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ABSTRACT


This work examines the epigram of the Early Byzantine church of St. Polyeuktos, and the lineage of its patron, Anicia Juliana, in order to gain insight into the structure’s layout, decoration, and departure from architectural norms.

By utilizing the epigram as a guide, it examines the design and decoration of the church. Topics covered include aspects of the structure such as its design connections to the Temple of Jerusalem, the vine and peacock iconography of its great entablature, the presence or absence of a domed roof, and a baptismal mosaic of Constantine. It also touches upon related commissions that lay outside the confines of St. Polyeuktos, such as the Vienna Dioscorides medical treatise, and churches, such as St. Euphemia, also constructed by the patron.

Anicia Juliana designed St. Polyeuktos to match the measurements of the Jerusalem Temple. Its distinct decorative program included imagery and an inscribed poem that made this theme clear. This study finds that the unique perspective of this female patron has not been fully explored. By reviewing the history of her female progenitors, it establishes the theory that the Anicia Juliana possessed personal knowledge that prompted her to custom design St. Polyeuktos in hope of it someday housing the Temple treasure.

Although the interior location of the first half of the inscribed epigram has been firmly established within the nave of the St. Polyeuktos, the location of its second half remains a mystery. Sculptural fragments from its great entablature, bearing lines from the epigram, were accidentally unearthed in the quarter of Sarachane, Istanbul. A copy of the epigram, found in a tenth-century manuscript from the Palatine Anthology, AP 1.10, played a crucial role in identifying the church. This study examines the glosses, tie marks and signes-de-renvoi that surround the poem’s text, in an effort to establish the layout of the second half of the epigram for the exterior compound of the church.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Anicia Juliana was a prominent figure in Early Byzantine Constantinople. Raised as an imperial princess in the early sixth century, she was born into a family whose history was filled with an impressive number of affluent and influential men and women. Although she herself never attained the position of Empress, she did hold the title of Patricia. As a Christian noblewoman of rank, and wealthy heir to a royal fortune, she followed in the footsteps of her predecessors as a prolific patron. Juliana’s commissions included the beautifully illustrated medical manuscript, the Vienna Dioscorides, and the construction of what at that time was the largest church in Constantinople, her luxuriously decorated palace church St. Polyeuktos.

Renowned for her role as a great builder and decorator of churches, her efforts eventually rivaled that of the Emperor Justinian. She also championed the cause of Christian Orthodoxy and played a part in its restoration. Juliana was determined to be remembered. By exercising the aristocratic principles paideia and philanthropia, (moral discipline and benevolence), she skillfully navigated the political and religious culture of her time and succeeded in creating a lasting legacy for herself and her family.

Ever since the 1960 discovery of Anicia Juliana’s monumental Early Byzantine church, interest in the structure and decoration of the church along with Anicia Juliana as a historic figure and female patron has been on the rise. The sculpture unearthed during the discovery of the Church of Saint Polyeuktos had been part of the church’s great entablature. Three exquisitely carved elements were employed in its design: an epigram, a vine frieze, and a number of peacocks. This examination will endeavor to contribute to
the study of this unique work. A thorough study will be made of the epigram as it relates to the design, decoration, and layout of the church, as well as Juliana’s family history and her other commissions in an effort to better understand the patron and her greatest achievement.
Chapter 2

The Genealogy of Anicia Juliana

Figure 1. Marble Portrait Bust of a Woman with a Scroll, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Bust thought to be of Anicia Juliana.
Anicia Juliana (c. 461/462 - c. 527/528) was an influential Byzantine heiress. She was an accomplished patron of the arts and actively involved in the political and spiritual culture of her time (fig. 1). Her parents were Emperor Flavius Anicius Olybrius (unknown - c. 472) and Empress Galla Placidia (c. 439/443 – c. 480/484). Her father was an aristocratic patrician who held the prestigious and highly elevated political office of consul in 464. He went on to reign as Emperor of the Western Roman Empire for less than one year before his death in 472. Her mother, who outlived him, was a descendant of Emperor Theodosius the Great, the last emperor to rule over the united Roman Empire.

Anicia Juliana was a well known and accomplished individual, yet two other women with the same name precede her. One of them, an Anicia Juliana from the late fourth century, was married to an Olybrius who served as consul in 395, not to be confused with Juliana’s father who reigned as emperor in 472. This was a popular family name and eventually Juliana’s son was also given the name of Olybrius. He went on to also become a consul in 491. Care is required in order to avoid confusion, as both names, Juliana and Olybrius, are intertwined throughout our Juliana’s history.

Born in the eastern capital of Constantinople, Juliana was raised in her family’s palace in one of the most affluent neighborhoods in the city. The young princess would have been quite privileged, highly educated, and exposed to only the very finest things.

2. Martindale 1980, 796-798; 887
that both eastern and western aristocracy had to offer. One could say that she lived a high
profile lifestyle.\textsuperscript{6}

Anicia Juliana grew up to become an accomplished patron of the arts. An
examination of her ancestry makes it very clear that she was born and raised to fulfill this
role. A study of her family history and how she was trained in the traditions of the royal
court will help expand our understanding of her position as patroness.

Juliana appears to have spent her entire life in Constantinople and was considered
its wealthiest and most aristocratic resident.\textsuperscript{7} Her impressive lineage extended back for
centuries (fig. 2). On her father's side it included the wealthy and prominent \textit{gens Anicia},
hence her \textit{nomen}, or family name, \textit{Anicia. Juliana} was her personal name or \textit{cognomen}.
From here on she will be referred to by this less formal rendering of her name.

On her mother's side she was descended not once, but twice, from both the
Theodosian and Valentinian dynasties. Her great-grandfather was Theodosius II and her
grandfather was Valentinian III. She was, therefore, one of the last survivors of an
illustrious dynasty that by the early sixth century had outlasted all others except for the
Julio-Claudians.\textsuperscript{8} This was the lineage and legacy that Anicia Juliana worked so
diligently to preserve. Juliana had no intention of being forgotten, and was determined
that she and her family would be remembered.

\textsuperscript{7} Michael Maas, \textit{The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian} (Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press, 2005), 439.
\textsuperscript{8} Geoffrey Nathan, "Pothos Tes Philoktistou': Anicia Juliana's Architectural Narratology" in \textit{Byzantine
Association for Byzantine Studies, 2006), 434.
Strength of character was a trait shared by many of the women in Juliana’s family. Her imperial genetic background was replete with notably strong women dating back to the beginning of the Theodosian and Valentinian lines. These resourceful wives, mothers, and daughters lived within the patriarchal system of Roman society. Technically
they were unable to hold governmental office. Nevertheless, these aristocratic women often wielded considerable religious and secular power. Quite a number of them had reputations as strong, politically savvy individuals who had no compunctions about taking control of a situation when necessary.

Juliana’s heritage extended back through Theodosian and Valentinian lines, quite possibly all the way back to Constantine the Great. Frakes proposes that her fourth great-grandmother Justina, wife of Valentinian I, may have been a member of the Constantinian dynasty through a maternal link. By tracing back family names, Frakes finds evidence that Justina, her daughter Galla, (the wife of Theodosius I), and her granddaughter Galla Placidia might all have Constantinian ties. If so, this would not only link all three of these major dynasties together, it would also connect Juliana to Constantine I and his mother Helena. This would have served her well by strengthening her imperial ties and validating her family’s place in history. An association with Helena was also desirable and was a popular claim of many female members of imperial families.

Justina is perhaps one of the oldest examples of the strong and influential female characters who were a part of Juliana’s legendary history. Justina was married to Valentinian I. She was his second wife. His first wife Severa had made the mistake of telling her husband about the beautiful woman she had met at the baths, Justina. Legend has it that he was so smitten with Justina that he considered legalizing polygamy.

However, it appears that he and Severa did divorce and Justina became his second wife. Like Helena, she was also an Arian Christian. Years later after her husband’s death she attempted to influence the church through her son, the child emperor Valentinian II. She tried to grant Arians the right to assemble for worship and to exile Ambrose, an orthodox bishop. Arianism denied the divinity of Christ, and was unpopular with the orthodox trinitarian majority. Her attempt failed. Later, when Italy was invaded by the usurper Maximus, she managed to escape to northern Greece with her two children Galla and Valentinian II. Justina also negotiated a dynastic union of the eastern and western empire by arranging the marriage of her daughter Galla to Theodosius II, thus engaging Theodosius against Maximus and restoring Valentinian II as emperor of the West.

While Juliana’s female ancestors may have been strong and resourceful, the male historians of the time would have us believe that they were also notorious troublemakers. These women were said to be the cause of a number of invasions. After the death of Valentinian III, rumors flew that his wife, Juliana’s grandmother Licinia Eudoxia, had written to the Vandal King Geiseric asking him to invade Rome and rescue her from an unwanted marriage to Petronius Maximus. After the Vandals sacked Rome in 455, she and her two daughters, Juliana’s future mother Placidia and aunt Eudocia, were captured and taken to Carthage in Africa (fig. 3). About seven years later Licinia Eudoxia and Placidia were released and moved to Constantinople, while Eudocia stayed in Carthage and married Geiseric’s son Huniric.

Juliana’s grandmother Licinia Eudoxia may have been inspired by another strong willed relative, her great-aunt Princess Justa Grata Honoria. She was Licinia Eudoxia’s rebellious sister in law. As the daughter of Constantius III and Galla Placidia, she grew up in the palace of Ravenna, but at the age of sixteen had an affair with her chamberlain and was exiled to Constantinople to live with the Sisters of Theodosius. After about twelve unsatisfactory years of pious and wholesome living, Honoria came up with a plan to escape. She managed to get a eunuch to deliver her ring and plea to the most well known and ruthless individual she could think of, Atilla the Hun. When Theodosius II found out, he had her sent back to her brother Valentinian III in Italy. His advice was to

turn her over to Atilla. Her brother could have had her executed, but their mother Galla Placidia intervened and Honoria was spared. In the end she married a senator and fell into obscurity. Atilla attempted to claim her as his bride along with a dowry of half the western Roman Empire. He was refused, and decided to invade the west in 451 and 452.\textsuperscript{14}

While the majority of Juliana's female ancestors were actually skilled social engineers, the tendency for historians to stereotype these women as selfish, hysterical females is clear. Surely those who planned these invasions had their own motivations for war and were not simply at the beck and call of imperial damsels in distress. It is reasonable, however, to imagine that these women would have certainly been smart enough to make the best of any situation into which they were placed.

While, according to some ancient historians, both Juliana's maternal great-aunt as well as her grandmother were the cause of invasions by both the Huns and the Vandals, another noteworthy female relative is found on her father's side of the family. Anicia Faltonia Proba, Juliana's paternal great-great grandmother, was notorious for opening the gates of Rome to Alaric and the Visigoths in 410.\textsuperscript{15} Supposedly at some point during the long siege, she became fed up with the situation within the walls of Rome. According to Procopius, circumstances had degenerated to the point of cannibalism.\textsuperscript{16} Her solution to end the famine and plague she witnessed was to have her servants simply open the gates

\begin{flushright}
15. Kate Cooper, "Chapter 13 Gender and the Fall of Rome" in A Companion to Late Antiquity, ed. Philip Rousseau (Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley & Sons, 2012), 187; and also August Friedrich von Pauly, Pauly's Realencyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft Vol. 1, Part 2 (J. B. Meltzer, 1894), 2201–2202. \\
\end{flushright}
and invite the invaders in. She is said to have acted out of pity, but of course questions arose regarding her motives.

Gibbon believed that the rise of Christian ideals had emasculated Roman society and had contributed to the fall of Rome. This concept is still being examined today by historians like Kate Cooper in an effort to better understand the gender roles of the time. This would have made prominent Christian women of the era easy targets for blame. Nevertheless, even though it is difficult at this point in time to separate fact from fiction, or weed out romanticized notions, the strength, determination and resourcefulness of Juliana’s female ancestors remains a predominant theme throughout these legendary tales.

For example, Gibbon states that “by the agreement of the three females who governed the Roman world” the betrothal of first cousins once removed, Licinia Eudoxia and Valentinian III, took place in 424, and they were wed in 437. This match was highly significant in that it served to reunite the divided Theodosian and Valentinian lines. This leads to the question of who these three influential women he refers to were.

It would be easy to believe that the powerful empress Eudoxia (c. 380 – c. 404), wife of Arcadius, could have been one of them. She was Juliana’s great-great-grandmother and is easily confused with her namesake Licinia Eudoxia (c. 422 – c. 462).

18. Kate Cooper 2012, 188, 190-192, 196-199.
However, she would have died twenty years before the betrothal took place. Therefore, I believe that Gibbon is referring to the western empress Galla Placidia, and the eastern empresses (Athenais) Eudocia and Pulcharia, as the three influential women responsible for arranging the historic marriage.

Galla Placidia was one of Anicia Juliana's two maternal great-grandmothers and the mother of the groom. (Athenais) Eudocia, the mother of the bride, was the other. She is often identified by her pre-Christian conversion name Athenais. Pulcheria was Juliana's sainted great-great-aunt and one of her most powerful predecessors. At an early age she had taken charge of the empire through the upbringing of her brother, the young emperor Theodosius II. She also took a vow of virginity that eliminated male competitors and enabled Pulcheria to revolutionize established concepts of female authority.

Further evidence supports the identification of these three particular women as Gibbon's three female rulers. Pulcheria had arranged for the marriage of (Athenais) Eudocia to her brother the emperor, but the relationship inevitably led to a rivalry between the two formidable women. They ended up competing for imperial and ecclesiastic influence. It was a unique situation to have two titled empresses (Augustae) of the same generation associated with the same emperor. Nevertheless, it appears that they were able to work together along with Galla Placidia to plan the course of their family's future, before their rivalry became an issue. Just before the betrothal took place, (Athenais) Eudocia was living in Constantinople with her husband, Emperor Theodosius II, and their children, including Licinia Eudocia. Pulcheria had moved out of their palace,

but she had not left the capital. The recently widowed Galla Placidia had come from Rome with her children, Justa Grata Honoria and Valentinian III, to live in Constantinople with her nephew, the eastern emperor, and his wife. Therefore, the timing for these particular three women to come together and agree upon the betrothal of Licinia Eudoxia to Valentinian III is correct.

The reuniting of Anicia Juliana’s prestigious family further strengthened her imperial claims. All the effort that went into plotting the course of her family was certainly not something she would have wanted to waste. Juliana would have been acutely aware of the need for her husband or son to rule as emperor in order to maintain the imperial status of her family. She must have fully expected to become empress or at least the mother of an emperor, but it was not to be.

Juliana had come close to reigning as a queen. In 478 the emperor Zeno had offered her hand to Theodoric the Great, who would later become King of the Ostrogoths, but was turned down. She later married a military general and politician Areobindus (Flavius Areobindus Dagalaiphus Areobindus, c. 460 – c. 512). He came from a distinguished Roman family and was the great-grandson of the famous general Aspar. A commander of troops during the war with Persia, he held the office of Count of the Stable, and served as consul (elected public official) in 506. Any aspirations Juliana had

to becoming an empress were finally put to rest when he refused the position of Emperor.

In 512 a mob showed up at Juliana’s house shouting “Areobindus for emperor!” They were dissatisfied with the current emperor Anastasius and his monophysite views, but Areobindus was not interested in usurping the position and supposedly had already fled the scene. This uprising was the culmination of a series of dangerous and destructive riots. Areobindus, who was probably elderly and retired, is presumed to have died shortly after this event.

Juliana and Areobindus had a son named Flavius Anicius Olybrius after his grandfather. He became a consul in 491 at a very young age. Olybrius eventually married Irene, the niece of emperor Anastasius I, and they had two daughters. One of the girls was given the paternal family name Proba.

When Anastasius I, who was childless, died in 518, Juliana had probably hoped that her son would be chosen as the next emperor and thereby continue their imperial line, but that was also not to be. Instead, her aristocratic son was passed by and the position was given to Justin I, an illiterate military commander of peasant descent. Juliana would not have been pleased with this turn of events. It was during his reign between 524 and 527 that she commissioned her most famous church, St. Polyeuktos, by enlarging and decorating the original built by her great-grandmother (Athenais) Eudocia. While no mention is made of her husband, Juliana’s son and grand-daughters are

included in the epigram inscribed within the church’s great entablature.\textsuperscript{35} (Appendixes 1-3) Perhaps she still entertained hope of her grandchildren becoming future rulers. However, at this point in life she must have dedicated herself to making sure that her family would be memorialized. Her strong resolve to conquer time and keep her family history alive is still evident today within the remains of her magnificent church.

