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ABSTRACT

This dissertation proposes a social analysis of the Early Christian basilicas (4th-6th century) of Southern and Central Greece, predominantly those in the Late Roman province of Achaia. After an introduction which places the dissertation in the broader context of the study of Late Antique Greece, the second chapter argues that church construction played an important role in the process of religions change in Late Antiquity. The third chapter examines Christian ritual, architecture, and cosmology to show that churches in Greece depended upon and reacted to existing phenomena that served to promote hierarchy and shape power structures in Late Roman society. Chapter four emphasizes social messages communicated through the motifs present in the numerous mosaic pavements which commonly adorned Early Christian buildings in Greece. The final chapter demonstrates that the epigraphy likewise presented massages that communicated social expectations drawn from both an elite and Christian discourse. Moreover they provide valuable information for the individuals who participated in the processes of church construction. After a brief conclusion, two catalogues present bibliographic citations for the inscriptions and architecture referred to in the text. The primary goal of this dissertation is to integrate the study of ritual, architecture, and social history and to demonstrate how Early Christian architecture played an important role in affecting social change during Late Antiquity.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the Christian church as an important source of political, economic, religious, and social authority in the ancient Mediterranean contributed in a significant way to the transformation from the ancient to Byzantine world. By the sixth and seventh century the ecclesiastical hierarchy had become closely tied to the imperial government and in a position to command considerable moral, economic, and political resources. Churches increasingly occupied prominent places in the urban and suburban landscape, and the varying experiences of Christian liturgy came to mark the important events in the life of the community and the individual. Scholars have long recognized the social and cultural changes associated with the rise of Christianity. In many cases, however, their efforts to understand these profound changes have fallen short of explaining how they actually occurred in the very local world of everyday life in Late Antiquity. This dissertation will approach this issue by examining the place of Christian architecture in the expansion and development of Christianity as a cultural system in Late Roman Achaia and vicinity from the late 4th to the early 7th century.

This investigation will focus on how the clergy and the congregation sought to construct identities in a changing symbolic world where the increasingly powerful church recast the ideas, images, and, in many cases, the actual material of the ancient world into
a coherent Christian cosmology. The church actively maintained and drew upon its deep roots in ancient culture for numerous reasons. On some occasions, the Christian hierarchy recognized their inability to eradicate all evidence of paganism. In other contexts, the emperor, for example, realized that it would be profitable to integrate the traditions and trappings of imperial rule into a new Christian model of imperial authority. I will argue that on the local level the persistence of certain aspects of ancient culture, particularly the ritual structures, decorative motifs, and epigraphic conventions, played an important role in communicating the new expectations of the Christian church and Christian empire. The world of the local aristocrat, traditional religion, and civic ritual provided the backdrop for the emergence of Christianity to a far greater extent than the world of the capital, the emperor, and Patristic fathers. The continued vitality of civic life into the 5th and 6th centuries influenced the development of a “communicative practice” dependent on the norms, values, and iconography of ancient society and contributed to the creation of a Christian culture whose broad appeal was rooted in its fulfillment of basic expectations articulated by centuries-old traditions of Mediterranean culture. The novelty of Christianity in this formulation was not its ability to supplant the world of antiquity, but its ability to transform, reshape, and appropriate the ancient world to construct a social order with an entirely new set of justifications, beliefs, and structures.

The study of architecture provides a way to examine the nature and process of cultural change, and, in fact, has several advantages over the study of ancient text for the student of Late Antique society. First, the audience for architecture was inevitably broader than the audience for literary sources. Even for that small percentage of society
who had both the leisure and ability to indulge in reading, the cost of books was significant. The aristocratic audience for literary production influenced the matters ancient authors discussed, leading to an emphasis on aristocratic concerns. Monumental religious architecture, especially the Early Christian basilica, served a much broader audience and therefore became the point of contact between the ideas of the elite, who were often instrumental in the construction and decoration of churches, and the rest of Late Antique society. As my dissertation will demonstrate, the ability to communicate Christian theology using wide range of socially relevant images and rituals made the church building a vital link between elite expectations and popular sensibilities. Second, the literary evidence for Greece provides very little information concerning the process of Christianization in this region. There are no substantial narrative descriptions of Christian holy men, powerful bishops, or imperial authorities contributing to the development Christianity in southern and central Greece. In contrast, the architectural remains of early Christianity are widespread and substantial. Developing techniques to make the architectural remains of Early Christian churches answer questions relevant to current discussions in social, religious, and cultural history opens a vast store of material to the eye of the historian. Finally, churches are not ordinary architecture. The Early Christian church was sacred space and served as the locus for the liturgy. The role of the church as sacred space ensured that individuals expected a symbolically charged experience within the church and also that the experience of the rituals and architecture would have extended beyond its walls. For this reason churches provide not simply one

---

of the few available sources for Late Roman Greece, but a uniquely promising source as churches represented the place where all levels of Late Antique society witnessed the contact between heaven and earth.

My goal is to present Early Christian architecture as evidence for social change. Consequently, this dissertation represents a selective probing of architectural, decorative, and epigraphic evidence from Early Christian churches rather than a comprehensive study of the architecture or even a systematic treatment of any one component. The reasons for this are, in part, because studies of specific aspects of Early Christian churches already exist. While an updating of A. K. Orlandos’ dated but comprehensive survey of Early Christian architecture in Greece is needed, it is difficult to imagine any scholar getting sufficient access to the fine quality archaeological data necessary to produce a systematic and comprehensive new treatment of Early Christian architecture in Greece. Consequently, the following examination of Early Christian material evidence will emphasize architecture as a source of social history generally, and, in particular, will concentrate on the wealth of material from southern and central Greece. Specifically, it will demonstrate that architecture provides ample evidence for a complex interplay
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2 A similar phenomenon pervaded Early Christian homiletics, see: B. Leyerle, _Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom’s Attack on Spiritual Marriage_, (Berkeley 2001), 60-67 described John Chrysostom’s attack on the rhetoric of theatre permeating the language of sermons.
between pre-existing values and emerging cultural systems in the ancient and Medieval Mediterranean.

The following introduction falls into three parts. First I will briefly sketch the historical and historiographical trends in the history of Late Antique Greece. Then, I will present a basic prospectus of the architectural and archaeological evidence for this dissertation with particular attention to the difficulties attendant to any effort to group these buildings into categories for study. Finally, I will provide a short outline of the organization of this dissertation.

1.1. Context of History

In recent years Greece from the 4th to the 7th century, referred to as Late Antique, Late Roman, Early Byzantine or Early Christian period, has received considerable scholarly attention. A. Avramea’s study of the Peloponessus during this period has largely superceded Bon’s venerable study of post-classical Greece to provide the best basic overview of this period. Moreover, her slim volume presents a useful summary and discussion of the literary, archaeological, numismatic, and epigraphic sources. The contributions in the most recent edition of the Cambridge Ancient History by M. Whitby presented a useful summary of the military and economic environment of the Southern Balkans and Greece. T. Gregory, F. Trombley, J.-M. Spieser have provided important
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analysis of religious and political developments during Late Antiquity.⁷ R. Rothaus, A.
Frantz, G. Fowden, and numerous Greek scholars have provided valuable regional studies
that have contributed greatly to our knowledge of epigraphic and archaeological
material.⁸

1.1.1. Sources.

The difficulty facing anyone interested in reconstructing a narrative of events for
Late Antique Greece rests in the paucity of narrative literary sources. Ancient authors
mentioned Greece primarily when some disaster such as an earthquake, invasion, plague
or schism struck, and even then they do not demonstrate an intimate familiarity with the

242; J.-M. Spieser, “The Christianization of the City in Late Antiquity,” in Urban and Religious Space in
Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium, (Aldershot 2001) (originally in French: Ktima 11 (1986)), 49-55; --,
“Le Ville en Grèce du IIIe au VIIe siècle” in Urban and Religious Space, (originally in Villes peuplement
dan l’Illyricum protobyzain (Rome 1984)), 315-340; --, “The Christianisation of Pagan Sanctuaries in
Greece,” in Urban and Religious Space, (originally in French: Neue Forschungen in griechischen
Heiligtümern (Tübingen 1976)), 1-13; F. Trombley, “Paganism in the Greek World at the End of Antiquity:
The Case of Rural Anatolia and Greece,” HTR 78 (1985), 327-352; --, “Boeotia in Late Antiquity:
Epigraphic Evidence on Society, Economy, and Christianization,” BOIOTIKA H. Beister and J. Buchler
eds. (Munich 1989), 215-228; --, Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529. (Leiden 1993), vol. 1,
283-344; J.-P. Sodini, “L’habitat urbain en Grèce à la veille des invasions,” in Villes peuplement dan
l’Illyricum protobyzain, 341-396.
267-700. Athenian Agora 24, (Princeton 1988); R. Rothaus, Corinth: The First City of Greece, (Leiden
Agora and the Progress of Christianity,” JRA 3 (1990), 494-501; -- “Late Roman Achaea: Identity and
Defence,” JRA 8 (1995), 549-567. Some examples of the contribution from Greek scholars to our
understanding of Late Antiquity at a regional level: R. Etzéoglou, “Quelques aspects des agglomérations
dans les anatoliques au Sud-Est de la Laconie,” Geographie historique du monde méditerranéen, (Paris 1988),
99-107; A. Lambropoulou, “Θέματα τῆς ιστορικής γεωγραφίας τοῦ νομοῦ Ήλειας κατὰ τὴν
A. Moutzali, “Η πόλη τῶν Πατρών κατὰ τὴν προτοβυζαντινή περίοδο,” in Achaea und Elis, 259-264;
D. I. Pallas, “Η Παλαιοχριστιανική Νοτιοανατολική Αττική,” Πρακτικά επιστημονικής
συνάντησης νοτιοανατολικής Αττικής 2 (1985), 43-80; O. Karagiorgou, “Demetrias and Thebes: the
fortunes and misfortunes of two Thessalian port cities,” in Recent Research in Late Antique Urbanism. L.
region.\textsuperscript{9} There are a few exceptions, of course. For Athens, we have the Marinos, \textit{Life of Proclus}, a 5\textsuperscript{th} century pagan philosopher.\textsuperscript{10} F. Trombley, G. Fowden and A. Frantz have drawn heavily on this text in their discussions of the religious situation in Athens during the 5\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{11} For the sixth century Procopius in his buildings discussed the fortification of the towns of Illyricum Orientalis and in the Wars provided some information regarding the Balkan campaigns.\textsuperscript{12} References to Greece appear in such diverse literary sources as the 4\textsuperscript{th}-century letters of Ambrose of Milan, the works of Late Pagans like Libanius, Eunapius and Zosimus, scattered references in the Ecclesiastical Historians, Middle Byzantine Notitia, geographical works, the Actae of councils, and, finally, the occasional mention of Greece by travelers heading to points east or west.\textsuperscript{13} None of these sources, with the possible exception of the \textit{Life of Proclus} provides much information relevant to expansion of Christianity, social structure, or culture of Late Roman Greece.

The limitations of the literary sources have allowed archaeological evidence to play an exceptional role in writing the history of Greece during Late Antiquity. While many of the details remain hotly contested, archaeologists have gradually constructed an image of Greece at the “end of the ancient world.” Confounding their efforts is the fact that the latest antiquity has traditionally been a low priority for excavators, and few sites have published comprehensively their late antique remains. There is some evidence,

\textsuperscript{9} For a summary of sources see: Avramea, \textit{Le Péloponnèse}, 42-46; Rothaus, \textit{Corinth}, 16-21; 70-73.
however, for a change in attitudes. Excavations at the Athenian Agora, Isthmia, Korinth,
Demetrias in Thessaly, Thasos, and Emporio on Chios, have all produced volumes
focusing exclusively on post-classical remains. Numerous other projects have
published intermittently on Late Antique levels. Survey archaeology has held out
particular hope for the study of Late Antique land use and economy. Intensive pedestrian
surveys of large tracts in the Korinthia, Argolid, and Laconia have produced intriguing, if
as yet, undigested data for the Late Roman period. These surveys have also resulted in
the discovery of several previously overlooked monuments of Late Antique date. Despite
this recent progress, the tendency to privilege the Classical and Hellenistic periods and
the “prestige finds” associated with these excavations continues to exert a powerful sway
on the archaeological community in Greece. Nevertheless, the recent progress in
publishing late antique levels and monuments, and the copious material turned up by
intensive pedestrian surveys provides reason for optimism.

The study of Late Antique and Early Byzantine epigraphy, as I will discuss in
greater detail in the final chapter of this dissertation, has enjoyed recent popularity with
the publication of several valuable collections of inscriptions. Funerary epigrams
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13 For example: Libanius, Or. 14; Hierokles, 645.13-658.3; Darrouzès, Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae
14 Frantz, Athenian Agora; T.E. Gregory, Isthmia V: The Hexamilion and the Fortress, (Princeton 1993); S.
Bakhuisen, F. Gschnitzer, C. Habicht, P. Marzolff, Demetrias V, (Bonn 1987); R.L. Scranton, Corinth XVI.
Medieval Architecture in the Central Area of Corinth, (Princeton 1957); M. Ballance, J. Boardman, S.
15 For example: H. Bowden and D. Gill, “Late Roman Methana,” in A Rough and Rocky Place. H. Forbes
and C. Mee eds. (Liverpool 1997), 84-91; M. H. Jameson, C. N. Runnels, T. H. van Andel, A Greek Countryside,
16 E. Sironen, The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica. (Helsinki 1997); G.
comprise the vast majority of known texts, and they hold out the promise for providing valuable social information for Greece during Late Antiquity. Currently, however, these inscriptions, many of which have only now received proper editions, have not been fully digested by scholars, although F. Trombley’s use of epigraphic evidence to discuss Christianization in Greece and Asia Minor demonstrates the great promise these inscriptions possess as historical sources.17

While there is reason for optimism in the study of late antique Greece, problems remain. Much of the archaeological material, especially that turned up by intensive survey, is particularly difficult to date. Furthermore, our ceramic chronology is only now gaining the degree of resolution necessary to discuss changes during the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries. The vast number of Early Christian inscriptions, seemingly valuable evidence for the spread of Christianity and social structure, may in the end prove totally resistant to a precise chronology, leaving scholars once again ignorant of the transformation which occurred within the period under study. Finally, long-held biases against the study of Byzantine and Late Antique levels continue to limit the opportunities for the excavation, publication, and study of Late Antique sites. Currently the only approach that the evidence will sustain, as I will discuss in the second half of this introduction, is one that treats the Early Christian archaeological remains from Southern and Central Greece in a synchronic way despite the very real possibility that new discoveries, improved
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17 Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization*; --, “Boeotia in Late Antiquity”.

techniques, and more systematic publications will allow future scholars to approach these
same monuments in a more diachronic way.

1.1.2. Religion

The conflict between paganism and Christianity continues to dominate recent
discussions of Late Antique Greece. Scholars have proposed various paradigms for the
transition from paganism to Christianity. The only aspect that has generally held
universal acceptance is a relatively late date for the widespread appearance of the cultural
aspects of Christianity. While the precise date for such seemingly significant events as
the conversion of the important Athenian temples to Christian use, the destruction of the
Athenian Asclepieion, or the earliest basilica type church in southern and central Greece
remain disputed, scholars generally agree that there is little solid evidence for widespread
Christianity before the fifth century. Even in the face of a rather fluid chronology for
much of the archaeological evidence, the general trend has been to push known ceramic
types later – from the late fourth and fifth centuries into the sixth and sometimes even
seventh centuries – continuing to support the late date for the conversion of Greece to
Christianity.

The ambiguity of the chronology has, in part, contributed to a certain ambiguity in
how we understand the end of paganism in Greece. A. Frantz made the influential
argument that the pagans occupied the centers of towns, while Christians lived in separate
communities outside the ancient city center probably in neighborhoods clustered around
their churches. This living arrangement both allowed civic paganism to persist but also limited the opportunities for open conflict. Scholars have challenged this on several grounds. J.-M. Spieser proposed that in many places in Greece paganism was dead and gone by Late Antiquity and Christianity emerged to fill a kind of spiritual void. T. Gregory, F. Trombley, and R. Rothaus, however, have tried to demonstrate that the archaeological evidence preserves definite indicators of pagan and Christian co-existence and occasional violence during Late Antiquity. These scholars have also recognized, however, that a view of paganism as a system of formal cults associated with civic life excluded a vast and vital part of late antique religious life. Thus, the relationship between traditional or “Hellenic religions” and Christianity varied enormously according to the specifics of religious ritual, and local power structures and traditions. This variation ensured that contacts between the new religion and earlier practices ranged from accommodation to conflict. My dissertation, as I will outline in detail in the first chapter, contributes to on-going debates on Christianization by examining this phenomenon not as a change in religious practice alone, but as a change in the symbols and principles supporting social order. This approach will allow for a far more fluid understanding of the relationship between traditional religion and Christianization and examines Christianity in the 5th and 6th century as place where ancient culture was explained and appropriated by a Christian cosmology.

1.1.3. Politics and Economics, Church and State

The majority of the buildings discussed in this dissertation are located within the Late Roman province of Achaia governed from Korinth. This includes churches in the modern regions of Achaia, Attica, Boeotia, Elis, Korinthia, Arcadia, Laconia, Messenia, parts of Phocis, and the islands of Aegina, Salamis, and Euboea, basically all of mainland Greece south of the Thermopylae pass, and was associated by some Late Roman geographers with Hellas. I have excluded, in an effort to produce a manageable corpus, churches the Ionian islands, the Cyclades, the Sporades, which are sometimes associated with the Greek mainland. In the Diocletianic reorganization Achaia was placed in the prefecture of Illyricum Orientalis, which was ruled from Thessaloniki for most of the period under consideration here. Although, this prefecture was initially under the sway of the Rome and the West, in no small part on account of its proximity to the Latin speaking Illyricum Occidenatis, the political fate of Greece was largely tied to that of the Eastern Roman Empire for the period under discussion in this dissertation. It is clear that the Emperors in Constantinople made periodic efforts to ward off the various invading tribes such as the Goths, Huns, Avars, and Slavs to at least the extent that these invasions of the southern Balkans threatened the security of the capital.

There continues to be great controversy regarding the extent of damage these various invasions inflicted. Increasingly, however, the trend has been to minimize the disruptions of the various 5th-century invasions on the southern Balkans, and emphasize the 5th and 6th centuries as a period of economic and demographic expansion. Literary and archaeological evidence for large-scale construction projects in cities, especially fortifications, churches, and the upkeep of certain civic amenities such as baths and fora
complement the evidence from archaeological surveys to create a picture of political stability and economic expansion. The continued economic prosperity likely allowed civic institutions to continue well into the 6th century, and thus suggests that the decline of cities and urban life only occurred at the very end of the 6th and perhaps even the beginning of the 7th century.

From an ecclesiastical standpoint, Greece stood between the East and West. The diocese of Achaia, with its Metropolitan at Korinth, followed the civic organization of Illyricum Orientalis and was governed ecclesiastically by the Archbishop of Thessaloniki. He was officially under the Pope at Rome, although it is clear that the geographical proximity to the Patriarch at Constantinople made his allegiance to one or the other a matter of convenience. Further compounding the liminal position of Greece in the world of ecclesiastical politics were the cultural, economic, and political ties to the Greek-speaking East. It is almost certain, for example, that the liturgy in Greece was in Greek, rather than Latin, as in most of the regions under Papal jurisdiction.

The position of Greece and Illyricum Orientalis between East and West is nowhere made more clear than in the events of the Acacian schism from 484-516. The Bishop of Thessaloniki openly supported the Partriarch of Constantinople Acacius in his efforts to promulgate the Emperor’s Zeno’s Henotikon to gain reconciliation with the church of Alexandria under Peter Mongus. The Pope Felix III opposed this document claiming to stand firm in support of Chalcedonian Christianity. While the Bishop of Thessaloniki split from Rome, the Pope conducted a vigorous propaganda campaign in
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Greece. This ultimately succeeded in splitting off many Greek bishops from
Thessaloniki and securing their (re)allegiance to the Papal cause. The dispute between
Thessaloniki, the bishops of Greece, Rome and Constantinople, did not come to an end
until the accession of Justin I to the throne in 518 and his abandonment of the Henotikon.

This dissertation will find little opportunity to relate the material evidence from
Greece to the complex world of ecclesiastical politics. Consequently, such matters as
ecclesiastical and political borders will be treated rather lightly. I have included in both
my discussion and catalogue, some of the important churches from sites formally outside
the province of Achaia. In particular, I have included the churches from southern Epirus,
just across the border from Achaia, in the province of Epirus Vetus with its Metropolitan
at Nikopolis. This includes churches from Acarnania, Aetolia, Epirus, Eurytania and
Western Locris. I have also included churches from southern Thessaly, and Phthiotidis,
including, the important churches at Nea Anchialos and Demetrias, which were under the
jurisdiction of the Metropolitan at Larissa. It is clear that the geographical continuity,
Greek language, and their position under the Archbishop of Thessaloniki aligned the
churches from southern and central Greece in the world of ecclesiastical politics,
economics, and probably liturgy. I will often refer to the geographic region for this
dissertation as “Greece” or “Southern and Central Greece,” both of these designation
apply to all the churches included in this catalogue and not the borders of the modern
Greek state or the varying boundaries of the province or later theme of Hellas.23

22 For a concise narrative description of the schism see: P. Charanis, Church and State in the Late Roman
23 Avramea, Le Péloponnèse, 31-40; P. Charanis, “Hellas in the Greek sources of the sixth, seventh, and
eighth centuries,” Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend Jr., K.
1.1.4. Invasions and the End of Antiquity

Two decades ago it would have been possible to make the late 6th century the *terminus ante quem* for the continuous use for many of the monuments included in this study. According to various late sources, the Slavs poured into Greece in the last two decades of the 6th century and in dramatic fashion marked the end of the ancient world in most areas of the Southern Balkans. Recent studies, however, have shown that this picture of the end of antiquity is far too simple.\(^{24}\) This dissertation hopes to contribute to the growing complexity of the debate surrounding the end of antiquity by proposing that prestige enjoyed by the ecclesiastical hierarchy throughout the Byzantine Dark Ages had roots in social transformations taking place during the Early Christian period. While this, in and of itself, is not a novel assertion, it presupposes a degree of continuity between the Early Byzantine period and the end of antiquity and suggests that the so-called “grand brèche” which continues to hold sway in periodization schemes and textbook treatments of the end of antiquity in Greece, was, in fact, a bridgeable chasm.\(^{25}\) The appropriated material of antiquity created a deep foundation for the new institutions of the Byzantine
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world, and, moreover, encouraged polyvalent readings of ancient material throughout the later periods. Thus, as prosperity returned to Greece during the 8th and 9th centuries, it was accompanied by a re-emergence of images drawn from the ancient world as filtered through a Christianizing lens crafted in Late Antiquity. It comes as no surprise then, that the tactics the church employed to symbolize the revitalization of ecclesiastical institutions ranged from verse inscriptions in Classicizing dactylic hexameter to stories of wandering holy men converting penitent pagans to the re-occupation of the sites of Late Antique churches. In the end, no matter how disruptive the invasions of the Slavs were, they appear to have disrupted the institutional memory of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in only a limited way, as bishops and church leaders constructed identities for themselves using techniques which were surprisingly similar to those used by their late antique predecessors.

1.2. The Architecture

1.2.1. Basic shape and plan

Since many of the terms used in the following dissertation are rather specialized, I thought it useful to include a brief, if abstract, description of an Early Christian basilica in Greece to guide a non-specialist reader through the occasionally technical discussions in this text. The main emphasis of this dissertation will be on the floor plans of the church, rather than the elevations since there exist no substantially preserved elevations from any

churches within my dissertation area. Any comments on the three dimension space within an Early Christian basilica in Greece reflect the influence of standing buildings from this period in Thessaloniki, Ravenna, Rome, and Constantinople.

The basic design of an Early Christian in Greece is a wood-roofed basilica with a semicircular eastern apse. The main nave rose above two or four flanking aisles and presumably had a double-pitched roof while the aisles had shed roofs. Ceramic tiles covered both. The apse typically had a masonry half dome tiled on the exterior. To the west of the nave and aisles there was occasionally an open-air atrium composed of colonnaded stoas on the west, north and south sides. The atrium provided access to the western-most space of the church proper, called the narthex, which ran the entire width of the building. The narthex, in turn, provided access to the central nave and flanking aisles. The aisles and nave of the church were occasionally interrupted at their east end by a north-south projection known as a transept which had either three or five bays depending on the number of aisles. A low barrier marked either the central bay of the transept or the eastern end of the main nave as the bema or chancel area. To the east of this space was the apse, often inscribed by a low bench or series of steps called a synthronon.

1.2.2. Size

Accurate dimensions for Early Christian churches in Greece have often proven difficult to ascertain. Some excavation reports only provide partial dimensions, and many churches are not fully excavated. Sufficient evidence does exist, however, to show that the size of Early Christian churches in Greece varied greatly. Lengths are the best
indicator of overall size since the dominant axis of these buildings was longitudinal.
Total lengths ranged from the massive Lechaion basilica which exceeded 100 meters and
the smaller but still substantial church on the Ilissos island in Athens which stood at 77
meter in length to the smaller churches like those found in southeastern Attica many of
which are less than 20 meters in length. The majority of Early Christian churches in
Greece are under 50 meters in length.

1.2.3. Chronology

The lack of texts describing Greece during the Early Christian period hinders the
dating of even the most significant monuments. The conversion of the major temples in
Athens, the Parthenon, the Hephestion, the Asclepieion, and the Erychtheion, for
example, have only recently been placed in widely agreed upon chronological ranges,
despite the existence of the 5th-century literary source, The Life of Proclus by Marinos,
which makes no specific mention of churches.26 Some scholars have endeavoured to date
the destruction of buildings through the use of sources which refer to large and
destructive earthquakes which occurred in Greece during the Early Christian period.
Central to this debate are the well-known tremors in the first half of the sixth century
which are attested to in Procopius and Evagrius.27 The particularly fractious tectonic
structure of Greece, however, has mitigated against generalizing seismic events beyond
the immediate region in which they were known from literary sources. Unfortunately,

26 Frantz, “Pagansim to Christianity”, 187-203; Gregory, “Survivals of Paganism,” 229-242; C. Mango,
27 Avramea, Le Péloponnèse,44-47; R. Rothaus, “Earthquakes and Temples in Late Antique Corinth,” in
Archaeoseismology, S. Stiros and R. E. Jones eds. (Athens 1996), 105-112.
the sources for these earthquakes are notoriously problematic. Moreover, the
archaeological evidence is not at all clear in differentiating the destruction by a specific
earthquake and the subsequent reconstruction, so their value as sources for dating
individual buildings is relatively limited.

Another traditional means for dating buildings is through the study of small finds
discovered during excavations. While small finds have been useful for the dating of
some churches in Greece, perhaps most notably the elucidation of the several building
phases associated with the Lechaion basilica or Demetrias A, in general, small finds do
not represent a useful or reliable means for dating these buildings. In part, this is owing
to the fact that many churches in Greece were excavated as salvage operations where the
excavators privileged speed over completeness, and did not carefully record small finds
or did not excavate the church systematically. Other churches were excavated in the
early twentieth century in keeping with standards which were more focused on
uncovering architectural remains than the now datable ceramic debris associated with
them. Finally, since Early Christian churches in Greece are relatively common across the
landscape, many never receive full or comprehensive publication, which would include
objects and stratigraphy necessary to propose a chronology. On account of these
shortcomings, the common techniques used by archaeologists to date a building are not
effective for determining the date of Early Christian churches in Greece. Many
buildings in Greece are simply dated Early Christian or 5th/6th century based on their
basilican plan.

Occasionally, there is an inscription which establishes a firm date for the use of
the building. The most notable case for this comes from the church at Lavriotic Olympus
where a funerary epitaph from the exonarthex seems to preserve the date 504 or 559.\textsuperscript{28} This inscription would thus indicate a \textit{terminus ante quem} for this building. The inscription which might refer to the Nika riots was found built into the wall above the arcade separating the nave from the aisles at Nea Anchialos Gamma. It has been used to suggest a date for that phase of the buildings after the riots in Constantinople of 532, although whether this refers to event in Constantinople remains in doubt.\textsuperscript{29} While other churches have inscriptions with dates, they most commonly refer to indiction years and these cannot be assigned to a precise year in the calendar. In other cases the evidence only provides the most sketchy guidelines. The Kodratos church outside of Korinth, for example, is most frequently ascribed to the sixth century despite a funerary inscription built into the floor which seems to date from the late 4th/early 5th.\textsuperscript{30} Occasionally, individuals mentioned in inscription can be assigned dates. Kitzinger, for example, constructed an elaborate argument for the dating of Basilica A and Basilica B at Nikopolis based on the probable dates of the bishop Alkison, who participated in the events surrounding the Acacian schism and is mentioned on an inscription from an annex attached to Basilica B.\textsuperscript{31} Generally speaking, however, there are few inscriptions associated with churches that give specific information concerning the buildings date, and even those that do rarely provide a secure date for construction.

\textsuperscript{28} E. Sironen, \textit{The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica}, (Helsinki 1997), 269-270 no. 235; C. Foss, “Three Apparent Early Examples of the Era of Creation,” \textit{ZPE} 31 (1978), 241-246; Pallas, “Ἡ Παλαιοχριστιανική Νοστοματωλική Ἄττική,” 51 interprets it as a date in the Julian calendar.


Another method often considered for the dating of the Early Christian churches in Greece is the study of the style of floor mosaics. Sodini, Spiro, and, most recently, Assimakopolou-Atzaka have produced wide-ranging catalogues of the Early Christian mosaics in Greece. These mosaics are frequently used to date the building in which they lay. Spiro and Assimakopolou-Atzaka relied essentially on a series of dating criteria established by E. Kitzinger in the 1950s based in part on the mosaics of Antioch and Apamea. They supplemented these broad criteria with information concerning the dates of local mosaic styles and sought to use well-preserved and well-known mosaics to date more fragmentary works wherever possible. Dating any building by mosaic style is at best an inexact science. The debates circling the dating of the palace mosaics at Constantinople, variously dated from the 4th to the 7th century, reflect the problematic nature of stylistic mosaic chronologies. While generally speaking the mosaic chronology in Greece has considerably less controversy surrounding it, the fragmentary nature and poor quality of many of the mosaics make it difficult to assign anything but the broadest dates. Furthermore, such factors as the redecorating of buildings with mosaic floors makes dating a building based on mosaic style alone insufficient. What is
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clear from a general survey of floor mosaics in Greece is the remarkable geographic and chronological continuity of motifs and themes. The practice of paving floors of important areas with mosaics stood as a hallmark of buildings, especially churches, of the Early Christian period, and marks them off significantly from churches constructed later.

Likewise instrumental in providing broad dates for the construction of Early Christian churches in Greece are the remains of architectural decoration. J.-P. Sodini and R. Kautsch established the basic criteria for dating architectural sculpture in Greece by relating the evidence in Greece to the better known chronology in the capital. V. Vemi has attempted to further refine Sodini's chronology in his study of Ionic impost capitals in Greece. The shortcoming of these types of analysis is that they depend upon relatively elaborate architectural remains which are not always present in the churches of Greece. Furthermore, as Vemi pointed out in the introduction to his work, capitals are often reused later. This makes them less than ideal for dating the construction of a specific building unless they are confirmed as being in their original location. The number of impost capitals in Vemi's catalogue known to be in their original location is quite small and this reflects the limited number of datable capitals that can be associated with specific buildings. Here, like mosaic decorations, later modifications to buildings and the use of spolia further obscure an already difficult activity of dating based on architectural decoration.
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36 Vemi, *Les Chapiteaux Ioniques à Imposte de Grèce*.

There have also been efforts to date Early Christian church architecture in Greece through the study of church proportions. Scholars have dated churches in Greece based on the intercolumnar spacing, size of apse, and the ratio of the width of the nave to its length. To my knowledge, none of these systems has been tested widely or systematically. Their primary value to scholars studying the churches of Greece has been to distinguish churches built during the Early Christian period from those built later. The lack of utility for dating buildings within the Early Christian period is largely because regional variation in church form appears to supersede chronology as the leading influence in the shape and proportion of churches. Scholars have argued for well-defined regional forms in Epirus, Attica, and the Peloponnesus. Pallas and others have argued that certain annexes attached to early Christian churches might reflect changes in liturgy which can be assigned a relative chronology. The lack of churches with well-substantiated absolute dates, however, makes arguments based on the architectural correlates of liturgical morphology impossible to verify.

This brief overview of the problems involved in dating the Early Christian churches of Greece demonstrates the significant complexity of such endeavors. The linchpin to our difficulty in dating Early Christian architecture in Greece is ultimately the lack of buildings that have secure absolute dates. This has been compounded by the poor state of preservation of known Early Christian churches, the tendency of the ancients to
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38 Pallas clearly toyed with the idea of dating based on intercolumnar intervals, but never produced a comprehensive theory. See: D.I. Pallas, s.v. “Korinth” in Realelexicon zur Byzantinischen Kunst 4 (Stuttgart 1990); --, “Ἡ Παλαιοχριστιανικὴ Νοτιοανατολικὴ Ἀττική,” 43-80; --, “Corinth et Nicopolis pendant le haut moyen-àge,” FR 18 (1979), 93-142; For similar efforts for slightly later buildings see: P.L. Vokotopoulou, Ἡ Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ εἰς τὴν Δυτικὴν Στερεάν Ἑλλάδα καὶ τὴν Ἑπείρον ἀπὸ τὸν τέλος τοῦ 7ου μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ 10ου αἰώνα. (Thessaloniki 1975).

use spolia in construction, the lack of small finds information, and the apparent regional variation in church forms. To this list one can also add the tendency in scholarship to deal with the various distinct features of early Christian churches, their mosaics, architectural decoration, proportions, et c., independently of one another. It is worth noting, however, that even among those churches studied as integrated buildings, scholars have reached little consensus concerning their chronology. In my catalogue at the end of this dissertation, I have attempted to outline various efforts to date these buildings, and have included the features of these buildings which scholars have dated in independent studies.

The effect of these complex problems of dating on this dissertation is two-fold. The first effect is that this dissertation will not attempt a diachronic study of ecclesiastical architecture in Early Christian Greece. The difficulties in dating the churches of Greece are in many ways the result of their remarkable similarities in form and decoration. As a group, these churches are most notable for their conspicuous lack of outliers. The similarities among the churches commend them to study as a discrete unit. It suggests, although it does not guarantee, that the message projected by churches during this period remained relatively stable and consistent. This dissertation, therefore, will allow the broadest, and hopefully most sustainable, dates assigned to the churches of Southern and Central Greece as a group to frame the historical events under consideration. The result of this is that I will frequently treat the period from the end of the 4th century to the end of the 6th century as a single period during which a wide array of phenomena associated with the Christianization process took place at different rates and in diverse places.
1.2.4. Function

Scholars have occasionally made efforts to group the Early Christian churches in Central and Southern Greece according to their function. There are at least four functional categories which scholars have associated with the churches of Greece, and these categories are by no means mutually exclusive.

First, and perhaps most widely accepted, is the category of cemetery church. This category has been the subject of intense scrutiny largely owing to its role in the development and location of the earliest Christian cult space in the Mediterranean. The traditional argument, advanced by Grabar, Krautheimer, and others, is that tombs became locations for Early Christian devotional practices in Pre-Constantinian times and received monumental treatment with the recognition of Christianity and the commencement of imperial support.40 C. Snively has studied the cemetery churches of the Balkans, particularly in Macedonia, but she has also worked to identify some of the cemetery churches in the Central and Southern Greece. Among those she identified were the Kraneon and Kodratos basilicas in the area of Korinth, the Ilissos basilica in Attica, and Nea Anchialos Delta.41 She established two difficulties relating to the identification of cemetery churches in Greece. One is the tendency of later tombs to be dug through the floor or in the vicinity of existing churches. The second, and perhaps more difficult of the two problems, is the presences of random tombs in many churches in the Mediterranean. Snively chose to focus on churches that existed in well-defined cemetery
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areas and containing numerous tombs. She goes on to note that cemetery churches were
typical basilican in plan and not in that way outstanding from the average Early Christian
church in Greece. Some of these so-called cemetery churches, however, actually have
features which are difficult to understand if these churches primary function was to be
funerary. These include synthrona complete with a space for an episcopal throne,
elaborate baptisteries, and annexes, perhaps for storage, that occur regularly in Greek
churches in a wide array of contexts.\(^{42}\) This, then, left the only hint to their function,
according to Snively’s criteria, their location in known cemeteries. This is not a
particularly compelling argument since we know little about settlement patterns and the
chronology for the use of cemeteries, and it underscores the difficulties scholars have
experienced in superimposing functional categories to the Early Christian ecclesiastical
architecture in Greece.

Another problematic category at times applied to buildings in Southern and
Central Greece is that of pilgrimage church. Perhaps the most important building
identified as a place of pilgrimage is the Lechaion Basilica outside of Korinth. Its
excavator, D. Pallas, identified this large church as a center for pilgrimage, largely owing
to its enormous size and possible association with St. Leonidas and his companions.
Pallas argued that the “second atrium” of the church served as a hotel for pilgrims and the
extensive water works found there were used for both ritual ablutions and the more
practical purpose of providing pilgrims with a source of water after their journey.\(^ {43}\)

\(^{42}\) Kiato, Epidauros, Hermione, Demetrias A, Nea Anchialos – B, A, Spata, Stamata, Brauron, et c.
\(^{43}\) Pallas, "L’édifice culturel chrétien et la liturgie dans l’Illuricum oriental," \textit{Studi Antichita Cristiana} 1
(1984), 503-504. He also included the Kraneion Basilica and Basilica A at Philippi in his list. For Basilica
Scholars have also linked churches associated with healing to pilgrimage sites. The ancillary chambers of some of these churches stand near or on earlier pagan shrines to Asclepeius and scholars have argued that these may have provided for the practice of incubation. Unfortunately, the evidence for these churches being pilgrimage sites remains scant. The size of the Lechaion church is not reason enough for its identification as a pilgrimage site – especially since it was located in the Metropolitan see of Korinth. It seems more likely that churches associated with healing might have retained a certain lure for pilgrims, but again there is no specific evidence to support this beyond arguments resting of the suspicious position of synchronistic religious practices. As an effective functional category then, pilgrimage churches must be questioned for Greek churches.

A potentially more revealing functional category is that of cathedral. There are numerous bishops known from Greece and it is clear that Korinth was the Metropolitan bishop of the province of Achaia. Nikopolis, the seat of the Metropolitan of Epirus Vetus, and Athens were important bishoprics. In a number of the cities known to be seats of bishops there are Early Christian basilicas. Often the designation of an episcopal church goes to the basilica most centrally placed in the city. Certainly the arguments behind the naming of the tetraconch building in Athens as this city’s first cathedral derive from the structure’s location in the courtyard of the Library of Hadrian and within the

A at Philippi he follows P. Lemerle’s reasoning see: P. Lemerle, *Philippes et la Macédoine Orientale.* (Paris 1945), 286, 296-301.
Late Roman fortification walls. In other cases the presence of ancillary buildings attached to the church, such as in the case of the building at Hermione or Basilica B at Nikopolis, suggest the building functioned as a cathedral. Both buildings have annexes which have been referred to as episcopal residences. In a building attached to Basilica B in Nikopolis, the presence of an inscription to the Bishop Alkison in what appears to be an audience hall would seem to suggest that this basilica was, at least at some point, the cathedral (Ep. Cat. 25). However, the inscriptions dedicating Basilica A also imply the patronage of not one, but two of the city’s bishops (Ep. Cat. 21-24). Clearly, then, the presence of inscriptions crediting episcopal funding does not necessarily make the church the cathedral of a city. The presence of ancillary buildings might be a better indicator, but in many instances the exact function of these buildings is too poorly understood to form a definitive conclusion.

Certain features found in specific Early Christian basilicas of Greece have been used to suggest that the church was specifically a seat of bishops. Perhaps most notable among them is the presence of a synthronon or a baptistery. The synthronon would serve, according to Orlandos, as the place for the episcopal throne and also as seats for the attending clergy or presbyters. The ubiquity of this feature in the Greek world makes it unlikely to suffice as the indicator of a bishop’s church. The other diagnostic
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characteristic that might reflect a church being a cathedral would be the presence of a baptistery. While no specific baptismal rite is preserved for Southern Greece, elsewhere during the Early Christian period the bishop reserved exclusive right to the performance of this important ceremony of initiation.\textsuperscript{50} Thus, a baptistery, one could argue, would reflect a link to episcopal power. The location of baptisteries, however, does not seem to reflect what is known concerning the ecclesiastical organization of Greece. In some areas, such as the Korinthia or Attica, the number of baptisteries and their location seems to defy any link with probable episcopal sees. There are at least 4 baptisteries around the city of Korinth – the Lechaion, Kranieon, Skoutelas, and Kenchreai basilicas. The baptisteries discovered to date in Attica include those in locations where bishoprics seem unlikely – Brauron, Lavriotic Olympus, Stamatas, Aigosthena. The former three are in rural areas in SW Attica and the latter basilica, while quite large, does not seem to clearly correspond to a population center.

The final functional type of church is the so-called “watch keeper” basilicas identified by T. Gregory and others.\textsuperscript{51} These churches tend to be placed near or upon the remains of important pagan sanctuaries. Their function, it would appear, was to neutralize or Christianize the pagan powers which might still reside there. J.-M. Spieser voiced an important caveat for scholars who are inclined to privilege the role of churches in the Christianization of pagan sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{52} He stressed in particular the difficulties


associated with knowing the date of a sanctuary’s abandonment or destruction and the
construction of the church. He also emphasized the importance of understanding the
habitation patterns of the areas around the ancient sanctuaries. As more is known about
the demography of Greece it seems possible that some of these watch keeper basilicas
will be redefined as churches serving local populations. The churches at Delphi, for
example, might be better understood as serving the apparently prosperous Late Antique
community which had grown up around the sanctuary. Some churches seem likely to
have functioned to Christianize a formerly pagan site, such as the church on the island of
Delos or perhaps the church at Dodona. We have some examples of this type of
construction from the ancient literature.53 We should not underestimate, however, some
of the nonreligious reasons for constructing a new Christian basilica near or atop the
pagan remains, such as the availability of land, well-built foundations, and building
materials.

Efforts to categorize ecclesiastical architecture by its function have not truly been
successful, but this may be itself a telling fact. In general, the architectural and
archaeological evidence for functional differentiation is scant. To be sure, some churches
do appear to have had specific functions and it seems not unreasonable to assume that
churches did play different roles in the community, but what is more revealing is still the
overwhelming similarities in design, features, and organization. This suggests that within
Greece the church as an architectural phenomenon may have represented first and
foremost rituals common to all Christian churches rather than those differentiated by
specific functions based on the practical or ritual needs of the community. This

53 For examples see: Trombley, Hellenic Religion and Christianization, vol. 1, 123-146.
dissertation will argue, in keeping with the opinions of most of the scholars who have studied the ecclesiastical architecture of Greece, that the primary function of Greek churches was to provide an enclosed space for the performance of liturgy. The lack of evidence for functional variation in the churches in Greece suggests that the communication of ideas associated with the liturgy formed the basic functional imperative guiding the design of Greek churches – either overtly or tacitly. Thus, it seems likely that while churches undoubtedly fulfilled a variety of needs within Greek society, their potential use as proper liturgical structures held pride of place among functional influences on their basic architectural form.

1.2.5. Regional Styles

R. Krautheimer, in his magisterial survey of Early Christian and Byzantine architecture, consistently identified the churches of Greece as having a distinct architectural style. He credited the distinctive features of this style with the position of Greece both geographically and politically between the east, the churches of Constantinople and the Aegean lands, and the west, Ravenna, Milan, and the churches of the Adriatic.\(^54\) From the western influences, the churches of Greece tended to favor a loosely defined tripartite transept manifest either in the form found around Korinth\(^55\) or in the form found among the Epiriot churches.\(^56\) From the east came the presence of a narthex, an atrium, an ambo, and the use of Ionic impost capitals to support arcades.
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\(^55\) Korinth – Kraneion, Lechaion – port, Epiraus.

\(^56\) Nikopolis – A, Nikopolis -- D
between the aisles and the central nave. Unfortunately, Krautheimer’s observations remain undeveloped and untested, but his observations regarding the eastern and western influences on church architecture in Greece provided an important paradigm for understanding Christianity there in a more general way.

The arguments for specific architectural regional variation within southern and central Greece remain largely inconclusive. The most distinctive variant form exists in Epirus. Many churches, especially those in the immediate vicinity of Nikopolis, have transepts that exceed the width of the nave and aisles with arms that are separated from the chancel by projecting piers and perhaps low walls. Churches of this form, however, can appear elsewhere in Greece, such as the Ilisos basilica outside of Athens (Athens—Iliissos), and the church at Daphnousia. In transept basilicas elsewhere in Greece, such as around Lechaion and Kraneion basilicas outside of Korinth or the basilica at Epidauros, the transept arms are separated from the central chancel area by arcades which appear as continuations of the arcade which separates the aisle from the main nave. In both types the transept space is divided from the aisles through either narrow doors or what appeared to have been arched openings. Oddly enough, a church of this form appears at Nikopolis – Basilica B.57 While the form of the transept in both Epirus and the Peloponnesus appears in a general regional pattern, neither church type appears with any regional exclusivity. The significance of these regional architectural patterns is further weakened by the fact that the function of the transept remains unknown.

D. Pallas has argued that the churches of southeastern and central Attica perhaps deserve to be recognized as a distinct group of buildings.\(^{58}\) The defining features of these churches are their wood-roofed design, three aisles separated from the nave by arcaded colonnades, raised stylobates supporting the columns, double narthexes, and lengths between 15 and 20.8 meters. Few of these features, however, are so distinctive to define these churches as a distinct group, except perhaps for the frequency of double narthexes which are rare elsewhere in Greece.\(^{59}\) It remains most convincing, then, to continue to group the churches of Attica with the churches from the Peloponnesus, and this is how they will be treated here.

In general efforts to associate groups of churches have been dictated more by geography than by architectural features and have perhaps led to studies and conclusions which obfuscate the basic nature of ecclesiastical architecture in Greece. The churches of Greece are most notable for their remarkable consistency. It is my contention that this consistency in architectural form reflects a consistency in Christian practice in Greece, Greek society, and perhaps even the motives of those individuals who constructed these buildings.

1.2.6. Conclusions

Studies of churches in Greece have attempted to organize the buildings into categories based on function, region, and chronology. These efforts have generally speaking, fallen short of producing convincingly defined sub-corpora within the larger
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corpus of churches in Greece. The poor condition of much of our evidence concerning these churches has in part been responsible for the failure of these efforts. Certainly the lack of chronological indicators in excavations and publication makes it difficult to construct a convincing sequence of Early Christian churches. The architectural similarities present among the churches of Greece during the Early Christian period tends both to mitigate against the use of a diachronic, functional or regional approaches, and to present their unity in form as a more compelling object for study. If we allow for the idea that unity in architectural form might reflect a certain consistency in the way a group of people through time and across space understood their relationship to one another and to the divine, then the study of these churches as a unified corpus is not only justified but necessary for a social analysis of Greece in the Early Christian period. The lack of obvious functional variation in the architectural forms employed pushes our analysis further in this direction. The one basic function that a church can be thought to perform is to enclose a space for the liturgy – the proper ritual through which humanity’s relationship with the divine and the sacred was defined. The fact that the basic features of an Early Christian church in Greece remain consistent despite the possible differences in function suggests that the role of liturgy was central to the ideas expressed in ecclesiastical architecture and the *sine qua non* for its existence. This is to say that if most churches were built to house liturgy⁶⁰ – and this would have been the most basic
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⁵⁹ For double nathcees see: Lavriot Olympus, Spata, Brauron.
⁶⁰ L. Bouyer, *Liturgy and Architecture*, (Notre Dame 1967) 43-68, viewed the primacy of liturgical influence over architectural form as having occurred with “Byzantine Architects” who “discarded all the features of the pre-Christian basilica which were not adapted to the Christian liturgy, so they evolved a new type of building where everything was there only for its own purpose.”; T. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park, PA 1971), 4. This is not to suggest that function dominated form in the case of Early Byzantine churches. It is clear that forms did have a certain continuity and meaning which transcended a simply functional interpretation of their organization and
function that a church was expected to perform – then the lack of architectural outliers seems to indicate quite strongly that this basic functional and ultimately symbolic concern is predominant in the buildings’ organization. While it seems likely that not all churches were intended for liturgy at all times, all churches appear to have symbolically invoked the liturgy through their spatial organization.

1.3. Outline of the Dissertation

The limits of the archaeological evidence have in the past prevented scholars from using the evidence from the Early Christian churches in Greece to discuss cultural change. The chronological problems associated with these buildings seemed to present an insurmountable difficulty for the creation of narrative because it was impossible to use these buildings to track the spread or development of Christianity within Greece. Since the desire to produce a narrative remains deeply rooted in the nature of history as a discipline, scholars tended to look elsewhere in the Mediterranean to examine the growth and spread of Christianity, particular Asia Minor and Syria where literary sources are more available. The architecture of Early Christian Greece, however, even when viewed synchronically, does produce valuable information concerning the way in which Christianity manifested itself as a cultural system. Through these monuments one can apprehend the convergence of various cultural influences in a Christian context – ranging from an elite discourse based in the persistence of classical paideia to the traditional
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structure. This statement is only meant to suggest that liturgy was the *sine qua non* for the spatial definition of a church and thus should enjoy a certain primacy in any effort to understand how buildings were understood in their ancient context.
religious practices that permeated ancient society. The co-existence of these varied
cultural currents in the space of a Christian church contributed to the expansion of
Christianity as a cultural system and enabled a wide range of individuals in Late Antique
society to construct identities in relation to its architecture and ritual.

The first chapter of my dissertation will examine the place of Christian
architecture in the both the modern and ancient discussions of conversion. This will
demonstrate that Christianization as a cultural and religious phenomenon has always been
closely associated with monumental architecture. Not only can the relationship between
architecture and conversion or Christianization be seen in the ancient sources, but modern
scholarship has also appreciated and theorized on the nature of the relationship between
religion, society, and architecture. I have proposed a method for examining the Christian
churches of Greece that draws inspiration from scholars who have studied the nature of
the sacred from E. Durkheim and Eliade to P. Bourdieu and his fellow post-modern
theorists. In particular, I have melded Bourdieu’s perspective on communicative practice
with Eliade’s ideas on the nature of ancient religious space and argue that cosmology
from an Eliadean perspective is not, as he argued, expressed through a system of
universal symbols, but rather expressed in a language conditioned continually by a “logic
of practice” that derived meaning from contexts far beyond the boundaries of religious
space.62 In Late Antiquity, an absolute and transcendent reality of the sacred existed

61 See for example: S. Mitchell, Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. vol. 2: The Rise of the
Church. (Oxford 1993).
62 Bourdieu, P., The Logic of Practice. trans. R. Nice. (Stanford 1990); P. Bourdieu, Language and
immutable, although deeply interdependent, at the center of new constellations of cultural, social, and religious expression.

In chapter two I will explore how the nature of sacred space in an Early Christian context was set in the practice of Christian ritual. The Early Christian liturgy in Greece, however, has been and remains the cause of some disagreement among scholars. My chapter seeks to avoid this by placing the major movements present in almost all Early Christian liturgies in the context of Greek churches rather than attempting to use the Early Christian architecture in Greece to reveal the structure of the liturgy. This chapter does not propose a reconstruction of the Early Christian liturgy for Greece nor does it seek to ascribe liturgical functions to every aspect of church architecture; rather it examines how certain features of Early Christian liturgy, particularly processions, fit the architecture. The second part of the chapter suggests that the basic features of Christian ritual when set within the context of the churches in Greece, produced certain modes of interaction encoded with social significance for the participants. In particular, Christian liturgy served to locate and define individuals in relation to the sacred. The particular effect of this was to position the clergy in the architecture and ritual as mediators between humanity, represented by the laity, and the divine. In doing this, the Christian liturgy drew heavily on the ritual language of Late Antiquity and associated the social meaning of these rituals with Christian liturgical theology.

Chapter three examines the significance of floor mosaics in the religious and social environment communicated through Christian liturgy and architecture. The floor mosaics of Early Christian Greece decorated liturgical space in particular and contained motifs that played upon the full range of meanings present in the Christian liturgy.
Symbols, such as Solomon’s knots and eye-shaped lozenges, which appeared commonly in the context of traditional religion or “magic”, also were present in liturgically significant areas of the church. This suggests that traditional religious symbolism could work to define the space of liturgy and, simultaneously, that liturgy could be served by traditional religious symbolism. The use of such pre-Christian religious symbols in liturgical space marked the appropriation of traditional religious practices by Christianity and, at the same time, placed the Christian liturgy in the broader cultural milieu characterized by close interaction between the powers of the divine and humanity. This same reciprocal relationship between the symbolism of Christian liturgy and the iconography of floor mosaics is also evident in the numerous motifs present in both Christian and secular contexts throughout Greece. Hunting scenes, calendar mosaics, and depictions of rural life complemented the liturgy in defining Christian ritual space as simultaneously social and religious. This is not to suggest that the “social” or “magical” meaning dominated the religious meaning of Early Christian space, but rather to argue that the two meanings were inseparable. Just as the Christian liturgy was social ritual, Christian mosaics drew on iconographic contexts outside the sacred space to construct meaning in Christian space relevant in both religious and social terms.

Christian epigraphy likewise contributes to our understanding of the social world embedded in Early Christian sacred space, and this is the topic of chapter four. The inscriptions from Early Christian churches provide a glimpse of the Early Christian religious economy. They demonstrate that donors from a wide range of economic means contributed to the construction of Early Christian basilicas. While the economic realities of the Late Roman city probably shaped the way in which Early Christian buildings were
financed, a dependence or at least acceptance of lay donors of modest means challenges any interpretation of Christian sacred space as strictly an elite construction in an architectural or ideological sense. The placement of lay inscriptions in liturgical space defined in part by access limited to the clergy permitted the laity contact with the authority vested in the clergy while observing the physical barriers protecting the sacred. Thus, the clergy’s authority as mediator was not only affirmed by the donations of the laity, but these texts also demonstrated a degree of permeability in liturgical space. The language of the texts themselves, often inscribed prayers or votives, once again served to bridge the gap between earlier pagan practices, elite language, and prayers found in the context of traditional religious practices or “magic”. As the clergy mediated between the human and the divine, so these texts mediated between the world of pre-Christian Greece and the world of the church.
A Note about Citation

In general, my notes will refer the reader to my catalogue where I have included the basic references to the buildings discussed in this dissertation. Since I refer to buildings by name in the text, I have organized this catalogue by names rather than by numbers as scholars often prefer. I did this on account of the provisional status of the catalogue and the ultimately likelihood that it will require additional entries and deletions. Furthermore, I think that in the text, the names of the monuments convey far more information to the reader and require less paging back and forth between the catalogue and the text. In some instances I have included only the name of the site, in others, the name of the site and the region. A list of sites by region and a list of regions with all their sites is included to facilitate access to the catalogue. I have not included figure numbers in the text, except in those instances when I am referring to a specific feature visible on the plan. I have included figure numbers and numeric citations to my epigraphy catalogue (Ep. Cat.). Due to changes in procedure and policy regarding the submission of dissertation at Ohio State University, I have decided to exclude figures from this dissertation. In their place I have included a “List of Excluded Figures” as Appendix B. This list is keyed the master church catalogue and the discussion of mosaics in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 2
CONVERSION AND CHRISTIANIZATION

A study of the interaction between religious architecture and the changes in the society and culture of Late Antiquity must have roots in two important debates. One concerns the nature of religious change in Late Antiquity. The way scholars understood the relationship between religion, culture and society typically depended on their definition of conversion or Christianization. The second main debate, while less venerable and visible, involves specifically the interpretation of religious architecture in the Late Antique world. Scholars have approached the material evidence for Christian cult and ritual in vastly different ways, many of which offer observations relevant to my broader interest in the mechanisms of social change. This chapter will place my dissertation in the context of these two traditions of scholarship and will demonstrate my contributions and departures from it. The final section in this chapter will examine ancient attitudes toward the spread of Christianity and will demonstrate that my approach, which foregrounds the role of architecture, finds support in the ancient sources.

The spread of Christian influence on society and culture is best understood as a long-term process rather than as a discrete event in the life of a community or individual.
Baptism of an individual, or even a group, as happened so often in Late Antiquity, did not necessarily make people Christian from a cultural or social standpoint nor even necessarily by the religious standards of the day. My study will separate the ritual act of initiation from the cultural phenomenon of conversion or Christianization. Furthermore, the emergence of Christianity should not be interpreted as a teleological process with a definite end representing “total” or “thorough” Christianization. The interpretation of Christianization as a gradual, cultural, and non-teleological phenomenon is bound closely to the definition of religion employed in this dissertation. My approach will understand religion to be a complex system of symbols that exist simultaneously within a deep, illustrious, and ultimately conservative framework of spiritual and ritual thought and in the medium and substance of social communication. The expression of religious ideas reflects the tension between conservative and eternal cosmological principles and the dynamism of social relationships and social logic. Buildings, especially churches, represent one of the ways that the eternal and sacred is made manifest and exerts an influence over social and cultural experience. Perhaps the most significant advantage of an approach that emphasizes the process of change on the social level is that it tends to downplay individual or institutional agency and focuses instead on the mechanisms of change, especially those embodied in Early Christian architecture, that led to the expansion of Christian culture in Late Roman Greece. This is not to imply that specific groups did not influence the expansion of Christian practice and belief or benefit from it, but rather that these groups negotiated their relationship to Christianity within a framework created by a Christianization process that was itself a product of these efforts to negotiate positions of ascendancy, primacy or privilege in relation to more eternal
truths. Finally, as with any study that examines cultural change, this dissertation will not seek to differentiate between manifestations of change and change itself. As I will argue, these two phenomena are in no way independent from one another and represent the reciprocal interdependency of symbol and action in everyday life.¹

A more practical side effect of this approach will be to separate the discussion of the expansion of Christianity and Christian cultural symbols from debates regarding the “decline of paganism.” First, there is already a considerable corpus of scholarship on this particular topic for the Eastern Mediterranean.² Despite this, the lack of textual sources, difficult chronological issues, and our fragmentary knowledge of the archaeology of pagan cult during the fifth and sixth centuries for Greece, has left the relationship between Christians and pagans almost impossible to understand, even in the rare instances of the conversion of a temple to a church. Furthermore, the general tendency to discuss the rise of Christianity at the expense of a public or institutional paganism, characterized by monumental architecture, has occasionally obscured the far more complex nature of pagan practice during antiquity.³ Several recent books have properly emphasized the fact that Christianity as a cultural phenomenon was not necessarily de

³ For a useful corrective to this perspective see: F. Trombley, Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529. 2 vols. (Leiden 1993); R. Rothaus, Corinth, 126-134.
facto incompatible with ideas deeply rooted in traditional religious beliefs. 4 The hazy relationship between “Christianity” and “paganism” is most apparent in the various aspects of Christian iconography that have pagan roots, and in the aspects of Christian practice that reflect the continuation of certain pagan rituals and practices, such as magic or local festivals, couched in Christian terms. Thus, ambiguous sources reflect what probably were ambiguous boundaries between Christianity and paganism, and efforts to discuss one in terms of the other are likely to remain at best problematic.

One of the goals of this dissertation is to consider the idea of Christianization in a broader frame than studies of the Christian – pagan conflict have typically allowed. To this end, I have tended to emphasize examples of Christian cultural expansion that look at the phenomenon independently from paganism. This approach has its strengths and weaknesses, as it tends to relegate certain aspects of the traditional culture, namely “pagan” practices, to the background, but it also improves our ability to understand the mechanism of Christianization as a process, which clearly operated outside of explanations offered by conflict-based interpretive models.5 At times, I will be compelled to use the word “pagan” or the term “paganism” out of stylistic necessity, but, in general, I will try to qualify my use of these words so as to emphasize the particular aspect or type of non-Christian religious practices to which I am referring. This will allow me to differentiate, for example, the civic paganism of monumental urban temples, from the popular paganism of magic, amulets, and rural shrines.

2.1. Constructions of Conversion

The scholarship relevant to any discussion of conversion and Christianization in the ancient world is vast. Scholars have approached the topic using a wide array of methods and sources. The following brief treatment of the subject will focus on some of the major trends in scholarship relating to conversion and Christianization. My emphasis will be on those scholars who studied conversion as a large-scale social phenomenon, rather than as a personal or small-scale experience. I will also concentrate attention on those scholars who have dealt in some way with the Christianization of Greece. There is no intention of presenting an exhaustive treatment of the scholarship on this vast and complex subject, but instead, I will provide a brief overview of the state of the field as a general guide to the direction of my contribution.

The background for any discussion of conversion, Christianization, and late antique religion is in the debates of the early 20th century. Perhaps the most influential of the scholars studying conversion during that period was A.D. Nock. Writing in the 1930s, he followed the work of William James, who described the experience of
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conversion in highly personalized and spiritual terms. James saw conversion as the moment when “a phase of cognitive crisis and break down is resolved by an experience of a divine saving power that brings new knowledge and new meaning to life.”\(^8\) Having divided religions into religions of tradition and prophetic religions, Nock went on to define conversion, an essential feature in prophetic religions, in a similar way: “a reorientation of the soul of an individual, his deliberate turning from indifference or from an earlier form of piety to another, a turning which implies a consciousness that a great change is involved, the old was wrong and the new is right.”\(^9\) The ancient conversion narratives of Justin Martyr, Arnobius, and Augustine formed the core of his evidence for this phenomenon. These individuals experienced conversions that permanently altered their life and worldviews.

Scholars influenced by the first wave of anthropological and sociological thought, especially E. Durkeim, provided a counterpoint to the Nockian view of conversion.\(^10\) These scholars asserted that the legacy of paganism and polytheism remained fundamental to the understanding of Christianity from antiquity to modern times and argued that the core beliefs of ancient Christianity were simply those of ancient paganism recast.\(^11\) Religion was a medium through which social expectations or social structures manifest themselves and correct practice held greater importance than correct belief,
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\(^{9}\) Nock, *Conversion*, 7; My discussion of conversion here has been facilitated by K. Harris, *Fifth Century Views of Conversion: A Comparison of Conversion Narratives in the Church Histories of Sozomen and Socrates Scholasticus*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis: The Ohio State University (Columbus 1998).
inasmuch as the two could be separated. The introduction of Christianity, consequently, represented a change in the way ancient religion was expressed rather than a change in the ancient worldview. At its most basic interpretation, the emergence of Christianity amounted to little more than a change of names as the saints represented the ancient gods transformed. This approach to the study of religion allowed these scholars to side step the sticky issue of religious belief so central to Nock’s definition of conversion.

Today it is popular among scholars to argue that Nock, like James before him, wrote under the influence of 19th century notions of religiosity. Some have sought to demonstrate that the nature and experience of religion in Late Antiquity was fundamentally different from the modern concept of religion and that efforts to determine whether an individual was a ‘true believer’ is a matter for theologians. The historical method, they argue, deals best with manifestations, attitudes, and behaviors. This approach has driven scholars to understand the changes in religion in Late Antiquity as a process whereby the symbols and practices of traditional religious belief are transformed into the symbols and practices associated with Christianity. They often refer to this process as Christianization and their works have tended to emphasize the manifestations and symbols of religion in both literature and material culture.

13 Deichmann, “Früchristliche Kirken”, passim.
14 MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (AD 100-400)*. (New Haven 1984), 4, for a particularly ironic indictment. For a direct critique see: C.Babcock, “Ramsay MacMullen on conversion: a response,” *The Second Century*, 5 (1985/6) 82-9
15 Rothaus, *Corinth*, 1-7, for a nice summary of the methodological difficulties encountered in any study of ancient religions.
The notion of Christianization has gained increased acceptance in recent years, despite the fact that the meaning of the term varies considerably from scholar to scholar. The following section will outline some of the major strands in the discussion of Christianization in the ancient world. The very ambiguity of the term, however, which scholars have applied to groups of people, buildings, literary genres, and institutions indiscriminately, makes the clear definition of schools of scholarship difficult. Hopefully, this brief survey of literature on the matter will place my contribution into ongoing debates on the relationship between social and religious change and the spread of Christianity in the Mediterranean.

R. MacMullen provides a useful point of departure for a discussion of Christianization and conversion. He has written extensively on the issue and his scholarship has a tremendous popularity. In the introduction to his, *Christianizing the Roman Empire A.D. 100-400*, he issued the typical caveat. He warned that efforts to study conversion as an ancient phenomenon too often relied on modern conceptions of Christianity as a touchstone for determining true belief; that is, they relied on the notions of conversion advanced by Nock. The ancient sources, MacMullen argued, should be the source for understanding the process whereby ancient individuals adhered to a set of recognizable Christian practices. Christianization, for MacMullen, was the process by which groups or communities in antiquity became recognized as Christian by the standard of their contemporaries. As an abstraction this approach would seem to have merit, but once confronted with the reality of the ancient sources it proved unsustainable. MacMullen read the ancient sources with a Nockian eye by projecting back on the very
vocabulary of the ancient authors notions of conversions at home only in the 20th century. 17 Thus, despite his claims to follow the sources, he advanced a view of conversion as “that change of belief by which a person accepted the reality and supreme power of God and determined to obey him.” 18 By defining conversion in this way MacMullen can dismiss many of the mass conversions described in the fifth century ecclesiastical historians as not really being true conversions because they were not accompanied by instruction or a personal acknowledgement that a change in belief or actions was intended. With this, MacMullen fell back into the position that his method explicitly sought to avoid as he dismissed some accounts and accepted others by selectively reading the ancient sources filtered through Nock. This is especially evident in his attempts to address the question, “How complete was conversion?” 19

For a perspective situated at the opposite end of the spectrum of scholarship, we can look to R. A. Markus. In The End of Ancient Christianity, he has perhaps provided the most substantial contribution to the discussion of conversion and Christianization in recent years. 20 The strength of this book is not its revolutionary approach to the subject, but that it articulated a trend apparent, but undefined, in recent scholarship on the matter of conversion. Markus criticized the work of scholars who sought to divide Late Roman society into neat compartments defined by modern criteria, whether these compartments are termed ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’, ‘Christian’ and ‘pagan’, or ‘elite’ and ‘common.’ 21 He argued that while certain divisions in society surely existed, their boundaries tended to be

---

16 MacMullen, Christianizing, 9.
17 R.P.C. Hanson, Review of R. MacMullen’s Christianizing the Roman Empire, CR 35 (1985), 335-337.
18 MacMullen, Christianizing, 5.
19 MacMullen, Christianizing, 74.
20 R. A. Markus, The End of Ancient Christianity, 11.
fluid, and therefore modern definitions of conversion or Christianization that depend on these boundaries for their articulation oversimplify complex phenomena. In place of efforts to partition aspects of the ancient world for convenient judgement, Markus suggested an approach deriving from the anthropological theories of C. Geertz. Geertz argued that religion was a system of symbols by which individuals described and ultimately understood their environment. For Markus:

“In other words, what I shall be primarily concerned with is the manner in which Late Roman Christians, lay and clerical, drew the line which distinguished what they would have seen as their 'religion' from the rest of their activity and experience, their secular lives and its setting (which I sometimes also refer to as their culture). My investigation will be concerned, essentially, with Late Roman Christians' conception of Christianity itself: how far did they think its boundaries reached?”

By studying the various ways in which ancient authors perceived Christianity, he determined that the boundaries of Christianity constantly changed as they expanded to influence most areas of culture. Thus, he defined Christianization as the expansion of Christianity as a system of cultural symbols into areas occupied by other symbolic systems. Markus’s book focused especially on the expansion of Christian thought into conceptions of the body, space, and time. He dealt broadly with the rise in asceticism as a means of self-definition in explicitly Christian terms, the creation of a Christian

21 For a useful discussion of these divisions using set theory: see Rothaus, Corinth, 1-7.
topography, particularly in Rome, and the gradual adoption of Christian feast days as points of cultural and chronological distinction.\(^{23}\)

Other scholars working both before and after Markus have extended the ideas expressed in his relatively brief treatment of Christianization as a cultural phenomenon to other areas of ancient society and culture.\(^{24}\) For Markus and scholars like him, the treatment of Christianization has been transformed from studies in which the number of Christians gradually increased to take over the Roman world,\(^{25}\) to one in which the use of Christian symbols gradually came to bear on most areas of culture. The latter process has become the starting point for most scholars interested in the religious transformations of Late Antiquity.

P. Brown, most prominent among those who share Markus’s view of ancient Christianization, addressed specifically the “problem of Christianization” in a lecture published in 1995. He specifically highlighted the flaws in the method employed by MacMullen, namely that the narrative of Christianization or conversion presented by ancient authors was a product of their age.\(^{26}\) Brown drew attention to the fact that our sources for conversion are biased and that this bias has affected subsequent narratives dependent on these sources. Both the Christian triumphalism, girded by ideas of “cosmic sympathy,” so evident in eastern sources, and the constant despair at the persistence of

\(^{23}\) Markus, *The End*, 92-130 for time, 140-155 for space.

\(^{24}\) see note 30.


paganism prevalent in western authors, are products of the historiographical tradition of Late Antiquity and should be viewed with critical caution.

Brown followed Markus’s approach into the world of Christian symbols as well. He argued that Christian symbols and images gradually emerged alongside the traditional symbols of public authority in the iconography favored by the Mediterranean elite. For Brown, then, Christianization referred to the process whereby the elite defined its right to rule through a wide array of symbols of power and authority. These symbols, in turn, drew both on long tradition of public iconography with roots in paganism and on Christian symbolism, mixing the two in different proportions depending on the contexts, medium and audience. As the audience for these displays changed from a being predominantly pagan to being predominantly Christian, the elite shifted the method by which it demonstrated its position of ascendancy. This transformation of symbols held the key to understanding both the nature and expression of authority. Ultimately, in the West, challenges to aristocratic authority manifested itself in a growing intolerance of both traditional pagan practices and dissent within Christianity. In the east, a greater feeling of self-confidence, perhaps on account of the early intellectualization of Christianity in a Greek context and the greater stability of the traditional structure of elite authority, allowed the elite to continue drawing freely on both traditional and Christian

modes of expressions. Brown’s approach, advanced here specifically, but implied tacitly throughout his corpus of scholarship, has proved quite influential.

Numerous other scholars have elaborated upon this idea of cultural Christianization and the structure of power in Late Antiquity. Recent efforts by T. Mathews in the development of Christian modes of expression in art and iconography, S. McCormack in the development of Christian court ritual, and A. Cameron in her discussion of rhetoric in the Christian empire, to name just a few of the many scholars interested broadly in this process, have emphasized the changes brought about by the interpenetration of Christianity and traditional forms of elite expression. According to Brown and others, the expansion of Christianity and the retreat of secular, pagan, or traditional forms of expression transformed the symbols, language, institutions, and ultimately the structures of Mediterranean society. The logic inherent in the deployment of Christian symbols shaped the discourse of Late Antiquity and played a major role in the transition from the ancient world to the Medieval. Thus, while MacMullen and others hoped to say something about the worldview and beliefs of individuals in Late Antiquity, this group of scholars saw the roots of changes in the symbols themselves. Among these

scholars an appreciation has formed for the reciprocal relationship between the changes in cultural expression during Late Antiquity and social practice.

In an effort to substantiate this vacillating, reciprocal, dialectic between symbols and society, a number of scholars have sought use many of the same concepts advanced by Brown and others to re-examine Late Antique religion. These scholars project cultural models of Christianization, as asserted by Markus, back on ancient religion as both an institution with objects of veneration, texts, and buildings, and as a system of beliefs concerning the way in which the divine interacts with humanity through the auspices of these institutions. F. Trombley, in his well-researched work on the Christianization of Mediterranean religion, typifies the approach favored by many of these scholars. Trombley focused on the Christianization of religious practices, cult sites, and ritual as important for understanding the process of conversion in antiquity. He emphasized “the transformation of local gods, the Christianization of rite, and temple conversions.” T. Gregory considered the problem from the pagan perspective and examined the persistence of paganism in Greece from Late Antiquity. He proposed an approach supported by more anthropological considerations, and argued that the persistence of specific pagan ritual and practices in late antique and early Byzantine Greece tended to be

31 Conflict base models abound. One of the most interesting manifestations of this is in the influential medium of translated sourcebooks. Consider the emphasis on cultural and religious conflict in two prominent sourcebooks: B. Croke and J. Harries, Religious Conflict in Fourth-Century Rome: A Documentary Study. (Sydney 1982); D. Lee, Pagans and Christians in Late Antiquity: A Sourcebook. (London 2000), 10-72.  
32 F. Trombley, Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529, 2 vols. (Leiden 1993); F. Trombley, “Paganism in the Greek World at the End of Antiquity: The Case of Rural Anatolia and Greece,” HTR 78 (1985), 327-352: coined the phrase: “the ‘mechanics of conversion’ in the countryside of the sixth-century later Roman Empire. This process consisted fundamentally in implanting monasteries in districts where few villages had been Christianized, or where the population was nominally Christian but so badly instructed that earlier pagan practices still persisted.”  
in the context of “first order concerns.” The continued adherence to traditional, pagan religious practices in matters of life and death suggested to Gregory a continued belief in the power and efficacy of the ancient gods and rituals. Similarly, J.-M. Spieser’s work on the Christianization of cities and of pagan sanctuaries similar to Trombley, Gregory, and others, considered the Christianization process as the gradual advance of Christianity into the spiritual void left by a dying paganism. To Speiser, Trombley, and Gregory the real place for Christianization was in the religious beliefs and practices of the Mediterranean world as opposed to the politics, art and culture of the society. The foundation of cultural continuity was in the popular beliefs that took centuries to shed fully the vestiges of pagan cult and ritual that openly defied Christian belief.

