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The figure-engraved glasses described in this catalogue were acquired between 1881 and 1959. Three of them (cat. nos. 1, 6, 13) came from the Jules Charvet collection, purchased and presented to the Metropolitan Museum in 1881 by the then trustee H. G. Marquand. Six others (cat. nos. 4, 5, 7, 9, 14) were part of the Julien Gréau collection, purchased by J. Pierpont Morgan and later lent to the Museum in 1910 and then bequeathed to it in 1917. This gave the Metropolitan the largest holding of ancient glass in the United States at the time.

Many pieces in the Gréau collection, including engraved ones, were sold in 1928. This sale, or “de-accessioning” in museum parlance, very controversial at the time, was meant to “dispose of surplus material.” It also unfortunately deprived the Museum of many engraved fragments which, in the light of later discoveries, would be quite interesting today. It is difficult to know what exactly were the criteria of which to keep and which to sell; the state of preservation of the vases more than the interest of the iconography seems to have been the guiding principle.

The other glasses (cat. nos. 2, 3, 8, 10, 11) were acquired from dealers, directly or through agents; one was discovered during the Museum’s excavations in Egypt (cat. no. 12).

Of all these, only one (cat. no. 8) comes from a known findspot, and a poorly documented one at that, a grave in Sicily. The other objects discovered with it are now lost; some were not even inventoried. It will therefore be important to find comparaanda so as to gather more information on the dating and the probable origin of each glass.

Molded and polished glass decorated with lathe-cut grooves appeared in the third century B.C.;7 glass adorned with engraved figures is attested only much later, from the first century A.D. onward, first in the eastern provinces of the Roman world. This production—which must be distinguished from relief-cut glass, that is, glassware adorned with carving in relief, such as cameo glass—is at first modest. The origin of this craft is probably a belated application of the already ancient art of the gem cutter. The oldest known figure-engraved vases, dating from the first to the early second century A.D., are generally molded and polished and then figure-engraved. The ornamentation of these early pieces is usually simple.

It is pertinent to mention here vases of obsidian, engraved and then inlaid with glass. Obsidian (a natural volcanic glass) had been used for tools and jewelry since Paleolithic times, and it was always the object of a brisk trade. But glass-inlaid obsidian vases in shapes reminiscent of early engraved glass—skyphoi, shallow bowls, and plates (Figure 1)—appeared only between the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. Indeed, the oldest figure-engraved glass we know of (Figure 2) is a translucent green handled bowl with inlaid engraving; it would therefore seem that the early engraved-glass industry was at first a derivative or an imitation of costlier obsidian vases; but this fact should not be stretched too far, since none of the other early engraved glasses I know of were inlaid and green-colored. The obsidian industry could be of Egyptian origin, just as the early engraved glasses were.

Production of engraved glass apparently increased in the third and fourth centuries A.D.; most of it seems by then concentrated in the western provinces, especially the Rhine area, Great Britain, and Italy. It is possible to classify most of these finds by “workshops.” A workshop, in this context and throughout this study, is a group of vases of contemporaneous shape and exhibiting the same engraving techniques and a similar composition of the design. The simplicity of the tools used by the engravers allowed them to travel from one center to another in search of patrons, which explains in part the wide distribution of several workshops.
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The notes for this article begin on page 46.
The method used by the engravers was probably, as we have seen, akin to the craft of the gem cutter. R. J. Charleston has gathered what little data there is pertaining to this question; he pointed out that no engraving tool has ever been discovered (or identified as such) so far. These tools were probably lathes powered by means of a bow to which an assortment of bronze wheels and points could be fitted. They were very likely used in conjunction with an abrasive, such as sand mixed with water. Depending on the width and diameter of the wheel and the pressure applied to the glass, the artist could trace a mere abrasion on the surface of the vase or leave a relatively deep cut in a certain shape. It is possible that superficial detail may have been added by hand. The one capital archaeological document is the representation of a lathe on a gem cutter’s headstone (Figure 3). Nothing of importance can be added to Charleston’s conclusions.

This is a technically simple method, but it demands great patience and skill. The finest pieces probably took weeks to finish, and one understands the despair of the artisan who lost a vase trying to do too much.

The mention of glassware is common enough in ancient literature, but its description is often vague and misleading. It is usually difficult (if not impossible) to know with certainty whether one deals with lathe-cut, figure-engraved, mold-blown, or cameo glass, or even cut rock crystal or obsidian for that matter. Here is a quick overview of the texts that may or may not have a connection to engraved glass.

An excerpt of Pliny the Elder (A.D. 23–79), "Some are wheel-made, others wrought as silver vessels," probably applies to molded and lathe-polished vases, still popular in Pliny’s time; our catalogue number 1 would be a good example of this kind of ware. And the vases destroyed by the overeager engraver mentioned earlier are possibly, in Martial’s mind, relief-cut or cameo vases. When he emphasizes elsewhere the low mercantile value of wrought glasses, these are certainly mold-blown vases, which were by then mass produced. A poem of the Greek Anthology describing a "wrought crystal" likely refers to an engraved glass, according to Trowbridge, but in this particular case her solution would be anachronistic because the poem is probably too early. A papyrus of early Christian date mentions the use of goat’s blood to soften crystal and glass; but the purpose of this operation is not known, nor whether the glass was then engraved.

The “glass that has been mined” mentioned by the novelist Achilles Tatius could have been engraved,
but the expression used to describe it is more reminiscent of openwork cage-cups, which were quite literally excavated in a very thick blank.

Dom Leclercq believed that two passages in Tertullian (ca. 160–ca. 240) described glass cups engraved with the figure of Christ; but Tertullian never actually mentioned what these vases were made of; they might have been of clay, metal, or wood, for all we know. Besides, if the use of glass objects in the liturgy is known from the third century onward, it is never said that such objects are engraved or in any way adorned; the use of glass patens during the pontificate of Zephyrinus (199–217), for instance, is alluded to in the Liber pontificalis, and Jerome (ca. 347–420) praises the simplicity of the use of the glass chalice. But, again, nothing in these texts (or their contexts) allows one to see in them ornate, expensive objects. The only exception I know of is a “chalice of crystal of admirable beauty” mentioned by Gregory of Tours (ca. 538–ca. 594), and then it was quite possibly made of rock crystal. Finally, the following statement in Quintilian (ca. 35–ca. 95), “The art of engraving includes wood, ivory, marble, glass, precious stones,” very likely applies to sculpture in relief. There is not much to draw from it.

As far as I know, there are only four passages in classical literature describing what is almost certainly engraved glass. The first appears in the Digest: “If you gave a vase to be cut, and if it breaks because of the engraver’s carelessness, the latter is responsible; but if it breaks not because of carelessness but because of defective workmanship, he is not responsible.”

