarded as alien elements in the archaeological heritage of the Conquest period. In order to place these finds into their proper context, the issue of to what extent these finds can be regarded as culturally Byzantine must be examined.

Two striking points emerge clearly from a closer look at the artefacts traditionally regarded as Byzantine products: very few finely crafted items of precious metal with Mediterranean affinities are known from the Carpathian Basin, even though these are the types which are principally regarded as genuine Byzantine wares. At the same time, there are several Byzantine jewellery types of which not one single piece has come to light in this region.

Altogether 13 crescentic earrings, a jewellery type traditionally identified as a Byzantine product, are known from eight sites in the Carpathian Basin to date. The first pair of these earrings to be found played an important role in determining the type as a Byzantine import: the pair from Grave 1 at Kecel was made from gold and thus fitted the simplified criteria distilled from the axiom which equated good quality pieces with genuine Byzantine products. The silver bracelets from Tiszaesztlár and Szarvas were identified as Byzantine goods on the same grounds. Both are hinged bracelets: the birds on the piece from Tiszaesztlár and the griffins on the one from Szarvas are alien to the decorative motifs of the Conquest period. Curiously enough, no attempt was made to search for similar pieces from the Mediterranean,
Plate 3 Byzantine and Balkanic finds from 10th–11th century Hungarian burials according to K. Mesterházy’s classification

Plate 4 Byzantine-type finger-ring with widening bezel from Grave 235 at Ibrány-Esböhalom

Plate 5 Silver earring of the crescent type

Plate 6 Byzantine-type hinged bracelet from Grave 12, Cemetery II at Tiszaeszlár—Bashalom
even though an overview of this type would have proved most instructive, seeing that comparable pieces from Byzantium, whence they originated, are generally dated to the 11th–12th centuries— the pieces from Hungary thus furnish evidence that the type had already appeared in the 10th century. At the same time, the silver and predominantly bronze trinkets found in addition to the finely crafted pieces could not be fitted into the concept equating good quality jewellery articles with Byzantine products. Neither should it be forgotten that the treatment of Byzantine types as Slavic, discussed above, remained unchallenged for a long time. The shortcomings and the pitfalls of both viewpoints are apparent if the cemeteries containing the burials of the Byzantine population are examined. The grave goods from the oft-analysed burial ground at Kastro Tigani included pieces made from the most common non-precious metal types, indicating that jewellery crafted from precious and non-precious metals were both commonly used in Byzantium, and that their possession depended mostly on an individual’s wealth. The examination of the jewellery types from larger Byzantine cemeteries proved this point even more forcefully. The 233 burials of the Azoros cemetery in southern Thessaly yielded a rich assortment of Middle Byzantine jewellery. The finds included earring, finger-ring, and bracelet types known from the northern Balkans and the Carpathian Basin. Similarly, somewhat simpler jewellery types are known from the Greek mainland and the Greek islands too. While it may be argued that these were not Byzantine, but Balkan products, there has been a steady increase in comparable finds from the Empire’s Anatolian regions as shown by the few publications in this field. The finds include finger-rings with a shield-shaped bezel, hinged bracelets of sheet metal, twisted wire bracelets, and earrings decorated with wire loops. There is no apparent reason to doubt that most of the comparable pieces from the Carpathian Basin were indeed simple jewellery articles used also in Byzantium.

The issue of smaller workshops supplying a particular area or region cannot be side-stepped, even though very little is actually known about these workshops. While it is quite obvious that some jewellery items represent the local variant of a particular type, it is also clear that the basic form was distributed over a fairly extensive area. What is uncertain is whether a particular variant can be equated with the activity of a workshop. To take but one example: finger-rings with a widening bezel decorated with a heraldically posed eagle, or a bird holding a leafy branch in its beak shown in profile, are known from both the Balkans and Anatolia. The few published Anatolian pieces also include types, such as the ones bearing a human head, which are virtually lacking from the Balkans. The activity of local workshops is reflected even more spectacularly by the presence of more variable types, especially in cases when social circumstances were conducive to the growth of workshop centres.

