Lamps with “temple façade”
decoration: witness to urban
vitality in the northern and
western Black Sea and the
ties with Constantinople

Abstract: The architectural motif in the form of an arch-on-columns, the titular “temple façade”, decorating the discus of late antique lamps, has been the subject of debate and various interpretations of the meaning without reference to the rendering or the lamp type. An examination of known examples of lamps with this particular motif has identified four different lamp type variants and two main renderings of the decoration. Ovoid lamps bearing a representation of an arch-on-columns, the most numerous among the finds, come mostly from Constantinople and nearby cities, the Black Sea coast and the Danubian sites, the sole exceptions being Egypt (where they appear also in a late variant), Cyprus and Byblos. Reconstructing the distribution of these types and renderings has introduced some “order” into the existing hypotheses and highlighted issues connected with understanding the booming economy of the Pontic area as well as the recently rebuilt Danubian limes fortresses, during their apex, in the 5th and 6th centuries AD. It has also contributed to the discussion aimed at ending the widespread use of the term “Balkan lamps” for products that represent the output of Pontic and Danubian workshops influenced by the Imperial capital in Constantinople.
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Seldom have so many hypotheses been presented over the years on a group of lamps with intriguing decoration on the discus in the form of an arch or niche with two columns in the facade. However, there has been
a considerable mix-up in the literature with regard to the lamp shapes and the different renderings of the architecture.

The theme is depicted in two very different ways, one associated with lamp variants defined as A and D, and the other with two other variants, B and C [Figs 1, 2]. This affords the opportunity to trace four different regions of diffusion as well as further workshops which produced lamps of this type, creating the said differentiation of types. The present study is supplementary with regard to a recent panoptic of 6th century AD lighting devices from the Balkans and beyond which did not include this ensemble (Curta 2016).

**VARIANT A**

"CONSTANTINOPOLITAN-TYPE" HAYES 8 LAMPS AND THEIR LOCAL DERIVATIVES: NAIVE TEMPLE FAÇADE WITH ADORNED COLUMNS AND GRAPEVINE

Before going into a typological characteristics of the variant and its imitations, let us first review the discussion regarding these lamps and take a closer look at the geographical distribution.

Thérèse Oziol (1977) was the first to suggest a neutral interpretation of the theme, which she found on a single example known from Cyprus [see Cat. 82 with references]. The lamp from the National Museum in Nicosia is of unknown provenance. The theme according to Oziol was

---

**Fig. 1.** The “temple façade” motif: A – the most complete version (Greek East: British Museum, Bailey 1988: Q 3309); B – a traditional Constantinople rendering (imported or made in Chersonesos: Zalesskaya 1988, identical to types Hayes 39, 40, 43); and C – two examples of progressive degeneration of the motif (lamps from Chersonesos workshops; courtesy of the State Museum-Preserve “Tauric Chersonese” | drawing D. Zhuravlev)
Christian and Jewish by equal measure. In 1991, working on a similar lamp found at Thasos [Cat. 78], Catherine Abadie-Reynal remarked on their popularity in Egypt, but also and mostly in Constantinople and in the Black Sea area (Abadie-Reynal and Sodini 1992). In 1992, publishing a lychnological corpus from the excavation of the Church of Saraçhane in Istanbul [Cat. 64–74], John W. Hayes established this kind of lamps as a separate type, his Type 8, in recognition of its abundance in the city. He knew of several examples with the same decoration, plus the 11 from the American research at the Saraçhane site. For Hayes, their fine clay and their nice glossy slip, “in some cases attaining a metallic lustre”, were an indication of local manufacture (Hayes 1992: 82, discussion of the type and lamps, 85–86 Nos 34–44 and Pl. 20). Several lamps were known from Constantinople prior to Hayes’ research and an enormous number was recently produced from excavations at the sites of a new trans-Bosporan metro line and its stations (see Karagöz, Atik, and İsk 2007: 44, 85, No. U24, from Üsküdar and excavations for metro construction). Finally, Denis Zhuravlev relaunched the debate in 2007 when he published 12 lamps of this type from a synagogue discovered in Chersonesos (Zhuravlev 2007; 2011). Zhuravlev referred to other lamps of the kind previously discovered at Chersonesos (here Cat. 7–23, including intact lamps published in Kobylina 1978 and Zalesskâa 1988 and two fragmentary ones); to this one should add the Ermitage lamps [here Cat. 1–5]. Despite Zhuravlev’s extended

Fig. 2. Four variants (or types) of lamps bearing the columns-and-arch decoration: A – “Naïve temple façade” on ovoid lamps (type Hayes B), Chersonesos (State Historical Museum, Nos 217 and 353, unpublished; B – “Accurate temple façade with ‘semi-rosette’ niche” on late lamps (type Hayes 3) from Asia Minor, Rhodes (Katsioti 2019: Samian lamps 4–5 = Katsioti 2017: 430–431, S3 and S4); C – “Accurate temple façade with ‘semi-rosette’ niche” on a Caesarea-type lamp: Lebanon (Bouvier Collection, Chrzanovski 2019: 405, Cat. 673); D – Fayum-made elongated lamps with simplified arch-and-column, scene toward handle, Karanis (After Shier 1978: Pl. 7) (Processing L. Chrzanovski)
discussion of the type and the debate surrounding its interpretation, the finds from the synagogue in Chersonesos have come to be called a “rare Jewish-type”, this mainly in modern Bulgarian research (see, for instance, Mustafčieva 2013 and Rusev 2015).

The city of Halmyris in the Black Sea leads the quantitative ranking with 18 lamps of this kind from recent extensive excavations: one intact, 10 fragments with partly preserved handle and discus and seven small fragments (see Topoleanu 2000: 180–181, No. 459, Pl. LVI; the other lamps are unpublished and are currently under study by Florin Topoleanu as part of his forthcoming publication of the lychnological corpus from the site) [Cat. 28–38].