The legislator uses the word diatretum, “engraved,” hence diatretarius, which means “engraver,” of intaglio, relief, or open-work glass; the same law expounded here probably applied to every kind of wrought glass. One can always argue that natural rock crystal (or obsidian) rather than glass is meant here, but it is hardly possible to argue that obsidian or rock crystal can have “defective workmanship” (rimas vitiosas), whereas artificial glass can.

This text (which is included in a legal code because the case certainly reappeared in court a number of times) is interesting. We can see that, in this case, the customer could himself supply the glass to be engraved. On the other hand, the engraver could commission the vitriarius (glassmaker) to supply him with a number of unadorned glasses, of a convenient shape and thickness. Be that as it may, we understand here that the glassblower is independent of the engraver. There probably was not too close a collaboration between engraver and glassblower.

Claudian (ca. 365–408) three times mentions glass globes upon which stars and constellations are pictured. These are not natural rock crystal globes filled with water, as Trowbridge rightly noticed; it was technically much easier for the glassworkers to “fire-close” a small aperture in the wall of a glass globe after filling it with water. As far as I know, no object of this kind has yet been discovered, but colorless, glassy-looking globes symbolizing the universe do appear in Roman art.

Much importance has been given to the literary sources describing Alexandria as an important glassworks center. It was, at a given point in time, but most of these references are anterior to the apogee of the figure-engraved glass industry in the third and fourth centuries. Engravers certainly did work in Alexandria, but there is no evidence that it remained a major center of this particular trade in late antiquity.

The subjects on engraved glass are indifferently pagan or Christian. Many of these are repetitive and betray the influence of sketchbooks that patrons might have consulted before commissioning an engraved vase. The accompanying inscriptions show that they were sometimes meant as gifts. They were sometimes commissioned by very wealthy patrons, or by some imperial administration, in order to commemorate an important celebration, such as the vicennalia (twenty years of rule) of an emperor or the nomination to office of a high-ranking civil servant. Some of the finest pieces were obviously distributed as gifts (missoria) by the grantees of these offices, often members of the highest families of the empire, during such a celebration. In these cases, the influence of official and monumental art (ivory diptychs, silverware, mosaics, sarcophagi) is sometimes visible in the composition.
As we saw earlier, according to the surviving literature, very poor Christian communities used glass vases, most probably unadorned, because they could hardly afford the service of a *diatretarius.* But was engraved glass ever used by some communities, as several archaeologists have suggested? As far as I know, only one such glass has been found within the ruins of a church, a tall bottle (Figure 4), which could hardly have been used in the liturgy and was already broken when interred in the grave, as its fragmentary state shows. Besides, it is difficult to explain why any liturgical vase would end up in a grave. So while engraved-glass vases with Christian motifs were indeed commissioned by Christian patrons, there is no compelling reason to suppose that the same vases were used for the liturgy.

**CATALOGUE**

*Editor's note: All dates, unless specified, are A.D.; all vases are described from the outside; all dimensions are given in centimeters. H.=height, L.=length, W.=width, Diam.=diameter.*

**Cat. no. 1** (Figures 5–7). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 81.10.237. Ex coll. Charvet; gift of H. G. Marquand. Cast and polished, colorless, hexagonal bowl with a hexagonal base and long, wide, flat handles, pierced near the rim; two joined fragments; part of wall and rim missing; rim chipped in places. Purchased in Italy. L. 14.3; W. 8.1; H. 2.7.

Twin buds at the end of a single stem on the flat handles and a vine scroll on the rim. On the interior of the center of the vase, a lozenge with buds at the angles and a cross inscribed within a circle in its center. The engraving, except for the inner lozenge, is clean, wide, and shallow.

**Date:** ca. 100–150.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Froehner, *Collection Charvet*, p. 95 n. 1 and fig. on p. 107.

Cast and polished glass vases of this shape, usually unadorned, have been found in Germany and Gaul, northern Italy, the Iberian Peninsula, and Mauretania Tingitana. But the best parallel remains a small fragment of unknown origin in the Toledo Museum of Art. They obviously imitate metallic models, a large number of which still exist. The exact origin of the shape is uncertain. Alarcão believed that Cologne could have been a center of fabrication, and that is a possibility; but this Germanic production itself could also originate from Italy. The method of manufacture makes them early pieces.

**Cat. no. 2** (Figures 8–12). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 59.11.14. Ex coll. R. W. Smith; Fletcher Fund, 1959. Free-blown colorless beaker, rounded rim; twelve joined fragments; part of the body missing. H. 10.8; Diam. 9.9.
Figures 8–11. Beaker (cat. no. 2), early 2nd–4th century. H. 10.8 cm, Diam. 9.9 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1959, 59.11.14

Figure 12. Drawing of cat. no. 2 (Elizabeth Wahle)
In the middle of the body, a quadriga is pictured very schematically on a lathe-cut ground line underlined by hatching; the chariot is depicted as a simple obtuse angle perched on a wheel with uneven spokes. The charioteer also is sketchily rendered, kneeling on the chariot and holding the reins with one hand and (apparently) a whip with the other, outstretched hand. His head is a simple, squarish silhouette. The horses are better executed; the first one is rendered in three-quarter view, its forelegs extended forward. A plume is visible between its ears. The three other horses are identical protomes sketched one in front of the other. Six crude hind legs are pictured underneath the first horse.

Behind the quadriga stands a small, latticed, triple-gabled structure (a spina?) with a palm next to it; in front of the quadriga remain the upper parts of two squarish figures between palm branches. The first one holds in his outstretched hand an unidentified object. Their features are barely visible. Widely spaced hatching appears on the lower part of the body. Under the rim, between two lathe-cut fillets, an inscription reads:

EYTYY[I] EIEI HC APEΘOYCIMOC NΙLOC ΠΥΡΙΝΟYC

(EUTUKI... EIEI...ES ARETHOUSIMOS NILOS PURIPNOUS)

This would be the name of the charioteer, followed by the names of the four horses. I do not know why the third letter of the second word is not on the same line as the others. The motive is merely abraded.

**DATE:** The shape of the vase and the shape of the letters place it between the early second and the fourth century.


The findspot is unknown and the provenance uncertain; the Greek inscription is not in itself a safe indication of eastern workmanship.

The transcription of the inscription was apparently problematic for some and read differently. Smith and Shelton saw APEΘOY(C) and CIMOC as two separate names. R. Zahn reconstituted EYTYY[I]ς (or EYTYY[I]ς) Ν(E)ΙΑΟC ΠΥΡΙΝΟYC ΑΡΗ(ι)ΘΥC. EYTYY[I]ς is the likelier supposition, because of the available space on the glass. Christine Alexander read APEΘOYCIOC. She apparently believed that the _mu_ was crossed off.