The approach favored by scholars such as Brown and Markus has emphasized religion as a cultural phenomenon in order to move away from the explicit discussion of belief that characterized scholarship in the Nockian tradition. In contrast to Nock, their studies focus on religion as a kind of cultural vocabulary, loosely following a Geertzian approach, and rarely deal explicitly with the issue of belief. Efforts by Gregory and others, have, to a certain extent, attempted to re-integrate the idea of “belief” or, at very least, a specifically religious mentality into how we understand the spread of Christianity. They have done this by examining the archaeology and literature pertaining to religious activities in their own right rather than as part of a larger bundle of

---

cultural actions and material. While this approach has its own difficulties, it finds complements in the idea of cognitive archaeology or “archaeology of the mind” developed by scholars interested in the study of material culture and languages. These scholars approach behavior, or the remains of activities, as an indicator of ways of thinking. As belief is a particular way of thinking, and an important, generative one at that, reconstructing the ritual and architectural world could provide insights into belief. This becomes even more the case if material remains can be interpreted as representing a particular cosmology which provides information relevant to the patterns of thought which generated the material objects themselves.

The source of belief and its manifestations, whether they are ritual, architectural, or even spiritual, are typically regarded as separate. The source or impetus, however, for certain ritual behavior and its material record has generated considerable disagreement. Geertz, an anthropologist, tended to follow the line prescribed initially by E. Durkheim regarding religion as generated by the very culture which it, in turn, described; thus, creating a reciprocal relationship which ensured the continued relevance of both. While adopting aspects of a Geertzian approach, rooted in Durkheim and favored by Brown, I also intend to look outside the relationship between symbol and

---

38 Although this approach has come under recent critique, see, for example: C. Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York 1992).
society to ideas advanced by M. Eliade, and his fellow Historians of Religion. They viewed religion *qua* religion as the primary impetus for various social and cultural phenomena rather than an epi-phenomenal bi-product or a cluster of socially constituted symbols. Furthermore, these scholars perceived the basis of religious thinking or religious logic, and consequently the deployment of religious symbols, as something that transcended the experiences, traditions and, ultimately, the time of the existing culture.

For this dissertation, it is the religious change itself that formed the foundation of subsequent cultural and social changes, rather than the wide array of historical events which promoted the introduction and establishment of Christianity in a particular area. Thus, the building of a church and the construction of an ecclesiastic hierarchy, for example, did not itself represent the Christianization of an area. It is the effects of these structures as manifestations of a transcendent religious reality that led ultimately to the changes in the symbolic structure of Late Antique society. As the following section will demonstrate, this approach finds some support in the ancient sources, who realized that the religious and cosmological influenced the ordering of the world and linked the heavenly reality to architecture and ritual.

2.2. *Church Construction, Christianization, and Conversion*

The views advanced by Markus and those who adhered to a similar perspective on the expansion of Christianity as a cultural system are important in that they provide a description of the changes that occurred in the Late Antique world. Furthermore, they

---

demonstrate that the phenomenon of ‘conversion’ when understood on the level of a society as opposed to the individual, describes a process rather than a single event. The difficulty with these studies is that they describe change better than explaining how or why it occurred. Churches, for example, are seen as the projection of episcopal authority rather than the producers of it. Early Christian architecture can provide evidence for how ‘the mechanics’ of Christianization, as a cultural process, actually occurred and explain how cultural and social changes took place through the manipulation and negotiation of social and cultural symbols and space. Thus, churches represent both a medium for Christianization and mode of its expression. This dual role of churches, however, has not been fully appreciated in previous studies of Late Antique church construction. Scholars have often considered the presence of churches as evidence for Christianization, but both in the text and on the ground the relationship between Christianization and churches is a complex one.

It is, for example, clear that the practical needs of an existing Christian community are not the only reason for the construction of a church, although, some scholars have assumed this. The construction of churches was likely related to the projection of imperial or episcopal power in some communities, such as in the churches surrounding Rome or Milan. Other reasons for church construction include the production of a Christian sacred landscape characterized by the churches that marked martyr’s tombs, the locations of miraculous events, places associated with the Passion,

41 Brown, *Authority and the Sacred*, 16, in fact admits, “Christianization is easier to describe than to explain.”
and spots long held as having certain intangible sacredness. Competition among aristocrats, genuine piety, and de-paganization likely spurred the construction of Christian churches in the Late Roman period as well. Finally, the construction of churches served to facilitate explicitly the projection of religious symbolism into the realm of social relationships.

Traditional studies of church construction in antiquity have followed three approaches. The most familiar approach to early Christian architecture is the traditional art historical approach. Scholars working this tradition emphasized the evolution of early Christian art and architecture. It has tended to be quite formalistic and interested primarily in creating chronological typologies which are presented in various catalogues, handbooks, and surveys. The efforts of these scholars to organize and present the material evidence form the foundation of this dissertation. Their conclusions, however, were typically limited to discussions of artistic and stylistic development. They did not, as a rule, consider the broader social context for the phenomenon. This has, in part, caused social and cultural historians to neglect the work of these scholars and the material

45 C. Mango, Byzantine Architecture, (Milan 1978), 7-9, 70-71: proposed three modes for examining Christian architecture: the typological, the functional, and the historical. Mango allied himself to the “historical” approach which meant that he would read Byzantine architecture as a product of the various economic, political, and military conditions of the Eastern Mediterranean during the long life of the Byzantine state. I have tended to group typological and function approaches together into a broad “art historical approach” and then divided the historical approach into scholars interested in churches as manifestation of political realities and those interested in churches as religious architecture.
they studied, except as a way to illustrate trends derived from the literary and epigraphic
texts. Over the last 30 years, however, the methods applied by social and political
historians and art historians have experienced a growing convergence as they have
recognized increasingly common aims. The result of this has been a number of studies
by historians and art historians alike which bring art historical and architectural evidence
to the fore as a source for understanding the ancient world, and these works will be
discussed below.

Political history became the initial area to benefit from the convergence of art
historical approaches and those favored by more traditional historians. The best example
of this is R. Krautheimer’s work, *Three Christian Capitals*, in which the author openly
declares that his studies: “are the attempt of an old historian of art to explore the borders
of his field and to transgress into that of political history: to view the architectural
monuments of the Christian capitals of the fourth and fifth centuries and their location
within the urban texture as reflecting the political realities and ideologies of
Constantinian Rome, Constantinople, Milan, and early papal Rome.”

P. Brown’s occasional comments regarding church building in his various studies follow closely in
Krautheimer’s footsteps, although Brown viewed the social organization of politics as a
phenomenon penetrating to far deeper levels of ancient society. Today, historians and
art historians commonly discuss the control, building, and iconography of churches as
aspects of urban politics, especially where good political narratives reveal competing
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Antiquity,” *JRS* 67 (1969), 91-103; P. Brown, “Town, Village, and Holy Man: The Case of Syria,” in
aristocrats, dynasts, or institutions.49 These studies tend to emphasize the role of church building as elite or imperial expressions of authority. In this formulation, church construction, like the phenomenon of Christianization itself, becomes simply a medium through which larger political or social tensions are played out. Churches as the product of elite activities or munificence serve primarily to express elite attitudes and values.50

The approach to ancient religion and religious architecture taken by scholars such as Trombley, Spieser, and Gregory has sought to demonstrate that church building can best be understood in the context of ancient religion.51 Trombley and Gregory in particular have seen church construction as a tool in the conflict with persistent paganism. They have especially focused on the construction of churches in or around pagan sanctuaries. Related to this kind of study are those scholars who examine the emergence of a distinctly Christian sacred landscape as a counterpoint to a sacred landscape informed by pagan deities.52 This view, as I have mentioned previously, conceives of

50 Brown’s assertions regarding the role of martyria are closely related to his arguments concerning the role of the holy man in Late Antiquity. Some scholars have perceived his interpretation of the holy man as overly ‘functionalist’ (see especially A. Murry, “Peter Brown and the Shadow of Constantine,” JRS 73 (1983), 191-203), and a similar objection could be levelled against his interpretation of martyria. Perhaps more problematic is the tendency for Brown’s interpretation of the patron-client dyad so fundamental to our understanding of Late Antiquity to be misinterpreted as the elite-common dyad against which he so ardently argued. Thus a martyr shrine which according to Brown showed a heavenly analogy to the earthly patron-client relationships, can become places where the elite show a simple form of Christianity to the common folks.
religious history as a narrative independent of politics or social conventions, and rarely sees the construction of churches as the cause for greater social transformation. As opposed to scholars like Brown, who are primarily interested in Late Roman social and political institutions, this group of scholars has tended to emphasize conversion or Christianization as a change in religious practices.

There are, of course, scholars who do not fit into either of these categories. A. Wharton, for example, has argued that the construction of churches led to the important changes in the nature of urban topography between the ancient and medieval periods.\(^{53}\) While certain social implications associated with these changes are discussed briefly, especially in her discussion of the construction of the Neonian baptistery in Ravenna, they were not fully exploited. Humphries, in his work on the conversion of Northern Italy, presents some interesting observations concerning the way in which the ecclesiastical elite used churches to reinforce its position within both its own Christian community and the larger urban community.\(^ {54}\) L. Michael White has suggested that the urban topography of the areas where Christian communities existed in the pre-Constantinian period should provide an important component to how we understand the function of *domus ecclesiae*.\(^ {55}\) The approaches of these scholars, particularly Wharton’s, did much to reveal the complexity of the social dynamic manifest in the relationship


\(^{54}\) Humphries, *Communities of the Blessed*, 191-193.

between urban and religious space, but they do not examine the ways in which a building could play an active role in the transformation of social relations.

The work of these scholars peripherally considered the way that a church building affected those who frequented it, whether clergy or the laity. Brown, for one, implied that churches had an important role in shaping social organization. Martyria, in particular, represented an idealized, heavenly example of the relationship between the elite and their clients.\textsuperscript{56} Scholars following in Brown’s footsteps, however, have generally seemed reluctant to see material culture as having an impact on the organization of society during this period. Finally, the approach of Gregory, Trombley and others concerned with the material manifestation of the religious changes taking place at the end of antiquity, stop short of arguing that these changes in material culture could produce changes in social structure as well as religious practice.\textsuperscript{57} Churches, in most discussions represent merely expressions of some late antique impulse, whether religious, political, or broadly socio-cultural. It is my contention that churches produced experience and thereby expressed to their various audiences a social reality which emerged in the very midst of the dialectic between the sacred and its expression in socially constructed human terms.

The basis for my study rests upon certain methodological assumptions that, while widely held, are rarely made explicit. Although this dissertation will not propose a universal way of reconciling the historical method and efforts to determine the nature of ancient conversion or ancient Christianity, it will operate under a compromise position

\footnote{\textsuperscript{56} Brown, \textit{Culture of the Saints}, 86-127.}
that might ultimately present a framework for approaching important matters of belief with the tools and evidence available for historical analysis. Architectural theorists and practitioners of architectural analysis in many fields have long understood that space plays an essential role in shaping an individual’s experience. Architecture often served to present a set of values and expectations through creating an often highly biased setting. In this capacity domestic architecture, in particular, has been seen as a reliable guide and an important component of the “structuring structures” that support social organization.

Sacred architecture endeavored to promote a particular response or set of responses from those who experienced it – whether it be the clergy, the formal participants in the Christian ritual, or members of society who experience it without such a well-defined connection to Christianity. Gregory, Trombley, and others, have at least tacitly accepted this assumption when they interpreted the competition between paganism

---

57 T. E. Gregory, *Vox Populi: Popular Opinion and violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus, Ohio 1979), argued that religious allegiances influenced the behavior of groups especially in an urban context.


59 The phrase comes from: P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. trans. R. Nice (Cambridge 1977) and is developed more fully in P. Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*. trans. R. Nice. (Stanford 1990). For Bourdieu, domestic architecture represented the way in which a “structured structure” manifested itself as a “structuring structure.” For a domestic building, the overarching structured structure included the basic social relationships, traditions, or customs of a particular society. The structuring structure was the house itself whose form was governed by certain social expectations and customs, but whose use served to create new social definitions and expectations which it would in turn communicate to its users. Bourdieu used the termed “habitus” to describe the relationship between structured structures of social behavior and structuring structures that produce them, and understood it as the generative principle that governs all
and Christianity as being played out in architectural terms. Eliade took this a step further in arguing that sacred architecture served as a location where relationships played out on the cosmic level are expressed on the material, terrestrial, and social level, and while arguing that how the cosmic and eternal order was made manifest depended on the social context of the architecture, its ritual and its intended audience, he asserted that certain basic symbols had universal functions and meanings in all cultures. The social and cultural ideas communicated through monumental architecture are, in part made evident in the building’s design and decoration, in part generated through the rituals that take place there, and, in part produced through the perception of the rituals and the space by the individuals who witness it.

Communicative practices. Thus, habitus leads buildings to be arranged in a particular way and function socially in a particular way.


61 These three simultaneous readings of architectural space draw on a rather idiosyncratic reading of H. Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*: through the critique of E.W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. (Oxford 1996). Lefebvre divides space for the purpose of his analysis into three states: “Spatial practice (perceived space), Representations of Space (or conceived space), and Spaces of Representation (lived space) (Lefebvre, 33-39). These three spatial states do not, however, exist independent from one another and to explain this Lefebvre described them as elements of a single bodily existence. This central trialectic could form a useful point of departure for this dissertation with the “Representations of Space” rooted in Christian cosmology and cosmography, the “Spatial Practice” of Christian ritual, and “Spaces of Representation” or lived space in the impact of ritual and cosmology on the social expression of space within the Early Christian world. None of these ways of seeing space exist independently of one another nor are properly separable (Soja, *Thirdspace*, 53-82, and specially 65-70). It is worth noting that in my proposed organization for reading space, I would propose, differing from Lefebvre that the “Spaces of Representation” represent the space of history, religion, memory and belief and are loosely analogous with Bourdieu’s idea of “habitus” (This should not be confused with Lefebvre’s use of the same term (239-241, and in his critique of Panofsky, 258-260) which he equated with conceived space and, in particular, the Greek development of cosmological space. R. Laurence, “Space and Text,” in *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*. *JRA Supp*. 22 (Portsmouth, RI 1997), 7-14 esp. 9, used the same trialectics proposed by Lefebvre, although somewhat more mechanically identifying “representational spaces” as those informed by archaeology, and “spatial practice” and “representations of space” as being those best read through literary sources. For a critique of this see: P.M. Allison, “Using the Material and Written Sources: Turn of the Millenium Approaches to
The creation of a monumental Early Christian architecture in conjunction with other strategies such as the suppression of competing opportunities for religious expression, and less structured displays of power such as preaching or miraculous actions, served to condition, to influence and to constrain, but not to dictate the responses of an ancient individual. Churches were places that presented an individual with a group of architectural, ritual, and iconographic stimuli that served to communicate ideas of cosmology, social order, and morality. As individuals participated in rituals communicated through a shared symbolic language, generated in part from a common tradition and experiences, they produced an interpretation of the form, decoration, and meaning of an Early Christian church. This is to say that when people were exposed to the experience of Christianity, particularly the powerful and basic experience of Christian architecture, they actively produced “conversion” or “Christianization” as they negotiated the tension between the concrete architectural form, ritual, and preconceived notions regarding religious experiences. While the exact nature of Christian beliefs on an individual level in Late Antique Greek society remains impossible to determine, the potential for Christian belief increased with the exposure to Christian experiences supplied through Christian architecture, wandering holy men, highly symbolic liturgical ritual, or Christian symbols on a coin. The cosmological aspect of early Christian architecture – which itself derived from notions of a religious experience rooted deeply in the Mediterranean tradition – ensured that experiences produced within its walls and rituals did not remain local, but had far-reaching implications.

Roman Domestic Space,” *AJA* 105 (2001), 181-208, esp. 199-200. In fact, as I would read Lefebvre none of these spaces can be read without reference to literature and archaeology (that is studies of architecture and other material evidence).
If we can accept that Christian architecture presented a human experience that linked social expression to cosmic reality thereby producing an opportunity for significant shifts in an individual’s worldview, then it should also have an influence on attendant social, economic, and political changes. The link between the belief in a particular cosmology and social structure has stood as a fundamental assumption in the study of the history of religions for nearly a century. As the ecclesiastical architecture of Greece presents the historian with a map of both Christian ritual and religious experience, it can also provide insights into the social organization of the period. Like cosmology, the social structure emerged from a dialectic between the expectations of the individual presenting the cosmology and the expectations of those who witnessed it. In later chapters, this dissertation will explore at length the dialogue between Christian architecture and ritual and the expectations of individuals who lived in a society with deeply set loyalties to traditional religious and ritual experiences.

2.3. A Closer Look: The Case of Late Antique Church Construction

The wide range of social, architectural, and political contexts in which church construction occurred speaks to its importance as a basic aspect of Christian practice and hints at the wide range of symbolic meanings associated with it. As mentioned above, there is strong evidence that church construction was motivated by political and religious considerations, whether ecclesiastical, local, or imperial. It is also seems likely that individuals and groups in antiquity viewed church construction as a component of the

---

Christianization and conversion process. Numerous sources for conversion in Late Antiquity include mentions of church construction, referring to it either as a pious reaction by the converted community or as part of missionary activity in a region. The linking of church construction with the spread of Christian ideas and worldview might even be part of the motivation which led both Diocletian and Licinius to include attacks on church buildings as part of the formal, legal structure of their persecutions. This section will provide a brief discussion of the evidence linking church construction to the promulgation of Christianity within a region or group, and conclude with a short analysis of some of Diocletian’s and Licinian’s activities with regard to churches.

The sources for the role of church construction in conversion and Christianization are diverse in geography, chronology, and genre. They range from episcopal letters and sermons of the later fourth century to hagiography of the sixth century, and span geographically from Italy to Syria. It appears that the link between the construction of churches and conversion was widely held in Late Antiquity and not limited to a particular kind of conversion narrative, period, or location. Moreover, an argument drawn from a wide range of sources mitigates against the direct transmission of the kind of bias that Brown has identified in conversion accounts of the 5th-century West, although the roots of biases in deep-set cultural attitudes tend to make their influence omnipresent.63

The following brief discussion of primary evidence will privilege sources which place church construction exclusively in the context of conversion, as opposed to those that discuss the building of a church as a gambit in a political or dynastic conflict64 or as a

63 Brown, Authority and the Sacred, 24-27.
64 See for example: the church of St. Polyeuktos at Sarachane in Istanbul: Gregory of Tours, De gloria martyrium PL 71 cols. 793-5, R. M. Harrison, Excavations at Sarachane in Istanbul, Vol. 1 (Princeton
part of a local campaign to eradicate a particular pagan sanctuary or temple. This is not to suggest that churches constructed with political or anti-pagan considerations in mind did not contribute to the Christianization of a particular area or group, but rather that, as mentioned above, numerous scholars have already discussed these churches and motivations for their construction. In fact Christianization as a cultural phenomenon cannot be considered separately from the political world or the world of pagan ritual. The paucity of sources for the literary and religious history of Late Roman Achaia, however, provides only rare opportunities for placing a particular building in a well-defined political context. Finally, the following discussion of churches and conversion is organized by genre in order to demonstrate that the link between church building and Christianization was not a literary trope, but a widely held attitude in Late Roman society.

Perhaps the most elaborate evidence connecting church construction to conversion comes from the conversion narratives recorded by the 5th-century ecclesiastical historians Sozomen and Socrates. In three of their major conversion stories – the conversion of the Iberians, the Indians, and the Egyptians of the Nile Delta –

---

1986), 5-10. Although instances of explicit political motives for the construction of churches are rare, they are frequently attributed to emperors and bishops who claim to have been moved by more pious impulses. See for example: R. Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals*; or A. Wharton, *Refiguring the Post-Classical City*; J. R. Curran, *Pagan City and Christian Capital* (Oxford 2000), 90-157.


church construction is linked to the group’s acceptance of Christianity. In the case of the Iberians, it is the king of the Iberians himself who requested “a basilica of the Roman plan” for his newly converted kingdom. The church building of the Indians and the Iberians was accompanied by the introduction of Christian clergy. The church built by the Egyptians on an island on the Nile Delta replaced a pagan temple without violence and without mention of daimons. Doctrinal instruction accompanied it.

The link between church construction and conversion emerges from hagiographic sources as well. In Gregory of Nyssa’s *Life of Gregory the Wonderworker*, the author related how the newly converted communities of Asia Minor were “zealously erecting handsome temples ( ναοί) in the name of Christ.”70 Kallinikos’ *Life of Hypatios* described the saint’s efforts to encourage local potentates to build churches in an effort to Christianize the countryside.71 When Kallinikos wished to describe the persistence of paganism in the Phrygian countryside of the fifth century, he referred to it as devoid of both monks and churches, thus marking churches and monks as crucial indicators of Christianity.72 In John of Ephesus’ *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, Symeon the Mountaineer coming upon a village which had fallen into apostasy from want of a priest, repaired and

---

69 Socrates, 4.24; Sozomen 6.20.
72 Kallinikos, *Life of Hypatius*, 88.; Mitchell, *Anatolia.* vol. 2.; 118 takes issue with this description claiming that the countryside, “had been Christian since the third century A.D.” The evidence for fourth to sixth century Phrygia is poor. Mitchell does not consider the idea that countryside could return to paganism over two hundred years.
restored the church, held services, and instructed the youth in Christian doctrine.\footnote{PatOr 18.681; F. Trombley, “Paganism in Greek World”, 338.} John of Ephesus himself was credited with the conversion of 80,000 people, and the construction of 98 churches and 12 monasteries.\footnote{Mitchell, Anatolia. vol. 2, 118-119 considers Trombley’s estimates problematic.} F. Trombley has argued that these numbers might accurately reflect the Monophysite bishop’s missionary activities in 6\textsuperscript{th} century Anatolia.\footnote{F. Trombley, “Paganism in Greek World”, 338.}

Paulinus of Nola and John Chrysostom, writing didactic poetry and sermons respectively, recognized the importance of churches as places of Christian instruction for rural dwellers.\footnote{See also the sermons of Caesarius of Arles, from 6\textsuperscript{th} century Gaul. See Knight, The End of Antiquity, (Gloucestershire UK 1999), for a brief discussion of the phenomenon of rural, villa churches.} Paulinus explained that the wall decorations of his newly enlarged martyrium complex to St. Felix outside of Nola would “seize the beguiled minds of the rustics through their wonderous appearance.”\footnote{Paulinus, Carm. 27. 582-83; D. Trout, “Town, Countryside, and Christianization,” in Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity. R. W. Mathisen and H.S. Sivan eds. (Brookfield, VT 1996), 183. D. Trout, Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems. (Berkeley 1999), 160-196; For an interesting consideration of images and Christianity: P. Brown, “Images as a substitute for writing,” in East and West: Modes of Communication. E. Chrysos and I. Woods eds. (Leiden 1999), 15-35.} John Chrysostom, famously encouraged estate owners to “build a church and get a teacher to help oversee the task on behalf of all, that all may be Christian.”\footnote{Trombley, Hellenic Religion, vol. 2, 94; John Chrysostom, Homiliae in Acta Apostolorum, PG 60, 13-384.} As he would so often as Bishop of Antioch and Patriarch of Constantinople, John contrasted churches with secular institutions, namely taverns, baths, markets, and festivals, noting that churches had the opposite effect from these places of worldly enticements.\footnote{T. Barnes, “Christians and the Theater,” in W.J. Slater ed., Roman Theater and Society. E. Togo Salmon Papers 1 (Ann Arbor 1996), 161-180; R. Lim, “Consensus and Disensus on Public Spectacles in Early Byzantium,” in L. Garland, ed. Conformity and Non-Conformity in Byzantium, ByzFor 25 (1997), 159-179; Markus, End, 112-123.; Leyerle, B., Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom’s Attack on Spiritual Marriage, (Berkeley 2001), passim.}
In a late 4th-century correspondence, Vigilius, the bishop of Trent, told how a mob of enraged pagans made human souvlakia of three Christian clergymen on the roof beams of their newly constructed church after they had disrupted a pagan procession in a remote village of the Val di Non.\(^8\) Evidently not only had the missionaries built a church, but the local pagans associated it closely enough with the missionaries’ activities to warrant its removal. Basil of Caesarea commended the effort of an otherwise unknown Bishop Arcadius for his church building activities, saying that he too would build churches if he could just get his hands on sufficient relics.\(^8\) Similarly he corresponded with the governor of Cappadocia whom a local bishop had accused of blocking the construction of a church, episcopal residence, and hostel.\(^8\) It is unclear whether these letters concerned church building in the context of conversion, but it is likely that Basil’s interest in church building was related to his general concern with exerting influence over affairs throughout Cappadocia and Anatolia.\(^8\)

The aforementioned sources all described the building of churches without references to religious conflict at specific pagan shrines or, with the possible exception of Basil’s letters, to specific examples of local politics. These sources also show the wide range of agents responsible for the construction of churches, including zealous new converts, kings, local potentates, holy men, and powerful bishops. The various


\(^8^1\) Basil, *Ep*. 49

\(^8^2\) Basil, *Ep*. 94

\(^8^3\) Mitchell, *Anatolia*, vol. 2, 72-80 for a discussion of the efforts by Cappadocian bishops to control both the vast countryside associated with their sees and the various urban and imperial institutions scattered throughout the territory. To Mitchell, *Anatolia*, vol. 2, 72, “The Church thus took every opportunity to establish itself as the principal source of authority in social as well as religious matters. Divine justice had a long pedigree in Anatolian villages.”
individuals responsible for the construction of churches and the conversion of Christian communities contributed, undoubtedly to the proliferation of ecclesiastical architecture throughout the Mediterranean; for, in their minds, church building was a conspicuous component of conversion in Late Antiquity. The link between church building and Christianization demonstrated that ritual space was closely allied with the spread of the Christian faith. In some cases the expansion of Christian ritual space seems to be associated with doctrinal instruction, in others, the church building itself sufficed to represent the area’s Christianity.

Similar evidence for the importance of ecclesiastical architecture in the maintenance and spread of Christianity comes from the persecutions of Christians in the 4th century. According to Lactantius, the initial act of the Diocletianic persecution of 303 was to destroy the Christian building that overlooked his palace in Nicomedia.\(^84\) The sources further indicate that the destruction of churches was part of the official “edict” of persecution and may have occurred quite widely from Egypt, to the West, and in various imperial cities.\(^85\) These passages are, of course, problematic on many levels. First, the exact nature of the buildings that these persecutions destroyed is not at all clear. White associates them with the pre-Constantinian building described by Eusebius at the beginning of book 7.\(^86\) Second, the role of these so-called *Aulus Ecclesiae* or “hall churches” and Christian ritual remains obscure, although it seems likely, as White
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\(^{84}\) Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum*, 12.4-5. For the exact nature of this building see: L. Michael White, *Building God’s House*, 130-131. For more discussion of these events see:


\(^{86}\) Eusebius *HE* 7.1.5. “How could anyone describe those assemblies with numberless crowds and the great throngs gathered in every city as well as the remarkable concourses in the houses of prayer? On account of these things, no longer being satisfied with their old buildings, they erected from the foundations
argued, that these buildings incorporated basic liturgical features as their predecessors, the *Domus Ecclesiae*, did. Third, the destruction of churches might just as well be interpreted within the context of general attacks on Christian material resources, and, thus a reasonable extension of the book-burning and the confiscation of liturgical vessels, lands, and vestments. If, however, we can understand these activities as attacks on the ability of Christianity to spread and reproduce, then the destruction of the basic media of ritual and cultural communication – architecture, texts, and liturgical objects – appears far more exacting. It is possible then to understand Diocletian’s attacks not as attacks on the manifestations of a rival sources of cosmology, but rather as an attack on a cosmology that was constructing itself using the same strategies as Imperial authority had for centuries. There is some evidence from later persecutions that suggests just such attacks did occur in the Early Christian period.

The anti-Christian activity of Licinius, as described in Eusebius, appears explicitly to acknowledge the social significance of Early Christian ritual. S. Corcoran believed this text to reflect an actual edict as Eusebius himself states. First, Licinius banned the assembling of bishops. Then, “he made a second law, requiring men and women should not be present together at prayers to God, nor women attend the sacred schools of virtue, nor bishops give instruction to women in devotional addresses, but that

---

*churches of spacious dimensions in every city.* For a discussion of this particular text see: White, *Building God’s House*, 128 n.96.

87 White, *Building God’s House*, 102-139.
women should be appointed as teachers of women.”91 Finally, “he said that the normal assemblies of lay people should be held outside the gates in open country, since the air outside the gates was much fresher than that in the urban places of worship.”92 The edict prohibiting men and women from worshipping together would appear to undermine the ritual organization of the early 4th-century places of worship where presumably men and women assembled together. E. A. Judge, in his discussion of this passage, assigned it to Licinius’ desire to “break down the very effective system of social relations.”93 This is vague, and a better understanding of the way in which church buildings functioned at this time would undoubtedly provide a better understanding of this passage. Eusebius placed this particular law in a moral context, stating that the debauched character of Licinius prevented him from believing that men and women could exercise virtuous chastity. Although the architecture of the building did not, in this case, reinforce moral behavior, it was consistent with the moral expectations of the Christian community. Licinius recognized that an attack on these moral expectations could be achieved through an attack on the ritual organization of Christian worship.

It was only as the Christian communities were feeling more confident in Constantinian protection that Licinius promulgated another edict to weaken the institutional church, ordering lay assemblies to meet outside the city. This can be seen as another attack on the church by undermining the use of specifically ecclesiastical architecture. Hall and Cameron recognize it correctly as “an opposite policy from that of

91 Eusebius, VC 1.53.1 (S.G. Hall and Av. Cameron, Eusebius: The life of Constantine (Oxford 1999), 91.)
92 Eusebius, VC 1.53.2 (Hall and Cameron, Eusebius, 91.)
Constantine’s building program. Judge, always interested in the social aspects of early Christianity, noted that it would likely impair the church from carrying out charitable activities in cities. The edict, however, does not prohibit the church buildings for being used as places to store charitable donations, distribute alms, even conduct irregular assemblies, as the edict only prohibited “normal assemblies of lay people.” I would contend that this policy was more likely designed to disrupt the growing influence of Christian ritual practice in cities of the east by preventing such conspicuous gatherings as processional liturgies. Furthermore, by outlawing ritual in the cities it would slowly erode the bonds linking the architecture and urban space to the cosmology implied through Christian liturgy. Overtime, churches would lose their symbolic significance upon the landscape.

Licinius’ expulsion of the Christians from their churches in the city presaged one of the favorite techniques for treating offending groups deemed heretical during the later 4th, 5th and 6th centuries. Even as Licinius became more vehemently anti-Christian later in his reign, he refrained from the outright destruction of churches; although he was accused of confiscating churches and sacred sites as well as treating the clergy harshly. This activity was more or less consistent with a trend among later emperors who frequently, although not always, preferred to remove the assemblies of offending
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94 Hall and Cameron, *Eusebius*, 228
96 Baldovin, J., *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, OCA 228 (Rome 1987), for a discussion of the development and significance of processional and stational liturgies in the Roman and the East.
97 Sozomen, 2.32; 5.7; 5.8; 6.17; 8.8; 8.21; Socrates 2.27; 3.41 4.7; 5.7; 5.15; 5.20; 6.8; 6.9; 6.21; 7.7; 7.9; 7.31 et c.; see H.O. Maier, “The Topography of Heresy and Dissent in Late Fourth Century Rome,” *Historia* 44 (1995), 232-249. T.E. Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 118.
98 Eusebius, *VC*, 2.24-42 is the primary evidence for Licinius actions. This is most probably an excerpt from an edict issued by Constantine to the residents of Palestine presumably in 324. For a full discussion
religious groups from the city rather than destroy their buildings. This allowed the
buildings of a discredited creed to be confiscated by more acceptable congregations,
instantly turning one-time symbols of a creed’s worldview and authority into symbols of
another creed’s triumph. On a practical level, it occasionally limited clashes between
competing Christian groups in the streets as advocates of one position defended their
assemblies or processions from the challenges of another.99

Other Christian writers also provided contemporary evidence for the importance
of their church buildings and the proper organization of space within them in liturgical
handbooks of the 2nd – 5th centuries and the later liturgical commentaries of Pseudo-
Dionysos and Maximos Confessor make the link between conversion and church
construction clear particularly as they explain the theology linking architecture and ritual.
An interest in the setting and physical arrangement of Christian ritual appears at least as
early as the second century in the Didache (9-10), followed by a more detailed
discussions 3rd - 5th centuries in the Didascalia Apostolorum, the Apostolic Constitution,
and the Testamentum Domini. By the 5th - 7th centuries the liturgical commentaries of
Pseudo-Dionysos and Maximos Confessor closely linked the understanding of
architecture with an interpretation ritual infused with mystical overtones. It is important
to note that I am not implying Maximos Confessor’s 7th century interpretation of ritual
and architecture in Constantinople is appropriate for 5th and 6th century Greece,100 but
rather that the general association of architecture and ritual both as manifest in handbooks
and in interpretive treatises reflects the inseparability of these two phenomena in the Late

of this document see: Hall and Cameron, Eusebius, 239-243 with citations. Eusebius, HE 10.8.15-19
asserted that Licinius did destroy churches.
99 Baldovin, Urban Character, 183-184.
Antique mind. These sources provide such an important source for how we understand Christian liturgical architecture they will be considered at length later in chapter 3.

The connection between architecture and ritual rests at the heart of this dissertation. Through the ancient acknowledgement of this interaction, Eliadean interpretations of the importance of the sacred center are grounded in the reality of late antique “practice.” In Bourdieu’s terms, the structuring structures of late antique society and the transcendent truths of ancient Christianity emerge in the structured structures of the Christian basilica to create the real experience of Christian cosmology and ultimately Christian faith through the generative influences of habitus. To various groups and individuals in Late Antiquity the proliferation of Christian architecture ran concurrently with the conversion of the Mediterranean world to such an extent that in the Late Antique mind the two phenomena appear consistently as either the cause or effect or both. The zealous Christians of the Life of Gregory the Wonderworker built churches in celebration of their new faith, whereas the unfortunate missionaries in the Val di Non suffered on the beams of the church they built to bring Christianity to the pagans of that remote area.

The attacks on church buildings during the various Tetrarchic persecutions simultaneously prevented the Christian community’s expression of their Christianity, and limited its ability to expand into the cosmological or “symbolic map” of the Late Antique city and into the cultural and symbolic systems of recent or would-be converts. 101 The role of the church as a point of cosmological grounding made it as important for those

100 For the difficulties with this method see Chapter 4: Mosaics and Meaning.
who sought to convert and influence Christians, as it was to those who had converted and made it an appealing target for the enemies of the Christian order.

2.4. Conclusions

Providing a coherent method for examining Early Christian architecture from a social perspective is a difficult task. A wide array of motivations, both attributed and implied in the ancient sources and the modern historiography, turn to a muddle any effort to determine such tried-and-true historical attributes as individual agency and motive. I have isolated a group of ancient sources and shown how they link church building with conversion as both an event and a process, and proposed that the anti-Christian activities of fourth century emperors provide additional insights into the function of Christian architecture. There appears in both these activities an appreciation of churches as an indispensable feature of a Christian community. The reason for this lies in the importance of the church as a cosmological point of reference. This conclusion is supported by both evidence from liturgical handbooks and from later liturgical commentaries which link ritual to its architectural setting.

This conclusion is quite important for studies of Christianization. A view of Christianization as a process of cultural change operating at the level of social definition, has generated important studies demonstrating the emergence of a new symbolic vocabulary in daily life at the end of antiquity. It has done less, however, to describe the way in which these changes took place. The ancient sources seem to provide a hint. If churches make transcendent reality apparent and visible through the physical
manifestation of proper ordering and cosmology in architecture and ritual, then the construction of churches, particularly in conjunction with conversion, becomes an important mechanism in the construction of Christian culture during Late Antiquity.
3.1. The Architecture of Liturgy in Early Christian Greece

As early as the second century AD there is evidence that the proper organization of the Christian rite was a concern of the church. Books 7-15 of the Didache, which dates to less than a century after the canonical gospels, preserves an outline of the proper procedure for early Christian ritual.102 In the Didascalia Apostolorum of the third century the ritual division of the clergy and laity had manifest itself as a spatial division.103 The clergy was arranged in the east with the bishop and the laity toward the west.104 Further elaboration of these ideas appear in other third century texts, such as the Canonical Letter 11 of Gregory Thaumaturgos. R. Taft summarized briefly a phenomenon that is at the

---


103 P. Bradshaw, The Search, 87-88, 89-92 for a discussion of the also third century Apostolic Traditions which places less emphasis on the proper arrangement of clergy and congregation.

heart of these texts and forms a central theme to this section of the dissertation: the importance of proper order – *taxis* – to the Christian liturgy. This concern ultimately appears in its most potent form in the fourth and fifth century “church orders,” such as the *Apostolic Constitution* and the *Testamentum Domini*.\(^{105}\) In these texts, especially the latter, it is not simply the church hierarchy and ritual which receives attention, but their architectural context as well.

By the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries the idea of a close relationship between architecture and ritual received even more powerful elaboration in the writings of Ps.-Dionysios and Maximos Confessor.\(^{106}\) These authors took the architecture of the church and the liturgy and bound the two together in a sophisticated mystical exegesis which fully integrated the ekphrastic and theological impulses of Late Antiquity. These scholars emphasized the cosmological arrangement of the church building as a kind of foil for the Christian liturgy. For Ps.-Dionysios, in particular, the hierarchical arrangement of access to the Christian liturgy reflected the hierarchical arrangement of heaven in both form and substance. The priest, while performing the liturgy, became the priest at the altar in the same way that Christ was the high priest at the heavenly altar. Thus the priest acquired tremendous authority in the position of mediating between the realm of heaven and the earthly realm, both representing the heavenly hierarchy and


leading those with less privileged access to it. Consequently, proximity to the sacred became an important way to demonstrate rank during the funeral rites, as only priests could be laid-in-state within the chancel barrier, monks immediately outside the barrier, and the laity at some distance. When the many of the ideas of Ps.-Dionysios are brought forth in an exegetical discussion of the liturgy in Maximos Confessor the whole impact of the relationship between the cosmology, the clergy, the liturgy and liturgical space becomes central to his understanding of human salvation. The architecture thus functioned to provide a context in which the liturgy communicated its meaning in an effective way.\(^\text{107}\) This integration of cosmological order, human society, ritual, and architecture, is not, of course, unique to Christian liturgical commentary. Ancient writers in a wide range of genres sought to understand the relationship between the celestial world of the divine and the terrestrial world of human activity. Cosmas Indicopleustes had in the fifth century developed an understanding of Christian geography derived from the shape of the tabernacle of the Old Testament.\(^\text{108}\) Ecclesiastical historians and chroniclers from Eusebius to Socrates Scholasticus to Theophanes shared the idea of cosmic sympathy and linked the events in the political sphere with the relationship between the church and God.\(^\text{109}\) The works of Late Roman architecture and sculpture


appear to have explored these issues as well when they actively worked to demonstrate not only the highly ritualised relationship between visitor and host, but also the *proper* cosmological relationship between the various members of Late Roman society and the divine.\textsuperscript{110} This impulse to synchronize proper social relationships, architecture, ritual, and cosmology appears throughout Late Roman society. It is not at all surprising, then, to discover it in discussions of religious architecture and it has often shaped the interpretation of sacred space in ancient cultures more generally.\textsuperscript{111}

To return to Early Christian basilicas, it is essential that we recognize the highly integrated relationship between ideas of order, ritual, and architecture in Late Antiquity. The following chapter will examine this relationship in the context of Early Christian churches in Greece. The nature of Christian ritual, and the way in which Christian ritual informed and was informed by the architecture of Early Christian basilicas in Greece will be the linchpin to many of the subsequent arguments in this dissertation. At the same time, it is necessary to avoid taking an overly functional approach remembering C. Mango’s word advice “every student of Byzantine architecture should pay the closest attention to the destination of the building he is considering. In so doing, however, he will often discover that form and function do not necessarily go hand and hand.”\textsuperscript{112} This chapter will seek to avoid this pitfall by considering the symbolic and liturgical aspects of Early Christian architecture together. I will also consider the organization of Christian architecture.

\textsuperscript{110} The various studies by B. Kiilerich especially: *The Oblisk base in Constantinople: Court Art and Imperial Ideology.* (Rome 1998), 139-165; H.-P. L’Orange, *Art Form and Civic Life in the Later Roman Empire.* (Princeton 1965); G. Fowden *Empire to Commonwealth,* (Princeton 1993); P. Garnsey and C. Humfress, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World,* (Cambridge 2001), 83-106.


\textsuperscript{112} C. Mango, *Byzantine Architecture,* (Milan 1978), 8, 70-71.
ritual at a very basic level, accepting that the finer points of the Christian liturgy were subject to regional and chronological variation, and that variation in architecture did not necessarily require variation in ritual and vice versa.

3.1.1. Background and Method

The most difficult aspect of the study of Greek architecture and liturgy is the fact that no proper liturgical text exists for Greece. Moreover the Greek church, as part of the province of Illyricum Orientalis, remained under the jurisdiction of Rome until the 8th century, yet was Greek speaking, obscures many of the traditional routes of liturgical influence common to the families of Eastern and Western liturgy. Greek architecture, however, has recognizable parallels throughout the Aegean and Western Asia Minor. Scholars recognizing the distinctive position of Greek churches between East and West, have often sought to demonstrate its unique qualities, and its dependence on traditions from both areas. Until recently, however, the ultimate association of the Greek church with the church in the East has led to a greater effort to find parallels among the churches of the East. While recent scholarship has attempted to demonstrate closer ties between Greek liturgical organization and the West, in the end, the lack of substantial positive evidence for the nature and organization of the Greek liturgy makes any effort highly speculative.

The effort to discover the roots of Greek architecture is as old as the field of Christian archaeology and established now deeply held biases in both scholarly tradition and archaeological practice. The earliest excavators of Greek churches sought to link their architecture to information from known, predominantly Eastern, liturgical texts. G.A. Sotiriou, in many ways the father of Early Christian archaeology in Greece, was among the earliest scholars to observe an apparent relationship between the churches of Greece and a series of liturgical handbooks prepared at the end of antiquity. The most important texts for the study of Greek churches were the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Testamentum Domini*.\(^{114}\) The *Apostolic Constitutions* is an early 4\(^{th}\) century compilation of a number of earlier liturgical texts including the *Didache*, the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, and the *Apostolic Traditions*, a liturgical text typically ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome in the 2\(^{nd}\) century.\(^{115}\) The *Testamentum Domini* is a 5\(^{th}\) century Greek liturgical text preserved in a Syriac translation with a section dedicated to a discussion of the proper architecture of a church. The text itself was assembled from many different sources but the core of this text is also a modified version of the *Apostolic Traditions*.\(^{116}\) While arguments over provenience, date, and final redaction continue to swirl around all these documents, they emerged as the preferred guides to understanding the architecture of Christian churches in Greece. Of particular interest to Sotiriou and many of his successors was the function and development of rooms flanking the apse and their
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\(^{114}\) G. A. Sotiriou, “Αἱ χριστιανικαὶ θῇ βαι τῆς Θεσσαλίας,” *AE* (1929), 40-41; --, *Χριστιανικὴ καὶ Βυζαντινὴ Ἀρχαιολογία* (Athens 1942), 174; --, “Η πρόθεσις καὶ το διακονικὸν ἐν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ,” *Θεολογία* 18 (1940), 76-100.


\(^{116}\) Bradshaw, *The Search*, 95-96.
relationship to annexes adjoining the narthex. He proposed that chambers associated
with the narthex initially served as the prothesis and diakonikon. By the later 6th century,
he argued, they had moved to flank the apse and from this emerged the regular Middle
Byzantine arrangement of pastophoria on either side of the eastern chancel. A. K.
Orlandos followed Sotiriou’s use of the Testamentum Domini and Apostolic Constitutions
in his examination of the churches in Greece, citing both frequently in support of his
identification of various features in the Early Christian basilicas. While relying on
these liturgical texts for his general interpretation of Early Christian churches in Greece,
he also deployed them to argue specifically that the prothesis chamber and diakonikon
initially appeared attached to the narthex of Greek churches. This approach was not
limited to Greek scholars. P. Lemerle adopted a similar approach in his publication of
the Basilica A at Philippi citing primarily Syrian sources in his efforts to explain the
architecture there.

The ideas of Orlandos, Sotiriou and others attained their most sophisticated form
in the hands of D. I. Pallas. Pallas, a prolific and conscientious excavator, felt that newly
excavated material and refined chronologies provided important new insights into the
issues of liturgy and text. He proposed not only that the Testamentum Domini and
Apostolic Constitutions still best illuminated the architecture of Early Christian Greece,
but also that the distribution of the latter text could account for the gradual emergence of
the typical Middle Byzantine pastophoria in certain areas. As it was clear, however, that

---

not all churches in Greece adopted the arrangement of eastern pastophoria recommended in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Pallas suggested that the *Testamentum Domini* preserved an alternate liturgical and architectural tradition promulgated by an author or redactor familiar with the organization of liturgical space in many, but not all, Greek churches.\(^{119}\)

In the few cases when the features in Greece did not accord with descriptions in either the *Apostolic Constitutions* or in the *Testamentum Domini*, Pallas argued that these features either derived from early western influence on the Greek liturgy, such as an initial offertory procession or on developments unique to the Greek liturgical practice, which required features such as his famous “Hellenic type pastophoria.”\(^{120}\)

As with Sotiriou and Orlandos, the majority of Pallas’ emphasis fell on features of the Greek church that presaged the Middle Byzantine arrangement of the sanctuary and a liturgy characterized above all by the Great Entrance, the procession that moved from the northern prothesis chamber to the central bay of the sanctuary or bema. Thus, he sought to emphasize the influences that led to the positioning of the prothesis and diakonikon flanking the main apse.

Amidst the efforts to place the features and development of the architecture of Greek churches in the context of eastern and western liturgy, many scholars also emphasized the unique features associated with the churches of Greece and Illyricum Orientalis more broadly. T. Mathews’ commented on the architecture of Greece in his

---


efforts to distinguish it from the liturgy and architecture of Constantinople in the 5th and 6th centuries. He noted six features which characterized Greek churches: seats for the clergy flanking the altar in addition to the synthronon, an ambo placed off-axis in the nave, a short portico (or solea) preceding the central chancel entrance, prothesis chambers either as pastophoria or annexes off the narthex, a tripartite transept, and high stylobates separating the nave from the aisles.121 He went on to argue that some of these features found their closest parallels in the Western liturgies, although he did not provide any clear examples and in some cases the functions he assigned to these features – such as prothesis in annexes either adjoining the narthex or in eastern pastophoria – reflected his own reliance on the archaeological interpretations of Sotiriou, Orlandos, and Pallas.122

Despite this fact, Mathews observed that the churches of Greece do not show sufficient similarities to the architectural description which appeared in the Testamentum Domini to justify the claims made by Greek scholars and argued that the text, which was likely Syrian in origin, appears to fit better the churches of Southern or Western Syria such as those which have been excavated at Jerash.123 Mathews, however, did not pursue this comparison.

Recently, a new group of scholars, typified by the scholarship of Y. Varalis has begun to re-examine the archaeological evidence to challenge the conclusions of Pallas

121 T. Mathews, The Early Churches, 105-118.
122 T. Mathews, The Early Churches, 120 “Prothesis or offertory rooms are also common in Greece.”; These arguments have been further promulgated by the basic surveys: R. Krautheimer, with S. Ćurčić. Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture. Fourth ed. (New York 1986), 138.
and his predecessors. They have shown quite convincingly that the archaeological evidence alone from Greek churches is not sufficient to establish a detailed reconstruction of the liturgy. Moreover, there is no independent evidence to associate the *Apostolic Constitutions* or *Testamentum Domini* with Greek ecclesiastical architecture. Furthermore, these scholars have challenged on conceptual and archaeological grounds the idea of an evolutionary development of ecclesiastical architecture which ultimately led to the typical Middle Byzantine arrangement of the sanctuary. Finally, the enthusiasm of Pallas, Orlandos and others to identify parts of the church with the liturgical spaces mentioned in the texts led them to overlook inconsistencies in the plans of these buildings which could provide powerful counter arguments against their straightforward theories. The changes in Early Christian buildings, particularly in the sixth and seventh centuries has suggested the emergence of significantly different ritual priorities, such as space for the veneration of martyrs and holy relics, which remain to be explored in detail.

The following chapter will propose a basic shape of an early Christian liturgy while taking into account some of the features unique to Early Christian churches in Greece. It will not deal with all aspects of the Early Christian liturgy in Greece since the function of many features associated with Greek churches is currently under active debate. Consequently, I have not taken the space here to specifically address the
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arguments of Pallas and others, in part because the basis for their arguments is sufficiently flawed to make their conclusions untenable, and in part because others such as Mathews and Varalis have already or are in the process of doing this. Furthermore, the specific arguments that Pallas and others advanced regarding prothesis chambers, diakonika or pastophoria relied on scant or problematic archaeological evidence such as the occasional footings for now-lost “prothesis” tables. Evolutionary models of architectural development are likewise sufficiently under fire as to make their refutation unnecessary, even though the dates for the Early Christian churches of Greece remain too heavily contested to present a powerful counterargument. Finally, future excavations and ongoing studies of Greek churches appears poised to proceed with greater attention to building phases and datable, and these should shed more light on the function of specific spaces within the church. As scholars continue to marshal evidence, it is hopeful that a clearer picture of the function of various rooms in churches will emerge over the course of the next several decades.

Even though the archaeological and literary evidence for Greece limits our discussion of the architecture and liturgy of churches to general points, there remain approaches and conclusions which scholars have yet to make regarding the basic shape of the liturgy in Greece. Several widely held assumptions will form the basis for my conclusions. First, I will assume that the primary function of most churches was to house the liturgy. Thus the most common and basic features in Greek churches were features demanded by the liturgy. Second, there is no evidence to consider the liturgy in the Greek church to be radically different from the liturgies elsewhere in the Mediterranean.

This is one of the basic assumptions favored by comparative liturgiologists like R.F. Taft, and it is rooted in the idea that while liturgies did not develop in an evolutionary pattern, all liturgies in the Mediterranean were in some ways similar and drew on a finite array of possible components, actions, and participants. While Taft emphasized that the strongest similarities exist within liturgies of the same liturgical families, such as Egyptian, West Syrian, or Roman, it follows that the fundamentally regional character of these liturgical families ensured that the primary influences on the liturgy of any given area derive from contact with other liturgical families in neighboring regions. It is therefore essential to consider the liturgy and architecture of Early Christian Greece in the context of liturgies which occur in neighboring areas, such as Italy and, particularly, Constantinople, which exerted a continuous effort to standardize liturgies in the East from at least the fifth century on and perhaps even a century earlier. Since the majority of the basilicas in this study would appear to date to the fifth century at earliest, we should expect that the rites of Constantinople and Rome, the two most powerful nearby sees exerted considerable influence on the shape and structure of the liturgy in the southern Balkans.

I will also use in a number of places the methods advanced by T. Mathews to relate liturgy to architecture in his important study of the Early Christian churches of Constantinople. In concert with Taft’s view that liturgies were broadly related
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128 R. F. Taft, The Byzantine Rite: A Short History (Collegeville 1992), 18-26 would see the first efforts to consolidate and standardize regional liturgical practices in the 4th century.
throughout the Mediterranean basin, Mathews recognized that the fundamental relationship between the requirements of liturgy and church architecture could present important information concerning variation in liturgical practice.\textsuperscript{129} This led Mathews, on the one hand, to view with suspicion earlier efforts to link the liturgical practices of places where significant architectural differences exist, recognizing in particular “the liturgical plans of Greece and Constantinople are sufficiently well distinguished to presuppose some fundamental differences in liturgical observance during the Early Byzantine period.”\textsuperscript{130} The scholarly context of this point bears mentioning. Mathews’ arguments against the parallels between the liturgies in the two churches were directed toward R. Krautheimer who had used the architecture of churches in the Aegean basin to speculate on the liturgy of the capital. He argued, in particular, that the congregation were barred from the central nave in the churches of Constantinople. Mathews was at pains to dismiss this and, in fact, demonstrated conclusively that the laity entered the central nave in Constantinopolitan churches in part because no barriers existed between the aisles and nave in most churches in the capital. Thus, Mathews’ recognition of architectural differences between the two liturgies provided, on the other hand, a key to illuminating the relationship between the liturgy and the architecture in the capital. The

\textsuperscript{129} T. Mathews, \textit{The Early Churches of Constantinople: Liturgy and Architecture}. (University Park, PA 1971), \textit{passim}. For more general discussion and various critiques see: R. Taft, \textit{The Byzantine Rite: A Short History}. (Collegeville, MI 1992), 1-70; H.-J. Schulz, \textit{The Byzantine Liturgy}. Trans. M.J. O’Connell. (New York 1986), 1-35. For more critiques of this method see also: A. Grabar, Rev. of T. Mathews’ \textit{Early Churches of Constantinople}, \textit{CA} 22 (1972), 242-244; C. Strube, Rev. of T. Mathews’ \textit{Early Churches of Constantinople}, \textit{BZ} 67 (1974), 408-413; For a more positive comment see: R. F. Taft, “Quaestiones disputatae: The Skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia and the Entrances of the Liturgy Revisited,” \textit{Oriens Christianus} 82 (1998), 54-58 (53-87) esp. 58 “This does not mean, of course, that every building with an atrium of narthex or galleries or pastophoria housed the same liturgy. \textit{Pace} the common attempts to exaggerate East-West differences, the commonality across the spectrum of Late-Antique liturgy was broad. But it does mean that clear shifts in the arrangement of church space can and sometimes do signal notable shifts in liturgical usage, as I have detailed elsewhere for Byzantium.”
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following analysis will proceed by recognizing that the architectural differences between Greece and Constantinople suggest differences in liturgy. This is not to say, however, that these liturgies were not related, and this too appears in certain similarities in the arrangement of space. By attempting to understand the similarities and differences in the liturgy through the similarities and differences of the architecture, I hope to escape dependence on the liturgical sources of problematic provenience and demonstrate that while the specifics of the liturgy in Greece will remain for the time unknowable, the basic character of the liturgy is preserved in the organization of liturgical space. My examination of the liturgical architecture in Greece will proceed west to east in the church building, from the exterior of the church to the most sacred eastern end.

3.1.2. Atrium and Narthex

The atrium and narthex served an important purpose in Early Christian architecture, particularly in the East. From an architectural perspective both spaces provided buffers or thresholds between the profane world outside the church and the sacred space of Christian ritual. The importance of thresholds, doorways, portals and gates in the context of sacred space has, in recent years, attracted considerable attention particularly among scholars who study later Medieval architecture.131 These studies have sought to understand how the architecture and decoration of these spaces prepared the viewer for the experience of the iconography of the church and mediated between the

sacred and profane. The articulation of this space would have also influenced the rituals that took place there, although scholars have not always recognized the importance of this. Not only, then, did these spaces provide a visual and architectural backdrop to liturgy, but they also shaped liturgical movement and thereby shaped the physical and visual experience of liturgy for the audience. The following section will explore the relationship between the atrium and narthex in the Early Christian architecture and ritual in Greece.

While less than 30 excavated atria make any conclusions tentative, some general observations can be offered regarding their design and role in the liturgy. The Greek atrium was a large court, typically colonnaded on three sides, and most frequently situated to the west of the narthex and main nave of the church. In some cases it provided access to various flanking rooms which may have served the liturgical and practical needs of the clergy and congregation. Occasionally they received decorations ranging from marble paving to mosaic floors to wall painting. The atria of some of the most elaborate churches housed fountains and basins, which likely provided water for ritual ablutions of the faithful as they gathered to enter the church. Despite the
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133 Orlandos, Βασιλική, 94-124; Pallas, “L’édifice culturel chrétien,” 499-517.
134 Brauron, Athens – Asclepieion, Epidaurus, Hermione.
136 Lechaion, Kraneion, Hermione, Nikopolis --B, and Nea Anchialos -- A, B, D, Basilica A at Philippi; Eusebius HE 10.4.40; J. Chrysostom; Paulinus of Nola, Ep. ad. Severus. 32.15; Orlandos, Βασιλική, 110-111; Pallas, “L'édifice culturel chrétien,” 503-504. He argued that the atrium could house pilgrims (see:Procopius, de Aed. 5.6.25 for this), and, regarded the Testamentum Domini’s claim that it could have serve as a place for mass baptisms with scepticism, although he conceded that this may have happened occasionally (see A. Frolow, “le bassin de la Grand basilique de Carigrad,” REG 82 (1969), [89-103], 95-97). There is no evidence for either of these functions in the narthexes of Greece.
prominence of the atrium as the western most architectural space along the east-west axis of a church, many Greek churches lack monumental entrances to the atria. Furthermore, the atrium typically communicated with the narthex through only two narrow, doors offset from the main axis of the building. The lack of a continuous axis projecting from the apse of the church through to the entrance of the atrium is significant for our interpretation of the Greek liturgy and has not been sufficiently emphasized in past studies.137

Throughout the Mediterranean a monumental entrance to the atrium is a visible link between the space inside and outside of the church. Eusebius in his vivid fourth century description of the propylon of the basilica at Tyre described how it engaged the world outside the church by “turning the gaze even of strangers to the faith…so that none might hastily pass by without first having his soul mightily struck by the memory of the former desolation and the wonderous miracle of today.”138 Monumental entrances drew attention to numerous important churches in the Eastern Mediterranean such as the Church of the Holy Sepluchre in Jerusalem, the first Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, the major Christian complex excavated at Jerash and the Basilica A at Philippi.139 It is not their monumentality alone that made for the importance of these propyla. The popularity of liturgical processions throughout the Mediterranean made these entrances essential backdrops to important Christian spectacle.140 The entrances to the atrium
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139 A. Wharton, *Refiguring the Post Classical City: Dura Europos, Jerash, Jerusalem, and Ravenna.* (New York 1995), 66-75. Wharton’s discussion of the monumental entrance to the church at Jerash is particularly emphatic. Philippi’s entrance to the atrium is on the south side owing to the street plan, but it is quite elaborate, see P. Lemerle, *Philippes*, 291-295. Ay. Sophia: Mathews, 89-90.
140 J. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship.* OCA 228 (Rome 1987), 214
would have marked the preliminary destination of liturgical processions, and provided a monumental antecedent for the prayers associated with the liturgical opening of the church.\footnote{C. Strube, \textit{Die westliche Eingangssseite der Kirchen von Konstantinopel in justinianische Zeit}, (Wiesbaden 1973), 102-15; John of Ephesus \textit{HE}, 3.3 tells how crowds flocked to see the clergy enter the churches in Constantinople. For the opening prayers see: R. Taft, \textit{The Byzantine Rite: A Short History}, 33-34.}

Despite their prominence elsewhere only a handful of Greek churches appear to have monumentalized entrances to the atrium.\footnote{The west entrances to the atrium of Basilica B at Nikopolis and Basilica A at Nea Anchialos appears to have been integrated into the street porticos. The western entrance to the basilica at Epidaurus may have included a colonnaded portico as well.} The basilica at the Asclepieion in Athens has only narrow doorways into the atrium. The atrium at the church at Demetrias A was initially accessed only through a narrow corridor with doorways set slightly off axis. Basilica B at Nea Anchialos has small propylon but its placement along the south wall of the church is off-axis from the narrow atrium. Likewise in the basilica at Hermione, a corridor in the south wall of the atrium provides the only direct access from outside the church to the atrium.\footnote{For the lack of axial entrances to the atrium see: Olympia, Argos – Aspis. See also: The north church of the Aliki basilicas on Thasos: J.-P. Sodini, \textit{Aliki II} (Paris 1984), 172-173, and the basilica at Dion: \textit{BCH} 94 (1970), 1060 fig. 368.} The massive Lechaion basilica appears to have lacked an architecturally significant entrance to the atrium entirely and the most elaborate entrance to the church appears to be through a door in the south wall narthex. While the small number of atria with excavated west walls mitigates again making any firm conclusions from these examples, it would appear that axial or monumental entrances to basilicas are uncommon in southern and central Greece. Moreover, it appears almost certain that a dramatic propylon was neither a requirement nor necessarily a priority in the arrangement of even large churches.
The lack of an axial entrance to the atrium de-emphasized in an even more pronounced way the relationship between the access to the church building from outside and the processional orientation of the interior of the building. Moreover, a non-axial entrance to the atrium would have made the access logistically difficult for the large public processions which regularly negotiated the major streets of Late Roman world. It seems unusual that the entrance to the church would have lacked the kind of embellishment common to large public buildings and present along major processional routes in antiquity where broad colonnaded streets and monumental gateways emphasized a sense of passage.\textsuperscript{144} It is possible the lack of a monumental destination in the form of an architecturally elaborate propylon suggests that a public procession may have played a smaller part in the liturgy of Greece than elsewhere, even though we know next to nothing about street grids, processional routes, and stational practices for this area.\textsuperscript{145} The implications of these observations will be discussed more fully in the second part of this chapter.

The lack of a continuous processional axis leading from the exterior of the building to the interior of the church is further emphasized by the lack of an axial entrance from the atrium to the narthex. Most atria in Greece communicated with the narthex through two doors in the east wall which were offset from the central axis and aligned with the north and south colonnades of the atrium. These doors also tended to be

\textsuperscript{144} A. Wharton, \textit{Refiguring the Post-Classical City}, 64-65.
\textsuperscript{145} For a monumental entrance to a palace on a processional route Procopius \textit{De Aed.} 1.10.15-19; Note, however, that by the sixth century triumphal processions through city streets were in decline in the capital (see M. McCormick, \textit{Eternal Victory: Triumphal rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Medieval West}. (Paris 1987), 24, 68. Processional liturgies declined by the seventh, if not earlier, (see. Baldovin, \textit{Urban Character}, 225-226).
This staggered arrangement of entrances would not have only obstructed direct movement between the atrium, the narthex and the central nave, but also obscured the lines of sight further shielding the interior of the nave or aisles from the atrium.\footnote{Snively, “Aspects of Form and Function in the Churches of Stobi,” 522 fig. 1.} The central door in the east wall of the narthex which provided access to the central nave was often monumentalized into a tribelon or, in the case of the Lechaion, a pentabelon.\footnote{Kiato, Stamatas, Spata, Athens – Ilissos, Korinth – Kraneion, Sparta I, Nea Anchialos -- A, B, D, Mytikas. And J. P. Sodini, “Note sur deux variants régionales dans la basilique Grèce ed des Balkans: le tribéon et l’emplacement de l’ambon,” \textit{BCH} 99 (1975) 582-587; Orlandos 147-151, 305-306.} This would have served to emphasize the main axis of the church from the narthex and would have stood in contrast to the solid west wall of the narthex which separated this space from the atrium or the exterior of the church.

This arrangement of space and entrances can shed some light on the opening stages of the liturgy. Two patterns are known for the entry of the clergy into the church. In Constantinople, it would appear that the laity entered the church at the same time as the clerical procession. To facilitate this, the churches had many large doors in the west as well as to the east, north, and south walls. As the clergy performed the opening prayers in the narthex, the people filled the nave to witness the clergy’s initial procession which was later referred to as the “Little Entrance.”\footnote{R. Taft, \textit{The Byzantine Rite}, 33-34; R. F. Taft, “Quaestiones disputatae: The Skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia and the Entrances of the Liturgy Revisited,” \textit{Oriens Christianus} 82 (1998), 59-60 (53-87); T. Mathews, \textit{The Churches of Constantinople}, 138-145; T. Mathews, “An Early Roman Chancel Arrangement and its Liturgical Uses,” \textit{RAC} 38 (1962), 71-95. For Rome also see: L. Bouyer, \textit{Liturgy and Architecture}, 55-62; G. Dix, \textit{The Shape of the Liturgy}, (Glasgow 1945), 120-123; Pallas, “L’édifice culturel chrétien,” 501 noted that atria tend to be particularly common in Ravenna, Istria, Dalmatia, Syria, North Africa, and in the interior of Asia Minor.} In the West, where atria are somewhat less common, the laity entered the church prior to the clergy.\footnote{For example: Demetrias A, Epidauros, Kiato, Brauron.} The reasons
for this are complex and involve the location and time of the rite of prothesis which is obscure in the Greek liturgy. Nevertheless, both systems for admitting the clergy and laity into the church allow the congregation to witness the dramatic initial clerical procession. In fact, the high drama of this clerical procession led to its continual elaboration throughout the Byzantine and Medieval periods, and this has led scholars to argue that the entire architectural arrangement of an Early Christian basilica served to accommodate processions of this very kind.

The architecture of Greek churches provides some clues regarding the order of entry in the Early Christian liturgy in Greece. There is little evidence for a Western style rite of prothesis for churches in Greece. The lack of numerous additional entrances in the north and south walls and the way in which the atrium and narthex communicated in Greek churches made it likely that, if the laity and clergy both entered the church at the start of the liturgy, they use the same entrances into the narthex. This alone eliminates the possibility that the clergy and laity enter the narthex simultaneously. If we accept that it was important, however, that the congregation witnessed the initial procession of the clergy as in most Early Christian liturgies, then the laity must have entered the aisles prior to the clergy entering the nave. For Greece, then, the best solution to this is that the clergy entered the narthex prior to the laity and performed the prayers of entry while the laity passed through the narthex and into the aisles through the northern and southern doors. This fits well with the traditional argument for the function of the atrium as the place where the laity could assemble while the clergy performed the rites of entry in the

---

main church, and it accounts for the unusual arrangement of doors in Early Christian Greece.\(^{153}\)

The primary function of the narthex, then, in this reconstruction was to provide a space for the clergy to say the prayers of entry prior to their procession into the church. This interpretation would fit well even those churches in Greece with double narthexes.\(^{154}\) Orlandos suggested that the exo-narthex served the same function as the eastern portico of the atrium peristyle.\(^{155}\) In churches with a double narthex in addition to an atrium, such as the Lechaion, Brauron, and Kraneion, basilicas, these enclosed outer narthexes could have supplemented the space available for the assembly of the clergy prior to the entry procession. This is in keeping with what Mathews suggested for the double narthex at Ay. Sophia in Constantinople.\(^{156}\) He argued that it served either to accommodate the large number of people who would have either gathered to watch the Imperial liturgy which often would begin in the narthex or to allow the numerous individuals involved in the entry procession to organize themselves. While no church in Greece would have regularly, or perhaps ever, witnessed an Imperial liturgy as in the capital, it is possible that the more elaborate narthex arrangement would have served a similar purpose. Certainly large churches like Lechaion, Kraneion, and Basilica Gamma at Nea Anchialos might have had reason to expand the space reserved for the organization of a large number of clergy who participated in the “Little Entrance.”

---

\(^{152}\) This is contra: Pallas, “Corinthe et Nikopolis,” passim; Pallas, “Monuments et Text,” 37-60; Pallas, “l’Édifice cultuel,” 544-557.

\(^{153}\) Taft, The Byzantine Rite, 33-34; Mathews, Early Churches, 145.

\(^{154}\) Lechaion, Kraneion, Kenchreai, Olympia, Lavirotic Olympus, Eleusis, Brauron and Spata in Attica, Church A on the Island of Kephalos, Nikopolis E, and Nea Anchialos Gamma,

\(^{155}\) Orlandos, Βυζαντινή, 136; The use of the exo-narthex as a place for burials, like in later Byzantine times, seems unsubstantiated by the archaeological evidence.

\(^{156}\) Mathews, Early Churches, 145.
other instances the exo-narthex might have substituted for an atrium in places where space did not permit such a large open space. In the case of Kenchreai, for example, it is possible that the space available for the church within the urban grid made an atrium impossible. The fixed dimensions of the workshop of Pheidias at Olympia might have likewise required an exo-narthex to serve in place of an atrium.157

The claims of Pallas and others for the narthex being the place for catechumens cannot be accepted. Over the last several decades, scholars have undermined any possible reading of evidence for this practice in Constantinople to the extent that is has seriously challenged efforts to make the case for this practice elsewhere.158 Although Pallas, Orlandos, and others have argued that the catechumens stood in the narthex on the basis of Testamentum Domini, the archaeological evidence for this is sparse and difficult to interpret independently.159 While the occasional presence of a bench running along the west wall of the narthex, such as at Hermione and Brauron suggests that individuals witnessed the liturgy from the narthex, it provides no information concerning their identity. Depending on the number of catechumens present in a community the galleries

157 The church at Eleusis might have likewise had limitations based on space. The lack of a clear floor plan and construction sequence for the various walls and doors, including the later western porch, makes it difficult to propose reasons for its unusual arrangement.
159 Pallas, "L'édifice culturel chrétien,” 509-510. The compiler of the Testamentum Domini referred to the narthex as the “house of the catechumens.” Pallas reasoned this was because the term was unknown to him at the time. There is, however, an inscription from Trikala in Northern Greece with the word, “cov νηροθηκαν” in it (ed. pr. A.K Orlandos, ABME, 8 (1955-1956), 119-120); I.Varalis, Ἑ Εὐδοκαση, 28 (cat. no. 576), noted this, and accepts a date in the middle or first half of the 5th century for the floor contemporaneous with Pallas date for the composition of this part of the Testamentum Domini. M. Spiro Critical Corpus of the Mosaic Pavements on the Greek Mainland, (New York 1978), 410-411, who established the date for this floor, noted that the motifs present on it could go later. Orlandos, 136-138. They also relied in part on a canonical letter of Gregory Thaumaturgos, Letter 11, that is now considered
of a church would be better able to accommodate them. There is some evidence to suggest that the number of catechumens in Greece could be quite large since Greece Christianized rather late and, according to Socrates Scholasticus, baptisms only occurred once a year.160

Finally, it is not uncommon for the narthex to provide access to the various ancillary chambers which flank the nave to the north and south. Our poor understanding of the function of these chambers and the fact that only rarely does the narthex provide the only means of access to these rooms, makes it difficult to draw any specific conclusions.161 The narthex, then, is best interpreted, as in Constantinople, as a place for the clergy to assemble and perform the necessary rituals prior to their procession to the chancel area.

The architecture of the western end of Greek churches can, in the end, tell us more about what the liturgy in Greece was not like, than what it was like. The lack of a monumental axial entrance to the atrium suggests that the entrance to the church was not a monumentalized public event. This argues against the presence of public, urban, liturgical processions as Baldovin proposed for elsewhere in the East, and also proposes a weak link between the exterior of the church and the most sacred western end.162 It seems that the atrium represented a liturgically distinct space from the rest of the church.

spurious and later. (C. Mango, The Art of the Byzantine Empire, (Toronto 1986), 25 n. 8 for a brief discussion.)


161 Nemea – Sanctuary, Brauron, Spata, Athens – Ilissos, Kiatro, Epidauros

162 Cf. J.-M., Spieser, “Portes, limites et organisation de l’espace dans les églises paléochrétiennes,” Klio 77 (1995), 433-445 has argued that the point of Early Christian architecture from the door of the church is to draw the individual to the apse. The churches of Greece with their particularly circuitous path from the city to the church suggests that the door itself did not symbolize the link between the city and the sacred, but rather the ritual.
Processions, while they might have organized in the atrium, were unlikely to have passed directly from outside the church in the nave. Furthermore, processions started in the atrium would have either snaked their way through the narthex before entering the main nave or paused there. This again would mitigate against understanding the atrium as an area for prominent liturgical display. This is not to say that the liturgical processions, particularly the lesser or first entrance did not begin in the atrium, but rather to suggest that because the entrance to the narthex from the atrium was not an especially monumentalized event, it was probably not a particularly spectacular one either. It remains likely that the atrium served as a pleasant and protected place for the congregation to gather and perhaps comport themselves properly prior to the service with water and shade, both commodities in the sometimes hot and dry conditions of Greece. The relative lack of integration between the main processional axis of the church, the movements of liturgical spectacle, and the building’s urban context, suggests the liturgy of Greece remained something that took place in the private of the church itself rather than in the public of the streets or even the atrium.

3.1.3. Nave and Aisles

The previous section on the atrium and narthex in Greek churches relies heavily on my interpretation of the function of the nave and aisles. In this matter I have followed the lead of Pallas and Orlandos, although I have not necessarily accepted all their arguments, particularly those based exclusively on the evidence from the Testamentum Domini or other liturgical sources. The architecture and arrangement of liturgical
furnishings such as the ambo and solea can provide important evidence for the organization of both the congregation and clergy in the church. The location of these groups during the Christian liturgy is not only essential to our understanding of the relationship between the clergy and the laity, but also important to understanding how the decorative and epigraphic programs of the church should be interpreted, as will be clear later.