Findspot distribution has been augmented by several recently published finds from excavations in the richest cities of South Russia, Bulgaria and the Danube Delta, rendering any “strictly religious” interpretation of the motif absolutely senseless. This particular ornament on the Hayes 8 lamps seems to have blossomed...
in the northern and western Black Sea region, whence it came as a result of the newly flourishing economy stimulated by Imperial efforts to consolidate the Danubian border and to bolster the rebuilding of strategic cities, a work often attributed to Justinian but initiated much earlier in fact and only aggrandized by him, as reported for posterity by Procopius in his Περί Κτισμάτων (De Aedificiis).

The distribution map of these lamps drawn based on the recorded finds centers on three major cities from the general region—Constantinople, Halmyris and Chersonessos—each delivering more than 20 lamps. Between them, the coast is rich in discoveries of lamps of this kind. Moving east from Chersonessos, we find one such lamp at the Il'ichevskaya fortress [Cat. 6] in the Taman Peninsula; going west, there are two lamps found at Olbia [Cat. 26] and a lamp of unknown provenance in the Archaeological Museum of Odessa [Cat. 27]. On the Bulgarian coast, lamps of the type include: four at Varna

| A. “Naive temple façade” on ovoid lamps |
| Constantineople, Saracha – 16 lamps |
| Chersonesos – at least 19 lamps + five more said to have been discovered there |
| Halmyris – at least 18 lamps |
| Alexandria/Egypt – at least five lamps |
| Other sites |
| 1) Taman (Illichevska Fortress) – one lamp |
| 2) Olbia – two lamps |
| 3) Museum of Odessa – one lamp from the vicinity of the city |
| 4) Argamum – two lamps |
| 5) (L)ibida – four lamps |
| 6) Sacidava – one lamp |
| 7) Capidava – two lamps |
| 8) Ulmetum – one lamp |
| 9) Novae – one lamp |
| 10) Sucidava – one lamp |
| 11) Sadovets – one lamp |
| 12) Sirmium – one lamp |
| 13) Anchialos – two lamps |
| 14) Varna – four lamps |
| 15) Akra – three lamps |
| 16) Hadrianopolis (Edirne) – two lamps |
| 17) Thasos – one lamp |
| 18) Cyprus, National Museum – one lamp |
| 19) Byblos – one lamp |
| 20) Akcakoca – one lamp |
| 21) Hadrianopolis – two lamps |

| B. “Accurate temple façade with ‘semi-rosette’ niche” on Asia Minor lamps |
| (non-exhaustive list) |
| A) Miletus – one lamp |
| B) Calynnos – one lamp |
| C) Didyma – one lamp |
| D) Rhodos – two lamps |
| E) Sephori – two lamps |

| C. “Accurate temple façade with ‘semi-rosette’ niche” on Cesarea-type lamps |
| α* Byblos – two lamps |
| β* Ha-Goshrim – one lamp |

| D. “Degenerate facade with a cross under an arch” on Fayum-made elongated lamps, scene toward the handle |
| Karanis – one lamp |
| The Anawati Collection – one lamp |

Fig. 3 (on opposite page). Key to findspots
[Cat. 55–58], two at Anchialos near Burgas [Cat. 59–60], and three at Akra near Chernomoretz [Cat. 61–63], plus one recently found in a pit at the ancient settlement of Hrisosotyra, also near Chernomoretz (Hristov 2019: 56 and Pl. 52).

Dobrogea is impressive in terms of findspots. Argamum delivered three lamps [Cat. 43–45] (unpublished, mentioned in Topoleanu 2000: 181); (L)ibida four [Cat. 39–42], Capidava two [Cat. 47–48], Sacidava one [Cat. 46] and Ulmetum one [Cat. 49].

Identical lamps were found further west on the Danube, in the cities listed as centers consolidated or renovated by Justinian and his predecessors: single lamps have been found at Novae [Cat. 50], Sucidava [Cat. 51], the “Gothic” fortress of Sadovets near Pleven [Cat. 52], where the lamp was associated with coins from the reign of Justinian (AD 527–565) and one of Mauricius Tiberius (AD 582–602) and, astonishingly, even in Western Serbia, at Sirmium [Cat. 53]. One more intact lamp, from the National Museum in Sofia but without provenance [Cat. 54], should be added to the list from Bulgaria.

Further south and nearest to Constantinople, lamps of this type have also been recorded. On the Black Sea coast and its vicinity, three lamps have been found east of Istanbul: one in the city-harbor of Akçakoca [Cat. 75] and two in the huge nearby hinterland city of Hadrianopolis [Cat. 76–77].

On the European side of the Bosporus, the one lamp among a thousand lighting devices published from the area of the city walls and of the Makedonia Tower of Hadrianopolis (Edirne) [Cat. 79], which was probably made in one of the many ovens discovered inside and outside the early Imperial walls during the rescue excavations, opens up the discussion—even more than beforehand—concerning the production of the huge workshop areas around Constantinople and, last but not least, the lychnological output of the most prolific Southern Pontic ceramic production centers like Sinope. The latter are completely unpublished and hence a blank for research.

Coming to Egypt, Donald M. Bailey, suggested that these “Greek East unplaced lamps”, were of Egyptian origin, based on the possible provenance of most of the parallels he knew [Cat. 80–81]. As a matter of fact, he quoted as coming from Alexandria (or Egypt) a lamp from the Benaki collection, and another unpublished one from Kom el-Dikka (Bailey 1988: 49). A third Egyptian product is a lamp from Dunand’s 1939 excavations at Byblos [Cat. 83].

