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SUMMARY

The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate that the sacred silver objects from the sixth-century Sion treasure had different biographies and multivalences in different contexts. By this I mean that these objects had different conceptual dimensions in their production and usage in sixth-century Byzantium. These different meanings were a result of the changing interrelationships between people and the objects, depending on the intention and functionality of the objects and the contexts in which they were used. I will highlight three main aspects, all closely related. The first is the question of the changing function of the silver treasure: as commodity for sale; as a gift to God; as used inside the church for liturgical performances or as decorative church revetments. Tied to this is the intention of its users, something developed through ritual and knowledge, which gave the treasure its intended function – which relates to its functionality and the contexts in which it was used. These contexts enabled the users of the silverware to perceive these objects in different ways and give them meanings and life-stories, or biographies. For example, when a worshipper inside the church engaged with a paten, say, their reading and valuing of that object was not that which the donors perceived when they gave it as a gift.

My examination is carried out with a focus on the fifty-two silver objects from the Sion treasure which I have examined in Antalya Museum in Turkey and the Dumbarton Oaks Collection in Washington DC. Relying on my examinations in these two collections, the arguments in this thesis will be based on the forms, inscriptions, decorations, stamps and monograms on the objects. My thesis will discuss both what the value of the silverware was to its producers, donors and what its value might have been to those using these objects inside the church, not only to clergy but also to lay worshippers.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate that the sacred silver vessels from the Sion Treasure possessed differing biographies and multivalences in different contexts. This means that these objects had different conceptual dimensions in their production and usage from the sixth century to the ninth century in Byzantium.1 These different meanings occurred as a result of the changing relationships between people and the objects. This thesis highlights three main aspects, all of which are closely related. The first is the question of the changing function of the silverware: as commodities for sale, as gifts to God, as items used within the church during the liturgical performance, or as functional and decorative church revetments. Connected with this is their users’ intention, which was developed through ritual and knowledge and lent the objects different functions, and their intended function, which relates to their use and the context in which they were employed. These contexts enabled their users to perceive these objects in different ways, and to give them meaning and life-stories, or biographies. For example, when a worshipper in church engaged with a paten, for the worshipper, the value of that object was not the same as that the donors perceived when they gave it as a gift. This thesis argues that a study of the form and morphological features of the objects alone does not provide a sufficient understanding of the biographies and value of objects placed on them by their contemporaries. Rather, it is necessary to align their morphological features with their functions and materiality, and the intention behind their use by Byzantine people, in order to understand the value given to these objects by their contemporaries.

1.1 The Sion Treasure

This thesis focuses on the objects in the so-called Sion Treasure, which was discovered as buried during illegal excavation in 1963 by villagers from Buyuk Asar, in the Kumluca district of Antalya Province, in Turkey. The region in which the objects were found was known as Lycia in the Byzantine era. Following the discovery of the objects, some were taken to Antalya Museum, but others were sold to private collections, which

1 As it will be explained later in this thesis, the objects are considered to be produced in the sixth century and were used to the beginning of the ninth century, when they were buried.
means that the Treasure is now divided between five collections: Antalya Museum in Turkey; Dumbarton Oaks in the United States of America; a private collection in Geneva; and the Digby-Jones and Hewett collections in London. There are not enough evidences to explain how these objects were divided between these collections. However, when I discussed this situation with the archaeologist Suleyman Atalay in Antalya Museum, he suggested that these objects were found during illegal excavations. As the museum reports states, some were taken to the Antalya Museum via confiscation. Others had already been sold to collectors by villagers before the police and museum curators reached to the area of excavation. I have also searched for police reports but could not find any information about who found and sold these objects to the collectors. But, according to the acquisition history of the objects detailed on the website of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and the acquisition report of the objects in Antalya Museum, it seems likely that the Greek collector George Zacos, who was a dealer based in the Grand Bazaar in Istanbul, working between Switzerland, London and Istanbul, bought objects from Sion from the villagers and then sold most of them to Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss who later gave these objects to Dumbarton Oaks. Zacos might have also sold other pieces to other collections in London and Switzerland. The acquisition dates of some of the objects is recorded on the Dumbarton Oaks website. For example, a book cover (No. 44), three patens (Nos. 4-6) and the altar table covers (Nos. 48 and 49) were given in 1963 whilst a censer (No. 20), an openwork lamp with openwork inscription (No. 40) and a cross-shaped polycandelon (No. 9) were given to the Dumbarton Oaks collection in 1965. According to the report from the Antalya Museum, all the objects in Antalya Museum were confiscated in 1963.

Some of the objects, which are mostly flat, were found in good condition, such as the patens (Nos. 1-6), the circular and cross shaped polycandela (Nos. 7-12), and the censers (Nos. 19 and 20). Others were found crushed, folded and rolled up. The rectangular polycandela (Nos. 14-18) are in a fragmentary condition except one (No. 13) which was restored in Dumbarton Oaks. These state of the polycandela indicate that they might have been crushed during burial. Two of the book covers (Nos. 44 and 45) are crushed and one of them is in a fragmentary condition (No. 45); the third book cover exists in several pieces (No. 53). Only one chalice was found in one piece but still there

---

2 I have found this information from the museum reports in both Antalya Museum and Dumbarton Oaks.
3 This number and following numbers which refer to the objects are from Table 1 in the appendix.
are cracks on its body (No. 27). The other chalices from the Antalya Museum were not folded but detached from their foot and crushed (Nos. 24-16). Two chalices from Dumbarton Oaks survive only as the body, without feet (Nos. 23 and 24). Two other chalices in Dumbarton Oaks were folded and are detached from their foot (Nos. 21 and 22). Two of the standing lamps were also flattened and rolled up (Nos. 31 and 32). One further standing lamp in Antalya is detached from its foot (No. 34). The last example is in Dumbarton Oaks and is in good condition (No. 33). There are also other examples of objects which were folded. These include the ewer (No. 30) and the amphora (No. 28) which is folded as folding a towel. The plain altar table sheets were rolled up (No. 49). The lampstands were also detached and folded (Nos. 46-47). The other surviving objects in the treasure were all crushed and are now in a fragmentary condition. Three of the openwork lamps were restored at Dumbarton Oaks, but still have missing fragments. The other six openwork lamps are in fragmentary condition. When these folded and rolled up objects are examined, they give an indication of intentional folding. The traces of nails on the altar table sheets, for example, indicate that they were removed carefully without ripping them off. They might have been folded to be put in a storage case to fit them, though there is no evidence again to explain whether these objects were buried with a storage case or buried randomly. Perhaps they were folded and rolled before carried to wherever they were buried. Some of the objects, especially the flat ones, might have been stacked on top of one another and the others which did not fit in the bag might have been folded to create more space.

During my examinations of the objects in Antalya Museum, and in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, it was possible to marry some of the fragments across the collections by comparing their measurements and forms. For example, five of the rectangular polycandela in Dumbarton Oaks which are in fragmentary condition can be completed with fragments in the Antalya Museum (Table 1, Nos. 14 and 16). My examination of the material in Antalya and Dumbarton Oaks, and the subsequent completion of certain objects, enabled me to conclude an approximate total number of items included in the Sion Treasure. As far as it is now possible to reconstruct the Treasure, it can be understood to consist of 54 identifiable objects, along with various unidentified fragments and pieces that are now detached from the vessels and cannot be matched
with other fragments. Some of the identified objects are complete, while others are in a fragmentary condition. Even though 3 pieces of objects from the treasure are identified, they cannot be matched with other pieces. Therefore, I have considered them as identifiable, but detached pieces. For example, a piece of a candlestick (No. 52) is detached and does not match anything else. Similarly, the piece of book cover from Antalya (No. 53) is different from the other two book covers. This clarifies that there were three book covers in the Sion treasure, but the other pieces are lost. Additionally, the asterisk (No. 54) is used to hold a paten, but it is hard to say which paten it belongs to. It is now being displayed as attached by soldering to the paten in Dumbarton Oaks Museum (No. 6).

Taken together, the Treasure consists of six patens (one with asterisk), twelve polycandela, two censers, seven chalices, two amphorae, one ewer, four standing lamps, eight openwork lamps that can be employed in either suspended or standing form, one suspension bracket, three pairs of book covers, two lampstands, rim sheeting for an altar table, plain sheets for the top of an altar, two inscribed plain sheets, and one base of a candlestick. All of the objects from the Treasure are silver, and some are gilded. Antalya Museum holds two patens, five polycandela, one censer, three chalices, one amphora, one standing lamp, the base of a candlestick, rim sheeting fragments, and plain sheet fragments for an altar table, and one inscribed plain sheet. There are also fragments that marry objects in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, since the museum also has nine detached pieces, including chalice bases, chains, and miscellaneous objects and fragments. Meanwhile, the Dumbarton Oaks collection holds three patens, seven polycandela, one censer, four chalices, one amphora, one ewer, three standing lamps, seven openwork lamps, one suspension bracket, two book covers, two lampstands, and rim sheeting fragments and plain sheet fragments for an altar table. In addition, there are

---

4 According to Susan Boyd, there were between 53 and 58 objects, excluding 22 revetments and chains, but she also counted the miscellaneous unidentified objects and detached pieces. Susan A. Boyd, "A "Metropolitan" Treasure from a Church in the Provinces: An Introduction to the Study of the Sion Treasure", in ed. Susan A. Boyd and Marlia Mundell Mango, Ecclesiastical Silver plate in Sixth-Century Byzantium, (Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1992), 5-38. According to examinations I made in both collections (Antalya and Dumbarton Oaks), when the identified objects and fragments come together, the number of the objects becomes 54. Depending on this study, this thesis will consider the number of objects as 54 and exclude the detached pieces which could not be identified.

5 According to Boyd, there were six chalices, but she did not count one chalice in Antalya. See ibid., checklist. And Table 1, no: 27 in this thesis.

6 See Table 1, nos. 14, 16, 36, 45, 48, 49.
also thirteen detached pieces, including one asterisk, four chalice bases, and miscellaneous objects. One paten is in a private collection in Geneva, one openwork lamp is in the Digby-Jones collection in London, and some fragments of two objects are in the Hewett collection in London.

Many of the Sion Treasure objects bear inscriptions, stamps, monograms, and decoration. In total, 44 of the 54 objects are inscribed, with 39 of the inscribed objects bearing the names of their original donors, and the name of the individuals in whose memory the objects were given.\(^7\) Of these 39 objects inscribed with the names of their donors, the 12 inscribed polycandela have the monogram of their donor, instead of a full name. In total, there were four specific donors: Bishop Eutychianos, Bishop Paregoros, Priest Zacharias, and Bishop Theodore. In total, 29 of the 54 objects were donated by Bishop Eutychianos, including three patens, all of the polycandela, two censers, four standing lamps, two amphorae, six of the openwork lamps, and one suspension bracket for lamps. The rim sheeting for an altar table, and the plain sheet were donated by Bishop Paregoros, and one plain sheet was donated by a priest, Zacharias.

Because several of the inscriptions bear the name of ‘Sion’, some scholars claim that these objects might have belonged to the Sion Monastery.\(^8\) According to the *Life* of St. Nicholas of Sion, this monastery was founded in the sixth century in the mountains of Myra, in Karbel-Asarcık village.\(^9\) It is situated a few kilometres north of the well-known monastery of Nicholas of Myra, the modern town of Demre, and 40 km from Kumluca, where the objects were found. The original position of the church was determined by studying the *Life* of Nicholas of Sion: in the course of his topographical research, Harrison discovered a monastery with a *triconchos* church that was potentially situated in a location mentioned in the life of the saint. And the most recent studies on the *Life* of Nicholas of Sion, together with those concerning the topography of Lycia,
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\(^7\) Four inscribed chalices and one inscribed base of a candlestick do not bear the names of donors. See Table 1 and 2, nos. 22,23,25,26 and 52. And six objects, (Nos. 2, 5, 6, 38, 39, 45), have names inscribed on them, however since the names of these people are preceded by the formula of ‘For the Memory of’, they might have been given by someone else for the memory of those whose names written on objects. The detailed discussion of this will be made after the description of inscriptions.


have indicated that the monastery of Nicholas of Sion is situated in Karabel-Asarçık village.  

Since the objects that constitute the Sion Treasure were found buried in the hill of Buyuk Asar, Kumluca, which is 40 km from the Sion Monastery, some scholars claim that they might have belonged to the church in Kumluca, and they connected Holy Sion with Buyuk Asar. However, the lack of evidence for this, and the fact that there are no traces of a church on the hill mean that this assumption is unsubstantiated. As Ihor Ševčenko noted, there is no church with the name ‘Holy Sion’ in Kumluca, therefore the name should instead be considered to relate to the church of Holy Sion in Jerusalem, and the individuals who donated the objects to the Sion monastery were likely to have considered it to be the counterpart of the shrine in Holy Sion in Jerusalem. Indeed, the Life of St. Nicholas of Sion suggests that the church was founded in a place that God showed Nicholas was the counterpart of the Holy Sion in Jerusalem. Moreover, in the vita, it was observed that Nicholas “produced many (miraculous) signs and cures for those who believed through him in Holy Sion.” All of this makes it highly likely that the church of Holy Sion in Lycia is that situated in Karabel-Asarçık village, and that the objects in the Sion Treasure might have been given to the church by donors who believed it to be the counterpart of Holy Sion, because of St. Nicholas. Since all of the objects were found together, they may have belonged to the same church. In his study, Harrison attempted to locate empirical evidence that the objects could be carried from the village of Karabel to Kumluca, noting that, according to his topographical examinations, the track from Karabel to Kumluca takes one day to walk, and he himself travelled this road with a donkey bearing a load of at least 100 kilograms. This proved that it would be entirely possible to transport the silver objects from the church in this way. Moreover, Harrison interviewed a villager who used to travel from Karabel to the

---

13 Nicholas of Sion, Vita, 31.
14 Ibid., 35.
15 Martin Harrison, Mountain and Plain: From the Lycian Coast to the Phrygian Plateau in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Period, (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 38, note 47.
mosque in Kumluca for prayers on Fridays, departing the village on Thursday evening, and returning on Friday evening.\textsuperscript{16} It is therefore possible to conclude that this track was also a viable route during the Byzantine era, and that the Treasure was likely transported to Kumluca by donkey, and buried there.

The dating of the objects in the Sion Treasure is problematic. The stamped objects can be dated to the second half of the sixth century, near the end of the Byzantine Emperor Justinian I’s reign, since all of the stamps bear the monogram and bust of Justinian I.\textsuperscript{17} Meanwhile, the date of the unstamped objects is generally associated with the date of the foundation of Sion Monastery. In addition, Ševčenko compared the writing style of the inscriptions with the objects from other treasures from the sixth century, and claimed that both the ligatures, and the use of certain letters, such as the style of the alpha and omega forms, are similar to those on objects from other treasures dated to the sixth century.\textsuperscript{18} However, he also noted this evidence is not sufficient for epigraphists, and that the form of the inscriptions, the date of Sion Monastery, and the inscriptions bearing the name of the Holy Sion should also be considered.\textsuperscript{19} As a result of the current lack of additional evidence regarding the dating of the objects, this thesis assumes that all of the objects in the Sion Treasure are from the sixth century, or the beginning of the seventh century, since there is also a possibility that some of them may have been donated to the church some years after its foundation.

Another problematical matter concerning the Sion Treasure is when it was buried. It is most likely that the Treasure was buried by individuals from the church, following the Arab invasions that commenced in the second half of the seventh century. The first confrontation between the Byzantine and Arab navies that occurred near Lycia was the so called ‘Battle of the Masts’, near Phoenix, Lycia, in 655 AD, in which the Byzantine fleet was defeated by the Arabs. This is considered to mark the commencement of the Arab invasions of Lycia, and the defeat engendered other invasions and attacks\textsuperscript{20} that

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 38.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 40-41.
continued from the seventh century to the beginning of the ninth century, with the Arab fleet settling in the port of Phoenix in 715 AD, and Harun al-Rashid attacking Myra in 809 AD.\textsuperscript{21} It has been suggested that the first Arab incursion near Phoenix Bay, which is 20 km from Sion Monastery, might have prompted the removal of important objects from the church for burial in a secure place. However, the defeat of the Byzantine fleet, and the loss of Syria and Antioch, a decade before the invasions, may also have promoted people to conceal the objects.\textsuperscript{22} The people who buried the Sion Treasure most plausibly were those who were responsible for safekeeping of these objects or responsible for the administration of the church and monastery property in the Sion Monastery. Monasteries generally preserved these objects in their storage room which is also called \textit{skeuophylakion}, and there were monastic officials who were responsible for the safekeeping of these objects was also called \textit{Skeuophylax}.\textsuperscript{23} It might have also been decided by the administrators who were responsible for monastic property to decide to bury the objects for safekeeping.

Since there is no specific information about when exactly the Arabs captured the city of Myra, it is also possible that the objects were buried following other attacks, and while Harrison proposed that the objects may have been buried for safekeeping after Myra was attacked by Harun al-Rashid in 809 CE, he also noted that the objects may have been stolen by the Arabs and buried in Kumluca.\textsuperscript{24} However, since the condition of the objects is good, with some rolled up intentionally and were not ripped off and removed even with their nails, it is unlikely that they were buried by the Arabs. And it can therefore be claimed that the Treasure was buried for safekeeping sometime before the capture of Myra, probably at some point in, or after, the end of the eighth-century. If this was the case, then the objects were used between the second half of the sixth century, or the beginning of the seventh century, and the end of the eighth century. This

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item For the discussions about the Sion treasure and their find spots, see Boyd, 'A “Metropolitan” Treasure from a Church in the Provinces', 7.; Hellenkemper, 'Ecclesiastical Silver Hoards and their Findspots: Implications for the Treasure Found at Korydella, Lycia', 68.
\item Harrison, \textit{Mountain and Plain}, 31-40.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
assumption enables the use of certain primary sources written in the seventh and eighth century, regarding the perception of individuals within a church, and value of the art objects contained in a church.

1.2 Aims, contributions and methodology of the thesis

In previous studies, which are discussed later in this thesis, the silver vessels from the Sion Treasure were considered largely in terms of their morphological features, with their stylistic differences analysed in a bid to define the workshops that produced them, and, most recently, the objects were examined in terms of their sensual affect.\textsuperscript{25} However, the value and significance of the objects at the time when they were created and used does not lie only in their visual characteristics and sensual affordances, since their relationship to and with people is also significant; while their functionality lends them one life story, another biography is gained through their users, in terms of their producers, patrons, and the individuals within the church, not only the clergy, who engaged with them. The objects also possessed a biography in certain contexts that affected both their usage, and individuals’ perception.

The primary focus of this thesis lies in the following questions: What happens when we examine these objects in three stages of their life, from their production, their usage as a gift to God, to their use in the church context? And what happens when we examine the objects in the different contexts of their production, donation, and usage in church? What was the purpose of these silver objects? What did they mean to their producers? What did they mean to their donors? And what was their value and biography for worshippers? Did their biography change throughout their life, or by gaining new biographies, did they become multivalent, and gain multi-biographies? This thesis seeks to understand the value and life story of these silver vessels in Early Byzantium by examining the value given to them by the Early Byzantine Christians who created and donated the objects, and engaged with them within the church. Rather than simply asserting, for example, ‘these objects were to be used in a church’, or ‘they were given as a gift’, this thesis explores these questions in more detail by exploring the

\textsuperscript{25} A more detailed explanation of previous studies on Sion objects will be given in the theoretical and literature review chapter.
information that can be gained about the intentions of the donors, the perceptions of the church users, and the effect of these aspects on the value of the objects.

This thesis also provides fresh information about the vessels in the Sion Treasure, since the objects in Antalya Museum have never been fully incorporated into discussions of the Treasure. This is because Susan Boyd, one of the foremost scholars of the Treasure, was never been able to view the objects fully, or to examine them first-hand because she did not have the opportunity to visit Antalya. Instead, Nezih Fıratlı, who was the director of Antalya Museum in the 1990s, and Ihor Ševčenko and Erica Cruickshank Dodd, who visited Turkey, photographed the objects and sent the photographs, along with brief information, to her. As she admitted, these photographs were not enough to correlate fragmentary objects between Antalya and Dumbarton Oaks. She was only able to examine the objects in Dumbarton Oaks and the other three private collections. Moreover, details about the items from the Treasure in Antalya are not fully provided in the Dumbarton Oaks publications, nor in Boyd’s checklist. Neither includes detailed information about the decoration; the weights and forms are incorrectly cited; and the museum accession numbers of objects on Boyd’s checklist is unclear. Consequently, a key aspect of the present project was to examine the objects in both Antalya Museum and the Dumbarton Oaks collection in detail, considering their form, weight, measurements, inscriptions, stamps, and decoration. This account forms the major part of Chapter 3, with the details listed in Table 1, for ease of reference.

The first-hand examination of the Sion Treasure silver in the Antalya Museum and Dumbarton Oaks collections conducted by the author of the present thesis therefore provides additional information about the number of pieces from the Treasure held in these collections, along with details of their measurements and decoration. I compared this with Boyd’s checklist of the objects from Antalya Museum, Dumbarton Oaks, the private collection in Geneva and London and Hewett collections in London, and discovered that inaccuracies exist in Boyd’s list. With the help of the current Director of the Antalya Museum, Nur Direr, I was able to connect fragments of various objects, and to reconsider the number of pieces in the collection, and their measurements. As a consequence of these first-hand examinations, and by comparing them with the content of Boyd’s checklist, I prepared a revised table of the objects in the collection (see Table

27 Ibid., 19-34.
This table records the museum’s accession number of each object, together with its dimensions, condition, material and form, inscription, donor, and silver stamp. The fragmentary objects are also listed, together with the detached objects that it was not possible to associate with others. I have added the weights of all chalices in Antalya Museum, which were not provided in Boyd’s checklist. In addition, the objects’ thickness, in terms of the silver sheet used, and the dimensions of the inscriptions were also examined. These are all elements that are not a part of the Checklist. The height of the inscriptions were important information for this thesis because this information will be used when discussing the visibility and legibility of the inscriptions in chapter 6.

In addition to measuring the thickness of the objects and the dimensions of the inscriptions, there are other contributions which this research made to the checklist. There are some missing objects. This might be because the scholars who provided information to Boyd might have not seen those objects. There is one chalice missing (No. 27) in Boyd’s checklist: this is described in this thesis. There is one base of a candlestick which was also not seen by other scholars (No. 52). The inscription and detailed description of the object cannot be found in the publications made by scholars from Dumbarton Oaks. Nor did they see the fragment of amphora (No. 29) which has an inscription completing the inscription on the amphora. While translating the inscription on amphora, Ihor Ševčenko considered this fragment as missing. It was not and now the inscription can be completed. The weight of this object is also missing in the checklist. There is one standing lamp in Antalya which has broken into two pieces (No. 34). When I examined this object, I was able to find its foot and measure the object as complete. The weight of the object is also provided in this thesis and I have also examined its thickness and measured the height of the inscriptions. Three rectangular polycandela (Nos. 14,16,18) have fragments in two collections, Boyd’s suggestions and matchings of these were wrong. I have been able to marry the fragments. Further, seeing these objects as more complete enabled me to have their approximate weights and examine them as complete. There are numerous plain altar table sheets which were not examined by Dumbarton Oaks scholars. I was able to examine the measurements of the objects and compare them with the pieces in Dumbarton Oaks. This enabled me to make assumptions on the total weight of silver used to cover altar table. I will also discuss this in the section describing altar table sheets in chapter 3. I have also examined numerous

---

detached pieces, such as pincers, bases of vessels and unidentified fragments. These objects also enabled me to measure the approximate total weight of objects and revetments in the treasure. As I mentioned earlier, I have not counted the asterisk and piece of book cover as complete piece, rather I have considered them identifiable but detached pieces.

I was not able to examine the paten (No. 3) in the Geneva Private collection, nor the openwork lamp (No. 42) in the Digby Jones collection nor the fragments (Nos. 29, 36) in Hewett collection. In order to present a complete picture of the entire Treasure, however, I have included these objects in the table 1. I have used the information provided by Boyd, but there is not enough information about the measurements of the objects, such as their weights. Therefore, it was not possible for me to present the actual weights of these objects.

Ihor Ševčenko and Erica Cruickshank Dodd did visit Turkey and examine the objects. Ševčenko translated the inscriptions, and Dodd examined the stamps on the silverware. This thesis adds no new, or additional, information about the inscriptions, so I have used Ševčenko’s translations throughout (though I also made my own translations of inscriptions). In only one case, (No. 52), I have offered my translation in addition to Ševčenko’s. Moreover, I also translated the inscription on the fragment of amphora (No. 29) mentioned above and compared it with the edited translation of Ševčenko. For inscriptions, I have also produced a table in the appendix (Table 2) which indicates the inscription as it is written on the object and the edited version and translation by Ševčenko.

The stamps on the objects in the Sion Treasure were first examined by Dodd. She was unable to publish her full work on the Sion Treasure’s silver stamps, and only produced two papers discussing the possible workshop origins of the objects, which mentioned the stamps, without providing detailed information. She explained that although she was able to view the objects in Antalya Museum, and to combine them with the objects in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, she was not able to publish her paper on the stamps on the objects in the Sion Treasure, because she believed that it would be inappropriate to publish only the objects in the Dumbarton Oaks collection. Therefore, only the

29 Ibid., 39-56.
symposium paper she produced is available, and it does not explain the stamps in detail. There is not detailed explanation about why she was not allowed to publish the objects from Antalya, but she explains that there was conflict between Antalya Museum and Dumbarton Oaks about bringing the Sion Treasure back to Antalya museum. At that time there was an agreement between Dodd and Firatli to publish the vessels together, but Antalya Museum did not allow Dumbarton Oaks scholars to publish work about the Sion objects in the Antalya Museum, and so this agreement foundered. During my research in both collections I have also examined the stamps on objects in both collections and present them both together (chapter 3 and in table 3 in the appendix).

I have also provided additional information about the cost of the Sion treasure. The monetary value of silver objects has been studied by Marlia Mundell Mango, but she did not studied the monetary value of the Sion Treasure. The monetary value of the objects is important for this thesis because it leads me to discuss the opportunity of donors to buy these objects and present them to the Sion Monastery. I will discuss the cost of the Sion treasure in chapter 4 and I have also provided a table for this (See Table 4 in appendix.

Based on examinations of the objects in Antalya Museum, and in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, the arguments in this thesis are based on their form, inscriptions, decorations, stamps, and monograms. The thesis discusses both the value of the silverware to its producers and donors, and what its value might have been to those using the objects within the church, both clergy and lay worshippers. The inscriptions, for example, provide the names of the objects’ donors, and their hopes of what they might gain from their gift, and these inscriptions also offer potential information about the reasons behind the objects’ production and donation to the church.

Examining the inscriptions from the perspective of their donors requires a consideration of the notions that lie in the meaning of inscribing an object, and the power of

inscriptions. Moreover, it is necessary to consider the intended viewers of the inscriptions, and whether they were people within the church, or whether the words were addressed only to God, or indeed, both. The inscriptions are a central part in this discussion of the multivalence of the silverware in this thesis, since they offer insights into how patrons approached the vessels, and what they expected from these inscriptions, which engenders discussion regarding how people perceived the inscriptions, and what they meant to them. This requires an examination of the knowledge, and social status of Early Byzantine church-goers, both those who were able to read the inscriptions, and had access to the materiality of the objects, in terms of seeing, touching or handling them, and those who were not able to engage with the objects, or who could not read them because they were illiterate.

These issues were considered during the examination of the objects in the Antalya Museum and Dumbarton Oaks collection, during which the potential different viewing points of the Sion objects were explored. The height of the inscriptions was also measured to determine whether or not they were legible from a distance of two or three metres, which was the likely distance that the congregation stood from the objects, and to gain a sense of what people might have seen on the objects from a distance, and from close-up. Was it possible for the users of the vessels to read the inscriptions easily, or with difficulty, or indeed not at all? If the users could not read them, then what functions might they have served? Who were the inscriptions for: the priests who used the vessels, the congregation who saw them, or for God alone? The way in which the congregation held the vessels, and the way in which they were used within the church, was also considered, in order to demonstrate how the objects were, or were not, accessible to people in the congregation, thereby indicating how people possibly engaged with the objects. This exploration supports the argument that the objects within a church should not be discussed according to their sensual affordances alone.

In addition, the stamps on the objects provide information about the circulation of silver in sixth-century Byzantium, and this engenders a discussion of the commercial value of the objects, and a consideration of how they moved from a commercial cost to a value for God. By discussing about how the objects circulated and became commercial objects, this thesis explores the value of the objects in their production context, which encompasses a discussion of how the objects were valued by their producers. It was also necessary to examine the decoration on the objects, in terms of its functions for the
producers, donors, and other viewers. In order to determine how the objects were valued in different contexts during the course of their life, the objects, and their value in terms of their form, decoration, and inscriptions, is examined in three different contexts. For example, when discussing the value of the objects during their production, the value of the decoration, measurements, and form for their producers is examined, while in a gift context, the objects’ value for their donors, and in a church context, their value for the church people is examined.

Overall, the methodological approach to the objects employed in this thesis is to examine them in their cultural context, and their material malleability. The concept that human agency and material agency affected one another, and therefore the objects gained their biography through a combination of both aspects, is also discussed. Due to this interrelationship between human agency and material agency, the context in which objects are used also affects their biography, since this affects both the human perception of objects, and their usage. These features cannot be considered to be independent of one another, rather they function interdependently in the life of objects and affect objects’ value. Figure 1 presents the interrelationship between the different factors that affect objects’ biographies, and their value, illustrating the fact that the biography and the value of objects is affected by three aspects: human agency, material agency, and context. These aspects also affect one another; for example, the material properties of objects affect people’s intentions to use them, and context also affects people and objects during the usage of objects. In other words, context affects people’s perception and intentions when using objects, and it also changes the way in which objects are used. For instance, an object might have been used on a dining table, or during the Eucharist. The function of the silver vessels also changes according to the context in which they are used.
1.3 Chapter Summary

This thesis is structured in two parts, consisting of seven chapters in total, including the Introduction. Following the introductory chapter, the thesis presents a chapter discussing the interdisciplinary framework of the thesis, including the extant literature concerning the silverware, and the methodologies that are applied to Byzantine art objects, and proceeding to a discussion of the interdisciplinary theories and methods that the thesis employs to the Sion Treasure.

The first chapter of Part One of this thesis (Chapter 3) presents the material features of the objects in the Sion Treasure, while the second chapter of Part One (Chapter 4) considers their monetary value, production, and circulation, as the necessary first step for examining the biographies and value of the objects. For example, it is necessary to consider the circulation of the silver in the form of bullion, or as objects, and their monetary value when discussing how the objects were accessible to people and silversmiths, and their cost to their donors.

Part Two of this thesis examines the objects from their production through to their usage within the church. Each chapter in this part considers the effects of context, people, and the material features of the objects on their biography, and the multivalence
of the silverware. In this context, in the first chapter of Part Two (Chapter 5), the profile of the objects as commodities, and the purpose of their production, is considered. Chapter 6 explores the donors and their objects, examining concepts regarding the intended function of the objects. This chapter discusses how the silver vessels may have been intended as gifts to God, and the factors that made them such. The chapter employs the examination of the inscriptions, decorations, and monograms on the vessels presented in Chapter 3. Following the discussion of the purpose of the production, and the value of the objects for their producers, the chapter considers the meaning of the decorations and inscriptions on the objects, together with their value for their donors, exploring the value of objects, and discussing the issues that arise regarding notions of performativity, in terms of the fact that the function of the objects might be a gift to God, bearing the donor’s wishes. Finally, Chapter 7 examines how the concept of ‘the biography of objects’ operates when considering the objects in the Sion Treasure in the context of their user engagement, considering whether people were able to touch and see the objects, and what happened both when they engaged, and did not engage, with them, and whether the inscriptions were read, or not. While an earlier chapter considers the effect of the inscriptions as read by other people, in terms of understanding the value of the vessels to the patrons, Chapter 7 examines the effect of reading inscriptions, and seeing and touching the objects, on the perception of their viewers, asking if and how these experiences might have changed the understanding of the objects. The main premise of the chapter is that the objects in the Sion Treasure gained their biographies not only via their material properties, but also as a result of the cognition of people, and the church context, which lent them different biographies.

In order to present the data in a clear form, Table 1 lists the objects with their numbers, measurements, and whether or not they are inscribed and stamped, employing the checklist produced by Boyd, and revising the mistakes it includes regarding the measurements and number of objects. Table 1 also includes the fragmentary pieces, in order to provide a complete picture of the contents of the Sion Treasure. Table 2 also provides the inscriptions in Greek as written on the object and edition made on the incomplete inscriptions by Ševčenko. Meanwhile, Table 3 presents the stamps, according to Dodd’s division of the stamps by type, in terms of whether they are round, square, hexagonal, cruciform, or long, in order to clarify the sorts of stamps applied to the vessels and includes the information that Dodd did not publish. And the table 4
presents the cost of the sion objects to their donors. The table shows calculation of the weights of the objects both in kg and roman pounds and indicates their price in sixth century.
2. A THEORETICAL AND INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO THE SION TREASURE

This chapter presents a review of the extant literature concerning the silverware and methodological approaches to Byzantine art. It also discusses the theories that lie at the foundation of the arguments this thesis employed to claim that the use of theoretical and methodological approaches to objects changes the understanding of the sixth-century Byzantine values lent to the Sion Treasure’s silver. The chapter commences with a discussion of the literature regarding silverware, which is divided into two sections: the first discusses the studies concerning the Sion Treasure, and the second discusses the literature regarding silverware in general. The chapter then proceeds to a presentation of the extant methodological approaches to Byzantine art, while the final section of the chapter presents the extant theories regarding the biography and life of objects, material culture, and agency, together with neuroscientific theories concerning the perception of art, in terms of emotion and knowledge.

2.1 Studies of silver objects

2.1.1 Studies of the Sion Treasure

There is an extensive body of extant work regarding the Sion Treasure. The objects from the Treasure were published in a series of studies by Boyd and Ševčenko, in which Boyd discussed the background of the Treasure, and provided information concerning the current location of the objects, their original donors, and the origins of the objects. She sought to introduce the objects to a wider audience, and to consider their importance in Byzantine art, evaluating them in terms of their stylistic differences, and dating them according to their stamps. She argued that the stylistic differences of the vessels indicated that the objects were produced in different workshops, and suggested that the similarities between the vessels indicated a level of mass production. Although the objects’ forms are similar, and may have been produced by the same workshop, Boyd argued that their different styles of decoration indicated that they were decorated at different workshops. She also compared different vessels in terms of their quality, connecting this factor to their supposed workshops, but without explaining

---

these terms in detail. In addition, she discussed the reasons why the objects might have been buried. In the appendix, she listed the objects in Antalya Museum, the private collection in Geneva, and in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, providing information about each of the objects’ inscriptions, and including a translation of the inscriptions, and a list of donors, as well as information regarding whether or not each object is stamped. The list did not describe the appearance of the stamps, and the weights and sizes provided for the objects in Antalya Museum are incorrect.\(^{34}\) This article provided the starting point for the present thesis’s discussion of the production of the objects, and the list provided important information about the donors of each piece.

In addition, Boyd produced an article about the openwork lamps from the Sion Treasure that presented detailed information about the decoration and forms, and about the donors of the openwork lamps.\(^{35}\) In this article, she again discussed the background of the Treasure, and presented information about the donors of the objects, employing the same arguments as in her earlier article.

Meanwhile, Ševčenko produced an important study about the inscriptions and monograms on the Sion objects,\(^{36}\) which provided information about the donors of the objects, and the formulae employed in the inscriptions, comparing them with other formulae in Byzantine inscriptions. The study provided a translation of all of the inscriptions, and details of the formulae on the objects from Antalya Museum, the Geneva private collection, and the Dumbarton Oaks collection. By employing the combined information from the inscriptions, Ševčenko sought to locate the origins of the Treasure, and argued that the objects belonged to Sion Monastery.

Meanwhile, the book covers in the Sion Treasure were studied by both Ernst Kitzinger and John Lowden. The former examined the one pair of book covers in the Sion Treasure that are decorated with crosses,\(^{37}\) including a detailed description, and a discussion of the meaning of the iconography of the cross depicted with teardrops, and flanked by palm trees, which he identified as the tree of life. By considering the other

\(^{34}\) Boyd, 'A “Metropolitan” Treasure from a Church in the Provinces', 5-8. She explains here that she did not see the objects at first hand.


\(^{37}\) For the object, see Table 1, no 44. For the description of the objects, see Ernst Kitzinger, 'A Pair of Silver Book Covers in the Sion Treasure', in ed. Ursula E. McCracken et al., Gatherings in Honour of Dorothy E. Miner, (Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1974), 3-17.
book covers and art objects, he observed that the depiction of the tree of life had become a common feature of decorated objects by the time the book covers were made. In contrast, Lowden discussed both book covers in the Treasure, in order to understand the relationship between the decoration and the objects, arguing that the decoration on the covers provided information about the function of the book. Consequently, he argued that the book cover depicting Christ and two saints was used to cover the gospel book, and the cover with the cross was used for the Acts of the Apostles, because the cross was flanked by two trees of life, representing Christ transfigured between Moses and Elijah. However, neither author considered the value of the decorations to their donors, and Lowden made semiotic assumptions, and his observations were based only on the symbolic meaning of the decoration, which limited the meaning of the objects to their visual aspects.

In addition to these studies, there are important examinations concerning the technical aspects and production of the Sion objects. For example, Richard Newman and Henry Lie examined 13 of the objects, and four sets of suspension chains in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, using a stereo binocular microscope, and X-radiography to study the tool marks, and other surface features. This represented an important study for the consideration of the production process of the objects, as it provided full details of their composition, including the amounts of silver, alloy, and gold used when producing the vessels, for example. However, it should be noted that this was not a complete technical study of every piece in the Treasure, and none of the pieces in Antalya Museum have been analysed in this way.

Meanwhile, Pieter Meyers also provided information about the composition of the silver used in the manufacture of all of the Sion objects in Dumbarton Oaks, as well as in the sixth-century Kaper Koraon Treasure, providing ample evidence for discussing the

metallic purity of the objects, since he included information regarding the percentage of silver in each object.\textsuperscript{40}

In another study, Dodd examined the stamps on the Sion objects by referring to her previous study on Byzantine silver stamps, and presenting important information about the appearance of the stamps, and the information they provide about the date of the Treasure, and its circulation. However, in both of her articles about the stamps on the silverware from the Sion Treasure, Dodd did not provide detailed information about the stamps on the objects, only discussing the circulation of the objects, and making assumptions about where they might have been produced.\textsuperscript{41} Nevertheless, these studies were important for the present thesis, because they enabled the commencement of a discussion regarding the stamps, and the objects’ circulation.

In general terms, all of these studies of the Sion Treasure considered the objects it included, how they were used, and their style and form, and they are therefore useful for considering the ways in which these liturgical objects possessed materialistic and monetary values, and for comparing them with other treasures, in terms of their stylistic patterns. Since they presented an examination of the forms, styles, technical aspects, and monetary value of the Sion objects, as well as details about the names of their donors, the information regarding the donors of each object, and their wishes, is easy to locate. These sources prompted the present researcher to explore the purpose of the objects, and the importance of their monetary value and forms for the biography of the objects, since, in order to develop the arguments in this thesis, specific information about the objects, such as their inscriptions, materials, and form, was important.

\textit{2.1.2. Studies of other silver objects from Early Byzantium}

In addition to the extant work on the Sion Treasure, scholars have examined other examples of liturgical silver. Treasures from Syria were studied by Marlia Mundell Mango, whose initial aim was to catalogue and present them, and whose main questions were: What are they? Where were they donated, and by whom? She made certain


assumptions about why the objects were donated, suggesting simply that they were
donated for ritualistic purposes, without explaining this in detail. She also studied the
monetary value of silverware in another article, in which she focused on the value of
silverware, and its cost for the donor, which is useful for considering issues concerning
the monetary value of silver. In addition, Mango also discussed the purpose and
location of silver stamping, in the case of the Kaper Koraon Treasure, which initiated a
discussion regarding the position of stamps, and the circulation of silver.

A broader approach to silverware was taken by Ruth Leader-Newby, who compared
pagan and Christian silver, in order to discuss the place of silver in the Byzantine world,
particularly in terms of the transformation of silver vessels from secular to sacred, both
in function and appearance. In order to address this, she examined silver plate in terms
of Late Antique cultural history, and the classical education of elite individuals.
However, she did not consider how the objects were valued in the Christian context,
instead focusing more generally on how the role of silver changed when it was used in
Christianity, and examining the stylistic continuum, and its new meaning in
Christianity.

