Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

A CHRISTIAN CITY IN THE BYZANTINE AGE.

II.

I HAVE first of all to correct an error in the former part of this article, due ultimately to a misprint in Labbe's edition of the *Acta Conciliorum*, The name Barathra does not occur in any ancient authority, only Barata, Baratta and Barattha (together with some false forms, which may be ignored as mere errors). In Labbe's Nicene lists, A.D. 325, either a broken letter *t*, or a misprint *r* in place of *t*, causes the name to appear Barathra (unless it is minutely inspected); and thus it is given in the classified lists printed in my *Historical Geography*, p. 331. The form Barathe in the Peutinger Table, therefore, seemed to prove that Barathra occurred in the original map from which the Table ultimately was derived. This idea must now be abandoned: Barathe implies an original Barattha. The identification of Maden Sheher as Barata, therefore, rests only on the general arguments stated in my study of Lycaonian topography, in the Austrian *Jahreshefte*, 1904, *Beibl.*, p. 82, which though strong are not conclusive. It remains quite possible that the old name Barata (pronounced, at least in later Roman time, Varata) is to be regarded as identical with the modern Varta, Abyss, and that Maden-Sheher is the Turkish translation of the ancient name. But this philological theory cannot be used as an argument at present to support the topographical identification; rather, the philological theory needs to be supported on the topographical fact.

In the concluding paragraph the relation between the churches of the Kara-Dagh (Barata) and graves of the dead was introduced, and it was pointed out that these churches show how the old Anatolian belief, that no place was properly consecrated unless a grave were connected

with it, and that the making of a grave was in itself an act of religious worship, was revived in a slightly Christianized form.

In the first place the mere fact that in a small district we have at least sixty churches, and probably others either undiscovered or obliterated, shows that these churches were not used only for purposes of Christian assembly and congregational ritual. Moreover, a number of them are too small. The mere building of a church must have been in itself felt as an act of religious duty and merit.

In the second place, as my wife began first to observe, there is a marked tendency to have beside each church (apart from those actually inside the circuit of the town-dwellings) a grave and a basin cut in the rock for holding water. Cases of this class are too many to enumerate. They are the general feature of the locality.

In the third place, a grave is sometimes found in the vestibule or narthex of the church.

In the fourth place, we very often found a sepulchral inscription engraved in a conspicuous way on a church, most frequently on one of the doorposts or on a supporting column in the middle of the double doorway. It is impossible to suppose that such inscriptions, placed so conspicuously, were unauthorized or unconnected with the purpose of the construction. Perhaps it might forthwith be assumed that these inscriptions state the intention and character of the building; but in view of all that depends on this principle it is best that reasons should be stated, in case there be any reluctance to admit the view which is here set forth. When I first observed these sepulchral inscriptions on the churches, I thought they had been placed on the buildings, after they had stood for years, from the desire to bury the dead close to the holy shrine; but I found that this view does not explain the facts.

Now these sepulchral inscriptions on churches at or near Barata are all very late. They are engraved in coarse, rude letters, and their whole style marks them as later than anything else of the kind known to me in Anatolian epigraphy. Some examples will show clearly that they are of the poorest and least educated style.

1. On the apse of Church No. III. in Bin Bir Kilisse—

Here lies the daughter of Stephanus, who never felt sensation or pleasure, on the tenth November.[1]

It can hardly be supposed that, in epitaphs so brief as these, the description of the child implies only that she died too young to speak: that could have been expressed by stating her age. She had been a witless child, who never shared in the pleasure or intercourse of life[2]; and this fact is stated, evidently, as part of the reason why special attention was paid to her grave: on this point there will be more to say in a subsequent paragraph.

The adjoining stone bears an extract from Psalm cxxxii. 14,[3] written by the same hand as a sort of consecration of the church in a higher religious style. These two inscriptions are like the dedication and the consecrating words of Scripture, engraved on the two sides of the entrance to a rock-church at Siniandos.[4]

2. On the middle column in the west door of church No. VI. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

Theodoros, the slave of Christ. (Here) was laid to rest Papadia in the month of March on the fifteenth. Amen. God give her bliss.

[1] This and the other epitaphs are complete, unless the contrary is stated. The Greek text of all is given at the end of the article.

[2] Hence she was nameless, probably unbaptized (M. Clermont Ganneau).

[3] Mr. C. H. Turner pointed out to me that it was an inaccurate quotation of this Psalm: hence it is necessary to take *κατυκύσο* as equivalent to *κατοικήσω*.

[4] The inscriptions are given by Rev. H. S. Cronin in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, pp. 97, 339. In 2 *ισέλθομεν . . . ις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κ(υρίο)υ ψάλοντες ψαλμῦς.* In 1 *ἀθλοφό[ρ]ου κὲ παν[ελεήμο ?]νος κὲ παναμ[ώμο]υ κὲ παναγίας.* I copied them in 1905.

