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<td>TAM</td>
<td>Tituli Asiae Minoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIB</td>
<td>Tabula Imperii Byzantini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Travaux et Mémoires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VetChr</td>
<td>Vetera Christianorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSt</td>
<td>Wiener Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPE</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRVI</td>
<td>Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For a discipline that has until very recently been denied existence, Byzantine epigraphy is doing remarkably well. Paul Lemerle’s laconic statement that ‘l’épigraphe byzantine n’existe pas’ (pronounced at Oxford’s International Congress of Byzantine Studies in 1966) has been reiterated often enough for the field to gain the reputation of being elusive and esoteric; but it no longer faithfully describes the state of epigraphic scholarship nor the state of research into inscriptions.

The past few years alone have seen several significant contributions towards advancing the discipline, including an impressive lineup of collective volumes dealing with late antique and Byzantine epigraphy, such as *Viewing Inscriptions in the Late Antique and Medieval World* (edited by Eastmond in 2015), *Inscriptions in Byzantium and Beyond* (Rhoby, also in 2015), *Inscriptions in Byzantine and Post-Byzantine History and History of Art* (Stavrakos in 2016), *Writing Matters: Presenting and Perceiving Monumental Inscriptions in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Berti and others in 2017), *The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity* (Bolle and others, also in 2017) and *Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art: Crossing Borders* (Moutafov and Toth in 2018). Another major accomplishment has been Andreas Rhoby’s four-volume edition of verse inscriptions, *Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung* (Vienna, 2009–18), the result of a Vienna project led by Wolfram Hörandner.

The presence of epigraphy has become ever more prominent at the International Congresses for Byzantine Studies (round tables in Sofia 2011, Belgrade 2016; round table and open communication session in Istanbul 2021), while the 2017 International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, for the first time in its history, included panels focusing on ‘later’ Greek material. There have also been other epigraphy-focused events, such as the *Summer Workshops in Byzantine Epigraphy*, convened by Toth and Rhoby (Athens 2014 and Istanbul 2018). All this demonstrates a huge increase in interest in inscriptional matters and a growing awareness of the significance of epigraphy – a discipline concerned with the presentation, classification and interpretation of inscriptions – in the field of Byzantine Studies. Byzantine epigraphy has been dislodged from its ancillary position as handmaiden to the historical sciences, good only for serving up new ‘facts’, and has become an academic subject in its own right.
However, Lemerle’s words still strongly resonate if we bear in mind the areas where elementary groundwork has not yet been done: most noticeably, the discipline remains uncodified and there is still no consensus over the most fundamental issues, such as how to edit and present epigraphic material. As Cyril Mango explains in his opening address, one of the most pressing needs is for an album of dated inscriptions, which would allow us to trace the development of epigraphic script throughout the centuries. Xenaki’s contribution to this volume remedies this lacuna to a certain extent by offering a detailed description of the types of script in the Parthenon. But much more needs to be done before we can date, with a fair amount of certainty, inscriptions that bear no date.

Another problem with Byzantine epigraphy is how inaccessible and disparate the material still is. Although the well-known corpora by Kirchhoff in CIG, Grégoire for Asia Minor, Guillou for Italy have been enriched by some more recent publications such as Asdracha for Thrace, Lehmann and Holum for Cesarea Maritima, Sironen for Athens and Corinth and Mitchell and French for Ankara, we are far from having complete collections available to the wider academic community. A significant step forward has been made by focusing on thematic selections (Rhoby on inscriptional poetry and Nowakowski on epigraphic evidence for the cult of saints). A notable progress in this area has been achieved by the Text Encoding Initiative Epidoc and by making some collections available online (Aphrodisias by Roueché; Northern Black Sea by Vinogradov; Phrygia and Lykaonia in MAMA X; Asia Minor and Greece in Topoi). Ever since the first one, there has hardly been an International Congress of Byzantine Studies without people bemoaning the lack of edited sources and stressing the problem of access and the need for a ‘corpus’. At the Congress in Sofia in 2011, the creation of a new series, Inscriptiones Graecae Aevi Byzantini (IGAB), was announced with the intention of providing a publication platform for the projects that are underway, such as the Corpus of Dated and Datable Inscriptions from Constantinople and its Hinterland (Mango, Ševčenko and McCabe) and Dokumentation und Auswertung der griechischen Inschriften Kretas (13.–17. Jh.) (Tsamakda), and those whose realization still lies in the future, such as Dedicatory Inscriptions and Donor Portraits (Kalopissi-Verti) and Byzantine Inscriptions of Mt Athos (Androudis and Hostetler).

The meaning of the word ‘inscription’ needs some clarification. As perusal of the present volume will immediately show, most of the material is not engraved in stone, but is painted, inlaid in mosaics, scratched on hard surfaces, imprinted in lead, etc. Thanks to the Vienna project, Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung (BEIÜ), we now have a representative corpus of ‘inscriptions’ in the widest sense of the word: not only inscriptions in stone, but in all other media as well. The present volume highlights one of the fundamental differences between late antiquity and Byzantium proper: the move from outside – public, official, carved out in solid stone – to inside – private, devotional, and part of an artistic programme. It also notes shifts in epigraphic habits, such as the retreat of stone as the preferred epigraphic medium before fresco and wood painting.
techniques, and the ever more prevalent inclusion of symbols and images in epigraphic messages (see Toth in this volume).

Then there is the issue of readability and legibility. Inscriptions may be difficult to read with the naked eye; inscriptions may even be hidden from sight and, therefore, impossible to read (see Felle in this volume). Legibility, however, does not amount to readability. The fact that a text is legible does not necessarily mean it is read. Take Μ[ήτη]ρ Θ[εο]ῦ on sacred images. Not to have ΜΡ ΘΥ next to an image of the Mother of God would be blasphemy in the Orthodox world. But does it mean that the faithful actually read Μήτηρ Θεοῦ, or did they consider it to be a logo, a graphematic design not unlike the universal Coca-Cola trade mark which even people with no reading ability can immediately recognize? The ubiquitousness of texts on religious imagery poses a fundamental question: why identify the Crucifixion as a σταύρωσις if everybody recognizes the iconography? What is the function of text in such cases?

Related to the question of readability is the issue of literacy. The vast majority of the Byzantines could not read and yet they were surrounded by inscriptions of all kinds, which either implicitly or explicitly addressed them. Take dedicatory inscriptions, which usually end with a plea for salvation: occasionally, given their location in the church (say, close to the sanctuary), it is clear that the appropriate response for the faithful was to commemorate the donors in their prayers and thus to strengthen their chances of success in the afterlife – but if very few members of the congregation could read, how were they supposed to know that this was expected of them? The answer is that the ‘lesser sort’ know perfectly well what their social ‘betters’ want from them: money talks – and so does power. In general, social and cultural codes are as important as reading skills in understanding a message: an inscription on the city walls of Constantinople, for instance, is in itself a declaration of imperial power and needs no deciphering for it to be understood (see Melvani in this volume). Furthermore, evidence of visual literacy and mediated reading, with people reading out the text of inscriptions to others less skilled (see Rhoby), serves as a reminder that a variety of means of accessing epigraphic texts will have been available to a wide spectrum of users. This aspect adds a layer of complexity to the customary question ‘Who reads inscriptions?’ and should act as a caution against the tendency of reducing the issue of reception to the problem of literacy.

Epigraphy is not content only: it also has non-verbal dimensions, such as the beauty of the script, the ornamental effect, the interaction with the object or the surface on which the inscription is found, its ceremonial or liturgical usages, the act of writing itself (think of graffiti as a form of marking one’s presence), and the human desire for communication. It is worth noting that as from circa the year 1000, the lettering becomes generally more difficult to decipher: cursive forms, abbreviations and ligatures, some of them quite intricate, become increasingly fashionable, and the result is that ornament wins over content. What matters is not so much the content, but the visual aspect of the inscription. The medium becomes the message. This also explains the popularity of pseudo-Kufic (pseudo-Arabic) inscriptions in Byzantium: these inscriptions have no obvious
meaning, but are just there because their highly stylized and decorative patterns are agreeable to look at.

The present volume is divided into six thematic clusters. The first theme, ‘After late antiquity: traditions and transitions’, looks at the similarities and asymmetries in epigraphy from late antiquity to the medieval period. Destephen offers a general overview of trends in late antique epigraphy, with particular emphasis on Asia Minor, highlighting the rarefaction of the epigraphic habit and the elite character and Christian nature of most of the surviving evidence. Both Jacobs and Leatherbury examine mosaic inscriptions in the Levant in the later sixth to the eighth centuries: Jacobs points out that most floor inscriptions come from rural areas and that the donors appear to belong to the middling sort, while Leatherbury looks at the ways in which local communities both retained and adapted their epigraphic habits after the Islamic conquest of Syria and Palestine. Toth focuses on the transformations of the Abgar Story in religious imagery and inscriptions as a case study in how writing, depicting and performing interact in Byzantium.

The second theme is that of ‘Legibility and readability’. It consists of two papers. The first, by Rhoby, deals with the ways in which spectators perceive, interpret and react to inscriptions, regardless of their reading skills. The second paper, by Felle, examines funerary non-exposed inscriptions in Italy and the Balkans: that is, inscriptions placed inside tombs and, therefore, obviously not intended to be read by anyone.

The third thematic cluster, ‘Church and state’, which consists of three papers, covers most of the epigraphic material to be found in Byzantium. As Pallis points out in his paper, in churches inscriptions are everywhere: from the entrance right up to the sanctuary, from floors to domes, along the walls both exterior and interior, on holy vessels and embroidered fabrics. Pallis rightly calls the Byzantine church a ‘house of inscriptions’. It is a house of words because God Incarnate is the Word: it is a discursive space that enables the faithful to communicate with the divine. Melvani’s paper deals with inscriptions in the public domain, in particular on fortification walls and suchlike, which form a treasure trove of imperial messages. His paper demonstrates the power of the written word and its use as an ideological vehicle for the promotion of the imperial cult. The paper by Wassiliou-Seibt offers an overview of the production of inscriptions on Byzantine lead seals: a conservative estimate is that there are more than a hundred thousand. The earliest lead seal inscriptions tend to be fairly simple but, as time goes by, they become increasingly elaborate and sophisticated and are quite often cast in verse. Lead seal inscriptions are important because they offer detailed information on the state and church apparatuses and the patterns of self-fashioning practised among Byzantine dignitaries.

The fourth theme, ‘Formal and informal inscriptions in Athens’, comprises studies of two Athenian churches: the Parthenon dedicated to the Theotokos (Xenaki) and the Hephaisteion dedicated to St George (McCabe). Both churches offer a mass of epigraphic material: carved or scratched inscriptions that are often called ‘graffiti’, though many of these texts have an official character. Xenaki examines the obituaries of church officials in the Parthenon: since these can be
securely dated, they enable us to study the development of epigraphic script at one particular site. McCabe, too, looks at funerary inscriptions, both formal and informal ones, highlighting how the Hephaisteion material offers us a precious glimpse of the local community living nearby the church.

The fifth thematic grouping, ‘Objects, texts and images’, focuses on inscriptions on works of art. Hostetler argues that the placement of patrons’ names is an important part of how inscriptions convey meaning. He distinguishes four types: conspicuous, iconographic, interactive and functional, and explains their relation to the works of art on which they are found and how they serve to express personal, ideological and spiritual messages. Lidova turns her attention to ‘textual frames’ in early Byzantine art: inscriptions on the frames of icons in the collection of St Catherine’s at Sinai and in the church of Santa Maria in Trastevere in Rome. As she explains, the purpose of these textual frames is to transform the icons into speaking images. Drpić studies inscriptions on Byzantine enkolpia (devotional pectorals). He focuses on three aspects of these inscriptions: the feeling of wonder that the pectoral instils in the viewer, the aesthetics of brevity, and the intimate rapport between the pectoral and its wearer.

The sixth and last part of this volume includes case studies of hitherto unknown or unexplored inscriptions. Thonemann and Lauxtermann publish a verse inscription from the region of Konya, probably written on the façade of a hermitage, in which a monk and presbyter called Sabas had built his tomb while alive. This inscription is found in the notebooks of Sir Willam Ramsay, which are kept at Oxford. Stavrakos publishes another verse inscription, from the church of Sts Theodoroi in Myrtia, Laconia: the text, dating to 1281–82, celebrates St Kournatos, a saint hardly known outside Asia Minor, and offers historical information on the city of Monemvasia in the later thirteenth century. Lauxtermann discusses a Greek text found in a collection of Latin inscriptions and argues that this epigram accompanied an image of St Peter that had been set up by king Liutprand (712–44) in the monastery of Sanctus Petrus in Caelo Aureo in Pavia. He also discusses a Latin building inscription from Cortelona, which presents king Liutprand as the protector of the church against the schismatic Leo III and as the restorer of the ‘Catholic order’.

We are extremely grateful to Cyril Mango for accepting our invitation to open the forty-ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies and address the gathered epigraphists with a rousing speech (for which see the ‘Opening Address’ in this volume). It is no exaggeration to say that Cyril Mango has been a major source of inspiration and direction for all of us, from his survey of the Byzantine inscriptions of Constantinople in 1951 to his various excavation reports, the corpus of dated inscriptions he put together with another great scholar, Ihor Ševčenko, his innovative article on the development of the epigraphic script from late antiquity to the mid-Byzantine period, and the volume on Greek and Latin epigraphy he co-edited with Cavallo in 1995. Where would we be now if it had not been for him? This is why we should like fondly to dedicate this volume to Cyril Mango.

Marc Lauxtermann
Ida Toth
Today’s occasion takes me back 25 years when a number of interested colleagues and I tried to structure the syllabus for the MSt and MPhil in Byzantine Studies to include four auxiliary disciplines, namely Numismatics, Palaeography, Sigillography and Epigraphy. Numismatics was taken on by Michael Metcalf, Keeper of the Heberden Coin Room in the Ashmolean, and Palaeography by Nigel Wilson, while I was saddled with Sigillography and Epigraphy, on which I remember giving a number of lectures. That was in 1992.

We were perhaps a little too hasty in assuming that there existed a ready-made and generally accepted definition of what epigraphy meant in that context. We assumed that just as Byzantine sigillography had to do with impressions made on lead blanks, so Byzantine epigraphy, like its antique ancestor, had to do primarily with texts carved on stone. We should have paid more heed to the dictum of Paul Lemerle to the effect that a discipline of Byzantine epigraphy did not exist. In other words, there was no accepted definition: the antique model was perhaps inappropriate to the Byzantine Middle Ages and epigraphy was rather to be treated as a catch-all, embracing not only inscriptions incised on stone, but also, and more frequently, other media, such as paint and mosaic, ivory and steatite. Epigraphy included both public and private communications written on a variety of objects or scratched on the walls of ancient monuments. Whereas it would not be difficult to accommodate these marginal categories, a more delicate and important question is that of chronology. Where does our coverage begin and where does it end? It used to be customary to equate ‘Byzantine’ with ‘Early Christian’ or ‘Greek Christian’. Today the trend is to posit a separate period called Late Antique beginning with the accession of Diocletian (284) and ending with the death of Herakleios (641). It may be noted at the same time that the volume of Late Antique material is generally much greater than that of the ‘medieval’ Byzantine as illustrated by the following Table which I have quoted elsewhere.1

_Aphrodisias_ (extensively excavated during the last century); number of inscriptions:

1500: Early Empire
223: Late Empire, i.e. from the mid-3rd c. to the 6th c.
7: the whole Byzantine period, until the 11th or 12th c.
Laodicea Combusta, a small town of East Phrygia (before recent excavation):

300: found on site (mostly funerary), of which 130 Christian, and of those 130 only 10 are Byzantine (i.e. after the 6th c.).

Thessalonica, often called the ‘second biggest city of the medieval Empire’:

Ch. Edson Corpus (IG IX.2.1, 1972): 1020 items (of which the vast majority are pagan)
D. Feissel and J.M. Spieser: 130 Christian down to the 6th c. and 28 in the subsequent Byzantine period.

Needless to say, one would obtain very different figures if the calculation were made not on the basis of the classical lands of western Asia Minor and Macedonia, but of the Near East (Syria and Palestine) down to the Arab conquest. The latter are usually excluded for no good reason from studies of Greek epigraphy although they are for the most part both Greek and Christian and offer the further advantage of being very numerous and often precisely dated by local eras.

Whether as a result of foreign conquests (Near East and Balkans) or social change (land remaining within the Empire), the volume of inscriptions produced after Late Antiquity shows a steady drop. Whole categories of inscriptions die out, e.g. the honorific, usually accompanying statues of provincial governors, still in evidence in the fifth and sixth centuries as at Ephesus and Aphrodisias; or the category of edicts represented by the customs tariff of Abydos (on the Dardanelles) of the reign of Anastasios (Figure 0.1), the transit tariff of Anazarbos in Cilicia, and several others, the last example known to me being of the reign of Phokas. The two or three so-called late ‘edicts’ are in fact theological definitions, like one summarizing the decisions of the General Council of 680 that was posted in St Sophia (now lost) and, particularly incongruous, one displayed following the insignificant council of 1166 under Manuel I of which I am showing the first of five surviving sections of text, starting with the obsolete triumphal Roman formula, Isaurikos, Kilikikos, Armenikos and eleven other of the same kind for good measure (Figure 0.2).

The traditional categories that survived into the Middle Ages were reduced to building and funerary inscriptions. Among the first type, the repair of fortifications of several cities is epigraphically documented, the obvious example being of Constantinople’s both land and sea walls, ranging in date from 447 to 1448. These show a concerted campaign under the emperor Theophilos (829–42), represented today by nine survivors in situ (Figure 0.3), but originally numbering more than 20, and a further effort under John VIII Palaiologos (Figure 0.4). Others date from the reigns of Leo III (Figure 0.5), Michael III (Figure 0.6), Basil II (Figure 0.7) and Manuel Komnenos, in 1164 (Figure 0.8). Restorations in other cities are epigraphically attested in the ninth and tenth centuries at Nicaea,
Selymbria, Ancyra, Smyrna and Attaleia, repeatedly insisting on the concepts of security and firmness.

