What Does a Signature on a Banknote Actually Mean?

Audrius Moskaliovas | Founder & Curator, WorldBanknotes.eu

Online article updated 9 September 2026 | PDF edition 27 October 2026
https://worldbanknotes.eu/collector-guide/identification/what-do-banknote-signatures-mean/



India 20 Rupees, Hungary 500 Forint and Botswana 10 Pula banknotes showing different signature arrangements.

A signature is one of the smallest features on a banknote and one of the easiest to overinterpret. Collectors use signatures to distinguish varieties, date production periods and identify officials. Catalogues may assign a separate signatory designation to notes that are otherwise nearly identical.

That makes a simple-looking question surprisingly difficult: **what does a signature on a banknote actually attest?**

The intuitive answer is that the people whose signatures appear on a note are the officials who personally authorised it, so the number of signatures should reveal how many people were required to approve the issue. Comparative evidence does not support that as a universal rule.

> **A banknote signature is a jurisdiction-specific authentication and representation device. It may be part of the legally prescribed form of the note, represent an office, execute or authenticate an institutional act, preserve a promise-to-pay tradition, or identify a production period or catalogue variety. The number of visible signatures is not, by itself, a universal measure of approval structure, issuer liability or legal-tender status.**

The useful question is therefore not simply *how many signatures are there?* It is *which legal and institutional layer is this printed mark operating in?*

Five Layers Behind a Banknote Signature

Five different things can coincide on one note, partially overlap, or diverge. Keeping them separate prevents most of the common mistakes.

Layer	What it asks	Why it matters
Physical mark	What is visibly printed: signature, seal, stamp, name or title?	Appearance establishes what is on the note, not automatically what it does in law.
Catalogue signature variety	How does a catalogue group the signatories or assign a signature designation?	Useful for identification and catalogue varieties, but not automatically a physical census.
Represented office	Which office or institution does the mark represent?	The office may be institutionally more important than the individual officeholder.
Legal authentication / execution	Does a statute, regulation or corporate rule specify who authenticates or signs for the issuer?	This is the layer most easily confused with visible signature count.
Issuance, liability and legal status	What rule authorises the issue and gives the note its monetary status?	These rules may sit elsewhere in the monetary framework; see also who issues banknotes.

In cataloguing, a printed name should not be labelled “the official who authorised the issue” unless the issue-specific evidence actually establishes that function.

Honduras: When the Law Prescribes Three Signatures

Honduras provides a strong positive case because the banknote-form rule is explicit. Article 27 of the *Ley del Banco Central de Honduras* prescribes three facsimile signatures on banknotes: the President of the Central Bank, the Manager of the Central Bank and the relevant Secretary of State for finance.

The catalogue architecture matches this unusually well: The Banknote Book arranges Banco Central de Honduras signature varieties under the same three office columns. Individual notes can therefore be distinguished by particular three-person combinations.

But Article 26 performs a different job. It establishes the Central Bank as the sole issuer of legal-tender notes and coins and gives them their monetary force. Article 27 describes the form of the note and its signatures.

Honduras shows that signatures can be legally required without making the signature count itself the source of the banknote’s monetary status.

Bank of England: From Handwritten Authentication to Printed Continuity

The Bank of England provides an unusually clear historical bridge between individual authentication and modern mass printing. Its own historical material records that after 1809 the cashier's signature was the only handwritten part of the note, that legislation in 1820 allowed signatures to be printed, and that the Bank adopted printed signatures in 1853. From 1870 the printed signature was consistently that of the Chief Cashier.

The visual feature therefore survived while its mode changed. A handwritten act on an individual instrument became a printed representation embedded in a mass-produced design. The modern Chief Cashier's signature still sits beside the Bank's promise to pay, but it is reproduced as part of the note.

Officeholder succession makes the point even more clearly. When Victoria Cleland-signature notes were introduced in 2015, the Bank stated that they were the **same design** as notes carrying the signatures of Chris Salmon and earlier Chief Cashiers, and that the different-signature notes would circulate together with the same status. Holders did not need to exchange the predecessor-signature notes.

The officeholder changed. The signature on newly produced notes changed. The status of the predecessor-signature notes did not.

The Euro: A Signature in the Design, Legal Tender from the Treaty

Euro banknotes make the separation even cleaner. Each note bears the signature of an ECB President, and the European Central Bank states that notes carrying the signatures of Wim Duisenberg, Jean-Claude Trichet, Mario Draghi or Christine Lagarde are all equally valid.

ECB Decision ECB/2013/10 lists the President's signature among the elements of the banknote design. The legal authority behind euro banknotes is established elsewhere: Article 128 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union gives the ECB the exclusive right to authorise their issue, allows the ECB and national central banks to issue them, and provides that the banknotes issued by the ECB and the national central banks are the only such notes having the status of legal tender within the Union.