Various barriers between the nave and aisles are characteristic features of the Early Christian churches of Greece. In Greek churches the arcuated nave colonnades often rested on raised stylobates.\textsuperscript{163} Intercolumnar parapet screens usually measuring just under a meter high, complemented the raised stylobates and further obstructed the movement from the nave to aisles.\textsuperscript{164} The evidence for the existence of these marble plaques most often comes from cuttings in the columns of the nave colonnade or their bases.\textsuperscript{165} In a number of better-preserved examples the parapet screens on the elevated stylobate exceeded a meter in height. At times, a difference in the floor level between the nave or aisles also reinforced this barrier.\textsuperscript{166} Unfortunately in most cases it remains difficult to determine whether and where the nave stylobates and in-columnar parapets were interrupted, although occasionally, it appears that there were breaks at the eastern

\textsuperscript{163} Orlandos, \textit{Basilikì}, 264-265; Pallas, “L’édifice cultuel,” 520-521. The height of the stylobates varied considerably from as low as .06 m at the Acheiropoietos in Thessaloniki to .85 m at the church in the workshop of Pheidias at Olympia, but most fell between 0.2 and 0.3 meters. (Glyphada (.14); Distomo (.2); Daphnousia (0.28m); Athens -- Asclepieion (.28); Lechaion -- port(.4); Molaoi I (0.4); Korinth -- Kraneion (.45); Athens -- Erechtheion (0.5); Kainepolis-Kyparissos -- Ay. Petros (.56);

\textsuperscript{164} Sodini, \textit{Aliki II} (Paris 1984), 70-87 for a discussion of the motif on these plaques in the context of the double basilica of Aliki on Thasos. It is often difficult to determine if the plaques belonged to the intercolumniations of the nave or the chancel screen, especially in cases where the chancel screen underwent numerous phases and the plaques may have been reused.

Columns, stylobate blocks, and parapet screens were often removed or altered for re-use in later buildings making it difficult to reconstruct the original arrangement of this part of the church.

Mathews’ approach to the liturgy and architecture of Constantinople provides a point of departure for a discussion of the nave and aisles in the liturgy of Greece. He argued that in the capital one of the essential liturgical considerations for the organization of the nave was the need for a processional path unobstructed by the congregation. The liturgy required that members of the clergy had some freedom of movement in the eastern part of the main nave both during the initial procession and at various times during the service when access to the ambo was necessary. In the Constantinopolitan rite, however, the laity not only entered the church simultaneously, or slightly behind the clergy, but also experienced the liturgy from both the nave and the aisles. Since there were no barriers to obstruct the movement of the congregation between the nave and aisles of most Constantinopolitan churches, it was necessary to have a built solea, a raised pathway protected by low screens to ensure the clergy the necessary freedom of movement between the centrally placed ambo and the bema.

170 Mathews, The Early Churches, 24-25; For the congregation pressing against the solea during the procession of the Gospel see Paul the Silentary, Desc. ambonis, 244-251; S. G. Xydis, “The Chancel Barrier, Solea, and Ambo of Hagia Sophia,” AB 29 (1947), 1-24.
If we continue to accept the assertion that the liturgies of Constantinople and Greece drew on the same basic tradition, particularly in terms of the clerical procession, then the organization of the nave and aisles must accommodate the requirements of the liturgy despite its differences in arrangement. It is seems probable that the nave was intended as processional space. Its monumental entrance, longitudinal organization, and elaborate decoration, made it well suited for the spectacle of procession. The high clerestory rising above the lower aisles and likely pierced with large windows would have filled the nave with light, further serving to highlight the special character of the main axis of the church. Unlike the central nave in Constantinople, the ambo of Greek basilicas is typically offset to the north or south of the axis of the nave and it is not usually linked to the bema area by a solea. The offset ambo would have left the central axis of the nave open for processions, while the lack of a prominent solea suggests that the clergy expected to process through the eastern half of the nave unhindered by the throng of the faithful. Once the service had begun, there was apparently no need to

171 For the main entrance to the nave see: Orlandos, Βασιλική, 139-144; J.-P. Sodini, “Note sur deux variantes régionales dans la basilique Grèce et des Balkans. Le tribèlon et l’emplacement de l’ambon,” BCH 99 (1975), 582-585 [582-587]; V. Vemi, Les chapiteaux ionique à imposte de Grèce à l’époque paléochrétienne. BCH Supp. 17 (Paris 1989), for the use of directional ionic impost capitals which faced east and west to emphasize movement; For mosaic decoration see Chapter 3.

172 If we accept Orlandos highly probable reconstruction: Orlandos, Βασιλική, 378-398

173 Sodini, “Note sur deux variantes régionales”, 585-7; P. Jakobs, Die Früchristlichen Ambone Griechenlands, (Bonn 1987), 30-36. There is currently some debate regarding whether the placement of the ambo reflected a certain region character of the liturgy. Jakobs more comprehensive study of Greek ambos present observations which run counter the conclusions of Sodini. Sodini proposed a far more orderly view of liturgical variation based on the placement of the ambo to either the north or south of the main axis. He drew a line through Boeotia noting that churches to the north of that line had ambos offset to the south of the naves main axis, whereas churches to the south had them offset to the south. This division to Sodini followed the line of jurisdiction between the Bishops of Korinth and those of the Thessaloniki, between whom there is some evidence of conflict during the fifth and sixth centuries. The examples of churches with central ambos in Greece tend to reflect either outside influence (such as in the case of the Lechaion basilica outside of Korinth or the Ay. Nikon on the acropolis of Sparta or late date such as the example of Ay. Sophia in Korone.)

174 There are several well-know examples of churches with prominent soleas on the central axis of the church: Lechaion outside of Korinth, Ay. Sophia at Korone, and the church on the Acropolis of Sparta.
provide the clergy with free access to the ambo during the service. The most likely reason for this is that the congregation stood in the aisles at least during the times in the service when the clergy was in the nave. It seems most probable, in fact, that the congregation stood in the aisles for the majority of the service since the high stylobates and parapet screens which ran along the nave colonnade made access to the nave quite limited.

The placement of the congregation in the aisles and the clergy in the main nave fits well with our reconstruction of the initial stages of the liturgy and the architecture of the west end of the church. The doors from the atrium to the narthex would have facilitated access to the aisles. A central door in the west wall of the narthex was unnecessary since only the clergy would pass from the atrium to the central nave. Moreover, the lack of a central door ensured that the clergy had a protected space to prepare for their entrance to the nave, safe from the bustling entrance of the entering congregation. Thus, not only the organization of the main nave, but the organization of the entire western part of the church suggests that the congregation stood in the aisles of the early Christian basilicas of Greece.

This reconstruction of the principal movements of the Greek liturgy and their relationship to the nave and aisles does not, of course, account for all the possible functions of these spaces. There is much that we do not and cannot interpret in the architecture of Early Christian basilicas in Greece. It is difficult to know, for example, without recourse to the Testamentum Domini or similar texts, whether men and women
stood in separate aisles, although it has long been assumed for the churches of Greece.\textsuperscript{175}

The transepts at the east end of the aisles must likewise remain a mystery despite the scholarly attention that the tripartite transept has received.\textsuperscript{176} It is possible that these spaces facilitated communication between the bema and aisles or that they were reserved for the veneration of relics. It seems clear, whatever their function, that they are not morphologically related to the tripartite sanctuaries of later Byzantine times.\textsuperscript{177} Finally, several churches display second stylobates and barriers parallel to the stylobate of the nave colonnade typically from later phases in the buildings use.\textsuperscript{178} The function of these barriers is not known, although it might reflect a change in the function of the aisles at a later date.\textsuperscript{179}

The liturgy of Early Christian Greece need not be seen as exceptional to accommodate many of the characteristic features of Greek Early Christian architecture. Even without a definitive text or a complete understanding of such important rites as prothesis, it is clear that the basic organization of the Greek basilica served a liturgy not entirely unlike that of Constantinople, but with certain fundamental differences. The narthex and main nave functioned primarily to facilitate a clerical procession, whereas the atrium and the aisles accommodated the faithful. The faithful could not have processed behind the clergy directly into the main nave, as in the capital. Instead they entered the aisles, where they watched as the clergy walked down the nave to the most

\textsuperscript{175} Orlandos, \textit{Βασιλική}, 265; Krautheimer, 159; Pallas, “L’édifice cultuel,” 517-520.
\textsuperscript{177} M. Altripp, \textit{Die Prothesis und ihre Bildausstattung in Byzanz unter besonderer Beruchsichtigung der Denkmuler Griechenlands}. (Frankfort 1998) 5-10.
\textsuperscript{178} See for example the south aisle of the basilica at Kiato.
sacred area of the church around the altar. The architecture and ritual combined at this moment to differentiate the laity as spectator from the clergy as processor, and this, as I will discuss later, represented a powerful division in Late Roman society. The east end of the church, the destination of the clergy, is this area to which I will now turn.

3.1.4. The East End of the Church

The destination of the various processions and ultimately the attention of both the congregation and the clergy is the eastern end of the church. The east end of the church was the focus of Christian ritual and stood diametrically opposed to the less sacred and more public western end of the church. This juxtaposition between the sacred eastern end and the profane or less sacred west had developed early in the theology of Christian architecture, and is paralleled in the organization of the clergy arrayed in the east and the laity who stood in the western part of the church. The segregation of the sacred east from the profane west was further emphasized through architectural features such as the raised bema and the chancel screen. The chancel screen presented an opportunity for sculptural elaboration as did the various pieces of liturgical furnishings from altar tables to secondary tables to basins. Many Greek churches distinguished the position of the clergy architecturally with a synthronon inscribed in the apse and occasional parallel benches arrayed along the north and south sides of the the bema.

179 Y. Varalis, pers. comm. Pointed out the potential significance of these barriers in our understanding of the function of the aisles and changes in Early Christian cult practice in Greece.
180 The spatial arrangement of the clergy and laity was evidently quite early: Didascalia Apostolorum, 2.57-58
Scholars have focused considerable attention on the arrangement of the chancel screen in the east end of the church.\textsuperscript{181} The great difficulty in studying this area comes from the fact that the eastern part of the church is rarely preserved undisturbed. This area of the church frequently underwent numerous changes, some of which are unlikely to have been properly noted by the early excavators. Occasionally the use of the apse and chancel area in later construction destroyed the early Christian chancel entirely.\textsuperscript{182} The limitations of the archaeological evidence are coupled with the ambiguity of the Early Christian liturgy in Greece, a detailed knowledge of the function and arrangement of east end of the Early Christian church in Greece becomes impossible. Even D. Pallas, one of the most careful excavators and observers of the Early Christian basilicas in Greece waivered in his interpretation of the scant evidence from the eastern end of the church. At one point he identified the bases in the bema of early Christian churches the as the supports for “thalassa” basins, and later acknowledged that these may have supported prothesis tables used during an early Western style liturgy.\textsuperscript{183} As with other areas of the church in Greece, I will restrict my analysis to features of the east end which are well attested in a wide array of liturgies or can be explained by a simple variation of liturgical use.

In Greece, the chancel screen typically demarcated the eastern end of the central nave standing either independently or as simply a lateral barrier running between the raised stylobates of the aisle colonnades. It is clear that the main entrance to the chancel was through a central door which was occasionally preceded by a short solea-like porch

\textsuperscript{182} See for example: Spetses--Pityoussa, Kenchreai, Markopoulo, Aigosthena.
projecting into the central nave. Occasionally there are entrances in the north and south side of the chancel screen providing access to narrow corridors running between the free standing chancel barrier and the nave stylobate, but in no cases does the chancel communicate directly with the aisles. The chancel barrier itself is typically preserved only at the stylobate level and as a few broken pieces of the screen itself. In most cases the screen stood roughly the same height as intercolumnar parapets, slightly over a meter when placed on their elevated stylobates. There are some examples where the entire chancel area was elevated a step above the floor of the main church. Thus, the chancel area was separated from the main nave using many of the same strategies employed to separate the main nave from the aisles.

The bema itself housed the clergy and the holy table. The holy table typically stood in the eastern half of the chancel, perhaps covered by a baldichino and standing over a small cross-shaped reliquary. The clergy were typically arrayed in the apse on a synthronon. At its simplest, the synthronon comprised only a low step inscribed in the apse, such as the kind at Brauron or church at the sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea. In more elaborate examples, the synthronon might have a platform for the bishop’s throne at the apex of the apse or even, as in the case of the Lechaion basilica, have a series of niches.

---

183 D.I. Pallas, Ἡ θάλασσα τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν; (Athens 1952); Pallas, “Monuments et texts,” 50 n.6.
184 Korinth – Skoutelas, Kiato, Argos – Aspis, Hermione, Nea Anchialos – A, B, D, Martyrios,
185 Sodini, “Les dispositifs,” 445-447 for example the narrow corridors that run parallel to the chancel screen and nave stylobate found with the PI shaped transept at Basilica Gamma at Nea Anchialos.
186 Kiato, Lechaion – port, Athens – Asclepieion,
188 Particularly visible in the churches around Nea Anchialos in Thessaly, but also present at Brauron and elsewhere, There is little scholarship on these features for Greece. See the general treatment by Orlandos, Βασιλική, 466-468.
presumably for lower clergy flanking that throne. Some churches had additional benches running along the north and south sides of the chancel, possibly for the lower ranks of the clergy, such as readers and deacons. It is clear from the evidence for footings that other tables stood in the chancel area, perhaps so-called secondary tables, or prothesis tables, but their function in the liturgy remains unclear. It is also not uncommon to find basins of various kinds in the eastern end of the church, and these most likely provided water for the ritual ablutions of the priest during various part of the liturgy. Even without detailed information pertaining to the liturgical furnishings at the east end of Greek churches, the chancel barrier, the seats for the clergy, and the holy table emphasized the importance of the rituals which took place there and designated this area as the most sacred in the church.

The central opening of the chancel screen, the axial synthronon, and the placement of the holy table reinforced the powerful longitudinal axis of the early Christian basilica. The barriers, places for the clergy, and the necessary accouterments for the mysterion of the liturgy, created a space that not only fulfilled basic functional requirements for the liturgy, but also presented a symbolic destination and center for the church more generally. The nature of the liturgical sources and archaeological evidence does not permit us to discuss in detail the function of the east end of the church, although the basic arrangement remains clear. It was in the eastern end of the church that the clergy arranged themselves around the ritual and architectural sacred center, the altar, in a

---

189 Central thrones: Korinth -- Kraneion, Kiato, Lechaion – port.
190 Nea Anchialos A, B, D, G, and Martyros; Demetrias B; Theotokou in Thessaly; Nikopolis A, B, D, Spetsae, Skoutela, Epidaurus.
manner that continued to privilege access to the east and the central axis of the church itself. This access to east and the center does not necessarily reflect a strictly functionalist requirement for the liturgy, but it does coincide with the basic symbolic arrangement of the building.

3.2. Liturgy, Space and Order

Christian liturgy in Greece exists only in its broad outlines. Nevertheless, certain characteristic elements appear with sufficient regularity in the architecture to suggest that they exerted an influence on the basic structure of liturgical organization. The close relationship between liturgical and architectural organization in an Early Christian context finds parallels in the desire among Late Antique authors to communicate the principals of *taxis* in a wide array of metaphysical, social, and ritual contexts. The role of Christian ritual and architecture has not, however, been approached in this way, despite the strong interest in ritual studies throughout the twentieth century. The long tradition of liturgiological approaches to Christian ritual, while invaluable to our understanding of its basic form, has emphasized the development of liturgy as the central component to Christian devotional life rather than as an important structuring element in society. I propose that the Christian ritual served as a proactive or formative influence on the way in which basic components of society related. Furthermore, the proliferation of Christian architecture and liturgy enabled the ecclesiastical hierarchy to establish its claims to civic authority through a direct appeal to Christian cosmology. This appeal to cosmological

192 D.I. Pallas, *Ἡ θάλασσα τῶν ἐκκλησίων*; (Athens 1952)
order also formed an important basis for cultural Christianization, as it established reciprocal interaction between Christian liturgy and architecture as central to the mediating ritual between the world of the divine and human existence.

The recent scrutiny of ritual as a heuristic category has worked to come to terms with the relationship between how a ritual works and what a ritual is.\textsuperscript{193} In light of the recent debate, it is necessary to advance a definition of religious ritual that emphasized functional and communicative aspects. First, rituals are repetitive and occur at regular intervals or consistently on specific occasions.\textsuperscript{194} The Christian liturgy, for example, occurred not only on a weekly or daily basis, but also formed an important component of many ritualized rites of passage, such as baptism. Second, religious rituals communicate proper organization by making manifest transcendent reality in human terms.\textsuperscript{195} The authors of liturgical handbooks and texts were clearly aware of this, and the attribution of many liturgical texts to apostolic figures or even Christ himself served to demonstrate the revelatory nature of the divinely ordained arrangements for the sacrament.\textsuperscript{196} Furthermore, commentators on the liturgy from the fifth century on sought to show how ritual was tied directly to the order of the cosmos or the events of divine revelation.

Either of these models ensured that the liturgy as a ritual represented a heterotopic vision


of a profound reality that transcended and informed the ability of humanity to make it manifest in Christian ritual.\textsuperscript{197} Finally, ritual is both informed by its social context and reflects it.\textsuperscript{198} The Christian liturgy, a comparably new ritual in fifth and sixth century Greece, drew upon traditional forms of ritual expression and recombined them with exclusively Christian practices. By recombining, modifying, and embedding traditional forms of ritual practice within an exclusively Christian conceptual framework, they managed to effectively communicate a form of Christian liturgical theology in a way that promoted a broader understanding of the rite’s social significance.

The following study of Early Christian liturgy will consider how it communicated divine order through the interplay between recognizable forms of ritual behavior and their architectural context. My primary focus will be on how Christian ritual in Greece worked to construct the identity of both the clergy and the laity by arranging them in relation to the liturgy and to sacred space within ecclesiastical architecture. As I have noted throughout this dissertation, the link between ritual \textit{taxis} and social \textit{taxis} was already well established by Late Antiquity. Specifically, the cosmological interpretation of the Early Christian liturgy, which had developed by the fifth century, encouraged the interpretation of Christian ritual in way that expanded its meaning far beyond the limits of immediate ritual efficacy. The liturgy communicated its manifold meaning, in part, through church architecture which, in turn, reinforced and preserved the ritual through its relative permanence. The very physicality of the church building enabled it, in effect, to

mediate between the ephemeral nature of any single occasion of the liturgy and the eternal reality expressed by the ritual, and thereby form an essential link between ritual order and social order. Thus the very nature of religious ritual, the traditional social context for its performance, and the cosmological imagery imbedded in Christian liturgical practice constructed through architecture a program of ritual identity that had immediate relevance in the social sphere.

Christian architecture and ritual constructed social identity in three ways. First, Christian ritual manipulated the tradition of procession in order to demonstrate Christian hierarchy and the relationship between the sacred space of the church and the profane world. Second, architectural barriers and rituals of passage worked to frame and emphasize the clergy’s position as mediators between the laity and the divine. Finally, Christian ritual and architecture drew on traditional forms of display, such as processions, to construct an identity for the clergy rooted in new forms of ritual authority, even though many members of this group already hailed from the local or even pan-Mediterranean elite. Christian ritual, and their particular place within it, however, worked to transform the very basis for their elite status and allowed them to claim authority based in both the sacred and secular worlds. This represented the emergence of a new tactic in constructing social identities, and may have been particularly important as the decline of civic paganism and the emergence of Christian ritual limited the opportunities for a local aristocrat without ecclesiastical associations to express his authority in a religious, and, consequently, cosmological level.

3.2.1. Processions and Power

Processions had a long history in Greek ritual, architecture, and art as a form of religious and political display.\(^{199}\) Throughout antiquity religious groups, some quite marginal, would have had processions through cities or to important shrines to publicize the cult and display the number and passion of its adherents.\(^{200}\) With the decline in public paganism in the late fourth and early fifth centuries came the gradual demise of many pagan processions, although it is difficult to determine with precision when this occurred.\(^{201}\) Processions persisted, however, in both secular and religious ritual. In the secular sphere, the imperial *adventus* emerged as a form of procession *par excellence*.\(^{202}\) Imperial triumphs, or the triumphs of rival Germanic kings, continued as well, and periodically filled the colonnaded streets and then the hippodromes of the Mediterranean with cheering crowds.\(^{203}\) Christian processions driven by the importance of stational liturgical practices and, at least in the East, full processional liturgies filled the streets of

---


Mediterranean as well. With the Bishop at its head, Christian congregations and clergy made their way chanting and singing psalms to important sanctuaries both within and outside city walls. The prevalence of these processions, as with the processions of antiquity, led to their popularity in both secular and religious art. The Christian liturgical procession, whether spread in the streets of Mediterranean cities or limited to the nave of the church, operated within a long and active tradition of processional rituals.

There is no surviving evidence for large-scale public Christian processions in southern and central Greece. In fact, as the first part of this chapter argued, there are certain architectural features in Greek churches which recommend against the presence of urban liturgical processions in some areas of Greece. The reasons for this are unclear, but might be related to ongoing tensions between Christian and pagan populations.

Throughout the Mediterranean there is evidence that public processions became opportunities for conflict as religious groups sought to upstage or disrupt the processions of their rivals. Another possible explanation rests in the general decline in urban processions in the later fifth and sixth centuries, perhaps attributable to changes in the character of Late Roman cities or shift in ritual tastes. Finally, J. F. Baldovin has noted that processional liturgies were not especially popular in Rome until the 7th and 8th centuries.

---

205 Mathews, *Clash of Gods*, (Princeton 1993), 150-157 attempts to separate the idea of procession from the idea of “cosmic iconography” in church buildings. This is unnecessary since processions was adapted from Neoplatonic context into the language of Christian cosmology at the same time as processions become increasingly common in art and ritual of 5th and 6th century. Thus, this idea of procession, far from being a concrete practical method for displaying hierarchy, as Mathews claims, is similarly related to ideas of mystical and ritual *taxis*. (see for example A. Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, passim.)
centuries and even then tended to be short and centered in the immediate vicinity of the church and its piazza, as opposed to the evident popularity of liturgical and secular processions in Constantinople and the east.\textsuperscript{209} While the exact liturgical relationship between churches of Greece and Rome is not clear, it is possible that urban processional liturgies were introduced into Greece only rather late. This would, in part, account for the articulation of the atrium and narthex of early Christian basilicas there.

While evidence for the urban context of liturgical processions is problematic, the organization of the interior of the Christian churches of Greece was well suited for processional practices. The monumental size, basilica shape, and decoration present in Greek churches would have likewise emphasized the relationship between liturgical processions and elite ritual. The central nave was typically among the most richly decorated areas of the church adorned with mosaics or other luxury pavements, columns of expensive materials, and elaborately carved impost capitals. Their basilica shape would have also echoed the form of the impressive monumental buildings of the Roman period and contemporary domestic architecture of the elite throughout the eastern Mediterranean. Finally, most public processions were organized according to understandable principles with the important figures appearing either in the front or the back of the procession.\textsuperscript{210} While the details of the clerical procession in Greece remain hazy, it is almost certain that the first or “Little Entrance” would have taken advantage of the widely understood symbolism inherent in processional rituals in antiquity and

\textsuperscript{208} Baldovin, \textit{Urban Character}, 183-184 referred to this as “processional warfare.”
\textsuperscript{209} Baldovin, \textit{Urban Character}, 159-162
\textsuperscript{210} There is considerable evidence that this was the case in a Christian context: Canon 56 of the Council of Laodicea; Justinian, \textit{Novella} 123,4-5; J. Baldovin, \textit{Urban Character}, 210-215; J. Mateos, \textit{La célébration de la parole dans la liturgie Byzantine}, (Rome 1971), 123.
reinforced it through the architecture and decoration of the Early Christian basilica in Greece.

While processions provided an opportunity for clerical display, the presence of raised stylobates and parapet screens, in addition to the columnar screens of the nave colonnade, established physical and visual barriers which defined the positions of the clergy and the laity in relation to sacred space. While the practical and symbolic implications of the physical separation of the clergy and laity should be rather clear, the columnar screen of the nave colonnade also created the visual perspective from which the congregation and the clergy would view the ritual. The nave colonnade encouraged the laity to view the procession from a perpendicular perspective. From the clergy’s position, the nave colonnade screened the laity from the sight and placed the sacred east end of the church at the center of their vision. By screening the laity from the view and presenting the east end of the church as the physical and visual destination of the clergy, it encouraged through the architecture one of the central characteristics of the famed “imperial calm.”

This posture was memorialized in numerous examples of Late Antique sculpture which depicted the emperor and various elites alike with their eyes upturned to God. Furthermore, mosaics showing processing martyrs, such as at St. Apollonare Nuovo in Ravenna and processing emperors, as at San Vitale in the same city, confirm the importance of processions of dignitaries in the context of sacred space. In the same way as mosaics and statues, the clergy’s impassive eastward stare reflected their

\[211\] Amm. Marc. 16.10.2-4. For a sixth century example see: A. Cameron, Flavius Cresconius Corippus, In laudem Iustini minoris libri quattuor (London 1976), 192.
position as mediator between the profane world, from which they processed, and the divine.\textsuperscript{212}

It is worth noting here that, in contrast to the outward gaze of the Justinian and Theodora at San Vitale which finds parallels in later Early Byzantine icons, the clergy in Greece did not engage the lay viewer actively or reciprocally in the process of mediation.\textsuperscript{213} Like the processing emperor, the clergy in Greece stressed their separateness from the laity. The architectural discontinuity between the exterior of the church or the atrium and nave would have already separated the laity from the clergy in a physical way as the limited access to the central nave would have required the clergy to enter the narthex before or after the laity. This was continued as the place of the laity in the aisles and the clergy in the nave would have further divided participants in the processional ritual into the roles of the viewer and the processors by positioning each group with unique and mutually exclusive views. The clergy as it processed down the axis of the main nave would have emphasized its role as the link between the profane world and the sacred space at the east end of the church.

The significance of the divisions enforced by the arrangement of the nave and aisles is perhaps most powerfully articulated within the cosmological dimensions of churches. The physical separation, the difference in ritual activity, and the lack of visual reciprocity would have enforced a dichotomy between the clergy and the laity and presented the clergy in a posture consistent with Late Antique displays of authority. The rigidly maintained divisions between the two groups may have been especially important

\textsuperscript{212} J. Elsner, \textit{Art and the Roman Viewer}. (Cambridge 1995), 223-233; S. MacCormack, \textit{Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity}. (Berkeley 1981), 38, 44-45.

\textsuperscript{213} Elsner, \textit{Art and the Roman Viewer}, 186 “eye contact is mediation.”
in a place like Greece where rival sources of power, such as the curial councils, persisted and Christianization took place quite late. The promotion of the clergy as separate from others encouraged the privileging of their ritual activities, especially in their role as mediators between the sacred world and the profane. If we accept that early Christian ritual architecture was understood in a cosmological way, then the place of the laity at the periphery and the clergy at the center of the sacred axis of the church would have certainly reinforced and imitated a divine order. The positioning of the laity in the aisles of the church placed them at the margins of the axis which provided access to the divine.

3.2.2. The Privilege of Access

Ambrose of Milan’s request that the Emperor Theodosius leave the chancel area of his cathedral church could easily be interpreted as a prelude to the power struggle between the two men.\(^{214}\) The bishop’s request demonstrated how the ritual authority of the bishop during the liturgy transcended even the most powerful source of temporal authority, at least in the see of Milan. While the chancel barrier formed a relatively clear boundary between the place of the clergy and the laity, the churches of Greece framed this barrier within a series of hierarchically organized sacred spaces. The ritualized passage through these spaces not only heightened the anticipation of access to the sacred from a phenomenological perspective, but would have also linked the clergy’s power of

---

\(^{214}\) Socrates, *HE* 7.25.9; N. B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*. (Berkeley 1994), 297-298 interpreted it as a miscommunication between the two bishop and the emperor, but considering Socrates’ interest in “cosmic sympathy” and the ‘Ambrosian’ historiographic tradition from which much of our information about Theodosius come (McLynn, 359-360) is perhaps better interpreted as a clear effort to demonstrate Ambrose’s authority in the sacred sphere and his power to mediate between God and the affairs of the emperor which would come to dominate the relationship between the two men.
mediation with the privilege of access. Furthermore, the deployment of individuals and groups in the various spaces of the church created discrete levels of division among those who participated.

The atrium appears to have existed on the very fringe of the church’s sacred center. The narthex communicated with the atrium, when present, or the exterior of the church through doors situated in the west wall and offset to the north and south of the church’s main axis. This arrangement of doorways barred direct access to the central axis of the nave and separated the path of the clergy from the path of the laity at the start of the liturgy. The entrance to the narthex initially also articulated the existence of two axes in church building – an east-west and a north-south gradient of sacredness radiating out from the east end and the central processional axis of the building respectively. The relationship between this particular articulation of space and the ritual is brought to the fore in T. Mathews’ recent discussion of the idea of convergence in Early Christian art. To return again to the processional mosaics from St. Apollonare Nuovo and San Vitale in Ravenna, Mathews suggested that they reflected the basic idea of convergence in Early Christian art. When combined with the semi-circular half dome in the east, these mosaics demonstrated the total lack of any incongruence between the latitudinal dimension of the medium and the idea of processional motion. While there is little possibility for a true “converging procession” from, say, the aisles of the church toward

---

215 This is a common assumption in the ancient world and is clearly manifest in the articulation of Late Roman domestic architecture, where lines of access and privilege served to establish the authority and influence not only of the master of the house, but also his guests. (S. Ellis, “Power, Architecture, and Décor: How the Late Roman Aristocrat Appeared to his Guest,” in Roman Art in the Private Sphere. E.K. Gazda ed. (Ann Arbor 1991), 117-134.)

216 These two axes of sacredness, hidden by the strong longitudinal arrangement of the nave, suggest the more centrally planned architecture characteristic of the Middle Byzantine period.
the apse, the north and south offset of the doors in the west wall of the narthex complements evidence in other media to suggest an awareness of two architectural and ritual gradients of sacredness radiating from both the east end and the central axis of the church.

The passage from the narthex into the nave and aisles, shows how the two axes of sacred gradient worked to stress the privilege of access accorded to different ranks of individuals. The clergy entered the nave through the central door in the east wall of the narthex. This door received the most monumental treatment, often in the form of a tribelon with elaborate capitals and columns. The central entrance to the main nave was suitable for apotropaic symbols or pious sentiments either inscribed on the easternmost panel of the main nave or on the central panel of the narthex. The inscriptions always faced the west and the expected route of the procession. These sentiments, which will be discussed in greater detail later in this dissertation, almost certainly reflected, in some way, the important prayers spoken by the clergy as they crossed this barrier and processed through the space of the central nave. Like the central procession in general, the crossing of barriers and the act of entering into a more sacred domain provided the moment for mediation and intercession; thus at the same time that the exclusivity of the clergy’s role was reinforced so was their ability to intercede. As the previous section argued, the procession down the central nave toward the chancel screen in the east continued to stress the role of the clergy as mediators between the laity and God by emphasizing both spatially and temporally the privilege of access accorded to the clergy.

217 T. Mathews, *Clash of Gods*, 142-157. These ideas are offered as a challenge to Lehman’s influential interpretation of domed space as representing the celestial sphere.
While it is not known who was allowed access to the chancel area other than the presiding clergy, the lack of communication between the chancel and the aisles would suggest that access to the chancel area was restricted to a single group for the duration of the service. The importance of the chancel area came, of course, as a result of it being the place where the clergy performed the central ritual of the Christian liturgy – where God became manifest in the bread and wine of the communion meal. The barrier, then, distinguished this space from the central nave of the church, in particular, which was used for less central and religiously significant rituals. In Greece the chancel screen appears not to have served a rigorously functional purpose. Unlike Mathews’ proposed function for the chancel screen and solea in Ay. Sophia in Constantinople, which may have physically prevented the throngs of faithful from storming the most sacred area of the church to gain access to its divine rewards or perhaps to the celebrity bishops who presided over the liturgy there. It is impossible to rule out entirely, however, the possibility that in Greece communion was distributed to the faithful over the chancel screen.218 Unlike the crowd-control functions of chancel barriers in Constantinopolitan churches, in Greek churches, where the clergy and clerical movement dominated the central nave, the chancel barrier demarcated an increase in the sacredness of the space from the nave to the area where the highpoint of the Christian ritual would happen. Thus, for example, it architecturally differentiated the readings, which most likely occurred at the ambo, or the initial clerical procession (or any later processions, for that matter) from the mysterion itself, which took place at the altar in the central or eastern part of the

chancel. It would have also distinguished those seated, either on the synthronon or ancillary benches, in the chancel area from those standing or seated elsewhere in the church. Thus the chancel barrier reinforced and monumentalized a ritual reality. Similar to the entrance to the main nave, inscriptions marked the privilege of access to the chancel barrier and, thereby, like at the entrance to the central nave, appear to link access to mediation.

The function of the synthronon and flanking ancillary benches would have been to draw attention to the position of the clergy arrayed at the ritually significant east end of the church. These liturgical furnishings seem to have marked the two gradients of the sacred present in Greek churches and used them to distinguish further any hierarchical divisions within the clergy itself. The synthronon at its most elaborate reserved a space for the episcopal throne at its apex and was complemented by benches in the chancel area. This arrangement would have placed the bishop at the center of the apse flanked by the higher clergy. The lower clergy may have been seated on benches along the north and south sides of the cancel area. The combination of the higher clergy radiating along the apsidal synthronon and joined by lower clergy at the northern and southern borders of the chancel to the west presented the clergy as a rough homology for the arrangement of individuals within the basilica more generally. As the congregation was relegated to the aisles, the lower clergy would sit in positions radiating out along the axis of the church to the north and south. From a ritual perspective, as the laity witnessed the clerical procession from the aisles, it is possible that the lower clergy witnessed the higher clergy during the consecration of the bread and wine to the north and south of the main axis. On
a more practical level, the elevated position of the synthronon further separated the clergy seated there from the clergy on the flanking benches. This would have made the higher clergy who sat there more visible to the congregation and, like the civic magistrates who sat on the elevated dias in a secular basilica, the priest could easily monitor, in at least a symbolic way, the activities in the chancel area. Thus, both separation by elevation and proximity to the axis generated a spatial and social hierarchy in the chancel area, which most likely related to the order of the clergy in the initial procession. While the exact order of the procession itself is impossible to determine, almost every procession in antiquity and every known liturgical procession structured itself with attention to rank constituted through social or ritual privilege. The peripheral seats accorded to the lesser clergy and the centrality of the episcopal throne would have reinforced the order of the procession throughout the service. Moreover, the permanence of the stone or masonry synthronon and the chancel benches would have made the hierarchical arrangement of the eastern end of the church visible even when a Christian liturgy was not taking place. In fact, the emphatic processional axis of the church and its hierarchical meaning would have probably been visible from the exterior of the building as well.

3.3. Conclusion: Constructing the Clergy in Early Christian Architecture and Ritual

The relationship between architecture, ritual, and society in any time or place is  

219 Canon 56 at the Council of Laodicea stipulated that the bishop enter the chancel prior to the clergy. This need not apply for Greece specifically, but it does show that a concern for the proper ordering of a procession was recognized from the 4th century. J. Mateos, La célébration de la parole dans la liturgie Byzantine, (Rome 1971), 123.
never clear cut or easy to define. The interaction between these three aspects of culture depends on myriad factors that make up the social context for the monument and ritual. Placing the ritual and architecture of the Early Christian basilica in the context of Late Roman Greece is difficult since our knowledge of the period and the region is relatively deficient. Certain broad trends are identifiable, however, and shed light on the Christianization process in Greece and the role of Christian architecture in the Eastern Mediterranean in general. First, because there is little evidence in Greece for holy men and we know that the cultural aspects of Christianity appear only rather late in Greece, there is reason to assume that the clergy played an important role in the Christianization of the region. Second, the important role of Christian architecture in conversion narratives suggests that architecture and ritual played an important part in cultural Christianization. The spread of cultural Christianity would have depended on Christian architecture to mediate spatially and temporally between the place of the laity and clergy in the liturgical moment and their place in a world dependent on the sacred for meaning. Finally, the building of a Christian cosmology, an important, if not the essential, component to the basic structure of Early Christian society and culture and the transformation of the ancient world to the Byzantine, manifests itself in the relationship between Christian architecture and Christian ritual. Architecture assumed the role of mediator between the human moment of ritual and the relative permanence of the church building and between the fluidity of ritual practice and the rigidity of architectural form. The architecture of Early Christianity as a participant in the Late Roman discourse on taxis, amplified and projected the ritual taxis of the liturgy on the body of the individual participant and on the body in Late Roman society.
P. Brown has noted that the expansion of liturgy during Late Antiquity coincided with the rise in clerical authority. Bishops’ efforts to incorporate martyr’s graves into episcopal basilicas by associating them spatially and ritually with the divine liturgy, represented the clergy’s efforts to appropriate access to the divine patronage of martyrs.\(^{220}\) A similar effort to appropriate access to the divine through the liturgy occurred when the church was confronted with any source of religious authority outside the control of a liturgically sanctioned authority, such as the charismatic power possessed by the holy man. In these instances the church often endeavored to “liturgicalize” the holy man through either forced enrollment in the clergy or posthumous glorification in a liturgical context.\(^{221}\) In these ways rival sources of Christian authority, whether it be from the charismatic leadership or the wealth and clients of a local aristocrat, were absorbed into a ritual that placed the clergy at the center. This strategy used Christian ritual and architecture to overwrite the social identity of the individual or phenomenon with an identity constructed through the institutional and ritual authority of the church and clergy.

In Greece the liturgy clearly constructed an identity for each participant, from the high clergy who depicted themselves as mediators between the humans and the divine, to the laity whose positions as spectators transformed the act of witnessing from a passive action to one that affirmed privilege. The strongly hierarchical arrangement of Early Christian churches and the relatively rigid relationships between lines of sight and liturgical procession in Greek churches played a significant role in orienting the


participants’ perspective on liturgy and thereby projected a series of familiar spatial and
ritual relationships from the broader context of public ritual to the specific context of the
Christian rite. Simultaneously the arrangement of the church erected a series of physical
and visual barriers which defined the degree of sacredness as it radiated out from the east
end of the church along the processional axis toward the exterior of the building. These
barriers set apart individuals, groups, and ultimately the entire sacred space of the church
stressing the positions of privilege enjoyed by the individuals participating in the liturgy
in various capacities. If we accepted that the expansion of liturgy was related to efforts
of the clergy to define and regularize the relation between the sacred and society, then the
spread of early Christian churches in Greece whose designs emphasized both the
hierarchical aspects of the liturgy and the exclusivity of the Christian ritual might well
reflect a social reality in which the relationship between the sacred and society, and the
clergy and the laity was challenged or remained unclear.

The evidence from other sources for Greece supports this interpretation. It would
seem that the civic councils, often with pagan members, remained a viable source of
power in Greece throughout the fifth and into the sixth centuries. Various pagan
practices, granting individuals access to sacred power outside the control of an
institutionalized authority, may have persisted as well, albeit in an increasingly
clandestine and perhaps even subversive way. The efforts to expand the place of the
liturgy in Christian practice, and concomitantly the institutional authority of the church

and the clergy, would have met in Greece both rival sources of institutional authority and sources of sacred power outside of any institutional control. The clearly delineated spaces and vistas within an Early Christian church would have promoted in the context of the liturgy the role of the clergy as privileged mediators between divine authority and the community. This tactic may have been most effective when it was set against the backdrop of truly monumental Christian architecture, the wealth and iconographic message of its decoration, and, in a broad trans-Mediterranean context, the already substantial political power of the institutional church.

In Greece, however, the institutional authority of Christianity depended, in part, on the spread of Christian architecture and liturgy. Putting aside, for the time, the material and economic symbolism of Early Christian churches, and the more explicit iconographic relationship between decoration and ritual, which I will discuss in chapters four and three respectively, it is clear that the buildings themselves would have communicated certain aspects of the Christian ritual even when liturgy was not taking place. In fact, Christian architecture projected a human ritual onto a monumental scale which exceeded the chronologically limited liturgical moment. From the exterior of the church, the monumental size of Christian architecture juxtaposed the privileged access of the clergy and congregation with the monumentality of Christian ritual space.\(^{224}\) It was...
simultaneously visible on account of its large size, and highly private, thereby promoting the position of those with access without jeopardizing the very nature of the privilege. The interior divisions functioned in a similar way by providing a detailed symbolic guide to the liturgical motion, as segregated spaces and hierarchical furnishings invoked in built form the place of each member of the Christian ritual hierarchy. Thus, architecture complemented and expanded the liturgical moment from the realm of gesture, speech, and motion on the human scale, to a position infused with the visibility and significance provided by monumental space.\textsuperscript{225}

As the architecture made concrete and monumental the motions and divisions implicit in liturgy, it also projected the ritual performed in human time beyond the limited timeframe of the event and its participants. In a sense, while the liturgical moment imitated and made present the moments of Christ’s life and recreated the cosmological order in heaven, Christian architecture lent these events a kind of permanence that approached, from the human perspective, the eternal significance of the events memorialized in the liturgy itself. Even as the clergy mediated between eternal realities and the limited range of human expression, the architecture attempted the same thing in reverse. The timelessness of God appeared in the relative timelessness of architecture.\textsuperscript{226}

The concept of \textit{taxis} as it relates to early Christian architecture, as made clear in the liturgical handbooks and exegetical literature, is the final component to the study of

---

\textsuperscript{225} White, \textit{Building God’s House}, 102-139.

liturgy and space in Early Christian Greece. Numerous media throughout Late Antiquity reflect the necessity and importance of proper order. The interest in achieving or understanding the proper ordering of the cosmos propelled individuals to consider the relationship between human deeds and expression, on the one hand, and heavenly form and the divine will, on the other.227 During Late Antiquity, the organization of liturgy served as an essential touchstone for the emergence of a Christian cosmology in Late Antiquity. The liturgy became a recognizable model, empowered through any number of explicit relationships with the divine order, which could be applied in widely varying contexts and served to communicate divine sanction or even its terrestrial manifestation, clerical authority. On account of this, proper order in the liturgy became not only a matter of ritual propriety, but also a matter of properly expressing the relationship between humanity and the divine. It is inevitable that the cosmological significance of liturgy would carry over to the sphere of ecclesiastical architecture, although this link did not receive its fullest expression until the seventh century. The regimented regularity of Early Christian architecture in Greece, even allowing for the vagaries embedded in the archaeological evidence, regional variation, and uncertain chronologies, represented a conscious effort to reproduce a plan whose meaning must have been formed through its recognizable relationship to ritual and its cosmological implications. The spread of Christian architecture in Greece, then, represented not simply the transfer of an appropriate form, but the transfer of a medium that ensured the proper communication and expression of the social relationships that shaped emerging Christian ideas of

227 H.-P. L’Orange, Art Form and Civic Life in the Later Roman Empire. (Princeton 1965) This is not, of course, an exclusively late antique phenomenon.
hierarchy, privilege, and authority. In Greece, where the authority of both the Christian
God, the institutional church, and the clergy was not absolute, there developed a ritual
and architecture that emphasized the exclusivity of the Christian community, the
privilege of special access, and the authority of the clergy as mediators between the
human and the divine, and broadcast these ideas across space, through their monumental
expression, and time, through the relative permanence of monumental architecture.
CHAPTER 4

MOSAICS AND MEANING

Mosaic floors are the most common form of architectural decoration preserved from late antique Greece. Domestic, public, and ecclesiastical structures received mosaic decoration of varying qualities and styles throughout both the Peloponnesus and central Greece. These floors demonstrate a homogeneity of style and theme to such an extent that it is often difficult to determine the original setting for mosaic decorations found without architectural context. The fact that similar mosaic styles and motifs can appear in very different kinds of buildings points toward a dynamic relationship between iconography and context. The following chapter will consider how the use of mosaic decoration in the context of liturgy worked to communicate social identity, authority, and even values in a Christian setting. To extract this kind of social information from the mosaic floors of Early Christian Greece, however, it is necessary to consider not only the immediate architectural and ritual context for the floors but also the broader social context for the iconography deployed in a Christian setting. This chapter, in particular, will extend my examination of the confluence of aristocratic imagery and the early Church to the iconography of floor mosaics. I will argue that these floors bound the iconography of aristocratic values to the Christian liturgy and the clerical hierarchy by
drawing on motifs with deep roots in aristocratic modes of expression in order to
stimulate a continued intermingling of aristocratic and ecclesiastical authority in Late
Roman Greece.

Scholars have long recognized the similarity of motifs found in domestic, public
and ecclesiastical settings.¹ Most scholars, however, have tended to emphasize the
influence of Christian liturgy and theology in their interpretation of mosaic imagery in a
Christian buildings in their efforts to understand the appearance of “secular” or even
pagan motifs in a Christian context.² They proposed that the best way to understand the
apparent contradiction between the sacred space and the profane iconography was to
view the Christian space and ritual as exerting a “Christianizing” influence over the
fundamental or primary meaning of the motifs. Thus, by reading the mosaic pavements
in their ritual and theological context, the intended exegetical or allegorical interpretation
of the iconography became evident. Cosmological views, such as those advanced by
Pseudo-Dionysios and Maximos Confessor and cosmographical views, influenced by the
likes of Cosmas Indicopleustes, have presented a particularly suitable interpretive
frameworks for teasing a meaning from Early Christian mosaic floors – especially those
which appear to depict scenes associated with the terrestrial world. In other cases
Patristic sources, particularly exegetical works, provided varied and nuanced
interpretations of both natural and secular imagery to produce meaning in even the most

¹ A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins*. (London 1969), 51-54 notes not only the
similarities in mosaic iconography between churches and villas, but also the appearance of the same motifs
in the Great Palace Mosaic of Constantinople; H. Maguire, *Earth and Ocean: The Terrestrial World in
Early Byzantine Art* (University Park, PA 1987) 20-21 included the baths at Antioch and Gaza in his
discussion of Christian cosmographic imagery in Early Byzantine times.
² Recent examples of this approach: P. Donceel-Voûte, *Les pavements des églises Byzantines de Syrie et du
Liban I*. (Louvain-de-Neuve 1988), 492-544; J. Elsner, *Art and the Roman Viewer*, (Cambridge 1995), 221-
245; H. Maguire, *Earth and Ocean*;
mundane iconography. This method of interpretation has often infused the decoration of liturgical space with even richer layers of meaning than the later liturgical commentaries and ekphrastic descriptors proposed. This technique has been specifically applied to certain floors from Greece, particularly the well-preserved mosaics from Basilica A at Nikopolis and the Thyrsos basilica in Tegea.

While this method of reading mosaic floors has demonstrated how relatively mundane imagery can produce powerfully Christian messages in the context of both the liturgy and the exegetical spirit of Late Antiquity, it has tended to downplayed the contribution of traditional aristocratic iconography in imparting meaning to Christian sacred space and ritual. I will argue that there was a reciprocal relationship between ritual and iconography enriched by motifs which were particularly susceptible to polyvalent interpretations drawn from their use in a wide array of contexts. This relationship between meaning and context exerted an important influence on how Early Christian space functioned to affect the phenomenon of cultural Christianization by promoting a dialogue between traditional Roman iconography and values and Christian ritual and liturgical theology.

The mosaics found in the churches of Greece incorporated numerous motifs found in secular contexts. In domestic space, particularly in Late Roman villas, these motifs

---

3 This is not to downplay the traditional interpretation of the roots of so much Early Christian iconography in emperor cult and imperial iconography. See for example the classic treatments the likes of: H.P. L'Orange, *Studien zur Geschichte des spätantiken Porträts*, (Oslo 1933); -- *Studies in the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World*, (Oslo 1953); Otto von Simpson, *Sacred Fortress: Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna*. (Chicago 1948); and A. Grabar, *L’empereur dans l’art byzantin*. (Paris 1936). The recent challenge by T. Mathews, *Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art*. (Princeton 1993) has done much to emphasize the need for a more nuanced approach to the sources of Christian iconography and less to call for its total re-evaluation.
were often arranged to reflect the social values of the patron or owner of the house.\textsuperscript{4} The presence of these same motifs in a religious context becomes more striking when we consider again how Early Christian liturgy drew heavily on the rituals common to a broader Late Antique context. Once we divorce Christian liturgy from a context informed exclusively by Christian terms, and consider Christian ritual as dependent upon and parallel to a whole series of ritualized activities that served to negotiate and construct identity in Late Antiquity, it becomes possible to examine mosaic iconography as another way in which the various members and groups within Christian Greek society communicated social position and rank within the newly constituted group. This is not to replace a Patristic, Christian, allegorical, interpretive paradigm with one informed by Late Roman social or religious values, but rather to suggest that the motifs present in mosaic floors appearing in a secular context, were deemed suitable to communicate ideology in an ecclesiastical context. This phenomenon finds its closest parallels in use of classicizing language in Early Christian literature. Scholars have recognized that the appropriation of Classical learning facilitated the ability of the Christian hierarchy to communicate with aristocratic and imperial authority.\textsuperscript{5} In a similar way, the use of mosaic pavements with conspicuously secular themes allowed for the integration of aristocratic and Christian values in a highly visible context.

This chapter will explore how multivalent meanings present in Early Christian floors enabled the ecclesiastical hierarchy to appropriate symbolism and ultimately the

authority present in the broader “pagan,” “preChristian” or “secular” world. The deployment of motifs from a non-liturgical setting in the context of liturgy ensured that the decoration of Early Christian ritual space drew on the vast resources of symbolism available to Mediterranean society in the same way that Late Antique social ritual served Christian liturgy. The fragmentary nature of the material evidence and its considerable variation in iconography makes it impossible to offer a single comprehensive interpretation of all the floors or all the motifs present. Consequently, I will examine some of the more common motifs and the several of the better-preserved floors. First, however, I will demonstrate generally the interdependency of mosaic decoration and the liturgy in Greece. Then I will argue that certain motifs, commonly found in the context of traditional religion, appear in Early Christian mosaic floors, and the relationship between their placement and the function of the space suggests that their use in Early Christian mosaics was not explicitly different from their use in a more “secular” context. Finally, I will examine closely five figural mosaics from Greece and show how their iconography served to communicate ideas relevant to the construction of identity, authority, and social order in a Christian context.

4.1. The Nature of the Evidence

By themselves the mosaic floors from churches in Greece are fairly resistant to any interpretation or analysis. For nearly 30 of the over 80 mosaics found in Greece our understanding of their original context is somehow incomplete. Many of these floors are

reported and published only as isolated, single panels from an indeterminate architectural context or fragments of mosaic too small to determine their size, subject matter, or context. Often these mosaic fragments come to light beneath the floor of existing churches, as scattered tesserae, or as isolated sections of borders preserved in later phases of construction. Even when the mosaic floors do exist in a defined architectural context, rarely is the entire floor preserved *in situ*. The tendency for later churches to be constructed on the foundations of earlier churches,\(^6\) the practice of digging later graves through the floors of Early Christian basilicas, and the general vagaries of site formation have also made the full preservation of church floors rare. In an effort to mitigate the effect of these serious problems with the evidence, I will try whenever possible to focus my study on better preserved examples with the hope that they might shed some light on the vast array of more problematic evidence.

Compounding these difficulties further is the fact that we do not have much information concerning the wall or ceiling decoration present in these churches beyond the occasional glass tesserae or flakes of plaster indicating the presence of mosaic or fresco decoration on the walls or ceiling. A notable exception to this are the large fragments of an inscribed fresco from the wall of the atrium of Basilica Alpha in Demetrias. They appear to be paraphrases of Old and New Testament passages, and possibly served as captions for pictures showing various Biblical scenes.\(^7\) The few

---

\(^6\) See for example the churches at Aigosthena in southern Attica, Skripou at Orchomenos in Boeotia, or the numerous churches identified as Early Christian on Methana.

examples from other periods and places where mosaic floors exist alongside wall and ceiling decoration suggests that they were to be viewed as a single decorative program.\(^8\) Unfortunate in most cases when we have a some idea of the wall and ceiling decorations, like at the churches at Ravenna or Ay. Demetrios in Thessaloniki, the original floor treatment has long been destroyed. The incomplete nature of the evidence for decorative programs is a rather serious obstacle to interpreting the meaning of any specific decorative element or theme in the basilicas in Greece. In place of despairing this long-standing limitation, I will simply offer tentative conclusions.

Another serious limiting factor on this study is chronology. While this has been discussed in other contexts throughout this dissertation, it is worth returning briefly to the specific problems in establishing chronology for Early Christian floor mosaics. Putting aside the occasional problems with determining whether the floors were part of a building’s original design or part of a subsequent renovation, the date of a mosaic floor has often been considered an important factor in assigning a date to a building. Despite the careful study by pre-eminent scholars there are no established criteria for the relative or absolute chronology for floor mosaics in Greece.\(^9\) The difficulties involved in dating floors are tied both to the inherent limitations of stylistic dating and the lack of


comparanda with fixed dates upon which to base a chronology. There has been a tendency to rely on the development of certain motifs in architecture or decoration to establish a relative chronology. Certain features like aniconic decoration have been deemed characteristic of the earliest Christian floors, particularly those of the 4th and early 5th century. In contrast, two dimensionality in representation, often accompanied by crude workmanship, has been associated with floors from the latest antiquity. Various other motifs, both decorative and iconographic, have served to date mosaics to the half-century, quarter-century, or even decade. Over the last few decades, however, our appreciation of ancient style has become more sophisticated, and scholars have become increasingly attentive to the ancient practices such as archaising and borrowing from diverse sources, and sensitive to the prospects for highly divergent forms of expression to exist concurrently during a single period. Consequently the confidence in stylistic, and largely evolutionary models, for determining relative chronology has eroded, at the same time as more sophisticated methods in the excavation and analysis of finds has held out the prospect for better absolute chronologies. The current ambiguity


11 M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, lxiv-lxv.

12 This kind of analysis has not proceeded without critique: See, J.-P Sodini, Rev. of P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Bull AEEMA 13 (1990-1991), 426-428.

and volatility in our current knowledge of chronology for this period has led me to
analyse the archaeological evidence for the Early Christian period in Greece
synchronically rather than diachronically. The entire early Christian period can only at
this time be studied as a single chronological unit.

Several massive efforts to catalogue the Early Christian mosaics of Greece make
both the opportunities to study them excellent and the relative lack of systematic analysis
surprising. While the floors of Greece are not in as fine a condition as floors from North
Africa or the Levant, the series of published catalogues facilitates study. The 1987
catalogue of P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka is the most recent collection and is more
complete than the earlier studies of J.-P. Sodini and M. Spiro.14 Spiro’s catalogue,
however, continues to provide the most careful discussion of the floors’ archaeological
and architectural contexts and to present the most thoroughly argued justification for the
dates of the floors. Sodini’s article-length compilations are more cursory; however, his
regular contributions to the *BullAIEMA* are a constant source of additional information.

Interpreting the regional context for Greek mosaics below the provincial level
does not appear possible as of yet, since cultural, production, and trade networks for Late
Roman Greece require further study. The exact details of mosaic production remain
unclear, and many of the issues surrounding this matter, such as the existence of pattern
books or the organization of labor, remain actively debated.15 A better understanding of
how mosaics were produced, whether by regional workshops or itinerant craftsmen,
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14 P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα των Παλαιοχριστιανικών Ψηφιδιαστών Λαξεύων της
699-753.
would improve our understanding of cultural, economic, and social relationships in late antique Greece. Efforts to clarify these issues should complement the efforts of scholars working to determine the distribution patterns of locally produced pottery or the organization of masons, for example.

16 For a general discussion of the organization of artisans in Late Antiquity see: J.-P. Sodini, “L’artisanat urbain à l’époque paléochrétiennne (IVe-VIIe s.)” *Ktima* 4 (1979), 71-119. For evidence from elsewhere for the existence of workshops: K. Dunbabin, *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa* (Oxford 1978), 23-30. R. and A. Ovidiah, *Hellenistic, Roman and Early Byzantine Mosaic Pavements in Israel*. (Rome 1987), 181. Thus far, several workshops or itinerant craftsmen have been identified in Greece with some certainty. They seem to have worked mostly in the southern Balkan peninsula with occasional evidence for their work on Crete. These workshops or artisans seem likewise to have decorated both churches and secular buildings, sometimes with remarkably similar motifs. Sodini identified six of these workshops and possible evidence for several groups of itinerant artisans (J.-P. Sodini, “Mosaiques Paléochrétiennes de Greece,” 739-753). The workshop responsible for the spectacular mosaic floor in the church at Delphi appears also to have produced mosaics for what appears to have been a Christian building in Thbes and a large building of uncertain function (basilica?) at Hypati near Lamia (M. Spiro, *Critical Corpus*, 209-210, 232-233, 305). At least two workshops appear to be centered in Argos by 5th century, although the extent of the influence is unclear (G. Äkerström-Hougen, *The Calendar and Hunting Mosaics of the Villa of the Falconer in Argos*. (Stockholm1974), 68-69). One, appears to have been responsible for the earliest phase of the mosaics at Hermione, the floors from Aigosthena, and perhaps even the floors from Epidaurus. The workshop or workshops of Athens is perhaps the best known, and it was responsible for a number of both secular and religious buildings there (Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, *Συντάγμα II*, 9-21). Assimakopoulou-Atzaka speculated that the style of mosaics produced in Athenian workshops had a wide influence over mosaic work elsewhere in Greece (Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, *Συντάγμα II*, 22). Likewise a single workshop constructed the elaborate, late mosaics at the church at Klapsi, the possible bath building at Loutro Hypatis and the church at Elston (J.-P. Sodini, “Mosaiques Paléochrétiennes de Greece: L’atelier de Klapsi et de Loutra Hypatis,” *BCH* 102 (1978), 560-561 (557-561)) Other workshops are likely, such as in Nikopolis and Nea Anchialos on account of the sheer amount of mosaic work they would have provided during the vigorous production of numerous large churches (P. Assimakpoulou-Atzaka, “Early Christian and Byzantine Magnesia,” in P. Hourmouziadis, *Ancient Magnesia*. H. Zigada trans. (Athens 1982), [107-177], 129.) Predictably similar architecture and mosaic styles appear in the immediate vicinity of both of these important Christian urban centers. It is difficult to determine the extent to which a distinct workshop exerted influence as opposed to the influence exerted by a wealthy commercial and administrative center whose elaborate Christian architecture might have encouraged imitation in other smaller centers, independent of the activities by specific workshops. There is some evidence for a more mobile type artisan working in the Peloponnesus and Crete, although their activities do not appear in an ecclesiastical context (R. J. Sweetman, *The Mosaics of Roman and Early Christian Crete*. 2 vols. Unpub. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Nottingham (Nottingham 1999), vol. 2., 439-442.). There are clear stylistic similarities between the mosaics from a large building in Elis and those uncovered in the narthex of an Early Christian basilica near Knossos in Crete. The pavements from a Late Roman villa in Hermione appear similar to those from the basilica at Suña in Crete. In general, the scattered and poorly preserved state of our evidence compounded with the inexact chronology of these floors will limit the conclusions we can draw concerning the direct influence of particular centers, workshops, or groups of artisans on the production of decorative programs in the Peloponnesus and central Greece.
communities will place the decoration of Early Christian basilicas in a far more refined regional context, and perhaps even make available approaches to the study of material culture on the scale of the average late antique individual who would have undoubtedly lived in a very local world. Alongside these efforts, however, basic matters such as determining how certain regularly appearing motifs circulated, whether by pattern books or through personal relationships between a master craftsman and an apprentice, must also be determined. Unfortunately these matters are beyond the scope of this dissertation, but if and when they are resolved, they promise to improve the resolution at which we can study the religious landscape of Late Antique Greece.

4.2. The Relationship between Mosaic Pavement and Liturgy in Greece

While the relationship between mosaic floors and liturgy has long been appreciated, the exact nature of this relationship has never clearly been explicated. This is largely because our understanding of liturgical motion in Early Christian churches is almost always fragmentary, mosaic floors are poorly preserved, and their meanings are difficult to determine. Despite these problems, some mosaic floors do appear to have a discernable relationship to liturgical use as far as it can be determined. The clearest indication of this is that the main nave, the narthex, and the bema areas are the most likely to receive ornamental paving. The aisles, by contrast, only rarely received the same decorative treatment as the main nave, narthex, and bema. While any statistical

---

expression of this tendency would be invalid for numerous reasons, the general pattern of the known location of floors reflects an almost 2 to 1 tendency for naves to be paved over aisles. This practice complements an already pronounced tendency to emphasize the longitudinal symmetry and axis of the building with such features as the longitudinal colonnades flanking the main nave, the tribelon providing an entrance at the west, and an axial apse in the east. Furthermore, the high clerestory, likely pierced by numerous large windows would have provided more light to the central nave than the aisles, making the floor mosaics there appear more visible and dramatic.

The orientation of floor mosaics in churches can rarely provide conclusive evidence for specific patterns of liturgical movement. The only floors that consistently receive the same orientation are those decorating the nave, the main processional pathway of the building. The best examples of this practice come from the Thyrsos basilica at Tegea, the basilica at Delphi, basilica I at Molaoi, Basilica A at Nikopolis and the basilica at Klapsi. In these churches the majority of the figural panels have a clearly western orientation. Inscriptions from naves are also almost always oriented to the west and found along the axis of the floor (Figs.12, 60, 83). The orientation of the mosaics and inscriptions suggests that the processing clergy were the “primary” audience for the floors rather than the congregation, who were relegated to the aisles.

Elsewhere in the church, however, a consistent pattern of mosaic orientation fails to emerge. While the bema often received elaborate pavements, they are rarely figural,

---

19 Reason for the invalidity of statistics: 1. circularity: tendency to consider isolated mosaic panels either nave or narthex mosaics; 2. invalid sample size: very partial collection of mosaic floors; 3. non-random sample: excavators tendency to excavate main naves and bemas more carefully and completely than aisles.
so do not allow a clear assessment of their orientation. Narthex mosaics, likewise, do not present a consistent picture that would establish a firm relationship between mosaic orientation and liturgical motion. Mosaics occurring in transepts, arguably the most

---

21 The very limited information regarding a figural mosaic from the apse of the basilica at Lavriotic Olympus suggests that it faced west as does its inscription which runs along the base of the synthonon. At Klapsi, however, a figural emblema appears to face the north transept. The architecture of the transept and the orientation of the mosaics located there, as I will discuss later, suggests that the liturgy practiced in this church was different from other transept-basilicas in southern and central Greece and seems to reflect influences from western Illyricum in its architectural style and presumably liturgy. (See: R. Krautheimer, with S. Curcić. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*. 4th ed. (New York 1986), 118-119; R. Krautheimer, "S. Pietro in Vincoli and Tripartite Traspept," *PAphS* 84 (1941), 353-429.)

22 The most intriguing narthex mosaic comes from Delphi. This mosaic, among the more elaborate narthex mosaics from Greece, featured a central medallion, now mostly destroyed, flanked to the north by an oblique grid filled with standing birds in profile (fig. 43). Most of the birds appear to stand on a ground oriented toward the south except for three west-facing birds at the northern extent of the mosaic. These three birds would have greeted someone entering the narthex by way of the north entrance; thus it seems likely that they were oriented in such a way as to react to the expected and possibly liturgical movement through this space. The birds oriented to the south, however, should also have reflected an expected pattern of movement in this space. Unfortunately the fragmentary nature of the church’s floor plan and the loss of the southern panels of the mosaic make it difficult to determine the exact path implied by these birds. A similar arrangement of figures can be found in more complete five-panel mosaic from Aigion which might come from a narthex (figs. 1-4). The two northern and two southern panels were designed to be viewed from the central panel. The central panel worked to integrate movement from the north, south, west, and possibly even the east with a cross-shaped design made by a complex guilloche band framing vases with ivy sprouts on the arms of the cross. Eight smaller squares at the corners of the cross and the corners of the panel contained birds oriented east and west. A single bird in the southeast corner is oriented south and no birds are oriented toward the north. The confusion of this southeastern bird does not seem explainable in the otherwise systematically organized mosaic. The principal direction of view, however, for the central panel would be from the west since a fragmentary inscription interrupts the mosaic’s eastern border. At Demetrias Alpha, an inscribed panel at eastern exit of narthex suggests that the proper orientation for viewing was facing the nave of the church. From Nikopolis Alpha a grid pattern contains birds, sea creatures, and vegetal motifs all oriented northward. To the south of this narthex stands an apsidal structure typically interpreted as a prothesis chamber and toward the north stands a two-room baptistery. The narthex may have served as a hallway linking the prothesis to the baptistery, even though the narthex also communicated with the atrium to the west and the nave and aisles to the east. It is appealing to speculate that the north facing birds linked the more commonly used prothesis chamber to the central entrance of the main nave rather than the baptistery which does not have any known liturgical relationship with the prothesis chamber. A similar pattern can be found in the mosaic inscriptions found in the church at Antikyra (fig. 8). There are two inscribed ex-voto panels here. Both near the central panel, one faces west from the tribelon entrance to the main nave and the other faces south, from the northern most part of the southern panel. The badly neglected, and now nearly lost, mosaic floor in the narthex of the basilica Hermione consists of two phases. The first phase, dated from the end of the fourth to the second half of the fifth century, was aniconic and thus unhelpful for determining orientation. Another phase, dating to perhaps as late as the middle of the sixth century, with evidence for coarse repairs even later (end of the 6th century?), consisted of figural panels set into the aniconic fields in the narthex. The central panel of the narthex remained unmodified and aniconic. To the north of the central panel in the narthex, two panels
enigmatic feature of Early Christian churches, do not shed additional light on the use of these spaces either.\textsuperscript{23} Various ancillary chambers, and baptisteries also receive mosaic floors in churches. Ancillary chambers attached to the narthex which scholars have interpret as either diakonika or prothesis chambers are occasionally paved like at the churches of Hermione, Epidauros, Nikopolis Alpha and Delta, and Molai I (figs. 58-61). Baptisteries are paved as well. Over half of the churches with mosaic floors and baptisteries have mosaic floors in the baptisteries. Again, the sample size is small, but the general trend is broadly informative. Like “prothesis” chambers and transepts, rooms with possibly liturgical functions appear to get more elaborate decoration. Nevertheless, the pavements themselves do not allow for conclusions regarding the liturgical movement in Greek churches.

face the western passage from the atrium into the narthex. Immediately to the south of the central panel and oriented eastward is a single panel apparent facing the exit of the south aisle into the narthex. The southernmost figural inset is oriented northward and placed at an entrance into the narthex from a building complex arrayed to the south of the basilica proper. This is the only instance, however, in which a mosaic in the narthex faces the nave or aisles.

\textsuperscript{23}The best known of decorated transepts comes from Basilica Alpha at Nikopolis (figs. 67-68). Here two elaborate, figural emblemata with inscriptions are oriented toward the west. This orientation suggests a connection between the aisles and the transept established through the architecture. The elaborate mosaics at Klapsi in Eurytania cover the floors of the transept arms which terminate in apses like those of the church at Dodona, Paramythia, Dyrrachium or elsewhere along the west coast of Illyricum (for a brief discussion of these churches see: N. Cambi, “Triconch churches on the Eastern Adriatic”\textit{ACIAC} 10.2 (Thessaloniki 1984) 45-54. Varalis, “Deux églises à choeur triconque de l’Illyricum oriental. Observations sur leur type architectural,” \textit{BCH} 123 (1999), 215-218. He noted that for true triconch chancels the function seemed to be liturgical, as opposed to funerary, and influenced in particular by Western practices.). The north transept arm is paved with a grid filled with birds, symbols, including a Solomon’s knot, and marine life. The birds who stand on only the barest indication of ground, appear to be oriented toward the north, as is the mosaic, and inscription, in the north apse of the transept. The south transept is paved with an aniconic pattern and therefore determining the orientation is impossible. The south apse, decorated with a vegetal motif, appears to be oriented toward the south. Thus, the orientation of the decorations in the transept arm of the church at Klapsi suggest a different function from the transept at Nikopolis, although the numerous other inscriptions from the church at Klapsi often have orientations that are not only inconsistent with the architecture, but also inconsistent with orientation of the mosaic decorations they adorn. The mosaics found in the transepts of the Ilissos basilica in Athens, and Nikopolis Epsilon are too poorly published and preserved to give much indication of orientation.
While mosaics were not oriented consistently, the decoration of liturgically important areas of the church appears to have served two purposes. The arrangement demonstrates a desire to provide a suitable setting for liturgy and commemorate it in a perpetual way. The tendency of liturgical space to be paved suggests that any message implied through these floors was to be read in this context. As I have demonstrated earlier in this dissertation, the architecture of liturgy, the liturgical procession, and the act of liturgy itself served to introduce and reinforce social differentiation and the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Late Roman Greece. The presence of additional cultural information, such as exists in floor mosaics, would, as later parts of this chapter will demonstrate, allow the clergy both to communicate with the congregation and to appropriate motifs and their associated ideas for the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Second, it would memorialize the processional character of the space. Like many of the architectural features, the presence of floor mosaics in spaces used for liturgical ritual will ensure that the building, even when not in use as a liturgical structure, was imprinted with the liturgy. The tendency to decoration liturgical space, such as the narthex, the nave, the bema, the apse, and the transept when present seems to coincide with liturgically important areas of the church.

4.3. Magical Mosaics

If we accept, even in the broad terms proposed here, that floor mosaics are related to liturgy, then we must also consider the relationship between their iconography and ritual. While a more detailed analysis of secular or aristocratic imagery present on floor mosaics will conclude this chapter, I intend here to consider some possible religious
imagery present on Late Roman floors. There are three issues which are immediately relevant to any discussion of religious imagery on Early Christian floor mosaics. First, Christian images, drawn either from scriptural or allegory appear quite rarely on floors in Greece. Second, scholars have frequently interpreted aniconic floors in Greece as reflecting a uniquely Christian tendency to avoid natural imagery easily associated with a still-active paganism and, consequently, early, dating to before the first half of the fifth century, and. Third, throughout the Christian period certain symbols associated with popular apotropaic devices and decoration appear on Christian floors. It is curious to note that the aversion to natural symbols for their possible association with paganism does not appear to extend to symbols with established religious meanings. It is possible to suggest that the apprehension felt regarding animal or natural images was preserved for certain forms of paganism most commonly associated with a public and civic authority.

There are few examples of biblical or Christian symbolic imagery on floors. This should perhaps be unsurprising since the idea of placing divine images or symbols on the floor seemed, to some at least, as impious in antiquity as it would today. In the Vita Porphyrii, for example, after the Bishop destroyed the great temple to Zeus at Gaza and built a church on the spot, he paved the church’s atrium with panels from the temple as a form of desecration.24 Nonetheless, there are some few examples of Biblical imagery and Christian symbols on floors elsewhere in the Mediterranean,25 and the practice was

sufficiently widespread to warrant imperial legislation against it. In many cases, it is difficult to determine whether a floor has explicitly Christian imagery or not, since the symbols employed by Christians were rarely exclusive to a Christian context. Crosses, for example, appear on mosaic pavements continuously from the Hellenistic era, and many of the figural images associated with Christianity were adapted from pagan iconography or were intended to be interpreted allegorically. I touch upon some of these issues in the second section of this chapter. The only clear instance of a Christian figural image derived image from the New Testament covered by this dissertation comes from the mosaic floor at Aigion (fig.1). A panel there contains a representation of the Good Shepherd, a favorite Early Christian image associated with New Testament allegories, although, even here, this image type originally derived from pre-Christian depictions of Orpheus. I have already mentioned the fresco inscriptions from Demetrias which suggest that Biblical imagery might have adorned the walls of Early Christian churches in Greece while at the same time been considered unsuitable for floors. As I will discuss more fully in the next chapter, quotations from scripture are rare in the epigraphy of Greece in general, and do not appear on floor mosaics there. The tendency not to decorate the floors of Early Christian churches with Biblical imagery or symbolism drawn from an explicitly Christian symbolic vocabulary made these surfaces available for other forms of display.

26 Codex Just, 1.8.1; Council in Trullo (J.D. Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, XI (Florence, 1765), col. 975, no. 73); H. Brandenburg, “Bellerophon christianus?” Romische Quartalschrift 63 (1968), 49 ff. interpreted this legislation as against the use of the cross in private houses. 27 A. Grabar, Christian Iconography, esp. 1-54; H. Maguire, Earth and Ocean, 17-40; J. Elsner, Art and the Roman Viewer, 275-279. 28 A. Grabar, Christian Iconography, 8-11, 20-23; T. Mathews, Clash of Gods, 68-72; J.B. Friedman, Orpheus in the Middle Ages. (Cambridge 1970).
It is clear that no absolute consensus existed concerning the appropriate subject matter for mosaic floors, and this has caused some consternation among scholars seeking to understand the decorative programs employed in Early Christian churches. Scholars have often viewed the occurrence of aniconic pavements, however, as the key to understanding the distinctive decorative program in the earliest Christian churches in Greece. They have interpreted the absence of natural images on Christian floors as follows: The use of natural images on floor mosaics was not a concern of the first Christian church builders. The mosaics of the church at Aquileia and of the earliest church at Philippi, excavated beneath the octagon,\textsuperscript{29} testify to this as both have images drawn from nature and appear to date from the fourth century. By the end of the fourth century, however, and concurrent with the first wave of stridently anti-pagan legislation issued by Theodosius I, Christians began to shy away from natural images on their floor mosaics and tended toward aniconic floors.\textsuperscript{30} The reason for this, it has been argued, was that nature and by extension natural images remained closely associated with pagan worship and gods. During the final phases of the pagan/Christian rivalry, when relations were the most tense, the inclusion of images associated with paganism ran the risk of blurring the profound and occasionally violent difference between the two groups. Thus, the absence of images on floors served to define Christianity and, for archaeologists, it became a chronological indicator, confirmed by a small number of relatively well-dated aniconic mosaics. When lacking other evidence, scholars dated aniconic floors to the end

\textsuperscript{29} Maguire, “Christians, Pagans, and the Representations of Nature,” 132-136: The mosaic from Philippi was originally interpreted as much later on account of its iconic imagery (see Spiro, \textit{Critical Corpus}, 629-631). Once the name of a bishop, Porphyrius who is thought to be the Bishop who attended the synod at Serdica in 342/3, was uncovered the date was revised to the fourth century. The date of this mosaic floor remains only as secure as the identification of Porphyrius with the fourth century bishop.
of the fourth to the beginning of the fifth century. The church at Epidauros, often considered the earliest Christian basilica in Greece has been dated to the early fifth century largely following this reasoning (figs. 14-16). The early dates assigned to the church at Daphnousia and the baptistery at Amphissa (figs. 5-6) proceed from this logic as well.\(^{31}\) As the fifth century progressed, however, images of nature returned to floor mosaics and remained on them until their gradual decline in popularity during the 7th and 8th centuries.