In all probability Theodore was father of Papadia, who in that case was unmarried.

3. On the side of the entrance to a small chapel built on to church No. XXI. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

(Here) was laid to rest the Domestikos on May fourth.

The Domesticus was one of the highest officers in the Byzantine army; and probably Barata produced only one person who ever attained that rank. Hence his name is omitted as being familiar to all readers of the epitaph. He probably belonged to the ninth or tenth century, when the Saracen raids were being repelled from Anatolia. There can be no doubt that this chapel was his memorial.

4. On the middle column in the west door of church No. I. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

Here lies Mousianou, (son of) George

Other words or names follow which I cannot understand; yet the letters are clearly legible; the engraver must have erred.

5. On the middle column in the west door of church No. V. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

Here lies the blessed Chionia in the month of Pephruary.[1]

The inscriptions, which are dated only by the month without the year, show a low standard of chronology. The date by indiction, though it is a bad system, shows a distinctly higher standard, and points to an earlier period and better education. Hence the two following, which are evidently companion epitaphs, must be placed earlier than those which mention only the month.

[1] This may serve as a specimen of the spelling in these late inscriptions: it indicates a very rude pronunciation of the Greek language.

It may be doubted whether the epithet *μακάριος*, applied to Chionia in 5, had at this late period any other meaning than "deceased"; and perhaps it may be taken as indicative of sympathy and pity for an untimely death. In older inscriptions, as for example *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 22, *μακάριος* carried more connotation in an epitaph.

6. On a stone in the west front of church No. II. at Deghile at the south corner—

Here lies Philaretos son of Akylas : I died in the war on thirtieth May, indiction the fourth.

The war was doubtless the war against the Arabs, which lasted for nearly three centuries from about 670.

7. On a stone beside the last in the same course of the west front of church No. II. at Deghile—

Here lies Akylas : he died on eleventh April, indiction the tenth.

It is to be presumed that the church was built by Akylas in memory of his son, and that the father himself was afterwards buried beside his son. The epitaph of the latter is on the corner-stone in the place of honour, but still not in such a conspicuous position as 2–5.

A noteworthy fact is that the older epitaphs give more information and are more individualized than the later. Even the following must be regarded as older than 2–5, which are of the latest and worst class.

8. On the south wall of church No. VII. at Deghile—

Here lies Paul : he died on the third of April.

The addition of the verb " he died " raises this above the level of 2–5 ; and, in fact, the church of Paul was probably among the earliest of this late class of churches.

Considering the conspicuous position in the building occupied by all these inscriptions, we must suppose that they had some connexion with the construction. At first I thought that they might have been engraved on the completed churches as a special honour permitted by the ecclesiastical authorities, or even on the buildings after they had fallen into ruins. But both these hypotheses seem inacceptable. So long as there was a Christian population in Barata, it cannot be supposed that the churches, even though ruined, lost their sanctity in the popular eye so completely that the pillars of the doorways

could be used as chance gravestones. The churches were and remained to the end holy places, and could never have been used without permission as cemeteries, and neither graffitti nor unauthorized epitaphs can be supposed to have been placed so conspicuously on them.

Nor is it a sufficient explanation of the facts to say that there was a strong popular desire to be buried in holy ground, and that the right to be buried in the doorway of the church as the most honourable place was granted as a compliment or for money. We have found no proof of the western habit of making graves in the churches and of surrounding the churches with graves close up to the walls, and covering the walls with sepulchral inscriptions. In some cases, as No. VII. at Maden-Sheher and I. at Deghile, churches were built in the midst of or close to cemeteries already existing; but here the graves are, in my opinion, older (as is certain in regard to some of them, but cannot be proved in every case). There is one sepulchral inscription in each of those late churches, and no more;[1] and this one is placed in a specially conspicuous position.

Nor is it a sufficient explanation to suppose that this right was granted to certain distinguished persons as a mark of special respect and honour. The persons commemorated are not those who had won a high position or rendered services to the church or the state. One is an idiot child, others are young women in all probability unmarried.[2] It seems probable that, just as in ancient Athens the loutrophoros vase of the marriage ceremonial was placed on the grave of a girl who died unmarried, so here the church-burial is a sort of compensation in the

[1] I except certain older inscribed stones which were taken and put into the walls when they were building: the inscriptions being more or less defaced: see *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 262.

[2] The husband would probably be mentioned, if they were married.

world of death for misfortune in life or untimely death. One person alone is distinguished, the Domesticus; and in his case it is on other grounds quite certain that the church at the door of which he was buried was his sepulchral monument. The Domesticus was laid to rest in a small memorial church of cruciform shape which was attached as a sort of chapel to the north side of the large church No. XXI.