After her death (c. 527/528), Juliana’s son Olybrius would have witnessed the construction of Hagia Sophia, and been well aware of any rivalries or differences in political and spiritual opinions between his mother, Juliana, and the current Emperor Justinian. Unfortunately, but for obvious reasons, within five years of Juliana’s death her son was exiled because of his involvement in a plot against Justinian. According to Harrison, “His property, which presumably included the palace and its church, was confiscated. Although he was eventually permitted to return to Constantinople and his property was restored to him, he himself had no sons, and nothing is known of subsequent occupants of the palace or of the church’s administration. The church could, however, still be visited in the tenth century.”\textsuperscript{36}

Although she never attained the position of Empress, nor the prestigious honorific of \textit{Augusta} (Imperial Majesty) held by many of her female predecessors, Juliana did hold the title of \textit{Patricia}, making her a Noble or Noble of Senatorial Rank in her own right.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{36.} Harrison 1989, 142.
She would no doubt have been privy to court politics and the elaborate palace ceremonies of the emperor and empress. Born and bred within this elite world, she would certainly have been aware of the latest trends and fashions. Judging by the surviving evidence we have of her commissions, she was also a trendsetter. Juliana grew up within and surrounded by the domas, or palatial residences and churches created by her aristocratic ancestors. As an adult she would become a prolific patron and renovate many of these same buildings. Her familiarity with their architecture, as well as the paideia (moral discipline) of her secular and spiritual education would have been a profound, perpetual influence on the young Juliana.

Greek paideia began with an ideal rather than the individual. It was a philosophy intended to create an ideal member of society. It sought to mould character to fit a model of virtue so that individuals might achieve their potential. It was an education of culture that went beyond promoting the basic skills necessary for tradesmen and artists. It provided ancient proverbial guidance regarding friendship, courtesy, poise, anger management, and skills of persuasion in the face of violence. For the powerful aristocracy it became a reliable code of social ethics much like that of the chivalric code of medieval knights or the more modern archetype of an English gentleman. In the Early

---


Byzantine period of Juliana, *paideia* had become less of a supreme ideal in and of itself, and more of a primary stage necessary for the development of Christian character.  

Juliana was raised at a time when social ethics had undergone a transformation. Just as *paideia* had been redefined, the classical concept of *Philanthropia* and the rationale behind showing mercy to others had also undergone a shift in perspective as Christianity took hold in the Eastern Empire. Those in need were no longer viewed as individuals subject to Fate, but rather as objects of compassion. Philanthropy was no longer a mere action arising from superior privilege, or to be bestowed within one’s own social group. Instead, it had become a divinely inspired act of worship. The sick and needy were no longer viewed as abandoned by the gods. Instead, they provided an opportunity to learn about the compassionate nature of the Christian God through acts of philanthropy. This in turn led to more public and social acts of altruism.

These newly evolved principals clearly influenced Juliana’s predecessors and no doubt encompassed values that were handed down to her. The imperial women in her line were known by their acts of patronage and were responsible for the construction and renovation of many churches. They also secured relics, erected hospitals, and were involved in many other acts of charity and patronage. As a leading citizen of Constantinople, Juliana followed in their footsteps as a prominent benefactor. She stands out from among these other female commissioners as accomplishing this without ever


holding the title of empress, although this may have been a traditional role for non-regent female members of the imperial family.42

The epigram inscribed within the church of St. Polyeuktos, her best-known architectural commission, describes Juliana as constructing more houses of worship than she herself could keep track of.43 The notion that she did indeed possess more than was recorded is not so far fetched. Magdalino examines the possibility that Juliana “as the sole survivor of the Theodosian imperial line, inherited all the Theodosian properties in the tenth region of Constantinople” (fig. 4). This would have included the homes of two

43. “Not even thyself knowest how many houses dedicated to God thy hand hath made; for thou alone, I ween, didst build innumerable temples all over the world, ever fearing the servants of God in Heaven.” The Greek Anthology 1916, 9-10. (See Appendix 3.)
of her great-grandmothers, (Galla) Placidia and (Athenais) Eudocia, and that of a childless great-great-aunt Arcadia, as well as three churches, St. Polyeuktos, St. Euphemia, and most likely St. Stephen. Magdalino speculates that Juliana may have been raised by her parents in *ta Olybriou*, her great-grandmother (Galla) Placidia’s palace that was adjacent to the church of St. Euphemia. 44 When her parents passed on, and the estate became a monastery, she would most likely have moved into *ta Ioulaines*, the palace inherited from her other great-grandmother (Athenais) Eudocia that was attached to her palace church, St. Polyeuktos. He also points out that *ta Olybriou* was probably named after Juliana’s father, who had no familial connection to the area, because he had escaped the siege of Rome and moved to Constantinople ahead of the women. He would have acquired the property through marriage or betrothal; however Juliana’s mother and grandmother would have not yet been released from their Vandal captivity in Carthage (North Africa). 45 Juliana is therefore associated with at least two palatial residences.

These elite homes were located in one of the finest neighborhoods in the city, between the *Mese*, which was the main road through Constantinople, and the aqueduct in a location that gave them primary access to the city's water supply (fig. 5). The women who inhabited such homes and worshipped in their adjoining family churches were very involved in the construction, design, and decoration of these sacred spaces. Mothers often handed them down to their daughters as family heirlooms.46 The imperial women would have also recognized the advantage of being steps away from the Baths of Constantius

---

and a *Nymphaeum*. Such was the lifestyle of privilege to which Juliana would have been accustomed.

Descended from a long and impressive line of influential imperial women, Juliana appears to have inherited the tenacity of those who came before her. Surely she would have grown up with and been familiar with the stories and exploits of these empresses, patrons, poets, and leaders. Clearly influenced by her family's historic fortitude and inspired by her familiarity with their many visible public works, she aspired to carry on their tradition of strength, philanthropy, and influence.

47. Magdalino 2001, 68,55 (for Nymphaeum a building filled with plants and flowers, sculpture, fountains, and paintings. The nymphaeum served as a sanctuary, a reservoir, and an assembly chamber where weddings were held. See http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/423203/nymphaeum)
Chapter 3

The Identification of St. Polyeuktos

Our first glimpse of Anicia Juliana's magnificent Church of Saint Polyeuktos came in 1912. A large Ionic impost capital (fig. 6) was discovered in the same area of Sarayhane where a future dig would reveal stones with similar motifs. It bears a frontal peacock set within a concave fan formed by its outspread tail feathers and surrounded by a scrolling grapevine. This finely carved sculpture was originally attributed to the Church of the Holy Apostles by Gustave Mendel.48 It was subsequently suggested by Cyril Mango and Ihor Ševčenko that it belonged with those found forty-eight years later in 1960, which have been attributed to Saint Polyeuktos.49 Although its association with Anicia Juliana and her church of Saint Polyeuktos is clearly recognizable today, at the time this proud peacock with his tail in full display remained a silent herald of things to come.

Figure 7. Inscribed block found in Saraçhane, Istanbul, includes segment of Line 27 from the poem. Archaeological Museum, Istanbul.

In April and May of 1960 significant discoveries were made in the Saraçhane quarter of Istanbul. Several important pieces of Byzantine sculpture as well as some brick vaults were found by construction workers who were leveling the area near the new city hall. The initial discoveries included an inscribed block (fig. 7), an inscribed niche-head
(fig. 8), and two types of cornices, all made of fine Proconnesian marble. They were richly carved with foliage, cornucopias, monograms, rinceaux, large conchs embellished with peacocks, and an inscription band.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Fragment of inscribed niche head with peacock tail from the main entablature of St. Polyeuktos church in Constantinople, with part of Line 31 of the poem.}
\end{figure}

It was Ihor Ševčenko who recognized some of the surviving inscribed words as phrases from a poem preserved in the Palatine Anthology, \textit{AP} 1.10, a collection of ancient texts is located in the Heidelberg University Library.\textsuperscript{51} This manuscript,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} Mango and Ševčenko 1961, 243.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Identification first reported by Ihor Ševčenko and J. Lafontaine, "Fouilles et découvertes byzantines à Istanbul de 1952 à 1960," \textit{Byzantion} 29-30 (1959-1960), 386 (cf. also 358-360); and Mango and Ševčenko
\end{itemize}
otherwise known as the *Anthologia Palatina* (abbreviated *AP*), or Greek Anthology, contains an exemplary collection of Greek epigrams. Originally, the entire manuscript resided in the Palatine library at the University of Heidelberg, but it was later divided and rebound into two separate volumes that were split between Heidelberg and Paris. AP 1.10 is found in the larger of the two, the *Codex Palatinus* 23, currently in Heidelberg.

Ševćenko states: "The inscription on the two sides of the rectangular block reads: YCKAMAT/OYCMELAPO; while on the niche-head OYA' AYTH ΔΕΔΑΗΚΑΕ. AMETP is written in a semicircle. This inscription may be readily completed since it appears in the Palatine Anthology, 1.10. It is part of a 76-line epigram on the church of the martyr Polyeuktos." The impost block is inscribed with a phrase from line 27 of the poem and the niche-head is inscribed with a phrase from line 31. Both of them are part of a passage that praises Anicia Juliana for her piety and patronage, and positively identifies the inscribed stones with the church of St. Polyeuktos. The surviving phrases have been highlighted within lines 26 to 33 in the translation below.

εὐσεβῆς πλήθουσαν; ὄλης χθονὸς ἐνναετήρες

σοYC KAMATOYC MELAPOσαν ἄειμνήστους γεγαώτας.

ἔργα γὰρ εὐσεβίς οὐ κρύπτεται· οὐ γὰρ ἀέθλους

---


52. Edited by A.H. Bullen with Thomas Stanley's translation, *Anacreon* (London: Lawrence & Bullen, 1893), xvii - xix


<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=pst.000006175610;view=1up;seq=13>.


54. Harrison 1989, 41, 82, 84, 88, 128-129.
λήθη ἀποσβέννουσιν ἀριστοπόλων ἁρετῶν.

ὅσα δὲ σῇ παλάμῃ θεοπειθέα δώματα τεύχει (30)

ΟΥΛ' ΑΥΤΗ ΔΕΔΑΗΚΑΣ. ΑΜΕΤΡήτους γάρ, ὑιο,

μοῦνη σῷ ξύμπασαν ἀνά χθόνα δείμαο νηώς,

οὐρανίου θεράποντας ἀεὶ τρομέουσα Θεοῖο.55

What place was there which did not learn that your purpose is full of piety? The inhabitants of the whole world sing your labours, which are always remembered. For the works of piety are not hidden; oblivion does not wipe out the contests of industrious virtue. (30) Even you do not know how many houses dedicated to God your hand has made; for you alone, I think, have built innumerable temples throughout the whole earth, always revering the servants of the heavenly God.56

Mango and Ševčenko inform us that "The original—and smaller—structure, we learn from the epigram, had been built by the Empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II (408-

55. Mango and Ševčenko 1961, 244; I have included the Greek passage in the same way that it appeared in the article. However, I have chosen to represent the phrases in uncial letters rather than modern Greek print in order to better match the actual letters carved on the sculpture. This includes the upper case Greek uncial C that was a standard form of sigma during late antiquity and the middle ages. I have left the P in AMETΡήτους because even though I cannot see it on the sculpture itself, Ševčenko included it. In doing this I used the Greek version of the poem found in Mary Whitby’s article: Mary Whitby, "The St Polyeuktos Epigram (AP 1.10) A Literary Perspective," in Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism, ed. Scott Fitzgerald Johnson (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2006) 56. Whitby 2006, 163; To double check the translation I ran the corresponding Greek words to "sing your labours", through Tufts University’s online Greek word study tool Perseus and got: thy,thine / toil, trouble / celebrate with song and dance or sing before - So I feel confident that this is correct. For the second highlighted translated phrase Perseus gave me: but not / self / learn / unmeasured, immeasurable, immense, so I believe that ‘Even you do not know how many’ is accurate. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0472%3Abook%3D1%3Ach apter%3D10>
450); the bulk of the epigram, however, is devoted to the church as it was later enlarged and rebuilt by the Princess Anicia Juliana.\textsuperscript{57}

Figure 9. A plan of Constantinople showing the location of St. Polyeuktos.

Upon examining the glosses (or marginal notes) surrounding the manuscript of the Palatine Anthology, Mango and Ševčenko also note that "The scholia on the epigram inform us that its text was inscribed in various parts of the church of St. Polyeuktos. There can be no doubt therefore that the pieces of sculpture we are discussing belonged to that church."\textsuperscript{58} Further proof of the church’s location is provided by the Book of Ceremonies regarding the processional route taken by the Emperor on Easter Monday.

\textsuperscript{57} Mango and Ševčenko 1961, 243.
\textsuperscript{58} Mango and Ševčenko 1961, 244.
While en route down the main road or Mese from his palace to the church of the Holy Apostles, the Emperor would make a stop at the church of St. Polyeuktos to change his candle (fig. 9). These combined facts confirm the connection between the architectural fragments and the church's location in Saraçhane.

The discovery of the architectural fragments and their connection to the carefully recorded epigram found in the *Palatine Anthology* validate the words and intention of its author. It is interesting to note that the particular words discovered on the block read, "your labors are sung." Centuries after the destruction of Juliana’s church, the stones were still at work, singing her praises and ensuring that Juliana’s labors would always be remembered. Her works are no longer hidden, even though earthquake, plunder, and time had almost eliminated any memory of her greatest accomplishment. True to the poem, oblivion has not wiped out the memory of Anicia Juliana and her magnificent church, St. Polyeuktos.

If one looks back to that first peacock-embellished capital, and compares it to sculpture of the Saint Polyeuktos church found years later, it becomes clear that Mango and Ševčenko's astute observation regarding their connection was accurate. While both are constructed of the same stone and found in Saraçhane, they are also connected by parallels in workmanship and iconography. The combination of the conch-like setting of the peacock and the deeply undercut grapevine on the impost capital reveal an unequivocal relationship with the great entablature of Saint Polyeuktos. The same expert

60. My thanks to Dr. Dru Johnson, Associate Professor of Biblical and Theological Studies, The King's College, NYC, and Associate Research Fellow, Institute for Advanced Studies - Shalem Center, Jerusalem for his assistance in identifying the specific phrases on the stone.
level of craftsmanship that would be found decorating Anicia Juliana’s beautiful church is echoed in the finely carved grapevine of the impost capital. The peacock is yet another link between the two. While peacocks are a common feature of Christian paradisal iconography, it is their unique placement and unusual prominence throughout the nave of Saint Polyeuktos that has contributed to their association with the patroness. It was most likely her choice to integrate the peacock as a distinct design element in the entablature. A further examination of the iconographic significance of Juliana's integration of peacock and grapevine motifs for the entablature will follow once this examination of the epigram and its situation within the Saint Polyeuktos complex is completed.
R. Martin Harrison believed that Juliana had looked to the Temple of Solomon as the architectural model for her Saint Polyeuktos church (fig. 10). He based this conclusion on a number of factors, one being the unusual unit of measure (the royal cubit) employed in the design and the way the building appeared to share a twenty-cubit square blueprint with the sanctuary of Solomon’s Temple. Harrison found it hard to resist the idea that Juliana was attempting to evoke the Solomonic Temple due to the poem’s claim that “She alone has overpowered time and surpassed the wisdom of the celebrated Solomon, raising a temple to receive God, the richly wrought and gracious splendor of
which a great epoch cannot celebrate.” Harrison also noted the fact that both Juliana and Solomon maintained residences adjacent to the sacred buildings they constructed, and recognized that they shared similar decorative programs (fig. 11). The interior and doors of Solomon’s Temple were decorated with alternating palm-trees and cherubim surrounded by vegetation, and Juliana’s Church of Saint Polyeuktos followed a similar program, but with one distinctive difference: instead of cherubim, she took the opportunity to depict the winged zoomorphic guardians of the temple as peacocks, which were also known as the birds of the Empresses.62

Figure 11. Interior of Solomon’s Temple (The real temple would probably have been smaller in scale and a curtain separating the sanctuary from the innermost dwelling of the Divine Presence would normally have been closed.)