There are a few jewellery types, especially among the most lavish assemblages, which have not yet been found in the Carpathian Basin. These include earrings and finger-rings decorated with cloisonné enamel, whose absence from this region is all the more striking because pieces from the 10th century are known from the Balkans: suffice it here to mention the crescentic earrings of the Preslav Treasure. The dating of the finger-ring type from the Kastro Tigani cemetery to the Middle Byzantine period seems somewhat controversial because earlier publications assigned the entire burial ground to the 6th–7th century. It might be more reasonable to conclude that the cemetery has a Middle Byzantine phase. An earring from one of the burials is an 8th–11th century type, while the finger-ring can most definitely be assigned to the Middle Byzantine period. David Buckton has convincingly argued that cloisonné enamel was not used before the 9th century in Byzantium. The bird depiction on the finger-ring is best paralleled by finds from the 9th and 10th centuries, such as a bracelet from Thessalonica, the necklace and earrings of the Preslav Treasure, and a pair of earrings in the British Museum. The finger-ring from the Šestovici cemetery in the Ukraine (Pl. 8), the counterpart of the piece from Kastro Tigani, can likewise be dated to the 10th–11th century. While it might be argued that jewellery articles decorated with cloisonné enamel did not reach the Carpathian Basin owing to their cost, we admittedly know very little about the original value of these pieces. A grave assemblage from Naupaktos must be cited in this respect. One burial in the partially excavated and published cemetery yielded a broken crescentic earring decorated with cloisonné enamel, suggesting that earrings of this type were in some cases part of everyday costume. There is nothing to indicate that the graves of the Naupaktos cemetery uncovered to date contained the burials of high-ranking, wealthy individuals.

---

Plate 7 Byzantine-type hinged bracelet from Szarvas

Plate 8 Byzantine finger-ring from Šestovici
Basket earrings (Pl. 9) represent another jewellery type lacking from the archaeological record of the Carpathian Basin. In contrast to earlier views, which dated the use of the type to the 6th–12th centuries, we may now rightly assume that it represents a Middle Byzantine type. It would appear that the 10th–11th century earrings of this type were mostly distributed in the Empire's Anatolian type. The precise cultural earlier assemblages and newly excavated ones are published and the Carpathian Basin will remain problematic even if genuine Byzantine articles and their copies from the Balkans archaeological and historical narratives. Still, the separation of construction of meta-histories and the rejection of former post-modernism, the intellectual climate favours the understanding of Byzantine jewellery of the 9th–11th centuries. Firstly, there is a need for the publication of the find assemblages and their contexts from excavations conducted in the heartland of the Byzantine Empire, because without this corpus of data, it is virtually impossible to distinguish genuine Byzantine pieces from their local copies. Secondly, it is necessary to deconstruct existing interpretations of the period's so-called southern Slavic jewellery and to discard the former narrative on the ethnic interpretation of archaeological finds. The latter seems to be the easier of the two since in this age of post-modernism, the intellectual climate favours the construction of meta-histories and the rejection of former archaeological and historical narratives. Still, the separation of genuine Byzantine articles and their copies from the Balkans and the Carpathian Basin will remain problematic even if earlier assemblages and newly excavated ones are published according to modern standards. The precise cultural attribution of the various types, subtypes, and variants distinguished through a meticulous classification and typological study of the finds will remain a problematic issue. The construction of categories, types and typological sequences is obviously an attempt to bring some order into the world around us. However, this approach is just one of the many techniques for studying the past. The creation of well-defined clusters, while undeniably useful, is not the single means of understanding the peoples of the past, whose world was much more open in some respects, and considerably more closed in others than we are apt to conceptualise today. We must make every effort not to become ensnared by our analytical approaches. Ancient peoples hardly thought in the categories we employ today and a more fruitful approach in this respect is to try to understand them on their own terms. Obviously, I am not against the modern analytical procedures used by our discipline. I merely wish to draw attention to the fact that when speaking of Byzantine jewellery and Byzantine cultural impacts, we tend to think in different categories than the people who actually wore these ornaments as part of their costume. This is quite natural since we can hardly place ourselves in the life and mindset of peoples who lived 1,000 years ago. However, if our aim is to contextualise our observations concerning a particular artefact type – and this is, after all, one of our goals in cultivating archaeology – we can hardly ignore the people who used them. In other words, the main problem as I see it, is that many of the artefacts we label Byzantine goods were hardly regarded as such by their contemporary users living several hundreds of kilometres away from Byzantium. This label had no political or cultural relevance for them. Depending on the actual situation, an artefact of this type represented a prestige item from a distant land (or a curious, alien artefact), a copy of the prestige items used by the élite of a smaller or larger community, or, conversely, the routine use of an item used by most people around them. This primarily depended on the extent to which what we call Byzantine cultural impacts (whether genuine pieces or copies) actually affected a particular community. The contextual interpretation of the given artefact type in the recipient cultural environment obviously depended on the profoundness of the impact: the wider the distribution of an artefact type and the more it was copied, the more it tells us about the recipient culture, while the more traditional it remained, the more it adhered to the original model, the more it reveals about the donor culture.
The bottom line of the above survey is that the lack of certain artefact types seems to be most striking. The almost complete absence of elaborately crafted, outstanding Byzantine jewellry pieces suggests that the acculturation undergone by the ancient Hungarians after their settlement in the Carpathian Basin – whose archaeological imprints have been discussed here – was a profound process. It would appear that instead of the superficial adoption or imitation of luxury items for prestige purposes, this was a process affecting everyday life in this culture. To employ a slightly bold parallel: in the same way as Byzantium politically exploited and culturally moulded into her own likeness the states of the region which Dimitry Obolensky succinctly termed the Byzantine Commonwealth, there emerged a commonwealth of material culture which to a smaller or greater extent reflected Byzantium, whose members exploited this cultural heritage on their own terms. The ethnocentric, nationalistic political narratives of the 19th and 20th centuries transformed this commonwealth into a Moravian, Serbian or Hungarian narrative. One major task of 21st century research will be to identify the shared elements and the cultural dynamics of this commonwealth in order to better understand its nature and how it actually functioned.