The whole series of churches bearing these inscriptions, therefore, seem to have been built as memorials of the dead.

Now compare this class of church inscriptions with a different class, in better style of writing and spelling.

9. On the front of the same door-pillar in No. VI., which has inscription 2 on its side,

Through the vow of Teucer, son of Papias.

10. At the west door of the same church, No. VI., in which are inscriptions 2 and 9, on the stone at the left side from which springs the left arch of the double doorway,

Through the vow of Nesius, son of Tiberius.

11. In the same church, No. VI., over the door leading from the narthex into the church proper,

Through the vow of Mammas the trib(une).

No epigraphist would hesitate for a moment to place inscriptions 9–11 much earlier than 2;[1] yet they are on

[1] They are engraved and spelt in a superior style; and the names suit best with a comparatively early date. Teucer never passed into Christian nomenclature, and we should not be inclined to believe that it was used much, if at all, later than the fifth century. The other names in 9–11 were all adopted as Christian, but Nesius is found in the Episcopal lists only A.D. 431, and Mammas, though found in A.D. 692, was far commoner in the councils of the fifth and sixth centuries than in the later. Papias is found in the Councils of A.D. 451, 503, 869. The fifth, or possibly the sixth century is the time when the church was built and these inscriptions engraved. There is a doubt whether the formula was in vogue as early as the fourth century; otherwise I should have suggested a fourth century date for such a name as Teucer.

the same church, of which we have supposed that 2 was the dedicatory inscription. The explanation is that this church fell into ruins, either having been destroyed by the Arabs when Barata was captured by them somewhere about A.D. 700, or having suffered from earthquake; and it was restored or rebuilt at a later time. The restoration was very complete. The roof had fallen in, but considerable part of the walls was standing, with the doorway on the west, the windows of the apse on the east and the lower part of the windows on the sides. The height to which the walls remained standing does not favour the hypothesis of an earthquake;[1] and therefore we regard it as pretty certain that this church was destroyed by the Arabs somewhere about A.D. 700, and rebuilt as a memorial of Papadia at a later date (in the ninth century probably, as we shall show in a later paragraph).

When the epitaphs are regarded in this chronological order, it is apparent that they indicate a degeneration of religious feeling and a reversion to the simplest ancient belief about the grave. Just as the ancient grave was a temple, the home of the dead, who is a god identified with and partly merged in the supreme deity, so in this late Christian period the church is, so to say, the sepulchral monument; but the point of distinction remains that, so far as we can discover, the Christian was never actually buried inside his church monument. Still it was the fact that the one great religious duty, alike in this late time and in the oldest period, was to prepare a grave, and the grave was a sanctuary. No trace remained, so far as we can observe, of the idea that the church was a place of

[1] That earthquakes occurred in this volcanic region may be assumed as certain. At Deghile my wife was informed that a severe shock had been felt there two years ago. At Bin Bir Kilisse I was told by a native that no earthquake was known to have ever occurred there; but I distrust his evidence.

instruction in moral duty and religious thought; the church was in itself holy, and it was a duty supreme above every other—so far as remains show—to build a grave-church.

Several of these epitaphs, especially 2, 4, 5, were engraved on churches of an earlier time, which had sunk into ruins (probably when the city was destroyed by the Arabs, as it must have been, owing to its exposed situation [1]) and afterwards been restored and largely rebuilt. The rebuilding must be connected with the epitaph, and the restoration of a ruined church was evidently equally meritorious with the building of a new one, and carried the right to be buried at the doorway and to have the epitaph engraved on the central column supporting the door.

The deterioration in religious feeling was accompanied by a deterioration in education. A glance at the sequence of the inscriptions is sufficient to show this. The examples given above are proof enough. Christianity is the religion of an educated people, and deterioration on the religious side implies and produces deterioration also on the educational side. A successful defence against barbarous foes has often stimulated a people to higher intellectual effort; but the successful defence of Asia Minor against the Arabs produced no such effect. We can hardly call it a national defence, though the people were forced to take some measures for self-defence, and the epitaph of Philaretos, given above, shows some pride in a defender of the country. The repulse of the Arabs, however, was mainly due to a professional army and one which was in a considerable degree foreign and mercenary. The people of Barata threw themselves on the protection of the saints. They built churches. They made the churches an essential part of

[1] The possibility must be left open that an earthquake caused the ruin. But in Nos. I. and VI. it seemed probable that ruin by an earthquake would have been more wide-reaching.

their defences. When their city was destroyed by the Arabs, they made Deghile, three miles to the west and high on the hills, the centre of their state, and fortified it. The rock peaks, which were most vital points in the line of defence or immediately outside of it, were occupied by grave-churches, and thus placed under the protection each of its special saint. A people so devoted to saints and holy places has not in itself the elements of vigour or of education; and the Turkish conquest of a degenerating nation was the inevitable result.