The distinction is direct: **the President's signature is a prescribed design and institutional element; issue authority and legal-tender status arise from the Treaty framework.**

Botswana: Two Institutions on One Banknote

Botswana provides a modern bank-and-government model. In 2021 the Bank of Botswana announced a second emission of the P50 carrying the signatures of the former Minister of Finance and Economic Development, Dr Thapelo Matsheka, and Governor Moses Dinekere Pelaelo.

The Bank also stated that the new emission would circulate concurrently with the existing P50. The physical change was not literally signature-only - a post-print varnish was also added - so the two emissions should not be described as identical except for the signatures.

The succession evidence remains strong. A new Minister/Governor pair could identify a new emission while the predecessor emission continued in circulation. The signatures visibly represent both government and central-bank offices, but their replacement did not operate as an expiry switch for the earlier notes.

India: A Promise Clause Inside a Specialised Currency Law

Modern Reserve Bank of India notes preserve a form that strongly resembles the historic language of a signed promise. RBI material for the redesigned ₹10 note identifies an obverse group containing the Guarantee Clause, the Governor's signature with Promise Clause, and the RBI emblem.

That visible form is real, but Indian law provides a direct warning against treating the modern banknote as an ordinary promissory note. Section 4 of the Negotiable Instruments Act 1881 expressly excludes a bank-note or currency-note from the statutory definition of a promissory note.

The Reserve Bank of India Act supplies the specialised monetary framework instead: section 22 establishes the RBI's sole right to issue banknotes, section 25 governs their form, and section 26 governs their legal-tender character and guarantee.

The RBI's 2018 ₹10 introduction also provides a succession control. The new note carried the Governor's signature, while the RBI expressly confirmed that earlier ₹10 banknotes remained legal tender.

The promise and the signature are therefore meaningful features, but their legal significance has to be read inside the banknote's own monetary-law regime rather than imported from the ordinary law of negotiable instruments.

Japan: No Catalogue Signature, but Official Seals

Japan exposes a different problem: even the word *signature* can be too narrow. The Banknote Book classifies the 1953 Japanese 100-yen note, P-90, as **No sig.**

Yet Japan's National Printing Bureau identifies official seals on Bank of Japan notes: the seal of the Governor of the Bank of Japan on the front and the seal of the Director-General of the Bank's Currency Issue Department on the reverse.

The Bank of Japan Act separately provides that the Bank issues banknotes and that Bank of Japan notes are legal tender without limit. The existence of those seals should not be rewritten as a statutory signature requirement unless a source establishes that function.

Zero catalogue signatures can coexist with official authority marks. Bank of Japan notes carry legal-tender status under the Act, independently of how a catalogue classifies their signatures. For a catalogue, "No signature" and "no official mark" are not interchangeable statements.

Hungary: Four Printed Signatures, Two-Person Corporate Signing

Hungary is the strongest warning against equating visible signature count with legal approval count. The MNB regulation governing the redesigned 500-forint note specifies four printed signatures, and the note form itself shows four visible signature marks.

Separately, the Magyar Nemzeti Bank's documented corporate-signing framework for banknotes provides for joint signing by the Governor and a Deputy Governor designated by the Governor. The official version history and the MNB organisational rules in force in 2018 support this as the applicable corporate-signing regime for the relevant period.

The defensible conclusion is not that the other two printed signatures are decorative. Their precise legal role should not be invented. What is established is narrower and more important: **four signatures are**

specified on the banknote form while the documented corporate-signing mechanism requires two persons.

> **Printed signature count ≠ number of persons required for corporate execution.** Hungary is enough to disprove that equation as a universal rule.

Currency Boards: When Signatures Track Governance - and When They Do Not

The study must not overcorrect. There are historical systems in which signature count really did map directly onto governance - and others in which the relationship changed over time.

West African Currency Board: A Positive Control

An IMF *Staff Papers* article reproducing the West African Currency Board Regulations 1949 states that currency notes were to be authenticated by facsimiles of the signatures of the members of the Board for the time being.

Here the intuitive model works: the authentication rule directly links the facsimile signature set to Board membership. The original official regulation scan has not been located in the research package, so this remains an authoritative historical reproduction rather than a primary-source closure.

The point is important because it shows why "signatures are merely decorative" would be just as wrong as "signature count always equals approval count."

East African Currency Board: Changing Signature Architecture

The East African Currency Board provides the strongest within-issuer counterexample. The same institution moved through sharply different signature arrangements.

Checkpoint	Visible / catalogue architecture	What can safely be concluded
1958	Four signatures at right; none at left	The catalogue explicitly records four visible signatures.
1961	Four signatures at right; three at left	Seven visible signatures are explicitly documented.
1964 Lake Victoria design	Chairman + Secretary	The visible signing architecture was reduced to two offices.