There was one more issue that led Harrison to the conclusion that Juliana had evoked Solomon’s Temple in an effort to associate herself with the archetypal king. This involved a perceived rivalry between the aristocratic Princess and the low-born Emperor Justinian. Upon completion, Hagios Polyeuktos stood as the largest and most beautiful church in the city of Constantinople; however its status changed once Justinian completed his massive reconstruction of Hagia Sophia, replacing Juliana’s church as the largest in the city (fig. 12). It is said that Justinian, upon viewing his completed Hagia Sophia, exclaimed, “Solomon I have vanquished thee.” This is often interpreted as a reaction on the part of the Emperor towards Juliana and her church.\(^\text{63}\)

![Figure 12. A view of Hagia Sophia viewed as it would have appeared as a church minus the minarets that surround it today.](image)

This rivalry is further reflected in a sixth-century story written by Gregory of Tours that tells of the elderly Anicia Juliana outwitting Justinian (Appendix 4). In it he asks Juliana to make a donation to a public fund. She agrees, but asks for some time to collect it, and then secretly has her craftsmen cover the ceiling of her church with her

\(^{63}\) Harrison 1989, 40, 139.
gold. When Justinian comes to collect the donation, she takes him next door to her church. After they pray, Juliana shows him the golden ceiling, tells him that he may take what he wants, and that she would not oppose him. Outwitted, the Emperor praises its craftsmanship and prepares to leave, but not before Juliana presents him with a golden ring she had been wearing, while hiding its jewel in her palm. She informs Justinian that it is more valuable than the gold. Gregory of Tours points out that the ring was significant because it was set with a large Neronian emerald. He also attributed the protection of the church’s newly acquired gold to intervention of Saint Polyeuktos himself. Harrison considered the significance of this gesture “Was this ring her father’s, when was he emperor? Augustus, when he thought that he was dying, had handed his ring to his chosen successor, and later Hadrian had made a similar gesture. Perhaps the gift of the ring in her church was not the snub it first appears but rather the formal transfer of royal authority to Justinian as her acknowledged successor.”64 This would have been a significant gesture on Juliana’s part, given that Justinian’s predecessor was Justin I, an elderly, uneducated soldier who was chosen for the position of Emperor over her own son, Olybrius, who was a more deserving candidate.65

While during her lifetime Juliana had triumphed in her reconstruction of St. Polyeuktos, Justinian was soon to rebuild an even larger Hagia Sophia. There is an interesting connection between these two churches. Hagia Sophia’s original incarnation had been ordered by Constantine the Great. The church had been destroyed by fire on two occasions, and it is Justinian’s third redesign that still stands today. While St. Polyeuktos was originally built by Juliana’s great-grandmother, the Empress (Athenais) Eudocia, to

64. Harrison 1989, 40.
house the relic of the martyr’s skull, it is also significant that the second reconstruction of Hagia Sophia had been commissioned by her great-grandfather, the Emperor Theodosius II. Therefore, Juliana’s great-grandparents had both been involved in the construction of the two churches. In effect, Justinian was appropriating Juliana’s family heritage and prestige for himself.66

At the time, a religious disagreement over the nature of Christ had pitted the orthodox, who believed that Christ had two natures and was both divine and human, against the monophysites, who believed that Christ had only a single divine nature. A controversy erupted over the excommunication of the monophysite Patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius. This created a split between the eastern and western church that lasted thirty-five years. Juliana, who supported orthodoxy, played a part in trying to end the Acacian Schism by corresponding with the Pope.67 Juliana would have been glad to see the reconciliation of the eastern and western churches occur within her lifetime. Her pro-orthodox viewpoint also played a significant role in the design and decoration of St. Polyeuktos. In this, Juliana was also following in the footsteps of her great-grandmother the Empress (Athenais) Eudocia, who built the original church after her conversion from monophysite heresy to orthodoxy.68 The reconstructed St. Polyeuktos celebrated the restoration of orthodoxy and the hoped-for reunion of the churches of Rome and Constantinople. This resulted in the end of the Acacian Schism, so her role in resolving the schism was given concrete form in Juliana’s new church.

Basing the design of the church of St. Polyeuktos on the Biblical Temple was both architecturally and politically progressive. While Juliana appears to have drawn inspiration for her decorative program from motifs found within the Solomonic temple that once stood in Jerusalem, Christine Milner points out that her innovative and original design for the construction of the building itself also purposely matched the divine measurements of Ezekiel’s visionary temple.\(^{69}\) This was a design for a new temple to replace the desecrated temple of Solomon so that orthodox worship could be restored. In referring to Ezekiel’s temple, Juliana created a monument that was a dynastic and imperial statement of political and religious reform.\(^{70}\) Jonathan Bardill, who has studied the subject in detail, refers to the church as a “monument to the orthodox cause”.\(^{71}\)

Over time scholars have begun to understand that the view of Juliana as solely emulating Solomon’s Temple was a misinterpretation of the evidence.\(^{72}\) Milner was the first to point out the fact that many contemporaries held negative views towards the Temple of Jerusalem and believed that it would be only be rebuilt by the antichrist.\(^{73}\) Perhaps this is why church builders like Anicia Juliana and Justinian felt the need to make public proclamations of surpassing Solomon, to dispel any notion that they intended to actually rebuild his temple. Taking this into consideration Milner suggested that building a version of Ezekiel’s visionary temple would be preferable to rebuilding

---


70. Milner 1994, 77-78.


73. Milner 1994, 75.
Solomon’s earthly one, especially since Ezekiel’s temple was a symbol for the universal Christian Church.\textsuperscript{74}

Bardill sheds further light on the subject by pointing out the fact that when referring to Constantine’s church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, Eusebius “makes the striking claim that it is the New Jerusalem, facing and superseding the defiled Jewish Temple of King Solomon, which had been destroyed in A.D.70.” He also identifies correspondences in the timing of the construction of both churches: Constantine building the Holy Sepulchre after unifying the Christian Church at the Council of Nicaea in 325, and Juliana constructing Saint Polyeuktos after her role in the reunification of Constantinople and Rome in 519.\textsuperscript{75}

One feature connecting Juliana’s new temple church to the Biblical Temple was its deliberate elevation (fig. 10).\textsuperscript{76} Bardill notes the great depth of its foundations and the fact that St. Polyeuktos had been “designed to stand upon a platform that raised the nave floor 4m above the paved atrium outside.” He states that “This unusual arrangement was presumably dictated by the Biblical description of the steps leading up to Ezekiel’s Temple.”\textsuperscript{77} The epigram itself notes the “deep rooted foundations” of the building, which would have been required to support the elevation of the structure, an elevation that would have been in keeping with the original Biblical model. The exact external measurements of the church also followed those of Ezekiel’s temple, which was 100 cubits square.\textsuperscript{78} This was a departure from the traditional Byzantine method that was commonly employed, which relied upon internal measurements. Milner explains that this

\textsuperscript{74} Milner 1994, 75-76.
\textsuperscript{75} Bardill 2006, 356.
\textsuperscript{76} Harrison 1989, 127.
\textsuperscript{77} Bardill 2006, 361, 364.
\textsuperscript{78} Ezek. 41:13, \textit{Douay-Rheims Bible} (used for all biblical references).
deviation "would appear to indicate the accuracy with which the plan of this particular church reproduced the key elements of the Biblical formula."79 Juliana’s decision to model the building of St Polyeuktos on this particular version of the temple was intentional, for as Milner also points out, “it is in Ezekiel's temple (and not Solomon's) that the rightful ruler leads his people from idolatry to orthodoxy; and it is from Ezekiel's temple (and not Solomon's) that the Water of Life flows out to restore the land."80

It is important to note that Solomon’s temple did also play a role in the design of St Polyeuktos, although this is most evident within the building’s interior. First of all, the epigram claims that Juliana “...alone has overpowered time and surpassed the wisdom of the celebrated Solomon, raising a temple to receive God, the richly wrought and gracious splendour of which a great epoch cannot celebrate.”81 Secondly, while Solomon’s temple, the first temple, was renowned for its beauty long after its destruction, the second temple constructed by Herod incorporated elements of both Ezekiel’s visionary temple as well as its Solomonic predecessor. Nevertheless, it was no small claim to have surpassed Solomon, and the association of artisans assembled by Juliana would have been the most highly skilled available. Likewise, she would have purchased only the finest materials in order to create a monument of this significance.

Evidence for the wealth poured into Juliana’s decorative program can be seen by the fragments of over a half dozen different types and colors of marble, remnants of glass in a variety of colors, as well as gold leaf, mother of pearl, and amethyst (fig. 13). Some of the inlaid and mosaic fragments were figurative, but these were not as prevalent as the numerous abstract pieces found during the dig. The fine inlaid panels and gold-backed
mosaics found amidst the remains of the church of St Polyeuktos are comparable to those of San Vitale in Ravenna, among others.\textsuperscript{82}

Figure 14. Figured mosaic from the area of the apse. Scale: approximately 12cm across.

Geometric mosaic appears to have covered at least part of the nave, but the majority of mosaic fragments were found in the area of the apse and other vaults. The examples found highlight another significant discovery, one of many ‘firsts’ related to Juliana’s patronage. Harrison verifies that Saint Polyeuktos appears to have housed the first figured vault mosaic of the sixth century to be discovered in Constantinople. This is significant because most were destroyed during the iconoclasm of the eighth century (fig. 14).\textsuperscript{83} The lavish wealth and innovation that went into the construction and decoration of Saint Polyeuktos is a tribute to Juliana’s vision in “raising a temple to receive God.”\textsuperscript{84}

Moreover, there has been some speculation that associates the Saint Polyeuktos church with the treasures that once resided in the Herodian Temple. Finbarr Barry Flood points out the fact that like Saint Polyeuktos, Hagia Sophia also recalls the Jerusalem Temple. In addition, he notes that Justinian’s church would have been under construction

\textsuperscript{82} Harrison 1989, 76-79.
\textsuperscript{83} Harrison 1989, 76-80, 85.
\textsuperscript{84} Whitby 2006, 164, See Appendix 2.
when the Temple treasure was brought to Constantinople in triumph in 533.\textsuperscript{85} Sean Kingsley, who has studied the Temple treasure and written a popular book on the subject, believes that the Emperor Justinian may have stored the menorah, trumpets, and Table of the Divine Presence in the late Juliana’s church.\textsuperscript{86} He tells how Procopius relates a tale about what may have ultimately happened to the treasure once the parade through Constantinople had ended: “and among these were the treasures of the Jews, which Titus, the son of Vespasian, together with certain others, had brought to Rome after the capture of Jerusalem. And one of the Jews, seeing these things, approached one of those known to the emperor and said: ‘These treasures I think it inexpedient to carry into the palace in Byzantium. Indeed, it is not possible for them to be elsewhere than in the place where Solomon, the king of the Jews, formerly placed them. For it is because of these that Gizeric captured the palace of the Romans, and that now the Roman army has captured that the Vandals.’ When this had been brought to the ears of the Emperor, he became afraid and quickly sent everything to the sanctuaries of the Christians in Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{87} Kingsley speculates that Justinian, seeking to protect his own interests, would have had no compunctions about placing the House of Anicia Juliana at risk. Therefore he believes that the Emperor would have been quite content to have stored the Temple treasure in Juliana’s church until its return to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{88}

Here I would like to propose another possibility, and also point out that neither Flood nor Kingsley consider the likelihood that Juliana may have had a home for the

\textsuperscript{85} Finbarr Barry Flood, \textit{The Great Mosque of Damascus: Studies on the Makings of an Ummayyad Visual Culture} (Brill, 2001), 77-87 esp. 78.
\textsuperscript{88} Kingsley 2007, 276.
Temple treasure in mind when she made the decision to depart from architectural norms and intentionally construct a church based on the measurements and decoration of the Biblical Temple. Juliana would have been quite familiar with the journey the treasure had made from Jerusalem to Rome and then to Carthage in North Africa. This is due to the fact that when the Vandals, led by Geiseric, sacked Rome in 455 (fig. 3), her mother Placidia, as well as her aunt Eudocia, and grandmother the Empress Licinia Eudoxia, were captured along with the Temple treasure and taken to Carthage. Licinia Eudoxia and Placidia spent seven years there until they were set free and moved to Constantinople. However, her aunt Eudocia stayed in Carthage and married Huneric, the son of the Vandal king Geiseric. While all this took place before Juliana was born, she would nevertheless have been familiar with the story of the capture of the women in her family. She would also have been conscious of the whereabouts and significance of the famous treasure of Jerusalem. Juliana’s cousin was Hilderic, Huneric and Eudocia’s son, who ruled as king of the Vandals from 523 to 530. As ruler he would have been in possession of the Temple treasure. Therefore it is not far-fetched to believe that she may have hoped or somehow intended for the Temple treasure to find its way to Constantinople and into her church. Saint Polyeuktos appears to have been custom-designed to fulfill the role of a sanctuary befitting these particular sacred and historic treasures.

The Temple treasure did eventually arrive in Constantinople in 533. The Romans’ defeat of the Vandals was celebrated with a triumphal procession in Constantinople similar to the Triumph of Titus from AD 71 in which the treasure had once before been paraded with other spoils through the streets of Rome (fig. 15). 90 Although Juliana would not live to see this happen, she certainly appears to have been prepared for the occasion. The groundbreaking design of Juliana’s signature church continues to be a subject of scholarship, and our understanding and appreciation of the work commissioned by the patroness continues to unfold.

90. Procopius, 279, 281.
Chapter 5

Interior Location of the Epigram

Martin Harrison spent six seasons at Saraçhane with a team of archaeologists excavating the site and recording the discoveries made there, including more inscription-bearing sculpture. In the end a total of seven archaeological fragments containing seven of the poem's original seventy-six lines were recovered, and they hold the key to any reconstruction of the church's superstructure. The recovered fragments of marble text were all from the first half of the poem. All were located within the area where the nave of the church would have stood, which accounts for their excellent state of preservation.

The locations of these fragments correspond to metadata contained in the glosses of the poem AP 1.10 of the Palatine Anthology (Appendix 1). These inform us that the first forty-one lines did indeed surround the nave. It is likely that the five-hundred year-old church was still standing at the time the manuscript received its annotations, and that the glosses are based upon first-hand observation in situ by tenth-century scribes. The notes also indicate that the second half of the poem was located outside the narthex.

Unfortunately no sculpture containing lines from this second section was recovered.

The pieces of sculpture bearing the epigram at Saraçhane are all that remain of the great entablature that once surrounded the nave of the church of St. Polyeuktos. The quality of the workmanship is exemplary. Luxurious twisting grapevines cover the face and spandrels of the entablature above the gracefully carved inscription band that winds along the architrave. Harrison states that much of the sculpture would have been painted

91. Harrison 1989, 43.
in bright colors, even gold. Beneath the text, large peacocks populate the arches and niches of the entablature. These are skillfully fashioned with heads, necks, and bodies carved in the round (fig. 16).

Figure 16. Peacock Body from of the Church of Saint Polyeuktos at Constantinople.

According to the poem the entablature would have been supported by a nave colonnade that in turn supported another colonnaded gallery above. Three types of blocks were discovered: niches, arches, and corner-blocks. Each niche was inhabited by one large frontal peacock displaying an outspread tail. Every arch contained a pair of confronted peacocks perched upon rounded bosses, beak to beak, with outspread tails almost touching at the center of the arch above them (fig. 17). Although not visible in the illustration, Harrison observed that each peacock appears to have been adorned with a necklace carved in low relief. Their eyes were most likely made of green glass beads, and it is possible that a chain may have been suspended from their beaks. The image of lamps suspended beneath them is easy to imagine.

96. Harrison 1989, 81, 84, 121.
97. Harrison 1989, 81, 84, 121.
98. Whitby 2006, 164. AP 1.10. Lines 56-60: “on this side and on that! On either side of the central nave, columns standing upon sturdy columns support the rays of the golden-roofed covering. On both sides recesses hollowed out in arches have given birth to the ever-revolving light of the moon.”
100. Harrison 1989, 121.
Figure 17. Reconstruction drawing of the interior of St. Polyeuktos, Harrison 1989.
The richly sculpted blocks were arranged in an arch, niche, arch pattern. These were shallowly curved, allowing each set to create an open curvilinear exedra or semi-circular bay of about seven meters in diameter separated by corner blocks bearing straight sections (fig. 18). Three of these exedrae were positioned on each side of the nave, thus surrounding it with Juliana’s poem and a spectacular grapevine inhabited by at least thirty-four large peacocks adorned with colorful plumage and gleaming eyes (fig. 19).

The ornately sculpted great entablature provides a paradisal backdrop for Juliana’s proclamation. The epigram is carved in high relief with raised letters 10 to

102. Harrison 1989, 81-84.
11.5cm high. The poem is easily divided into two halves, an *encomium*, or formal statement of praise, in this case honoring Juliana’s patronage and piety, and an *ekphrasis*, or verbal description of the interior of the church. The *encomium* was located on the interior of the structure, while the *ekphrasis* was placed outside. Several of the interior fragments, including the arch inscribed with line 32, retained traces of bright blue pigment in the background. The epigram is exceptionally long. If stretched out horizontally, the seventy-six lines of diactylic hexameter would have extended for more than an eighth of a mile. Creating it would have been labor intensive and completing it was a major accomplishment. In fact, nothing similar to the St Polyeuktos epigram can be found on any Late Antique or Byzantine monument. The closest example is found in Justinian and Theodora’s church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus, which was constructed about ten years after the church of St. Polyeuktos (fig. 20). The inscription on this entablature is much simpler than the one in Juliana’s church. It is shorter, not as deeply carved, and merely runs horizontally around the interior of the building. In St. Polyeuktos the inscription was more masterfully executed, and ran up and around a series of arches and semicircular niches.

