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THE SILVER HOARD AT THE BADISCHES LANDESMUSEUM KARLSRUHE

In 1993, the Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe purchased a small hoard of partly damaged early Byzantine silver objects. The original findspot and context of the treasure is unknown but it may be identical with some silver artefacts discovered in the Biqā valley in Lebanon in 1983. The ensemble, which obviously belonged to a church, consists of a censer, a cross, three chalices and a spoon. The silver content of the objects accounts for 93-95%. The total weight of the treasure adds up to 1644.8 g, i.e. quite precisely five Roman pounds that correlate with a monetary value of 20 solidi. The composition of the hoard is not unusual as comparable hoards consisting of a modest number of pieces of church silver dating to the 6th-7th centuries are known from Greater Syria. As a detailed description and discussion of the objects is given elsewhere, a summary of the basic data should suffice here.

1 The investigation of the silver objects took place as part of the compilation of the collection catalogue of late antique and Byzantine antiquities at the Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe (see Fourlas 2017). The enterprise was conducted as part of the research programme of the Leibniz-WissenschaftsCampus Mainz/Frankfurt: Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident – an interdisciplinary research cooperation of the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum and the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz. The collection catalogue has been published in 2017 as volume 8, 1 of the series »Byzanz zwischen Orient und Okzident«.
2 The silver hoard was purchased from the art dealer Nicolas Koutoulakis (Switzerland) and the objects were in his possession since 1985 according to Prof. Dr Marlia Mundell Mango (pers. comm.). The conformity of the silver hoard now at Karlsruhe with objects found in the Biqā valley is suggested by M. Mundell Mango (pers. comm. and Mundell Mango 1998, 215 note 41). The information on the discovery is based on the testimony of the Lebanese archaeologist Ibrahim Kawkabani, the witness at the trial dealing with the famous Seuso treasure at the Supreme Court of the State of New York (record of 17 May 1993, 141-151). But I. Kawkabani refers only to five objects (a censer, a cross, a spoon and two others). I am much obliged to Maria Mundell Mango for providing me with a copy of the court records.
4 Mundell Mango 1986, 228-250 nos 57-76.
5 Fourlas 2017, 145-161 nos IV.115-120.
1 Censer (inv. no. 93/1055)  
Height 6 cm, diameter c. 10.5-11 cm, weight 183 g  
Date: late 6th-1st third of 7th century.  
Inscription: at upper rim Μεγαλού ὑπὲρ ἀναπαύσ(εως) Καρ-  
ρίλου προσένεγκ(εν) τῷ ἁγ(ίο) Κο(ν)σταντίνῳ  
(»Megalous offered this for the [eternal] rest of Karilos to Saint Con-  
stantine«).  
Decoration: four medallions with nimbed bust images  
of Christ, a veiled woman (certainly the Mother of God),  
an angel (Gabriel) and an armed young soldier, certainly  
St Constantine (fig. 3).  

2 Cross (inv. no. 93/1060)  
Height 13.6 cm, width 11.2 cm, weight 41.8 g  
Date: c. 2nd third of the 6th-1st third of the 7th century.  
Inscription: cross monogram consisting of the letters Λ, Κ,  
Ο, Α, Α most probably the name of a donor in the geni-  
tive.

3 Chalice (inv. no. 93/1056)  
fig. 2  
Original height c. 26 cm, diameter c. 20 cm, weight 635.7 g  
Date: c. mid-6th-1st third of the 7th century.  

4 Chalice (inv. no. 93/1057)  
Height 17 cm, diameter c. 13 cm, weight 332.3 g  
Date: probably later 6th-1st third of the 7th century.  

5 Chalice (inv. no. 93/1058)  
fig. 4  
Height 19.7 cm, diameter c. 13-15.5 cm, weight 394.8 g  
Date: c. 2nd third of the 6th-early 7th century.  
Inscription: at upper rim Ὑπὲρ μνήμης καὶ ἀναπαύσεως Φρά-  
μαρίχ (»for the memory and [eternal] rest of Framarich«).  

6 Spoon (inv. no. 93/1059)  
fig. 5  
Length 22 cm, weight 57 g  
Date: c. 2nd third of the 6th-early 7th century.  
Inscription: Φύσα μὴ καῆς (»blow, so that you shall not  
burn yourself«) on the handle and a cross-shaped mono-  
gram on the disc consisting of the letters Φ, Ρ, Μ, Α.
The dating of the objects is based on typological, stylistic and epigraphical criteria. They show resemblances to early Byzantine silverware especially from Syria from the mid-6th to early-7th centuries and were, therefore, most probably manufactured in the region. There are several significant similarities with pieces of the Attarouthi treasure (from Taroutia Emporon, modern Karrātīn al-Kabīra; prov. Idlib/SYR; fig. 6) which is dated to the later 6th or early 7th century, in particular, the censers\(^6\).

The timeframe for the hiding date of the (possibly incomplete) treasure is narrowed down to the later 6th century at the earliest by the dating of censer no. 1\(^7\). It is usually assumed that several silver treasures of church inventories datable to the period of the 6th to mid-7th century especially from Syria, Lebanon and Turkey\(^8\) were hidden as a consequence of the Sasanian and Arab invasions\(^9\) and the treasure in Karlsruhe fits well into this context. If the treasure was indeed discovered in the Biqā valley it may have been hidden

---


\(^{16}\) On the dating of the censer see in detail Fourlas 2017, 156 no. IV.120.

\(^{17}\) The treasures are listed by Mundell Mango 1992a, XXIV note 21. – Cf. the survey by Witt 2006, 109-113.

during the Sasanian advance towards Damascus through the Orontes valley in 613, although a burial in the context of the Arab occupation of the Biqā valley in 635-637 appears more likely.10 Due to the lack of any information regarding the archaeological context of the hoard in Karlsruhe an interpretation must rely on information provided by the objects themselves. Apart from typological, iconographical and stylistic criteria especially the inscriptions offer significant clues for further discussion. They are remarkable for two reasons. First, they attest the obviously Germanic name Framarich (nos 5-6), which is quite exceptional on early Byzantine church silver.11 The name Karilos on censer no. 1 is also of western provenance and both names indicate some relation of the local community to foreigners from the west. Second, the inscription on no. 1 seems to witness a saints’ cult of the first Christian emperor Constantine otherwise hardly known at that time. Furthermore, the armed soldier depicted on the censer is certainly to be identified with the saint named in the inscription and the object is thus providing one of the earliest images of Constantine as a saint (fig. 3). The questions that emerge from this remarkable silver hoard are quite obvious: Why are foreigners from the West commemorated in the East and how can the exceptional veneration of Constantine be explained? In my paper, I will try to reconstruct the historical setting of the community that generated and used this ensemble of silver objects.

THE INSCRIPTIONS

The inscriptions on the censer (no. 1) and the chalice (no. 5) have a commemorative character. The first inscription is addressed to St Constantine in the dative case in view of the salvation of a certain Karilos. This

---

10 In autumn 613, the Persian general Sahrbaraz advanced through the Orontes valley and crossed the Anti-Lebanon in order to capture Damascus (Stratos 1968, 107-108). – See Russell 2001, 47-48 on the destruction of some village churches on the Phoenician coast that is considered to be connected with the Persian occupation of the area in the years 614-617. On Arab raids and the occupation of the Biqā valley in 636 see Kaegi 1992, 112.

11 The donor inscription of Ardaburius iunior (of Alan and Gothic origin) on the silver chalice at Dumbarton Oaks is the only other example I know, cf. Demandt 1986, 113-117.
Fig. 4 Silver hoard at the Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe: chalice no. 5. – (Photo R. Müller, RGZM).
dedication suggests that this gift was offered to a local church dedicated to the sainted emperor. Inscriptions on early Byzantine church silver addressing other saints with τῷ ἁγίῳ, with a toponym added (e.g. τῷ saint Sergios of the village Kaper Koraon)\(^\text{12}\), confirm the assumption that the mentioned dedication referred to such a church. This implies that this church was consecrated to Constantine as a warrior saint, as suggested by the figure on the medallion depicted in traditional Roman military armour (fig. 3). If the saint is indeed identical with Constantine I (306-337), this would be very early evidence for an established cult of the first Christian emperor (see below).

Usually, the formula ὑπὲρ ἀναπαύσεως is thought to indicate that the mentioned person (in this case Karilos) was already deceased\(^\text{13}\). The name of the donor Megalous is considered to be female in the nominative case\(^\text{14}\). However, the name Megalous is not attested anywhere in the nominative case\(^\text{15}\). A 6th-century funerary inscription from a cenotaph in Emesa (Homs; prov. Homs/SYR) testifies \(\text{Μεγαλλούς}\) in the genitive case (from \(\text{Μεγαλλώ}\) or \(\text{Μέγαλλης}\))\(^\text{16}\). But perhaps it requires a subject in the nominative case\(^\text{17}\). So either the grammar of the inscription is inaccurate or Megalous is indeed a nominative form not yet explicitly attested elsewhere. As occasionally Greek female names end in -οῦς in the nominative case, this possibility is conceivable\(^\text{18}\). If we take into account that the other names on the silver objects are of western origin I would add a further possibility that the ending -οῦς may be due to the phonetical pronunciation of the Latinized Greek masculine name Megalus (then \(\text{Μήγαλος}\))\(^\text{19}\). But although this solution would fit to the grammar of the inscription the female gender of Megalous seems more likely.