Notes
1 This study is a slightly expanded version of a paper read at the conference “Intelligible Beauty”. Recent Research on Byzantine Jewellery. In view of the complexity of the subject and its prolific literature, I have only quoted the most recent literature and, as far as this was possible, those works published in a western European language. For a comprehensive survey of the literature on 9th – 11th century Byzantine jewellery, see V. Grigorov, Metalni nakiti ot srednevekovna Bǎlgarija (VII–XI v.), Sofia, 2007; A. Bosselmann-Rücksie’s PhD study (in print); and P. Lango’s PhD study (currently in preparation). For an excellent overview of the archaeology of the Slavic-speaking countries in the Balkans, see M. Takács, A középkor régészete az észak-balkáni régióban - párhuzamos és összehasonlítható vizsgálat [The archaeology of the Middle Ages in the North Balkan region. A parallel and comparative analysis] (in press). I am grateful to Miklós Takács for his wide-ranging lectures, which drew my attention to many issues of north Balkan archaeology and for kindly allowing me to read his unpublished manuscript. This study was kindly supported by an OTKA grant (OTKA 72630).
3 It seems useful to clarify the term ‘jewellery’ as used in this paper. There is no general consensus as to what artefact groups should be included in this category. In some cases, adornments applied to the belt or the costume are also included. In the case of material cultures, whose remains predominantly originate from archaeological contexts (most often from cemetery excavations), a distinction is often drawn between costume ornaments and jewellery in order to better circumscribe the circumstances (and ultimate aim) of deposition in the burial. The former generally include various costume adornments – usually made from some non-perishable material, most often metal – while the latter comprise articles used for decorating the body. Beads make up a special group of jewellery, which will not be discussed in this paper because their analysis has grown into an independent discipline with its own research techniques, among which various analytical procedures occupy a prominent place to the extent that any advances in bead studies are practically unimaginable without them. Suffice it to quote here a single example for illustrating these difficulties. Several reviewers of a recent monograph on Byzantine objects in the material culture of the Avar period (E. Garam, Funde byzantinischer Herkunft in der Awarenzeit vom Ende des 6. bis zum Ende des 7. Jahrhunderts, Budapest, 2001) have pointed out that distinguishing those genuine Byzantine products reaching the Avars as ‘imports’ in the form of gifts, booty, subsidy, or trade from their local copies is still problematic: see, E. Riemer in Trüber Zeitschrift 65 (2002), 385–6; J. Drauschke in Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters 34 (2006), 316–20.
4 One possible reason for the frequent depiction of jewellery in the Late Antique period has been discussed by B. Küllerich, ‘The Abundance of Nature – the Wealth of Man: Reflections on an Early Byzantine Seasons Mosaic from Syria’, in E. Filtz and P. Åström (eds), Kairos: Studies in Art History and Literature in Honour of Professor Gunilla Åkerström-Hougen, Jonsered, 1998, 27–31. I would like to thank László Török for calling my attention to this paper. For an excellent photo of the figures with earrings (in particular the better preserved figure on the left) see, B. Borkopp and M. Restle, ‘Guntertuch’, in R. Baumstark (ed.), Rom und Byzanz, Schatzkammersticke aus bayerischen Sammlungen, Munich, 1998, cat. no. 64, 209. The debate over the date of the shroud has flared up again: the date in the early 11th century suggested by A. Grabar (‘La soie byzantine de l’évêque Gunther à la cathédrale de Bamberg,’ Münchener Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst 7 (1956), 7–26) and his followers (e. g. A. Geijer, ‘Bishop Gunther’s Shroud in Bamberg Cathedral: Some Marginal Notes’, in M. Flury-Lemberg and K. Stolleis (eds), Documenta Textilia, Munich, 1981, 156–62) was challenged in the early 1990s by G. Prinzing, ‘Das Bamberger Guntertuch in neuer Sicht’, Byzantinoslavica 54 (1993), 218–31, who linked the making of the shroud to the Bulgarian victory of the emperor John I Tzimiskes in 971. In contrast, T. Papamastoras (‘The Bamberg Hanging Considered’, Delton és Christianés Archaiologikéz Etraíres 24 (2003), 375–92 believed that the shroud could be linked to Nikephoros II Phokas’ triumphal procession of 1069. M. Restle, ‘Das Guntertuch im Domschatz von Bamberg’, in K. Belke, E. Kislinger, A. Kübler and M. A. Stassinopoulou (eds), Byzantina Mediterranea, Vienna, 2007, 547–68 refuted Papamastoras’ arguments and seconded Prinzing’s view, who maintained his earlier standpoint (G. Prinzing, ‘Nochmals zur historischen Deutung des Bamberger Guntertuches auf Johannes Tzimiskes’, in M. Kaimakova, M. Sokolom and M. Smorag Rozyczka (eds), Byzantium, New Perspectives: ‘The Bamberger Guntertuch Contact Zone, from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century (Byzantia et Slavica Cracoviensia 5), Cracow, 2007, 123–32). Despite the ongoing debate, a date in the later 10th century is now generally accepted. In spite of the excellent conservation work on the shroud, its poor state of preservation does not allow the reconstruction of minute details, such as whether the female figure is shown wearing an earring or a temple pendant as suggested by Natalija Ristovska in her paper read at the conference. For the shroud’s restoration see, S. Müller-Christiansen, ‘Beobachtungen zum Bamberger Guntertuch’, Münchener Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst 17 (1966), 9–16, and eadem., Das Guntertuch im Bamberger Domkammer, Bamberg, 1966 (the latter study was unavailable to me).
5 L. Safran, ‘Redating some South Italian Frescoes: The First Layer at S. Pietro, Orrano, and the Earliest Paintings at Sta Maria Della Croce, Casaranello’, Byzantion 60 (1990), 330, fig. 9.
6 For these silks, see A. Murheus, Byzantine Silk Weaving ad 400 to AD 1200, Vienna, 1997, 47–50, figs 14A–B, 74A, 85B with earlier literature. For another perspective see, A. Cutler, ‘Imagination and Documentation: Eagle Silks in Byzantium, the Latin West and Abbasid Baghdad’, BZ 96 (2003), 67–72.
7 While there has been a welcome proliferation of exhibition catalogues presenting various collections, this has not resulted in the identification of Middle Byzantine jewellery types intended for daily use, even though some of these superb catalogues were organised around the theme of ‘Alltag/Everyday life’, at least in their title, and a few indeed included pieces worn as part of everyday costume. Most of the latter, however, dated from the Late Antique period: see ‘Profane Welt und Alltag’, in C. Stiegemann (ed.), Byzanz: Das Licht aus dem Osten. Kult und Alltag im Byzantinischen Reich vom 4. bis 15. Jahrhundert, Mainz, 2001, 231–364; ‘Alltag und Luxus’, in L. Wamers (eds), Die Welt von Byzanz – Europas östliches Erbe, Munich, 2004, 213–367. An exceptionally large number of pieces of Middle Byzantine jewellery can be seen in the exhibition catalogue Kathimerínē státo Byzantinós, Athens, 2002.
9 B. Babić, ‘Report on the Old Slavic Findsspots in Macedonia’,