---

106. Harrison 1989, 81, 84.
While some scholars, including Mango and Ševčenko, have dismissed the epigram as yet another example of flowery writing, Carolyn Connor argues for the epigram as a “literary work of art in its own right.”¹⁰⁹ In her insightful article “The Epigram in the Church of Hagios Polyeuktos,” she examines the ways in which a viewer would have experienced reading the epigram if they were to have visited the church of St Polyeuktos in Constantinople. Recognizing the epigram as the key component to understanding the meaning of the building’s sixth-century social context, Connor situates the text of the poem within the structure in the order in which it would have been experienced. Essentially taking the reader on a guided audio-visual tour of the monument, she utilizes the poem, the archeological evidence unearthed by Harrison, and the story of Juliana outwitting Justinian by Gregory of Tours (Appendix 4), to imagine the interior of

the church. This perspective provides an enlightening glimpse into the early Byzantine "thought world" by leading the hypothetical viewer to imagine the original impact of the church.\footnote{Connor 1999, 481-510, 482 footnote 9.} In the spirit of that journey, a full translation of the two part poem is included below arranged in the manner in which I believe it would have been read by one approaching and then entering the church, beginning with the descriptive ekphrasis followed by the proud encomium. I have chosen to use Mary Whitby's English translation (Appendix 2) as it appears in her detailed literary analysis "The St. Polyeuktos Epigram (AP 1.10): A Literary Perspective".\footnote{Whitby 2006, 161-164. Also see footnote 10 on page 161 where she states that her version is based upon Harrison's translation as adapted by Bardill and herself. (See Appendix 2 for Greek and English versions.)} In order to familiarize the reader with the church, like Connor, I am reorganizing the text in a way that represents my own study.\footnote{Connor 1999, 493-501. Connor suggests that lines 66-76 could stand alone as a separate epigram, first encountered to the right of the entrance outside of an atrium and visible from the Mese (main street). She divides the epigram into three sections, at the entrance, outside in the atrium, and then inside the church. Connor proposes that lines 42-65 were arranged upon four plaques around the atrium to be read in this order: 42- mid. 47, mid. 47-52, 53-59, and 60-65, with lines 1-41 running around the interior of the church from the southeast to northeast piers.} Further on I will propose two new possible layouts of the inscription for consideration. One will examine the possibility of it running across the front of four atrium level doorways of the narthex façade and then off to the right hand side of the atrium or courtyard. The other, more symmetrical possibility, places the epigram on the north and south sides of that same courtyard.
Chapter 6

Exterior Location of the Epigram

To date, the author of the Saint Polyeuktos Epigram remains a mystery. Connor believes that Juliana was the author of her own epigrams. She contends that the educated patroness may have been following in the footsteps of her great-grandmother (Athenais) Eudocia, who had been known as a poet, scholar and orator.113 Whitby, on the other hand, disagrees and states that “while Anicia Juliana probably did not write AP 1.10 herself, she took care to search out a top-quality wordsmith in a world where not all poets were of such a high caliber.”114 Bardill adds that the verses of AP 1.10 that were displayed outside the church appear to have been composed several years later than those on the inside, possibly by a different author, and that they are distinct from each other in subject and style.115

The tenth-century scribes who originally recorded AP 1.10 visited the Church of Saint Polyeuktos in person. They appear to have begun their study from in front of the altar within the nave of the church, where they wrote down the first 41 lines of the poem that were carved on the great entablature. They then proceeded to a secondary area located somewhere outside of the narthex where the rest of the poem, lines 42–76, were located. There they copied down the inscription and added notes or scholia of their own in the margins of their text.116 Due to the lack of archeological evidence, the location of this remaining inscription is difficult to ascertain. Only the poem and margin notes

recorded by the scribes who visited the site remain. These are all that currently exist to inform us about the exterior location of this second half of the epigram.

While it is generally accepted that *AP* 1.10 was divided in two, with one half positioned inside the church and the other outside, Connor expands the idea. Rather than splitting the poem into the two epigrams recognized by Harrison, she proposes dividing the poem into three individual ones.\(^{117}\) She finds evidence for her interpretation in the glosses of the poem in the Palatine Anthology, placing them in this order: one to the right of a main entrance off the street, a second around an atrium to the west of the church, and a third inside around the nave. In this arrangement, a viewer approaching the complex would have first encountered lines 66-76 inscribed to the right of a main entrance facing the Mesē, the main street of the city.\(^{118}\) This is based upon her interpretation of evidence found in the scholia which reads “last is the slab to the right of the entrance on which these things are inscribed,” which is followed by a reference mark, or tie mark, she interprets as an asterisk before line 66.\(^{119}\) Connor’s placement of this particular section of the epigram in a location visible from the street would have served as an advertisement for what lay ahead inside the church - a beautiful, shining, multi-storied interior featuring a large mosaic of the Baptism of Constantine:\(^{120}\)

\begin{quote}
What singer of wisdom, moving swiftly on the breath of the west wind and trusting in a hundred eyes, will pinpoint on each side the manifold counsels of art, seeing the shining house, one ambulatory upon another? (70) Thence, it is possible to see above the rim of the hall a great marvel of sacred depiction, the wise Constantine, how escaping the idols he overcame the God-fighting fury, and
\end{quote}

\(^{117}\) Harrison 1989, 33.
\(^{118}\) Connor 1999, 493-499, esp. 495-497.
\(^{119}\) Connor 1999, 495-496.
\(^{120}\) Miiler 1994, 78-79.
found the light of the Trinity by purifying his limbs in water. Such is the contest that Juliana, after a countless swarm of labours, accomplished for the souls of her ancestors, and for her own life, and for those who are to come and those that already are.

Connor also suggests that a structure, perhaps a propylon (formal gate) or monumental portico, may have existed between the street and the atrium. She proposes that it may have included an arch because one is mentioned in the gloss as a prominent feature. However, this is a matter of speculation as no physical evidence exists for a gateway at the site.

Once through the arch that Connor envisions as a passage into the atrium, she believes that one would be encircled by the second epigram, lines 42 – 65, describing the beauty of the monument and detailing its spectacular interior. Access to the nave, and perhaps certain sections within it, would have been reserved for the baptized faithful especially during liturgies involving the Eucharist. Therefore it may also be worth considering the idea that the epigram’s narrative describing the beautiful interior of the church and culminating in “the great marvel,” depicting the baptism of Constantine, was intended to motivate the catechumens towards baptism.

The third epigram, lines 1-41, would be experienced upon stepping into the ornately decorated nave. There, finally surrounded by the church’s shimmering mosaics and gilded ceiling, one would discover the epigram, now transformed into a dedication inscription and set within the ornately carved entablature. Gracefully sculpted between lush grapevines and imposing peacock guardians, the ornate inscription of the great

121. Connor 1999, 496.
entablature of Saint Polyeuktos Church would have surrounded visitors with the rest of
the poem, literally invoking them to sing the praises of its patron Juliana and
acknowledge her many accomplishments.124 The exuberant nature of its lyrical text,
framed by lively peacocks and a scrolling grapevine, was a uniquely designed testament
to the memory of Juliana and her line. Later on we will explore this unusual choice of
iconography and its connection to that of the Biblical Temple of Jerusalem.

While Connor's intriguing theory about the arrangement of the poem appears to
make sense, Whitby’s more literary-oriented study does not support it, particularly in
regard to dividing the poem at line 66 for a third separate epigram. While Whitby does
not focus on deducing the exact physical location of the epigram, she does acknowledge
its division into two sections, with the first half of the poem located inside the church,
and the other inscribed on a series of plaques outside “At the entrance of the church,
outside the narthex, on five plaques (42-46, 47-50, 51-56, 57-61, 62-76).” She also
emphasizes the fact that “except at line 50, the division of the lines between the different
plaques as described in the lemmata does not coincide with a strong grammatical break.
Hence the plaques must have been close together and lines 42–76 read as a continuous
poem. It is likely, however, that this is a distinct poem from lines 1–41, as Harrison
suggested.”125 If the plaques do indeed need to be placed near each other in order to
properly accommodate the inscription, and Connor’s proposed arrangement does not
allow the text of the poem to flow accordingly, then this discrepancy warrants further
investigation.

125. Whitby 20+06, 160-164; also see 159, note 1, 160-161, notes 6-7, and 185, regarding references to
Bardill’s as of yet unpublished work Solomon Surpassed. Particularly in her choice of translation of
Anthologia Palatina (AP) 1.10, as well as various proposed arrangements of the plaques, all “carefully
discussed, and rejected, by Bardill, Solomon Surpassed.”
The external epigram associated Juliana with three carefully chosen individuals. This portion of the poem was displayed on plaques on the exterior of the building where it publicly compared her works to those of Constantine, Theodosius, and Solomon. It is likely that they were ornately designed. Connor points out that although the poem was written by a learned patron in a language geared towards the elite and well educated, even a semi-literate viewer would have been able to discern these famous names, along with those of Eudocia, Polyeuktos, and especially Juliana, whose name appears rhythmically six times throughout. The epigram proclaimed that she has overcome time and surpassed Solomon's wisdom in raising this splendid new temple to receive God. It also associated her with Constantine as a great builder of churches. The church itself, along with its epigram, stood as a highly visible and impressive public symbol of the past and future strength of her Theodosian line.

The second half of the epigram was located somewhere in the outer area of Juliana's new temple complex, so an effort to visualize the atrium's layout is necessary. The width of the atrium itself measured twenty-six meters. This was exactly half the width of the superstructure of the St. Polyeuktos church (fig. 21). Evidence of walls to the north and south were discovered during the excavation. The church of St. Polyeuktos lay to the east. Unfortunately, due to significant destruction of the western area, it was not possible to determine the exact length of the atrium, although some remains indicated that it was twice as long as it was wide.\footnote{126. Connor 1999, 499-500. 127. R. Martin Harrison and Nezih Firatli and John W. Hayes, "Excavations at Saraçhane in Istanbul: Fifth Preliminary Report, with a Contribution on A Seventh-Century Pottery Group". Dumbarton Oaks Papers Vol. 22 (1968): 195-216, esp. 197.}
Figure 21. A restored plan of the Church of Saint Polyeuktos at Constantinople. Harrison 1989.
The great central staircase of Juliana’s church measured eight meters in length. It led to the center of the elevated narthex and western main entrance of the church, which stood five meters above the surrounding atrium (fig. 22). Also, there appears to have been a rather wide landing in front of the main entrance to the church situated above the arched substructure of the staircase. To the north of the atrium stood a dominant structure that may have been a baptistery or a martyrium.

Figure 22. Substructure for the great staircase of the Church of Saint Polyeuktos at Constantinople. Some of the surrounding original sixth century marble pavement of the atrium still remains. The ranging pole marks the external vault beneath the staircase built against the central part of the outer wall of the narthex. To the right, part of the bottom step of the staircase that led from the atrium to the main entrance in the narthex is still in place.

Aside from the fact that the epigram includes the subject of Constantine's baptism as a prominent artistic feature of the church, the discovery of what appears to be a sunken central floor with a drain supports its use as a baptistery. By the eleventh century it had been converted into a cistern.  

Unfortunately no evidence is available to prove the existence of a possible corresponding building for the south side of the atrium. Nevertheless this form of church compound was typical at that time. An example can be seen in the fourth-century Hagia Eirene of Constantinople (fig. 23).

Figure 23. Floor Plan of Hagia Eirene of Constantinople

131. Harrison 1989, 64, 68.
No exonarthex (secondary outer narthex) was discovered during the excavation of St. Polyeuktos. However, the remains of two parallel walls on the north side of the atrium form a cryptoporticus, or narrow passage, before the baptistery. This appears to have been a substructure for a gallery that would have overlooked the atrium, and any northern door into the western façade of the church would have been approached at this higher level. This feature may have been similar to the balcony surrounding the Women’s Court of the Herodian Temple (fig. 24). Also, while no evidence has been found to reveal the exact location of Juliana’s palace, which predates the church, (Appendix 4) we do know that it must have stood near St Polyeuktos. Taking this into consideration, Harrison finds the prospect of locating Juliana’s palace on the northern side of the church an attractive possibility. This would explain the elevated entrance, which would have provided direct access to the church via a bel étage, or main level of her palace, even with an entrance into the northern side of the narthex.

Earlier, Connor’s suggestion that a formal gate, perhaps one with an arch, may have been located between the atrium and the street, was discussed. These atria, such as that of Old Saint Peter’s in Rome, were typical of the time (fig. 25). The Herodian temple had also been surrounded by similar courtyards and gates. One in particular, the large Nicanor Gate that separated the Court of Women from the Court of Israel, would have stood out from the others as a potential design element worthy of imitation (fig. 24).137 However, while a formal entrance or gate may have been included at Saint Polyeuktos, unfortunately no archeological evidence of a gateway was found during the

excavation of the site. Also, the steps of the Nicanor Gate were rounded and unlike any stairs found during the excavation of St. Polyeuktos.

Figure 25. Drawing of Old St. Peter's Basilica as seen in the fifth century. Artist Kenneth John Conant

As the question of the epigram’s location in this area remains unresolved, special attention should be paid to the area of the façade below the principal entrance into St. Polyeuktos. Here, at the base of the narthex, were four doorways with marble steps leading down into the substructure below (fig. 26).

Located at the atrium level, two of the doorways lay to the north and two to the south of the great staircase, allowing direct access to the crypt via an axial or central passage under the nave. Surrounding the northern and eastern sides of the atrium of St. Polyeuktos, the baptistery and church façade would have both extended up above the first story. On the north this would have been necessary in order to accommodate the

139. Lundquist 2007, 115.
overlooking gallery of the baptistery and alternate raised entrance to the church. On the eastern side of the atrium, a total of five entrances would have penetrated the tall façade of the church narthex, with the grand staircase in the center, extending into the atrium. As stated earlier, there is not enough archeological evidence to properly reconstruct the appearance of the southern and western perimeters of the atrium. Fortunately, the verses and notations of the poem’s scholia provide some clues as to the exterior arrangement of the second half of the epigram in this region.

Figure 26. Northern stairs descending from the atrium down to the narthex substructure of the Church of Saint Polyeuktos at Constantinople.

Connor’s interpretation of the manuscript and Whitby’s observations of the poem suggest conclusions that are inconsistent with each other and are in need of resolution. Each represents a different orientation and scholarly perspective. Connor divides the
epigram into three sections rather than two. She believes that the last 11 lines of the poem form a "cohesive unit." She proposes placing the very end of the poem, lines 66-76, in a separate location at the street entrance to the complex.\(^{140}\) Whitby, in contrast, asserts that all five of the individual plaques containing the second half of the epigram would have been placed close together and read as one continuous poem from lines 42 to 76. Explaining her view, she states that "I am not here concerned with the debate about the exact location and arrangement of the plaques. But I would stress that, except at line 50, the division of the lines between the different plaques as described in the lemmata does not coincide with a strong grammatical break. Hence the plaques must have been close together and lines 42-76 read as a continuous poem."\(^{141}\) Given this grammatical restriction, and taking the existing archaeological evidence into consideration, an improved arrangement for plaques 42-76 appears to take shape.

While Connor's theory is attractive, it is somewhat speculative. Perhaps a more simple and exact conclusion can be extracted by a closer reexamination of the existing evidence (Appendix 7). Care will be taken to avoid drawing any conclusions outside the boundaries of the remaining archaeological evidence and annotations of the poem. A simple reading of the marginal comments of the manuscript makes it clear that the exterior half of the epigram began "at the entrance of the church, outside the narthex," perhaps towards either an "arch or arches." It was inscribed upon four plaques, possibly placed all around something, with four or five lines on each. Following that, a last plaque was then situated to the right, or right hand of the entrance "on which these things were inscribed." This distinction is most likely made to point out some sort of clear division

---

140. Connor 1999, 495-497, 519-520.
between the location of verses or lines 42 to 61 inscribed upon the four plaques at the outside of the narthex, and 62 to 76 which appear to continue on, but in a separate location somewhere off to the right.

One reasonable interpretation of this would be to match the four plaques with the four obvious doorways leading down below the narthex into the crypt, two on either side of the main staircase and entrance to the church. Although a large arch is likely at the main entrance, the four doorways may have also been topped with arches. This would allow for the inscription to run “all around,” up and over the arches, perhaps in the same manner in which it did inside the nave on the great entablature. It would have also run from left to right, or north to south, across the narthex or church’s façade, in which case it would begin by moving in the direction of a main central arch over the entrance at the top of the staircase. The single strong grammatical break pointed out by Whitby would then make sense as it is a halfway point that would have divided the four plaques cleanly in half, with two sections on either side of the great staircase or main entrance.  

Considering the fact that the expanse of the western side of the church was punctuated by five entry points, the entire narthex or church’s façade might be considered an entrance “on which these things,” namely the four plaques, “are inscribed.” This placement of the inscription would have allowed those approaching St. Polyeuktos by way of the atrium a clear view of the epigram. As for the last plaque, or final section of the poem, lines 62 to 76 would have continued on a wall to the south. This would be consistent with the fact that Harrison found evidence of a southern wall during the excavation (fig. 27).  

---

of the complex and perhaps even from the baptistery gallery. The comment “at the entrance of the same church, outside the narthex” does not necessarily mean that the inscription could be placed absolutely anywhere outside the narthex. Instead it may indicate that the epigram was inscribed on the entrance of the church, outside, upon the actual façade of the narthex or front of the church.