In the funerary sphere, Late Antiquity is marked by the increased production of sarcophagi centred on Prokonnesos and, on a lower social level, of steles of ordinary people: shopkeepers, petty traders, such as Alexander Sakkas of 585 (Figure 0.9), fishermen, soldiers, minor clergy, Jews. I have even encountered one wet nurse. Additional details often include the date of death (the name of the month usually misspelt), the native village of the deceased, his Christianity indicated by the adjective pistos, etc. The last example known to me in the area of Constantinople is of an African soldier in the expeditionary force of Herakleios that overthrew Phokas in 610. From then on ordinary people cease being commemorated by inscription. I know of only one exception – of one George, a doorkeeper, and his wife Euphrosyne in 1181 (Figure 0.10). Two urban graveyards at Constantinople have not yielded a single inscribed tomb. The surviving inscribed tombstones are of important persons: imperial officials, abbots, high ecclesiastics, etc., often in iambic verse or even hexameter as on the sarcophagus of Michael the synkellos of the early tenth century (Figure 0.11) and the burial of Michael Tornikes, Grand Constable buried ca 1328 in the Chora Monastery (Figure 0.12).
Figure 0.2 Conciliar Edict of Manuel I (1166) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
Figure 0.3  Repair of Sea Walls under Theophilos (829–42) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)

Figure 0.4  Repair of Outer Land Wall under John VIII Palaiologos (1440) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
Figure 0.5  Repair of Tower under Leo III and Constantine V, Land Walls, Tower 37 (727–41) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)

Figure 0.6  Repair of Sea Walls under Michael III by Bardas Caesar (856–9) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
Figure 0.7 Restoration under Basil II and Constantine VIII, Land Walls, Tower 36, 976–1025 (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)

Figure 0.8 Repair of Sea Walls under Manuel I (1163–4) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
Figure 0.9 Sepulchral cross of Alexander Sakkas (584–5) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)

Figure 0.10 Epitaph of George, doorkeeper, and his wife Euphrosyne (1181) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
As to important persons, they can no longer make use of sarcophagi which become unobtainable even to members of the imperial family. The solution that was eventually adopted was to place such burials in arcsolia usually in the narthexes of monasteries, the tomb itself being pieced together out of fragments of marble slabs (Figure 0.12). That left sufficient space for the insertion of an epitaph, usually in iambic verse. Often preserved among the works of named poets, these effusions lay more stress on the aristocratic lineage of the deceased than they do on the mystery of death.

The corpus of dated and datable inscriptions

You will allow me to make an announcement. Most of the pictures I have shown you have been taken from a corpus of dated and datable inscriptions from Constantinople and its hinterland which, as some of you know, has been in preparation by the late Ihor Ševčenko and myself over the past 50 years and is about to be completed by the effort of Anne McCabe. The corpus is limited to texts in Greek and the chronological span is 375–1456. Latin inscriptions have been omitted because there are too few of them, all falling within the same broad period (fourth and fifth centuries). The corpus, as I have said, includes nearly all the examples of inscriptions I am showing. To these may be added a series of monuments with imperial inscriptions – of Theodosios I in 390 (Figure 0.13), Constantine VII in 948–59 (Figure 0.14) on the Egyptian and masonry obelisks

Figure 0.11 Epitaph of Michael the synkellos (901–25) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
Figure 0.12  Epitaph of Grand Constable Michael Tornikes, Kariye Camii (ca 1330) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
Figure 0.13  Dedication of the Egyptian Obelisk (390) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)

Figure 0.14  Restoration of the Built Obelisk in the Hippodrome by Constantine VII (948–59) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)
in the Hippodrome and Manuel I (1143–80) for repair work on Constantine’s column (Figure 0.15). There are also further examples from the extensive collection of imperial wall restorations of the eighth, ninth, tenth to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in addition to those I mentioned earlier. Finally there is a group of representative churches built in the sixth, tenth and fourteenth centuries (Figures 0.16, 0.17 and 0.18).

*Figure 0.15 Column of Constantine, repairs by Manuel I (1169) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)*

*Figure 0.16 Dedication of the Church of St Polyeuktos by Anicia Juliana (524–27) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)*
Figure 0.17  Dedicatory Inscription of the North Church of the Monastery of Constantine Lips (907) (© Dumbarton Oaks Fieldwork Archive; photo Cyril Mango & Ihor Ševčenko)

Figure 0.18  Inscription of General and protostrator Michael Glabas Tarchaneiotes, Pammakaristos Monastery (ca 1310)
The primary purpose of this project is to provide a palaeographic album such as exists in manuscript studies illustrating the evolution of script by means of photographs. The total number of entries in the corpus is ca 130 and all, with one exception, on stone. The exception is of the bronze doors of the vestibule of St Sophia. They have been included because they suffered mutilation in modern times, and, in our opinion, deserved to be recorded while still complete. The project has been supported throughout by Dumbarton Oaks where the photographs are kept.

From the fourth to the tenth century, epigraphic script remains stable allowing for slight variations – a capital script that avoids all intrusions of cursive forms. A more compressed and increasingly ornamental alphabet then gains currency at the expense of legibility which is occasionally maintained thanks to a technique that has been little noticed, namely the use of lead as inlay of letters in out-of-doors inscriptions, producing a black-on-white effect, as seen from the Monastery of Lips (Figure 0.17), two from the reign of Manuel I in the twelfth century (Figure 0.8) and inscriptions from the repairs of land walls under John VIII in the fifteenth century (Figure 0.4). It is nice to think that as the Turks were standing at the gates, Byzantine craftsmen were busying over the niceties of epigraphy.

Notes
2 C. Mango, I. Ševčenko and A. McCabe, Corpus of Dated and Datable Byzantine Inscriptions from Constantinople, Bithynia and European Turkey (forthcoming).
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2 C. Mango, I. Ševčenko and A. McCabe, Corpus of Dated and Datable Byzantine Inscriptions from Constantinople, Bithynia and European Turkey (forthcoming).

Chapter 1

1 I would like to express my gratitude towards Ida Toth, Michael Featherstone and the anonymous reviewer for having read, corrected and improved this paper.

2 A. Rhoby (ed.), Inscriptions in Byzantium and Beyond: Methods, Projects, Case Studies (Vienna, 2015).

3 Totals, in round figures as elsewhere in the present study, have been made from the Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien volumes (henceforth abbreviated IK). See H. Wankel et al., I.Ephesos (IK, 11–17d); S. Şahin, I.Nikaia (IK, 9–10c); J. Nollé, I.Side (IK, 43–4); M.H. Sayar, I.Anazarbos, I (IK, 56). In the case of the city of Miletus, the count is based on A. Rehm et al., I.Milet. See also my recent paper: ‘The Late Milestones of Asia Minor’, Gephyra 16 (2018), 173–84.

4 MAMA, I, 1–284. In this volume, some numbers have been duplicated and even triplicated. Besides, inscription nos 249 to 260 are medieval (i.e. mid-Byzantine) and some documents, which are numbered, are uninscribed monuments.

5 G.H.R. Horsley and S. Mitchell, I.Central Pisidia (IK, 57); J. Strubbe, I.Pessinous (IK, 66).

6 Indications for Ancyra are provided by Stephen Mitchell, to whom I am very grateful.

7 F.W. Hasluck, Cyzicus. Being Some Account of the History and Antiquities of that City and of the District Adjacent to It (Cambridge, 1910), 263–95. According to the author, miscellanea include ‘landmarks, inscriptions from architecture, graffiti from gymnasia, small objects, etc.’.

8 C. Roueché, Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity. The Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions Including Texts from the Excavations at Aphrodisias Conducted by Kenan T. Erim (London, 1989).

9 Among 905 complete or fragmentary inscriptions collected by the two-volume corpus of Smyrna, there are only 14 late antique inscriptions, all of them funerary or votive. See G. Petzl, I.Smyrna, I (IK, 23), 559–72. In the case of Cyzicus, it is worth pointing
out that only epitaphs, which number 588, have been published by E. Schwerheim, *I.Kyzykos*, 1 (IK, 18). Non-funerary epigraphic documents are still awaited.


13 It is worth mentioning that only votive inscriptions carved upon altars and dedicated to some fifteen deities have been published, and therefore none of them is public. These texts have been edited and commented by T. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie* (Zutphen, 1978), 32–52. Besides concern for relatives, in central Asia Minor crops and cattle remained major preoccupations of this category of inscriptions as recently underlined and examined by C. Schuler, ‘Inscriptions and Identities of Rural Population Groups in Roman Asia Minor’, in J. Davies and J. Wilkes (eds), *Epigraphy and the Historical Sciences* (Oxford, 2012), 63–100, in particular 72–8.

14 For late antique inscriptions, see R. Merkelbach, *I.Assos* (IK, 4), 30 (a statue base of Constantius II), 31 (milestone of Theodosius I), 32–3 (dedications on mosaic pavements inside a church), 35 (ex-voto for a general’s son), 35a (donation to a church by a priest who was also a councillor), 69 (sarcophagus), 72 (another sarcophagus reused by a priest).


16 Some 290 inscriptions have been published in the case of Erythrae, but late antique documents are scant. See H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, *I.Erythrai*, I (IK, 1), 141 (statue base of Honorius and Theodosius II), 142 (invocation for a deacon and physician), 143 (fragmentary epitaph), 144 (fragmentary invocation). We have counted only 6 late antique Christian inscriptions in Iasos and 2 in Bargylia. The epigraphic corpus that both cities have in common consists of respectively 383 and 37 inscriptions (fragments are excluded). For Iasos, see W. Blümel, *I.Iasos*, II (IK, 28,2), 418 (funerary invocation), 419 (isopsephic epitaph), 420 (fragmentary dedication of a church under a bishop), 421 (fragmentary dedication of another place of Christian worship), 422 (blacksmith’s epitaph) and 423 (fragmentary epitaph of a priest). A statue base of the Emperor Julian and a tretecarchic milestone are also mentioned in W. Blümel, *I.Iasos*, I (IK, 28,1), 14 and 19. Regarding Bargylia, see W. Blümel, *I.Iasos*, II (IK, 28,2), 637 (dedication of a diakonikon) and 640 (invocation). Numbers 638 (dedication of some place of worship) and 639 (idem) are medieval.

author assumes that theophoric names remained in use among Christians in Rome. Some of them were associated to calendar, astrology and horoscope, but pagan or mythological names were greatly reduced after the fourth century. See also my recent paper: ‘Christianisation and Local Names: Fall and Rise in Late Antiquity’, in R. Parker (ed.), Changing Names: Tradition and Innovation in Ancient Greek Onomastics (Oxford, 2019), 258–76.


19 MAMA, III, 201–780. Certain entries have been duplicated or triplicated.

20 Several representatives of the Finnish school of Roman onomastics have reported this evolution: I. Kajanto, ‘The Emergence of the Late Single Name System’, in H.-G. Pflaum and N. Duval (eds), L’onomastique latine (Paris, 1977), 421–30, in particular 424, who have dated to the fourth century the turning point to less sophisticated names; idem, ‘Roman Nomenclature during the Late Empire’, in I. Di Stefano Manzella (ed.), Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano. Materiali e contributi scientifici per una mostra epigrafica (Vatican, 1997), 103–11, in particular 108–9 on the names borrowed from the Bible, taken from famous martyrs or suggesting a Christian value or virtue. See also H. Solin, ‘Problème de l’onomastique du Bas-Empire’, in J. Desmuliez and C. Hoêt-van Cauwenberghes (eds), Le monde romain à travers l’épigraphie: méthodes et pratiques (Villeneuve d’Ascq, 2005), 271–93, in particular 275–7 and 282–3. The author has investigated the remarkable popularity of the name John among laymen and above all clerics in Rome. The success is dated to the fourth to fifth centuries in the West, but it may have been earlier in the East given the testimony of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria circa 248–265, who already noticed his brethren’s inclination to the names of John, Paul and Peter. For Dionysius’ testimony, see Eusebius of Caesarea, Historia Ecclesiastica, VII, 25, 14.

21 In the case of Corinth, an in-depth study of 662 complete or fragmentary funerary inscriptions, of which 105 are still unpublished, has been carried out by M.B. Walbank, ‘Where Have All the Names Gone? The Christian Community in Corinth in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Eras’, in S.J. Friesen, D.N. Schowalter and J.C. Walters (eds), Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society (Leiden and London, 2010), 257–323, at 293–4 and 297, on the small pool of pagan and Christian names. The particularly well-documented case of Rome has been examined by H. Solin, ‘Le transformazioni dei nomi personali tra antichità e medievo’, in F. De Rubeis and W. Pohl (eds), Le scritture dai monasteri (Rome, 2003), 15–45, in particular 40–1 and 44 on the prevalence and permanence of names related to the major characters of the New Testament. This survey can be completed by F. De Rubeis, ‘Le epigrafi fra tarda antichità e primo medioevo’, in P. Delogu and S. Gasparri (eds), Le trasformazioni del V secolo. L’Italia, i barbari e l’Occidente romano (Turnhout, 2010), 705–30, in particular 705–6, who relies upon data provided by Carlo Carletti and Werner Eck. According to both scholars, the epigraphic documentation of pagan Rome may total some 90,000 inscriptions, of which 86,000 are epitaphs, and the epigraphic production of Christian Rome may amount to 35,000 (or 40,000) inscriptions, of which 94% are funerary.


28 According to the iconographic index provided by *MAMA*, I, 239. This number includes cases in which crosses have probably been erased.

29 *MAMA*, III, *passim*. The proportion of Christian tombs rises up to 90% if we include funerary inscriptions without any cross but with formulae, names or functions that prove that the deceased were Christians.


31 C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity*, nos 23, 38, 42, 45, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, etc.


33 See my paper ‘La christianisation de l’Asie Mineure jusqu’à Constantin’, 173 and n.50.
34 These figures have already been mentioned in the introduction to the Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, 3. Diocèse d’Asie (325–641) (Paris, 2008), 61–2. In the case of the forthcoming corpus of Ancyra, according to Stephen Mitchell (in correspondence), clerics represent some 10% of the total of late antique inscriptions.

35 The presence of clerics in Corasium and Corycus has been fully studied by S. Hübner, Der Klerus in der Gesellschaft des spätantiken Kleinasien (Stuttgart, 2005), 81–120, in particular 83–8 on the history and characteristics of both necropolis and 106–12 on the privileged position of clerics within late antique society.

36 Clerics represent about a sixth of all late antique inscriptions, Greek and Latin alike, found between the southern shore of the Danube river, the northern coast of the Aegean sea, and the eastern coastline of the Adriatic, see my study: ‘La coexistence du grec et du latin en Illlyricum (ier–vi er siècle)’, in C. Ruiz Darasse and E. R. Luján (eds), Contacts linguistiques dans l’Occident méditerranéen antique (Madrid, 2011), 129–44, at 140. More systematic collections provide very similar proportions of ecclesiastical documents among late antique inscriptions: 26 out of 245 in V. Beşevliev, Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien (Berlin, 1964) (medieval inscriptions have been omitted); 56 out of 285 in D. Feissel, Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes du Macédoine du ier au vi er siècle (Paris, 1983); 14 out of 112 in A.C. Bandy, The Greek Christian Inscriptions of Crete (Athens, 1970); 21 out of 145 in G. Kiourtzian, Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes des Cyclades, de la fin du ier au vi er siècle après J.-C. (Paris, 2000) (the angelos graffiti from the island of Thera are omitted); but only 16 out of 462 in Attica according to IG, II, 5, which mainly relies on the epigraphic documents collected and edited by E. Sironen, The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica. An Edition with Appendices on Scripts, Sepulchral Formulae and Occupations (Helsinki, 1997). In the last case, paucity of ecclesiastical inscriptions may result from the local inclination to anonymous epitaphs and the high proportion of fragmentary gravestones. For the Adriatic regions, in particular Venetia and Istria, see G. Cuscito, ‘Gradi e funzioni ecclesiastiche nelle epigrafi dell’alto Adriatico orientale (sec. iv–vi)’, in Atti del III Congresso nazionale di archeologia cristiana (Trieste, 1974), 211–53, at 239–41.


39 Many ruined rural churches are frequently mentioned and briefly described in several volumes of the Tabula Imperii Byzantini (TIB). For the above-mentioned provinces, see F. Hild and M. Restle, Kappadokien (Kappadokia, Charsianon, Sebasteia und Lykandos) (Vienna, 1981) (TIB 2); K. Belke, Galatien und Lykaonien (Vienna, 1984) (TIB 4); F. Hild and H. Hellenkemper, Kilikien und Isaurien, 2 vols (Vienna, 1990) (TIB 5).

41 S. Hübner, Der Klerus in der Gesellschaft, 89–90.


43 A few examples of aristocratic foundations and donations: J. Stauber, I.Adramytteion, 2 (IK, 51), 11, amended by D. Feissel, REG 111 (1998), 706 (no. 639) (undetermined sanctuary); R. Merkelbach, I.Kalchedon (IK, 20), 22 (martyrium); W. Blümel, I.Knidos, 1 (IK, 41), 243 (paving of a church); H. Grégoire, Recueil des inscriptions, 124 quater (oratory in Hypaepa); C. Roueché, Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity, 163 a–b (martyrium?); D. Feissel, REG 100 (1987), 370–1 (no. 493) (martyrium in Isauria); M.H. Sayar, I.Anazarbos (IK, 56), 1, 58 (church).


of Late Antiquity’, Ramus 37 (2008), 191–213, at 192–8, on the invaluable importance of studying epigrams to measure the diffusion and influence of the Nonnian manner on the late antique renewal of Greek poetry; idem, ‘Saxa loquuntur? Epigrammi epigrafici e diffusione della paideia nell’Oriente tardoantico’, AT 18 (2010), 163–80, at 175–7, on the elitist relations of author, reader and audience.

46 R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber, Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten, 1. Die Westküste Kleinasien von Knidos bis Ilion, 2. Die Nordküste Kleinasien (Marmarameer und Pontos), 3. Der ‘Ferne Osten’ und das Landesinnere bis zum Taurus, 4. Die Südküste Kleinasien, Syrien und Palaestina (Stuttgart-Leipzig, 1998–2002). If we omit fragmentary inscriptions and texts only transmitted by literary sources, in particular the Greek Anthology, the corpus comprises some 1,480 epigrams, of which 250 belong to Late Antiquity, that is, more than 15%. Whereas late antique inscriptions usually represent 5 to 10% of all preserved inscriptions, this higher proportion demonstrates, albeit in a very statistical way, the keen interest of late Roman elites in versified epigraphy and highbrow poetry. Half of the late antique epigrams collected by Merkelbach and Stauber are concentrated in three provinces: Asia, Caria and Bithynia, that is the heartland of Greek civilization in Asia Minor.