**Cat. no. 3** (Figures 13, 14). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 26.60.96. Fletcher Fund. Body of bowl, slightly greenish glass, free-blown fragment. 8.3 x 3.7; reconstructed Diam. ca. 9.

A deer pictured (on the bottom of the vase?) in profile to the right is inscribed in a circle. This circle is itself inscribed in a larger one, the space between the two being filled by a row of rosettes. Another quadruped inscribed in a circle is also visible. In the field, to the right, three stars within circles are placed around a lozenge with palm motives.

The engraving of the rump, back, and neck of the animal is quite clean, wide, and shallow. The legs, head, and antlers are cut with a finer wheel, and the hooves with an even finer one. The circles are rendered by a succession of short, cut lines. The front part

**Figure 13.** Bowl (cat. no. 3), probably 4th century. 8.3 x 3.7 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1926, 26.60.96

**Figure 14.** Drawing of cat. no. 3 (Elizabeth Wahle)
of the animal is artfully represented in three quarters, while the back and the head are seen in profile; this gives the deer a graceful twisting movement.

**DATE:** probably fourth century, from the shape of the vases listed in the comparanda.

**UNPUBLISHED.**

This fragment belongs to a group of vases that are probably of Roman origin. Harden\(^1\) sees here the production of one workshop; as far as I know, twelve vases belong to the same "workshop."

**COMPARANDA:**


12. Another unpublished fragment is in the Toledo Museum of Art, no. 80.1189.

**Cat. no. 4** (Figures 15–20). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 17.194.318. Ex colls. Disch, Gréau; gift of J. Pierpoint Morgan. Colorless free-blown glass bowl, three joined fragments; a fragment of the body is missing. Found in Cologne. H. 6; Diam. 9.5.

Four circles at right angles to each other on the body; within each of these, a bust facing front with the head to the left. The engraving of the medallions, each with two concentric circles, must have been done with a lathe, since there is no variation in the groove. The engraver must have first traced two opposing medallions, then the two others, because they intersect in places. The groove under the lip was then traced, also with a lathe, overlapping the medallions at one point. On the bottom, an abraded rosette with eight petals and a dot in each of the spandrels.

For the busts themselves the engraver used a wider wheel, because the tunic and the face are simply abraded. The nose, the eyes, the mouth, and the hair are rendered by narrow incisions, made with a fine wheel. In the spandrels, abraded edicules and stars appear. Within the concentric circles of each medallion are forty or so abraded tongues.

**DATE:** fourth century, from the context of comparandum no. 1.


This vase belongs to a group well represented in the Rhineland. Three out of the four known vases come from Cologne or the area.

**COMPARANDA:**
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Figure 20. Drawing of cat. no. 4 (Elizabeth Wahle)


Cat. no. 5 (Figures 21–26). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 17.194.319. Ex coll. Gréau; gift of J. Pierpont Morgan. Colorless hemispherical free-blown bowl with polished rim, two joined fragments; partly covered with incrustation; a fragment of the rim is missing. H. 4.6; Diam. 11.2.

On the bottom, a rosette with twelve petals is framed within a herringbone pattern and a broken line. In the middle of the body, two garlands intersect to form six medallions. Within them, one sees two latticed lozenges, two rosettes with eight petals, one with thirteen petals,
and one with sixteen. Stars or rosettes dot the spandrels formed by the medallions. On the upper part of the body, two parallel registers of superimposed Xs and herringbone pattern. The engraving is clean, deep, and narrow. The line separating the different motifs was traced with a lathe.

**Figure 26.** Drawing of cat. no. 5 (Elizabeth Wahle)

**Date:** probably fourth century, by the style of the heads of comparandum no. 1.

**Bibliography:** Froehner, *Collection Charvet*, pl. 184.3, no. 1083; Richter, “Room of Ancient Glass,” p. 23, fig. 29; Eisen, *Glass*, p. 553, pl. 136.

This vase, though it does not feature human or animal figures, is reminiscent of a bowl now in Corning, formerly in the Sangiorgi collection (comparandum no. 1).

**Comparanda:**


2. Bowl, found in northern France. H. 5; Diam. 21.5. Musée d’Évreux, no. 5996. Geometrical motifs. G. Sennequier, “Verrerie d’époque romaine retrouvée en Haute-Normandie” (doctoral diss., Université de Tours, March 1993) pl. 15, no. 16 (Figure 27).

**Cat. no. 6** (Figures 28–33). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 81.10.240. Ex coll. Charvet; gift of H.G. Marquand. Colorless free-blown hemispherical bowl with polished rim; complete, incrustation in places. Found in Mainz. H. 5.4; Diam. 8.9.

The lip is underlined by three parallel grooves. On the body, four columns alternate with four figures, facing front with the head to the left. They wear long tunics and hold a bunch of grapes in each hand. The columns are simply rendered by three long vertical lines between two short ones, which represent the base and capital. The engraving of the columns, clothes, and limbs is crude, merely abraded with a wide wheel. The hair, eyes, nose, and mouth, as well as the vine branch, are traced with a finer wheel. On the bottom is an abraded rosette with eight petals.

**Date:** fourth century.


I know of thirteen comparable objects; the vase comparandum no. 8 was found in a grave with a coin of Anastasius I (491–518), but the style of engraving, especially the treatment of the head, and the shape of the vase preclude a late date. By the sixth century, it was already an heirloom. Its findspot, like those of most of the comparanda, indicates that it was made in Germany.

**Comparanda:**

1. Bowl, found in Brumath-Stephansfeld (near Strasbourg).
Figures 28–32. Bowl (cat. no. 6), fourth century. H. 5.4 cm, Diam. 8.9 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Henry G. Marquand, 1881, 81.10.240

Figure 33. Drawing of cat. no. 6 (Elizabeth Wahle)


Cat. no. 7 (Figures 34–37). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 17.194.324 and 1992.61. Ex coll. Gréau, gift of J. Pierpoint Morgan; and ex coll. Higgins Armory, Worcester, Mass. Greenish free-blown hemispherical bowl with polished lip; six joined fragments; part of the body is missing; what is left is pitted in places. H. 8.76; Diam. 18.6.

At the bottom of the bowl, inscribed in a wide, sketchily abraded circle, stands a man facing left. He is wearing a toga and extends his right arm in front of him. A long staff with a rounded end is still visible under his right arm; it is important to note that he does not hold it. His head and left arm are almost erased because of the deterioration of the glass. The "floating staff" is not a mere walking stick but identifies him, I believe, as Moses or Aaron; the rod turned into a snake (Exodus 4:3, 7:9–12) is pictured here. There is no other interpretation that would explain the importance given to this object, combined with the central position of the figure in the composition and the fact that he is wearing a toga, which seems to identify him as a prophet, as we will see later. We do not have here the scene of the actual metamorphosis of the rod, quite rare in Christian iconography.35

Around the wall of the bowl, some scenes are still discernible. The torsos of three figures wearing short tunics, facing front with their heads turned to the left and their arms outstretched, are emerging from a structure made of five courses of squarish blocks with three openings; the Three Youths in the Furnace are obviously pictured here (Daniel 3:13–25). This scene, very common in Christian iconography, appears almost the same way on contemporaneous Roman sarcophagi (Figure 38).36 To the right of this structure, a little higher in the field, the base of a column, on top

Figure 37. Drawing of cat. no. 7 (Elizabeth Wahle)

of which the bust of Nebuchadnezzar was probably pictured, is still visible as are the legs of a figure (a servant of the king?). On the left, the lower part of a man dressed in a pallium (a royal functionary?) is turned toward the furnace and also belongs to this scene.