This argument which has gained wide acceptance, relies on several literary sources that criticise the pagan use of natural images in their rites. Maguire related the aniconic nature of certain floor mosaics to the attacks on paganism and its use nature by certain fourth century Christian writers.\(^{32}\) These attacks were rooted in a belief in the power of *daimones* who tended to the natural images themselves or were represented by the images.\(^{33}\) Thus, Christian criticism was directed against individuals who sought to command this power in the context of pagan rites and pagan practice. The obscure St. Nilus of Sinai provides one of the only passages that specifically criticised the use of images from nature in a Christian context; although it is worth noting that no matter how often this passages is cited to support this argument, nowhere does it refer explicitly to floor mosaics or paganism. When asked:

\(^{31}\) Several churches with aniconic mosaics have been attributed to an early date on the basis of coin finds or careful stratigraphic excavation, such as the two churches at Demetrias. Other churches have received early dates on account of the names found on inscriptions. For examples from elsewhere see: H. Maguire, “Christians, Pagans, and the Representations of Nature,” 131-160.
“whether it be fitting to set up their images in the sanctuary inasmuch as they have borne testimony of Christ by their martyrs’ feats, their labours and their sweat; and fill the walls, those on the right and those on the left, with all kinds of animal hunts so that one might see the snares being stretched on the ground, fleeing animals, such as hares, gazelles and others, while the hunters, eager to capture them pursue them with their dogs; and also nets being lowered into the sea, and every kind of fish being caught and carried on shore by the hands of the fishermen.”

He replied, “I say that it would be childish and infantile to distract the eyes of the faithful with the aforementioned (images).”

In any event, scholars have regarded the aniconic nature of many Early Christian floors of the late 4th and early 5th century as an expression of anti-pagan sentiment.

The difficulty with this, however, is that many aniconic mosaic floors include symbols frequently associated with magic or popular religion. Determining what exactly constitutes magic or popular religion in the ancient world has been at the center of serious academic debate for over a century, and here is not the place to develop a distinctive definition for such a complex phenomenon. Suffice it to say, that outside the pale of public paganism and institutional Christianity existed a whole array of religious practices which alternately competed with and complemented organized cult. Some of these activities, when found to challenge the authority and prestige of institutionalized religion, were branded as “magic” and suppressed. The periodic responses to these shadowy

---

activities seemed to do little to diminish the popular enthusiasm for “magical” or popular means of gaining access to supernatural power. The continuous literary record of efforts to suppress magic reflect its persistence as does the archaeological record which has provided numerous examples of amulets, papyrus spells, inscribed prayers and apotropaic symbols which represented religious practices that sat uneasily at the fringe of “conventional” ancient public cult. Moreover, recent scholarship on the status of magic in Late Antiquity, has suggested that by this period the lines between what some scholars have termed “magic” and Neo-Platonic thought had become so blurred as to make traditional distinctions between academic philosophy, public cult, and “magic” potentially misleading.

Early Christian and Patristic prohibitions against magical rites and popular religion are every bit as well known and vehement as their attacks on the rites practiced by institutional or public paganism. These texts did not prevent H. Maguire following the work of E. Kitzinger from proposing an apotropaic meaning for several symbols which appear regularly on church floors, such as Solomon’s knots, cross-shaped flowers, eight-armed rays, and swastikas. There is no doubt that some of these symbols, such as


eight-, nine-, and twelve-armed rays, and cross-shaped flowers, occur commonly in a magical context, on amulets, magical papyri, and lamellae used presumably in magical rights. Furthermore, he recognized some of these same symbols on the floors from the Southern Balkans such as the baptistery at Héraclée Lyncestis, where a Solomon’s knot is surrounded by a series of concentric, radiating rings. Throughout the Roman period Solomon’s knots, among a whole array of potentially magical symbols, appear in Greece and in both domestic and religious buildings. Traditionally, scholars have dismissed these symbols as decorative, but considering the important meaning of this symbol in other contexts, it seems unlikely. Maguire and Kitzinger have argued that the repeated patterns and combinations of certain important geometric symbols, their association with inscribed prayers, and their appearance at architecturally and liturgically important junctions recommends that these symbols served in a Christian context to attract or ward off the attention and power of divine figures as they had for centuries in a pagan context.

40 E. Kitzinger, “The Threshold of the Holy Shrine: Observations on Floor Mosaics at Antioch and Bethlehem,” in Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten II. P. Granfield and J.A. Jungmann ed. (Munster 1970), 639-647. For an interesting early Roman example from Greece: see: G. Salies, “Römische Mosaiken in Griechenland,” BonnJbb 186 (1986), [241-284]; E. Sulenik, Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece, (London 1934), 44-45 pl. XI. The aniconic mosaic from the Synagogue on Aegina included a double border of Solomon’s knots in swastikas shaped like “whirl like rosettes”. E. R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. vol. 2 (New York 1953), 75-76: It is interesting to note that Goodenough in his magisterial study of Jewish symbolism refers to this symbol as a “design of cross loops” (75), and concludes that “the rosettes and swastikas in the mosaic are used so formally, and in a design apparently constructed so essentially as ornament, that one could not use its elements as evidence of symbols in Judaism, though it would be just as dangerous categorically to deny any symbolic association. For the ivy leaves in the front perhaps a better case could be made as to symbolic intent.” (76 n. 32). The most well-known example of Solomon’s knots in the setting of a synagogue comes from the fourth century phase of the Synagogue at Sardis (for a brief summary and bibliography see: Lee I. Levine, The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years. (New Haven 2000), 242-249. Levine noted the prevalence of aniconic decoration in diaspora synagogues, but noted that at Sardis the aniconic floors contrasted sharply with iconic decorations elsewhere in the building, such as statues of lions and eagles supporting the table from which the torah may have been read.)
There are numerous examples of apotropaic symbols on mosaic floors from southern and central Greece. These symbols find parallels in “pagan” or a “non/pre-Christian” context, and commonly appeared in magical papyri, amulets, and more mundane household objects requiring special protection. They functioned to protect particularly vulnerable spaces like thresholds, entrance halls, city walls, or fortifications.41 Their position on floor mosaics in Greece seems to suggest a similar role for them there. Furthermore, if we accept that the floor mosaics in Greece were tied to liturgical motion which, at least in part, informs the meaning of inscribed sentiments on the floor (see Chapter 5), then it becomes almost unavoidable to suggest that “magical” symbols must relate to liturgy as well. Thus, the Solomon’s knots in the border of the nave mosaic at Epidauros (figs. 14-16) or those in the central panel at Demetrias A (figs. 11-13) are no longer aniconic expressions “innocent” of all possible links to paganism, but symbols of religious power detached from their most common context and appropriated by a new ritual, Christian liturgy, and by a new institutional authority, the Christian clergy.42 While these mosaics could represent an effort to avoid natural


42 Note also, for example, the “eye” motif in the western most panel at Daphnousia in the border immediately inside the entrance to the main nave. A similar appearance of this motif occurs at Demetrias Alpha. At what appears to be the western threshold panel of the first phase of the main nave, a stylised eye motif, a circle inscribed in a rhombus, interrupts the border and likely served to provide protection. See: M. Dickie, “The Fathers of the Church and the Evil Eye,” in Byzantine Magic. H. Maguire ed. (Washington, DC 1995), 9-34; K. Dunbabin and M.W. Dickie, “Invidia rumpantur pectora: The Iconography of Phthonos Invidia in Graeco-Roman Art, JbAChr 26 (1983), 7-37; J. Russel, “The Evil Eye in Early Byzantine Society: Archaeological Evidence from Anemurium in Isauria,” JÖB 32.2 (1982), 539-548; See also the eye motif on the border of the first floor kitchen at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens’ Loring Hall ( for a discussion of the evil eye in Modern Greek culture: C. Stewart, Demons and the Devil: Moral Imagination in Modern Greek Culture, (Princeton 1991), 290-292).
imagery, they certainly cannot be viewed as devoid of religious imagery from outside a Christian context.

It is not possible here to examine every symbol with a possible magical interpretation found on floors in Greece, but a case study of one symbol, Solomon’s knots, will demonstrate how widespread certain motifs could be. First Solomon’s knots are common in southern and central Greece and they appear in what might be interpreted as purely decorative contexts and as well as in contexts that suggest more significant meaning for this symbol. Knot patterns possessed an apotropaic quality throughout antiquity. Knots of various shapes appeared in a wide range of generally apotropaic contexts, from the knot of Hercules appearing on mirrors and fastening the sashes of generals to the knot of Solomon adorning belt buckles and the seals of amphora. E. Kitzinger initially noticed the use of Solomonic knots on floor mosaics in a religious setting and postulated that they served an apotropaic function similar to crosses. In fact, the shape of the Solomon’s knot, with its four arms, might have suggested a cross or even a chi to an appropriately pious Christian. Kitzinger did caution against too adventurous interpretation of these symbols which would result in the opening of the “floodgate of symbolic interpretations of innocent ornaments in late antique art.” The following

study will probably come too close to the obvious perils for Kitzinger’s comfort, but will generally follow the method laid out in his short study and the aforementioned study by H. Maguire. I will place the knot motifs in the context of both the mosaic and the architecture of the building, as well as considering their possible implications in relation to the Christian liturgy.

A close parallel to the panel found in the baptistery at Heraclea Lykestis appears in a partially excavated villa from Argos – a radiating circle surrounds a Solomon’s knot (fig. 7). While the architectural context of the mosaic from Argos is obscure, it appears to come from an entry room which would be a suitable location for an apotropaic symbol. A very similar representation of a Solomon’s knot appears in the north transept arm of the Nea Anchialos Delta (fig. 18) and was surrounded by four pairs of square panels, diagonally opposed, filled with four-pedal flowers, knot patterns, inward-pointed ivy leaves, and “wheels of wave crests.” This part of the church clearly functioned as a funerary annex since several vaulted tombs stood beneath the floor. Tombs were often considered suitable places for apotropaic symbols.

There are several examples from the churches of Greece where Solomon’s knots appear in locations that suggest an apotropaic function. As I have already noted, Solomon’s knots are used in the border of the aniconic mosaic from the nave mosaics from Epidaurus combined with eye-shaped lozenges that might represent stylized eye patterns. The presence of Solomon’s knots on the borders of the nave mosaics probably

---

47 AD 23 (1968), 143-144; BCH 92 (1968), 1040 ff. While the floor plan of the villa in Argos remains somewhat obscure, it is common to find apotropaic symbols in entrance halls.
48 Spiro, Critical Corpus, 363.
served to protect the central processional pathway of the floor. Elsewhere in Greece knot motifs are present in entrance areas. At Basilica Gamma at Nea Anchialos the motif appears both in the border and the main panel of a mosaic from a room that links the basilica proper to the complex of building to the south (fig. 20). In this floor a Solomon’s knot is surrounded by a circle of eight wave crests which could represent a stylised version of an eight-armed ray, a well-known magical symbol. At Aigio in Achaia, Solomon’s knots appear in two rows at the northern and southern extents of the northern panel narthex mosaics (fig. 2). Although the architecture of this church is difficult to interpret, the arrangement of the knots suggests that they guarded progress through the narthex. Solomon’s knots also decorate the first phase of narthex mosaics from the church at Hermione (figs. 44, 46). At Theotokou in Thessaly a panel laid out at the entrance to the main nave consisted of a Solomon’s knot, a star-crossed disk, a tree, and at the center of the threshold, a peacock (fig. 10). In Troeze (fig 10), Distomo (fig. 19), and Antikyra in Boeotia (fig. 8) Solomon’s knots are shown on nave mosaics. At Klapsi (fig. 52), Daphnousia, and Hermione they occur among other designs, images, and symbols at the eastern or central panels of the nave mosaic. This arrangement may have coincided with either the increase in sacredness associated with the eastern end of the church or with the location for certain prayers during the liturgical procession. The central mosaic panel in the nave of Basilica Alpha at Demetrias featured the Solomon’s knot in a repeating pattern, crosses, and a eye-shaped lozenge at what was likely the entrance to the nave in the basilica’s first phase (fig. 11-13). The repeating pattern of

Solomon’s knots, following Maguire’s argument, may have served to intensify the power of the symbol. Finally, the mosaic from the baptistery at Kenchreai, like that from Heraklea Lynkestis, also feature Solomon’s knot patterns. Baptisteries are places where liminality and rites of passage intersect and exorcisms occurred exposing all participants to potential supernatural harm. The baptistery at Amphissa featured eye-shaped lozenges at each door (figs. 5,6). Many other examples of Solomon’s knots, not to mention other symbols common in the context of “magic” appear in the mosaic floors of Greece. Moreover, they appear throughout antiquity on floor mosaics in the Eastern Mediterranean, although most studies treat them only in a cursory manner.

The function of various motifs on the floors of the Early Christian churches is difficult to determine with confidence. Moreover, it is almost certain that each motif or symbol expressed a wide range of ideas simultaneous. Nevertheless it is possible to interpret Early Christian decorative programs in a way which is attentive to regionally specific circumstances. For example, in Greece there is evidence that strong sympathies for paganism persisted long after the start of the fifth century. If the absence of images drawn from nature reflected a hesitancy to allude to certain aspects of paganism, such as public worship and sacrifice of animals or statues, then one would suspect that this practice would persist longer in areas where paganism was slow in giving way to

---

51 Dunbabin, The Mosaics of Roman North Africa, 161-172 has a nice discussion of possible magical allusions from North Africa. She discusses, however, primarily figural expressions of magic, like peacocks and dolphins, or apotropaic scenes, rather than symbols common in the context of ritual magic.
Christianity. Perhaps for Greece it would be better to interpret these floors, particularly those at Daphnousia and Epidauros where the chronology is not at all secure, as regional manifestations of iconoclastic attitudes which existed throughout the history of Early Christianity.\footnote{N. Baynes, \textit{Byzantine Studies and Other Essays}, (London 1955), 116-143, 226-239. P. Brown, “A Dark Age Crisis: Aspects of Iconoclastic Constrovery,” \textit{EHR} 88 (1973), 1-34; R. Cormack, \textit{Writing in Gold}, (London 1985), 1-140.}

The presence of symbols often found in a “magic” or apotropaic context appears to link institutional Christianity, as manifest in monumental architecture and liturgy, with a source and manifestation of supernatural authority outside traditional institutional control. The appropriation of these symbols would serve two distinct purposes. First these signs would have served to protect and mark the church building and the liturgy as special. Their appearance in liminal areas, such as thresholds, entrance halls and in the narthex of the church, follows a pattern similar to the placement of apotropaic symbols in non-Christian contexts.\footnote{The practice of placing Solomon’s knots at crucial points in sacred space continued into the Middle Byzantine period where sacred knots appear on the carved marble door jambs of churches and chancel barriers. E.g. see N.B. Drandakis, \textit{Βυζαντινά Γλυπτά της Μονής} (Athens 2002), 89-91, figs 189 and 191.} The most obvious reason for their deployment in such places is that they would provide protection to the church building at vulnerable points such as entrances or in places where the sacred and the profane come into close contact.\footnote{E.D. Maguire, H. Maguire, and M.J. Duncan-Flowers, \textit{Art and Holy Powers in the Early Christian House}, (Urbana 1989), 1-33; V. Turner, “Variations on a Theme of Liminality,” in Blazing a Trail, ed. E. Turner (Tucson 1992), [48-65], 59. Turner would likely view this as either a kind of “normative communitas” or, if in fact, the early Christian liturgy was largely post-liminal or liminoid, this might have reflected a kind of “ideological communitas.”}

Solomon’s knots served to protect material objects in a domestic setting and appear regularly at the entrances to houses and on storage containers such as amphora. These symbols, however, may not have served exclusively to ward off powers potentially
detrimental to the church building itself. They may have also worked to attract supernatural attention and protection to the Christian ritual. Maguire has noted a parallel between the decoration of mosaics and the decoration of liturgical vestments which were likely designed to attract divine attention.\(^56\) The use of apotropaic symbols may have also functioned to communicate important breaks in the ritual space of the church. Space was divided in early Christian church in numerous way, some of which we have already discussed, such as architectural barriers and breaks in mosaic decoration. Apotropaic symbols, which served to guard important transitions in other contexts, may have marked changes in the nature of ritual space within the church. This includes changes in the degree of sacredness which would have also been marked by certain prayers and often, although not always by architectural features. The churches at Hermione, Daphnousia, and Klapsi, for example, have aniconic panels arranged in the central nave. In each case, the middle or eastern panel consisted of a complex grid enclosing a series of symbols, such as four-petal flowers, crosses, and Solomon’s knots. Perhaps these apotropaic symbols functioned to protect or draw attention to the liturgical procession as it paused in the center of the main nave to utter certain prayers or approached the chancel area. The divisions created through ritual, architecture, and decoration would have emphasized the clergy’s procession in the nave, and their position as mediators between a profane world and a protected sacred space inhabited and structured by God. Thus, apotropeia in a Christian context did more than simply protect sacred space, they served, along with architecture and ritual, to mark off sacred space from the everyday space of the profane world.

The use of these images in a Christian context would have also served to appropriate these symbols and institutionalise them. Like various aspects of ritual and forms of decoration, the presence of “magic” symbols in an institutional context, especially when combined with the repression of magical practices in the population at large contributed to the “Christianization” of another aspect of ancient culture. Scholars have paid considerable attention to such phenomena as the ordination of desert holy men who often continued age old practices of ascetic devotion and dwelt on the absolute fringes of ecclesiastical control.57 This appropriation of symbolism associated with popular religious attitudes could be seen in a similar light. The association of non- or pre-Christian symbols with the institutional church would have further promoted an understanding of the world in exclusively Christian terms.

The conflict between paganism and Christianity certainly occurred during antiquity and sometimes manifest itself in a violent way. While the evidence for such violent conflicts in Greece remains in dispute, the idea of a violent clash remains capable of dominating the imagination of even the most wary scholars and threatens to produce a binary understanding of ancient religion that belies the complexity of ancient religious life.58 The appearance of apotropaic symbols in the church floors of Greece represents an important example of how clear cut divisions between popular religion, magic, and Christian practice stand forth more distinctly in the world of Patristic rhetoric and modern scholarship than in the world of Late Antique practice. The realization that there may

1995), 51-72.
have been a complicated interplay between various forms of religious expression in antiquity suggests a more complex interpretation than provided by the arguments of Kitzinger and others to explain the avoidance of natural images in certain Christian floor mosaics. Perhaps some groups within Christianity sought to avoid images associated with the rival institutions of civic paganism and their strong association with public sacrifice. The symbols of popular religion, or magic, such as Solomon’s knots, did not carry with them the same strong associations with a source of institutional authority, and therefore could be appropriated with less risk and perhaps greater benefit. It is also possible that the aniconic floors found in Greece represented groups of Christians who like Nilus of Sinai preferred an aniconic decoration out of an attitude rooted in a kind of asceticism which appeared to have little to do with the fear of daimonic powers linked to images of nature.

4.4. Figural Mosaics in a Social Context

The social interpretation of mosaic floors has become a favorite subject in recent studies of Roman villas. Scholars who have examined mosaics in a domestic context have argued that the iconography and placement of the mosaics served to construct the identity of their patron. In many cases the iconography of these floors became a barometer of Romanization, as Roman ideology and values intermingled with traditional

expressions of civic, martial and individual virtue. The idea that mosaics worked to emphasize particular characteristics of the owner or patron depended on the rituals involved in the domestic display and everyday life. Closely allied to studies of domestic space and ritual in Italy, the studies of mosaics from Roman and Late Roman villas have been largely successful in demonstrating how aristocratic domestic ritual and decoration identified the patron with values which were essentially parallel to those developed in elite literature of the time.60 I contend that the transfer of certain elements of elite iconography to an ecclesiastical context embedded familiar aristocratic values in the very substance of the Christian late antique liturgy the same way that paideia helped to establish the ecclesiastical hierarchy as rightful participants in the aristocratic discourse. Early Christian liturgy, especially in its function as cosmology building through long established rituals of social differentiation, appropriated the iconography of social privilege for the expression of Christian social order. Moreover, this was done in a way that communicated the message of the new faith in a medium both well-established in the material context of Late Roman Greece and traditionally reserved for the local elite who persisted in Greece as a rival source of civic and perhaps even religious authority.

The following interpretive essay will focus on five floors: Delphi, the Thyrsos Basilica at Tegea, Basilica A at Nikopolis, Klapsi in Eurytania, and Basilica I at Molaoi in Laconia. The context for their analysis will be that of local iconography, and the social significance embedded in the use of motifs common to an elite setting in an ecclesiastical context. Despite the difference in theme and composition, it is my argument that these

60 G. Bowersock, Hellenism in Late Antiquity. (Ann Arbor 1990); P. Brown, Power and Persuasion, passim; B. Leyerle, Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives, (Los Angeles 2001), 1-6. who juxtaposed an
floors produce social meaning through complex, polyvalent, symbolism common to a wide range of architectural, ritual, and social contexts in Greece. By focusing primarily on the themes of the large figural panels rather than the inhabited grids found commonly in the same floors or the geometric designs discussed in the first section of this chapter, this section will target motifs or themes prominent both in the liturgical and iconographic context of the specific floor and in the culture more generally. The central position of the panels that this chapter intends to examine, recommends against interpreting them as merely decorative and will show how even the central motif of mosaic floors from an early Christian liturgical context participated in a cultural discourse that went beyond the interpretive framework provided by Biblical allusions and Patristic texts.

4.4.1. *Earth, Ocean, Games, and Months – Christian Time, Space, and Authority*

The floor at Delphi will be the point of departure for the first part of the following discussion as it integrated two motifs common to an aristocratic context throughout the Mediterranean: scenes of violence and the personification of the months. Aspects of these motifs also appear in the iconography employed in Tegea and at Nikopolis Alpha. The iconography of these three churches demonstrate how aristocratic motifs utilized in a Christian setting can be read in a way not entirely inappropriate or incompatible with the goals of the emerging Christian hierarchy in Greece, even if interpretations specific to their liturgical context draw from the realm of Late Antique theology.

Antiochene mosaic depicting a personification of Megalopsychia with John Chrysostom’s preaching on theatres, and other evils rooted in traditional civic acts of munificence and values.
The church excavated beneath the Hotel Apollo in the village of Kastri near Delphi, contained a mosaic which has similar characteristics not only to the Thrysos basilica at Tegea, but also the floors uncovered at Thebes and in Thessaly. The most dramatic mosaics are from the central nave. The west panel, closest to the entrance to the nave from the narthex, has at its center a round emblema depicting a deer in the clutches of a pouncing panther (figs 36, 38). Peacocks surround the emblema at the cardinal points and eagles at the corners (figs. 36, 37). In the northwest and northeaster points of the panel are depictions of two months rushing toward the center panel inscribed with the letters “KA” and “KAI” respectively (figs 40, 41).

The western panel of the nave mosaic at Delphi presents some difficulty for an interpretation based strictly on patristic or Christian iconography. The presence of peacocks, regularly associated with eternal life, and eagles, which are identified with immortality or the resurrection of the soul, appear to complement the possible funerary tone of the nave inscription and would be appropriate imagery for a funerary church.\(^{61}\) In contrast, the presence of only four isolated in-rushing months, which I will discuss in some detail later, has no precedent in the mosaic pavements of Greece.\(^ {62}\) Furthermore, the central emblema, a dramatic and violent scene of a panther and deer, offers no immediate explanation in Christian literature. The rather one-sided struggle could be the struggle of the soul against temptation, or the seizure of the soul from the world of the

---


\(^{62}\) Rushing months have been treated see: M. Spiro, “Representations of Months and Seasons,” *BullAIEMA* 7 (1978), 262-263.
living, as deer are often thought to represent the soul in a Christian context.63 Neither explanation is completely satisfactory, however, nor receives much confirmation in Patristic texts.

Viewing the central panel in the context of aristocratic art rather than Christian exegesis provides an alternative explanation for the theme of the mosaic. Since the panther involved in the violent central emblema is an exotic animal, this panel might best be interpreted as an allusion to games in the amphitheatre. It seems likely that the theatre at Delphi was modified at some point, like many Greek theatres, to accommodate animal combats, so an allusion to staged animal combats would be relevant to the local audience.64 Versions of this motif appear in mosaics from Chios, Cos and Cyprus.65 The best example, however, for a depiction of an arena combat between animals comes from the central emblema of a third century mosaic from a bath at Philippi. Here a tiger cat strides triumphantly away from a decapitated donkey carrying the victim’s head in its mouth.66 A theatre or circus theme would not be inherently out of character for a floor mosaic, since we know that Early Christian writers drew on imagery from staged combat in their writings, but animal combats are not, to my knowledge, attested in an allegorical text.67

63 D. Levi, Antioch Mosaic Pavements, 326-343. Levi’s interpretation of the numerous hunting panels at Antioch as allegories for victory, generosity, and moral triumph has been particularly influential in the interpretation of almost any mosaic depicting combat especially if they come from a Christian context.
66 Waywell, “Roman Mosaics in Greece,” AJA 83 (1979), 301-302 (no. 41). It is interesting to note that this mid 3rd century mosaic also included peacocks and birds as well as animals in combat.
67 Prudentius, Psychomachia, is perhaps the best-known example of this.
The large figural mosaics in the south transept wings of Nikopolis Alpha can shed additional light on the mosaic at Delphi, since it too offers a scenes likely derived from depictions of arena contests. Maguire and Kitzinger have both discussed the mosaics from the north transept arm of this basilica in detail. The large central panel facing the west consists of an elaborate landscape with trees, waterfowl and large birds (fig. 67). A long inscription praising the Bishop Doumetios, the mosaics, and the building, which I will discuss in next chapter, occupied the western part of the central panel. The entire panel is surrounded by five complex borders, the most striking of which is filled with marine creatures and fishermen engaged in various forms of fishing, including fishing with a pole, a harpoon, and a hand line. An inscription seems to identify this scene with the earth in the center and the marine border as the earth surrounded by the ocean (Ep. Cat. 21). The south arm of the transept is not as well preserved. The central panel, now largely lost, depicted two soldiers dressed in tunics and boots, carrying spears, and accompanied by a dog (fig. 68). They appear to walk toward a tree. Originally they were named in an inscription which is now badly damaged. This central panel of the south arm is surrounded by three borders of which the third border will concern us here. It shows a vine rinceau encircling figures hunting wild animals (fig 69-74). The rinceau forms 16 circles each enclosing either a single, semi-nude hunter or a single wild animal depicted sometimes only in part. In many cases the hunter has thrust his spear forward into an animal who, in turn, snarls and paws the air. The only exceptions come from two circles which depict a hunter wielding a sword and a helpless, brightly-colored cock. The
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entire mosaic is done in brilliant polychrome tesserae. The elaborate mosaics and inscriptions praising the bishop Doumetios suggest that this building may be the cathedral for Nikopolis, or at least among the more important churches in the city.69

Kitzinger has advanced the most complete interpretation of these pavements.70 The vine rinceau boarding the mosaic in the south transept is dedicated to hunting themes. Kitzinger argued that the nude figures are idealized hunters, since nudity, such as in the case of cupids, can represent a celestial character, and the entire scene might depict an idealized, staged hunt. A mosaic with a similar theme was uncovered around the peristyle of a villa in Megalopolis in the early 1970s.71 In a gird of octagons linked with a meander pattern, chubby, naked and half-naked, young boys frolic and play (figs. 63-65). Many are armed with spears and shields, and wear capes. Several appear to hunt animals in other panels. Dunbabin in her discussion of such mosaics depicting children as hunters in North African mosaics considered these in some cases parodies of the more serious amphitheatre hunting mosaics and in some cases “realistic” depictions of circus shows.72 She suggested that these mosaics might well “portray real performances put on by children. It is highly likely that aristocratic children indulged in this sort of bloody sport, and that it would have appealed to Roman taste to put on displays where the participants were children. Perhaps we have in these mosaics another example of a workshop adapting and altering established designs to commemorate some special

71 Assimakopolou-Atzaka, *Συντάγμα II*, 74-77 no. 17.
interest of the patron or activity of his family.\textsuperscript{73} The probable public nature of a villa’s central peristyle made it an appropriate location for the depiction of an aristocratic pursuit such as hunting, even if it was in an idealized way.\textsuperscript{74} Moreover, hunting was a common theme of floor mosaics from all periods, and there are examples from various contexts from Late Roman Greece such as the Villa of the Falconer (figs. 27, 28). If these nude or semi-nude figures represented idealized circus type hunts, then they might have also alluded to certain civic values such as munificence which existed at the core of the aristocratic ethos.\textsuperscript{75}

The identification of the hunting figures in the border of Nikopolis Alpha as depicting a circus scene led Kitzinger to interpret the two standing figures in the central panel, who were fully armed, as less-idealized, victorious \textit{venatores}. Unfortunately a \textit{tabula ansata} inscription between the two figures is hopelessly fragmentary, so while an exact identification may have been intended, it is unrecoverable. He then proposed that this panel can only be understood if juxtaposed to the earth and ocean scene from the north transept. If the mosaics in the north transept seem to represent the terrestrial world, as the inscription would imply, then the south panel must represent the heavenly realm.\textsuperscript{76}

As at Delphi the animal fights from the circus may have stood for the human struggle


\textsuperscript{76} E. Kitzinger, “Studies on Late Antique and Early Byzantine Floor Mosaics,” 108-120. This is an inversion of the tradition view of paradise and earth as proposed by A. Grabar, “Recerches sur les sources juives de l’art paléochrétien,” \textit{CA} 11 (1960), 41-71. (Donceel-Voûte, \textit{Les pavements des églises Byzantines de Syrie et du Liban I}, 485-489). From the mosaic in the north church at Haouarté, Adam looks over a peaceful Edenic paradise in the central nave, while the aisles depict the earth and man and are populated
against sin and temptation and the victorious *venatores* represented the possibility of an ultimate triumph in the struggle. This reading allowed Kitzinger to suggest that the victorious *venatores* were none other than Elijah and Enoch, the first two human occupants of the heavenly realm. While the precise theological or cosmological message intended by the mosaics at Nikopolis, like those at Delphi, remains obscure, the inscription preserved with the mosaic on the north transept wing provides some information necessary for a social analysis of these panels. An inscribed reference to Homer (I. 17.447, Od. 18.141) suggests an audience who participated in a discourse that continued to privilege classical learning – a clear allusion to the values of the Late Roman aristocracy. It seems hardly a great leap of faith to suggest that the images which this inscription frames contains allusions to aristocratic values as well.

The Roman arena and its depiction in art has been the object of considerable study over the last several decades. Scholars agree that the arena combats served to reinforce values near the heart of the Roman society. The triumph of the strong over the weak, the otherness of barbarians, and the inferiority of individuals who behaved in a way contrary to the Roman ethos found expression in arena contests. The role of the aristocrat in providing games reinforced their position as the arbiter of the Roman values. By the second century, the close association of circus games with Roman values led to their popularity on domestic floor mosaics. The transfer of this imagery to the domestic sphere provided a way for individual aristocrats to show their role in the spread and
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with animals fighting each other and man at work. (Donceel-Voûte, 102-119). From Nikopolis, earth seems Edenic as compared the warfare necessary to reach an unseen paradise.

maintenance of the very Roman values which ensured their position of authority. Thus depictions of arena combats would have stressed the Roman-ness of the individual and emphasized their own close ties to the ruling elite. Allusions to arena combats on mosaics from churches, even within a context infused with Christian values in some ways hostile to those promoted by the arena contests, served to create for the ecclesiastical aristocracy a place within traditional order of the Roman state. The use of images from the arena, while no longer symbolizing the patronage of arena combats, would have demonstrated the clergy’s role as patrons and arbiters of social values in a more general way. Furthermore, the clergy’s appropriation of symbols associated with Roman values signalled the arrival of the church as the institution which would define the values ensuring proper social organization. The use of these motifs to express ideas or allegories directly relevant to Christian theology ensured both the perpetuation of aristocratic identity rooted in patronage and traditional ideas of Romanitas, while at the same time transferring these ideals to an ethical system based on a new set of cultural ideals based in the teachings and cosmology expressed through liturgy.

The personifications of the months found in western panel of the Delphi mosaic have an equally aristocratic pedigree. Two inward rushing months of a set of four are preserved in the floor complete with the inscriptions “KA” and “KAI” to be completed by their now lost opposite numbers (figs. 40,41). The figure in the northeast corner carries a basket of fruit (perhaps an eggplant, a squash and a peach), wears a light tunic, and is

79 For the negative reactions of Christians to the events of the arena see: Tertulian, De spectaculis, passim; Augustine, Confessions, 6.8.
80 Spiro, Critical Corpus, 244
barefoot. This is a typical depiction of a summer month, probably August. The north-west figure wears the same light tunic, but also sandals, and carries a sheaf of wheat. This has certain parallels to the depiction of the month of July in the mosaic at Thebes (fig. 35) and Thyrsos Basilica at Tegea (fig. 75) which shows figures carrying sheaves of wheat. The mosaic at Thebes is thought to be a product of the same workshop. This motif was undoubtedly completed by the no longer extant southeast and southwest corners of the panels, which would have contained the letters “LOI” and “POI” and two other summer months July or June and September.

The Thyrsos basilica at Tegea is quite remarkable. The main nave is decorated with a grid of 16 panels containing personifications of the 12 months and at its eastern
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81 In the Villa in Argos, it is June depicted carrying a sheaf of wheat. (Äkerström-Hougen, The Calendar and Hunting Mosaics, 80). This would seem to reflect more realistically the harvest practices in Greece, although A.-H. explanation for the difference between the month of June when the wheat is harvested and July when it is threshed does not accord with agricultural practice. These two activities would not have been separated by much time and this suggests that these are generic harvest scenes.

82 The mosaic found at the so-called basilica of Thyrsos at Tegea has evoked considerable debate over the 100 years since its discovery. The building itself was originally reported as a single naved, oriented, apsidal structure. Spiro, suggested that the building was perhaps a secular audience hall on account of the inscription at the west entrance to the building which she considered to be of “the kind of inscription one would expect to find in the more secularised atmosphere of an audience hall in which “the most holy Thyrsos” held court.”(Spiro, Critical Corpus, 181.) She further argued against this building having a liturgical function because of the lack of any evidence for such basic liturgical furnishings as the foundation of an ambo or chancel screens. The east end of the church, including the mosaics in the apse there, is very poorly preserved leaving open the very real possibility that these features did actually exist. Orlandoš in his general discussion of the Christian monuments in Tegea, considered this building as a three-aisled basilica on account of the presence of a narthex to the east of the paved nave and the discovery of several cross-inscribed ionic impost capitals, which as I have shown are rare outside a liturgical context (Orlandoš, “Παλαιοχριστιανικά και Βυζαντινά μνημεία Τεγέας-Νυκλίου,” ABME 12 (1973), 66-69.). Furthermore he mentioned in his general survey of Early Christian architecture in Greece that he was aware of an unpublished sigma table excavated from the Thyrsos basilica suggesting some liturgical activity in that place, although not necessarily confirming the building as having a primarily liturgical function since such tables have been found in a wide array of contexts, including villas such as in Athens (Orlandoš, Ἡ Συλλογής Παλαιοχριστιανικής Βασιλικής 485). A tomb arranged parallel to the north wall of the western antechamber further suggested the presence of a narthex. This, along with evidence for the use of several Ionic impost capitals points to this being a three-aisled basilica (Orlandoš, “Παλαιοχριστιανικά και Βυζαντινά μνημεία Τεγέας-Νυκλίου,” 12-19, 22-81). Avramea, quite recently, has argued unconvincingly that this building was a martyrium to the bishop Thyrsos and that the tomb found to the north of the narthex chamber belonged to the esteemed bishop (A. Avramea, “Ἡ Βασιλική του θύρσου στὴν Τεγέα καὶ η επιγραφή της,” DXAE (1999), 35-40; cf. D. Feissel, BE (2000), 797.).
and western end the four rivers of paradise (figs. 75-82). Seven of the panels are well preserved and demonstrate careful workmanship. Each month is dressed appropriately for the season and is depicted performing some seasonally characteristic activity, except November whose activities are unclear (fig. 80). In the apse, a panel which is now destroyed showed two youths, identified as the “Kaloi Karoi”, carrying baskets of fruit and rushing toward a central figure of a man. At the western end, two putti hold a metrical inscription praising the Bishop Thyrsos, discussed in more detail in the next chapter (fig. 83). The presence of a tomb in the northern bay of the narthex hints at a possible funerary function for this church.

Mosaics depicting the months were very popular in Greece during Late Antiquity. Additional examples exist from The Villa of the Falconer at Argos, a Christian building at Thebes (figs. 32-35), and Loutro Hypatis. Perhaps the most famous of these is in conjunction with a falcon hunt mosaic from the Villa of the Falconer in Argos (figs. 21-26). The presence of mosaics depicting the months in such a variety of locations emphasized that this motif had a meaning appropriate to a wide variety of contexts.

While Äkerström-Hougen’s thorough study of the mosaics from the Villa of the Falconer outside of Argos, stressed the relationship between the calendar mosaic there and illustrated Late Roman calendars, she also found this mosaic generally consistent with the calendars at Tegea, the preserved panels from Thebes, and the mosaic at Delphi

the central nave there exists another series of inscribed mosaic panels whose relationship to the main nave is unclear. Orlandos has suggested that this room was a parecclesia, but examples of this feature are rare in Greece. The mosaic inscription which separates the two badly damaged panels runs, “Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God with the Son and the Holy Spirit,” and this could allude to a liturgical utterance, and thus suggests a liturgical function for the room. The published reports and studies are quite inadequate making it unlikely ever to determine the form and function of this building. The presence of a tomb mitigates against it being a reception hall, and the reference to a bishop in the inscription makes the most likely identification of this building as a church or a very large private chapel.
even though the architectural context for these panels varied considerably. For example, at least one traditional festival is expressed in the calendars of the Tegea and Argos despite the fact that they derive from a “Christian” and “secular” setting respectively. In Argos, for the month of May, the mosaics depict a man with a basket of roses, a wreath of flowers, and a floral crown (fig. 23). At Tegea, the personification of May is shown with a basket of flowers and a floral crown (fig. 76). This mosaic at Argos makes a clear allusion to the *rosaria* or *rosalia*, initially a festival to honor the dead, but by the fourth century a feast to celebrate the arrival of summer.83 A similar depiction of this feast is found on the Calendar of 354, which was prepared for an aristocratic Christian patron.84 Salzman, in her study of this important Late Roman calendar, emphasized the significance of this festival in both religious and economic terms. In religious terms she associated the importance of the Rose Festival, which was celebrated with games, to the rise in interest in astrological and seasonal celebrations during the fourth century.85 While there is insufficient evidence to argue that the depiction of a May on the Tegea floor was a direct allusion to a pagan festival as it appears to be at Argos or in the Calendar of 354, the continued use of the iconography at Tegea reflects a preference for traditional symbolism over personifications of an explicitly non-pagan nature. The clear allusion to the Rose Festival in the mosaic in nearby Argos which appears roughly contemporary, places the Tegea mosaic in a discourse which operated to a considerable degree outside the specific religious context of the building. It seems, then, reasonable to consider that the floor at Tegea, like the floor at Argos, served to show the prosperity

found within the cycle of rural life and linked this ideal to the patron, individual, or institution most closely associated with the floor. This adds an additional level of meaning to H. Maguire’s already rich reading of this floor as a depiction of earth and ocean. Now the earth and its prosperity is not only the domain of man, but also a world constituted in aristocratic terms and linked to the authority of the clergy through their privileged access to the central nave and the liturgical procession.

The mosaic from Delphi, unlike the floors at Tegea or Argos, does not appear to have depicted the full cycle of months and this presents some difficulty for interpretation. If it were a single month, then the floor might allude to a particular occasion. If it showed the full range of months, then it would surely be an allusion to the cycle of rural prosperity. The depiction of June and August (with the panels possibly depicting July and September as the most likely candidates for the lost panels) and the fragments of a KA and KAI opens the narrow possibility that these four panels were intended to symbolize the pleasant clime of paradise. These four months alone, however, and their identification as the kalos(oi) kairos(oi) has no exact parallel from Greece. The month of May received the designation “kalos kairos” in Tegea (fig. 76). At Korinth, a mosaic from a building initially identified as a church bears a similar sentiment, and with its depiction of two rushing figures it appears the be linked thematically to the mosaic at

86 Parrish, *Season Mosaics of Roman North Africa*. (Rome 1984), 13. “In an imperial context, this term [*felicitas temporum*] had a propagandistic meaning, referring to the Emperor’s beneficent rule and the promised return of the golden age. But in a private house, the seasons had more generalized associations with prosperity and good fortune, and lacked any direct political overtones.”
Delphi and the now destroyed apsidal panel of the mosaic at Tegea. The published photographs of the mosaic from Korinth are too poor for any substantial reinterpretation of these panels. Spiro, in her catalogue, suggests that the dress and floral decoration of these figures identify these personifications as the summer months of May, June, and July.

The two remaining depictions of months from Delphi illustrate the months most frequently associated with agricultural prosperity: June and July are typically depicted reaping and threshing respectively; August is shown with harvests of fruit; and September would have likely borne grapes. If the mosaics were in a cycle, like at Argos, Tegea, and presumably Thebes, then they might be expressing the idea of regeneration or rebirth. This iconography was, understandably, popular in a funerary context, such as the famous Season Sarcophagus at Dumbarton Oaks. From Delphi, the isolated summer months, however, seem to emphasize prosperity and “good times” rather than regeneration in cyclic terms. These panels probably allude to agricultural prosperity in a decidedly rural and aristocratic terms, thus linking the liturgy to a kind of display of wealth common in an aristocratic context. Like the Tegea and Nikopolis mosaics these floors present the audience of the Christian liturgy with an array of images most of which would be experienced in a context informed by their association with aristocratic images at the same time as they were associated with their allegorical or even literal Christian
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89 Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, *Συντάγμα II*, no. 34, p. 94. She dates this mosaic to the first half of the sixth century on account of its “pseudo-emblemata” style. Spiro, *Critical Corpus*, 96-102, dates the pavement to the second half of the fifth century, based on thematic similarities to floor at Tegea and the floor at Delphi, which she also dates to this period. The excavators, C.K. Williams, AD 22 (1967), B’1, 285, dates the building, and presumably the pavement by extension, to the fourth century.


91 Hanfmann, *The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks*. (Cambridge, MA 1951), vol. 1, 210-261 includes a thorough study of the iconography of the seasons.
meaning. At Argos and the Thebes calendar themes similarly complement images related to aristocratic identity. Both combine scenes of the months with hunting. According to its inscription, a member of the clergy, Paul, “the priest and teacher”, commissioned the mosaic at Thebes (figs. 31-35). A hunter with dogs spears a stag in its central panel. The similarity to the mosaics at Delphi has prompted some scholars to suggest that the same workshop produced both.92 The Villa of the Falconer juxtaposed scenes of the months and panels depicting hare coursing and falconry on two sides of a peristyle court.93 The scenes from Argos and Thebes associate the months with hunting, and thus, tie the rhythms of rural life, with each month’s seasonal abundance, to aristocratic pursuits.94 From the perspective of aristocratic display it allowed the guests to survey the owner’s seasonal abundance and appreciate his ability to participate in leisure activities.

The mosaic from Delphi, then, with its central emblema showing a possible scene from the amphitheatre could well be read in the greater context of aristocratic display. The mosaic at Delphi draws upon the imagery of prosperity implied in seasonal or calendar mosaics and instead of presenting it with the iconography of the hunt, it is connected to a possible amphitheater scene with all its aristocratic associations. C. Kondoleon in a recent collection of articles dedicated to the “Art of Ancient Spectacle” has argued, as elsewhere, that floor mosaics were designed to engage the viewer in the spectacle and to commemorate a real or imagined occasion tied in some way to the

---

patron of the floor. The presence of time imagery, such as mosaics personifying the months, often exist in this context as well, and ought to be understood in the context of civic calendars, such as the Codex Calendar of 354, which expressed time in a way quite similar to floor mosaics. I would contend that certain Christian floors may have functioned in a similar, although not identical, way.

Like munificence in a civic context, the decoration of Christian church worked not only to elevate the position of the patron but also to characterize the individuals who regularly used the buildings. This was different from decoration in a domestic context where the patron is most often the owner of the house, and the iconography reflected more on that individual than any visitor or guest. No matter who the patron of floors in an Early Christian context was, the liturgy performed by the clergy soon became the primary context in which these floors were viewed. This may account for the fact two of the floors with the richest imagery from an aristocratic context, Tegea and Nikopolis, appear to be associated with episcopal patrons. Two bishops, both named Doumetios, take credit for paving the floors of the church at Nikopolis. The floor at Tegea, as I will discuss in greater detail elsewhere, is closely associated with clerical authority as its inscription refers in lyrical and exaggerated terms to a bishop or perhaps even abbot of a monastery in Tegea named Thyrsos. Unfortunately the inscriptions at Delphi are fragmentary and the name and title of the patron is lost. While it is impossible to determine the status of the patron or patrons of the floor at Delphi, the use of imagery derived from an aristocratic setting in a Christian context reflected the same transfer of authority from the locus of traditional aristocratic expression, namely villas, baths, and

---

95 C. Kondoleon, “Timing Spectacles: Roman Domestic Art and Performance,” in C. Kondoleon and B.
perhaps even the amphitheater to the specific ritual and theological context of Christian sacred architecture. The appearance of images of the hunt, the calendar and the arena in churches allowed the patrons or, perhaps more frequently, the presiding clergy, to associate themselves with the prosperity and privilege represented in the floor mosaics, and thereby placed the values represented in these floors into the context of the Christian liturgy and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Moreover, the presence of calendar themes in a Christian setting many have contributed to the “Christianization of time”, whereby the traditional festivals marking the significant moments of the year and made possible by the civic patronage of the aristocracy, gave way to Christian feasts and celebrations, overseen by the clergy.\textsuperscript{96}

\textit{4.4.2. Molaoi and Klapsi: Floors at the Fringe}

In comparison with the floors from Nikopolis, Tegea, and Delphi, the floors from Molaoi and Klapsi appear crude in style and construction. The pavements from Molaoi are made with large tesserae and represent its subjects in a two dimensional way devoid of subtle shading, coloring, or proportional anatomical details (figs. 56-62). Four large panels show four eagles snatching helpless rabbits from chaotic scenes scattered with animals, plants, and sea life in no particular orientation in the typical \textit{horror vacui} style (figs. 56-59). The large figural panels from Klapsi, which are damaged and poorly published, seem likewise to present images of the sea and land in a jumbled way without much attention to orientation (figs. 48-52, plan 61). While their disorderly presentation

\textsuperscript{96} R. A. Markus, \textit{The End of Ancient Christianity} (Cambridge 1990), 125-130.
could lead one to assume a decorative intent for these floors, it is clear that many of the motifs assembled have places within Christian iconography. Like the floors at Delphi, Nikopolis, and Tegea, however, these floors have also adopted parts of iconography at home in an aristocratic settings in Greece. They draw on motifs similar to those that appear in a domestic context, even though these motifs do not necessarily have meanings exclusive to a domestic space. The floor at Molaoi shows how the assembling of motifs from a domestic setting can produce meaning that are both unique to their Christian context and relevant to the position of the church in Late Roman Greek society. The floors from Klapsi demonstrate images associated with elite life are sometimes incorporated into mosaics whose meanings are unlikely to represent a single coherent program. The barrage of images present in the various panels at Klapsi seems to suggest that the meaning of the floor is not dependant upon a systematic interpretation based upon the interplay between the various panels, but present a montage of symbolic and decorative themes intentionally left open to a wide array of interpretations. The floor’s basic meaning might still be dependant on its context in a Christian building or in a liturgical space, but the meaning of specific panels might also exist in relative iconographic isolation. The floors in both churches demonstrate how the imagery present in mosaic floors, while primarily informed by their location in liturgical space, also drew upon a more or less contemporary aristocratic discourse in the same medium.

The church at Molaoi is paved with a series of panels, the four largest of showing eagles with outstretched wings carrying off struggling prey, apparently, rabbits. The inscription from the main nave of the church suggests a funerary function, although no contemporary graves were reported. In such a context the eagle snatching a hare has a
well-established meaning. The eagle had long symbolized resurrection, even in a pagan context, and they can be found on funerary altars and sarcophagi from the 1st century. \(^{97}\) The eagle snatching the hare could easy illustrate the ascent of the soul heavenward after its separation from the terrestrial realm. \(^{98}\) A funerary interpretation is further encouraged by the kantharos flanked by two birds in the “chapel”, a motif not uncommon in funerary settings but also common in a secular setting as well (fig. 61).\(^{99}\)

The motif of an eagle with its prey is not at all uncommon in mosaics from Greece found in both secular and Christian settings including baths, churches, and villas. One of the late panels of mosaic in the church at Hermione depicts an eagle with outstretched wings clutching another smaller bird in its talons (fig. 47). This mosaic is surrounded by a geometric panel in an entrance hall on the southwest side of the atrium, which included another figural panel showing a sheep in a natural setting. From a villa at Megalopolis, in a panel along the west side of what appears to be a peristyle shows an eagle with its wings spread carrying a rabbit in its talons (fig. 66). The exact iconographic context for this mosaic is difficult to determine since it was flanked by two relatively non-descript geometric panels. From a circular mosaic excavated in Thebes, an eagle clutching a rabbit is among the images in a series of trapezoidal panels encircling a central field showing a bust labelled, “Mousa” (figs. 29-30). The other trapezoidal panels depict vegetal designs, fish, and other birds and the entire panel is bordered with a marine

---


\(^{99}\) For various interpretations and functions of cantharoi see: Maguire, *Earth and Ocean*, 9-10, 36-37, 40; E. g. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, *Σύνταγμα ΙΙ,* Pl.62a (Hermione), Pl. 236d (Antikyra), Pl. 98 (Thebes), and Pl. 307b (Loutro Hypatis)
scene. Images of the muses are not uncommon in the eastern Mediterranean during antiquity and are frequently associated with aristocratic patronage of the arts. While the lack of architectural context for this panel makes a more precise meaning difficult to establish, this mosaic appears to be thematically related to several other mosaics discussed here with its border of fish, geometric frames, and depictions of birds, marine life, and vegetal patterns. Interestingly, M. Georgopoulou, in a brief discussion of this mosaic, compared it almost exclusively to mosaics from ecclesiastical settings, such as the mosaics at Klapsi, Delphi, and Amphipolis, while admitting that the most likely setting for this panel was from a bath. A more realistic version of this same motif appears, of course, in the Villa of the Falconer mosaics, where a falcon snatches up a fleeing rabbit while another scurries for cover (fig. 27-28). The presence of an eagle seizing prey in a wide array of context is not to imply that this imagery did not acquire a distinct meaning in a Christian context, but to point out a possible underlying significance of this iconography that goes beyond its immediate context and draws on the use of this iconography throughout Late Roman aristocratic society. The presence of eagles with prey in mosaics from a variety of contexts demonstrates how individual features of mosaic iconography can move back and forth between an aristocratic, public and Christian context. The nature of Christian iconography, then, presents a valuable parallel to the practice of liturgy itself where aristocratic ritual blends with Christian cosmology.

100 C. Kondoleon, Domestic and Divine, 309; 101 M. Georgopoulou, “Ψηφιδιατο δάπεδο ἀπὸ τὴ Θηβα,” AAA 13 (1980), 39-52. The presence of a fragment of a pipe found below the floor would suggest a bath. The presence of a Muse would recommend against placing this panel in a baptistery. The association of image in the center panel with depictions of the Kastalian Nymph from Delphi are not compelling because the presence of a nymph in the central emblema of the narthex from Delphi is purely conjectural. No figure actually remains there, although the remains of an image of a cantharos pouring water makes the association with the Kastalian spring enticing. (find panel that he is comparing this too, not from Delphi...)
The blending of “secular” iconography to form a Christian meaning is made even more apparent when one considers how the images of animals, birds, and marine life complement the panels showing eagles and prey. The apparently random assortment of animals, plants, and fish presents no obvious single interpretation. The suggestion that these panels depict the terrestrial realm becomes problematic when it become clear that two of the panels with eagles in them include primarily birds and fish. In most Christian cosmologies birds and fish are associated with the creatures of the fifth day and were products of the water, not the earth. While panels of the nave, which show rabbits among the creatures of the fifth day, might allude to the life giving waters of baptism, the two mosaics from the “chapel” cannot share this meaning as the fish and birds share space with a snake and plants. Furthermore, in both floors there are panels illustrating groups of seemingly random rural creatures including an ox, a rabbit, and, in one instance, a dolphin (figs. 60, 62)! Similar arrays of animal life are not uncommon in Early Christian floors from Greece, but are more often arranged in grids. The mosaic at Delphi, for example, included a shepherd, saddled donkeys, horses, and goats, alongside a cat holding a rodent in its jaws, a strutting lion, a polychrome zebra, and a “handsome” dog. While various suggestions for these girds of creatures have been offered, these panels continue to elude a single clear interpretation deriving from either the explicit values of the traditional aristocracy or in the Christian exegetical literature. Just like the eagle with prey, nature and rural themes are not uncommon in mosaics from late

102 Gen. 1.20-23; Basil, Hex. hom. 8.
103 Maguire, Earth and Ocean, 57-66, esp. 59; For the prevalence of cocks among the bird show see the insightful comments of P.G.J. Post, “The Interpretation of Cock-Scenes: Method and Application,” ACIAM X.2 (Thessaloniki 1984), 429-443. Cocks are associated with victory, heraldic imagery, and even magic.
104 See R. Kolarik: abstracts from the 1999 Byzantine studies conference.
antique and suggests that this floor presented images at home in both an aristocratic and Christian setting. Thus, these floors resist a single exegetical interpretation, although certain key Christian themes such as the ascent of the soul, stand out. The use of iconography from a wide array of contexts, ranging from rural life typical to an aristocratic setting, to creation in Genesis, facilitated the blending of Christianity and aristocratic culture on the local level.

The floor from the church at Klapsi presents a veritable barrage of images. The themes range from rural life, to magical symbols, to the marine world. It appears as if a separate donor or group of donors provided each panel and perhaps retained significant control over the themes expressed. While the inscriptions do little to assign a specific meaning to the floor, they closely associate the clergy, including a reader, a deacon, a priest, and a bishop, with these elaborate mosaics pavements. These mosaics are the most resistant of the five floors to a systematic or unified interpretation. Unlike at Nikopolis or Molaoi, the inscriptions from this church do little to guide our viewing and combined with the lack of a thematic or iconographic unity presents an environment that must have encouraged multiple interpretations. A similarly chaotic arrangement of panels with various themes is visible in the South basilica of Caričin Grad where the floor of the central nave is paved with panels depicting large figural scenes, inhabited grids, and simple geometric patterns. Like the mosaic from Klapsi, there are no inscriptions explicitly designed to guide the viewers’ interpretation.106

I will approach the Klapsi floor in the main nave from west to east. The first three panels are grouped together in a common boarder. The eastern most panel which is badly damaged shows a peacock perhaps in a garden. The next panel, also damaged, depicts a scene of marine life surrounded by a inner border of wave crests (fig. 51). The final panel of the three is a grid of octagons filled with various birds, marine animals, and symbols, including a Solomon’s knot, in various orientations interrupted at its eastern most extent by an inscription, oriented west, crediting the various members of the clergy, including a bishop, for the mosaic (fig. 52). To the east, a large panel shows a small bird and a rose bush in the center of a radiating shield (fig. 48-50). It appears to be oriented eastward from its position in the eastern most panel of the central nave, although in published plans of the church it is shown oriented to the west (plan 61). The meaning of this is unclear despite the fact that a radiating shield functioned in many settings to attract the viewer’s attention to a central motif. The inscription on this panel, a prayer by a sub-deacon asking for the protection of St. Leonidas, does not immediately shed light on the meaning of the small bird. If the bird were a dove, it could represent the Holy Spirit, but in most cases the dove of the Holy Spirit is not shown standing on the ground with a flower. The outer parts of the panel depict several running animals which seem to be dogs except in the northeast part of the panel where a boar, chased by what appears to be a dog, seeks to escape eastward. Since the most prominent animals in the north and south part of this mosaic are the three dogs (or the two dogs and the one donkey-dog) and

\[\text{107} \quad \text{E.D. Maguire, H. Maguire, and M.J. Duncan-Flowers, Art and Holy Powers in the Early Christian House, (Urbana 1989), 5-7 for concentric circles; For swirls from a Late Roman context see: Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συνταγμα II, Pl. 3β, 5β (Argos villa), Pl. 88 α-β (Megalopolis villa), Pl. 235 (basilica at Antikyra), Pl. 300 (basilica at Thavmakos) et c.}
\[\text{108} \quad \text{Spiro, Critical Corpus, 288 n. 443 – Interprets this animal as some kind of donkey dog.}
\]
the boar, we can interpret this scene as a boar hunt. Further supporting this interpretation is the fact that chase scenes are a usual way to frame a round emblema.

The depictions of rural life and hunts such as those found at Klapsi and Molaoi are deeply rooted in not only aristocratic, but also royal iconography. From Hellenistic times, the depiction of the hunt with its connections to Macedonian royalty became a common scene on sarcophagi. The hunt during Late Antiquity was closely associated with aristocratic life and was a regularly depicted on the floors of elite villas throughout the Mediterranean. It seems likely that hunting motifs emphasized the villa owner’s bravery, proficiency with weapons, and leisure time. While none of these things appear as distinctly Christian values, allusions to a hunts in Christian contexts are not unprecedented. The floor mosaic from the Christian building at Thebes and the South Basilica at Caričin Grad, which shares the Klapsi basilica’s diverse array of iconography, depict hunts in a Christian context. Like scenes from the arena, rural life, and the calendar, the conflation of aristocratic images, iconography with strong connections to Christian symbolism, and Christian architecture reinforces the position of the ties of Christianity to traditional social order, while simultaneously introducing a new form of architecture, new principles of hierarchy, and, in some cases, a new and competing source of authority within the Late Roman world. The occasionally contradictory or imprecise iconography, such as the kind present at Klapsi, suggest that these issues were
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not entirely resolved, although it is possible that the vigorous chase was meant to be juxtaposed with the serene bird in the center of the radiating shield, thus symbolizing peaceful isolation from a chaotic and dangerous world.\textsuperscript{112}

This floor brings to the fore one of the essential issues regarding my interpretation of social meaning the Early Christian floor mosaics. The combination of motifs in new ways, such as shown in the mosaic at Delphi or in the floors at Klapsi and Molaoi, should introduce new meanings to motifs typically found in domestic or more secular settings.\textsuperscript{113} However, simultaneously there appears to be a conscious effort to include imagery from diverse local contexts. At least several of the motifs present in the floor at Klapsi fit loosely into the depictions of “rural life” as I have interpreted them elsewhere. To read the social message implicit in these panels showing rural and hunting scenes as promoting aristocratic values associated with the “taming of nature” or the prosperity and leisure of a rural estate may be reading too much into the explicit and intended meaning of these floors. What the Klapsi mosaics do suggest, however, by their apparently


\textsuperscript{113} Z. Kádár, \textit{Survivals of Greek Zoological Illuminations in Byzantine Manuscripts}. (Budapest 1978), discusses the relationship between illustrated scientific and zoological manuscripts and floor mosaics (This idea was also noted by R. Koralik, BSC 2000 see abstracts.). The idea of manuscript illustrations influencing and transmitting the motifs used in floor mosaics was developed most prominently by K. Weitzmann in \textit{Ancient Book Illuminations} (Cambridge, MA 1959) and \textit{Illustrations in Roll and Codex} (Princeton 1970). While Dunbabin, \textit{Mosaics in the Greek and Roman World}, 303 follows most modern scholars in rejecting this argument on practical grounds, noting that books were too expensive to be widely distributed and that there is very little solid evidence owing largely to the paucity of surviving Late Roman manuscripts or even later manuscripts with definite links to earlier period. The idea that floor mosaics might contain allusions to other elite media is, of course, exciting to consider, especially in light of the more or less aristocratic nature of the motifs. While the evidence remains scant, it would be enticing to suggest that the imitation of motifs found in books, the aristocratic context for many of the images present in floors, and the elite values likely associated with the images themselves could combine to tie the mosaic decorations from Early Christian basilicas even more strongly to the identity of the Late Roman intellectual, social, and economic elite.
unprogrammatic deployment and its numerous inscriptions associating the mosaics with various ranks of clergy is that mosaic floors themselves persist as a form of decoration deeply rooted in the practice of elite display. The admixing of various motifs some with and some without explicitly Christian meanings identified through epigraphy, various overt visual clues, or spoken references likely constitute at the broadest level, elite display. Figural mosaics such as the kind present at Klapsi make even more explicit the link between an aristocratic medium and a liturgical Christian context.

The motifs present in the Late Roman floors from Delphi, Nikopolis, Tegea, Molaoi and Klapsi are in many cases clearly associated with motifs found in roughly contemporary villas and baths in Greece. The allusions to such themes as rural life, the hunt, the calendar, and the arena have ties to elite values. The interpretation of these floors as examples of Early Christian allegorical expression is not inappropriate, but separates the religious meaning of ecclesiastical architecture from meanings embedded in the communicative practice itself. The social contexts for almost all forms of clerical display – the architectural context, the ritual context, and the decorative programs employed in its elaboration – communicated Christian order and cosmology in terms charged with social meaning to the local audience. As the clergy became more and more important members of the social, political, and economic hierarchy in Greece, churches provided the backdrop for communicating both the idealized, religious, cosmological roots of their power and the practical manifestations of it. This inherently multivalent understanding of the role of sacred space in the ancient world demands a multivalent interpretation of many of the details. Although our exact understanding of the rituals which took place in the various spaces within a church remains less than perfect, the
general function of the building as a place for the display of clerical authority through
liturgical ritual strongly encourages the interpretation of these floors in this context.
While the clergy likely did not seek specific credit for civic spectacles, although this is
not impossible, the nature of aristocratic display involved asserting competence in a
medium that would have relevance in the local and imperial community. The desire to
present themselves in the language of the elite and the language of the church led to the
synthesizing of Christian imagery, such as was present in the liturgy, in unique aspects of
Christian architecture, and in the nature of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, with traditional
expression of aristocratic values such as the use of floor mosaics, construction of apsidal
halls and the use of Classicizing language.

4.5. Conclusions

To understand fully the social significance of the floor mosaics of Late Roman
Greece they must be placed within this broad cultural context. Despite the recent
tendency to view ancient art as polyvalent, scholars continue to emphasize a single,
primary meaning for iconography at the expense of truly polyvalent analysis. Early
Christian art has proven particularly susceptible to this kind of interpretation, especially
since scholars have tended to view the theological significance of Christian iconography
and its salvific value as the main factor in its deployment and development. Pagan or
pre-Christian motifs discovered in a Christian context are generally interpreted in terms
of Christian allegory, and their persistence is attributed to the limited repertoire of local
workshops, the continued use of pattern books, or the decorative appeal of the certain
patterns and themes. While allegorical explanations present possible interpretations for certain motifs that could be otherwise difficult to understand, they tend to downplay the way that the broader cultural context of this iconography affected the meanings intended by patrons or interpreted by the audience.

The arguments advanced in this chapter sought to advocate an interpretation of the mosaics that emphasized “how they meant” alongside better-known interpretations of the mosaics’ specific meaning. This division, however, has tended to separate the idea that how a particular medium communicated ideas from the very nature of the ideas communicated. The true nature of multivalent iconographic interpretation demands that scholars observe both the cultural context for particular iconography and, at the same time, the way in which the various motifs functioned to present a more or less consistent meaning in a specific ritual or architectural environment. For example, the location of certain mosaic motifs in liturgical space must account both for the significance of these mosaics in the context of a ritual which functioned as a religious ceremony with explicitly religious ends, and for their significance in a ritual which functioned as a social phenomenon with relevance far beyond its interpretation as a sacred rite. As recent scholarship has brought to the fore, the separation of religion from society in antiquity is largely a product of modern scholarly divisions. Consequently, the social implications of mosaics in the context of religious architecture, especially when they contain motifs common outside the specific ritual environment of a church, must be considered as we recognize increasingly that religion and society did not function in separate compartments but were, in fact, deeply interdependent. The use of symbolism in a church that has relevance in a broad cultural context is the most basic manifestation of
cultural Christianization and demonstrates, yet again, how ecclesiastical ritual, architecture, and authority drew upon the existing symbolic world and placed it within the authority of the institutional church.

The presence of motifs derived from popular religion (or magic) such as Solomon’s knots, demonstrate that the use of aniconic motifs in churches may not have been simply an effort to avoid religiously offensive images. The appearance of motifs which have apotropaic meanings suggest that the patterns on the floors served to protect the space and probably Christian liturgy from supernatural threats. Interpreting the aniconic symbols on Early Christian floors within a religious context is consistent with the recent appreciation of the blurred boundaries between Christianity and earlier “Hellenic” religious practices. The presence of pre-Christian symbols of religious power in a Christian context underscores how the material record reflects the ambiguity present in our understanding ancient religion more broadly. This provides but one example of how the strategies used to express sentiments in space defined by Christian ritual nevertheless operated in a cultural discourse greater than that provided by the immediate context of Christian sacred space and ritual.

As the boundaries between the sacred and the profane become increasingly unclear, it is now possible to reconsider how motifs present on Early Christian mosaic floors functioned in coordination with the rise in ecclesiastical power in the “secular” realm. Unfortunately, the specifics of how a particular individual deployed and articulated their position in Late Roman Greece are scarce on account of our less than comprehensive understanding of the patronage in an ecclesiastical context. There is some indication, however, that certain floor mosaics, such as those at Nikopolis and
Tegea, which drew on themes long central to traditional elite representation, were the products of episcopal patronage. Furthermore, the presence of this iconography in the space made significant by the liturgy would have linked the context for the mosaic with the clergy, whether they were the patrons or not. The incorporation of calendar motifs, hunting scenes, and arena combats into a context defined by Christian liturgy reflects the practice of Christianization as this dissertation has defined it. The primary importance of the Christian hierarchy in defining the context for non-Christian motifs led to the intermixing of Christian hierarchical principles with the already well-established principles of aristocratic distinction regularly manifest in elite iconography. The appropriation of traditional elite motifs for the Christian social order allowed for the establishment of a Christian cosmology with its own ritual, iconographic, and architectural logic which remained still comprehensible in terms of traditional social values. This reflected the need to communicate with individuals who were either incapable or as yet unwilling to understand the Christian cosmology based largely on the exegesis of sacred texts. It also may be suggestive of competition between the emerging ecclesiastical hierarchy and traditional aristocrats who would have gradually lost their ability to assert their competence to rule through a discrete iconography operating outside a Christian context.

While in many cases the motifs present in mosaic paving can be interpreted within the framework of Christian allegory, the use of such motifs in a Christian context, even to communicate ideas essential for an individual’s salvation, would have worked to establish the church and those associated with it as a source of authority, along with the liturgy and the architecture itself. The specific cases these values would have continued
to be associated with the individual responsible for the floor mosaics. In other cases, the location of the mosaics in spaces defined by their relationship to the liturgy, like the nave, the bema, and the narthex, would have enabled the clergy, some of whom would have hailed from relatively modest backgrounds, to appropriate the mosaics’ symbolic meanings for themselves as representatives of the institutional church. Through the ritual of liturgy, the clergy infused the building and its decoration with significance and thereby assumed proprietary control over the space of the church. It would seem likely that this allowed them to represent themselves as individuals who had command of resources and as patrons of the community’s needs both physically and spiritually. This is generally in keeping with the role of Christian architecture which derives its meaning both from the conflation of the traditional iconography of Roman ritual with the Christian sacred rite, and its use of architectural forms closely tied to aristocratic authority and hierarchy. The authority of the clergy in performing Christian ritual and relationship between the mosaics, their motifs and ritual space could serve to imply a relationship between liturgical activities and the prosperity of the community. While specific evidence for the relationship between depictions of prosperity and liturgical ritual is scant, the presence of apotropaic symbols and inscribed prayers on floor mosaics – the latter I will discuss at greater length in the next chapter – suggests that the floors were perceived as more than simply passive decoration.
The inscriptive evidence associated with ecclesiastical architecture in Greece has not received systematic study. This chapter will use this evidence to shed light on how individuals placed themselves through the agency of inscribed texts within the ritual space created by Early Christian architecture and its decoration. The preceding chapters have outlined how Early Christian churches served to promote through their ritual, architecture, and decoration, a particular cosmology and its manifestation as social organization. The church building itself has emerged as an important actor in this reorientation of ancient society through providing a human and physical reality which made manifest the actual organization of sacred, eternal, and heavenly hierarchy and cosmos. While the enduring sacred reality provided an immutable point of reference, the nature of communicative practice and the existence of rival sources of institutional power ensured that a constant tension existed between the authority vested in access to the sacred and the way in which this access was obtained. The control over the liturgy ensured that the clergy retained a privileged relationship to the sacred and undoubtedly contributed to the authority of the clergy in the secular realm. This chapter will examine
the epigraphy from Early Christian churches in order to tie the ritual of Christian liturgy, with all its social implications, to the financial arrangements that allowed for the rapid expansion of Christian architecture.

During the last several decades, our knowledge and understanding of the Late Roman or Early Christian inscriptions from the eastern Mediterranean has improved as a result of several valuable catalogues and discussions. Most recently E. Sironen has compiled and re-edited the Late Roman and Early Byzantine inscription of Athens and Attica,¹ and this, along with C. Rouechè collection of inscriptions from Aphrodisias in Caria, have become indispensable guides to the world of Early Christian epigraphy and touchstones to this study.² D. Feissel with various collaborators has produced a bibliography of Late Roman and Byzantine inscriptions for the Peloponnesus, Thessaly, and Macedonia, has also facilitated the study of Late Roman inscriptions from Greece.³ Finally, the catalogue of Late Roman floor mosaics produced by Assimakopoulou-Atzaka includes the texts of inscribed mosaics, and clearly superceded the hand made
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¹ E. Sironen, *The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica*. (Helsinki 1997).
transcriptions included in M. Spiro’s early catalogue of mosaics. Much work still remains. Despite the efforts of L. Robert, D. Feissel and most recently Sironen, many important inscriptions, such as the mosaic inscriptions from Nikopolis, still do not exist in proper critical editions and this makes them risky and difficult for non-specialists to study.

From the various published collections and the occasional published excavation reports, I have selected for the following study inscriptions that can be placed in a specific architectural context. Consequently, inscriptions from mosaic floors, many of which have clear indicators of their original position within the church or remain in situ, form a large part of this corpus. Inscriptions from columns, chancel and parapet screens, and liturgical furnishings (ambos, baptismal fonts, holy tables) are also included. I have also noted several inscriptions that appear to have been originally placed about the entrance either to the church or the chancel area. The difficulty in determining the original location of these inscriptions limits their usefulness for this discussion, however. I have chosen to exclude the vast number of Late Roman funerary inscriptions from my discussion even though they can and have shed important light on late antique social and religious practices. Unfortunately these inscriptions are rarely in situ and the specific context of their display remains sufficiently unclear so as to make difficult any
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conclusions regarding how their sentiments were expressed in an architectural setting.

The inscriptions selected for this study are included in a catalogue in the appendix. This catalogue is meant only to facilitate the analysis here, rather than to lend any additional insight into the readings of the texts.

This chapter consists of two discrete but dependent sections. Section one examines these texts as evidence for Late Antique attitudes toward religious donations. Past efforts to understand the economics of church construction have neglected epigraphic sources, preferring instead to rely on impressions based largely on Hellenistic and Roman practices. While the comparison of ecclesiastical construction to earlier construction practices in the ancient polis may be valid in that they both reflect a generally prosperous economy, they do not necessarily reflect similar social phenomena. The building of a theater in the second century A.D. may not have been the same phenomenon as the construction of a church in the middle of the fifth century. There is evidence to suggest that individuals from much more modest backgrounds contributed to the building of churches and that such contributions came from a high percentage of the congregation.