2.2 Methodological approaches to Byzantine art and objects

The study of Byzantine material culture is broad, and has developed since the late
twentieth century and early twenty-first century, with art objects and other artefacts
examined according to their socio-cultural values from a contemporary perspective.
Viewing practices, and how the value of art changed from pagan to Christian contexts
was examined by Jaś Elsner, who also considered objects from the viewpoint of their
contemporaries.
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Meanwhile, Beatrice Caseau studied the sensual affordances of objects, smell in particular, considering the function of objects, rather than their meaning. She argued that approaching art using the senses facilitates a fuller understanding of the object. She proposed that by acknowledging how Christians approached an object, and their external world, using their senses, it is possible to conclude that Christians used their senses to experience objects, and to achieve knowledge of God.47

Similarly, Liz James produced important ideas regarding how the church affected the Byzantine populace, in terms of their sensual experience of art, and how this changed the perception of the Christian viewers of the Byzantine mosaic of the Virgin and Child in the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (modern day Istanbul). She observed that the atmosphere of the church had an effect on people’s senses, that the church provided sounds and smells, and inside the church, people were able to touch icons and marbles. Therefore, by using their senses, people were able to experience the church, and felt that the divine dwelt within it. Hence, she claimed that the context of the church altered the perception of Byzantine people when they experienced the art objects within the church.48 This study was important for the present thesis, since it also examined the effect of the church context when the Christian faithful encountered the silver objects within it. Elsewhere, James studied the experience of the Projecta Casket in the British Museum, examining the relationship between people and the object, and initiating a discussion of the form and material qualities of objects, in terms of their effect on its contemporaries. This study represented an important approach to Byzantine objects in its consideration of their use value, and how they performed with their materiality, indicating that objects in Byzantium were not only valued for their appearances.49 Moreover, James also studied the materiality of the mosaic of Archangel Gabriel in Hagia Sophia, employing a similar approach, and discussing the relationship between matter and materiality, arguing that a connection exists between what the object is made of, and the object itself, stating “its quality to be material or even of being matter” can
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alter the function of objects in some ways, providing the comparison of an object made of glass and an object made of silver, which, although they might have been made for similar purposes, may have different functions, in terms of their materiality.

Additionally, she discussed the fact that the meaning of the objects also derives from their function and use, as in the example of a reliquary, which derives its function from the fact that it carries relics. She noted that meaning of an object can change, according to its materiality, function, and the intention of its users.\(^{50}\) These studies presented breakthrough ideas about how to approach Byzantine objects, and were therefore important, as they provided a new methodology for approaching Byzantine silver.

Employing these ideas, the present thesis considered the objects in the Sion Treasure in terms of their materiality, materials, and function, and how these aspects changed the objects’ value in Early Byzantium.

In terms of experiencing icons and their multisensory effects, Bissera Pentcheva studied icons and their sensual affordances, as icons inspire people to touch them, and taste them by kissing, an experience that helped people to understand the objects’ value by using their senses.\(^{51}\) The study argued that it is not possible to understand the value of art, or to experience it, by simply viewing it. Since Byzantine objects also provide sensual affordances with their tactility and textures, it might be assumed that people in Byzantium experienced them by touching and kissing.

A study conducted by Averil Cameron was concerned the material culture of Byzantine art, and the examination of objects in their context. By questioning what happens if objects are removed from the context which they belong, she considered whether the objects retained their usefulness.\(^{52}\) This was significant for the present thesis, which also studied the effect of context on the usage, biography, and value of objects, employing Cameron’s concept to discuss the importance of context on the usage and function of objects, and the differences between sacred silver objects, and silver objects on a dining table.


Another author who explored context and its effects on a Byzantine viewer’s experience of art was Nadine Schibille, who conducted an important study on Hagia Sophia’s aesthetic experience, focusing on the conceptual dimensions of Hagia Sophia as a work of art. By employing the writings of Procopius and Paul the Silentiary, she discussed the importance of ekphrasis for viewing sixth-century Hagia Sophia, arguing that with ekphrasis, sixth-century people saw Hagia Sophia in terms of conceptual dimensions, and different aesthetic experiences. Moreover, she provided an important new approach by arguing that the multiple ‘aesthetic choices’ had value to the interior design and architecture of Hagia Sophia, whose decoration and light provided a divine experience to its Byzantine audience. This aesthetic experience occurred using cognitive, social, political, and religious conditions.53 This study also provided an important approach to Byzantine art, and Byzantine aesthetic, enabling the reader to understand how the sixth-century church was created and experienced with sixth-century eyes. This methodology was also important for the present thesis when discussing the usage of objects within a church, and their value for Byzantines, as it included a consideration of the effect of the atmosphere of a church on people’s perception of the objects within it, as it is important to instigate a discussion of the influence of knowledge and cognition when Byzantine people approached art objects, and what the aesthetic meant for them.

A more recent study of silver objects was conducted by Heather Hunter-Crawley,54 whose thesis concerned an examination of the materiality of objects, and adopted a methodological stance, in which she explicitly rejected Cartesian dualism, and instead considered objects from the perspective of sensorial affordances, in terms of how people experience objects using their senses by touching, kissing, smelling, and listening. For example, a censer provides the smell of incense, and at the same time the sound of clicking when it is carried by a deacon. The study proposed that objects should also be considered in terms of their functions that are experienced using the senses, and its primary focus concerned the ways in which antique Christianity might look different if the lens of Cartesian dualism was removed, and replaced with an embodied perspective.

Cartesian dualism, as Carl Knappett explained, separates the mind from the external world, and minimises material expression, lending priority to behaviour, and separates behaviour and thought from the external world. Therefore, the mind and thought are primary, and behaviour and sensual experience are secondary, when experiencing the world around us. However, scholars who support Cartesian dualism fail to consider the experience of the world using the senses, and their relationship with the mind. As Crawley argued, it is necessary to consider both the senses and the mind when experiencing the world, therefore the sensorial affordances of an object can help its audience to engage with the divine presence. For example, the light-reflective surfaces of objects inspire viewers to experience Christ, because divine light is associated with Christ. By avoiding semiotic approaches that explain only the symbolic meaning of objects, she argued that ‘common sense’ religious practice seeks divine presence through sensory experience. She commenced her analysis with amulets and apotropaic devices, and continued with pilgrimage souvenirs and ampullae, and finally evaluated the sensory affordances of silver objects in the celebration of the Eucharist. According to Crawley, in all cases the experience of material culture within an embodied perspective is also the experience of divine presence.

However, since Crawley’s study examined the sensorial affordances of material, and their effect on the perception of people of objects, she failed to consider social status, and the object’s usage within a church, both of which might create different perceptions. In the example of a lamp, for instance, the lamp is not intended, like a chalice or icon, to be kissed and touched, due to its heated surface. In her study, Crawley argued that the sensory affordances provided by objects are the main source for reaching the divine presence. This might be the case with amulets that are carried and touched by their owners, and therefore perceived with ‘common sense’, but the members of a congregation experience the silver objects in a church differently, because of the church hierarchy, and the different usages of the objects. The present thesis argues that silver objects within a church, and the liturgical silver given to the church as a gift, should be examined in a different way from amulets and pilgrim souvenirs, as their sensual affordances cannot be generalised for all objects within a church. While the present thesis concurred with Crawley’s concept that materiality is important for examining the

place of objects in late antique Christianity, rather than examining only the sensual affordances of objects, it considered the interaction between materiality and the social and religious culture of Byzantium, and the context in which the objects were used.

2.3 Theoretical and methodological background: the effect of the relationships between objects, people, and context on the biography and multivalence of objects

The present research is concerned with the concept of the biography of objects, and the fact that objects have changing life stories, and therefore argues that the biography of objects changes, depending on the context in which they were used, and their interrelationships with people. The theories and ideas on which the thesis was primarily founded are material culture theories from the fields of anthropology, archaeology, and psychology. This interdisciplinary study proposes that the value of the objects in the sixth-century Sion Treasure can only be understood by examining them from the perspective of the relationships between people and objects, and the possible effect of the context in which the objects were used, and the people who used them. By developing the extant theories of material culture, this study explores the Sion Treasure from different perspectives, thereby changing the understanding of how sacred silver objects were valued in Early Byzantium. This new perspective demonstrates that sacred silver objects also had a life in the way that people do, and throughout the course of their life, as a result of the different contexts in which they were placed, they gained new values. While the relationship between objects and people, and objects in context and use, are not new theories, the consideration and employment of these theories has always previously been separated, thereby creating weaknesses and problems for the theories, which are discussed in detail below. If the theories are conflated, however, such as incorporating agency, the cultural biography of objects, intention theory, common sensory archaeology, cognition, and art and behavioural archaeology, it becomes possible to answer matters such as what the objects were really for, how they came into existence, their function, how they were used, and how all of these aspects affected the biography and life of the objects. In other words, the affordances of objects; the intention, knowledge, and cognition of people; and the context of the objects are interrelated and are therefore vital for understanding the life of objects.

In addition, this thesis employs methods and theories that explore the objects and their socio-cultural environment, in an object-centred approach that seeking to clarify how
the objects in question were made, and in what conditions they were produced and used, which subsequently facilitated the discussion of their sensual affordances and biography.

2.3.1 Biography and life of objects

The theory of the biography and life of objects is employed by anthropologists to examine the relationships between objects and people. The theories involved are influential, and underpin studies concerning material culture. In The Social Life of Things, a volume of essays by Arjun Appadurai and Igor Kopytoff, Appadurai proposed that objects have social lives and life histories, just like people, in the sense that objects move from one context to another, from their production through their usage, and in these different contexts, they have different life histories and gain new biographies. His primary focus was ‘things’ as commodities that have ‘exchangeability’, arguing that a thing’s biography as commodity can alter its social life, proposing that “economic exchange creates value”, and “value is embodied in the commodities that are exchanged”.

According to Appadurai, ‘commodity situation’ is the stage in the life of a thing that has the potential to be a commodity, and he divided the definition of a commodity situation into three parts: first, the ‘commodity phase of a thing’; second, the ‘commodity candidacy of a thing’; and third, the commodity context in which things can be placed. The commodity phase is a place in which things are considered to be commodities, and therefore, the commodity candidacy of a thing is defined by things that possess the standards and criteria of a commodity, in other words, their exchangeability. Meanwhile, the commodity context concerns the placement of exchangeable things in their commodity phase. For example, when a watch is produced, it is in its commodity context, waiting to be exchanged with a counterpart of the value of the watch. When this watch bought or exchanged, it is removed from its commodity context. It might then be given as a gift, or used for checking the time. At this stage, the watch is valued

57 Appadurai, 'Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value', 3.
58 Ibid., 13.
according to its other functions. Therefore, Appadurai’s essay was primarily concerned with commodities, how objects become commodities and non-commodities, and how they are valued in the commodity context. He proposed that the historical circulation of things should be assessed by examining the things themselves, their forms, their uses, and their ‘trajectories’. By examining the circulation of objects, their recontextualization, commodification, and decommodification, the way in which people valued these objects can be inferred. Moreover, Appadurai argued that the value of the objects, their ‘commodity candidacy’, and their exchange situations are defined by their cultural framework, therefore some things possess standardised values, which he termed “Regimes of Value”, which represent the value that is variable from situation to situation, and from commodity to commodity, and which are determined by social political factors. For the objects in the Sion Treasure, it is possible to apply this theory by evaluating the ‘regimes of value’ in the sixth century, and assessing the objects according to how Byzantine people valued them during their production and usage.

According to Appadurai, things move, and they pass through many transformations, or “paths and diversions”, in which the interrelationships between people and things, political and social forces, and the paths of the objects from hand to hand, can create different diversions. In the course of the diversion and circulation of objects, they can have a biography as a commodity; lose their commodity candidacy, since “things can be moved out of the commodity state”; and regain their biography as a commodity. To exemplify this, Appadurai employed the examples of valuables from Kula in the form of necklaces and arm shells, explaining that these objects gained new biographies when they moved from hand to hand, and place to place. The path the objects took reflected their cultural and social relationships, as the exchange of the objects was not simply via trade and commerce, as they were given as gifts, and their value was negotiated between the giver and the receiver by considering their reputation and fame. In order to clarify the concept of de-commoditisation, Appadurai explained that, for example, some objects used in funerals that are buried with the owner cannot be reused as a commodity, and that objects that possess a ritual value might only make one journey,
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and cannot return to the commodity state.63 In other words, “commoditisation lies at the complex intersection of temporal, cultural and social factors”.64

In addition, Appadurai made two further points of significance for the present study regarding how objects are valued, and how demand for objects is created. By considering the modern usage of ‘things’ he explained that consumption creates demand, and to make an object a commodity, and to sell it, requires the presence of need and utility, although this demand and value can change from culture to culture, and object to object. Demand is also a culturally and socially “regulated and generated impulse” that is not based on individual desires and needs. Moreover, Appadurai noted that “social and economic forces” have an important effect on determining demand, but that demand can also manipulate the social and economic forces.65 These ideas were important for the consideration of the value of the Sion silver objects, in terms of their production, and in order to understand how the demand for silver was created in sixth-century Byzantine culture.

According to Appadurai, in the commodity context, there are two important factors that affect the exchangeability of objects, and how they are valued: political and social circumstances. Hence, the exchangeability of objects should be considered in societies, rather than by making formal distinctions between objects. This theory supported a central idea of the present study, concerning the fact that when considering the formal features of objects, comparing them with other objects, in terms of their stylistic differences, does not aid in understanding how the objects were valued and used in the sixth century. In this context, Appadurai primarily considered ‘things’ to be common, not individual, arguing that individual objects can have individual and different biographies, but in common, their biography as a commodity is determined by socio-cultural forces. Although these concepts concerned the modern usage of things, and the modern life of commodities, they can equally be applied to examples from the sixth-century Sion Treasure. By employing these ideas, especially in Chapter 5, this thesis explores how the objects from the Sion Treasure were valued during their production, what their biography was, and how need and utility affected their production. Finally, by developing Appadurai’s ideas, this thesis explores how demand for silver was
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created in the sixth century. For example, by assessing how the social and political factors in the sixth century affected the circulation of silver and its exchange, and how social and political factors affected the production of silver objects.

Proceeding from Appadurai’s ideas, the co-author of *The Social Life of Things*, Kopytoff, also made important assumptions about objects, and how they gain new biographies in their life, from their role as a commodity, and through their consumption. For example, a car in its commodity phase is a thing to be sold, but in its usage, it can be a gift, and can embody family memories. Therefore, for its users, the car can become more than merely a commodity. For example, a car might be inherited by a son from his father, and therefore remind him of his father and of memories associated with the car. For him, the car therefore possesses additional biographies to its commodity biography. According to Kopytoff, the meaning of things cannot be understood at only one point in their existence; rather, throughout their existence, the production, exchange, and consumption of an object are of relevance. Furthermore, he argued that the importance that an object possessed during its existence derives from its relationship with the people and events to which it related, and he examined the ways in which objects gain life stories and biographies when they are moved from one context to another, proposing that the biography of objects does not change during the course of the paths the object travels; conversely, objects gain new, additional biographies without losing their past biography. Moreover, the object as a commodity retains its commodity value throughout its period of usage, and by being passed from hand to hand, gains new biographies, therefore the commodity value is just one element of the biography of an object’s life. For instance, while a car has a commercial biography, with its sale and resale price, it can also have social biographies, such as the history of its usage, its previous users, and their economy and social position.

Furthermore, Kopytoff argued that the nature of the biography of objects is determined by ‘social contest’ and individual taste, and he noted that a commodity must have a use value, and can only be exchanged with a thing that is its counterpart, or has an equivalent value. According to this approach, gifts can also be a commodity, as “gifts are given in order to evoke an obligation to give back a gift, which in turn will evoke
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similar obligation – a never ending chain of gifts and obligations.”\textsuperscript{68} However, some gifts, and other objects, may not be intended for selling back, as they are ‘inalienable’, and therefore retain their status as a gift, and their current biography. But, unless they are ‘de-commoditised’, they still remain as potential commodities that it is possible to resell or exchange, because they continue to have exchange value, if somebody who possess them wants to sell or exchange them.\textsuperscript{69} This means that the objects keep their biography as potential commodities even if they are removed from commodity phase, in other words they become gifts or used for another transactions. Therefore, it is possible to say that by being a gift the object did not lose its biography to be a commodity, it had multi-biographies and became multivalent. The ideas presented by Kopytoff concerning the facts that objects’ biographies change when they move from place to place, and hand to hand; and the fact that they do not lose their previous biography when they gain a new biography, inspired the author of the present thesis to evaluate the objects in the Sion Treasure, and their circulation from their production to their consumption by donors and church people, according these principles.

According to Appadurai and Kopytoff, the changes in an object’s biography, and an object’s potential to be a commodity, is determined by social and political forces, not by individuals, as objects are commoditised and de-commoditised according to certain rules in certain societies. However, their theories possessed weaknesses, as their examples and discussion did not extend beyond the socio-political, and its effect on commodities. Moreover, they only considered the biography of objects as commodities, how it changed, and how objects become commodities again during the course of their life history. While these theories are important, they require further development, and more specific and concrete examples. In addition, the biography of objects should be examined in different contexts in their life that affect and change their biography.

The relationship between people and an object’s biography was also discussed by Gosden and Marshall,\textsuperscript{70} who re-evaluated the theories proposed by Appadurai and Kopytoff, arguing that as people and objects accumulate time, movement, and change, they are enmeshed with each other, therefore objects develop a life story, or stories,
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through their differing interrelationships with people. The authors observed that many of the existing theories, including those of Appadurai and Kopytoff, focused on the context of exchanges, and the way in which objects gain biographies in the hands of people, proposing instead that context is the most important factor for altering the biography of objects. For example, a ceremonial context in which certain objects are used can be an important factor for changing the biography and value of the objects for the people who use them in the ceremony. For example, the masks used in ceremonial performances on the Pacific northwest coast of Canada are not significant in themselves, rather they gain meaning in the context of the performance as objects for ritual purposes. This proposition was important for the present study, and Chapter 7 discusses the value of objects within a church context and considers how their biography changes in such a context.

The theory of cultural biography and the life of objects was evaluated more recently in studies that produced important additional contributions to the theories. In terms of context, and the other factors that alter an object’s value and biography, Svašek employed the concept of transit and transition, in which transit is the circulation of objects, and transition is the changing biography, aesthetic experience, status, and the way in which people experience them. In addition, Maihoub considered the life of objects, and how their biography changes, depending on their socio-cultural context, arguing that particular art objects are perceived and interpreted in different ways, according to the changing circumstances and modes of their representation, aestheticization, and spatial (re)contextualisation. She also suggested that while making the objects, the artist focuses on achieving the desired effect on the intended recipient, arguing that social parameters reinforce the engagement between people and objects. She considered how artworks are aesthetically experienced and valued in their recontextualization, and within social parameters. Although these two studies lacked specificity, only briefly explaining the importance of the context in which objects
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possess their biographies, the ideas they presented were significant for the present thesis and were applied as an element of the study’s approach to sixth-century silver.

The commodity value and biography of objects was also discussed by Murakami, who considered how demand is created, and the commodity market improved, focusing on how consumer demand is created by examining the process of creation. In addition, she discussed the fact that it is necessary to consider an object’s life as a whole, in order to understand its meaning in detail. When discussing how demand is improved, she noted that the use value, exchange value, and aesthetic value, all of which were issues of relevance to the present thesis, she explained, “everything that we consume has some utility or functionality, which is determined by a mix of our biological and cultural needs.” Her study primarily discussed consumer behaviour, and desire and demand, and how these create the use, production, and consumption values of objects. These ideas are also important as building blocks for exploring how consumer behaviour changes the value of objects in the course of their production and consumption. This consumer behaviour affects the craftsmen when they are creating the object, as they consider the market demand. Moreover, Murakami discussed the fact that the consumer behaviour created in certain cultures should also be considered, and since consumer behaviour affects the production and usage of objects, it is also important to understand how the behaviour of consumers is shaped, and what factors affect consumers when they are choosing products and using them for certain purposes.

In terms of the present study, the theories concerning the cultural biography of objects facilitated a new methodological approach to the Sion Treasure that considered the objects to possess social lives, and biographies that changed in different contexts, since social, political, and economic factors affect the biography of objects. However, these factors were only one element, as the functions of the objects, and their functionality in certain performances, also had an important effect on their biography. In order to examine the objects in terms of their materiality, it was also necessary to consider the extant theories regarding material culture.
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2.3.2 Material culture, agency, and cognition

When studying the material culture and biography of objects, it is important to consider the theories of material agency. A major figure in discussion of art objects as social and cultural actors is Alfred Gell, whose book, *Art and Agency*, discussed the social role and value of art, and whose core theory concerned how objects act on people. According to Gell, art objects are produced in order to affect people. He argued that anthropological theories concerning art objects should therefore consider the impact of social relationships on the biography of objects, and also how people act on objects. He claimed that objects have agency, because they influence people emotionally, but he also argued that art objects cannot be agents themselves, rather they act as ‘indexes’ of their makers or users’ agency. He employed the example of a chipped stone that might have been used for different purposes in a prehistoric context, but when adopted for display on a person’s mantelpiece, it becomes an index of that person’s agency. Moreover, Gell rejected the semiotic analyses and linguistic approaches to art, since, for him, the art object is not the part of language, as it cannot be used for communication in the same way as language.

In his article reassessing the theory of agency, Robert Layton contributed to Gell’s work, arguing that Gell was correct to reject the linguistic model that considers objects to be forms of visual communication, and supporting Gell’s idea that art objects cannot be considered to be language, rather they can be “visual signs with meanings when they only used as part of language, that is as graphics.” However, for Layton, the weakness in Gell’s theory was that he minimised the cultural convention when examining the value of objects, and Layton argued that minimising this convention is wrong, because it is important for shaping visual art. Therefore, in order to understand the value of art in its cultural context, the cultural convention should be considered, remembering that the aesthetic appreciation of an object changes from culture to culture, and from context to context. These ideas were of significance to the present study of the Sion objects, and
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this thesis argues that they should be examined in their cultural context, and that they possessed different biographies and values in different contexts.

Over time, the theory of material culture and agency was improved by anthropologists, archaeologists, and art historians. For example, in his article ‘Making sense: Archaeology and Aesthetics’, Chris Gosden discussed the interrelationship between material culture and the senses, primarily considering the role of objects in material culture, and how material affects humans via the senses, noting that “objects can be seen to be active, but they are active in the manner of objects not in the manner of people. To call of objects secondary agents makes them look like people, but certain deficiencies of intention”, 81 adding, “We all live in a sensorium which is socially and culturally created; which depends on subtle interactions between humans and things”.82 By criticising Gell, he claimed that the concept of aesthetics is important for understanding how people act on objects, and how they perceive and value objects. For him, admitting that objects are secondary agents weakened Gell’s theory, since formal qualities that create affects should also be examined. He claimed that when arguing that art objects are valued by cultural and conventional values, the aesthetic is more important than making “cross cultural considerations of objects,”83 that each object has a different value, and aesthetic and sensual qualities, and that “each culture creates their own sensory environment, both physically through construction a material world with its own set of sensory properties.”84 Elsewhere he improved on the ideas regarding ”object-centred agency”, and discussed the fact that the formalistic properties of objects are important, because they create certain rules that determine that an object is intended to be sensed. The focus of his article concerned what objects do, and what they require from people, as objects encompass obligations to act with their forms.85 The two articles he produced on this matter were important for the development of the theories of material agency, because he explained that, in order to understand the value of objects, the material agency should be considered, which was an important instigator for future discussions of the value of objects that are affected by the functionality of objects. For example, according to this approach, the material qualities and forms of the silver
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objects in the Sion Treasure should be considered in addition to intentions of people and context, when examining their value in Early Byzantium.

In the field of archaeology, this material culture and agency theory was improved by Knappett in a paper that also influenced the ideas and methodology employed in the present thesis, as he proposed a theory based on cognitive archaeology that criticised Cartesian dualism by arguing that a dualistic conception weakens the theory of material culture. However, this cognitive approach was not concerned with symbolism, rather its focus was the sensing of the external world and signification. When criticising symbolism, Knappett provided the example of smoke, explaining that the smoke is not the symbol of fire, it is the index of fire.86 When discussing agency, he observed that Gell considered it to be the capacity of acting and intentionality, and argued that it is not possible to define it as simply a human property. In a similar approach to that of Gosden, Knappett also discussed the fact that objects have the ability to affect people, therefore it is necessary to consider both human agency and material agency,87 and that the former should be considered from the perspective of psychological and sociological perspectives. The contribution of Knappett to the understanding of agency was that it is important to examine both human and material agency, rather than only one or the other. He also observed that mind and thought affect human agency, which was significant for the present thesis, and particularly for the discussion in Chapter 7. In a later article, Knappett developed these ideas by working on “Actor-Network-Theory”, which he defined in the following way: “Agency is a process distributed across collectives of human and nonhumans. These collectives can be considered in terms of networks, composed of heterogeneous nodes and links”.88 In order to clarify the complexity of human or material agents, he explained that while people who are anti-guns admits that guns kill people, people who produce guns claim that people kill people, and in this sense, the gun is just a tool. Here some people position the material as an agent, while others position the human as an agent.89 These ideas were important for the discussion of the agency of the sixth-century silver in the Sion Treasure, and this thesis discussed that objects have an effect on their biography, together with humans
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and intentionality, incorporating a consideration of both human and material agency, in the same way as Knappett.

A paper by Tim Ingold also considered the materiality of objects in terms of their agency, and the effect of the environment surrounding them, discussing the fact that other studies in material culture mainly focused on the consumption of objects, rather than their production, claiming that people are attracted by the objects themselves, not the materials from which they were made, although those materials remain present and functioning. He argued that describing the properties of objects provides information regarding their life stories, since “things are active not because they are imbued with agency but because of ways in which they are caught up in these currents of the lifeworld”. His approach is important when discussing the production of objects, and the ways in which their properties are important, and it proved to be significant for the present thesis in terms of its exploration of value of the Sion Treasure’s objects within a church context.

A further study concerning Gell’s theory of agency was produced by Howard Morphy, who claimed that the theory possesses weaknesses, because of the lack of consideration given to aesthetics, arguing that Gell neglected to consider how objects are animated, how they possess agency, and how people are affected by a particular object. He noted, as did other scholars, that both material agency and human agency should also be considered.

A further important argument concerning the production of objects and material agency was proposed by Lambros Malafouris, who employed the making of pottery by a potter as an example, and used material agency and cognitive archaeology as the basis of his theory. He argued that human agency and material agency cannot be separated, continuing, “while agency and intentionality may not be properties of things, they are not properties of humans either: they are the properties of material engagement, that is of grey zone where brain, body and culture conflate,” thereby considering both human and material properties. His core argument was that material features affect human
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agency, and vice versa, thus these two agencies are interdependent, and in order to understand the value of objects fully, both should be considered.

In addition, van der Leeuw considered human and material agency by evaluating how potters came into existence through exploring the origins of pottery. In a similar approach to that of Malafouris, van der Leeuw also argued that agency and intentionality are interrelated, and that that materials and the human brain affect one another. He examined intentionality in two ways: ‘prior intention’ and ‘intention in action’. Prior intention concerns the existing intention to make an object, and the possession of a previous idea or knowledge of how to do so, while intention in action concerns the material properties of objects that prompt them to be made according to the potential use of that object. For example, a person might decide to make an object before obtaining the necessary materials, and when those materials are obtained, the object is shaped according to its properties.93

Another archaeologist who both criticised and developed the theory of agency was John Robb, who argued that agency should not be generalised, rather it should be examined in specific contexts, since it is ‘contextual and situated’, and is characterised by its social relationships, not by those with individuals. He also claimed that agency is ‘fundamentally material’, since the material futures of objects affect their relationship with people, and those relationships affect the materials.94 Elsewhere, when developing these ideas, he argued that abstract theories, such as Gell’s theory of agency, which concerned the fact that things have an important effect on our lives, are useful only for philosophical and abstract analyses, and that there is a need for an applicable theory that focuses on objects by asking “how they work, what social task they are intended to accomplish?”95 His theory therefore provided an important foundation for the consideration of the production of objects.

The body of work on the subject of material culture in the archaeological field demonstrated how materials should be examined when discussing their cultural value, and these theories can be combined with that of Gell, which considers people’s

intention and the materiality of objects, in order to understand the value of objects. When conflated, these theories indicate that if the value of an object needs to be understood as whole, material and human agency should be considered to be interrelated. It was therefore necessary that the present study considered both material and human agency, and it subsequently argued that human and material relationships are important for understanding the value of the objects in the Sion Treasure.

In addition to the aforementioned anthropological and archaeological theories, Art History studies of agency were also important for this thesis. In an article that developed Gell’s ideas, Michelle O’Malley evaluated the function of a Renaissance Purification altarpiece in a social context, and thereby proposed new ideas regarding how the function of art objects should be examined, and the aspects on which their production relies. By considering the web of obligations required to create the altarpiece in question, she demonstrated the way in which commissions work, and how their intention is shaped. Moreover, by discussing the prototypes, primary, and secondary agencies, she also provided remarkable ideas regarding the ideas of agency and network relationships that affected the confraternity (the donors of the altarpiece), and the producers, both before and beyond the production of the altarpiece, arguing that the Purification altarpiece had an influence on both the producers and the confraternity within the network relationships affected by its production.96

Meanwhile, Jeremy Tanner and Robin Osborne also criticised Gell, claiming that his primary focus concerned agency, the “system of action intended to change the world”, and not the symbolic representation, thereby minimising the cultural and traditional aesthetics. They argued that it is also necessary to consider the aesthetics, not in general terms, but in cultural and traditional terms.97 Moreover, Caroline van Eck also criticised Gell for his failure to consider the aesthetics of objects, and human behaviour, suggesting that by connecting Gell’s “ahistorical, systematic, anthropological account of the agency” with an art historical approach, and by considering the ‘sublime’, it is possible to understand the experience of ‘living presence’. She explained that Gell minimised the aesthetics for an individual work of art, and failed to consider the cultural

and traditional effect on the value of art objects, also noting that human behaviour
cannot be understood without the use of cognitive and moral approaches, and that a
consideration of the aesthetic aspects of an artwork is important for determining the
index of the agency, which is experienced differently from person to person, otherwise
there would be no difference in the agency. According to van Eck, Gell’s approach to
agency and art that minimised the aesthetic experience reduced the ways of considering
art objects in an art historical sense that examine the objects in their cultural context and
assess the aesthetic experience within a certain cultural environment.98

The present thesis employed these concepts to argue that artworks as materials should
be examined by considering their materiality, and their relationship with humans and
the cultural environment. Moreover, these theories incorporated the fact that cognitive
and moral examinations should be included when evaluating objects by discussing the
intentionality involved, and its effect on the objects. Therefore, in order to examine the
material and human agency, the extant theories concerning function, behaviour, and
cognitive psychology should also be discussed.

A number of important extant studies featured the function of objects, and how they
become multi-functional through their interrelationship with humans, and the form of
things and their effect on the meaning of objects, in terms of how the shape of objects
relates to its function, and how the form of an object is designed to fulfil its functional
purpose.99 Disagreement exists concerning the proper function of objects, and their
other functions, in the discussion of the form of objects, and the behaviour of people
that alters their function. For example, Michael Brian Schiffer defined three types of
functions: techno-function, socio-function, and ideo-function, in which techno-function
is the main purpose of the object, for example, the chair is produced for seating
purposes, although a luxury chair might possess a wider socio-function, since it
demonstrates the wealthy of the donor. Meanwhile, the ideo-function is the symbolic
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representation of an object, for example, a throne symbolises authority. However, Beth Preston argued that this relationship between function and form is too broad, as multiple forms can fulfil one function. For example, interior lighting can be fulfilled by bulbs, candles, or oil lamps; equally, one form can also serve multiple functions. By considering the functions of objects, and the concepts that affect their function, Preston proposed that objects fulfil two essential functions: ‘system function’ and ‘proper function’. She employed spoons as an example, explaining that although a spoon is produced for use in picking up food (its proper function), it can also make a noise when dropped (system function). She concluded that the concept is more important for understanding the function of objects, since the system function is conceptual, and given to an object via a consideration of its malleability. Her arguments regarding proper function and system function were important for the present study, because they suggest that people can change the function of objects by their intentions, depending on their functionality, thus, for example, the ability of objects to be used within a church, and their functionality to become gifts to conduct the wishes of their donors.

When considering intention, it is necessary to note Paul Bloom’s theory on intention and artefact concepts, which was important for both Chapter 5 of this thesis, which discusses the production of objects, and intention of producers, and also Chapters 6 and 7, which concern the intentions of the donors of the Sion Treasure objects, and of the people who used them in the church. Moreover, his arguments were also important for the consideration of the different appearance of the patens in the Treasure, and the different appearance of the chalices and lighting equipment, for example, since Bloom explored the ways in which the intentions of people affect the functions of objects, arguing that “we determine that something is a member of a given artefact kind by inferring that it was successfully created with the intention to belong to that kind”. The present thesis proposed that this might explain the reasons for the differences in the ways that the objects in the Sion Treasure were decorated, since decoration need not be related to function. By employing this theory, this thesis argued that knowledge of
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people is important for understanding an object’s function and eventual biography. This was illustrated by Bloom in the example of a chair, as

“Even without necessary and sufficient features, we do possess knowledge about chairs, what they typically look like and how they are typically used, and we can use this knowledge – along with our notions about the relationship between intention and product – to infer whether a novel entity was intended to be a chair, just as we can use the same sort of knowledge to infer whether something was intended to be a picture of a dog, or a work of art.”

It was possible to apply these ideas to the Sion objects, in terms of the intention and knowledge the donors decided to ascribe to the objects as gifts to God, and those of the church people who used them for liturgical purposes.

These ideas were later developed by Schiffer, who contributed to the theories of the function of objects, and the behaviour of people, using behavioural archaeology, and considered its importance for understanding the meaning, value, and functions of objects for their contemporaries. He examined pots in Kalinga that were used to cook rice, or other meals, and were also used as gifts, first discussing the social life in Kalinga, which he explored himself, and then investigating the technical properties of the objects, in order to understand how the vessels functioned for multiple purposes. He argued that, in order to perform in certain activities, objects must possess certain capabilities. For example, a cooking pot should be resistant to high thermal shock, in order that it does not crack when placed over a fire. He explained that a pot might also be used for ritual performances, or as a gift, and that its shape should enable it to fulfil these purposes. For example, in the context of the Kalinga pots, they might be used for offerings, placed on the floor just before a house is burned. He argued that this range of functionality of objects can be understood in terms of the interrelationship between the functionality of objects, and human behaviour, in which people combine their knowledge and social context: “The function of this pot changes as it moves along the behavioural chain”. In terms of knowledge and experience, and their effect on the behaviour of people in determining an object’s function, he provided the example of a Kalinga man and women, explaining that the
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Kalinga man had minimal knowledge of pottery because he was not, like the women, immersed on a daily basis in the use of this technology. The female pottery users made choices regarding which pots to use for rice and which for vegetables, the size of the pot, and how to cook various items based on their knowledge, experience, and traditions.\textsuperscript{107}

He criticised other theories concerning agency and the life of objects, by such theorists as Knappett and Kopytoff, suggesting, in a similar way to Robb, that the arguments concerning material properties should be developed to create concrete theories, explaining, “by investigating the technical properties of the vessels (such as shape, form, size, surface finish)”, the actual use and performance of objects can be understood.\textsuperscript{108}

These theories and ideas were valuable for the present thesis, since it argued that the Sion objects were multifunctional, and were placed in different contexts, and ascribed different functions as a result of the interrelationship between their functionality, and the behaviour of their users, which was developed by their knowledge, experience, and socio-cultural background. Chapter 5, for example, discusses the production of the objects, why they were made, and what the consideration of their producers may have been; Chapter 6 explores the function of the objects as gifts and materials for conducting the wishes of their donors; and Chapter 7 examines the function of the objects within the church, also considering the material and form of the objects, and their size and shape.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the extant psychological theories of material culture, since they are important for understanding human behaviour, and the cognitive approach to art objects. The reasons for different perceptions of art objects were explored by Ann Marie Barry, who examined the human brain system via neurological experiments,\textsuperscript{109} arguing that

\begin{quote}
the perceptual system upon which all communication is built derives primarily from an interaction with the environment and thereafter develops according to accumulating knowledge and emotional influence and memory. Evolution thus dictates how and why we react, with the
\end{quote}
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effect that what we perceive as pleasurable and even expansive is based in recognisable patterns linked to survival mechanisms.\textsuperscript{110}

This theory was important for the present study when assessing the different perceptions of people of objects within a church, because it explains that emotions and environment affect people when they approach art objects. In addition to the environment, Barry also discussed that the fact that memory is an important factor that affects people’s perception of art objects, which was applicable to the present thesis in terms of the approach of church people to sacred silver objects within a church. In addition to Barry’s experimental neuroscience theory, additional theories exist that support the importance of context and emotions when experiencing art objects. These theories also evolved from experimental research that discovered that emotions and context have an important effect on the perception of people of objects,\textsuperscript{111} and they therefore enabled the present study to consider the value of art in a church context, and the effect of this context and church people’s emotion when they experienced the objects in the Sion Treasure.

This chapter commenced with a discussion of the extant literature concerning the Sion Treasure, and silver objects in general, in order to explain the research that was relevant to the present study, and to demonstrate the gaps and weaknesses in these works, arguing that they are formalistic and semiotic approaches to silver objects that are unsuitable for understanding the value of objects in sixth-century Byzantium. The chapter then presented the methodological approaches to Byzantine art and objects that were useful for the present study, in terms of the developments in their approach to art objects, since these studies facilitated the framing of the methodology that was employed for this thesis’ discussion of the Sion Treasure. Since this thesis argued that the Sion Treasure should be examined using an interdisciplinary approach, only the theories that were of relevance were presented. Each of these possesses weaknesses. For example, Appadurai’s theory considered only commodities, and the effect of human
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intention and political factors on the value of objects, while Gell only considered human agency, believing objects to be secondary agencies. The chapter then progressed to discuss the archaeological theories that developed these approaches by proposing that material and human agency should be considered to be interrelated, although they do not consider the importance of context, and its effect on human behaviour and cognition. This chapter proposed that both context and human cognition should be considered when examining the value of objects, and that their importance for the perception of objects and their biography requires a consideration of the theories of neuroscience and art. Therefore, in summary, when all of the theories discussed in this chapter are conflated, they enable a full comprehension of the value and biography of the silver objects in the Sion Treasure, and the factors that changed their biography.
PART 1:

THE SION OBJECTS: THEIR DESCRIPTION, PRODUCTION, CIRCULATION, AND COST

3. WHAT ARE THESE OBJECTS? A DESCRIPTION OF THE SILVER VESSELS FROM THE SION TREASURE

This chapter presents a detailed description of the silver from the Sion Treasure, covering their inscriptions, decoration, materials, form and stamps. This examination is crucial, as it provides the empirical and specific evidence required for the discussions concerning the biography and multivalence of the objects in later chapters. The descriptions of the silverware were previously employed to conduct comparative approaches to the study of the Treasure, seeking to use the stylistic differences to understand where the vessels were produced, whether or not the Sion Treasure related to other Late Antique silverware, and to consider how many artisans involved and may have worked on their production. In contrast, this thesis employed the material features of objects to initiate discussions regarding their biography, in order to understand how human and material agencies affected the value of the objects, and how these objects became multivalent.

In the review of scholarly work regarding Late Antique liturgical silver, it was observed that although the extant examinations of Sion silver provided important information about the objects from the Antalya Museum and the Dumbarton Oaks collections, in terms of their decoration, inscriptions, stamps, form, manufacture, and donors, they did not describe the vessels in Antalya Museum in sufficient detail,112 as the measurements and forms of these objects, and the description of their decoration, have not previously been fully presented. While a number of the studies discussed the patens, polycandela,
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openwork lamps, and book covers in question, the amphorae, standing lamps, chalices, censers, and altar table sheets have not been fully described, to date. In addition to this there is also base of a candlestick which have not been examined by other scholars. It is also an important object to present. Therefore, as I have already discussed in the aims and contributions part, this study will provide detailed information about the objects with their decoration, weights, forms, stamps and inscriptions, and will bring new information about the fragments and weights of objects. This chapter summarises the current knowledge of the treasure resulting from this new study, by extending the information in table 1. Since Dodd did not publish her work on the stamps on the Antalya Museum and Dumbarton Oaks pieces, these were examined first-hand by the present researcher, and the findings summarised in this chapter, and in Table 3 in the Appendix. In addition, when discussing the items in the Treasure that are held in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, in terms of their materials, and how they were made, this thesis employed the information published by Newman and Lie, who made a technical examination of the vessels.

The discussion of the possible monetary values of the objects in Chapter 4 is based on the weight of the objects, which is provided in this chapter, while it is not possible to know their exact price following their production in the workshops, the weight of the silver provides an approximate price for the metal used in their production, and hence an approximate price for the objects at the time of their creation. Chapter 4 also discusses each donor of the objects, and the total amount and value of their donations, together with the stamps, which assists in the discussion of the circulation of the objects in same chapter, and while the inscriptions are employed in Chapter 6 when discussing the value of objects for their donors. The discussion below is organised by vessel form, commencing with the patens, followed by the polycandela, censers, chalices, amphora, chalices, standing lamps, openwork lamps, lampstands in column form, altar table sheets, and candlestick base.
3.1 The objects in the Sion Treasure

3.1.1 The patens

In total, there are six patens in the Sion Treasure. Two are currently located in Antalya Museum, three in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, and one in the private collection in Geneva. All of the patens are inscribed with the names of their donors, and one (in Antalya Museum) is stamped with imperial stamps (No. 1, Plates: 1-3). Two of the patens (Nos. 5 and 6, in Dumbarton Oaks) have weight marks that differ from their actual weights, which might be because of a loss of weight during their manufacture. The marks might have been applied when the silver was in the form of bullion and then it might have been shaped. This is hard to explain because there is also possibility that shaping the bullion by hammering might make the weight marks illegible. There is also another possibility that the weight marks might have been applied after the silver was shaped as a single sheet by hammering. And when the decoration was applied to the single sheet of silver might also make the object lose its original weight, because decoration includes engraving. For example, the fluted border and cross were made by using engraving techniques.