Behind him, the lower halves of two figures are visible, one on each side of a menhir-shaped rock from which flows a spring depicted as four curved lines; one of the figures wears a short tunic and the other a toga. This scene represents Moses (in a toga) and another Israelite and the miracle of the rock in Horeb (Exodus 17:6–7; Numbers 20:9–11), from which the spring flows as Moses strikes it with his rod. It is one of the more common scenes in early Christian art; the symbol of life-giving water is often expounded in the Scriptures and by the church fathers.56

The engraving is clean and narrow. The incisions are never really long (1 cm at most), save for the lathe-cut groove under the lip. Only the lower part of the legs, the feet, and the face are etched less deeply with a wider wheel. Of the features of the face, the lozenge-shaped eye, the mouth, the nose, and the hair rendered with short parallel lines were engraved later.

DATE: 330–380 (see cat. no. 8).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Froehner, Collection Gréau, pl. 186.1–2.

This glass belongs to a large group of vases, already identified by Froehner (including the next one, cat. no. 8) as originating from Cologne, some of which were found in graves dated by coins to the middle of the fourth century.57 The main characteristics are the profile of the head, the schematic drawing of the legs, the hieratic aspect of the figures, and the multiplication of fillers in the field: edicules, trees, hatching, volutes, dots. (See Figure 4 and comparandum no. 1.)

After a close study of the vases of the same group, one notices that the figures in togas58 are almost always to be identified as prophets: Christ, Abraham, Aaron, or Moses (an Old Testament prefiguration of Christ). The shapes of the vases of this group (beakers and bowls) are also typically found in the fourth century. This vase and the following, catalogue number 8, are stylistically close to catalogue number 4 and catalogue number 6.

COMPARANDA:


9. Fragment of beaker(?), found in Trier. 5.2 x 4.8. Trier, Landesmuseum, no. 98.91. Man with a toga. Goethert-Polaschek, Katalog, p. 73, no. 306.
25. Flat fragment, findspot unknown. H. 5.5; L. 7.5. Museo Sacro Vaticano, no. 317. Christ facing front. R. Garrucci, Storia dell’arte Cristiana, Prato 6 (1880) p. 93, pl. 264, no. 3; Fremersdorf, Antikes Glas, p. 92, no. 850, pls. 55, 56.
28. Bowl, chipped rim, found in the Rhineland. H. 5.5; Diam. 9.1. Private collection. Heads facing left. Antiken aus rheinischem Privathbesitz, pl. 152, no. 342; Salomonson and La Baume, Römische Klein kunst, p. 74, no. 269, pl. 59-1.
29. Fragment, found in Gorsium (Hungary). 2.2 x 2.7. Museum of Székesfehérvár, no. 75,251.1. Head with a halo facing right. J. Fitz, “Forschungen in Gorsium,” Alba Regia 13 (1972) p. 259, no. 533, pl. 5, fig. 2.
32. Bowl, two joined rim fragments, found in Gorsium (Hungary). 11.5 x 6.3. Museum of Székesfehérvár, no. 72,83.2. Indistinct motive. Fitz, “Gorsium,” p. 240, no. 6.
34. Fragment, found in Trier. 3.5 x 4.4. Trier, Landesmuseum, no. 19, 262. Winged man, column. Goethert-Polacheck, Katalog p. 60, no. 227.
35. Fragment of bowl, found in Trier. 7.4 x 8.8. Trier, Landesmuseum, no. 98,126. Bust on the bottom, hunting scene around. Goethert-Polacheck, Katalog p. 32, no. 84.
37. Fragment, found in Rome. 4.5 x 4.2. Whereabouts


**Cat. no. 8** (Figures 39–41). Dept. of Medieval Art, 17.190.492. Ex coll. Sarti, bought from the Sangiorgi Gallery, Rome, by J. Pierpont Morgan. Greenish free-blown glass plate, eighteen joined fragments; part of the rim is missing. Found in Zambuca Sabut (Sicily). H. 3.6; Diam. 24.

In a central medallion, one sees on a ground line a standing man with a halo, facing left and wearing a toga. He holds in his outstretched right hand a long rod. To the left, in front of him, a slightly smaller figure stands stiffly facing front, wrapped in a shroud. The Raising of Lazarus is pictured here. In the field appear two rolled manuscripts, usually associated with Christ in early Christian iconography, a long palm, a lozenge, and hatching. Below the ground line is a lattice motif.

The medallion is framed by a vine-and-grape motif between double lines; around the rim is a picket border underlined by a wide fillet. These are reminiscent of the framing motifs of the Toledo Museum of Art beaker.46

The engraving is very much akin to that of the preceding glass, and both indeed belong to the same workshop. A laboratory analysis has shown that there are no traces of gilding, as Le Blant assumed;49 he was probably led to believe so by the iridescence of the glass.

**DATE:** Found in a “Christian” sarcophagus containing, with our cup, “Several fragments of engraved glass which were destroyed . . .” and coins dated between 350 and 360.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Le Blant, “Note sur une coupe,” pp. 213–214, pl. 4; Bulletin archéologique (1887) pp. 187–188; De Rossi, Bulletino di archeologia cristiana (1888–89) p. 77; J. Pilloy, Études sur d’anciens lieux de sépultures de l’Aisne (Saint-Quentin, 1895) p. 158; DACL III, 2, col. 3008, fig. 3335; A Special Exhibition of Glass from the Museum’s Collection (New York, 1936) p. 16, fig. 15; Shelton in Age of Spirituality, p. 444, no. 404.

This vase belongs with the preceding group. The scene is commonplace in early Christian art and is seen for instance on many sarcophagi and catacomb paintings.

**Cat. no. 9** (Figures 42–50). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 17.194.328. Ex coll. Gréau; Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan. Slightly greenish free-blown glass bowl, nine joined fragments; parts of the rim, body, and bottom missing; iridescent and pitted in places. H. 7.7; Diam. 18.