In church No. III. at Deghile we have a good example of a series of constructions, the sequence of which can be determined both architecturally and epigraphically. The church was built according to a vow made by a group of persons, whose names are given on the inner front of the apse:

12. The vow of Akylas and Valerius [sons of Vic ?]torius. The vow of Indakos, son of Valerius. The vow of Dometios. They, having made a vow, completed (the church). [The vow] of Cle[mens], of Valerius, of Dometios.

This inscription is expressed in an earlier formula, stating a principle which, at least in outward expression, is more in accordance with the nature of Christianity. The reason for the vow is not mentioned. There is no overt association with a grave. Yet we may suspect, from the development which occurred later, that even here the vow was not unconnected with sepulture. That, indeed, cannot be absolutely proved; but it is certain that a stately tomb and a less conspicuous one were placed in the south end of the narthex, and that the stately tomb bears the name of [Vic ?]torius the Presbyter, who seems to be the father of two of the dedicants.[1]

All these names, except Indakos, passed into Christian

[1] The name of [Vic]torius is unfortunately mutilated both on the apse and on the tomb in the narthex. This mutilation prevents certainty.

nomenclature, and afford no criterion of date. Indakos is not found in the list of bishops at the councils 325–879 A.D., but occurs in Lycaonian Christian inscriptions of the fourth or fifth century as the name of a bishop and other Christians. From this one name no argument as to date can be drawn safely.

Then, some time later, Longinus son of Indakos died; and in his memory there was erected a triple gateway leading into an open space, which was bounded on the south by the church and on the north by a private house of larger size than is usual in these ruins. We may conjecture that some or all of the people connected with the construction of the church belonged to the family which owned this house. On one of the supporting pillars of the gateway was engraved the epitaph—

13. In memory of Longinus, son of Indakos, the presbyter.

On another of the pillars was engraved the inscription—

14. Through the vow of Paul, son of Longinus.

The gateway, then, was erected by Paul, according to a vow, as a sepulchral monument to his father Longinus. A gateway must lead into something; and there can be no doubt that the space between the house and the church was in some way marked off, and the gateway was constructed as a more splendid entrance to it. It is a pity that we did not excavate this space completely in order to determine its character, and whether there were family graves in it.

Then some years passed, and the construction was enlarged. The narthex of the church was carried far out to the north to join the house, and a series of arches was built on the inside of this prolongation. The whole space between the church and the house was thus enclosed completely by walls. An inscription on one of the arches gives

the reason and the date for this enlargement and for the whole series of constructions.

15. Through the vow of Basil the presbyter, there was completed the Presbyterion under Leo the most holy metropolitan until Constantine the most holy metropolitan during 51 years. And, being involved in powerlessness and unable to consummate the divine teachings, of my own free will and voluntary choice I begged leave to resign the much-loved liturgy of Christ; but I have persevered in prayer[1]; and I entreat the Merciful One for forgiveness of my sins and at the same time of (the sins of) Irene my wife.

It was written by the hand of Basil the presbyter, in the month of September, indiction the fourth.

What the Presbyterion was I am unable to say.[2] The

[1] I am indebted to M. Clermont Ganneau for the interpretation of the letters επημενιμε as ἐπι(με)μένημαι. This I prefer to the idea that also has occurred to me, ἐπιμένομε(ν); for the omission of the reduplication is found also in δυνημένον for δεδυνημένου (which was unknown to the distinguished French scholar and explorer, when he sent me the emendation). The augment is also omitted in [τ]ε[λι]όθη. M. Clermont Ganneau's suggestion (for which I am most grateful to him) sets aside the interpretation given in my *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 258 f., on the suggestion of another distinguished scholar. Several points in the inscription which I could not understand in my first interrupted copy have been completed by study for many days during 1907. I owe to M. Ganneau also the reading δηδάγματα.

[2] It perhaps was a church presided over by a presbyter, as distinguished from a church where there was a bishop. Then a Kollegion (mentioned in 17) was a church where there was a college of several presbyters. Church No. III. at Bin Bir Kilisse was a Kollegion, and it is one of the larger churches. No. XXI. has a bishop's chair. No. I. at Deghile had a screen fixed across the first two columns of the nave, and must therefore have had a college of presbyters attached to it. The same is the case with several other of the churches, in which the apse (originally the space allotted to the body of presbyters) was found insufficient, and the eastern end of the nave was screened off for their benefit. Another interpretation of Presbyterion has been suggested, that it meant a place (church) where the presbyters met. In that case the Presbyterion would be equivalent to the Kollegion. It has been suggested also that the word is here used in the sense which is well known elsewhere (see Sophocles, *Lexicon of Later and Byzantine Greek*, *s.v.*) viz., "the office of a presbyter." In that case the inscription would not mention formally any building, but would simply record that "by the vow of Basil the presbyter his office as presbyter was completed": this I cannot accept, for one does not vow to terminate one's presbyterate; Basil was compelled by ill health to do so. The vow of Basil was

name is in some way applied to include the entire complex of buildings, whose construction we have just described. The period of fifty-one years cannot possibly denote the time required for Basil's small additions; and in all probability it gives the whole time from the inception to the completion;[1] and Basil prides himself on having put the finishing touches to a work called a Presbyterion, which had been in process for fifty-one years. Leo was metropolitan bishop of Iconium at the second council of Nicaea in A.D. 787; and therefore the fifty-one years may fairly be reckoned from 790 to 840, or 800 to 850.