A second possible, and perhaps more likely, scenario situates the four plaques containing the first 20 lines of this half of the poem, from 42 to 61, upon the northern wall of the courtyard. Here at the entrance (in the courtyard) outside the narthex, the lines would have run from west to east “in the direction of the arch,” or main arched doorway (above the main stairway), to the church located on the outside of the narthex or church’s façade. This might also be interpreted as being read from west to east “in the direction of the apse” as this is another possible translation of the Greek word for “arch.” The remaining 15 lines of the epigram, lines 62 to 76 on the last plaque, may have continued across the way on a southern wall. This would have been to the right, meaning the wall to the right when facing the main entrance to the church. Viewed from inside the atrium, this would place the fifth plaque on the southern wall to the left (or possibly even the right) of the southern street-side entrance that Connor proposed.144

144. Connor 1999, 496.
Figure 27. General Plan of Church Excavation, Sarachane. Harrison 1989. Image altered by additional red highlighting of the south wall foundation at Area T/20-21.
Either way, in this configuration, any viewer entering from the south would find themselves facing the northern wall and the first four plaques. This particular arrangement on the north and south wall seems to be more consistent with the symmetrical layout of the epigram on the great entablature within the sanctuary. As earlier noted, the width of the church’s courtyard, or atrium, was exactly half the width of the superstructure of the St. Polyeuktos church (fig. 21, fig. 27 and fig. 28).145

Symmetry is a prominent theme in the poem. As Bardili points out, “The most striking feature of this description is the emphasis that is laid upon the church’s symmetry. We read how it glitters like the sun ‘on both sides’; of columns ‘on either side’ of the nave; of recesses ‘on both sides’; of walls ‘opposite each other’; and of elaborate decoration ‘on each side’.”146 Therefore it is this simple symmetrical proposal for the layout of the epigram that once graced the exterior of Juliana’s church that may well be the most likely one.

Figure 28. Atrium diagrams showing two proposed exterior placements of epigram plaques

Chapter 7

The Poem

*Palatine Anthology AP* 1.10: On the Church of the Holy Martyr Polyeuktos

Ekphrasis

Lines 42-76 from the second half of the poem would have been viewed first because these verses are inscribed at the entrance of the church on a series of plaques outside the narthex (fig. 21, fig. 27, and fig. 28). For the purposes of this study, I am providing descriptions of my proposed locations for each one. These differ from Connor’s proposal in that I do not believe that the epigram was divided into three portions.147 I am utilizing Whitby’s translation for the 76 lines of the entire poem, with particular attention paid to her division of the second half of the poem into these five sections: 42–46, 47–50, 51–56, 57–61, and 62–76, representing five individually inscribed plaques.

1) Lines 42–46 located in the atrium to the east over the first of four doorways leading down below the narthex into the crypt, to the far left of the main staircase and entrance to the church:

What choir is sufficient to sing the contests of Juliana who, after Constantine, embellisher of his Rome, after the holy all-golden light of Theodosius, (45) and after royal descent from so many forebears, accomplished a work worthy of her family, and more than worthy

147. Connor 1999, 496.
2) Lines 47–50 located in the atrium to the east over the second of four doorways leading down below the narthex into the crypt, directly to the left of the main staircase and entrance to the church:

   *in a few years? She alone has overpowered time and surpassed the wisdom of the celebrated Solomon, raising a temple to receive God, the richly wrought and gracious splendour of which a great epoch cannot celebrate*

Whitby notes that this is the location of the only strong grammatical break coinciding with the division of the lines between the different plaques as described in the gloss. I propose that this break at line 50 would then make sense as a halfway point that would have divided the four plaques, with two sections each located on either side of the great central staircase and main entrance.148

3) Lines 51–56 located in the atrium to the east over the third of four doorways leading down below the narthex into the crypt, directly to the right of the main staircase and entrance to the church:

(51) How it stands forth on deep-rooted foundations, springing up from below and pursuing the stars of heaven, and how too it extends from the west, stretching to the east, glittering with the indescribable brightness of the sun (55) on this side and on that! On either side of the central nave, columns standing upon sturdy columns

4) Lines 57–61 located in the atrium to the east over the fourth of four doorways leading down below the narthex into the crypt, to the far right of the main staircase and entrance to the church:

support the rays of the golden-roofed covering. On both sides recesses hollowed out in arches have given birth to the ever-revolving light of the moon.

(60) The walls, opposite each other in measureless paths, have put on marvellous meadows of marble.

149. Connor 1999, 491, 496, 498; Here Whitby includes some wording that might also be credited to Connor perhaps, regarding roof vs. dome terminology. This will be investigated further on in this chapter. See 491 footnote 31 where Connor credits Smith with suggesting she translate “golden roof” from line 55 as “golden-roofed covering”, (Paton says “dome”) as well as 496 and 498 where she identifies the term as her translation.
5) Lines 62 - 76 located in the atrium either beginning to the far right of the narthex, continuing after the fourth doorway to the crypt, or around the corner on the southern wall of the atrium:

which nature caused to flower in the very depths of the rock, concealing their brightness and guarding Juliana's gift for the halls of God, so that she might accomplish divine works, (65) labouring at these things in the immaculate promptings of her heart. 150 What singer of wisdom, moving swiftly on the breath of the west wind and trusting in a hundred eyes, will pinpoint on each side the manifold counsels of art, seeing the shining house, one ambulatory upon another? (70) Thence, it is possible to see above the rim of the hall a great marvel of sacred depiction, the wise Constantine, how escaping the idols he overcame the God-fighting fury, and found the light of the Trinity by purifying his limbs in water. Such is the contest that Juliana, after a countless swarm of labours, accomplished for the souls of her ancestors, and for her own life, and for those who are to come and those that already are.

Concerning the arrangement of these verses outside the church, a secondary and possibly more viable alternative places the first four sections (1 - 4) of the poem on the northern wall of the atrium or courtyard, and the last section (5) on its southern wall.

150. Connor 495, 496; Here Connor believes an asterisk in the manuscript marks the beginning of a third separate epigram at the start of line 66.
Encomium

Lines 1 – 41, from the first half of the poem, are inscribed upon the great entablature within the nave of the church (fig. 33 and fig. 34). These would have been the second set of verses viewed by visitors to the church.

6) Lines 1-21 inscribed clockwise around the interior nave entablature on the south side of the nave starting from the southeast corner:

The empress Eudocia, in her eagerness to honour God, was the first to build a temple to the divinely inspired Polyeuktos; but she did not make it like this or so large, not from any thrift or lack of resources—for what can a queen lack?—(5) but because she had a divine premonition that she would leave a family which would know how to provide a better embellishment. From this stock Juliana, bright light of blessed parents, sharing their royal blood in the fourth generation, did not cheat the hopes of that queen, who was mother of the finest children, (10) but raised this building from its small original to its present size and form, increasing the glory of her many-sceptred ancestors. All that she completed she made more excellent than her parents, having the true faith of a Christ-loving purpose. For who has not heard of Juliana, that, heeding piety, she glorified even her parents by her finely-laboured works? (16) She alone by her righteous sweat has made a worthy house for the ever-living Polyeuktos. For indeed she always knew how to provide blameless gifts to all athletes of the heavenly King. (20) The whole earth, every city, cries out that she has made her parents more glorious by these better works.
7) Lines 22-41 continuing clockwise around the interior nave entablature on the north side of the nave ending in the northeast corner:

For where is it not possible to see that Juliana has raised up a glorious temple to the saints? Where is it not possible to see signs of the pious hands of you alone? (25) What place was there which did not learn that your purpose is full of piety? The inhabitants of the whole world sing your labours, which are always remembered. For the works of piety are not hidden; oblivion does not wipe out the contests of industrious virtue. (30) Even you do not know how many houses dedicated to God your hand has made; for you alone, I think, have built innumerable temples throughout the whole earth, always revering the servants of the heavenly God. Following on all the well-labouring footsteps of her ancestors, (35) she fashioned her ever-living stock, always treading the whole path of piety. Wherefore may the servants of the heavenly King, to whom she gives gifts and for whom she built temples, protect her readily with her son and his daughters. (40) And may the unutterable glory of the family of excellent toils survive as long as the Sun drives his fiery chariot.
Anicia Juliana's largest commission was the church of St. Polyeuktos, however, the patroness and her family were responsible for the construction and decoration of many other churches throughout the region. The St. Polyeuktos epigram tells us that Juliana's building program was so prolific that even she had lost track of how many churches she had built. We do know that she was involved in the renewal of a decorative program for another church in Constantinople, one dedicated to St. Euphemia. It was founded by her grandmother, Licinia Eudoxia, then decorated by her mother, Placidia, and later further embellished by Juliana as she carried on the family tradition. She also is said to have built a church in honor of the Virgin on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus, and possibly another one dedicated to St. Stephen, located in the same area of Constantinople as St. Polyeuktos and presumably her palace and family estates. Juliana and her predecessors were also involved in the construction and decoration of a church in Honorata, a suburb of Constantinople. Evidence for this is found within the Vienna Dioscorides (Codex Vindobonensis med. gr. 1), a manuscript that Juliana also commissioned, in which the citizens of Honorata praise her and her paternal family the Anicii for building a "church of the Lord towering beautifully on high."152

Similarities may exist between the churches of St. Polyeuktos and St. Euphemia, Juliana's earlier commission. Although the building no longer stands, evidence regarding St. Euphemia and its epigram can be gleaned from the original folios and translations of

151. Mango and Ševčenko 1961, 244.
poems that would have been written by eyewitnesses who had access to the site while it was still intact. A future investigation of the scholia of the St. Euphemia poem AP 1.12–17: *On St. Euphemia of Olybrius* (Appendix 5-6) and a comparative study of it alongside AP 1.10: *On the Church of the Holy Martyr Polyeuktos* (Appendix 1-3) seems in order.

While *AP* 1.10 praises Juliana’s church-building efforts, it makes no mention of her commissioning any works outside the realm of architecture. Nevertheless, although Juliana was a prolific builder, she also found time to commission the Vienna *Dioscorides*, a deluxe illuminated medical treatise. Although not represented in *AP* 1.10, it possesses two attributes that connect it to the Saint Polyeuktos epigram. First, aside from containing Juliana’s portrait, it includes a short acrostic poem that joins *AP* 1.10 in its praise of the patroness for constructing yet another church. Secondly, it features a prominently placed folio bearing the image of a peacock that was apparently moved up to the front of the manuscript at some point during its life.153 As we have seen, peacocks played a prominent role in the sculptural decoration of Saint Polyeuktos, literally supporting the carved epigram in great entablature surrounding its nave. Therefore, it is possible that whoever placed this image in the front of her manuscript may have been aware of the boastful nature of its inscription and understood Juliana’s association with the beautiful bird.

A closer look at the manuscript reveals its usefulness. As an important matron in charge of a large household, Juliana would have been responsible for the medical care of her family and servants. The fact that she commissioned a medical book illustrates her
dedication to this role.\textsuperscript{154} Although the Vienna Dioscorides was produced in Constantinople during the second decade of the sixth century, a surprising number of its original folios have survived. A total of 485 of its original 550 folios remain intact. The first seven are richly decorated full page miniatures, one of which is a dedication miniature of Juliana herself. An Herbarium, or De Materia Medica, follows, illustrating the work of the pharmacologist Dioscorides (first century AD) as well as commentaries by Krateus and Galen. It also includes five other treatises or appendixes, on a range of related topics - a Song of the Power of Herbs; Venomous Beasts; Poisons and their Antidotes; Fish and Fishing; and a study of Birds.\textsuperscript{155} “Being one of the oldest painted manuscripts of firm origin and date, this Greek codex has a particular importance in the history of art. There are 479 paintings, 392 of them full page, and many of them exquisite examples of Byzantine art.”\textsuperscript{156}

In the dedication miniature, folio 6v, Juliana is formally depicted in a hierarchical format in the center of the page (fig. 29). She is enthroned on a raised platform on a throne that appears to have with zoomorphic legs, and is dressed in imperial garb of gold and purple, complete with red shoes and a crown. At her side are the personifications of Magnanimity on her right and Prudence on her left. Prudence points to a large book that appears to rest on a stand, while Magnanimity holds what may be gold coins in her folds of her gown. Juliana holds an ivory tablet in her left hand. With her right hand, she drops coins onto an open book held by a putto labeled “Desire/Longing of the lover of

\begin{flushright}
156. O. Wächter, “The Restoration of the ‘Vienna Dioscorides’.” (Studies in Conservation, 7 (February 1962) 22-26, esp. 22.
\end{flushright}
building.” In front of the putto is another figure at Juliana’s feet in proskynesis labeled “Gratitude of the Arts.”¹⁵⁷ Set upon a blue background, these figures are framed within an eight-pointed star formed by two interlocking squares and joined to a circle by a border of what appears to be a twisted rope motif. A red outline surrounds the circle. Within the eight sections between the circle and the squares, putti are found actively involved in the construction of a building. Each point of the star contains a gold letter on a red background and each in turn is linked to line from a poem. Together they form an acrostic poem based on the name Juliana. The verses of the poem are written in tiny white letters in the narrow black border of the octagon between the blue field and the golden cord (fig. 29).¹⁵⁸ These lines were discovered and reconstructed by A. Von Premerstein, allowing him to identify the church in Honorata with the patroness Juliana (fig. 30).¹⁵⁹

“Behold with all good praises, Queen, the Honoratae hymn you and praise you. Magnanimity of the Anicii goes forth into all the world to speak [your praises] of which family you are a member. For you built the church of the Lord towering high and beautiful.”¹⁶⁰

Scholars disagree as to Anicia Juliana’s role in the production of this manuscript. Some conclude that she was its sole patron; others believe that it was commissioned for her and given to her as a gift. Both Weitzmann and Gerstinger believed that the citizens of Honorata, a district of Constantinople, had it made for Juliana as a gift of thanks for constructing a church in their town. But, in her thesis on the patronage of this manuscript, Kathy Jo Wetter points out that if this were true then Juliana would be portrayed in the dedication miniature dropping coins onto a church rather than a book, and that an actual person, as opposed to a putto, would be shown presenting it to her.161 Furthermore, she believes that the acrostic text of this folio has been misinterpreted. Von Premerstein, the only scholar to have concentrated solely on the issue of this manuscript’s patronage, does manage to make a connection between the acrostic and the poem about Juliana in the Palatine Anthology, but he was writing at the turn of this century and would not have been aware of the architectural inscription discovered at the site of St. Polyeuktos. Therefore, Wetter points out that the acrostic was not a model for the poem, as he believed. Instead, she proposes just the opposite as conclusive evidence of Juliana’s

patronage, and argues that it is most likely a representation of the poem as it appears in the sculpture of the church she built for the people of Honorata.Obviously, if Juliana had no compunctions about placing such a bold statement upon her Saint Polyeuktos church, it would not be surprising for her to incorporate something similar into any of her other commissions, be it a manuscript or another church. In fact, her portrait miniature in the Vienna *Dioscorides* may have served a specific purpose since “The poem reminds us that Juliana was a pious Christian who built a church, a fact that is not at all evident in this collection of writings by pagan authors accompanied by illustrations in highly classicizing style.” Folio 1v is a full page miniature of a magnificently illustrated peacock (fig. 31). Unfortunately the upper portion has suffered significant damage. Nevertheless, its subject is still quite visible. A proud peacock, painted in blue and gold, occupies almost the entire page. With tail feathers fanned in full display, his position is not quite frontal, but rather a three-quarter pose which provides the illustration with a feeling of animate realism. A single feather lies in the lower left side of the page. Its quality differs from the illustration of the peacock above it, indicating that it is most likely a doodle drawn by a later owner of the manuscript.

Wetter disagrees with the prevailing hypothesis that this folio was originally the frontispiece for the bird treatise and that its present placement is the result of an error made during a fifteenth-century re-binding.\textsuperscript{164} Based upon its relevant symbolism and the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{164} Wetter 1993, 5,6.}
predominance of the peacock motif in the sculpture of St. Polyeuktos, she agrees instead with the theory that the placement of the peacock in the front of the manuscript itself was intentional. She adds that “It is curious however, that Weitzmann and Gerstinger, writing about the manuscript after the discovery of Juliana’s church, did not even note the personal significance of the peacock for her. Martin Harrison, on the other hand, recognized the importance of the peacock for Juliana, but was not familiar with the miniature on folio 1V and therefore was not able to establish a firm link between the two.”

Interestingly enough, Juliana was more famous as a builder of churches than as a patron of books or literature. This is most likely due to the public nature of the buildings and the more personal relationship that would have existed between a manuscript and its owner. Therefore we find that it is her architectural pursuits which are praised in the epigram of Saint Polyeuktos while no mention is made of the manuscript. This is also true of the epigram of her Saint Euphemia church as well the acrostic poem related to the church she built for the citizens of Honorata.

It should also be noted that Juliana’s philanthropy continued long after her death. Her wealth enabled her to leave a considerable endowment to St. Sabas, the oldest continuously inhabited monastery in existence. Her generosity enabled it to endure some difficult times and survive to today. In fact, her relationship with the monastery must have been a close one since upon her death her eunuchs went to St. Sabas to become monks.