14 An exhaustive list of references would greatly exceed the scope of this study and I will therefore merely refer to the ongoing debate in this field. For a general overview of the Balkans in the 4th–7th century, see F. Curta, ‘Peasants as ‘Makeshift Soldiers for the Early Middle Ages’, in M. Grünbart, E. Kislinger, A. Muthesius and T. Rahden (eds), ‘Ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie’ (Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde – Ergänzungsbände 42), Berlin and New York, 2004; V. Bierbrauer, ‘Zur ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie’, in W. Pohl (ed.), Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen, Vienna, 2004, 45–84; for the occasionally over-critical Anglo-Saxon attitude towards the continental (predominantly German) research tradition, see A. Gillett (ed.), On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnicity in the Early Middle Ages (Studies in the Early Middle Ages 4), Turnhout, 2002.

15 It might rightly be argued that there was a marked population decline in the Balkan Empire during this period, which played a major role in the transformation of the earlier settlement structure. This obviously contributed to the dominance of Slav groups in some regions, but it could hardly have led to the overall disappearance of the Romanised population. To quote but one example: in the 12th–13th centuries, a major portion of the population of Asenid Bulgaria was made up of pastoralist groups speaking a Neo-Latin tongue, who were migrating northward from the more southerly regions of the Balkans: see; G. Ostrogory, History of the Byzantine State, Oxford, 1968 (2nd ed.), 403–4, esp. 404, n. 1. For a general overview of the Balkans in the 6th century, see F. Curta, ‘Peasants as ‘Makeshift Soldiers for the Occasion’: Sixth-Century Settlement Patterns in the Balkans’, in T.S. Burns and J.W. Eade (eds), Urban Centers and Rural Contexts in Late Antiquity, East Lansing, 2001a, 199–217 (http://www.cla.ufl.edu/users/efcura/PEAS.pdf); and idem., ‘The Making of the Slavs. History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500–700’, Cambridge, 2008, 121–50. For another perspective, see A. Dunn, ‘Continuity and Change in the Macedonian Countryside from Gallienus to Justinian’, in W. Bowden, L. Lavan and C. Machado (eds), Recent Research on the Late Antique Countryside (Late Antique Archaeology), London and Boston, 2004, 359–77; and idem., ‘Rural Producers and Markets: Aspects of the Archaeological and Historical Problem’, in M. Grünbart, E. Kislinger, A. Muthesius and D.Ch. Stathakopoulos (eds), Material Culture and Well-Being in Byzantium (400–1453) (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanztarschung 11), Vienna, 2007, 101–9. The difficulties in this field of research are reviewed by A. Dunn, ‘The transformation from polis to kastron in the Balkans (III–VII cc.)’ (general and regional perspectives), Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 18 (1994), 60–80.