Karilos appears to be the name Carilos, a variation of Carillus that is composed of the Celtic Carus and the Latin suffix -illus. This name was widespread in Gaul during the 1st-3rd centuries\(^\text{20}\). The toponym Cariliacum (Charly; dép. Moselle/F), which is attested on Merovingian »national« gold coins dating to the early 7th century, is derived from the (personal) name Carilos\(^\text{21}\). As far as I can see, no record of either Carilos or Carillus dates after the 3rd century. However, the derivation Carellus is familiar in the Latin and in the Post-Roman Romance-speaking regions\(^\text{22}\). The Greek equivalent Καρέλλος is attested only for the 6th and 7th centuries,

\(^{12}\) On dedicatory inscriptions on early Byzantine church silver addressing other saints with τῷ ἁγίῳ, etc.

\(^{13}\) Witt 2006, 124-125.

\(^{14}\) Maaß 1994, 194.

\(^{15}\) Prof. Dr Denis Feissel (Paris) is of the same opinion (pers. comm.). – Maaß 1994, 194 states that the name is widespread. But he only refers to one inscription from Emesa (Homs). This inscription, however, is not a conclusive evidence for this name, as it is only tentatively reconstructed from a monogram: IGLS V no. 2488: »Μεγαλούς\(?)\) serait un nom féminin en -ος; [...]. Il paraît moins probable que le 1er nom (A) soit, aux génitifs, le nom d’homme Μέγας, Μεγάλος, [...]; – None of the relevant prosopographical lexica contains an entry for Μεγαλούς.

\(^{16}\) Saliby 1993, 267 fig. 10; SEG 43 no. 1020; SEG 44 no. 1575.

\(^{17}\) As in the inscriptions of other silver objects from the 6th to early 7th-century Syrian treasures: Piguet-Panayotova 2009, 11 no. 4: Διόδορος διάκονος Ασταριώς ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ προσήνεγκε; Mundell Mango 1986, 87-89 no. 7: Κυριακὸς εὐξάμενος προσένεγκε τῷ ἁγίῳ Σεργίῳ. – See also the second example referred to above note 12.

\(^{18}\) Cf. the nominative form Μυροκαλλοῦς in a late antique funerary inscription from Apameia in Bithynia: Corsten 1987, 134-135 no. 131 (advice by Prof. Dr Denis Feissel, Paris).

\(^{19}\) For an example for the Latinized form from Rome (4th century) see PCBE II 1479 s. v. Megalus. – Examples for the Greek form Μεγάλος are attested by inscriptions from Palestine: SEG 20 nos 458. 465.


\(^{21}\) Buchmüller-Pfaff 1990, 146. The »national« gold coins (»monnaies de monétaires«) labelled Cariliaco are dated to 620-640. Depeyrot 1998, II 60.

\(^{22}\) On the Latin suffix -illus see Becker 2009, 85-86. She points out that the suffix -illus was only sporadically used in the Middle Ages. – Examples for early evidence of the name »Carellus« are known from Western Europe and the Latin-speaking areas: Paul, 4,47 (Italy, 7th century); Becker 2009, 321 (Spain, 943). – The magister militum of Italy Carellus (559) possibly originated from the province Moesia Secunda (see note 24), which lies on the borders of the Latin and Greek-speaking areas. – I am indebted to Prof. Dr Wolfgang Haubrichs (Saarbrücken), who confirmed that the name Carilos/Carellus is restricted to the Latin-speaking regions (pers. comm.).
thus the name does not seem to have been very common\textsuperscript{23}. The best-known Καρέλλος held the office of \textit{magister miílium} in Italy in 559\textsuperscript{24}. Lead seals dated to the 6th or 7th century label another Carellus \textit{candidatus} (in Latin) and a third \textit{Καρέλλος ἀπο υμάνων}\textsuperscript{25}. Further seals solely bare the name Carellos in both Latin and Greek characters\textsuperscript{26}. It therefore seems reasonable to assume that the »Karilos« commemorated by the censor (no. 1) may have originated from a predominantly Latin-speaking region part (of the empire or from one of the barbarian kingdoms in Western Europe). This hypothesis is supported by the fact that Framarich, who was commemorated on one of the chalices (no. 5), points to a Germanic background.

The first element of the name Frama- happens to be the Romanized form derived from the West Frankish Chramn-\textsuperscript{27}. The majority of the records for this name element are to be found in the West Frankish realm and are hardly attested east of the Rhine\textsuperscript{28}. The inscription on the chalice (no. 5) provides the oldest evidence for the name Framarich. Further early evidence for this name and its variations is attested for the 9th-11th centuries in northern France and Belgium, in particular\textsuperscript{29}. Therefore, it seems likely that Framarich came from the Merovingian realm and had roots in Northern Gaul or a neighbouring region. An east-Germanic origin (Gothic or Vandal) can be ruled out\textsuperscript{30}. The formula Υπὲρ μνήμης καὶ ἀναπαύσεως is common on church silver of the 6th century and might indicate that Framarich was already deceased\textsuperscript{31}.

The monogram on the spoon (fig. 5) undoubtedly refers to the same Framarich\textsuperscript{32}. The inscription »blow, so that you shall not burn yourself« suggests that the spoon was originally designed to be used as part of a dinner set, not for liturgical purpose\textsuperscript{33}. If Framarich was indeed already deceased it seems likely that his

\textsuperscript{23} There is neither entry in The British Academy, A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names vol. i-V (Oxford 1987-2013) nor in the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (ed.), Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit Abt. I vol. 2 (Berlin 2000) or Abt. II vol. 3 (Berlin 2013). Beßevliev 1964, 58 refers to an inscription of the 3rd century from Rădăvica/BG (IG in Bulgaria repertae IV no. 2147) mentioning a Strategos bearing the similar name Καρέλλος. He considers the name to be either of Thracian or Celtic origin.

\textsuperscript{24} According to two Greek epitaphs his wife and son were buried in Odessa in the province Moesia Secunda (Varna/BG). PLRE III 272 s.v. Carellus 1. – Beßevliev 1964, 58-59 nos 87-88.

\textsuperscript{25} PLRE III 272 s.v. Carellus 2-3 date both individuals to the 6th century but the seals referred to are to be dated rather to the 7th century (advice by Dr Alexandra Wassiliou-Seibt, Vienna).

\textsuperscript{26} Zacos/Veglery 1972, 565 no. 765a-b dated to the 6th century. It remains unclear if this Carellus is identical with one of the afore-mentioned individuals. According to Dr Alexandra Wassiliou-Seibt (Vienna), these seals are to be dated rather to the 7th century, too. Cf. above note 25. A further example is part of the collection of the Kunsthistorisches Museum at Vienna (Münzkabinett MK 64).


\textsuperscript{28} I am grateful for detailed advice given by Prof. Dr Wolfgang Haubrichs (Saarbrücken) on the regional distribution of this name. According to the assessment of Prof. Haubrichs the old German toponyms Framarichesberge in Bavaria und Framerich (Framrach near St. Andrae) in Kärnten/A (12th century), that are supposed to derive from the personal name Framarich (see Förstemann 1913, 928-929), are »imports« from the west. They were probably introduced to the language area of old German in connection with the development of the territories during the Merovingian and Carolingian age.

\textsuperscript{29} Most of the evidence compiled by Förstemann 1966, 514. – Framaricus: Orkondenboek van Holland 40-41 no. 65, dated 988; MGH SS 5, 65 (Framericus): Bishop of Thérouanne, France, 964-995; Cartulaire Saint-Victor, 604 no. 608: Marseille, France, 1053. – Framarich: MGH Necr. Suppl., 238 column 278: Jumièges, France, 11th century. – Framericus: Polyptique Imignon, 107 no. 235; 150 no. 108: Paris region, France, 823-828. – Chartes Stavelot, 180 no. 79 line 17: Liège, Belgium, 960. – Ibidem 102 no. 40 line 21: Monastery of Stavelot, Belgium, 880/881; ibidem 121 no. 50 line 24: Monastery of Stavelot, Belgium, 907; ibidem 158 no. 68 line 26: Monastery of Stavelot, Belgium, 947; ibidem 184 no. 82 line 22-23: Monastery of Stavelot, Belgium, 966; ibidem 529 no. 283 line 5: Monastery of Stavelot, Belgium, 9th-10th centuries. – Polyptich Saint-Remi, 49: Reims, France, after 848. – Femrench: MGH Necr. Suppl., 212 column 189: Ettenheimmünster, Germany (near Strasbourg), c. 9th-10th centuries.

\textsuperscript{30} According to Prof. Dr Wolfgang Haubrichs (Saarbrücken) the specific form of the name is restricted to the northern Galloromania and its contact zones. He excludes an east-Germanic origin (pers. comm., 4 June 2014).

\textsuperscript{31} On the formula see Witt 2006, 188-190.

\textsuperscript{32} Maaß 1994, 195.

\textsuperscript{33} Although silver spoons were occasionally part of church treasures, an application in the liturgy cannot be generally proven for the early Byzantine period. For the controversial debate see Mundell Mango 1990, 248 fig. 39; 1986, 118-122 nos 18-19; 239 no. 69; cf. Taft 1996, 215-216; Hauser 1992, 78-87. – Mundell Mango 1986, 120 has drawn attention to the fact that two of the spoons of the »Hama treasure« were presented by individuals who also gave chalices to the church and she as- sesses them (with further evidence) as indications for an early use of spoons in the Eucharistic service. To these Framarich’s spoon and chalice could be added as a further joint donation of such objects.
Anonymous dependant donated the spoon and the chalice to the church or that he himself dedicated both objects in his last will. Names are a significant indicator for the identity of a person and express a bond with a specific cultural tradition, although one has to be cautious in drawing conclusions on the ethnicity of a person solely by the name without further evidence. Nevertheless, it is certain that Framarich, and quite certainly Karilos, too, had foreign, i.e. non-Greek roots. As Germanic people living in the Byzantine Empire usually adopted Greek personal names by the second or third generation at the latest, it seems likely that at least Framarich had come to the region as a first-generation "immigrant". Interestingly, Framarich’s name most probably indicates an origin from Northern Gaul, and the Gallo-Roman root of the name Karilos might point to a provenance from Gaul, as well. But why had Framarich and Karilos travelled so far from home? And what was their mission in Greater Syria?