This very precise calculation gives a date and a welcome confirmation for our previous results. About A.D. 800 the later custom of putting purely sepulchral inscriptions on a church and regarding the Church as practically a sepulchral monument had not yet come into fashion. It was then still usual to state simply that a church was erected in accordance with a vow, even although (as in this case) a grave was placed in the narthex and the church was in a certain way memorial and sepulchral. Before 850 a gateway adjoining the church and forming part of the series of ecclesiastical constructions was inscribed with a memorial inscription in memory of Longinus the presbyter. About 850, when the narthex was enlarged, there was placed in the new wall an epitaph of the latest and poorest character—

to do something, and the object of the vow is here defined as τελειῶσαι τὸ πρεσβυτέριον; in No. 12 the object of the vow is simply τελέσαι (τὴν οἰκοδομήν); in No. 16 it is τελέσαι (or τελειῶσαι) τὸ κολλήγιον: the completion of the Kollegion in the one case, and the completion of the Presbyterion in the other case, must be interpreted as exactly parallel to each other. The interpretation which we reject might be taken to imply that Basil vowed, if he completed fifty years of the presbyterate, to make the building, on which (about 855 A.D.) he engraved his inscription: the relationship of the other persons would then be the only evidence as to the time over which the series of buildings extended; but this would give a very similar result, only less narrowly defined.

[1] This is not a logical or grammatical construction; but the sentence is illogical on any interpretation.

16. Here lies Sergius in the month, fourteenth, of Octouberius.

The exact year when Basil, now a very old man, wrote his inscription (which is practically his epitaph, and which in that view may be compared with the epitaph of St. Avircius Marcellus, engraved in the seventy-second year of his age, under his orders and oversight, on the tombstone which he had provided for himself) was a fourth indiction; and, as M. Clermont Ganneau points out in his letter to me, this must either be 840 or 855 A.D. I prefer the later date, as suiting better the letters and the whole circumstances.

I must state in general that all the architectural facts mentioned are due originally to the knowledge and quick observation of Miss Bell, though she must not be regarded as responsible for the theories which I base on them or the form in which I state them.

The inscriptions on church No. III. at Bin Bir Kilisse throw light on and receive light from the group of inscriptions in No. III. at Deghile. In the nave above the arcades and over the apse was engraved in small groups of letters—

17. [Certain persons, whose description and names are lost] having made a vow in common, completed the Kollegion.

On the outside of the apse is the one given above as No. 1. Which of these is earlier, and which later, or are they contemporary? We found no traces of reconstruction in this church; and therefore it is to be presumed that it was constructed at one time by one group of persons, who inscribed inside the record of their action in a most conspicuous and honourable place. Outside, one of them was permitted to inscribe the record of the sepulchral character of the building. The latter record was not as yet permitted to be inscribed on one of the doorposts, but was relegated

to a less honourable but still conspicuous position on the apse. A church had not yet come to be regarded as practically equivalent to a sepulchral monument; but popular opinion was far on the way to that stage; and therefore this church belongs to the period intermediate between the inception and completion of the Presbyterion No. III. at Deghile, say about 840 A.D. The inscription inside the Kollegion is closely related in character to that on the apse inside the Presbyterion, but rather later in style than the latter; both record in the earlier fashion that the building was made through the vow of certain individuals. The inscription on the outside wall of the Kollegion has a place not unlike that of Nos. 13 and 14 outside the Presbyterion, keeping the sepulchral record outside the church, and it approximates in character rather to Nos. 6, 7, than to Nos. 2–5. Epigraphically, therefore, the conclusion is that the Presbyterion was begun about 805 A.D.; church No. II. at Deghile bearing inscriptions 6 and 7, was built about 820; the gateway at the north-east end of the Presbyterion with inscriptions 13, 14, about 830; church No. III. at Bin Bir Kilisse about 840; while the Presbyterion was completed about 855.