18 One good illustration of the approach equating quality with the place of manufacture, and of how even the very possibility of the existence of simple Byzantine jewellery has been rejected out of hand, is provided by the discussion of the bronze earrings found at Boljetin by: S. Ercegović-Pavlović, ‘Le dépôt des boucles d’oreilles de la fortification romano-byzantine à Boljetin sur le Danube’, Archaeologica Jugoslavica 8 (1967), 93: ‘Tous ces exemplaires de boucles d’oreilles mentionnés [Starčević, etc.], comprennent la paire de Mačvanska Mitrovica, ont été exécutés dans un haut technique d’orfèvrerie, soit en filigrane, soit en granulation ou combi, le plus souvent en or ou en argent. Tous ces exemplaires étaient considérés comme importation byzantine […]’ En Yogoslavie, sans doute, les découvertes de Trilje et de Golubici, auraient représentés l’importation byzantine direct […]’ Si nous opposons aux boucles d’oreilles du dépôt de Boljetin les analogies mentionnées, autant de la Yogoslavie qu’au delà de ses frontières, visuellement et à la première vue il n’y aurait pas de grandes différences dans la manière d’exécuter de ces boucles d’oreilles et des boucles d’oreilles ornées, ce qui permettrait de les considérer comme Byzantines. Cependant la métal dont elles étaient faites, le cuivre et le bronze avec l’enduit mince d’étain, ne parle nullement en faveur de l’hypothèse de l’importation Byzantine quand il s’agit de ce dépôt de Boljetin’.

19 For social conditions in the rural areas of Byzantium during the 10th century, based chiefly on data from the southern Balkans, see N. Oikonomidès, ‘The Social Structure of the Byzantine Countryside in the First Half of the Xth Century’, Symeikto 10 (1966), 105–22. It is perhaps instructive to quote the data published by J.-C. Cheynet and C. Morrison on the income and subsistence conditions of the different social groups in Byzantium: ‘three levels of income can be distinguished: (1) unqualified workers who were able, over a long period, to earn at most 1 nomisma per month, when not unemployed; (2) qualified workers, professional soldiers, and craftsmen, who enjoyed a wide margin of income, three to ten times more than that of unqualified workers; (3) unqualified workers, as judges or strategoi, as well as the wealthiest merchants and bankers, whose incomes differed from the first category by a factor of 150 or more’; C. Morrison and J.-C. Cheynet, ‘Prices and Wages in the Byzantine World’, in A.E. Laiou (ed.), The Economic History of Byzantium. From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century, Washington DC, 2002, 872. Thus, if we know that one nomisma covered the monthly expenses of a poor family, a jewellery article equivalent to a pair of earrings weighing several nomismata should be treated according to its value in Byzantine society (cf. the pair of earrings from Kecele discussed below).