»THE ARMY OF HEROIC MEN« RECRUITED BY TIBERIUS II IN 574/575: A POSSIBLE CONNECTION?

First, I would like to discuss the possible reasons for Westerners to travel to and actually settle in the Levant. In the 6th and 7th centuries, people from the Latin-speaking world travelled to the region primarily for two reasons: as pilgrims heading for the holy sites in Palestine or as officials or soldiers in the service of the Roman government. As there was no important supraregional pilgrimage site in the Biqā valley, the area of discovery suggested by Marlia Mundell Mango, it cannot be assumed that the people mentioned in the inscriptions travelled for religious reasons. As trade with the Western Mediterranean in general and Merovingian Gaul in particular was dominated by Greeks and Syrians, it seems likewise improbable that Karilos and Framarich came to the region for business reasons. What seems most likely is that they were soldiers in imperial service. Two factors account for this: First, people of Germanic origin were almost exclusively hired for military service, as numerous names of Germanic origin of officers and soldiers in the

34 On disposal by the will of silver dishes and spoons to churches see Hauser 1992, 85-86.
36 Brandes 2009, 306. – See also below note 50.
38 On the supposed discovery in the Biqā valley see note 2. – The pilgrim of Piacenza, chap. 46 (570 AD) obviously travels through the Biqā valley on his way back from the Holy Land. Donner 2002, 293 with note 218. He does not mention any Christian site there.
40 Already Maaß 1994, 195 (without references) assumed that Framarich was a soldier in Roman service.
6th and early 7th centuries attest (tab. 1)\textsuperscript{41}. Second, in the frontier provinces in the Near East, many military units were garrisoned. Especially the province of Phoenicia Libanensis (fig. 6), to which most of the supposed area of the discovery of the silver hoard (administratively) belonged, was characterized by a strong military presence\textsuperscript{42}. In the 6th century, a striking force of c. 6000 cavalries was stationed there, and it seems to have been billeted in rather small units at several sites\textsuperscript{43}. In the 6th century, this force was occasionally committed to campaigns in Syria or Mesopotamia against the Sasanians\textsuperscript{44}. Framarich and Karilos may have been part of this force and may have been permanently based somewhere in the region. Interestingly, an \textit{ala prima Francorum} was stationed at Cunna in the Biqā valley (the supposed area of discovery) according to the \textit{Notitia dignitatum} by c. 400\textsuperscript{45}. Cunna is not identified yet, but it is to be located somewhere between Heliopolis and Laodicea (Scabiosa) in the northern part of the dale and is probably identical with the village of Ras Baalbek (gov. Baalbek-Hermel/RL) at the northern entrance of the Biqā valley (fig. 6)\textsuperscript{46}. It is assumed that this unit was raised together with the \textit{ala prima Alamanorum}, the \textit{ala prima Saxorum} and the \textit{cohors quinta pacata Alamanorum} that were likewise deployed in the province\textsuperscript{47} as early as the tetrarchy or during the reign of Constantine I, Constantius II or Julian\textsuperscript{48}. Nothing is known on the fate on any of these units. Although military units originally composed of Germanic people kept their original name for a long time, they were usually restocked by locally recruited men\textsuperscript{49}. In addition, »barbaric« families living in the Greek-speaking part of the empire usually gave up their naming tradition in the second or third generation the latest and took up Greek names\textsuperscript{50}. For these reasons, it has to be ruled out that Framarich or Karilos were descendants of soldiers of the \textit{ala prima Francorum}. If the \textit{ala prima Francorum} was still stationed in the Biqā valley by the 6th century, it cannot be ruled out that Framarich and Karilos were allocated to the unit. But it would also be possible that they belonged to a newly levied unit of foreigners or were assigned to some other regular regiment garrisoned in the region\textsuperscript{51}.

\textsuperscript{41} Apart from the individuals listed in tab. 1, further examples of soldiers of the 6th and early 7th centuries with Germanic names are attested mainly by funerary inscriptions: Çetinkaya 2009 (Constantinople); Scharf 2001, 91-99 esp. nos 2 and 4 (Constantinople); Feibiger 1939, 40-42 nos 66-67 (Constantinople); Lefebre 1907, no. 559 (Apollonopolis/EG). – Whitby 1995, 109 points out that the non-Roman names of officers are a significant indication for their ethnic origin. Generally on Germans in Roman military service in Late Antiquity Jones 1964, 619-623. On the enrolment of Barbarian recruits in the 6th century see Whitby 1995, 103-110. – According to a revision of an inscription from ar-Ruwayb in northern Syria (Feissel 2016) it testifies a dux named Fredouf. – The inscription on a 6th century military grain measure in the British Museum that is said to be from Antioch (1972,0103.1) refers to a comes Vadila (probably a Goth): IGLS III 2, no. 1073; Borchart/Hiedenbant 1923/1924, 153-164. On the name Reichert 1990, 745. Vadila may have been a civil provincial governor (\textit{comes Orientis}) or a military commander (\textit{comes rei militaris}). On these comites see Skeen 1901, 659-664 nos 64. 77. – The sometimes assumed identity with the Ostrogothic comes Adila on Sicily attested in 507/511 (PLRE II 9 s. v. Adila 1-2) is speculative. \textit{Addendum}: U. Hutten, Germanen in frühbyzantinischen Inschriften: Vom Namen der Person zur Identität der Gruppe. Gephyra 16, 2018, 185-204. I became aware of this reference after preparation of the final proofs.

\textsuperscript{42} On the impact of military presence on rural infrastructure and epigraphy in the province see Trombley 2004, 86-87. 98-99.

\textsuperscript{43} Trombley 1997, 164; Liebeschuetz 1977, 497-499 especially on the significance of the mobile reserve under the command of the dukes of Phoenicia Libanensis. Proc., Wars I 13,5; II 8,2; II 16,17; II 19,33.

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Notitia dignitatum}, Or. XXXIV 35. – Generally on the \textit{Notitia dignitatum} see Slootjes 2013, 1133-1145 with the relevant bibliography. – On the most recent state of research and especially the reliability of the Eastern lists see Kaiser 2015.

\textsuperscript{46} Cunna is certainly identical with Conna which lies on the road from Damascus to Emesa halfway between Heliopolis and Laodicia (Scabiosa) according to the \textit{Itinerarium Antonini} 199, 7-9. Musil 1928, 273; Benzinger 1901, 885. – This contradicts any assumption that Cunna has to be identified with a fort on the strata Diocletiana as Kennedy/Riley 1990, 204 figs 153-154 have stated (Khan El-Qattar).

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Notitia dignitatum} Or. XXXIV 36-37. 41.

\textsuperscript{41} Pollard 2000, 29. 140. – Hoffmann 1969, 140.

\textsuperscript{48} Kaiser 2012, 117-118; Bagnall/Palme 1996, 7 note 24. – On the continuity of many late Roman military units until the 6th century see Jones 1964, 655.

\textsuperscript{49} Brandes 2009, 306. – Cf. Scharf 2001, 95-96; a few examples: The comes Glaostes (PLRE III 535, 6th century?) named his daughter Anthousa (PLRE III 90). In the funerary inscription from Jerusalem (5th-6th centuries), Thekla is denominated »daughter of Maroulfus the German« (Cotton 2012, 346-347 no. 970). – See \textit{addendum} in note 42.

\textsuperscript{50} Barbarians seem to have been joining regular units especially in the 6th century Whitby 1995, 72; Haldon 1984, 100.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>operation area</th>
<th>rank/office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aldio</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>MVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aligrum (Goth)</td>
<td>552-554</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aloin (Lombard?)</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>mercenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aluith</td>
<td>538-539</td>
<td>Italy, Constantinople</td>
<td>commander of Herul federates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amalafidas (Goth/Thuringian)</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>Balkans</td>
<td>commander (MVM?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ansfrid (Goth or Lombard)</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>MVM or dux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ansimuth</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>Thrace</td>
<td>infantry commander (dux?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ariarit</td>
<td>546-547</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>bodyguard of Ioannes Trogolita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arimuth</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>Illyricum</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arioulph</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>army commander (MVM?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Auctorit (Lombard?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Arufus</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Herul leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aruth (Herul)</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Herul leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Asbadus 1</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Thrace</td>
<td>candidatus, cavalry commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Asbadus 2 (Gepid)</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>leader of Gepids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Droctulfus (Sueve/Lombard)</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>Thrace, Africa</td>
<td>army commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eiliphredas</td>
<td>586(-588?)</td>
<td>Phoenicia Libanensis, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>dux of Phoenicia Libanensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Francio 1</td>
<td>c. 568-588</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>MVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fronimith</td>
<td>546-548</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fulcaris</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>commander of Herul federates, MVM (vacs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Geisirith</td>
<td>546-548</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Gentzon</td>
<td>593-594</td>
<td>Thrace</td>
<td>MVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Gibastes</td>
<td>6th century?</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>comes et dux Scythiae?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gibimer 2</td>
<td>mid? / late 6th century?</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>dux Palaeastinae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gibrus</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>Lazica</td>
<td>commander of Lombards and Heruls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gilderich</td>
<td>527/528</td>
<td>Lazica</td>
<td>MVM (vacs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Godilas 1</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Thrace</td>
<td>MVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Godilas 2 (Thracian)</td>
<td>547-548</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>officer of the bodyguard of Ioannes Trogolita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gudescalcus 1 (Lombard?)</td>
<td>599/600</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>dux Campaniae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Guduin 1</td>
<td>595, 602</td>
<td>Thrace</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Guduin 2</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>dux at Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gulfaris</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>MVM of Istria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Guntharis 1</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>commander of Heruli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Guntharis 2</td>
<td>540, 545/546</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>bodyguard of Solomon, mag. miltium, dux Numidiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ildiger</td>
<td>534-540</td>
<td>Africa, Italy</td>
<td>MVM vacans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ildigisal (Lombard)</td>
<td>(550/551-)</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>dux of Phoenicia Libanensis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Indulf / Gundulf</td>
<td>549-552</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>bodyguard of Belisarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Iugildus Grusingus (Lombard)</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>mercenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mundilas</td>
<td>537-539</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>officer of Belisarius’ bodyguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mundus (Gepid)</td>
<td>532-536</td>
<td>Balkans</td>
<td>MVM per Illyricum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nordulfus (Lombard?)</td>
<td>590(-595?)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>patricius and commander of troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ognaris</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>Lazica</td>
<td>officer of Martinus’ bodyguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Phanitheus (Herul)</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>commander of Herul federates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1  Military men in Roman service bearing Germanic names 527-641 according to PLRE III. – MVM = magister utriusque militae.
This would not have been an extraordinary case. Germanic soldiers were often deployed to fight in the wars of the 6th century against the Sasanians. They were recruited on a regular basis from the Danube region. On the eastern frontier, Goths and Heruli are attested in particular for the time of the reign of Justinian I (527–565). In addition, Procopius of Caesarea mentions that under the same Emperor five cavalry regiments of Vandal prisoners (Vandali Iustiniani) were set up and were destined to be settled permanently in Armenia and Moesia (MVM per Armeniam, MVM presentalis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>name (possibly a Goth)</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>operation area</th>
<th>rank/office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sindual (Herul)</td>
<td>(554-)559(-c. 566)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Herul leader, MVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Sinduit</td>
<td>547-548</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sittas 1</td>
<td>528-538/539</td>
<td>Armenia, Moesia</td>
<td>MVM per Armeniam, MVM presentalis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1 (continued)