47 Nearly every grade of the ecclesiastical and even monastic hierarchy was interested in funerary or dedicatory epigrams. Here follows a sample in which Anatolian inscriptions are predominant. Bishops: MAMA, I, 171 (Laodicea Combusta in Pisidia); MAMA, VIII, 221a (Canan in Lycaonia); W.M. Ramsay, The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, I, 2 (Oxford, 1895), 742, no. 680 (Docimium in Phrygia). Priests: MAMA, VIII, 320 (Iconium in Lycaonia); SEG, 45, 1701 (Ancyra in Galatia); MAMA, I, 402 (Oricstus in Galatia). Lower grades: MAMA, I, 226 (deacon in Laodicea Combusta); E. Schwertheim, I.Klaudiu polis (IK, 33), 120 (lector of Hadriani in Bithynia); MAMA, VII, 240 (another lector in Galatian Claneos); S. Şahin, I.Nikaia (IK, 9), 550 (a nun).

48 The epigraphic habit was still going strong in Late Antiquity according to the conference proceedings edited by A. Donati (ed.), La terza età dell’epigrafia (Faenza, 1988).

49 Unfortunately my paper had already been completed when the interesting study by S. Mitchell, ‘The Christian Epigraphy of Asia Minor in Late Antiquity’, in K. Bolle, C. Machado and C. Witschel (eds), The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity (Heidelberg, 2017), 271–86, came out.

Chapter 2


2 The content of dedicatory inscriptions in these provinces has not been given proper attention either.

3 For another aspect of this evolution see I. Jacobs, ‘Late Antique Encroachment in the City Centres of Asia Minor: Economic Bustle and Socio-Political Significance’, in R. Haensch and Ph. von Rummel (eds), Himmelwärts und erdverbunden? Religiöse und wirtschaftliche Aspekte spätantiker Lebensrealität. Band 1 des Clusters 7 des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts (forthcoming).


6 E.g. Y. Israeli and D. Mevorah, *Cradle of Christianity* (Jerusalem, 2000), 86–7, described as ‘Part of the mosaic pavement from the church at Kissufim, depicting ‘Calliora’ and ‘The Lady of Silthous’ donating sixteen gold coins and a chicken’.


14 Habas, ‘Donations and Donors’, 77, fig. 4; Hachlili, *Ancient Mosaic Pavements*, 239.


19 Najjar and Sa’id, ‘A New Umayyad Church’, 547: (cross) *At the time of the most pious and most holy Bishop George, was renovated and terminated the whole work of the holy place by care of George (son) of John, and of the priest John and of all (the members of) their families, in the year 750* (cross).
20 Najjar and Saʾid, ‘A New Umayyad Church’, 552: (cross) For the pardon of the sins of John the priest (cross); (cross) O Lord God of saint Varus have mercy of Stephan and of Samuel [...] Amen (cross).

21 Najjar and Saʾid, ‘A New Umayyad Church’, 553: (cross) O Lord God of Saint Varus remember your servant John the priest and George son of John and all (the members) of his house.

22 Cohen, ‘Kissufim’, 256 for the region immediately around Kissufim. For churches built in the broader region, see A. Michel, Les églises d’époque byzantine et umayyade de Jordanie (provinces d’Arabie et de Palestine), Ve-VIIIe siècle: typologie architecturale et aménagements liturgiques (Turnhout, 2001).


25 Walmsley, ‘The Village Ascendant’, 517, for Khirbat al-Samra. A similar even spread is noticeable in almost every village.


29 There is no evidence whatsoever that the prosperity of the countryside was negatively impacted by the Islamic conquest (Walmsley, ‘The Village Ascendant’, 511).


33 Hamarneh, ‘Continuity or Change?’, 65.

of Ecclesiastical History 69 (2018), 709–27 argues for the presence of rural family churches independent of church hierarchy.


37 Di Segni, ‘Epigraphic Documentation’, 176–8. In addition, the church of the Theotokos which was erected in Madaba in AD 767.

38 For instance, Di Segni, ‘The Territory of Gaza’, 47–8, n. 30, calls her ‘a gentlewoman’ and refers to her as belonging to an ‘aristocratic family’.


42 Hamarneh, ‘Continuity or Change?’, 62, with further pertinent literary passages and references.

43 Hirschfeld, ‘Farms and Villages’, 64, comes to a similar conclusion; see also pp. 64–7 for a discussion of the villagers’ autonomy.

44 Hachlili, Ancient Mosaic Pavements, 162–6, Table VII.3.


48 Baumann, Späantike Stifter, 303–7.

49 The treasure is presented and discussed in M. Mundell Mango, Silver from Early Byzantium. The Kaper Koraon and Related Treasures, Walters Art Gallery (Baltimore, 1986).

51 Mundell Mango, *Silver from Early Byzantium*, no. 35.
52 Mundell Mango, *Silver from Early Byzantium*, no. 19 versus no. 57–9, with discussion on pp. 11–13.
54 Mundell Mango, *Silver from Early Byzantium*, 8–11.
55 Bishop Eutychianos donated about one third of the treasure. Among the other donors, there were two or possibly three more bishops, one priest, two deacons and one reader, as well as secular members of the society, one of whom bore the title of *lamprotatos*. A second lay donor may have been a *clarissimus*. See S. A. Boyd, ‘A ‘Metropolitan’ Treasure from a Church in the Provinces: An Introduction to the Study of the Sion Treasure’, in S.A. Boyd and M. Mundell Mango (eds), *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate in Sixth-Century Byzantium*, 5–34, at 8–14 and Appendix 1; Ševčenko, ‘The Sion Treasure’, 46–9, Appendix for the donors of the Sion treasure.
56 Mundell Mango, *Silver from Early Byzantium*, 10. Similarly, B. Fourlas, ‘Saint Constantine and ‘the Army of Heroic Men’ Raised by Tiberius II in 574/575: Some Thoughts on the Historical Significance of the Early Byzantine Silver Hoard at Karlsruhe’, *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseums* 62 (forthcoming), discusses a silver hoard currently at Karlsruhe, possibly discovered in the Biqā valley in Lebanon, that included a censer and a spoon donated to an unknown sanctuary by Frankish soldiers in the Roman East.
58 Habas, ‘Donations and Donors’, 74.
63 Habas, ‘Camel caravans’, for a description of all examples and a discussion of camel caravans in contemporary society and economy.
64 Baumann, *Spätantike Stifter*, 226–32; Donceel-Voûte, ‘Les pavements’, 54; Dunbabin, *Mosaics*, 184–5; and Habas, ‘Donations and Donors’, 86; idem, ‘Camel caravans’ have all argued that the traders/camel owners were perceived as wealthy men of high status, potential donors to the church.
B. Brenk, ‘Monasteries as Rural Settlements: Patron-Dependence or Self-Sufficiency?’, in W. Bowden, L. Lavan and C. Machado (eds), *Recent Research on the Late Antique Countryside* (Late Antique Archaeology 2) (Leiden, 2004), 447–76, at 453. That is, until the seventh century, when they seem to become more numerous.


Bagnall’s analysis of village occupation mentioned in Egyptian papyri of the sixth and seventh centuries even led to rather disappointing results, with no more than the expected array of agriculturists, builders, a baker and so on (Bagnall, ‘Village and City’).

At Chorazin in Galilee, the larger houses of the settlement surrounded the synagogue, with more modest houses a bit further away. They were constructed in the fourth century, but continued in use until the eighth (Y. Hirschfeld, ‘Farms and Villages’, 42). Most village settlements mentioned by Hirschfeld were composed of similar residences. At Sobota in the Negev the high-quality architecture of the ca. 170 houses identified generally suggests equality, with houses being around 360 square meters, housing some 12 to 13 individuals. Only one house, designated as House 2, stands out as it covered a ground surface of 770 square meters, with 14 rooms surrounding the spacious courtyard, because it was physically connected to building no. 1, which seemed to have served some communal function, and possibly to the nearby wine-press as well. As at Chorazin, it was located in the immediate vicinity of a cult building, in this case the North Church (Y. Hirschfeld, ‘Social Aspects of the Late-Antique Village of Shivta’, *JRA* 16 (2003), 395–408, at 403–7). Similarly, the stone-built sixth-century houses in the villages in North Syria all were of more or less the same dimensions and quality (G. Tate, ‘Prosperité des villages de la Syrie du Nord au VI siècle’, in S.A. Boyd and M. Mundell Mango (eds), *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate in Sixth-Century Byzantium*, 93–8, at 95–6; Gatier, ‘Les villages’, 111).

Chapter 3


8 For a good summary, see Wood, ‘Christians in the Middle East’; also C. Robinson, Empire and Elites after the Muslim Conquest: The Transformation of Northern Mesopotamia (Cambridge, 2000); M. Levy-Rubin, Non-Muslims in the Early Islamic Empire: From Surrender to Coexistence (New York and Cambridge, 2011).


13 See e.g. M. Squire, Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity (Cambridge, 2009), 147, 347, with additional references. Recent work by epigraphers and art historians alike has focused on the verbal-visual dimension of Byzantine texts: see e.g. A. Papalexandrou, ‘Text in Context: Eloquent Monuments and the Byzantine Beholder’, Word & Image 17, 3 (July–Sept. 2001), 259–83; L. James, ‘“And Shall These Mute Stones Speak?” Text as Art’, in L. James (ed.), Art and Text in Byzantine Culture (Cambridge, 2007), 188–206; A. Eastmond (ed.), Viewing Inscriptions in the Late Antique and Medieval World (Cambridge, 2015); S. Leatherbury, ‘Reading and Seeing Faith in Byzantium: The Sinai Inscription as Verbal and Visual “Text”’, Gesta 55, 2 (Fall 2016), 133–56; Toth, this volume, p. 80 and note 49.


15 See e.g. Di Segni, ‘Greek Inscriptions in Transition’.

16 See above n. 7.


18 The vast majority of these are referenced by Schick, Christian Communities; Gatier, see supra n. 3; and Di Segni, see bibliography above n. 11. More churches than these show signs of iconoclastic ‘scrambling’, which apparently occurred in the eighth century: see n. 63 below.

19 See above n. 12.

20 On the church of St George at Khirbat al-Samra, one of several in the town built around the date of the conquest, see P.-L. Gatier, ‘Les inscriptions grecques et latines de Samra et de Rihab’, in J.B. Humbert and A. Desreumaux (eds), Fouilles de Khirbat
es-Samra en Jordanie. I. La voie romaine. Le cimetière. Les documents épigraphiques
(Paris, 1998), 383–92, no. 73 (dated dedicatory inscription); on the debated date of the
church, see the summary in SEG 48–1930.
21 F. Zayadine, ‘Deux inscriptions grecques de Rabbat Moab (Areopolis)’, Annual of
the Department of Antiquities of Jordan 16 (1971), 71–4; also Schick, Christian
Communities, 121, 434–5.
22 See A.M. Yasin, ‘Renovation and the Early Byzantine Church: Staging Past and
Prayer’, in B. Biton-Ashkelony and D. Krueger (eds), Prayer and Worship in Eastern
23 For example, in a mosaic inscription from the pavement of the monastery of Mar
Liyas at Deir el-Liyas, dated to 776: L. Di Segni, ‘Varia Arabica. Greek Inscriptions
from Jordan’, LA 56 (2006), 579–80; SEG 56–1904. On these formulae, see Baumann,
Spätantike Stifter.
24 As in the so-called Lower Church at Quwaysmah, renovated in 717/718: see S.
Saller and B. Bagatti, The Town of Nebo, Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio
Maior 1 (Jerusalem, 1949), 257–63, nos 1–2; J.T. Milik, ‘Notes d’épigraphie et de
topographie jordaniennes’, LA 10 (1960), 147–84, at 177–80; M. Piccirillo, ‘Le chiese
grecques et latines de Syrie (hereafter IGLS), 21, Inscriptions grecques et latines de
Jordanie, vol. 2, Région centrale: Amman, Hesban, Madaba, Main, Dhiban (Paris,
1986), 52–3; SEG 34–1517.
25 As in the octagonal Kathisma church in Palestine, whose fragmentary dedication reads,
‘Through the provision and zeal of the esteemed John … ’: L. Di Segni, ‘A Greek
Inscription in the Kathisma Church’, in G.C. Bottini, L. Di Segni and D. Chrupcala
(eds), One Land – Many Cultures. Archaeological Studies in Honour of Fr. S. Loffreda,
Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio Maior 42 (Jerusalem, 2003), 187–8; Di
Segni, ‘Christian Epigraphy in the Holy Land’, 248–9, fig. 2; SEG 53–1855.
26 As in the church of St Varus at Khilda in Jordan: M. Najjar and F. Sa’id, ‘A New
Umayyad Church at Khilda-Amman’, LA 44 (1994), 547–60, inscription at 551,
photos 9–11, Pls. 36–37; SEG 44–1416.
27 As in the church of St Stephen at Umm al-Rasas (Kastraon Mefaa): M. Piccirillo,
‘Le inscrizioni di Kastron Mefaa’, in M. Piccirillo and E. Alliata (eds), Umm
al-Rasas Mayfa’ah I: Gli Scavi del Complesso di Santo Stefano (Jerusalem, 1994),
241–69.
28 As in the chapel of the Theotokos at Ayn al-Kanisah, renovated in 762: see L. Di
Segni, ‘La data della capella della Theotokos sul Monte Nebo: Nota epigrafica’,
Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio Maior 27 (Jerusalem, 1998), 425–67, no. 55; SEG
44–1410.
29 Najjar and Sa’id, ‘A New Umayyad Church’, 551; SEG 44–1416.
30 M. Piccirillo, ‘Le inscrizioni di Kastron Mefaa’; the church was renovated later in the
eight century.
31 On the names of donors in inscriptions of the period, see Di Segni, ‘Greek Inscriptions
32 Generally, see Di Segni, ‘The Use of Chronological Systems’; Di Segni, ‘Greek
Inscriptions in Transition’.
33 See above n. 10.
34 On the Khilda church, see Najjar and Sa’id, ‘A New Umayyad Church’; on the church
at Quwaysmah, see above n. 24.
35 See J.-B. Humbert, Y. Abu Hassuney, A. Hassuney, M. Abu Muhammar and H.
Salim, ‘Mukheitem à Jabaliyah, un site Byzantin’, in J.-B. Humbert et al. (ed.), Gaza
36 Interestingly, the inscription, erected during the reign of the caliph Mu’awiyah, is dated according to two systems, the hijra (‘according to the Arabs’), as well as to the local era: L. Di Segni, ‘The Greek Inscriptions of Hammat Gader’, in Y. Hirschfeld (ed.), *The Roman Baths of Hammat Gader: Final Report* (Jerusalem, 1997), 185–266, at 237–40.


38 On these two churches, see Di Segni, ‘Christian Epigraphy in the Holy Land’, 251–6, fig. 4; Di Segni, ‘Greek Inscriptions in Transition’, 357–9; *SEG* 50–1497 and *SEG* 50–1498 (Yattir); *SEG* 53–1842 (Khirbat Istabul).


44 Di Segni, ‘The Use of Chronological Systems’.


46 E.g. the church of St Peter (‘church 78’) at Rihab in Jordan, built between 630 and 650: Gatier, ‘Les inscriptions grecques et latines de Samra’, 383–92, no. 92.


48 As in a monumental example from the church of Peter and Paul at Jerash, now on display in the Yale University Art Gallery: see R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber (eds), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten, 4: Die Südökste Kleinasiens, Syrien und Palaestina* (Munich, 2002), 356; Rhoby, *Byzantinische Epigramme*, 393–4; Evans with Ratliff, *Byzantium and Islam*, cat. 1.

49 Ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁσιωτ(άτου) (καὶ) μακαριοτά/του Θεωδώ̣̇ρου ἀρχηεπισσκού/που ἠψεφόθε τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου / σπουδ ignorance διακ(όνου) ή(ν) / φύλαξον, Θ(εό)ς Σέργις Κονιτς· ἀμὶν Κ(ύρι)ε: see Gatier, ‘Les inscriptions grecques et latines de Samra’, no. 72; *SEG* 48-1929.

51 For a discussion of epigraphic intermediality, especially the relationships between inscriptions and text in manuscripts, see especially G. Agosti, ‘Per una fenomenologia del rapport fra epigrafia e letteratura nella tarda antichità’, in L. Cristante and T. Mazzoli (eds), _Il calamo della memoria. Riso di testi e mestiere letterario nella tarda antichità, VI_, Polymnia: studi di filologia classica, 18 (Trieste, 2015), 13–34.


57 On earlier uses of apotropaic symbols in conjunction with inscriptions, see Maguire, ‘Magic and Geometry’. On magic in the period generally, see most recently D. Boschung and J.N. Bremmer (eds), _The Materiality of Magic_, Morphomata 20 (Paderborn, 2015).

58 On cross-frames, see Leatherbury, ‘Writing, Reading, and Seeing’. On the Theodosian-era prohibition against placing crosses on floors, which never appears to have been enforced in any kind of comprehensive way, see most recently G. Peers, ‘Crosses’ Work Underfoot’, _Eastern Christian Art_ 8 (2011), 101–19.


65 On Islam’s rejection of Christ as the son of God, see C. Simelides, ‘The Byzantine Understanding of the Qur’anic Term *al-Samad* and the Greek Translation of the Qur’an’, *Speculum* 86 (2011), 887–913. For an opposing view, see H. Maguire, *Nectar and Illusion*, 39–41, who argues instead that the Madaba inscription is an attempt to persuade even Muslim visitors to the Madaba church.

66 See M. Milwright, *The Dome of the Rock and Its Umayyad Mosaic Inscriptions* (Edinburgh, 2016), 179–80, who mentions the Madaba inscription, but who identifies it as part of the original sixth-century phase of the church rather than as part of the mid-eighth century renovations.

67 See above n. 1.


69 The most recent translation is that of Milwright, *Dome of the Rock*, 69–72 (quoted portion at 70).

70 Grabar considered this possibility, but dismissed it as ‘not very likely’, though he did see an extended connection between the text of the inscriptions and the Christian liturgy of Jerusalem in the period: see Grabar, *Shape of the Holy*, 65–8; for a more recent, nuanced discussion of the audience that the inscriptions construct for themselves, see Milwright, *Dome of the Rock*, 214–50. On the mosaicists, see Grabar, *Shape of the Holy*, 71–104.