Added to this list are three artifacts without known provenance: a fragment (with a further fragment) from the National Museum in Warsaw [Cat. 85–86], another fragment at the Museo Egizio of Florence [Cat. 87] and a third, the shape inspired by a late Loeschcke VIII lamp, in the Kaufman Collection [Cat. 84]. Very recently, an apparently Egyptian lamp, sold at auction in Zürich [Cat. 89], reinforced the idea that the Delta and Fayum lampmakers were also producing this kind of lamps.

An exceptional Egyptian-made lamp, linked to our variant D (late Egyptian derivative) and now at the Archäologisches Museum der WWU Muenster [Cat. 88], shows the same motif but with four columns, the exterior ones bearing
the triangular tympanons of the temple roof, and a cross in the center of the composition. This artifact, without a known provenance, is yet more testimonial of “late Christian Egyptian” creativity and the skill of some of the highest-quality Alexandrian and Fayum workshops, even if the lamp itself does not add to the issues addressed below.

In view of the evident concentration of lamps of this kind in and around the imperial capital, in the northern and western Pontic region as well as on the Danubian limes, and adding to this the lamps from the Bulgarian hinterland and the others from Thasos and northern Turkey, the origin of this type must be placed near Constantinople.

Copies of lamps of the kind that is found in the Saraçhane corpus started to be produced very soon in several Pontic workshops, imitating more or less the fabric and the slip, the accurate rendering of the motif and the handle treatment. Chersonesos and Halmyris are perfect examples illustrating the appropriation by local workshops of a theme much appreciated by their customers.

With all due reservations, the distribution map, even if reflecting only published material, reveals a complete absence of the lamp type from Asia Minor (where the motif is reduced and reproduced on another type of lighting device) as well as from the Aegean world.

Meanwhile, Egyptian and Alexandrian workshops adopted the motif and the lamp type in the same way as they did several other motifs. The intense macroregional ties linking the Egyptian coastal metropolis with the main cities of modern Cyprus and Lebanon is enough to explain the origin of these lamps and the routes by which individual examples found their way to Cyprus and Byblos.

Nevertheless, the few original Egyptian artifacts that are known cannot compete either in quantity or quality with the corpus from Constantinople and the best workshops of the Black Sea presented here. With the exception of the lamps from Cyprus and Byblos, both of which were traditional trade centers as well as markets for Alexandrian goods, it is more than likely that none of the other lamps listed here can be linked to an Egyptian producer.

Once workshops in the suburbs of Constantinople and the direct hinterland of the city started to produce these lamps for the local market, sales abroad had to be a natural consequence. Thus, the first wave to be observed is composed of perfectly-made lamps, sometimes adorned with a metallic-looking slip, and with some of the most complete ornaments including two (instead of the traditional single) “bunches of grapes”, a triangular detail of the decoration present on both lamps preserved in the British Museum. (Bailey hesitated to attribute an ‘Egyptian’ provenance to these lamps, prudently opting to include them in his “Eastern Greek—The Balkans” [i.e. Pontic]—section).

The first group was evidently purchased from the Constantinopolitan workshop and quickly copied. Credible imitations were made in the strong production centers located in cities in the western and northern Black Sea region, rendering the decoration to perfection and recreating the shape in identical form, albeit sometimes with a tape handle or a vertical molded handle. Local northern
and western Black Sea imitations soon appeared, changing the shape of the reservoir to an ovoid form and, above all, decorating the discus with a “decomposed” motif, a naïve rendering of only parts of the classical décor, a phenomenon well observed at Chersonesos, Halmyris, Akra and Anchialos, and also in Egypt, if variant D be considered as a later and simplified version of the classical type.

VARIANT B

“SAMIAN-TYPE” HAYES 3 LAMPS: ACCURATE TEMPLE FAÇADE WITH A ‘SEMI-ROSETTE’ NICHE FLANKED BY TWO COLUMNS

Eric C. Lapp (1991) briefly discussed three lamps with a “temple” motif: a fragmentary one from excavations in Sepphoris and two previously published examples from the Asia Minor centers of Miletus (Menzel 1969: 99, No. 641, Fig. 72/3) and Calymnos (see Bailey 1988: Q 3201, p. 392 and Pl. 113).

A similar lamp from Didyma (Wintermeyer 1980: 140, Pl. 66) caused considerable confusion for further research, conflating the different variants of the decoration regardless of the lamp type. In truth, Lapp’s lamps are late Eastern Greek lamps with a nozzle-channel (the Hayes 2 type at Saraçhane), ornamented on their small discus with a finely drawn ‘semi-rosette’ niche flanked by two columns. Lamps of this kind were found also on Rhodes (Katsioti 2017: 430–432, S3–S4), where they are considered to be very probably Samian (Katsioti 2019: Nos 4–5), as well as, again, at Sepphoris (Lapp 2016: 99–100 and 259, No. 185).

VARIANT C

“CAESAREA-TYPE” LATE ROMAN LAMPS: ACCURATE TEMPLE FAÇADE WITH ‘SEMI-ROSETTE’ NICHE FLANKED BY TWO COLUMNS

The motif appears on a third type of lamp: the “Caesarea Byzantine Type”, dated from the end of the 5th to the 6th century AD (for the type, see Awarkeh 2005; Ala Eddine and Awarkeh 2011). The three lamps published until now bear, in mirror-image, the scene facing the handle as it is the doxa on this lamp-type. It is often the very same decoration ornamenting the Asia Minor lamps, and on one lamp a more stylized version. The very same decoration is evoked on a lamp from Byblos (Dunand’s excavations, illustrated in Frangié and Salles 2011: 301, Pl. 13) and another one from recent excavations at Ha-Goshrim (Sussman 2017: 200–201 No. 2394, 464 and illustration on page 594). A somewhat less accurate rendering of the niche is found on a lamp bought near Byblos (Bouvier Collection, Chrzanovski 2019: Cat. 673). The harbor city of Byblos thus delivers a very rich and interesting lychnological corpus, being the only place where the “temple” appears in two variants of the theme and on two lamp types, both imported, one from Egypt and the other from the Caesarea region.
VARIANT D