---

53 Procop., Wars I 13,19; I 14,39; II 3,21; II 18,24; II 21,4; II 24,12; II 24,14; II 25,26-27. – On the significant role of Herul soldiers in Justinian’s wars see Sarantis 2010, 381-393. – Feissel 2016, 189 assumed that the dux Fredoulf named in an inscription from ar-Ruwayb in northern Syria that is dated to 551 might have been a Frank. But this is not proven yet.
the cities of the praetorian prefecture of the East. The Scythae Iustiniani based at Apollonopolis in Egypt seem to have been Goths.

According to the written sources, only on one occasion, large numbers of Germanic men were enrolled after Justinian’s wars. In the East, war with the Sasanians broke out anew in 572 and Tiberius II was appointed Caesar by Justin II in 574 to counter the threat. To this end, Caesar used a one-year truce to conduct a major recruiting campaign in 574/575. By spending considerable sums he managed to raise a large field force consisting mainly of Germanic troops. The church historian Evagrius Scholasticus praises Tiberius for having recruited a multiethnic army of formidable cavalry: »And he collected such an army of heroic men, from..."

---

54 Proc., Wars IV 14, 17-18; Schwarze 2015, 116. – On Vandal soldiers in the East see also Proc., Wars II 21, 4. – Hoffmann 1969, 140 suggests that the Germanic auxiliary units deployed in the province of Phoenicia according to the Notitia dignitatum (Or. XXXIV 35-37. 41) were likewise formed from prisoners of war under the tetrarchy.

55 Kaiser 2012, 118. – A fragment of an early 6th-century Gothic-Latin bible from Italy found near Antinoë is probably connected to the presence of Gothic soldiers. On the fragment see Kuhlmann 1994, 196-207 pls 13-14. – Cf. the funerary inscription of the soldier Rigimer from Apollonopolis Magna (Lefebre 1907, no. 559) which is thought to be connected with the unit of the Scythae Iustiniani.


by recruiting the best men both from the tribes beyond the Alps in the vicinity of the Rhine, and those on this side of the Alps, the Massagetae and other Scythian nations, and those near Paeonia, and Mysians, Illyrians and Isaurians, that he established squadrons of excellent horsemen almost 150,000 in number.« 58 These numbers are exaggerated. The army will rather have numbered 12,000-15,000 men or 15 regiments as recently suggested59. These soldiers formed elite units of the field army during the last years of Justin’ II reign and under his successors Tiberius II Constantine (578-582) and Maurice (582-602)60. Obviously, Tiberius’ funds were well invested, as the Sasanians suffered a decisive defeat in Armenia once the army had been put into action in 57661.

It is generally assumed that apart from residents within the empire, Franks, Burgundians and possibly Saxons from beyond the Alps, Goths and Lombards from Italy, as well as Bulgars and Gepids from Pannonia and along the Danube were among the newly levied troops62. Referring to Evagrius’ account, some scholars stress the probability of Frankish mercenaries in the army because of the good relationship between the Austrasian kingdom and Constantinople in the 570s and 580s63. As hiring fighting men was common practice in the Frankish realm for both magnates and kings it is conceivable that some of these mercenaries may have been contracted for imperial service64. Archaeological remains of Frankish provenance in the Byzantine Empire have not yet been studied systematically, but some objects seem to corroborate the presence of people from North of the Alps in the East in the later 6th and early 7th centuries. I am especially referring to a (belt?) buckle with triangular plate from Anemurium in Isauria (Anamur; İl Mersin / TR; fig. 6a) dating from around the late 6th to the first third of the 7th century (fig. 7a), a type that is widespread in the Frankish realm (fig. 7d-e)65. Although it is unclear how this buckle reached Anemurium, J. Russell assumed that it


59 Whitby 1995, 89; Haldon 1984, 97. – Schwarze 2015, 122 suggested that these so-called Tiberiani comprised of 15 alae of approx. 500-600 men each.

60 Haldon 1984, 96-101.


62 Whitby 1995, 89; 2000, 274 note 52; Ditten 1993, 127. – J. Eph., Hist. eccl. VI 13 mentions an army of 60,000 Lombards commanded by the magister utriusque militae per Orientem Justinian in 575 (PLRE III 744-747 s.v. Istiniarius 3). – On these Lombard mercenaries see Bergamo 2007, esp. 98-100. – J. Eph., Hist. eccl. III 13. 26 also attests Arian Goths leaving their families at Constantinople while being sent on a campaign to the East. – Scharf 2001, 101-104 suggested that these Goths were probably foederati withdrawn from the Danube region to Constantinople and that the testimony of John may be connected to some funerary inscriptions of foederati from Constantinople dated c. 580-620. – According to CIL II 212 the army of Orientes erected a statue of emperor Justin (most likely Justin II) as a warning towards the Sasanians near Nisibis (probably in summer 578). Trombley 2007, 350-352 considers the unusual Vulgar Latin inscription in Mesopotamia to be a consequence of the presence of large numbers of Western soldiers in the army due to the recruiting campaign of Tiberius II.

63 Ditten 1993, 127; Stein 1919, 59. – On the tight diplomatic relations between Constantinople and the Merovingian realm, especially from the late 560s-580s, see Drauschke 2015, 110-111 and more detailed Drauschke 2011a, 252-257 with further bibliography.

64 On bands of mercenaries in Merovingian Gaul see Bachrach 2008, 182-183. – The Frankish prince Gundovald spent his exile from the 570s to 581 in Constantinople (PLRE III 566-567 s.v. Gundovaldus 2). He surely went there with some followings and he might have been able during his long stay in Constantinople to set up a stable network of contacts with the Frankish realm. This may have attracted mercenaries to enter imperial service. – A fragmentary papyrus letter from Hermoupolis (P.Vindob. G 14307) dated to the second half of the 6th century also attests Franks (Φράγγος). But these are considered to be soldiers of a late Roman military unit labelled as Franci (either the ala I Francorum or the cohors VII Francorum attested by the Notitia dignitatum), not ethnic Franks: Bagnall/Palme 1996, 4-7.

65 Russel 1982, 144-145 fig. 8, 28. He refers to some comparable buckles from Switzerland (note 48). Belt buckles with triangular plate are widespread in the Frankish realm in the period of the last third of the 6th to the first half of the 7th century. On the type and its chronology see Müssemeier e. al. 2003, 19 Gür3A-B. D figs. 7, 9; Koch 2001, 87 fig. 24 Phase SD 7, 284-285 fig. 115; 576 Fundliste 35; Siegmund 1998, 25-27 Gür3.1; 3.3; 204-205 fig. 81 Phase 6. 8.
may have been «left behind by some wandering mercenary» 66. The comparatively small size of the buckle indicates that it may have belonged rather to a sword harness or maybe a leg binding (»Wadenbindengarnitur«) than a belt 67. To this chance find from Anemurium a comparable West Frankish belt buckle (fig. 7b, dated to the 2nd half of the 6th century) and the loop of another example (later 6th-early 7th century), likewise of West Frankish provenance, should be added. They are both parts of the collection of Byzantine belt buckles in the RGZM, a former private collection that has been compiled in the vicinity of Constantinople 68. The fourth buckle of this type in the RGZM with decoration similar to the belt buckle was found at the late Roman fortress of Sadovec (obl. Pleven / BG) that was occupied until the late 6th century (fig. 7c) 69.