Each of these six patens was produced from a single sheet of silver, by working on a lathe, and by compressing and stretching the metal with a hammer. The traces of the lathe and hammering are evident on the bottom of the objects (Plate: 3). The patens were decorated using repoussé, chasing, and engraving techniques, and although their forms are similar, they differ in their types of decoration. The centres of the patens are encircled by inscriptions, and their borders are raised from their centre. One paten in the Antalya collection (No. 1, Plate: 1), which was donated by Eutychianos, according to its niello inscription, has an eight-armed Christogram in its centre. This huge Christogram almost fills the centre, and is gilded, with the two gilded lines separating the niello inscription from the centre and the border. It has a cusped border, and its decoration is divided into three separate rows, with the first row after the inscriptions, and a wider space of approximately 30 mm used for the decoration. In this space, there are 29 concavities decorated with vine leaves. This row is followed by one that is decorated with vine leaves, and the last is decorated with classical egg and dart motifs.
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The paten is 61 cm in diameter, with a foot of 1.6 cm in diameter, and it weighs 5,400 g. There are six stamps applied on the bottom of the paten.

One paten from the Geneva collection (No. 3, Plates: 6 and 7), and one paten from the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 4, Plates: 8 and 9) have a similar type of decoration, but differ from one another in terms of the form of their decoration, and their measurements. These two patens were also donated by Eutychianos. The Geneva paten has a six-armed Christogram at its centre, smaller than that on the Antalya paten (No. 1). This Christogram is encircled by a bordered niello inscription, which is identical to the inscription on the Antalya paten (No.1), although Boyd suggested that the style of the inscription is different, because there is an abbreviation on one of the letters from theo to tho. The Geneva paten also has a cusped border divided into three rows of decoration, commencing with leaves that alternate with ‘Sasanian palmette’, filling 26 concavities, followed by vine leaves, and finally egg and dart motifs. The weight of this paten is unpublished. It is 73.5 cm in diameter. The Dumbarton Oaks paten also has a six-armed Christogram at its centre, and is surrounded by a niello inscription. The style of the inscription is similar to that of the paten in the Antalya collection, with a cusped border decorated with leaves, alternating with Sasanian palmettes, filling 24 concavities, surrounded by leaves, and egg and dart motifs. This paten weights 5,200 g, and measures 60.5 cm in diameter, which is very similar to the Antalya paten.

The other three patens, two of which are in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (Nos. 5 and 6, Plates: 10, 11, 12, and 13), and one in Antalya Museum (No. 2, Plates: 4 and 5), all have a gilded cross at their centre, surrounded by an inscription. The Dumbarton Oaks patens have identical decoration, with gilded crosses and gilded fluted borders. Paten (No. 5) measures 58 cm in diameter, and weighs 4,537 g, and (No. 6) measures 58.5 cm in diameter, and weighs 4,234 g. According to its inscription, paten (No. 5) was donated in memory of Angeleuos Roufinos, while (No. 6) was donated in memory of John. The Antalya paten (No. 2) also has a gilded cross at its centre, surrounded by an engraved inscription, and gilded bands. There is no decoration other than the large cross. An engraved technique was employed for the inscription in which the abbreviation was also used, and its plain decoration makes this paten distinct from the others. It measures 77.5
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cm in diameter, and weight 8,000 g, making it the heaviest piece in the entire Treasure. The height of the letters on all of the patens varies between 17 to 23 mm.

The patens in the Treasure therefore have individual decoration, styles, and measurements, and these differences lead scholars to make assumptions about their production sites. For example, three objects (Nos. 1, 3, and 4) bear the name of Eutychianos, and while their appearance is similar, they have different styles of decoration, since the paten in Antalya has an eight-armed Christogram, and a cusped border decorated with repoussé leaves, whereas the Geneva and Dumbarton Oaks patens have six-armed Christograms, and borders decorated with leaves and Sasanian palmettes. The number of concavities filled by the leaves also differs: the Antalya paten has 29, while the Geneva and Dumbarton Oaks patens have 26 and 24, respectively.

There are also differences in the style of the Christograms, and in the inscriptions. The Christogram on the Geneva paten is the smallest, and has a basic design, while the patens in Antalya and Dumbarton Oaks have larger Christograms, with elegant serifs, and are smooth in style, although there are also differences between these two, in the detailing and the shape of the Christograms. Based on these differences, Boyd asserted that these objects were the product of two different craftsmen, and might have been produced in two different workshops, and she employed these assumptions to discuss workshop culture in Byzantium. She also suggested that the similarities between the form of these objects indicated mass-production, with them made to a certain point, and then later decorated and finished at different workshops, with the stamped Antalya paten produced in Constantinople, and the other unstamped, and therefore not imperially-validated, patens in the buyer’s hometown. However, although the patens share similarities, and also differences in their style, it cannot be assumed that these objects were produced in different workshops by different craftsmen, since the differences may have been the result of the different materials used, or the choices of the craftsman, and possibly the choices of the donor, who may have wished them to look slightly different. These differences in style are discussed further in Chapter 5, in the context of the value of the objects at the time of their production.

There are also similar assumptions made about the other three patens. The two in Dumbarton Oaks (Nos. 5 and 6), which were donated in memory of Angeleuos and
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John, respectively, are identical in shape and decoration. It was assumed by Boyd that they were produced at the same workshop, at the same time, while she highlighted the differences in the paten in Antalya Museum, which was donated in memory of Maria, from the others, in terms of its lettering and decoration, suggesting that it was made at a different workshop.\textsuperscript{116} The lack of evidence regarding the workshop at which the objects were created means that these assumptions are difficult to prove, and this thesis suggests that, rather than making assumptions about the workshops where the objects were made, the conditions and circumstances behind the production of the objects should be examined. For example, as discussed in the theoretical framework section of this thesis, the knowledge of the producers and commissioners, and their socio-cultural background, should be discussed, in order to facilitate more accurate assumptions about the value of the objects in the sixth century.

3.1.2 Polycandela

In total, the Sion Treasure includes 12 polycandela, which are important in terms of their production and decoration. Each of these vessels was produced from a single sheet of silver, shaped by hammering, and decorated using openwork and engraving. All of them were burnished after the shaping and decorating stages. They share a similar type of decoration. In form, three of the polycandela are cruciform (Nos. 7, 8, and 9, Plates: 14-27), three are circular (Nos. 10, 11, and 12, Plates: 28-34), and six are rectangular (Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, Plates: 35-71). All twelve of the polycandela have an inscription and a monogram identifying their donor as Eutychianos the Bishop (Episcopou), and all of them bear imperial stamps.

The three cruciform polycandela, two of which are in Antalya Museum (Nos. 7 and 8), and one in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 9), are identical in shape and decoration. These three are in the form of a cross, with arms of equal length, designed to hold 12 lamps, with three holes in each arm. The donor’s monograms are at the centre of the polycandela and are surrounded by niello inscriptions. Dolphins flank the centre and connect the openwork arms and the centre. Their eyes and the side fins are decorated with chased and engraved lines, and their tails connect to fleur de-lys at the centre. The three lamp holes on each arm are supported by dolphins and palmette motifs and culminate with the fleur-de-lys. Each of the four suspension loops is attached by
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two rivets on the upper side of the end of each cross arm. The location of the stamps on the polycandela differs; while (No. 7) has five imperial stamps surrounding its centre, between the dolphins (Plate: 15), the stamps on (Nos. 8 and 9) are located one on each arm, between the rivets, with one more at the centre, between the tails of the dolphins (Plates: 18 and 25). On these three polycandela, there is also evidence of ancient soldered repairs (Plate: 16). In addition, the monograms of Eutychianos on the polycandela are slightly different in their style of script.117 These polycandela are identical in terms of their weight and measurements: each is 57 cm in diameter, and weighs 2,800 g. The silver is 3 mm thick at the centre of each, and the height of the letters in the inscriptions on each is 11 mm.

The three circular polycandela are also identical in shape and decoration. Two of the circular polycandela are in Antalya Museum (Nos. 10 and 11), and one is in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 12). Each of these three was also produced from one single sheet of silver, and shaped by hammering, with engraving and openwork techniques employed for decoration. These polycandela were designed to hold 16 lamps. There are rivets for loops on the back of each to enable them to be hung. Each bears imperial stamps, and in the centre of each is a cross, the arms of which terminate in four open circles to hold the lamps. These circles are flanked by dolphins, in the same form of decoration as on the cruciform polycandela: the tail of each dolphin connects with that of the other dolphins, and a fleur de-lys-motif. The dolphins face vegetal scrolls surrounding the openwork monograms of ‘Eutychianos Episcopou’. The centre is enclosed by an openwork border, with a niello inscription.

The stamps on these polycandela are identical to the stamps on the cruciform polycandela. These circular polycandela are 56 cm in diameter, and each weighs 3,500 g. The thickness of each varies from 4 to 5 mm, and the height of the letters is 11 mm.

The remaining six polycandela are all rectangular in shape, and only survive as fragments, with the exception of that in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No 13, Plate: 35), and exist only as, for example, centre or end pieces. These fragments are divided between the Dumbarton Oaks collection and Antalya Museum. Table 1 explains this further, and details which pieces belongs to which object (Nos. 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18).

117 Boyd also mentioned this difference, see ibid., 10.: Bouras also described one of these polycandela see Bouras, Lighting in Early Byzantium. Catalogue No. 26.
Despite their fragmentary condition, it is possible to recreate their decoration. All of these polycandela were shaped from single sheets of silver, and two have 14 holes, while other four have 12 holes for holding lamps. These objects have two different shapes and forms of decoration: two have tri-lobed end pieces (Nos. 13 and 14, Plates: 35 and 44), while the other four were designed with semi-circular end pieces (Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18, Plates: 51, 57, 64 and 65). There are openwork monograms of Eutychianos on the centre of each polycandelon that are encircled by niello inscriptions. The two polycandela with semi-circular end pieces have dolphins and hearts flanking the monograms (Nos. 15 and 16, Plates: 51 and 64), while on the centre of the other two semi-circular end pieces (Nos. 17 and 18, Plates: 64 and 65), the monograms and inscriptions are surrounded by palmette and fleur-de-lys motifs, in a foliate design. The two polycandela with tri-lobed end pieces are also decorated with paired dolphins and heart motifs (Nos. 13 and 14). The central rectangle of the polycandelon is ‘stepped up’ to a rectangle border with an openwork band with holes and palmette motifs. Loops are riveted to each corner, with stamps near each of them. All of the rectangular polycandela are stamped with the same names and monograms as the other polycandela. It is only possible to calculate the weight and measurements of one polycandelon correctly (No. 13), which is 57 cm in length, 37 cm in width, and weighs 2,647 g. Not enough survives to be certain of the measurements of the other rectangular polycandela, although they appear to be broadly similar to (No. 13).

Table 1 provides the measurements of the objects, together with the detached fragments, the thickness of which varies between 2 to 4 mm, with the height of the letters being 21 mm.

These polycandela were designed in a similar form, and decorated with similar motifs. All of them are all inscribed, and all bear the monograms of their donor. Nevertheless, despite the apparently identical form and dimensions of the three cruciform polycandela, or the three circular polycandela, there are differences between them, as the lettering of the monograms, and the location of their silver stamps varies.\footnote{118 For the discussion of the lettering of monograms see Boyd, ‘A “Metropolitan” Treasure from a Church in the Provinces’, 10.}
3.1.3 Censers

The Sion Treasure includes two censers, one of which is in Antalya Museum (No. 19), and the other in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 20), although they have not previously been discussed in any detail. Both of the censers were produced by casting them in a mould, and both are decorated using repoussé, chasing, and soldering techniques. These objects were also donated by Bishop Eutychianos. The Antalya censer (No. 19, Plates: 73-75) is circular in shape, and is attached to its chain by three hooks that are soldered to the rim of the censer. The body of the censer rests on a ring-shaped foot that is 11.5 cm in diameter. There are three lines of decoration on this censer, the first of which, at the bottom, is decorated with ribbing type decoration with stylised eggs and fleur-de-lys. In the centre, there are five scenes from the life of the Virgin, namely the Annunciation, the Trial by Water, the Visitation, the Journey to Bethlehem, and the Nativity. Meanwhile, the final level of decoration is a niello inscription surrounding the rim. This object is 17 cm in diameter, 11.6 cm in high, and weighs 1,520 g. The thickness of the censer is 7 mm, and the height of the letters is 9 mm.

Meanwhile, the Dumbarton Oaks censer (No. 20, Plates: 76-80) is decorated with figural, animal, and vegetal motifs,119 and is hexagonal in shape, and supported by four standing peacocks. Like the censer in Antalya Museum, the niello inscription encircles the rim of the censer. In the middle register are medallions of figures of Christ, St. Paul, and St. Peter, separated by peacocks. These medallions are encircled by vegetal motifs, and are flanked by palmette motifs, and the tails of standing peacocks that are attached to the body of the censer using soldering. This object is 15 cm high, 20.2 cm in diameter, and weighs 1,725 g. Both of these censers, like the patens, are gilded. Both are stamped with five similar imperial stamps.

3.1.4 Chalices

There are seven chalices in the Sion Treasure (Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27), four of which are inscribed, and provide important examples of inscriptions without the names of their donors. Most of the seven survive only as bowls, detached from their bases. In the case of No. 21, in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, only the flattened bowl

119 Ibid., Checklist no. 18.
of the chalice is preserved (Plate: 81), and in the case of No. 22, which is also in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, again, only the bowl is preserved, and there is an engraved inscription between the gilded bands encircling the rim (Plates: 82 and 83). This chalice measures 22.5 cm in diameter, and weighs 222 g. The bowl was produced from single sheet of silver and was burnished following its completion. Meanwhile, the bowl of chalice No. 23, which is also in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, is also preserved, together with the knob of the foot (Plate: 84). Its diameter is 17 cm, and its weight is 341 g. It has a hemispherical body and was produced from a single sheet of silver. There is an engraved inscription encircling its rim. In the case of No. 24, which is in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, only the broad bowl is preserved; it is not inscribed, but there are two engraved crosses on its body, and two gilded bands encircling the rim (Plate: 85). Meanwhile, chalice No. 25 is in Antalya Museum, and only its body survives. This was also produced from a single sheet of silver. Its foot might have been attached using soldering, as evidenced by the traces of silver copper solder on the bottom of the bowl (Plates: 86-89). It has a pointillé inscription, and is 9.5 cm high, 16 cm in diameter, and weighs 500 g. Chalice (No. 26) is also in Antalya Museum. Again, only the bowl is preserved. It has gilded bands encircling the rim with an engraved inscription (Plates: 90 and 91). There are two engraved and gilded crosses on its body, and it measures 14 cm in height, 22.5 cm in diameter, and weights 930 g. The seventh chalice, No. 27, is also in Antalya Museum. It is complete, with a broad bowl and a conical foot (Plates: 92 and 93). This bowl was produced from a single sheet of silver, with its foot attached using soldering. The chalice is not inscribed. Two gilded bands encircle its rim, and there are two gilded crosses on its body. It measures 32.5 cm in height, 22.5 cm in diameter, and weighs 1,040 g.

3.1.5 Amphorae

There are two amphorae in the Sion Treasure: one is preserved in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 28), and the other is preserved in Antalya Museum (No. 29). Both were also donated by Bishop Eutychianos. The amphora in Dumbarton Oaks is crushed and folded, with the rim detached from the body of the amphora. It has a fluted neck, and is decorated with a band of palmettes below this, with a niello inscription encircling the body. The decoration is engraved, and the amphorae bears five imperial stamps, similar to other stamps in the Treasure (Plates: 94-96). It is 32 cm in height, and weighs 2,954
The second amphora has the same niello inscription and foliate design decoration (Plates: 97-99). It is in a fragmentary condition, with the body and rim in Antalya Museum, and the fragment of the bottom, which was not examined for this thesis, in the London Hewett collection. There are no traces of stamps on this vessel. It is 30 cm in height, and weighs 1,350 g. These amphorae were not presented in detail in previous publications.

3.1.6 Ewer

There is one ewer in the Sion Treasure that is now in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 30, Plate: 100). It has a gilded repoussé decoration, is not inscribed, and is crushed and folded. It is 36 cm in height, and weighs 822 g.121

3.1.7 Standing lamps

There are four standing lamps in the Sion Treasure, three of which are in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (Nos. 31, 32, and 33), and one in Antalya Museum (No. 34). Lamps (Nos. 31 and 32) were flattened and rolled up (Plates: 101 and 102). They are all similar in form, shape, and decoration, and their niello inscriptions are identical. Lamp (No. 31) weighs 1,170 g, and (No. 32) weighs 1,291 g. Lamp (No. 33) is in good condition. It was shaped from a single sheet of silver using hammering, and has a cup-shaped body, and a ring foot (Plates: 103-105). It is not known whether the ring foot was attached later by soldering, or whether the foot and body were shaped together.122 It bears the same inscription as standing lamps (Nos. 31 and 32). The niello inscription encircles the rim, and there are two engraved crosses on its body. It measures 18.5 cm in height, with a 17.2 cm rim diameter, and an 18.4 cm ring foot diameter. It weighs 1,150 g. and bears five imperial stamps. Lamp (No. 34, which is in Antalya Museum, is identical in every way to the others, in terms of its decoration, inscription, measurements, and weight, although the foot and body of this object are separated from one another (Plates: 106 and 107).

---

120 See also ibid., Checklist no. 15.
121 Ibid., Checklist no: 17.
122 Newman and Lie, 'The Technical Examination and Conservation of Objects in the Sion Treasure', 82.
3.1.8 Openwork lamps (standing and hanging lamps)

There are eight openwork lamps in the Sion Treasure, seven of which are in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, and one in the Digby-Jones collection in London (No. 42). These objects have both feet and loops on the rim for chains, and therefore may have been used as both standing and hanging lamps. They were originally designed to hold glass lamps. There are different styles of decoration on these objects, and two types of inscription: niello and openwork, although all of them are decorated using openwork. The inscription on one of the lamps is illegible (No. 41). All of the lamps are stamped with imperial stamps.

Lamp (No. 35) has a hemispherical bowl, a baluster foot, and plain rim that thickens at the top (Plates: 108 and 109). There is no indication of how the foot was attached to the body.¹²³ The loops are attached to the rim using soldering, and the plain rim is encircled with a niello inscription, in which the letters epsilon and omega are decorated with crosses.¹²⁴ The body of the lamp is decorated with inverted hearts. It measures 15.5 cm in height, with a rim diameter of 18 cm, and a foot diameter of 6 cm, and weighs 663 g. The rim is 3 mm thick. Lamp (No. 36, Plates: 110-115) survives in a fragmentary state, but bears same inscription as Lamp (No. 35). Its form and decoration are also similar. Lamp (No. 37) has a hemispherical body, and a stemmed baluster foot, which is longer than the feet of the other openwork lamps (Plates: 116 and 117). The niello inscription is identical to that of the previous lamps, but the lettering is different, as the omega and epsilon are not decorated with crosses,¹²⁵ and at 2.1 cm, the letters are taller than those on the previous two lamps, which are only 1.1 cm tall. The rim of the lamp is not plain like the previous two, and projects outward, while the body is decorated with openwork scales, alternating with triangles. The lamp is 17 cm tall, with a rim diameter of 21 cm, and a foot diameter of 7 cm, and it weighs 1,112 g. The rim thickness is 3 mm.

Lamp (No. 38) has different decoration, and a different inscription from the other lamps, and is in a fragmentary condition, with the body, rim, and foot detached from one another. It has a hemispherical body, and a hexagonal rim, with flanges in a triangular

¹²³ Ibid., 83.
¹²⁵ Ibid., 193.
form, and a baluster foot. A niello inscription encircles the rim, and the body is decorated with openwork ‘diaper patterns’ (Plates: 118-123). The lamp is 11.4 cm tall, with a rim and flange diameter of 21.4 cm, and a foot diameter of 6 cm, and weighs 566 g. The height of letters varies between 1 and 1.2 cm, and the rim thickness is 3 mm.

Lamp (No. 39, Plates: 124 and 125) is of a similar shape and decoration to No. 38, although its inscription cites a different person, ‘Himeria’. It is possible to complete its rim with the rim fragment held in the Hewett collection in London. Although it is not possible to determine its height, due to the detached fragments, the diameter of the rim and flanges is 22.4 cm, and its weight is 565 g.

Lamp (No. 40) has a cylindrical-shaped body, its openwork decoration consists of a colonnade and arcades, and it is inscribed with an openwork style inscription (Plate: 126). Its rim diameter is 15.5 cm, it weighs 490 g, and the height of the letters in the inscription is 1.2 cm. Lamp (No. 41, Plate 127) is of a similar shape and style of decoration, but is crushed, folded, and in multiple fragments, which in total weigh 231.7 g.

Lamp (No. 42), which is in the Digby-Jones collection in London, has a plain rim, a hemispherical bowl, and a baluster foot. Its niello inscription encircles the rim, and its bowl is decorated with an openwork bisected scale design (Plate: 128). It is 10.5 cm tall, with a rim diameter of 14.3 cm. Its weight is unknown. In design and shape, it resembles lamp Nos. 35, 36, and 37. It was not possible to examine this lamp first-hand.

Six of these lamps were donated by Bishop Eutychianos, and the other two were donated in memory of Himeria and Eutychianos, excluding the title of ‘bishop’. They represent three different types of form, and four different types of openwork decoration. Four of the lamps are in the shape of a hemispherical bowl, with a squat-stemmed foot. Two of these are decorated with inverted hearts (Nos. 35 and 36), while the other two are decorated with scales and triangles (Nos. 37 and 42). Two of the lamps (Nos. 38 and 39) have a hemispherical body, and a hexagonal rim decorated with six flanges in a triangle form. The body of these lamps is decorated with openwork ‘diaper patterns’. The other two lamps (Nos. 40 and 41) are cylindrical in shape and are decorated with an architectural design; their inscriptions are also in an openwork style. The differences

---

126 Ibid., 194.
between the lamps is also discussed in Chapter 6, in the context of the taste of the producers and donors.

3.1.9 Suspension bracket for hanging lamps

This bracket is in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 43, Plate: 129). It is in the shape of a cross, with one vertical, and four horizontal crossed arms. It can be hung using the bracket on the top of the vertical arm. Each arm has a bracket for suspending lamps, five in total. The reverse and the obverse of the arms are inscribed with niello inscriptions. This bracket was also donated by Bishop Eutychianos.

3.1.10 Book covers

There are two pairs of book covers from the Sion Treasure in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, one of which is decorated with a cross and geometric motifs (No. 44, Plates: 130 and 131), while the decoration of the other is figurative (No. 45, Plates: 132 and 133). Meanwhile, Antalya Museum has small pieces of one book cover that complete the figurative cover in the Dumbarton Oaks collection (No. 45, Plate 134). The pair decorated with crosses (No. 44) was discussed in detail by Kitzinger. Its decoration was created using a repoussé technique, and the plaques are bordered with meander motifs between beaded edges. There are quatrefoils on the corners, while inside the frame, there is an arcade that is supported by spiral fluted columns, and divided by vertical flutings. This arcade surrounds the cross, which is flanked with palm trees, which Kitzinger identified as trees of life. On the spandrels, there are palmette leaves flanking the pediment. The other book cover (No. 45) is framed with overlapping leaves, or birds’ wings, between beaded edges. Again, it has quatrefoils on the corners, and floral medallions at the centre of the lines. Within the frame, there is an arcade whose spandrels are decorated with fleur-de-lys and peacocks pecking the vines. The arcade is supported by spirally-fluted columns with acanthus capitals. Inside the pediment, which is also framed by overlapping leaves between beaded edges, there is a conch shell, and three six-pointed stars on the angles. At the centre of each panel, Christ stands between two saints, holding a book in his left hand, while the right is raised in a gesture of blessing. The centre is framed by a pointillé inscription. In addition to these pairs, and the fragments belonging to them, there is also one fragment in Antalya.

127 Kitzinger, 'A Pair of Silver Book Covers in the Sion Treasure', 3-17.
Museum that cannot be matched with either of the other two pairs (No. 53, Plate: 135). This may suggest that there was another book cover that has not survived. As it is not a complete object, it is considered here in this thesis as a detached fragment.

Both sets of book covers are gilded. There is no evidence for how these pairs were attached and connected, as there are no traces of nails being used, except for rectangular cuttings on the sides. The pair with crosses measures 37.2 x 30 cm, and 37.5 x 27.6 cm, and weigh 917 g. Since the other pair have detached fragments, it is not possible to measure them accurately, but the estimated measurements are 25 x 2.8 cm, and the surviving fragments weigh 317 g.

3.1.11 Lamp stands

The lampstands from the Sion Treasure are in a fragmentary state, and the fragments are preserved only in the Dumbarton Oaks collection. There are two capitals, of which one is crushed and torn; one column base; and two column shafts. Since there are two column shafts and two capitals, the total number of lampstands can be presumed to be two (Nos. 46 and 47). The capitals are both decorated with an acanthus leaf decoration. The capital of No. 46 is the most complete and well-preserved, therefore its measurements are likely to be more accurate. It is 8.1 cm in diameter, 15 to 15.5 cm high, and 15.5 to 16.2 cm wide. It weighs 872 g, and is 0.6 mm thick at the bottom, and 1.2 mm thick at the top. It was created by hammering out a single sheet of silver. The bottom of the capital is circular; it flares outward and is square at the top. The plate, which is decorated with a foliate design, was soldered at the top. There are also signs of soldering on the plate, which might indicate that lamps were attached to this lampstand using soldering. The decoration was made using chasing and engraving, and the object was burnished. The soldering appears at the bottom of the object, indicating that it was attached to the shaft using soldering. The column shaft is inscribed with a repoussé inscription. This shaft is cylindrical in shape, and was formed from a single sheet of silver, and connected using soldering (Plates: 136-137). It is 1 mm thick, 43.7 cm high and 8.8 cm in diameter. It was decorated using hammering, chasing, and engraving.

---

128 For more discussion about the number of objects, see Boyd, 'A “Metropolitan” Treasure from a Church in the Provinces', 31-32.
129 The technical examination of this object was carried by Newman and Lie, and detailed examination of the object can be found in their paper. See Newman and Lie, 'The Technical Examination and Conservation of Objects in the Sion Treasure', 83.
This column shaft fits with the column capital,\(^{130}\) and they are displayed together in Dumbarton Oaks Museum, but it lacks its base. The column shaft measures as 43.7 cm in height, and 8.8 cm in diameter.

The capital of lamp stand (No. 47) is detached and crushed (Plate: 140). It has a similar decoration to that of the capital of lamp stand (No. 46), and weighs 435 g. In addition, the same type of manufacture and form are evident in the shaft as in the shaft of lamp stand (No. 46). This shaft is decorated with rosettes and flanking crosses in two bands on the centre of the shaft. This shaft fits with the column base, and they are displayed together. This column base was formed from a single sheet of silver by hammering, with the square bottom rising to a vertical rim and circular top (Plates: 138 and 139). It is attached to the column shaft using soldering. It is 0.8 to 1.1 mm thick at the bottom, and 2 to 2.5 mm thick at the top. The column shaft and base together weigh 1,400 g. It is 68.6 cm high.\(^{131}\)

### 3.1.12 Altar table sheets

There are 14 separate sheets that would have been used to cover the rim and top of the altar. These sheets are divided between the collections in Antalya Museum and Dumbarton Oaks. When the sheets connected, it is evident that they would have covered the rim and top of the altar (No. 48, Plates: 141-146) and (No. 49, Plates: 147 and 148).\(^{132}\) My studies at Dumbarton Oaks show that it is possible to reconstruct the altar table using the measurements of the sheeting. In total, the front and back of this altar table are 225 cm in length, and it can be gleaned from the traces of folding that the thickness of the rim is 5 cm. Meanwhile, the left and right edges are 116 cm in length. The total measurements of each piece are presented in Table 4. When completed, the total measurement of the table sheets is 225 x 116 cm, including the rim sheets and the plain sheets for the top of the altar. Therefore, this measurement also indicates the total measurement of the altar table. The rim sheets for the front and right edge of the altar are inscribed using a repoussé technique, with the inscription commencing at the left side of the front panel, and ending at the right end of the right edge. There are signs of

\(^{130}\) Ibid., 83.
\(^{131}\) Ibid., 84.
\(^{132}\) All 14 sheets were combined in two numbers as rim sheeting and sheets for top of the altar.
silver soldering and riveting on these objects, indicating that they were possibly riveted to the table, and later silver soldered together, overlapping one another.

There are also two decorated and inscribed sheets, but it is uncertain whether these objects belonged to the altar table, or were placed elsewhere in the church, such as on a templon screen. It is also possible that these two objects, (No. 50, Plates: 149 and 150) in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, and (No. 51, Plates: 151-154) in Antalya Museum, were placed on the altar table. Traces of silver soldering on both sides of the rims of the plain sheets indicate that they may have been soldered to the plain sheets that cover the top of the table. However, the measurements do not fit the altar table, as both of the objects are 97 cm in length, and 39 cm wide, which means there would be a gap of approximately 19 cm in width, and 140 cm in length. Therefore, they may have been placed elsewhere within the church, or there may have been another two or more sheets for the top of the altar that have not survived. As it is apparent in the illustration of the altar table, the top of the altar is covered with rivets and soldering, and the rim sheets are positioned on the plain sheets (Plates: 145 and 147). Furthermore, there are also traces of the soldering on the edges of rim sheets and on these two inscribed sheets. There may have been additional materials that covered these rivets and solder marks, possibly these two objects, or altar cloths.

These two plain sheets were inscribed with repoussé inscriptions; No. 50 was donated by the Priest Zacharias, and No. 51 was donated by Bishop Paregoros, who was also the donor of the rim sheets.

3.1.13 Base of a candlestick

When this detached object that is preserved in Antalya Museum (No. 52) was examined, it was possible to determine that it is the base of a candlestick (Plates: 155-156). It has two feet shaped as knobs, and a niello inscription surrounding the rim of the foot, but it lacks an end, indicating that the foot of the candlestick on which it stood was larger. The missing foot, and traces of detachment, support this assumption. The form of the

---

133 I owe many thanks to Gudrun Buehl who is museum director in Dumbarton Oaks for her recommendations and the time to discuss this object by comparing it with other candlesticks.

134 The inscription of this object was examined and translated by the author. See, Table 1, no. 52.
object bears similarities with other lampstand bases, for example the objects in Mango’s article concerning the Lampsacus Treasure.\footnote{Marlia Mundell Mango, ‘Three Illuminating objects in the Lampsacus Treasure’, in ed. Chris Entwistle, Through a Glass Brightly: Studies in Byzantine and Medieval Art and Archaeology Presented to David Buckton (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2003).Fig. 9.1.}

### 3.2 Inscriptions

An explanation of the inscriptions on the objects in the Sion Treasure is provided in a table 2 in the appendix of this thesis that details the formulae they include, and which object was given by which donor. This present section presents summary of the information about inscriptions. In total, 44 of the 52 objects in the Treasure were inscribed. One of the inscriptions is illegible, due to the smashed and crushed state of the object (No. 41). Only 5 of the inscriptions on the chalices, and one on the base of a candlestick lack a name. The inscriptions on these objects are; ‘a vow/or prayer of those whose names are known to god’, ‘having giving thanks I made it’, ‘for the most holy hymn this was presented’.

The inscriptions on these objects provides important information about their donors, and the reasons for their production, and therefore constitutes important evidence for the discussion in Chapter 5 regarding the reasons for their creation, and for explaining the market in sacred silver. As previously noted, in Chapter 6 the formulae of the inscriptions are employed as evidence of the intentions and wishes behind the donation of these objects, since, as is evident in Table 2, the inscriptions that employ the formulae, ‘in fulfilment of a vow’, ‘this object presented’, and ‘offers this’ are accompanied by the wishes of the donors. These formulae also explain that the silver objects were presented to the church as a gift. The wishes of donors will be discussed in detail in chapter 6.

According to the inscriptions, the donors of the objects were primarily members of the clergy: three bishops, (Eutychianos, Paregoros, and Theodore); one priest (Zacharias); and one deacon (Prinkipios). The names that do not include a title (Maria, Himeria, John, Roufinos, and Eutychianos) can be assumed to be lay people.

Whether these lay people and Deacon Prinkipios were the actual donors, in the sense that they presented the objects, or whether their relatives gave the objects on their
behalf, is unknown, since the objects on which their names appear include the formula, ‘for the Memory of’. While this has been the matter of some discussion among researchers, assumptions were made without supporting evidence. For example, since the name ‘Eutychianos’ on lamp (No. 38) lacks an adjective, or the title of ‘Most Holy Bishop’, while the other inscriptions bearing the name of Eutychianos and his title, and the names of Himeria, and others, appear with the formula of ‘for the Memory of’, Boyd suggested that these pieces of silverware may have been given by the children or grandchildren of these people in memory of them. 136 Meanwhile, the inscription on the rim sheeting (No. 48) indicates that Bishop Paregoros offered it in memory of his family, not for himself, which suggests that the objects with a names accompanying the formulae ‘for the Memory of’ may have been donated by the family of the named individuals. In addition, Boyd suggested that two lamps (Nos. 38 and 39) may have been donated by Bishop Eutychianos in memory of his parents, or grandparents, Eutychianos and Himeria. 137 However, there is no evidence for this, as the name Eutychianos, without an accompanying title of bishop, and that of Himeria, may indicate that they were members of someone else’s family.

For the purpose of the present thesis, it was assumed that the donors of the objects may have been either the individuals named on the objects, in their own memory, or the relatives of these individuals. In order to avoid confusion, it was not assumed that these individuals were necessarily the donors of objects, rather it was clearer to state simply that the object in question was donated in memory of Himeria, for example. Chapter 6 presents a more detailed discussion of objects donated in the memory of an individual, in the context of the discussion of the formulae on the inscriptions, and their value for their donors.

3.3 Stamps

In total, 20 of the 52 objects in the Sion Treasure were stamped; eight of them are held in Antalya Museum, and the others in the Dumbarton Oaks collection. All of these stamped objects were donated by Bishop Eutychianos. I was able to examine these in both collections, and to compare them with stamps from other treasures. Since it is important that the stamps are examined in detail, and are published alongside

137 Ibid., 194.
photographs, the present thesis does so in Table 3, thereby contributing additional information to the study of the Treasure. These stamps also provide valuable information about the circulation of silver in Byzantium.

When the stamps applied to the silver objects in Antalya Museum and in the Dumbarton Oaks collection were examined, it was evident that there are variations in the busts and monograms of Emperor Justinian I, and in the officials, and the inscribed names of the officers. All of the stamped objects were given to the monastery by Bishop Eutychianos, and each object generally includes five stamps, although some have six stamps as a result of the same stamp being applied twice (Nos. 13, 18 and 42). Meanwhile, some of the objects only have one or three surviving stamps, which may be due to the objects’ fragmentary state, or may be because only one or three stamps were applied originally.\(^{138}\) Although some of the stamps are illegible, especially the stamps on paten (No. 1, Plate: 3), rectangular polycandela (No. 15, Plates: 55 and 56), (No. 18, Plates: 67 and 68), and openwork lamps (Nos. 35, 36, 38 and 40, plates: 109, 114, 123), the busts and monograms of Emperor Justinian I can be recognised. It was only possible to examine the stamps on two of the standing lamps (Nos. 33 and 34), since the other lamps were crushed and folded.

In her examination of the stamps on the silver objects from different treasures, Dodd divided them into two different kinds: imperial, and non-imperial. Imperial stamps are of five sorts: round, hexagonal, square, long, and cruciform. While the circular and long stamps bear the busts of the reigning emperor, and the inscribed name of officials, the hexagonal and square stamps bear the monograms of the reigning emperor, and the cruciform stamps bear the monograms of the financial officers, and the names of the officials who worked under the Comes Sacrarum Largitionum, in whose offices silver, gold, and other commodities were controlled for the purpose of taxation, and were and stamped with hallmarks.\(^{139}\)

When the stamps from the Sion Treasure are compared with those from other treasures from the sixth century, it is possible to observe similarities between their shapes and numbers, and even between the monograms and names inscribed on them. According to

\(^{138}\) See Table 3 for detailed explanation of the stamps on objects.

Dodd’s catalogue, and her examination of the stamps on the objects from the Sion Treasure, these objects bear the busts and monograms of the Emperor Justinian, and the inscribed names and monograms of sixth-century officials. This thesis employs the tables created by Dodd in her book that list the busts and monograms of the emperors, and the inscribed names and monograms of the officials, as a reference.\textsuperscript{140} While Table 3 in the Appendix provides detailed information about all of the stamps, in general terms, the content of the stamps on the Sion Treasure objects is listed below (the stamps on the objects that are not mentioned are illegible).

- The round stamp has a bust of Emperor Justinian, and the inscribed name of an official: Iohannis appears on eight polycandela (Nos. 7 to 14, and 18); Leontion appears on two rectangular polycandela (Nos. 15 and 16), one amphora (No. 28), and one censer (No. 19); Christophorou appears on one censer (No. 20), and two standing lamps (Nos. 33 and 34);
- The hexagonal stamp bears the monogram of Emperor Justinian, and an inscribed name: Italon appears on polycandela Nos. 7 to 18, and Christophorou on one censer (No. 19);
- The square stamp bears the monogram of Emperor Justinian, and an inscribed name: Dorotheon appears on nine polycandela (Nos. 7 to 14, and 18); and Euceteic appears on one rectangular polycandelon (No. 16), one censer (No. 19), and one amphora (No. 28);
- The long stamp bears the bust of Emperor Justinian, the monogram of his chief official of finance, and an inscribed name: Iohannis appears on polycandela Nos. 7 to 14, and 18; and Diomidou appears on censer No. 19;
- The cruciform stamp bears the monogram of a finance officer, and an inscribed name: Iohannis appears on polycandela Nos. 7 to 14, and 18; Eufronion appears on polycandelon No. 16, one censer (No. 19), and one amphora (No. 28); and Cergion appears on one censer (No. 20), and one standing lamp (No. 33).

The only legible monograms of officials are those on the polycandela and censers, which are those of Iohannis and Diomidou. The name of the same officials is stamped on some of the polycandela, excluding the two rectangular polycandela (Nos. 15 and

\textsuperscript{140} See Dodd, Byzantine Silver Stamps. Tables I-V.
16); instead of the name Iohannis, they bear the name Leontion, which is also on the censers and amphora. These names appear on both the stamps from the reign of Emperor Justinian I and that of Justin II;\textsuperscript{141} because of their similarities, it can be said that these were stamped within a short period of time. Another intriguing fact is that the name of ‘ΔΟΠΟ-ΘΕΟV’ is not evident on the objects dated to the reign of Emperor Justinian I (527-565 CE); rather the name appears at the beginning of the reign of Emperor Justin II. It is also applied to the square stamp affixed to the Riha paten and fan, and the Stuma Fan, all of which are dated to the reign of Emperor Justin II.\textsuperscript{142} Moreover, it is intriguing that the name of ‘ΙWAN-NOV’ is present in the hexagonal stamp of these objects, as it also evident on the polycandela in the Sion Treasure. According to Dodd, this relationship with Justin II’s reign indicates that the objects can be dated to near the end of Justinian I’s reign.\textsuperscript{143} However, this is complicated by the fact that the imperial monograms are from the reign of Justinian, while secondary monograms and inscribed names are from the reign of Justin II, therefore, it may be that these officials worked during the reigns of both Justinian I and Justin II.

By examining the stamps, it is possible to suggest the approximate date of the objects, and possibly the places where they were stamped. Although this thesis does not argue these matters in detail, it is appropriate to provide a brief discussion of the locations where they may have been stamped, and the possible date of the objects, in the next chapter. However, it should be noted that the dates of the objects, and when they were given to the church, cannot be determined by examining the stamps alone, since they were applied to the objects before they were shaped or cut for decoration. The examples provided in the illustrations of the stamps demonstrates that some of the stamps were cut in half during their decoration, the rivets were put on some of them, and some of the stamps were burnished, which suggests that these objects were completed sometime after they were stamped (Plates: 21, 22, 32, 34, 40, 43, 55).

This chapter provided detailed descriptions of the objects in the Sion Treasure, and raised certain problems with other scholars’ approaches to their study, in order to present the key material evidence that was employed throughout the present study: the\textsuperscript{141} The name appears in Dodd’s list of inscribed names. But they are dated to the reign of Justin II. Ibid., Table IV.\textsuperscript{142} These objects which were found in Syria are examined in Mango’s and Dodd’s catalogue, and they dated these objects to the beginning of Justin II’s reign. See ibid., figs. 20,21,22.\textsuperscript{143} ‘The Question of Workshop: Evidence of the Stamps on the Sion Treasure’, 59.
decoration of the silverware, and their inscriptions and stamps. When the information contained in this chapter was considered alongside the rest of the thesis, it enabled the main questions of this thesis to be tackled. A consideration of the different styles of decoration and form, and the fact that some of the objects have the same form and style of decoration, alongside a consideration of their monetary value, engendered a discussion of the biography of the objects. Did these stylistic similarities change the biography of the objects? Were their physical size, weight, and decoration significant for their value and biography? An awareness that these objects were given to Sion Monastery as gifts to God, and were used in liturgical ceremonies, also affected the present approach to understanding the value of objects in the Treasure.