The core of this study will be an analysis of how these texts functioned in their architectural setting. It will particularly emphasize how lay donations served to provide the laity with access to areas ritually and architecturally reserved for the clergy. I will briefly examine how these inscriptions “worked” in conjunction with their architectural and ritual setting. This study will draw from recent work on the function of inscribed sentiments in antiquity and its conclusions will complement those of the previous chapter regarding the placement and function of magical symbols in Christian architecture. The
5.1. The Economics of Christian Building

Dedicatory inscriptions in ecclesiastical buildings are an under-utilized source of information concerning the relationship between the social and economic organization. These inscriptions often provide information regarding the social position of the donor, the extent and nature of the donation, and perhaps, most importantly, the attested motivation for the dedication. In the past, efforts to understand the socio-economic relationship between individuals and the church during the Late Roman period have primarily been limited to studies of large-scale elite foundations known from literary sources or from individual archaeological discoveries.7 Scholars have also focused on the role of the aristocratic idea of *megalopsychia* and its impact on episcopal charity in the cities.8 The limited array of textual sources for Late Roman Greece has compelled historians to look to other evidence in order to understand the socio-economic aspects of

---

ecclesiastical patronage. The epigraphy testifies to how the economic relationship between the church and individual was memorialized in the architecture and decoration of the churches themselves.

While precise financial details of this relationship are often obscure, in many cases it is possible to draw conclusions from the relative value of the offerings or the level of wealth available to a person of a specific rank or status. These values provide clues to the levels of wealth available to various donors and suggest that individuals of relatively modest means could and did make donations to churches. This does not exclude the role of the elite but suggests that the relationship between church and individual was different from that proposed through the study of literary texts, or based upon ancient models of civic euergetism or munificence. It also reflects the central position of the liturgy and church building in the life of both the common and the elite.

Concepts of civic munificence have often occupied a central place in the discussion of ecclesiastical patronage. P. Veyne has provided perhaps the most widely accepted interpretation of elite giving in antiquity. Veyne’s view of euergetism and munificence in antiquity, as many scholars who work in this area today, is rooted in ideas of the “gift economy” first advanced by M. Mauss in the first part of the 20th century. Giving in the Greco-Roman context became an opportunity for the display power and

---

garnered honor associated with the proper use of wealth. The best example of this was civic munificence which served to aggrandize the city and, by association, the donor. Typically, giving was an elite practice first and foremost, which reinforced fundamental divisions in ancient society, particularly between the elite, who gave and the rest of the citizens, who received. The desire to display power and distinguish oneself from the average citizen led the elite to dominate the field of civic generosity - both building and charity - during the classical and Roman periods, largely through their position on local curial councils.

It is important to emphasize, however, that throughout the Late Roman period the role of the curial class underwent a significant change. While it is true that, particularly in Greece, city councilors continued to exist and have access to considerable resources, it is also apparent that rival institutions drew away members and prestige from this group and established a rival hierarchy that possessed fundamentally different structural logic and access to resources. Moreover, imperial legislation had made it more and more difficult for the traditional means of aristocratic competition to persist, particular after the confiscation of civic revenues during the fourth century. The decline in resources available to curial class, however, did not put an end to the practice of civic euergetism entirely, but encouraged it on a much smaller and more mundane scale. The migration of members of the civic aristocracy to the imperial service and the church dispersed the

12 J. Lendon, *Empire of Honor*. (Oxford 1997), 222-235: For a discussion of the social dynamics which allowed this system to work and the problems associated with its break down in Late Antiquity.
resources of this group diminishing both the rational and opportunities for civic building tied to a competitive class of civic elite.

Recent scholarship has emphasized the continued wealth of Late Roman cities in the East, and it would appear that Greece was no exception. Building activities persisted in both Athens and Korinth, for example, despite the limited resources available to the curial class. The construction of churches served as important evidence for the resources available for the disposal of Late Roman communities. These buildings, like the Late Roman walls which arose around many Early Christian demanded considerable financial resources, and undoubted drew a large part of them from local communities. The difference lay in the way in which these buildings were financed and this provides crucial evidence for the shift in the principles essential to the Late Roman social hierarchy.

Despite this growing awareness of institutional change concurrent with the rise of Christianity during the fourth and fifth centuries, some scholars have continued to interpret the economics of church construction exclusively through the lens of a pre-Christian paradigm largely informed by logic and structures implicit in civic organization centered around a highly competitive curial hierarchy. The proximate reason for this confusions lies in a particular line of argument, advanced most deliberately by J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz and A.H.M. Jones, that tied the decline of cities to the decline of the curial class. P. Whittow and H. Kennedy, relying primarily on evidence from Asia Minor and Syria respectively have argued that institutional changes, such as the increase in imperial

funding, the rise of the church, and the formation of a class of provincial elite with close
ties to the capital, should not be misinterpreted as economic changes. H. Kennedy has
worked to demonstrate that the decline of secular building in Syria and the increase in
ecclesiastical construction were identical barometers of regional prosperity. P. Whittow,
perhaps going ever further, has argued that ecclesiastical construction represented the
same instinct by the same individuals as earlier forms of secular patronage. These
arguments while according well with the view that bishops of the 4th - 6th centuries were
drawn from the curial class, do not always recognize the ways in which changes in the
attitudes toward acts of civic or community munificence accompanied institutional
change. Thus, one of the real issue confronting scholars interested in the transformation
of the Late Antique city is to clarify the role of institutional change, particularly the
emergence of the Christian church, of the basic structure of civic finances and
monumental construction in the Late Roman city.

One group of scholars, including Veyne, P. Brown, E. Patlagean, and others have
recognized that during Late Antiquity a desire for salvation in the afterlife acquired
increased significance as an impetus for munificence. This change in the mentality
behind the financing of monumental architecture appears to have been restricted by the
more deeply set structures of civic patron-client behavior. This allowed for the putative
persistence of basic divisions between donor/patron and receiver/client albeit in a state
transformed by Christian morality. Thus, for Brown, for example, the bishop assumed
the role of civic patron despite the fact that Christian morality dictated that the more

important reward for munificence was no longer the veneration of the clientes, but rather
the salvation of the soul.\textsuperscript{19} Patlagean and Dagron, who understood important shifts in the
basic social fabric of the Late Antique city and the concept of citizenship perceived the
bishop as an economic patron of a new kind of economically constituted citizen/client.\textsuperscript{20}

Other scholars, however, have examined the mechanics of church financing
during Late Antiquity and suggested that the financial organization of church
construction was fundamentally different from earlier periods. J.-P. Caillet approached
the matter through an examination of mosaic floors where a close correlation existed
between the amount of the donation recorded on the floor and the size of the pavement.\textsuperscript{21}
From these pavements he was able to differentiate between church construction financed
through “official” dedications, which were made by bishops and other church officials
and included the institutional wealth of the church, and lay donations, which were non-
institutional personal wealth. A.H.M. Jones likewise differentiated between the churches
financed by institutional wealth and private churches, typically built by wealthy land
owners on their estates.\textsuperscript{22} The former were tied closely to ecclesiastical politics and
resources, whereas the latter, so-call parochial churches, were independent from
episcopal financial or administrative control. J. P. Thomas’s study of private religious

\textsuperscript{18} H. Kennedy, “The Last Century of Byzantine Syria: A Reinterpretation,” \textit{ByzFor} 10 (1985), 176-177; M.
Whittow, “Ruling the Late Roman and Early Byzantine City: A Continuous History,” \textit{Past and Present} 129
(1990), 13-20.
\textsuperscript{20} E. Patlagean, \textit{Pauverté économique et pauverté sociale à Byzance, 4e-7e siècles.} (Paris 1977); G.
Dagron, “Le christianisme dans la ville Byzantine,” \textit{DOP} 31 (1977), 19-23; Also: H. Sarandi-Mendelovici,
\textsuperscript{21} J.P. Caillet, “Les dédicaces privées de pavements de mosaique à la fin de l’Antiquité. Occident européen
et monde grec donées socio-économique,” in \textit{Artistes, artisans, et production artistique au Moyen Age.} vol
II. (Paris 1987), 34.
foundations, however, suggested a far more complex reality than advanced by either Jones or Caillet. Thomas noted that there were not clear boundaries between churches funded through institutional wealth, private funds, and episcopal resources, and, in fact, diverse donors contributed money to all kinds of churches.23

More recently, W. Bowden, has proposed a model for understanding the financial system that supported the construction of churches in Late Antique Epirus Vetus.24 He proposed a system where churches built from various sources of wealth ranging from imperial donations to the resources of powerful local bishops to the more humble contributions of craftsmen who gave small amounts of money or provided free labor. Furthermore, the churches once built continued to depend on these individuals and institutions for support as the buildings demanded financial support for both physical maintenance and the pay for the clergy. The local bishop oversaw this system and was responsible not only for the allocation of resources in church construction but also for soliciting the necessary additional resources. Bowden concluded that while the new public buildings were funded by a broad section of the community, their construction continued to provided “testimony to the rise of a new elite in late antique society.”25 The relationship between the impact of the buildings on the status of the clergy and the status of the individuals who financed their construction was not pursued in Bowden’s analysis,

23 J. P. Thomas, Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire, (Washington D.C. 1987), He notes the difficulty in distinguishing between truly independent foundations and those which were only lay assisted.
but the systems of church finance he proposed recognized the change in the economic structure of monumental construction.

The inscriptions from Greece paint a complex picture of the financing of church construction. Only a very few buildings can be definitely credited to a single patron, either ecclesiastical or lay. Most buildings, for which there is epigraphic evidence, appear to be the product of cooperative efforts, often including both the laity and the clergy. It is sometimes difficult, however, to know whether to associate the inscribed sentiments to the original construction of a church or as part of a subsequent renovation or addition at which time the relationship between the church and its social and economic context may have changed. Despite this ambiguity it is nevertheless possible to make a number of positive statements regarding economics of church construction in Greece and to suggest that they represent significant changes in the way in which monumental architecture was funded during Late Antiquity.

It is clear that some structures in Greece have every sign of being episcopal foundations. The inscriptions from Basilica A at Nikopolis memorialized the contributions of two bishops and placed a strong emphasis on their generosity (Ep. Cat. 21-24). This suggests that this church was a principal church for the important city of Nikopolis. The first Dometios claims responsibility for the entire church and its decoration in an elaborate mosaic inscription which included a quote from Homer (Ep. Cat. 21). Later another bishop by the name of Dometios commemorates his own paving of the atrium (Ep. Cat. 24). The archbishop Alkison took credit on a floor mosaic for the foundation of another church in the city of Nikopolis, Nikopolis B, making it possible that this church was also an episcopal foundation (Ep. Cat. 23). He is likely to
be the same Alkison whose signed the Libellus of Hormisdas in opposition to the Henotikon in the conflict between the Pope Felix III and the Patriarch Acacius in the 515.26

The basilica at Tegea has occasionally been attributed to a certain Thyrsos and might represent an episcopal foundation as well, although nothing in the inscription explicitly claims this. The flamboyant text inscribed in the entryway to the church crediting Thysos with the buildings has often been read to interpret the building as either a monastic or episcopal foundation (Ep. Cat. 5). Recently A. Avramea has proposed that the church was not built to commemorate a bishop or hegemon Thyrsos, but rather the Early Christian martyr Thyrsos whose tomb may have been in the northern compartment of the narthex. This is unconvincing for several reasons not the least of which rests on the grammar of the inscription, as D. Feissel has properly noted.27

The other cases from Greece where a bishop’s name appears in the inscription, however, are not as clear cut as the examples from Nikopolis and appear to name the bishop as the coordinator or simply one of several contributors to a specific construction project.28 This suggests that, by and large, a rigid division between episcopal, lay, and

27 A. Avramea, “Ἡ Βασιλικὴ του Θύρσου στὴν Τεγέα καὶ ἡ εἰγραφή της,” *DXAE* (1999), 35-40. Argued that the important early Christian site of Tegea erected a church to the martyr Thyrsos as a rival to the Korinthian martyr Leonidas, noting that in at least one martyrology, the two saints were celebrated on the same day, January 28th. See D. Feissel, *BE* (2000), 797.
28 Several of these inscriptions which either include a bishop alongside the names of other individuals or note a bishop but make no specific claim regarding his personal relationship to the construction project, involve the phrase ἐπὶ + a proper name and this has occasioned at least two variant readings which make it difficult to determine from the inscribed text who is exactly responsible for the munificent act (see for instance the different reading presented in a single work by a single scholar: C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity.* (London 1989), nos. 25, 29 where she rendered ἐπὶ + the gen. as “in the time of” as compared to nos. 42 and 60 where she rendered the same formula “under.”). I. Ševčenko in “The Sion Treasure: Evidence from the Inscriptions,” in *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate in Sixth Century Byzantium.* eds. S. A. Boyd and M. M. Mango. (Washington, DC 1992), 42-42 argued that the formula ἐπὶ followed by a
clerical financing of church construction is not applicable in a Greek context. The existence of inscriptions from individuals of widely varying ranks suggests cooperation between the bishop and the community. Contemporary inscriptions from the church at Klapsi, for example, record the cooperation between a relatively large group of individuals. The inscription in the central nave refers to the Holiest Bishop Aimelianos during whose time the mosaic was made, thus suggesting, along with the churches ornate decoration, an association with the city's episcopal seat. The presence of several other inscriptions crediting various members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy with contributions

name is simply a convention of dating and might say nothing concerning the actual patron of the object. M. Mango in Silver from Early Byzantium. The Kaper Koraon and Related Treasures. (Washington 1986), 3 (see no. 65 and 57) offered a slightly different reading of this formula noting that silver with the formula ἐπὶ, might represent objects that were acquired “(under”) a certain clergyman”. That is, acquired by a member of the clergy through a combination of sources available to the church ranging from rents from land, to small donations, to the regular funds available for the upkeep and maintenance of the church building. The former interpretation accords well with Caillet's, suggestion that members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy may have acted as coordinators of donations, particularly those for smaller or more humble aspects of the church such as floor mosaics, silver plate, and liturgical or architectural furnishings ("Dedicaces privees de pavements de mosaique," 34). The churches of Greece show the potential for various readings: An inscription from a thorakion found in the church of Philiatra in Elis included both the name of a bishop, which is now lost, and a phrase plausibly reconstructed to provide a more precise date (Ep. Cat. 20). The word κολάνθων has been supplied by its editor, Pallas, and affirmed by L. Robert in order to understand the ΙΑΝ found on the subsequent line as the first letter of the word Ἰωνησιάν (Pallas, ΡΑΕ (1960), 186; L. and J. Robert, Bull. Œpig. (1967), 282 referred to this as “fragments d’une datation par l’évêque.”). An inscribed closure panel from Basilica Beta at Nea Anchialos credits Stephen the humble deacon for the donation of the stone in the time of or under the Bishop Elipidos (Ep. Cat. 55). At Kallion, in Phocis an inscription including the ἐπὶ formula states that the building was constructed from its foundations (ἐκ θεμελίων) and laid out (ἐκεντρήθη) ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐλαβείστατος πρεσβυτέρου Διονύσου. It went on to ask everyone who is goes in the room to pray for Dionysios and his family. Other inscriptions from the annex, however, do not include the ἐπὶ formula, and instead feature ex-voto sentiments and the exact amount of the donations (Ep. Cat. 43-45). In the church at Klapsi (ancient Klausion in Euytania), three inscriptions, apparently contemporary, use the ἐπὶ formula, but refer to two different individuals (Ep. Cat. 27-29). Two lengthy inscriptions include names of a great and God-loving bishop Aminianos, two priests, a reader and steward as well as a general reference to “all the other clergy” and an indication date. Elsewhere in the same church a single inscription uses a similar formula with the name Didymos, but the additional phrase ἐπὶ τῶν κεραυ (Ep. Cat. 29). This Didymos, otherwise unknown, is not named in any other inscription nor is he provided with a rank or office. Moreover, the inscription's small size and remote location, at the top of a mosaic decorating the north apse on an apsidal transept, suggests that Didymos was the donor of only that mosaic. An examination of the inscriptions from Greece that use the ἐπὶ formula shows that this formula did not have a consistent meaning in the epigraphy of Early Christian Greece. While it might, in some cases, stand simply as a chronological marker, in other cases it seems likely to function to assign credit to a particular individual for coordinating the financing of a particular project.
to the building's decoration, however, reflect a more complicated financial situation than the mosaics at Nikopolis. If this is, in fact, the principal church of Klapsi, then this might reflect co-operative construction methods employed by even the highest members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. It is likewise possible, however, that bishops gave money to decorate non-principal churches. In fact, the inscription from a mosaic panel dedicated by the Archbishop Peter in Nea Anchialos Gamma seems to reflect this possibility (Ep. Cat. 56). As does the inscribed ambo at Tegea, which the bishop Ophielos dedicated for his salvation, although it is possible that he provided for the entire church as well (Ep. 5).

It is also probable that in some cases, such as Nikopolis or Hermione, mosaic floors were constructed or donated later than the church and thus inscriptions could commemorate subsequent donors. Whether any of these churches should be understood as principal churches or private churches remains difficult to say. Thus perhaps the only conclusions that one can draw from these findings is that church construction received both episcopal and private financial support.

There is some evidence, however, for private lay foundations in Greece. At Daphnousia, Eugenios and his wife Dionysiea constructed a church from its foundations. The epithet λαμπροτάτος identifies Eugenios as an individual of a senatorial family, the Eastern equivalent of vir clarissimi (Ep. Cat. 49). A certain Damokratia, ἡ λαμπροτάτη, appears to claim responsibility for Basilica Alpha at Demetrias (Ep. Cat. 52-53). In the church in Aigio, a fragmentary inscription credits an individual whose name is now lost with the construction of the church from the foundation (Ep. Cat. 2). A poorly reported mosaic inscription from Megara seems to attribute this building a single, possibly lay donor (Ep. Cat. 14). Finally, the floor inscription at Delphi is too fragmentary for any
certain analysis, but it seems to represent a lay foundation since no plausible reconstruction of an episcopal or ecclesiastical title is likely (Ep. Cat. 40-41). Despite the fragmentary state of the evidence these inscriptions provide clear evidence for lay foundations in Greece.

While it is apparent that individuals donated a wide range of materials and furnishings to churches, it is often difficult to determine even the relative financial value of a particular dedication. Marble columns, plaques, and liturgical furnishings, among the more common gifts to churches, were often made from spolia, and consequently their value varied considerably depending on the availability of disused building material in a particular region. Other dedications to Greek churches, such as textiles or precious metal vessels and decorations, have not survived in sufficient numbers to allow any real conclusions. The only artifact that can shed consistent light on the pattern of donations in Greek churches are mosaic floors.

The donation of a mosaic floors was a broadly accessible way to contribute to the decoration of an Early Christian church in the Mediterranean. Mosaic floors represent one of the most common aspects of church decoration in Greece with over 80 examples preserved. They were not, however, among the more expensive decorations available to someone wishing to adorn monumental architecture. D. Janes, in his study of gold decoration and Caillet, in his study of dedicatory inscription in Italy, noted that

---

29 Bowden, *Town and Country*, 148: noted that opus sectile floors like at Nikopolis A, or in the Korinthia at Lechaion or Sikyon were more expensive. Presumably the terracotta floors found at churches like that at Nemea represent the other end of this spectrum.
individuals of extreme wealth rarely donated mosaic floors. This may be attributable to the relatively modest cost of floors, which we can derive generally from two sources. One, is Diocletian’s Price Edict, where it established the daily rate of a mosaicist as 50-60 denarii per day. These figures compared favorably to the daily rate for a mason or carpenter at 50 denarii a day, or an ordinary wall painter at 75, and were considerably lower than those offered to a figure painter at 150 denarii a day. The other source for the relative value of floor mosaics are the mosaics themselves, which not only occasionally indicated of the value of the gift made to the church, but also are sufficiently well-preserved to allow some estimate of their total area. Caillet, has used the evidence from the mosaics themselves to argue that, while the cost of mosaics showed tremendous regional variation, they were generally inexpensive with costs ranging from as little as 50 m² per solidus from a mosaic in Crete to 3 m² per solidus in from mosaics in N. Italy and in Palestine (3 m² per solidus). Only two mosaics in the area covered by this dissertation provide sufficient information for this kind of analysis. A mosaic in the church at Antikyra in Boeotia has a mosaic crediting Elizabeth and Simian with a gift of a single solidus (Ep. Cat. 16-17). Unfortunately the mosaic is too badly damaged to allow us to determine the cost per square meter of floor (Ep. Cat. 43-46). A mosaic from the annex of a church at Kallion, which also includes the amount donated by the individual, is in better condition. Here approximately 65 sq. meters of mosaic is preserved. Caillet

misread the inscriptions and determined that 2 ½ solidi were paid for this mosaic (approx. 26m² per solidus) rather than 2 solidi (32.5m² per solidus). Notwithstanding Caillet’s mistake, these figures must be used with caution. On the one hand, scholars have already taken note of the tremendous regional differences in both wages and prices. The quality and subject matter of the mosaic would have also influenced the cost as would the availability of a local mosaicist to do the work. On the other, the exact financial relationship between the inscribed donation and the completed mosaic remains unclear. Unlike mosaics in Palestine or Italy, the donors never establish the relationship between their donation and the amount of mosaic donated. This ambiguity makes more specific conclusions regarding the relationship between cost of floors and the value of the donations, difficult to sustain.

The modest amounts recorded in some of the inscriptions from Greece, however, reinforce the notion that ecclesiastical giving was not simply an elite venture.

Understanding the value of the solidus in any local economy is very difficult.

---


35 J.P. Caillet, “Les dédicaces privées de pavements,” 15-36: cited four inscriptions included in this study which he determined to have a clearly defined relationship between the donor and the area of the floor. These are the floor at Laureotikos Olympos, where an anonymous donor gave 40 sq. m.; Nea Anchialos A, where an anonymous donor gave 20-30 sq. m.; Nea Anchialos Gamma, where the Bishop paid for an inscribed floor panel (approx. 15 sq. m. -- no dimensions were given of the floor panel); and Molaoi, where an anonymous donor gave nearly 100 sq. m. of mosaic. Unfortunately his reasoning behind this was obscure and in many cases supported by erroneous readings of the inscriptions. For example, at Molaoi, the inscription clearly commemorated the gift of more than a single donor as it refers to “all of them” and their “names”. For this reason I have decided not to include a discussion of this material in this dissertation.

36 See for example: J.-P. Caillet, _L'evergetisme Monumental Chretien en Italie et a es Marges: D'apres l'epigraphy des pavements de mosaique (IVè-VIIè s.)_, (Rome 1993), 451-459 for numerous examples from Italy; R. and A. Ovadiah, _Hellenistic, Roman, and Early Byzantine Mosaic Pavements in Israel._ (Rome
Furthermore, it is clear that the urban and rural poor may have had very limited access to only small amounts of small denomination currency. There is, however, reason to believe that an artisan class existed with access to modest amounts of disposable capital. The donations of one or a half a solidus recorded on the floors at Kallion and Antikyra represent fairly meager contributions in the economic terms of the Late Roman Empire. The most impoverished families would have lived on as little as 3 solidi a year and from various sources we know that a laborer made between 7 and 10 solidi a year. Even if we assume that the income of a laborer in Greece is considerably lower, a half solidus donation remains modest. A point of comparison is the donation of ecclesiastical silver to churches. A sermon by Severus of Antioch, called upon his congregation to donate silver claiming that even the poorest could afford to give a pound of silver (approx. 4 solidi). M. Mango in her discussion of the monetary value of ecclesiastical silver donations noted that the least expensive silver pieces (chalices, lamps, and censors) probably cost only around 4 solidi, although they could, of course cost much more. The

---

1987), no. 55, p. 46. A fragmentary inscription from the Synagogue at Caesarea Maritima recorded Iulis for a vow made...feet (πόδες).
37 W. Bowden, “A New urban elite?”, 63; C. Morrison, “Monnaix et prix à Byzance du Ve au VIIe siècle,”
40 M. Mango, "Monetary Value of Silver Revetments and Objects," 133.
general impression left by the prices of mosaic and the wages of the day is that mosaic floors, like liturgical vessels, provided an inexpensive medium available to all but the poorest of private donors. Despite this these individuals wanted to memorialize the exact amount of their donation, and all but one have the names of the donors. While the exact cost of features like chancel screens, small columns, column capitals, and even liturgical furnishings such as ambos would have varied greatly, the inscriptions provide no evidence that a different group was responsible for these objects. It is therefore possible that individuals of modest wealth could afford almost all the basic adornments preserved in Early Christian basilicas in Greece, excluding, of course, mosaics on walls and vaults which were more expensive on account of their common use of gold leaf.41

The modest cost of these adornments would have made giving money to the church accessible to a wide range of individuals, and, as I will demonstrate in the second half of this chapter, the rewards for the donations were considerable. The modest cost of donations to church must be at least partially responsible for the wide array of individuals represented in dedicatory inscriptions. From among the ecclesiastical hierarchy, archbishops (Ep. Cat. 25, 56), bishops (Ep. Cat. 4, 5, 6, 20, 21-24, 2, 34, 55), priests (Ep. Cat. 27, 28), presbyters (Ep. Cat. 46), deacons (Ep. Cat. 55), deaconesses (Ep. Cat. 31, 47), sub-deacons (Ep. Cat. 20), readers (Ep. Cat. 15, 18, 19, 27, 37, 47), and stewards (oikonomos) (Ep. Cat. 27, 28) are all represented.42 Moreover, they donated all manner and location of floor mosaics. Bishops donated mosaics in the nave and atrium. Presbyters paved the bema, nave, and rooms in non-liturgical ecclesiastical buildings.

41 D. Janes, Gold and God, 55-60.
Reads donated a paved mosaic floors and an ambo. A reader at Olympia who was a marbler likely paid for, at least the marble plaque inscribed with an appeal to Christ for help. A marbler was a member of the artisan class in Late Antiquity and would have earned more than a typical day laborer. Among the laity there is far less evidence for secular or civic status among donors to churches. From Greece, while there are numerous examples of non-clerical laity giving donations, there are only two, from Daphnousia and Basilica A at Demetrias, providing status marking epithets, both of which commemorate individuals of senatorial rank. Another inscription from Olympia named a Kyriakos as an estate holder (ἐμφυτευτής) (Ep. Cat. 19). While detailed information regarding the status of lay donors is elusive, the widely varied status of the clergy, the modest cost of the church decorations, and the regular occurrence of multiple donors, suggests that contributing to the church was open to many individuals within society. This reflects a significant shift in the practice of civic munificence from earlier periods when the civic elite served narrowly as an exclusive donor class in the ancient city.

It is impossible to deduce truly quantitative economic data from this corpus of inscriptions. It is possible, however, to venture some impressionistic conclusions regarding the economic structure of early Christian communities in Greece. This basic analysis demonstrates that while several churches appear to have been initially

---

42 A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 906-908 noted that priests and deacons, at least, were salaried, he noted “From a financial point of view the order which a cleric held was much less important that the church to which he belonged.” (906)


44 Although this is not true of Late Antique mosaics from Greece more generally.
constructed by single “donors” or families, many churches were communal efforts. Of the 40 churches with inscriptions, 13 named more than one member of the community. In addition to these churches where there is evidence for multiple donors, it is a fair guess that several other donor inscriptions which exist on single architectural members, like marble plaques, columns, ambos probably reflect churches decorated by multiple donors even though the evidence for the other donors no longer exists. In the end, it would appear likely that over half the churches would have involved multiple donors in their construction.

Early Christian inscriptions presents evidence suggesting a shift in the way in which monumental architecture was financed and challenges the traditional view of ancient munificence as controlled by a small group of wealthy elite. There are several possible reasons for this. P. N. Kardulias has argued that the large scale construction projects of Late Antiquity demanded no less resources than the construction projects of the middle Roman period.45 If we observe with Bowden, that the proliferation of ecclesiastical architecture throughout Greece occurred within a relatively narrow span of 150-200 years (ca. AD 450-AD 600), we can imagine that considerable pressure was placed on the resources of Late Antique communities, especially if we assume that at least initially only a percentage of the community would be available and interested in supporting Christian building due to persistent predilections for paganism.46 Moreover, we know that many communities in Late Antiquity deployed considerable resources to the construction of large fortification walls during this same 200-year period and

---

continued to maintain and modify their urban centers as well.\textsuperscript{47} It is possible that the widespread construction activities of this period taxed the resources available to late antique communities in a way that exceeded the ability of the traditional social structure to provide resources. Consequently, new forms of social and economic organization emerged to accommodate the increased pressure on local resources.

This model does not provide much of an explanation for why churches were constructed despite the pressure on resources, nor does it explain why communal involvement in the financing of church construction emerged as the specific solution to a putative resource crisis. M. P. Bonz provided a possible interpretation of these practices in her effort to explain the differences between Jewish and pagan benefaction in late 3\textsuperscript{rd} and early 4\textsuperscript{th} Sardis.\textsuperscript{48} She argued that the secular or pagan government of Sardis donated the space in a public building for the synagogue during the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century when the web of wealthy donors and municipal officials who supported civic institutions and buildings collapsed under the financial pressures of late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century economic crisis. The Jews continued to be able to support institutions like the Sardis synagogue despite financial pressures because they drew on “a flexible and broadly based revenue structure, consisting of large and small private donations and a well-supported common fund.”\textsuperscript{49} Bonz speculated that this adaptive economic structure had roots both in a particular Jewish attitude toward giving which stressed the necessity and advantages of even


\textsuperscript{49} Bonz, “Differing Approaches,” 152.
humble donations to the temple or synagogue, and in the fact that Jews were large group with a high degree of internal cohesion.

It is possible, as W. Meeks has argued, that the social organization of Early Christian communities was related to that of the early synagogue. L. Michael White, has similarly suggested parallels between the organizational structure of private cults, synagogues, and Early Christian communities in the period before Constantine. These parallels might include the development of a similar form of financial organization that persisted from a period before the construction of large scale monumental architecture. Moreover, Early Christian communities in Greece may have relied on older forms of financial organization on account of strains placed on the resources available to them, such a general increase in construction in the Late Antique city and the presumed reluctance of the pagan minority to support Christian cult buildings. The evidence for any of these trends, as for the Late Roman economy in Greece more generally, remains scant except that churches do appear to draw from a broad based revenue structure with smaller and more substantial donors sharing the burden of Early Christian architectural expansion. The following section will demonstrating that there is also epigraphic evidence to reflecting a shift in the motivation for Early Christian donations to building in Greece that might have allowed the continued construction of monumental architecture even when faced with limited economic resources.

51 L. Michael White, *Buildings God’s House in the Roman World*. (Baltimore 1990), despite the promising title White adds very little to our understanding of how Early Christian communities were financed.
5.2. Socio-religious motivations in ecclesiastical inscriptions

The following section will examine the formulae used in ecclesiastical inscriptions in order to gain insights into the religious and social mindset behind donations to ecclesiastical foundations. This section of the chapter will examine the inscriptions not as evidence for the economics of church finance, but rather as evidence for the motivation behind giving to churches. I will examine in particular the methods the faithful used to commemorate their donations. Any conclusion drawn from a relatively small group of inscriptions will necessarily remain tentative. Moreover, any attempt to argue for motivation from epigraphic evidence remains perilous as the use of particular formulae could be influenced as often by vagaries in the epigraphic habit as by genuine changes in mentality. Nevertheless the interplay between inscriptions and ritual and between Christian epigraphy and traditional epigraphic practice in the context of the aforementioned shift in the economics of monumental building suggest changes reflected in both the act and expression of pious giving.

This study will draw upon certain basic assumptions regarding epigraphy during antiquity. First, the individual responsible for the inscription intended the sentiments to be expressed orally or in conjunction with a spoken ritual. This was an essential characteristic of ancient epigraphy and represented an attitude toward writing which viewed it as an extension of the oral as much as an independent medium of communication.\textsuperscript{52} This interpretation of written texts in antiquity supports the second

assumption essential to my reading of the epigraphic evidence from churches – the oral aspect of inscribed texts places epigraphic evidence within the realm of performance and ritual. Among those who study the ancient world, particularly magic, J. L. Austin’s and S. J. Tambiah’s works on performative utterances has provided a basis for interpreting certain inscribed sentiments as “speech acts.” These theories have been most effectively deployed in discussions of ancient magical objects which include prayers and images meant to aid the possessor and, sometimes, bring ill to an enemy.53 For inscribed magical objects like amulets or curse tablets which were largely devoid of any known ritual context, this theory has tremendous appeal and utility because it conceives of the words themselves as the ultimate locus of ritual action.54 More recent scholarship, drawing on social linguistics, has downplayed the significance of the meaning of the words themselves, and emphasized the importance of the ritual context of the words, even if the only evidence for this comes from verbal indicators within the texts themselves.55 Since, as I have argued throughout this dissertation, we have certain indications regarding the


basic pattern of liturgical, or ritual, movement within Early Christian basilicas in Greece, we can place many of the inscriptions from known architectural contexts within a broad ritual context. This approach will make it possible to interpret with a finer degree of specificity not only what the donors intended through their donations, but also how the words in the inscriptions worked to accomplish these goals or objectives.

The inscriptions from the churches in Greece can be arranged into three groups based upon the implied reason for their dedication and the formula they employed. Each of these groups have parallels from around the eastern Mediterranean both on floor mosaics and on other artifacts typically associated with an Christian ritual space. Group one consists of inscriptions which glorify or honor the individual who made or coordinated the donation. They typically did not make an explicit reference to a religious motivation for the donation. In their simplest form these texts merely named the individual responsible, although they could be more elaborate in crediting the donor with their achievements. The second group explicitly stated a religious motivation for a gift and expressed this with a typical Christian ex-voto formula, which could either name the donor or refer to the donor as “the one whose name God knows”. The final group are inscribed prayers with a verb in the imperative, the addressee in the vocative, and in some cases a noun in the accusative naming the donor. These texts may or may not explicitly refer to the act of donation or even the donor, but I am assuming a relationship between the act of donation and the text itself on account of parallels between the placement of these inscriptions and other inscriptions which are explicitly dedicatory or ex-voto in nature. In language, these texts can be quite similar to graffiti found commonly in

---

55 R. Bauman, *Verbal Art as Performance*. (Rowley, MA 1977); E. Goffman, *Frame Analysis: An Essay*
churches throughout the eastern Mediterranean, but are distinguished from it by their more formal nature.\textsuperscript{56} This seems to suggest a closer relationship between the inscription and the object in which they are cut, if stone, or arranged, if mosaic, than one would expect from a graffito.

The first group of inscriptions include a wide array of texts which praise or name a donor, but do not assign an explicitly religious motivation for the donation. The best examples of this are: the series of Dometios inscriptions from Nikopolis A (Ep. Cat. 21-23), the inscription naming the Archpriest Peter from Nea Anchialos Gamma (Ep. Cat. 56), and an inscription crediting Ioannes from an ambo found at Troezen (Ep. Cat. 8). These inscriptions are all more or less complete and explicitly credit a donor for a particular donation. Other inscriptions which are similar to these in that they do not contain an explicit reference to religious motivation include the two inscriptions naming Damokratia with her honorific, \textit{η λαμπροστάτη}, on the floor of the Basilica A at Demetrias (Ep. Cat. 52-53). Another names a certain Neo as the maker of a column capital from Mytikas in Acarnania (Ep. Cat. 1). Several fragmentary inscriptions should be added to this groups including the well-known, but as yet only poorly published Alkison inscription from Basilica B at Nikopolis (Ep. Cat. 54), an inscription from Aigion (Ep. Cat. 2), and an unedited presumably Christian mosaic from Megara (Ep. Cat. 14).

There are several problematic inscriptions which I have placed in this group since they do not claim a religious motivation for the donation. The inscription from a mosaic

\textsuperscript{56} Sironen, 11-12, refers to inscriptions “in the proper meaning of the word (i.e. texts cut in stone, not merely scratched)”
at Hermione (Ep. Cat. 7) and at Philiatra name bishops (Ep. Cat. 20). Two similar
inscriptions from the well-inscribed mosaic at Klapsi in Eurytania name specific
members of the clergy, as well as the clergy generally, in the donation of mosaic panels
in the central nave and bema (Ep. Cat. 27-28). In the north conch of the transept an
inscription refers to a certain a certain Dydimos (Ep. Cat. 29). Finally, the mosaic from
the floor of the Thyrsos basilica has certain commonalities with inscriptions crediting
certain individuals for donations or construction (Ep. Cat. 5). It praises Thyrsos for noble
things and appears to credit him for the buildings and mosaic floors, whether he helped
spiritually as a holy martyr or historically as wealthy bishop remains open to debate.

Several of these inscriptions stand out on account of their length and elaborate
nature. The most impressive is perhaps series of Dometios inscriptions from the north
wing of the transept, the nave and the ancillary room the south of the narthex. This series
of inscriptions is quite similar to secular inscriptions in their exaggerated praise of the
patron.57 The use of a Homeric quotation “όσσα τε γαῖαν ἐπὶ πνεῖει τε καὶ ἑρπεῖ” 58
appears to be exceptional among inscriptions from Southern and Central Greece and
further attests to the classicizing nature of this inscription despite its placement in a
Christian context. The best parallel for this kind of language comes from the inscription
at the entrance to the nave of the Thyrsos basilica in Tegea which Pallas has identified as
metrical (Ep. Cat. 5).59 He has likewise identified a metrical inscription from the south

57 See: Sironen, nos. 4-30, pps. 52-100. for some examples from Attica.
58 Il. 17.447; Od. 18.141
59 D. I. Pallas, “Παλαιοχριστιανικές ρωμικές ἐπιγραφικές,” Rivista di Studi Byzantini e Neoellenici
10/11 (1973/74), 41-42.
aisle of Basilica G at Nea Anchialos (Ep. Cat. 56). The reference to the Archbishop Peter as a teacher combines with the metrical composition to testify to Peter’s familiarity with classical paideia, among the traditional hallmarks of the Mediterranean elite. Thus each of these inscriptions from Nikopolis A, Basilica Gamma at Nea Anchialos and the Thrysos basilica at Tegea reflects the persistence of classical education as a sign of rank. In the case of Tegea and Nikopolis, mosaics with scenes drawn from an aristocratic context further encourages a reading of these texts that parallels the values associated with ecclesiastical officials with those of the pan-Mediterranean elite. It is interesting to note, however, that Dometios’ homonymous successor set up a mosaic inscription in the atrium of Basilica A at Nikopolis, which, in contrast to the inscription of his predecessor, bears no marks of classical values while thanking Christ for his office and the martyr Demetrios for his protection.

The remaining texts provide less direct information regarding the social world of Late Roman Greece. Individuals named in these inscriptions are typically identified by name and title, and this suggests that memorializing in stone or tesserae a position in the ecclesiastical or social hierarchy was an important consideration. Not only are high ecclesiastical positions, such as bishops, referred to by their titles, but laypersons of rank,

---

60 Pallas, “Παλαιοχριστιανικές ρωμικές ἑπιγραφικές,” 43: This inscription also has points of comparison to other inscriptions from Late Antiquity Greece. With an interesting comparanda from the Christian building in Thebes where another teacher, Paul, is credited with funding the mosaic floor in a Christian building with elaborate mosaics. Elsewhere in the same building, an inscription uses very similar language – σεμνος, σοφος – to praise the teacher Konstantine. The similarities between these inscriptions might be attributed to contact between the two regions in Greece either in terms of related although probably not identical workshops (Sodini, BCH 94 (1970), 739-753) or trading links between the areas: P. Petrides, BCH 121 (1997), 694


62 It is remotely possible that these inscriptions echo the language of acclamations see: C. Roueché, “Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire,” JRS 74 (1984), 181-199; P. Maas, “Metrische Akklamationen des Byzantiner,” BZ 21 (1912), 28-51 for their typical metrical structure.
such as ἡ λαμπροτάτη, Damokratia, used their honorific titles as well. The tendency to make clear one’s rank, however, is not limited to those inscriptions that are secular in tone.\textsuperscript{64} It is possible that the use of ἐπὶ formula in an ecclesiastical context by individuals whose rank would not traditionally have entitled them to serve as a chronological indicator, such as the untitled Didymos of the Klapsi floor, was an effort to imitate the practices of more prestigious individuals.

Drawing general conclusions regarding epigraphic practice in Greek churches from this small group of inscription is impossible. Several inscriptions from this group, however, tend to confirm trends visible in other media, particular floor mosaics. They draw on classical themes and meters to aggrandize the church and the donor while simultaneous placing the church and its high officials in the pan-Mediterranean aristocratic discourse. Outside of these several examples of explicit classicizing, however, there appears to be no overall tendency to identify oneself according to rank, either secular or ecclesiastical, than in ex-voto dedications, although designations of rank are considerably less likely to be found in inscribed prayers. There are also no instances of anonymous dedications. In general, this kind of dedication presented a group of donors, many of whom were members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, who sought to demonstrate their place among the Late Roman Eastern Mediterranean elite in a Christian context.

The second group of inscriptions are those identified by votive formulae. I have identified this type quite broadly to include any inscriptions which use the word ὀπὲρ and

\textsuperscript{63} D. Feissel, “L'éveque, titres, et fonctions d'apres les inscriptions greques jusqu'au VIIe siecle,” in \textit{Actes Du Xle Congres International d'Archeologie Chretienne}. vol. 1. (Rome 1989), 801-826.
a noun. This means that several types of inscriptions which may, in fact, be liturgical or even honorific are included here. The reason for this are three. First, there are grammatical similarities between liturgical and honorific language and the language of votive. Second, they appear in the same architectural context within the Christian church. Finally, the formula of liturgy and votive are occasionally intermixed suggesting that the two forms had become conflated. This group of inscriptions is the most common found in the Early Christian churches in Greece (25) and among the most common type of non-funerary Early Christian inscription.

Votive offerings with the ὑπὲρ ἐνχηρεῖα formula are the most common forms of Christian ex-voto offerings in the Eastern Mediterranean. Despite this, there have been only sporadic efforts to study the meaning of the formula in a Christian context. In the DACL, H. Leclerq assembled and discussed briefly ex-voto formulae. He demonstrates the wide range of liturgical objects and furnishings upon which ex-voto formula appear and linked the formula and practice to earlier pagan votives. The formula employed in Christian votives, however, differs from the most common formula from a pre-Christian context, while on the simplest level performing the same basic function – to mark an object as a gift to the divine or its representative. The formulas employed in a Christian context and the location of the dedication within the church served to integrate a wide array of ideas into the experience of Christian ritual and liturgical space.

64 Sironen, 401-408, has demonstrated that the use of honorifics or titles of rank may be, in fact, relatively less common in a funerary context.
W. Burkert defined a votive in antiquity as "a gift made to the god in consequence of a vow."\textsuperscript{66} The exchange of gifts then obligated the deity to respond to a, "a self-imposed 'if-then'" in Burkert's words.\textsuperscript{67} This vow took the form of a prayer, and thus the use of the word "εὐχὴν" which can be defined most simply as a public acclamation. The successful fulfilment of the vow by the god was the sign of a good relationship between the individual and the particularly deity. The ex-voto offering was both the commemoration of this act and the sacrificial offering to the deity which ensure the vow's success. Pagan votives could range from whole temples to simple plaques set up around the temple or sacred area. There is no solid evidence that sacred votives were arranged in any particular way around the temple, although there was limited literary evidence to suggest that the best spots were close to the most sacred area of the temple.\textsuperscript{68}

Christian votive offerings use two formulae, neither of which appear to have enjoyed wide spread use among pagans. This suggests an effort to differentiate Christian votives from those erected in pagan sanctuaries. The pagan formulae commonly used the participle εὐξημενος or, particularly during the Roman period, the phrase κατεὐχὴν.\textsuperscript{69} The distinctively Christian ex-voto formula ὑπὲρ εὐχής is suitably rare in a pagan context to suggest a conscious effort to differentiate Christianity from paganism. The Christian formula is then typically followed by the name of the individual or individuals who made the vow in the genitive case.


The closest parallel to the Christian votive formula are those found in Jewish
synagogues, particularly those from Ionia, Lydia, and Caria in Asia Minor. B. Lifshitz in
his collection of donor and founder inscriptions from Jewish synagogues cites several
examples with the same formula. B. Lifshitz in his collection of donor and founder inscriptions from Jewish synagogues cites several examples with the same formula. C. Roeche noted that this formula is typical of
Christian and Jewish practices in Caria. In Caria, there is evidence for Jewish use of this
formula from the 3rd century, and it seems likely to have exerted influence on later
Christian practice in this region. For Greece, however, there is no evidence for the
Jewish use of the ὑπὲρ ἔναρμας formula; instead the few Jewish votive formula from
Greece tend to use the word ἔναρμα with the name of the donor such as in the series of ex-
voto dedications from the synagogue in Delos. It seems likely that the Christian use of
this formula in Greece derives from its use elsewhere in the Empire, rather than
immediate Jewish influence, although our knowledge of Jewish dedicatory practice from
the Greek mainland is quite limited.

In addition to this formula’s occasional use in a pagan or Jewish context, I would
identify other two sources which contributed to its application in a Christian setting. A
similar formula is not uncommon in imperial dedications. In these inscriptions found in
several places in Late Roman Achaia the preposition ὑπὲρ was often paired it the words

---

69 Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, 330-331 with examples. But see Ep. Cat. 46 for Christian use of a pagan
formula.
72 Lifshitz, *Donateurs*, no. 30 which Lifshitz states, “est sans doute du IIIe siècle de notre ère.”
73 There is some little evidence for this formula in an apparently pagan context: from Hermione: *SEG
17.163* and, interestingly from Caria: *BCH* 14 (1890), 371 no. 13; for other examples see: Rouse, *Greek
Votive Offerings*, 331.
74 Lifshitz, *Donateurs*, nos. 3-8.
Inscriptions with the formula ύπερ σωτηρίας are quite common in Early Christian contexts and often appear in the same contexts as ύπερ εὐχής inscriptions such as mosaics, thorakion panels, and ambos. Thus, these objects should be considered ex-voto dedications as well, but instead of representing the undefined εὐχή these inscriptions are rather more explicit and tie the dedication to the salvation of an individual or family member. A more complete discussion of the meaning of this inscription will follow, but it is possible that these inscriptions honoring God were intended to echo honors previously offered to the emperor or high dignitaries. That is to say that Christians drew on imperial language to describe God’s gift of salvation, or better in this context, security.

This, however, is not a simple example of the language of imperial dedication migrating to Christian use. It is likely that the ύπερ family of formulae also drew on liturgical language. Once again, the lack of a liturgical source for Greece limits the strength of the conclusions here, but based on comparisons between inscriptions and known liturgical texts elsewhere it appears that there was a relationship between inscribed architecture, silver liturgical objects, and the oral performance of Christian ritual. The formulae ύπερ εὐχής, ύπερ σωτηρίας, ύπερ ἀναπαύσεως καὶ...

---

75 Sironen, no. 38 from the Diogeneum at Athens; Feissel, “Inscriptions du Péloponnèse,” nos. 6, 7 from Korinth; IG 7.24 from Megara;
76 In the spirit of E. H. Kantorowicz, Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamation and Mediaeval Ruler Worship. (Berkeley 1946), 66 where he described how Byzantine court ceremonial grew to echo “the language of the liturgy.” Also: A. Cameron, Circus Factions. (Oxford 1976), 230-232.
78 F. E. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western. (Oxford 1896), Ap. Const. 25.22; Liturgy of St. James, 47.5, 62.17; Liturgy of St. Mark, 113.21, 120.5, 141.19; Coptic (Jacobite), 153.7;165.37;166.37; 183.18; Nestorian Liturgy 257.1,288.29; Liturgy of St. Basil (9th c.) 313.18; Armenian Liturgy, 424.29-30; The Luxor Diptych see: R. Taft, The Diptych. OCA 238 (Rome 1999), 83-85.
σωτηρίας,79 ύπερ ἀναπαύσεως καὶ ἀφέσεως,80 all appear in known liturgical sources from the east. G. Downey has demonstrated that the same or similar phrases appear on known fragments of Syrian Jacobite liturgy in particular, although it is clear that these, and similar phrases were present in other eastern liturgies as well.81

Downey examined one particular inscription on a silver liturgical vessel known as the “Chalice of Antioch” which read: ύπερ ἀναπαύσεως καὶ σωτηρίας. He interpreted this as being directed toward the repose of the (ἀναπαύσεως) of the deceased and for the safety (σωτηρίας) of the living.82 In comparing it to other inscriptions he commented on the occasional insertion of the phrase ύπερ εὐχής and determined that it was best understood as simply a variation. J. Lassus in his study of the churches of Syria also noticed the frequent pairing of the word εὐχής with the word σωτηρίας, and read the σωτηρίας to refer to heavenly salvation rather than earthly safety. The exact meaning of σωτηρίας is relatively unimportant except that if σωτηρίας referred to eternal salvation then with this formula a Christian donor "demande une recompense pour son acte de generosite."83 It is clear that Lassus read these inscriptions with the idea of the pagan votive in mind. Downey assumed that these inscriptions represented requests for the continued security of the living, thus, served as continual reminders to God of God's obligation to them. While Lassus and Downey noted the frequency of liturgical formulae

79 G. Downey, "Inscription on a Silver Chalice," AJA 55 (1951), 349-353; Brightman, Liturgies, 105.30-106.5.
81 G. Downey, "Inscription on a Silver Chalice from Syria in the Metropolitan Museum of Art," AJA 55 (1951), 349-353; R. Taft, The Diptych. OCA 238 (Rome 199), 83-85 cites the Luxor Diptych which includes the formula ύπερ τῆς σωτηρίας.
82 G. Downey, "Inscription on a Silver Chalice from Syria in the Metropolitan Museum of Art," AJA 55 (1951), 349-353.
in both the silver plate and architectural inscriptions from Syria, neither scholar explored the exact nature of the relationship between these inscriptions and the liturgy except to reference to them as "inspired by liturgical usage."^84

The majority of ex-voto type inscriptions from known the Early Christian basilicas in Greece use the ὑπὲρ ένασεως καὶ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν formula (Ep. Cat. 16, 17, 31, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 55, 58). Five of the twenty-five inscriptions identifiable as ex-voto types employ the ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας variation (E. Cat. 4, 9, 19, 32, 39). Two inscriptions use the more elaborate and most clearly liturgical formulas of ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν from near Porto Rafte in Attica (Ep. Cat. 15) and from Delphi ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν. (Ep. Cat. 15).^85 Inscriptions of all these types occurred across a wide range of architectural features with no apparent correlation between inscription formula and dedication. It is likely that the donor placed the inscription upon the dedicated object itself with the exception of the marble plaque from Olympia which commemorated the paving of the floor of the church.^86 The individuals commemorated by these inscriptions do not seem to be from a particular group, although perhaps members of the high clergy, such as Bishops and priests, are less common in these votive inscriptions than in inscriptions that praise the donor. Eugenios, in an mosaic inscription from Daphnousia, was a λαμπροτάτος (Ep. Cat. 49); deaconesses dedicated mosaics at Klapsi (Ep. Cat. 31), Patras (Ep. Cat. 3), and Malandrino in Phocis (Ep. Cat. 47), a reader gave a mosaic at Klapsi (Ep. Cat. 31); a deacon and reader gave a thorakion at Nea Anchialos (Ep. Cat. 55) and Porto Rafte respectively (Ep. Cat. 15). At the Martyrios

^84 Downey, “Inscription on a Silver Chalice,” 351.
^85 I have no source for the entirely reasonable emendation to this text.
basilica at Nea Anchialos, the Diogenianos and his son gave a mosaic for a vow in the memory of the priest Epaphra and his family (Ep. Cat. 59). There does not appear to be any correlation between the professed rank of donor and the kind of object dedicated.

Unfortunately it is impossible to place these texts in a specific liturgical context since similar phrases appear in a number of places in the eastern liturgies, and no specific liturgical text exists for Greece. It is clear, however, from their placement in the church that these inscriptions were meant to be read in the context of the liturgical space. The only inscriptions of this type that cannot be placed within the liturgical space of the church are those from Kallion which come from a series of annexes to the south of the narthex. Other mosaic inscriptions adorn the central panels of the narthex (Antikyra (Ep. Cat. 17), the Martyrios Basilica from Nea Anchialos (Ep. Cat.59), the Cemetery Basilica at Delphi (Ep. Cat. 41)), in the bema or apse (Demetrias B (Ep. Cat. 51), Klapsi, Daphnousia (Ep. Cat. 49), and Lavriotic Olympus) or a flanking chapel or diakonika (Molaoi I: Ep. Cat 39). The fragmentary mosaic from Patras (Ep. Cat. 3) would appear to be a nave mosaic on account of its east – west orientation. The inscriptions on these mosaics tend to be oriented to the west. The inscriptions on closure panels, which either come from parts of the chancel screen or intercolumnar parapets, would have also, presumably, faced toward the nave.

The location and orientation of the mosaics can provide important information concerning the attitude toward donations to the church. The complex interplay between the clergy, liturgy, and the divine place the donors and their dedication in a position both outside and dependent upon the existing ecclesiastical and ritual hierarchy. First, the

---

86 For other examples of this see: Roueché, Aphrodisias, 113-116; From Korinth: SEG 29.303.1,
mosaic and thorakion inscriptions appear to depend upon the route of the clergy during the liturgy. In some cases, such as those inscriptions in the bema, the inscriptions would not be ordinarily visible to the congregation arrayed in the aisles. Even inscriptions at the entrance to the main nave or in the central panel of the narthex might be outside the expected path of the congregation during the liturgical use of the church. The placement of the inscription in relation to the liturgical movement of the clergy complemented the language employed in the inscriptions, which, as I have demonstrated almost certainly contained echoes of liturgical utterances. While their position and apparent dependence on the clergy would suggest an intended clerical audience, their ex-voto nature, however, makes clear their real audience, God; for the vow, properly, was made to the Divinity. Inscriptions in silver plate from elsewhere in the Mediterranean show a similar sense of audience. Many times votive offerings were recorded on the objects in a script too small to be easily read from any distance or while carried in procession. The best parallel for this is the series of anonymous ex-voto inscriptions from Greece which record the donor as either the one whom God knows such as at Molaoi (Ep. Cat. 38: ὁθε ν οἱδεν ὁ Θ(εο)ς τὰ ὄνόμαται) or as God’s servant at Kiato (Ep. Cat. 33) or Eleusis (Ep. Cat. 12: τοῦ δοῦλου σου). These demonstrate the clearest break with traditional interpretations of civic munificence since these anonymous donations are clearly directed toward God rather than an earthly audience. Despite the placement of even these inscriptions in liturgical space, however, stresses the role of the clergy as

87 P. Donceel-Voûte, Les pavements des églises Byzantines de Syrie et du Liban I. (Louvain-de-Neuve 1988), 478 has made a similar observation regarding the mosaic pavements in the Greek east.
88M. Mundell Mango, Silver from Early Byzantium, 5; Chosroes II “the things written on this paten are not for the sight of men.” Evagrius HE 6.21; Compare to law of 538 “many persons are building churches in order to perpetuate their own names;” Justinian, Novel, 67.
mediators between humanity and divine by making them the proximate audience for an inscriptions designed to serve as a reminder to the divine or to commemorate the good will of God. The clearly public and votive formulae used to commemorate gifts to the divine would have advertised the efficacy of the clergy and the Christian ritual in achieving the desires of lay and clerical donors alike.

The placement of lay votives in the liturgical space provides some insight into both the function of Christian ex-voto inscriptions and the motivations for Christian giving, and church construction. The inscriptions of the laity which exist in a space defined by clerical ritual permitted a lay individual access to the divine independent of direct clerical intervention, but still within the framework of a Christian liturgy. This practice allowed the laity both to participate intimately, if by physical proxy, in the Christian liturgy and to penetrate the process whereby divine cosmology and hierarchy was communicated. The floors and architectural sculpture which made up the setting for the creation in human terms of Christian culture, divinely ordained hierarchy, and the rituals integral to proper relationship between God and humankind derived in part from the explicit generosity of the laity. By co-opting the language of one of the traditional forms of ritual gift, the votive, and a common formula for public honorifics, the Early Christians in Greece brought ancient ideas of piety to bear on the Christian liturgy and liturgical space – the process whereby the divine cosmology becomes manifest in historical time, physical space, and human society.

The third group of inscriptions consist of prayers for divine intervention. These inscriptions, like ex-votos, appear to be deployed according to liturgical movement, and occasionally use liturgical language. Typically they consist of a verb in the imperative
and a noun in the vocative. The best examples for this are in the basilica at Klapsi (Ep. Cat. 30), at Basilica B at Nea Anchialos (Ep. Cat. 54), at Malaoi I (Ep. Cat. 38), from near Korinth at the Kodratos Basilica (Ep. Cat. 35) and the basilica on Akrokorinth (Ep. Cat. 34), from Brauron (Ep. Cat. 11), and from the basilica at Kiato (Ep. Cat. 33).

Inscriptions of this kind, however, are not particularly uncommon anywhere in the Early Christian Mediterranean. Numerous inscriptions of this type appear in the discussions of Early Christian invocations and prayers from Asia Minor, the Levant, and Greece. Moreover, they often occur in the context of ecclesiastical activity, gracing Christian architecture, mosaic pavements, and liturgical silver. Despite their frequency in a Christian context, they drew part of their form and meaning, like ex-votos, from traditional religious practices and projected the thought world of popular religion onto acts of pious Christian dedication, the performance of liturgy and the creation of Christian cosmology. The context of the Christian liturgy and the cosmological meaning it imparted in Christian sacred space, however, brought these prayers into concert with Christian thought and probably contributed to their continued use into the Byzantine period and beyond.

The variation among these inscribed prayers probably reflects the different origins of these formulae. First, at least three inscribed prayers are of a type that often appear on magical objects and building inscriptions, particularly from Syria. Two inscriptions from a column at Brauron and a mosaic at Nea Anchialos respectively pray for βοήθεια (Ep. 89).

---

Cat. 54). The inscription from Brauron (Ep. Cat. 11) asks God to help the one who is praying and the one from Nea Anchialos asks St. Demetrios. An inscription from the nave mosaic of the well-inscribed church at Klapsi solicits protection (φυλαξίς) from St. Leonidas (Ep. Cat. 30). These inscriptions are often found in liturgical contexts elsewhere in the Mediterranean occurring regularly on liturgical silver. They occasionally appear in liturgical texts, however, as Donceel-Voute has argued in her study of inscriptions on mosaic floors in Syria and Lebanon, they are not properly liturgical.

The relationship between these two formulae and the language of inscribed amulets, in particular, has been recognized since the early part of this century. While none of these three inscription were found in a specifically magical context, as H. Maguire has argued for some inscribed sentiments on floors in Syria, the regular appearance of these specific formulae in the context of magic objects all but assures some relationship. Furthermore a meaning at least partially separate from their liturgical

---

90 Sironen, p. 334 n. 1, remarked that he is aware of two unpublished acclamation one of which is from Brauron and is “will soon be published.”
91 The use of this word is occasionally tied to the text of Ps. 25.20 or even better Ps. 140.04 where a similar formula appears.
context persisted as at least some of the βοηθεί inscriptions which are found on plain marble slabs may not have been installed in churches. Elsewhere in the East texts with these formulae often derive from houses, public buildings, or even fortifications. These formulae were also common in graffiti like the βοηθεί graffito made in a piece of revetment in the octagonal baptistery of the Lechaion Basilica (Ep. Cat 36), in several examples from Corinth, and in numerous texts dated to Byzantine period. Not all of the inscribed prayers found in churches derive from a magical context, however.

Some invocations which share grammatical similarities to βοηθεί types, in that they have an imperative and an accusative construction, are best considered liturgical. Three inscriptions in particular from Kiato (Ep. Cat 33), Molaoi I (Ep. Cat. 37) and one in the Kodratos Basilica from outside of Korinth request remembrance (Ep.Cat. 35: μνήσθητι); the inscriptions from Kiato and Molaoi direct the request to God, the Korinthian inscription to the Martyr St. Kodratos. Each inscription is carved in a different medium: Kiato on a thorakion panel, Molaoi I in a mosaic floor in the chapel or pastophorion situated to the south of the main nave, and Kodratos Basilica on a marble epistyle which, although preserved as the lintel of a tomb, was perhaps originally part of


97 Sironen, 332bis and 334. The inscription of reader and marbler Andreas from Olympia is probably from the church in the so-called workshop of Pheidias because Andreas is member of the clergy, although it is not on a piece of liturgical furnishing.


99 Graffiti from Greece from the Late Roman period are poorly recorded. The Lechaion texts are included in this catalogue: B.D. Meritt, Greek Inscriptions 1896-1927. Corinth Vol. 3 Part 1. (Cambridge MA 1931), nos. 199 and 210; A.K. Orlandos and L. Branouses, Τὰ χαράγματα τοῦ Παρθενώνος ἦτοι ἐπιγραφαὶ χαρακτηθεῖσαι ἐπὶ τῶν κιόνων τοῦ Παρθενώνος κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοχριστιανοὺς καὶ βυζαντινοὺς χρόνους, (Athens 1973): The Early Byzantine and Later Inscriptions, many of which are graffiti from the Parthenon show that this formula remains popular throughout the Byzantine period.

100 For liturgical inscriptions see also: Sironen, nos. 340, 343, 344bis., 345, 346, 346bis.
a chancel screen. The context for this particular formula, while similar in grammatical structure to βοήθει and φυλαξόν inscriptions, is most likely the liturgy. Similar language appears in both the diptychs and the various commemorations in many eastern liturgies. The only challenge to this is the occasional appearance of this formula in non-liturgical settings, such as on a theater seat at Aphrodisias.

Three other likely liturgical inscriptions should be included with this group, although exact liturgical parallel are absent. One is from the Thyrsos basilica at Tegea and, unfortunately has suffered from rather inconsistent transcription (Ep. Cat. 6). SEG 34.328 has it reading: "Αγιος, Άγιος, Άγιος Κύριος ὁ Θεός?] σὺν Υἱῷ κ[αι] Πνε[υμ]ατι Ἁγίῳ, Orlandos in an earlier discussion of the text, however, transcribed it with the word Άγιος four times. A photo included in his 1973 article is difficult to read, but recommends his earlier editions transcription showing faintly the Α and Π of the fourth Άγιος. Inscriptions of a similar kind, although typically with word Άγιος three times rather than four appear in a wide range of contexts, including amuletic. This inscription is similar to Isaiah 6.3, and the text of the sanctus chanted during the anaphora

102 Similar to the language of the intercession or diptych: Liturgy of St. James, 55.1,4,9,12,20,24, 27,30,33;65.7,13,31;57.13; Syrian (Jacobites), 90.15, 17, 26, 30, 91.36; Diptych in the Lit. of St. Mark: 130.7, 10, 14, 17, 20, 23; Coptic (Jacobites), 172.7, 22, 33; 173.6,16,28; 174.8; Liturgy of St. Basil (9th c.) 332.15, 29; 333.1, 4, 26; 334.3; 336, 10,14 ,23; St. John Chrysostom, 389.27,29,31; Liturgy of St. Basil, 407.11,13,18,20,22,32; 408.4; 409.12. See also: Taft, The Diptych, passim. Rare on silver: See Ševčenko, 41. ύπερ μνήμης . . and variants; for the commoration (with this formula); see, Taft, Great Entrance, 227-234 for a correction of Brightman’s confusion regarding the place diptychs and commemorations (which occur during and interrupt the Great Entrance), which are a much later addition to the liturgy.
103 C. Roueché, Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity, no. 338; Possibly also Sironen, 336
104 A. K. Orlandos, “Παλαίωχριστιανικά καὶ Βυζαντινά μνημεία Τεγέας-Νικλίου,” ABME 12 (1973), 72, fig. 37. [1-128]
105 G. Kiourtzian, Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes des cyclades, 58, notes numerous other instances of this chant, often called the trisanctus and differentiated it correctly from the proper liturgical trisagon.
An inscription found on a marble column on Akrokorinth which asks God to grant the bishop Photios peace and remission of sins seems to draw on liturgical language, and although an exact parallel in an existing liturgy is not forthcoming, requests for peace and remissions for sins often appear separately in liturgical texts (Ep. Cat. 34). The final liturgical utterance inscribed in stone I will only mention briefly. E. Sironen published a fragment of a baptismal exorcism found on a baptismal font from Eleusis. This text warrants closer study than it has yet receive and will receive here.

While scholars have tended to consider all inscriptions as oral, inscribed prayers from a wide variety of contexts have a particular significance. Inscriptions on amulets have often been interpreted as kinds of “performative utterances” which do, in effect, what they say. Perhaps, these amuletic inscriptions, which are often identical to the θοηθει inscriptions found on floors, were meant to echo the spells uttered at the time of the amulet’s manufacture or activation. The inscriptions on the amulet, often accompanied by magical symbols (some of which are not uncommon on Christian floors) would then perpetually utter the spell. Commonly it is argued that various magical symbols, along with nonsense words such as Ephesiaca grammata, served to draw the deity’s attention to the amulet and the text. Once the images had the divine’s attention the initial prayer could occur again and again, reinforcing and confirming its initial intent.

---

106 The text is similar to Revelation 4.8; Brightman, Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, 385; Liturgy of St. Basil, 403.
107 Even a cursory perusal of Brightman will reveal numerous occasions: Liturgy of St. James, 36-39. See note xx.
108 Sironen, no. 344; For a good general discussion of inscribed exorcisms see: G. Kiourtzian, Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes des cyclades de la fin du IIIe au VII siècle après J.-C. (Paris 2000), 32-42.
109 G. Vikan, “Art, Medicine, and Magic in Early Byzantium,” DOP 38 (1984), 33-51; H. Maguire, “Magic and Geometry,” 265-270 proposes that some symbols themselves actually have the power using the case of Solomon’s knots and eight armed rays.
and thereby, improving the efficacy of the prayer itself. Inscriptions on mosaic floors may have worked in a similar way. These inscriptions would have benefited from their position in the sacred building of the basilica and their relationship to liturgy.

Unlike amulets, whose ritual context is often obscure, forcing scholars to rely on their texts for information, inscribed prayers in churches have a context provided both by their placement in the architectural setting of the church and our knowledge of Early Christian liturgy. Like ex-voto inscriptions these inscribed prayers may have depended upon a clerical audience which could be ensured by their placement along the path of liturgical processions. The inscriptions tended, again like ex-votos, to be arranged in liturgically significant space, such as on nave mosaics, like at Klapsi, thorakion screens, like at Kiato, or on columns which in the cases of Akrokorinth and Brauron may been from either the nave colonnade or from any number of smaller colonnades in the channel area. The liturgy and the clergy would have served to bring the inscribed sentiment to the attention of God or a particular saint. Thus, in the place of magical symbols, strategic placement of the inscription served to capture the God’s or a particular saint’s attention. Moreover, it was neither the sentiments expressed in the prayer alone, nor the language in which it was expressed that mediated between the donor and God, but its context in liturgical space and in relation to liturgical language. The proximate ritual provides an imminent context to the preformative utterance and ensures efficaciousness of the invocation or prayer.¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ To refer back to Austin: This is the difference between the performative nature of saying “I bet the brown horse will win” while watching the Kentucky Derby with friends, and saying “I bet the brown horse will win” while standing at the window at Churchhill Downs.
We know, however, that some of these inscribed prayers exist outside the context of Christian liturgical architecture. The strategy of placing inscribed prayers, or inscribed sentiments more broadly, might best be understood by examining parallels from Greece as well as elsewhere in the Mediterranean. As I have already mentioned, numerous inscriptions with the βοηθει type formula graced house lintels in Syria, and scholars have long considered these apotropaic. \(^{111}\) On an even more monumental scale, the outer wall of defense works of the city of Miletus has seven cartouches each with a request to an angel to defend the city, an astrological sign, and then the seven Greek vowels. D. Frankfurter has characterized this inscription as the "concretization" of the oral, "due to its parallels with similar formula from Gnostic and pagan magical texts." \(^{112}\) He goes on to argue that the string of vowels identified the recipient of the request and inscription served to "perpetually utter" the request to protect the city. Another similar example is from an inscription in the walls of Edessa which were inscribed during the 5th century with a quotation from the spurious letter of Jesus to King Abgar, "Your city shall be blessed and no enemy shall ever be master of it." \(^{113}\) These two inscriptions, like inscribed prayers on the lintel’s of houses, relied on efficacious positioning for part of their power. This seems to suggest broadly that the efficacy of the prayer depended in part on the placement of the inscribed prayer in the intended location of its action, rather than, as I have argued, positioning it in the proper ritual context.

This difference in “the logic of placement,” however, can be reconciled. The inscribed lintels and city walls placed the prayer where the particular action it requests

---


\(^{112}\) D. Frankfurter, “The writing of magic and the magic of writing: the power of the word in Egyptian and Greek traditions,” *Helios* 21 (1994), 202-203 [189-221]
was to occur, in churches the prayer was placed where it was most likely to be heard by God. Similarly the beneficiaries of inscribed amulets presumably wore the amulets, bracelets, or rings with the magical formulae or images. The liturgy replaced any number of strategies designed to attract the deity’s attention. Moreover, if we understand the church building as cosmological space, the spatial relationship between the beneficiary of the prayer and the prayer itself becomes more clear as well. The placement of inscribed prayers in liturgical space would make sense if the space within the church function analogically in relation to the world outside the church. The place of the individual in relation to the sacred, the Christian hierarchy, and fellow members of the laity or clergy, represented or reflected the place of the individual in the terrestrial world. The converse of this S. R. Holman has recently recognized in John Chrysostom *Hom. in Ep. 2 ad Cor* 20.3. Here John Chrysostom compared the altar of the church, the tradition place for the individual to sacrifice to the bodies of the poor in the streets, calling on his congregation to make sacrifices to the poor to secure the rewards of the liturgical sacrifice. S. Harvey and D. Krugger have both recognized liturgical parallels in the narrative structure of saints’ lives in Lat Antiquity. On a more general level, the parallels between the activity in the celestial sphere and the terrestrial sphere have long been recognized in the theory of cosmic sympathy expressed by Ecclesiastical Historians of the 5th century. Thus the efficacious placement of an inscription in terms of the liturgy

---

113 J. B. Segal *Edessa.* (Oxford 1970), 72-75.
and architecture, even if the inscription was anonymous as at Brauron, Kodratos in Korinth, Nea Anchialos A, Kiato, and Molaoi I, may reflect an acknowledged parallel between the decoration, architecture and the ritual of the divine liturgy and the terrestrial world. The use of similar inscriptions in a more secular context, such as house lintels or even Christian amulets, may have eventually been read as invocations of the liturgy, just as the liturgy influenced the increasingly choreographed chants of the crowds at the hippodrome.116 Unlike ex-votos, these inscribed prayers are not offerings left at the temple of God, but active participants in the dynamic relationship between the liturgical world and the terrestrial world mediated by the physical and ritual reality of Christian architecture and liturgy.

The relationship between inscribed sentiments, architecture, Christian worship, and Late Antique social reality is complex and difficult to grasp entirely. The inscriptions in churches clearly reproduced the language of traditional religious inscriptions, secular commemorations, and the Christian liturgy. This fusing of diverse traditions would have ensured that the inscriptions were meaningful to a wide audience. On the one hand, the high clergy either received praise or praised themselves in verse inscriptions following a tradition popular among secular officials in Late Antiquity and earlier. Elite members of the laity included their rank in inscriptions gracing their dedications. This assures us that powerful members of the Christian community in Greece, like elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean used the church as a vehicle for the kind of self-aggrandizement familiar among participant in ancient civic life. On the other hand, lay and clerical donors also sought to commemorate their donations to the church

in ways which demonstrated a desire to take advantage of the sacred space and ritual. They placed their inscriptions in places responsive to the Christian liturgy and thereby ensured that the clergy read them in their capacity as mediators between the God and humanity. The fact that mosaic floors often served as the medium for votive expressions as well as prayers, should, further put to rest the argument that floors were an inappropriate medium for religious sentiments. The oral language of these inscriptions were performative utterances of a complex kind. While almost all of them appear to have depended on the liturgy for their activation, some clearly sought to interact with the liturgy through the use of shared language. Their placement in areas of the church that not only served to facilitate, symbolize and glorify the liturgy, but also commemorate it, gave the sentiments expressed in pious inscription access to the same temporal extension that architecture provided liturgy. As with mosaic floors and architecture, the inscribed sentiments that displayed the piety of the congregation and their economic commitment to the church were integrated with the ritual and gained meaning and significance from the reciprocal relationship between human expression and sacred truth.

5.3. Conclusions

While pious motivations accounted for numerous donations to churches, it is likewise clear that the traditional motivations for donations, such as self-promotion appear in the inscriptional record as well. The diversity of motives for donating mosaic floors, church furnishings, or pieces of architecture to churches likely reflects the (Berkeley 1946); E. Petterson, Heis Theos (Göttigen 1926).
diversity of the groups making these various donations. Traditional elites transferred their ambitions and language from the secular or civic hierarchy to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. By their side, however, a new class of donor emerged perhaps from among the Christianized artisan class, whose relatively modest means and status would have excluded them from acts of civic munificence in the ancient polis. In the Early Christian world, however, they made important contributions to the decoration and upkeep of the Christian buildings which stood at the center of their community’s sacred and ritual identity. It is likely, in fact, that their donations played an important role in facilitating the building boom which took place during the fifth and sixth centuries and led to the proliferation of Christian sacred architecture throughout southern and central Greece. Thus, the evidence from Early Christian inscriptions in churches both highlights a change in the way monumental architecture was financed and provides important insights into the nature of the change itself. First, the inscriptions suggest that the clergy solicited donations from a broader social strata including members of the artisan class, as occurred elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean. According to the epigraphy, donations to churches worked to facilitate access to various divine rewards for the individual donors, such as salvation, safety, and protection. This stands in contrast to the "classical" form of civic munificence limited to an intensely competitive curial class. This group by Late Antiquity appears to have been increasingly poor, ineffectual, and both unwilling and unable to lead the way in the financing of monumental architecture. The resources available to the church through the willingness of a larger percentage of the population to support church construction and decoration led to the proliferation of Early Christian
architecture in urban and rural areas. Christian architecture, often the most visible architecture in a Late Roman city, projected Christian ritual space to the community.