Three grooves underline the rim, and a fourth one sets the ground line for the scenes. On the body, seven people and four animals are divided into two scenes by clumps of trees. The first scene shows a hunter facing right, clad in a pallium, half leaning on a spear and collapsing into the arms of a comrade dressed in a short tunic and leggings. In front of them, a woman runs in their direction with outstretched arms, a long veil flowing from her elbows; behind them, a thick fillet indicates the entrance of a lair into which runs the boar that gored the wounded hunter pursued by a hunting dog. In front of the animal another hunter stands with his left leg raised, as if to avoid the charge of the boar, and thrusts at it with his now-invisible spear. He wears a Phrygian cap and a pallium, and carries a shield in his right hand. Only the back of the boar is visible, etched with a triple line of ovolos and bristly hair. Its lair is partly hidden behind a tree trunk formed by a row of ovolos and wide palm leaves. The 1903 drawing shows him as part of the second scene.

The latter scene, behind the woman, shows another lair, similarly marked by foliage, out of which charges a boar attacked by two dogs. In front of them, a hunter rushes forward facing left, a spear firmly held with both hands. His left shoulder is covered by a pallium. Behind him, two archers take aim at the animal, their hands held up, as if they had just shot at their target. The first archer, a woman, is dressed in a short tunic with a single strap, and the other wears a pallium around his shoulders. The first scene represents the death of Adonis, and the other Meleager and the Hunt for the Calydonian Boar.

The engraving, very wide, deep, and clean, is characteristic of the group to which it belongs. The figures are stiff, the torsos twisted unnaturally (the thorax seen frontally and the abdomen in three-quarter view), the hands large and the fingers very long. The head, seen in profile, shows a long nose, large almond-shaped eyes, and hair and beard formed by rows of small ovolos; shown frontally, the cheeks are round, the nose long and narrow, the mouth small, the eyes still almond shaped. The folds of the clothing are wide and stiff.

**DATE:** Second half of the fourth–early fifth century. **BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Froehner, Collection Gréau, no. 1092, pls. 187.1, 2; Ginsburg, Hunting Scenes, p. 21, fig. 10, p. 29 n. 47; B. Caron, “A Figure-Engraved Glass Bowl,” MMF 28 (1993) pp. 47–55.
This remarkable vase is part of a very large group which was centered essentially in Rome and Northern Italy—Aquileia and Ravenna—and was dubbed the group of the Master of the Cup of Daniel by R. Barovier-Mentasti, who dated it to the middle of the fourth century. I initially agreed with her conclusions, but after closer study of the internal and external criteria of some of the sixty or so vases of this group (at last count, that is), I now believe that the *floruit* of this workshop can be pushed to the second half of the fourth century and the early fifth. This new chronological frame rests on eight particular vases.

The first is the celebrated fragment of the Antiquarium Comunale (Figure 51; see comparandum no. 2). Since its discovery, because of its inscription celebrating an emperor’s *vicennalia*, it was successively identified with Diocletian, Constantine, Constantius II, and finally Honorius. Thus, despite the inscription, its exact date is still discussed, although, as we will see later, Constantius’s era is likely.

The second vase, formerly in the Fgdor collection, pictures Cybele and Attis. The worship of these oriental gods enjoyed a short revival in Italy during the rule of Eugenius (A.D. 392–394); this object could be a relic of this revival.

A small fragment in the Campo Santo in Rome (Figure 52; see comparandum no. 6) features a palm tree and a halo near the rim; the palm tree is identical to the one pictured on one of the more important vases of the group, a plate from Ostia (see Figure 55). The Campo Santo fragment looks quite insignificant at first, but in the context of fourth-century Christian iconography in Western art, an important observation can be made about it. Taking into account its diameter and that of the halo still visible behind the tree, it allows only enough room for a very simple composition of three standing figures framed by palm trees (see reconstruction).

Such a composition can be linked only to a number of monuments (found mainly in Rome) displaying the same composition and representing Christ standing on a mountain with the four rivers of Paradise (Genesis 2:10–14) and giving the Law—a volume inscribed *Lex Domini*—to Peter on his left while Paul stands on his right; palm trees always frame this scene, the *Traditio Legis*, or Transmission of the Law. It first...
Figures 42–49. Bowl (cat. no. 9), second half of 4th–early 5th century. H. 7.7 cm, Diam. 18 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917, 17.194.328
appeared, according to T. Buddensieg, on the mosaic of the apse of St. Peter’s in Rome that was put up in the second half of the fourth century (Figure 53). Most of the objects displaying this scene (sarcophagi, paintings, reliefs) also date from the second half of the fourth century.66 Another glass fragment from the Vatican (Figure 54; see comparandum no. 37) features the center of the same composition; the palm tree is still faintly visible behind Peter. The symbolism of this image, the exhortation and the life-giving flowing water, appears explicitly in a text of St. Hippolytus (ca. 170–235): “A perennial stream is flowing. Four rivers are flowing from it, watering the earth. It is the same with the church: Christ, who is the river, is announced to the world by the four gospels. He waters all the earth and sanctifies everyone who believes in him, according to the prophet: ‘Rivers will flow from his body.’”70

The fifth vase, the aforementioned plate from Ostia (Figure 55; see comparandum no. 4), representing Christ holding a long cross on his left shoulder, is
almost identical to the well-known St. Lawrence mosaic from the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia in Ravenna (Figure 56). The latter is dated, and there seems to be a consensus among specialists, to 425–450. The glass is unlikely to be the inspiration for the (very) official iconography of the mausoleum; and if the reverse is true, the glass would also be dated to 425–450. But a mosaic of the church of San Pietro Crisologo in Ravenna shows a Christus militans with exactly the same gesture. This mosaic, as we know from Agnellus, was made in the late fourth or early fifth century, before being remade in the mid-fifth century. This remake, as is often the case, could very well have reproduced the earlier composition.

The sixth vase, a lost plate known from two seventeenth-century drawings, pictures an aristocrat, the prefect of the annona; this kind of glass was usually made to celebrate the nomination of a civil servant to a higher office by picturing the grante in his new functions. So since the prefect of the annona became an important personage and acceded to senatorial rank only after 326, we can assume that this date is a terminus a quo for the lost plate.

Another official commission, represented today by a small fragment with the head of Rome (or Constantino- nople)Nicephore found in Rome (comparandum no. 15), can be reconstructed to a certain degree. The large size of the original plate, 35 centimeters in diameter according to Paribeni, and the squeezed impression made by the surviving figure would leave room for one oversize or two smaller central figures flanked by personifications of both capitals, as Paribeni noticed; more precision would in this case be mere speculation. The fact, however, that Rome and Constantinople appear side by side on coinage from 343 on would tend to place this fragment in the second half of the century.

And finally, a tiny fragment was discovered in Carthage in a cistern sealed about 425 by the construction of the Theodosian wall.

These vases therefore provide us with circumstantial evidence (if nothing else) that indicate a floruit stretching between 326 and 425, more likely between the middle of the fourth and the early fifth century.