---

Chapter 9

The Question of a Dome

Taking both the architectural remains and the poem into consideration, more is understood about the interior of the church than the exterior. Yet there is one major aspect of the design that has been left to conjecture. Was St Polyeuktos a domed church? If so, it would predate the domed structures Sts. Sergius and Bacchus and St. Sophia built by Juliana’s rival Justinian and represent a significant advance in early Byzantine design. Not much is known about the architecture of late fifth and early sixth-century Constantinople. With no surviving examples, this makes Juliana’s church something of a missing link. Up until Justinian, ecclesiastical architecture in Constantinople was defined by traditional timber roofed basilicas such as St. John Stoudios (fig. 32). 167

Figure 32. Church of St. John of Stoudios, Constantinople

Although no architectural evidence for a dome survives, Harrison did believe that a dome was highly probable due to the curved exedrae, massive foundation, and square ground plan he unearthed (fig. 33).  He believed that, “St. Polyeuktos was by any account an ambitious, novel and extravagant building, and a dome in this context will come as no surprise.” He looked to the epigram, particularly lines 55-57 of the poem preserved in the Palantine Anthology, for further evidence. His translation reads, “On either side of the central nave, columns standing upon sturdy columns support the rays of a golden roof,” but he did recognize the ambiguity of the word aktis, the Greek word for ray, making it difficult to discern if this referred to the ribs of a golden dome or simply to golden rays of light. However Bardill, who did a study on the roof of this church, finds the term aktis usually does refer to a “ray of light.”

Connor also examines the poem and concludes that Harrison’s translation of line 57, χρυσοφοι άκτινας άερταξον ου καλύπτρης, might be understood more literally as “support the rays of the golden-roofed covering.” She argues that “Since the word for covering, καλύπτρης, is often used to refer to a veil, it suggests a rounded form, such as the covering of a woman’s head. This impressionistic description in the epigram gives some reason to think the roof above the galleries was a spherical dome.” She also believes that the epigram does not specifically mention a dome because it would have been redundant and obvious to anyone visiting the site. In the poem we read that the church was “glittering with the indescribable brightness of the sun” and that “On both

172. Connor 1999, 490-491; She credits Peter Smith for suggesting this in footnote 31.  
sides recesses hollowed out in arches have given birth to the ever-revolving light of the moon."174 Both are references are to the obviously spherical sun and moon. Nevertheless, Bardill disagrees with this interpretation commenting that, "by that reasoning, one might as well claim that the entire description of the church given in the verses concerned was redundant. Connor's assertion not only assumes that the poem was read only in situ whilst observing the structure – whereas, in fact, such a sophisticated work almost certainly circulated as a poem in its own right – but also neglects the fact that other descriptions of domed churches in this period do not fail to make much of the crowning architectural achievement."175 He also argues that her association of the word καλύπτρης to a veil-covered head is, "hardly a justifiable conclusion, since the term might refer to a covering of any shape and does not in itself imply curvature."176

Figure 33. Harrison’s proposed church layout including poem lines, dome and four supports.
Figure 34. Bardill's proposed church layout without dome including poem layout.
Bardill’s interpretation of the evidence has led him to a different conclusion (fig. 34). He looks to the findspots of the fragments and a measurement of the letters of the epigram to conclude that the two rows of three columnar exedrae did exist, thus justifying the necessity of the two large foundation walls along the sides of the nave. Basing his argument on his revised distribution of the poem’s verses, which differs from Harrison’s earlier conception (fig. 33), he proposes that the system of columns and piers necessary to support the great entablature would not have allowed space for four huge dome-supporting piers. He also points to the fact that the architects of the church would not have attempted to raise a dome without the inclusion of an adequate support system. He therefore concludes that the linear arrangement of the exedras indicates the existence of a trussed wooden roof for Juliana’s church.177 The epigram’s reference to a golden roof, as well as its claim that Juliana had “surpassed the wisdom of the celebrated Solomon, raising a temple to receive God,” are both supported in the story by Gregory of Tours in which Juliana outsmarts Justinian’s attempt to obtain her wealth by attaching it to the roof of the her church (Appendix 4). Apparently this would have amounted to about 330 lbs. of gold.178 Bardill identifies the roof as the primary subject of the story.179 He points out that the tale clearly “describes the process of making a ceiling for the church by inserting gilded panels between the roof-beams.” He also notes that, “Usually in Byzantine churches, niches are arranged on the angles of a hexagon or octagon and serve to support a dome. The linear arrangement of niches in St. Polyeuktos is therefore highly unusual, and it strongly suggests that the nave was covered by a trussed wooden roof.

rather than a brick dome.” The Biblical description of Solomon’s Temple does not include a dome. However it does refer to a wooden roof covered in gold, as would be in keeping with the epigram. Bardill makes one more significant observation in pointing out yet another architectural connection between Juliana’s church and the Biblical Temple. He observes that the two-story rows of marble piers and columns bear a deliberate resemblance to a *scaenae frons*, an elaborate decorated architectural backdrop of Roman theaters (fig. 35), and that the Greek word σκηνή used in Revelation to describe the New Jerusalem has a dual meaning of ‘tent’ or ‘tabernacle’ as well as ‘stage’. He therefore comes to the conclusion that “Clearly, Anicia Juliana intended that St. Polyeuktos should resemble the heavenly Temple not only in its dimensions and decoration, but also in its architectural scheme.”

![Figure 35. Merida Roman Theatre, Spain](image)

181. 1 Kings 6:9: So he built the house, and finished it: and he covered the house with roofs of cedar. 6:22: And there was nothing in the temple that was not covered with gold: the whole altar of the oracle he covered also with gold.
Chapter 10
The Marvel of Constantine’s Baptism

The epigram tells of a “great marvel” featuring Constantine that could be found inside Juliana’s church. Its precise location is unknown. In Milner’s compelling study, “Image of the Rightful Ruler,” she reconstructs the mosaic of Constantine’s Baptism that would have played a prominent role in the decorative program of the church of St. Polyeuktos.183 Working with a minimal amount of evidence she presents a surprisingly firm argument for its purpose and design. She argues that Juliana was purposely emulating the visionary Temple of Ezekiel, rather than the temple of Solomon, citing as one reason the prevailing negative attitude associating the rebuilding of the Solomonic Temple with the actions of the antichrist.184 She also points out the fact that only Ezekiel’s Temple is described in the Bible as measuring 100 cubits square, while the Temple of Solomon measured 60 X 20 cubits.185

Ezekiel 41:13-14:

“And he measured the length of the house, a hundred cubits: and the separate building, and the walls thereof, a hundred cubits in length. And the breadth before the face of the house, and of the separate place toward the east, a hundred cubits.”

184. Milner 1994, 75-76.
1 Kings 6:2:

"And the house, which King Solomon built to the Lord, was threescore cubits in length, and twenty cubits in breadth, and thirty cubits in height."

2 Chronicles 3:2-3:

"Now these are the foundations, which Solomon laid, to build the house of God, the length by the first measure sixty cubits, the breadth twenty cubits. And the porch in the front, which was extended in length according to the measure of the breadth of the house, twenty cubits: and the height was a hundred and twenty cubits: and he overlaid it within with pure gold."

Ezekiel’s visionary temple was also associated with political and religious reform under the leadership of a new ruler. One could easily imagine that Juliana at some point would have expected her son to be cast in this role. Milner felt that it was the appropriate model for Juliana because when it came to Ezekiel’s Temple, it was theoretically possible to build an original structure. This particular version was also distinguished by the foundational spring said to flow out from beneath it to become a river of life and healing, thus symbolizing the Water of Life associated with Christian baptism. Milner states, “Ezekiel’s temple, then, is associated with orthodox worship, the emergence of the rightful rule, and the waters of baptism. All three aspects were represented in the one mosaic at Hagios Polyeuktos of which we have a description: that is, the mosaic depicting the baptism of Constantine the Great.”^{186}

Milner acknowledges that the majority of mosaic fragments that survived the iconoclasm were discovered in the area of the apse, yet concludes that this would have been an unlikely location for the Constantine mosaic.187 Instead, she proposes the western façade of the church or the narthex interior as possible locations for the image. She also acknowledges the problematic nature of the last three words of Line 70 in AP 1.10. These vary in translation between “over the arch of the court” and “above the center of the porch” depending upon the particular translation cited.188

On the other hand, Connor argues for a more central placement within the church itself. She bases this upon the proximity of an adjacent building, thought to be a baptistery, that would have heightened the mosaic’s significance, and her translation of the poem’s line 70.189 While citing Harrison’s translation,190 Connor reinterprets the phrase “over the arch of the court,” or ὑπὲρ ἄντρυγος αὐλῆς, to “over the border of the hall.” Translating ἄντρυγος as ‘border’ instead of ‘arch’, she states that ἄντρυγος is the Homeric term for the rim of a shield or the rail around the front of a chariot. She also contends that the other term αὐλῆ can be translated as either a courtyard or hall, as in the hall around which a house might be built.191 Whitby seems to agree with the use of the term hall because her translation states, “Thence, it is possible to see above the rim of the hall a great marvel of sacred depiction.” However she chooses to use the term ‘rim’ rather than ‘border’.192

188. Milner 1994, 78.
Still, perhaps the word arch should not be dismissed so easily. It bears noting that shield rims and chariot rails can be curvilinear, and thus may have more in common with the term arch than the term border. Taking this into consideration, one could venture to rephrase this section of verse as “over the arch of the hall.” If this hall was the nave, and the curvilinear location of the apse is ruled out because it would have been reserved for a more sacred image such as Christ, there are still some possible locations to consider. These include the six semi-domes, three on either side of the nave, and the possibility of a triumphal arch to the east in front of the transept (fig. 34).

First I would like to establish the placement of the Constantine baptism mosaic within the nave of the church of Saint Polyeuktos. There is a specific order to the ekphrasis, or descriptive half of the epigram, that was situated outside the church. Its last ten lines provided a step by step explanation to visitors of the beautiful sights they would witness once they stepped inside Saint Polyeuktos. The verses also reveal clues concerning the location of the mosaic of Constantine’s baptism.

The exterior epigram described a “singer of wisdom, moving swiftly on the breath of the west wind,” indicating an entrance into the church from the west. It continued with “trusting in a hundred eyes,” alluding to the ‘eyes’ found in the tail feathers of the peacocks surrounding the viewers, as well as their own eyes as they gazed upon the interior of the church. This is an obvious reference to the interior of the nave, not the narthex. It is clearly referring to the many sculpted peacocks of the great entablature that would have been an outstanding feature of the central nave. Perhaps this poetic form of imagery was purposely employed in order to maintain an element of mystery and surprise to enhance the experience of those visiting the church.
The epigram then spoke of pinpointing the “manifold counsels of art” on each side, and of seeing the “shining house, one ambulatory upon another.” These further observations would have occurred from within the nave, as they described a series of narrative artistic displays located upon either side of the multi-storied interior of the church. It then culminates with an arrival to the focal point of the descriptive journey, the great marvel of Constantine’s baptism, proclaiming, “Thence, it is possible to see above the rim of the hall a great marvel of sacred depiction, the wise Constantine, how escaping the idols he overcame the God-fighting fury, and found the light of the Trinity by purifying his limbs in water.”

The epigram ends by praising Juliana for her patronage and accomplishment. In fact, its second half begins and ends referencing Constantine and the ‘contests’ of Juliana. The term ‘thence’ indicates a perspective only obtained by that particular vantage point, which in this case is within the nave of the church. The poem’s earlier references to the design of the “central nave” with its glittering interior, storied columns, golden roof, and marble walls should also be noted. Surely this evidence confirms the necessity of placing the mosaic of Constantine’s baptism within the actual nave of the church, as opposed to the western façade or within the narthex.

With the epigram as our guide we have discovered that the marvel of Constantine the Great’s testimony is the climax and destination of our tour. The story it portrays, or at least the highlights of the story, are revealed: how he stopped fighting God and escaped idolatry, became enlightened by the Trinity, and was purified through baptism in water. This great marvel was located in a prominent and elevated position. After witnessing the “manifold counsels of art” on each side of the nave, viewers are lead to look up and see
"the shining house, one ambulatory upon another." From here they are told that they could see the "great marvel" located "above the rim of the hall." Depending upon which translation is applied this could also be above the edge, arch, center, or border of the hall. This leads to two possibilities.

Figure 36. Stavelot Triptych, Morgan Library & Museum NYC
Milner looks to the later period Stavelot Triptych as an example of the story’s composition, dividing the depiction into a similar trio of images (fig. 36). It is not hard to imagine a narrative series of mosaic images depicting Constantine’s baptism placed in the six semi-domes of the central nave. The epigram describes a two-story ambulatory surrounding the central nave where columns stood upon other columns supporting a series of semi-domes and a golden ceiling. The epigram also states that the marvel was located above a central rim, edge, or border. Perhaps these terms refer to the great entablature, which would have been a prominent feature surrounding the center hall of the nave.

**Figure 37.** Saint Paul Outside the Walls, Rome, Italy. Triumphal arch mosaic donated by Galla Placidia (Juliana’s great-grandmother.)

However, the series culminates in Constantine’s baptism. This is the focal point of the story, and would most likely require a prominent and central placement somewhere else in the nave. Perhaps the baptism scene could have been located upon a triumphal arch located before the transept, similar to that of St. Paul Outside the Walls (fig. 37). This placement would coincide with the version of the translation “above the arch of the hall.” A triumphal arch before the altar may have enhanced the temple theme, serving to help separate the holiest area, or holy of holies, from the rest of the sanctuary (fig. 34). It is also in keeping with the fact that the majority of figured fragments discovered by Harrison were located in the area of the apse, which would have been in close proximity to a triumphal arch. The semi-domes may have provided a location for part of the poem’s “manifold counsels of art” found on either side of the central nave. These may have portrayed any number of appropriate Biblical images. In this configuration the entire narrative of the Constantine mosaic may have been displayed upon a triumphal arch. While a depiction of Constantine might be considered an unusual placement in such a sacred space, the fact that the emperor had been granted sainthood and the title “Equal of the Apostles” by the Orthodox Church should be considered. Also the poem does appear to lead to the conclusion that the great marvel illustrating the story of the Baptism of Constantine the Great, the focal point of the epigram, may have been located on such an arch within the Church of Saint Polyeuktos.

195. Gilbert Dagron, Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium (London: Oxford University Press, 2003), 143-144.
Chapter 11

The Great Entablature - A Frame for AP 1.10.

Juliana designed a Great Entablature to carry and surround her message. This was likely the most significant surviving element of her St. Polyeuktos church. The chance unearthing of its remains in 1960 provided a catalyst for research that continues to this day. The discovery of the ornate pieces of sculpture unlocked significant information about the early Byzantine architectural innovations of Juliana and their cultural context. The three primary elements that made up the great entablature - the epigram, the vine, and the peacock - have provided us with a great deal of insight into the world and intentions of Anicia Juliana. It was a beautiful expression, and is perhaps Juliana’s most memorable and ambitious statement regarding her imperial lineage and desired legacy. The numerous peacocks and elaborate vine frieze provided an extended frame for Juliana’s epigram, all combining to create a verbal ornament that surrounded those who entered into the church. 196

Figure 38. Detail of carved arch, Church of St. Polyeuktus, Sirâçhane Istanbul.
The Vine

The finely crafted naturalism of the grapevine that encircled the nave exhibits an unusual depth and artistry that would have been found throughout Anicia Juliana's luxuriously decorated church. Highly naturalistic grape leaves are carved with delicate raised veins. Some even fade into the background, implying a third dimension (fig. 38). Luxurious, twisting grapevines cover the face and spandrels of the entablature above the gracefully carved inscription band which winds along the architrave. Harrison suggests that much of the sculpture may have been painted in bright colors, even gold.197

Juliana’s prominent inclusion of the vine frieze was an intentional allusion to the golden fruit-bearing vegetation of the renowned Temple of Jerusalem (fig. 39). In Finbarr Barry Flood’s extensive study he states that the most celebrated example of this motif was found in the Herodian Temple, where “…the Jerusalem vine had once surrounded the entrance to the heart of the Temple.” He also noted that “…the vine was evidently trailed above the columns which flanked the entrance to the sanctuary, thereby acting like a kind of entablature…”198 Middot records “There was a golden vine at the doorway to the Sanctuary, supported by poles, and anyone who offered a donation of a [gold] leaf, a grape, or a cluster would hang them on it [the vine].”199 There is room for discussion as to whether or not these offerings were golden or actual living vegetation.200 Josephus describes the entrance as a gate “covered with gold all

197. Harrison 1989, 81, 84.
over, as was the entire wall surrounding it. Above it were the golden grape-vines, from which hung bunches as big as a man.”

Figure 39. Recreated image of the Temple of Herod showing the Golden Vine.