Chapter 4

1 Early drafts of this paper have greatly benefited from the opportunities of being presented at seminars and conferences in Oxford, Vienna, Budapest, Sofia and Mainz. I am especially grateful to Averil Cameron, Ivan Drpić, Rebecca Gowers, Pawel Nowakowski and Thorsten Opper for their advice and comments on the final version of this study.


5 The Abgar Story has generated a large body of scholarly output; in fact, so much so, that the extant secondary literature can be studied as a viable research topic in its own right. For the most recent, but by no means comprehensive, overview, see Guscin, The Tradition of the Image, 1–5. Some of the current scholarship has been dedicated to exploring connections between the Holy Image of Edessa and the Shroud of Turin. The idea of identifying the Image with the Shroud remains highly tenuous and it does not seem to be supported by the evidence of primary material: A. Nicolotti, From the Mandylon of Edessa to the Shroud of Turin: The metamorphosis and manipulation of a legend (Leiden, 2014). As this problem has no relevance to any Abgar-related epigraphy, it will not be addressed in the present study.

Anatolia (Warsaw, 2018), and S. Leatherbury, Inscribing Faith in Late Antiquity: Between Reading and Seeing (London, 2019).

7 For a critical assessment of recent scholarship on the issue of epigraphic habit, see Nowakowski, Inscribing the Saints, 33–44.

8 Eusebius, Hist. eccl. I.13, 1–22. Osrohoene was a Hellenistic Kingdom, later a Roman province in northern Syria, with the capital in Edessa, modern-day Şanlıurfa in southeastern Turkey. Coincidentally, Hellenistic and Roman Edessa was also a place where epigraphic culture thrived in an archaic form of classical Syriac: H. Drijvers and J. Healey, The Old Syriac Inscriptions of Edessa and Osrhoene: Texts, translations, and commentary (Leiden, 1999). See also L. Greisiger, C. Rammelt and J. Tubach (eds), Edessa in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Religion, Kultur und Politik zwischen Ost und West: 117–207 (Beirut, 2009).


13 Egeria, Itinerarium, XIX, 19.


27 Dobschütz, Christusbilder; II, 59–61 (Chapters 24–25). On the late antique custom of placing figural imagery at or near city gates, see I. Jacobs, Aesthetic Maintenance of Civic Space: The ‘Classical’ City from the 4th to the 7th c. AD (Leuven, 2013), 78–84; L. Lavan, ‘Political Talismans? Residual “Pagan” Statues in Late Antique Public Space’, in L. Lavan and M. Mulryan (eds), The Archaeology of Late Antique ‘Paganism’ (Leiden, 2011), 462–3.

28 Remarkably, this episode received a distinct visual and epigraphic treatment on the silver-gilt revetment on one of the later replicas of the image: see F. Dell’Acqua, ‘The Fall of the Idol on the Frame of the Genoa Mandylion: A Narrative on/of the Borders’, in B. Crostini Lappin and S. La Porta (eds), Negotiating Co-Existence: Communities, Culture and Convivencia in Byzantine Society (Trier, 2013), 143–73.

29 For the find context, see R. Heberdey, ‘Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesus IV’, JÖAI 3 (1900), 84–96.

30 For an overview of the late antique monumental epigraphy of the Abgar Story, see Caseau, ‘La lettre de Jésus à Abgar d’Édesse’, 36–40, and Henry, ‘Apostropeic Autographs’.


36 The bibliography on the development of the discourse on icons in Byzantium is vast. Pertinent to the Abgar Story and the Edessan image of Christ are: A. Cameron, ‘The Mandylion and Byzantine Iconoclasm’, in H.L. Kessler and G. Wolf, The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation, 33–54; H. Belting, ‘In Search of Christ’s Body. Image or Imprint?’, ibidem, 1–11; Belting, Likeness and Presence, 146–63. On the process of transformation from the narrative to the visual, whereby the materiality of the sacred relic played a crucial and transitional role, see G. Dagron, Décrire et

38 With the central panel having been lost, the icon has been reassembled of the two surviving wings of a triptych. It is divided up into four fields: top right features King Abgar, and top left Thaddeus, the apostle of Edessa. The bottom two registers show two pairs of standing saints: St Paul of Thebes and St Antony on the left, and St Basil and St Ephrem on the right: K. Weitzmann, *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai. The Icons, volume I: From the sixth to the tenth century* (Princeton, 1976), 94–8, no B58; S. Brock and D. Taylor (eds), *The Hidden Pearl, II. The Heirs of the Ancient Aramaic Heritage* (Rome, 2001), 49 and 122–5.

39 There survive a few other early representations of the Edessan image of Christ, such as the fresco in the Telovani Church, which predates the Sinai triptych: see Z. Skhirtladze, ‘Under the Sign of the Triumph of Holy Cross: Telovani Church Original Decoration and its Iconographic Programme’, *CahArch* 47 (1999), 101–18. Another example is the fresco from Deir Al Syrian, which is near contemporary to Sinai Abgar. It is important to stress that both these images have been identified on the basis of their epigraphy.


43 The miniature comes from the illustrated manuscript of the Chronicle of John Skylitzes (Madrid, Ms. Vitr. 26–2, fol. 131r). Dating proposals range from the first to the last quarter of the twelfth century. For a summary of recent scholarship, see V. Tsamakda, ‘Historical Writing’, in eadem (ed.), *A Companion to Byzantine Illustrated Manuscripts* (Leiden and Boston, 2017), 121–5.


Narratio de Imagine, 41 (ch. 2, l. 7).

Ibid., 39 (the title).


Narratio de Imagine, 51 (ch. 14), 65 (ch. 32).

The divine image and the letter taken from Edessa together: ibidem, 77 (ch. 49, ll.1–3); the chest with the image and the letter taken to the Blachernae, then by boat to the Imperial palace, and finally deposited in the Church of the Pharos: ibidem, ch. 56.

Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός, ὁ εἰς σὲ ἐλπίζων οὐκ ἀποτυγχάνει: ibid, 59–61 (Chapter 25). See also above, page 76 and notes 27 and 28.


A. Rhoby, Byzantinische Epigramme auf Ikonen und Objekten der Kleinkunst (Vienna, 2010), 291–2. Rhoby lists several other cases of the use of this inscription.

The plaque shows the Adoration of the Magi on the obverse: K. Weitzmann, Age of Spirituality: Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century (New York, 1979), 476.

This inscription has not been published. I am grateful to Georgi Parpulov for providing me with his transcription and translation:

Χριστῷ μὲν δῶρα προσέφερον οἱ μάγοι, ἐγὼ δὲ ῥύπον πολλῶν ἀμπλακημάτων.
+ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός, ὁ εἰς σὲ ἐλπίζων οὐκ ἀποτυγχάνει ποτὲ.
+ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός, σκέπε, φρούρε, φύλαττε τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Κ[ … ], τῷ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἁπάσαν κτίσιν ἔχοντι κατακριθῆναι.

The Magi offered gifts to Christ, but I [offer him] the filth of [my] numerous sins. Christ [our] God, he who places hope in You never fails. Christ [our] God, shelter, guard, protect Your servant K[ … ], who will be condemned more than the whole world.


82 It has been suggested that the Vatican and Genoese Mandylia, together with the missing central panel of the Sinai triptych, all reproduce the dimensions of the Edessan relic or of its ‘official’ copies: Belting, Likeness and Presence, 210–12.


84 Sources record Mantaldo’s gift to the church, but give no precise details on how, and on what grounds, Montaldo acquired the Mandylion: S. Origone, ‘Giovanni V Paleologo e i Genovese’, in Calderoni Masetti, Bozzo Dufour and Wolf, Intorno al Sacro Volto, 109–11 and 114; G.P. Balbi, ‘Una lunga carriera, un breve dogato: Leonardo Montaldo doge di Genoa tra il 1383 e il 1384’, ibidem, 117–22. The history of the veneration of the Volto Sacro in Genoa is beyond the interest of this paper, but it should be noted that today the icon carries a further, outer frame, which was fitted in 1702.

85 1) ὁ Αὔγαρος πρὸς τὸν Χ(ριστὸ)ν τὸν Αὐγαρος | ἀποστελλων, 2) ὁ Ἀνανιας τὸν Χ(ριστὸ)ν μὴ | δυνάμενος ἱστορῆσαι, 3) νιπτόμενος ὁ Χ(ριστό)ς τὸ | μανδηλίον και τὴν ἐπίστολήν τοῦ Αὐγαρος | διδούς, 4) ὁ Χ(ριστό)ς τὸ | μανδηλίον και τὴν ἐπίστολην τῶ Αὐγαρῳ διακομίζων, 5) ὁ Αὐγαρος τὸ εἰδολόν καταλύσας, τὴν εἰκόνα ἱστησί | τῶ | Αὐγαρος τὸ εἰδολον καταλυσας, την εικονα | ἱστησε, 6) ὁ επισκόπος ἀποκαλύπτει | τοῦ κεραμίου τὸ μανδηλίον έντειχιζε, 8) ἀποκαλύπτει τὸ μανδηλίον διακαλύπτει | τοῦ κεραμίου εχοντος τὴν εἰκονα, 9) ὁ επισκόπος τὸ εἰδολον τὸ πυρι επιχεων τοὺς Περσας κατεκαυσε, 10) τοῦ μανδηλίου διακομίζους εἰς | τὴν κωνσταντινουπολιν [ … ] ιάθη (after A. Cataldi Palau, ‘Le inscrizioni delle formelle nella cornice del Sacro Volto di Genoa’, in eadem, Studies in Greek Manuscripts, II (Spoleto, 2008), 844–6). All participles used in the inscriptions have a deictic function, and should be understood to imply ‘This scene shows …’.


90 The Church of the Holy Mother of God in Matejče is in an alarmingly poor state of preservation, and its survival is under threat. So far as it still could be seen, the Abgar Story occupies the second register of the south-eastern pillar of the main nave. It consists of three scenes depicting the origin of the miraculous relic and of some faint traces of Greek text describing the episodes of the story: see E. Dimitrova, _Manastir_
93 For an overview of scholarship, see Dell’Acqua, ‘The Fall of the Idol’, 158–60.
104 The *Epistula Abgari* is a version of the Abgar Story believed to have undergone a revision ca. 1032, when the relics of the Letters of Abgar and Christ were transferred to Constantinople following the Byzantine capture of Edessa. On the tradition of the *Epistula Abgari*, see Guscin, *The Tradition of the Image*, 79–106.
105 The translation *ad sensum* is mine. For the Greek texts, see Guscin, *The Tradition of the Image*, 82, II. 9–16.
106 M. Zellmann-Rohrer, ‘“Psalms Useful for Everything”: Byzantine and Post-Byzantine manuals for the Amuletic use of the Psalter’, *DOP* 72 (2018), 113–68.
109 Some Byzantine lead seals have holes for suspension (in secondary use): see, for example, Dumbarton Oaks Collection BZS.1955.1.2825; BZS.1958.106.5363; and BZS.1951.31.5.101. I am grateful to Ivan Drpić for this observation.

113 The research programme EPIMED – Culture écrite médiévale is the most comprehensive initiative to date to examine the role of epigraphy in medieval writing culture: https://epimed.hypotheses.org/ (accessed 13 May 2019). The EPIMED colloquium L’Inscription Signe et Image: Définitions et Perspectives (Casa de Velázquez-Université Complutense Madrid, 12 October 2018) addressed a broad range of methodological issues on visuality and writing. For the summaries of communications, see https://epimed.hypotheses.org/category/colloques (accessed 13 May 2019).

114 Eastmond, Viewing Inscriptions, 2.

Chapter 5


The editor prints ὑμῶν, but one of the three surviving manuscripts provides ἡμῶν which is more likely to be the correct reading.


5 It is reported that ca. 5,000 people died in this earthquake, cf. N. Ambraseys, Earthquakes in the Mediterranean and Middle East. A Multidisciplinary Study of Seismicity up to 1900 (Cambridge, 2009), 189–92; K.-P. Todt and B.A. Vest, Syria (Syria prōtē, Syria deutera, Syria Euphratēsia) (TIB 15) (Vienna, 2014), 557.


8 See S. Müller-Abels, in S. Döpp and W. Geerlings (eds), Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur (Freiburg – Basel – Vienna, 1999), 220–1.

9 Ed. Laga, Eustratii presbyteri vita Eutychii, 38, 1130–2.


14 I will not address the question of the text’s function recently raised by P. Odorico, ‘Du recueil à l’invention du texte: le cas des *Parastaseis Symtomo Chronikai*’, *BZ* 107 (2014), 755–84.


The passage refers to Livistros’ dream of his sojourn in the realm of Eros (Ἐρωτοκρατία).

22 The epigram in the famous Marc. gr. Z 524 (Diktyon 69995) (Sp. Lampros, ‘Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς κώδιξ 524’, NE 8 (1911), 1–59 and 113–92, at 29–30 [no. 61]) bears the title Επί τῶν κατὰ Θεσσαλονίκην νεοφυηθέντων ὅλων τοῦ Σικουντηνοῦ Ἀράκτα, ἦχοντες διαφόρους παλαιὰς ἱστοριάς καὶ τὸν αὐτοκράτορα κύρο Μανουήλ τὸν Κομνηνόν, ‘On the newly built house of Leon Sikountenos at Thessalonica that contains various pictures from olden times as well as that of the emperor, the lord Manuel Komnenos’.


23 See M.D. Lauxtermann, Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and Contexts, I (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien XXIV/1) (Vienna, 2003), 293–5.


27 On the depictions of singers in Byzantium and the Slavonic world, see N.K. Moran, Singers in Late Byzantine and Slavonic Painting (Byzantina Neerlandica 9) (Leiden, 1986).

28 Ed. A. Markopoulos, Anonymi professoris epistulae (CFHB XXXVII) (Berlin – New York, 2000), ep. 94, 5–7: τὸ παραπεῖθόν τι τοὺς ἐμοὶ μαθητιῶντας ζητῶ σχεδίαζεν ἰάμβους σοὶ τῷ πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ἰάμβων πατρί, καὶ ἀγυιαῖς καὶ πλατείαις ἀνατιθέναι … See Lauxtermann, Byzantine Poetry, 42. The cited passage also reveals that Theodore was a very active poet, as he is called ‘the father of many and nice iambs.’


31 W. Hörandner, A. Rhoby and A. Paul (eds), Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung (Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung XV, XXIII, 35, 42), vols I–IV (Vienna, 2009–2018), passim (henceforth BEIÜ).

32 Spingou, Words and artworks. Foteini Spingou is currently preparing an edition of some of the poems in the Marcianus collection for Oxford University Press.


34 On this issue more generally, see St. Greenblatt, Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare (Chicago, 2005).


38 Abundant material may be found in the inscription database http://epigraphy.packhum.org/ by searching for παριὼν, παριόντ- etc.

39 *BEIÜ*, vol. III, no. GR86.


41 The oldest manuscript that transmits the title (cod. Marc. gr. 141) dates to the eleventh century.


48 See Mango, ‘The Byzantine Inscriptions of Constantinople’, 64.


See Rhoby, ‘Text as Art?’.


*BEIJ*, vol. IV, 297, no. GB4.


71 See, e.g., I.A. Eliades, *Naoς Μεταμορφώσεως του Σωτήρος (Αγιά Σωτήρα) Παλαιχωρίων. Ιστορία – Αρχιτεκτονική καὶ Τέχνη/The Church of the Transfiguration of the Saviour (Hagia Sotera). History – Architecture and Art* (Nicosia, 2009), 77 (fig. 54); Rhoby, “Secret Messages?”, fig. 6.


73 Probably instead of ΤΤΔΦ. A possible solution is Τοῦτον τὸν Τύπον Δαίμονες Φρίττουσι.

74 There is one X too many. Possible solutions include Χριστὸς Χάριν Χριστιανοῖς Χαρίζει or Χριστός Χριστιανοῖς Χάρις Χαρίζεται.


77 Λουκᾶς ὁ γράφων οἶδε μύστας τοῦ λόγου / πράξεις δὲ τούτων πρὸς Θεόφιλον γράφει: *BEIÜ*, vol. IV, 186–7, no. GR6.


80 See E. Moutafov and A. Rhoby, ‘New ideas about the deciphering of the cryptic inscription in the narthex of the Panagia Asinou (Phorbiotissa) church (Cyprus)’, *MEG* 12 (2012), 181–7.


**Chapter 6**

2 The text is fragmentary: [οἰκοδομήθη αὐτὸς ὁ ναὸς ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτίων τοῦ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ -c.20- καὶ τῆς συνβίου αὐτοῦ Βενερίας κ(αὶ) τῶν τέκνων αὐτοῦ, ἀμήν (A.E. Felle, ‘La chiesa. La documentazione epigráfica’, in Maruggi and Lavermicocca (eds), Memoria e progetto, 13–17; idem, ‘Un caso di scrittura non esposte. Le iscrizioni a sgraffio del sepolcreto della chiesa di San Pietro a Crepacore (Torre Santa Susanna, BR)’, Scrittura e Civiltà 25 (2001), 343, n. 3.


4 Nowadays the unprotected graffiti have almost completely vanished because of exposure to sun and rain.

5 Felle, ‘Un caso’, nos 1, 4, 6, 8–10, 12, 15–16, 18–19, 24, 28–29, 32–45.


8 This kind of formula occurs already in a number of early Christian inscriptions in Rome: e.g. ICUR, IV 9375a; V, 13031b; IX, 24834b; IX, 24843.4; X, 26351.


10 Placed in the corridor of the so-called ‘South Church’, an arcosolium tomb is internally decorated by a painted cross and the inscription [crux Xρ(ist)i / confusio / diaboli. The same text (crux Xρ(ist)i / confusio / diāb o’li est) is engraved on a brick, found inside another tomb in the same complex: the tomb is in the vestibule between the ‘South Church’ and the refectory: see R. Hodges (ed.), San Vincenzo al Volturno, 2. The 1980–86 Excavations, Part II (London, 1995), 15–16, fig. 1.15 and fig. 1.1, tomb 8348). Another incomplete painted inscription, found inside a tomb, in front of the main gate of the so-called ‘Crypt Church’ (R. Hodges (ed.), San Vincenzo al Volturno, 1. The 1980–86 Excavations, Part I (London, 1993), 60–3, figs 6.22-23-24; fig. 6.18, tomb 246) recalls the faith of the anonymous deceased in the resurrection: ego Talaricus / [cr]edo s(an)ctam resurrectionem: R. Hodges et al., ‘The discovery of Abbot Talaricus’ (817–3 October 823) tomb at San Vincenzo al Volturno’, Antiquity 71 (1997), 453–6.