21 This holds true for the few case studies of Byzantine cemeteries too. It should be recalled that the overview of Byzantine cemetery archaeology written by A. Rettner for the Byzantium exhibition held in Munich in 2004 took up no more than a single page, and included a mention of all the major burial grounds of the Early, Middle and Late Byzantine period (cf. A. Rettner, ‘Grabbeigaben’, in Wamers (n. 9), 360). The record is rather patchy even if the number of cemeteries mentioned by Rettner could be increased by a full list of these cemeteries. The extent to which these burials have been destroyed is reflected by the comparison of the overall number of 5th–7th century Byzantine buckles with the pieces known from burials, settlements and hoards (for a list of finds with a secure context, see M. Schulze-Dörrlamm, Byzantinische Gürtelschnallen und Gürtelschlägse im Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum i, Die Schnallen ohne Beschlag, 156–60; and idem., ‘Rural Producers and Markets: Aspects of the Archaeological and Historical Problem’, in M. Grünbart, E. Kislinger, A. Muthesius and D.Ch. Stathakopoulos (eds), Material Culture and Well-Being in Byzantium (400–1453) (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanztarschung 11), Vienna, 2007, 101–9. The difficulties in this field of research are reviewed by A. Dunn, ‘The transformation from polis to kastron in the Balkans (III–VII cc.)’ (general and regional perspectives), Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 18 (1994), 60–80. For an overview of this period in the history of research in English, see Langó (n. 2), 203–05; see also I. Böna, ‘Die Archäologie in Ungarn und die ungarische Landnahme’, Acta Archaeol 49 (1997), 347–9. J. Hampel did not use the label ‘Bjelo Brdo’ in his scheme, this horizon appeared as Group B and was for a long time termed ‘Hampel B’ in Hungarian research. The label ‘Bjelo Brdo culture’ appears to be ineradicable from the archaeological literature in spite of its multiple connotations. The choice of designation in the early 20th century was motivated by the conviction of Slavic researchers that these Reihengräberfelder with poor grave goods represented the archaeological heritage of the Slavs. Even though the culture’s then known distribution predominantly coincided with the Hungarian-speaking regions of the Carpathian Basin (meaning that the names of the sites where the culture’s finds had come to light were predominantly Hungarian), they consciously strove to choose a type site which would, by its very name, reflect the material’s cultural attribution to the Slavs, finally settling on the Bjelo Brdo site, even though it lay on the fringes of the culture’s distribution. (cf. the type site mentioned above was only identified by the Croatian archaeologist. Ljubomir Niederle, the founder of Slavic archaeology: see Cs. Bálnit, ‘Kultur des 9. Jahrhunderts’ (Studia Arheologica 11), Budapest, 1919, 161.) The anachronism of projecting an ethnic interpretation of this kind onto the 10th–11th centuries was disregarded, as was
the simple fact that the name Bjelo Brdo does not appear in medieval sources (unlike the two Hungarian settlements, Hagymás and Szarvas, lying at a distance of 8.5 km from each other, between which the village of Bjelo Brdo lay): see A. Kiss, ‘Zur Frage der Bjelo Brdo Kultur’, Acta ArchHung 25 (1975), 334. The unbiased line of archaeological research regards this culture as a poly-ethnic complex incorporating the burials of a political formation: first, the burials of the Hungarian Princedom and, after 1000, the commoners’ graves of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom, irrespective of ethnic groups.

23 Langó (n. 2), 200–07.

24 For Pulszky and his influence on Hungarian archaeological thought, cf. Langó (n. 2), 200–02.


27 J. Hampel, *Újabb tanulmányok a fonogfálati kor emlékeiről* (New studies on the antiquities of the Conquest period), Budapest, 1907.

28 J. Hampel, *Alterthumer des frühen Mittelalters in Ungarn I–III*, Braunschweig, 1905. The change in Hampel’s perspective compared to his previous synthesis published in 1900 can be felt in this monumental work, parts of which were also published in Hungarian two years later (cf. n. 27). Writing about the 10th–12th century Reichengräberfelder, Hampel (ibid., 32) noted that ‘Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach haben wir viele von diesen bescheidenden Grabeinlagen slawischen Bewohnern des Ungarlandes zuzurechnen.

29 For Niederle and his scholarly oeuvre, see W. Antoniwiecz, *Hans Zeiss, Joachim Werner und die archäologischen Forschungsbilder* (Der Geburtstag von Paul Reinecke und der 25. Jahrestag des Carl von Pollmann-Geburtsmonats Martynovka’ type mounts as Byzantine products in northern Balkans were most often also lumped together here. The latter usage, however, is misleading owing to the many differences between the two regions.

30 For a historical overview of research and the relevant literature, see J.H. Rosser, *A Research Strategy for Byzantine Archaeology*, *Byzantine Studies/Études byzantines* 6 (1979), 153–4; E. A. Ivison, *Burial and Urbanism at Late Antique and Early Byzantine Corinth (c. AD 400–700)*, in N. Christie and S.T. Loseby (eds), *Towns in Transition. Urban Evolution in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, London, 1996, 114–20, for a broader perspective; cf. E. Riemer, *Byzantinische Schmuck der älteren und jüngeren Frankenzeit*, in *Byzantinobulgarica* 1 (1977), 311–25. Writing about the 10th–12th century archaeological assemblages from the Carpathian Basin and the neighbouring areas since the finds from the greater part of the northern Balkans were most often also lumped together here. The latter usage, however, is misleading owing to the many differences between the two regions.

31 The information concerning these unpublished buckles was given me in 1975 by Prof. Gyula László Davidson (n. 20), 268, n. 38.


34 Dezso Csállány offered an evaluation of the buckle collection purchased by Gyula Mészáros in Istanbul, which he brought with him when he returned to Hungary, while Joachim Werner discussed the buckles in the Diergardt Collection of the Römisch-Germanisches Museum in Cologne. They both provided an overview of the then known parallels to these buckles.


50 It is hardly surprising that Jochen Giesler proved to be the exception to this rule. Due to his German schooling, he remained unaffected by the research preferences of Hungarian scholarship. He convincingly demonstrated the Balkan connections of several artefact types known from the Carpathian Basin. Giesler (n. 13), 95–7. Hungarian reviews of Giesler's study simply ignored these issues.