St. Polyeuktos, Hagia Sophia, and also the Dome of the Rock, were all decorated with golden vine frieze motifs, and incorporated vegetative iconographic and paradisal themes into their design in order to strengthen their ideological claims to the heritage of the Jerusalem Temple and its Solomonic legacy.\textsuperscript{202} New Testament associations would also have played a part in the prominence of the grape vine, due to its association with the Eucharist and Christian communion, as well as Christ’s statement “I AM the true vine.”\textsuperscript{203} Christ would have been very familiar with the Herodian temple and its vine.

Golden vines are not mentioned in Old Testament descriptions of Solomon’s Temple. Rather than a vine, it was decorated with golden fruit trees that echoed those said to have existed in Eden. However, it is also recorded that Solomon’s Throne was sheltered by a vine.\textsuperscript{204} Flood observes an underlying “tendency in Christian iconography to blur the distinction between the First and Second Temples, to combine and conflate the details of both: thus the vine motif which sometimes appears around the entrance of the sanctuary of the First Temple is, strictly speaking, more appropriate to the iconography of the Second.”\textsuperscript{205} Juliana incorporated elements from all of the Biblical Temples into her design, the two earthly versions built by Solomon and Herod, as well as Ezekiel’s visionary one. It therefore contains elements that range from the Eden of Genesis to the New Jerusalem of Revelation.\textsuperscript{206} With this in mind it is quite possible that the paradisal iconography of Saint Polyeuktos is intentionally timeless, and fulfills the epigram’s claims that Juliana had surpassed Solomon and overpowered time.

\textsuperscript{202} Flood 2001, 78-79, 86-89.
\textsuperscript{203} John 15:1 “I AM the true vine; and my Father is the husbandman.”
\textsuperscript{204} Flood 2001, 82-83, 85.
\textsuperscript{205} Flood 2001, 82, 86.
\textsuperscript{206} Gen. 2:8-9, Rev. 21:9-27.
The Peacocks

This timeless realm was inhabited by peacocks. Their iconography is strongly associated with Juliana because of her decision to incorporate the beautiful bird as a motif in the great entablature of her most famous construction. At the time, the presence of the numerous peacocks found within Saint Polyeuktos would have been as well known to the public as the wealthy patron herself. Even today, it is the discovery of Juliana’s impressive peacocks that has captured our attention and rejuvenated an interest in her work.

Juliana’s decision to surround the nave of St. Polyeuktos with peacocks was an innovative departure from tradition. Harrison observed that, “In interesting contrast to the Temple which had cherubim but no peacocks, the church had peacocks but no cherubim. Cherubim were zoomorphic, with wings and many eyes, and connoted royalty – and the same might be said to be true of peacocks, which were the birds of Empresses. In the circumstances it seems probable that the peacock, with its royal associations, was chosen to play this symbolic role in Anicia Juliana’s programme.”\(^{207}\) It was a pair of golden cherubim that stood over the Ark of the Covenant. Cherubim are also recorded in the Bible as appearing elsewhere in the decoration of the Temple (fig. 11). Ezekiel 41:18-20 states:

> “And there were cherubims and palm trees wrought, so that a palm tree was between a cherub and a cherub, and every cherub had two faces. The face of a man was toward the palm tree on one side, and the face of a lion was toward the palm tree on the other side: set forth through all the house

---

207. Harrison 1989, 139.
round about. From the ground even to the upper parts of the gate, were cherubims and palm trees wrought in the wall of the temple.”

Juliana’s exchange of the peacock for the cherubim is not so far fetched. As is often typical of angelic subjects, depictions of the Temple cherubim were open to interpretation. According to Harrison, even the Jewish historian Josephus was unable to give a concrete description of their appearance, as he said that, “none could tell or even guess what they were like.” Juliana’s choice of the peacock as an artistic and iconographic replacement for the cherubim of the Biblical Temple was a move towards a more open and contemporary interpretation of the sacred space. This design choice highlighted the role of the church of St. Polyeuktos as a new Temple constructed for a New Jerusalem.

The iconography of the peacock was clearly significant to Juliana and can be read on numerous levels. On one hand the majestic bird could be simply understood as a representation of one of the wonders of God’s creation. Byzantine writers were aware of this. In the poem about the created world, the Hexaemeron, George of Pisidia writes: “How could anyone who sees the peacock not be amazed at the gold interwoven with sapphire, at the purple and emerald green feathers, at the composition of the colors in many patterns, all mingled together but not confused with one another?”

Gregory of Nazianzus even mentions the beauty of the peacock in one of his orations: “Whence does the peacock, that boastful bird of Media, get his love of beauty and of praise (for he is fully conscious of his own beauty), so that when he sees any one approaching, or when, as they say, he would make a show before his hens, raising his neck and spreading his tail

in circle around him, glittering like gold and studded with stars, he makes a spectacle of his beauty to his lovers with pompous strides?"210

On another, perhaps more significant level, the peacock was a symbol of immortality and was often incorporated into paradisal themes, particularly in the case of Christian funerary art. There are a number of reasons for this. The markings on its tail feathers were compared to stars, its flesh was considered incorruptible, and it shed and renewed its beautiful plumage on a yearly basis. These were all factors associated with immortality. In fact, the glorifying, and perhaps even deifying, symbol of the peacock often appeared on coins that commemorated the consecration of dead empresses.211 Their formal pose and placement within Saint Polyeuktos serves to increase their spiritual and symbolic impact. Perhaps the ‘eyes’ of the peacock guardians were meant to represent the omniscient all-seeing eyes of God. Clearly the decision to place emphatic representations of the impressive birds was intentional. Connor even imagines Juliana planning the decoration of the church with her own final resting place in mind.212

Juliana may also have had the biblical record of Solomon importing peacocks along with other luxury items in mind as she designed St. Polyeuktos.213 As Constantinople was a major center for international trade in exotic goods, surely peacocks would have been readily available to its residents. It is not hard to imagine Juliana owning a few of them herself, or having had access to peacock inhabited gardens as a young princess.

211. Maguire 1987, 39.
213. 2 Chron. 9:21 “For the king's ships went to Tharsis with the servants of Hiram, once in three years: and they brought thence gold and silver, and ivory, and apes, and peacocks.”
Figure 40. Peacock in silk textile. Treasury of Aachen Cathedral.
It was also likely that her familiarity with peacocks stemmed from her access to a host of imported luxury items and silken textiles (fig. 40). Peacocks were associated with the ruling class and culture of the neighboring Sassanid Empire. Her husband Areobindus was a general who had been involved in the Persia war, which may increase the possibility of Juliana's familiarity with Sassanid war booty; however, luxury gifts were often exchanged between members of the upper classes of both cultures. And by her time this was a well-established iconography.

Juliana's early sixth-century interpretation of cherubim as peacocks is a design concept that is still with us. The last vestige of this avian association with angelic iconography remains in the pairs of liturgical fans used during Christian Orthodox liturgy today. Also known as ripidia, hexapteryga, or flabellum, these instruments, now topped with metal or wooden disks often embellished with depictions of angelic six winged seraphim, were once functioning fans. Their use during the Anaphora of the Eucharistic rite dates back to the late fourth century and is outlined in the Apostolic Constitutions. This Early Christian collection of treatises belongs to the Church Orders. It specifically calls for the use of peacock feathers in the design of the fans, stating "But let two of the deacons, on each side of the altar, hold a fan, made up of thin membranes, or of the feathers of the peacock, or of fine cloth, and let them silently drive away the small animals that fly about, that they may not come near to the cups." During the Anaphora the bread and wine are transubstantiated and consecrated as Christ's body and blood. This

event is the apogee of the Divine Liturgy and would have taken place during the second half of the service, after the unbaptised had departed at the close of the Liturgy of the Catechumens. Over time these liturgical fans evolved from the original models into the stylized forms that are still in use today. Perhaps this was due to the fact that the feathers would naturally tend to degrade over time and eventually shed, thus necessitating the design change in order to maintain the fan’s purpose and effectiveness.

During the Anaphora, a song known as the cherubicon is sung. Its words of praise are derived from those of the seraphim that surround God in Isaiah’s vision. From Isaiah 6:1-3:

“In the year that king Ozias died, I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and elevated: and his train filled the temple. Upon it stood the seraphims: the one had six wings, and the other had six wings: with two they covered his face, and with two they covered his feet, and with two they flew. And they cried one to another, and said: Holy, holy, holy, the Lord God of hosts, all the earth is full of his glory.”

Juliana’s decision to recreate a stylized Temple setting by surrounding worshippers with avian representations of angelic figures would have certainly enhanced their experience. One can imagine worshippers singing the cherubicon, surrounded by these peacock avatars. John Chrysostom discusses this communal act in one of his homilies:

“While the legions of angels praise above, down the human congregations sing the very same hymn. Above the seraphim jubilate the thrice-holy hymn, from deep down the human crowd raise with the same hymn into a solemn communion of the heavenly with the earthly spheres—a eucharist, one cheerfullness, one acclaim.”

It is fortunate that two sixth-century examples of these liturgical fans have survived. Although discovered in separate locations, their design and imperial control stamps indicating Constantinople as their point of origin make it possible to establish them as a pair. One is currently located in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection in Washington D.C. (fig. 41) and the other in Istanbul (fig. 42). “A fan from Stuma (in Istanbul, Archaeological Museum) is similar enough in size and design to the Riha fan that they are considered a pair. They differ insofar as the Stuma fan has seraphim with six wings engraved on it instead of the cherubim as on the Riha fan. Although no other such pairs of fans have survived, literary references and visual representations provide evidence of their existence.”

Figure 41. Silver Liturgical Fan/Flabellum with cherubim from Riha Constantinope, AD 565-578
(Dumbarton Oaks Collection)

Figure 42. Silver Liturgical Fan/Flabellum with seraphim from Stuma Constantinope, AD 565-578
(Istanbul Archaeological Museum)
This particular pair contains representations of two different angelic beings. One depicting the six winged seraphim of Isaiah’s vision of God, also associated with the Anaphora and the cherubicon. The other a representation of the wheels and four winged cherubim of Ezekiel’s encounter with the Almighty.\textsuperscript{220} It should also be noted that the prophet’s vision of the New Temple also involved cherubim.\textsuperscript{221} The peacock iconography incorporated into the design of this particular pair of liturgical fans may be significant. The inscribed peacock feathers surrounding the disks may be an indication of a transition away from the use of real peacock feather fans. Given their date and the fact that they came from Constantinople, it could also be possible that at some point may have been put to use in the church of St. Polyeuktos.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Peacock niche from Apa Shenute (the White Monastery) near Sohag Egypt.}
\end{figure}

In addition to Biblical references, Juliana would have had access to other forms of inspiration. A number of examples of peacock iconography set within architectural frameworks predating the early sixth-century construction of Saint Polyeuktos can be

\textsuperscript{220} Ezekiel 1.
\textsuperscript{221} Ezekiel 41:18-25.
found. These would have been available for Juliana and her artisans to draw inspiration from for the design and decoration of her new church. These examples include Late Antique textile design, sculpture, and mosaic imagery. Luxurious Sassanid (Persian) and Egyptian fabrics would have been available. Many were decorated with peacocks in a variety of abstract and structured settings, some paired and others posed with their tail feathers fanned out inside semi-domes (fig. 40). An example of peacock niche sculpture from the fifth century was available in the monastery of Apa Shenute (the White Monastery) near Sohag in Egypt (fig. 43). However the most outstanding example available was included in the mosaics panels of Hagios Georgius, the Church of Saint George, a former mausoleum also known as the Rotunda of Galerius in Thessaloniki in northern Greece (fig. 44).

These mosaics are of the highest quality, comparable to those which could be found in Ravenna. These finely crafted mosaic panels feature pairs of orant saints positioned in front of two-story architectural fantasies. The ornate backdrops resemble Roman theaters (fig. 35) or the rock cut tombs of Petra. Jewel embellished architectural elements set upon a golden background include ornately designed columns, arches, semi-domes and ciboria. Peacocks and fountains add to the paradisal nature of their decorative schemes. Scholars believe this is intended to be a representation of Celestial Jerusalem, possibly in keeping with descriptions of the heavenly kingdom found

in sermons by St. John Chrysostom. This is similar in nature to the timeless new temple theme that Juliana appears to have established for Saint Polyeuktos.

Figure 44. Early fifth century mosaic from Hagios Georgius, Salonica (Thessaloniki), Greece.

Juliana and her family would have been familiar with Saint George and its decorative program. In fact, Aristotle Mentzos, who has studied the chronology and theme of the mosaics there, believes it may have been decorated by the Empress Galla Placidia, Juliana’s great-grandmother, in celebration of the imperial wedding of Athenais Eudocia and Valentinian III. This union was significant because it embodied the union

of the eastern and western realms of the empire. It also reunited the Theodosian and Valentinian lines of Juliana’s family. Taking this into consideration, it becomes easier to connect Juliana’s decoration of Saint Polyeuktos to the fanciful constructs depicted in the mosaic panels of Saint George. Both churches are tied to themes of reunion. Saint George celebrates a reunited empire, and Saint Polyeuktos the reunion of its church under orthodoxy.

A number of similarities can be observed in the architectural layout of Saint Polyeuktos and the heavenly façade of the Saint George mosaics; the two-story colonnade, decorative friezes, numerous arches, and especially the apse decorated with oversized peacock feathers situated behind an ornate ciborium. This image of the fanned-out tail feathers of a peacock lining an apse could easily translate into the sculpted peacock niches of the great entablature of Saint Polyeuktos. It should also be noted that other mosaic panels at Saint George exhibit a number of jeweled ciborium columns.\(^227\) These abstract designs may have been the inspiration for the unusual geometric design of the amethyst-encrusted ciborium columns of Saint Polyeuktos (fig. 13). Perhaps it is not too far fetched to view the architectural fantasies of the Saint George mosaics as a possible blueprint for the design and decoration of Saint Polyeuktos. It is not difficult to imagine Juliana referring to these heavenly images during her effort to create a sacred space related to the Old Testament prophecy of Ezekiel’s visionary temple.

\(^{227}\) McKenzie 2007, 352; Mentzos 2000, 75-76.
New Testament references to believers and members of the greater Church as being part of a new living and holy temple should also be taken into consideration.

1 Peter 2:5:

"Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

Ephesians 2:19-22:

“So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and are of God’s household, having been built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the corner stone, in whom the whole building, being fitted together, is growing into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are being built together into a dwelling of God in the Spirit.”

Ultimately, Juliana’s renovation of the church of Saint Polyeuktos created a monument signifying the fulfillment of Ezekiel’s vision, a representation of the reunified Orthodox Church, and its contemporary New Testament role as the embodiment of God’s Temple here on earth.
Chapter 12

Conclusion

Anicia Juliana was a prolific patroness and an intriguing historical figure. While only a remnant of her many works remain, their presence has provided numerous clues to the facts surrounding her fascinating testimony. Scholars continue to analyze this evidence in an ongoing effort to unlock important information about the architecture and culture of the period. Since the serendipitous discovery of the sculptural fragments of the Church of Saint Polyeuktos, many new details regarding Juliana’s creativity and her determination to leave a lasting impression have been revealed. This cynosure, now regarded as the largest and most sumptuous church in Constantinople for a decade after its construction, has served its purpose well. Juliana intended her uniquely designed edifice to act as a new Temple for a new era while at the same time memorializing the accomplishments of herself and her family. She went to great lengths to plan and adorn Saint Polyeuktos with beautiful mosaics, symbolic sculptures, and an epigram outlining its purpose. This inscription, which once conveyed Juliana’s message throughout the grounds and around the sanctuary of the church, is still informing us about the building and its benefactor to this day.

While there has been a tendency to succumb to the temptation to emphasize the possible rivalry between Juliana and the Emperor Justinian, first suggested by Harrison, and to romanticize her legacy, it is clear that Juliana had her own ideas about how she wished to be remembered. Evidence of this is seen in the composition of her works.

In the portrait miniature of her manuscript, the Vienna *Dioscorides*, she is surrounded by figures representing magnanimity and prudence, indicating her generosity and good judgment (fig. 29). Her generosity and that of her family is also discussed in the poem that surrounds that image (fig. 30). At her church, Saint Polyeuktos, Juliana’s epigram expands upon those themes and also takes on a more religious tone in its emphasis on her piety.

The half of the epigram that was inscribed outside around the atrium of Saint Polyeuktos focused solely on the patroness and her involvement with the reconstruction of the church. It compared her work on Saint Polyeuktos to the works of Constantine, pointed to her Theodosian ancestry, and praised her for overcoming time and surpassing the wisdom of Solomon. The inscription also celebrated Juliana’s architectural and decorative achievement by describing many of the noteworthy attributes of the church, and dedicated it all to the memory of Juliana and her family (Appendixes 1-3).

On the other hand, the interior half of the epigram placed more emphasis on Juliana’s devotion and her fame as a builder of numerous churches. This message was carried upon the church’s great entablature, surrounded by the peacock-inhabited vine frieze that framed the nave. Once again the epigram praised Juliana and her great achievement in reconstructing the glorious church, but it also emphasized the contributions made by other members of her family. Here her piety was referred to over and over again, presenting Juliana as “having the true faith of a Christ-loving purpose,” and as an individual whose “purpose is full of piety.” It also celebrated her building campaign, noting that by following the examples of her predecessors she had built an innumerable number of churches throughout the surrounding region (Appendixes 1-3).