14 See Felle, ‘La documentazione epigrafica’, n. 73 and n. 79 with previous bibliography.


22 ‘… scritti in maniera incerta e frettolosa’: Giglio, ‘La cristianizzazione’, 1784.

23 Very probably, both in S. Pietro a Crepacore and in Trani too, the graffiti were traced by some participants to the burial, because they too had to be written just before the closing of the tombs.

24 *PG* 50, 815–20 (esp. 819, l. 14).


26 *PG* 50, 819, ll. 20–21.

27 *PG* 87.3, 4072–3 and *PG* 87.3, 4084–5, esp. 4084.

28 See *BHG* 410.


31 Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo in pretiosam et vivificam Crucem*, 134, ll. 1 and 3 respectively.

32 Giglio, ‘La cristianizzazione’, 1786. An historical essay about the cult of the relic of the True Cross by A. Frolow, ‘Le culte de la relique de la Vraie Croix à la fin du Ve – et au début du VIIe siècles’, *BSI* 22 (1961), 320–39 is dedicated just to these


35 *Ps 131:14* occurs in other funerary inscriptions, from Asia Minor (Felle, *Biblia*, n. 436 and 437) to Greece (Felle, *Biblia*, n. 576). I already underlined in these epigraphs the ‘deviation’ in the use of the original Psalmic text, where ‘the subject is the Lord, who establishes Zion as his resting place […]’. In our inscriptions, the original Zion is conceptually substituted by the tomb, and the text is uttered not by the Lord, but by the deceased. It seems […] that in these cases quoting the Bible is actually conceived as a powerful tool to protect not only the tomb, but also the dead’ (Felle, ‘Expressions’, 782–3).

36 See Felle, *Biblia*, 19 and nos A1041–A1069.

37 But see also other examples, e.g. the tomb found close to the public hospital in Thessaloniki: E. Kourkoutidou-Nikolaidou and Ch. Tsionou, ‘Βυζαντινά και μεταβυζαντινά μνημεία κεντρικής Μακεδονίας’, *AD* 33 (1978), 240 and fig. 108.


39 More recently, see Felle, ‘Expressions’, 803, n. 49.


42 See the painted tomb found in Callatis (Romania): see Felle, *Biblia*, n. 521; for other internally painted tombs in Stara Zagora in Bulgaria, see R. Pillinger, V. Popova and B. Zimmermann (eds), *Corpus der spätantiken und frühchristlichen Wandmalereien Bulgariens* (Vienna, 1999), 36–9, n. 24, n. 28, n. 29, figs 68–70.


But let us not forget the increase in the production of the so-called ‘invisible sarcophagi’ already during the third century AD: see K. Meinecke, ‘Invisible Sarcophagi: Coffin and Viewer in the Late Imperial Age’, in S. Birk and B. Poulsen (eds), *Patrons and Viewers in Late Antiquity* (Aarhus, 2012), 83–105.

Chapter 7

1 I would like to thank professors Ida Toth and Vasileios Marinis and Dr Alexandra Konstantinidou for their help during the preparation of this essay. When I refer to verse inscriptions included in Andreas Rhoby’s *Byzantinische Epigramme in Inschriftlicher Überlieferung* (vols 1–4), I am not citing earlier bibliography, as it is easily accessible there.


BEIÜ 3, 673–6: TR79, Abb. CIII–CVI.


A well-preserved example is that of the church of Zoodochos Pigi at Samari, Messenia (late 12th—early 13th c.), where on each mullion impost-like capital a foliated cross with tetragrams appears, to protect the window opening.

Examples from Greece have been gathered by Th. Pazaras, Ανάγλυφες σαρκοφάγοι και επιτάφιες πλάκες της μέσης και ύστερης βυζαντινής περιόδου στην Ελλάδα (Athens, 1988), with Middle Byzantine inscriptions in nos 1, 2, 11, 62, 74 and 92.


Petrocheilos, Επιγραφικές μαρτυρίες για τη βυζαντινή Άνδρο’, 190, n. 9, figs 156–9.


22 A dedicatory inscription with mention of the sculptor’s name has been preserved on the altar slab of the Agios Nikolaos church at Milea, second half of the 11th c.: see Feissel and Philippides-Braat, *Inscriptions du Peloponèse*, 304–5, nr. 45, pl. IX, 1.


27 As for example at Panagia tou Arakou, Lagoudera, Cyprus, dated to 1192: see A. and J.A. Stylianou, *The Painted Churches of Cyprus. Treasures of Byzantine Art* (London, 1997), 158, fig. 84, and 174–5, fig. 96.


42 M. Mundell Mango, ‘The Significance of Byzantine Tinned Copper Objects’, in Θημίσιμα στη μνήμη της Λασκαρίνας Μπούρα (Athens, 1994), 221–4, pl. 115.1–2, 116.3.
43 On the conservative character of these inscriptions see Toth, ‘Epigraphic Traditions’, 214–5.
44 As shards from the Corinth area indicate, dated to the late 12th–early 13th c.: see K. Skarmoutsou, ‘Νικόλαος Κορινθίας. Νικόλαος Αγίου Νικολάου Μαψού’, AD 46 (1991), B’1, 179, πλ. 80γ–δ.
49 The earliest examples of Middle Byzantine church embroidery, the poterokalymma (chalice veil) and diskokalymma (paten veil) of the Halberstadt Cathedral, dated to the 12th c., bear long epigrams on the frame and the ground of the Eucharistic representations (BEIÚ 2, 374–8: nos Te4–5).
54 Maguire, ‘On Names and Their Absence’, 143.
57 E. Kounoupitou-Manolessou, ‘Αγίος Νικόλαος Ραγκαβάς. Συμβολή στην ιστορία του μνημείου’, DChAE 4/24 (2003), 59–60, fig. 11.
58 With this concern in mind, in their inscriptions several donors ask the chanters and the readers to pray for them: see Drandakis, Γλυπτά της Μάνης, 3, 19, 27, 47, 50, 154.
60 The most striking example is that of the marble mason Niketas Marmaras from Mani, who proudly signed five of his works in the years around 1075: see S. Kalopissi-Verti, ‘Epigraphic Evidence in Middle Byzantine Churches of the Mani (Patronage and Art Production)’, in M. Aspra-Vardavaki (ed.), Λαμπηδών. Αφιέρωμα στη μνήμη της Ντούλας Μουρίκη, vol. 1 (Athens, 2003), 340–5, fig. 3.

Chapter 8


38 See also the publication of the Ekthesis by Heraclios during the Monotheletism controversy: W. Brandes, ‘Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Seventh Century: Prosopographical Observations on Monotheletism’, in A. Cameron (ed.), *Fifty Years of Prosopography: The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond* (New York, 2003), 103–18.


46 E.g. the Hagia Sophia mosaic inscriptions or the enamel from the Pala d’Oro in San Marco, Venice, which may have originated from the templon of the imperial Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople (T. Whittemore, *The Mosaics of Hagia Sophia at Istanbul*, vol. 3 (Boston, 1933), 13–20, 23–7; S. Bettini, ‘Venice, the Pala


51 E. Vranousi, Εγγραφα Πάτμου. Α’ Αὐτοκρατορικά (Athens, 1980), 34.

52 Ivison, Urban Renewal, 21–3.

53 Ed. Hörandner, Theodoros Prodromos, no. XXIX, lines 6–11. Although so far no explanation has been given on why Prodromos produced more than one text for John II, it is possible that the tomb featured multiple funerary epigrams.

54 Stephenson, Tomb, and Lauxtermann, Byzantine Poetry, 237. For the epitaph in honour of Nikephoros Phokas, see Lauxtermann, Byzantine Poetry, 308–9.

55 Schneider and Karnapp, Studtmann, 53.


59 Bryer and Winfield, Pontos, 244. See also A. Eastmond, ‘The Empire of Trebizond’, in A. Eastmond (ed.), Byzantium’s Other Empire: Trebizond (Istanbul, 2016), 49.

60 N. Melvani, Late Byzantine Sculpture (Turnhout, 2013), 20–1; R. Ousterhout, ‘Emblems of Power’, in A. Ödekan, N. Necipoğlu and E. Akyürek (eds), The

61 Van Millingen, Byzantine Constantinople, 184–6; Rhoby, Epigramme auf Stein, 626–8; Mango, Inscriptions of Constantinople, 56; Foss, Anomalous, 80.


63 Spieser, Recueil, 162–3.

64 This layout is reminiscent of 6th-century examples, such as an honorific inscription of Justinian I from Mopsuestia. See G. Dagron and D. Feissel, Inscriptions de Cilicie (Paris, 1987), 141–6.


67 Asdracha, Thrace, 306–9; Crow, Bayliss, Bardill, Water Supply, 106, 238.


71 For examples, see: D. Feissel, ‘Les métropoles d’Éphèse au Xle siècle et les inscriptions de l’archevêque Théodôros’, in A. Avramea, A. Laiou, and E. Chrysos (eds), Byzantium, State and Society, in Memory of Nikos Oikonomides (Athens, 2003), 231–49; Cheynet and Drew Bear, Une inscription d’Akrôinon; Barsanti, Una proposta.


73 Lauxtermann, Byzantine Poetry, 52–3; Papalexandrou, Echoes of Orality, 176–81.


75 See Georgii Sphrantzae Chronicon, ed. R. Maisano (Rome, 1990), 8–10: εὑρέθησαν καὶ γράμματα ἐν μαρμάρῳ λέγοντα οὕτως. ‘Φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, φυλάξῃ τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Ιουστινιανὸν’; see also A. Philippidis-Braat and

76 See e.g. the various texts in P. Magdalino (ed.), *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th centuries* (Aldershot, 1994).


---

**Chapter 9**


5 Père V. Laurent, *Les bulles métriques dans la sigillographie byzantine* (Athens, 1932) published more than 700 metrical seal inscriptions. But as the material has increased exponentially to more than 4000 examples and as the field of sigillography has developed new methodologies and new approaches, a new edition was clearly a desideratum, which is why I decided to produce one, resulting in two volumes up till now (Wassiliou-Seibt, *Corpus* I and II), while the third is still work in progress.

7 For some examples, see DO 58.106.2417, ed. Wassiliou-Seibt, *Corpus* I, no. 737 (late 11th–early 12th c.): Ἐμὸς τύπος σφράγισμα τοῦ συνωνύμου, ‘My stamp/figure is the seal of the synonymous’: St. George depicted on the obverse of the seal is speaking. DO 58.106.4981 [Thierry (Étampes/France)], ed. Wassiliou-Seibt, *Corpus* I, no. 219 (first half of the 12th c.): Βροτοτρόφον σὺ καὶ βρεφοτρόφος βρέφος, | Θεοφάνιον τὸν Προμουντηνὸν σκέπε (two dodecasyllables, both with C5; assonance and hyperbaton in the first verse), ‘You, nursling, provider of the mortals (scil. Jesus Christ), and provider of the nursling (scil. Mother of God), protect Theophanios Promoundenos’. For βρεφοτρόφος as epitheton of the Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography see S. Efstratiadis, *Ἡ Θεοτόκος ἐν τῇ Ὑμνογραφίᾳ* (Paris, 1930), 13. Cf. also the epiclesis ἀνανδρε μήτερ, παρθένε βρεφοτρόφε on a (today lost) Panagiarion (dated to the 14th c.) of the Panteleimon monastery (Athos) sponsored by Alexios Komnenos Angelos. See A. Rhoby, *Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung* (Vienna, 2009–18), vol. II, 263, no. St2 (henceforth *BEIU*).


9 See Wassiliou-Seibt, *Corpus* I, 33–5, and especially no. 1142 (with earlier editions).


14 DO 47.2.1399 (unpublished).


16 Former collection Schlumberger, G. Schlumberger (ed.), *Sigillographie de l’empire byzantin* (Paris, 1884; repr. Turin, 1963), 601 (facsimile); Wassiliou-Seibt, *Corpus* II, no. 1876, with references to the Slavic origin and the members of the family name Bouzenos (*bjzi, ‘elder’) in Byzantium. The dignities πρωτοκυνηγός (first hunter) and πρωτοϊερακάριος (first falconer) are attested since the second half of the thirteenth century.


18 For the use and the earliest appearance of this accentual metre in Byzantine poetry see Lauxtermann, *Spring*, 21–40.

19 Wassiliou-Seibt, *Corpus* I, 55.

20 Wassiliou-Seibt, *Corpus* I, 55. The same inscription also occurs with a slight variation: Γεώργιον πατρίκιον σκέπε, Λόγε Θεοῖο, διδοὺς σθένος σου τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ, φύλαξ, ‘Word of God, protect the patrikios George, giving your power to the anthypatos as his guard’. 
21 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus II, no. 2155.
22 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, 56. For the use of these metres in Byzantine poetry, see Lauxtermann, Spring, 41–54.
23 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, 56.
24 H. Hunger, ‘Die Makremboliten auf byzantinischen Bleisiegeln und in sonstigen Quellen’, SBS 5 (1998), 15, no. 5a; Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1138 (obv.: the Theotokos enthroned with the child on her lap).
27 DO 58.106.5351. Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1016.
29 DO 58.106.1616; Ermitaž, M-9283. Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1016 (with references).
37 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 358 (two specimens from the former Zacos collection).
38 G. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica II. Sprachreste der Türkvolker in den byzantinischen Quellen (Berlin, 1958), 339.
39 Niketas Choniates, Historia 75.61–76.84 (ed. van Dieten). Cf. R.-J. Lilie, Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge (Stuttgart, 2004), 84.
40 All the references by K. Barzos, Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν, vol. II (Thessaloniki, 1984), 432–4.
41 Fogg 1147; Orghidan; former Schlumberger collection. For the correct reading and date see Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus II, no. 2031 (references to the earlier bibliography). Katsaros, Κασταμονίτης, 138, no. 17.

42 Fogg 1437; former Zacos collection (photos in the systematic archive for Byzantine Sigillography at the Austrian Academy of Sciences/Division of Byzantine Research); IFEB 111. Katsaros, Κασταμονίτης, 138, no. 17; Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 743.

43 Ἐν σοὶ πεποιθώς, σταυρέ, τοῦ κόσμου φύλαξ, ǀ πολλῷ πόθῳ τέτευχεν σὸν θεῖον τύπον ǀ ὁ Πανθήριος εὐτελὴς σὸς οἰκέτης, re-edited in BEIŪ, vol. II, 238–9, no. Me69.


45 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus II, nos 2225, 2711, 2722.


47 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1294 (with earlier editions). On the obverse the apostles Peter and Paul, with the seal’s owner in the middle. It must be stressed that owners of seals are rarely ever depicted. As a second example we may note Constantine Mesopotamites, metropolitan of Thessaloniki (1197–1227), see V. Laurent, Le corpus des sceaux de l’empire byzantin. VI/1–3. L’église (Paris 1963–1972), no. 464. For a detailed commentary see Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 950.

48 Laurent, Corpus V/1, no. 804; Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 146. About Georgios Bardanes see A. Galone, Γεώργιος Βαρδάνης: Συμβολή στη μελέτη του βίου, του έργου και της εποχής του (Βυζαντινὰ Κείμενα και Μελέται 46) (Thessaloniki, 2008).

49 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 2250. Obv.: the two apostles, standing, and in the middle the bust of Jesus Christ in a medaillon.

50 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 670. Obv.: the two apostles, standing.

51 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 669 and 671–672; II, nos 1921–1922.

52 Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1287.

53 E.g. Λιταῖς φοιτητῶν, Χριστέ, ἡγοῦ σῷ δούλῳ, ‘Christ, guide your servant through the intercessions of the apostles’, on a work of art, perhaps a comb (dating to the reign of Leo VI), kept in the Bode Museum in Berlin and reedited in BEIŪ, vol. II, 322–4, no. E117.


55 Jordanov, Corpus II, no. 69 and III, no. 1824; Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I 38; II, no. 2691. This motif also appears on the seal of Theodoros Styppeiotes protonbellisimos and megas sakellarios (early 50s of the 12th c.), a specimen of which is archived in my collection: though it sheds new light on Styppeiotes’ career, I will not discuss this seal here because I.G. Leontiades, ‘The Seal of Theodoros Styppeiotes Protonbellisimos and Megas Sakellarios (early 50s XII C.)’, SBS 13 (2019), 71–9, deals with it in detail.

56 Fogg 2310; another similar specimen was offered in the Auction Gorny 181, 12.–13.10.2009, no. 2805 (incomplete reading). See Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus II, no. 2867.

57 DO 58.106.3272. Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 673.

58 See Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus II, nos 1934, 2079 and 2364.

59 See Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 187a, b.
IFEB 450 (first half of the 13th c.). Ch. Stavrakos, ‘Ein unpubliziertes byzantinisches Siegel aus der Sammlung Savvas Kophopoulos: Einige Bemerkungen zur Sicherung mit Blei’, in Cl. Ludwig (ed.), Siegel und Siegler. Akten des 8. Internationalen Symposiums für byzantinische Sigillographie (Frankfurt, 2005), 163–5; Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1115; Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1300: Λόγοι πτερωτοίς ἐν μολυβδίναις πέδαις / Δερμοκαΐτης ἐμπεδεῖ Νικηφόρος, ‘Nikephoros Dermokaites fetters winged words in shackles of lead’. The seal’s owner wants to show off his good breeding: λόγοι πτερωτοί, which stands for the rapid communication of addresser and addressee, obviously refers to Homer’s ἔπεα πτερόεντα. The metaphor μολυβδίναις πέδαις designates the seal closing the letter. Please note the alliteration in πέδαις and ἐμπεδεῖ.

Stavrakos, ‘Blei’; Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus I, no. 1115.

A.-K. Wassiliou-Seibt, ‘Der ausgesprochene Verzicht auf Heiligenbilder in verifizierten byzantinischen Siegelinschriften’, Parekbolai 6 (2016), 57–78. This study revises the erroneous interpretation of Maria Campagnolo-Pothitou, ‘«Comme un relent d’iconoclasme» au début du XIIe siècle: le témoignage sigillographique’, in M. Campagnolo et al. (eds), L’iconoclasme dans l’art religieux byzantin. Actes du colloque de Genève (1–3 octobre 2009) (Geneva, 2014), 176–91, who sees a connection both with the imperial ambitions of Anna Komnene and with the intellectual milieu at the time, including supporters of Eustratios, metropolitan of Nicaea, who was condemned for heresy in 1117.