Historical research by Joachim W. Kratz records that EACB Board membership was increased from four to seven in 1960. The seven-signature 1961-1962 phase is therefore consistent with a seven-member governance phase.

But the 1964 move to Chairman + Secretary did **not** mean that the Board itself had simply become a two-person body. The visible signature count changed more dramatically than the institution's membership.

The precise archival decision explaining why the 1964 design replaced the wider signature set with Chairman + Secretary has not been established from an accessible decision record. Its cause should therefore be left unresolved rather than attributed to decolonisation, delegation, administrative simplification or any other convenient explanation.

What the evidence already establishes is enough: **one issuer can change its signature architecture as its representation or authentication mechanism changes.** A banknote's signature count is not a fixed diagram of the issuer's organisational chart.

Does a New Signature Invalidate Old Banknotes?

Across the modern succession controls examined here, a change of signatory does not by itself invalidate otherwise valid predecessor-signature notes.

System	What changed	Official evidence about predecessor notes
Bank of England	Chief Cashier	Cleland-signature notes were the same design as predecessor-signature notes and circulated alongside them with the same status.
Euro / ECB	ECB President	Duisenberg-, Trichet-, Draghi- and Lagarde-signature notes are equally valid.
Botswana	Minister + Governor pair	The second P50 emission was announced to circulate concurrently with the existing emission.
India / RBI	Governor signature	The 2018 ₹10 introduction stated that previously issued ₹10 banknotes remained legal tender.

These examples establish a comparative pattern, not a universal rule for every currency ever issued. The publication-safe conclusion is narrower: **in several modern monetary systems, a change of signatory changes newly produced notes or emission identity without, by itself, extinguishing the status of predecessor-signature notes.**

What Signatures Mean for Collectors

For collectors, signatures remain one of the most useful diagnostic features on a banknote. They can separate otherwise similar varieties, identify a production period, reveal a change of officeholder and sometimes document a change in the institutional architecture behind an issue.

That is why signature information belongs alongside date, issuer, denomination, catalogue reference and other identification fields in a structured catalogue. The practical identification process is covered more broadly in How to Identify a Banknote.

- **Record what is visible.** A printed signature, handwritten signature, seal and stamp are different mark types.
- **Record the represented office separately.** A name should not silently inherit a legal role from its job title.

- **Keep catalogue variety separate from physical count.** A catalogue may group names in ways that are useful for attribution but are not a fresh count of visible marks.
- **Treat legal function as issue-specific.** "Authorised the issue" is safe only when the relevant legal or official source establishes it.
- **Do not treat an officeholder change as a validity date.** Check the issuer's withdrawal and legal-status rules separately.

A safe general formulation for catalogue use is: **Signatures identify the officials represented on a banknote and can help distinguish issue periods or catalogue varieties. Their legal function varies by issuer and should be recorded as issue-specific rather than assumed.**

Final Thoughts

A signature looks personal. A modern banknote is usually institutional.

The printed signature retains a connection to the older history of the banknote as an authenticated promise, but modern monetary systems have developed in different directions. In some jurisdictions the law prescribes particular facsimile signatories. In others the signature is a design or series element layered on top of a separate statutory issue mechanism. Historical currency boards can tie signature sets directly to governance, while the same issuer can later adopt a completely different signing architecture. Japan shows that official authority marks do not even have to be catalogue-classified signatures.

The strongest conclusion is therefore one of **non-equivalence, not irrelevance**. Signatures matter greatly - for identification, chronology, representation, authentication and sometimes legal execution - but their meaning cannot be read from the number of marks alone.

For a collector, the better question is no longer simply *Who signed this banknote?* It is: **What does this mark represent in this monetary system, and which rule gives it that meaning?** That question turns a small printed detail into a record of the institution behind the note.

Frequently Asked Questions

What does a signature on a banknote mean?

It depends on the issuer and period. A signature can represent an office, form part of a statutory note specification, authenticate or execute an institutional act, preserve a promise-to-pay tradition, or identify a production period or catalogue variety.

Do more signatures mean more people had to approve the banknote?

Not universally. Hungary provides a direct counterexample: four signatures are specified on the banknote form while the documented banknote corporate-signing mechanism uses two persons.

Does a new governor or cashier signature make older notes invalid?

Not by itself in the modern systems examined here. The official evidence differs by system: predecessor notes retained the same status, remained equally valid, circulated concurrently, or remained legal tender after a signatory change.

Does a banknote need a signature to be legal tender?

There is no universal positive-law rule requiring that. Japan is a clear example: Bank of Japan notes have legal-tender status under statute, while the catalogue can classify a note as having no signature and the physical note carries official seals instead.

Why do catalogues list signature varieties?