This conclusion also favors a late dating of the aforementioned Antiquarium Comunale fragment (see comparandum no. 2). Indeed, a way to tentatively date this scene is to do so by linking it with a securely dated group. In the light of the chronology we propose, the earlier candidates, Diocletian and Constantine, can be ruled out. Constantius's late vicennalia of 357, Valens, Gratianus, Valentinianus, Theodosius, and Honorius would still be acceptable.

Only one solution, however, would explain the vicennalia inscription, the name Severus written over a secondary figure, and the lack of a crown on the head of the main figure. The latter could be Julian the Apostate, Caesar of Constantius II from 355 to 360; his coinage prior to his accession to the throne shows him undiademmed, and his magister equitum in 357/358 was named Severus. We may suppose that the Antiquarium Comunale bowl is one of a pair of identical vases, one of which showed Constantius and
the other Julian, each surrounded by his respective retinue. We have to realize that officially commissioned glassware, just like silverware, could form a set of several pieces.

We will make a final remark. Several vases of this group (comparanda nos. 2, 3, 12, 15, 18, 22, 23, 33, 35, 41) show a sitting or standing figure where the vertical axis of the composition is obvious; furthermore, they sometime display an architectonic background, otherwise rare in the production of the Master of the Cup of Daniel. These details are reminiscent of the ivory diptychs and sumptuous silverware, such as the missorium of Theodosius, which were gifts distributed by the emperor and new grantees of high office. The outlandish expenditures lavished on such occasions forced Theodosius to introduce legislation to limit them; newly appointed magistrates then replaced ivory and silver with glass.

**Comparanda:**


3. Plate, five fragments, of which two are joined, found in Ravenna. Reconstructed Diam. 24. Ravenna, Soprintendenza ai Beni Ambientali Architettonici, no. RA 6549. Seated high


5. Fragment of bowl and plate, findspot unknown. Sarasota, Ringling Museum of Art. Christ as the Good Shepherd. Froehner, Collection Gréau, no. 1098, pl. 188.4.


11. Fragment of plate, found in Porto. 13.2 x 5.5. Museo Sacro Vaticano, no. 298. Figure in a shrub, and putto. Floriani-Squarciapino, “Vetri incisi portuensi,” pp. 260–262, fig. 5; Fremersdorf, Antikes Glas, p. 90, no. 843, pls. 55, 57; Caron, “Un Verre grave,” p. 173, fig. 5.


17. Fragment of body, findspot unknown. Whereabouts unknown. Head of Hydra. Froehner, Collection Gréau, pl. 188.2, no. 1094.


22. Plate, four fragments, three of which are joined, findspot unknown. Collection of the Campo Santo. Two registers of standing figures. Armellini, “I vetrí cristiani,” p. 54, pl. 3.1; Caron, “Note sur deux dessins,” p. 304, pl. vi.2.

dessins," pp. 349–358, pls. i, ii.


37. Plate fragment, found in Porto (Figure 55). H. 7.8; L. 11. Museo Sacro Vaticano, inv. 313. Transmission of the Law and inscription: LEX DOMINI. De Rossi, "Utensili cristiani," pl. 1.3; Garrucci, Storia dell'arte 6, p. 98, pl. 464, no. 5; DACL VI, 2, col. 1577, fig. 5408; Floriani-Squarcipino, "Coppa cristiana," p. 209, fig. 8; idem, "Vetri incisi portuensi," p. 250, fig. 3; Fremersdorf, Antikes Glas, p. 91, no. 846, pl. 55.


42. Plate, rim fragment, findspot unknown. Sarasota, Ringling Museum of Art. Feminine headdress. Froehner, Collection Gréau, pl. 190.6, no. 1103.


48. Fragment of hemispherical cup, findspot unknown. 5.2 x 6.1. Museo Nazionale Romano, no. 380800. Man in Eastern dress; inscription on the rim: LET... De Tommaso, "Vetri incisi," p. 102, fig. 4.


50. Fragment of plate, found in Rome. 8.9 x 4.2. Whereabouts unknown. Lyre. Sagui, "Produzione vetrarie," p. 124, fig. 8.64.


We could mention six unpublished fragments in the Corning Museum of Glass: 66.1.143; 66.1.146; 66.1.145; 66.1.141; 72.1.18, plus the following vase, catalogue number 10, and at least one unpublished plate from the antiquities market.

Cat. no. 10 (Figures 57, 58). Dept. of Medieval Art, 18.145.4. Formerly in the Vallicella Library, Rome. Free-blown rim fragment, slightly greenish. L. 8.9; H. 4.5.

The rounded rim is marked by three grooves. On the body is an edicule with a rounded roof, two elongated acroteria, and open double doors. On the inner side of the doors, a lozenge is inscribed within two rectangles. Inside the edicule, the upper part of a body in a shroud and facing right is visible. On the right, the upper part of the body of a man, holding a staff and with a haloed head, faces left. A retrograde inscription (meant to be read from the inside and reading... LBAT IN LAIAVRS) identifies the scene: the Raising of Lazarus.

The engraving is wide, clean, rather deep. The features and the hair are finely rendered.

Date: second half of fourth–early fifth century.

Bibliography: F. Buonarroti, Osservazioni sui alcuni frammenti di vasi (Florence, 1716) p. 60; Garrucci, Storia dell'arte 6, p. 91, pl. 462, no. 11; Mowat, "Exemples de gravure antique," p. 297, no. 15; DACL VI, 2, col. 1578, no. 3.

Buonarroti read the inscription LIAT IN LAIAVRS; Garrucci, Leclercq, and Mowat, LIATA LAIAVRS. This vase, because of the treatment of the features of the head and the stiffness of the folds, probably belongs to the preceding group.

Cat. no. 11 (Figures 59–62). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 13.198.5. Pale blue free-blown conical vase, polished rim, a button under the body; intact. Found near Hama (Syria), according to the dealer. H. 14.9; Diam. 6.9.

In the middle of the body, on opposite sides, two bunches of six grapes are pictured; in between is an eight-branched star. Over the grapes, between two fillets, a Greek inscription reads, I1E ZHCHC (phonetically spelled for the correct I1E ZHCAIC, "Drink so that you may live!") and diagonal hatching. This expression has sometimes been used in a religious context, since it can be construed as being linked to
the celebration of the Eucharist and the consecration of the wine; but in this particular case it has no cryptographic religious meaning whatsoever. This simple drinking expression is met time and time again on vases, written phonetically in the Greek or Latin alphabet (or even a mixture of both), in a number of ways, by people who had only a passing acquaintance with Greek, but knew its meaning: "Cheers!"83 Under the grapes is hatching between two fillets. The motifs are rendered by abrasion.