Kekaumenos, Strategikon § 47.20–24, ed. Litavrin (St Petersburg, 2003), 228.

E.g. DO 58.106.5194; Zacos II 1069. See also G. Schlumberger, Mélanges Archéologiques: Monnaies, Medailles, Méraux, Jetons, Amulettes etc (Paris, 1895), 282–4 (obv.: bust of the Theotokos, Episkepsis type).

PG 37, 936a: poem I, 2, 33, line 120.


For this person see R.-J. Lilie et al. (eds), Prospopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. II. Abteilung (Berlin, 2013), no. 27115.


De Ceremoniis 360.21–361.2; 778.15–19, Reiske. Cf. G. Dagron (ed.), ‘L’organisation et le déroulement des courses d’après le livre des cérémonies’, TM 13 (2000), 91 (text) and 90 (translation and notes). See also the Kletorologion of Philotheos: N. Oikonomides (ed.), Les listes de préséance des IXe et Xe siècles (Paris, 1972), 181.5–9 (text) and 180.


Former Zacos collection (Photo in the Viennese Archive). Wassiliou-Seibt, Corpus II, no. 1853.
Chapter 10

1 The archimandrite Antonin has first recorded two texts of the ἐμνήσθη type: Antonin, O drevnikh xristianskich nadpisiakh v Afinakh (On the Ancient Christian Inscriptions of Athens, St Petersburg, 1874), 72–3, nos 101–102, pl. 24, republished in A. Orlandos and L. Vranoussis, Ἐπιγραφαὶ χαραχθεῖσαι ἐπὶ τῶν κιόνων τοῦ Παρθενῶνος κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοχριστιανικοὺς καὶ βυζαντινοὺς χρόνους (Athens, 1973), nos 20–21 (probably not based on autopsy); another inscription naming the goddess Athena (Παλλάδος) is engraved on the upper course of the stylobate (eastern part): Orlandos and Vranoussis, Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, f. 43 (1859), no. 3711; Antonin, Inscriptions, 40–76, nos 1–102, pls 15–24; Orlandos and Vranoussis, Χαράγματα.


I submitted the manuscript to the Éditions of the École française d’Athènes in October 2018; the recueil will be published within two years. Since my edition is under publication, references to the Parthenon inscriptions follow the edition by Orlandos and Vranoussis.


The bibliography on the subject is vast. For an overview, see L. Brubaker and J. Haldon, Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680–850: A History (Cambridge, 2011); see also the contributions by J. Haldon, J. Koder, and Ch. Lightfoot in C. Morrission (ed.), Trade and Markets in Byzantium (Washington, 2012), ch. 4, 6, and 7.


Orlandos and Vranoussis, Χαράγματα, *16–*17.

Orlandos and Vranoussis, Χαράγματα, no. 153.

Orlandos and Vranoussis, Χαράγματα, nos 34, 80, 83 (the last is not transcribed).


See, for example, I. Ševčenko, ‘Inscription Commemorating Sisinnios “Curator” of Tzurulon (AD 813)’, Byz 35 (1965), 564–74, at 567; Mango, ‘Byzantine Epigraphy’, 244, figs 15 (c. 750), 17 (812), 18 (813), 19 (c. 820); Kiourtzian, Cyclades, nos 58–59, 115, 131.

Orlandos and Vranoussis, Χαράγματα, no. 83.


Orlandos and Vranoussis, Χαράγματα, no. 82.
19 The Θ with crossbar extending beyond the outline of the letter is attested in early Christian inscriptions, but (vertical or oblique) serifs are absent.
22 M. Sklavou-Mauroeidi, *Γλυπτά του Βυζαντινού Μουσείου Αθηνών* (Athens, 1999), no. 120; Oikonomides, ‘Skripou’.
23 Par. gr. 510, fol. Cv and Par. gr. 139, fol. 7v, 419v.
24 Sklavou-Mauroeidi, *Γλυπτά*, no. 120; Oikonomides, ‘Skripou’.
26 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 81.
27 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 70.
29 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 75, 77, 187.
30 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 197.
31 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 75, 187–188.
33 For example in Constantinople at the church of Theotokos of Constantine Lips, in the epitaph of the synkellos Michael: Mango, ‘Byzantine Epigraphy’, figs 25, 27.
34 For example: Par. gr. 510 (879–82), fols 1, 4–6, 14, 18–20; Par. gr. 923 (after 843?), fols 9–16; Par. Suppl. gr. 1085 (ninth to tenth century), fols 1–6, etc.
36 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 217.
37 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 214.
38 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 55.
40 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 39.
41 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 40, 48.
45 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 144–145.
47 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 8, 215. We observe the same in the obituary of a certain Georgios (966), engraved in the Hephaisteion: Antonin, *Inscriptions*, 21–2, no. 7, pl. 9.
48 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 218.
49 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 34.
50 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 79.
51 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 164.
52 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 71.
53 Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 70.

Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 71, 126. For some examples of these expressions in inscriptions from the ninth century, see: Ševčenko, ‘Sisinnios’, and Asdracha, *THRACE*, nos 64, 68.

Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 9–10, 144–145.


Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 19, 27, 45–46, 128.

For example, in the medieval texts engraved in the cave of Gastria in Tinos, the invocation formula is Κύριε, βοήθει: Feissel, ‘Ténos’, 483–503. The same formula is widely used in the medieval inscriptions of Cappadocia, while the formula Μνήσθητι, Κύριε is extremely rare: G. De Jerphanion, *Une nouvelle province de l’art byzantin. Les églises rupestres de Cappadoce*, 2 vols (Paris, 1925–42), vol. I, 166, 168–70, 173, 175–6, 201, 301, 473, 475, 477–8, 481, 485, 487, 489–90, 491, etc. We observe the same phenomenon in the unpublished medieval invocations from the church of Stylite Niketas in Kizilcukur (personal documentation, material under study).

Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, nos 27, 45, and 168 (new reading).


Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 46.


Orlandos and Vranoussis, *Χαράγματα*, no. 9.

For the manuscript tradition of both works, see: http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/.

Chapter 11

1 W.B. Dinsmoor, *Observations on the Hephaisteion*, *Hesperia* Supplement V (American School of Classical Studies, 1941, repr. Amsterdam, 1975); H. Koch, *Studien zum Theseustempel in Athen*, Abh. der Sächsischen Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,


3. I should like to thank Prof. Cyril Mango for first drawing these inscriptions to my attention, and Prof. John Camp, Director of the Athenian Agora Excavations, for permission to discuss Agora material. My warmest thanks also to Dr Nikoletta Saraga and Dr Kleio Tsonga of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens for permission to examine the inscriptions. I am grateful to Craig Mauzy, Assistant Director of the Athenian Agora Excavations, for his excellent photographs.

4. On these last, carved as ex-votos before or after a voyage by sea, see M. Goudas, ‘Μεσαιωνικά χαράγματα πλοίων ἐπὶ τοῦ Θησείου’, *Byzantion* 2 (1911–12), 329–57; and O. Meinardus, ‘Medieval navigation according to ikodigraphemata in Byzantine churches and monasteries’, *DChAE* 6 (1970–72), 29–52.

5. E.g. of a plague in Athens in 1555; and in 1770 an influx of refugees to the city from Pire (near Thebes), K.G. Zesios, ‘Χαράγματα ἐπιγραφικά ἐπὶ ἀρχαίων μνημείων καὶ χρυσομακρικών ναῶν’, *Διετίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ελλάδος* 2 (1885–89), 20–32.

6. The Late Antique inscriptions have been published by E. Sironen, *The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica* (Helsinki, 1997) and *IG V2–3* (2008). The most comprehensive collection of medieval inscriptions in Athens is the publication by Archimandrite Antonin, *O drevnikh khristianskich nadpisjakh v Afinakh* (St Petersburg, 1874). Medieval inscriptions in the collection of the Byzantine Museum may be found in M. Sklavou Mavroeid, *Γλυπτά του Βυζαντινού Μουσείου Αθηνών* (Athens, 1999), nos 120 and 175–176 (St John tou Mangoute), 129, 158 (unknown churches), 201 (a fortified tower), 246 (the Parthenon), 247, 248, 257 and 284 (monastery of St John Kynegos on Hymettus), 263–7 (an unknown church), 298. See also A. Xyngopoulos, ‘Αἱ ἐπιγραφαὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τῶν Ἁγίων Θεοδώρων ἐν Ἀθήναις’, *EEBS* 10 (1933), 450–53; and E. Kounoupiotou-Manolessou, ‘Ἅγιος Νικόλαος Ραγκάβας. Συμβολή στὴν ἱστορία τοῦ μνημείου’, *DChAE* 24 (2003), 55–62.


10. On Pittakis, successor of Ludwig Ross as Director of Antiquities of the modern Greek state, see P. Kavvadias, *Ἱστορία τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν ἔτει 1837 ἱδρύσεως αὐτῆς μέχρι τοῦ 1900. Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Αθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 3* (Athens, 1900), 12 and 17, n. 5.

11. *AE* 1853, fasc. 34, pp. 939–40: nos 1599 and 1600; *AE* 1854, fasc. 38, pp. 1214–6: nos 2449–2454; *AE* 1858, fasc. 50, pp. 1809–10: nos 3468–3478, with facsimile. The inscriptions are described as ὅλη ἡν χρησιμοικεῖ πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν ὅτι οἱ οἱ τῶν Ἑλληνικῆς εἰσιν ἀπόγονοι τῶν ἄρχαίων Ἑλλήνων.

13. *CIG*, IV part 40 (Berlin, 1859), nos 9321–9336 (Panagia Lykodemou); 9337–9344 (Propylaia); 9345–9349 (Hephaisteion); 9350–9421 (Parthenon). As D. Feissel has kindly pointed out, the date 1877 associated with the volume is that at which the index was published.


18. Ibidem, 201; see also Bayliss, *Provincial Cilicia*, ch. 5.


23. Ch. Bouras, *Βυζαντινὴ Ἀθήνα*, 16ος-12ος αι., Μουσείο Μπενάκη, 6ο Παράρτημα (Athens, 2010), 182. Bouras also points to robbing of metal clamps and dowels as evidence that there was a period when the building was not used for worship.

26 Death notice of George: ed. Ladas, no. 9, pp. 68–9.
27 Pittakis and Antonin mistakenly attribute an inscription to AM 6007 = AD 499: Pittakis, *AE* 1853, fasc. 34, p. 939: no. 1599, and Antonin, *Theseion* no. 1, p. 18; see Ladas, no. 10, p. 70. (Pittakis’ no. 1600, which he dates AD 492, is certainly a misreading of ευοδία.)
28 Ladas, no. 2, pp. 60–1 and pl. 26.
31 See below, notes 75–81. Other monasteries founded in Attica and Boeotia in the tenth and eleventh centuries include those of Moni Petraki, Panagia Lykodemou, Daphni, Hosios Meletios, and Hosios Loukas.
34 Antonin, *Theseion* nos 12–16, p. 23.
35 *PL* 215, col. 1561: Ep. 256, *De confirmatione privilegiorum*.
36 Jacques Paul Babin explains that it was considered too far out of town to be turned into a mosque: *Relation de l’état présent de la ville d’Athènes, ancienne capitale de la Grèce, bâtie depuis 3400 ans, avec un abbrevé de son histoire et de ses antiquités* (Lyon, 1674), 18. According to Pittakis, an attempt at conversion was halted by the arrival of a firman from Constantinople: *L’ancienne Athènes* (Athens, 1835), 87; also in É. Isambert, *Itinéraire descriptif, historique et archéologique de l’Orient* (Paris, 1873), 105, where the incident is said to have taken place in 1660. Ciriaco d’Ancona, who visited in 1436, describes the temple as being ‘in agro Athenarum’: see C. Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum* (Leipzig, 1874), I, 727, and E.W. Bodnar, *Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens*, Collection Latomus 43 (Brussels-Berchem, 1960), 183.
43 ‘Empfang König Ottos von Griechenland’, Munich, Neue Pinakotheke, Inventory no. WAF 353.
44 Kavvadias, Ἱστορία τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας, 12, n. 3.
46 A. K. Orlandos, Έργα τοίχων Βυζαντινού μνημείου Α´· ἐν Ἀθήναις, Ἀρχαίον τῶν Βυζαντινῶν Μνημείων τῆς Ἑλλάδος II (1936), 207–16.
48 Calculated to have taken place some 5500 years before the Incarnation of Christ (5508 BC for purposes of conversion to the Gregorian calendar): V. Grumel, La chronologie (Paris, 1958), 111–28.
49 Orlandos and Vranoussis, Ἱστορία τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας, 12, n. 3.
50 See Grumel, La chronologie, 192–203.
51 Ladas, 60–1 and pl. 26, no. 2.
52 On the plaster and frescoes on the exterior of the Hephaisteion in the Byzantine period, see Bouras, Βυζαντινή Αθήνα, 182–3. There is also a possibility that Τ (300) in the date may be a misreading of Υ (400) since the letter upsilon appears with a vertical hasta elsewhere in the inscription. In that case the date would be ΔΜ 6421 = AD 912, still the earliest dated inscription on the building by half a century.
53 Ladas observes that a graffito on the Parthenon commemorates an archbishop Hypatios: Orlandos and Vranoussis, Τὰ Χαράγματα, no. 71, late ninth or tenth century.
55 See Ladas’ explanation, pl. 58, n. 1.
56 Ladas, 62–5, no. 4: ετ(ε)λ(ιω)θ(η) εν κ(υρι)ω ο δ(ου)λ(ο)ς του θ(εου) Γεωργιος μη(νι) φευρ(ουαριω) ης τ(ας) γ´ εν ημερα σα(ββατω) ωρα γ´ ινδ(ικτιω) θ´ ετους ςυοδ.
57 Ladas, 66–7, no. 6.
58 Ladas, 61–2, no. 3.
59 Ladas, 71–2, no. 11, with a bad drawing; that of Antonin, pl. 9, no. 8 is better.
60 Ladas, 69–71, no. 10.
61 Ladas, 67, no. 7.
62 Ladas, 68–9, no. 9.
63 Ladas, 65–6, no. 5.
67 J. Darrouzès, Épistoliers byzantins du Xe siècle (Paris, 1960), 357 (IX: Lettres diverses, no. 19); Rentakios is called πολλάκις.
69 Ladas, 75–6, no. 13.
Compare for example the obituary notices of abbot Plato of the Sakkoudion monastery (d. 4 April 814), his nephew abbot Theodore of Studios (d. 11 November 826), and the latter’s brother archbishop Joseph of Thessaloniki (d. 15 July 832), recorded (at a later date, after the copying of the manuscript?) on fol. 344r of the Uspenskij Gospels, cod. Petrop. 219 (AD 835). See J. Pargoire, ‘À quelle date l’higoumène saint Platon est-il mort?’, EO 4 (1901), 164–70. Another example is the obituary notice of Patriarch Nicholas III inscribed in a manuscript of the Synaxarion from the monastery of the Pantanassa on the island of St Glykeria: C. Mango, ‘Twelfth-Century Notices from Cod. Christ Church gr. 53’, JÖB 42 (1992), 228.

On the fine plaster applied to columns of the Parthenon, see Orlandos and Vranoussis, Τὰ Χαράγματα, *16.

The term is discussed in Orlandos and Vranoussis, Τὰ Χαράγματα, *5 and *16.

The far more numerous Christian graffiti on the columns of the Parthenon are also concentrated at the west end of the building, to the right of the main entrance of the church: see the plan in Orlandos and Vranoussis, Τὰ Χαράγματα, *15.

Antonin, Theseion, 28, no. 33.

Ibidem, 29, no. 36.

Ibidem, 30, no. 40.

Ibidem, 28, no. 34.

Ibidem, 28, no. 30.

Ibidem, 28, no. 28.

Ibidem, 28, no. 29. He probably served Ioannes Blachernites, Metropolitan of Athens 1068–86, who is commemorated on the Parthenon, Orlandos and Vranoussis, Τὰ Χαράγματα, no. 58.

Ibidem 29, no. 35.


Platon d. 8 December AM 6495 (AD 986) might seem to be a monastic name, but he is not described as a monk. One may note how few monks are commemorated in the Late Antique inscriptions of Athens and Greece: see Sironen, The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions, no. 311, 319–320, and Appendix 3 n. 226, p. 403.

Antonin, Theseion, 21, no. 5.

On prayers for the departed in the liturgy, see R.F. Taft, A History of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, IV: The Diptychs, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 238 (Rome, 1991), especially 23ff and 95ff on the ‘Diptychs of the Dead’. Lists of names to be read could include not only clergy but also members of the community in good standing.

J. Goar, Euchologion, sive rituale Graecum (Venice, 1730), 447.


Two inscriptions at Panagia Lykodemou are ‘true’ epitaphs: ἐνθ(αδε) τεταπτε, Antonin, Lykodemou, 3, no. 1; ἐντ(αυθα) κειται, Antonin, Lykodemou, 4, no. 4.

Dinsmoor, Hephaisteion, 10–11.

See Th. Pazaras, Άναγλυφές Σαρκοφάγοι και επιτάφιες πλάκες της μέσης Βυζαντινής περιόδου στην Ελλάδα. Δημοσιεύματα του Αρχαιολογικού Δελτίου 38 (Athens, 1988).

According to Dinsmoor, Hephaisteion, 4: ‘The tomb-builders had commonly hewn their sepulchres out of the soft poros of the ancient foundations and had not scrupled to tear up both marble and poros for use in lining and covering the graves’. See ibidem, 4–11 and plan on p. 5; see also Orlandos, Ἀρχεῖον II (1936), 214–6.

On burials in areas of lesser liturgical importance in churches, see V. Marinis, ‘Tombs and Burials in the Monastery tou Libos’, DOP 63 (2009), 166.


98 Ibidem, 63, 69–70, chs. 89 and 107.

99 Ibidem, 74–5, ch. 118.


103 Antonin, *Lykodemou*, 4, no. 4; *CIG* 9336 εντα(υ)θ(α) κειτ(αι) Στεφαν(ος) ο πρωτ(ο) κτιτωρ τη τεταρ(η) ημ(ερα) τ(ου) δεκεμβρι(ου) (ινδ) ιγ ετους ςφνγ.