51 In the introduction to his study, Mesterházy clearly stated that he would not discuss certain jewellery types, such as rings with widening bezels, necklace pendants, pendants and crosses, which also had south-eastern European affinities (the function of these crosses in the Carpathian Basin is still debated because it is usually impossible to determine whether they were worn as religious relics or 'jewellery'). These omissions have in part been remedied; see T. Keszi, '10. századi zárt zemleughelyek pajzs alakúan kiszélesedő fejelj, pentagramma és madár ábrázolásai (Geschlossene Plattenringe aus dem X. Jahrhundert mit schildförmig ausgebreiteten Kopf, mit Darstellung von Pentagramma und Vogel)', in A. Perémi (ed.), Ana nepvindorlóskor fiatal kutatás 8. találkozójánál (Bratislava, 1989), 509–36. Another interesting instance of such a focus is the one on Byzantine and Balkan jewellery in the upper Danube region.

26 E.g. the finger-rings with widening bezels, of which 73 pieces were known from the Carpathian Basin in the mid-1900s: see Keszi (n. 51).


The graves of this cemetery have still not been published in full. For a good photo of the bracelet, see Fodor et al. (n. 61), 190, figs 9–11. For a general description of the cemetery and its finds, see ibid.


73 Drauschke (n. 4), 317, noted this in connection with this cemetery.


77 Ibid., 269.

78 Found at Tille Höyük: J. Moore, Tille Höyük t. The Medieval Period, Ankara, 1983, fig. 55.3. (Unfortunately, an exact dating of the bracelet within the Middle Byzantine period is impossible owing to the lack of a stratigraphic context.)


80 Ödekan (n. 76), 126–7.

81 Ibid., 129–30.

82 A historical situation of this type can be envisioned in the broader region of the Carpathian Basin during the 9th century. The smaller centres emerging in the eastern fringes of the expanding Carolingian Empire in the Moravian Basin, Pannonia, and Dalmatia all had workshops catering to the needs of the local élite, producing artefacts in a similar style adapted to local taste. These workshops produced their own jewellery types during the Early Middle Ages, influenced in part by the repeated cultural impacts from the south: see B.M. Szóke, ‘Die Beziehungen zwischen dem vor- und frühbyzantinischen Westen und den byzantinischen Ländern des 9.—11. Jahrhunderts (Frauenractzeubehör und Schmuck)’, in F. Daim (ed.), Awarenforschungen I (Studien zur Archäologie der Awaren 4), Vienna, 1992, 862–3. For the changing views concerning the origins of a particular jewellery type, see B.M. Szóke, ‘Karolinger-zeitliche Gräberfelder I–IV von Garabonc–O fál, Antaeus 21 (1992), 124–9 and idem., ‘New findings of the excavations in Mosaburg/Zalavár (Western Hungary)’, in Henning (n. 49), 412–3.


85 It is difficult to fit the artefact types from the Tigani cemetery into a chronological scheme. Most of the buckles are 6th–7th century examples of the ‘Corinth’ type. The buckle from Grave 52, which also contained the finger-ring, can be assigned to the buckle type with U-shaped buckle plate (no photo is available of this find), whose 8th century date cannot be excluded. This would fit in with the early 8th century date of the crescentic earring (cf. n. 86). (It must be noted here that the globules typical for earrings of the Middle Byzantine period can be clearly made out on the earring’s hoop, but the piece itself has a hoop and hook fastener. This type of fastener, widespread during the Early Byzantine period, survived into the next period, although it was uncommon in the case of the crescentic type in question. It seems to me that this was a feature probably characterising the early pieces of the type.) It is uncertain how the date of the cloisonné enamelled finger-ring can be harmonised with the above: one possibility is that the U-shaped buckles were late pieces surviving into the early 9th century, another is that the finger-ring represents one of the earliest cloisonné enamelled jewellery pieces. Be that as it may, this issue can only be resolved with the publication of other cemeteries. What seems certain from the dominance of Early Byzantine artefacts and the almost complete lack of classical Middle Byzantine pieces is that Grave 52 can be assigned to the latest phase of the Tigani cemetery and dated to the beginning of the Middle Byzantine period. David Buckton believes that cloisonné enamelled jewellery began to be manufactured from around 800 (cf. n. 87). While a break in the use of the cemetery cannot be excluded, there is nothing to indicate such an event.

86 For a photo of the earring, cf. Kypraiou (n. 71), 182, cat. no. 199 (with a dating to the 6th century, N.B. Drandakes). Antje Bosselmann–Rücksie suggested a 9th–11th century date for the earring: see A. Bosselmann–Rücksie, ‘mittelbyzantinische Ohrringe mit Filigran und Granulation’, in Womers (n. 9), 334. In her comments on my paper read at the conference, Yvonne Stolz mentioned that a similar earring, found in an 8th-century context, will be published in her doctoral dissertation. I would like to thank her for this piece of information.
Bulletin D. Buckton, 'Enamelling on Gold. A historical perspective', Reliquary in New York, and the Antecedents of Middle Byzantine Art in the West', See also Yeroulanou, this volume, Pl. 25.