The inscriptions themselves further facilitated the expansion of Christianity on a cultural level by expressing sentiments in epigraphic language that both drew on the traditional language of munificence and the emerging language of the Christian liturgy. Despite similarities to earlier dedicatory formulae, it is clear that ex-voto dedications and inscribed prayers depended upon liturgical language and ritual motion to ensure their efficacy. This not only served to promote to ability of the clergy to gain divine favor for their congregation, but also allowed the laity access to the sacred ritual and its architectural expression. Individuals contributing to the glorification of the divine liturgy gained more than just credit from their fellow citizens and coreligionists, they earned access to the sacred time and space of Christian ritual and architecture.

The relationship between the physical upkeep and construction of the church buildings and the liturgy followed a trend evident elsewhere in Late Roman society. As the influence of Christian liturgy expanded to involve Christian culture more and more deeply with “secular” or traditional Late Roman culture, the financial arrangements required to support the expansion and elaboration of liturgical space itself gained expression in liturgical terms. As Bowden and others have argued, the financial mechanisms for the expansion of Christianity – namely the growing pool of resources made available through the encouragement of pious donations from all members of the congregation – depended on the community’s acceptance of the efficaciousness of the liturgy. The articulation of liturgical space through iconography, ritual, and language embedded in Late Roman culture bound liturgical theology, particularly the role of
Christian ritual in mediating between God and humanity in Late Antiquity, to a long tradition of elite display and religious expression ensuring a smooth transition from the ancient world to the Byzantine.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

Christianization as a cultural process is closely tied to the idea and practice of mediation. The idea of mediation, as a central aspect to the process of Christianization, in the religious space of Early Christian Greece is not a simple matter, however. At its most visible the practice of mediation appears in the role of the clergy as they brought humanity into contact with the divine through the ritual of Christian liturgy. Clerical privilege in the sacramental aspects of Christian religious life is homologous with their access to the growing economic, political and cultural capital accorded to the institutional church and inaccessible to the laity except through clerical intercession. Thus, Christianization became the mediating factor whereby power and authority as something tactile and real in ancient society crossed from the realm of the civic elite to that of the ecclesiastical elite during Late Antiquity. Finally, Christianization mediated between the religious traditions associated not only with the temples, priesthoods and cult celebrations essential to civic life and the civic elite but also with the simple, but efficacious religious practices present throughout Mediterranean culture and common to everyday life. Christianization as a process both melded public and private religious practices and inscribed both rituals in the exclusive, but permeable Christian liturgy. Christianization
Early Christian space as space of mediation between two different ideas, times, social structures, and, ultimately natures (the human and the divine), presents a way of understanding Early Christian church architecture that is not incompatible with the recent trend in the conceptualization of space. According to this formulation the architectural space of the early Christian context manifests itself in three overlapping and inclusive ways. First, it was sacred space. Each church appeared as Eliades’ sacred center and communicated this meaning through the rituals of the Christian liturgy which preserved a sense of mystery and reinforced a sense of privileged exclusivity. Second, it was social space. The rituals that articulated the nature of the sacred center did so in language embedded with ideas of civic and social identity, rank, and display. Ritual privilege was paralleled with the growing social and political authority possessed by the clergy in matters outside the church building. The third kind of space combined the natures of sacred space and social space of the church (or in Eliades’ language: the sacred and profane) and integrated them continually. In doing this, it created a third kind of space, a space of mediation and ambiguity that allowed for the profane to transcend human reality and the sacred to manifest itself in human form.

This is not idle theorizing. The conventional narrative of Late Antiquity has long privileged the concept of mediation in the discourse of the period. The ancient holy man’s central claim to authority, for example, was in his right to parrhesia, or his ability to speak openly with both the imperial elite, including the emperor, and God. One of the main thrusts of liturgical theology, and later, the theology of icons focused on the ability
of these devotional practices to bridge the gap between the human world and the divine. Intercession, was, needless to say, merely an expression of the ability to mediate. These basic and long recognized forms of mediation were undoubtedly present in the Early Christian liturgy of Greece. The entire practice of the liturgy was, as R. Taft has pointed out, rooted in a concept of *taxis*, that, I would argue, pervaded the ritual and social life of the Late Roman world. The architectural manifestation of ritual *taxis*, evident in some of the earliest works on Christian ritual, ensured that the rites of mediation were not chance occurrences but visible in the architectural and ritual articulation of space in the church itself. On the most basic level this *taxis* emphasized the separateness of the laity from the clergy, and the clearly demarcated boundaries present in architecture, decoration, and rituals established clerical procession as a ritual of passage. Thus, the *taxis* of Early Christian space in Greece constructed clerical and lay identities through careful articulation of their relationship to the sacred, and more specifically in how they witnessed and experienced the progress of the Christian liturgy. As Turner understood, rites of passage, such as the Christian procession, were liminal, betwixt and between, and therefore, unique and worthy of its own heuristic category. Unlike Turner’s conclusion that rites of passage created a sense of *communitas* where social boundaries collapsed, I would argue that the special status of Christian liturgical and architectural *taxis* enforced those boundaries necessary for the construction of social identities and social roles central to how Late Roman society conceptualized authority while at the same time according privilege to those capable of crossing from one state to another. Primary among the characteristics central to Late Roman ideas of authority and power was the ability to mediate between various levels in society established through social and religious ritual.
Mediation between the human and the divine was not the only role that churches fulfilled. Churches served to Christianize many traditional modes of social and religious expression, thus mediating between the traditional culture of the ancient world and the Christianized culture of the Christian Roman Empire. The mosaic floors found in many Early Christian basilicas in Greece depended on the persistence of socially encoded meanings in certain motifs to communicate meaning in a Christian context. Animal and human combat scenes, such as those from Delphi and basilica A at Nikopolis, had a long tradition in the iconography of Roman civic patronage and surely identified the clergy as patrons of their emerging Christian constituents. Of course, these same floors also had meanings drawn from Christian allegory and promulgated through Christian homilies throughout the empire. Even if we assume that the allegorical meanings of these floors had a certain primacy, it remains significant that they expressed their message in the traditional language of elite display. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the calendar mosaic from the Thyrsos Basilica at Tegea where the imagery of elite display served to express Christian notions of the terrestrial realm. Christian space depended upon the language of the traditional aristocracy and ensured that it both persisted and was subsumed within a Christianizing discourse. Thus, Christian space was Christianizing space, actively and continuously replaying the act of appropriation that implied a social and religious aspect to the messages it communicated. Constantly mediating, it reinforced past social structure through appropriating its language, while transcending the tradition social order through placing it within a space infused with authority attained through access to a Christian sacred.
This same process manifests itself in the use of various forms of traditional religious expression in epigraphy and mosaic. Inscribed prayers and symbols deriving from “magical” contexts appear in a space characterized by its ability to cross the boundary between the God and humanity. The traditional techniques used to perform this very function, find themselves at home in Christian context, but transformed. This occurred in a way more complex than often assumed by scholars of Late Antique religious change who long sought evidence for religious syncretism. Christian space actively embedded the very meaning of symbols and epigraphic formulae from a context outside the pale of Christian cult practice into the performance of the liturgy. The symbols remained the same, while their logic of practice becomes tied to ritual order implicit in the Christian liturgy. In the language of Bourdieu, the particular “habitus” of Christian space, the generative principle of culture that itself mediates between structured structures and structuring structures, transforms the social logic of use, while relying on certain immanent meanings rooted in traditional religious practices.

For the Early Christian period in Greece, Christian architecture as mediating or Christianizing architecture actively generated a cultural reality. To characterize the Christian space as exclusively sacred space or social space, or even both at different times, misrepresents the complexity of Christian architecture and threatens to view the two notions of space as independent discourses. The architecture of Early Christian Greek churches was active, dynamic, and integrating. Creating a kind of “thirdspace” that was both neither sacred nor profane and both at the same time. Space of this kind was particularly essential for the cultural transformations taking place in Greece during the fifth and sixth centuries. The continued vitality of civic life and its structures
demanded that the emerging Christian hierarchy both spoke the language of civic elites and reinscribed it within a Christian ritual context. The persistence of traditional religion as a means of access to the divine encouraged an active integration of these symbols into Christian space as well. Their power as religious symbols, however, could not be eliminated without eroding the efficaciousness that dictated their use. Furthermore, the apparent rarity of Christian spectacles in Greece, such as the destruction of temples or the ascetic feats of Christian holy men, perhaps necessitated an approach to Christian architecture that Christianized and established reciprocal links between existing traditions and a new cosmology based in Christian theology. The symbolic eradication (or the relegation to memory) of the social, political, and religious expression of pre-existing cultural systems, demanded that a fully formed and distinctive alternative existed and could thrive in the place of one that was ritually discredited. The gradual Christianizing of Greece either presupposed a certain potent indelibility present in the traditions ultimately native to the home of the Gods and the Polis or was confronted with this reality. Consequently Christianization in Greece emerged as an approach which neither eradicated previous expressions of social and religious order nor accepted them, but proposed a third path evident in Christian architecture. This third path allowed and encouraged traditional social and religious organization to exist by continuously incorporating it into a discourse rooted in Christian theology and ritual; what becomes visible in this process, in Bourdieu’s terms again, is the emergent Christian logic of practice.

This dissertation explored history as a process by which a knowable past becomes a knowable future. I have elevated Christian architecture to a unique place by
highlighting its role as mediator. I have supposed that within the confines of Christian ritual space certain basic and long held to be opposed relationships were breached continually: the sacred and the profane, elite and non-elite, the clergy and laity, traditional religion and Christianity, the present and the eternal, and past and the future. The breaching of these opposed relationships created a space which reinforced existing oppositions through the structure of Christian ritual and architectural *taxis* while proposing a unique Christian cosmological, social, economic, and political reality which in turned redefined those opposed points. Thus, Christian space created not a synthesis of the non-Christian and Christian but an independent reality that demanded that the two opposed poles existed and could be understood, but also provided for their negation. It is my hope that this approach provided new ways to approaching Christian architecture and Late Roman society.

I also intended, however, for this dissertation to breach yet another persistent opposition between the world of antiquity and the post antique/Byzantine/Medieval world. The study of Late Antiquity should no longer be read as the end of the ancient world or the beginning of the Byzantine, but ultimately as the period which characterized how both the Byzantine and the ancient worlds should be understood. The continued redeployment of the classical tradition in the service of Byzantine culture should no long appear as an independent manifestation of an archaizing impulse, but as a tactic that sought to re-appropriate a view past constructed during Late Antiquity.
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APPENDIX A

PLANS
Plan 1. Alimos

Plan 2. Liopessi – Ay. Athanasios


Plan 4. Glyphada

Plan 5. Lavriotic Olympos
Plan 10. Aigosthena

Plan 11. Eleusis – Ay. Zacharias

Plan 12. Vardia

Plan 13. Eleftherai (I and II)
Plan 18. Athens -- Parthenon

Plan 19. Athens – Panayia in Petra

Plan 20. Athens – Library of Hadrian

Plan 21. Athens -- Hephaisteion

Plan 22. Athens -- Olympeion
Plan 27. Lechaion -- Port

Plan 28. Korinth -- Kraneion

Plan 29. Kenchreai

Plan 30. Nemea -- Sanctuary
Plan 31. Kiato

Plan 32. Nemea – Evangelista Hill

Plan 33. Ano Epidauros - Lalioteika

Plan 34. Epidauros
Plan 35. Argos -- Aspis

Plan 36. Argos -- Alika

Plan 37. Argos -- Od. Kephaliou

Plan 38. Hermione
Plan 48. Tegea -- Thyrsos

Plan 49. Lycosoura

Plan 50. Skioessa Bozaitikon

Plan 51. Olympia
Plan 52. Anthedon

Plan 53. Daphnousia

Plan 54. Demetrias B

Plan 55. Lai

Plan 56. Demetrias A
Plan 61. Klapsi

Plan 62. Theotokou

Plan 63. Mytikas

Plan 64. Delphi -- Cemetery
APPENDIX B
List of Excluded Figures

The following list provides references to the figures that I have been regrettably compelled to withhold from this dissertation. The numbers correspond to the numbers in the catalogue of churches and text.

1. Aigio, narthex, second northern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 106β)
2. Aigio, narthex, first northern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 106α)
3. Aigio, narthex, first southern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 107β)
4. Aigio, narthex, central panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 107α)
5. Amphissa, baptistery
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 323)
6. Amphissa, baptistery, west threshold panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 325β)
7. Argos, villa
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 4α)
8. Antikyra, nave and narthex
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 235)
9. Distomo, central nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 241)
10. Theotokou, threshold main nave
    (M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, fig. 417)
11. Demetrias A, main nave
    (M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, fig. 426)
12. Demetrias A, main nave, threshold of bema
    (Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, P, Hourmouziadis, G.C., Makris, K.A.,
     Athens 1982, plate 54.)
13. Demetrias A, main nave, western part
    (M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, fig. 428)
14. Epidauros, main nave, central panel
15. Epidauros, main nave, western panel
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 49α)
16. Epidauros, main nave, eastern panel
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 49β)
17. Epidauros, building
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 50α)
18. Nea Anchialos – D, north transept
(M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, fig. 408)
19. Troezen, main nave
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 230)
20. Nea Anchialos – G, atrium annex,
(M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, fig. 376)
21. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 1-1)
22. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 1-2)
23. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 2-1)
24. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 2-2)
25. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 3-1)
26. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 3-2)
27. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 5-1)
28. Villa of the Falconer, peristyle
(G. Äkerström-Hougen, Villa of the Falconer in Argos, fig. 5-2)
29. Thebes, bath?
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 266α)
30. Thebes, bath?
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 268δ)
31. Thebes, Christian building,
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 259α)
32. Thebes, Christian building,
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 259β)
33. Thebes, Christian building,
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 260β)
34. Thebes, Christian building,
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 260α)
35. Thebes, Christian building,
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 261α)
36. Delphi, main nave, western part
(P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 343α)
37. Delphi, main nave, western part
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 343β)
38. Delphi, main nave, western part
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 344α)
39. Delphi, main nave, western part
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 345)
40. Delphi, main nave, western part
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 346α)
41. Delphi, main nave, western part
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 346β)
42. Delphi, narthex, central panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 348β)
43. Delphi, narthex, northern part
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 348α)
44. Hermione, south entrance to atrium
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 67α)
45. Hermione, narthex, second southern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 62α)
46. Hermione, south entrance to atrium
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 67β)
47. Hermione, south entrance hall to atrium
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 65α)
48. Klapsi, main nave, eastern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 279β)
49. Klapsi, main nave, eastern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 280γ)
50. Klapsi, main nave, eastern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 280β)
51. Klapsi, main nave, second western panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 282α)
52. Klapsi, main nave, third western panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 281β)
53. Hypati, baptistery, southern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 312α)
54. Hypati, baptistery southern panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 312β)
55. Hypati, baptistery
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 310)
56. Molaoi I, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 139α)
57. Molaoi I, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 139β)
58. Molaoi I, “diakonikon”
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 140α)
59. Molaoi I, “diakonikon”
60. Molaoi I, “diakonikon”
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 140β)
61. Molaoi I, “diakonikon”, threshold
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 141β)
62. Molaoi I, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 138β)
63. Megalopolis, villa, main room
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 79β)
64. Megalopolis, villa, main room
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 80γ)
65. Megalopolis, villa, main room
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 79γ)
66. Megalopolis, peristyle, west panel
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 90β)
67. Nikopolis – A, north transept
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 67, fig.4)
68. Nikopolis – A, south transept
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 77, fig.11)
69. Nikopolis – A, south transept, border
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 78, fig.12)
70. Nikopolis – A, south transept, border
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 79, fig.13)
71. Nikopolis – A, south transept, border
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 80, fig.14)
72. Nikopolis – A, south transept, border
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 81, fig.15)
73. Nikopolis – A, south transept, border
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 82, fig.16)
74. Nikopolis – A, south transept, border
   (A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 83, fig.17)
75. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 100α)
76. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 100β)
77. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 101α)
78. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 101β)
79. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 102α)
80. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 102β)
81. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 99α)
82. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 99β)
83. Tegea – Thyrsos, main nave, threshold
   (P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Συντάγμα II, fig. 103β)
APPENDIX C

Catalogue of Relevant Inscriptions

This catalogue is a representative sample of inscriptions from known or estimable architectural contexts in Greece. It makes no claims to being exhaustive, although it includes the vast majority of inscriptions from known architectural context. Most are from floor mosaics and editions of these exist in the second volume of the catalogue of Greek mosaic floors edited by P. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka. These editions are to be preferred to M. Spiro’s hand-written transcriptions in her corpus of the same pavements. Whenever possible, I have included better editions of these inscriptions, however, since both mosaic catalogues transcribed the inscription texts only in the majuscule. I have generally preferred the editio princeps of an inscription, except in the cases where a substantially emended or improved version exists. In any instance where I have selected an edition other than the princeps, I have marked the source of this text with a star. Whenever available I have used the much improved texts recently offered by E. Sironen and D. Feissel.

Several inscriptions did not make this catalogue, because either they deserve more careful treatment than my chapter provides or conversely, they are too fragmentary state to contribute additional information. Two inscriptions, in particular, deserve brief notice here. Both are funerary in nature, mention bishops, and appear to have been placed in the central nave of Early Christian churches. One comes from the Kodratos basilica outside
of Korinth and mentions the bishop Eustathios. The other inscription is from a mosaic adorning a sarcophagus lid from Sparta. At first glance the location and nature of these two inscriptions present certain parallels with covered cemetery inscriptions found common in North Africa, and recommend a possible funerary function for these buildings. The Eustathios inscription, however, appears to have ante-dated the construction of the church, perhaps by as much as a century, suggesting that the inscription may have served to commemorate the bishop rather than actively mark his place of burial. The sarcophagus lid decorated with mosaic from Sparta, has as comparanda an example with no architectural context from Athens which also mentioned a bishop, has been dated to the middle of the fifth century. It is roughly contemporary to the building itself and the excavator has argued that it might be associated with the commemoration of a bishop involved in the Acacian schism.¹ These inscriptions provide potentially interesting evidence for the use of emergence of a cult of episcopal martyrs or holy men and would further reinforce the idea that the ecclesiastical hierarchy was deeply involved in the spread and character of Christianity in Greece.² The other inscriptions which I have excluded from this catalogue as those which are terrifically fragmentary in nature, such as several floor mosaic inscriptions from Klapsi, a fragment of a chancel plaque found near Troezene, and several small inscriptions from Athens and Korinth which might have originated in church buildings but their architectural context can no long be determined.

¹ A. Barkourou, AD 44-46 (1989-91), 335-360
² See also Sironen, pp. 156-157 no. 83. A large sarcophagus lid found on Tsakalof street in Athens at the foot of Lycabettus mentioned a bishop Clematios (ὁ ἐν ὅσιος ἐπισκοπῆσας Κλημάτιος [- - -]). It included two depressions which some have suggested served as places for libations. Note the similarities in the use of the aorist participle with the Thyrsos inscription from Tegea.
Finally, several inscriptions included here have not been prepared in proper edition. Since I was not trained to prepare an inscription for publication nor have I sought access to this material, the texts included here should not be treated as editions. All inscriptions in recorded in this catalogue should be regarded as non vidi. It is my hope however, that the analysis and presentation of these inscriptions should make them better known and attract epigraphists to this valuable and under-studied corpus of material.

Text of Two Inscriptions Excluded from this Catalogue


Location: In the area of the central nave (tomb E). The fact that the inscription could ante date the church by some 150 years (late 4th/early 5th c. for a church built in the 6th c.) has lead some to consider that this (Daux, *BCH*, 86, 1962, 700-702) could be the dedicatory inscription of the cemetery church.

Εὐστάθιος ἐπισκοπὸς ἄνεπαυσάτο τῇ πρὸ ἐς καλ(ανδρῶν) Ἰουλίων


Location: Covering the top of an empty sarcophagus in the central nave of a church (Sparta IV).

Κυμητήριον τοῦ τὴν ὁσίαν μνή(μην) ἐπισκὸς Στεφάνου τοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλ(ῶν)] ὥς ἄνεπαυσάτο μ[η]- νὸς Νοεμβρίου κ[ζ] Ἰνδ s τετάρτη
# Catalogue of Relevant Inscriptions

1. **Acarnania** | **Mytikas**

**Location of Inscription:**
**Direction:**
**Editions:**
SEG 30 (1980), no. 514

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>νέω Α Ω ἐποίησεν</td>
<td>Neo made (this)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Achaia** | **Aigion**

**Location of Inscription:** Narthex
**Direction:**
**Editions:**
ed. pr.: I. Dekoulakou, AD 29 (1973-1974), B' 379-380
SEG 29 (1979) no. 423.
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Sytagma II, 82.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΙΙΗΙ</td>
<td>ΤΟΣ ἀνέστη [ἐκ θεμέλιων τὴν ἐποίησεν]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achaia Patras -- Od. Kanakari

Location of Inscription: central nave?
Direction: facing west
Editions:
SEG 29, (1979), no. 425,
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 87.

Text: Η θεοφιλεστάτη διάκονος Αγριππια-νή ύπερ ευχής αὐτής ἐποίησεν τὴν μούσασιν
Translation: The most God loving diaconness Agrippiani, for her vow, made the mosaic.

Discussions:

Arcadia Tegea

Location of Inscription: 
Direction: 
Editions:
ed. pr. G. Mendel, BCH 25 (1901), 281 n. 33.
N. Bees, BCH 31 (1907), 381, no. 3.
IG V 2, Add., 145.
T. Alexopoulos, Arkadika symmikta, 28.
*D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnese, 296, no. 37.

Translation: The most holy Ophelimos, for his salvation.

Discussions:
SEG 34 (1984), 330.
**Location of Inscription:** entrance to apsidal hall

**Editions:**
CIG V.2.169.
Pallas, Paliocchristianikes rythmikes epigraphes, Rivista di Studi Byzantini e Neocellenici 10/11 (1973/74), 41-42.
M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 186
*SEG 34 (1984), 327.
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 78-79.

**Text:**
[Τοῦ σεπτοῦ τουτοῦ τεμένους | ἐν ἑνεκακαιδέκατος | θύρος, ὁ ὁσίω|<σ> ἡγησάμενος,
ἐμφοτέρων ἐκμυεν προσηγορίας
πάσιν ἐσθαλίς καὶ
μαρτυρεῖ | τὰ κτίσματα καὶ λίθου
λεπταλῆς εὐσύχθετος κό[σ]μος
-----------------
]

**Translation:**
(Spiro, 655):
The most holy Thyrsos who was the nineteenth priest and hegemon(?) of this sacred precinct eclipsed the titles (names) of all (of the eighteen) together by all kinds of noble things. And the buildings and the "well-arranged adornment of delicate tesserae" bear witness to this.

**Discussions:**
D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnesse, 371, no. 137.
SEG 35 (1985), 399.
D. Feissel, BE (2000), no. 797.

---

**Location of Inscription:** floor of chapel

**Editions:**
ed. pr. Orlandos, Paliocristianika ke Byzantina Mnemeia Tegeas-Nykliou. ABME 12 (1973), 72, fig. 37.
*Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 79.

**Text:**
ΑΓΙΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΣ | (Κήρυκας ὁ Θεός)
ΣΥΝ ΥΣΩ Κ(αί) ΠΝΕΥΜ(ατι) ῾Αγιῳ . . ΩΗ

**Translation:**
(Spiro, 655):
Holy, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God with the Son and the Holy Spirit.
7 Argolid Hermione

Location of Inscription: entrance to atrium

Direction:


Text: Ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοφίλ(εστάτου) ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν Ἐπιφανίου ἀνενεώθην τὸ ἔργον.

Translation: (Spiro, 654):
In the time of our most God-loving bishop, Epiphanios, the building was restored.


8 Argolid Troezen

Location of Inscription: central nave

Direction:


Translation: The reader Ioannes for his wife and child decorated the ambo in the holy and praised [church] of the Archangel Michael.


9 Argolid Troezen -- Lakkomata

Location of Inscription: central nave

Direction: facing west


Text: Ο ΤΑΠΙΝΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΥΠΕΡ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ

Translation: The humble Theodore for his salvation and his family.

Discussions:
Attica Athens -- Asclepieion

Location of Inscription:
Direction:
Chreaghan and Raubitschek, "Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens," Hesperia 16 (1947), 29, no. XI.
I. Travlos, AE (1939), 67

Discussions: F. Halkin, "Inscriptions grecque relatives a l'hagiographie," ABoll 70 (1952), 123.

Text:
[(-----?)
[tJ kt…?]-
[santi?]
[τ]Òn "A-
[γ]ιον Α
νδρέαν.

Translation:
(Sironen 323): "[---to the one who founded?] (the church of) St. Andrew."

Attica Brauron

Location of Inscription:
Direction:
SEG 14 (1957), no. 296.

Discussions: F. Halkin, "Inscriptions grecque relatives a l'hagiographie," ABoll 70 (1952), 123.

Text:
Xριστιανε βοήθη
[σφ δεομενο
A ... Ω

Translation:
(Sironen 338): "Christ, help the one who is praying."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Inscription:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attica Eleusis -- Ay. Zacharias</td>
<td>For a vow of your servant Ioannos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction:**

**Editions:**
I. Barnea, To palaiochristianon thyistirion.
(Athens 1940), 162.
E. Chalkia, "Osservasioni su un tipo di mense paleocristianie," in Quaeritur inventus colitur.
Miscellanea in onore di Padre Umberto Maria
Fasola, B. Studi di antichità cristiana 40. (Vatican City 1989), 126.
E. Chalkia, Le mense paleocristiane, Studi di antichità cristiana 40 (Vatican City 1991), 59, 221.

**Text:**

[ὑπέρ εὐχῆς] τοῦ δούλου σου [Ἰωάννου]  

**Translation:**

For a vow your servant Ioannos

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Inscription:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Attica Lavreotic Olympus | (Spiro): For a vow, one whose name God knows, has beautified the <apiphnon>. \(\text{(Sironen):}\) "For a vow of a person whose name and number God knows, he (is the one who) decorated (this church)."

**Direction:**

**Editions:**
ed. pr. N. Kotzias, PAE (1955), 119.
A.J. Festugiere, Museum Helveticum 16 (1959), 143.
Spiro, 85.
M. Hatzidakis, AD 29 (1973/74), 194.
E. Gkindi-Tsophopoulou, AD 38 (1983), B'1 70.
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, 142.

**Text:**

[ὑπέρ εὐχῆς οὐ οὐκ ἔχειν τὸ ὄνομά καὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐκκαλέργησέν]  

**Discussion:**

SEG 15 (1958), 141.
C. Foss, ZPE 25 (1977), 284.
D.I. Pallas, PESNAA 2 1985, 50.
SEG 37 (1987), no. 144.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Editions</th>
<th>Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bocotia, Antikyra</td>
<td>ed. pr. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, 150.</td>
<td>For her vow, Elizabeth [together with Simian] paved this for a one gold piece.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Boeotia Antikyra

**Location of Inscription:** Narthex, central panel  
**Direction:** facing west  
**Editions:** ed. pr. Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, 150.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΜΙΚΡΟΥ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ [ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ]</td>
<td>For a vow of little Diogenes and his entire family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elis Olympia

**Location of Inscription:** plaque  
**Direction:**  
M. Guarducci, Epigrafia greca IV, 333-334.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κ(ύρι)ε Ἰ(ησού)ς Χ(ριστ)ός, βοήθω(ε)Ι τῷ δ οὐλῷ σου Ἀνδρέᾳ, τῷ ἀναγνώστῃ καὶ μαρμαράρῳ</td>
<td>Lord Jesus Christ help your servant, Andreas, marbler and reader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elis Olympia

**Location of Inscription:** plaque  
**Direction:**  
**Editions:** ed. pr. Inschriften von Olympia. Olympia V (Berlin 1896), 656.  
**Discussions:** P. Velissariou, Scholion eis epigraphen Olympias, Actes du 1st Congres des Etudes d'Elide, Athens 1980 (Peloponnisia, Suppl. 8), 159-166.  
D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnese, 373, no. 155.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κυριακός ὁ ἐν Λαβέστατος ἀναγνώστης καὶ ἐμφυτευτὴς τῆς κτήσεως ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἑαυτοῦ εὐξαμένος νος ἐκαλλιέργη σεν τὴν στρώσιν.</td>
<td>Kyriakos the most pious lector and estate holder decorated the pavement of the building praying for his salvation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elis Philiatra

**Location of Inscription:** thorakion  
**Direction:**  
**Editions:** ed. pr. D. Pallas, PAE (1960), 186.  
**Discussions:** D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnese, 373, no. 156.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἐπι τοῦ ἅγιωτάτου Ἑπισκόπου ... καλεῖντων:] IAN(οὐαρίων;)</td>
<td>In the time of the most holy Bishop ... kalens of January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Epirus Nikopolis -- A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></td>
<td>Nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>Location of Inscription: Nave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Λιθων ἀπαστράπτοντα Θ(εο)ῦ χάριν ἐνθα και έπιθα ἐκ τεμεθλον τολύπευσε και ἀγιοιν πορε πάσαν δομητιος περίπυστος αμοιμήτων ἰ ἐρημίν ἀρχιερεύς παναριστος ἄλης πάρθης μέ γα φεγγος.</td>
<td>(Spiro 658): A stone flashing forth God's grace hither and thither from the foundations of he finished and all splendor gave Dometios widely known archpriest of faultless priests, great light of all the fatherland; the very gate of the lord. Let just men enter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὐθή ἡ πύλη του Κ(υρίον). δίκαιοι εἰ σελαθόννων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Editions: | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22</th>
<th>Epirus Nikopolis -- A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></td>
<td>South chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>Location of Inscription: South chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed. pr. A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 91.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 440.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΟΙΚΟΝ ΑΠΑΣΤΡΑΠΤΟΝΤΑ Θ(ΕΟ)Υ ΧΑΡΙΝ ΕΝΘΑ Κ(ΑΙ) ΕΝΘΑ ΔΗΜΑΤΟ ΚΑΙ ΚΟΣΜΗΣΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΓΙΑΙΗΝ ΠΟΡΕ ΠΑΣΑΝ ΔΟΥΜΕΤΙΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΠΥΣΤΟΣ ΑΜΩΜΗΤΩΝ ΙΕΡΗΝ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΠΑΝΑΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΟΑΣΗ ΠΑΤΡΗΣ ΜΕΓΑ ΦΕΝΤΟΣ</td>
<td>(Spiro 657): A house flashing forth God's grace hither and thither he built and adorned and gave all splendor, Dometios, widely known archpriest of faultless priests, best of all, great light of all the fatherland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Editions: | |
| ed. pr. A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 91. | |
| M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 440. | |
### Epirus Nikopolis -- A

**Location of Inscription:** N. chancel wing

**Translation:**

Here you see the famous and boundless ocean.

Containing in its midst the earth

Bearing round about in all the skillful images of art everything that breathes and creeps

The foundation of Dometios, the great-hearted archpriest.

**Editions:**

- ed. pr. A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 68.
- *E. Kitzinger, DOP 6 (1951), 100.
- M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 453.

**Discussions:**

### Epirus Nikopolis -- A

**Location of Inscription:** West porticoe

**Translation:**

Dometios the first build the revered church, the present Dometios of Nikopolis, being the successor to the former and of his episcopate, by the power of the Christ beautified all the atrium.

Happy, indeed, in youth as a pupil of the former ([shepherd?]?) each giving thanks for the protection of the martyr Demetrios.

**Editions:**

- *E. Kitzinger, DOP 6 (1951), 87.
- M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 464.

**Discussions:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25</th>
<th>Epirus Nikopolis -- B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></td>
<td>South Complex, hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
<td>ed. pr. A. Philadelpheus, DXAE, 4 (1927), 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 488.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
<td>[ ] OU KURIΩU ΗΜΩΝ ἙΣΙ ΤΟΥ Ο ΑΓΙΩΤΑΤΟΣ ΑΡΧΙ [ ]ΑΓΟΣ ΑΛΚΙΣΩΝ ΕΚΤΙΣΕΝ [ ] ΘΕΜΕΛΙΩΝ ΤΟ ΠΑΝ ΕΡΓΟΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
<td>(Spiro, 658)): . . . the most holy archbishop Alkison constructed the entire building from the foundations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>Eurytania Klapsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></td>
<td>bema, western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
<td>ed. pr. E. Chatzidakis, PAE (1958), 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 294.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 167.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
<td>. . . [ ] ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩΣ . . . [ ] ΤΩΝ . . . [ ] ΤΩΝ . . . [ ] ΤΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 167.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27</th>
<th>Eurytania Klapsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></td>
<td>in bema in front of holy table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
<td>ed. pr. E. Chatzidakis, PAE (1958), 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 167.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
<td>Επὶ Εὐρυτηκίου και Πολυκάρπου τῶν ΘΕΟΦΙΛΕΙΣΤΑΤΟΥΝ ΑΝΑΚΟΥΣΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΕΝΒΟΔΕ ΑΓΙΟΤΑΤΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΟΥ [ΤΟΥ] ΘΕΟΦΙΛΗ [ΚΛΗΡΟΝ ΟΙΝΟΚΟΙΝΩΝ ΟΡΑΤΟΙ ΕΠΙΤΡΕΠΟΝΤΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΥΡΥΤΗΚΙΟΝ ΛΕΙΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΤΡΕΠΟΝΤΟΣ ΕΡΓΟΝ].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
<td>(Spiro, 656 -- without Chatzidakes emendations): [ ] God-loving priests, and Melissos the most God-loving reader and steward of the most holy church, and all the God-loving [ ], of the all-glorious Leonidas and the mosaic was done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussions:</strong></td>
<td>J. and L. Robert, BE (1961), 356.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location of Inscription: Central nave

Eurytania Klapsi

Direction:

Editions:

Text:
'Επὶ τοῦ ὁμοιωτάτου ἐπισκ(όπου) ἤμων Αἰμελιανοῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρων
Εὐτυχιανοῦ καὶ Πολυκάρπου καὶ
Μιλήσιοῦ τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου
ἀναγ(ωνοῦ) καὶ οἰκο-
νόμου καὶ παντ(ός) τοῦ κλήρου ἐγένετο
ἡ χαμοκέντησις ἑνδ. ἴα.

Translation:
(Spiro 656):
In the time of our most illustrious Bishop Aimelianos and priests Eutychianos and Polycarpos, and Melissos the most reverent reader and steward, and all the clergy, the mosaic was made, in the 11th indiction.

Discussions:

---

Location of Inscription: north apse of trichonch transept

Eurytania Klapsi

Direction:

Editions:
M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 299.
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 167.

Text:
ΕΠΙ ΤΩΝ ΚΕΡΩΝ
ΔΙΔΥΜΟΥ ΚΕ
ΕΚΕΝ
ΤΗΘ

Translation:
In the time of Didymos it was made

Discussions:

---

Location of Inscription: west edge of 1st nave panel to the east

Eurytania Klapsi

Direction:

Editions:
M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 288.
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 167.

Text:
ΑΓΙΕ ΛΕΩΝΔΗ ΦΥΛΑΞΩΝ ΤΟΝ
ΔΟΨΛΩΝ ΣΟΥ ΙΩΝΗΝ
ΥΠΟΔΙΑΚ(ΟΝΟΝ)

Translation:
(Spiro, 657):
Saint Leonidas, guard your servant John, the subdeacon

Discussions:
## Location of Inscription: **Eurytania Klapsi**

**Direction:** in bema next to holy table

**Editions:**
- M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 296-297.

**Text:**

| Πολύγηρος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος(ος) ἀναγ(νώστης) κε Ἀνδρο-μάχα ἡ θεοφιλ(εσ)-
| τ(άτη) διακ(ονισσα) ύπερ εὐ-
| χής αὐτῶν ἐ-
| καλιέργησαν. |

**Translation:**

(Spiro, 657):

Polygeros the most reverent reader and Adromache the most God-loving deaconess for their vow have done this beautiful work.

**Discussions:**

## Location of Inscription: **Korinthia Kenchreai**

**Direction:** 

**Location of Inscription:** "across the top"

**Editions:**
- ed. pr. Scranton and Ramage, "Investigation at Kenchreai," Hesperia (1964), 139.
- SEG 11 (1954), 263.

**Text:**

| ΣωΤΗΡΙΑΣ ΑΥΤῶΝ ΕΚΑ[...] AMHN |

**Translation:**

For their salvation [it] was decorated.

Amen

**Discussions:**
- J. and L. Robert, BE (1965), 163.
- D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnese, 369 no. 103.

## Location of Inscription: **Korinthia Kiato**

**Direction:**

**Editions:**
- ed. pr. A. Orlandos, PAE (1933), 83.
- SEG 11 (1954), 263.

**Text:**

| Μνήσησθι Κόριε τοῦ δούλου σου --- καὶ ἀπάντων <τῶν> καλλιεργοῦ[τῶν] |

**Translation:**

Remember, Lord, your servant . . . and all of his decorations.

**Discussions:**
- D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnese, 369, no. 105.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location of Inscription:</th>
<th>Direction:</th>
<th>Editions:</th>
<th>Discussions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
<td>Korinth -- Acrokorinth</td>
<td>Location of Inscription:</td>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>Editions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG 29 (1979), no. 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text: Δόρψε, Χριστέ, Φωτίω χάριτι τῆς σῆς [ἀγαθότητος ἐπικόσμω ἔλεος, εἰρήνην [καὶ ἀφεσίν] ἀμαρτίων [- - - -].</td>
<td>Translation: Grant, Christ, Photius, bishops by the grace of bounty, peace and remission from sins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
<td>Korinth -- Kodratos Basilica</td>
<td>Location of Inscription:</td>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>Editions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Stikas, PAE (1962), 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text: Ἄγιε Kodράτε μνήσθη τῷ δούλῳ σου...</td>
<td>Translation: St. Kodratos, remember your servant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
<td>Lechaion -- port</td>
<td>Location of Inscription:</td>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>Editions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnese, 367, no. 86.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text: Μόσειν ΣΤΟΥΑ/ ΒΟΗΘΗΑ/Σ/ΟΥ /Ο/ Λού;ΚΙΑΝΟΥΔΗΑΚΩΝ/ου [συν γυναικι και τ]ΕΚΝΙΣ</td>
<td>Translation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

328
37  Korinthia  Lechaion -- port

**Location of Inscription:** Octagonal baptistery

**Direction:** 

**Editions:**

**Discussions:**
D. Feissel and Phillipidis-Braat, Inscriptions du Peloponnese, 369.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| μην : ] IMAIOD  
Εν: ] ΔΟΚΗΑΝ | |

38  Laconia  Molaoi -- I

**Location of Inscription:** nave

**Direction:** 

**Editions:**
ed. pr. R. Etzeoglu, AE (1974), 249. (in maj.)  
R. Etzeoglu, AD 27 (1972), B'1, 304.  
Pallas, Monuments, 310 no. 99  
* SEG 34 (1984), 304.  
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 102

**Discussions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Μνήσθητι Κόριε καὶ ελε̱- 
ησον πάντας τούς 
καλλιεργούντας ἐν τ̱- 
ῃ ἐγία σου ἐκκλησίᾳ | Remember, Lord, and 
have mercy on all those 
decorating in 
your holy church. |

39  Laconia  Molaoi -- I

**Location of Inscription:** Diakonikon

**Direction:** 

**Editions:**
R. Etzeoglu, AD 27 (1972), B'1, 304.  
Pallas, Monuments, 310 no. 99.  
SEG 34 (1984), 305.

**Discussions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Translation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Υπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ ἀφέ̱- 
σεως ἁμαρτιῶν ἃν οἱ - 
δὲν ὁ Θεός τὰ ἰδοματα | For salvation and 
forgiveness of sins 
of those whose name God knows. |
### Location of Inscription

- Phocis Delphi -- Cemetery
  - **Location of Inscription:** Central nave at entrance to bema
  - **Direction:** facing west
  - **Editions:**
    - ed. pr. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 245.
    - Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, 196.
  - **Discussions:** Like previous this inscription has a mysterious emendations appearing on the PHI CD. It has been included here for consistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τις ὁ τοῦ κα[---]</td>
<td>For rest [and the remission] of sins…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶκου εὑρετή[---]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ θεοπρεπία[---]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔποιησαν το μουσιον (?) τούτο(?) - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location of Inscription

- Phocis Delphi -- Cemetery
  - **Location of Inscription:** Narthex, central panel
  - **Direction:** facing west
  - **Editions:**
    - Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, 196.
  - **Discussions:** The text of this inscription is incorrectly transcribed by Spiro. She omitted the first line of the text even though the letters were completely visible in the photograph she included in her corpus (pl 241). The Packard Humanities Institute, Corpus of Greek Inscriptions and Papyri CD ROM includes the edition of the text I have here, but cites M. Spiro's incorrect edition as its source. I have not been able to track down the source for the entirely reasonable emendations that the editors of the PHI CD recommended, but since they are reasonable I have retained their text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὑπὲρ ἀνα[παύσεως καὶ ἀφέσεως]</td>
<td>For rest [and the remission] of sins…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμαρτία[---] - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰκε[---]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθ(-) o οἰκ(-) ou[---]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Phocis Kallion -- Christian Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text:</td>
<td>Agatholkes and Hilaria and their son Alexandros on account of them and their family made this for a half a gold piece.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation:</td>
<td>Translation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44</th>
<th>Phocis Kallion -- Christian Building</th>
<th>Location of Inscription:</th>
<th>room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text:</td>
<td>On account of a vow of him and his household whose name God knows, made this for one gold piece.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation:</td>
<td>Translation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Inscription</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phocis Kallion -- Christian Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed pr. V. Petrakos, AD 26 B’1 (1971), 283.</td>
<td>Zosimos on account of a vow of him and all his family wrote this for half a gold piece.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 200.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζώσιμος υπέ-</td>
<td>Zosimos on account of a vow of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φεύγων καὶ παντὸς τοῦ</td>
<td>him and all his</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἔγραψε·</td>
<td>family wrote this for half a gold piece.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἤμοσσίου.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phocis Kallion -- Christian Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed pr. V. Petrakos, AD 26 B’1 (1971), 283.</td>
<td>This holy (church) was built from the foundations and paved by the most pious presbyter Dionysios. All entering pray for him and his family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 200.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐπί τοῦ εὐλαβεῖστατου πρεσβυτέρου</td>
<td>This holy (church) was built from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονυσίου ἀνεναιώθη ὁ</td>
<td>foundations and paved by the most pious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁγίος ἐκ θεμελίων καὶ ἐ-</td>
<td>presbyter Dionysios. All entering pray for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κεντριζή. Πάντες οἱ έφα-</td>
<td>him and his family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>όντες εὐξαμαθαὶ υπέρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Inscription: Malandrino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Inscription:</strong> Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 227.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 202.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οἱ εὐλαβεῖστατοι...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγγέλτηκα...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ Εὐτυχιανὸς ἂν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>με ταῖς εὐλαβεῖστα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Location of Inscription: Achinos -- Perivolaki

**Direction:**

**Editions:** ed. pr. P. Lazaridis, AD 16, 1960, 164.

**Discussions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἁγιος Αθανάσιος ο Ἀλεξάνδρεας</td>
<td>Holy Athanasios of Alexandria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Location of Inscription: entrance to the Bema

**Direction:**


**Discussions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Εὐγένειος ὁ λαμπρότατος καὶ Διονυσία ὑπὲρ εὐχῆς ἐαυτῶν καὶ τῶν παιδίων Αὐτῶν σύμπαν τὸ ἔργον τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐκ θεμελίων ἐπλήρωσαν.</td>
<td>Eugeneios, the illustrious, and his wife Dionyseia for a vow of themselves and their children completed the whole building of the holy church of God from the foundations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Location of Inscription: around circular plaque (no context)

**Direction:**

**Editions:**


**Discussions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ὁ [ἈΠΙΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗΣ] [Ε]ΑΥΤΟΥ</td>
<td>Of the Apostles on account of a vow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51  Thessaly  Demetrias B  

**Location of Inscription:** central panel of bema  
**Direction:** facing west  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ο εὖλα [-----] ύπερ εὐχής αὐτο [ἐποίησεν].</td>
<td>The blessed... for a vow made this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ύπερ εὐχής Θεοδοσίας καὶ Ονήσιμος ἐποίησαν.</td>
<td>For a vow Theodosius and Onisimos made this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ύπερ εὐχής ἐφυτεύματσι</td>
<td>For a vow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Συσῖννος καὶ τῆς μητρὸς</td>
<td>Sisinnos and his mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀυτοῦ ἐποίησαν.</td>
<td>made this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Οὗ ὁ Θεός τὸ ὅνομα οἶδεν ἐποίησεν.</td>
<td>He, whose name God knows, made this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussions:**

52  Thessaly  Demetrias A  

**Location of Inscription:** central nave at entrance to bema  
**Direction:** facing west  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δαμοκρατία</td>
<td>Damokratia, the illustrious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ λαμπροτάτη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussions:**

53  Thessaly  Demetrias A  

**Location of Inscription:** narthex at entrance to main nave  
**Direction:** faces west  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δαμοκρατία</td>
<td>Damokratia, the illustrious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ λαμπροτάτη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussions:**
54 Thessaly Nea Anchialos -- A

**Location of Inscription:** In a room to the N of the narthex

**Direction:** facing west?

**Editions:**
ed pr. P. Lazaridis, PAE (1972), 355.
*A.K. Orlandos, Ergon (1972), 131.
M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 365,

**Discussions:** This inscription has had three radically different transcriptions.

| **Text:** | **Translation:** |
| "Αγιε Δημήτριε Βοήθη | Saint Demetrios help (me) |

55 Thessaly Nea Anchialos -- B

**Location of Inscription:** On a closure plaque

**Editions:**
ed. pr. N. Yannopoulos, ByzJ 1 (1920), 389/390, no. 9.
G. Sotiriou, AE (1929), 156 no. 5.

**Discussions:**

<p>| <strong>Text:</strong> | <strong>Translation:</strong> |
| Επι Ἔλπιδιος τοῦ Ἐλπιδος(τοῦ) ἑπισκόπου ςτὸ(στὸς) Διάκο(νος) ὑπὲρ εὐχής | In the time of the most holy bishop Elpidos, Steven, the humble deacon, for a vow. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Inscription</th>
<th>South aisle, central aisle</th>
<th>Location of Inscription</th>
<th>in the wall of the church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text:</td>
<td>`Ο τής μελίσσης</td>
<td>τής σοφής</td>
<td>διδάσκαλος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation:</td>
<td>The teacher of the sweet wisdom, Archbishop Peter, a famous man, offered to the church of God this august and suitable work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pallas, Palaiochristianikes rythmikes epigraphes, Rivista di Studi Byzantini e Neoellenici 10/11 (1973/74), 43.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Spiro, Critical Corpus, 394.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Inscription</th>
<th>Thessaly Nea Anchialos -- G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text:</td>
<td>Νάκο καὶ τής τῶν Πρασίνων τῶν ὑθοδόξων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation:</td>
<td>Victory. The luck of the Greens of the Orthodox!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Location of Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Provisional Catalogue of

Early Christian Churches in Southern and Central Greece

The following catalogue of Early Christian churches is a work in progress. As best I can tell, it contains nearly all evidence that might suggest the presence of an Early Christian church in southern and central Greece. This catalogue is heavily dependent on the work of earlier scholars to the extent that it might better be considered a concordance of their previous efforts to present the information known about Early Christian churches or their various features. G. Sotiriou made the first effort toward collecting all the information about Christian churches in the 1929 volume of 'Arkhaiologikí Ephemeríz. Subsequent publications such as A. K. Orlandos magisterial Ἡ Ξυλοστέγος Παλαιοχριστιανική Βασιλική published in 1952, while not a catalogue, provided important information regarding Early Christian architecture. Orlandos conducted many of the excavations on which his catalogue was based and in other instances he included unpublished or little known information in the copious footnotes of his survey. Monuments excavated after Orlandos survey were included in his report at the 4th ACIAC published in 1957, D. Pallas’s article in the RAC of 1959 and then in his Les monuments
paléochrétiens de Grèce découvert de 1959 à 1973.\textsuperscript{1} More recently, A. Avramea noted the presence of Early Christian churches in her gazetteer of the Peloponnesus published as an appendix to her 1997 book.\textsuperscript{2} The final catalogue that I reference by number has only appeared very recently and in very limited circulation. Y. Varalis doctoral dissertation at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki included what is by far the finest and most far reaching catalogue of Early Christian churches in the east. He summarized in Greek the archaeological reports for over 900 churches from Illyricum Orientalis.\textsuperscript{3} From an archaeological standpoint his catalogue is superior to mine. Unfortunately it is in Modern Greek which will limit its accessibility to non-Greek scholars for as long as Modern Greek remains a language known primarily to specialist who study material from within the borders of the Hellenic Republic. Hopefully, his excellent catalogue will find a publisher and receive wide distribution.

Various catalogues of features of Early Christian architecture, have also helped create my collection. Of particular importance were the catalogues of mosaic pavements prepared by J.-P. Sodini, M. Spiro, and P. Assimakopoulo-Atzaka since mosaic floors are common in Christian churches. I have only provided Assimakopoulo-Atzaka and Spiro numbers since both of those catalogues post-dated Sodini’s, provide the same citations, and include better descriptions. V. Vemi’s catalogue and discussion of ionic impost capitals, P. Jakobs catalogue of Early Christian ambos, and N. Laskaris catalogue of


\textsuperscript{2} A. Avremea, \textit{Le Péloponnèse du IVe au VIIIe siècle.} (Paris 1997)

Early Christian burials from Greece also provided valuable information for features typical of Early Christian architecture in Greece. I have referred to these catalogues, and the catalogue of D. Pallas and gazetteer of A. Avramea by the entry numbers that these authors have provided.

Guide to the Catalogue

The first bold-faced word in each catalogue entry is the name of the region where the church is located. The catalogue is organized by region.

The second, non-bold-faced word, is the name of the site. In general this word refers to the modern place name, but in some cases, when the site is better known by an ancient name, I have included that as well. In cases where there are multiple churches at the same site or location, I have a specific building name as well.

The far right of the top line indicates the type of building. Buildings referred to simply as “basilica” are buildings whose exact features are unknown, “basilica?” is typically reserved for architectural fragments likely associated with a basilica type building.

The location field provides information regarding the location of the building.


The Alt. Name field provides any alternative name in the rare instances when a building goes by a name other than its official site name.

The date line gives any proposed dates for the building. The entry ‘EC” is used for buildings that have only been given the date of “Early Christian.” In cases where some dispute or explanation exists for the date, I have included brief summary of it here.
The next line includes information regarding the various features of the building.
Architecture: lists any known architecture space associated with the building.

Furnishings: lists any architectural sculpture or liturgical furnishing associated with the building. In many cases this is all that remains.


The next section provides some information regarding extant mosaic pavement.

Mosaics: lists the location of known mosaic pavements.


Report citations list the major archaeological reports for each site.

Feature notes presents my “working notes” for each monument.

The box offset to the right of the catalogue entry contains references to my plans, figures and the epigraphy catalogue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Acarnania</strong></th>
<th>Island of Kephalos in Ambraciot Gulf -- A</th>
<th><strong>Date:</strong></th>
<th>500–599</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>On an island in the Ambraciot Gulf, NW of Vonitsa.</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>Raised stylobates, synthonon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>28a</td>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>Atrium, double narthex, annex,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>Architectural sculpture, chancel screen, ambo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>Nave, bema/apse,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td>Church A</td>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 146-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Mparla, PAE (1965), 78-94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Mparla, PAE (1966), 95-102.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Mparla, PAE (1968), 16-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes</strong></td>
<td>Fragments of chancel screen found in situ, and fragments of an altar and perhaps an ambo were found in the church. This building has a number of annexes, apparently to the N and S and W. Perhaps a diakonikon to the S of the narthex composed of two compartments, according to Pallas; there is a long N-S annex to the N of the narthex as well, whose function is unclear.</td>
<td><strong>Plans:</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Figures:** | | **Epig. Cat.:** | 342

Based on the similarities between the sculpture and mosaics here and those at Nikopolis (according to Pallas).
**Acarnania**  Island of Kephalos in Ambraciot Gulf -- B  
*Two aisled basilica with east apse and transept*

**Location**  On the island of Kephalos in the gulf of Arta, about 120 m south of Basilica A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>28b</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Church B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
<td>The evidence for date provided by Spiro is the similarities in design to the churches built at Nikopolis during this time and the presence of some small fragments of similar floor mosaics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:**  narthex, baptistery,  
**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpure,  
**Features:**  door,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  

**Mosaics:**  nave,  
**Mosaic Citations:**  Assimak-Atz No:  
Spiro No.: 148

Pelekanidis-Atzaka 107-108, n. 84
Spiro, 421-423, n. 148.

**Report Citations**

C. Mparla, D. Pallas, PAE (1968), 21-23.
Pallas, RAC 35, 196ff.

**Features Notes**
Very strangely shaped church with a transept but no visible N or S aisles -- makes one wonder if the church was changed later or even during construction. Two nartheces with a baptistery to the NW of the exonarthex.

---

**Acarnania**  Mytikas  
*Basilica*

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: St. Sophia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:**  N/A  
**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpure,  
**Features:**  tribelon,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  

**Mosaics:**  
**Mosaic Citations:**  Assimak-Atz No:  
Spiro No.:  

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acarnania Ochthia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No: 26 Varalis No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Furnishings</th>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No.</th>
<th>Jakob No.</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acarnania Vonitsa -- Drymos</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>tombs,</td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No: 27a Varalis No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Name: Drymos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Mosaics</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acarnania</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vonitsa -- Kelephi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelephi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Mastrokostas, AAA 4 (1972), 192-193, fig. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Mosaics</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acarnania</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>tombs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vonitsa -- Palioklissi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palioklissi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Mastrokostas, AAA 4 (1972), 185-192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Achaia

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avgamea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500–599

Ass.-Atz. dates the mosaic to the first half of the sixth century.

**Architecture:** narthex,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics:** nathex,

**Mosaic Citations:**

- BullAIEMA 9 (1983), 1153-1155.

**Report Citations**

- Sodini, L'Habitat urbain, 389.

---

### Achaia

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avgamea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Assimak-Atz No: 22
- Spiro No.: 346

**Report Citations**

G. Papandreou

**Features Notes**

- Ancient ruins.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Achaia</strong></th>
<th>Chryssokelaria Pylias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td><em>Basilica?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Architecture:** | N/A | **Features:** | N/A |
| **Furnishings:** | architectural sculpture, | **Laskaris No:** | Vemi No: | Jakob No: |
| **Mosaics:** | | **Mosaic Citations:** | Assimak-Atz No: | Spiro No: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Achaia</strong></th>
<th>Dyme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td><em>Basilica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Architecture:** | N/A | **Features:** | tomb, |
| **Furnishings:** | architectural sculpture, | **Laskaris No:** | Vemi No: | Jakob No: |
| **Mosaics:** | | **Mosaic Citations:** | Assimak-Atz No: | Spiro No: |
### Achaia - Gourzoumiza

**Location**: On the hill of Ag. Andrea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 76</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A  
**Features**: N/A  
**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,  
**Mosaics**:  
**Mosaic Citations**:  

**Report Citations**
- A. Moutzali, 11th Symposio XAE (1991), 71

---

### Achaia - Kato Achaia

**Location**: Near the ancient cemetery and the modern church of the Theotokos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 129</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A  
**Features**: tombs,  
**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,  
**Mosaics**:  
**Mosaic Citations**:  

**Report Citations**
- A. Moutzali, AD 45 (1990), B'1 150.

**Features Notes**
- Remains of an apse.
- Numerous EC tombs suggests this to be the site of an EC basilica.
### Achaia

**Kato Roitika**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 240</th>
<th>Avramea No: 277</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 480 – 520  

**Architecture:** N/A  

**Features:** raised stylobates, aisles, Mosaics:  

**Mosaics Citations:**  


**Features Notes**

Mosaic in south aisle of a partially excavated basilica  

**Report Citations**

G. Touchais BCH 106 (1982), 556.  
A. Moutzali, 11th Symposio XAE (1991), 70.  

---

### Achaia

**Kleitoria**

**Location**  
Near Kalavryta and the late Byzantine church.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 138</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'  

**Architecture:** N/A  

**Features:** N/A  

**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure,  

**Mosaics:**  

**Mosaics Citations:**  

**Features Notes**

Apse of a possible EC Basilica.  

**Report Citations**

M. Pertritaki, AD 48 (1993), B’1 129.
### Achaia

#### Leontion

**Basilica?**

**Date:** EC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Near more recent church of the Panayia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varalis No: 280</td>
<td>Avramea No: 280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


### Achaia

#### Patras -- Ay. Andreas

**Basilica**

**Date:** 500, 599

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Varalis No: 221</th>
<th>Avramea No: 282</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500, 599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** waterworks,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varalis No: 221</td>
<td>Avramea No: 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

E. Mastrokostas, AD 19 (1964), B'2 183-184.


A. Moutzali, 13th Symposio XAE (1993), 34.
## Achaia
**Patras -- Charadros**

**Basilica?**

### Location
Near the site of Spilia or Varkos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 270</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Date:
'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: N/A</th>
<th>Features: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics: fragment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations
- M. Petropoulos, AD 46 (1991), B’1 155.

### Features Notes
Fragment of mosaic possibly from a basilica.

## Achaia
**Patras -- Od. I. Vlachou**

**Basilica?**

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 225</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Date:
'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: N/A</th>
<th>Features: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics: architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations
- I. Papapostolou, AD 36 (1981), B’1 162.

### Features Notes
Possible Roman nymphaea converted to a Christian church in Early Byz. period
### Achaia
**Patras -- Od. Kanakari**

**Location**
On Od. Kanakari 124-126

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** raised stylobates, waterworks, tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:** 33  
**Varalis No:** 223  
**Avramea No:** 282  
**Alt. Name:**

**Date:** 490-515
Ass.-Atz. dates the mosaic to the end of the fifth beginning of the 6th c. Contributing to this date is Velissariou's article which places the formula in the first decade of the sixth century.

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Features Notes**
Three open air areas exist to the south one of which has two wells. The inscription which names the deaconess Agrippiani comes from a later phase.

### Achaia
**Patras -- Od. Kanakari II**

**Location**
Od. Kanakari 46-52.

**Date:** 400-449
Ass.-Atz. dates it to the first half of the fifth century

**Architecture:** narthex,  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:** 112  
**Varalis No:** 224  
**Avramea No:**  
**Alt. Name:**

**Report Citations**
### Achaia

**Patras -- Od. Votsi**

**Basilica?**

**Location**  
On Votsi road.

**Date:**  
'EC'

**Pallas No:** Varalis No: 222  
Avramea No: pg. 88  
Alt. Name:

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
Spiro No:.

**Report Citations**

I.A. Papapostolou, AD 27 (1972), B1, 289.  
Nothing but mosaic fragments and a Deltion notice.

---

### Achaia

**Platavobrysi**

**Basilica?**

**Location**

**Pallas No:** Varalis No: 230  
Avramea No:  
Alt. Name:

**Date:**  
'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
Spiro No:.

**Report Citations**

A. Moutzali, AD 42 (1987), B'1 190.  
Preserved apsidal structure.
### Achaia  
**Skioessa Bozaitikon**

**Location**  
On the west side of the river Selemonou

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 248</th>
<th>Avramea No: 284</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500 599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- A. Pantelidou, AD 37 (1982), B'1 163.
- A. Pariente, BCH 114 (1990), 753.

**Features Notes**

What is apparently an octagonal church built into the ruins of a Roman tomb with a built apse to the east.

---

### Achaia  
**Tritaia**

**Location**  
Under church to the Virgin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 2</th>
<th>Avramea No: 268</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

Apse under a more recent church.
### Aegina

#### Location
Possible basilica on the coast, near the Byzantine church of the Pavagista

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

### Aegina

#### Location
21 10 p. 226

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 400 499</th>
<th>Varalis dates this building to the middle of the 6th century.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>annex, baptistery,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture, chancel screen,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>p. 226</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**
A. M. Schneider, RAC 4 (1927), 350.
G. Sotiriou, basiliki, 194, 221, fig 49.
G. Welter, Aigina, (Berlin 1938), 62ff, fig. 54.
A.K. Orlandos, 448, 466, 471, 473.
P. Lazaridis, AD 22 (1967), 161-162.

**Features Notes**
Notable in this church is the pastophorion in the SE of the nave (in the S aisle). There might not have been raised stylobates. Only partially excavated (the E end). Tombs to the NW of the church and in the S aisle. Preserved chancel screen with a column base suggests (according to Pallas (1977), 13) a triumphal arch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aetolia</th>
<th>Astakos</th>
<th>Basilica?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>At the church of the H. Sotera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architecture: N/A
Furnishings: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>fragment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: 54</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some mosaic fragments and the remains of an apse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aetolia</th>
<th>Ay. Georgios</th>
<th>Three aisled basilica with east apse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Varalis No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>580 699 Varalis Dates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architecture: N/A
Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Vokotopoulos, AD 22 (1967), 325-326, plan 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.D. Triandafyllopoulou, AD 33 (1978), Chronika, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Konstantios, AD 35 (1980), B1 344.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Soustal and J. Koder, TIB 3 (Vienna 1981), 155-156.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bommelje and P.K. Doorn, Aetolia and the Aetolians. (Utrecht 1984), 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Konstantios, EiperChron 26 (1984), 130.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aetolia

**Gavrolimni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>At the church of the Virgin Panaxiotissa.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Architecture: | N/A | Features: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture, | Mosaics: | |
| Laskaris No: | Vemi No: | Jakob No: | |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: | Spiro No.: | |

### Report Citations

D. Konstantinos, 1st Symposio XAE, 41. D. Konstantinos, AD 35 (1980), B'1 345. Chambers were excavated to the west of the Middle Byzantine church there. Fragments of architectural sculpture have also been found.

### Aetolia

**Kainorio -- II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outside of the village.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Architecture: | N/A | Features: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture, | Mosaics: | |
| Laskaris No: | Vemi No: | Jakob No: | |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: | Spiro No.: | |

### Report Citations

### Aetolia

**Kainourio -- I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>In the cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basilica?**

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furniture: | architectural sculpture, |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: |
| Report Citations | Possible EC basilica. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### Aetolia

**Karpension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>At a place called Armoniada to the NE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basilica?**

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furniture: | N/A |
| Mosaic Citations: | fragment, |
| Report Citations | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: |

---

**Report Citations**


### Report Citations

P. Vokotopoulos, AD 22 (1967), 338.
P. Lazaridies, AD 28 (1973), 386.
### Aetolia

**Kato Basiliki**

*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

**Location** On the hill of Ag. Triada near ancient Kalydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No</th>
<th>Varalis No</th>
<th>Avramea No</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500 – 549

Varalis records a date in the first half of the 6th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings</th>
<th>Laskaris No</th>
<th>Vemi No</th>
<th>Jakob No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sodini, 523-524</td>
<td>Aisles are separated from the main nave by piers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations

E. Mastrokostas, *AD 16* (1960), 196.
P. Soustal and J. Koder, *TIB* 3 (Vienna 1981), 121.

### Magali Chora or Zapanti

*Basilica?*

**Location** North and southeast of the church of the Koimisis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No</th>
<th>Varalis No</th>
<th>Avramea No</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 600 – 699

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>Architectural sculpture,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sodini, 523-524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Kirsten, <em>AA</em>, (1941), 118-119.</td>
<td>Aisles are separated from the main nave by piers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Aetolia**

**Mastron**

*Three aisled basilica with three apses*

**Location**
In the village of Mastron

**Date:** 580-649
Vokotopulos dates this building to the late 6th or early 7th c. based primarily on its continued use of floor mosaics. The triple apses is typical of later buildings and it has numerous characteristics that make it at the edge of my time frame.

**Architecture:** narthex, nave, bema/apse,
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,
**Features:** synthronon, raised bema,

**Report Citations**
- P. Vokotopoulos, AD 22 (1967), 328-329, plan 2
- P. Soustal and J. Koder, TIB 3 (Vienna 1981), 202

**Features Notes**
The most exceptional characteristics of this church are its three apses and the fact that the nave is separated from the aisles walls peirced by arcaded arches (actually a triple arched arcade). There seems to be some remains of a chancel screen and a raised bema and traces of a narthex.

Central apse exceeds an arc and this is quite exceptional in Greece.

**Location**
In the village of Mesolongi

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A
**Features:** N/A

**Report Citations**
- Ergo UPPO 3 (1999), 218.

**Features Notes**
Recently discovered and noted.
### Aetolia

**Location**
Along the road from Agriniou to Antirrio

**Pallas No:** Varalis No: 188  
Avramea No:  
Alt. Name:  

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  

**Laskaris No:** Vemi No:  
Jakob No:  

**Mosaics:**  

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
Spiro No.:  

---

**Report Citations**  
D. Konstantios, 1st Symposio XAE (1981), 41.  
D. Konstantios, EiperChron 26 (1984), 133.

---

### Aetolia

**Location**
At the foot of the hill at a site called Foinikia.

**Pallas No:** Varalis No: 189  
Avramea No:  
Alt. Name:  

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** narthex, annex, baptistery,  
**Features:** raised stylobates, tombs,  

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  

**Laskaris No:** Vemi No:  
Jakob No:  

**Mosaics:**  

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
Spiro No.:  

---

**Report Citations**  
P. Soustal and J. Koder, TIB 3 (Vienna 1981), 106  
S. Bommelje and P.K. Doorn, Aetolia and the  
Aetolians. (Utrecht 1987), 105.  
Lippman, (forthcoming)
### Aetolia

**Location**: Near the modern village at a place called Erimitou

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;EC&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


### Aetolia

**Location**: At the church of the Theotokos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 599</td>
<td>Date Varalis records.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- P. Lazaridis, *AD 16* (1960), B’ 197.

**Features Notes**

- Part of the apse survives.

---
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### Arcadia

**Astros Kynourias**

**Location** On the site of the Monastery of Loukous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>180</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 400 599

Spiro dates the piece of mosaic floor to the fifth century and Orlandos dated it to the 6th century.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Sodini, Mosaiques 709

**Features Notes**

- Little information concerning the features of this church.

---

### Arcadia

**Chotoussa**

**Location** On the base of the Hellenistic temple at the ancient Kaphyai, called Prinakos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 480 520

Varalis records a date at the end of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Assimak-Atz No: 16
- Spiro No.: 58

**Features Notes**

- Little information concerning the features of this church.
### Arcadia

**Gortys -- near 12thc. Chapel of Ay. Andreas**

**Date:** 'EC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No: 94</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture: N/A</td>
<td>Features: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

H. Metzger, BCH 75 (1951), 130-134.

**Features Notes**

Just a note.

---

### Arcadia

**Kato Doliana**

**Date:** 'EC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 130b</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture: N/A</td>
<td>Features: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

Possible EC church.
### Arcadia

**Kato Meligous**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 500 – 599

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Report Citations**


---

### Arcadia

**Lepenou**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Report Citations**


---
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### Arcadia  Lycosoura

**Location** Near the ancient temple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hag. Athanasios</td>
<td>Tombs on account of their construction style appear to date to the 5th-6th century and the basilica is contemporary. Varalis proposd a mid 6th c. date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** narthex, Features: tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Plans: 49</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arcadia  Mantinea -- 1

**Location** SW of the ancient theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 400 599

Zakynthinou thinks that these churches are early Christian whereas Fougeres identified them as Byzantine. Gritsopolis dates the site to after the ninth century.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations

V. Leonardos, PAE (1896), 100, 119-120.
K. Kourouniotis, PAE (1916), 121.
A.K. Orlandos, 448.

### Arcadia  Mantinea -- 1

**Location** SW of the ancient theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 400 599

Zakynthinou thinks that these churches are early Christian whereas Fougeres identified them as Byzantine. Gritsopolis dates the site to after the ninth century.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations

G. Fougeres, Mantinee et l'Arcadie Orientale, (Paris 1898), 170, 193, 517-518, 599.
G. Steinhauer, AD 29 (1973-4), B'2 299-301.
V. Konte, Symmeikta 6, 1985, 107-108
J.-P. Sodini, Habitat urbain, 364.

### Features Notes

Two churches excavated by the French but never properly published brought to light two "Byzantine" churches. Some bronze lamps found here.
Arcadia

Location: In the site of the ancient city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date: 'EC'

Architecture: N/A

Features: N/A

Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

Laskaris No: Vemis: Jakob No: Pallas No: Spiro No: Assimak-Atz No: Areopagos No: Alt. Name: Mosaics:

Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: Areopagos No:

Report Citations

G. Fougeres, Mantinee et l'Arcadie Orientale, (Paris 1898), 170, 193, 517-518, 599.
V. Konte, Symmeikta 6 (1985), 107-108

Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: Areopagos No:

Features Notes

Not much information here.

Arcadia

Location: Site is near theater.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date: 'EC'

Architecture: N/A

Features: N/A

Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

Laskaris No: Vemis: Jakob No: Pallas No: Spiro No: Assimak-Atz No: Areopagos No: Alt. Name: Mosaics:

Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: Areopagos No:

Report Citations

AD 1973 B'1, 175-178.
M. Anninos Kavalieratos, PAE (1901), 45-48.
V. Konte, Symmeikta 6 (1985), 109-110.

Features Notes

Some few fragments of architecture and marble which might have come from a church.
### Arcadia

#### Location
At Levidi (or Levidiatiko campo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500-599

Coinage of Justin II was found at the site, suggesting destruction by Slavs.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 72

**Features:** N/A

**Features Notes**

The report in Konte said that the church could be either three or five aisled. The excavation was not published, as the information was supplied by the ephor.

**Report Citations**

V. Konte, Symmeikta 6 (1985), 114.
A. Pariente, BCH 114 (1990), 739.

#### Location
A few kilometers south of the Tripolis-Megalopolis highway.

**Pallas No:** Varalis No: 218 Avramea No: 96

**Date:** 550-599

Spiro, no earlier than the middle of the sixth c. Ass-Atz. dated the mosaics to the middle of the second half of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** narthex,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:** Vemi No: Jakob No: p. 290

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 19 Spiro No.: 72

**Features:** door, synthonon,

**Features Notes**

Only the central nave and narrow narthex were excavated. Possibly 5 aisled.

**Report Citations**

Konte, Symmeikta 6 (1985), 115.
### Arcadia

**Palladion -- Ay. Georgios**

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Date: | 550 – 599 | Middle to second half of the 6th century. |

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture, |

| Mosaics: |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: |
| Spiro No.: |

| Features: |
| tombs, |

| Plans: | 45 |
| Figures: |
| Epig. Cat.: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Libertini, ASAA, 1-21 (N.S. 1939-1940), 225-230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Konte, Symmeikta 6 (1985), 115.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arcadia

**Phalaisiai**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basilica?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**To the South of the village near the church of Hag. Triada.**

| Date: | 'EC' |
| **Pallas No:** | **Varalis No:** | **Avramea No:** | **Alt. Name:** |
|  |  | 124 |  |

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture, |

| Mosaics: |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: |
| Spiro No.: |

| Features: |
| N/A |

| Plans: |
| Figures: |
| Epig. Cat.: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few fragments of a basilica?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Arcadia

**Location** at Provantinon under the present church of Hagia Ioannes. Perhaps on the site of an archaic sanctuary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89b</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 450 - 550

Dates based especially on the sculpture found around the site of Provantinon. Perhaps the individuals noted on the inscribed ambo was the same Ophelimos who took part in the council of Chalcedon (451), although the style etc. of the ambo suggests a relatively later date (Pallas).

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:**

**Varalis No:**

**Avramea No:**

**Jakob No:** p. 321-32

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Features:** N/A

**Plans:**

**Figures:**

**Epig. Cat.:** 4

---

### Arcadia

**Location** In the Agora on the site of a sanctuary of Apollo.

**Date:** 400 - 525

Orlandos dated the mosaic fragments to the fifth century. Varalis suggested a date in the first quarter of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery,

**Features:** tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:**

**Varalis No:**

**Avramea No:**

**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Features Notes**

**Plans:**

**Figures:**

**Epig. Cat.:** 5, 6

---

### Note

Not much known about this church. Apparently partially excavated but not well described or published. Noted in Orlandos with dimensions of its length but nothing else. Varalis suggests it is a 5 naved basilica. A prothesis or chapel is attached to the atrium with an eastern apse.

---

370
### Arcadia | Tegea -- Alea | **Basilica**

**Location** On the site of the ancient temple to Athena Alea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 89a</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No: 95</th>
<th><strong>Alt. Name:</strong> Basilica of Alea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** raised stylobates, architectural sculpture, chancel screen.