The next chapter discusses the production and circulation of objects in Early Byzantium, and this information, together with that presented in the current chapter engenders the subsequent discussion of the biography and value of the objects at the time of their production in sixth-century Byzantium, including a consideration of the purpose of the decoration and inscriptions, along with the purpose of the objects themselves. The intention is not to compare them with other silver objects from the same period, since an evaluation of the comparative degree of craftsmanship or decoration serves little purpose. Rather the discussion concerns the objects in their own changing contexts, and in terms of their different users.
4. THE PRODUCTION, CIRCULATION AND COST OF THE SION TREASURE

This chapter aims to examine the production and circulation of the Sion silver vessels, as well as to establish the cost of these items to their donors. Although there is no exact evidence of where the Sion objects were made or how the silver as a raw material was gained by the producers, this chapter will discuss how silver in general, as both a raw material and a finished object, was circulated in the Early Byzantine period. The circulation of silver and its control by the state will serve to indicate the commercial value of objects and their accessibility for people and producers, aiding the discussion of the commodity value of objects which will be presented in the following chapter. The cost and circulation of silver will indicate the financial circumstances of donors and their ability to buy silver. Therefore, this discussion will indicate how silver as a material was valued and used in sixth-century Byzantium. Using the information gathered and the stamps identified on the Sion objects, assumptions will be made concerning where these objects might have been produced, and how accessible they were to their producers as silver materials, and their donors in the form of silver objects. Before beginning discussion on how Sion objects were produced and circulated, this chapter will start by presenting the circulation of silver, since understanding the circulation of silver in the Early Byzantine period will enable subsequent discussion on the production and circulation of silver objects from Sion Treasure.

4.1 Circulation of silver as a material and as silver vessels in Early Byzantium

Silver was used in Early Byzantium for many purposes, including the production of objects for private houses and churches, such as plates and jewellery. However, there was no silver coinage in Early Byzantium; they were used only for plate and jewellery.\(^{144}\) Silver was circulated around the Early Byzantine Empire in the form of bullions (i.e. bars or ingots). Silver ingots valued by weight and were used to make payments. The Theodosian Code shows that penalties could be paid for by in silver ingots, as opposed to coins. For example, five Roman pounds in weight of silver, per

head, was to be paid if the mules from the imperial post were diverted for private purposes.145

There are no ancient sources to indicate where silver as a material was circulated, or where crafted silver items were made and consequently distributed. Silver was mined and given to the state by the miners, who worked in state-controlled workshops. Private miners were able to sell silver ingots, but had to pay taxes to Largitiones, the institutions responsible for collecting taxes on luxurious metals, such as gold and silver.146 Recent archaeological analysis shows that silver was mined in Greece and Anatolia.147 The silver ore was in a state combined with copper and lead; once mined, it was smelted to make it more pure and to remove the lead and copper. The silver was then alloyed with copper and gold to make it harder so that it was ready to shape.148 As with other items of value, silver objects were often stamped for authorisation. Imperial stamps were used on coins and bricks, to control the circulation of these materials. Coins had to be authorised, and brick stamps were collected as taxes from owners.149

This authorisation and control was the responsibility of the comes sacrarum largitionum, an office which measured and controlled the weights of commodities, such as gold and silver, as well as other materials.150

Ancient sources indicate that silver was owned by wealthy people and also by silversmiths in its raw material state. A silversmith in Jerusalem reported his shop burgled, with approximately 100 Roman pounds of silver stolen. When the silversmith spoke to St. Sabas, he communicated that much of the silver was not his own

148 Lie, 'The Technical Examination and Conservation of Objects in the Sion Treasure', 78.
150 Dodd, Byzantine Silver Stamps, 35-45.
property. This story illustrates that not only did silversmiths buy their own materials, but that some of the silver to be worked was brought in by commissioners. There are recorded examples of silversmiths or dealers who sold recycled silver in their shops. Theophylact Simocatta retells the story of Paulinus, a pagan who lived in Constantinople, who sold his silver bowl, which had been used to collect the blood from his sacrifices, to some dealers. This bowl was re-melted to make an item purchased by the Bishop of Thracian Heraclea who presented it to the shrine of St. Glyceria. In a story told of Theodore of Sykeon, his archdeacon, who was sent to buy a paten and chalice for the Eucharist, bought recycled silver from the shop. Materials bought by donors and examples of people bringing their own materials, indicates that private workshops sold silver to silversmiths and wealthy people, and it is also clear that recycled silver was circulated around the Byzantine Empire.

Secular silver used for dining, toiletry, and jewellery was found in domestic homes. Seven of the 14 silver objects found in the Sevso Treasure would have been used for dining and the remainder were identified as ewers and bath utensils. The Esquiline Treasure contains two plates for dining with monograms of their owners. The Lampsacus Treasure, found in the western part of Turkey, includes spoons, illuminating objects and bowls. Emperors gave gifts of textiles, gold and silver cups, for example, with the purpose, as Cutler explains, of improving relationships and displaying their power.

155 Ibid., 135; 'Three Illuminating objects in the Lampsacus Treasure', 64-75.
Sacred objects were usually donated to churches by bishops, emperors, deacons, priests and lay people. The *Liber Pontificalis* provides examples of imperial and non-imperial church donations. Bishop Silvester provided all but one item for the church that he built. That one object was a silver chalice from Emperor Constantine, weighing 20 pounds of Roman silver.\(^\text{157}\) Emperor Constantine’s donations to the Lateran Church and St Peter’s Basilica are also recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis*.\(^\text{158}\)

In addition, there are non-imperial donations found in Syria and Antioch. Treasures found in Hama, Stuma, Riha and Antioch were, according to their inscriptions, presented to village churches in Syria. These silver treasures bear the name of Kaper Koraon, and thus are known as the Kaper Koraon Treasure. The 56 silver objects found include: eight chalices, seven patens, five crosses, one cross revetment, two lamp stands, three lamps, three ewers, one flask, one bowl, one mirror, one box, eleven spoons, one ladle, two strainers, two fans, and four plaques. Of the 56 objects donated to St. Sergios, four of the objects were given by high ranking people and the others were given by lay people.\(^\text{159}\)

It is evident therefore that silver was a sought-after material used to craft dinnerware and gifts as well as sacred items to be donated to churches. As with the Sion Treasure, objects from the other treasures have dedicatory inscriptions and stamps. It can be seen that most of these items were controlled by the Roman state and were an important source of taxes.

The next section will discuss the production and circulation of the objects found in the Sion Treasure, followed by the presentation of the total cost of the Sion objects and their cost to each donor. The monetary value of these silver objects has been examined by Mango, although the exact amount of silver from the Sion Treasure was not discussed.\(^\text{160}\)

---

\(^{160}\) 'The Monetary Value of Silver Revetments and Objects Belonging to Churches, AD. 300-700', 123-36.
4.2 The production and circulation of the Sion Treasure

The objects in the Sion Treasure were each made from a single sheet of silver. Some items, including the circular censer and patens, were produced by working on a lathe. The silver sheets were shaped, compressed and stretched by hammer to make the desired object, which was then decorated. The chalices were silver soldered to their foot, silver soldering also used for the holes for chains in the polycandela and censers. For inscriptions, the technique of engraving was used as well as the technique of niello, which used copper. Relief techniques were used on patens and censers. After decoration, gilding was used.\(^{161}\)

Dodd concluded that the Sion objects were first crafted and stamped in Constantinople, then decorated in local workshops. She believed that imperial stamps, which acted as the guarantee of the workshop, were applied in Constantinople. Dodd supported her argument by using evidence of the name of the officials, asserting that since all the stamps on the Sion silver from the same century bear the same names, the officials cannot be in two places at the same time. Therefore, Dodd deduces that the authority of the Byzantine state over silver did not spread to all places of the Empire, instead they were controlled and stamped in Constantinople, they were not stamped in local workshops as the coins which were also stamped in local workshops. Dodd concludes that there are no mint marks on the imperial stamps, but if they are imperial stamps, they show that the place of stamping is Constantinople.\(^{162}\) By this she means that coins normally had their mint marks which indicates the workshops they were produced, but since the stamps for silver objects do not bear mint marks, the imperial stamps, as she argues, also gives evidence of the stamping place which is Constantinople. This might be true because the officials, whose names and monograms appear on stamps, worked in Constantinople, as I previously explained they were worked under the control of Comes Sacrarum Largitionum. But the fact that the silver, which was used to produce these objects, was stamped in Constantinople does not mean that the objects in the Sion Treasure were produced in Constantinople.


\(^{162}\) Dodd, 'The Location of Silver Stamping: Evidence from Newly Discovered Stamps', 217-18.
In her examination of the Sion objects, Dodd suggested that one donor, Eutychianos, may have travelled to Constantinople where he bought stamped silver. There are, however, similar objects to stamped ones in terms of decoration, which were not stamped. For example, there are two identical patens which were presented by the same bishop: a stamped one, kept in the Antalya Museum (No. 1) and the unstamped paten residing in the Dumbarton Oaks Museum (No. 4). Dodd has proposed two contrasting explanations. Perhaps Eutychianos might have procured his paten from Constantinople and brought it to the local workshop where it was copied by the silversmith. Or maybe the stamped paten was exported and decorated together with the other similar paten. Dodd argues that the local silversmith copied the paten produced in Constantinople.  

In addition to Dodd’s examinations on stamps, Mango examined the purpose and places of silver stamping in the context of the stamps which were applied to the silver objects in the Kaper Koraon Treasure. She argued that not all imperial stamps were applied in Constantinople for it was a long journey from Syria to Constantinople just for stamping objects. Stamps might have been applied in other centres of Byzantine at the same time. Mango believes that there were other officials at different centres, using Syria as an example. She likens this to coinage, where different centres used the stamps of officials in Constantinople. She also states that certain bishops may have gone to Constantinople and bought their silver from there. For example, Megas, who was a bishop in Syria and attended to court in Constantinople, might have bought the ewers there which he donated to the church of St Sergius in Kaper Koraon.

Although some silver which used in the manufacture of objects in the Sion Treasure may have been stamped by state officials in Constantinople, it does not have to be the case that all of the donors travelled to Constantinople. It is plausible at the very least that silversmiths bought stamped silver from the capital and produced these objects in local workshops. The possibility of reaching stamping places and the accessibility of donors to silver should be discussed. Eutychianos, for example, may have been wealthy enough to go to Constantinople or, travelled there in his role as a bishop for reasons.

relating to the administration of the churches in his diocese.\textsuperscript{166} However, these suppositions do not necessarily determine that he purchased his silver from Constantinople. Eutychianos may have purchased his silver objects from local workshops who had acquired the stamped silver from the state. The mining of silver was under the state control, with the silver bullions of precious metals being transferred to the state.\textsuperscript{167} Therefore, the state may have sold the stamped silver to the local workshops. It can be assumed that the private miners also sold unstamped silver to silversmiths after making payment to \textit{Largitiones}.\textsuperscript{168} The process of the production of silver plates may also be evidence for this assumption. When objects are examined from a technical viewpoint, it can be proposed that the objects were stamped before the process of decoration, for example, when they were bullions or sheets of silver. Contrariwise, stamping after the decoration would have proved challenging. After stamping, the objects were decorated: stamping them after they were decorated might have been difficult. Therefore, it can be supposed that silversmiths bought stamped silver from the capital, then produced and decorated the objects. This is more plausible than the assumption that Eutychianos bought his stamped silver from Constantinople and brought it to local workshops to be worked on. Consequently, it is difficult to identify the workshops used to produce the stamped objects because stamping and making silver objects are different processes. Therefore, it can be said that stamps might indicate the stamping places of silver, but they do not provide evidence for the places of production of silver objects from these stamped silvers.

Assumptions have been made that these stamps were also to guarantee the purity of the objects. Dodd argued that the stamped silver of the Sion Treasure was finer than the unstamped silver, in terms of quality of the silver material and the decoration. She illustrated this by comparing the two patens from the Sion Treasure; she argued that the silver in the stamped paten (No. 1), donated by Eutychianos, was purer than the silver in the unstamped paten (No.2), which was donated ‘for the memory of Maria’. But, on


\textsuperscript{167} Matschke, 'Mining', 115.

further technical examination of these objects, the unstamped paten weights 8000 grams and the stamped paten weights 4300 grams; approximately 90% of both patens are made of silver, the remaining 10% being made of gold with copper used for the niello inlay. This examination proves that both objects were ‘fine’ in terms of material. In similar vein to Dodd, Mango proposed that the stamps were the hallmarks to guarantee the purity, and moreover, the proof of authorisation. However, this does not mean infer that unauthorised silver is impure. In contrast to Mango, Hendy argued that recycled objects may have been stamped to prove their purity in terms of material. He explains that pure silver objects generally include silver content between 85% and 95%; however, he adds that it cannot be assumed that all stamped silver is recycled. Silver stamps are simply the hallmarks showing the authorisation of silver and for tax purposes.

Consequently, it seems fair to suggest that some silver objects were controlled by state and the others were sold directly to the silversmiths. The stamped objects from the Sion Treasure may or may not have been stamped in Constantinople while in the form of silver sheets or bullions, but this does not prove that they were shaped and decorated in Constantinople. There is possibility that including the unstamped silver, these objects might have been made in Lycia. This is more probable than Eutychianos travelling to Constantinople to purchase stamped silver vessels and then the unstamped silverware being made in Lycia. Recent archaeological examinations show that there were metal workshops in Lycia. The tools for making silver and decorating metal objects suggest that there were also silversmiths in this area. Therefore, it is feasible that some or all of the Sion objects were produced in Lycia.

The stamped silver objects indicate the sequence of the stamping dates of the silver bullion. However, it is difficult to assess the exact dates of when these objects were made and when they were donated to the monastery. This is because of the fact that objects were shaped and decorated after they were stamped, and this might be just after they were stamped or after some time. On examination of the stamps, it is clear that

---

169 Meyers, 'Elemental Compositions of the Sion Treasure and Other Byzantine Silver Objects', 169-77.
171 Hendy, 'The Administration of Mints and Treasuries, Fourth to Seventh Centuries, with an Appendix on the Production of Silver Plate', 13..
silver bullion for some objects were stamped at the same time, and the silver for the other objects were stamped later or earlier. Stamps on the polycandela are identical which suggests that the silver for the polycandela were stamped at the same time. Nonetheless, it would be unreliable to make assumptions about the sequence of donations by relying on the stamp dates. The polycandela may all have been given to the church at the same time, but it is unclear when this was. Comparing the stamps from the Sion Treasure with those from other treasures, the stamps can all be dated to the mid-sixth century. Therefore, the objects from the Sion Treasure may have been made and presented to the church in the mid-sixth century or late-sixth century. As discussed earlier, it is more reliable to assume the date of the donation of these objects according to the foundation of the monastery than from their silver stamps.

4.3. The cost of the Sion Treasure

An estimation of the original costs of the items in the Sion Treasure can be calculated from the quantity of silver used, although it is impossible to predict how much the decoration of the objects increased their value. Additionally, some of the objects are incomplete, making it difficult to find their exact weights. The weight of the pieces from the Sion Treasure, as it survives and including fragments, but excluding nails, is approximately 384.736 Roman pounds (which is approximately equal to 125,873.4 grams in today’s measurements). In the sixth century, one Roman pound equated to 327.168 grams. The inscriptions on the objects indicate the donors of the objects, so it is possible to calculate the number and weight in silver each donor gifted. Table 4 in appendix shows the number of objects that were given by each donor and presents each donor and the objects they donated, and their costs to donors. I have converted the pounds of silver to solidi by using the information gained from the *Ecclesiastical History* by John of Ephesus. According to this source, one pound of silver costs four gold solidi.

---

It can be seen from Table 4 that Bishop Eutychianos donated the most silver. His gifts consisted of three patens, twelve polycandela, two censers, two Amphorae, four standing Lamps, eight Openwork Lamps, one suspension bracket for five lamps. In total, Eutychianos donated at least 62,216 grams (approximately 190.16 Roman pounds) of silver to the monastery of Sion, presumably on several separate occasions. Some of the surviving silver is folded, flattened and crushed and consequently it is difficult to estimate the exact weights of the original objects, however, it is assumed to be more than the weights recorded in Table 4, and thus, this weight of silver equates to 760 solidi. This does not take into account that the gilding present on many of the objects would have increased their value further.

The name Paregoros is found on the rim sheeting of the altar table revetments as well as on the inscribed plain sheet. It is difficult to assess whether all the silver for the altar table was given by Paregoros, however, it can be assumed that the altar table revetments were commissioned by him, for which he could have paid approximately 340 solidi.

There are also inscribed names on the silverware given in their remembrance. It is unknown who the donors of these objects are, whether it was by the name inscribed or by someone else. Paten (No.2), given ‘for the memory of Maria’, cost 97 solidi. Paten (No 5) was given ‘for the memory of Angeleuos Roufinos’ cost 55 solidi. The paten (No.6) given ‘for the memory of John’ cost 51 solidi. The book cover which was given ‘for the memory of Deacon Prinkipios’, cost approximately 3.8 solidi’s worth of silver. The openwork lamps given ‘for the memory of Eutychianos’ and Himeria (Nos. 38 and 39) each cost approximately 6 solidi.

The chalices do not bear the name of their donors but their weight of 10.8 Roman pounds, it can be calculated that approximately 44 solidi’s worth of silver was used. The uninscribed vessels weigh approximately 22 Roman pounds, which equates to 88 solidi.

In comparison to these donations, imperial donations are much bigger. Justinian’s silver donated to Hagia Sophia has been estimated to weigh approximately 40,000 Roman pounds which cost 160,000 solidi.175 There are also donations made to Roman churches, worth approximately 500 solidi. The Lateran church received 17,725 Roman pounds of

---

silver from Constantine.\textsuperscript{176} Donations to non-imperial churches include objects in the Kaper Koraon Treasure; one of the donors, named Megas, gifted silver worth 75 solidi. A paten of bishop Paternus cost 80 solidi.\textsuperscript{177}

It is clear from these evidences that Eutychianos was the donor who gave the greatest number of silver objects and spent the most solidi for his donation. Bishops earned their incomes from the church endowments and they were responsible for the finance of the churches.\textsuperscript{178} However, there is no evidence of how much the bishops of Sion Monastery earned or received from their congregation in a year. Theodore of Sykeon received a solidus a day, totalling 365 solidi a year.\textsuperscript{179} Eutychianos’ total donations, of approximately 760 solidi, is almost the equivalent of two years’ salary for Theodore of Sykeon. However, Eutychianos’ donations might not have been be made at the same time but spread out over many years.

Comparing the salaries of imperial officials from the time of Justinian, it becomes clear that the amount spent by Eutychianos would not be exceptional for high ranking persons, but it would be a significant donation for the middle and lower classes. For example, the advisers to the Prefect of Africa were paid 1440 solidi a year, his secretary was paid 504 solidi a year and his officers were paid 10 solidi a year. Furthermore, his soldiers were paid 9 solidi a year.\textsuperscript{180} These examples show that the endowments made to the Sion monastery were plausible and the income of the bishops of the Sion monastery were more than the incomes of the middle class. Whilst the donations might have been above average, it cannot be said that they were exceptional.

One of the important elements of the Sion Treasure is that it includes almost every object used in a church which indicates the needs of the church and its population. Envisaging thinking about the silverware as commercial objects, makes it possible to look at the concept of demand and desire in the market, at producer relationships and the opportunity of donors. The monetary value of the silver objects shows that the most
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important factor in donation was the opportunity of donors to make these donations. This was related to their income and their willingness to sacrifice a proportion of their wealth through the purchase of these silver objects, as opposed to any other form of vessel, be it pot, pewter or gold. Silver, when they have the opportunity, became a material in demand for giving to churches, with its durability and usage in certain contexts. This affected the market of silver objects in Early Byzantium, which will be discussed in later chapters. Furthermore, to understand the circulation of silver, the point must be made that Bishop Eutychianos used his resources to give most of the objects to his church.
PART 2:
THE LIFE OF THE SION VESSELS

5. THE BIOGRAPHY AND VALUE OF THE SION OBJECTS IN THEIR PRODUCTION AND CIRCULATION

This chapter reviews the biography and multivalence of silver objects from the Sion Treasure, focusing on the initial stage of their life, which is their production context. The thesis examines the value of objects at different stages, because their decorative aspects and the materials used in their production had different values than they had when they were used as gifts and employed to be used inside the churches. The production process relates to the first stage of the objects’ life and needs to be addressed highlighting the fact that value bestowed on them at manufacture was different from that when they were used as gift and liturgical objects inside the churches. Examination of the materials used in the creation of the objects, their decoration, production process and subsequent circulation will open discussions on the value and biography of sacred silver in their production and circulation. As I proposed earlier, in order to discuss the value of the objects in the production context, the form, decoration and monetary values of objects are important details and need to be discussed in detail. As silver items, the objects undeniably had a commercial value, and so were perceived as commodities with an exchange value when first produced. Therefore, this chapter will argue that in their commodity phase, objects with their material and decoration had different meanings and need to be considered in order to understand fully the biography of sacred silver in Early Byzantium.

Developing an understanding of the vessels as commercial objects begins by considering the metal itself. The circulation of silver, its control by the state, and modes of production and marketing indicate the commercial value of the objects. The circulation of silver also demonstrated how accessible the objects were to people. The stories presented in previous chapters indicated that some patrons purchased their own silver in the form of bullion, requesting that craftsmen create specific desired objects for them, while others requested objects made using the craftsman’s own materials. This
accessibility of objects by donors or market is also important to discuss how demand was created and affected the production of objects.

The stamps and weight marks applied to some objects indicate that they were controlled by the state to pay taxes. In the case of unstamped objects, there were also taxes gained from miners or silversmiths. Donors used their wealth to obtain these objects, and the producer or seller earned some money through creating them. There is something of a circle here, because the demand from, and desire of patrons, aligned with their ritual and social background, created a market for silver. While discussing the commodity phase of objects, Appadurai mentions the term “commodities provisionally defined as objects of economic value”. This is crucial in underlining that the Sion objects in their production phase can be defined as commodities. They were objects created for the purpose of economic exchange, meaning they had a commercial value when they first entered circulation and production. Both as silver bullion and finished articles, taxes and monetary sums were paid on these objects. Stamps in the form of hallmarks demonstrate that the state was also earning money from silver, and viewed such items as commodities.

Discussing the significance of objects the commodity phase of object, and how they were valued at this time, demands an explanation of how a market in sacred silver emerged. Drawing on the findings from the examination of the circulation of silver in the previous chapter, the market for silver and the attendant value given to it by producers can be discussed. The market for silver improved in the context of its usage inside churches, and within a culture that valued donations to the Church. In this chapter, I will also consider the effects of items’ commercial value on their production and decoration. In other words, I will question the perception of objects relative to their form, and decoration in the context of their being commodities. Moreover, the evidence will reveal that the motives of patrons created the market for silver, as producers sought to create objects that would please their clients.

Finally, the chapter will examine the different measures applied to objects and form, and what their decorations and inscriptions tell us about the meaning and value of the objects themselves, in particular, by considering the relationship between markets and producers. The expectations of the market, i.e. demand, and the personal taste of

---

producers were interrelated. This interrelatedness requires examination on the terms used: demand, desire, needs, opportunity and utility. In this context, it is necessary to move beyond simply describing the decorations, and discussing where these objects were produced by looking only at their decoration, stamps and inscriptions. Thus, the chapter will address how the commodity phase affected decoration and production and how the producers perceived these objects. The perceptions of producers and the value they bestowed on the objects affected how they produced and decorated them. Specifically, this chapter examines how these objects came into existence, and how they were valued at this time. Rather than comparing the decorations of objects to find their workshops, understanding the effects of human agency, which was affected from social environment of people and material agency, will indicate the possible reasons behind producing objects with different styles of decoration and measurements.

To evaluate the value of objects and their material and formal features in production and in the marketplace, I will consider human and material agency. When considering human agency, social, economic and cognitive factors will be examined, and in the case of material agency I will examine the material properties of the objects, for example the material qualities that led producers to create them. What kind of factors affected the production of these objects? How did they come into existence? The circulation of silver, as discussed earlier, might indicate the process of production, but the emphasis herein is on the factors that resulted in the items produced being created and circulated as sacred objects, with commercial value. To answer these questions, the terms need and utility, which were associated with regimes of value in Early Byzantium will be considered, highlighting demand and material properties, while also examining the market in silver objects. To summarise, this chapter will discuss the commodity phase of silver objects, how they came to be commodities, and the key characteristics of this phase that affected the production, value and biography of objects.
5.1 Donation and creating a market for silver objects and a demand for silver

Understanding the market for silver relates to questions about how these objects came into existence, and how they were valued. The purchasing of silver increased the market for silver, improving the circulation of silver objects as commodities, not only to meet the needs of the church but also for secular use, such as dining or as gifts. Donors gave objects to churches based on the needs of the churches and considering the limitations of their own wealth. In addition, some monasteries set out their own needs for liturgical equipment and church revetments. The combination of the functionality of the objects (their functionality as gifts and as used inside the church) and the intention, demand and opportunity of their donors created this market in silverware. Chapter Four illustrated something the numerous donations of silver made to churches apparent from discovered treasures and from primary sources. The majority of these silver objects were used inside churches, although they could also be melted down for their monetary value. Rather than simply outlining the needs of the market, this chapter will also explain how these needs were defined and created in Early Byzantium.

To begin discussions about how the market in silver was created, and the effects of need and utility on the production of silver objects, I will first explain the culture of sacred donations in Early Byzantium, because this culture had a significant effect on the production of objects. The reasons for giving sacred gifts differed from secular gift giving, since such gifts were bestowed on churches or holy places, as donors were giving to God rather than to people. Although sacred objects might have been presented to the clergy inside the church, the implication was that they were gifts to God. This brought about various consequences, as was apparent in different ways. The fundamental intention was to please God rather than human individuals, as was the case when secular gifts were given, as for example when emperors sent silver objects as gifts to the Sasanians and Arabs.

Religious gifts did not serve to underline the relationship between the power of the giver over the receiver. As Marcel Mauss discussed, there are obligations between individuals when receiving gifts, whereby the receiver subsequently feels a need to

---

183 Cutler, 'Significant gifts: Patterns of Exchange in Late Antique, Byzantine and Early Islamic Diplomacy', 79-85.
reciprocate by giving a gift in turn. He admits; ‘such a return will give its donor authority and power over the original donor, who now becomes the latest recipient.’\(^{184}\) However, according to Christian belief, God is the source of all power and worldly matters, and he gives wealth and poverty to people according to his will. Thus, patrons of church silver have no need to display their wealth or their authority to God in the manner emperors did when giving gifts to other rulers. The donors received blessings in return for their gifts, and reciprocation in material form was not expected.\(^{185}\) The gift may however be given in thanks to God for gifts already received from God; or (as inscriptions on some objects state) for the salvation of donors, in fulfilment of vows, or in exchange for something else that they perceived to have been given by God. The act of gifting involved a sacrificing of the donor’s wealth, which God had bestowed in the first place, taking the form of thanks.

Gift-giving to God in Christianity included giving money to the poor as charity, or gifting things that were needed, like ecclesiastical silverware, to churches and holy places. These were a form of practicing ‘philanthropy’, a quality given by God to individuals, which obliged Christian donors to give to the poor and make offerings to the church, to generally fulfil the expectations of God. As the Fourth Church Council of Chalcedon (448), explains: ‘we were made by God for works of philanthropy’.\(^{186}\) This responsibility required that donors give offerings to the poor and to churches. By doing so, they believed they were making offerings to God. Offerings to the church were made in different ways; these included giving money for the construction of the church, giving money to priests to supply Eucharistic breads, wine, and other needs. These offerings could have been made on the occasion of the Offertory, which is the occasion set for giving gifts to churches. As part of the communion service in the early churches, it was necessary to bring offerings.\(^{187}\) There was also occasional giving as and when donors could afford to give. Paul’s writings in the Epistles to the Corinthians


\(^{186}\) For detailed discussion about philanthropy and this citation, see Claudia Rapp, 'Charity and Piety as Episcopal and Imperial Virtues in Late Antiquity', in ed. Miriam Frenkel and Yaacov Lev, Charity and Giving in Monotheistic Religions, Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Islamischen Orients (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 75.

gives important examples about giving gifts, and their importance in pleasing God. The point made was that these offerings were not for worldly returns, but rather for spiritual returns. In Paul’s writings, generosity was encouraged:

Each of you should give what you have decided in your heart to give, not reluctantly or under compulsion, for God loves a cheerful giver. And God is able to bless you abundantly… This service that you perform not only supplies the needs of the Lord’s people, but is also overflowing in many expressions of thanks to God… And others in their prayers for you their hearts will go out to you, because of the surpassing grace God has given you. 188

This explains the importance of giving gifts to churches or to others in the form of charity, and how such gifts are the same as gifts to God. Paul’s writings indicate that Christians gave prominence to gift giving as they saw it as giving to God to please him, thank him and sacrifice their wealth. Other examples of writings amongst the Church Fathers demonstrate the importance of gift giving in early Christianity. Caesarius of Arles instructed his congregants that gift giving was an obligation, and that it was equal to doing other good works. 189 Textual sources preserve examples of giving gifts to God by the congregation in church, with congregants offering their gifts on the holy altar. Besides the obligation to give, congregants also believed that their salvation and forgiveness for their sins would be obtained. The Synod of Macon (585) includes commands about gift giving. According to the acts of the synod, by giving a gift on the holy altar in offertory, congregants will ‘obtain remission of their sins’. 190 And in a story from the life of Saint John the Almsgiver, according to the Patriarch John, the giving of gifts on a holy altar was equal to giving money to the poor. 191

In addition to synods and constitutions, stories from the lives of saints are one way to understand the culture of gift giving in Christianity, and the sacrifice of wealth to receive blessings and salvation from God.

The stories also indicate that the wealth of donors have already belongs to God, and that the donors were aware of this. In a story from the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos, we are told that a philosopher named Evagrios, when he became Christian and was
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baptised, gave the Bishop of Cyrene named Synesios ‘three gold denarii for the benefit of poor.’ Saying; “take these three kentaneria, give them to the poor and let me have a certificate that Christ shall give them back to me in the world to come”. ‘The bishop took the gold and promptly made out the desired certificate.’ When the philosopher became ill, he asked his children to bury him with this certificate and they did as he requested. ‘While the Bishop Synesios was lying down at night the philosopher appeared to him and said: “Come to the tomb where I lie and take your hand-written paper, for I have received what was owing to me. I am satisfied, and I have no further claim on you. To make you quite sure, I have counter-signed the paper in my own hand.” The bishop was not aware that his hand-written certificate had been buried with the philosopher.’ After speaking with the philosopher’s children the bishop learnt that he had been buried with the paper which he had given him. They opened his tomb and read the letter stating; “From me, Evagrius the Philosopher, to you sir, the most holy Bishop Synesios, greetings. I have received what you wrote down in this promissory note. I am satisfied, and I have no further claim on you in respect to the gold which I gave you; or rather, by your agency, to Christ our God and Saviour.”192 This story is important as a key to understanding that according to Christian belief, people helped churches and the poor to please Christ and God. They did this sometimes on their own, or through another agency or the churches. They were motivated by the belief that by their generosity they would receive a spiritual return and salvation in the afterlife.

The majority of these offerings, as endowments, were spent on buying church equipment, on the needs of the clergy, and on alms for the poor, as can be seen from these stories. In another story from the anonymous sayings of the Desert Fathers, it is indicated that the money in effect belongs to Christ, and it is the responsibility of those who can afford to do so to help and protect the poor and gain their own protection. One tale tells of a rich man in Alexandria who fell ill. Fearing death, he took thirty pounds of gold and gave them to the poor. Later he became well and began to regret what he had done. He had a friend who was devout, and he confided his regrets to him about what he had done, but his friend told him, “You ought rather to have rejoiced, having offered them to Christ”, but he was not convinced. “Here are thirty pounds of gold”, [the friend] said, for he too was rich. “Come to Saint Menas' and say: 'I am not the one who carried

out the commandment: he's the one,' and you take this gold.” When they came to Saint Menas’, he pronounced those words and took the thirty pounds; then, just as he was going out of the door, he died. They said to the [previous] owner of the gold pieces: “Take what is yours”, but he said “Certainly not, by the Lord! Since I gave them to Christ, they are his. Let them be given to the poor.”

Another story from the *Life* of Sabas indicates that Christians also made offerings to specific churches where they knew holy people or clerics were living. As the fame of St. Sabas spread, many people from the surrounding areas started making offerings to the church, ‘particularly when they saw his angelic mode of life and his existence detached from matter. The blessed man preferred to spend most of the offerings on buildings and maintenance of the place; whatever he thought pleasing to God’. There is also an important story about pleasing God and making donations to Christ. A man of patrician rank asked a goldsmith to make a ‘jewelled cross’ as an offering to the church. The master charged his apprentice to make the cross. And the youth decided to add money from his wages to this offering, saying; ‘since the patrician is offering so much wealth to Christ, why should I not add my wages to the value of the cross?’ When the patrician arrived, the cross was weighed and he found the weight to be more than he had paid for. Then the young apprentice said: ‘I saw how much money you were offering to Christ and I thought I would add my wages so that I could have a share in the offering together with you, and that Christ would accept my offering’. These stories explain the gravity Christians placed on making offerings to Christ through the church. This also explains that they chose materials according to the needs of the churches and their personal wealth.

In some cases, people commissioned the erection of entire churches and/or responsibility for maintaining them through endowments. From the life story of Euthymius, a monk from Palestine who lived in the fifth century, it can be learnt that Empress Eudocia built many churches for Christ, and before her death she assigned

---


194 The name of the church is not mentioned in the story, possibly it is the church of saint Sabas, in the story the church is mentioned as ‘the Church Built by God’; see Cyril of Scythopolis, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, ed. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, ch. 18; English trans. Price, 110-12.

these churches sufficient income to meet their needs.196 There are also examples of patrons who made donations to churches or built churches with the assistance of ‘co-operative patronage’.197 The inscription from the floor mosaic of a church in Anemurium, possibly from the sixth century, mentions that people commissioned the renewal of the narthex mosaic by stating: ‘through their prayers let all be granted mercy’.198 This shows that people gave what they could afford to give. There are multiple motives for the various donations, remembrance by God, salvation of one’s soul, fulfilment of vows, forgiveness of sins and crucially gratitude for gifts and blessings received from God.199

When the faith and dictates of Christianity and its effect on the intentions of donors are considered, the influence of knowledge and education requires discussion. What was taught in church, through the writings of the Church Fathers, Apostles, and saints developed an appreciation for the value of gift giving. In this context, it is worth noting that many of the donors of the Sion Treasure were bishops and deacons who were themselves well educated with a high-ranking status inside the church. Their position and the work they engaged in their daily lives almost certainly affected their beliefs about giving gifts to God. They might have considered the implications of what happens when they give objects as gifts, and the importance of providing financial support to holy places. Bishops for example played an important role in Christian society, as they were representatives of Christ in the world, with responsibility for engaging in philanthropy.200

Some Christians provided money to churches as endowments and helped the poor, either with churches acting as intermediary or independently, and some Christians gave gold and silver directly to churches. In some cases, benefactors gave bronze objects. The needs of churches, in terms of donated silver included equipment used for liturgical purposes, and church revetments. All churches required liturgical items, as explained in
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200 Apostolic Constitutions II, 24.7, cited in Rapp, 'Charity and Piety as Episcopal and Imperial Virtues in Late Antiquity', 80.
the *Vita* of St. Pancratius. St. Peter sent Pancratius and a preacher named Marcian to the west to spread the gospel there, and ‘provides them with the equipment needed for setting up a church’, such as ‘two sets of silver paten and chalice, two crosses made of cedar boards…’.

In addition to chalices and paten, churches needed censers for burning incense, and silverware in which the priest could wash his hands. The church also needed revetments for holding candles and items for the altar table.

The vessels of the Sion Treasure also show a need for equipment inside the church; however, a lack of information make it difficult to explain the reasons for the number of objects given. Some scholars have questioned why so much silver was given to the Sion Monastery, but no answers have been conclusive. However, certain assumptions can be made and indeed, when we compare the objects given to other churches, the quantity of silver vessels in the Sion Treasure seems proportional. It seems likely that the large number of objects was also related to the population of the faithful attending the church and the size of the church. The church of Sion is now a ruin, but it was once a three-aisled basilica with a large triconch apse and a rectangular baptistery attached to it.

The silver for the altar table was used to cover the table and protect it. The polycandela were used for the lighting inside the church. Therefore, it can be said that the majority of these objects were used inside the church and were considered essential equipment. Some items might not have been in continual use, but were perhaps used for special occasions or as needed.

There are also examples showing that these objects might have been sold for economic reasons. That is, the items could be sold by church administrators as needed. This alienation of church property was rare, but there were some conditions under which objects were melted down and exchanged for cash. Under the laws of Justinian, the alienation of church property was allowed only for ransoming prisoners of war. And in cases of special need items could be melted and sold to ensure sacred sites did not fall into debt.

There is also a further example describing the alienation of church property. In 622 Heraclius issued an order to take some silver objects to Hagia Sophia...
to raise funds.\footnote{Trans. in Hendy, \textit{Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy 300-1450}, 495.} According to the \textit{Life} of St. Sabas, it was said that it is appropriate to meltdown the monastery’s property in times of financial difficulty. In a time of famine, the steward of the Great Laura came to St. Sabas and told him that they have nothing, not even water to rinse their mouths. Upon hearing this, Sabas said to him; ‘I shall not prevent the liturgy of God. For you lack any of the requisites, the presentor will send to the city a precious vessel or vestment by the monk responsible for offerings. He will sell it to buy what you lack, so that we can perform the liturgy of God’\footnote{Cyril of Scythopolis, \textit{Living the Monks of Palestine}, ed. Schwartz, \textit{Kyrillos von Skythopolis}, ch. 58; English trans. Price, 168-169.}. Therefore, it can be said that the silver or gold objects given to church were valuable material and could be used in all circumstances.

There are ancient sources to indicate the usage of silver inside the churches that refer to donations. St. Demetrius explained that his shrine was decorated with silver. ‘It is hexagonal in plan, having six columns and as many partitions, shaped out of carved, assayed silver. At the top it bears a silver sphere of no small size’\footnote{Saint Demetrius, \textit{Miracula S. Demetrii}, mir. 10, Greek text in ed. Migne, \textit{Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca} 116, (Paris, 1864), 1265, English trans. in Mango, \textit{The Art of the Byzantine Empire: 312-1453, Sources and Documents}, 129.}. When his shrine was damaged by fire, the bishop decided to melt the rest of the silver and build a new shrine, but he ordered the bishop to wait for donations to be made before commencing work.\footnote{Saint Demetrius, \textit{Miracula S. Demetrii}, mir. 6, Greek text in ed. Migne, \textit{Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca} 116, 1241-1248; Greek text and French trans. in, ed. Paul Lemerle, \textit{Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans}, 2 vols., vol. 1 (Le Texte) (Paris: CNRS, 1979), 90-95.} John of Ephesus’s \textit{Ecclesiastical History} explains that the ciboria of churches in the capital were decorated with silver revetments. When Emperor Maurice started to restore his ‘native town of Arabissus’ he ordered a search for skilful craftsmen, blacksmiths, and builders, and the old church was taken down and a new church constructed: ‘he sent himself a large and splendid set of church-furniture of silver and gold, with beautiful vessels for the altar, and for the adornment of the building and large ciborium’\footnote{John of Ephesus, \textit{Historiae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia}, English trans. in Smith, \textit{The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus}, 362.}. In his \textit{Lives of the Eastern Saints}, John of Ephesus mentions a woman whose name is Soziana. When her husband died, she gave their valuables, such as silk, to the church.\footnote{John of Ephesus, \textit{Lives of Eastern Saints}, trans. E. W. Brooks, Patrologia Orientalis 19 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1926), 191-96.}
Therefore, the churches needed – wanted - silver vessels and the belief and the opportunity of donors themselves created the market in ecclesiastical silverware, turning such items into valuable commodities in the eyes of their producers. By opportunity I am referring to the wealth of donors. As I indicated in Chapter 4, these objects were expensive for the middle classes, who seemed to have been the main donors of the Sion Treasure. When they could afford to give silver objects, they did so according to the needs of their churches, giving vessels that their church lacked. The donors of the Sion Treasure made their donations in the form of silver objects. Presumably they were aware of the needs of the church and were aiming to supply them. Even though they might not have been used or they were not needed, the donors gave the objects expecting that the church might use them later. In an example from the law of Justinian, which says that church property can be alienated on certain occasions, these objects are always seen as important to the church, for their utility, monetary value and decorative qualities. The dates of the donations are close to the date of the monastery was built this might have encouraged donors to help this church, which would make sense; as St Jerome mentions in his letter to Demetrias (Letter 52), a good option for wealthy Christians is to augment ‘churches, may adorn their walls when built with marbles, may procure massive columns, may deck the unconscious capitals with gold and precious ornaments, may cover church doors with silver and adorn the altars with gold and gems’. 210

Severus of Antioch in a homily, speaking about the silver Ciborium of the Martyrdom of St Drosis, asks his congregants to offer what they could afford to construct an altar. He encourages them by saying; if someone who possesses very little gives a pound of silver, what everyone gives would be perfect and will be the sufficient sum. He criticised wealthy people who gave nothing for lying in high beds and eating from silver dishes. ‘But they are negligent and hesitate to give some of their objects.’ He encourages them by advising them: stretch out your hand and give joyfully. You will obtain rich rewards and your family will be heathy, and after your departure from here below, you will be in the kingdom of heaven.211 In this context, it is understood that the

rich should be willing to philanthropically sacrifice their wealth, which was given to them by God, to supply what needed and help the church. All of these circumstances had a knock-on effect on the market for silverware.