“FAYUM-TYPE” LATE PIRIFORM LAMPS: DEGENERATE FAÇADE WITH A CROSS UNDER AN ARCH ON TWO COLUMNS

The motif of variant A has a very synthetic survival form in Egypt, on two known lamps: the first found at Karanis [Cat. 90] and the second one preserved in the Anawati Collection [Cat. 91]. Contrary to Shier’s dating of the Karanis lamp (late 3rd to 4th century AD, where however all the timeframes proposed for lamps are to be taken very carefully), this very poorly executed piriform type becomes popular only in a very late period before the Islamic invasion, hence from the late 6th to the 7th century AD.

CHRONOLOGICAL AND ICONOGRAPHIC ISSUES

An intermittent heated debate has concerned the temple-façade iconography and its first appearance, as well as the particular lamp types associated with this imagery. A date for the introduction of the motif on a specific lamp type, variant A, in the second half of the 5th century AD has been set by recent stratigraphic excavations in Dobroega. The last lamps of this kind seem to have been produced in the end of the 6th or even the beginning of the 7th century AD, regardless of the motif variant, whether elegant or “decomposed” (final period corresponding to the production of the poorly-attested Fayum derivative, that is, variant D).

The motif adorning variant A then appeared on the “Caesarea-type” lamps (variant C), attested first in the end of the 5th century AD. It would go on to be reproduced on the “Samian” or Asia Minor type (variant B), generally assigned by researchers to the second half of the 6th century AD, as attested by artifacts from Rhodos. Hence, the floruit of all types was in the 6th century, and their disappearance at the end of the same century with a handful of later exceptions.

The many interpretations of the depiction need not to be discussed again here: as a matter of fact, with the exception of the Chersonesos synagogue and the Saraçhane church, no lamp with a known context appears to be provenanced from a sacred/cultic place or cemetery. The motif was obviously very popular among all segments of the population irrespective of individual faith (whether Jewish or Christian) and the significance attributed to a lamp by its owner.

Last but not least, only three lamps are clearly Christian, and all are from Egypt: the two Fayum lamps (variant D) having the cross between or under the arch and the amazing lamp from Muenster [Cat. 88], which has the most complex and careful rendering, four columns instead of two, where the cross plays a primary role, places as it is under the center arch.

Summing up the different interpretations, the simplest and most neutral is Bailey’s who saw it simply as arches adorned with bunches of grapes, while Hayes (1992) interpreted the theme as a “baldacchino” supported on four columns, “sometimes
resembling a crude diademed head in frontal view”. A similar interpretation was proposed by Abadie-Reynal, who saw it as a (holy) baldachin or canopy. Oziol considered the theme as associated with the symbols used by the clergy of Antioch, i.e., the stylized grapevine under the arch, which sanctifies the depiction and above all the lamp itself (as the symbol of Canaan and of the Blood of the Christ). According to Zalesskaâ, the stylized façade represents a martyrrium with a baptismal font in front of it (the triangle adorned with dots), or it could be a depiction of the sacred Christian myth of the “Fountain of Life”. For Lapp, it is the niche in the synagogue (bema) where the rolls of the Torah are kept in a chest, i.e., the teva, sometimes also called aron, the arch. Finally, for Michael Grünbart, the Egyptian lamp with a cross under the arch should be identified as the Chapel (Aedicule) built in Jerusalem by the Empress Helena, wife of Constantine the Great, as the “tomb of Christ”, while the single or double motif in front of the building should represent the monumental fence built around the monument to emphasize its importance.

Fig. 4. Four examples of late Egyptian Selesnow Type 2b lamps from the Bouvier Collection (After Chrzanowski 2019: 353–354, 655. Cat. 601, 602, 603, 604)
Starting with the most widespread type (variant A), it is no wonder that Bailey attributed it at first glance to Egypt, especially as the two lamps preserved in the British Museum have a fabric and slip of very high quality, similar to some Alexandrian products. The unique double bunch of grapes (instead of one) on the Muenster lamp, which is said to be from Egypt, demonstrates the creativity of the southern Mediterranean workshops, exemplified also by a doubling of the number of columns and the addition of a cross.

Bailey certainly noted the affinity of these lamps with so-called Coptic ovoid lamps with tiny tape handles added at the back, known as Selesnow’s Abu Mena 2b type (a subtype of ovoid lamps with the conical-molded handle replaced by an applied round one) and its derivatives, made in the Abu Mena ateliers as well as other Egyptian workshops in the 6th century AD (Selesnow 1988: 70; Chrzanovski 2013: 182–183, Type 2.b.3) [Fig. 4].

Consequently, while the earliest attestations of the motif, but rendered upside down (that is, toward the handle), which would go on to conquer the Pontic region, seem now to be an invention of the workshops at Caesarea (variant C, the earliest), the shape circulating in the northern part of the Empire may well be from Egypt, witnessing a rapid adoption of the Levantine motif by Alexandrian workshops and the subsequent influence exerted by their products on the Constantinopolitan producers. In addition, almost all the cities where lamps of this kind were made also delivered clay pilgrimage flasks and other paraphernalia brought from the holiest Coptic places, like the Saint Menas sanctuary in Abu Mena, witness to an awareness of the mainstream themes produced in Egypt, on the Black Sea and Danubian cities.