As to the relation of the older gods to the saints of the Orthodox Church, we have learned little. There is not here a continuous tradition, as there is at Iconium where the Christian population has never died out. At Barata the Christians probably maintained themselves for some time after the Seljuk conquest. There is a rude fortification, a walled village, evidently of a very late period, in the southern part of the lower town. It cannot be Turkish, for there has never been a mosque inside of it, and the fortifications are not such as we should readily attribute to the Seljuks. In the upper part of the town one of the churches has been transformed into a mosque in the early

Turkish period.[1] The situation here during the century following the Turkish conquest in 1072 was evidently similar to that which existed at a later time in Smyrna before that city was finally conquered by Tamerlane in 1402; the upper town of Barata, and the Castle of Smyrna, were held by the invading Turks: part of the lower town of Barata, and the port of Smyrna, were fortified and held by the Christians. Many other cases are known and some have been described elsewhere, in which a Christian and a Turkish village continued to exist side by side after the Turkish conquest, though gradually the Christian population either died out or became Moslem.[2] So it was at Barata. The lower town is now purely Moslem, while the upper town is absolutely uninhabited, and it was only through our excavations that the transformation of one of the churches into a mosque was discovered. Other churches were made into Turkish houses, as the excavations showed. As the Moslem population has died out, these have been abandoned and gradually filled up and covered.

If the Christian population of Barata had possessed sufficient energy, it would have maintained its continuity and would have preserved the memory of its saints and its festivals, for the Seljuk Sultans seem not to have been hostile to the Christian population of their dominions. It was internal and moral weakness, combined with the destruction of industry and civilization by the hordes of nomad Turkmens (who were never in any real sense subject to the Sultans until the nineteenth century), not persecution by the government, which obliterated (except in

[1] This is No. XV. (which Strygowski mixes up with No. XVI.). Another of the churches, No. X., was transformed into a bakery in that same period.

[2] For example Tefeni, the town of St. Stephen, and Karamanli, the men of the chief Karaman, and Sivasli, the people of Sevaste, and Seljukler, the Seljuks, were two such pairs of neighbouring villages: see *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. p. 303, ii. pp. 576, 581.

sporadic remnants) the Christianity of central Anatolia during the twelfth century. Through the destruction of the Christian tradition we are reduced to the evidence of epigraphy and nomenclature. In the city our researches disclosed in one church the name of Michael. And in the hills around there is some slight evidence. In a memorial chapel No. VII. at Deghile, which bears the epitaph of Paul on the outside of the north wall and has a grave in the entrance just outside the door on the west, there is on the apse an invocation to St. Conon, whose memory was specially revered in Isauria and the surrounding districts: *ἅγιε Κόνων β[οήθει ?]*. This may be taken as a proof that the chapel built as a memorial of Paul, whether by himself before his death or by his relatives after he was dead, was dedicated to St. Conon, a popular saint in Pamphylia, Isauria and Lycaonia. As the church of Paul is near the family house on the north side of No. III., this Paul may be the person mentioned in inscription 14. That would give 850–880 as the date of this memorial church of Paul, which is highly probable epigraphically.

It is also probable that the name Mahalitch,[1] by which the Turks call the highest peak of the mountain, contains a reminiscence of Michael, and that this lofty peak was dedicated by the Christians to the commander of the hosts of angels. The apse of the memorial chapel of Leo on the peak was formerly covered with fresco, of which only a very small part remains, showing ornamentation in interlaced circles and the broken first letters of the name of a saint.

[1] Often pronounced Mahlitch, especially with a vocalic ending, e.g. Mahlije (*h* aspirated); but the longer form must be the older.

The spelling is execrable; and yet it must be remembered that these are the epitaphs of persons of some wealth, who could afford to make constructions in or around the church, and who received the honour of a church-grave.

I could read the A of Ἅγιος and part of a letter which was probably M.

The names of Conon and Michael take us into the ordinary angel-service of Byzantine times. In the half-magical, half-liturgical superstition of the period no name was more often used as that of a heavenly protector and champion than the name of Michael the Archangel.

By A.D. 850 the pressure of the Arabs on Asia Minor was being relaxed, rather from their growing weakness and the disorganization of the unwieldy Caliphate, than from the strength or energy of the Byzantine Empire. The population of Barata, who had deserted the town at the foot of the mountain about A.D. 700, had been comparatively safe from the Arab raids in their high mountain abodes; and now they began to return and to rebuild the lower town, which, as it now lies before us in ruins, belongs to the two centuries 850–1050. Church-construction was the order of the day, and the main business of the inhabitants. We observed no evidence of corporate life or municipal or social activity except in this form. Society seems to have gone back almost to the old theocratic system of primitive Anatolia, in a degenerated form, with the Imperial Byzantine government standing apart in the background and occasionally intervening. In the two parts of the town, upper and lower,[1] there are about thirty churches. A few of these may possibly have survived from the time before the Arab conquest. Several were standing half ruined, and were reconstructed with new roofs and part of the walls rebuilt, as for example Nos. I., VI., VII., and XXI. But the great majority were new buildings, some perhaps on old foundations. The variety of design and the beauty of outline are remarkable. One would at first sight