Although Evagrius’ account is merely indirect evidence, it seems to be the only reference to Franks (i.e. people from the Frankish realm) in the service of the early Byzantine army to be found in the narrative source material after the 4th century 70. Apart from the recruiting campaign of 574/575, the enlistment of Germanic soldiers (especially Lombards) probably continued to a lesser degree in the later 570s and under the emperor

---

**Fig. 7** Buckles with triangular plate: a Anemurium (Anamur/TR), stray find. – b Mainz, RGZM inv. no. O.40054 (presumably from Asia Minor). – c Sadovec/BG, unstratified find, Mainz, RGZM inv. no. O.39877. – d Forstfeld/F, stray find. – e Pleidelsheim/D, grave 64. – (Drawings M. Ober, RGZM; a after Russell 1982, fig. 8.28; c after Uenze 1992, pl. 9, 15; d after Schnitzler/Arbogast/Frey 2009, fig. 100; e after Koch 2001, pl. 25). – Scale 1:2.
Maurice in the 580s. Still, for the early Byzantine period there is no evidence for any large-scale recruitment in the West after 575, and later recruitment campaigns were carried out among other people (e.g. Armenians). This is confirmed by a review of the "Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire". Until the late 6th century, officers bearing Germanic names are quite often attested in Roman military service, but evidence hardly exists for the 7th century or later (tab. 1). The five funerary inscriptions of the foederati at Constantinople dated to c. 580-620 that attest some Germanic names like Valdarich are among the latest examples. As a consequence of Tiberius' recruiting drive some officers bearing Germanic names held high military positions in the Eastern provinces in the last quarter of the 6th century (tab. 1, nos 17. 24. 61). It is probably not a coincidence that the dux of Phoenicia Libanensis (άρχως ... τῆς ἔμεσης) commanding the left wing of the Roman army at the battle of Solachon in 586 (fig. 6) is bearing the name Elliphredas (Εἰλιφρέδας) which is the Greek spelling of the undoubtedly Germanic name Ilifred or Hildifrid. The facts exposed above offer an indication why the presence of Western men in Greater Syria is not surprising in the last quarter of the 6th century. It seems reasonable to hypothesize that Karilos and Framarich were part of the military force raised by Tiberius II Constantine in 574/575 or the following years. It is likely that a considerable part of the Germanic soldiers enrolled by Tiberius II did not return to their homelands, but settled in the eastern Empire. In addition, Tiberius II, like previous emperors, seems to have offered land to some of the non-Romans enrolled in his recruiting campaign in the 570s so that they and their families also may have settled permanently near their garrison. During the 6th century, several new military sites and fortlets usually manned by small units were erected in the Syrian provinces. In Phoenicia Liban-
ensis the route along the Orontes via the provincial capital Emesa through to the Biqā valley was controlled by several forts. The foundation of Maurikopolis (Μαυρικούπολις), a town apparently founded by Emperor Maurikios and usually identified with the early Byzantine fortifications at Gūsija (Iusieh; prov. Homs/SYR) at the northern entrance to the Biqā valley (fig. 6), is a further hint that soldiers may have been newly based or settled in the region until the late 6th century.

**THE CULT OF ST CONSTANTINE**

I would now like to discuss what significance St Constantine may have had for the community that used the silver objects. The discussion of this question is closely connected to the problem of whether this saint is identical with the first Christian emperor. For Marlia Mundell Mango, providing a first brief presentation of the censer (no. 1), there is no doubt that it is »[…] the earliest evidence of the cult of the first Christian emperor […]«. Denis Feissel, on the other hand, refuses in his brief comments of the inscription to identify the figure as Constantine the Great, as he considers it too early for this cult. How should this problem be approached?

Only very little evidence for the early formation of the cult of St Constantine has survived. D. Feissel’s assessment of the inscription on censer no. 1 is obviously based on the assumption, shared by many scholars, that the veneration of Constantine was not established before the late 8th century. Although some kind of veneration seems to have taken place in Constantinople at the tomb of Constantine in the church of the Holy Apostles and at the porphyry-column on the Forum Constantini from the 5th century at the latest, it remains unclear when a cult was firmly established and spread to the provinces. The role of Constantine as a patron saint of churches and monasteries seems to be a reliable criterion to determine the origin of the later well-established cult. In Constantinople, the chapel of Constantine at the column on the Forum Constantini is attested by the 9th century but was certainly erected earlier during the »Dark Ages«. For the provinces, some scattered epigraphical evidence suggests that Constantine functioned as patron saint at least since the 7th century, and maybe already since the 6th century. The oldest testimony discussed so far is a lead seal dated to the 7th century which has been overlooked by art historians and archaeologists but has to be taken into account (fig. 8). The editors associate the inscription + [Τ]οῦ ἁγ[ί]ου Κω[ν]σταντί[ν]ου Γερμ[α]νίκα(ς) with a monastery or a deaconate of St Constantine at Germanikeia (Kahramanmaraş; Il Kahramanmaraş/TR) in Syria Euphratensis (fig. 6). They convincingly interpret the image of an emperor on the avers that is obvi-

---

81 Mouterde / Poiderbard 1945, 31-35.
82 On the identification of the site that guarded access between Emesa and Baalbek see Burns 2009, 223; Mouterde / Poiderbard 1945, 34-35; Honigmann 1930, 2394-2395. It is assumed that the Electi Iustiniani may have been newly based at Gerasa in 576: Haensch / Lichtenberger / Raja 2016, 196.
84 REG 108 no. 710. – SEG 44 no. 1575.
86 Wortley 2009, 355-357.
88 For a discussion of the art historical and epigraphical evidence see also Fourlas 2017, 159 no. IV.120. – Berger 2008, 12 note 44 assumes that the increasing number of examples for the personal name Constantine since the 7th century is provoked predominantly by the reception of Constantine as a saint.
90 Reading after image in high resolution. Reading after McGeer / Nesbitt 2005, 3: Τοῦ ἁγίου Κωνσταντίνου Γερμανίκα(ς) (different from Laurent 1972, 228). – On Germanikeia see Todt / Vest 2014, 1193-1206 s.v. Germanikeia. – I am grateful to Prof. Dr Christos Stavrakos (Ioannina) for hints on the seal and Dr Marta Zlotnick (Dumbarton Oaks) for providing images in high resolution.
ously inspired by imperial coin imagery as an image of St Constantine. But the iconography does not correspond to a specific coin type like other lead seals of the period and is rather freely adopted from imperial iconography of the reign of Heraclius and Constans II (officially Constantine IV) (figs. 9. 16). To this lead seal, two further inscriptions must be added: one from a church dedicated to St Constantine in 623 near Rihab (gov. Mafraq/JOR; fig. 6) during the years of the Sasanian occupation and a recently published epitaph from Germia in Asia Minor (Gümüşkonak; Il Eskişehir/TR) of the 6th century, witnessing again a monastery of St Constantine at Germanikeia. Furthermore, an invocation of Constantine and his sign (the cross) in the

Fig. 8 Lead seal of a monastery or diaconate of St Constantine of Germanikeia. – Dumbarton Oaks DO.58.106.362. – (Drawing after photo M. Ober, RGZM). – Scale 2:1.

91 McGeer / Nesbitt 2005, 3; Laurent 1972, 228. – The depiction of Constantine as a patron saint correlates, for example, with the bust image of the Virgin with Christ on seals of the diakonia of the Theotokos of the property of Verus in Constantinople (7th/8th centuries). McGeer / Nesbitt 2005, 77-78 no. 34.1a-d.

92 The crown topped by a cross, the globus cruciger and the large fibula are common to several types but the cross on long staff is a rather rare imperial attribute. It appears especially on folles and always grasped with the right hand of the emperor (e.g. DOC II, 88. 281. 295-306 nos 77b; 78.1; 105-127 pls 11-14). – The combination of globus cruciger and long cross-staff (again held by the emperor’s right hand) is introduced into coin imagery by Constans II on folles with the legend ἐν τούτῳ νίκα (cf. note 119 and fig. 9): DOC II, 406 pls 26-27.

93 On the church see Michel 2001, 221-222. – The dedicatory inscription has not been edited so far and is only published in translation: »By the grace of God Jesus Christ, this hall of prayer of the saint and victorious Constantine was founded and completed at the time of the most holy archbishop and metropolitan Polieuktos, with the providence and labor of Kaiumos (son) of Procopius the count, for the salvation and succor of himself and his God-beloved household, under the care of John and Germanus, most pious church-wardens, in the month of February, the 28th, at the time of the 11th indiction of the year 517 of the province [A.D. 623].« Piccirillo 2011, 105 fig. 4. – For an Italian translation see Piccirillo 2005, 387 note 64 (advice by Dr Robert Schick, Mainz). – Pawel Nowakowski, Cult of Saints, E01150 – http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E01150 (15.1.2019). The aforementioned lead seal (fig. 8) was not considered in this discussion. – The assumption that a hagiographical tradition for Constantine I was not yet established by the 6th century. He suggests that the monastery might be named after its founder and this view is accepted by Feissel in REG 127 no. 581 and Pawel Nowakowski, Cult of Saints, E01150 – http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E01150 (15.1.2019). The aforementioned lead seal (fig. 8) was not considered in this discussion. – The assumption that a hagiographical tradition for Constantine I was not yet established by the 6th century is not a profound argument against the emperor as a patron saint of the monastery at Germanikeia. Wortley 2009, 355 has pointed out that not a legend but devotion to a saint is in most cases the first symptom of a hagiological cult. – In addition, Winkelmann 1987, 628-631 suggested that parts of the earliest hagiographical vita of Constantine were composed before the 7th century. Cf. Cameron 1992, 262.

94 REG 127 no. 581 with the corrected reading by D. Feissel: Σο[λ]ο[μών] πο[λεως] Γερμα[νίκ]ειας μονῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Κωνσταντίνου. This reading is also accepted by the initial editor Walser 2013, 567-569 no. 20 the author doubts an identity with Constantine I because a hagiographical tradition was not yet established by the 6th century. He suggests that the monastery might be named after its founder and this view is accepted by Feissel in REG 127 no. 581 and Pawel Nowakowski, Cult of Saints, E01150 – http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E01150 (15.1.2019). The aforementioned lead seal (fig. 8) was not considered in this discussion. – The assumption that a hagiographical tradition for Constantine I was not yet established by the 6th century is not a profound argument against the emperor as a patron saint of the monastery at Germanikeia. Wortley 2009, 355 has pointed out that not a legend but devotion to a saint is in most cases the first symptom of a hagiological cult. – In addition, Winkelmann 1987, 628-631 suggested that parts of the earliest hagiographical vita of Constantine were composed before the 7th century. Cf. Cameron 1992, 262.