107 The area suffered destruction by fire in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century; possibly as a result of the attacks by Leo Sgouros and the Franks in 1204. See Agora Notebook KK VIII (1937), 1574–6; Notebook KK V (1936), 801–2 and 859–66; Notebook KK II, 201–2, 251, 259; together with plan, Sheet 563. I am grateful to Richard Anderson for help in identifying the plan. Cf. also D.B. Thompson, ‘The Garden of Hephaistos’, *Hesperia* 6 (1937), 396–425, esp. 401.

108 Agora Notebook MM I, 38–42 and 168–70. Unfortunately, the skeletons were not kept, so it is not possible to ascertain whether they were all male or mixed.

109 Orlandos and Vranoussis observe that on the Parthenon carefully carved deep inscriptions tend to commemorate clerics of high rank: *Χαράγματα*, 17.


111 Some of them have surnames, e.g. Νικόλαος Καλληρόης, Antonin 29 no. 38; Ανδρέας Παλικάντης, Antonin 25, no. 18. One is called Ιωάννης Καλαβρός, ‘Calabrian’, Antonin 26, no. 22.

112 Creaghan and Raubitschek note that the recording of the deceased’s profession is a peculiarly Christian phenomenon: ‘Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens’, 7.


115 See n. 29 above.
116 Antonin, Theseion, 25, no. 19.
117 Roger C.P. Doonan of the Department of Archaeology, University of Sheffield, kindly examined some of the metalworking debris in July 2006 (Lots BH 327–329), and compiled a report entitled ‘Assessment of metalworking debris from the Agora Excavations (Section BH)’. See also Dinsmoor, Hephaisteion, 1, n. 3, for publications of evidence of metalworking in the area in antiquity.
118 Antonin, Theseion, 26, no. 21.
120 ‘The Archaeology of Medieval Athens’, Essays in Medieval Life and Thought, presented in honor of Austin Patterson Evans (New York, 1955), 251, repr. in K.M. Setton, Athens in the Middle Ages (London, 1975), Study I. See also Bouras, Βυζαντινή Αθήνα, 80, and 78 for another set of vats in Section E, Agora Notebook E 2, 351.
121 Agora Notebook BH VI, 1329ff. The dump continues in the unexcavated area under modern Hastings St to the N.
122 The few whole shells may represent dead specimens (from which no dye may be extracted) collected by mistake; cf. D. Ruscillo, ‘Reconstructing Murex Royal Purple and Biblical Blue in the Aegean’, in D. Bar-Yosef Meyer (ed.), Archaeomalacology: Molluscs in Former Environments of Human Behaviour (Oxford, 2005), 103.
123 Antonin, Panagia Lykodemou, 10, no. 16.
124 For the γειτονία τῶν κογχλαρίων, see E. Granstrem, I. Medvedev and D. Papachryssanthou, ‘Fragment d’un praktikon de la région d’Athènes (avant 1204)’, REB 34 (1976), 27–8 and 35.
127 For the epitaph of a Jewish dyer, found at Corinth, see J. Starr, ‘The epitaph of a dyer in Corinth’, BNU 12 (1936), 42–9.

Chapter 12

1 My appreciation is due to all who have read, heard, and responded to various versions of this chapter, not only at this symposium, but also at Dumbarton Oaks and at the International Congress on Medieval Studies. I am especially grateful for the comments from Lynn Jones, Michael Maas, Jeffrey Hamburger, Leslie Brubaker, Alice Isabella Sullivan, and particularly from the editors of this volume, Marc Lauxtermann and Ida Toth, as well as the anonymous readers. All translations are mine, unless otherwise stated.


6 The seminal work on epigrams is A. Rhoby, *Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung*, 4 vols (Vienna, 2009–18), hereafter cited as BEIÜ. For the four objects discussed in this essay see BEIÜ, 2: Me23, Me111, Me112, Me110.


8 Traces of enamel have been detected in the incised letters as well as in the dots that outline the perimeter. The letters were blue, and the dots followed a repeating color pattern of blue, green, blue, red; J. Durand, ‘La Vraie Croix de la princesse Palatine au trésor de Notre-Dame de Paris: Observations techniques’, *CahArch* 40 (1992), 139–46, esp. 141.

9 BEIÜ, 2: 186: Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς Χ(ριστό)ς Στ(αυ)ρῷ παγεὶς ὕψωσας ἀν(θρώπ)ων φύσιν γράφει Κομνηνὸς Μανουὴλ στεφηφόρος.

10 BEIÜ, 2: 186.


14 A similar comparison between the crown-wearing emperors and Christ is also found in the epigram inscribed on the cross of the tenth-century Limburg Staurotheke; B. Hostetler, ‘The Limburg Staurotheke: A Reassessment’, *Athanor* 30 (2012), 7–13. Interestingly, the Notre-Dame cross was used in the coronation ceremonies of Polish kings when it was in their possession from the mid-fifteenth century to the mid-seventeenth century; see M. Derwich, ‘Le baiser de paix utilisé lors du couronnement des rois de Pologne et déposé au Trésor de Notre-Dame de Paris. Considérations sur

15 A patron’s claim to being the artist is a common conceit. It does not necessarily mean that he/she had anything to do with the making of the object, but was most likely the one who paid for it; M. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres*, vol. I (Vienna, 2003), 159. There are a few instances in which the patron and poet may be the same person; see for example, I. Drpić, *Epigram, Art, and Devotion in Later Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2016), 31.

16 The dimensions are 38.3 x 24.4 x 1.5 cm; M. De Kreek, *De kerkschat van het Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekapittel te Maastricht* (Utrecht, 1994), 90–115. For complete bibliography, see also Frolow, *La relique*, 231–3 (no. 135); *BEIÜ*, 2: 303–5 (Me111); and Hostetler, *The Function of Text*, 187–8 (no. A47).

17 This side incorporates other elements that were added in later periods, including a cruciform bracket at the upper end, the two brooches at the ends of the upper cross-arm, a gem at the lower end, and possibly the thirteen swiveled pegs that hold the relic in place. Pairs of silver and glass beads are mounted at the ends of the lower cross-arm, and recent analysis indicates that similar decoration was found on all six finials. For a virtual reconstruction, see D. Rezza (ed.), *La Stauroteca Maggiore Vaticana: Museo Storico Artistico del Tesoro di San Pietro* (Vatican City, 2012), fig. 6.

18 *BEIÜ*, 2: 303: Ὡραῖον εἰς ὅρασιν ὀφθὲν τὸ ξύλον
gέψασα με νεκροῖ τὸν Θεοῦ κατ’ εἰκόνα·
ὄρατος ὄν κάλλει δὲ θείας οὐσίας
ζωοῖ με Χριστός σαρκικῶς θανὼν ξύλῳ
5 ὡραῖοι φωνατῆσιν ὀρές τῶν ἐστεμένων
χάρισι τιμίων λίθων
ἡττῶν δι’ αὐτοῦ δαίμονας καὶ βαρβάρους.


21 The emperors are Romanos I Lakapenos (r. 920–44), Romanos II (r. 959–63), Romanos III Argyros (r. 1028–34), and Romanos IV Diogenes (r. 1068–71). The verse inscription bears breathing marks and diacritics which favour an eleventh-century date; cf. A. Guillou, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques médiévales d’Italie* (Rome, 1996), 55.

22 For the tradition of this iconography, see J. Deèr, ‘Das Kaiserbild im Kreuz’, *Schweizer Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte* 13 (1955), 48–110. It is also found on a tenth-century ivory panel now at Dumbarton Oaks (BZ.1937.18); J. Cotsonis, *Byzantine Figural Processional Crosses* (Washington, 1994), 66–7.


24 *DOC* 3.2, p. 525, pl. XXXV.

25 *DOC* 3.2, p. 537, 556, pl. XXXVII; and *DOC* 3.2, p. 585, 596, pls. XLI, XLII.

26 *DOC* 3.2, p. 628, pls. XLVI–XLVII.


> Τὸ θαῦμα καινὸν ὧδε τῶν ὁρωμένων
> Χριστὸς προτείνει δεξιᾷ ζωηφόρῳ
> ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὸ στέμμα, σύμβολον κράτους,
> πιστῷ κραταιῷ δεσπότῃ Βασιλείῳ.

5 Κάτωθεν οἱ πρώτιστοι τῶν ἀσωμάτων,
ὁ μὲν λαβὼν ἤνεγκε καὶ χαίρων στέφει,
ὁ δὲ προσάπτων τῷ κράτει καὶ τὰς νίκας,
ῥομφαίαν, ὅπλον ἐκφοβοῦν ἐναντίον,
φέρων δίδωσι χειρὶ τῇ τοῦ δεσπότου.

10 Οἱ μάρτυρες δὲ συμμαχοῦσιν ὡς φίλῳ
ῥίπτοντες ἐχθροὺς τοὺς προσκειμένους.

It is not clear where, or how, the liquid was stored inside the enkolpion. The seminal work on reliquaries of St Demetrios is A. Grabar, ‘Quelques reliquaires de saint Démétrios et de martyrium du saint à Salonique’, *DOP* 8 (1954), 305–13. For complete bibliography, see also *BEIÜ*, 2:305–7 (Me112), and Hostetler, *The Function of Text*, 188 (no. A48).

This latter detail suggests that Sergios may have hoped to be buried with the enkolpion; cf. I. Kalavrezou, ‘Enkolpion Reliquary of Saint Demetrios’, in H. Evans and W. Wixom (eds), *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843–1261* (New York, 1997), 168 (no. 117).

It is not clear where, or how, the liquid was stored inside the enkolpion. The seminal work on reliquaries of St Demetrios is A. Grabar, ‘Quelques reliquaires de saint Démétrios et de martyrium du saint à Salonique’, *DOP* 5 (1950), 3–28. See also Hostetler, *The Function of Text*, 52–8, with more recent bibliography.

P. Grotowski, *Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints: Tradition and Innovation in Byzantine Iconography* (843–1261), tr. R. Brzezinski (Leiden, 2010), 333 states that a lance in Byzantine ceremonial and art ‘was both a visible sign of victory, as well as a warning to enemies who still posed a threat to the imperial army’.

The direction of Demetrios’s gaze is not a standardized feature of his iconography. On two other reliquaries preserved at the Halberstadt Cathedral, for example, one includes an enamel image of Demetrios with his eyes looking to the right, and the other features a repoussé image with his eyes looking directly to the viewer; P. Janke, ‘Drei Demetriosreliquiare’, in H. Meller et al. (eds), *Der heilige Schatz im Dom zu Halberstadt* (Regensburg, 2008), 54–9 (Inv.-Nr. 16a and 24). The third Demetrios reliquary owned by the treasury (Inv.-Nr. 26) is missing its original lid decoration where Demetrios’s image would have originally been placed.
39 Cf. Grabar, ‘Quelques reliquaires’.
40 Cf. Grabar, ‘Quelques reliquaires’.
41 This type of representation is found on only two other extant Middle Byzantine reliquaries of St Demetrios. One reliquary is preserved at the Vatopedi Monastery at Mount Athos, and the other is in a private collection; BEIJÜ, 2: 206–12 (Me37–42), 3: 839–41 (AddI20); and Hostetler, The Function of Text, 173–74 (A20), 191 (No. A53).
43 1926,0409.1. The dimensions are 4.6 x 3.7 x 1.05 cm. For complete bibliography, see BEIJÜ, 2: 216–8 (Me47–48); and Hostetler, The Function of Text, 175 (no. A22).
44 BEIJÜ, 2: 217. Rhoby presents the two in situ verses as independent epigrams. I present them here as a single epigram because they form a cohesive thought with the anointing of myron as the cause to the effect of being protected in battle:
[...]
αἵματι τῷ σῷ καὶ μύρῳ κεχρισμένον,
αἰτεῖ σε θερμὸν φρουρὸν ἐν μάχαις ἔχειν.
45 Eustathios of Thessaloniki, Laudatio S. Demetrii (BHG 539), XXI.26, T.L.F. Tafel (ed.), Eustathii Thessalonicenses opuscula (Frankfurt, 1832; repr. Amsterdam, 1964), 173; PG 136: 188.
46 I know of only three other reliquary epigrams that give agency to the patron’s devotion or faith in the making of the reliquary; Hostetler, The Function of Text, 166 (no. A8), 183 (no. A38), 195–6 (B6).
47 For the ‘shield of faith’, see Grotowski, Arms and armour, 252–4.
48 When the doors are closed, it measures 13 x 8 cm. Each door is 8.5 x 3.5 cm; De Kreek, De kerkschat, 116–27. For complete bibliography, see also Frolow, La relique, 371–2 (no. 427); BEIJÜ, 2:300–3 (Me110); and Hostetler, The Function of Text, 187 (No. A46).
49 The empty fields are recessed, which suggests that they were filled with decoration, possibly enamel or repoussé plaques, as seen on interior wings of the True Cross Reliquary Enkolpion at the Museo della Cattedrale in Monopoli; W. Wixom, ‘Staurotheke’, in Evans and Wixom (eds), The Glory of Byzantium, 162–3 (no. 110). See also De Kreek, De kerkschat, 117, 120.
51 He was most likely paired with a pendant image of Helena on the lower right panel. The purpose of these hinged panels is not clear. One suggestion is that they may have enclosed additional relics; De Kreek, De kerkschat, 122.
52 BEIJÜ, 2: 301: ‘Ὅρα τί καινὸν θαῦμα καὶ ξένην χάριν’
χρυσὸν μὲν ἔξω, Χριστὸν ἐνδοῦν δὲ σκόπειν
δ ὡς τέτευχεν ἐκ προθύμου κυρίας
Ἰωάννης λύτρωσιν αἰτῶν σφαλμάτων.
54 Frolow, Les reliquaires, 239–52, esp. 241 states that the appearance of the cross suggests an immediate presence of God. Christ’s presence through his relics is
conveyed by other reliquary epigrams; see Hostetler, The Function of Text, 163–64 (A5), 179–80 (A32).

55 Ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Rev. 21:3); The Greek New Testament, 2nd ed., K. Aland et al. (eds) (Stuttgart, 1968), tr. RSV.

56 ἡ πόλις χρυσίον (Rev. 21:18), and παντὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ κεκοσμημένοι (Rev. 21:19); The Greek New Testament, 2nd ed., K. Aland et al. (eds) (Stuttgart, 1968), tr. RSV.


60 Le Typicon de la Grande Église, ed. Mateos, 30.21.


65 Maguire, Image, 8–9, and Lauxtermann, Byzantine Poetry, 42–3.

66 Those with three verses are Mercati, ‘Epigrammi’, I, II, IV, VI, VII.

67 There is evidence that artists were given written instructions on inscribing works of art; see Hörandner, ‘heilige Kreuz’, 123–5; and BEIÜ, 2: Me1–2.
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1 I should like to thank Marc Lauxtermann, Andrei Vinogradov, Arkadiy Avdokhin, and Alexandra Nikoforova for their valuable comments regarding the inscription surrounding the icon of S. Maria in Trastevere.


3 This is the case with the Ascension icon dated by Weitzmann to the sixth century and the image of Plato and Glykeria, today in the Khanenko Museum in Kiev: Weitzmann, The Icons, B. 10, B. 15.


7 See M. Lautermer, ‘A Lombard Epigram in Greek’, ch. 17, this volume.


11 Weitzmann considered this unusual image of God as a conflation of three natures – of God the Father, Christ Pantocrator, and Emmanuel as an Embodied Logos: Weitzmann, The Icons, 41. However, the use of this caption in Early Byzantine art indicates that Emmanuel is not yet connected exclusively to the theme of Baby Jesus and incarnation. I will be discussing this topic extensively in a forthcoming paper.

12 See Weitzmann, The Icons, 41.

13 It has been suggested that φιλόχριστος could stand for a proper name. However, it is more likely that here it works as an adjective defining the donor, since the use of this word in dedicatory inscriptions was not uncommon in the early Byzantine period.


17 A similar arrangement must have been characteristic of the icon of Plato and Glykeria, now in Kiev: Weitzmann, The Icons, B. 15. Two small panels with the images of Peter and Paul, today in the Vatican Museums, originally were parts of a small reliquary box, in which one of the icons played the role of the sliding lid:

18 Weitzmann’s transcription actually misses the last word, which can be quite safely reconstructed as ἐποίησεν.


20 Weitzmann, The Icons, B. 21, 45–46.


On the communicative nature of epigraphy and various ways the message written on an artwork interacts with the beholder in terms of ‘author’ and ‘addressee’ relation: P. Liverani, ‘Chi parla a chi? Epigrafia monumentale e immagine pubblica in epoca tardoantica’, in S. Birk, M. Kristensen and B. Poulsen (eds), Using Images in Late Antiquity (Oxford 2014), 3–32.

See the paper by Sean Leatherbury, ch. 3 in this volume.

Chapter 14

1 See, e.g., Symeon of Thessalonike, De ordine sepulturae, PG 155, 672C–D.


3 These terms point either to the object’s function or to its position on the body: phylakterion and phylakton derive from φυλάσσω (‘to protect’), periapton and periamma from περαμίτω (‘to tie on’ or ‘to hang about’), while enkolpion is a compound of the preposition ἐν (‘in’ or ‘on’) and the noun κόλπος (‘bosom’). See H. Gerstinger, ‘Enkolpion’, in RAC, vol. 5 (1962), 324–5; G.J.M. Bartelink, ‘Φυλακτήριον–phylacterium’, in Mélanges Christine Mohrmann: nouveau recueil; offert par ses anciens élèves (Utrecht, 1973), 25–60, esp. 27; C. Faraone, The Transformation of Greek Amulets in Roman Imperial Times (Philadelphia, 2018), esp. 5–7. For the term enkolpion and its association with Christian orthodoxy, see esp. M. Vinson, ‘The Terms ἐγκόλπιον and τενάντιον and the Conversion of Theophilus in the Life of Theodora (BHG 1731)’, GRBS 36 (1995), 89–99.


8 This estimate is based on the published material. The actual number may well be significantly higher. I should add that the above figure also includes epigrams on gems featuring Christian imagery which are not explicitly identified as *enkolpia* in the titles. As has been pointed out by K. Harrison, *Byzantine Carved Gemstones: Their Typology, Dating, Materiality, and Function* (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2015), 20 and 291, in medieval Byzantium engraved gems were normally used as neck pendants. It is safe to assume that this was the function of gems enhanced with the addition of epigrams, which in most instances would have been displayed on the mounts of such small-scale carvings. Needless to say, many of the shorter poems preserved in the manuscript record with no overt indications of their original context may have been composed for or inscribed upon *enkolpia*.