**DATE:** fourth–fifth century.


This group was first identified by Harden.84 The decoration is only abraded and quite simple: star, rosette, animal, grapes in bunches. A Latin or Greek inscription usually appears around the rim. None of the dozen or so vases of the group comes from a dated context; but from the study of the shapes, Harden could nevertheless date it to about the end of the fourth and the early fifth centuries. The dispersed findspots (Great Britain, Spain, Italy, Syria, Egypt) suggest the work of an itinerant workshop, although Harden narrows the area of fabrication to Syria or Egypt: “All in all, I would prefer to count it as Egyptian; that is, no doubt, an Alexandrian piece.”85 An Eastern origin is possible, but there is no overriding reason to place it in Alexandria. As we mentioned earlier, the temptation to label as Alexandrian every Eastern glass product is an unfortunate reflex, based partly on literary sources and their overenthusiastic interpretation;86 but most of them predate the *floruit* of figure-engraved glass in the Roman world. There is little or no archaeological evidence of engraved glass production in Alexandria in late antiquity.
COMPARANDA:

1. Bottle, neck cracked, found in Highdown Hill, Sussex. H. 20.3; Diam. of the mouth 6. Worthing Museum, no. 3500. Hares, dogs, and inscription (Figure 63). Harden, "Highdown Hill," p. 3, fig. 1; Weinberg, "A Parallel to the Highdown Hill," p. 26, figs. 4, 6.


Cat. no. 12 (Figures 64, 65). Dept. of Egyptian Art, o8.268h. Rogers Fund. Free-blown colorless bowl, polished rim; four joined fragments of rim and body. Found in Hibris, Khargah Oasis, Egypt. H. 4; Diam. 18.5.

Bust of a man, facing front, head to the right, holding a bow with his right hand. In the field are lines and hatching. The engraving of the body is crudely delineated by deep rough cuts; the features of the face and the curly hair are marked by a line of points joined with a scratched line. The bow and a few hatchings are abraded. There was room enough on the other side for at least one figure, perhaps Artemis or Actaeon.

DATE: fifth century.

UNPUBLISHED.

The findspots of the vases of the same group

Figure 63. Inscription on bottle from Worthing Museum

Figure 64. Bowl (cat. no. 12), 5th century. H. 4 cm, Diam. 18.5 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1908, o8.268h

Figure 65. Drawing of cat. no. 12 (Elizabeth Wahle)
(Montenegro, Egypt, and northern Italy) suggest an itinerant workshop. The engraving, especially of the head, is at first glance reminiscent of the so-called Lyceus group, which was centered in Cologne, according to Fremersdorf," or "the East," according to Harden," and dates from the third century. There are now reasons to believe that a good part of this group's production was made in the Rhine area, but itinerant it probably was.

Be that as it may, the relation here with the Lyceus group is superficial. None of the vases of the group comes from a known context; the Italian one, however, features a Christian scene that would be unusual for the third century, and is too much out of step with the compositions usually seen on the vases of the Lyceus group. The rendering of the body, with more squarish lines, is not at all akin with this group. The late date proposed by Bertacchi is probably justified.

**Comparanda:**


We can also mention unpublished fragments from the Toledo Museum of Art, nos. 358.853 and 80.1128, and the Corning Museum of Glass, nos. 72.1.15, 76.1.140, 79.1.295, and 64.1.52. None of them comes from a known context.

**Cat. no. 13** (Figures 66, 67). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 81.10.258. Ex coll. Charvet; gift of H.G. Marquand. Molded flat plate with a footring, colorless; iridescent; part of the footring missing. H. 1.3; Diam. 10.7; footring Diam. 5.1.

On the outside, within the footring, head with wings facing frontally. Around the ring are thirty-five tongues. The engraving is clean enough; around the incision delineating the head, the cheeks are marked by a shallow depression.

**Date:** nineteenth-century forgery.

**Bibliography:** Froehner, *Collection Charvet*, p. 70; Kisa, *Glas*, p. 666, fig. 254.

The cutting is not "right" for a Roman piece, and the figure is crammed on the underside, a spot where no Roman engraver would have put it when the entire flat surface of the vase was still completely blank. This surface was also artificially aged with acid. Such a composition is found, however, on genuine Roman glass.

**Cat. no. 14** (Figure 68). Dept. of Greek and Roman Art, 17.194.916. Ex coll. Greau; Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan. Two joined free-blown fragments of an unevenly flattened rim and body of a bowl(?); greenish glass. 6.2 x 7.7.
Palms and vegetal motifs around an inscription framed by two lines, which reads: VIPSANIA MASPANI / MVS AEIT HALASSA / SIDI ET / HCLAVDIO AVG LEPICLE / TO. 

DATE: forgery. 
UNPUBLISHED.

The grooves around the rim are very sloppily traced; on all other vessels, they are always lathe-cut in a clear manner; the engraving of branches flanking the inscription are not ancient-looking. The inscription, finally, does not make any sense and is (strangely!) intact.° The cutting is clean and deep.
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NOTES


Figure 68. Bowl(?) (cat. no. 14), 6.2 x 7.7 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917 17.194.916


5. A. Oliver Jr. traced a number of the engraved fragments of the 1928 sale: "Tapestry in Glass," JGS 17 (1975) pp. 68-70.


12. Corning Museum of Glass, no. 66.1.227; Goldstein, Pre-Roman, p. 151, no. 320, underlines the relation with obsidian vases. This reminds us that glassworkers could imitate many precious stones; Trowbridge, Philological Studies in Ancient Glass (Urbana, 1930) pp. 144–147, to which we can add Musonius, 20.4. I have made extensive use of this rich study for its philological research.

13. Pliny does mention glass dishes imitating obsidian: Natural History, 36.198: "Fit et tincturae obsianum genere ad escaria varia [Tableware of (imitation) obsidian is made by means of coloration]."

14. Haevernick, "Beitrag zur Geschichte," pp. 127, 130. The famous Stabian skyphoi are a clue to this. Grose, Early Ancient Glass, p. 342, favors an Italian, probably Roman, origin. This is also a possibility, when one considers the wave of Egyptomania that swept Italy in the first century.

15. This concept is based on Harden’s principles, according to which groups are to be divided by "shapes, design and techniques"; D. Harden, "The Wint Hill Hunting Bowl and Related Glasses," JGS 2 (1960) p. 46; F. Fremersdorff, Die römische Gläser mit Schiefl, Denkmäler des römischen Köln 8 (Cologne, 1967) pp. 20–21, identifies each group strictly by the technique of cutting. It is impossible to know whether one or more engravers worked within a "workshop"; they may have worked alone or with apprentices who carried out the sketch they outlined.