**Furnishings:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- A. Østby, Opuscula Atheniensia, 16 (1986), 75-77.

**Features Notes**

Little remains of this church but the stylobates with traces of the collonade. On some of the places for columns on the stylobate there are carved crosses. A column capital perhaps from the church at Alea. Østby objects to the conclusions of the early excavators and argues that the so-called stylobate of the so-called EC church is really the remains of the earlier temple cut into the rock. The other fragments of EC sculpture probably come from another near by church (perhaps the monastery).

### Arcadia | Tegea -- theater | **Basilica**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th><strong>Alt. Name:</strong> Basilica of the Theat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

**Features Notes**

Undergoing Excavations  
Only recently uncovered.
### Arcadia

**Tegea -- Thyrsos**

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>In the Agora.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>89d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td>Basilica of Thyrsos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>450-525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spoiro dates the mosaics to the second half of the fifth century or perhaps even later. Varalis dated the building to the first quarter of the sixth century.

| Architecture: | narthex, annex, |
| Features: | raised stylobates, tombs, |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture, |
| Laskaris No: | 28 |
| Vemi No: | Jakob No: |
| Mosaics: | nave, bema/apse, other, |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: 21 Spiro No.: 69-71 |

Simply immense: See Ass.-Atz. But especially:

Ass.-Atz., E chronologisi tou psiphedotou dapedou basilikes
Thyrso stin Tegea, in Aphieroma sti mnemi Styl. Pelekanidi,
(Thessaloniki 1983), 1-22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. Berard, AJA 5 (1889), 492.</td>
<td>It appears to be a three aisled basilica with a parecclesias to the north side of the church, seemingly attached to the north aisle. It is not clear whether they communicate. Varalis suggested that this was an additional aisle making it a five aisle basilica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Berard, BCH 16 (1892), 528-549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Berard, BCH 17 (1893), 1-24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Sotiriou, ACIAC, 4.1 (Vatican 1938), 365.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 155, 399, 427, 513.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For more bib see: Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Plans: | 48 |
| Figures: | figs. 21-28 |

### Arcadia

**Thelopoussa -- Ay. Ioannis**

**Basilica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>At the place called Toubitsi (Hag. Ioannis).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td>88-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remains of the ancient nave seem to fit dimensions of early Christian churches. Xyngopoulos questions the fifth to sixth century date.

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Features: | synthronon, |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture, |
| Laskaris No: | |
| Vemi No: | Jakob No: |
| Mosaics: | |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: |
| Spiro No.: | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Petronotis, Ellenika 26 (1973), 255-270.</td>
<td>Little except the apse of the early Christian church remains upon which a later church was erected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Xyngopoulos, Peloponnesiaka 2 (1957), 446-447.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Plans: |
| Figures: |
| Epig. Cat.: |
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### Arcadia

**Thelopoussa -- Panayia**

**Basilica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>at the Panayia de Vanaina lies the foundation of an earlier Christian building.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>88-90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
<th>Based loosely on the dimensions of the apse, but, again, Xyngopoulos questions the dating to the fifth or sixth centuries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>architectural sculpture,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Arcadia

**Vourvoura**

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Argolid
#### Ano Epidauros -- Ay. Paraskevi

**Location**  
At Ay. Paraskevi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 44</th>
<th>Avramea No: 73-78</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500-599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


### Argolid
#### Ano Epidauros -- Gephyraki

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 45</th>
<th>Avramea No: 73-78</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>400-499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible dates according to Varalis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>narthex,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

S. Charitonidas, AD 21 (1966), B'1 131.
### Argolid — Ano Epidauros — Lalioteika

**Location** at Lalioteika under the church of Hagia Marina

**Date:** 580-699
- Excavator thinks it is a "dark age" church. It had a bronze cross similar to those found at Tigani in the Mani and ceramics from the sixth or seventh centuries found in walls. Varalis concurs and dates the church to the seventh century.

**Architecture:** nartex, apses, nave, narthex, tribelon, tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Features:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:** nave, nartex

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 46

**Plans:** 36

**Figures:**

**Report Citations**
- A. Oikonomou, AD 37 (1982), B’1 130-131
- A. Pariente, BCH 114 (1990), 730.

**Features Notes**

The church itself has three aisles and three apses.

Oikonomou has dated the church to between the 7th and 10th century in part due to small finds and in part due to the architectural parallels with the Episkopi at Mastrou, also the church on Crete (Byzariou) and Hag. Iouannes Aperpanthou on Naxos dating to the dark ages. Tombs are from the 12th c. after the church had been destroyed. Sigma table found with it and some nice architectural sculpture which Varalis sees similarities with those of the church of Ag. Nikolaos at Kolloti.

### Argolid — Argos -- Alika

**Location** 800m to the east of Aspis church.

**Date:** 500-550
- Beginning of sixth century. Probably slightly earlier than the church at Sikyon and contemporary to the churches of Korinthia.

**Architecture:** narthex, annex, nave, apses, narthex, tribelon, tombs, raised stylobates, tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure, chancel screen,

**Features:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:** nave, narthex

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 52

**Plans:** 36

**Figures:**

**Report Citations**
- D. Pallas, AD 16 (1960), 95-100.
- D. Pallas, FR 118 (1979), 112-114.
- A. Oikonomou, 10th Symposio XAE, (1990), 60.

**Features Notes**

The door on the south wall of the nave has parallels with the door on the south wall of the Lechaion basilica and the basilica at Kiato. Benches for the clergy in the chancel area.
### Argolid

#### Location
Adjoining the temple in the sanctuary to Apollo Pythia on the Aspis Hill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>Coins of Justin II, suggesting destruction by Slavs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Architecture: | atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery, |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculptpure, chancel screen, |
| Laskaris No: | 26 |
| Vemis: | Assimak-Atz No: |
| Jakob No: | Spiro No: |
| Mosaics: | |

**Report Citations**

A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 207-210, 531.
A. Oikonomou, 10th Symposio XAE (1990), 60.

### Argolid

#### Location
To the west of Bath A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculptpure, |
| Laskaris No: | Vemis: |
| Jakob No: | Spiro No: |
| Mosaics: | Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: |

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**
The primary find here is a bread stamp (see Varalis, BCH 118 (1994), 331-342.
Argolid  

**Argos -- Od. Chatze**

**Basilica?**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 59</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 580 - 699  
Varalis dates the architecture late.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex,  
**Features:** waterworks,

**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

E. Protonotariou-Deilaki, AD 25 (1970), B’1 154.

**Features Notes**

Partially excavated but a associated agiasma was found with a complex drainage system.

**Argolid  

**Argos -- Od. Kephalari**

**Basilica?**

**Location** On the road to Kephalari.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 50</th>
<th>Avramea No: 45-46</th>
<th>Alt. Name: St. Paul (by inscripti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 500 - 600  
Coins in some of the surrounding buildings allow the complex to be dated to the sixth century. Varalis suggested the first half.

**Architecture:** baptistery,  
**Features:** synthronon, tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure, chancel screen,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 104</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No: 9</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

G. Touchais, BCH 104 (1980), 599-601.
V. Konte, Symmeikta 5 (1983),189-190.
Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, Syntagma II, 58-59 n. 9.

**Features Notes**

Only the East portion of a large basilica was discovered. Columns, plaques, mosaic pieces etc. Possible hints of a synthronon.
### Argolid

**Location**: Near the modern church of Ag. Konstantinos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>500–549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architectural Features**: Lamps excavated in the foundation date to 450-550 according to Varalis.

### Argos -- Od. Messenias-Arkadias

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Near the modern church of Ag. Konstantinos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>500–549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

A. Mpakourou, AD 38 (1983), B'1 99.
A. Oikonomou, 10th Symposio XAE, (1990), 60.

### Argolid

**Location**: Near the modern church of Ag. Konstantinos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>550–599</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

### Argos -- Od. Parados Danou and G. Seferis

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>550–599</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

### Argolid

**Location**
- **Argos -- Od. Parodos Danaou.**
- **Date:** 500-599

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some earlier 4th, 5th, and 6th century lamp types. Varalis dates it more narrowly to the first half of the 6th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>Features:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>tombs,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**
- G. Touchais, BCH 104 (1980), 599.
- A. Bakourou, AD 38 (1983), B’1, 99.
- A. Periente, BCH 114 (1990), 728.

### Argolid

**Location**
- **Argos -- Od. Parodos Theatrou**
- **Date:** 500-599

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Near the theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>Features:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features Notes**

Tiles associated with the construction of an apse(?). A fifth or sixth century tetraconch baptistery (see Periente 1990, although no floor plan).

A. Moutzali, AD 33 (1978), B’1 105-107.

---

379
**Argolid**

**Argos -- Paliopygra**

**Basilica?**

### Location

1.5 km from the theater at Argos

### Pallas No: 85b  Varalis No: 51  Avramea No: 44  Alt. Name:

### Date: 490 510

Spiro argues from the mosaic pattern that the building dates from the late fifth to early sixth c. The apsidal rooms mosaic might date to the mid sixth century. Ass-Atz. Dates the apsidal room mosaic to the second half of sixth century.

### Architecture: N/A  Features: tombs,

### Furnishings: architectural scultpure,

### Mosaics: other,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No: 4</th>
<th>Spiro No.: 52-54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Report Citations

E. Prontonotariou-Deilaki, AD 19 (1964) B'1 126-127.
E. Koukoupiotou, AD 24 (1969), B'1 64-65.
E. Koukoupiotou, AD 25 (1970), B'1 209-209.
V. Konte, Symmeikta 5 (1983), 188.

### Features Notes

Excavators are not sure if this is a basilica.
Argolid  Epidauros  

Five aisled basilica with east apse

**Location**  Near the propylaea to the sanctuary of Asclepius.

**Pallas No:**  Varalis No: 166  Avramea No: 72  

**Date:**  390-425  

Since little in the way of datable artifacts were uncovered the dating has rested on the architectural style and the style of the mosaic pavements. Ass-Atz dates the building by mosaic to the first quarter of the fifth century.

**Architecture:**  atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery, 

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpture, parapet screens, 

**Mosaics:**  nave, narthex, bema/apse, Annex, baptistery, atrium, other, 

**Mosaic Citations:**  Assimak-Atz No: 10  Spiro No.: 44-49  

R. Kolarik, Mosaics of Stobi, 413-414.  

**Features Notes**  The features of this important church continue to be debated by scholars (most recently Krautheimer) who have noted its place in the traditions of both eastern and western church construction. He places within the transept places for the deposition of offerings. Also noted that the piers separating the interior aisles from the nave and collonades separating the outer columns from the inner have roots in the in the East (the Holy Sepulcher). The existence of a baptistery to the north of the building is speculative.
### Epidauros -- Apollo Maleatas

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No: 72</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Date: 500 699</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


### Epidauros -- chapel

**Chapel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No: 87A</th>
<th>Varalis No: 217</th>
<th>Avramea No: 71</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Date: 400 420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Based on the date of the fortress, Pallas dates the church to the end of the 6th c.. Gregory, however, dates the fortress to the early fifth c. based on masonry technique (similar to the wall at Korinth) and this could place the church more than a century earlier.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

A. Frickenhaus, W. Muller, *MDJAI(A) 36* (1911), 29.
C. Kritzas, *AAA 5* (1972), 186.

---

382
**Argolid**  
**Epidaurus -- North of the Asklepeion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No: 72</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>&quot;EC&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  

**Mosaics:**  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
**Spiro No:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**  
**Argolid  Hermione**

*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

**Location** In the court yard of the gymnasium. The church is clearly part of a larger "episcopal" complex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>450-510</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No datable archaeological finds were reported but Spiro dates the building to the second half of the fifth c. with a restoration (by Epiphanios) in the first part of the sixth century based on mosaic style. The excavator dates the two phases of mosaics there to the 6th century and a repair in the 7th. Sodini dates the first phase of mosaics to the end of the 4th century (on the basis of the lack of zoomorphic representation) with a first half of the 6th century phase with later clumsy repairs.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery,  
**Features:** door, raised stylobates, waterworks,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen.

**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:** p. 248-24

**Mosaics:** nave, narthex, Annex, other,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 12  
**Spiro No.:** 59-65

Ass.-Atz., E chronologisi tou psiphedotou dapedou basilikes  
Ass.-Atz., Ta palaiochristianika psephidota dapeda tou  
Ass.-Atz., I mosaici pavimentali paleocristiani in Grecia. In  
Contributo allo studio ed alle relazione tra i laboratori. Corsi  

**Report Citations**

E. Stikas, PAE (1955), 236-239.  
E. Stikas, PAE (1956), 180-181.  

**Features Notes**

Very little discussion concerning the features of this basilica. The ambo and prothuron in the plan clearly date after the mosaics because they stand on them. There is evidence for a chancel screen, but nothing of the synthonon survives. There is a long bench running along the wall of the north aisle and a bench running along the west wall of the narthex. Note here the basins in the atrium (water works).
### Argolid

**Hermione -- Temple church**

**Location**  
Late Archaic temple on the Bisti in Hermione

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1909), 172-84</td>
<td>Converted temple.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:**

### Lyrkeia

**Location**  
Near the village named Lyrkeia, in a place called Pigadakia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'  
Floor mosaic so probably EC.

**Report Citations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.Pallas, AD 16 (1960), 100-101</td>
<td>Fragment of floor mosaic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:**
## Argolid

**Location**: Methana -- Av. Nicholas

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>425-475</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>68-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Koukoulis argues this based on an impost block found nearby and the ratio between impost and the capital (with the ratio being even or the impost being slightly taller). This is based on the work of V. Vemi (1989).

### Report Citations


### Mosaic Citations:

- Ionic impost capitals found in the vicinity of the church suggest that the apse of the present church of Ayios Nikolaos was the apse of an early Christian basilica. This is based in part on the architectural fragments found around the present church and the three windows in the apse which Vokotopoulos associates with main apses of the EC period.

## Argolid

**Location**: Methana -- Megalochori

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations

**Argolid**  Methana -- Palaiokastro  
*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>North of Palaiokastro, SW of Megalochoi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 183  Avramea No: 68-70  Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>400 599  Based on trowel marks, and architectural form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>narthex, annex, baptistery,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features:</td>
<td>raised stylobates,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td>Possible baptismal area to the south of the south stylobate in the south aisle, although this seems unlikely. Poorly preserved and discovered through field survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>T. Koukoulis, in C. Mee and H. Forbes, A Rough and Rocky Place, (Liverpool 1997), 133.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Argolid**  Methana -- Palaiokastro II  
*One aisled church with east apse*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>In the northeastern part of the kastro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 182  Avramea No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Argolid - Nea Tiryns

**Date:** Near the Late Roman and EC settlement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 202</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Location:** Near the Late Roman and EC settlement.

**Architecture:** narthex,

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**


**Report Citations**

- Bits of the narthex and fragments of architectural sculpture uncovered.

### Argolid - Prosymna

**Date:** 500 - 699

**Location:** Near the church Byzantine church of Ay. Georgios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 235</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**


**Report Citations**

- Architectural fragments.
Argolid  Spetses -- Pitoussa  

**Location**  On the island of Spetzes under the church of the Evangelistrias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 255</th>
<th>Avramea No: 64</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Evangelistria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:**  530-630  Soteriou dates wall construction of the building to the period of the early or middle 6th century -- Justinianic.

**Features:**  door, raised stylobates,

**Architecture:**  N/A

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:**

**Report Citations**

G. Sotiriou, PAE (1937), 97-103.
G. Sotiriou, ACIAC 4 (1940), 363.
G. Sotiriou, PAE (1940), 124-129.
A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 404.
P. Lazaridis, AD 21 (1966), B'1 119.
P. Lazaridis, AD 22 (1967), B'1 162.

**Features Notes**

This excavation had to be carried out with some care since a more recent church stands in the central aisle occupying part of the eastern apse. The western part of the church was not fully explored.

---

Argolid  Spetses -- Vrousti  

**Location**  Near the mill of Vrousti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 256</th>
<th>Avramea No: 64</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:**  400-499  Soteriou dated it to the fifth century based on its form and on the small finds there, like a bread stamp and a characteristic kind of tile. Found a coin of Heracleus there.

**Features:**  raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Architecture:**  narthex, annex,

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:**

**Report Citations**

G. Sotiriou, PAE (1937), 103-108.
G. Sotiriou, PAE (1938), 124-129.
G. Sotiriou, ACIAC 4 (1940), 363.
G. Sotiriou, PAE (1940), 32-33.
A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 203, 205, 257, 404.
P. Lazaridis, AD 21 (1966), B'1 119.
P. Lazaridis, AD 22 (1967), B'1 162.

**Features Notes**

Three step synthronon with clergy benches in the bema area. Otherwise a typical three aisle basilica with narthex. Chancel screen runs continuously across the central aisle. Doors at the eastern end of both aisles.
### Argolid

**Tiryns**

**Location**

- **Date:** 600–899
- Could be quite late.

**Architecture:** narthex, Features: tombs, Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

#### Mosaic Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Varalis No.</th>
<th>Avramea No.</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Report Citations

- K. Mylonas, *AE* (1884), 97.
- K. Muller, *MDAI(A)*, 38 (1913), 80.

### Argolid

**Troezene**

**Location**

- An inscription from an ambo was found at Hagia Soteri and an inscribed chancel(?) screen at the citadel.

**Date:** 500–600

- Datable architectural sculpture.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

#### Mosaic Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Varalis No.</th>
<th>Avramea No.</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Report Citations

- P.E. Legrand, "*Inscriptions de Trezene,*" *BCH* 24 (1900), 179ff.

Two inscriptions which probably are not related -- one from an ambo plaque and one from a cancel screen.
### Argolid

**Troezene -- Lakkomata**

**Location** At a place called Lakkomata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 480-500

Datable mosaic pavement. Ass.-Atz. dates it to the first half of the fifth century. Varalis recorded a date in the middle of the 5th c.

**Architecture:** narthex, annex,

**Features:** raised stylobates,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:** 163d  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:** nave,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 85  
**Spiro No:**

**Report Citations**

A. Kourenta-Raptaki, AD 34 (1979), B'1 119.
G. Touchais, BCH 113 (1989), 606.

**Features Notes**

A piece of inscribed mosaic pavement.

### Attica

**Aigosthena**

**Location** Ancient Aigosthena on the east coast of the Gulf of Corinth. Now a triconch church dedicated to the Virg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500-599

Orlandos dated the church to the late 5th or the early 6th c. Spiro on the basis of mosaics dates the church to the 6th c. (comparanda: Klapsi, Nea Anchialos, Nikopolis) both on stylistic grounds and the practice of separating the mosaics fields of the nave longitudinally. Sodini (1980) declared them difficult to date. Varalis saw two phases on in the second half of the fifth century and another, represented by the mosaics of the baptistery to the middle of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, baptistery,

**Features:** door, raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:** 95  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:** nave, narthex, bema/apse, baptistery,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 78  
**Spiro No:** 29-33

Sodini, BCH 94 (1970), 702-703
Sodini, BullAIMEA, 8 (1980), 163, 166.

**Report Citations**

A.K. Orlandos, PAE (1954), 129-142.
A.K. Orlandos, ACIAC 5 (1957), 110-111.
J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 120.

**Features Notes**

5 aisled and quite large with some elaborate, if crude decorations in the narthex and nave. Entrance to the narthex through a door in the S wall entry into the bapt is through the S wall of the S most aisle. Possible door in N wall. It seems some of the east side of an atrium was excavated.
Attica

Three aisled basilica with east apse

Location Near Trachones. Built on the ruins of the Thesmphorion.

Pallas No: Varalis No: 35 Avramea No: Alt. Name:

Date: 540 560 Dated to the 6th or 7th century by Soteriou, with later Byzantine additions. Varalis dated it to the middle of the sixth century with modification in the second half of the 6 or 7th century.

Architecture: narthex, Features: tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon, Furnishings: architectural scultpure, chancel screen,

Laskaris No: 91b Vemi No: Jakob No: p. 236

Mosaics: Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

Report Citations
G. Sotiriou, basiliki, 195, no. 25
W. Wrede, BCH 53 (1929), 496.
A.K. Orlandos, EMME 3 (1933), 155-156.
A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 487, 543.
J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976),170.

Features Notes
This church is difficult to understand due to the subsequent Byzantine use of the church. It appears to have had a transept, although that is by no means certain and it might be later. Notable is the single opening in the west wall of the narthex. Quite small.

Attica

Anabyssos

Basilica?

Location

Pallas No: Varalis No: 40 Avramea No: Alt. Name:

Date: 'EC'

Architecture: N/A Features: N/A

Furnishings: N/A

Laskaris No: Vemi No: Jakob No:

Mosaics: Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

Report Citations
E. Chalkia, 12th Symposium XAE, (1992), 60.

Features Notes
Architectural fragments
### Attica

**Location** On the hill of the Asclepieion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>450 460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 450 460

See Gregory abstract from BSC 9 (1983). Some scholars have proposed a sixth century date for the church based on wall construction and due to the two courtyards (after the 530s see for example Varalis).

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery

**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Features Notes**

The most interesting aspect of this church is the proposed early date and its location on the remains of the Asclepieion.

The church has two courtyards to the E and the W and the narthex could be entered from the S. The atrium could be entered from the W. There are a number of annexes to the N and S of the church. Access to water in the atrium.

**Report Citations**

St. Koumanoudis, PAE (1876), 20-22.
A. Xyngopolos, AE (1915), 52-71.
G.A. Sotiriou, EMME 1 (1927), 47.
I. Travlos, AE (1939), 34-68.
A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 517, 520, 521.
A. Orlandos, ACIAC 5 (1957), 111.
N. Platon, AD 18 (1963), B'1 18-22.
I. Travlos, PAA 18 (1944), 136-139.
I. Travlos, Blicklexikon zur Topographie des Antiken Athen (1971), 128.
D. Pallas, Theologia, 20 (1949), 185-188.
**Attica**  Athens -- Ay. Loukas

**Location**  On Od. Patision under the church of Ag. Louka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**  'EC'

**Architecture:**  N/A  **Features:**  N/A

**Furnishings:**  N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**  aisles,

**Mosaic Citations:**  Assimak-Atz No: 75  Spiro No:.

---

**Attica**  Athens -- Ay. Thomas

**Location**  Behind the Stoa of Attalus on Kladou st.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**  425 449  Dated by mosaic style by Asimakopoulo-Atzaka.

**Architecture:**  N/A  **Features:**  tombs,

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**  fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:**  Assimak-Atz No: 67  Spiro No:.

---

**Report Citations**

K. Pittakis, AE (1859), 1884.
D. Kampouroglous, Istoria ton Athinaion II (Athens 1890), 267-268.
A. Orlandos, EMME 3 (1933), 133.

M. Chatzidakis, AD 29 (1973-1974), B1, 189-190.
G. Touchais, BCH 103 (1979), 540.
H.W Catling, Archaeology in Greece, ArchRep (1979/80), 12.
### Attica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Athens -- Byronas 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No.</td>
<td>Varalis No: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avramea No.</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features Notes**

- Mosaic fragment.

**Mosaic Citations**


**Report Citations**


### Attica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Athens -- Church of Ay. Irene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No.</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avramea No.</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features Notes**

- Tombs,
- Architectural sculpture.

**Mosaic Citations**

- Assimak-Atz No: 76
- Spiro No.: 395

**Report Citations**

- Laskaris, 52
- Tomb
**Attica** -- Athens -- Erechthion

Three ailed basilica with east apse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>In the Erechthion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500-525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex,

**Features:** door, raised stylobates,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: 396

**Report Citations**

J. Paton et al., The Erctheum (1927) 492-523.
G. Soteriou, EMME I (1927), 43.
G. Soteriou, basiliki, 170-172.
F.W. Deichmann, JDAI 54 (1939), 112, 131.
A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 85, 234, 602.
I. Travlos, Bildlexikon zur Topographie des Antiken Athen (1971), 214.
J. Koder and Fr. Hild, TIB I (Vienna 1976), 128.
I. Travlos, s.v. "Athens" RBK, 358-359.
**Attica**  
**Athens -- Hephaisteion**  

*One aisled basilica with east apse*

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>St. George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Date:

600 – 630

Sculptural members of 6th century (parallels with the architecture of the Asclepeion during its
rebuildings which Xyngopoulos puts in the 6th c. (with its original construction in the 5th)
reused in the building placing it in early 7th century, perhaps during the reign of Heraclius
according in Frantz

### Architecture:

* Narthex,

### Features:

* Door, tombs,

### Furnishings:

* Architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

### Mosaic Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Plans:

21

### Figures:

### Epig. Cat.:

397

### Report Citations

- G. Sotiriou, EMME 1 (1927), 48-49.
- G. Sotiriou, basiliki, 172.
- F.W. Deichmann, JDAI 54 (1939), 112, 131-134.
- W.B. Dinsmoor, Observations on the Hephaisteion.
- P.M. Milojevic, ByzFor 24 (1997), 349.

### Features Notes

Apse reconstructed in the later middle ages.
Attica  Athens -- Ilissos  Basilica

**Location**  On Ilissos island, SE of the Olympeion in Athens. Outside the walls of Athens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 400-450</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ilisos Basilica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soteriou and Krautheimer originally dated it to the end of the 4th century or beginning of the 5th century. Hatzedakes dated it to the 5th century, Spiro to the middle of the middle of 5th, Sodini to the second half of the fifth. Pallas by comparing the architecture of Lechaion established a relationship between the two based on them both being dedicated to H. Leonidas (destroyed by mid 6th c.) Probably built, according to Pallas around 530.

**Architecture:** narthex, Features: tribelon, raised stylobates, tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:** narthex, other,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 72  Spiro No.: 10-13
Sodini, BullAIEMA 8, 1980, 162

**Report Citations**
A.N. Skias, PAE (1893), 124-125.
G. Soteriou, AE (1917), 106.
G. Soteriou, Evreterion, 51-55.
M.A. Sisson, BSR, 11 (1929), 70.
E. Chatzidakis, PAE (1948), 69-80.
E. Chatzidakis, CA 5 (1951), 61-74.
E. Chatzidakis, CA 6 (1952), 192.
A. Frantz, DOP, 6, (1965), 204.
R. Krautheimer, Architecture, 118-121.

**Features Notes**
The most interesting feature here is a stairway interrupting the N stylobate between the aisle and the nave which leads to a vaulted subterranean chamber -- perhaps the acrosolium of Leonidas. Sounds like a tomb. Interesting transept called by Krautheimer a "reduced cross transept" and he refers to eastern parallels. Perhaps an atrium or an exonarthex. Two chambers flank the narthex. Note the large supports in the chancel area (Krautheimer proposes a dome or pyramid over the central bay and sites the Menas church as a possible comparanda.)
**Attica**

**Athens -- Library of Hadrian**

**Tetraconque Basilica**

**Location**
In the courtyard of the so-called Library of Hadrian.

**Pallas No:** 1.B.1  
**Varalis No:** 26  
**Avramea No:**  
**Alt. Name:** Tetraconch

**Date:** 425-449  
**Mosaic Citations:** Spiro, Assimakopoulou-Atzaka, p 118-121, n. 61.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex,  
**Features:** raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:** 87  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  

**Mosaics:** aisles, other,  
**Spiro No.:** 6-9

**Features Notes**
Very strange building with serious scholarly debate still engulfing it. Things like its date, purpose, plan et c. are still unclear and difficult to understand.

**Report Citations**
A. Xygopoulos, DIEE 8 (1923), 121-122, 128.
A. Xygopoulos, EMME 2 (1929), 88.
I. Travlos, PAE (1950), 41-60.
R. Krautheimer, Architecture, 328 n. 43.
P. Lemerle, Byzantion XXII (1952), 180 ff.
A. Frantz, ACAIC 7 (1965), 527-530.
J. Travlos, Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athen (Tubingen 1971), 244, Flg. 321-323.

**Features Notes**
Destroyed at the end of the fifth c. or beginning of 6 and rebuilt as a basilica.
### Attica

**Location**
On the south slope of Lykabettos (Rue Tsakalof 26 -- Schisto-Dexameni)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>Only in a marble plaque which mentions an EC bishop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 600-699
Dated by Frantz to the 7th century on account of its poor construction.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Features:** tombs,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Laskaris No:** 13, **Vemi No:** Yemi No: **Jakob No:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inscribed sarcophagus lid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- A. Philadepheus, PAE (1910), 117.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 19 (1964), B1, 96.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 20 (1965), B1, 22.
- M. Axeimastou-Potamianou, AD 42 (1987), B’1 5.

---

### Attica

**Location**
Athens -- Mosque near Roman Agora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 600-699
Dated by Frantz to the 7th century on account of its poor construction.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Features:** N/A

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Laskaris No:** 13, **Vemi No:** Yemi No: **Jakob No:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note the Baptistery entry under the Tower of the winds. Not much information concerning this church, just two mention in the Deltion and a short mention in Frantz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- A. Philadepheus, PAE (1910), 117.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 19 (1964), B1, 96.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 20 (1965), B1, 22.
- M. Axeimastou-Potamianou, AD 42 (1987), B’1 5.
Attica

Athens -- National Garden

Three aisled basilica with east apse

Location

There is some debate. Frantz claims Lenoir placed this church simply "In Athens" whereas Orlandos and

Pallas No: Varalis No: Avramea No: Alt. Name:

Date: 550 570

The lack of a narthex and the existence of a small atrium suggests (to Pallas 1989 874-5) a date later than the middle of the sixth century.

Architecture: atrium, narthex, Features: raised bema,

Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

Report Citations

G. A. Soteriou, AE (1919), 5-6.
I. Travlos, s.v. "Athens" RBK 1, 373.

Mosaic Citations:

Features Notes

Similar to Kranion due to the piers separating the nave from the aisles. Also distinctive due to its lack of narthex and small atrium with a fountain the middle. Its proportions are similar to the churches elsewhere in Attica -- Kalybia Kouvaras Panaias, and Mygdaleza -- almost 1:1 or slightly smaller.

Location

There is some debate. Frantz claims Lenoir placed this church simply "In Athens" whereas Orlandos and

Varalis No: 19

Attica

Athens -- Od. Ay. Andreou

Basilica?

Location

From Varalis: To the west of the Metropolitan Megaron of Athens.

Pallas No: Varalis No: 19 Avramea No: Alt. Name:

Date: 'EC'

Architecture: N/A Features: N/A

Furnishings: N/A

Report Citations

G. Sotiriou, EMME 1 (1927), 56-57.

Features Notes

Found the east part of an apse.
### Attica — Athens -- Od. Sophroniskou

**Basilica?**

**Location**  East side of the hill of Muses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No.</th>
<th>Varalis No.</th>
<th>Avramea No.</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**  'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fragment, Assimak-Atz No: 77</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


---

### Attica — Athens -- Olympeion

**Location**  Near the Olympeion. This church is noted by Pallas but not noted by Frantz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No.</th>
<th>Varalis No.</th>
<th>Avramea No.</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Nickolaos ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**  400-499

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narthex,</td>
<td>raised stylobates,</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- I. Travlos, PAE (1949), 36-43.
- A.K. Orlandos, ACIAC 5 (1957), 111.

**Features Notes**

- Typical Attic three naved basilica. Without a synthronon or atrium. Tombs on floor plan in Pallas. Pallas also noted the "sholders" where the apse attaches to the main nave which has parallels with the Iisos basilica and the Kodratos church at Korinth.
**Attica**

**Athens -- Panavia in Petra**

**Date:** 540–560

Varalis proposes a mid 6th century date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Location | On the ruins of the the temple to Artemis Argoteras. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>Features:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narthex,</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pg. 33</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Plans: 19 |
| Figures:  |
| Epig. Cat.: |

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Features Notes: Apse and narthex of a single naved basilica.

---

**Report Citations**

- A. Skias, PAE (1897), 77–78.
- G.A. Sotiriou, EMME 1 (1927), 50.
- A. Orlando, EMME 3 (1933), 148.
- E. Peirce Blegen, AJA 50 (1946), 374.
- I. Travlog, Bildlexikon zur Topographie des Antiken Athen (1971), 214.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 175.
- E. Lygkouri-Tolia, AD 49 (1994), B'1 37.
- P.M. Milojevic, ByzFor 24 (1997), 348.

---

403
Attica

Date:

Athens -- Parthenon

Three aisled basilica with east apse

Location
On Acropolis

Pallas No: 14
Varalis No: 13
Avramea No: 37
Alt. Name: 'EC'

Deichmann identified a terminus ante quem from the earliest graffiti to 694.

Architecture: narthex, annex,

Features: door, raised stylobates, tombs,

Furnishings: architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

Laskaris No: 14
Vemi No: P. 238-23
Jakob No: 302, 449, 450

Mosaics:

Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:
Spiro No:

Report Citations
A. Michaelis, Der Parthenon (Leipzig 1871), 48.
W. Deichmann, Die Basilika im Parthenon. AM 63-64 (1938-1939), 127ff.
A.K. Orlandos, 52, 85, 120, 124, 157, 264, 275, 279, 302, 449, 450.
Travlos, RBK, 357-8.
M. Korres and X. Bouras, Meleti apokatastaseos tou Parthenonos, (Athens 1983), 138-139.
P. Kalligas AD 46 (1991), B'1 25.
P. M. Milojevic, ByzFor 24 (1997), 349.
**Attica**

**Athens -- Temple of Rhea and Chronos**  
*Basilica?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500 599 6th century or later.

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  
**Mosaics:**  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:  

**Report Citations**  
I. Travlos, (1971), 335  
Essentially unpublished.

---

**Attica**

**Athens -- Theater of Dionysos**  
*One aisled church with east apse*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 400 499

**Architecture:** narthex,  
**Features:** tombs,  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:** 88  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  
**Mosaics:**  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:  

**Report Citations**  
G. Kastriotis, PAE (1925), 24.  
I. Travlos, PAE (1951), 41-45.  
A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 155.  
I. Travlos, AE (1953/4), 301-310.  
A. Orlandos, ACIAC 5 (1957), 111.  
I. Travlos, Bildlexicon zur Topographie des Antiken Athen (1971), 538.  
Small single aisle church near the theater of Dionysos.
### Attica

**Location**
The site of Kotroni

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:**

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Features:** N/A

**Features Notes:**
Only parts of the north and east walls were excavated. Some tombs nearby.

**Report Citations**
E. Chalkia, AD 43 (1988), B'1 91.

### Attica

**Location**
Across from the port of Marathon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ag. Triada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 550 699

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:**

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Features:** raised stylobates,

**Features Notes:**

**Report Citations**
D. Pallas, RAC 35 (1959), 189.
J. Koder and Fr. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 264.
Attica Brauron

Location 500 m from the ancient temple to Artemis.

Pallas No: Varalis No: 66 Avramea No: Alt. Name:

Date: 480-550 Architectural parallels with the basilicas in Korinth -- especially the arrangement of the diakonikon and the baptistery to the N and S of the narthex. Varalis dates this church to the second half of the sixth century.

Architecture: atrium, double narthex, annex, baptistery, Features: door, raised stylobates, synthronon, tombs, Furnishings: architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

Mosaics: Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

Laskaris No: 19 Vemi No: Jakob No:

Features Notes
Note the skephylakion to the S of the main apse, which Pallas argued was used to store the host after communion (47). Also notable are the annexes to the W, around the atrium. Baptistery to the S. Well preserved and it communicates with the nave through a door in the S aisle. Varalis observed that many of the annex chambers appear to date to a later periods, especially those associated with the baptistery and its waterworks.

Report Citations
E. Stikas, PAE (1951), 53-76.
E. Stikas, PAE (1952), 73-91.
E. Stikas, PAE (1953), 103-104.
E. Stikas, PAE (1954), 123-128.
A. Orlandos, ACIAC 5 (1957), 110.
J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (1976), 137.
R. Krautheimer, Architecture, 121.
K. Eustratiou, AD 44 (1989), B'1 76.
E. Gkini-Tsophopoulou, AD 45 (1990), B'1 88.
### Eleftherai -- 1

**Location**  Near the fortress on the border.

**Date:**  'EC'

**Architecture:**  narthex, 
**Features:**  door, raised stylobates,

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpure, chancel screen, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No</th>
<th>Vemi No</th>
<th>Jakob No</th>
<th>Sporo No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:** 
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No

**Report Citations**
- E. Stikas, PAE (1939), 44-52.
- A.K. Orlandos, Basiilik, 144, 203-205.
- A. Orlandos, ACIAC 5 (1957), 110.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 154-155.
- Sodini, Aliki II, 284.

**Features Notes**
Like its partner to the north, this church is entered through a door in the south wall of the narthex. It does not have an atrium, nor does it have any of the secondary rooms that the other church has. Very simple "Attic Style" basilica.

### Eleftherai -- 2

**Location**  Near the fort on the border

**Date:**  'EC'

**Architecture:**  narthex, annex, 
**Features:**  door, raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpure, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No</th>
<th>Vemi No</th>
<th>Jakob No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:** 
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No

**Report Citations**
- E. Stikas, PAE (1939), 44-52.
- A.K. Orlandos, Basiilik, 144, 203-205.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 154-155.
- Sodini, Aliki II, 284.

**Features Notes**
A double church with the other churching some 7.5 m to the south of it. Very cursory excavation report in PAE, it is perhaps the only double church in southern Greece (compare the church at Heraklea Lyncestis and Aliki on Thasos). Two chamber to the west of the narthex and a propylea(?) to the south. Two additions: one an apsidal chamber to the north of the main apse and the other a square room on the south side of the east end of the south aisle.
**Attica**  
**Eleusis -- Av. Zacharias**  

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

**Location**  
Near the more recent church of Ag. Zacharias. NE of the Eleusinion.

**Pallas No:**  
**Varalis No:** 95  
**Avramea No:**  
**Alt. Name:**

**Date:**  
400 550  
Soteriou dated the church based on decorations of some closure panels to the fifth century. Varalis assigned a later date of the first half of 6th century.

**Architecture:**  
double narthex, baptistery,

**Features:**  
doors, raised stylobates, tombs,

**Furnishings:**  
architectural sculpture, parapet screens,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**
- Assimak-Atz No:  
- Spiro No:

**Report Citations**
- Sotiriou, Basiliki, 183-184.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 16 (1960), 77-78.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 20 (1965), B'1 140-141.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 24 (1969), B'1 98.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 154.

**Features Notes**
- The more recent church to Ag. Zacharias sits in the central nave and bema area of the EC church. A double narthex is somewhat unusual. The N chamber of the exo-narthex was used for burial. Two rooms exist to NE of the narthex which could have liturgical functions. There is no door in the W wall of the exo- or eso-narthex. So closure plack survive presumably from between the aisles and central nave. The door or tribelon communicating between central nave and narthex is likewise difficult to see clearly.

---

**Attica**  
**Eleusis -- Telestirion**  

**Basilica?**

**Location**  
On the site of the ancient Telestirion

**Pallas No:**  
**Varalis No:** 96  
**Avramea No:**  
**Alt. Name:**

**Date:**  
'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**
- Assimak-Atz No:  
- Spiro No:

**Report Citations**

**Features Notes**
- Possible church on the site of the ancient Telestirion, although the evidence is spares.
**Attica**  
**Glyphada**

**Location**  
On the coast near the town of Glyphada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 75</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>400 549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dated by Soteriou to the 5th century or the beginning of the 6th. Varalis suggests the second half of the sixth century.

**Architecture:** narthex,  
**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 91c</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:**  
**Features Notes**  
The most notable feature of this typical Attic basilica is the single opening in the west wall of the narthex, quite unusual.

---

**Attica**  
**Kaisariani**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 1.C.I</th>
<th>Varalis No: 122</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500 599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Varalis suggests date in the second half of the 6th century or even later based on architecture.

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Mosaic Citations:**  
**Features Notes**  
Main semi-circular apse with smaller apse to the south. Only the East end remains.
Attica
Kalyvia Kouvara -- Ay. Georgios

**Basilica?**

**Location** Near the post-Byzantine church of Kalyvia Kouvara.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 125</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, 

**Laskaris No:**  

**Vemi No:**  

**Jakob No:**  

**Plans:**  

**Figures:**  

**Epig. Cat.:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

Features Notes

Not much known here, since it is under the later church of the Holy Taxiarchs. But it appears to be a pretty usual single apsed two aisled basilica.

**Report Citations**

A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 150.

J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 195.

---

Attica
Kalyvia Kouvara -- Taxiarchs

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

**Location** Under the church of the Taxiarchs near Kalyvia Kouvara (aka Kalyvia Throrikou)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 126</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500 599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orlandos dated it broadly to the 5th or 6th century based on proportions and a preserved ionic impost capital built into the south wall (444). Varalis dated it to the 6th century.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:**  17

**Vemi No:**  

**Jakob No:**  

**Plans:**  

**Figures:**  

**Epig. Cat.:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

Features Notes

Not much known here, since it is under the later church of the Holy Taxiarchs. But it appears to be a pretty usual single apsed two aisled basilica.

**Report Citations**

Sotiriou, Basiliki, 185-186.


A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 203-205, 353.


J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1(Vienna 1976), 195.
### Attica - Kouvaras

**Location**: An inscription and a ionic imposte capital associated with the church of Ag. Georgios at Kouvara.

**Date**: 'EC' Vemi dates a capital found at the cite to the "Epoque de Justinien." (page, 85, n. 6.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No</th>
<th>Varalis No</th>
<th>Avramea No</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A

**Features**: tribelon, architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No</th>
<th>Vemi No</th>
<th>Jakob No</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics**:

**Mosaic Citations**:

**Features Notes**

- **Varalis No**: 152
- **Avramea No**: 6
- **Alt. Name**: 6
- **Spiro No**: Assimak-Atz No

---

### Attica - Laurion

**Location**: Near Hag. Paraskevi, the hill of Nikolo.

**Date**: 425-449 Dated by mosaic style.

**Architecture**: annex, architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No</th>
<th>Vemi No</th>
<th>Jakob No</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics**: bema/apse,

**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No: 81, Spiro No:

**Features Notes**

- **Varalis No**: 160
- **Avramea No**: 6
- **Alt. Name**: 6
- **Spiro No**: Assimak-Atz No

---

**Report Citations**

- A.K. Orlandos, AE (1923), 165-175.
- C. Mpouras, A. Kalogheropoulou, R. Andreadi, Ekklesies tes Attikes, (Athens 1969), 159-161, plan XX.

---

**Report Citations**

- M. Oikonomakou, AD 36 (1981), 55.
- M. Lazari, AD 36 (1981), B’1 83.
- E. Gkini-Tsophopoulou, AD 40 (1985), B’1 82.
- E. Gkini-Tsophopoulou, AD 43 (1988), B’1 87.
- I. Travlos, Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika. (1988), 204-205.

---

**Features Notes**

- **Varalis No**: 160
- **Avramea No**: 6
- **Alt. Name**: 6
- **Spiro No**: Assimak-Atz No

---

**Report Citations**

- M. Oikonomakou, AD 36 (1981), 55.
- M. Lazari, AD 36 (1981), B’1 83.
- E. Gkini-Tsophopoulou, AD 40 (1985), B’1 82.
- E. Gkini-Tsophopoulou, AD 43 (1988), B’1 87.
- I. Travlos, Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika. (1988), 204-205.
Attica

Lavreotic Olympus

Three aisled basilica with east apse

**Location** North of the acropolis of Aigileias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 213</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 450 530</td>
<td>The date is based on three things: the style of decorative sculpture, the shape of the ambo, and a typology of the inscription in the apse (see Kotzia PAE 1952). This date is supported by Jakobs (see p. 225). Varalis suggests a date slightly later, in the first third of the 6th century reading the inscription on the tomb as 559 (check epig.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:**
- double narthex, annex, baptistery,

**Furnishings:**
- architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:**
- bema/apse, other,

**Mosaic Citations:**
- Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 34-35
- Sodini 94 (1970), 703.

**Features Notes**
The most distinctive features here are the double narthex and the walls which project from the W side of the nave wall along the stylobates between the aisles. There is also the unusual central door in the W wall of the exonarthex and also in the exonarthex. Later the aisles were walled up and the church converted to a single nave church. A small entrance is found in the S wall of the S aisle to the E of the chancel screen.

**Report Citations**
- G. Soteriou, Basiliki, 184-185.
- Y. Bequignon, BCH 53 (1929), chron. 496.
- N. Ch. Kotzia, PAE (1952), 92-128.
- N. Ch. Kotzia, BCH 77 (1953), 205.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 118.
- M. Michaelidis, AD 29 (1973/1974), B1, 22.
- M. Hatzidakis, AD 29 (1973/74), 194.
- E. Gkini-Tsophopoulou, AD 38 (1983), B'1 70.
**Attica**  
Liopessi -- Av. Athanasios

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

**Location**  
Under the later church of Hag. Athansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 550 599  
Varalis provides a mid 6th century date with later 6th century phase.

**Architecture:** narthex, annex,  
**Features:** raised stylobates, tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Report Citations**

D. Pallas, RAC 35 (1959), 188-190.  
C. Mpouras, A. Kalogheropoulou, R. Andreadi, Ekklesies tes Attikes, (Athenes 1969), 236-7, plan XXV.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 26 (1971), B’1 66.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 27 (1972), B’1 188.  
M. Chazidakis, AD 29 (1973-1974), B’1 194.  
J. Koder and F. Hild TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 204.  
E. Gkini-Tsophopoulou, AD 46 (1991), B’1 85.  

**Features Notes**

Annexes flank the main apse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date: 400-499</th>
<th>Style of impost capital (Pallas) and style of architecture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 3</th>
<th>Varalis No: 216</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Basilica of St. Paraskevi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: narthex, annex,</th>
<th>Features: tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Furnishings: architectural sculpture, |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| D.I. Pallas, RAC 35 (1959), 187 s. n.2. |
| J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 204. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Salvage excavation when excavating the foundation for a new church. Simple three aisled basilica with a narthex. |
| There appears to be some sort of annex to the N. and an odd wall projecting from the W wall of the Narthex along the lines of the S stylobate. Evidence for a tribelon. |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date: 'EC'</th>
<th>Three aisled basilica with east apse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 170</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: N/A</th>
<th>Features: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Furnishings: architectural sculpture, |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Merely noted. |
### Attica

#### Marathon

**Location**: On the beach near the mouth of the Charadros.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 'EC'

**Architecture**: N/A

**Features**: N/A

**Furnishings**: N/A

**Laskaris No:**

**Vemi No:**

**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics**:

**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Features Notes**

Excavated part of an apse, perhaps of an EC basilica.

---

### Attica

#### Markopoulo

**Location**: Under the church of the Taxiarchs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basilica of St. Emilia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 450-499 Varal is date to the second half of the 5th century.

**Architecture**: N/A

**Features**: raised stylobates, architectural scultpure,

**Furnishings**: architectural scultpure,

**Laskaris No**: 92

**Vemi No**:

**Jakob No**: 6

**Mosaics**:

**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Features Notes**

Apparently a church with only two naves, one central nave and one aisle to S. Part of a transept to S. Very curious appearance, not much disimilar to Daphnousia, Ilisos island, or "Epiriot" style transept.
### Megara

**Attica**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 180</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 450-499  
Middle or first half of fifth century according to Ass.-Atz.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex,  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:** fragment,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 82  
**Spiro No.:**

**Report Citations**

P. Zoridis, AD 24 (1979), B'1 54-57, 59.  
Only noted.

### Peiraias

**Attica**

**Location**

To the west of the ancient theater.

**Pallas No:**  
**Varalis No: 226**  
**Avramea No:**

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:**  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
**Spiro No.:**

**Report Citations**

D. Philios, PAE (1880), 10, 47.  
Foundations of an apse.

### Location: Near the cemetery of the Metamorphosis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 227</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>&quot;EC&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: N/A</th>
<th>Features: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Report Citations


### Features Notes

This church was heavily overbuilt in a later period, probably medieval. The thorakion plaques used in the floor were inscribed. The apse was uncovered although there was evidence for this church from the late 19th century.

---

### Location: At the place called Drivlia.

|------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>400 549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: N/A</th>
<th>Features: tomb,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 18</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Report Citations

A. Milchofer, Karten von Attika. (1899), Text III-I, p. 9
H. Guini-Tsophopoulou, AD 46 (1991), B1, 85.
### Attica

**Location:** Site of old Rafina near the late Roman bath.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 480

**Mosaics:**

- **Architecture:** N/A
- **Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

- **Laskaris No:**
- **Vemi No:**
- **Jakob No:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Assimak-Atz No:
- Spiro No:

---

**Report Citations**


---

### Attica

**Location:** Skala Oropou

**Date:** 480 520

**Mosaics:**

- **Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery,
- **Features:** raised stylobates,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

- **Laskaris No:**
- **Vemi No:**
- **Jakob No:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Assimak-Atz No:
- Spiro No:

---

**Report Citations**

- L. Kraniotou, AD 35 (1980), B'1 81-82.

---

**Features Notes**

- The eastern part and the central nave were excavated. Some annexes perhaps associated with the baptistery to the south of the south aisle.
### Spata

**Location** In the region of ancient Kropia in the place named Skimbi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500 - 599

Insufficient evidence for a secure date, but the general impression, based on its dimensions and the columns is of a 5th c. date. Varalis proposes a second half of 5th c. date.

**Architecture:** double narthex, annex,  
**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, architectural scultpure, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  
**Spiro No.:**

**Mosaics:**
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
**Report Citations**
E. Mastrokostas, AE (1956), 31-32.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 20 (1965), 138-139, pl. 5.  

**Features Notes**
Note the double narthex and the strange series of anneces which run along the N side of the building. Pallas (Monuments, 10-11) suggests that annex to the E might have been a pastophorion and the annexes centrally placed might have served to receive the offerings of the faithful (as prothesis or diakonikon). There is an entrance in the S wall of the inner narthex and possible in the S wall of the S aisle.

---

### Mygdalexas

**Location** At the place called Mygdalexas near the church of Ay. Athanasios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  
**Spiro No.:**

**Mosaics:**
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
**Report Citations**

**Features Notes**
### Attica

**Stamatas -- Ay. Paraskevi**

**Location**  
At the place called Mygdalexas near the church of Ay. Paraskevi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 400 – 450  
Datable to earlier than the Basilica at Brauron, but the baptistery is built earlier.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery,  
**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** nave, narthex, bema/apse,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: |

**Report Citations**

- E. Tsophopoulou-Gkini, AD 34 (1979), B1, 122.
- E. Tsophopoulou-Gkini, AD 45 (1990), B1, 90-92.

**Features Notes**

The baptistery was added later which is unusual. Pallas suggests that it reflects priests assuming the responsibility for baptism (55-57). Door in S. wall and at the end of both aisles. The N aisle is wider than the S. It appears to have a single narthex and an atrium although this is by no means clear owing to the partially excavated condition of the west end of the church.

---

### Attica

**Stavros Geraka**

**Location**  
To the west of the modern church of St. Theklas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: |

**Report Citations**

- A. Orlandos, EMME 2 (1933), 175-176.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 16 (1960), B168.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 29 (1973-1974), B'1, 182.

**Features Notes**

Remenants of an apse.
**Attica**  Trachones

*One aisled church with east apse*

| **Location** | Between Kalamaki and Trachones |
| **Pallas No:** |  |
| **Varalis No:** | 36 |
| **Avramea No:** |  |
| **Alt. Name:** |  |
| **Date:** | 550-599 |

Varalis dates the building to the second half of the 6th century.

| **Architecture:** | narthex, |
| **Features:** | tribelon, tombs, |
| **Furnishings:** | architectural sculpture, |

| **Laskaris No:** | 91a |
| **Vemi No:** |  |
| **Jakob No:** |  |

| **Mosaics:** |  |
| **Mosaic Citations:** | Assimak-Atz No: |
| **Spiro No.:** |  |

| **Report Citations** | Features Notes |
| | |
| P. Lazaridis, AD 19 (1964), B'1 96-97. |
| J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 276. |

---

**Boeotia**  Anthedon

*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

| **Location** |  |
| **Pallas No:** |  |
| **Varalis No:** | 169 |
| **Avramea No:** |  |
| **Alt. Name:** |  |
| **Date:** | 430-499 |

Based on mosaic style from Spiro, but perhaps should be later. Varalis suggests second half of 5th c.

| **Architecture:** | narthex, |
| **Features:** | door, raised stylobates, |
| **Furnishings:** | architectural sculpture, |

| **Laskaris No:** |  |
| **Vemi No:** |  |
| **Jakob No:** |  |

| **Mosaics:** |  |
| **Mosaic Citations:** | Assimak-Atz No: |
| **Spiro No.:** | 77-78 |

Sodini, 94 (1970), 710.

| **Report Citations** | Features Notes |
| | |
| J.C. Rolfe, AIA 6 (1890), 101-104. |
| J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 123. |
### Boeotia Antikyra

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Palatia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 500 - 549

Ass.-Atz suggested first half of sixth century. Varalis concurs.

**Architecture:** narthex, 

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpure, 

**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaics: nave, nathex,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimakopoulo-Atzaka, 149-151, no. 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 87 Spiro No: 

**Features Notes**

Five aisled, like many in Boeotia. Possible annexes.

**Report Citations**

G. Lampakis, PXAE 3 (1903), 30.
J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (1976), 123.
E. Mpazirotopoulou-Valavani, AD 37 (1982), B'1 206.
Assimakopoulo-Atzaka, Mosaici in Grecia, 45
G. Gounaris, ACIAC 11.3 (1989), 2694.
A. Kourenta-Raptaki, AD 45 (1990), B'1 96 plan 9.

---

### Boeotia Chaironea

**Location** North of Chaeronea, near the church of Hag. Paraskevi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Hag. Paraskevi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** narthex, 

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpure, 

**Features:** raised stylobates, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaics: nave, nathex,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: 103 Spiro No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 87 Spiro No: 

**Features Notes**

Five aisled, like many in Boeotia. Possible annexes.

**Report Citations**

G. Soteriades, PAE (1904), 49-50.
G. Soteriades, Untersuchungen in Boiotien und Phokis, AM 30 (1905), 117.
P. Lazarides, AD 25 (1970), B1, 246.
### Boeotia

_Three aisled basilica with east apse_

#### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 92</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>405-499 Ass.-Atz. based on mosaic style. Perhaps later, Varalis dated it to the end of the fifth century. The excavator noted coins and lamps of the fifth century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Architecture: narthex, annex, Features: tribelon, raised stylobates,

#### Furnishings: architectural sculpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Mosaics: nave,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No: 89</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Report Citations

- B. Papadopoulou, AD 37 (1982), B'1 77-79.

---

### Boeotia

_Basilica?_

#### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 159</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Architecture: N/A Features: N/A

#### Furnishings: architectural sculpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Mosaics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Report Citations

- P. Lazaridis, AD 24 (1969), B'1 218.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 25 (1970), B'1 268.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 199.

#### Features Notes

Architectural fragments.
### Boeotia

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** baptistery,  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Report Citations**

P. Etzeoglou, AD 20 (1965), B'1 240-241.  
Drains and architectural sculpture suggest a baptistery.

### Boeotia

**Location**

Near the church of Ay. Paraskevi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Report Citations**

P. Lazaridis, AD 19 (1964), B'2 207.  
J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 244.  
Bits of Basilica.
Boeotia  
**Skripou -- Orchomenos**  

**Location:** Ruins presumably under the Middle Byzantine church at Skripou.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></th>
<th>Under the 9th c. church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'  
See Vemi's notes on two column capitals found nearby. Both date to the end of the fourth century. Soteriou dated the mosaic fragments to the fifth century.

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:** Vemi No: 17-18  
**Mosaics:** Assimak-Atz No: 101

**Mosaic Citations:** Spiro No.: 79  
Sodini, BCH 94 (1970), 713.

**Report Citations**  


**Boeotia**  
**Solinari**

**Location:** Near the modern church of St. John the Baptist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:** Vemi No: 260a  
**Mosaics:** Assimak-Atz No: 101

**Mosaic Citations:** Spiro No.: 79  
Sodini, BCH 94 (1970), 713.

**Report Citations**

2. Possible EC apse built on the possible site of a temple to Apollo Tolphousios.
### Boeotia

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**

- 400
- 499

N. Platon dates it to the fourth century.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

- other,

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Assimak-Atz No: 102
- Spiro No.: 74

Sodini, BCH 94 (1970), 713

**Features Notes**

Fragment of mosaic.

---

### Boeotia

**Location**

Near the Middle Byzantine nave of St. Thomas.

**Pallas No:** 7

**Avramea No:**

**Alt. Name:**

'EC'

**Date:**

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Assimak-Atz No: 102
- Spiro No.: 74

**Features Notes**

Little evidence for this church.

---

**Report Citations**

N. Platonos, AE (1937), II, 667.

### Boeotia

**Boeotia**  Thebes -- Gourna  

**Basilica?**

**Location**  At a place called Gourna under a church of the Virgin Eleousas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 106</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>architectural sculpture,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

B. Philippaki, S. Symeonolgou, N. Pharaklas, AD 22 (1967), B'1 239.

Fragments of architectural sculpture.

---

### Boeotia

**Boeotia**  Thebes -- New Sphageia  

**Triconch basilica with three aisles?**

**Location**  On the hill of Isminio Apollo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 107</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>architectural sculpture,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

B. Philippaki, S. Symeonolgou, N. Pharaklas, AD 22 (1967), B'1 239-240.

Y. Varalis, BCH 123 (1999), 225.

Possible triconch bema.
### Boeotia

Thebes -- Od. Kevtos

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 108</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Date: 480 499 | Possible date |

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural scultpure, |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Mosaics: | fragment, |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: | Spiro No: | \_ |

Unpublished.

**Features Notes**

A building with some mosaic oriented E-W that could be an EC building. Some architectural fragments were found nearby.

**Report Citations**


---

### Boeotia

Thebes -- Od. Pindarou

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 109</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Date: 480 499 | Varalis date, end of 5th century. |

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Mosaics: | fragment, |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: | Spiro No: | \_ |

unpublished

**Features Notes**

Fragments of a floor mosaic that might be from an EC church.

**Report Citations**

### Boeotia

**Thespiai**

**Date:** 580-699

Varalis suggests a late 6th to early 7th century date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Architecture:
N/A

#### Features:
- tombs,

#### Furnishings:
- architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 105</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 28 (1973), 286-287.</td>
<td>Aspes on the end of the main nave and the north aisle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Boeotia

**Thisbi**

**Date:** 'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Architecture:
N/A

#### Features:
N/A

#### Furnishings:
- architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 110</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Papadakis, AD 8 (1923), 182.</td>
<td>Possible pavement of the western part of an EC church.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Boeotia**  Xeronomi

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pg. 17</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500-699

**Architecture:** N/A  **Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Possible basilica.

**Features Notes**

- See report in Ballance, Boardman, et al.

---

**Chios**  Emporio

**Location** The cite of Emporio on Chios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 550-575

**Coins of Justin II (565-578) found near the foundation. Comparable to the church at Gul Bagtsche in Izmir (BZ 10 (1901), 568-573)**

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery,  **Features:** raised stylobates, raised bema,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpure, parapet screens, chancel screen,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** narthex, aisles, Annex, baptistery, atrium,

**Mosaic Citations:**

See report in Ballance, Boardman, et al.

**Features Notes**

- Well published. Entrance to the north of the church into the north side of the narthex. South side of the narthex apsidal, excavators consider this the prothesis. Baptistry to the south of the atrium -- round with cruciform found. Complex of buildings to the south of church. Strange semicircular protrosion on the south wall of the south aisle. East part of the church very damaged so exact arrangement of eastern end of aisles unclear, but chapels or transept "unlikely".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elis</strong></td>
<td>Anilion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 600–699

### Mosaic Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varalis No: 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avramea No: 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Gialouris, AD 28 (1964), B'2 178, pl. 188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Etzeoglou, AD 28 (1973), B'1, p. 236.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Elis Basilica?**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91a</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 450-524 Dated by Spiro to the second half of fifth century due to the style of the mosaic. Ass.-Atz. agrees and based her assesment on a relationship between the mosaics in Elis and those at the basilicas from Knossos on Crete (see her ACIAC X 1984 article). Varalis dated the building later to hed first quarter of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure,  
**Mosaics:** other,  
**Features:** tombs,  

**Mosaic Citations:**  
F. Glaser, Ein frühchristliches Mosaik in Alt-Elis, OJh 51 (1976/77), Beibl. 36-38.  
Sodini, BullAIEMA 8, 1980, 163.

**Features Notes**

Mosaic fragment attributed to an early Christian basilica due to it E-W orientation. The excavations here have not definitively decided that this is a basilica. Tombs in the vicinity.

**Report Citations**

G. Kiro, AA (1914), 138.  
N. Gialouris, PAE (1962), 125.  
N. Gialouris, PAE (1964), 136-137.  
G. Daux, BCH 89 (1965) chron. 749.  
N. Gialouris, AD 20 (1965), B2, 211.  
V. Mitsopoulou-Leon, OJh 48 (1966/7), Beibl. 77.  
A.H.S. Megaw, "Archaeology in Greece," ArchRep (1967/8), 12  
M. Ervin, "Newsletter from Greece," AJA 72 (1968), 271.  
V. Mitsopoulou-Leon, OJh 50 (1972/75), Beibl. 184.  
N. Gialouris, PAE (1973), 116-118.  
I. Travlos, PAE (1973), 216.  
M. Michaelidis, AD 29 (1973/4), B1, 22  
N. Gialouris, PAE (1979), 131.  

---

**Epig. Cat.:** 433
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Furnishings</th>
<th>Laskaris No</th>
<th>Vemi No</th>
<th>Jakob No</th>
<th>Mosaics</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elis, Kato Samiko</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Fragments of architectural sculpture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Furnishings</th>
<th>Laskaris No</th>
<th>Vemi No</th>
<th>Jakob No</th>
<th>Mosaics</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elis, Olena</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ruined church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations
E. Papkonstaninou, AD 37 (1982), B'1 134.
Elis

Olympia

Three aisled basilica with east apse

Location: In the workroom of Pheidias

Date: 400

Mosaic Citations:
- Features Notes: Access to the narthex through a door in the S wall. The churches design had to accommodate the dimensions and limitation of the workshop of Pheidias. Rather small. Eso and Exo Narthex with a four columns between.

Report Citations
- F. Alder et al., in Olympia II (Berlin 1892), 93-105.
- G. Sotiriou, Basiliki, 172-173.
- A. Mallwitz, Olympia und seine Bauten (Munich 1972), 264-266.
- C. Schonas, AD 44 (1989), 114.

Architecture: double narthex,

Features: door, raised stylobates, synthronon,

Furnishings: architectural sculpure, chancel screen,

Mosaics:

Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

Location: In the workroom of Pheidias

Date: 400

Varalis No: 212 Avrama No: 252-254

Plans: 51

Figures:

Epig. Cat.: 18,19

Pallas No: 111 Vemi No: Jakob No: p. 288-28
Elis

**Phigalia**

**Location** Near the town of Ano Phigalia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


X. Arapogianni, Ergon (1996), 44.

---

Elis

**Philiatra**

**Five aisle basilica with east apse**

**Location** In the place called Hag. Kyriaki to the SW of the villigae of Philiatra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 480 549 The dating is based on the excavators assesment of the style of architecture and the decorative sculpture. Pallas date the churches construction to 540-550 (and thus destroyed during the Earthquake of 550/551).

**Architecture:** narthex, annex,

**Features:** door, raised bema,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpure, chancel screen,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>p. 297, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** bema/apse,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


D. Pallas, PAE (1960), 177-194.

D. Pallas, AD 16 (1960), 122-125.

G. Daux, BCH 85 (1961), 718-719.

Minnesota Messenia Expedition, Reg. B., n. 408

**Features Notes**

The church is only partially excavated, but is unusual on account of its 5 aisle arrangements (see church at Aigosthena). Also interesting is the that the nave and aisles communicated not through a collonade but rather through a series of arched openings in a wall. Spiro claims that this "arcuated colonade" rested on elevated stylobate, but this is hard to imagine. The church was rebuilt as a three aisled church at the end of the sixth c. and the ambo and altar fragments might date to this period. At this time also a small annex was partitioned out of the S aisles perhaps to serve as a prothesis or diaikonik.
Elis  Pyrgos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Place called Lambeti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>Architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

P. G. Themelis, AD 2 (1967), B'1 208.

**Features Notes**

Architectural fragments.

---

Elis  Skylountia (kokkini Ekklissia)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Three aisled basilica with three apses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 247a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>400 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>Architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

E. Meyer, Neue Peloponnesische Wanderungen, (Berne 1957), 95.

**Features Notes**

Persisted apse with episcopal throne.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Doliana</th>
<th>Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics</strong></td>
<td>fragment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations</strong></td>
<td>Sodini, 723, n. 41. Spiro, 520, 177.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.I. Dakares, AD 19 (1964), B’3 313.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

438
Epirus  
Nikopolis -- A

Three aisled basilica with east apse and transept

Location  In the south of the Byzantine city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Date: 525-574 | The dates are generally provided by Kitzinger based on prosopographical analysis of the inscriptions and the style of the mosaics. The atrium seems to have been paved later.

Architecture: atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery, Features: door, raised stylobates, synthronon, raised

Furnishings: architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

Laskaris No: Vemi No: Jakob No: 

Mosaics: nave, narthex, Annex, baptistery, atrium, other, 


Features Notes
Features are numerous and well preserved. Note the propylaea on the S wall of the church to the W of the transept.

Report Citations
A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1915), 31-33, 59-95. 
A. Philadelpheus, AE (1916), 32-33, 49-54. 
A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1916), 34-54, 65-73, 121-122. 
A. Philadelpheus, AE (1917), 48-72. 
G. Soteriou, PAE (1926), 122-127. 
A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1926), 127-130 
G. Soteriou and A. K. Orlandos, PAE, 1929, 22-24, 86. 
G. Soteriou, basiliki, 206-207. 
E. Kitzinger, Mosaics at Nikopolis, 82-122. 
A.K. Orlandos, PAE (1961), 98-107 
A.K. Orlandos, Ergon (1964), 152-158. 
**for some random bibliographic mentions see Spiro p. 429-430.
**Epirus**

**Nikopolis -- B**

*Three ailed basilica with east apse and transept*

**Location**

In the center of the Byzantine city and, therefore, often thought to be the episcopal basilica

**Pallas No:** Varalis No: Avramea No: Alt. Name: Alkison Basilica or B

**Date:** 480-519

Based on architectural similarities with Basilica A it can be dated to a similar period. This date is confirmed by the reference to Bishop Alkison in an inscription located in a complex to S of the church. Further support for this date comes from the mosaics found here.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex

**Features:** raised stylobates, synthronon, raised bema,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:** Vemi No: Jakob No: p. 285-28

**Mosaics:** nave, bema/apse, atrium,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 157-16

Spiro, 465-488.

**Report Citations**

A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1921), 11-12, 42-44.
A. Philadelpheus, AE (1922), 66-79.
A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1922-3), 8, 40-44.
A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1924), 72-74, 108-112.
A. Philadelpheus, PAE (1926), 127-130.
G. Soteriou, basiliki, 201-203, 231.
G.A. Soteriou, PAE (1938), 16-18, 112-117.
E. Kitzinger, Mosaics at Nikopolis, 88-90.
A.K. Orlandos, Ergon (1964), 158-161

**Features Notes**

An elaborate basilica with a tripartite transept. Similar in this regard to Nikopolis A, and typical of other Epirot basilicas such as that at Dodona and Paramythia. The numerous features associated with the complex to the south can not be treated here in detail except to say that their direct relationship to the liturgical space of the church is not always clear.

---

**440**
**Epirus  Nikopolis -- D**

**Location** At a place called Karaouli or Analipsis, to the E of the city of Nikopolis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Basilica Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490-510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On the basis of the column capitals. Pallas suggests a sixth century date in his RBK article, while Sodini refutes this on the basis of mosaic style in his catalogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex,  
**Features:** raised stylobates, raised bema,  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, ambo,  
**Mosaics:** narthex, Annex, atrium,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 162-164, Spiro, 488-498  
**Report Citations**  
A.K. Orlandos, Ergon (1956), 60-63.  
D. Pallas, RAC 35 (1960), 196-197.  
A.K. Orlandos, PAE (1966), 196.  
D. Pallas, s.v. "Epiros" RBK cols. 221-231.  
**Features Notes**  
Another complex church with numerous important features. The raised bema is worth noting as is the apsidal chapel to the S of the narthex -- similar to that at Nikopolis A. The transept and the clergy benches are also worth mentioning.

**Epirus  Nikopolis -- E**

**Location** About 4 km from Nikopolis in the region of Maragona near Preveza.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Basilica Epsilon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6th c.) The church was attributed to the middle or third quarter of the 6th c.on account of the small &quot;vestry&quot; or &quot;sacristy&quot; in the S transept arm. Similar to that added later to Basilica A at Nikopolis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** atrium, double narthex, annex,  
**Features:** raised stylobates, synthronon,  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Mosaics:** narthex, other,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 165-166, Spiro, 498-503  
**Report Citations**  
D. Pallas, s.v. "Epiros" RBK col. 219.  
**Features Notes**  
Similar series of annexes to the S of the narthex. Not completely excavated so features are difficult to determine. Basin in atrium. It appears to have a double narthex although it is by no means clear.
### Epirus
#### Nikopolis -- G

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** ‘EC’

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** nathex,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: 65

**Features Notes**

- Not systematically excavated, partially uncovered.

---

### Epirus
#### Nikopolis -- ST

**Location** Between the basilica of Alkison and that of Dometios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** ‘EC’

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: 65

**Features Notes**

- Not systematically excavated, partially uncovered.

---

**Report Citations**


A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 8, 132-133, 142, 221, 261, 400, 422, 572.

### Epiros

**Strouni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:** Vemi No: Jakob No:  
**Mosaics:** other,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 176  
Sodini, 728-729, n. 47  
Spiro, 519, n. 76.

**Report Citations**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Euboea

**Amarythos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Three aisled basilica with east apse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500 599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:** 114  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  
**Mosaics:**  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:  

**Report Citations**  
K. Skarmoutsou, AD 36 (1981), B'1 84.  

**Features Notes**  
Fragment of apse.
**Euboea**  Ano Vatheia  *Basilica?*

**Location**  Near the church of Ay. Nikolaos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 43</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:**  'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>Plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

A. Andreiomenou, AD 16 (1960), B'1 150.

---

**Euboea**  Aulonari  *Basilica?*

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 62</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:**  'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>Plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

I. Konstantinou, I. Travlos, PAE (1941-1944), 30.
**Euboea**  Aulonari -- Itea

**Date:** A.V.

### Aulonari -- Itea

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>A place called Itea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings</th>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

I. Konstantinou, I. Travlos, PAE (1941-1944), 28. 31.

**Features Notes**

Only remains are a partially excavated room which might be associated with an EC basilica.

---

**Euboea**  Ay. Anna

**Basilica**

**Location** Near the small church of Ag. Basileios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Near the small church of Ag. Basileios.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings</th>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

A. Sampson, AD 29 (1973-1974), B'2 493.
### Euboea

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>550-550</td>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>baptistery,</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No: 31-34</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>Plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Epig. Cat.:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Giannopoulos, DXAE 1 (1924), 88-119.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 20 (1965), 292.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Euboea

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Hag. Paraskevi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Oikonomakou, Anthropologika kai Archaeologika Chronika 1 (1986), 159-160.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sapouna-Sakellaraki, AD 28 (1993), B'1 194.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently excavations uncovered tombs and part of an apse.
### Euboea

**Euboean Limnes**

**Location** Near the church of the Zoodochos Pege.

**Date:** 500 – 599 Based on Jakobs' dating of an ambo fragment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>p. 277-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans:</td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

M. Chatzidakis, PAE (1960), 324ff.

### Gerakiou

**Location** At a place called Metoxi Ay. Elenis

**Date:** 'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans:</td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

M. Georgopoulou-Meladini, AD 27 (1972), B'2, 371.

Fragments of architectural sculpture.
### Euboea

**Location**: Gymno Chalkidas

**Date**: 'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics**: fragment,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

Fragments of architectural sculpture.

### Euboea

**Location**: Karystos

**Date**: 'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics**: unpublished

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

Fragments of floor mosaic of a possible EC church.
**Euboea**

**Oreoi Euboeas**

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500 599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 172

---

**Euboea**

**Phylla**

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Near the church of Ay. Zacharia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 172

---
### Euboea

**Pissonas**

**Basilica**

**Location**: To the east of the settlement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>Features:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mosaic Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations

A. Sampson, AD 29 (1973-1974), B'2 490.

### Politika

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 600 799 Quite late.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>Features:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mosaic Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report Citations

A. Karouzos, AD 10 (1929), 16.
C. Themelis, AEM 4 (1955), 16-17.
A. Orlandos, ABME 3 (1937), 180.
### Euboea Psachna -- I

**Basilica**

**Location** Beneath the more recent church of Hag. Triada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

A.K. Andreiomeni, AD 16 (1960), B 152.  
J. Koder and Fr. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 260.

**Mosaic Citations**

Oddly shaped building with mosaic floor and apse toward east end.