95 On the church see Michel 2001, 221-222. – The dedicatory inscription has not been edited so far and is only published in translation: »By the grace of God Jesus Christ, this hall of prayer of the saint and victorious Constantine was founded and completed at the time of the most holy archbishop and metropolitan Polieuktos, with the providence and labor of Kaiumos (son) of Procopius the count, for the salvation and succor of himself and his God-beloved household, under the care of John and Germanus, most pious church-wardens, in the month of February, the 28th, at the time of the 11th indiction of the year 517 of the province [A.D. 623].« Piccirillo 2011, 105 fig. 4. – For an Italian translation see Piccirillo 2005, 387 note 64 (advice by Dr Robert Schick, Mainz). – Pawel Nowakowski, Cult of Saints, E01150 – http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E01150 (15.1.2019). The aforementioned lead seal (fig. 8) was not considered in this discussion. – The assumption that a hagiographical tradition for Constantine I was not yet established by the 6th century is not a profound argument against the emperor as a patron saint of the monastery at Germanikeia. Wortley 2009, 355 has pointed out that not a legend but devotion to a saint is in most cases the first symptom of a hagiological cult. – In addition, Winkelmann 1987, 628-631 suggested that parts of the earliest hagiographical vita of Constantine were composed before the 7th century. Cf. Cameron 1992, 262.
decoration of a cistern at Salamis on Cyprus (6th century) attests his role as intercessor similar to the inscription on censer no. 1, although he is not labelled as ἅγιος.95 The scarce epigraphical evidence is complemented by just two but nevertheless important proofs for images of Constantine in monumental church decorations of the 6th century. The famous epigram of the church of St Polyeuctus in Constantinople provides the earliest known evidence for an adaptation of Constantine as a saintly figure.96 It refers to a picture cycle at the western front of the church depicting legends associated with Constantine. The epigram alludes to at least two scenes, the baptism of Constantine and probably the victory over Maxentius97. A further picture cycle of three scenes from the life of Constantine existed in the

95 Sacopoulos 1962, 69-70 figs 9-10; † Βο(ήθσο)ν (ἡμας) ὦ Κω(ν)σταντῖνε κ(αὶ) τὸ σίγνο(ν) σου. † (advice by Dr Efthymios Rizos, Oxford). The painted inscription belongs to the same phase as the painted decoration and most of the other inscriptions in the cistern that are dated to the 6th century by Sacopoulos 1962, 82 and du Plat Taylor 1933, 108. Pouilloux/Roesch/Marcellié-Jaubert 1987, 87 no. 238 E followed by Pawel Nowakowski, Cult of Saints, E01317 – http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/recid.php?recid=E01317 (15.1.2019) with slightly different reading (I prefer the reading by Sacopoulos).


97 On the cycle see Fowden 1994, 276-284; Milner 1994, 73-81; Speck 1993, 134-147.
church of Karm Al-Ahbarîya (near Abu Mena; gov. Alexandria/EG) according to some fragments of murals (2nd half of 6th century). From the three scenes of the cycle only the vision of the cross is clearly determinable (fig. 10a-b)\textsuperscript{98}. These examples confirm an increasing interest in the memory of the first Christian emperor in the church already during the 6th century. In light of this pictorial evidence, the depiction of Constantine on censer no. 1 is not unique although still extraordinary: it differs from the images mentioned above in depicting the first Christian emperor as a single figure, recognizable by his helmet, and not in the context of a narrative cycle.

The depiction of Constantine on the censer (fig. 3) wearing a helmet is unusual for a warrior saint as these are without exception bareheaded in early and middle Byzantine iconography\textsuperscript{99}. The absence of the pearl diadem, a feature common since the time of Constantius II (337-361) on coin images depicting a helmeted emperor, might be explained by supposing that the artist adhered to iconographical prototypes predating its introduction\textsuperscript{100}. Constantine the Great is the last emperor who wore a pseudo-Attic helmet similar to the one worn by the saint on the censer, which can be found in particular on coin issues struck between 318 and 322 (fig. 11) and from 330 onwards this type was restricted to the iconography of Roma\textsuperscript{101}. Since Eusebius of Caesarea’s account of the vision of the cross the helmet of Constantine was connected to the ideology of Christian victory. After describing the monogram of Christ consisting of the letters Chi and Rho fixed to the \textit{labarum} Eusebius briefly states that the emperor was bearing these letters on his helmet subsequently\textsuperscript{102}. The famous silver \textit{multiplum} issued by Constantine in 315 or 325/326 confirms this statement (fig. 12)\textsuperscript{103}. The helmet of the emperor thus became like the \textit{labarum} a symbol for Christian victory. Interestingly, the helmet worn by Constantine on censer no. 1 has a round fitting with V-shaped topping attached to the front of its crest (fig. 3). Such fittings were introduced in the 4th century as adornments of the high crest-plate of late Roman ridge helmets and they are usually decorated with the Chi-Rho mono-

\textsuperscript{98} Witte Orr 2010, 78-84. 147-151 pls 2. 7. 26-27.  
\textsuperscript{99} Grotowski 2010, 89 points out that the helmet is unusual in the iconography of warrior saints.  
\textsuperscript{100} On the pearl diadem on the emperors’ helmet Bastien 1992, 223. – For a discussion of the iconography see also Fourlas 2017, 159-161 no. IV.120.  
\textsuperscript{101} On the coin images see Bastien 1992, 209-210 pl. 170, 10. – RIC VII 56-59. 112 no. 231 pl. 4; 438 no. 119 pl. 13; 508 no. 82 pl. 16. – Carlà 2013, 564 fig. II 28. – On coin images, the bejewelled ridge helmet is the characteristic type worn by all late Roman emperors since Constantine: D’Amato/Negin 2017, 263-266. – But besides coin images, the pseudo-Attic helmet is known from other iconographical records (in particular as equipment of guardsmen) until the 6th century: D’Amato/Negin 2017, 254-255 figs 276-279. – See also the references given in Fourlas 2017, 155 note 812.  
\textsuperscript{103} RIC VII 364 no. 36. – Carlà 2010, 87-95 fig. 9 suggested the vicennalia 325/326 as date of the issue.
gram (fig. 13)\textsuperscript{104}. They are not a typical component of Attic helmets\textsuperscript{105}. The fact that this fitting is accentuated on this small-scale image suggests that it is meaningful and probably of the same symbolism as the small monogram of Christ on Constantine's ridge helmet on the aforementioned multiplum (fig. 12).

\textsuperscript{104} Miks 2008, 455-461 figs 7-12. 15. 24; 2014, 26-27 figs 5. 7-9. 13.
\textsuperscript{105} On some of the helmets worn by the personifications Roma and Constantinopolis on ivory diptychs of the 6th century these adornments are also attached: Volbach 1976, 35 no. 15 pl. 7; 37-38 nos 23-24 pls 10-11; 31-32 no. 31 pl. 16. – The type of these helmets is not clearly determinable but on the diptych of Basilius (Miks 2008, 457 fig. 9) it seems to be a ridge helmet. The distinguished front plate of Attic helmets is not featured by these examples.
Furthermore, the legend of the discovery of the True Cross was also connected with Constantine’s military equipment: nails of the True Cross had been incorporated into the helmet and the bridle of his horse. This symbolic reference to Constantine’s helmet would help explain the unusual iconography on the censer, including the warrior saint with a helmet and would corroborate the identification of the depicted saint with the first Christian emperor. There are thus no serious reasons why the identification of the figure proposed by M. Mundell Mango should be doubted. What is more, we know of no other homonymous warrior saint who was already venerated in the early Byzantine period.

Constantine as an imperial model was revived in the later 6th century. Tiberius II was the first Caesar (and later emperor) who took up the programmatic name »Constantine« after 150 years. He also was the last sovereign of the early Byzantine period to recruit large numbers of Western barbarians. This raises the question of whether it really can be a coincidence that Framarich and Karilos belonged to a community venerating a warrior saint named Constantine, or whether this was the result of contemporary imperial policy.

Tiberius II was given the name »Constantine« (by Emperor Justin II) during his promotion to the rank of Caesar in December 574, as he was expected to renew the empire of Constantine the Great. This stylization of Tiberius II as a new Constantine appears to have been part of a purposeful propaganda campaign connected to the war against the Sasanians that broke out in 572 (and lasted until 591). This anti-Persian campaign was, for example, demonstrated by performances in the circus of Constantinople but mainly articulated in coinage. During his reign as sole emperor (578-582), a new iconography was introduced on the back of the gold coinage: the cross on a stepped base with the legend Victoria Augusti (fig. 14). The introduction of a new coin iconography in the context of a war against the Sasanians is not without a precursor. During the reign of Theodosius II (408-450), the type of »Long-Cross-Solidi« showing an image of Victoria holding a large gem-studded cross was introduced to gold coinage by 420 (fig. 15). K. G. Holum

106 The sources referring to the nails incorporated into Constantine’s helmet and bridle are summarized by Nesbitt 2003, 35-36. – On the original form of Constantine’s bridle and its later veneration see Bojcov 2008, 25-30; esp. 61-67 on the reintroduction of the cult of this relic in Constantinople in the 6th century. – For an archaeological discussion of the bridle of Constantine venerated since the Middle Ages in Carpentras (dép. Vaucluse/F), Chamalières-sur-Loire (dép. Haute-Loire/F) and Milan see Schulze-Dörrlamm 2011, 110-133. She suggested that the bridle in Carpentras may be identical with the relic venerated in Constantinople in the 6th century.