In conclusion, in variant A we are dealing with the same phenomenon that resulted in a similar mistake that many researchers have made with the so-called Balkan lamps, distributed in precisely the same way as this type, with some additional findspots in Asia Minor, including the Yassi Ada shipwreck. For an obscure reason, nobody has thought to compare the lychnological economy of the “Golden Age” of Rome and the one of late antique Alexandria, Constantinople and Antioch, the three biggest cities of the Empire at the time.

Five centuries earlier, a multitude of Italian officinae worked for the sole purpose of supplying Rome and, by dint of extensive distribution, influenced the rest of the Empire by their creativity and their impressive range of scenes and motifs—Northern African workshops first as well as the Western Mediterranean region, the Eastern Mediterranean having already been conquered by other skilled factories, such as the one of Romansis or the Knidian and Corinthian lamp industries to name just a few examples.

After the fall of Rome and the Western Roman Empire, power shifted to Constantinople, where all of the new fashions and trends were introduced regardless of origin. Obviously, some of them boomed. Naturally, natives of the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, as
well as the Black Sea littoral, the customers and hence the local artisans, retained a secular tradition of balancing between the adoption of artifacts and themes imported from the main centers and their own inventions. The lamp industry is an excellent reflection of these trends.

To conclude, this first and well attested variant is best considered as a “Constantinopolitan-type” Hayes 8 form with local derivatives, avoiding with regard to Egypt the kind of mythology that surrounds the “Balkan lamps”. That mythology draws upon two elements: first, that 30 molds were found in the 1940s at the fortress of Kranevo near Varna and, second, that the locally-made lamps of this type were hugely appreciated in the Western Pontic region. In the case of Kranevo, it was a sacred place with a holy cathedral surrounded by a citadel built by Justinian and manned by a military unit, hence deserving to receive special goods from the capital, including molds for making their own lamps (and recently published, Kuzmanov and Minčev 2018: Nos 957–993, Pls LXVI–LXIX). Keeping this in mind, the so-called “Balkan lamps” should correctly be designated as a “Constantinopolitan” Hayes 11 type with locally-made derivatives. Not the least because the term “Balkans” has no place in modern academia, being mainly a consequence of World War I campaign terminology, covering all of the “peninsula” from Pannonia to continental Greece. This geographical-historical definition, which is dedicated to all of the former Yugoslav republics, Albania, a small part of western Bulgaria and a part of continental Greece, cannot be used for the European part of Turkey, Bulgaria and Romania.
CATALOG

Lamps with illustration and/or description, consisting of inventory number and collection (if present), condition and dimensions, fabric, proposed dating and references to parallels.

1. **Northern Pontic area: Chersonesos:**
   - Ermitage lamp 1
     - Fragment; L. 9.5; W. 6.2; H. 3.2 cm
     - Red clay, no slip
     - 6th century AD
     - Zalesskaâ 2006: 168, No. 337 = Zalesskaâ 1988: 235, Fig. 1

2. **Northern Pontic area:** Ermitage lamp 2
   - Fragment: L. max. 7.4; W. max. 3.3; H. 3.5 cm
   - Red clay, no slip
   - 6th century AD
   - Zalesskaâ 2006: 169, No. 338

3. **Northern Pontic area:** Ermitage lamp 3
   - L. max. 7.5; W. max. 5.5; H. 3.5 cm
   - Red clay, no slip
   - 6th century AD

4. **Northern Pontic area:** Ermitage lamp 4
   - Intact; L. 9.5; W. 5.9; H. 4.8 cm
   - Red clay, no slip
   - 6th century AD
   - Zalesskaâ 2006: 169, No. 340

5. **Northern Pontic area:** Ermitage lamp 5
   - Intact; L. 9.5; W. 5.9; H. 4.5 cm
   - Red clay, no slip
   - 6th century AD

6. **Taman Peninsula: Il’ichevskaya fortress**
   - Reddish-grey, no slip
     - 5th to 6th century AD
     - Ustaeva and Žuravlev 2010: 88, Fig. 43; Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 287, Fig. 7

7. **Chersonesos:** Inv. 57/37080 (excavations of M.I. Zolotarev)
   - Intact, broken central part of discus
   - L. 10.3; W. 7.3; H. 2.7 (4.4 cm with handle)
   - Red clay, no slip
   - Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 297, Fig. 20,4
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8. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 1179 (old excavations, unknown find spot)
   Intact, lost handle and broken discus
   L. 10.2; W. 7.4; H. 3.4 cm (preserved)
   Red clay, no slip
   Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.10

9. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 16258 (excavations of K.K. Kostúško-Valúžinič, before 1907)
   Rear part of lamp, with handle
   L. 6.1; W. 5.6 (preserved); H. 4.2 cm (including handle)
   Red clay, no slip
   Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.5

10. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 1177 (old excavations, unknown find spot)
    Discus fragment; L. 5.0; W. 5.2 cm
    Red clay, no slip

11. **Chersonesos** (old excavations, unknown find spot)
    Rear part of lamp, with handle
    L. 4.7; W. 5.4 (preserved); H. 4.0 cm (with handle)
    Red clay, no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.11

12. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 16387 (excavations of K.K. Kostúško-Valúžinič, before 1907)
    Discus and nozzle fragment; L. 7.1; W. 3.7; H. 2.2 cm (preserved)
    Red clay, no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.7

13. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 3435/08 (excavations of R.K. Loeper, 1908, cistern of the 1977 basilica)
    Discus fragment; L. 5.6; W. 4.0; H. 1.1 cm (preserved)
    Reddish yellow (6/6 5YR) clay, no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.8

14. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 16347 (excavations of K.K. Kostúško-Valúžinič, before 1907)
    Left and rear part of lamp, with handle
    L. 6.2; W. 4.7; H. 2.8 cm (preserved)
    Red clay, no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.1

15. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 4031/08 (excavations of R.K. Loeper, 1908, cistern of the 1977 basilica)
    Intact except for broken handle
    L. 9.8; W. 6.6; H. 3.6 cm (preserved)
    Reddish yellow (7/6 7.5YR), no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.6

16. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 3763/08 (same as Cat. 15)
    Intact except for broken discus
    L. 9.4; W. 6.5; H. 3.1 cm
    Pink (8/4 7.5YR) clay, no slip

17. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 8630 (old excavations, unknown find spot)
    Intact, except for handle and broken discus; L. 8.9; W. 6.0; H. 3.4 cm (preserved)
    Red clay, no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.9

18. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 16482 (old excavations, unknown find spot)
    Intact except for area around filling hole;
    L. 10.6; W. 7.0; H. 3.4 (4.7 cm with handle)
    Red clay, no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.2

19. **Chersonesos**: Inv. 16455 (excavations of K.K. Kostúško-Valúžinič, before 1907)
    Fragment; nozzle and main part of discus lost; L. 8.3 (preserved); W. 6.7; H. 3.0 (4.4 cm with handle)
    Red clay, no slip
    Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.12
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20. Chersonesos: Inv. 71/37084 (excavation of M.I. Zolotarev 1984. Quarter 6, room 1)
Fragment, handle and rear part lost; L. 8.6; W. 6.5; H. 2.8 cm
Clay reddish yellow (7/6 5YR), no slip
Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 298, Fig. 20.3

21. Chersonesos
No description, dimensions or fabric given
Kobyliina 1978: 160, Pl. 27

22–23. Chersonesos
Two fragments, no description given
Kadeev and Soročan 1985: Fig. 1

Fragment; L. 7.3; W. 6.8; H. 2.0 cm (preserved)
Light orange clay, orange slip
6th century AD
Ušakov and Žuravlev 2014: 294, Fig. 17

Almost intact; L. 10.7; W. 7.2; H. 3.8 cm
Light orange clay, orange to brick slip
6th century AD

26. Olbia
Intact; L. 9.0; W. 6.7; H. 3.1 cm
Red clay with lime and mica inclusions, no slip
4th century AD
Kobyliina 1978: 161, Pl. 28 = Levina 1992: 78, No. 201, Pl. 9.75

27. Odessa Museum (not illustrated)
Unknown provenance
Intact; L. 7.7; W. 6.5; H. 2.6 cm
Light brown clay with mica, no slip
Levina 1992: 85, No. 226, Pl. 11.88

28. Halmyris: Inv. 51551
Intact; L. 9.50; W. 6.36; H. 3.09 (4.40 cm with handle)
Fine, reddish brown clay, glossy slip
End of 5th century AD
Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

29. Halmyris
Fragment; L. max. 8.02; H. 3.09 cm
Brick to orange clay, no slip
First half of 6th century AD
Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

30. Halmyris
Fragment; L. max. 8.31 cm
Brick to orange clay, no slip
First half of 6th century AD
Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

31. Halmyris
Fragment; L. max. 3.68; H. max. 1.72; 3.14 cm with handle
Reddish brown clay, dark red slip
Second half of 5th century AD
Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

32. Halmyris
Fragment; L. max. 3.55; H. max. 1.38, 2.48 cm with handle
Reddish brown clay, dark orange slip
End of 5th to beginning of 6th century AD
Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu
33. Halmyris
   Fragment; L. max. 5.14 cm
   Reddish brown clay, dark red slip
   End of 6th to early 7th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

34. Halmyris
   Fragment; L. 4.04; H. max. 1.54, 2.77 cm
   with handle
   Reddish brown clay, grey slip
   6th to 7th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

35. Halmyris
   Fragment; L. max. 6.87; H. max. 3.26, 4.13 cm with handle
   Reddish brown clay, no slip
   6th to 7th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

36. Halmyris
   Fragment; L. max. 3.02; H. max. 3.35 cm
   Light orange; clay, dark orange slip
   6th to 7th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

37. Halmyris
   Fragment; L. max. 4.88; H. max. 3.40 cm
   Light orange clay, dark orange slip
   7th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of F. Topoleanu

38. Halmyris
   Fragment; L. max. 4.8 cm
   Fine, reddish brown clay, glossy slip
   Second half of 5th century AD
   Topoleanu 2000: 180–181, No. 459

39. (L)ibida
   Upper part of lamp, with handle; L. max. 4.55; H. max. 3.35 cm
   Light to dark brownish orange clay with calcareous inclusions, no slip
   6th century AD
   Nuţu and Mihăilescu Bîrliba 2019: Pl. 3

40. (L)ibida
   Upper part of the lamp, with handle; L. max. 3.90; H. max. 2.92 cm
   Light to dark brownish orange clay with calcareous inclusions, no slip
   6th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of Florin Topoleanu

41. (L)ibida
   Side of lamp; not completely fired; L. max. 3.46; H. max. 1.39 cm
   Light to dark brownish orange clay with calcareous inclusions, no slip
   6th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of Florin Topoleanu

42. (L)ibida
   Upper right part of lamp; L. max. 8.46; H. max. 2.13 cm
   Light to dark brownish orange clay with calcareous inclusions, no slip
   6th century AD
   Unpublished, courtesy of Florin Topoleanu

43. Argamum
   Upper part of lamp with handle; L. max. 4.50; H. max. 2.97 cm
   Light to dark brownish orange clay with calcareous and mica inclusions, no slip
   6th century AD
   Courtesy of Florin Topoleanu (2000: 181)