### Euboea Psachna -- II

**Basilica?**

**Location** Near the monastery of Ay. Ioannos Kalybiti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

**Euboea**

**Robies -- Paliochori**

---

**Date:** 'EC'

**Basilica?**

---

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No.:</th>
<th>Varalis No.: 239</th>
<th>Avramea No.:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

---

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen, altar screen

**Features:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen

---

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**


---

**Report Citations**


---

**Euboea**

**Vatontas**

---

**Date:** 500 560

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

---

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No.: 13</th>
<th>Varalis No.: 64</th>
<th>Avramea No.:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture:** narthex, tribelon, raised stylobates

**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates

---

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen, altar screen

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen

---

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

- P. Lazaridis, AD 19 (1964), B'2 214, pl. 255d.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 24 (1969), B'1 211, pl. 215e and 216b.
- M. Georgopoulou-Meladini, AD 28 (1973), B'1, 317.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 280.

---

**Report Citations**

P. Lazaridis, AD 19 (1964), B'2 214, pl. 255d.

P. Lazaridis, AD 24 (1969), B'1 211, pl. 215e and 216b.

M. Georgopoulou-Meladini, AD 28 (1973), B'1, 317.

J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 280.


---

**Features Notes**

Door in the west wall of the church and possible door in the north wall.
**Eurvtania**  Klapsi  

**Location**  In the village of Klapsi, 6 km from Karpension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500-599  
Based on the triconch style which began to appear in the 6th c. (see Dodona and Paramythia) especially around Epiros. This date was confirmed by the style of mosaics.

**Architecture:**  
narthex,  

**Features:**  
door, raised stylobates, synthronon,  

**Furnishings:**  
arhitectural scultpure, chancel screen,  

**Laskaris No:**  

**Vemi No:**  

**Jakob No:**  

**Mosaics:**  
nave, nathex, aisles, bema/apse, other,  

**Mosaic Citations:**  
  Assimak-Atz No: 105  
  Spiro No.: 94-100  
  Sodini, 716, n. 33.


**Report Citations**  
D. Pallas, RAC 35 (1959) 191ff, n. 7.  
E. Chatzidakis, PAE (1959), 34-36.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 21 (1966), 272-274.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 22 (1967), 337.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 23 (1968), 280.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 24 (1969), 236.  
J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 188.  
D. Pallas, FR 118 (1979), 134.  

**Features Notes**  
A triconch basilica with colonades resting on stylobates separating the aisles from he naves and the transept divided into three parts by two arched arcade. Some evidence for a later baldichino over the altar in the chancel area. Little evidence for entrances. Single nathex.

| Plans: | 61 |
| Figures: | figs. 48-52 |
| Epig. Cat.: | 26-31 |
Eurvtania  Klepa

Location  Near the modern village.

Date:  'EC'

Architecture: N/A  Features: N/A

Furnishings: N/A

Mosaics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Report Citations

S. Bommelje and P.K. Doorn, Aetolia and the Aetolians. (Utrecht 1987), 89.

Korinthia  Alkyonides

Location  In the convent of the Virgin on this island.

Date:  'EC'

Architecture: N/A  Features: N/A

Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

Plans:  Figures:  Epig. Cat:  

Mosaics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Report Citations

J. Papachristadoulou, AAA 1 (1968), 116-117

Features Notes

Some fragments of architectural sculpture, apparently from an early Christian church.
### Report Citations

- Wiseman, The Land, 58
- Fowler, Corinth vol. 1, pt. 1.99
- Kordossis, ??? Get citation here sv. Almyri

---

**Korinthia**

**Location**: In the church yard and built into the village church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No: 9-10</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: ‘EC’

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features**: N/A

---

**Korinthia**

**Location**: Near the modern church of St. George at the summit of a hill near the cemetery of the village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 490 573

- A coin of Justinian II and Sophia found at some distance from the site, but pavement style suggests late fifth c. Ass.-Atz. suggests a first half of sixth century date.

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics**: fragment,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features**: N/A

---

**Korinthia**

**Location**: Bozikas -- near Ay. Georgios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 490 573

- A coin of Justinian II and Sophia found at some distance from the site, but pavement style suggests late fifth c. Ass.-Atz. suggests a first half of sixth century date.

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics**: fragment,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features**: N/A

---

**Report Citations**

- G. Daux, BCH 82 (1958), 702
- D. Pallas, RAC 35 (1959), 214-215
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Korinthia</th>
<th>Chiliomodi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Features:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Report Citations


### Features Notes

| 456 |
Korinthia  Kenchreai

**Location**  The Korinthian port of Kenchreai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kenchreai Basilica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 490-650

Excavators suggest that it was built in the late 4th century. This is unlikely. Dating this church is confusing. It seems like the central nave continued to be used well into the 7th c. This is contested.

**Architecture:**  double narthex, annex, baptistery, east apse

**Features:**  raised stylobates, tombs,

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpture,

**Mosaic Citations:**  Assimak-Atz No: 32  Spiro No.: p. 88-

Sodini, BullAIEMA 8, 1980

**Report Citations**

G. Lambakis, Christianiki Kenchreai, Miscellanea di Archaeologia, Storia e Filologia dedicate a prof. Antonio Salinas (Palermo 1907), 71-80.

A. Orlandos, AAA 10 (1935), 55-57.

R.L. Scranton and E.S. Ramage, AD 20 (1965), B'1 145, 151-152.

E.S. Ramage and R.L Scranton, AD 22 (1967), B'1 187.

R.L. Scranton and E.S. Ramage, Hesperia 36 (1967), 152-158.


Hohlfelder, Kenchreai III, 63-92

Adamscheck, Kenchreai IV, 82-140.

Williams, Kenchreai V, 69-88


Avramea-Kyrkou, Inventire, 42-43

**Features Notes**

Strange apsidal annex to southeast of main building which communicates with the southern most aisle. Very anomalous building. The exonarthex (Hohlfelder, 63), is difficult to identify as part of the church itself.
**Korinthia**  
**Kiato**  
*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

**Location**  
In ancient Sikyon near the railroad tracks.

**Pallas No:** 81  
**Varalis No:** 135  
**Avramea No:** 31-32  
**Alt. Name:**

**Date:** 480 - 599  
Thoroughly excavated there should be considerable evidence for dating. Pallas notes that the dimension (esp. the shorter nave) place the church later than Lechaion and Alika as does the apsidal diakonikon which flanks the nave on its s. side rather than the narthex. Varalis suggest that the earliest phase of the building might date to the end of the 5th century with a late phase including rooms to west and the south of the atrium dating the second half of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery  
**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Report Citations**

A. K. Orlandos, PAE (1933), 81-90.
G. Sotiriou, ACIAC IV.1 (1940), 358.
N. Zias, AD 29 (1973-1974), B'2 412.
H. Gallet De Santerre, BCH 77 (1953), 213.
H. Gallet De Santerre, BCH 79 (1955), 231.
D. Pallas, FR 118 (1979), 112-114.

**Korinthia**  
**Kleonai**  
*Basilica?*

**Location**

**Pallas No:**  
**Varalis No:**  
**Avramea No:** 22  
**Alt. Name:**

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Report Citations**

T. Gristopoulos, EEBS 36 (1968), 412
Kordossis, Korinthos, 67

---

458
### Korinthia

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 149</th>
<th>Avramea No: 3</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

Fragments of sculpture

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

D. Pallas, RAC 39 (1959) 205-207, fig. 20, 21

---

### Korinthia

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 140</th>
<th>Avramea No: 4</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 600-699

According to Pallas, the space between the intercollumations (1.9 m)

**Architecture:** narthex, baptistery.

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plans:**

24

**Figures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

C. Blegen, Corinth IIIi, 21-28.
A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 251.
D. Pallas, FR 118 (1979), 95.

Baptistery is not visible on published plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- Aaslepeion</td>
<td>650-699</td>
<td>waterworks, tombs,</td>
<td>annex,</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Roebuck, Corinth XIV, 168.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Pallas, s.v. &quot;Korinth&quot; RBK, col. 788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Features:</td>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>Plans:</td>
<td>Figures:</td>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- east of Agora</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 94 note</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Pallas, PAE (1953), 182.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Pallas, EEBS 28 (1958), 533.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Korinthia

**Location**: In the North Cemetery

**Pallas No**: 79c  **Varalis No**: 142  **Avramea No**: 3  **Alt. Name**: St. Kodratos

**Date**: 500 - 529  
Joseph, Cannon du la fete du Martyr Kodrate, Ode IX.1.  

**Architecture**: annex, baptistery, 
**Features**: waterworks, tombs,

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics**: 
**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Report Citations**

- E. Stikas, PAE (1962), 51-56.
- D. Pallas, FR 118 (1979), 105-108.

### Korinthia

**Location**: To the east of the gate of the city of Korinth outside the late antique walls.

**Pallas No**: 79B  **Varalis No**: 148  **Avramea No**: 3  **Alt. Name**: Kranceion Basilica

**Date**: 500  
Coins (PAE 1970, 98-117). Note Vemi's dating of the column capital to the second half of the 6th century. Difficult chronology relating to the triconch on the south side and the tombs around the apse.

**Architecture**: atrium, double narthex, annex, baptistery,  
**Features**: tribelon, raised stylobates, synthonon, wat

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

**Laskaris No**: 2, 98  **Vemi No**: 60  **Jakob No**:  
**Mosaics**: 
**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Report Citations**

- Sotiriou, Basilikai, 197-198.
- J. de Waele, ACIAC 3 (1934), 380-383.
- V.J. Shelly, Hesperia 12 (1943), 166-183.
- D. Pallas, RAC 35 (1959), 204-205.
- D. Pallas, PAE (1972), 205-250.
- D. Pallas, PAE (1977), 162-183.
- D. Pallas, FR 118 (1979), 101-105.

**Features Notes**

An elongated porticoed annex to the north was called a diakonikon by Pallas (1977). Church completely flanked by mausolea. Piers separate the nave from the aisles probably raised on stylobates.
Korinthia  Korinth -- near Ay. Paraskevi

**Location**  Near modern church of Ag. Paraskevi.  Intramural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79E</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**  400 – 499  Possible 5th century date based on ceramics in the wall.

**Architecture:**  N/A

**Furnishings:**  Architectural sculpture,

**Features:**  N/A

**Mosaics:**  

**Mural Citations:**

**Features Notes**

- Only a single wall.

---

Korinthia  Korinth -- Skoutelas

**Location**  To west of Ancient Korinth in Agricultural plane east of modern Lechaion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skoutelas Basilica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**  480 – 520  Varalis sees a two later phases occuring in the first half to the middle of the 6th century

**Architecture:**  Narthex, annex, baptistery, 

**Furnishings:**  Architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Features:**  Door, raised stylobates, synthonon,

**Mosaics:**  

**Mural Citations:**

**Features Notes**

- Benches for clergy flank a bema that projects into the main nave with a short central solea.  Large synthonon.  Room to E of both N and S aisle which Pallas dates to a later phase.
- Large elaborate baptistery.  An enkainion for relics under the altar and a baldachino covered it.  Appears to have a door communicating between the nave and the narthex.

---

Report Citations

- D. Pallas, PAE (1953), 175-183.
- D. Pallas, PAE (1954), 210-218.
- D. Pallas, PAE (1955), 193-200.
- D. Pallas FR 118 (1979), 105.

---

Mosaic Citations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches for clergy flank a bema that projects into the main nave with a short central solea. Large synthonon. Room to E of both N and S aisle which Pallas dates to a later phase. Large elaborate baptistery. An enkainion for relics under the altar and a baldachino covered it. Appears to have a door communicating between the nave and the narthex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Korinthia**  
**Korinth -- Temple Hill**  
*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>590 668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 590–668  
Originally dated based on a similarity between the sculpture there to that at Nea Anchialos A (6th century). The tombs in the narthex date to between the 7th and the 13th century, based on grave goods. Oddly proportioned for the period and polygonal apse suggest later construction, perhaps 11th-12th c., as does the parecclesia to the south of the church. By the 12th century a new church was built in that place.

**Architecture:** narthex, annex,  
**Features:** tombs, architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spire No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

H. S. Robinson, AD 29 (1973-74), B2, 255.  
H. S. Robinson, AD 30 (1975), B1, 61  

---

**Korinthia**  
**Korinth Limnes**  
*Basilica?*

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500–599

**Architecture:** baptistery,  
**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spire No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

There appears to be a diakonikon and pastophery flanking the apse as typical a church of a later period (of the Syrian Type as Robinson noted).
### Korinthia

**Krommyon**

**Location** At Ag. Theodori and presumably under the church of that name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 4</th>
<th>Avramea No: 1</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- Kordossis, Korinthos, 66 n. 38
- Pallas, Odoiporon ton Geraveion: Korinthia Protochronia (1960), 43-47.

**Features Notes**

- Numerous mable pieces reported around the church today and inscriptions are on the front of the modern church.

### Korinthia

**Lechaion -- near Roman Harbor**

**Location** Near the ancient harbor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>400 699</th>
<th>Lamps from the 5th to 7th century. Coins from the 11th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 141</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

- Fragments of architectural sculpture (capitals and columns), and ceramics. Possible west end of an EC basilica.
**Korinthia**  
Lechaion -- on hill of Hag. Gerasimos

**Location**  
on hill of Hag. Gerasimos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:**  
450

**Architecture:** N/A  
Features: N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 37  
Spiro No:  

**Location**  
on hill of Hag. Gerasimos

**23 39-52 p. 255-25**

**Pallas No:**  
79F

**Varalis No:** 150  
**Avramea No:** 5

**Date:**  
450 551

Dated in part by coins. A First phase begun, according to Pallas, in ca. 450 and completed in 490-500. An additional phase started during the reign of Justin I (518-527). The baptistery appears to have been earlier.

**Architecture:** atrium, double narthex, annex, baptistery,  
Features: tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon, tom

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:** 23  
**Vemi No:** 39-52  
**Jakob No:** p. 255-25

**Mosaics:** nave,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
Spiro No:  

**Report Citations**  
D. Pallas, PAE (1956), 164-178.  
D. Pallas, PAE (1957), 95-104.  
D. Pallas, PAE (1958), 119-134.  
D. Pallas, PAE (1959), 126-140.  
D. Pallas, PAE (1960), 144-170.  
D. Pallas, PAE (1961) 137-54.  
R. Krautheimer, Architecture, 131-134.

**Features Notes**  
Ambo in the center of the nave (a la Constantinople), 5 part transept (common in the West). Large atrium probably added later and diakonikon to the S of the narthex. Large baptistery to the south. Door on the south wall with a prostatis has parallels with the Alika church in Argos. Note the basins in the atrium.
### Korinthia
**Nemea -- Evangelista Hill**

**Location** On the Evangelista Hill overlooking the sanctuary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 204</th>
<th>Avramea No: 23</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Date: | 490 | 599 | Dated by Miller to the same time as the sanctuary church, but perhaps later. |

**Architecture:** narthex, **Features:** door, raised stylobates,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculptpure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 25</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This church has not received study other than the brief mention by Orlandos. There appears to be two large windows in the central apse and several openings in the stylobate. No flanking chambers on the narthex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 401, 571.
- Miller, Guide to Nemea, 80 n. 46.

### Korinthia
**Nemea -- Sanctuary**

**Location** On the ancient Xenon of the sanctuary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 84</th>
<th>Varalis No: 203</th>
<th>Avramea No: 23</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Date: | 490 | 510 | End of the fifth or beginning of the 6th with the baptistery dating to slightly later, perhaps the middle of the 6th century. |

**Architecture:** narthex, baptistery, **Features:** door, raised stylobates, synthronon, tombs,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculptpure, parapet screens, chancel screen,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many fragments of a chancel screen and what appears to be a parapet between the aisle and nave. Hints of an atrium. Rooms flank the narthex which might be liturgical in function. Baptistery appears to be in imitation of the Kraneion baptistery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- C. Blegen, AJA 31 (1927), 435.
- C.K. Williams, AD 20 (1965), B'1 155-156.
- Orlandos, ACIAC V, (Rome-Paris 1957), p 112 fig. 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sikyon -- Ay. Dimitrios</th>
<th>basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: architectural sculppure,</td>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varalis No: 187</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No: 83</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations

Ph. Drosogianni, AD 22 (1967), B'1 220. Foundations of an apse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sikyon -- near Vassilika</th>
<th>Basilica?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: architectural sculppure,</td>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No: 31-32</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations

A. Philadelpheus, AD 10 (1926), 49-50.
A. K. Orlandos, PAE (1937), 94-96.
G. Touchais, BCH 109 (1985), 773
G. Touchais, BCH 113 (1989), 598
**Korinthia**  Sikyon -- village of Vasiliko

**Location**  In the ruins of an ancient church in the theater of the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 246</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Date: 540 599</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varalis records a middle or second half of the 6th c. date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  **Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 42  Spiro No:

---

**Report Citations**

A. Phildepeus, AD 10 (1926), 47.
P. Lemerle, BCH 61 (1937), chron. 454.

---

**Korinthia**  Sophikon

**Location**  2 km east of the village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 250</th>
<th>Avramea No: 15</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Date: 500 550</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varalis propes a possible first half of 6th c. date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  **Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 43  Spiro No:

---

**Report Citations**

A. Orlandos, ABME 1 (1935), 70-74
J. Volanakis, Byzantine Politismos, 1 (1976), 119-121

**Features Notes**

Parts of the apse preserved.
### Korinthia  
**Zougra -- Pellene**  

**Location**  
On the ridge Tserkoba or Tserkobi, to the south of village, on the north part of the ridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 102a</th>
<th>Avramea No: 35</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>Some coins found there, latest: 584/5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations

A. K. Orlandos, PAE (1931), 73 n. 2.  
Kordossis, Korinthos 216 and n, 314  

**Features Notes**  
Possible ruins of a basilica.

### Korinthia  
**Zougra -- Senterina**  

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 102b</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>tombs,</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations

A. Orlandos, PAE (1931), 74-75.  

**Features Notes**  
What is possibly the east end of an EC church.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alyka</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>109b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>St. Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

N. Dandakis, PAE (1958), 199-203.
G. Daux, BCH 85 (1961), 693.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apidea</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td>109b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features Notes**

All that remains of the this church is the central apse which appears larger than the rather disorderly and disproportional flanking apses. Also, "Le blocage posterior qui a permis de transformer en piliers quatre intervention par rapport au plan original de l'eglise; le colonnes elancees de la phase anterieure sufficiaient pour une charpente mais etaient faibles pour soutenir une voute."

---

**Report Citations**

Orlandos, EEBS 4 (1927), 346-347.
M. Oikonomidou, AD 31 (1976), B'1 5.
### Laconia

#### Boiai-Neapolis

**Location**: Under the modern Cathedral.

**Date**: 500 - 599

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: Architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics**: Assimak-Atz No:

**Features**: N/A

**Furnishings**: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 99</th>
<th>Varalis No: 201</th>
<th>Avramea No: 179</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**


Architectural fragments found in the basilica of Neapolis.

### Laconia

#### Gerakas -- Ay. Pavlos

**Location**: Three aisled basilica with east apse

**Date**: 550 - 599

**Architecture**: Narthex,

**Furnishings**: Architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics**: Assimak-Atz No:

**Features**: Door,

**Furnishings**: Architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Features**: Door,

**Mosaics**: Assimak-Atz No:

**Features Notes**


It is possible that the nave is divided with piers rather than columns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gerakas -- Zarax Acropolis</th>
<th>Gerakas -- Zarax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Acropolis of Zarax</td>
<td>In the lower town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 69</td>
<td>Varalis No: 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>narthex,</td>
<td>Three aisled basilica with east apse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>raised stylobates,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No:  Jaakob No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td>A. J. B. Wace and F. W. Hasluck, BSA 15 (1908-1909), 169.</td>
<td>The most significant remains were the semicircular apse and an annex to the northeast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plans:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epig. Cat.:</strong></td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Citations

Aisles separated from the main nave by piers and arches on stylobates.
### Laconia

#### Geraki -- Ay. Sozon

**Location** Under the 12/13th century church of Hag. Sozon. Outline of the apse remains visible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 73</th>
<th>Avramea No: 165</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>400 499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Xyngopoulos, PAE (1937), 108.</td>
<td>Some architectural sculpture built into the walls of the later Byzantine church there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Geraki -- Kastro

**Location** In the Kastro at Geraki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 71</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Xyngopoulos, PAE (1937), 108.</td>
<td>Just a note that an early Christian church is in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Laconia</strong></th>
<th>Geraki -- Krini</th>
<th>Three aisled basilica with east apse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>To the east of the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 72</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>500 549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>annex,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpure, chancel screen,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reports:</strong></td>
<td>A. Xyngopoulos, PAE (1937), 108-114.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 87, 344, 346.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>M. Panayotidi, CorsiRav 22 (1975), 336.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Laconia</strong></th>
<th>Gytheion -- Basilica A</th>
<th>Three aisled basilica with east apse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>On the Acropolis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 78</td>
<td>Avramea No: 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>500 599</td>
<td>Based on mosais style. Varalis dates it to the second half of the sixth century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpure, chancel screen,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plans:</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Aisles separated from the main nave by piers. Primarily the eastern part of the church was excavated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Report Citations**

- A. Xyngopoulos, AD 38 (1983), B’l 98
- A. Pariente, BCH 114 (1990), 737.

**Features Notes**

- Only a brief noted appeared in AD. The apses appears to have been three walled on the outside and semicircular inside. Some of the presbytery was found, a possible narthex, and some column capitals etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laconia</th>
<th>Gytheion -- Basilica B</th>
<th>Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>On the acropolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong> 79</td>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong> 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jakob No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assimak-Atz No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spiro No.:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Features Notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Mparkourou, AD 38 (1983), B'1 98.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laconia</th>
<th>Gytheion -- town</th>
<th>Basilica?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>To the southeast of the theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong> 80</td>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>540 599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jakob No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assimak-Atz No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spiro No.:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Features Notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laconia  Kaineopolis-Kyparissos -- Ay. Andrea

Three aisled basilica with east apse

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Ay. Andrea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 500 620  Varalis suggests a 6th century phase followed by a much later phase (8th c.). Dandakis and Pallas suggest a date in the early 7th c. based on sculpture

**Architecture:** N/A  **Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** N/A

**Laskaris No:** 109b  **Vemi No:** 156  **Jakob No:** 101a

**Mosaics:** bema/apse

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 101a  Spiro No: 101c

**Report Citations**

N. Drandakis, PAE (1958), 199-203, 216.

---

Laconia  Kaineopolis-Kyparissos -- Ay. Petros

Basilica

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Ay. Petros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 550 599  Coin of Justinian and Tiberius II. Avramea claims that the building dated to the 5th c., although Drandakis report does not seem to provide a definitive date. At a later date a small church was built in the apse. Varalis dates this to the second half of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** N/A  **Features:** raised stylobates, raised bema, tombs

**Furnishings:** architectural scultpure, chancel screen

**Laskaris No:** 109b  **Vemi No:** 156  **Jakob No:** 101a

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 101a  Spiro No: 101c

**Report Citations**

N. Drandakis, PAE (1958), 206-216.
N. Drandakis, PAE (1960), 233-245.
N. Drandakis, S. Kalopissi, and M. Panagiotidi, PAE (1979), 208.

---
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**Laconia**

**Kainepolis-Kyparissos -- Monastiri**

**Basilica**

**Location** At the site of the Church of the Koimesis of the Virgin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 101b</th>
<th>Varalis No: 158</th>
<th>Avramea No: 187</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Monastiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 550-599

Perhaps three periods of use subsequent to EC. Some evidence for ash. Varalis suggests a date in the second half of the 6th c.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** synthronon, architectural sculpture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 109a</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Features Notes**

A three step episcopal throne which is probably later. A column capital. The apse was partially excavated.

---

**Laconia**

**Koniditsa**

**Location** One aisled church with east apse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 139</th>
<th>Avramea No: 156</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 580-699

Varalis dates this building to the end of 6th or the seventh century

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** tombs, architectural sculpture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 30</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

**Features Notes**

Single naved church with an apse.

---

Report Citations

N. Drandakis, PAE (1958), 199-203, 216.

R. Etzeoglou, AD 28 (1973), B'1 238-240.

G. Touchais, BCH 102 (1978), 675.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laconia</th>
<th>Ktirakia</th>
<th>Converted heroon or mausoleum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Found in Laconia Survey publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jakob No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

Ch. Christou PAE (1963), 130-136.
BCH 88 (1964) 730-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laconia</th>
<th>Molaoi -- I</th>
<th>Five aisled basilica with east apse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Possibly ancient Leukai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Addenda:</td>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>550 599</td>
<td>Based upon a stylistic analysis of the mosaic. The &quot;diakonikon&quot; was added later (perhaps second half of sixth, whereas the main part of the church is middle sixth). Late 6th c. coins (Justin II 573/4) suggests destruction by Slavs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>narthex, annex,</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture, chancel screen,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>nave, Annex,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: 45</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

R. Etzeoglou, AD 27 (1972), B1, 303-304.
R. Etzeoglou, AD 28 (1973), B1, 237-238.
R. Etzeoglou, AE (1974), 244-257, pl. 80-88.
R. Etzeoglou, Quelques aspects des agglomerations paleochretiennes au Sud-Est de la Laconie. Geographie historique du monde mediterranean. Fondation Europeenne de la Science. Activite byzantine. (Byzantina Sorbonensia 7 Paris 1988), 101-104. Fig. 2

# Features Notes

This church appears rather crude -- especially the strange, later, apsidal diaconikon added in the south eastern corner of the nave. Door in west wall of central nave might be later.
### Laconia

#### Molaoi -- II

**Location** 180 meters to the W of the Basilica 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Basilica 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500-515

When the church is fully excavated a better date could be established.

**Architecture:** narthex, annex,

**Features:** raised stylobates, synthronon,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Features Notes**

Very little is yet known about this church except that the base of some columns have been found in situ, the base of the altar has been found, the base of a "temple screen." Also, a synthronon is in the apse with a place for an episcopal throne. Perhaps also some column capitals.

### Laconia

#### Molaoi -- III

**Location** 120 meters to the south of Basilica 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Basilica 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500-599

Has not been thoroughly studied.

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:**

**Features Notes**

Only the central apse remains.

**Report Citations**


R. Etzeoglou, Quelques aspects des agglomerations paleochrétiennes au Sud-Est de la Laconie. Geographie historique du monde mediterranneen. Fondation Europeenne de la Science. Activite byzantine. (Byzantina Sorbonensia 7 Paris 1988), 101-104. Fig. 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Monemvasia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>580-599 Tied to the dating of Monemvasia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features:</td>
<td>synthronon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpure,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Etzeoglou, Quelques aspects des agglomerations paleochretiennes au Sud-Est de la Laconie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographie historique du monde mediterraneen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fondation Europeenne de la Science. Activite byzantine. (Byzantina Sorbonensia 7 Paris 1988), 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td>The first phase of the now domed, three apsed basilica dedicated to Christos Elkomenos. Little can be determined definitively except that the synthronon and the main apse might be early Christian. The flanking apses appear different in dimension and placement to the central apse. The main dome might be 17th c. (dated by inscription).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Oitylo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpure,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Avramea, LakSpoud 7 (1983), 11-16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td>Fragments of architectural sculpture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Laconia

**Phoinikion (Krissa)**

**Basilica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th>Near the town of Krissa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 266 Avramea No: 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;EC&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No: Jakob No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>Architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations:</strong></td>
<td>A. Delivorrias, AD 24 (1969) B'1 138-139, pl. 135g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Not excavated, but remains were described as &quot;extensive&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Laconia

**Sparta I**

**Three aisled basilica with three apses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 251 Avramea No: 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>600. Late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No: Jakob No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>Architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations:</strong></td>
<td>A. Adamantiou, PAE (1934), 126-127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Laconia

**Sparta I**

**Three aisled basilica with three apses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th>Near the town of Krissa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 266 Avramea No: 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;EC&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No: Jakob No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>Architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations:</strong></td>
<td>A. Delivorrias, AD 24 (1969) B'1 138-139, pl. 135g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Not excavated, but remains were described as &quot;extensive&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>Sparta II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>In cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>500 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>nave, fragment, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Large &quot;basilica like building on an eastern orientation featuring a vast room (7.9 x 18 m) with a mosaic-floor with animal scenes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laconia</th>
<th>Sparta III</th>
<th>Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Hill to the southeast of the Acropolis near the sanctuary of Aphrodite or the Dioscoroi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Large &quot;basilica like building on an eastern orientation featuring a vast room (7.9 x 18 m) with a mosaic-floor with animal scenes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**
- Sodini, L'habitat urbain, 389-390.

**Report Citations**
### Laconia

#### Sparta IV

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Od. Kleombrotou 34.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Pallas No:** 450

**Date:** 450–549

Two phases with the church dating most like the middle of the 5th century and the tomb mosaic to the middle of the 6th.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture: N/A</th>
<th>Features: tombs,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 30b</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics: nave,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

A. Mpakourou, AD 46 (1991), B′1 121-122.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Laconia

#### Talanta

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

**Location** Near the village of Talanta beneath the more recent church of Hag. Saranta. The excavators relate the ma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 253</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 'EC'</td>
<td>Primarily dated to the Early Christian period on account of its size and on account of the early Christian material found in the surrounding fields.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture: N/A</td>
<td>Features: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings: architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

N. Drandakis, Ergon (1982), 42.
G. Touchais, BCH, 107 (1983), 762.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The remains of an apse and the south wall of an apparent Early Christian basilica. A later church sits perhaps on the southern stylobate. Many fragments of closure panels and marble found in the vicinity further suggest an Early Christian basilica formerly stood on this spot.
### Laconia

**Tigani**

**Location** On acropolis of Tigani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>600–699</th>
<th>7th century date based on architecture. Probable earlier phase.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture:** three aisled basilica with three apses

**Features:** raised stylobates, synthronon, raised bema

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen

**Laskaris No.:** 31

**Varalis No.:** 262

**Avramea No.:** 190

**Alt. Name:**

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

Apsidal building attached to N wall. Colonnade apparently not on a stylobate. Polygonal exterior to apse might be later. Possible solea. Many tombs.

### Laconia

**Valtaki**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No.:</th>
<th>Vemi No.:</th>
<th>Jakob No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- K. Zissiou, Byzantis 1 (1909), 123.
- I. Varoucha-Christodouloupolou, AD 19 (1964), B'1 14.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Locris</strong></th>
<th><strong>Larymiña</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>A place called Pazaraki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style of sculpture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Architecture:** | N/A |
| **Features:** | N/A |
| **Furnishings:** | architectural sculpture, |
| **Laskaris No:** | |
| **Vemi No:** | |
| **Jakob No:** | |

| **Mosaics:** | |
| **Mosaic Citations:** | Assimak-Atz No: |
| **Spiro No.:** | |

| **Features Notes** | Marble fragments found in and around the Byz. church of Hag. Nikolaos |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Report Citations</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 24 (1969), B1 218.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 25 (1970), B1 268.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Locris</strong></th>
<th>Naupaktos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Od. Kapordeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>550-599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possibly dating to the second half of the 5th century.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Architecture:** | N/A |
| **Features:** | raised stylobates, |
| **Furnishings:** | architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen, |
| **Laskaris No:** | 118b |
| **Vemi No:** | |
| **Jakob No:** | |

| **Mosaics:** | nave, bema/apse, |
| **Mosaic Citations:** | Assimak-Atz No: |
| **Spiro No.:** | |

| **Features Notes** | Salvage excavation uncovered the east end and apse of an EC basilica. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Report Citations</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 21 (1966), 267-268.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. Vokotopoulos, AD 28 (1973), B'2 394-395.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 28 (1973), 395-397.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Zias, AD 29 (1973-1974), B'1 543.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Triantaphulou, AD 33 (1978), B'1 167-168.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Soustal and J. Koder, TIB 3 (Vienna 1981), 211.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Papadopoulou, AD 45 (1990), B'1 280.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Naupaktos -- Ay. Stephanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Naupaktos -- Ovriolakkas</th>
<th>Basilica?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 198</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>500 599</td>
<td>Possible 6th century date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Messenia

**Alagonia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>At the church of Ay. Sozonta.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Messenia

**Chryssokelaria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>A place called Loutsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural scultpure,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td>Korone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Ancient Korone, now the village of Petalidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong> N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong> Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spira No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Messenia</th>
<th>Korone -- Loggas</th>
<th>Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Varalis No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong> 228-229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Features:</strong> N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vemi No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jakob No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong> Assimak-Atz No: 51</td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spira No:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

M.E. Bouillon Boblaye, Recherches geographiques sur les ruines de la Moreem, 111.
P. Versakis, AD (1916), 65-118.
Minnesota Messenia Expedition, Reg. B., n. 504
### Messenia

**Messene -- Odeion**

**Basilica**

| Date: | 'EC' |
| Location: |  |
| Pallas No: | Varalis No: 190 | Avramea No: 201 | Alt. Name: |
| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture, |
| Mosaics: |  |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: |
| Report Citations: | Features Notes: Recently published. |

**Features Notes**

- P. Themelis, PAE (1994), 76.
- P. Themelis, PAE (1995), 63-64.
Messenia  Messene -- Theater

Three aisled basilica with east apse

Date:  "EC"

Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 191</th>
<th>Avramea No: 201</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Architecture: narthex, annex,
Features: synthronon, tombs,
Furnishings: architectural sculpture, parapet screens,

Laskaris No: Vemi No: Jakob No: Plans: Figures: Epig. Cat.: Mosaics:
Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No:

Report Citations

Ergon (1999), 47.
**Messenia**  Methone I  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>At the church of Hag. Ilias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>500 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td>Hag. Sophia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td>Higgins dated the mosaic to this period, after showing a photo of the mosaic to P. Megaw and J. Harris. (see Assimak.-Atz. 110 no. 107)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture |
| Laskaris No: | Vemi No: | Jakob No: |
| Mosaics: | fragment |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No: 52  | Spiro No:  |

**Report Citations**


**Messenia**  Methone II  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features Notes</td>
<td>Possible basilica only recently excavated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Architecture: | N/A |
| Furnishings: | architectural sculpture |
| Laskaris No: | Vemi No: | Jakob No: |
| Mosaics: | |
| Mosaic Citations: | Assimak-Atz No:  | Spiro No: |

**Report Citations**

Ergo UPPO 1 (1997), 163. 

| Plans: | |
| Figures: | |
| Epig. Cat: | |
**Phocis**  Amphissa -- **Baptistery**

**Location**  North of the Metropolitan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 38</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:**  390 - 410  Main baptistery floor appears to date from the end of the 4th to the beginning of the 5th century according to Ass.-Atz. Small conchs on the outside of the Bapt. Font are filled with mosaics possibly dating to the 6th century.

**Architecture:**  baptistery,

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**  baptistery,


**Report Citations**

P. Themeli, AAA 10 (1977), 242-250.
G. Touchais, BCH 103 (1979), 575.
A. Smpyraki-Kalatzi, AD 34 (1979), A’ 104.
BZ 73 (1980), 503, 506.

---

**Phocis**  Amphissa -- **Basilica**

**Location**  On Kontou St. and Basilopoulou.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 39</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:**  400 - 460

**Architecture:**  annex,

**Furnishings:**  architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No: 30</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**  nave, aisles, other,

**Mosaic Citations:**  Assimak-Atz No: 126  Spiro No: J-P. Sodini, BullAIEMA 8 (1980), 165.

**Report Citations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Phocis</strong></th>
<th>Arachova</th>
<th><em>Basilica?</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Near the road to Delphi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jakob No:</strong></td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Not much published.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Report Citations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Features Notes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Phocis</strong></th>
<th>Chrisso</th>
<th><em>Basilica?</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Near the Delphi to Chrysso road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jakob No:</strong></td>
<td>Spiro No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features Notes:</strong></td>
<td>Part of an apse from a possible Early Christian basilica.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Report Citations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Features Notes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Phocis

**Location** At the church of Ay. Basieius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: p. 194 n. 264

**Features Notes**

Report Citations


---

### Phocis

**Location** Two hundred meters to the E of the Museum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. George</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500-599  
The date of this church is suggested by the discovery of mosaic fragments and a column capital nearby.

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 130

**Spiro No.:** 84

**Spiro, 251-254**

**Features Notes**

Report Citations

- M. P. Foucart, Archives des missions scientifiques 2, 10 (1865), 105ff.
- E. Dyggve, CA, 3 (1948), 15-16.
- G. Daux, BCH 81 (1957), 707.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (1976), 144.

Little of this building remains except some fragments of mosaic and a column capital found nearby. The identification of this building as a church of St. George is dubious and its ecclesiastical function is in no way assured.
Phocis

**Delphi -- Cemetery**

**Basilica**

**Location** In Kastri under the Hotel Apollo which is no longer there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 500–599

Varalis dates this to the first half of the 6th century.

**Architecture:** narthex,  

**Features:** door, raised stylobates,  

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpure, chancel screen,  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Laskaris Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 129  

Spiro No.: 82-83  

**Features Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>figs. 36-43</td>
<td>40-41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Report Citations**

G. Daux, BCH 82 (1958), 239.  
P. Lazaridis, AD 16 (1960), B’1 167.  
G. Daux, BCH 84 (1960), 752-756.  
J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 144.  
V. Deroche, ACIAC 11.3 (1989), 2713-2715.  
P. Petridis, BCH 121 (1997), 684.

---

**Phocis**

**Delphi -- Gymnasion**

**Basilica?**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 540–560

**Architecture:** N/A  

**Features:** waterworks,  

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpure,  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Laskaris Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  

Spiro No.:  

**Features Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Report Citations**

P. Foucart, Memoire sur les ruines et l'histoire de Delphes, (Paris 1867), 18.  
Th. Homolle, BCH 23 (1899), 580.  
J. Jannoray, Fouilles de Delphes II, Le gymnase (1953), 15-16.  
V. Deroche, ACIAC 11.3 (1989), 2715-2717.  
P. Petridis, BCH 121 (1997), 682.

---

Very little preserved from this church, but Deroche (2715) reconstructs a brief description of it from notebooks and earlier excavators off-hand mentions. It appears to have had waterworks of some kind in the atrium and a possible phiale in the narthex (cf. Kiato).
### Phocis

**Location**: Delphi -- North of Temple of Apollo  

**Date**: 460–499  

Varalis dates it to the final third of the 5th century.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No</th>
<th>Varalis No</th>
<th>Avramea No</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A  

**Furnishings**: N/A  

**Features**: N/A  

**Laskaris No**:  

**Vemi No**:  

**Jakob No**:  

**Mosaics**:  

**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No:  

**Spiro No**:  

---  

**Report Citations**  

E. Goffinet, BCH 86 (1962), 256.  

V. Deroche, ACIAC 11.3 (1989), 2717-2718.  

### Phocis

**Location**: Delphi -- Roman Agora  

**Date**: 'EC'  

Speculation that a wall there is from an EC basilica in the Roman agora.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No</th>
<th>Varalis No</th>
<th>Avramea No</th>
<th>Alt. Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture**: N/A  

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,  

**Features**: N/A  

**Laskaris No**:  

**Vemi No**:  

**Jakob No**:  

**Mosaics**:  

**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No:  

**Spiro No**:  

---  

**Report Citations**  


Speculation that a wall there is from an EC basilica in the Roman agora.
### Phocis

**Location:** Near the temple of Apollo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>'EC'</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 154.

---

### Phocis

**Location:** Near the ruins of a church of Theotokou.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>'EC'</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:**

- architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- Primarily the inscription.
- J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 154.
### Phocis — Elateia — Temple of Athena

**Location:** Among the ruins of a temple of Athena.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No.</th>
<th>Varalis No.: 94</th>
<th>Avramea No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>550 699</td>
<td>Late probably.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No.</th>
<th>Vemi No.:</th>
<th>Jakob No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- Excavated very early.

---

### Phocis — Itea

**Location:** On the northeastern hill overlooking the town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No.</th>
<th>Varalis No.: 118</th>
<th>Avramea No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Furnishings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No.</th>
<th>Vemi No.:</th>
<th>Jakob No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**


**Features Notes**

- Fragments of architectural sculpture.
### Phocis

**Ita -- outside the town**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Basilica?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 119</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>architectural sculpture,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Mastrokostas, 11th Symposio XAE (1991), 67.</td>
<td>Some coins found in vicinity and fragments of wall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phocis

**Kallion -- Basilica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>'EC'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 123</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Features:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No: 117</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaics:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.Kh. Petrakos, AD 27 (1972), 383.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bakhuizen, AD 32 (1977), 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phocis Kastelli

**Location**: Near the ancient site of Boios in Phocis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 128</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date**: 'EC'

**Architecture**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics**: fragment,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- P.A. Tsakaris, "La Doride," Platon 12 (1960), 249.
- P.A. Tsakaris, I Archaia Doris, (Athena 1970), 44.

**Features Notes**

- Fragments of now destroyed mosaics possibly from an EC church.

### Phocis Kirra

**Location**: Three aisled basilica with east apse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 0</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date**: 525 599

- Second half of 5th century according to the dating based on coins, lamps, and other pottery.
- Assimakopoulou-Atzaka suggested a date, based on mosaic style, in the second quarter of the 5th century.

**Architecture**: narthex, baptistery,

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics**: nave, fragment,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

- A. Kyriakopoulou, AD 38 (1983), B'1 74-75.

**Features Notes**

- Partially published. Possible baptistery to the north.
- Possible narthex.
### Phocis

**Lilaia**

**Location**: Source of the Kiphissou

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 'EC'

**Architecture**: N/A

**Features**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics**:

**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No:  

**Spiro No.:**

**Report Citations**

- P. Lazaridis, *AD* 21 (1966), B'1, 245.
- Not much preserved.

---

### Phocis

**Lilaia -- Panayia**

**Location**: Church of the Panag

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**: 500 - 699

**Architecture**: N/A

**Features**: N/A

**Furnishings**: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics**:

**Mosaic Citations**: Assimak-Atz No:  

**Spiro No.:**

**Report Citations**

### Phocis

**Malandrino**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No: 174</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC’ Destroyed without adequate documentation.

**Architecture:** atrium, baptistery,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** baptistery, atrium,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 138, Spiro No.: 80

**Features Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics on a possible atrium and baptistery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

G. Karo, AA 48 (1933), 217-218.


N.A. Bees, Zum Verbum kenteim, Praktika tes Christianikes archaeologikes hetaireias 4, (1936-38), 52.

J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 211.


---

### Phocis

**Mariolata**

**Location**

In the small village below the ancient Acropolis of Boion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 16</th>
<th>Varalis No: 175</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 450 599 Little datable evidence for this church. The interlace border suggests to Spiro a terminus post quem for the mid 5th c. The architectural finds suggest a 6th c. date.

**Architecture:** narthex, annex,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
<th>Plans:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** nave,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 139, Spiro No.: 21

Sodini 712, n. 21

Spiro, 257-259 n. 87.

**Features Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are considerable annexes to the N and S of this church. Distinctive features include the colonade between the aisles and the nave not resting on stylobates and a transept of sorts comprising the E end of the N and S aisles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

P. Lazaridis, AD 18 (1963), 132. Pl. 169.

P. Lazaridis, AD 19 (1964), 237ff, plan 1, pl. 282-283.


J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 137.

D. Pallas, FR 118 (1979), 131.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phocis Nea Koukoura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>bema/apse,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Features Notes | synthronon, tombs, |

**Report Citations**

E. Chalkia, AD 43 (1988), B'1 96-97.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phocis Viniani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Citations**

### Phthiotidis  Achinos -- Perivolaki

**Basilica**

**Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

**Features Notes**

- **Architecture:** N/A
- **Features:** N/A
- **Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,
- **Mosaics:** fragment,
- **Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 110, Spiro No.: 165.
- **Laskaris No:**
- **Vemi No:**
- **Jakob No:**

#### Report Citations

- P. Lazaridis, AD 16 (1960) 162ff.pl. 147c,d.
- P. Lazaridis, AD 25 (1970), B'1 268.

### Phthiotidis  Ay. Constantinos

**Basilica**

**Location** Near church of St. Constantine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 480 - 499

**Features Notes**

- **Architecture:** N/A
- **Features:** N/A
- **Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,
- **Mosaics:** fragment,
- **Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 106, Spiro No.: 93.
- **Laskaris No:**
- **Vemi No:**
- **Jakob No:**

#### Report Citations

- N. Pharaklas, B. Philipppake, S. Symenoglou, AD 22 (1967), B'1246.
- P. Lazarides, AD 22 (1967), B'1 292-293.
### Phthiotidis - Daphnousia

**Basilica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Constantine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 390-420 Possibly the end of the fourth to the beginning of the fifth century.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex,

**Features:** door, raised stylobates, raised bema,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:** nave, bema/apse, other,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 111 Spiro No: 1


**Report Citations**

- A.K. Orlandos, Byzantion 5 (1929/1930), 207, 214, 219, 223-228
- G.Soutiriou, Basilikai Ellados, 208
- A. K. Orlandos, AD 12 (1929), 64
- Y. Bequignon, BCH 53 (1929) Chron. 505
- D. Evangeliades, AD 13 (1930/31), 22
- BZ 31 (1931) 197-198
- J. Koder and Fr. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 260.

**Features Notes**

Basilica with pronounced transept. Likely atrium to the west possibly with flanking rooms. Likely a single narthex with the remains of a atrium to the west.

| Plans: 53 | Figures: | Epig. Cat.: 49 |
### Phthiotidis  Halai

**Three aisled basilica with east apse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phthiotidis  Halai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Varalis No: 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avramea No:</strong></td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>400 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>narthex,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>raised stylobates, tombs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No: Jakob No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td>bema/apse,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th>Varalis No: 30a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pallas No:</strong></td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. Name:</strong></td>
<td>Basilica A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings:</strong></td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laskaris No:</strong></td>
<td>Vemi No: Jakob No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mosaic Citations:</strong></td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Citations</strong></td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 26 (1971), 286.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Sotiriou, AE (1929), 186 f., fig. 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phthiotidis  Hypati -- B

Location  On the corner of the outside wall of the church of Hag. Nikolaos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No: 30b</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Basilica B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date: 490 524  Spiro dates it to the end of the 5th or the beginning of 6th century.  Asimakopoulo-Atzaka dates it to the first quarter of the 6th century.

Architecture: N/A  Features: N/A

Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mosaics: other,

Mosaic Citations:  Assimak-Atz No: 120  Spiro No.: 101

Sodini, 716, n. 32 and 745.

Report Citations

BCH 45 (1921), 524.
P. Lazaridis, AD 16 (1960), 165ff., pl. 148b
BZ 56 (1963), 445.
M. Michaelidis, AD 26 (1971), B1, 17.
M. Michaelidis, AD 28 (1973), B1, 17.
P. Lazaridis, AD 28 (1973), B1, 321-322.
Spieser, La christianization, 317.
M. Georgopoulou, AAA 13 (1980), 149.

Features Notes

Location

35

Varalis No: Avramea No:

Spiro No.:

Assimak-Atz No:

Alt. Name:

Architecture: N/A  Features: tombs,

Furnishings: architectural sculpture,

Laskaris No: 35  Vemi No:  Jakob No:  

Plans:  Figures:  Epig. Cat.:  

Mosaics:

Mosaic Citations: Assimak-Atz No:

Spiro No.:

Report Citations

P. Lazaridis, AD 23 (1968), 252 pl. 195a-b.
P. Lazaridis, AD 26 (1971), 286.
### Phthiotidis (Lamia) Basilica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Varalis No: 29</th>
<th>Pallas No: 29</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name: Basilica of the Hagio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Mosaics:** fragment,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 113  
Assimakopoulo-Atzaka, 176-178, n. 113

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M. Michaelides, AD 26 (1971), B'1, 17  
Th. Spyropoulos, AD 26 (1971), 229-230  
P. Lazarides, AD 26 (1971), 286  
Papanagiotou, Mnemeia Phthiotidos, 122-124.  

---

### Phthiotidis (Rengi) Basilica?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Varalis No: 238</th>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Mosaics:** fragment,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 113  
Assimakopoulo-Atzaka, 176-178, n. 113

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
<th>Features Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P. Pantos AD 45 (1990), B'1 180.  
Architectural fragments and bits of mosaic |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Report Citations

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 113  
Assimakopoulo-Atzaka, 176-178, n. 113
### Phthiotidis

**Thavmakos**

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** N/A  
**Mosaics:** nave,  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: 112  
**Spiro No.:**  

**Report Citations**

P. Lazaridis, AD 28 (1973), B1 325.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fragments of architecture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Salamis

**Mouliou-Katsibilas**

**Basilica?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A  
**Features:** N/A  
**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture,  
**Laskaris No:**  
**Vemi No:**  
**Jakob No:**  
**Plans:**  
**Figures:**  
**Epig. Cat.:**

**Mosaics:**  
**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  
**Spiro No.:**  

**Report Citations**

D. Pallas, PAE (1941-1944), 24-26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Salamis

**Location**: At Perani and to the south of the church.

**Pallas No**: Addenda: Varalis No: 241

**Avramea No**: Alt. Name:

**Date**: 'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lazaridis, AD 27 (1972), B'1 191.</td>
<td>Architectural fragments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Salamis

**Location**: 

**Pallas No**: Varalis No: 242

**Avramea No**: Alt. Name:

**Date**: 'EC'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings:</td>
<td>architectural sculpture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics:</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Pallas, AE (1950-1951), 172-175.</td>
<td>Found fragments of architecture near a large barrel vaulted tomb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Mastrokostas, AE (1956), 34.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Koder and F. Hild, TIB 1 (Vienna 1976), 254.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Thessaly

**Location**

Found far from the center of the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>33b</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Cemetery basilica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 380–399

Dated by coins.

**Architecture:**

- narthex,
- basilica

**Features:**

raised stylobates, tombs,

**Furnishings:**

architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:** 5

**Vemi No:**

**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:**

bema/apse,

**Mosaic Citations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
<th>139-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

Theocharis, AD 18 (1963), B1 139-140.

Milojicic, AD 28 (1973), B2342

Marzoff, Demetrias I, 15

G. Hourmouziadis, Ancient Magnesia. (Athens 1982), 150.


### Thessaly

**Location**

**Date:** 400–599

Dated through careful stratigraphic excavation. 5 phases have been identified ranging from the early 5th to the late 6th with the gradual expansion of the church.

**Architecture:**

atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery,

**Features:**

door, raised stylobates, synthonon, raised

**Furnishings:**

architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

**Laskaris No:** 40

**Vemi No:**

**Jakob No:**

**Mosaics:**

nave, narthex, aisles, baptistery, atrium, other,

**Mosaic Citations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No.:</th>
<th>130-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iolkos</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volos</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near the church of the Virgin.</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
<td>narthex, annex, door, raised stylobates, architectural sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Giannopoulos, EEBS 8 (1931), 110-131.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Giannopoulos, EEBS 12 (1936), 401-410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Theocharis, AD 18 (1963), 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Deilaki, AD 29 (1973-74), B2 546-547.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Hourmouziadis, Ancient Magnesia. (Athens 1982), 151-152.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JHS (1906), 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA 13 (1906/7), 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Sotiriou, basiliki, 182.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.K. Orlandos, Basiliki, 205, 400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Hourmouziadis, Ancient Magnesia. (Athens 1982), 152.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Kourkoutidou, AD 23 (1968), 275.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Thessaly

**Mazi Malesinas**

*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No: 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architectures:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:** fragment,

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: |

### Report Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Thessaly

**Milina**

*Basilica?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pallas No:</td>
<td>Varalis No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avramea No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architectures:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furnishings:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No: |

### Report Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features Notes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Giannopoulos, Magnesia, 14-47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Hourmouziadis, Ancient Magnesia. (Athens 1982), 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments of EC architecture and sculpture around a later church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nea Anchialos -- A

**Location** Near the center of the city of Christian Thebes

**Pallas No:** 32A  **Varalis No:**  **Avramea No:**  **Alt. Name:** St. Demetrios

**Date:** 450 - 500

This building has been dated from the middle of the 5th c., by Soteriou -- on the basis of the brick work, plan, and style of sculpture; by Krautheimer to 470 on the basis of parallels with the Acheiropoietos church in Thessa. and the Studios church in Const.; Vemi dates the capitals of the columns variously from the start of the 6th c. to the second part of the 6th c.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery  **Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen

**Mosaics:** aisles, other

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.: 102-10

**Features Notes**
The most distinctive feature of this church is the large and ornate atrium. Otherwise it is a rather typical basilica without a synthronon. Door in the S wall of the S aisle. The chancel projects into the nave and is entered through a prothuron. The ambo is found to the S of the axis of the nave. Fountain in the atrium. Some controversy over the role of the room to the north of the atrium: the excavator called it a sacristy whereas Krautheimer called it the Diakonikon or prothesis. A room with numerous fragments of storage vessels stands along the south wall of the church.

**Report Citations**
G. de Jerphanion, Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di archeologie, serie 3, memorie 3 (1932-33), 112-122.
Krautheimer, 121-123.
Huxley, Lac. Spoud. 3 (1977), 100.
**Thessaly**  Nea Anchialos -- B

**Location**  Around 200m to the E of Basilica A. Notable for the road running to its north which forced the unusual s

**Pallas No:** 32C  **Varalis No:**  **Avramea No:**  **Alt. Name:** Bishop Elpidios

**Date:**  450-499  Perhaps dating to the same time as Basilica A. The mosaic in the atrium repaired by the humble deacon Stephanos and bishop Elpidios is probably later perhaps early 6th century (associated with repairs).

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex, baptistery,  **Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon,  **Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:**

**Mosaic Citations:** Assimak-Atz No:  **Spiro No:**

**Report Citations**

G. Soteriou PAE (1929)
P. Lazarides, PAE (1960) 60-63
P. Lazarides, PAE (1972), 39.
G. Hourmouziadis, Ancient Magnesia. (Athens 1982), 133.

**Features Notes**

From the available plan the and reconstructed chancel area in Orlandos it is clear that the chancel area was quite elaborate. He proposes intercolumnations at least as far W as the chancel runs into the nave. Note the proposed placement of the baptistery to the W of the atrium. Also has a porch with an entrance into the S wall of the S aisle. Also the monumental propylae giving entry into the atrium faces S. To the south of the atrium is a room identified as a sacristy with a hearth and storage area, presumably serving as a place for food preparation for the poor (see Praktika 1929, 67).

**Plans:** 58  **Figures:**  **Epig. Cat.:** 55
**Thessaly** Nea Anchialos -- center

**Basilica**

**Location** Near center of modern Nea Anchialos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 400 499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architecture:** N/A

**Features:** N/A

**Furnishings:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laskaris No:</th>
<th>Vemi No:</th>
<th>Jakob No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mosaics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mosaic Citations:</th>
<th>Assimak-Atz No:</th>
<th>Spiro No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans:</th>
<th>Figures:</th>
<th>Epig. Cat:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report Citations**

G. Hourmouziadis, Ancient Magnesia. (Athens 1982), 144.
**Thessaly**  Nea Anchialos -- close to sea.

**Location**  Excavated near the sea near a wine factory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- close to sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>'EC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskaris No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vemi No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakob No:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaics</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosaic Citations</td>
<td>Assimak-Atz No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiro No.:</td>
<td>Epig. Cat.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Citations</td>
<td>Features Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Theocharis, AD 17 (1961-62), 179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Hourmouziadis, Ancient Magnesia. (Athens 1982), 144.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thessaly  Nea Anchialos -- D

**Location**  About 400 meters outside the city wall, associated with an EC cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>32D</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
<th>Cemetery church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date:** 450-499

This date contradicts that of Sotiriou who wanted to date the building to the 7th c. on the basis of the sculpture and mosaics, and the flanking chambers for tombs on the nave. Soldini in his catalogue emends the date to the 5th c. and this date is accepted by Spiro. Laskaris accepts the 5th or 6th century date, and noted Sotiriou's terminus ante quem seems to be supported by the fact that two or three burial chambers seem unused.

**Architecture:** atrium, narthex, annex,

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, chancel screen, ambo,

**Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon, water feature

**Mosaic Citations:** Spiro, 352-366.

**Features Notes**

This church is considered the cemetery church for the Christian of Thebes. It is surrounded by numerous tombs. The chancel projects into the nave and is separated by a chancel screen. Orlandos argued that the anneces to the N and S of the narthex served as a prothesis and diakonikon respectively (see DCAH 1964-5). It has an unusual transept-like feature composed of two burial chambers projecting from the north and south aisles with access to them through a colonnaded door.
Nea Anchialos -- G

**Date:** 480-610

This building has a rather complex construction history including a major restoration sometime in the early 6th c. Spiro et al. dates the building based on the style of the mosaic pavements. Apparently the excavation reports on this building do little to shed light on the chronological relationships between the various layers, as many as 5. Famous Nika with a reference to the Greens inscription has sometimes associated the date of this building to the period after the Nika Revolt 532.

**Architecture:** atrium, double narthex, annex, baptistery, **Features:** tribelon, raised stylobates, synthronon, rais

**Furnishings:** architectural sculpture, parapet screens, chancel screen,

**Mosaics:** aisles,

**Mosaic Citations:**

| Spiro No. | 105-11 |

**Features Notes**

The various construction phases makes this building hard to understand. It is longer than Basilica A or B. It seems likely that the walls of the building were decorated with mosaics. Like Basilica A and B the chancel projects into the nave and is entered through a prothraon. It has two nathexes and a series of buildings to the S communicate with the main church via these rooms. Lazarides asserts that this basilica replaced an earlier 4th century basilica (Lazarides, PAE 1978).
### Thessaly

**Nea Anchialos -- Martyrios**

*Three aisled basilica with east apse*

#### Location

Outside the city walls at intersection of Stavridi and Zlatani.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basilica of Martyrius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 431

**Dated by the inscription to Martyrius found on the mosaic in the narthex.**

#### Architecture:

- narthex,

#### Features:

- door, raised stylobates, synthronon, tombs,

#### Furnishings:

- architectural sculpture, chancel screen,

#### Mosaics:

- narthex, aisles, bema/apse,

**Mosaic Citations:**

- P. Lazaridis, PAE 1978, 34-43.

**Features Notes**

- Named from an inscription in a chancel screen panel. Some annexes to the north of the narthex, perhaps Prothesis or diakonikon, perhaps storage. And perhaps another room off the north of the church.

#### Report Citations

- P. Lazaridis, PAE 1978, 34-43.

---

### Thessaly

**Olizon**

*Basilica?*

#### Location

Valtoudi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pallas No:</th>
<th>Varalis No:</th>
<th>Avramea No:</th>
<th>Alt. Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 'EC'

#### Architecture:

- N/A

**Features:**

- N/A

#### Furnishings:

- N/A

#### Mosaics:

- N/A

**Mosaic Citations:**

- Assimak-Atz No: Spiro No.:

**Features Notes**

- Named from an inscription in a chancel screen panel. Some annexes to the north of the narthex, perhaps Prothesis or diakonikon, perhaps storage. And perhaps another room off the north of the church.

#### Report Citations

- N. Giannopoulos, Magnesia, 17.
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Thessaly  Theotokou  Three aisled basilica with east apse

Location  Near later church of the Virgin.

Date:  'EC'  Coin found "in the church" of Justin II and Sophia, struck during the 6th year of their reign (570-571). Spiro dates the mosaic to the first decades of the sixth century.

Architecture:  atrium, double narthex, annex,  Features:  door, raised stylobates, synthronon, raised

Furnishings:  architectural scultpure, chancel screen,

Mosaics:  nave, narthex, aisles, atrium,

Mosaic Citations:  Assimak-Atz No:  Spiro No.: 123-12

Features Notes  Standard three aisle basilica, but with a rather exceptional west end with a narrow atrium like proch, an exo-narthex and an eso-narthex. Additional chambers are arrayed to the north and west of the church which might have liturgical functions, but it is unclear. Chancel screen fragments probably later (Soteriou 1929, 183).
Regions with Sites

**Acarnania**
- Island of Kephalos in Ambraciot Gulf -- A
- Island of Kephalos in Ambraciot Gulf -- B
- Mytikas
- Ochthia
- Vonitsa -- Drymos
- Vonitsa -- Kelephi
- Vonitsa -- Palioklissi

**Achaia**
- Aigion
- Ano Psophida
- Chryssokelaria Pylias
- Dyme
- Gourzoumiza
- Kato Achaia
- Kato Roitika
- Kleitoria
- Leontion
- Patras -- Ay. Andreas
- Patras -- Charadros
- Patras -- Od. I. Vlachou
- Patras -- Od. Kanakari
- Patras -- Od. Kanakari II
- Patras -- Od. Votsi
- Platavobrysi
- Skioessa Bozaitikon
- Tritaia

**Aetolia**
- Astakos
- Ay. Georgios
- Gavroimni
- Kainorio -- II
- Kainourio -- I
- Karpension
- Kato Basiliki
- Magali Chora or Zapanti
- Mastron
- Mesolongi
- Mesolongi -- Ay. Basilieus
- New Pleuron
- Paradeision
- Paravola

**Arcadia**
- Astros Kynourias
- Chotoussa
- Gortys -- near 12thc. Chapel of Ay. Andreas
- Kato Doliaina
- Kato Meligious
- Lepenou
- Lycosoura
- Mantinea -- 1
- Mantinea -- 2
- Megalopolis
- Orchomenos
- Palladion -- Ay. Christophoros
- Palladion -- Ay. Georgios
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phalaisiai</td>
<td>Nea Tiryns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>Prosymna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- agora</td>
<td>Spetses -- Pityoussa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- Alea</td>
<td>Spetses -- Vrousti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- theater</td>
<td>Tiryns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- Thyrso</td>
<td>Troezeke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelopoussa -- Ay. Ioannis</td>
<td>Troezeke -- Lakkomata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelopoussa -- Panayia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vourvoura</td>
<td>Aigosthena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alimos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argolid</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Epidauros -- Ay. Paraskevi</td>
<td>Anabysos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Epidauros -- Gephyraki</td>
<td>Athens -- Asclepieion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Epidauros -- Lalioteika</td>
<td>Athens -- Ay. Loukas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Alika</td>
<td>Athens -- Ay. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Aspis</td>
<td>Athens -- Byronas 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Bath A</td>
<td>Athens -- Church of Ay. Irene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Chatze</td>
<td>Athens -- Erechthion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Kephelari</td>
<td>Athens -- Hephaisteion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Messenias-Arkadias</td>
<td>Athens -- Ilissos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Parados Danou and G. Seferis</td>
<td>Athens -- Library of Hadrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Parodos Danaou.</td>
<td>Athens -- Lykabetos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Parodos Theatrou</td>
<td>Athens -- Mosque near Roman Agora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Paliopygra</td>
<td>Athens -- National Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiodauros</td>
<td>Athens -- Od. Ay. Andreou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiodauros -- Apollo Maleatas</td>
<td>Athens -- Od. Sophroniskou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiodauros -- chapel</td>
<td>Athens -- Olympeion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiodauros -- North of the Asklepeion</td>
<td>Athens -- Panayia in Petra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermione</td>
<td>Athens -- Parthenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermione -- Temple church</td>
<td>Athens -- Temple of Rhea and Chronos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyrkeia</td>
<td>Athens -- Theater of Dionysos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana -- Ay. Nicholas</td>
<td>Aulona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana -- Megalochori</td>
<td>Ay. Stephanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana -- Palaiokastro</td>
<td>Brauron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana -- Palaiokastro II</td>
<td>Eleftherai -- 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Eleftherai -- 2
Eleusis -- Ay. Zacharias
Eleusis -- Telestirion
Glyphada
Kaisariani
Kalyvia Kouvara -- Ay. Georgios
Kalyvia Kouvara -- Taxiarchs
Kouvaras
Laurion
Lavreotic Olympus
Liopessi -- Ay. Athanasios
Liopessi -- Ay. Paraskevi
Loutsa
Marathon
Markopoulo
Megara
Peiraias
Pikermi
Porto Rafe
Rafina
Skala Oropou
Spata
Stamatas -- Ay. Athanasios
Stamatas -- Ay. Paraskevi
Stavros Geraka
Trachones

**Boeotia**

Anthedon
Antikyra
Chaironea
Distomo
Larimna
Leivadia
Platanaki

**Chios**

Emporio

**Elis**

Anilion
Elis
Kato Samiko
Olena
Olympia
Phigalia
Philiatra
Pyrgos
Skyllountia (kokkini Ekklassia)

**Epirus**

Doliana
Nikopolis -- A
Nikopolis -- B
Nikopolis -- D
Nikopolis -- E
Nikopolis -- G
Nikopolis -- ST
Strouni

**Euboea**
Amarythos
Ano Vatheia
Aulonari
Aulonari -- Itea
Ay. Anna
Chalkis
Eretria
Euboean Limnes
Gerakiou
Gymno Chalkidas
Karystos
Oreoi Euboeas
Phylla
Pissonas
Politika
Psachna -- I
Psachna -- II
Robies -- Paliochori
Vatontas

Eurytania
Klapsi
Klepa

Korinthia
Alkyonides
Almyri
Bozikas -- near Ay. Georgios.
Chiliomodi
Kenchreai
Kiato
Kleonai
Korinth -- West of Amphitheater
Korinth -- Acrokorinth
Korinth -- Asclepeion
Korinth -- east of Agora

Korinth -- Kodratos Basilica
Korinth -- Kraneion
Korinth -- near Ay. Paraskevi
Korinth -- Skoutelas
Korinth -- Temple Hill
Korinthia Limnes
Krommyon
Lechaion -- near Roman Harbor
Lechaion -- on hill of Ay. Gerasimos
Lechaion -- port
Nemea -- Evangelista Hill
Nemea -- Sanctuary
Sikyon -- Ay. Dimitrios
Sikyon -- near Vassiliki
Sikyon -- village of Vasiliko
Sophikon
Zougra -- Pellene
Zougra -- Senterina

Laconia
Alyka
Apidea
Boi'ai-Neapolis
Gerakas -- Ay. Pavlos
Gerakas -- Zarax
Gerakas -- Zarax Acropolis
Geraki -- Ay. Sozon
Geraki -- Kastro
Geraki -- Krini
Gytheion -- Basilica A
Gytheion -- Basilica B
Gytheion -- town
Kainepolis-Kyparissos -- Ay. Andrea
Kainepolis-Kyparissos -- Ay. Petros
Kainepolis-Kyparissos -- Monastiri
Koniditsa
Ktirakia
Molaoi -- I
Molaoi -- II
Molaoi -- III
Monemvasia
Oitylo
Phoinikion (Krissa)
Sparta I
Sparta II
Sparta III
Sparta IV
Talanata
Tigani
Valtaki

Locris
Larymna
Naupaktos
Naupaktos -- Ay. Stephanos
Naupaktos -- Ovriolakkas

Messenia
Alagonia
Chryssokelaria
Korone
Korone -- Loggas
Messene -- Odeion
Messene -- Theater
Methone I
Methone II

Phocis
Amphissa -- Baptistery
Amphissa -- Basilica
Arachova
Chrisso

Delphi -- Ay. Basileius
Delphi -- Ay. Georgios
Delphi -- Cemetery
Delphi -- Gymnasium
Delphi -- North of Temple of Apollo
Delphi -- Roman Agora
Delphi -- Temple of Apollo Church
Elateia -- Acropolis
Elateia -- Temple of Athena
Itea
Itea -- outside the town
Kallion -- Basilica
Kallion -- Christian Building
Kastelli
Kirra
Lilaia
Lilaia -- Panayia
Malandrino
Mariolata
Nea Koukoura
Viniani

Phthiotidis
Achinos -- Perivolaki
Ay. Constantinos
Daphnousia
Halai
Hypati -- A
Hypati -- B
Hypati -- Loutra
Lamia
Rengi
Thavmakos

Salamis
Moulkiou-Katsibilas
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Perani -- Ay. Ioannos
Perani -- Panayia

Thessaly
Demetrias B
Demetrias A
Iolkos
Lai
Mazi Malesinas
Milina
Nea Anchialos -- A
Nea Anchialos -- B
Nea Anchialos -- center
Nea Anchialos -- close to sea.
Nea Anchialos -- D
Nea Anchialos -- G
Nea Anchialos -- Martyrios
Olizon
Theotokou
### Sites and Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achinos -- Perivolaki</td>
<td>Phthiotidis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigosthena</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alagonia</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alimos</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkyonides</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almyri</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyka</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarythos</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphissa -- Baptistry</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphissa -- Basilica</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anabyssos</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anilion</td>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Epidauros -- Ay. Paraskevi</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Epidauros -- Gephyraki</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Epidauros -- Lalioteika</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Psophida</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ano Vatheia</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthedon</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikyra</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apidea</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachova</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Alika</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Aspis</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- bath A</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Chatze</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Kephelari</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Messenias-Arkadias</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Parodos Danou and G. Seferis</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Parodos Danaou.</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Od. Parodos Theatrou</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos -- Paliopygra</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astakos</td>
<td>Aetolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astros Kynourias</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Asclepieion</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Ay. Loukas</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Ay. Thomas</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Byronas 2</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Church of Ay. Irene</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Erehthion</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Hephisteion</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Ilissos</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Library of Hadrian</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Lykabettos</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Mosque near Roman Agora</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- National Garden</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Od. Ay. Andreou</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Od. O. Sophroniskou</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Olympeion</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Panayia in Petra</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Parthenon</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Temple of Rhea and Chronos</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Theater of Dionysos</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Aulona</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Itea</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Ay. Anna</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Ay. Constantinos</td>
<td>Phthiotidis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Ay. Georgios</td>
<td>Aetolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Ay. Stephanos</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Boiai-Neapolis</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Brauron</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Chaironea</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Chalkis</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigion -- Chilionodi</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chora Aegina</td>
<td>Aegina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chotoussa Arcadia</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrisso Phocis</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chryssokelaria Messenia Glyphada</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chryssokelaria Pylias Achaia</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi -- Ay. Georgios Cemetery</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi -- North of Temple of Apollo</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi -- Temple of Apollo Church</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elateia -- Acropolis Phocis</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleftherai -- 1 Attica</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleftherai -- 2 Attica</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleus -- Ay. Zacharias Attica</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleus -- Telestirion Attica</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elis Kainorio -- II Aetolia</td>
<td>Chios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporio Kaisariani</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros -- Apollo Maleatas Argolid</td>
<td>Kallion -- Basilica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros -- chapel Argolid Kallion -- Christian Building Phocis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros -- North of the Asklepeion Argolid</td>
<td>Kalyvia Kouvara -- Ay. Georgios Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eretrea Euboea</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboean Limnes Karpension</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavrolimni Aetolia</td>
<td>Aetolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerakas -- Zarax Kastelli</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerakas -- Zarax Kato Basiliki</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraki -- Ay. Sozon Kato Doli</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato Meligous</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato Roitika</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato Samiko</td>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenchreai</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiato</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirra</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klapsi</td>
<td>Eurytania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleitoria</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleonai</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klepa</td>
<td>Eurytania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koniditsa</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- West of Amphitheater</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- Acrokorinth</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- Asclepeion</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- east of Agora</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- Kodratos Basilica</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- Kraneion</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- near Ay. Paraskevi</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- Skoutelas</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinth -- Temple Hill</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinthia Limnes</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korone</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korone -- Loggas</td>
<td>Messenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kouvaras</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krommyon</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ktirakia</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lai</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamia</td>
<td>Phthiotidis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larinna</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larymnna</td>
<td>Locris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurion</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavreotic Olympus</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechaion -- near Roman Harbor</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechaion -- on hill of Ay. Gerasimos</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechaion -- port</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leivadia</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontion</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naupaktos -- Ay. Stephanos</td>
<td>Locris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naupaktos -- Ovriolakkas</td>
<td>Locris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- A</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- B</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- center</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- close to sea.</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- D</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- G</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Anchialos -- Martyrios</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Koukoura</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Tiryns</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemea -- Evangelista Hill</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemea -- Sanctuary</td>
<td>Korinthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Pleuron</td>
<td>Aetolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis -- A</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis -- B</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis -- D</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis -- E</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis -- G</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis -- ST</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochthia</td>
<td>Acarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oitylo</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olena</td>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olizon</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>Elis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchomenos</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreoi Euboeas</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladion -- Ay. Christophoros</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladion -- Ay. Georgios</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradeision</td>
<td>Aetolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paravola</td>
<td>Aetolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras -- Ay. Andreas</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras -- Charadros</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras -- Od. I. Vlachou</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras -- Od. Kanakari</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras -- Od. Kanakari II</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patras -- Od. Votsi</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamatas -- Ay. Athanasios</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamatas -- Ay. Paraskevi</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavros Geraka</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strouni</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talanata</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanagra</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanagra -- Ag. Thomas</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- agora</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- Alea</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- theater</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea -- Thyrsos</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thavmakos</td>
<td>Phthiotidis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes -- Gouma</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes -- New Sphageia</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes -- Od. Kevtos</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes -- Od. Pindarou</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelopoussa -- Ay. Ioannis</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelopoussa -- Panayia</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theotokou</td>
<td>Thessaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thespiai</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thisbi</td>
<td>Boeotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigani</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachones</td>
<td>Attica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritaia</td>
<td>Achaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troezene</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troezene -- Lakkomata</td>
<td>Argolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valtaki</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardia</td>
<td>Aegina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatontas</td>
<td>Euboea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viniani</td>
<td>Phocis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonitsa -- Drymos</td>
<td>Acarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonitsa -- Kelephi</td>
<td>Acarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonitsa -- Palioklissi</td>
<td>Acarnania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vourvoura</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>