For a photo and a description of the bracelet, see Evans and Wixom (n. 12), 243–4, cat. no. 165A (S.T. Brooks), with the earlier literature. See also Yeroulanou, this volume, Pl. 25.

Totev (n. 83), 40–3, 46–9, figs 6–7, 9, 11, 13 (necklace), 56–7, fig. 17 (earring).


M. Petritakes in Archaiologikon Delton, Chronica 42 (1987), 175, pin. 86; for the cemetery map, cf. ibid., 174.

For a good overview of the earlier proposals for the date of basket earrings, see Gonosová and Kondoleon (n. 71), 83, 95, cat. nos 22, 30 (C. Kondoleon).

Some pieces were dated even earlier, to the 3rd century: cf. A. Yeroulanou, Diatrita. Pierced work gold jewellery from the 3rd to the 7th century, Athens, Benaki Museum, 1999, 277–8, cat. nos 462–4. Yeroulanou correctly noted that 'it is difficult to include them among pierced-work jewellery because the true pierced-work surfaces are minimal. Many of the holes in the surfaces are actually formed from wire, that is from small links soldered together, while others were formed by perforating the metal' (ibid., 74). The technical differences between genuine Early Byzantine opus interrasile and Middle Byzantine openwork jewellery are hardly surprising, given the many centuries between the two.

The pieces dated to the Early Byzantine period are without exception stray finds, whose dating to the 3rd–7th centuries lacks convincing arguments. More recently found pieces with secure contexts are all Middle Byzantine; as far as I know, earrings of this type have not been recovered from Early Byzantine burials in spite of the latter’s higher number: see R.M. Harrison, Excavations at Saracoçe in Istanbul I, Princeton and Washington, 1986, cat. no. 597 (from a layer dated by a mid-10th-century coin); M. Jenkins-Madina, ‘Jewelry’, in G.F. Bass et al., Serge Liman: An Eleventh-Century Shipwreck!, Texas A&M University Press, 2004, 289–90 (from a ship dated by early 11th century coins); C. Lightfoot and E. Ivison, ‘Amorium 2006, Anatolian Archaeology 12 (2006), 31. After finishing this manuscript, I came across Bossellmann-Ruickbie’s article, which came to a similar conclusion concerning the Middle Byzantine date of the currently known basket earrings: see A. Bossellmann-Ruickbie, ‘Byzantinisches, Islamisch oder ‘Internationaler Stil’? Email- und Körbchenohrringe aus dem östlichen Mittelmeerraum’, in U. Koenen and M. Müller-Wiener (eds), Grenzgänge im östlichen Mittelmeerraum, Byzanz und die islamische Welt vom 6. bis 15. Jahrhundert, Wiesbaden, 2008, 85–96.


For a brief overview of the earlier literature, see Borisov (n. 96), 290–3.

Ođekan (n. 76), 263–3 and Gill (n. 96).

One such bracelet was found in Grave 2 at Ludányahalász–Apáti pusztas S. Pintér, ‘Nőgrádvídköri régészeti kutatásokról [Archaeological investigations in the Nőgrád region], Archaeologia Értesítő 7 (1887), 431. I would thank Péter Langó and László Kovács for calling my attention to this piece.

For a comprehensive overview of many of the issues discussed here, see M. Bóna, Dunapentele története a honfoglalástól a 19. század közepeig a már eldég ismert, valamint tómanon bevont adatok alapján [History of Dunapentele from the Conquest period to the mid-19th century], Dunapentele, 1997 (2nd ed.), 3 kép, Mesterházy (n. 63), Abb. 4.1–2.

Mesterházy 1991 (n. 52), 156, fig. 6.

Byzantine archaeology as an independent field of research is hardly a well-established discipline: while several other fields of research overlap with it, none of them correlate precisely with what Byzantine archaeology should be about. Christian archaeology, focusing predominantly on the archaeology of buildings, does not include several areas of interest, and seems uncertain regarding its self-definition: see H.R. Seeliger, ‘Christliche Archäologie oder spätantike Kunstgeschichte? Aktuelle Grundlagenfragen aus der Sicht der Kirchengeschichte’, Rivista di archeologia cristiana 61 (1985), 167–87; Late Antique and Early Byzantine archaeology, the other advanced field of research, while definitely witnessing a thematic explosion (reflected by the series of conferences and publications of more recent years), merely encompasses the study of the Early Byzantine period. One welcome advance is the birth of a forum dedicated to the archaeology of the Middle Byzantine period (http://www.byzarch.bham.ac.uk/intro.htm). Still, a number of issues raised in the 1970s and 1980s remain unresolved: see Rosser (n. 34); T.E. Gregory, ‘Intelligible Beauty’.