16. Charleston, "Wheel-Engraving," pp. 86–87; Harden, "Ancient Glass," p. 54. L. Sagui, "Produzione vetrarie a Roma tra tardo-antico e alto medioevo," in Paroli and Delogu, La storia economica di Roma p. 124, suggested that the cutting was done in two operations: first, the surface of the picture was merely abraded, delimiting its contour, and then a deeper incision could be made. M. Pelliot, "Verres gravés au diamant," Gazette des Beaux-Arts 2 (1930) pp. 302–308, does not think that diamond was used in antiquity, contra Leclercq, DACLI VI, 2, col. 1576, who quotes Pliny but in a context which has nothing to do with glass; A. Oliver, "Rock-Crystal Vessels in Antiquity," Muse 7 (1973) p. 32, does not exclude the use of diamond for carving rock crystal. But rock crystal is mostly sculpted in the round and there is very little similarity between the working of glass and of rock crystal. G.D. Scott, "A Study of the Lycurgus Cap," JGS 37 (1995) pp. 60–61, fig. 23, provides a remarkable reconstruction of a workbench used for the carving of cage-cups; but such a tool, which allows for the simultaneous use of two drills, is uselessly complex for engraved glass.


18. Martial, Epigrams, 14.115, "Calices vitrei. Aspicis ingenium Nili: quibus addere plura dum cupit, ah quotiens perdidit auctor opus. [Glass vases. See the skill of the Egyptians: when he tried to adorn even more the (glass) vase, oh! how often did the craftsman lose it;]" in the same manner, in an excerpt in Clement of Alexander, Paedag. 2.3.35: τοις περί ερυθρής τε και γαλακτος και ακαθαρσίας τα καλλιτεχνηματα αντιλαταριωνα για τα λιθισματα και τα παρακάτω για την πολυσβετικη τσιμπημα του γυαλου, a superfluity of ornamentation on glass," probably refers to another relief-cut glass. Frohner, Collection Charvet, p. 94, n. 4, saw a carved glass in Greek Anthology 16.89, but nothing in the poem indicates the material it is made of: Πινει, λεγει το τομεαμα: "Drink" speaks the carving..."

19. W. Thorpe, "The Prelude to European Cut Glass," Journal of the Society of Glass Technology 22 (1938) p. 17, quotes Martial, 14.102: "Accipe ... calices ... surrentiniae leue toreuma rote [Accept ... cups ... worked smooth by a Sorrentine wheel]," and believes faceted cups are described here; but it could also be wheel-polished cast glass, as the adjective λευκο, "smooth, polished," might imply; and on p. 15, referring to Martial, 12.70: "O quantum diatreta ualent ... [Oh! how much can 'diatreta' do ... ]," he believes diatreta to be glass vases; but they could also be of metal. As for rock crystal, Pliny does mention that colorless glass (in his lifetime) is very popular because of its resemblance to rock crystal (35.199: Maximus tamen honos in candido traluentibus, quam proxima crystalli similitudine [The greatest popularity is for colorless glass, the most like rock crystal]) and it would be tempting to associate glass engraving with rock crystal carving; but there is hardly any resemblance between carved rock crystal and contemporary engraved glassware. On rock crystal vases, see H. P. Bühler, Antike Gefässe aus Chaledonem (Stuttgart, 1966); idem, Antike Gefässe aus Edelsteinen (Mainz, 1973); and C. Gasparri, "A proposito di un recente studio sui vasi antichi in pietra dura," Archeologia classica 27 (1975) pp. 350ff.


21. Martial, 12.74.5 and 14.94.1. He lived from ca. 40 to ca. 104. "Nullum sollicitans haes (vitrea popula) toreumata furem [these wrought-glass cups tempt no thief];" and "Plebeia toreumata vitri [plebian wrought glass]."

22. Greek Anthology, 9.776; see Trowbridge, Philological Studies, p. 54. The poet says Εν δε με μικρη κρυσταλλω το καλον δαιδαλον Αρσινοη γραφει τουτ έποιεν Σαστρηρης. "Satyreios wrought me on a little crystal and gave the pretty object to Arsinoe.

23. Without dwelling on this problem, painted or engraved glass
did not yet exist when the poem was written, probably in the middle of the 1st century B.C.; it therefore makes reference to another kind of glass or crystal object.

24. Trowbridge, Philological Studies, p. 107 n. 42a. The same notion is found in Fliny, 37,59.

25. Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon, 2.3: ὑάλον μὲν τὸ πάντα ἐργον ὑάρωνυμένηνtranslated as "The material of it was wrought rock-crystal" by S. Gaselee (Loeb ed.). Both Trowbridge, Philological Studies, p. 26, and Gaselee see here a rock crystal object; but the term skalos by the time of Achilles Tatius (ca. 300) had the more narrow meaning of "glass." C. Kondoleon, "An Openwork Gold Cup," JGS 21 (1979) pp. 49-50, was right to make the connection between this text and the cage-cups. Contra M. Vickers, "Rock Crystal: The Key to Cut Glass and Diatreta," Journal of Roman Archaeology 9 (1996) p. 51 n. 30, who thinks this was a rock crystal vase.

26. DACL, XV, 2, col. 2975: Tertullian, De Pudicitia, 7.1: "Procedant ipsae picturae calcium vestrorum [The same pictures are visible on your cups]," and 10.1: "Pastor quem in calice depingis [the Shepherd, whom you picture in the cup]."

27. Liber pontificalis, 16.2: Ét [Zephierinus] fecit constitutum de ecclesia, et paternae vitreae ante sacerdotes in ecclesia, et ministros supportantes, donec episcopus missas celebrat, ante se sacerdotes adstantes, sic missae celebrarentur... [(Zephierinus) did (establish the custom of holding) glass patens in front of the priests, in church, and (to have them held) by assistants, who hold them while the bishop says the mass, the priests standing in front of him. This is how mass should be celebrated]... trans. from L. Duchesne, Liber pontificalis (Paris, 1955). This text has sometimes been construed (H. d’Escarou-Doisy, "La Verrerie chrétienne découverte à Timгад," Libya 7 [1959] p. 59) to mean that Zephirinus allowed the use of glass vessels for the liturgy; the text describes only the introduction of the use of patens, which happen to be of glass. Objects described in the many lists of donations by emperors are usually said to be of gold and silver, never of glass: Duchesne, Liber pontificalis, I, pp. cxlii–cxlv.


29. Gregory of Tours, Miraculorum libri, 1.46, "Calyx crystallinus admirabilis pulchritudine."


31. Digest (Roman code of law) pp. 9, 2, 27, 29: "Si calicem diametrum faciendum dedisti, si quidem imperitia fregit, damn ei inuria tenebitur: si vero non imperita fregit, sed rimas habebat vitiosas, potest esse excussatus," quoted in Trowbridge, Philological Studies, p. 110 and n. 27. This law was written in the early 3rd century. Vickers, "Rock Crystal," p. 59, assumes it refers to "cage-cups," but there is no reason to believe the law does not extend to glass engraving.
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