[1] These form one whole, distinguished from Deghile three miles away on the mountain.

say that there was no degeneration in church architecture. Yet even here the details will not bear examination. The plan was traditional and good; the work was poor and bad. The measurements were always rough and inaccurate. In no case does any side correspond exactly to the opposite side. No real liking for the work appears, no loving care to make it as rich and as beautiful as possible. The mouldings are flat and poor, the walls bare, the lintels and other parts where ornament was almost necessary show poor designs or are perfectly plain. Very often two walls which meet are not worked into one another, but simply touch, as if one had been added at a later time; and yet both belong to the original plan and form parts of the original work.

Still, with all their faults, the buildings have a dignity and simplicity which are very effective. The great tradition of Byzantine architecture was preserved to the very end in this remote part of the Empire. It did not decay and die out gradually; it merely ceased when the Christian Empire expired, and when there was no longer any theatre for its activity.

Apart from the church architecture, there is little to say in favour of this provincial Byzantine town. Monasteries multiplied: they abound all over the mountain. The people seem to have been wholly dominated by ecclesiastic interests. Much of the land must have passed into the possession of the monasteries, and so been withdrawn from the service of the state. Patriotism could not survive in such an atmosphere; and there is no reason to think that the Imperial government either tried or deserved to rouse a national and loyal spirit, for it was becoming steadily more oriental, more despotic and more rigid. But the major part of the blame for the national decay must be laid on the Orthodox Church. The nation had been delivered

over to its care. It had been supreme and its authority unquestioned, after the Iconoclasts had been put down. The result was that art and learning and education were dead, and the monasteries were left. The Orthodox Church had allied itself with autocracy against the people, and with the superstitious mob against the heretics and the thinkers. Its triumph meant the ruin of the nation and the degradation of higher morality and intellect and Christianity and art. In our excavations, never deep, we did not find any article worth picking up.

But a high standard of material comfort still reigned in the mountain. The delightful air could not be ruined. The water supply, bountifully provided in early time, was cared for and maintained in good order. The vines grew generously on the volcanic soil of the hillsides. Whatever else failed, the wine-presses, which we found in numbers, were still trodden,[1] the harvests were still reaped, and the fruit still gathered from the trees. Pope, in the end of the Dunciad, describing the chosen refuge of Dulness, might have been speaking of the Kara Dagh under the sway of the Orthodox Church—

> To happy convents, bosomed deep in vines,
> Where slumber abbots, purple as their wines[2];
> To isles of fragrance, lily-silvered vales,
> Diffusing odours on the panting gales.

Whether the spirit of the two following lines would also suit, our information does not enable us to judge—

> To lands of singing and of dancing slaves,
> Love-whispering woods and lute-resounding waves.

If they did suit, the Orthodox Church would have restored one more feature of the primitive Anatolian ritual; but the general character of that Church does not lead us to believe that they suited.

[1] Strictly speaking, the presses were crushed down by lever power.

[2] We found the tomb of Ἄβας Πέτρος Παπᾶς.

NOTE.—It will be convenient to place here together the text of the inscriptions quoted:—

1. ἐνθάδε κατάκητε ἡ Στεφάνου, μὴ γνοῦσα χάρουσά ποτε, μηνὶ Νοέβρου ι΄: on the adjoining stone to left, αὕτη [ἡ] κατύκυσής μου ἧς ἐῶνα ἐῶνος, ὧδε κατυκύσο αὕτη[ν]: i.e., κατοίκησις, κατοικήσω: *Studies in the History*, etc., p. 261. See also no. 17.

2. On the capital of the pillar, Θεόδορος δοῦλο(ς) Χ(ριστο)ῦ: below on the shaft, ἐκημήθυ ἡ Παπαδήα μηνὶ Μαρτίου ἧς τὰς δεκαπέτε· ἀμήν· ὁ Θ(εὸ)ς μακαρήσῃ τήν. For the strange formula, stating the day of the month or the deceased's age, on the analogy of the modern expression for hours of the day, but with ἡμέρας understood instead of ὥρας, compare an epitaph in a village cemetery on the mountain ἔθα (sic!) κατάκητε Πανταλέον· ἐκυμίθη μηνὶ Γενοαρήου ἧς τὰς τρηάντα μήαν. τήν also is a modern usage.

3. ἐκυμήθ[η] ὁ Δομεστηκὸς μην[ὶ] Μαΐῳ δ΄.

4. ἔνθα κατάκιτε Μουσιανο[ῦ] Γ[ε]ωργίω λασυπλιγασυπωμινας.

5. ἔνθα κατάκητε ἡ μακάρηος Χηονήα μηνὶ Πεφρουαρήου.