Signatory combinations can distinguish production periods or otherwise similar notes. They are therefore useful for attribution and collecting even when a change of signature does not change the note's legal status.

Can a banknote have no signatures?

Yes. Some notes are catalogued as having no signature. That does not necessarily mean the note has no official authority marks; Japanese notes provide a clear example using official seals.

Are banknote signatures actually handwritten?

Historically, some were. Modern banknote signatures are usually printed or reproduced facsimiles. The Bank of England provides a documented transition from handwritten cashier signatures to printed signatures in the nineteenth century.

Is a signed promise-to-pay banknote simply a promissory note?

Not as a universal legal classification. India's Negotiable Instruments Act expressly excludes banknotes and currency notes from its statutory definition of a promissory note, while the RBI Act supplies the specialised monetary regime.

Selected References

1. Banco Central de Honduras - *Ley del Banco Central de Honduras*, Articles 26-27, for the separation between sole issue/legal force and the three prescribed facsimile signatures.
2. Bank of England - Chief Cashiers, for the institutional role of the Chief Cashier's signature.
3. Bank of England - Cleland signature notes issue, 24 February 2015, for same-design predecessor and successor signature notes circulating with the same status.
4. Bank of England - *The Bank of England Note: A Short History* (PDF), for the transition from handwritten to printed signatures.
5. European Central Bank - Banknote design and signatures, for the ECB President signature and equal validity of different presidential signatures.
6. Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Article 128, for euro-banknote authorisation, issue and legal-tender status.
7. ECB Decision ECB/2013/10, which lists the President's signature among euro-banknote design elements.
8. Bank of Botswana - Second Emission of the P50 Banknote, 3 November 2021 (PDF), for the Minister/Governor signature pair, concurrent circulation and post-print varnish.
9. India Code - Negotiable Instruments Act 1881, Section 4 (PDF), for the exclusion of bank-notes and currency-notes from the statutory promissory-note definition.
10. India Code - Reserve Bank of India Act 1934 (PDF), especially sections 22, 25 and 26 for issue, form and legal-tender rules.

11. Reserve Bank of India - Introduction of ₹10 denomination banknotes in the Mahatma Gandhi (New) Series, 5 January 2018, for the Governor signature, Guarantee/Promise Clause and continued legal tender of earlier ₹10 notes.
12. Bank of Japan Act, Articles 46-49, for Bank of Japan banknote issue and legal-tender status.
13. National Printing Bureau of Japan - Banknote FAQs, for the identification of the Governor and Currency Issue Department seals.
14. Magyar Nemzeti Bank - 25/2018. (VII. 3.) MNB regulation, for the four signatures specified on the redesigned 500-forint banknote.
15. Magyar Nemzeti Bank - organisational and operating rules effective 1 July 2018 (PDF), for the exact-period treatment of banknote corporate signing as a special signing regime.
16. Magyar Nemzeti Bank - official Founding Deed archive by effective date, whose chronology lists the 2015-10-30 version followed by the 2021-11-01 version.
17. Magyar Nemzeti Bank - notice of the Founding Deed amendment effective 1 November 2021, closing the effective-date chain across 2018.
18. Hungarian Parliament - MNB Founding Deed, clause 11.3, for banknote corporate signing by the Governor and a designated Deputy Governor.
19. H. A. Shannon, "The Modern Colonial Sterling Exchange Standard," *IMF Staff Papers*, reproducing the West African Currency Board Regulations 1949.
20. Joachim W. Kratz, "The East African Currency Board," *IMF Staff Papers* 13 (1966), for the 1960 increase of EACB Board membership from four to seven.
21. *The Banknote Book*, East Africa chapter, for the EACB signature-variety sequence and explicit 1958 and 1961 physical-signature descriptions.
22. Benjamin Geva, Seraina Neva Grünewald & Corinne Zellweger-Gutknecht, "The e-Banknote as a 'Banknote': A Monetary Law Interpreted," *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 41(4) (2021), 1119-1148, for the doctrinal history of the banknote as an authenticated obligation and its development into the modern monetary instrument.

Physical and catalogue cross-checks used for this article were kept separate from the legal analysis. No worldwide percentage distribution of visible signature counts is asserted here.

About the Author

Audrius is the founder and curator of WorldBanknotes.eu, a specialised catalogue and shop for collectible banknotes from around the world, and a long-time collector and researcher of paper money. His work focuses on banknote identification, catalogue structure, signatures, design and the historical and institutional context behind individual issues.

Explore Banknotes in the Catalogue

A signature is most useful when it is read together with the rest of the note: issuer, currency, denomination, date, catalogue reference and physical design. For the broader identification process, start with What Is a Banknote? and How to Identify a Banknote.

Browse WorldBanknotes.eu by country, currency or issuing authority, or open the full banknote catalogue.