109 Past victories over the Persians were reminded by beginning circus shows with a parade of Elephants captured in the East that bowed before the emperor and made the sign of the cross with their trunks: McCormick 1986, 95-96; J. Eph., Hist. eccl. II 48.


111 RIC X, 75.
has convincingly argued that this new imagery was part of an ideological programme in connection with the short war against the Sasanians in 421/422 which also included the erection of a monumental golden cross on the Rock of Golgotha by Theodosius II in 422. The motif of the cross on a stepped base introduced by Tiberius II alludes to the memorial cross on the Rock of Golgotha besides the Church of the Holy Sepulchre built by Constantine I and its significance as an instrument of imperial victory. According to John of Ephesus, the emperor was spreading the story that he had received a vision of the new reverse imagery of the coins, an explicit hint to Constantine’s vision of the cross before the battle at the Milvian Bridge. In addition, quite a few of Tiberius’ coins only bear the name Constantine and omit Tiberius. The new reverse type introduced by Tiberius II only reappeared under Herakleios (610-641) and his successors (fig. 16). Herakleios used Constantine as a model for his self-representation during the war against the Sasanians and founded a »Constantinian« dynasty by naming three of his sons Constantine. A major characteristic of the Constantinian indications in imperial self-representation, especially of Tiberius II, Herakleios and his sons, is its military content. The coin imagery and circumscriptions refer to Christian imperial victory, which is based upon divine support for Constantine’s campaigns (fig. 9). This concept emerged from the legend of Constantine’s vision of the cross and it was linked to Constantine’s imperial standard, the labarum, as well as to his helmet and the bridle of his horse, as has been explained above.

The battles between Constantine and his pagan rivals Maxentius and Licinius are presented by Eusebius of Caesarea as exemplary conflicts between heathen superstition and Christian miracle. As a consequence, the wars with the Persians were frequently presented both to soldiers of the Roman armies and to the wider populace in the light of a struggle between Christianity and the forces of evil according to J. F. Haldon. Thus, it is not surprising that in the Byzantine Empire Constantine was employed as a programmatic model in conflicts with the Sasanians. Since the time of Justinian I Constantine was associated with an unhistorical victorious campaign against the Persians which became part of middle Byzantine vitae of

---

112 Holum 1977; 1982, 102-110. – On this war see also Greatrex 1993.
114 Wessel 1978, 784-785.
115 J. Eph., Hist. eccl. III 14. – Generally on the political significance of dreams and visions of Roman emperors see Weber 2000, esp. 98-133. – On Constantine’s vision of the cross ibidem 288-290. – According to a narration circulating in the 5th century, the emperor (erroneously identified as Arcadius) ordered the Long-Cross-Solidi (fig. 15) to be struck after a victory against the Persians that was assured by bronze crosses on the cloaks of the soldiers: Holum 1977, 155-157. The allusion to Constantine’s vision of the cross is obvious.
116 e.g. DOC I, 266 nos 1-2; 268 nos 5-6; 269 no. 8; 271-272 nos 12b.2-14c.
117 Whitby 1994, 92-93 emphasized that Constantine had a »false start« as an imperial model under Tiberius II and became firmly established by the 7th century.
119 The gold coins of Herakleios depicting the cross on a stepped base bear the legend Victoria Augusti and on the silver hexaograms the war cry of the Roman army Deus Adiuta Romanis appeared. – Whalin 2019; DOC II, 94; Grabar 1984, 35-36 fig. 6. – The legend ἐν τούτῳ νίκα accompanying the image of the emperor Constans II (641-668) on fig. 9 is a quote from the narration of Constantine’s vision of the cross according to Eusebius of Caesarea. Eus., Vita Const. I 28, 2. – Dinkler/Dinkler-von Schubert 1995, 48-49; DOC II, 406. – On the coin image see also Brandes 2001, 100-101.
120 Grabar 1971, 32-39; Gagé 1921, esp. 382-391. – Cf. Brandes 2001, 94. – The different traditions of Constantine’s vision of the cross are discussed by Kazhdan 1987, 218-230.
122 Haldon 1999, 18.
123 Mal., Chron. XIII 3.
St Constantine\textsuperscript{124}. Reference to Constantine fighting the Persians already occurs in 7\textsuperscript{th}-century Coptic texts\textsuperscript{125}. A homily on the cross by Pseudo-Cyril even connects Constantine’s vision of the cross to a battle against the Persians near Antioch\textsuperscript{126}. It has been suggested that these Coptic texts presented Constantine as triumphing over the Persians because Egyptian Christians needed a heroic figure spending hope during the Sasanian occupation of Egypt and the subsequent conquest of the province by the Muslims in the 7\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{127}.

\textsuperscript{124} The core of this extended middle Byzantine narration on Constantine’s victory over the Persians is considered to be a reflection of the successful campaigns of Herakleios: Lieu 1998, 167-168; 2006, 313-317.

\textsuperscript{125} Wilfong 1998, 178. 181. 185-186. – Buzi/Bausi 2013, 412.

\textsuperscript{126} Buzi/Bausi 2013, 409. – Ps.-Cyrill, In laud. cruce 69-74. – The editor Campagnano 1980, 14 suggested a final redaction of the text in the first half of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textsuperscript{127} Wilfong 1998, 186-187.
This idea of Constantine defeating the Sasanians is not limited to written testimonies but also expressed in art. In a miniature of the Chludov-Psalter, one of the very few examples of St Constantine shown in military garb on horseback (fig. 17)\(^{128}\), the emperor is depicted as vanquishing Orientals with Phrygian caps and baggy trousers shooting arrows at him. In the context of the 9\(^{th}\)-century psalter the scene is accompanying Psalm 60,4 (»Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that they may flee from before the bow«)\(^{129}\) and the image was obviously selected because the reference to the banner or sign (σημείωσιν) could be connected to the vision of the cross\(^{130}\). But it can be assumed that the image is probably based on an early Byzantine prototype\(^{131}\). If so, the prototype would have been suitable to illustrate the idea behind a short Coptic text on an ostracon found in the Theban monastery of Epiphanius in Egypt (7\(^{th}\) century): »Constantine, the righteous king, believed in God with all his heart. God guided him in all his ways and protected him from wars with de[mons] and wars […] with heathens […] because of his faith in God. He humbled his enemies under his feet. And when the Persians shot arrows at him, God send a cloud and took him out from among them, with his horse. And those barbarians were subject to him and gave him tribute for all of his time. And they did not make war at all during his time.«\(^{132}\) To the image of the Chludov-Psalter another can be added. Traces of depictions of Constantine and the Persians in a presumably early Byzantine pictorial programme in a cave near Antinoë (El Sheikh Ibada; gov. Minya/EG) by the ruins of the monastery Deir-el-Dik existed in the early 20\(^{th}\) century\(^{133}\). In view of the highly probable connection of Framarich and Karilos to the »army of heroic men« recruited by Tiberius II to fight the Sasanians it seems reasonable to assume that the veneration of St Constantine and his depiction in military attire on censer no. 1 (fig. 3) allude to the idea of victory over the Sasanians just as the miniature in the Chludov-Psalter and certainly, also the lost paintings in the cave by the ruins of the monastery Deir-el-Dik.

Obviously, the aforementioned written and pictorial sources testify an increasing reference to Constantine since the 6\(^{th}\) and especially the 7\(^{th}\) centuries accompanied by an adaption of the general idea of Christian victory associated with him to a specific anti-Sasanian narrative with the first Christian emperor as protagonist\(^{134}\). This reception and construction of Constantine as victorious hero in connection to wars against the heathen Sasanians and later the Muslims during the 6\(^{th}\) and 7\(^{th}\) centuries seem to have been a response to cope with existential military threat and the occupation of core territories of the empire in order to demar-
categorize oneself from the enemy and to strengthen Roman self-identity\textsuperscript{135}. The utilization of old iconography for the depiction of Constantine on censer no. 1 expressed by traditional Roman armour (especially the pseudo-Attic helmet) probably indicates a purposeful selection of past imagery and a visual reference to the very roots of the Roman-Christian Empire. Therefore, in the context of the war fought by Tiberius II and Maurice successively Constantine would have been a most suitable patron saint. This is particularly true for a community partly consisting of non-Roman members of the military. The veneration of the first Christian emperor, attested by the inscription on censer no. 1, could be the expression of a specific group identity with strong ideological ties to Constantinople, the empire and the emperor\textsuperscript{136}. Maybe Constantine was purposefully chosen (possibly by a military chaplain) as a patron of the local church\textsuperscript{137} because he was able to represent Roman-Christian identity like no other saint, alongside loyalty to the emperor (the new Constantine)\textsuperscript{138}, while his adherents were hoping for divine support during the war against heathen enemies\textsuperscript{139}. The cult may also have functioned as an appropriate instrument to tie foreign soldiers ideologically to the empire and to promote their Roman identity\textsuperscript{140}.