12 The inscription is, unfortunately, not visible in Figures 14.3–14.4


18 In one of the manuscript witnesses, the fourteenth-century codex *Laur. Conv. Soppr.* 98 (fol. 40r), the title attached to epigram no. 112 (Braounou-Pietsch, *Beseelte Bilder*, 192–3) identifies the carving as an *enkolpion*. See also n. 8 above.


27 Manuel Philes, *Carmina*, ed. Miller, vol. 1, 133–4 (nos 269–71). Cf. A. Frolov, ‘Un nouveau reliquaire byzantin (*Manuelis Philae Carmina*, I, pp. 133–7)’, *REG* 66 (1953), 100–10. It is likely that another epigram by Philes (*Carmina*, ed. Miller, vol. 2, 74 [no. 32]) belongs to the same series. If this is the case, the despot apparently received the reliquary as a present from an unknown giver (see ibid., vv. 3–4: Δημήτριος δὲ πορφυρανθὴς δεσπότης / ἐγκόλπιον τὸ δῶρον ὡς κόσμον φέρει).


29 That the *enkolpion* may have been circular is suggested by Manuel Philes, *Carmina*, ed. Miller, vol. 2, 74 (no. 32, vv. 1–2): Τὴν τῶν μύρων θάλασσαν ἐκ Δημητρίου / ὡς ωκεανὸν κυκλοῖ φρέαρ. See above n. 27.


31 For a different interpretation of v. 4, see Pietsch-Braounou, ‘Manuel Philes und die übernatürliche Macht der Epigrammdichtung’, 88–9.


40 The phrasing is peculiar: ὀστοῦν (‘bone’) goes with διδύμου (‘of the Twin’), ξύλον (‘wood’) with σταυροῦ (‘of the Cross’), and θρίξ (‘hair’) with λύχνου (‘of the Lamp’).


42 E. R. Curtius, Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter (Bern, 1948), 287.


44 Michael Psellos, Poem 84, L.G. Westerink (ed.), Michaelis Pselli Poemata (Stuttgart, 1992), 459. Westerink’s edition is based on a single manuscript, Haun. 1899, which apparently offers the end of this one-liner in the wrong order: (…) λύχνου, λόγου.

45 On this metaphor, see Lampe, s.v. λύχνος B.

46 For a fuller discussion of the enkolpion’s personal significance, see Drpić, ‘The Enkolpion’.


48 Curiously, the identifying labels associate the angel with Luke, the lion with Matthew, and the ox with Mark. Only the label placed next to the eagle follows the standard pairing by associating this symbol with John.

49 See Frolow, ‘Un bijou byzantin’, 626.

50 See Avgoloupi, Simbologia delle gemme, 110–22, with references to the sources.


52 The poem’s title reads: Εἰς παναγιάριον ἐγκόλπιον ἔχον καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ αἵματος.


56 See Drpić, ‘Notes on Byzantine *Panagia*’.
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2 For a list of W.M. Ramsay’s publications down to 1923, see W.H. Buckler and W.M. Calder (eds), *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* (Manchester, 1923), xiii–xxviii. Ramsay’s most significant epigraphic and topographic contributions were *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), and the two published volumes of *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895–97).


4 Notably the photographs, squeezes and notebooks of Sir Christopher Cox and Michael Ballance, published as MAMA IX–XI: see http://archive.csad.ox.ac.uk/MAMA/ (MAMA IX and X); http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk (MAMA XI).


7 The mason did not observe syllabic division between lines: note especially lines 2–3, 8–9, 14–15, 15–16, 17–18.


9 See C. Brixhe, *Essai sur le grec anatolien au début de notre ère*, nouvelle édition (Nancy, 1987), 32 (degemination) and 46–9 (vowels).


13 For more information on dodecasyllables consisting not of 5+7 or 7+5, but of 5+5 or 7+7 syllables, or offering just one of the two hemistichs, see M.D. Lautzermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts*, vol. II (Vienna, 2019), Appendix Metrica, § 5.6.1 and 5.6.3.


16 Unnecessarily corrected by Rhoby (as in previous footnote) to τυφλούσθω.


19 *Septuagint, Odes* 12, line 9.


21 Eirini Afendoulidou-Leitgeb is preparing an edition of the *Dioptria*: we are most grateful to her for granting access to her edition in advance of publication. For the second parallel, see A. Berger, *Life and Works of Saint Gregentios, Archbishop of Taphar* (Berlin and New York, 2006), 514, at 2.238, app. crit. (reading of mss AN).

23 For Elias, see F. Ciccolella, Cinque poeti bizantini: anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310 (Alessandria, 2000), 37 (who rightly refers to Anacreontea 32.10 κόσις ὀστῶν λυθέντων). For Bardanes’ epitaph, see Rhoby, Byzantische Epigramme, vol. III, 256–60: no. GR69.

24 J. Strubbe, APAI EIΠITYMBΙΟΙ: Imprecations against Desecrators of the Grave in the Greek Epitaphs of Asia Minor (Bonn, 1997): nos 397 (Nazianzos: δώσει … τοὺς κατοχθόνιος θεῶς δίκην) and 398 (Sofular: λαβέτω νόσον τιν’ ἀθεράπευτον).


32 The term Δέσποινα is standard for the Theotokos: for her designation as ἡ ἀχράντος Δέσποινα (verses 1 and 11), cf. e.g. Rhoby, Byzantinische Epigramme, vol. III, 660–1: no. TR75 (Constantinople, Theotokos Pammakaristos), Δέσποινα … πανάχραντος; H.S. Cronin, ‘First Report of a Journey in Pisidia, Lycaonia, and Pamphylia’, JHSt 22 (1902), 94–125 and 339–76, at 97, no. 1 (Ilan Musch); improved text, W.M. Ramsay and G.L. Bell, The Thousand and One Churches (London, 1909), 531: τῆς παναχράντου ... Δέσποινας; IGLS 21/2, 131 (Madaba, AD 663): τῆς ἀχράντου Δεσποίνης[ν].


36 Cronin, ‘First Report’, 96–9, nos. 1–3; Ramsay and Bell, Thousand and One Churches, 531.

38 For people by the name of Saba, Sabas or Sabbas mentioned in Byzantine sources, see R-J. Lilie et al., *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Zweite Abteilung (867–1025)*, vol. 5 (Berlin and Boston, 2013), 648–69.

**Chapter 16**

1 See *AD* 37 (1982) 1989, Bʹ1, 123. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Ms Evangelia Pantou (Director of the Ephorate of Antiquities in Laconia) for her permission to publish the inscription, to father Athanasios Tsolakos (priest in the parish of Myrtia) for helping me to make the photographs of the church, and to Dr Panagiotis Perdikoulias and Dr Ludovic Bender for valuable information.

2 The church also has another name, not in general use in the region: St Kornelios. As for this second name see pp. 353–4.


5 + Θεὸν εὐμενῶς δυσωπῶν μὴ ἐλλείπῃ // ὦ μύστα σοφὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἱεράρχα // ὅπως παρέξῃ λύσιν ἀμπλακημάτων // τῷ μελενδύτῃ μοναχῷ Βασιλείῳ // τῷ πρὶν πόλεως Μονεμβάτης μεγίστῃ // οἰκονόμῳ τε, σοῦ δὲ δομήτωρ θείου // νῦν δ᾽ ἱστορήσαντός σε.

6 Apart from the spelling mistake in line 2: παρέξῃ instead of παρέξῃ (a variant form for παράσχῃ).


9 A. Rocchi, *Codices cryptenses seu Abbatiae Cryptae Ferratae in Tusculano digesti et illustrati* (Grottaferrata, 1883), 299, 9–12; see also https://dbbe.ugent.be/occurrences/19924.

10 K. Treu, *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments in der UdSSR: Eine systematische Auswertung der Texthandschriften in Leningrad, Moskau, Kiev, Odessa, Tbilisi und Erevan* (Texte und Untersuchungen 91), (Berlin, 1966), 210. See https://dbbe.ugent.be/occurrences/23918: ‘The text is scratched and this seems to be the remnant of a longer text’.


31 Jolivet-Lévy, *Cappadoce*, 269, pl. 149, 2.


35 K. Katsikis, ‘Ο ζωγραφικός διάκοσμος του μητροπολιτικού ναού του αγίου Νικολάου Κοζάνης (1730)’, in Εικοστό ένατο Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινής και Μεταβυζαντινής Αρχαιολογίας και Τέχνης. Πρόγραμμα και περιλήψεις εισηγήσεων και ανακοινώσεων (Αθήνα 15, 16 και 17 Μαΐου 2009), Βυζαντινό και Χριστιανικό Μουσείο (Athens, 2009), 65.


45 Papamastorakis, ‘Επιτύμβιες παραστάσεις’, 298.


50 In the village Apidia there are several churches in ruins that are still not published.


55. S. Kalopissi-Verti considers the settlement’s name, which is related to a personal name attested since the Paleologan era, to be datable to the late Byzantine period: see Kalopissi-Verti, ‘H. Strates’, 148.


58. Very interesting and well documented regarding the policy of Michael VIII: I.-A. Tudorie, *Imperial Authority in Crisis: Michael VIII Palaiologos (1258–1282) and the Relations between the Byzantine State and the Church* (in Romanian) (Braila, 2016).


63. Ch. Kalliga mentions that the ἅγριδιον has been identified, without offering precise information. She incorrectly asserts that the inscription at Sts Theodoroi is the oldest reference to the existence of the metropolis of Monemvasia: Kalliga, ‘Μονεμβασία’, 297. However, it is already attested in 1275 in the donor inscription of Dourianika: Foskolou, ‘Donor Inscriptions’, 457–61. See also: Sh. Gerстel, ‘Mapping the Boundaries of Church and Village. Ecclesiastical and Rural Landscapes in the Late Byzantine Peloponnese’, in Sh. Gerstel (ed.), *Viewing the Morea: Land and People in the Late Medieval Peloponnese* (Washington, 2013), 353.

64. Wastaff, *Development of Rural Settlements*, 29–47.
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1 I would like to thank Judith Herrin, Maria Lidova and Vivien Prigent for their insightful comments and extremely useful suggestions.

2 The manuscript can be consulted online at www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/sbe/0326. For a facsimile edition of fol. 67–86, see G. Walser, Die Einsiedler Inschriftensammlung und der Pilgerführer durch Rom (Codex Einsidlensis 326) (Stuttgart, 1987).

3 For a description of the manuscript, see S. Del Lungo, Roma in età carolingia e gli scritti dell’Anonimo augiense (Einsiedeln, Bibliotheca Monasterii ordinis sancti Benedicti, 326 [8 nr. 13], IV, ff. 67r–86r) (Rome, 2004), 14–5. For the date, see D. Bellardini and P. Delogu, ‘Liber Pontificalis e altre fonti: la topografia di Roma nell’VIII secolo’, Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome 60–1 (2001–02), 205–24, at 206. For the provenance from Fulda, see Walser, Die Einsiedler Inschriftensammlung, 9; previous scholarship believed the manuscript to have been copied in the monastery of Reichenau.


7 For the syllogae, see G.B. De Rossi, Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores, II.1 (Rome, 1888) [= ICUR] and A. Silvagni, ‘Intorno alle più antiche raccolte di iscrizioni classiche e medievali. I. Nuovo ordinamento delle sillogi epigrafiche di Roma anteriori al secolo XI’, Dissertazioni della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, ser. II, 15 (1921), 179–229. See also M. Buoncuore,

8 Silvagni, ‘Nuovo ordinamento’, 182–8, posits that, apart from a seventh-century collection of Christian inscriptions (the existence of which had been postulated by De Rossi, ICUR, passim), the compiler made use of a fifth-century collection of pagan inscriptions. There is no proof for all of this. For a justified critique of Silvagni’s methodology in general, see C. Vircillo Franklin, ‘The Epigraphic Syllaeae of BAV, Palatinus latinus 833’, in J. Hamesse (ed.), Roma, Magistra Mundi: Itineraria culturalia mediavelis, vol. II (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1998), 975–90.

9 C.B. Rose, ‘The Supposed Augustan Arch at Pavia (Ticinum) and the Einsiedeln 326 Manuscript’, JRA 3 (1990), 163–8, denies the Pavia connection of this and the following two inscriptions; but he has been convincingly refuted by E. Gabba, ‘L’arco augusteo di Pavia’, Athenaeum 78 (1990), 515–7.

10 The collection of inscriptions in the Einsidlensis has been published more than once: the most important editions are De Rossi, ICUR, II.1, 18–33 (the Pavia inscriptions are here nos II.78–82, on pp. 32–3) and Walser, Die Einsiedler Inschriftensammlung, 12–63 (nos 76–80 on pp. 61–3).


12 However, in the domain of the fanciful Mabillon is no match for M.P. Billanovich, ‘Un iscrizione paleocristiana di Pavia nella siliqoe di Einsiedeln’, Atti dell’Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti 151 (1992–93), 1103–28, who first rejects τὸν Θεόν λόγον as incorrect Greek (?), then ‘emends’ this to τὸν Θεώδοτον (!) and then boldly identifies the latter as St Sirus of Pavia (?!?). N. Everett, Literacy in Lombard Italy, c. 568–774 (Cambridge, 2003), 248, n. 46, is rightly doubtful of this interpretation.

13 There are some earlier examples, but these are quite exceptional: see A. Rhoby, ‘Vom jambischen Trimeter zum byzantinischen Zwölfsilber: Beobachtung zur Metrik des spätantiken und byzantinischen Epigramms’, WSt 124 (2011), 117–42.

14 For Andrew of Crete, see LBG, s.v.; for the orthodox hymns, see the internet. Eustathios of Thessalonica uses the word θεόγλυφος as an alternative for θεόγραφος, ‘god-written’ (referring to the stone tablets of Moses): see LBG, s.v.

15 E. Miller (ed.), Manuel Philae Carmina, vol. II (Paris, 1857), 75: no. Par. 33.8–9. Another parallel is Athanasius, Homily on the Song of Songs (PG 27.1352b): έπὶ ταύτης τῆς πέτρας στέκουσα οὐ πτοεῖται (…) οὐ φοβεῖται, ‘if (the soul of the faithful) stands on this rock (= Christ), it will not fear (…) it will not dread’. See also G. Binder and L. Liesenborghs (eds), Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zu Ecclesiastes, vol. I (Bonn, 1979), 208, §43, 20–2: οὐ κλονοῦμαι οὐκέτι ἀλλ᾽ ἔστη μοι ἡ σοφία κἀγὼ ἔστην, ‘I am no longer shaken hither and thither, but wisdom (= Christ) stands by me and I stand by it’.


17 For the text of this Victorine sequence, a hymn in honour of St Fronto, see C. Blume and G.M. Dreves (eds), Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi, 34: Sequentiae ineditae (Leipzig, 1900), 190 (no. 234). The ideas expressed here ultimately go back to St Augustine, Homily on Pentecost, no. 270: PL 38.1239.


20 A. Kirchhoff, *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, vol. IV (Berlin, 1859), pars XL, 372–3 (*CIG* 8816), is seriously underwhelmed by the quality of the verses, which are ‘composit(i) … ad praecepta artis byzantinae rudioris illius et horrendioris’. In his commentary (*ICUR*, II.1, 32), De Rossi dates the epigram to the seventh or the eighth century; in his introduction (*ICUR*, II.1, 16), however, to the seventh century.


23 The inscription is found in the Laureshamensis, a *sylloge* from Lorsch (hence its name), but now kept in the Vatican (Pal. lat. 833). Ed. De Rossi, *ICUR*, II.1, 169 (no. XVI.23); Everett, *Literacy in Lombard Italy*, 249. The translation is partially based on that of Everett, but also takes into account the following two Italian translations: F.E. Consolino, ‘La poesia epigrafica’, in *Storia di Pavia. II L’Alto Medioevo* (Milan, 1987), 159–76, at 164, and V. Lanzani, ‘La chiesa pavese nell’alta medioevo: da Ennodio alla caduta del regno longobardo’, ibidem, 407–86, at 471.

24 See Everett, *Literacy in Lombard Italy*, 250–1.


26 For the date of Liutprand’s pilgrimage to St Anastasius, see O. Bertolini, *Roma e i Longobardi* (Rome, 1972), 39–42. E. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries* (Vatican, 1957), 42–3, incorrectly sees a connection with Liutprand’s second visit to Rome in 738.


30 The Corteolona inscription explicitly states that king Liutprand had heard of Leo III’s heresy before going on pilgrimage to Rome in 729 – so the pope must be Gregory II. Although it cannot be excluded that Liutprand in fact heard of it at a later stage (after the forced abdication of Germanos I in 730 or the council of Rome in 731?) and deliberately misrepresented the sequence of events, I fail to see what he would have gained by doing so. Please note that the inscription does not mention an edict issued by Leo III in 726; it only states that he had been ‘persuaded by a wretched sage’ (Constantine of Nakoleia?) and had ‘fallen into the pit of schism’.


33 Ed. De Rossi, ICUR, II.1, 168 (no. XVI.21); Everett, Literacy in Lombard Italy, 248–9.


35 Since Belting, Likeness and Presence, 142–3, follows De Rossi (see n. 20) in dating the inscription to the seventh century, he assumes that the reference to papal primacy was ‘not so contentious an issue … at that time’ as it later would become; but in its eighth-century context, it clearly has a political message.

36 For the use of Greek as a status symbol in non-Greek environments, see J.-M. Martin, ‘Hellénisme politique, hellénisme religieux et pseudo-hellénisme à Naples (VIIe–XIIe siècle)’, Néo Poïèt 2 (2005), 59–78.


39 Rhoby, Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung, vol. I, 33, n. 18, thinks that the poet was Andrew of Crete himself, which is highly unlikely.

40 Why De Rossi, ICUR, II.1, 16, assumes that the epigrapher who copied inscriptions in Pavia is none other than St Boniface (c. 675–754), is beyond me. There is no evidence that St Boniface knew Greek, nor that he copied inscriptions from stone. Besides, the collection of inscriptions in the Einsidlensis is clearly Carolingian.