A further important factor which affected the market in silver was materiality, which is depended on the material qualities of the objects and what objects can do. Silver is a proper material for making items for lighting, and cheaper than gold. Silver is a durable and shiny material, which is resistant to corrosion caused by food and natural acids. By considering this, bishops and deacons, and some lay people sacrificed their income or wealth with silver, which was what they could afford. The inscriptions indicate that some donors gave these objects to fulfil a vow, some gave as offerings, and others gave for their families. There are also examples of inscriptions for particular objects, as when the donor Bishop Theodore made a donation for the renewal of a lampstand (No. 46).

The interrelationship between objects and their social environment, together with religious rituals, and belief practices all had significant effect on the market for these objects. The needs of churches, and gift giving culture more generally created collective demand for these objects. Therefore, when considering decorations and the form of objects and how they were created, the market in silver in sixth-century Byzantium should be considered, as well as the materiality of the objects to develop an appreciation for them from the perspective of both human agency and material agency. The examination of the value of objects in their production will indicate that they valued different than they were valued in other contexts.

5.2 Effects of the commodity phase on the perception of objects by producers

Having elucidated the market and demand for sacred silver, this section will discuss how the objects were valued by producers in the context of production. In this thesis, the question: ‘What were they were created for?’ is answered according to context. For example, instead of asking what they were created for in general, it would be better to first introduce the perspective of producers and answer this question from the eyes of producers to clarify under what conditions the items came into existence. To answer these questions and examine the objects in the context of their commodity phase, the agency of the producers, the agency of the commissioner, and the agency of the objects
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should be examined. Those agencies are crucial, because they have vital effects on how these objects should be, and what materials should be used to produce them.

Before initiating discussions about the objects’ value in their production, I should also mention studies focusing on the production of silver and assumptions made about why the objects were produced. Studies about the silver objects tend to be based on examining their sensual affordances and locating stylistic differences. For example, Heather Hunter-Crawley claimed that these objects were produced to gratify the senses. The sensual effect of objects cannot be coincidental, and the objects must have been produced to augment sensory experience. For example, as she explains, the paten (No. 5), from the Sion Treasure has a gilded cross on its centre, and its divine presence was deliberately ‘moulded into the cross during the Eucharist’. As Eucharistic bread was taken from the paten, the cross of Christ became visible by radiating light. Hunter-Crawley also mentions the polycandela, which are cruciform, and were created to be viewed as sensual objects. Additionally, Pentcheva mentioned that icons with inscriptions were intended to be both seen and read. She also discusses the light reflective surfaces of icons, and their sensory affordances. However, their qualities and functions were not only to be sensed. To examine the objects’ value and function in more depth we need to consider their production; considering the relationship between the objects and people as mentioned in introduction. As commodities are the items were objects created to fulfill the needs of customers and for exchange.

Earlier examinations of the Sion objects laid stress on a possible identification of the workshops for objects, and presented their stylistic differences. By defining their style, scholars tried to connect the Sion Treasure to other treasures, and also tried to prove that these objects had been made in specific workshops by relating their style to different workmen. Additionally, the discussions of the iconography of the book covers focused on evaluating the symbolic meaning of the objects. Scholars believed that these objects were produced with the intention that their decorations would carry meaning and that their function could be understood by examining the symbolic meaning of the decoration. For example, by decorating book covers with Christ and the apostles, the

assumption is that these covers were intended for the Gospel.\textsuperscript{216} These methodologies are not enough when examining the biography of objects in their production, since they are suggestions reliant on symbolic and stylistic comparisons. They do not consider the expectations of the producers and controllers of the silver. I am not arguing here that these assumptions are inaccurate, but that they are not the whole story in terms of the value and biography of the vessels. They might have been additionally meant as objects to be sensed or to carry some symbolic meanings to other people, as I will discuss in the following chapters. Notably, in their production, from the perspective of the producers they had functions that differed from those set out in other contexts. Therefore, rather than just explaining that these objects carried meanings, the different perceptions of people on these objects depending on their cultural and cognitive backgrounds should be examined. Most importantly, the importance of agencies on the biography and value of objects should be discussed.

As explained in Chapter 3, the objects in the Sion Treasure present a variety of decorations, inscriptions and forms. The similarities and differences associated with the objects’ decorations led some scholars to group the vessels as pairs, and to discuss the place of mass-production in the market for Byzantine silver. However, these objects should be examined while also considering regimes of value and the commodity phase of objects, underlining how these affected the production of objects. Regimes of value, as anthropologists have explained, combine rules for the value of things as created by material properties, and the social environment of materials including consumption, the agency of producers, consumers and materials.\textsuperscript{217} The production and consumption of objects are interdependent, and they affected each other during the production of objects. Therefore, producers might have first considered the expectations of the market, which is to say the donors and their recipients in the churches. They might have also considered how these objects might be valued in their consumption by their donors and inside the churches. Inscriptions show that the Sion objects are mostly commissioned to be used inside the churches. Thus, the instructions for making the objects appear to have focused on their use inside the churches. It is possible to presume how these objects


fulfil the needs of consumers. Monetary value can also be considered according to wealth of the donor, the other might also have been considered by the producer to sell his objects; for example, the values that depend on the object’s efficiency, suitability for some tasks.\(^\text{218}\) Therefore, it can be said that the use value of the objects is also important in their production, as I will show later with examples. Production and consumption are interrelated stages that they should be considered when the biography of objects and their production is being examined. Moreover, when examining production and commodity phase, various aspects should be noted, such as the agency of donors, based on their knowledge of ritual; the agency of producers, developed with their skills and knowledge; and finally, the agency of the objects themselves, proceeding from their material and utility to be used inside churches.

Considering the objects with their forms, decorations and inscriptions leads to a discussion of demand, utility, and functionality. Marketing objects in Byzantium indicates the effects of demand and needs on the production of objects. Demand is based on the knowledge of donors; for example, the knowledge about what kind of objects they can give to churches and the functionality of those objects. This can be defined as the agency of the donors. Demand is created by the social factors around donors, the needs of the church, and the classifications of objects given to churches as gifts to God. There are also economic factors, which generate demand for objects, for example, donors had demand for these objects since they could afford to buy them. Hence, producers in turn fulfil the needs of the market and expectations of donors. To fulfil the expectations of donors, producers need to gain awareness of the expectations of donors, so as to please them. Cutler, admitting that the physical qualities, fineness of silver depend on the consumer, adds ‘Whoever had the gold set the rules.’\(^\text{219}\) By this he means the commissioner decided what objects should look like and determined their quality. However, there are also the effects of the producer and materials on objects to consider. The quality of material or weight of the material from which an object was made did not depend on the producer, but its form and shape did to a much greater extent. So the differences in the Sion silver vessels in terms of their form cannot be


considered only as relative to the wealth of donors. Indeed, there are also differences between the object forms when presented by the same donor. For example, the patens given by Eutychianos, (Nos. 1, 3 and 4) share both similarities and differences in terms of their form and style of decoration. (Nos. 3 and 4) has palmettes and vine leaves on the rim, and six-armed Christograms (Plates: 7 and 9), while on (No.1) there is only one leaf and eight-armed Christograms (Plate: 2), which are bigger than the other two patens. Openwork lamps and rectangular polycandela also have different styles of decoration. On openwork lamps three types of decorations are applied, on rectangular polycandela there are two types of decorations applied, and two different forms. Moreover, the openwork lamps have three forms. These objects were bestowed by the same donor. However, there is insufficient proof to assert that these objects were produced in different workshops, or by different craftsmen. Donors might request decorative and beautiful looking objects, and objects can be given to the church, but the rest might depend on the silversmiths’ agency and material agency. A letter from the sixth century on papyrus found in Egypt discusses how a donor might demand beauty in an object. ‘Peshot writes to his brother Kolouthe and to his Brother Timotheos, his brothers in the Lord. The book which I have sent you, be responsible for decorating it, be busy with its plates. Choose only those that are good. Give it to somebody who does the job well, so that he can decorate it.’220 This story shows the requirements of the donor concerning the decoration of their books before being given to the church. But this also allowed the producer to decide how to fulfil expectations of the donor. The donor did not specify the decoration. So too the donors of the Sion Treasure may have made requests from silversmiths to decorate their silverware, and left the decision on how to make that object to the silversmith.

The relationship between the market and producers is predicated on producers creating objects that please their recipients. Thus, objects should both meet the expectations of donors, and, in the case of religious patrons, fulfil the needs of the churches. In the manufacture of silverware, since there is necessarily competition between silversmiths, it was inevitable that they emphasised meeting the expectations of donors. Therefore, for silversmiths, the quality of the decoration and the objects alike presumably played a role in persuading donors either to employ them or to purchase their wares. To persuade

consumers, they used their agency combined with their experience, skill and knowledge. Undoubtedly, the makers needed to consider the church in question, and the types of material they have available to them, if not provided directly by the donors. For example, the craftsman would be responsible for determining details, such as how many holes a polycandelon needed, or for patens, how big they should be. It is unknown whether donors gave detailed instructions about the materials used, or if producers conducted research themselves. It is plausible that donors knew what the church needed and asked for very specific items. For example, donors might have details such as the length of the altar table sheets, which were needed to cover and protect the entire table.

The producers rendered objects with the primary intention that they would appeal to and be acceptable to donors, as well as the church attendees who would use them. The primary aim of producers was to create objects that would serve their practical purposes also; a chalice must be a proper chalice, able to hold wine, easy to hold, and durable. The paten should be big enough for the ceremony, and lighting equipment should afford adequate lighting.

The production of objects to meet target needs can be explained using certain theories regarding the objects’ production processes. To achieve this, cognitive psychology and object agency are important. For cognition purposes it can be stated that the artist might have an awareness of prototype objects, or may have learnt about them from their masters. In addition, previous works and experience producing other objects might assist the producer in creating an appropriate item, as might observation of similar objects in the world around them.221 When discussing prototypes, or kind of objects, ‘kind theory’ can be used. For Bloom, kind theory arises when we determine that an object fits a specific category, based on its physical features and function.222 Thus, we classify objects with those judged to be of a similar kind, by considering their form and function. For example, a chair is made to be sat upon. There might be some variations in the proportion and decorations of chairs, but they are nevertheless recognisable as alike objects. Even when it is used to pick up a lamp, it is still a chair.223

In this context, the initial consideration of producers of Sion objects was a categorisation of the item according to expected physical and functional features. One
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craftsman’s polycandelon might differ from other polycandela, but its function was the same. Certainly, the physical features of objects also affect their function; for example, standing lamps and openwork lamps also function as lighting, but offer just one light. Whereas a polycandelon from the Sion Treasure can hold up to 16 lamps. In the context of polycandela from other treasures, there are no notable differences in terms of their forms. All are objects that are typically flat, or rectangular holding several lights.224 This kind of theory can also explain the primary functions of the objects. Primary functions are for example, that the polycandelon holds the lamp, where it would be used, or in what conditions also had an effect on its production; for example, the producer might seek to establish whether the polycandelon would provide enough lighting for the church based on its size, or the donor who commissioned it might give directions about this. Then they might have decided how big the polycandelon will be and produced it by consulting the world around him, in particular his knowledge about the objects. Schiffer uses pots from the Colorado Plateau to exemplify the effect of the knowledge of the producer and the primary function of the objects on their production. The form of the pot and its material were decided by considering the conditions in which the object would potentially be used, i.e. for storage and cooking. In order to do that the producer used his knowledge about his environment and how to make objects, because as Schiffer puts it; the ‘concept of performance characteristics includes the notion that people make decisions about their technology based on their knowledge, experience, and the social and natural environment in which they live.’225 He continues by stating that we are surrounded by our own cultural cues, which affect what we do and what we decide.226 These are effects which can shape the decisions of the producers when they start thinking about objects and deciding how to make them. Making rectangular, circular, or cross shaped items is the second production stage to consider, because they do not affect their kind membership, as I will discuss later in this chapter.

When discussing the decisions and effects of cognition, ritual, prototype objects, and social environment on the production of objects, the agency of materials should also be mentioned; that is, objects produced previously. As stated above, producers consult the world around before producing objects. They might have also investigated other similar
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objects to serve as prototypes. The presence of prototypes might have also affected the demands and desires of commissioners. Michelle O’Malley, when discussing the agency of altarpieces, mentioned that the prototype of altar pieces influenced the producers of objects and their commissioners. She states that existing altarpieces fuelled the creation of new altarpieces. For example, when discussing the Purification altarpiece, she mentions that the San Marco altarpiece affected the decision to produce later purification altarpieces. Karl Knappett also noted that human agency does not stand alone; indeed, intentions, cognition and decisions shift according to environment and material agency. Objects have the ability to ‘act back’ and thereby affect human psychology. As prototypes and examples, they can affect the knowledge of the producers of the objects. So, in the case of the Sion Treasure, when the commissioner asked the silversmith to make a paten, additional patens made previously came into his mind. The imagination of the producer is key when someone asks for a polycandelon, as certain kinds of polycandela come to his mind. When creating a design, fulfilling the expectations of donors is central, highlighting the functionality and beauty of the objects.

When considering the decision to make objects, and the intentions of producers regarding how to shape and decorate items, the second process to evaluate is their manufacture. In this process there are also the effects of cognition, the opportunities posed by producers, and the agency of the materials to be used when making the objects, as well as the agency of objects themselves. As Leuw points out, cognitive maps comprise different objects and the relations between them, and producers’ minds might also be affected by context, need and opportunities. Opportunities refer to the availability of materials and how many grams of silver they had. Material can be used to shape, decorate, gild and solder. In addition, the first thing a producer should consider is the durability of the object, for example, to make an object strong, it has to be alloyed with copper. The average percentage of copper used in Sion objects is 10%. Producers used this material to ensure the malleability of the object, according to the amount of material available.
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Leuw divided the process of manufacture into two phases; prior intention, which the producer has before starting manufacturing, and intention in action, which might change according to the availability of the material, or the shapes of the objects when decorating them. The role of the brain here is that it starts negotiating ‘between the opportunities and challenges of aims (e.g., characteristics of the end product), materials and tools to achieve the end product.’ Therefore, deciding how an object will look is the decision of the producer but constrained by the object’s material properties. Human cognition is affected by the environment and the material individuals are using. How big an object is depends on the material the producer has, as I mentioned earlier; it is dependent on the wealth of the donor. A producer creates an object considering the form and shape he has in mind. Knappett states that the intention of the producer when producing objects is shaped by the environment around him and by materials. Therefore, human agency cannot be the only factor affecting an object’s production, ‘we need to acknowledge both material and human agency’.

As Malafouris mentions, considering the potter and effects of the material properties of pottery on making the object, ‘it is the human side that makes the vital choices and takes important decisions. Many external factors (the texture of clay and its physical properties and may be even chemical consistency) may be allowed to determine some parts of action’. Schiffer, when discussing the availability of materials and shifting conditions around production, mentions that these technical choices and materials are vital when determining formal properties and appearances. For example, producers have to have the appropriate tools to carve objects, and for engraving or making reliefs, as well as sufficient silver to complete the item. Instead of making assumptions about the skills and the quality of the craft, the availability of the material and the decisions of the craftsman should also be discussed. For example, the fact that one paten weighs more than the other does not mean it was produced applying high craftsmanship. It might have arisen because of the availability of the materials, and the choices of the craftsman. The choices of the craftsman were shaped relative to the environment and material agency.
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When the object is ready to decorate, what is done depends on both the choice and taste of the producer and the material. How will the material allow us to decorate it? Even though there is a possible effect of the patron on the production of the object; the appearance of the silverware, however, was not solely the responsibility of the patron. The craftsmen also played their part. We cannot judge their work by only making comparisons between objects. For example, the Sion patens (No. 3 and No. 4) given by Eutychianos were compared by Susan Boyd. She argued that No. 4 (the paten from Dumbarton Oaks) exhibited higher quality craftsmanship than paten No. 3 (Paten from Geneva), on the basis that the Dumbarton Oaks paten’s Christogram fits in the centre of the paten and has elegant serifs, while the other paten’s Christogram is smaller and produced using a simple design (Plates: 6 and 8). We might equally explain these differences as arising from the craftsman’s choice, rather than their skill or the donor’s request. Both patens were equally successful, as Eutychianos liked both objects enough to buy them and give them to the Sion monastery. Additionally, there are also no big differences between Eutychianos’s patens in terms of weight, which might also suggest that the decorations were different not their quality or weights.

Therefore, it is possible to say that, by considering all the features of the material and what the market wanted, they began producing and decorating these objects. When they produced the objects, the decoration also depended on how much space the producer had. They tried to create good examples using the space available. Thus, the decoration depended on the form of the objects as well as on the material the producer had. They might use gold for gilding or make decorations by engraving or as relief. The decoration of objects also needs to match where the objects will be used. As Robb puts it, the design depends on knowing what kind of people will use the objects. ‘Design choices also incorporate knowledge of the situation in which an object will be used’.235 He also admits that the material features of objects are meant to be a guide, showing users how to make items functional.236 Discussing the knowledge of producers, Cutler mentions that decorations also depend on the knowledge of the producer, and their application of old ‘Phenomenon’, (which means using decorations which had been done before), is the sign of it. He continues by stating that the craftsman is influenced by the other objects’
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decoration, and depending on his knowledge he decorated these objects. This can be explained by assuming that in order to please the commissioner, the producer might have thought about how he can make an object with acceptable decoration and use his imagination in response to his environment and prototype objects. This might have also been the same for Sion objects. When openwork lamps are made, by considering his environment and the materials he could use, the craftsman might fulfil certain considerations.

The relationship between the objects’ shapes and their decoration is discussed by Swift. She mentions that vessels provide fields for decoration, in relation to their shape. For example, a plate gives the producer a flat or fluted rimmed surface to decorate, while the cup provides a long and spherical surface area. Depending on their shapes the items were decorated differently. For example, the patens rim and surface are decorated according to their shape, the vine leaves wave according to the shape of the rim. Producers used the available space to decorate objects, and in the case of polycandela, all the polycandela in the Sion Treasure were decorated with openwork dolphins flanking the holes in the lamps. This can again be explained by drawing on the opportunity of the producer to use enough space for the decoration. However, Swift’s ideas about the decoration and functionality of the objects cannot be generalised to all objects. For example, she mentions that the objects’ decorations are interrelated with their use. She indicates that only some areas of the objects are decorated, leaving areas intended to contain food and drink plain. She notes that producers decorated unused spaces. However, this is not applicable to all objects.

These examples show the production of objects is affected by the intention and demand of commissioners, the knowledge and cognition of producers, and prototype objects and materials to be used in the production. Finally, in terms of the decorations, these factors had an effect in addition to the space in the material which also affected the producer when decorating objects. The commissioner, the place where objects will be used, the intentions of producers and material agency are interrelated factors which affected the production of objects.
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Another important point, illustrating the effect of human agency and material agency on how sacred objects should be used inside churches relates to the purity of the objects. In this case, by purity, I mean the religious purity of the object, rather than its silver content. The material used for the production of object had to be appropriate to use inside the church. A story I have already cited from the *Life* of Saint Theodore of Sykeon might indicate this as a notion. Theodore sent his deacon to the capital to buy a silver chalice and a paten. He asked the archdeacon to buy fine silver. When the archdeacon presented the items for use in the Eucharist, Theodore told him that they were unsuitable. The archdeacon, indicating the 5 imperial stamps and good workmanship of the objects, argued that they were made from pure silver. Theodore told him that, while this might be so, they were nonetheless damned because of their previous use. When Theodore filled the chalice, the liquid became black. Then the archdeacon went to the capital to understand the reason for this, and to receive an explanation from the silversmith. The silversmith explained that the set had been refashioned from a chamber-pot used by a prostitute. It is a story that explains the expectations of the users of the religious objects were crucial, in particular, that purity – not simply in material terms - was a priority. In this story, Theodore, who has the demand for the silver objects did not ask for the material quality of objects, the religious value of the object was also important. This story also shows that how the silver objects should be produced when they were planned to be used inside the churches. Donors also considered the object’s purity in terms of its previous usage. Therefore, the market in sacred silver objects was affected by the social and religious context. Thus, the interrelationship between human and material agency affected the usage and biography of objects. The objects bought by Theodore’s archdeacon were not religious objects because of their previous usage and material. This was also because of the rituals implemented by their users.

Another story that explains the importance of the purity of materials used for the production of objects in terms of religious circumstances is a passage taken from the *History* of Theophylact Simocatta. It tells the story of a Constantinopolitan named Paulinus who had indulged in witchcraft and sold a silver bowl that he had used to collect the blood of his sacrifices to some dealers. When this silver object was recycled,
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and the other object made from the same material was displayed in the silver shop, the bishop of Thracian Heraclea purchased it and presented it to the shrine of St Glyceria in place of a copper bowl, which had previously been used for collecting sacred aromatics. Because of the new object’s former use the sacred aromatics disappeared.240 This story basically explains that the copper bowl was replaced with the silver bowl which had been brought by the Bishop of Thracian Heraclea and since the silver bowl was used for witchcraft before recycled, the object was not spiritually pure and could not be used to collect sacred aromatics. This story also indicates that since its materials were used for demonic reasons, the object, despite having been recycled, could not be used as a sacred object. The previous uses of the object, in particular its composite material and the ritual of the donor affected its biography. In order to gain biography as a sacred object, the object had to contain religiously pure material to meet the demand of donors. There is little evidence to suggest whether the donors of the Sion Treasure expected this, but it can be assumed that in Christian ritual an understanding of religious purity was common.

Therefore, it can be said that when these objects are seen as commodities by producers, then the decoration and form of the objects was perceived differently. The function of the objects required that they be suited to meeting clients’ demands. Producers, when considering the demands of the market, designed objects with a variety of decorations, inscriptions and different forms. This could be explained in that the demand of the commissioners was the central factor determining the decoration and different forms of the objects. The demand of the commissioners was developed according to their knowledge, belief and social background. The place where the objects were to be used was also important when deciding upon the shape and type of objects. Thus, producers created objects to be their kind which is the object that can be used inside the church and can be used as gifts to God. The objects were not only produced to appeal to the senses, they were intended to be multifunctional commodities, gifts expressing gratitude to God, and liturgical vessels. In terms of decoration, it can be asserted that producers used the spaces available to produce decorations, drawing on their knowledge about how to decorate sacred silver. It might also have been that commissioners ordered them to produce objects like this. The order might not have been in detail but could have been vaguely requesting good looking and well-crafted objects. These objects as

commodities were created to appeal to commissioners and create sales. By relying on their experiences, skills and cognition, craftsmen produced treasured objects. In the commodity context, both the agency of the materials and people had an important effect on the production of objects, determining how they were valued.

It can also be stated that these objects were viewed as commodities by producers in the production stage, but they did not lose this biography in their further usage. Relying on the earlier examples which explain the usage of objects for monetary value, it can be said that the significance of their monetary value resulted in items being melted down and sold in times of financial difficulty, as they still had a commercial value.
6. THE SION OBJECTS AND THEIR DONORS

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the biography of the silverwares given by donors, and the interrelationships between these objects and their donors. The intentions of donors and the functionality of the objects (as a gift to God) combined affected both how donors understood the objects and how their biographies were created by patrons. In order to examine this, I will focus on the inscriptions and formulae written on the silver vessels, also considering the value and the point of the decorations to donors. Therefore, this chapter will also show how silver objects, what was viewed in the previous chapter as commercial silver, changed in the hands of donors into gifts to God. In the previous chapter, which discussed how the market for sacred silver was created, it was mentioned that donors gave precious objects as gifts to God through the church as intermediary. This chapter examines the role of these objects as gifts, and what donors expected in the form of returns from God.

This chapter will also illustrate the extent to which human agency and material agency affected the biography of the objects as gifts to God. The human agency is that the donor intended to give the objects to churches as endowments representing a willingness to sacrifice their wealth. They also intended to request salvation, protection and remembrance from God. The material agency here is that the objects were able to carry the wishes of donors (their malleability and functionality), and therefore were given to churches or were chosen to be given to churches by donors. The variety of objects given to the churches was extensive and some items carried particular inscriptions; the wishes and names of the donors and these objects were inside the churches used as church revetments or were intended for particular liturgical purposes.

Inscriptions on church silver offer evidence of the value and biography of the objects from the perspective of donors. They tell us something about the expectations of the donors, in terms of what they believed donating the objects to churches as gifts to God would do for them. Moreover, the inscriptions and the silver vessels are interdependent: both show the function of the objects. Questions that this chapter will explore include how far the inscriptions indicated the sentiments of donors, or whether they also informed the functions of the objects. This review will also explore whether writing formulae on church silver to be used in ecclesiastical contexts (at the Eucharist, or in the Sanctuary and aisles), affected the valuing of the objects. What was the point, or added
value, from writing the donors’ names and monograms and wishes on church silver? What were donors expecting from these objects? And what did the objects do with their inscriptions and decorations for donors? These questions are important when seeking to understand the interdependence between object and text, and subsequently the value and biography of objects given by their donors.

Using the theories detailed in the theoretical framework, this chapter will look at the second phase of the objects’ life. They had a biography affected by the intentions of donors and the malleability of objects. This chapter discusses how these objects were used with their form and proper usage, and how they functioned for other purposes and became multivalent. On the one hand, the inscriptions changed the function of the object, and on the other the function of the object and the context in which it was used altered the power of the inscriptions. I will not examine here how church people perceive these objects and their inscriptions, rather I will discuss how these objects functioned for patrons. To achieve this, I will also consider the probability of these objects and their inscriptions being seen and read by other people, and the value of this to donors. This will lead me to understand whether the donor wanted the inscriptions to be read by other people, or if they were only intended as communications with God, or both.

To explore these questions, understand the value of the objects and their inscriptions, this chapter begins by examining the formulae on the pieces from the Sion Treasure. It begins by discussing the inscriptions and listing the formulae employed. It divides the formulae according to their meanings to understand clearly what kind of wishes the objects carried. Even though similar work has been completed by Ševčenko, I wish to show where else these formulae were used, in order to demonstrate the ritual of praying with objects.241 The formulae also show that objects for donors functioned differently when used by the people inside the church, clergy and laity. Inscriptions provide an important insight into the interrelationship between donors and the objects given as gifts.

Following the above examinations, which consider the objects and their usage in the church context and value for donors, the chapter continues by outlining the effects of usage of the objects inside the church. Since these objects were kept and used in holy

places, it is useful to ask how the inscriptions might have worked in the context of the church. Would they have been legible, for example? And if so, to whom? For example, chalices, patens, censers and ewers were all used in the Eucharist. Lamps and polycandela were used inside the church.

Therefore, the inscriptions on these vessels, the names of their donors and their wishes, were present at these services, inside the church, and indeed occupied the space inside the holy place in which others also moved around. While chapter seven will examine the value of the objects in church context to their users, this chapter discusses the possible values of these objects to donors, when these objects were used inside the church. After discussing inscriptions and their importance to the biography of objects, this chapter will also discuss briefly the significance of the objects’ form and decoration for donors. This follows on from the previous chapter, which found that for producers, aesthetic features were for pleasing receivers and met the needs of the market, but for donors they might have meant something different. Although there is insufficient evidence to explain what the decorations meant to donors, it is important to open discussions about these issues. As these objects, relying on their inscriptions, were a gift to God, and the donors hoped to gain salvation and help in return, it is possible that the form and decorations of the objects might have different values for donors that differed from those they had in their production and for church people.

6.1 The Sion vessels used for prayer: writing formulae on silver

Something of the expectations of donors might be understood from the inscriptions written on the Sion Treasure evaluating the formulae used. The table 2 also clarifies the motives of the donors of the objects, which formulae were used on which type of object and the extent of the different wishes and prayer on each object.

The information presented in the inscriptions makes it clear that the objects were seen by their donors as gifts: ‘this was presented in the time of’, ‘presents this to the Lord’, ‘offers this’, and for the fulfilment of a vow. This table shows that some of these inscriptions were written alone, and some were followed by the wishes of donors. Therefore, it also presents evidence about the donor of the object and the hopes of the donors: ‘for the salvation of X’; ‘for the remission of X’s sins’; ‘Trisagion help’, ‘holy Sion help’ and ‘for the memory and repose of X’. These phrases make it apparent that the objects were intended as gifts to God, and also came loaded with the wishes of their
donors, and pleas made to God. These were gifts with strings attached. The inscriptions show that patrons fulfilled their vows and gave their gifts to God, and at the same time they wanted protection, salvation, forgiveness and remembrance for themselves or their families. Additionally, the patrons had a chance to put their names on the objects. Therefore, I will discuss the formulae and how important they were in Christianity by linking them with formulas in other objects, mosaics and church walls to enable me to determine the role of inscribing in Christian rituals.

6.2 Protection, salvation, forgiveness and memory

The inscriptions can be discussed here under four headings: protection; salvation; forgiveness; and memory. They offer important evidence revealing the silver vessels to have supernatural, ritualistic functions, that met the needs of their donors to fulfil different purposes. The inscriptions make it clear that the objects helped people communicate with God, just as people in general carried amulets, rings with their wishes inscribed.

This formulation on silverware seems to have been relatively common, as Marlia Mundell Mango’s Catalogue also suggests. The objects in Mango’s catalogue were all donated to village churches in Syria. These objects also have formulae that include the wishes of donors. A number of chalices and patens from the treasure were inscribed with formulae, such as for the forgiveness of sins and for salvation. They also present formulae, ‘for the memory and repose of’.242

In addition to the formulae for salvation (‘save’), forgiveness of sins and memory, there is a request for ‘Help’, which is a common formula also used on other Byzantine objects. People used the formula of ‘Help’ on their marriage rings to protect their marriage, as with a sixth-century ring from Dumbarton Oaks.243 The inscriptions on floor mosaics provide further examples detailing how people wanted help and protection from God. For example, an inscription from a sixth-century floor mosaic

242 Mango, Silver From Early Byzantium: The Kaper Koraon and Related Treasures., Nos. 1,2,5,9,10,14,15,18,27,29,33,34,42,61,62.
243 In Dumbarton Oaks Catalogue, the example of marriage ring and its inscription which can be read as; ‘Lord help Marias’, for this example and its counterparts see Marvin C. Ross, Jewelry, Enamels and Art of the Migration Period, Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Medieval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1965.), Nos. 6, 36, 63, 69.
from Kourion in Cyprus bears formulae to ‘help’ and ‘protect’. Gavin Osbourne interpreted this as evidence that these formulae are signs of supernatural protection. The Byzantine people wanted help from God, and asked for protection by including inscriptions on the floor mosaics of their houses.\textsuperscript{244} It was common to use the same phrase on magical amulets, as it was believed to protect people from the evil eye. Two gold amulets from Dumbarton Oaks (dated to the third and sixth centuries) bear inscriptions requesting help and protection from God.\textsuperscript{245} The evil eye was believed, according to Church Fathers such as St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, to derive from the envious eyes of others, which then caused bad things to happen to people. Fear of the evil eye was very common in the Late Antique and Byzantine worlds.\textsuperscript{246} Therefore people placed formulae onto rings, amulets and mosaics to preserve them against this threat. The formula could also be used to protect individuals’ houses from natural disasters, and many carried amulets to receive miraculous healing. All of this is linked to the simple word ‘Help’ on the Sion objects. In addition to carrying amulets and rings, Byzantine people gave tokens, seals and certain objects to holy places. Gary Vikan argues that objects with the inscription ‘Lord help’ were used to obtain miraculous healing and protection. He presents examples of votive objects presented to the shrine of St. Symeon the Younger, because of the fact that the mountain, upon which the shrine was found, was called the Miraculous Mountain by the Byzantines.\textsuperscript{247}

When examining the Sion Monastery and its objects, it is apparent that just as people did with their magical amulets, seals and tokens, so too Eutychianos, Paregoros, and Zacharias did by giving the church silver. Rather than founding a church with money, they gave sacred silver to it to fulfil a functional purpose, and also for their own magical protection. It cannot be said that Eutychianos or the other donors gave their offerings to the Sion monastery simply because the monastery was powerful. Rather, by giving these gifts to the monastery, they both gave offerings to God and helped the monastery to have enough equipment to celebrate the liturgy, lighting the church and cover its altar table, and furthermore ensured their own protection and salvation, or so they hoped. As
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chapter five examined, the idea of philanthropy was an important one in Christian culture and people gave offerings to the church. They actually gave these offerings to God, through the agency of sacred places.

The reputation of the Sion Monastery, however, might have played a part. In the *Life of St. Nicholas*, we obtain information about how people saw the Sion Monastery. The monastery in the mountains of Myra is viewed as the counterpart to the monastery of Holy Sion in Jerusalem. As the *Life* says, when Nicholas came to the village in Tragallasos, ‘he said to all people “this is the place which God showed me to settle and built.” He began to build a glorious shrine. There appeared to him an angel of the Lord, saying: “this spot is a counterpart of Holy Sion in Jerusalem.”’ Nicholas grew up there and received ‘boldness’ from the holy spirit, and ‘produced many miraculous signs and cures for those who believed through him in holy Sion’. Just as the church in Jerusalem was the mother of all churches and a place of forgiveness, so its counterpart, the Sion monastery, was its local counterpart for forgiveness and salvation. Those who believed in St. Nicholas of Sion and his miraculous healings through holy Sion could expect to gain salvation and protection. The texts I added in chapter five also afford evidence that people used to bring offerings to holy churches; as the story from the life of St. Sabas shows, people made offerings when the fame of St. Sabas spread around the village. The belief in helping churches and asking for protection can also be seen in the homilies of Severus of Antioch. He encouraged congregants to give silver to the churches, and said that after these donations they might receive earthly and heavenly protection, for themselves, their children and their relatives.

Other phrases, which explain that these donors wanted help and protection through these objects are ‘Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us’, and ‘Trisagion help’. There are examples of a desire for help from the thrice holy in the liturgy. The formula ‘Thrice Holy have mercy on us’ was used in the liturgies of St Mark and St James and in Syrian liturgies. This formula was also used for inscriptions. For example, a stone door lintel found in Syria near the church door was inscribed with;
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'Thrice Holy have mercy on us'.  This shows that donors also used this formula to elicit help. In order to explain why the formula of the holy Trisagion could be used in this way, a story from the *Miracles* of St. Artemios might be important. When a man named Polychronios came to the saint for healing; the man heard the saint say, “The Holy Trinity which created all things visible and invisible, which preserves all men and watches over the diseased and sick, will cure you itself.” After this prayer, the patient was healed.  Even though this story is from the seventh century, it is a suggestive indication of the power of this formula and why Eutychianos might have inscribed his objects as demanding help from the ‘Thrice Holy’. In Nikephoros Kallistos’s *Ecclesiastical History* there were natural disasters and earthquakes that caused many people to die in fifth-century Constantinople. Further, people prayed to God by saying the hymn of Thrice Holy. An amulet from Anemurium inscribed with the Trisagion also shows that the Trisagion was used for protection from the evil eye. The desires for help and protection were not the only wishes of donors set out in the Sion Treasure. Other formulae used in the liturgy and in prayers appear on the silver vessels. These formulae were for the ‘Forgiveness of sins’ and pleas for salvation. Eutychianos chose to put his wish for forgiveness and salvation on the patens, which were used to carry holy bread. (Nos. 1 and 2) and on polycandela (Nos. 10, 11 and 12) and on suspension bracket (No. 43). These were written after the formula was presented to God and in fulfilment of a vow. He presented this object with a prayer. The inscription on the censer (No. 20) also indicates that Eutychianos fulfilled his vow with the censer and wanted salvation and forgiveness from his sins. This censer functioned for the fulfilment of a vow, and the donor also hoped for salvation and forgiveness from his sins. Again, this is not an unusual wish. On the atrium of the church of Holy Apostles in Anemurium, there is an inscription written on the floor mosaic. It reads; ‘O

Lord…. With thanksgiving I have brought you these gifts; accept them for the forgiveness of my sins.'256 Similarly in the Treasury of San Marco in Venice, there is a ciborium from the sixth-century found in Constantinople. On the left-right and front faces of the arches is an encircling inscription, which reads; ‘in fulfilment of a vow and for the salvation of the most glorious Anastasia’.257 Here, she claimed that she had both fulfilled her vow by giving the gift and also wanted salvation from God in exchange for it. These examples show the sorts of pleas and prayers that were common practice in Byzantium. Some people carried their prayers on their person in the form of amulets; whereas, others inscribed them on their offerings or placed them in churches and holy places. These objects carried the individual prayers of donors.

There is no exact evidence for the reason or the ritual of writing prayers on the silver, but, relying on the examples of inscriptions from other objects and buildings, it might be suggested that was a cultural and traditional way of praying when donors gave gifts to God. As discussed in the previous chapter, the donors of the Sion Treasure were well educated, or at the very least able to understand what happens when they give gifts to God and how to pray. Prayers during the liturgy were said loudly in unison, but the person singing the psalms and saying the prayers felt that the words were his own, as everybody prayed individually.258 Athanasios, the fourth-century Patriarch of Alexandria mentioned that ‘The psalms taught the Christians how to pray’. He continued that one says these prayers in his own words, ‘And sings them as they were written concerning him.’ In the congregation, the faithful hear the prayers and internalises them when reciting them.259 Psalms and prayers were also sung during the offerings made to the holy altar after eucharistic communion. Those prayers were variously for the remission of sins, forgiveness and salvation.260 The Council of Macon in 585, as cited in the previous chapter, when recommending congregants to give offerings to church states that people who give an offering must first petition that ‘they may obtain remission of their sins’261 Therefore, people knowing this, made their

256 The Mosaic Inscriptions of Anemurium, Erganzungsbande zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris (Wien Verlag Der Osterreichischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften, 1987), No. 10.
261 Cited in ibid., 21
offerings and prayed for forgiveness and salvation. It might be suggested then that people write their prayers on church walls, and objects after they pray as they did in the Eucharist. These objects and their interrelationship with the cultural environment functioned as gifts and conveyed wishes.

Another example of individual prayer, and how people considered themselves sinners in need of salvation, can be found in the hymns of Romanos the Melode from the sixth century. Romanos’s hymns taught people how to pray and a number of biblical stories. When judging himself, Romanos considered himself a sinner in front of congregants; this act was an act of confession and ritually performed and used in the liturgy. When accepting himself as a sinner and praying for forgiveness, he uses humble language, followed by a prayer for forgiveness and salvation. This phrase is not new, and can be seen in the Sion objects also. The word ‘humble’, followed by the words ‘forgiveness’ and ‘salvation’ was used in some objects given by Eutychianos. Eutychianos here, by accepting he was a sinner, placed his prayer on his offering.

In addition, when an individual prays by writing formulae on church silver, the donor might also have wanted to be commemorated and remembered by God and the faithful when reading the inscriptions. Some donors, as we can see in the inscriptions on patens from the Sion Treasure, mention explicitly their hopes of being remembered. It might also be that their relatives gifted objects for them in memoriam: ‘for the repose and memory of Maria the illustrious’, ‘for the memory and repose of John’, ‘for the memory and repose of Angeleuos Roufinos’, for the memory and repose of Himeria’, ‘for the memory and repose of Eutychianos’; indicating that they want to be remembered after death. We can interpret this as Maria, Angeleuos, John, Prinkipios, Himeria and Eutychianos wanting (or their relatives wanting them) to be remembered by God, and presumably the congregation (comprising their family and friends perhaps) after their death. This same formula was also used in the Liturgy: during the Great Entrance, worshippers prayed ‘Lord remember me in your kingdom’. Papalexandrou interpreted this as a ‘central motivating factor for every Byzantine that they be
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remembered by God himself for eternity.  
Therefore, with this culture of being remembered by God, donors wanted their wishes for remembrance to be bestowed on the objects. This remembrance, as they believe, might also help with their eternal salvation after death. It has also been suggested that these objects be given in memory to the relatives of these people after their deaths. Paregoros’ donations explicitly explain this, in the inscription of a rim sheeting for an altar table, he mentioned that Paregoros offered the item in memory of his family (No. 48). This can be interpreted as the silver objects also being used for commemoration.

6.3 Prayer and identity on church silver

Since these objects were used inside the churches, the value of the objects used inside the church could also be discussed. Drawing on these discussions, it can be said that the functions of the objects were that of a gift, and their usage inside the churches had an effect on their biography. That is, the objects were viewed as gifts to God by their donors. There are some assumptions about why donors might put their names on church silver, and the importance of writing wishes on church silver which were moving about inside the church.

An important point to mention here concerns the question of names on church silver: why donors chose to have their names and/or monograms inscribed on silver vessels, and indeed, why they might not have done or why they chose to appear anonymously. As presented at the beginning of this chapter, among the silver objects from the Sion Treasure, all polycandela carry monograms of Eutychianos, ‘Eutychianos Episcopou’. The majority of the inscriptions on the vessels of the treasure, except for those on the chalices, bear the names of the donors with attendant wishes. On most of the objects, the names follow the position of the donors in the church. All of the Eutychianos’ objects except for one (No. 38), have the phrase ‘Most humble Bishop’, and Zacharias’, Paregoros’ and Theodore’s name also followed by the same (No. 51). Prinkipios’ name is followed by the word ‘Deacon’. The names of Maria and Angeleuos Roufinos contain not only the title but are also followed by the phrase ‘illustrious memory’. In addition to these phrases, some names are followed by the phrase ‘most blessed’ (No. 39). There is no evidence to explain why the donors wanted their names to
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appear on their offerings. Relying on examples from other inscriptions, a number of assumptions can be made. One is to reveal themselves before God, by displaying their name to him, and offering up prayers for the self. Another might be to perpetuate their names and pray even after they die; a third might be to prove that they had made donations to other people (who were able to read them), so that they can be encouraged to make donations. The following story from the fifth century explains the donor’s intentions that the writings be seen by everyone and by God. Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II, decided to remain a virgin. To prove her ‘resolve she wished to make God Himself, the clergy and all the subjects witnesses her decisions. She, therefore, dedicated on behalf of her virginity a holy table to the church of Constantinople…. Upon the front of the table she wrote down these things that they may be known to everyone.’