\section*{CONCLUSION}

It is most unfortunate that the hoard discussed here was not properly excavated and that no further data regarding the original context is available today. This may have provided valuable additional clues, especially

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{135} The reference of Tiberius II to Constantine as heroic and victorious founder of the Christian empire is reminiscent of the construction of Arminius as German national hero in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century and the representation of the emperor Wilhelm I as his successor; see Zelle 2015, 57-59 figs 7-11.
\item \textsuperscript{136} Taking into account the supposed finding of the objects in the Bīqā valley, a local tradition may also have played a role, as Constantine founded a church near Helopolis (Baalbek) at the site of a temple of Aphrodite according to Eus., Vita Const. III 58, 3. The church has not been identified archaeologically yet and nothing is known about the later fate of the church from the written sources. On the church see Wallraff 2011, 13-14 note 21. – A deployment of troops at the Bīqā valley and an explicit expression of loyalty to empire and emperor would have made sense in connection with the forcible oppression of the pagan insurgency in Helopolis in 579 attested by J. Eph., Hist. Eccl. III 27. As no further data regarding the finding spot and the archaeological context of the silver objects is available, both thoughts have to remain speculative.
\item \textsuperscript{137} Chaplains were regularly assigned to military units in Late Antiquity. It is conceivable that they were involved in the selection of the patron saint of the troop. On military chaplains and churches of specific military formations see Haensch/Lichtenberger/Raja 2016, 187-189 note 45; 192-193; Rance 2014, esp. 126-128 with further bibliography.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Contemporary Byzantine authors regularly define their own side as »the Christians« or »the Romans« in contrast to the Sassanian enemies: Haldon 1999, 18-19. – Greatrex 2000, 268. 274 stresses that loyalty to the emperor and not ethnic origin was the determining factor of Roman identity especially of soldiers in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century. On Greatrex point and Roman identity of barbarian soldiers cf. the recent comments by Parnell 2015. – See also Leppin 2012, 252-254 especially on the Roman identity of the multiethnic army raised by Tiberius II. Generally on the Roman identity of the Byzantine army Kaldellis 2017, 187-190.
\item \textsuperscript{139} It appears that Constantine’s vision of the cross functioned as a source of hope, especially for the Byzantine army. The invocation of a comes to be victorious in the sign of the cross from Kapiropra (al-Kafir/al-Bāra); prov. Idlib/SYR: Todt/Vest 2014, 1362-1366) indicates the legends’ function as a source for hope in perspective of the success of a military commander just as for the emperor Constans II on the aforementioned coins (see note 119 and fig. 9). IGLS IV, no. 1457: »Μητρόπολι η Ἡ ἱεροτοκονάμυ τῆς Ἑγκατάκτους ἐν θείω ἱερῷ πραγματικά γίνεται (probably 6\textsuperscript{th} century). The named comes is possibly identical with the magister militorum and comes exercitorum of the late 6\textsuperscript{th}-early 7\textsuperscript{th} century (PLRE III 1052-1057 s. v. Priscus 6). – In the late antique fort of Viničko Kale (Vinica municipality/MK) 49 terracotta reliefs (presumably 6\textsuperscript{th} century) were discovered that possibly belonged to the wall decoration of the local church. Seven of them depict a cross with a Latin inscription alluding to Constantine’s vision of the cross. – Cat. Munich 1993, 61-62 nos 69-75 pl. 10: »Crux Christi, vince et vincere presta omnibus sperantibus in te«. – Dimitrova 1992/1993, 61-62. – On the fort see Mikulčić 2002, 55. 256-260 no. 169 figs 147-150. – In a liturgical text (10\textsuperscript{th} century) composed for the service of soldiers before battle victory is explicitly associated with the vision of the cross. Acoulitia 155 line 15-21: »Ο ἡμών τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου τριάδος της πολεμίων καὶ νίκης καὶ θρόνου της Βυζαντίας καὶ νόμου / νίκης καὶ καταρρήσεως τουθανατί (amartia) του στρατού σου (Θός) ἦς ἑσπανγχρος.«
\item \textsuperscript{140} Generally on the role of the local church as forum for expressing loyalty to the imperial government: McCormick 1986, 237-238. – The role of the clergy in strengthening the loyalty of Roman soldiers becomes apparent in the speech of bishop Gregory of Antioch (571-593) to the soldiers mutinying against their commander Priscus in Syria in 589 (Evagr. Schol. VI 12). Gregory upholds the Roman identity of the mutineers and acted as a mediator between emperor and army: Leppin 2012, 253-254.
\end{itemize}
for a more precise dating, which can only be attempted with stylistic and typological comparisons. Together with the information gained from the inscriptions the material presented above provides insights into social and religious practice as well as the self-conception of an early Byzantine community in Greater Syria.

With high probability, the inscriptions found on the objects bear witness to the migration to Greater Syria of at least two individuals originating from the Frankish realm or Latin-speaking regions in the second half of the 6th century. It is likely, however, that Framarich and Karilos had been part of a larger group from the West who served as soldiers in the imperial forces. The presence of Framarich (and quite probably Karilos too) in the East affirms earlier hypotheses that people from the Frankish realm were among the soldiers raised by Tiberius II Constantine in 575. Framarich and Karilos were obviously fully integrated in the commemorative practice of a Greek-speaking community as attested by the existence of family or relatives commemorating them.

The exceptional cult of Constantine as a patron saint attested by the Karlsruhe silver hoard suggests that the idea of the Christian Roman Empire, imperial victory and loyalty to the imperial government was an important part of this community's identity. This self-conception mirrored in religious practice appears not to be an isolated phenomenon but linked to the overall process of »liturgification«, the interfusion of all aspects of social life (including military) in the eastern Roman Empire with Christian rituals and symbols since the late Justinianic period. This process is explained as an attempt to stabilize society during a quickly evolving transformation of the established order caused by numerous crises. Decisive military successes of the Sasanians against their Roman adversaries such as their invasion of Syria and the capture and destruction of Antioch in 540 are considered to have contributed to the crises that shook the traditional Roman world view in the 6th century. As a consequence, a fundamental transformation of the Christianized Roman Empire to a sacred Roman-Christian Realm took place in the second half of the 6th century. In fact, by the 7th century the Roman state in the East blended with the church and Christian community. In view of this, the sanctification of its founder Constantine and his establishment as a patron saint is consequential while the sacralization of the reigning emperor was substantially enhanced during the process of »liturgification«. According to Averil Cameron the presentation of the reigning emperor as an embodiment of Christ on Earth since the reign of Justin II marks a turning point in imperial art and ideology.

The revaluation of the first Christian emperor, the emphasis of the concept of Christian victory associated with him and the anti-Sasanian adaption of this legend was obviously provoked by the fundamental military threat of the Eastern Roman Empire by the Sasanians and later the Muslims Arabs in the 6th and 7th centuries. The veneration and reception of Constantine as a Christian hero and saint in the eastern provinces, in particular those affected by Sasanian and later Muslim attacks or experiencing long-lasting occupation (e.g. Germanikeia, Rihab, Egypt) provided a society under stress with a new means of identification. This seems to have worked both for imperial propaganda as well as on a local level in the provinces and in occupied territories not controlled by imperial authorities.


142 On the stabilizing function of the »liturgification« see Meier 2012, 229-230.

143 Meier 2004a, 313-320, 340-341.

144 Meier 2004b, 162-164.

145 Haldon 2016, 97, 291-292.

146 On the intensified sacralization of the emperor since the late Justinianic period see especially Meier 2004a, 608-638, 2012, 230-231; Cameron 1979, 6-18. – Also Haldon 1994, 96-97; 2016, 96-97.

147 Cameron 1980, 76, 82-84.

148 On new identification poles created by the process of »liturgification« Meier 2012, 230. See also Haldon 2016, 289, 291 on the role of Christian-Roman identity and imperial political theology as important factors of cultural cohesion of eastern Roman society during the crisis of the 7th and 8th centuries.
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Der Heilige Konstantin und das von Tiberius II. 574/575 aufgestellte »Heer heldenhafter Männer«: einige Überlegungen zur historischen Bedeutung des frühbyzantinischen Silberhorts in Karlsruhe


St Constantine and »The Army of Heroic Men« Raised by Tiberius II in 574/575: Some Thoughts on the Historical Significance of the Early Byzantine Silver Hoard at Karlsruhe

The silver hoard comprising six pieces, which the Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe acquired in 1993, belonged to the inventory of a church dedicated to St Constantine. The hoard relates stylistically as well as typologically to Greater Syria and is particularly significant due to its inscriptions. Two of the objects feature Greek votive inscriptions that bear dedications to the memory of a certain Framarich and a certain Karilos. Both names suggest that their bearers originated from a Latin-speaking region, perhaps the Frankish kingdom. These men probably came to Greater Syria as soldiers during Caesar Tiberius II Constantian's great recruiting campaign in the context of the Sasanian war in 574/575.
According to one votive inscription, St Constantine was the patron of the church and he is even depicted as a soldier in armour. This is an extraordinarily early example for his cult and for the depiction of this first Christian emperor to become a saint. The cult of St Constantine clearly reflects the values and the self-perception of the congregation: the idea of a Christian-Roman empire, the concept of the victorious emperor and loyalty to him. The intention behind choosing this holy patron could have been a conscious binding of the foreign soldiers to the emperor and the empire. In general, the emergence and spread of the cult of St Constantine during the 6th and especially the 7th centuries was obviously related to the massive military threat posed and the eventual occupation of core territories of the empire by the Sassanians and later by the Muslim Arabs.

Saint Constantin et «l’armée de héros» constituée par Tibère II en 574/575: quelques réflexions sur l’importance historique du trésor d’argent byzantin précoce à Karlsruhe

Le trésor composé de six pièces, présentant des liens typologiques et stylistiques avec la région syrienne, fut acquis en 1993 par le Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe et faisait partie du mobilier de l’église de saint Constantin. Ce sont surtout les inscriptions qui donnent tant d’importance à ce mobilier. Deux objets sont, par leurs inscriptions votives en grec, dédiés à la mémoire de Framarich et Karilos. Ces deux noms indiquent une origine latine, voire franque. Il est probable que ces deux hommes soient arrivés comme soldats en Syrie à la suite de la campagne de recrutement lancée par l’empereur Tibère II Constantin en 574/575 lors de la guerre contre les Sassanides.
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