6. ἔνθα κῆτε Φηλάρετος Ἀκύλα· ἀπέθανον ἰς τὸν πόλεμον μηνὶ Μαΐου λ΄, ἰνδ. δ. The first person is certain, a usage common in older epitaphs.

7. ἔνθα κῆτε Ἀκύλας· ἀπέθανεν Ἀπρηλήου ιδ΄, ἰνδ. ι΄.

8. ἔνθα κατάκητε Παῦλος· ἀπέθανε μηνὶ Ἀπρηλύου γ΄.

9. εὐχῇ Τεύκρου Παπίου. Here and in similar short inscriptions εὐχή is possible; but the analogy of many longer ones proves that εὐχῇ is right and that a passive verb is to be understood as following.

10. εὐχῇ Νησίου Τιβερίου.

11. εὐχῇ Μαμμᾶ τριβ(ούνου).

12. (1) εὐχῇ Ἀκύλου καὶ Οὐαληρίου [Βικ?]τορί[ου].
(2) εὐχῇ Ἰνδάκου Οὐαληρίου.
(3) εὐχῇ Δομετίου· εὐξάμενοι ἐτέλησαν.
(4) On the central stone of the apse, between stones (1) and (2), are engraved irregularly Κλη[μεντος?] Οὐαληρίου Δομετίου, round the ornate cross which covers the middle of this central stone of the arch. On the high-built grave which fills the south end of the narthex is engraved [Βικ]τόρης πρεσβύ(τερος). The form -τορης, gen. τορήου, is of a common class: compare Βασήλης, -ήου, in 15, Σέργης in 16. Akylas (Aquila of Acts) is probably the person who occurs in 6 and 7, on a church close by.

13. ὑπὲρ μνήμης Λονγίνου Ἰνδάκου πρεσβυ(έρου). The second η is corrected from ε by the engraver.

14. εὐχῇ Παύλου Λονγίνου.

15. εὐχῇ Βασηλήου πρεσβυτέρου [τ]ε[λι]όθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον ὑπὸ Λέοντος τοῦ ἁγιοτάτου μητροπολίτου ἔος Κοσταντήνου τοῦ ἁγηοτάτου μητροπολίτου ἔτ(η) αν'. κὲ ἐλ[θ]όντος[1] μου ἐν ἀδυναμίᾳ κὲ μὶ δυνημένον μου ἐκτελῖν τὰ θῆα δηδάγματα, ἐκουσήᾳ μου τῖ γνόμ[ῃ] κὲ αὐθερετοβουλῇ (or as two words) παρετησάμην τὴν πολυπόθητον τοῦ Χ(ριστ)οῦ λιτουργίαν, τῇ δὲ προσευχῖ ἐπημένιμε, κὲ παρακαλῶ τὸν ἐλεήμοναν ὡς εὐσπλάχνος μυ δὸς ἄ[μ]αρτιμάτον ἄφεσην ἅμα κὲ Ἠρίνις τῖς συνβήου μο[υ].

ἐ[γρ]ά[φ]θι διὰ χιρ[ὸ]ς Β[α]σ[ι]λίου πρεσ[βυτέ]ρου μινὶ Σεπτεβρίου ιν. δ'.

The text is very worn and extremely difficult, the letters are rude, the lines irregular, and the stone friable. Unless it had been protected by the arch from the weather, the stone would have been quite illegible. And unless I had had the opportunity of studying the inscription for three weeks in all states of the light, I could not have deciphered the text completely. As stated above, I am greatly indebted to M. Clermont Ganneau. δυνημένον is certain.

16. On the west front of the northern enlargement of the narthex of No. VII. at Deghile.

ἔνθα κῆτε Σέργης μινὴ (sic!) ιδ' Ὀκτουβηρήου.

17. Above the arcades and apse of the nave of No. III. at Bin Bir Kilisse. The southern arcades had fallen in, when I copied the inscription in 1882; all have now fallen. [οἱ δεῖνες] τὸ κολλῆγιν ἐν κοινῷ εὐξάμενοι ἐτέ[λεσαν or λείωσαν]. No 1 is on the outside of the apse of the church.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DISCIPLE WHOM JESUS LOVED.

IN the second part of the Fourth Gospel, which deals exclusively with the Lord's Supper, the Cross, and the Resurrection, the Evangelist introduces a figure elsewhere unknown, "the Disciple whom Jesus loved." This portion of the Gospel is doubly marked off from the first twelve chapters, which deal with the public ministry; (*a*) by the general reflections on the results of Jesus' public work in xii. 37–50;

[1] Perhaps ἐνόντος, as I formerly read, is right; but I think the text is ΑΙ (where I is followed by a blurred space for a square θ) and not Ν (followed by a hole in the stone left empty by the engraver).