This example reveals that she wanted her decisions to be seen by God, the clergy and all other people. She chose to donate a table and write her intentions to communicate with God, in a manner that was also visible to other people. The decision of donors to write their names and inscriptions might have been intended for God or for others inside the church who might have read inscriptions. Most people mentioned their vow, and put their names on the floor mosaic, walls and silver objects, it depends which sort of gift they donated. We can see many examples of inscriptions, which mention the donor’s vow; some even state how many coins or gifts were given. For example, on the lintel inscription in the church of Rhodiapolis in Lycia, ‘Deacon Epigoros, presented (1 and 3 quarter gold coins) in fulfilment of his vow’. To explain the admiration of the people they see, or whom donors hoped they would see, there is an inscription from the wall of a fifth-century church in Aphrodisias which reads; ‘Tatianus made this vow, to be seen and admired by all’

Therefore, it might be suggested that the names on the inscriptions might have been confirming donations to God, in the eyes of people; as shown later in this chapter that was also true for silver. They can also be explained with individual prayer, as Romanos said in the congregation, Romanos, Humble and a sinner.
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Donors must have known that their silver vessels would be placed and used in holy places, and because they presumably expected the gifts to outlive themselves, they reported that their continued survival would guarantee continued intercessory prayers. With this understanding, the types of vessel that comprise the Sion Treasure are unsurprising. All these objects were designed for use inside the churches. Polycandela and lamps were used for lighting; chalices, patens, book covers and censers were used in the liturgy. Furthermore, all the objects bearing donors’ names were moved about inside the church, and presumably could come into contact with a range of users. So, the donor’s name was kept alive in the congregation, as was his or her name, prayers and hopes. On his silver vessels, Eutychianos used these objects to make individual prayers. The importance of individual prayers is made clear in the writings of the Church Fathers. In his questions and answers, Anastasios of Sinai says ‘All the services and liturgies and feasts and communions and sacrifices take place for this purpose that one may be purified from sins’.270 In his fifth lecture on the mysteries, Cyril of Jerusalem asserted that in the congregation, ‘we pray for all sick, poor and needed and all who have gone from us, since we believe that it is of the greatest help to those souls for whom the prayer is offered.’ He continues, stating that ‘then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep’.271 These examples explain that praying for oneself and for others, and commemorating people who are dead were common rituals. Placing names and wishes and placing the relatives name for their memories on the vessels might have created a similar ritual to commemorate and pray. Thus, having the named vessels circulate in the congregation, with the emphasis on forgiveness of sins, gaining salvation and protection and being commemorated, might have encouraged people to give silver as a gift, and inscribe it with their wishes and names, so that their wishes would be placed in the congregation or inside the holy church when they are dead. In this way they are also commemorated. Furthermore, having one’s name placed on the altar table, covered with the bread or wine of the Eucharist (as with patens and chalices), or enclosing the books of the Gospel brought the individual’s name and

perhaps the individual also closer to God, the divine, to protection and bestowed salvation through contact with God.

An example from the *Church History* of Evagrius makes this point further: Chosroes, the King of the Persians, when he donated a gold paten to the shrine of the martyr Sergius, inscribed his name on the objects, saying: ‘What is on this paten is not for the sight of a man, it is good fortune for me that my name should be carried on your holy vessels’. Since his wife Siren was a Christian, he hoped that these holy vessels would protect his wife and himself when these objects were used in the holy mysteries. As he continues, he made a vow that if his wife were to conceive his child, he would send the cross worn by her to the holy shrine. In his dream God appeared and thrice said to him that his wife had conceived. He responded to this immediately saying: ‘I trusted in your words and that you are holy and a granter of requests, so straightaway I sent the cross and its value to your all-revered house, ordering that from its value one paten and one chalice should be made for the sake of divine mysteries, but also that cross should be fixed on the honoured altar, and a censer of all gold’. He also mentioned these are ‘so that through your fortune, holy one, you may come to the aid of myself and Siren’.272 This story explains that the donor had made a vow, and after his dream stating his wish to be fulfilled, he made donations to the holy house and another request for protection. He believed that he made contact with God by writing his wishes, and so the objects are for God not man.

In the *Life* of Soziana, a patrician in Syria, the story tells that when Soziana’s husband, John, died she gave ‘expensive’ silver vessels to the church rather than selling them and giving to the poor; explaining, ‘Since I made this vow before God, they should be distributed among the holy altars of God together with all silver’.273 This story also underlines the importance that the donors wanted their donations to be placed on the altar and inside the holy church. The same idea or ritual might have been applied for the donors of the Sion Treasure, who wanted their gifts to be placed on the holy altar and to move about inside the church. They also gain protection and their names stay in the holy objects.

In addition to inscriptions including names, there are also others without. For example, neither of the inscribed chalices bears the names of their donors. On two of the chalices there is the phrase: ‘a vow of a prayer of those whose names are known to God’, and on one chalice the inscription can be translated as ‘having given thanks I made it’. With regard to the first phrase, Ševčenko asserts that this is a sign of self-effacement.\footnote{Ševčenko, 'The Sion Treasure: the Evidence of the Inscriptions', 42.; also see Leslie Brubaker, 'Elites and Patronage in Early Byzantium: The Evidence from Hagios Demetrios at Thessalonike', in ed. John Haldon and Lawrence I. Conrad, The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East: Elites Old and New in the Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 2004), 63-90.} This same inscription is used, for example, the inscription on a paten from the F. Alouf Collection reads; ‘in fulfilment of a vow and for the salvation of him whose name God knows’. \footnote{Mango, Silver From Early Byzantium: The Kaper Koraon and Related Treasures, Kat. No. 74.} This formula was common in Byzantine inscriptions, mentioning that the prayers to those who offer the objects are faithful, and they will gain a new name written in the book of the elect. These examples explain that this chalice was offered for the fulfilment of a vow and there was a wish that the donors’ names should appear in the book of life of the elect. This indicates a ‘wish for salvation’, because the book of life of the elect constitutes the names of those people elected by God to be saved. Ševčenko also reported that this formula was used in examples from the fifth and sixth centuries on the wall and floor mosaics and on the baptismal font.\footnote{Ševčenko, 'The Sion Treasure: the Evidence of the Inscriptions', 42.} This formula was also mentioned in the third miracle of St Demetrius, when he was restoring the church. He prayed to God for help; saying ‘this is the praying of names God know’. \footnote{St Demetrius, Miracula S. Demetrii, mir. 3, Greek text and French trans. ed. Lemerle, Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans, 1 (Le Texte), 197.} The same inscription can be found on wall mosaics, four of the inscription simply repeat themselves, ‘a prayer for one whose name God knows’.\footnote{Brubaker, 'Elites and Patronage in Early Byzantium: The Evidence from Hagios Demetrius at Thessalonike', 84.} It is evident therefore, that including or not including one’s name was a choice that donors made consciously and deliberately. It is also suggested that those donors choosing to be anonymous did so because they believed that God already knows their name.
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6.4 The question of the legibility of these inscriptions to people inside the church and their value for donors

Did anyone ever read these inscriptions however? Were they written to be read or written only for God? Work has been conducted to investigate the inscriptions on church walls and icons, and their possible effects on donors when they were read by other people. Even though those are not silver vessels, the ideas and methodology used are important starting points to examine the role of inscriptions on silver vessels used inside the church. Amy Papalexandrou discussed the role of inscriptions on monumental buildings, notably those on the walls of the Church of the Virgin of Skripou. She argued that these inscriptions, which were there to be seen by other people, outlined the donor’s hopes. She made the case that these texts were not to be read silently, but aloud, and that this meant the message was made more public through being heard. Moreover, these inscriptions both affected the perceptions of viewers, and made the donor’s hopes audible to listeners. Reading these inscriptions audibly made the buildings animated and kept the donors’ hopes alive. She argued that people walked around the church and engaged with the inscriptions, and that the people who were able to read these inscriptions read them out loud so that others understood.279 Additionally, Bissera Pentcheva examined the epigrams on icons, and mentioned that inscriptions with icon’s materiality created metaphoric images and conveyed the desire of donors. Therefore, according to Pentcheva, icons that carried the words of their donors changed their power in this context, because when they were read by other people the hopes of donors were repeated by those people, and thereby increasing the power of their prayers.280

When the inscriptions were read, this would bring the donor to mind. The reader of the inscriptions would know the donor and might then pray for the donor. Therefore, putting their names and wishes could also put the donors at the forefront of other people’s prayers to have mercy on them. Equally, whilst it is possible that the inscriptions on the Sion silver vessels were regularly read by their users or viewers, it is
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also possible that they were not. Some people were unable to see and read these inscriptions when the congregation met, and when they were inside the church.

Before making these assumptions, we need to ask: Who could and who could not access these objects? In order to examine this, this section will consider how and where these objects were used inside the church of Sion Monastery and how and when people may have interacted with these objects.

When thinking about the use of the liturgical objects, the book covers, the altar table sheets and some of the lighting equipment inside the church, it is possible to see that the accessibility of the objects and the visibility of their inscriptions changed according to how and where they were used inside the church. However, knowing where exactly inside the church these objects were used and how and when people interacted with them is a matter of some conjecture. The Eucharist is the most obvious example of when the liturgical vessels and book covers were used and when people interacted with them, seeing them and reading their inscriptions. It is also possible that they might have also been used outside liturgical hours and were made visible to the range of visitors who came to monastery. Additionally, their cleaners and safekeepers interacted with these objects. For the revetments and lighting devices it is also important to discuss where they might have been used inside the church. In this context, the plan of the church of the Sion Monastery is important.

As Harrison suggests, the church in Karabel in Lycia might have been the church of Sion Monastery. His plan suggests that the sanctuary of the church was a triconch, with three apses. The church has three aisles which terminate in barrel-vaulted passages leading into the north and south apses respectively, whilst a further door in the north apse gives access to the adjoining baptistery. The church has an atrium with three doors at the west end of the church from which it is possible to enter directly into aisles. There is no narthex (Plate 159). There is a baptistery on the north wall of the sanctuary which can be entered through the door from the north apse of the sanctuary. The baptistery has a single apse and it is rectangular. There are two chapels on the south side of the church which both can be entered from the doors in the south aisle. There are altar and sarcophagi inside the east chapel. The altar is a stone altar 1.30 m by 0.53
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The western chapel has no apse or an altar. In my view, it might also have been a storage room to put the objects used inside the church.

The altar revetments were most probably used on the altar inside the sanctuary of the church. It is not possible to say that they were used in the east chapel because considering the measure of a stone altar in the east chapel, it is 1.30 m in length, while the rim sheeting for altar table in the Sion Treasure is 2.25 in length.

The silver revetments such as lampstands, lamps and polycandela might have been used anywhere inside the church; they could have been used in the sanctuary, aisles, baptistery or chapels. Standing lamps and hanging lamps might have been used on the altar of the sanctuary to produce light during the eucharist or in other liturgical ceremonies. They might have also been used in chapels and baptisteries. Polycandela presumably hung from the roofs of the aisles. Indeed, in the ruins of the Karabel church and chapel, there were consoles with rivets attached that the polycandelon could have been attached to. The polycandela would have been hard to remove, even for cleaning, and would not have been carried about the church, unlike the lamps which could have been used anywhere in the church. Examples of other polycandela indicate that they were removed for restoration as well (Plate 16). Portable lighting was always needed. For example, during the Easter vigil, the newly-baptised moved in procession from the baptistery to the church. Portable lights were needed for this procession to lighten the church during the dark hours. As Beatrice Caseau has shown, it seems likely that most of the lamps were used on the altar or to the sides of the altar on chandeliers or lampstands. Lamps were used in the healing shrines of monasteries during the night to provide light to sick people. In Harrison’s plan of the church of Sion Monastery, there is no healing shrine, but it is possible that there might have been a healing shrine in the monastery, since there are passages in The Life of Nicholas of Sion that mention that certain villagers visited the monastery to be healed by Nicholas of Sion. For example, a sick man named Hermes came to the monastery and asked Nicholas of Sion to pray for him and Nicholas made the sign of a cross over him and sent him away after
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fifteen days. It is also possible that some of the revetments and lighting devices from the Sion Treasure were kept in storage and were taken out when they were needed. In monasteries there were storekeepers of these objects in the storage room and they were responsible to give these objects to clergy when they were needed.

Vessels such as the patens, chalices, amphorae, censers and book covers were mostly used for the service of Eucharist. As I will discuss later, during the Eucharist these objects were mostly used by the clergy to set up the communion and give it to the laity. The amphorae were used by the deacon, and the censer was used to provide the smell of incense carried by the deacon. These objects might have been also used in other occasions outside the communion. There were liturgical hours other than the Eucharist in monasteries, and other times for prayer. In The Life of Nicholas of Sion, there was a man who was ‘possessed by an unclean spirit’ visited where Nicholas of Sion was working. ‘And Nicholas took hold of him, blessed him with the sign of a cross by the power of Holy Spirit, gave him a hoe and bade him work.’ ‘At that very moment the man regained his senses, praised God and went on working. It was the ninth hour of prayer.’ Another chapter of the vita mentions a man named Paul who was a reader. He was possessed with an evil spirit and Nicholas prayed over him, ‘and the unclean spirit was put to flight’. After this Paul stayed in the monastery and ‘performed the functions of reader at Matins and Vespers, and sang psalms recited the readings, giving thanks to God.’ This passage indicates that the monastery had visitors outside the time of the liturgy; these visitors might have been in contact with some of the objects. Paul presumably had contact with the book covers inside the church when he was reading psalms or other books. He might also be in contact with the other objects, such as lighting devices and revetments. As these passages explains, the monastic community was different than the church community. The monastery had a variety of visitors, for a variety of reasons, most notably healing and pilgrimage. The Vita also mentions that Nicholas of Sion visited the shrine of Saint George in Plenion. And they congregated with lots of visitors from the village and outside the village. This example also indicate that monastic places took in lots of visitors from village and outside the village.
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People might have also brought their children. These people must surely have seen the silverware. It also needs to be considered that during the processions in the liturgy the deacon takes the gospel and process around the altar and goes outside the sanctuary and blesses the entrance. This is also another opportunity of people to see and interact with objects, especially book covers. The books, such as gospels with their silver covers, were carried by deacons inside the church during reading times and processions which makes them visible to visitors. There are also other possibilities that people moved inside the church during processions.291 Processional liturgies were also made by moving place to place and moving from church to church.292 There is also possibility that this kind of procession might have been made in Byzantine Lycia. This explains that there is also another possibility that people from other villages might have also seen these objects.

The censers might have also been carried by deacons not only inside the sanctuary but also in the aisles to provide the smell of incense inside the church. It is also probable that they might have been hung on the walls of the church. They were also used at funerals. As with the revetments, someone must have cleaned and kept safe these and other liturgical objects. These people interacted with these objects, they touched these objects and possibly read their inscriptions.

But it is hard to explain how they were seen or how they were interacted with these objects during these visitations and in their usage other than the Eucharistic hours. It is hard to know how visible the silver was to everyone inside the church. For example, the altar table sheets were used inside the sanctuary. The plan of the church indicates that the sanctuary was divided from the aisles via the barrel vaults but there was no templon screen. This lack of a templon screen would have made the altar table sheets, especially rim sheeting, visible to people. The lightning of the altar by lamps might have also made the inscriptions more visible, to put it differently, they might have increased the visibility of the inscriptions. But this is hard to explain, due to the lack of evidence.293 It also needs to be considered that the inscription continues to the right edge of the altar.

293 I was not able to examine the objects by using candles to see whether it increases the visibility of the object’s decoration and inscription due to the restrictions in the collections when I was examining objects.
This makes it hard to be read by people standing in front of the altar. There is also possibility that the altar table might have been covered by altar table clothes.

It is clear that there were countless occasions when the silverware might have been visible to people, but there is little evidence that suggests how people interacted with them outside of the liturgical hours. Therefore, I am going to take the Eucharist as a case study to explain how the silverware might have been used and how people might have interacted with it, because there is enough evidence that reveals how people interacted with liturgical silver objects during the communion. There are sources explaining how communion held and where people stayed during the communion. For revetments, which are not liturgical, I will also consider how far people were away from these objects and was this distance enough for them to read inscriptions on the revetments and lighting devices.

Robert Taft discusses primary sources, explaining how communion should be processed. 294 The apostolic constitution, written in 380 AD stated: ‘let the bishop communicate, then the presbyters and the deacons and the sub deacons and the readers and the cantors and the ascetics and, from among the women, the deaconess and the virgins and the widows, then the children and finally all people, in order’. 295 This explains that communion happened according to rules and hierarchy. Pseudo-Dionysius in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy explains the same order of partaking communion; ‘Having himself partaken of and imparted the divine communion, the hierarch concludes the ceremony with a sacred thanksgiving together with the entire sacred assembly.’ 296 There is also an important point to make that the clergy took their communion in the sanctuary and the laity outside the sanctuary. We can understand this clearly from Procopius’ writing about the amount of silver inside the sanctuary, he mentions; ‘that part of the church, which is especially sacred and accessible to priests only—it is called the sanctuary—exhibits forty thousand pounds of silver.’ 297 It was clearly not possible for lay people to engage with the objects used inside the sanctuary. These
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examples led me, therefore to divide the discussion first focusing on the patens, chalices, censers and altar table sheets, because they were used inside the sanctuary.

Patens were used to hold the bread of communion, and the chalices were meant to hold the wine of the Eucharist. Whilst the clergy physically engaged with these objects, carrying them, placing bread on them, filling the chalices, it is unclear whether the laity would have seen them up close. Some sources explain that the deacon carried the chalice and helped people to drink the wine, or mixed the wine with bread and gave it to people using a spoon. This makes it difficult to understand whether the laity taking communion engaged with the objects by taking them in their own hands, or took the bread and wine from the hands of the deacon. According to John Meyendorff, lay persons may have not received the Holy Communion with their own hands after the seventh century, but via a special spoon. This explains that communion was given to the laity via ‘intinction’, in which the laymen took bread and wine with a spoon from the hands of a deacon. In discussing this he did not mention how the communion was held in the early years. The assumption is that in early Christian times until the seventh century, communion was given from the chalice and paten. Robert Taft examined Communion spoons found in Syria, which dated back to the sixth century. He suggested that the pre-Chalcedonians used the Syrian orthodox liturgy, and used the spoon for ‘intinction’. That meant the laity were unable to engage with chalices and patens. What is not known is whether this was the case in sixth-century Lycia and the Sion Monastery, and it is worth noting that no spoons were found in this treasure, though that is not conclusive evidence either way. Thus, it is possible that people taking communion received the wine from chalices, either with their own hands or from the hands of a deacon. According to some sources, people received communion with their own hands, and gave it to other people using one chalice, and other sources mentioned that worshippers took the communion from the hands of a deacon. However, the use of the paten, whether it was carried by the deacon or left on the altar to distribute the bread, was not explained in detail.

There are six chalices in the Sion Treasure. A lack of information about how many chalices the monastery had overall prevents us from determining whether these 6
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chalices were only used in the Eucharist with the congregation. Some of them might have been kept for special occasions, or used when there was a larger congregation. The average measurement of the chalices is 14 cm in height and 950 gr in weight. Therefore, it is likely that the clergy were able to carry these objects, drink the wine from the chalices, holding them in their own hands. It is also possible that deacons carried these objects and gave wine to the faithful.

Since, like chalices, patens were also used for the purpose of eucharistic communion, there are similar issues regarding whether these objects were accessible to people. The objects could also be looked at and experienced by the clergy, but were unlikely to be examined by the laity. When the deacon gave bread to the laity, he presumably used the paten, although, he may have just brought the bread, leaving the paten on the altar. However, the lay person would only have been able to see certain areas of the paten, notably the parts closest to him/her and not covered in bread. As records I have taken during my examinations in Dumbarton Oaks show, if the paten were placed on a table which is 75 cm in height, it is likely that only one part of the object would be seen, possibly the rim (Plate: 13). In the case of the Sion patens, their weights were considerable; between 4 and 8 kg (specifically 4300, 4500, 500 and 8000 gr). This makes it really challenging to carry these objects, and was not conducive to the viewing experience.

But what of the inscriptions? It is likely that the clergy might have been able to read them. However, it seems unlikely that the congregation was ever in a position to read the inscriptions encircling the vessels. Even if they were literate, they would only have seen part of the inscription, that closest to them. In order to view all the inscriptions, they would have to turn the chalice, which is unlikely to have happened during a busy communion. The size of the letters does not help. On the two chalices from the Antalya museum the letters encircle the rim, which is between 21 and 23 cm in diameter. The size of the letters varies; the letters on the rim of the chalice (No. 26) are 1.2 cm high and encircled with lines in relief, while the others are 1.5 in high (No. 25), and one of the chalices from Dumbarton Oaks is also inscribed with engraving, and the height of the letters varies between 1.2-1.3 (No. 22). The engraving makes it even harder to read the inscription.
Moreover, it is also the case that the clergy and lay people gave consideration to the inscriptions or the decorations. To see the decorations on the patens, the bread would have to be removed and the cross decorating the objects would then be visible. However, we should also consider that the communion is busy, and people might not have time to spend looking at the objects and reading the inscriptions. Furthermore, with both the chalice and paten almost certainly the focus of the worshipper, clerical or lay person, would have been the bread and wine, not the vessel, which was a mere side-show in proceedings, however lavish and costly.

The censers also convey some important information about their use. There are two censers from the Sion Treasure, inscribed in niello technique, and with decorations encircling their bodies. The Sion censers were designed to be hung from three chains carrying burning incense, which was used for censing the altar and Eucharistic vessels. Unlike standing censers, which were placed on the altar, these censers were carried by deacons during the Eucharistic services or hung on the walls near the altar. Something of this can be seen in scenes depicting censers and indicating how deacons carried these vessels. The length of the chains of the Sion vessels is approximately 1 meter, which means they could have been carried at knee height. So, whilst the clergy (especially deacons who carry them) might have had a chance to view the objects, and read their inscriptions, the laity’s views were more restricted. Even if they were able to spot the inscriptions at knee-height, they would have been unable to read all the text without turning the vessel to view the whole inscription (Plate 75). This was unlikely to have been how people spent their time during the Eucharist. Furthermore, lay viewers would have had to stand close to the censer-swinging by deacons – perhaps within a meter – to stand any chance of reading the inscription, and whether this was possible during the service is another question. When people were away from the object, approximately one meter, it is also impossible for them to perceive the objects in the same way as the clergy did. As the records show, the inscriptions are hard to recognise from 1 meter.

away. It is also probable that people would have been further than one meter from these objects.

A very similar issue applies to the amphora. The amphora, which can also be described as a ‘ewer’, was part of the washing set in the liturgy. This ewer carried the water used for purifying the hands of priest before the Eucharistic service. The ewer was also used in the sanctuary of the church, and the laity would not see this object. Only the priest and the clergy engaged with it.

Even the altar table sheet, which was also inscribed with the hopes of donors and their names was not wholly public. As other vessels on the altar, the engagement of the laity with sheets was problematic, because they may not have entered the sanctuary. It was a challenge to even see the mosaics decorating the apse. Even if the individuals did enter the sanctuary, it is unclear whether they could they have read the writing. It is possible that these objects might have been covered by altar cloths, or by other objects such as the paten and chalice. In terms of the rim sheeting for example, based on my first-hand examinations at Dumbarton Oaks, the writing cannot be seen or read, even when standing near the altar table. And for those standing two or three meters away from the altar table, it would have been impossible to read the inscriptions, or possibly even see the objects clearly.

There are also some standing lamps which might have been used inside the sanctuary, the issues that arise are the same for all the lamps. Since they are circular the inscriptions are not visible. Both standing and hanging lamps (which means they may be used both by hanging or by standing) are decorated as openwork, and some of their inscriptions are also openwork, with the other inscriptions being in niello technique. These objects are also circular, and the inscriptions are encircling their rims. There is also another point relating to the place where these objects were used. If people stand away from these objects, it makes it hard to read them.

Beside the objects used in the Eucharist, additional objects were donated to the Sion monastery. Polycandela were used to illuminate the church, sanctuary and aisles. Unlike the floor candelabra, these objects hung from the roofs of the churches. Glass lamps were placed inside the holes. As there are also standing lamps and openwork lamps,

which were used in the sanctuary, it is difficult to be certain where these polycandela were used inside the church. The inscriptions on the polycandela from the Sion Treasure encircle their centre on the upper face with the monogram of the donor. Even though they were used in the church aisles, and were accessible to the faithful, the objects were placed on the upper level of the church, making it hard for people to read them. As the recording from the Dumbarton Oaks polycandela shows, when the objects are hung we need to look up to see the inscription, although it is hard to read it clearly. It is also similar for a hanging lamp; the lamp was hung on the altar table and displayed in the Dumbarton Oaks collection. Standing far away from the object makes it impossible to read the inscription. Moreover, the objects are circular, and if they were hung on the altar table or ciborium, it would be impossible to walk around the object to read the inscription (Plates: 26, 157 and 158).

In the case of inscriptions and their effect on the perceptions of viewers, it should also be considered that some people were illiterate. The literate population in Lycia and especially in monastery of Sion is unknown, but it can be estimated by looking at studies on Byzantine education in general. According to Robert Browning, people in higher education were rare among the Byzantine population, but the percentage of people who attended primary and secondary schools were remarkably high. As the Byzantine Empire needed literate individuals to fulfil roles as officials and administrators, the church and monasteries also required people able to read and write. The clergy had to know how to read and write in order to fulfil their ‘professional duties’. People who attended primary schools were able to obtain qualifications in reading and writing; (individual letters, syllables, monosyllabic words, and combinations of vowels). In secondary school the students were taught grammar, rhetoric and philosophy. Hence, it is quite possible to assert that the clergy, and some laity, even though they left school after primary school, they could also read the inscriptions. However, it is appropriate to mention problems with reading inscriptions,

---
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for example even though they are not poetic and rhetorical writings which require high literacy, the style of writings indicate that writer did not much care about the grammar.

The base of the lampstand (No. 52) from the Sion Treasure which was preserved in Antalya proves this. The inscription reads; ‘for the most holy hymn this cup is provided’. There are mistakes in the ligatures of omicron, upsilon and alpha. There are also some grammatical mistakes, for example the word; ‘OCRIOΣATA’ should be ‘OCRIOΣATΟΥ’, (Most Holy). The other verb is; ‘ΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΘΗ’, and it should be followed by ‘N’. Moreover, there are also grammatical errors in inscriptions on other objects, for instance, the word ‘Help’ written as ‘BOΘΙ’, while it should be written as ‘BOΘΗ’.305 However, these do not affect the understanding of what the inscription is intended to say. Unlike poems and rhetorical inscriptions, these inscriptions are simple and would not require a high degree of literacy to read. Papalexandrou discussed inscriptions on church walls, when people were passing they read these inscriptions and they were also read aloud so that their message would reach illiterate people.306 However, considering the uses of the Sion vessels, it is unlikely that this was the case here; it is impossible to say if people read the inscriptions aloud.

Therefore, it can be said that the inscriptions and objects reached people in different ways. Some, if not all members of the laity were unable to view the objects and read their inscription; in contrast, while the clergy was in the sanctuary with the vessels, they were in a good position to touch them and read their inscriptions. So, it is not unreasonable to ask whether the objects were intended to be seen and have their inscriptions read by others, or whether they were conceived of as objects simply for use inside the church, as reading the inscriptions was a question of chance.

Clearly, even if certain people could not reach the objects and did not read the inscriptions, there would be others who would by chance. It is likely that the donors gave the objects as gifts to God to be used inside the church, and when people read the inscriptions by chance, their names and wishes were remembered by others. This also suggests that the biography of the objects as gifts remained, which means inside the church they did not lose their biography as gifts rather, they were still the objects given
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as gifts to God. People reading the inscriptions by chance might also have been encouraged to give gifts to God and explore the culture of gift giving to churches.

The evidence explains how donors saw the objects and their inscriptions. The examinations also explain that the objects carried the words of donors with inscriptions. It also indicates what these inscriptions were for from the perspective of donors. The interdependence of the object and its inscription made the object multivalent. I have aimed to explain why these objects were inscribed in a particular way, and how well we can understand their meaning by looking at the inscriptions.

This section has discussed the possible meanings of inscriptions from the donor’s perspective. It has aimed to show how the ritual of giving gifts and expecting salvation functioned through silver objects. Therefore, it can be agreed that art objects and their inscriptions help us to understand that donors used the objects as gifts initially, as they wanted salvation, protection and forgiveness. From these examinations it is possible to say that these objects and their inscriptions functioned for multiple reasons; to be used in a church, as gifts, as objects to fulfil wishes and share the donor’s identity. In addition, as a result, the inscription could change the meaning of the object. The inscription conveyed the name and hopes of donors inside the church, possibly in the context of Holy Communion. The inscription did not restrict the meaning of the object, rather it increased the functionality of sacred silver.

6.5 The value of objects for donors with their decorations and forms

The ornaments included in the Sion Treasure form part of the same debate. While these objects with their decorations and forms were perceived by producers as designed to please receivers, in the hands of donors, who saw these objects as gifts, their decoration might also have performed different functions for them. Scholars discussed some figural and geometrical decorations to clarify their value to donors. Considering the uses of the objects inside the church, scholars also discussed that they were to be sensed by church people, their light reflective surfaces which were gold or silver and textured, encouraging people to touch them and perceive them as having divine embodiment. That is, people believed that by touching these objects they might have reached the divine embodiment. This discussion is examined in detail in the following chapter, and here I ask whether patrons considered the perceptions or thoughts of others: with their
materials and decoration, were the objects produced and given to the church by donors to be sensed by other people?

The donors of the Sion Treasure gave decorative objects to the church with some figures, such as peacocks, the Christogram, crosses, the tree of life, and dolphins. With these figures and the other vegetal motifs, the donors gave to God decorative objects and objects for their protection. The mosaics and door lintels were also decorated with similar motifs; for example, peacocks on censers, dolphins, scale and heart motifs in lamps and polycandela, meander motifs, tree of life on book covers, and of course crosses. As conventional decorations, crosses symbolised the triumph of Christianity and salvation.  

People decorated their mosaics and door lintels with crosses for protection against the evil eye and to ensure salvation. For some scholars the other decoration also had some symbolic meanings. The symbol of the dolphin was used in a number of lighting pieces. The dolphin symbolises a safe journey after life, and can be associated with salvation. In the early Byzantine period, it is argued that it was sometimes described as fish, becoming the symbolic image of Christ. The peacock can also be seen depicted on a number of objects, sarcophagi and church mosaics for example. It has become symbol of resurrection eternal life. However, the lack of evidence about why these decorations were chosen is not sufficient to understand whether the donors saw these decorations were for protection or held symbolic meanings. It is also not certain if the donors wanted these objects to be decorated in this way, as I discussed in the previous chapter. They might ask the silversmith to decorate them beautifully and properly to give to the church as a gift, and then the silversmith, drawing on his choice and knowledge, might make these objects as a gift to God. It is more reliable to depend on the theory about object agency and human agency when decorating these objects. As Chapter 5 discussed in detail, human agency, with its social environment, had an important effect on the production of objects. The producers, with their intention and knowledge about their social environment created these objects. The
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donors perceived these objects with their knowledge about what these objects can do and knowledge about their social environment. The intention of donors can also be accepted as human agency, as the meaning or value of the decoration would then be as they perceived or as what they wanted to see.

Firstly, the decorations can be explained as intended to please God and gain possible returns from God. Each donor has different intentions and beliefs about how to please God or how to obtain the help they want from God. The desire of donors is to get adequate objects to give to the church as gifts to God. Some of them gave simple decorations, such as gilded bands and crosses, but others gave decorative items. In terms of monetary value, highly decorative objects are more costly, and so arise most likely from the intention and capacity of donors to pay, and were not necessarily produced in different workshops from the simply designed items. The desire and intention of certain donors was to give decorated objects. This desire came with the background knowledge of donors developed by conventional and religious background. They have also these desires depending on their wealth. In terms of the forms and weights of objects, it can be said that some individuals sacrificed their wealth to get protection and salvation. The order given by Severus of Antioch, which was mentioned earlier is an important example for this. He ordered that for the shrine, everyone should give what they could afford. He continued that by doing so, people and their families would receive protection.311 Giving decorated and expensive objects might also be a sign of this, the donors gave what they could afford to give and sacrificed the wealth given to them by God. They did so to fulfil their vows, making offerings to God and gaining salvation and protection, and to commemorate their family members.

The perception of decorations can be explained by examining the donors’ intention by cognitive approach to the objects. The meaning of the aesthetic and decorative aspects of the objects were different for donors. The beliefs and rituals of donors were the most effective factors in terms of the value of the objects given by donors. Their knowledge was affected by this belief and the way they perceive those objects. The belief was that they will gain protection and salvation from the objects and that this will please God when giving the objects to the church. For them, the most important aim was that these objects should be appropriate to use inside churches. So, the question if the donors gave

these objects to be sensed can be answered as; they do not give these objects to be sensed by others. For donors the objects are for God and to please God. The examinations of the visibility of objects to people and the inscriptions on the objects also prove this.

The donors knew these objects were used in the churches in which God dwells, and they believed that the objects would extend God’s protection to them. They made their sacrifices by giving these objects to the church, and with these decorations these objects helped protect them. Therefore, it is not impossible to say that with the interrelation between donors’ belief and these objects, the biography and value of the objects became gifts, thereby giving opportunities for the donors to please God and gain protection. The first and foremost hope of donors was that with these decorations their gifts would be accepted by God. Spiritual returns were anticipated along with God’s pleasure in the object. Usage of the objects inside the church can also explain this. The objects were not produced to be seen by everyone. They were seen by the clergy and maybe by the cleaners of the objects inside the church. But by not all people. It might be well imagined that patrons were aware of this, since they were also from the church community. Therefore, the decorations on the objects and their monetary value can also be explained as intended to please God, and donors sacrificed their wealth to obtain these objects, in a way to thank God for what he had given to them and hope to gain salvation.
7. THE VALUE AND BIOGRAPHY OF THE SION SILVER IN THE CHURCH

In this chapter, I examine the biography and value of the Sion vessels as objects used in a church, a place where their use was different from that of objects made for sale or used as gifts. Inside the church, some of the vessels were used for Communion and others were used as lighting equipment or church revetments. Therefore, the value and biography of these objects inside the church — which was the third phase in the objects’ life, — should also be considered. However, when they were used in the church, they did not lose their previous biographies and values. They retained their biographies of being commodities and gifts for God; no biography was exclusive of the others. Thus, with their use inside the church and their relationship with churchgoers, they had multi-biographies and became multivalent.

This chapter argues that the material features of the Sion Treasure silverware were not the only features that influenced their perceived value. Context, materiality, and cognition have interdependent effects on the biography and multivalence of objects. As Figure One (in the Introduction) demonstrates, context affects both people, in terms of psychology and emotions, and usage of objects. Thus, the form of the Sion objects, their function (which changed according to the context in which they were used), and people’s knowledge and psychology (which was influenced by the context in which they were dwelt) changed people’s perception of objects. When people’s perception changed, their way of defining the Sion silverware also changed. Therefore, this chapter explores how the biography of the objects changed within the church context, and how the context of the church affected people’s perception of objects.

In the previous chapter, I explained the use of objects in the church and discussed the accessibility of these objects and their inscriptions to people. I then used these discussions to investigate the value of these objects in the church to their donors by considering them from the perspective of donors, investigating to what extent these inscriptions were accessible to people, and what happened when people read and did not read these inscriptions. Therefore, the importance of objects for donors has been explained. In the current chapter, I investigate the use of these artefacts inside the
church and in the Eucharist in more detail in order to understand how this affected people’s perception of the objects by examining them through the eyes of churchgoers.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section examines the importance of the material affordances of the objects and the knowledge and perception of people regarding the objects’ biographies. This section explains how the objects were used in the church and how this affected their biographies. When discussing the affordances of the objects, this section also considers the use of the objects inside the church and their accessibility to people. This discussion of accessibility is carried out through three questions: What happened when people experienced the silver objects with their senses, by touching, smelling, and kissing? What happened when people experienced these objects from afar? What effect did these two circumstances have on the biography and value of the objects? In order to answer these questions, I argue that churchgoers approached these objects with their imagination and prior knowledge, and this influenced the way people perceived the sacred silver of the objects. Therefore, this section argues that context changed the way people engaged with these objects, and although people did not engage with the silver objects with their senses, they already knew what these objects could do as a result of their imagination and prior knowledge.

The second section discusses the importance of context. In this section, I claim that in addition to imagination and prior knowledge of objects, the atmosphere of the church also affected the way people perceived these objects, since the context affected their emotions and emotion has a significant effect on the way people approach art objects.

Therefore, in order to understand the objects’ biography and value as a whole, I consider the material, sensual affordances of the objects, the knowledge and intentions of people, and the context that affected the biography of the objects by changing both their use and the cognition and emotions of the people who approached them, in order to demonstrate that people, things, and context are interdependent, and the interrelation of artefacts with people and context means they should be regarded as materials with more functions than just their artistic value. In this way, this chapter shows that material agency, human agency, and context all influenced the biography of objects in the church.

The examinations in this chapter include the objects’ affordances; for example, as items used in the Eucharist and for lighting the church. This chapter also examines the sensual
affordances of the objects; however, I argue that the sensual affordances were not the only features which gave the objects value and biography. There were also conditions beyond the objects’ visuality which affected their biography, such as human agency, which included people’s knowledge and imagination. I explain this using primary and secondary sources which give important information about the significance of knowledge when approaching art objects. I also present some theoretical research of cognition and art. This discussion of the effects of people’s knowledge, emotions, imagination, and context on the perception of art objects shows that when examining the value of objects inside the church material agency and sensual affordances of objects are not the only ways to understand the biography of objects as a whole. Thus, this chapter examines the effect of atmosphere on emotions in order to demonstrate that in addition to object affordances and people’s knowledge and imagination, the atmosphere of the context created emotions and also affected people’s perception of art objects. The primary sources explaining the context of the Eucharist and how the liturgy was held in the Byzantine era, and how people felt when they entered the church provide important examples to support these arguments.

7.1 Material affordances of objects, knowledge and imagination of churchgoers, and object biography in the church context

The objects inside the church were multifunctional in terms of both use and conceptual dimension. In the church, objects were valued according to their physical functions, such as holding the wine of the Eucharist, lighting the church, and for sensual affordances. However, people’s perception and interaction with these objects was affected by the church context. Some people engaged with these objects with their senses but others did not. This is the effect of context, which causes people to experience objects differently. The church was where the objects were used, activating people’s senses and psychology. The church was also a place that caused worshippers to experience these objects in different ways. The examination of the use of Sion objects in the church in Chapter Six demonstrated that this silverware was experienced and used by different people in different ways. For instance, the clergy were able to touch and see these materials up close, whereas lay people mostly observed them from afar. This explains the effects of context on the use of objects and people’s experience of those objects. In the context of the current study, experience refers to people’s use of the senses — touching, seeing, and kissing these objects. For example, when using an
object to drink wine, their lips touched the object’s rim and they had the chance to taste it. Some people were never in a position to experience these objects by touching or seeing them up close. These different ways of engaging with the objects meant that they were experienced in different ways. Thus, an investigation of the value of Sion silverware items in the church must include more than just a consideration of their materiality. The affordances of the objects or their value should be examined in two different ways: primary and secondary affordances. The primary affordances of the objects were the reason they existed in the churches, what they were designed for, and how each vessel was used. The secondary affordances were that they were created for a particular function, or they were brought into that function with people’s imagination and knowledge. Therefore, the secondary affordances depend on the opportunity of people to engage with the objects, people’s knowledge and beliefs, and the effect of context on people’s perception. Furthermore, a consideration of the sensual affordances of the objects can only be applied to the people who touched and kissed them, but the effect of context and the affordances of context on people’s psychology and knowledge are more general ways to investigate how these objects were experienced. Thus, I argue that the sensual affordances of the objects were not their primary performance, but occurred with people’s imagination — people knew how to approach and sense these objects.