44. Argamum
   Part of the discus and beginning of nozzle; fired incompletely; L. max. 5.24; H. max. 1.98 cm
   Light to dark brownish orange clay with calcareous and mica inclusions, no slip
   6th century AD
   Courtesy of Florin Topoleanu (2000: 181)
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45. Argamum: Inv. 43900
   Complete; L. 9.3; W. 6.80; H. 2.75/3.90 cm
   Light to dark brownish orange clay with calcareous and mica inclusions, no slip
   6th century AD
   Courtesy of F. Topoleanu (2000: 181)

46. Sacidava
   No description
   Scorpan 1978: 159, No. 12, Pl. III/12

47. Capidava
   Fragment; L. max. 5.9; H. max. 1.60 cm
   Opriș 2003: 172, No. 425, Pl. LXII

48. Capidava
   Fragment; L. max. 5.6; H. max. 2.00 cm
   Opriș 2003: 172, No. 426

49. Ulmetum
   No description
   Pârvan 1913: Pl. XXXI, Fig. 31, No. 11

50. Novae
   No description
   Čičikova 1999: 106–107 and Fig. 3

51. Sucidava
   Intact except for broken discus and base;
   L. 9.5; W. 6.4; H. 4.4 cm
   Red clay, red slip
   6th century AD
   Gherghe and Cojoc 2011: 97, No. 171, Pl. 48, Fig. 165

52. Sadovets
   Intact (no description)
   AD 527–602 and slightly later, based on associated coin finds
   Welkov 1935: 156, Pl. 20, Fig. 2:7

53. Sirmium
   Fragment; L. max. 5.8; H. 3.1 cm
   Dark red clay, no slip
   3rd and 4th century AD (proposed after near parallels of Pannonian lamps)
   Rubright 1973: 59, No. 54, Pl. V

54. Bulgaria, National Museum
   Intact; L. 9.4; W. 7.7; H. 3.2 cm
   Red clay, brownish red slip
   6th century AD
   Kuzmanov 1992: 40, No. 296

55. Varna, Roman baths
   Intact; L. 9.5; W. 6.2; H. 3.0 cm
   Light orange clay, red slip
   6th century AD
   Kuzmanov and Minčev 2018: 144, No. 716, Pl. XLI

56. Varna, near Roman baths (Caribrodska street with Vapčarov street)
   Intact; L. 9.5; W. 6.2; H. 2.8 cm
   Brick clay, no slip
   6th century AD
   Kuzmanov and Minčev 2018: 145, No. 717, Pl. XLI

57. Varna, Roman baths
   Fragment; L. 9.5; W. 6.5 cm
   Brick clay, no slip
   6th century AD

58. Varna, near Roman baths (Vapčarov street)
   Intact; L. 8.2; W. 5.8; H. 2.9 cm
   Brick clay, no slip
   6th century AD
   Kuzmanov and Minčev 2018: 144, No. 719, Pl. XLI
59. Anchialos
   Fragment; L. max. 6.0; W. max. 6.0 cm
   Red clay, no slip
   5th to 6th century AD
   Rusev 2015: 96–97, No. 73, Pl. XIX

60. Anchialos
   Fragment; L. max. 5.50; W. max. 6.43;
   H. max. 2.70 cm
   Red clay, no slip
   5th to 6th century AD
   Rusev 2015: 96–97, No. 74

61. Akra
   Fragment; L. 8.9; W. max. 5.8; H. max. 4.0 cm
   Orange-red clay, red slip
   After the 4th century AD, locally made
   Mutafčieva 2013: 148, No. 6

62. Akra
   Fragment; L. max. 6.5; W. max. 6.1; H. max. 4.1 cm
   Orange-red clay, red slip
   After the 4th century AD, locally made
   Mutafčieva 2013: 148, No. 7

63. Akra
   Fragment; L. 6.8 cm; W. max. 4.6; H. max. 2.2 cm
   Orange-red clay, red slip
   After the 4th century AD, locally made
   Mutafčieva 2013: 148, No. 8

64. Constantinople–Saraçhane
   Intact; L. 8.9; W. 7.0 cm
   Hard brick clay, rather metallic purplish-red slip
   6th century AD
   Hayes 1992: 85, No. 34

65. Constantinople–Saraçhane
   Intact; L. 8.9; W. 7.0 cm
   Hard brick clay, red to brown slip
   Early 6th century AD
   Hayes 1992: 85, No. 35

66. Constantinople–Saraçhane
   Fragment; L. max. 9.44; W. 7.7 cm
   Reddish clay and slip
   6th century AD
   Hayes 1992: 85, No. 36
67. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Intact; L. 9.65; W. 6.3 cm
Soft orange clay, orange slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 85, No. 37

68. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Intact; L. 9.7; W. 6.7 cm
Reddish clay and slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 85, No. 38

69. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Fragment; L. max. 9.0; W. 6.6 cm
Orange clay, brownish varnish-like slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 85, No. 39

70. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Fragment; L. max. 10.0; W. 7.1 cm
Pinkish orange clay, orange slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 86, No. 40

71. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Fragment; L. max. 8.8; W. 5.8 cm
Dull purplish-red clay and slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 86, No. 41
72. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Fragment; L. max. 8.3; W. 5.75 cm
Orange clay, worn orange-brown slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 86, No. 42

73. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Intact; L. 9.6; W. 6.3 cm
Reddish clay, worn orange-brown slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 86, No. 43

74. Constantinople–Saraçhane
Intact; L. 9.3; W. 5.9 cm
Orange clay and slip
6th century AD
Hayes 1992: 86, No. 44

75. Akçakoca
Intact; L. 8.5; W. 5.1; H. 4.0 cm
Red 2.5 YR 5/7 clay with fine lime inclusions
6th century AD
Okan and Önemli 2017: 95–96 and Fig. 5,E, p. 105