The material affordances of objects can be explained according to their performance characteristics; that is, they can be explained by what the objects do. These affordances depend on both the physical features of the objects and the behaviour of people. Before conducting a discussion of how context affected people’s perception of Sion silver in the church, I first examine the importance of knowledge and imagination to people’s perception of sacred objects in general. In this way, this section demonstrates that the objects became sacred silver both as a result of their material affordances and as a result of people’s imagination and prior knowledge. That is, what the objects could do and what people expected from them changed people’s perception of them. According to Schiffer, how an object performs depends on the behavioural chain constructed for it; for example, cooking, dining, or ritual performances.312 However, this behaviour chain does not sufficiently explain the interrelationship between objects and people and the value given to objects within the church. When considering the performance

characteristics of the objects, we should look at their function beyond the visual, which in the church is a conceptual dimension influenced by people’s knowledge and imagination. When combined with the intentions and knowledge of the people, the primary function of the Sion silverware became their secondary function. For example, chalices and patens were used to carry the blood and body of Christ during the Eucharist. Therefore, the objects’ primary function was to carry wine and bread. But with imagination and conceptual perception of the people, they gained secondary affordances, which were to carry holy mysteries. Thus, the value of these objects can be understood from their material characteristics and also from features beyond the material. These objects were valued in terms of their functionality in addition to their physical appearance and material qualities. 313

It can be argued that these objects were first valued according to their primary use in the church; for example, their appropriateness for use in the church. Chalices and patens carried wine and bread. These objects were essential to celebrating the Holy Eucharist. Similarly, the altar sheets needed to fit well as they were protecting the Holy Table. And the objects or church revetments used for lighting would have first been considered in terms of whether they were appropriate and would light the church sufficiently. For example, some people might have passed through without looking at the polycandela, but they were aware that the church was illuminated with the help of these objects. This is what people first wanted and expected from the objects — that they would light the holy place and be used during the Eucharist. The other affordances of the objects came after their primary affordances; for example, when people engaged with these objects they felt different. This occurred as a result of their belief and also the context in which these objects were used. The appropriateness of the objects to be used inside the church was also informed by features beyond the visible. For example, as shown in the examples given of, the life of Theodore of Sykeon and the history of Theophylact Simocatta, these objects had to be spiritually pure. The material of the objects could not be used for other, illicit purposes. These examples also demonstrate that the primary affordances and secondary affordances of the objects could not be separated in the church. For example, a cup used for pagan sacrifices could also be used to hold wine in
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other contexts, but within the church, this object could not be used for the Holy Mysteries.

The previous discussions explained the primary affordances of the objects; the next discussion is about the sensual affordances of the objects. The sensual affordances of the objects can be divided into two categories. Firstly, sensual affordances which came from their material, their shining surfaces, and their sensual impact when people touched and kissed them. Secondly, the sensory environment that the objects created in the church that was experienced by everyone, such as polycandela-created light or the censers which created the smell of incense. This sensory environment came from what the objects did, not from their material qualities.

Pentcheva and Crawley conducted research into the perception of icons and silver objects. These examinations were based on the material affordances of objects and their effects on people. Pentcheva studied the multi-sensory effects of icons and argued that the sensory experience of icons enabled people who touched them to perceive them in a different way to those who did not. She argued that, considering its material quality, such an object, ‘was meant to be physically experienced’. The tactile surfaces and textures of icons and reliefs enabled people to experience the object with both touch and sight. Furthermore, the light-reflective surfaces, gold colour, and the texture of the icons caused people to engage with their materiality, which was seen to embody the divine and therefore enable the faithful to interact with the divine. In this way, people used their all senses to experience the icons, as the material and gilded surfaces which reflected the light, the candles and oil lamps placed in front of the object, the fragrance of the incense, and the sounds of prayer enabled people to perceive the invisible. 314

However, the silver objects used in the Eucharist and as church revetments were not used in the same way as icons. Their transactions were different. Icons were to be seen and touched by people, whereas the church revetments and liturgical objects were used on the Holy Altar and for lighting the church. Therefore, experiencing these objects was different from experiencing the icons; therefore, the silver objects should be examined using different methodologies. For example, the knowledge and imagination of the people should also be considered. Icons carried images of divine and holy people, but the silver objects did not. What made the silver objects divine was not just their
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materiality, but also the imagination and knowledge of the people. The materiality of the objects prompted people to seek the divine presence and understand the objects’ invisible functions — context and perception were important.

Similar approaches to Pentcheva’s were applied to silver objects by Crawley, who examined the sensual effects of objects and viewers’ perception of them. She observed that the light reflective qualities of the objects derived from their gold and silver surfaces were understood not to reflect the sun but to emit a divine light of their own. Furthermore, that because of their sensory affordances, these objects made people engage with the divine presence. Thus, she argued that these objects were produced to be sensed and their function was to help people experience the divine presence.315 In addition, she claimed that the light reflective surfaces of the objects fulfilled the liturgical purpose of being related to Christ, and the tactility of the objects helped people experience them through touch.

For both scholars, the divine presence was experienced when people engaged with the light-reflective surfaces of the objects and touched them. The objects used in the Eucharist were also tactile. Therefore, by touching these objects, people confirmed their reality by obtaining full knowledge of them. According to Crawley, to understand the divine presence and sensory affordances of objects, we should consider their multisensory effects: sight, touch, smell, hear, taste. She claimed that the material qualities of the objects invited people into this multisensory engagement. The light reflective surfaces of the objects made people look at them. When the bread was removed, the shiny surface of the paten with the cross made people want to touch it. The borders encircling the cross created a halo effect, and this light with the cross symbolised Christ. In this Eucharistic context, worshippers experienced drinking wine from the chalice by also tasting the metal surface of its rim. Using the Riha chalice as an example, Crawley argued that that engaging with the sacred inscription also enabled people to interact with Christ’s blood — which is divine presence. Similarly, people experienced the clicking sound made by a censer carried by a deacon, as well as the smell of the incense. Like censers, lights also generated a fragrance with burning oil.

Therefore, the objects created multisensory effects, and by experiencing these objects people reached the divine presence.\textsuperscript{316}

These ideas are important to discussions of the sensual affordances of objects from the Sion Treasure, which also created multisensory affordances. As Crawley noted, the clergy could experience and touch the paten (\textbf{No. 5}), and when bread was removed from it, they would see a gilded cross in the centre, which created divine light. The chalices also had multisensory affordances. Some people touched them and, while drinking wine from them, even kissed them. In this way, people experienced the material features of the objects. In addition, the censers had shining surfaces, which as Crawley observed created divine light. Therefore, it can be assumed that for some people, some of the objects from Sion Treasure were valued according to their sensual affordances. In addition to carrying wine and bread, they also created sensory engagement. People did not just experience these objects through their function, they also experienced them through touch and sight. However, these examples do not give a complete account. The multisensory affordances of these objects would have been experienced by people who touched them, but not by people who did not touch them. Therefore, the affordances of objects cannot be restricted to their tactility and visuality.

Silver objects created multisensory effects, not just with their materials, but also as a result of their function. That is, their function was not only to be touched, kissed, or to be seen by everyone. The smell of the incense and the oil fragrance from lamps could be felt by everyone. The censer was made to give the smell of incense, and it provided just smell to people, it was not experienced through touching and seeing. As it can be seen in the examination I have made in previous chapter, when a deacon carried a censer he held it with his hands and swung it between his knees. Censers were also hung on the walls and ciborium. However, this made it difficult for some people to see them, as the picture of an altar in Dumbarton Oaks taken from afar shows (\textbf{Plates: 157-158}). Therefore, the function of the censer to create a smell was more important than its tactility. For example, the mother of Symeon Stylites the Younger used a censer to burn incense and make the church full of smell while she was praying.\textsuperscript{317} This demonstrates that smell was important, and was transacted by the censer. The other objects were also important in the church. For example, the polycandela provided lighting, the chalice
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carried the blood of Christ, and the paten carried the bread which symbolised the body of Christ. Their value was as servants of the Eucharist, and perhaps their users valued these objects according to their function, as a close encounter between people and the sacred elements of bread and wine. These objects were not only valued according to their sensual affordances, such as sensing them through touching and kissing, they were also valued according to their function, such as creating a particular smell and creating divine light. And other objects such as altar table sheets, might not have been touched or seen by even the clergy, but people knew what the objects did — in this case, they covered and protected the holy altar. Similarly, objects made from bronze or ungilded materials did not create a sensory affordance, as they did not shine in the same way as gilded silver. However, they still created a sensory environment and value with their important affordances, such as lighting the church, carrying wine, and creating the smell of incense.

The most important problem and point to discuss here is how and when people reached the knowledge of divine presence and the ability of an object to create sensual effects through experiencing, touching, or seeing. Previous research into the sensual affordances of objects has not considered the importance of imagination and knowledge regarding how to sense and relate to objects. The sensual affordances of Sion objects cannot be denied, but the knowledge of the people should also be considered when discussing the value of the objects within the church. Did people know the affordances of the objects or did they perceive them after touching? Was the only function of the objects to make people reach the divine presence? My examination of the objects in Antalya and Dumbarton Oaks revealed that touching a chalice and holding it reveals the object’s characteristics, how heavy is it, and the texture which makes it tactile. However, in the museum context, this experience was not the same as that of people in the sixth century within the context of the church. Their background knowledge and the idea of seeking the divine presence through the silver material and their imagination enabled them to perceive these objects in different ways. This demonstrates that the sensual affordances of the objects were not enough to give them a biography and value as sensual objects and to cause people to experience the divine presence. Even a paten given by an important friend and used at a dining table has sensual affects. Indeed, there are many examples of silver and gold objects of quality and colour used for dining tables. So, what made the Sion objects or other silver objects used in churches different?
The context in which they were used, and the knowledge and emotions of the people who used them. Knowledge can be discussed in terms of people who engaged with the objects and also people who did not engage with them but gave them value. Thus, the value and biography of Sion objects in the church did not only come from their materials but was also formed by the social environment.

Some people did not engage with these objects, either because they were used in the sanctuary, as lighting equipment, or hung two or three meters away, which made it hard for worshippers to engage with them through touch. In these cases, the prior knowledge of worshippers about these objects was important. People’s knowledge of the objects’ functions and what they can do affected their perception. They may have known that these objects had sensual affordances without experiencing them directly. Moreover, they knew these objects were used inside the church and therefore that they were holy objects. As people’s knowledge influenced them before they had seen the objects, their perception may have remained abstract had they not touched them. Nevertheless, knowledge played an important role in forming their perception of the objects. Crawley claimed that people reached the knowledge of divine presence after sensing these objects.318 However, it is likely that they possessed some knowledge of the divine before sensing the objects.

In Byzantium, people used to approach objects and churches with their senses and imagination.319 Christians used their inner senses — imagination and knowledge — to understand concepts beyond the visible.320 Inner sense can also be defined as spiritual seeing, which is experienced by faithful people with the help of the imagination. Christians used their inner senses to reach the divine embodiment and to know God.321 According to Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, ‘to see the unseen required and other sets of eyes, the eyes of the heart’.322 This imagination and abstraction were also applied in the Eucharist. For example, in his Mystagogical Catecheses, Cyril of Jerusalem stated
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'Do not then think of the elements as mere bread and wine. Instead of judging the matter by taste, let faith give you an unwavering assurance that you have been privileged to receive the Body and Blood of Christ.' 323 This shows that Christians were encouraged to see their environment with not only their outer senses but also their inner senses. The importance of seeing with the eyes of the faith was also evident in the writings of John Chrysostom. For Chrysostom, the spiritual seeing ‘makes the unseen visible from the seen,’ and he encouraged his audience to see the objects with the ‘eyes of the spirit’. 324 The other church father who encouraged people to use their imagination was Theodore of Mopsuestia, who stated that before ordering the sacrifices, everyone should look at the objects placed on the altar, and the priest should command them to ‘lift up your minds’. 325 This also demonstrates that people were encouraged to imagine themselves in Heaven and to perceive the objects on the altar and those used for the Eucharist as holy objects.

By knowing how to approach the objects and how to sense them, Byzantine worshippers perceived them or defined them as holy, as they were used in the Eucharist, for covering the altar and for lighting the church. Thus, the Byzantines valued the objects according to their function. For example, patens and chalices were used to carry the blood and body of Christ. People who touched them felt their textures and tactility, and by using their imagination in combination with outer senses they felt that they had engaged with the divine, since these objects were holding the Eucharist. Christians also touched and kissed the holy bread as if they were kissing and touching Christ. 326 Therefore it can be asserted that the vessels of the Sion Treasure were perceived in the same way. The primary affordance of the objects was that they carried the wine and bread of the Eucharist and provided light in the church, but with the imagination and


knowledge of the people, these objects also had secondary affordances — carrying the blood and body of Christ and creating a sensory environment and lightning, therefore engaging with the divine presence.

The stories of the lives of saints also show how people valued the objects used in the Eucharist according to their knowledge. In *The Spiritual Meadow*, John Moschos told the story of playing children who decided to take Communion of the Holy Eucharist. One of them became a bishop, another became a priest, another became a deacon, and the other remained a lay person. They set out everything for the Eucharist, including a paten and chalice.³²⁷ Through the story, Moschos shows that people’s knowledge of the function of these objects came from their childhood. People in Byzantium grew up with these stories and these educations. Even without seeing or sensing these objects, they knew that holy mysteries could not be conducted without them. Thus, the story explained how these objects were valued according to their primary affordances.

Another story also told by Moschos explained the secondary affordances of the objects that came about through the people’s knowledge, rituals, and imagination. The story describes how people from a town called Romilla went to the pope in Rome and complained about their bishop, accusing him of eating from the consecrated paten. After finding out that the story was true, the pope jailed the bishop.³²⁸ This story demonstrated how the paten had been consecrated and was holy; therefore, it could only be used for the Holy Eucharist and to carry the holy bread. In terms of its material or shape it might have been used for other purposes, but in terms of people’s rituals and beliefs this object was holy and could not be used for other purposes. Knowledge of these objects as holy occurred through the education and imagination of the people. As hymns and stories have shown, Christians approached these objects with their senses. Therefore, people already knew what these objects could do and how to associate them with divine before sensing or giving value to them.

Other than the paten and chalice, the altar revetments protected the holy altar by covering it, and amphora carried the holy water to purify the hands of the priest. The censer was also important because it carried the incense and produced a pleasant fragrance inside the church. For Christians, the smell of incense symbolised Paradise.

With the fragrance of incense, people felt that they were in Paradise. Furthermore, ‘to encounter a scent was to encounter proof of a material presence’ — Christians felt that the presence of a smell indicated the presence of God.\(^{329}\) Therefore, the censer as an object used inside the church functioned as a vessel for carrying the holy incense and creating the fragrance associated with Paradise.

Polycandela and other lighting objects also had an important role inside the churches — they provided light to the church. Light was considered an important element inside the church, as it enhanced the sense of sight and also enabled people to see the light reflective qualities of other object in the church.\(^{330}\) For example, Pseudo-Dionysius wrote that light is both important for pleasing the eye and ‘provoking associations with the divine’.\(^{331}\) By equating intelligible beauty and understanding the divine with knowledge, Pseudo-Dionysius associated light with the divine. He also claimed that seeing divine light through celestial light depends on the intelligence of the viewer, stating that divine light ‘generously grants the beneficent rays of its own light to whoever views it with the eyes of intelligence.’ Furthermore, that ‘the divine light, out of generosity, never ceases to offer itself to the eyes of the mind, eyes which should seize upon it for it is always there.’\(^{332}\) Therefore, in Pseudo-Dionysius’ writings, the light symbolised God and the way people reach the divine presence.

According to Nadine Schibille, light had an important role in Byzantine aesthetic experience. For example, the marble and light-reflective mosaics in Hagia Sophia created perceptible lights. Schibille also stated that Byzantine people were taught how to associate the light with the divine and how to perceive Hagia Sophia.\(^{333}\) In addition, she used two Byzantine authors who wrote about Hagia Sophia to show that ekphrasis in writing was important for Byzantine people’s understanding of the functions of art objects and buildings. Through ekphrasis, people could use their minds and imagination to see and understand objects. Ekphrasis showed people how to look at the objects and perceive them. That is, it made the objects intelligible.\(^{334}\) In both writings, light was
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important to understanding the significance and beauty of the building. These two writings call listeners or readers to use their minds and intelligence to reach the divine presence inside the building. These writings show that Byzantine audiences of art in churches perceived objects using their mind and knowledge. As light was considered important to reaching the divine presence and perceiving art objects, these objects contributed to the lighting of the church. They filled the church with light. In addition, the gilded surfaces of other objects such as patens and chalices created the radiance of light. People experienced this divine light with their intelligence and their knowledge of what light meant for them and how they could use their senses to experience it.

The importance of people’s knowledge and their perception of silver can also be seen in two miracles. In *The Miracles of Saint Thecla*, when the future bishop Dexianus removed the gold and silver treasures from St Thecla’s shrine at Seleucia in Isauria to inside the city for safekeeping during a brigand attack, the saint was furious and accused him of 'having robbed me of my decoration'. This story also reveals another way that objects were valued inside the church: St Thecla perceived them as decorative in addition to their religious values.

The following passage is from the *Miracles of Saint Demetrius*. When describing his silver ciborium, St Demetrius also mentioned the silver cross its dome: ‘At the very summit flashes forth the trophy that is victorious over death: by its silver composition it amazes our corporeal eyes, while by bringing Christ to mind, it illuminates with grace the eyes of the intellect.’ This description highlights the importance of light that brings Christ to mind in ways that only the eyes of the intellect can see. In this way, it provides an important summary of the Byzantine views of the Sion objects. These objects were valued according to their material affordances and people’s knowledge of them or of how to view and see them.

---


Examining the transactions of objects also requires discussion about the importance of inscriptions to the biography of objects in the church. Inscriptions were significant because they revealed the wishes of their donors. Some scholars have argued that when these dedicative inscriptions were read by the faithful, they would admire the donation which would help donors’ wishes to be perpetuated. In the previous chapter, I discussed the possibility of these inscriptions being read and their value to donors. So, in order to avoid overlap between the chapters, in this chapter I build the discussions around investigating what inscriptions meant to worshippers inside the church. Whether read by chance or intentionally, how did inscriptions affect the value of objects and people’s perceptions of objects in church? And how did people perceive the inscriptions when they could not read?

As I discussed in the previous chapter, people may have read inscriptions intentionally or by chance; nevertheless, it is possible to say that they were aware that these objects were gifts to God, and that these objects were used for salvation and protection. Reading the inscriptions may have been educational for them, and they may have admired the donations and perceived the objects in a different way. That is, the biography of the objects for them was not just vessels to be used inside the church or to help worshippers reach the divine presence, they were also objects that could be a gift to God.

Both perceptions might have encouraged people who saw and read the inscriptions to give gifts to God, and to see gift-giving as a pathway to salvation, as the inscriptions showed that they could achieve salvation, forgiveness, and protection from God through these objects. However, the audiences of the big public inscriptions and the small, more private inscriptions on silverware were surely not the same size. This suggests that the inscriptions on the objects were not intended for everyone. As I discussed in Chapter
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4, donors gave these inscriptions to God, the formulas were addressed to God, and some people inside the church read these by chance.

What the inscriptions on church silver could do was to explain the conceptual rather than the practical functions of the objects. Therefore, it can be said that for those who read them, the inscriptions increased the performativity of the object. Inscriptions made the inanimate object used inside the church into an animate object which transferred the words of the donor to God. In addition, the sensual effects of the objects which let people interact with the divine was their practical function but combining this with their conceptual function described through the inscriptions completed their transaction. For example, people would have known what to experience before touching an object, as they were taught about the importance of materiality through hymns and prayers. People who were illiterate and not close enough to read the inscriptions may have only considered the objects’ decoration, which they saw as visual signs. Thus, even though it was used in the context of the church which already made it religious, the combination of decoration and inscription made an object more powerful even if a viewer was unable to understand the words. For example, nielloed inscriptions used precious materials to attract viewers. Inscriptions written with other styles also used decorative elements. For example, they were bordered with two lines and the individual letters were written as decorative figures. This made the objects more elaborate, and even if a viewer did not know the name of the donor or the meaning of the inscription, they may have predicted what was written on the object or perceived it as significant powerful letter without knowing its meaning or what was written on it. Therefore, even though they could not read, the materiality of the object and its inscription was evident. This was further supported with people’s prior knowledge of the function of the objects. For Byzantines, the objects would carry holy mysteries, enlighten the church, create sensual environments, and also can be used as gifts for God.

Neuroscience and anthropological theories are important to understanding the significance of prior knowledge and its effect on the perception of art objects. Maihoub argued that previous knowledge of an object enables people to make interpretations, which affects their aesthetic experience of it. Knowledge of an artefact can be defined
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as the understanding of what it does, which influences the audience’s perception of it, since they already know its purpose. Maihoub also suggested that the sensual experience of objects changes their aesthetic values and the way people see them, but this depends on people’s knowledge of how to perceive them. Moreover, Maruska Svasek claimed that ‘sensory experience is often already influenced by additional knowledge about the object and its reported status, and by the spatial setting in which it is used or displayed’. This theory is notable, since it gives important insight into how people valued objects in the church setting using their own knowledge. Functional aesthetic theories also posit that ‘the aesthetic appreciation of an artefact can be influenced by knowledge of the artefact’s purpose’. From the perspective of knowledge and understanding what an artefact does, objects could be appreciated according to their sensory affordances and also their functions within the church. The theory of knowledge and aesthetic judgement is based on the ideas of Immanuel Kant, who claimed that the aesthetic judgement of an artefact is conceptually rich, because it involves having knowledge of the artefact’s purpose. Based on this argument of artefact aesthetic and knowledge, scholars have argued that the conception of ‘functional beauty’ is important, because it involves the understanding of what the object does, and people makes their judgement on objects according to this understanding. These functional aesthetic theories underpin the ideas presented in this thesis, that the Sion objects were valued according to their function, and then people approached them using their knowledge of what the objects could do. For example, when a person inside the church was situated far from the paten, he was not able to see its visuality, could not read its inscriptions, and could not touch it. However, he knew that the paten was carrying the body of Christ and doing important and holy work. Therefore, their understanding of the object was not gained through the use of the senses, but through their imagination.
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Neurological theories have also confirmed that ‘the perceptual system drives primarily from an interaction with environment and thereafter develops according to accumulating knowledge and emotional influence and memory’.\(^{346}\) Thus, an important point to take from these theories is that knowledge is important because it explains how brains respond to sensual experience. For example, smell might mean different things to different people, such as disgust, joy, or memory. But inside the church, people knew what the smell of incense meant, and this smell affected them according to this knowledge. William Seeley gave an important explanation about how prior knowledge and context affects understanding of object usage. He argued that prior knowledge about the shapes and functions of objects leads people to use their assumptions and imaginations to perceive them and give them conceptual meaning.\(^{347}\) Therefore, it can be argued that the Sion objects both functioned with their material affordances and with the knowledge and imagination of the people. It is the way that people valued the objects relative to the objects they wanted to see. Indeed, Tim Ingold asserted that the beauty of a sculpture cannot just be made depending on its material, it also depends on how people like to see it.\(^{348}\)

Chris Gosden made important claims regarding knowledge of how to sense objects, stating that ‘the locus of sensory activity is as much cultural as bodily, so that various cultures apprehend the world in different ways’.\(^{349}\) Therefore, when sensory experiences reach the brain from the body, the sensory experience is valued according to the knowledge of the viewer, which has been culturally and environmentally developed. According to Gosden, ‘each culture creates its own sensory environment, both physically through constructing a material world with its own set of sensory properties and culturally through emphasising and valuing certain types of sense impressions over others’.\(^{350}\) By relying on these ideas, Byzantines also created their sensory environment. They knew how to sense the objects or how to approach them with their senses. For example, as described at the beginning of this section, the experience of a person examining and touching the object in a museum was very different from that of a person touching and seeing the object in a church, which showcases the effect of environment
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and background knowledge. This explains why people in the church in Early Byzantium perceived these objects differently. For them, the value of the objects was not just associated with their material or sensory affordances, but was informed by their own knowledge. The patens and chalices could carry bread and wine to a dining table, but what made them different within the church was the importance of the wine and bread they carried and people’s knowledge of this importance.

According to Knappett, cognition cannot be restricted to the brain, but ‘is invariably drawn into the body and external world’. He defined the interrelationships between the brain, body, knowledge, and environment as networks which cannot be separated from each other and which together define human cognition. The brain is a dynamic system that is affected by both the body and the environment and combines these with knowledge to perceive the world around it. Knappett’s example of the mailbox provides a good explanation of how culture and environment affect knowledge of how to use objects and how people use this knowledge to give value to an object: ‘The reason people use mailboxes rather than litter bins to mail letters is not solely to do with the physical form of the receptacle; the user possesses cultural information such that he/she knows the letters will be emptied from the box and eventually delivered.’ Knappett’s ideas can also be used to understand how the cognition of Byzantine people was developed — within the social and cultural environment. People inside the church did not value the Sion objects according to their physical forms, they valued them through the cognition developed within the cultural and religious environment. They possessed the cultural knowledge that the paten inside the church should be used for carrying the bread of the Eucharist, which is the body of Christ. As Moschos’ story of the children demonstrated, Byzantine people were culturally aware that these objects were important to the holy mysteries. They learnt how to use their senses to perceive the objects and also what these objects could do within the cultural environment.

Therefore, according to these theories and neurological examinations, it can be said that the sensory characteristics of the materials were not the only features to give the objects
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value. Environment, culture, and knowledge of the objects were also important to the perceived value of the objects. Byzantine people lived in an environment which gave these objects invisible values, and but which also valued the senses of touching, seeing, hearing, and smelling. People learnt how to use these objects and how to sense them from the lives of saints, hymns, homilies, psalms, and sermons. Worshippers would have gained understanding of readings during the liturgy. A number of people in Byzantium were taught language, grammar, and how to read the Psalms and the New Testament.

7.2 Experiencing objects with emotions and senses in the church context

Although it has been discussed by many scholars, it is important in this study to examine church atmosphere, in order to understand how context affects the perception of objects and their biography. The context made the objects used in Byzantine church different from the objects used at the dining table. The inscriptions, decorations, and sensual affordances of the objects all performed differently within the church context and according to the different knowledge of the different members of the congregation. Considering the sense, the church also created the sensory affordances in its environment. Therefore, the sensual affordances created by objects are not the only features to examine when seeking to understand the biography of the objects. Marbles, mosaics, and other revetments imbued the church with heavenly and corporeal light. The sound and echoes of the church were also important for hearing. The religious services and the Eucharist made people activate and use all their senses. The objects and the atmosphere of the church worked together to create sensory affordances and prompted people to want to sense as much as possible inside the church. In this way, perception of the Sion vessels was just one of the processes of sensibility that occurred in the church context. I have discussed how the eyes of the faith and eyes of the intellect perceived what was invisible within the imagination. The church environment itself also
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affected the knowledge, emotions and imagination of the people inside it. The church was a place in which people congregated and worshipped, hymns were sung, psalms were read, and prayers were made. Therefore, it affected people’s emotions and their approach to the objects it contained. When describing the church of Hagia Sophia, Paul the Silentiary observed: ‘everything is clothed in beauty, everything fills the eye with wonder’.  

When people entered the church, their five senses were activated. They heard the hymns and music, they touched the marble, and smelt the incense, and they saw the light. Byzantine worshippers inside the church used their senses, they were active. They also touched icons and marbles to sense them, and may have even kissed them. Indeed, John Chrysostom mentioned kissing the doors in his sermons: ‘do you not see how many of you kiss even the porch of this temple, some stooping down, some gasping it with their hand and putting their hand to their mouth’. Using this example, Chrysostom tried to explain how the eyes of the worshippers inside the church seek the divine presence, but that sight alone is not enough, and worshippers must also use their other senses to reach the divine. He claimed that ‘through these gates and doors Christ entered into us, whensoever we communicate. Who partake of the mysteries understand what I say’. The church context also enabled people to reach the heavenly realm from the earthly realm, and it was believed that ‘the church is earthly heaven in which super celestial God dwells and walks about’. As Liz James explained, sight was not the only sense people used inside the church — the censer and burning oils generated smells, and people touched icons, marble, and other objects when they could. Touch also made people active inside the church — it confirmed to them that they were inside the holy place and experiencing it. Sound was another important element inside the church, in which hymns and prayer echoed.

---

359 Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire: 312-1453, Sources and Documents*, 89.
360 Andrew Louth, 'Experiencing the Liturgy in Byzantium', *Experiencing Byzantium* 18 (2013): 84.
361 Caseau, 'Experiencing the Sacred', 69.
365 James, 'Senses and Sensibility in Byzantium', 525-30.
During the Eucharist, people inside the church used their imagination and senses to reach out to God. Every part of the church was holy for them, and every part was a way to reach the divine. The senses in particular were used by people to reach the invisible.366

Pseudo-Dionysius wrote extensively on the role of imagination and perception of God inside the church and in the holy mysteries. He stated that:

Approaching the holy activity of the sacred office we come closer to those beings who are superior to us. We imitate as much as we can their abiding, unwavering and sacred constancy, and we thereby come to look up to the blessed and ultimately divine ray of Jesus himself. 367

For Pseudo-Dionysius, symbols and imagination allowed people to communicate with the divine. However, these symbols were not holy in themselves, but they were holy within the liturgy. Outside the liturgy and outside the church context, even bread and wine were not holy — they became important during the service.368 This example illustrates the importance of context and how the Sion objects were valued inside the church. It also explains again how people approached and behaved in different environments.

In his Church Mystagogy, Maximus the Confessor noted the importance of knowledge and symbols: ‘the entrance of people into the church with the bishop represents the conversion of the unfaithful from faithlessness to faith and from sin and to recognition of god as well as the passage of the faithful from vice and ignorance to virtue and knowledge.’369 For Maximus, every movement and every part of the church had meaning, which people can reach with knowledge: ‘The mind arrives at contemplation when it is moved by wisdom, by contemplation to knowledge, by knowledge to enduring knowledge, by enduring knowledge to truth.’370 This lecture is important to understanding how people perceived the holy church and objects inside it. As he noted,
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everything inside the church had meaning. Therefore, the Sion objects also had meaning, given by the people inside the church through their spiritual seeing combined with their knowledge. This emphasises the importance of context: these objects functioned differently inside the church from inside private houses. Thus, in addition to perceiving these objects according to background knowledge created by their social environment, people’s perception of these objects was also affected by the church environment. This illustrates how knowledge, emotion, and imagination affected people’s perception inside the church.

Thus, context changed and informed people’s cognition. When people came to the knowledge that God dwelt inside the church and it was a heavenly place, it changed the way they perceived things inside it. Although they did not touch and see the silver objects, they experienced them differently from how they experienced them on the dining table. With regard to the knowledge of being inside the church, John of Damascus stated that the form and presence of something can be understood by the combination of our mind and sight. When these are combined with the other senses and experienced, ‘we thus come to the knowledge’.371 This highlights the importance of knowledge gained prior to sensing objects to reaching the divine presence. People were already aware of the divine presence before they touched or did not touch the objects. They were aware that the divine was already inside the church and they were experiencing it, since the Christian church was perceived as a place which combined the earthly and heavenly worlds; that is, the church was perceived to include both the visible and the invisible world.372 And people reached the understanding of this invisible world via their inner senses and spiritual eyes.

In this context, understanding people’s knowledge and emotions is important to understanding their approach to the objects and other elements inside the church. What made the objects defined and valued differently from the objects on the dining table was that they were inside the church where God dwells, and people were aware of that.


When they looked at these objects, they perceived them with their emotions and the knowledge of being present in earthly Heaven.

In her article, Pentcheva examined the multisensory aesthetics of Hagia Sophia, mainly based on marble and gold and their psychological effects on the spectator according to Byzantine texts and ekphrasis. She argued that aesthetics, etymology, and liturgy should be interpreted together. An interior of marble and gold provides shimmer and reflection, and these marbles acoustically reflect sounds. In Hagia Sophia, the faithful moved between seeing the reflection of lights on the marble and hearing the acoustic hymns and combined this with the taste of wine and environment of the Eucharist.

‘Multisensorial energy is activated in the Eucharistic liturgy through the burning of incense, the oblation procession, chanting, and, finally, the consumption of the bread and wine transformed into the body and blood of Christ’. This energy enabled people to experience the Holy Spirit inside the church, and this affected their psychology.373

Scientific research has revealed the importance of cognitive and emotional perception to understanding the aesthetics of art. According to Ann Marie Barry, ‘aesthetics, neurology confirms, is a matter of proportion and transcendent emotional response’:374

Aesthetics which might be defined as the pleasure we find in the experience of art, is based in this reward system and represents a level of pleasure that involves all of the brain’s basic systems to some degree: left and right hemispheres, emotional–cognitive path-ways and processes, and neurological networks.375

Furthermore, the environment people interact with, as well as knowledge, emotional influence and memory, affects the perception system. The acts of the brain evolve with the environment we experience.376 For example, the smell of food can remind us of childhood and may give us pleasure or hearing a song could make us either sad or happy. It is also affected by our experience of the environment around us.377

Experimental neurological research has proved that context has a significant impact on
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emotions, motivations, and cognitive stimulations which influence how people perceive objects.\textsuperscript{378}

In Byzantium, these emotional and cognitive pathways inside the church were enhanced by other aspects, such as using all senses and having a knowledge of being inside a holy place, and made people give these objects different biographies. Hearing the hymns and smelling the incense or fragments of oils may have been pleasing and made people feel as though they were in Heaven. Therefore, in this environment full of holy and divine experiences, although people did not touch and read the inscriptions of the objects, they perceived them in different ways. They became holy objects inside the holy place.

Although they may not have engaged with the objects, people engaged with the sensory affordances of other elements inside the church. As the primary sources and studies presented in this chapters have indicated, the people already knew the divine presence inside the church. Therefore, although they did not touch the Sion silverware, the atmosphere inside the church changed their perception and they viewed the objects as holy.

These silver objects were then gifts from donors to God, transacting eucharistic, and lighting purposes, and they were defined as holy objects since they carried out holy transactions. This indicates that the biography and value of objects improved through contextual dimensions and interaction with people. It was dependent on the functionality of the object and its interaction with people within the context. So, this recontextualization helped objects gain different biographies. That is, objects gained biographies when they moved from context to context and they did not lose their previous biographies.

\textsuperscript{378} David Brieber et al., 'Art in Time and Space: Context Modulates the Relation between Art Experience and Viewing Time', 1.
8. CONCLUSION

This thesis has argued that the silver objects from the Sion Treasure had different biographies and multivalencies in different contexts. These range from their production and their usage as gifts to God to their usage inside the church. In these contexts, their biographies were determined through their relationships with people: the ways in which they were seen and used. This relationship between objects and people was based on intentions, knowledge and opportunity of people and the functionality of the objects themselves. Moreover, it was a relationship affected by the contexts in which the silverware was used, and the culture in which the users lived.

This thesis is founded on theories of material culture, the cultural biography of objects, neuroscience and art, and these concepts are supported with material from primary sources, mainly hagiographical writings and hymns. My contribution has been to take these ideas and apply them to a specific example; to explore how the actual materials of the Sion Treasure might have affected people, and how the aims for the silver objects might affect the ways in which they were used. These vessels influenced people through how they perceived and used objects, and the context in turn that shaped the vessels’ performance. For example, inside the church where the holy mysteries were performed. This discussion was elaborated on with stories from the life of Theodore of Sykeon, and the history of Theophylact Symocatta, which demonstrated that for liturgical and sacred purposes, objects and their composite materials had to be pure in spiritual terms. These stories also showed what people expected from these objects. A key point of the thesis was to develop the understanding that the value of objects cannot be understood by looking at them from a single perspective. These objects functioned in multiple contexts, having different meanings and values for different people.

The first part of the thesis examined the objects in detail, and discussed their costs and circulation. This part is important because it provides up-to-date and reliable information on the Sion silverware in both Dumbarton Oaks and Antalya for the first time. I produced a new list concerning the objects from Dumbarton Oaks and the Antalya Museum. It also describes objects from the Geneva and Hewett collections, although these objects and fragments have not been examined first-hand by the author of this thesis. I discussed how silver and silverware circulated in Byzantium, and the
extent to which they were accessible to people generally. These were important points when considering the commercial value and market for silver. Looking at the decorations and forms of objects indicated the value of decorations for producers, donors and those in churches who saw and interacted with the vessels. The descriptions given explored how far the inscriptions provided information about the functions of objects; as well as the formulae used on the vessels in the Treasure. This information indicated that the objects were given to God, and how the donors expected spiritual returns from God in exchange for their gifts.

This analysis has added to our knowledge of the Treasure. The weights of chalices, standing lamp, altar table sheets, amphora from Antalya Museum were not studied and presented before. Without measuring the weights of the objects, it would not be possible to calculate the total weight of silver from the church of Sion Monastery. Including all fragments, but not the pieces in the three private collections, the approximate weight of silver used for objects from Sion Monastery is 125,873.4 gr.

I also matched for the first time the fragments of 3 rectangular polycandela (Nos. 14, 16 and 18) between the two collections. So, for example, the fragment of rectangular polycandelon (No. 16), (DO number: 65.1.7) was assumed to be a match with the Antalya piece (Museum No. 1031). However, when their measures are considered, the fragment in Dumbarton Oaks actually matches Antalya fragment (Museum No. 1030). I was also able to add two new objects to the catalogue: a chalice (No. 27) and the base of a candlestick (No.52), and to show that there were actually three, not two, book covers. Where previous publications suggest that the amphora in Dumbarton Oaks had ram’s-head handles, when I examined it, there were no traces of handles, not even cracking. This indicates that the ram’s head handles which for part of the Treasure must have belonged to a different object. It now seems that there were 54 objects in the Treasure. Most of the objects, such as chalices, ewer and standing lamps were folded and rolled up. My examination showed that they were folded intentionally, possibly to be fitted inside some sort of box or case for safekeeping during or before burial of objects.

I have also presented detailed information about the decorations of objects which were not presented in detail before, notably the censers, amphorae and polycandela which were not previously presented in detail in terms of their decoration and their thickness. This study also gives new information on the height of the inscriptions which enabled
me to discuss visibility of objects. From the silver stamps, I argued, in contrast to earlier
discussions, that it was possible that silver might have been sold to silversmiths either
directly from miners or when they were approved by the administrators.

The aim of Part Two was to examine the silver vessels in three different contexts in
their life courses. Questions arose about what happens when we examine the life of
these objects from their production; how their biography changes through their lives;
how, if they gained new biographies they become multivalent and the roles of the
objects in different contexts as indicated in their production, for their producers they
served as a means for earning money and fulfilling the demands of the market. In the
hands of donors, these objects functioned as gifts to God. When used inside the church,
they did not lose their value, either as commodities, or as gifts to God. They were holy
objects to be used inside the Eucharist, covering the holy altar and lighting the church.

Chapter 5 examined the objects in their production context as commodities and
demonstrated how they functioned as commercial objects. Their decorations and form
functioned for producers, fulfilling the demands of the donors. In order to explain this, I
explained how the demand for sacred silver improved and explained the culture of gift
giving to God in Early Byzantine Christianity. The opportunity of donors to buy objects,
and the functions of objects to be given to church and as gifts to God created the market
for silver. This information showed that these objects were also selected specifically to
be apt gifts for God. Some donors gave the churches coins as endowments or funds to
build churches, whereas others chose to give silver items, aware the church might melt
them down for cash later. This market affects the production of objects. Producers
considered that these objects had to be sufficient to use inside the church, and had to
fulfil the needs of the churches. This can explain that human agency, material agency
and context affected the production of objects. Human agency in production can be
explained as relating to the knowledge of producers, the intention of producers and
donors, and the opportunity of donors to buy these objects. Material agency in this
context can be explained as silver being used as a proper material to be used inside the
church and they gave a chance to donors to give these objects as gifts to God. The
context here is the production process and market. Context both affects the value of
objects and how they should be, as well as the market and the producers.
Chapter 6 discussed the value of objects to donors. They were not valued as commodities in the hands of donors. They were gifts to God. This chapter also indicated that human and material agency is important to establish the biography of objects. In addition, the context of the church affected this interrelationship. Donors intended to use these objects as gifts to God, they inscribed them and wrote their wishes on these objects. These objects were gifts to God that carried the wishes of donors inside the church. The functionality of the objects to be used inside the church, and the intentions of donors to use them as gifts to God, enabled objects to gain biography as gifts.

The final chapter of the thesis explained that the people inside the church valued these objects differently from how they were valued by donors and producers. For some people reading the inscriptions the objects might have been valued as gifts to God. Whereas, for others, who experienced them with their senses, they might have been valued according to their sensual affordances. However, in general these objects were valued by their function as holy items inside the church. This perception of objects by people as holy happened with their knowledge and emotions. Thanks to neurological theories on cognition and its effects on the perception of objects, and also some primary sources, such as the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Pseudo-Dionysius and the *Mystagogy* of Maximus the Confessor, it could be explained that people experienced the objects inside the church differently from the objects used outside the church. This chapter also indicated that human and material agency and context were important factors affecting the object’s biography. The context affected people and changed how they approached the objects; the context also changed how the objects were used.

Part 2 was the main part of this thesis because it brought a new approach to the silver. Previously the Treasure had been catalogued and analysed in terms of its materiality: materials, decoration, what the inscriptions say. My approach was to argue that these silver objects had multiple biographies and values. The biography of the Sion Treasure silver vessels changed inside the different contexts in which they existed and were used, and within those contexts, in their interrelationships with different people. The intentions and expectations of people also changed the biography of the objects. They started as commodities but continued to be used as gifts, a role which they gained as a result of their functionality and through the intentions of donors. They functioned in different ways inside the church, because they were used inside a holy place. People approached the silverware with their senses, emotions and most importantly with their
knowledge about these objects. These together enabled them to see the silverware as a collection of sacred objects, different from the plates used inside private homes. I also showed that human agency, material agency and context are interrelated and cannot be separated from each other when examining an object’s biography. Knowledge and intention of the producer affected the making of the objects, as did the quality of the material and the social environment. Inside a culture of Christian gift giving, donors perceived the Sion objects as materials to be used for forgiveness, salvation and protection. They might help procure the salvation of patrons, perpetuating their memory and names. Moreover, inside the church, the silver vessels gained additional biographies: they were objects to be used for holy mysteries, for lighting the church, for the protection of the holy altar; and to shield and highlight holy books. They also had a role to help people to experience the divine.