76. Hadrianopolis: domus, room 6, level 1, found in 2007
Discus and nozzle fragment; mouldmade; convex shoulder, flat discus
L. max. 5.5; W. max. 3.8; H. max. 1.1 cm
Non-porous, fine, light red clay (2.5YR 6/8) with some tiny lime and sand inclusions; light red slip (10R 6/6) on exterior and interior
Late 6th century AD
Laflı and Kan Şahin 2013: 373, 375, No. 22, Pl. 6/22

77. Hadrianopolis: domus, found in 2007
Discus and nozzle fragment; L. max. 6.4; W. max. 4.4; H. max. 1.0 cm
Fine, light red clay (2.5YR 6/8), frequent mica and lime inclusions; light reddish brown slip (2.5YR 6/4) inside and out
Late 6th century AD
Laflı and Kan Şahin 2013: 373, No. 23, 376, Pl. 6/23
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78. Thasos
Intact; L. 10.4; H. 3.1 cm
Orange clay, no slip
Abadie-Reynal and Sodini 1992: 75–76, L 51

79. Hadrianoupolis (Edirne)
Fragment, bottom lost, nozzle broken;
L. max. 9.2; W. 6.3; H. max. 2.4 cm
Light red clay, red slip
5th to 6th century AD
Dagli 2008: 152, No. 224, Fig. 237, Pl. 57

80. Greek East or the Balkans: British Museum
Intact, broken handle; L. 10.2 cm; W. 8.1 cm
Orange clay, no slip
6th century AD
Bailey 1988: 415, Q 3309, Fig. 58, Pl. 122

81. Greek East or the Balkans: British Museum
L. 9.4; W. 7.2 cm
Orange-red clay, no slip
6th century AD
Bailey 1988: 415, Q 3310, Fig. 58, Pl. 122

82. Cyprus, National Museum
Damaged, lost handle and nozzle termination; parts restored; L. 11.0; W. 7.7; H. 3.3 cm
Salmon reddish clay, red-to-dark orange slip
Oziol 1977: 276–277, No. 837, Pl. VII

83. Byblos
No description; illustrated in Sussman 2017: 200

84. Egypt(?): Kaufman collection
No description
Kaufman 2012: 258, No. 931

85. Alexandria(?)
Intact; L. 11.0; W. 7.3; H. 3.5 cm
Dark red clay, no slip
86. Alexandria (?) (not illustrated)
   Fragment; L. max. 2.25 cm
   Dark red clay, no slip
   Bernhard 1955: 337–338, No. 357

87. Egypt
   Damaged, handle and nozzle termination missing; L. max. 7.1; W. 6.8; H. 3.5 cm
   Dark red clay, red slip
   Michelucci 1975: 110, No. 378

88. Egypt: Archäologisches Museum der WWU Muenster
   Intact; L. 10; H. 2.3 cm
   Dark red clay, red to dark brown slip
   Second half of 6th century AD
   Grünbart 2012: Cat. 188, No. 69; https://westfalen.museum-digital.de/index.php?t=objet&amp;oges=354

89. Egypt: Auction Zürich 2010
   Intact; L. 11; W. 7.7 cm
   Light salmon red clay, white cream slip
   https://auction.catawiki.com/kavels/11169995-roman-egyptian-oil-lamp-with-columns-l-11-cm

90. Egypt
   Intact; L. 9.0; W. 6.3; H. 2.9 cm
   Burnished red clay, no slip
   3rd to 4th century AD (dating by the authors)
   Shier 1978: 78, No. 422, PIs 7 and 45

91. Egypt
   Intact; L. 11.4; W. 7.9; H. 4.4 (6.4 cm with handle)
   Dark red clay, white cream-green slip
   Djuric 1995: C239, p. 78
POST SCRIPTUM

Just before this article went to print, the authors were informed of a forthcoming publication by a friend and colleague, Ioan Carol Opriș, professor at the University of Bucharest, to be published in the online quarterly Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology (www.jaha.org.ro) (Opriș forthcoming).

With his usual kindness, Ioan shared with us his point of view and the objectives of his research: the importance of the *annona* maritime route within the *Quaestura Justiniana exercitus* for the main Pontic urban settlements and the growing importance of the representations of the Holy Sepulcher aedicule in the same period that our lamps were produced, a proposal of iconographic identification of the motif he reached after carefully reexamining all the hypotheses written in earlier studies on the meaning of this discus decoration.

His proposal fits in very well with the devotion for the holiest of all Christian buildings, as stated in the *Peregrinatio Egeriae*, a text written around AD 380: “Now at the tenth hour, which they call here λυχνικόν or as we say lucernare, all the people assemble at the Anastasis in the same manner, and all the candles and tapers are lit, making a very great light. Now the light is not introduced from without, but it is brought forth from within the rails, where a lamp is always burning day and night, and the vesper psalms and antiphons are said, lasting for a considerable time” (translation: The Pilgrimage of Etheria, II.24, McClure M. L.; Feltoe C. L. eds. and trads., London 1919).

Opriș’ research tackles the very topics the authors decided to avoid in this article, focusing instead on a study of individual lamps belonging to the individual groups. Once the two papers are published, there is no doubt that they will complement one another to build a complete framework for further studies.

Parallel work on Bulgarian material for the study of lamps found at Novae in Bulgaria gave Chrzanovski the opportunity to inspect a unique local imitation of the Asia-Minor type, of unknown provenience, kept at the Museum of Varna (Kuzmanov and Minčev 2018: 118, No. 525, Pl. XVIII) [Fig. 5]. The lamp is yet more proof of the appreciation for the motif, which was depicted in a fairly simplified way on a local derivative of an Asia-Minor type lamp, so commonly made and found in the Lower Danube area.

Fig. 5. Lamp from the Varna Regional Museum (After Kuzmanov and Minčev 2018: Pl. XVIII)
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