This thesis has explained the biographies of objects in early Byzantium through their usage inside the church in early Byzantium. However, their biographies did not end inside the church. These objects were buried for safekeeping, and this is another part of their biographies. These show that people gave importance to their objects and hoped that they might have used them again. They have even collected the nails which were used on altar table sheets. In the 20th century the silverware was found and perceived as a collection of objects to be sold to and by collectors. They could earn money: they were turned once more into commodities. Now they are displayed inside museum cases as ‘works of art’, in a context which people see them from 21st-century eyes and cannot even touch them or understand their real value. In the 21st century, their biography and functions are objects to be displayed in the museums and attract tourists (this is true for the Antalya Museum). The silver constantly gains new biographies from century to century.379

To examine the object’s biography, it is necessary to consider the roles undertaken according to human and material agency and context. By taking this approach and focusing on the multivalence of the silverware, my thesis looked differently at the sixth-

379 The further study about the objects’ future biographies could not be done in this thesis because, there were not enough evidences to discuss these issues and there is also an excavation needed to be done which takes 3 or 5 years to reach evidence.
century silver, emphasising the different values and narratives around it held by its contemporaries.
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APPENDIX
## TABLE 1: OBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>MUSEUM INV. NO</th>
<th>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</th>
<th>MEASUREMENTS</th>
<th>INSCRIPTION</th>
<th>DONORS</th>
<th>STAMPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ANT. 1020</td>
<td>SILVER, Circular dish with foot. Centre: Eight-armed gilded Christogram. Rim: decorated with vine leaves and gilded with gold. In good condition, small crack on the rim. (Plates: 1-3).</td>
<td>Diam. 61 cm; diam foot 1.6 cm; Wt: 5400 g. <strong>Letters</strong>: H. 17-17.5 mm; <strong>Thickness</strong>: Rim: 2 mm, Body: 4 mm; <strong>Height</strong>: (From bottom to top): 6 cm.</td>
<td>Niello inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ANT. 1021</td>
<td>SILVER, Circular Dish with foot. Centre: Gilded Cross. Rim: gilded cusped and undecorated border. In good condition. (Plates: 4 and 5).</td>
<td>Diam: 77.5 cm, foot: 1.9 cm; Wt: 8000 g. <strong>Letters</strong>: H. 25-26 mm. <strong>Thickness</strong>: Rim: 3 mm. Body: 6 mm.</td>
<td>Engraved inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td>For the memory of Maria</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>DO 63.36.1</td>
<td>SILVER, Circular dish with foot. Centre: Gilded six-armed Christogram. Rim: Gilded vine leaves and Sasanian palmette decoration. In good condition. (Plates: 8 and 9).</td>
<td>Diam: 60.5 cm. Weight: 5.200 g. Letters: 17-18 mm. Thickness Rim: 2 mm, Body: 4 mm</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>DO 63.36.2</td>
<td>SILVER, circular dish with foot. Centre: Gilded cross. Rim: fluted and gilded border. In good condition. (Plate: 10).</td>
<td>Diam: 58 cm weight: 4,537 g Letters: 16-17 mm. Thickness Rim: 2 mm, Body: 4 mm.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td>Angelous Roufínos (For the Memory)</td>
<td>Weight Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>DO 63.36.3</td>
<td>SILVER, circular dish with foot. Centre: Gilded cross. Rim: fluted and gilded border. In good condition, displayed with asterisk in Dumbarton Oaks. (Plates: 11-13).</td>
<td>Diam: 58.5 cm Wt: 4.234 g Letters: 16-17 mm. Thickness Rim: 2 mm, Body: 4 mm. Niello inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td>(For the memory of John and his daughter)</td>
<td>weight Marks 13 pounds 1 ounce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>POLYCANDERON</td>
<td>ANT. 1051</td>
<td>SILVER. Cruciform. Designed for Holding 12 lamps. Decorated with dolphins flanking holes and foliate design. In good condition. (Plates: 14-17)</td>
<td>57x57 cm. wt.: 2800 gr. Letters: 9-11 mm. Thickness: 2.5-4 mm. Niello inscription and openwork monogram. Monogram is on the centre and surrounded by an inscription.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial stamps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON</td>
<td>DO 63.36.6 and ANT. 1033, 1031 and 1028.</td>
<td>SILVER. rectangular with tri-lobed end pieces. Paired dolphins decoration. Designed for holding 14 lamps. 6 detached pieces, 3 in DO, 3 in Antalya Nos: 1033, 1031, 1028. (Plates: 44-50).</td>
<td>Wt. 2,562.5 g. (Including Antalya fragments), L. 54 cm, W. 31 cm (due to loss of some fragments). Letters: 1-1.2 cm. Thickness: 3-6 mm.</td>
<td>Niello inscription and openwork monogram. Monogram is on the centre and surrounded by an inscription.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial stamps, (3 in DO fragments 2 in Antalya Fragment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Catalogue No</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Museum Inv. No</td>
<td>Material, Form and Condition</td>
<td>Measurements</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>Stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON</td>
<td>DO.65.1.7 and ANT. 1030</td>
<td>SILVER. rectangular with semi-circular end pieces. Foliate design decoration. Designed for holding 12 lamps. 9 detached pieces. Central rectangle, 1 semi-circular end piece, 5 fragments for semi-circular end piece, and 1 fragment of lateral rim. Can be completed with lateral rim in Antalya No. 1030. (Plates: 57-63).</td>
<td>42.5x26.4 cm, wt. 1759 g Letters: 1-1.2 cm. Thickness: 3-6 mm</td>
<td>Niello inscription and openwork monogram. Monogram is on the centre and surrounded by an inscription.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>4 imperial stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON</td>
<td>DO.65.1.8</td>
<td>SILVER. rectangular with semi-circular and pieces. Paired dolphins decoration. Designed for holding 12 lamps. 3 detached pieces. Central rectangle and 2 joining fragments of lateral rim. Other pieces are missing. (Plate: 64)</td>
<td>27.5x20 cm; Wt. 981 g Letters: 1-1.2 cm. Thickness: 3-6 mm</td>
<td>Niello inscription and openwork monogram. Monogram is on the centre and surrounded by an inscription.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>1 imperial stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CENSER</td>
<td>DO. 65.1.5</td>
<td>SILVER. Hexagonal. Foot supported by 4 peacocks. Each square decorated with medallions of Christ, St. Peter and St. Paul. In good condition. (Plates: 76-80).</td>
<td>H. (with rings and feet), 15 cm; diam (corner to corner) 20. 2 cm, (side to side), 17.7 cm, wt. 1725 g. Letters: 5-6 mm, Thickness; Rim: 5 mm Body: 1.2 mm.</td>
<td>Niello inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>DO.63.36.19</td>
<td>SILVER. Incomplete. Only flattened bowl preserved. (Plates: 81).</td>
<td>Wt. 273 g, height was not measured.</td>
<td>unscribed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>DO.79.8</td>
<td>SILVER. Only flattened and folded bowl preserved. (Plates: 82 and 83).</td>
<td>Diam. 22.5 cm; wt. 222 g. Letters: 1.2-1.4 cm. Thickness: Rim: 2 mm, Interior of bowl: .0.5-0.7 mm. Height was not measured.</td>
<td>Engraved inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>DO.65.1.11</td>
<td>SILVER. Hemispherical bowl. Only bowl and knob of foot preserved. (Plate: 84).</td>
<td>H. (bowl) 10.2 cm; diam 17 cm; wt. 341 g. Thickness: 2 mm rim, 0.4-0.7 body.</td>
<td>Engraved inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>DO.63.36.20</td>
<td>SILVER. Broad cup. Only bowl is preserved. Decorated with two engraved crosses. (Plate: 85).</td>
<td>H. 10.5 cm, Diam. 15.5 cm; Wt. 257 g</td>
<td>uninscribed</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>ANT. 1043</td>
<td>SILVER. Bowl of the chalice is preserved. Foot is lost. No decoration. (Plate: 86-89).</td>
<td>H. 9.5 cm; Diam. (rim)16 cm, wt. 500 g. Letters: 8-9 mm. thickness: rim:2 mm, body: 0.5 mm.</td>
<td>Pointillé Inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>ANT. 1036-1</td>
<td>SILVER. Bowl of the chalice is preserved. Foot is lost. Decorated with two engraved crosses. (Plates: 90-91).</td>
<td>H.14 cm; Diam. (rim) 22.5 cm; Wt. 930 gr. Letters: 11 mm; Thickness: rim 4 mm, body 1.2 mm.</td>
<td>Engraved inscription encircling the rim.</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>ANT. 1036-2</td>
<td>SILVER. Broad body, conical foot. Body and foot both preserved, but some fragments are lost. Two engraved crosses. (Plates: 92-93).</td>
<td>H. 32.5 cm; Diam(rim) 22.5 cm, (foot) 12 cm; wt. 1,040 g</td>
<td>uninscribed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AMPHORA</td>
<td>DO 65.1.4</td>
<td>SILVER. Fluted at neck and base. 2 fragments, body and rim. Rim: fluted decoration. Body: foliate design decoration.(Plates: 94-96).</td>
<td>H. 41.5 cm, wt. 2.954 gr. Letters, 1.5 cm. Thickness; Rim: 2 mm, Body, 1mm Foot, 4mm.</td>
<td>Niello inscription encircling the body of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>AMPHORA</td>
<td>AN. 1049 and 1039</td>
<td>SILVER. Broken in 3 pieces. 1 fragment is missing. Probably completed by the piece in London, Hewett Collection. Foliate design decoration. (Plates: 97-99).</td>
<td>H. 30 cm, wt. 1350 g. Letters, 1.5 cm. Thickness; Rim: 2 mm, Body, 1mm Foot, 4mm.</td>
<td>Niello inscription encircling the body of object. The missing letters are in the fragment which complete this object in Antalya no. 1039.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>EWER</td>
<td>DO 63.36.14</td>
<td>SILVER, flattened and folded. (Plate: 100).</td>
<td>H. 36 cm, wt: 822 gr, Thickness; Rim: 2 mm</td>
<td>uninscribed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>DO. 63.36.15</td>
<td>SILVER. Possibly cup shaped. Flattened and rolled up. (Plate: 101).</td>
<td>Wt. 1,170.5 gr</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>DO. 63.36.16</td>
<td>SILVER. Possibly cup shaped. Flattened and rolled up. (Plate: 102).</td>
<td>Wt. 1,291 gr</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>DO. 63.36.17</td>
<td>SILVER. Cup shaped body and ring foot. Body: two engraved crosses. Foot: acanthus leaf Decoration. (Plates: 103-105).</td>
<td>H. 18.5 cm; Diam. Rim 17.2-18.4 cm diam foot 9.7-10.4 cm; Wt. 1,159 gr. Letters 1.1 cm. Thickness: 3. mm.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial Stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>ANT. 1050 and 1042</td>
<td>SILVER. Cup shaped body and ring foot. 2 detached pieces, foot and body. Body: two engraved crosses. Foot: acanthus leaf Decoration. (Plates: 106-107).</td>
<td>H. 18.5 cm; Diam. (rim) 17.5 cm, (foot) 10 cm; wt 1200 gr. Letters 1.1 cm. Thickness 3. mm</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>3 imperial stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>DO 63.36.25 and 63.36.21</td>
<td>silver. Hemispherical bowl decorated with inverted hearts. With squat-stemmed foot. This lamp can be used as both suspension and standing. Some inverted hearts lost. (Plates: 108 and 109).</td>
<td>H. 15.5 cm; Diam. (rim) 18 cm; Diam. (foot) 6cm; wt 663 gr. Thickness: rim: 3 mm. body: 0.8-0.9 mm.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>1 imperial stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>Rim fragment: DO 63.36.25a and foot DO 65.1.14. Parts of rim and body fragment in Antalya nos: 1047 and 1048 1-2. and rim Fragment London Hewett collection.</td>
<td>SILVER. Hemispherical bowl with inverted hearts. Squat-stemmed foot. With rings for chain and foot. This lamp can be used as both suspension and standing. Multiple fragments. Incomplete. (Plates: 110-115).</td>
<td>Approx. 500 g. letters: 1 cm.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object. (Inscription completed by comparing the fragments of inscriptions from 3 collections.)</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>1 imperial stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>DO 65.1.6</td>
<td>SILVER. Hemispherical bowl with design of scales and triangles. Squat-stemmed foot. With rings for chain and foot. This lamp can be used as both suspension and standing. Restored, in good condition. (Plates: 116 and 117).</td>
<td>H. (without rings) 17 cm; Diam. (rim) 21 cm, Diam. (foot), 7 cm; wt 1,112 gr. Letters, 2.1 cm. thickness: 1mm-1.5mm.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial stamps; 4 on Flanges, 1 on foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>DO 65.1.19, a-c, 79.11 and 63.36.22</td>
<td>SILVER. Openwork lamp with Everted Flanged Hexagonal Rim and hemispherical body. This lamp can be used as both suspension and standing. Incomplete. (Plates: 118-123).</td>
<td>H. 11.4 cm, Diam (rim with flanges): 21.4 cm; (foot): 6 cm; Wt. 566 gr. Letters: 1-1.2 cm. Thickness: rim: 3 mm. Thickness for body was not measured.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>5 imperial stamps; 4 on Flanges, 1 on foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>DO 79.10 a-d, 63.36.23 and 63.36.32</td>
<td>SILVER. Openwork lamp with Everted Flanged Hexagonal Rim and hemispherical body. This lamp can be used as both suspension and standing. Rim completed with the rim fragment from London Hewett collection. Incomplete, some fragments are lost. (Plates: 124 and 125)</td>
<td>Diam 22.4 cm, (foot) 6 cm; Wt. 565 gr.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>For the memory of Himeria</td>
<td>3 imperial stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>DO 65.1.12</td>
<td>SILVER. Openwork lamp. Cylindrical shaped body. Decorated with openwork architectural design. This lamp can be used as both suspension and standing. (Plate: 126).</td>
<td>H. (without rings) 10.1-1.3 cm; Diam. (rim) 14.4-15.5 cm, Diam. (foot), 5 cm; wt 480 gr. Letters: 1 cm, thickness; 3 mm.</td>
<td>Openwork Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>1 imperial stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>DO 65.1.15</td>
<td>SILVER. Openwork lamp. Crashed, folded and in multiple fragments. (Plate: 127).</td>
<td>Wt. 231.7 g</td>
<td>Openwork Inscription. Cannot be read</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>London, Digby Jones Collection</td>
<td>SILVER. Decorated with openwork scale design. Not examined at first hand. (Plate: 128).</td>
<td>H. 10.5 cm; Diam (rim) 14.3 cm, Diam (foot) 4.7 cm. Weight was not measured.</td>
<td>Niello Inscription encircling the rim of object.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>6 imperial stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>SUSPENSION BRACKET FOR FIVE LAMPS</td>
<td>DO. 65.1.18 AND 63.36.31</td>
<td>SILVER. Cross shaped. For five lamps. In good condition. Two vertical and two lateral rods. (Plate: 129).</td>
<td>H. 89 cm, W. 36.5 cm; wt 2,014.6 gr. Letters: 5-6 mm.</td>
<td>Two Niello inscriptions. Obv: vertical rod and lateral rod. And rev: vertical rod and lateral rod.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>BOOK COVER</td>
<td>DO 63.36.9-10</td>
<td>SILVER. Pair of book covers. Each cover decorated with crosses flanked by cypress trees. In good condition. (Plates: 130 and 131).</td>
<td>A: 37.2x30 cm; B: 37.5x27.6 cm, Wt. A: 495 g and B: 422 g.</td>
<td>uninscribed</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>BOOK COVER</td>
<td>DO 63.36.8 and DO 65.1.3; Antalya: 1034</td>
<td>SILVER. Pair of book Covers decorated with Christ between apostles. In multiple fragments. Front and back cover completed with the multiple fragments from Antalya. (Plates: 132-134).</td>
<td>Front cover: 25x23.8 cm, wt. 317 gr. Back cover: 23.4 x 17.5 cm, wt. 250 g.</td>
<td>Front Cover, pointillé inscription. Back cover, pointillé inscription but not complete. Some words on Antalya piece and some words on Dumbarton Oaks piece.</td>
<td>For the memory of Prinkipios and Konon</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>LAMPSTAND</td>
<td>DO 63.36.13, DO. 65.1.9</td>
<td>SILVER. This capital and this column shaft fits together and are displayed together in DO collection. Column base is missing. Capital decorated with acanthus leaves. (Plates: 136-137).</td>
<td>Acanthus Capital: H. 15-15.5 cm. wt. 872 gr. Column Shaft: H. 43.7 cm. Diam. 8.8 cm, wt. unknown. Letters 2 cm. Thickness: 1-3mm.</td>
<td>Repoussé Inscription surrounding the centre of the column Shaft</td>
<td>Restored in the time of Bishop Theodore.</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 1: OBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>MUSEUM INV. NO</th>
<th>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</th>
<th>MEASUREMENTS</th>
<th>INSCRIPTION</th>
<th>DONORS</th>
<th>STAMPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>LAMPSTAND</td>
<td>DO. 63.36.12, DO 63.36.18, DO 65.1.23</td>
<td>SILVER. Column shaft and Column base are displayed together in DO collection. Lines of rosettes on the shaft. Acanthus capital is detached. Capital is crushed and torn. (Plates: 138-140).</td>
<td>Capital: Wt. 435 g. Column Shaft: H. 52.2 cm; Diam 8.8 cm; Wt. 1215.4 g, Column Base: H. 16.4 cm, wt. Unknown. Thickness: 1-3 mm.</td>
<td>uninscribed</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>RIM SHEETS FOR ALTAR TABLE</td>
<td>DO. 65.1.10 a-g and DO. 63.36.11 a-d. ANT. 1037 1-2 and 1038 (A-B-C)</td>
<td>SILVER. Rim sheeting from front, left and right edges and back of the altar. In various detached pieces. In multiple fragments. (Plates: 141-146).</td>
<td><strong>Front Panel:</strong> L. 2.25 m, H. 19.5 cm; H.(inscribed Face), 5 cm; Wt. 2.817 gr. <strong>Right Edge:</strong> L. 1.16 m, H. 19.5 cm; H.(inscribed Face), 5 cm; Wt. 1321 gr. <strong>Left Edge:</strong> H. 19.5 cm; L. 1.16 m; Wt. 1445 g. <strong>Back of altar:</strong> H. 19.5 cm, L. 2.25 cm, wt. 2968 g. Letters: 2-2.5 cm. thickness: 1.1 mm.</td>
<td>Starts in front panel and ends in the right edge. Repoussé inscription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PLAIN SHEETS FOR TOP OF THE ALTAR</td>
<td>DO 65.1.10, j, k, l. and ANT. 1024 1-2 (A-B)</td>
<td>SILVER. Plain sheets used to cover the top of the altar. In various detached pieces. (Plates: 147 and 148).</td>
<td>W. 1.14, L. 2.23. wt. 16328 g. these measures were reached when all detached objects from the top of altar were put together. Thickness: 1.2 mm.</td>
<td>uninscribed</td>
<td></td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>INSCRIBED PLAIN SHEET</td>
<td>DO. 79.4</td>
<td>SILVER. Plain sheet. Small fragments are missing. Decorated with cross. In good condition. (Plates: 149 and 150).</td>
<td>L. 97 cm; W. 37 cm; Wt. 3,164 g. Letters 2-2.5 cm. Thickness: 1.1 mm</td>
<td>Repoussé Inscription.</td>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>INSCRIBED PLAIN SHEET</td>
<td>ANT 1025 and 1044</td>
<td>SILVER. Plain Sheet. Completed with small fragment. The other fragments are missing. Decorated with cross. (Plates: 151-154).</td>
<td>L. 95.5 cm, W. 39 cm; Wt. 2980 g Letters 2-2.5 cm. Thickness: 1.1 mm</td>
<td>Repoussé Inscription.</td>
<td>Paregoros</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>BASE OF A CANDLESTICK</td>
<td>ANT. 1036-3,</td>
<td>SILVER. Flattened and crushed. Foliate design decoration. (Plates: 155-156).</td>
<td>wt. 930 g. Letters: 5 mm, thickness: 1 mm.</td>
<td>Pointillé inscription.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unstamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>ASTERISK</td>
<td>DO 79.5</td>
<td>SILVER. Now displayed with the paten in Dumbarton Oaks, DO. 63. 36.3, No: 6. (Plates: 11-13).</td>
<td>Wt. 893.5 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CHAIN</td>
<td>ANT. 1023</td>
<td>SILVER</td>
<td>L. 43 cm, wt. 230 gr. Possibly the chain of polycandelon. Ant. No: 1028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>CHALICE BASE</td>
<td>DO 63.36.33</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>H. 8.8 cm; wt. 84 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>CHALICE BASE</td>
<td>DO 63.36.34</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>H. 12 cm; wt. 108 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>CHALICE BASE</td>
<td>DO 63.36.35</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>H. 8.5 cm; Wt. 63 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>CHALICE BASE</td>
<td>DO 79.9</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>H. 8.5 cm; Wt. 61 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CHALICE BASE</td>
<td>ANT. 1039.2</td>
<td>SILVER, conical foot.</td>
<td>H. 11.5 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>BASE OF VESSEL</td>
<td>DO 63.36.24</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>Diam. 13cm; Wt. 304 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>BASE OF VESSEL</td>
<td>DO 63.36.38</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>BASE OF VESSEL</td>
<td>ANT. 1050-2</td>
<td>SILVER. Flattened.</td>
<td>wt. 1800 g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>SHEET FRAGMENT</td>
<td>DO 65.1.10 h</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>h. 15 CM; l. 25.5 CM; Wt. 192 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>MUSEUM INV. NO</td>
<td>MATERIAL, FORM AND CONDITION</td>
<td>MEASUREMENTS</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION</td>
<td>DONORS</td>
<td>STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>SHEET FRAGMENT</td>
<td>DO 65.1.10 i</td>
<td>SILVER. Not examined.</td>
<td>H. 14 cm; L. 28.5 cm; Wt. 212 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>SHEET FRAGMENT</td>
<td>ANT. 1045, 1- 2-3-4-5</td>
<td>SILVER. 5 separated fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>SILVER NAILS</td>
<td>DO 63.36.30</td>
<td>SILVER. 29 silver nails, 28 in DO, 1 in London Hewett Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>COLONNETTES</td>
<td>DO 65.1.13, a- c</td>
<td>SILVER. Three Spirally Fluted Colonnets.</td>
<td>wt. varies between 101.6-294.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>PINCERS</td>
<td>DO 65.1.22</td>
<td>silver-plated bronze.</td>
<td>L. 13.8 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>KNOB</td>
<td>DO 65.1.20</td>
<td>SILVER. Pierced by an opening from a shaft. Unknown if from a lampstand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>SILVER HOOPS</td>
<td>ANT. 1047, 4- 5</td>
<td>SILVER. 4 Pieces of silver hoops. Possibly from an openwork lamp.</td>
<td>Diam. 1.8 cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>PIPES</td>
<td>ANT. 1041,1-4</td>
<td>SILVER. 4 Detached Pieces.</td>
<td>L. 75 cm; Diam. 1.9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>KNOB</td>
<td>ANT. 1035</td>
<td>SILVER. In the form of a ball. Might have been from candlestick.</td>
<td>H. 6.9 cm, diam 5 cm; Wt. 190 g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (as appears on object)</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (edited)</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΣ ἘΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΤΩ ΜΕΓΑΛΩ ΘΕΩ ΥΠΕΡ ΑΦΕΣΕΥΣ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Eutychianos, most humble bishop, (presents or offer this) to the Great God, for the forgiveness of his sins. (Note: except no. 52, all of the translations are Ihor Ševčenko's translations.)</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΜΑΡΙΑΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑ,</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΜΑΡΙΑΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑ(ΘΗΣ)</td>
<td>For the memory of Maria the illustrious.</td>
<td>For the memory of Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΣ ἘΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΤΩ ΜΕΓΑΛΩ ΘΕΩ ΥΠΕΡ ΑΦΕΣΕΥΣ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ</td>
<td>not edited</td>
<td>Eutychianos, most humble bishop, presents this to the Great God, for the forgiveness of his sins.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΟΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ Κ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ ΗΜΩΝ ΕΠΙΣΚ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΟΙ</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΟΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ Κ(AI) ΜΑΚΑΡΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ ΗΜΩΝ ΕΠΙΣΚ(ΟΠΟΥ) ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΟΙ.</td>
<td>This was presented in the time of our most holy and blessed bishop Eutychianos.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΑΓΓΕΛΕΥΟΥ ΡΟΥΦΙΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΗΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΑΣ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ</td>
<td>not edited</td>
<td>For the memory and repose of Angelous Roufinos of illustrious memory</td>
<td>Angelous Roufinos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ Κ. ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΗΣ ΘΕΟΦΙΛ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ Κ ΠΡΟΚΛΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΘΥΓΑΤΡΟΣ</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ Κ(AI) ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΗΣ ΘΕΟΦΙΛ(ΕΚΣΤΗΣ) ΜΝΗΜΗΣ Κ(AI) ΠΡΟΚΛΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΘΥΓΑΤΡΟΣ</td>
<td>For the memory and repose of John, of god loving memory, and procle his daughter</td>
<td>For the memory of John and his daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (as appears on object)</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (edited)</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Cruciform)</td>
<td>Inscription: ΤΡΙΑΓΙΕ Κ’ Ε ΒΟΗΘΙ, monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>TRΙΑΓΙΕ Κ(ΥΡΙ)Ε ΒΟΗΘΙ</td>
<td>Inscription: Thrice-holy Lord help, Monogram: bishop</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Cruciform)</td>
<td>Inscription: ΤΡΙΑΓΙΕ Κ’ Ε ΒΟΗΘΙ, monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>TRΙΑΓΙΕ Κ(ΥΡΙ)Ε ΒΟΗΘΙ</td>
<td>Inscription: Thrice-holy Lord help, Monogram: bishop</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Cruciform)</td>
<td>Inscription: ΤΡΙΑΓΙΕ Κ’ Ε ΒΟΗΘΙ, monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>TRΙΑΓΙΕ Κ(ΥΡΙ)Ε ΒΟΗΘΙ</td>
<td>Inscription: Thrice-holy Lord help, Monogram: bishop</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Circular)</td>
<td>Inscription: ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ, monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: In fulfilment of a vow and for the salvation of</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eutychianos, most humble bishop. Monogram: Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Circular)</td>
<td>Inscription: ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ, monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: In fulfilment of a vow and for the salvation of</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eutychianos, most humble bishop. Monogram: Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (as appears on object)</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (edited)</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>POLYCANDElon (Circular)</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ, monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>In fulfilment of a vow and for the salvation of Eutychianos, most humble bishop. Monogram: Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>POLYCANDElon (Rectangular)</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘΙ, Monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: Holy Sion help, Monogram: Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>POLYCANDElon (Rectangular)</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘΙ, Monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: Holy Sion help, Monogram: Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>POLYCANDElon (Rectangular)</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘΙ, Monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: Holy Sion help, Monogram: Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>POLYCANDElon (Rectangular)</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘΙ, Monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: Holy Sion help, Monogram: Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>POLYCANDElon (Rectangular)</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘΙ, Monogram: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: Holy Sion help, Monogram: Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>INSRIPTION (as appears on object)</td>
<td>INSRIPTION (edited)</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Rectangular)</td>
<td>Inscription: ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘΙ, Μονογραμ: ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Inscription: Holy Sion help, Monogram: Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>CENSER</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΣ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΤΗ ΔΕΣΠΟΙΝΗ ΤΗ ΘΕΟΘΟΘΟΚΩ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Eutychianos, most humble bishop, (offers this) to our lady, the Mother of God.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CENSER</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΚ ΚΑΙ ΑΦΕΣΕΒΩΣ Α.. ΑΧΙΣΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΚ ΚΑΙ ΑΦΕΣΕΒΩΣ Α[ΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>In fulfilment of a vow and for the salvation of and the forgiveness (of the sins) of Eutychianos, most humble bishop. Amen</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>NOMATA ΟΙΔΕ</td>
<td>[ΕΥΧΗ ΣΙΩΝ ΘΕΟΣ ΤΑ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ ΟΙΔΕ[N]</td>
<td>A vow/a prayer of those whose names are known to god.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>ΕΥΧΗ ΣΙΩΝ ΘΕΟΣ ΤΑ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ ΟΙΔΕΝ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>A vow/a prayer of those whose names are known to god.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CHALICE</td>
<td>ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ Ν ΠΕΠΟΑ</td>
<td>ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ Ν ΠΕΠΟ[ΗΚ]Α</td>
<td>Having given thanks I made (it).</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AMPHORA</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ Ε</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘ[Ι] ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ Ε[ΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ]</td>
<td>Holy Sion Help Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>AMPHORA</td>
<td>ΑΓΙΑ ΣΙΩΝ ΒΟΗΘ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>not edited. Inscription can be completed with other piece which DO scholars did not see.</td>
<td>Holy Sion Help Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (as appears on object)</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (edited)</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>ΧΙΑΝΟϹ ΕΛΑΞΙϹΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑ</td>
<td>[ΕΥΤΥ]ΧΙΑΝΟϹ ΕΛΑΞΙϹΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑ[Λω ΘΕω]</td>
<td>Eutychianos, Most Humble Bishop, (offers this) to the Great God</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>..Ϲ ΕΛΑΞΙϹ.. ΣΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑΛ...</td>
<td>[+ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟ]Ϲ ΕΛΑΞΙϹ[ΤΟϹ] ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑΛ[ω ΘΕω]</td>
<td>Eutychianos, Most Humble Bishop, (offers this) to the Great God</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟϹ ΕΛΑΞΙϹΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑΛω ΘΕω</td>
<td>not edited</td>
<td>Eutychianos, Most Humble Bishop, (offers this) to the Great God</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟϹ ΕΛΑΞΙϹΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑΛω ΘΕω</td>
<td>not edited</td>
<td>Eutychianos, Most Humble Bishop, (offers this) to the Great God</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧ..ΑΝΟϹ ΕΛΑΞΙϹΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑΛω ΘΕω</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧ[Ι]ΑΝΟϹ ΕΛΑΞΙϹΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓΑΛω ΘΕω</td>
<td>Eutychianos, Most Humble Bishop, (offers this) to the Great God</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>ΕΥ... ΣΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓ..ω ΘΕω</td>
<td>ΕΥ[ΤΥΧΙΑΝΟϹ ΕΛΑΞΙϹ]ΣΤΟϹ ΕΠΙϹΚΟΠΟϹ Τω ΜΕΓ[ΑΛ]ω ΘΕω</td>
<td>Eutychianos, Most Humble Bishop, (offers this) to the Great God</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (as appears on object)</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (edited)</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΣ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟς ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΤΩ ΜΕΓΑΛΩ ΘΕΩ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Eutychianos, Most Humble Bishop, (offers this) to the Great God</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ Κ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΗΣ ΜΑΚΑΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ.</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ Κ(ΑΙ) ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΤΗ ΜΑΚΑΡ(ΙΑΣ) ΜΝΗΜΗΣ.</td>
<td>For the memory and repose of Eutychianos of blessed memory.</td>
<td>For the memory of Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΙΜΕΡΙΑΣ ΘΗΣ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΩΤΑΘΗΣ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>For the memory and repose of the most blessed Himeria.</td>
<td>For the memory of Himeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΣ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΤΗ ΔΕΣΠΟΙΝΗ ΤΗ ΘΕΟΘΟΚΩ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>Eutychianos, most humble Bishop, offers this to our lady, the Mother of God.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>ΥΠΕΡ ΕΥΧΗΣ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ</td>
<td>Not edited</td>
<td>In fulfilment of a vow of Eutychianos, most humble bishop.</td>
<td>Eutychianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (as appears on object)</td>
<td>INSCRIPTION (edited)</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>LAMPSTAND</td>
<td>ΑΝΕΝΕΨΩΗ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ + ΕΠΙ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΟΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ ΕΠΙϹΚΟ..</td>
<td>ΑΝΕΝΕΨΩΗ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ + ΕΠΙ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΟΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ ΕΠΙϹΚΟ[ΠΟΥ]</td>
<td>This was renewed in the time of Theodore, most holy Bishop.</td>
<td>Renewed in the time of Bishop Theodore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Catalogue No</td>
<td>Object Description</td>
<td>Inscription (as appears on object)</td>
<td>Inscription (edited)</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Rim Sheets for Altar Table</td>
<td>Front Panel: ΠΑΡΗΓΟΡΟΣ ΕΛΑΧΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ Κ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΓΟΝΑΙΩΝ Κ… ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ Κ ΑΝΕΨΙΩΝ Κ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΚΕ (end of the front panel). Right edge: ΣΕΒΗΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΦΙΑΝΟΥ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΗ ΑΛΙΘΕΙΝῷ ΘΕΩΝ ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΕΙ</td>
<td>Front Panel: ΠΑΡΗΓΟΡΟΣ ΕΛΑΧΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΓΟΝΑΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΕΨΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΨΕΦΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΚΕ (end of the front panel). Right edge: ΣΕΒΗΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΦΙΑΝΟΥ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΗ ΙΩΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΡΘΑ ΑΛΙΘΕΙΝῷ ΘΕΩΝ ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΕΙ</td>
<td>Paregoros, Most Humble bishop, offers this to Christ the true God for the memory and repose of his parents, and brothers and their children, and Nicholas, Severus, and Apphianos, the Lector.</td>
<td>Bishop Paregoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Inscribed Plain Sheet</td>
<td>ΖΑΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΕΛΑΧ… ΠΡΕΣΒΕΥ ΕΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΗΣΕΝ</td>
<td>ΖΑΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΕΛΑΧΚΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΓΟΝΑΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΕΨΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΨΕΦΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΚΕ (end of the front panel). Right edge: ΣΕΒΗΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΦΙΑΝΟΥ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΗ ΙΩΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΡΘΑ ΑΛΙΘΕΙΝῷ ΘΕΩΝ ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΕΙ</td>
<td>Zacharias, most humble Priest, offered (this), brought forth fruit.</td>
<td>Priest Zacharias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Inscribed Plain Sheet</td>
<td>ΠΑΡΗΓΟΡΟΣ ΕΛΑΧ… ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΕΚΑΡΠΟΦΟΡΗΣΕΝ</td>
<td>ΠΑΡΗΓΟΡΟΣ ΕΛΑΧΚΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΥΠΕΡ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΓΟΝΑΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΕΨΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΨΕΦΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΚΕ (end of the front panel). Right edge: ΣΕΒΗΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΦΙΑΝΟΥ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΗ ΙΩΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΡΘΑ ΑΛΙΘΕΙΝῷ ΘΕΩΝ ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΕΙ</td>
<td>Paregoros, most humble Bishop, offered (this), brought forth fruit.</td>
<td>Bishop Paregoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Base of a Candlestick</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΥΜΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΟΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ Ο ΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΑΤΕΣΧΕΥΑΣΘΗ</td>
<td>ΕΠΙ ΥΜΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΟΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ Ο [Δ]ΙΣΚΟΣ ΚΑΤΕΣΧΕΥΑΣΘΗ</td>
<td>(At/for) the most holy hymn, this object was presented. Translated by author</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: STAMPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>ROUND</th>
<th>HEXAGONAL</th>
<th>SQUARE</th>
<th>LONG</th>
<th>CRUCIFORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PATEN</td>
<td>Bust of Emperor Justinian I. Inscription illegible</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I. Inscription illegible</td>
<td>illegible</td>
<td>illegible</td>
<td>illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Cruciform)</td>
<td>Bust of Emperor Justinian I. Inscription (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
<td>Monogram of Emperor, Justinian I. Inscription (ITA-ΛOV), Italon.</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I, inscription (ΔΟΠΟΘΕΟV), Dorotheon</td>
<td>Bust of emperor Justinian I and monogram of Ioannes (official) and inscribed (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
<td>Monogram of Ioannes (Official). (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Cruciform)</td>
<td>Bust of Emperor Justinian I. Inscription (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
<td>Monogram of Emperor, Justinian I. Inscription (ITA-ΛOV), Italon.</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I, inscription (ΔΟΠΟΘΕΟV), Dorotheon</td>
<td>Bust of emperor Justinian I and monogram of Ioannes (official) and inscribed (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
<td>Monogram of Ioannes (Official). (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (Cruciform)</td>
<td>Bust of Emperor Justinian I. Inscription (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
<td>Monogram of Emperor, Justinian I. Inscription (ITA-ΛOV), Italon.</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I, inscription (ΔΟΠΟΘΕΟV), Dorotheon</td>
<td>Bust of emperor Justinian I and monogram of Ioannes (official) and inscribed (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
<td>Monogram of Ioannes (Official). (IWAN-NOV), Ioannou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>ROUND</td>
<td>HEXAGONAL</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>CRUCIFORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>ROUND</td>
<td>HEXAGONAL</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>CRUCIFORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (rectangular, semi circular end pieces and pired dolphins)</td>
<td>Bust of emperor Justinian I, inscribed (ΛΕΟΝ – ΤΙΟV), Leontiou</td>
<td>illegible</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I: inscribed name is illegible, two letters: 'EV.....'</td>
<td>illegible</td>
<td>Cut in Half during decoration. Monogram of official: name: (ΕVΦΠΟΝΙΟV), Eufroniou.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>ROUND</td>
<td>HEXAGONAL</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>CRUCIFORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (rectangular, semi circular end pieces and foliate design decoration.)</td>
<td>Bust of emperor Justinian I, inscribed (ΛΕΟΝ – ΤΙΟΥ), Leontiou</td>
<td>NOT SURVIVING</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I. Inscribed name: (EVCE – TEIC), Euceteis</td>
<td>Bust of emperor Justinian I. Monogram and inscribed name are illegible.</td>
<td>Monogram of the official (Letters on monogram: ΑΔΕΟΥ name: (ΕΥΦΡΟΝΙΟΥ), Eufroniou.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>POLYCANDELON (rectangular, semicircular end pieces with paired dolphins decoration.)</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>NOT SURVIVING</td>
<td>NOT SURVIVING</td>
<td>NOT SURVIVING</td>
<td>NOT SURVIVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>ROUND</td>
<td>HEXAGONAL</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>CRUCIFORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>CENCER</td>
<td>Bust of Emperor Justinian I. Insc: (ΧΠΙΚΤΟ-ΦΟΡΟΥ), Christophorou</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I. Insc: Illegible</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I. Insc: Illegible</td>
<td>Bust of emperor Justinian I and monogram of the official. Monogram and inscription are illegible.</td>
<td>Monogram of the official (Illegible), (ΣΕΡΓΙΟΥ), Cergiou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>STANDING LAMP</td>
<td>Bust of Emperor Justinian I. Insc: (ΧΠΙΚΤΟ-ΦΟΡΟΥ), Christophorou</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I. Insc: Illegible</td>
<td>Monogram of Justinian I. Inscription: illegible.</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: STAMPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>ROUND</th>
<th>HEXAGONAL</th>
<th>SQUARE</th>
<th>LONG</th>
<th>CRUCIFORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>not surviving</td>
<td>Illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESIS CATALOGUE NO</td>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>ROUND</td>
<td>HEXAGONAL</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>CRUCIFORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>OPENWORK LAMP</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
<td>not examined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4: THE COST OF THE SION OBJECTS TO THEIR DONORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>OBJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL WEIGHT</th>
<th>POTENTIAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Eutychianos</td>
<td>Three Patens (Nos. 1, 3 and 4), 12 Polycandela (Nos. 7-18), two Censers (Nos. 19 and 20), two Amphorae (Nos. 28 and 29), four Standing Lamps (Nos. 31-34), 8 Openwork Lamps (Nos. 35-42), one Suspension Bracket (No. 43).</td>
<td>62,216 grams /190.16 Roman pounds</td>
<td>760 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For memory of Maria</td>
<td>Paten (No. 2)</td>
<td>8000 grams/24.45 Roman pounds</td>
<td>97 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the memory of Angeleuos Roufinos</td>
<td>Paten (No. 5)</td>
<td>4,537 grams/13.8 Roman pounds</td>
<td>55 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the memory of John</td>
<td>Paten (No. 6)</td>
<td>4,234 grams/12.9 Roman pounds</td>
<td>51 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the memory of Prinkipios</td>
<td>Book Cover (No. 45)</td>
<td>317 grams/0.96 Roman pounds</td>
<td>3.8 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Theodore (Donor for restoration)</td>
<td>Lampstand (No. 46)</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Paregoros</td>
<td>Altar Table Sheets (Nos. 48 and 49), one Plain Sheet (No. 51)</td>
<td>27,859 grams/85 Roman pounds</td>
<td>340 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest Zacharias</td>
<td>One Plain Sheet (No. 50)</td>
<td>3,164 grams/9 Roman pounds</td>
<td>38 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the memory of Eutychianos</td>
<td>Openwork Lamp (No. 38).</td>
<td>566 grams/1.7 Roman pounds</td>
<td>6 solidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the memory of Himeria</td>
<td>Openwork Lamp (No. 39).</td>
<td>565 grams/1.7 Roman pounds</td>
<td>6 solidi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>