The reconstruction and dedication of the church of Saint Polyeuktos was Anicia Juliana’s crowning achievement. The structure encompassed her final effort to conquer time and memorialize her family’s legacy. Its epigram provided Juliana with one last opportunity to record her accomplishments in a way she felt befitting. After confirming her wisdom, generosity, and piety, it ends with a prayer for the protection of herself, her son, and her granddaughters, and for the infinite survival of the memory of her family and their works (Appendix 2).

Although Saint Polyeuktos no longer stands, the remnants of Juliana’s signature church and its epigram have survived the test of time. The discovery of the beautifully sculpted fragments of the church of Saint Polyeuktos and their connection to the poem recorded so long ago in the Greek Anthology has initiated a renewed interest in the renowned patroness and her works, as well as her family history. It appears that Juliana’s prayer has been answered.
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Appendix 1
From the Palatine Anthology AP 1.10:
Folios 50, 51, & 52 of the Epigram on the Church of the Holy Martyr Polyeuktos
Appendix 2
From the *Palatine Anthology AP 1.10:*
Translation of the Epigram on the Church of the Holy Martyr Polyeuktos
as per Whitby
(Reordered to present Greek and English translations separately.)

Beginning with lines 1–41 from inside the church:

On the south side of the nave:

Εὐδοκίη μὲν ἄνασσα, Θεὸν σπεύδουσα γεραιρεῖν,
πρώτῃ νηὸν ἔτευξε θεοφραδέος Πολυεύκτου·
ἀλλ’ οὐ τοῖον ἔτευξε καὶ οὐ τόσον· οὐ τινι φείδοι,
οὐ κτείτον χατέουσα (τίνος βασίλεια χατίζει·)
ἀλλ’ ὡς θυμὸν ἔχουσα θεοπρόποιν, δττὶ γενέθλην (5)
καλλείψει δεδαύναι ἀμείνονα κόσμον ὑπάζειν.
ἐνθὲν ᾽Ιουλιανή, ζαθέων ἀμάρυγμα τοκῆν,
τέτρατον ἐκ κεῖνων βασιλήμον ἅμα λαχοῦσα,
ἐλπίδας οὐκ ἔφευσεν ἀριστοῖδινος ἀνάσσης,
ἀλλὰ μὲν ἐκ βαιοῦ μέγαν καὶ τοῖον ἑγείρει, (10)
κῦδος ἄεξήσασα πολυσκήπτρων γενετήρων·
πάντα γὰρ, δοσα τέλεσσεν, ὑπέρτερα τεῦξε τοκῆν,
ὤρθὴν πίστιν ἔχουσα φιλοχρίστου μενοινῆς.
τὶς γὰρ ᾽Ιουλιανήν οὐκ ἠκλεεν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὺς
εἰκαμάτοις ἔργοις ἐνὸς φαέδεντες τοκῆς, (15)
εὐσεβής ἀλέγουσα; μόνη δ’ ἱδρότι δικαίῳ
ἀζιον οἶκον ἔτευξεν ἄειζώφ Πολυεύκτῳ.
καὶ γὰρ ἂεὶ δεδάκτηκεν ἀμεμφέα δῶρα κομίζειν
πᾶσιν ἀεθλητῆρισιν ἐπουρανίου βασιλῆς.

πᾶσα χθόν boάρ, πᾶσα πτόλει, δι´ τοκῆς (20)

φαιδροπέρους ποίησεν ἀρειστέροις ἐπ´ ἔργοις.

On the north side of the nave:

ποῦ γὰρ Θουλιανὴν ἀγίας οὐκ ἔστιν ἱδέσθαι
νηὸν ἀναστήσασαν ἀγαλέα; ποῦ σεό μοῦνης
εὐσεβέων οὐκ ἔστιν ἱδεῖν σημῆνα χειρῶν;

ποῖος δ´ ἐπλετο χώρας, δς οὐ μάθε σεό μενοινήν (25)
eὐσεβής πλήθουσαν; ὅλης χθονὸς ἐναπετήρες
σοὺς καμάτους μέλπουσιν ἀειμνήστους γεγαδάτας.

ἔργα γὰρ εὐσεβῆς οὐ κρύπτεται· οὐ γὰρ ἀέθλους

λήθη ἀποσβέννυσιν ἀριστοπόνων ἀρετάων.

όσα δὲ σῇ παλάμη θεοπείθεα δῶματα τεύχει (30)

οὐδ´ αὐτῇ δεδάκκας· ἀμετρήτους γὰρ, οἶο,

μοῦνη σῷ ξύμπασσαν ἀνὰ χθόνα δείμαο νηῶς,

οὐρανιοῦ θεράποντας ἀεὶ τρομέουσα Θεοῖο.

"Ἰχνεσι δ´ εὐκαμάτοισιν ἐφεσπομενή γενετῆρων

πᾶσιν ἀεὶ ζώουσαν ἐγν τεκτήνατο φύτλην, (35)

eὐσεβῆς ξύμπασσαν ἀεὶ πατέουσα πορείην.

τούνεκά μν θεράποντες ἐπουρανίου βασιλῆς,

όσας δῶρα διδωσιν, ὁσος δωμήσατο νηῶς,

προφτονοῖς ἐρύσαν σὺν νῦι τοῖσ τε κούραις·
μίμνοι δ' ἀσπετον εὐχος ἀριστοπόνου γενέθλης, (40)
eἰσόκεν ἡλιος πυρᾶμπτα δίφρον ἐλαύνει.

At the entrance of the church, outside the narthex, on five plaques

Ποῖος Ἰουλιανῆς χορὸς ἀρκιὸς ἔστιν ἄεθλοις,
ἡ μετὰ Κωνσταντῖνον, ἐῆς κοσμῆτορα Ρώμης,
καὶ μετὰ Θεοδοσίου παγχρύσεον ιερὸν ὅμμα
καὶ μετὰ τοσσατίων προγόνων βασιλῆιδα ρίζαν, (45)
ἀξιον ἡς γενεῆς καὶ ύπέρτερον ἤνουσεν ἔργον

eῖν όλγους ἐτέεσσι; χρόνον δ' ἐβιήσατο μοῦνη,
καὶ σοφίην παρέλασεν ἀειδομένου Σολομόνος,
νηὸν ἀναστήσασα θειδόχον, οὐ μέγας αἰῶν
οῦ δύναται μέλψαι χαρίτων πολυδαίδαλον αἴγλην: (50)

ὁίος μὲν προβέβηκε βασιλεῖας τεθεμέθλοις,
νέρθεν ἀναθρώσκων καὶ αἰθέρος ἀστρα διώκων.
ὁίος δ' ἄντολυς μηκῦνεται ἐξ δύσιν ἔρπων,
ἀρρήτως Φαεθόντος ύπαστράτων ἅμαρυχαῖς
τῇ καὶ τῇ πλευρῆσι μέσης δ' ἐκάτερθε πορείης (55)
κίονες ἀρρήκτος ἐπὶ κίοσιν ἐστηθῆτες

130
χρυσορόφου ἀκτίνας ἀερτάζουσι καλύτερης·
κόλποι δ' ἄμφοτέρωθεν ἐπ' ἀψίδεσσι χυθέντες
φέγγος ἀειδίνητον ἐμαυώσαντο σελήνης·
τοίχοι δ' ἀντιπέρηθεν ἀμετρήτουσι κελεύθοις (60)
θεσπεσίους λειμόδας ἀνεξώσαντο μετάλλων,

οὐς φύσις ἀνθήσασα μέσοις ἐνὶ βένθεσι πέτρης
ἀγλαίην ἐκλεπτε, Θεοῦ δ' ἐφύλασσε μελάθροις
δύρον Ἰουλιανῆς, ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα τελέσῃ,
ἀχράντως κραδίς ὑπὸ νεύμασι ταῦτα καμοῦσα. (65)
tίς δὲ φέρον θόν ἵχνος ἐπὶ ξεφυμηδας αὑρας
ὑμνοπόλος σοφίς, ἑκατὸν βλεφάροις πεποιθας,
tοξεύσει ἑκάτερθε πολύτροπα δήνεα τέχνης,
oίκον ἰδὸν λάμποντα, περίδρομον ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ,
ἐνθεν καὶ γραφίδων ιερῶν ὑπὲρ ἄντυγος αὐλῆς (70)
ἐστίν ἵδειν μέγα θαῦμα, πολύφρονα Κωνσταντῖνον,
pῶς προφυγὼν εἰδωλα θεημάχον ἐξεβέσε λύσαν
καὶ Τριάδος φάος εὔρ<έν> ἐν ὑδασι γυὴι καθήρας.
Τοῦν Ἰουλιανῆ, μετὰ μυρίων ἐσμὸν ἀέθλων,
 ἤνυσε τούτον ἀέθλων ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς γενετήρων (75)
καὶ σφέτερῳ βιότοις καὶ ἐσσομένων καὶ ἔόντων.
On the south side of the nave:

The empress Eudocia, in her eagerness to honour God, was the first to build a temple to the divinely inspired Polyeuktos; but she did not make it like this or so large, not from any thrift or lack of resources—for what can a queen lack?—(5) but because she had a divine premonition that she would leave a family which would know how to provide a better embellishment. From this stock Juliana, bright light of blessed parents, sharing their royal blood in the fourth generation, did not cheat the hopes of that queen, who was mother of the finest children, (10) but raised this building from its small original to its present size and form, increasing the glory of her many-sceptred ancestors. All that she completed she made more excellent than her parents, having the true faith of a Christ-loving purpose. For who has not heard of Juliana, that, heeding piety, she glorified even her parents by her finely-laboured works? (16) She alone by her righteous sweat has made a worthy house for the ever-living Polyeuktos. For indeed she always knew how to provide blameless gifts to all athletes of the heavenly King. (20) The whole earth, every city, cries out that she has made her parents more glorious by these better works.

On the north side of the nave:

For where is it not possible to see that Juliana has raised up a glorious temple to the saints? Where is it not possible to see signs of the pious hands of you alone? (25) What place was there which did not learn that your purpose is full of piety? The inhabitants of the whole world sing your labours, which are always remembered. For the works of piety are not hidden; oblivion does not wipe out the contests of industrious virtue.
(30) Even you do not know how many houses dedicated to God your hand has made; for you alone, I think, have built innumerable temples throughout the whole earth, always revering the servants of the heavenly God. Following on all the well-labouring footsteps of her ancestors, (35) she fashioned her ever-living stock, always treading the whole path of piety. Wherefore may the servants of the heavenly King, to whom she gives gifts and for whom she built temples, protect her readily with her son and his daughters. (40) And may the unutterable glory of the family of excellent toils survive as long as the Sun drives his fiery chariot.

At the entrance of the church, outside the narthex, on five plaques (42–46, 47–50, 51–56, 57–61, 62–76):

What choir is sufficient to sing the contests of Juliana who, after Constantine, embellisher of his Rome, after the holy all-golden light of Theodosius, (45) and after royal descent from so many forebears, accomplished a work worthy of her family, and more than worthy

in a few years? She alone has overpowered time and surpassed the wisdom of the celebrated Solomon, raising a temple to receive God, the richly wrought and gracious splendour of which a great epoch cannot celebrate.

(51) How it stands forth on deep-rooted foundations, springing up from below and pursuing the stars of heaven, and how too it extends from the west, stretching to the east, glittering with the indescribable brightness of the sun (55) on this side and on that!

On either side of the central nave, columns standing upon sturdy columns
support the rays of the golden-roofed covering. On both sides recesses hollowed out in arches have given birth to the ever-revolving light of the moon. (60) The walls, opposite each other in measureless paths, have put on marvellous meadows of marble, which nature caused to flower in the very depths of the rock, concealing their brightness and guarding Juliana's gift for the halls of God, so that she might accomplish divine works, (65) labouring at these things in the immaculate promptings of her heart. What singer of wisdom, moving swiftly on the breath of the west wind and trusting in a hundred eyes, will pinpoint on each side the manifold counsels of art, seeing the shining house, one ambulatory upon another? (70) Thence, it is possible to see above the rim of the hall a great marvel of sacred depiction, the wise Constantine, how escaping the idols he overcame the God-fighting fury, and found the light of the Trinity by purifying his limbs in water. Such is the contest that Juliana, after a countless swarm of labours, accomplished for the souls of her ancestors, and for her own life, and for those who are to come and those that already are.\textsuperscript{232}

and Paul, for by giving honour to His servants a man offereth great glory to the King Himself. Here is profit for the soul and for the eyes. Let each get what he hath need of by his prayers, and take joy in looking at the beauty and splendour of the house.

9.—*On the Church of St. Michael in Bothreptus*

And this celebrated work too is the fruit of thy toil, skilled Gerradius. For thou didst reveal to us anew the lovely temple of the captain of the angelic host.

10.—*On the Church of the Holy Martyr Polyeuctus*

Eudocia the empress, eager to honour God, first built here a temple of Polyeuctus the servant of God. But she did not make it as great and beautiful as it is, not from any economy or lack of possessions—what doth a queen lack?—but because her prophetic soul told her that she should leave a family well knowing how better to adorn it. Whence Juliana, the glory of her blessed parents, inheriting their royal blood in the fourth generation, did not defeat the hopes of the Queen, the mother of a noble race, but raised this from a small temple to its present size and beauty, increasing the glory of her many-sceptred ancestors; for all that she made, she made more magnificent than they, holding the true faith of a mind devoted to Christ. Who hath not heard of Juliana, how in her pious care she glorified even her parents by fair-fashioned works? All alone by her righteous toil she built a worthy house to immortal Polyeuctus, for she had ever studied to give blameless gifts to all athletes of the Heavenly King. Every country cries,
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πᾶσα χθόνι βοά, πᾶσα πτόλεμος, ὅτι τοκῆς φαϊδροτέρους ποιήσεις ἀρειστέρους ἐπ' ἔργοις. τὸν γὰρ Ἰουλιανήν ἄγιοις οὐκ ἔστιν ἰδέαν νῆν ἀναστήσασαν ἀγακλέα; τὸν σέο μούνης εὐσεβέσαν οὐκ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν σημεία χειρῶν; ποῖος δ' ἐπλετο χῶρος, δε οὐ μάθε σεῖο μενουνήν εὐσεβής πλήθουσαν; ὁλὴς χθόνις ἐναυτήρεσι σοῦς καμάτους μέλπουσιν ἀειμνήστους γεγαώτας. ἔργα γὰρ εὐσεβής οὐ κρύπτεται· οὐ γὰρ ἄειθλος λήθη ἀποσβέννυσιν ἀριστοπόνων ἀρετῶν.

ὁσα δὲ σῇ παλάμῃ θεοπείδεα δῶματα τεύχει οὐδ' αὐτὴ δεδάνεσα· ἀμετρήτους γάρ, ὅλα, μούνη σὲ ξύμπασαν ἀνὰ χθόνα δείμαο ναούς, ὀὐρανίου θεράποντας ἀεὶ τρομέονσα θεὸν.

ἐκεῖσι δ' εὐκαράματοιν ἐφεσπομένη γενετήρων πᾶσιν, ἀειξώουσαν ἐὴν τεκτήνατο φύλην, εὐσεβής ξύμπασαν ἀεὶ πατέουσα πορείνην. τοῦνεκά μὲν θεράποντες ἐποιμαίον βασιλῆσις, ὀσιος δόρα διδώσων, ὀσιος δωμῆσαι νησούς, προφρονέως ἐρύσεθε σὺν νιέι, τοῖο τε κοῦρος· μίμων δ' ἄσπετον εὐχος ἀριστοπόνοις γενέθλης,

ἐἰσόκεν ἡμῖν πυριλαμπέα δίφρον ἐλαίνει.

Ἐν τῷ εἰσόδῃ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ναοῦ ἔξω τοῦ νάρθηκος πρὸς τὴν ἁγία

Ποῖος Ἰουλιανῆς χορὸς ἀρκιῶς ἐστὶν ἄεθλοις, ἢ μετὰ Κωνσταντῖνον ἔης κασμήτορα Ἀγίως, καὶ μετὰ Θεοδοσίου παγχρύσεων ἱερὸν ὁμα, καὶ μετὰ τοσατῶν προγόνων βασιλῆδα δίζον, ἄξιον ἦς γενεής καὶ ὑπέρτερον ἡνυσεν ἔργον εἰν ὀλγοὺς ἐτεσιν; χρόνον ὢν ἅβιδεστατο μούνη,
every city, that she made her parents more glorious by better works. Where do we not find that Juliana hath raised splendid temples to the Saints? Where do we not see the signs of the pious hand of thee alone? What place hath not learnt that thy mind is full of piety? The inhabitants of the whole world sing thy works, which are eternally remembered. For the works of piety are not hidden; oblivion doth not quench the labours of beneficent virtue. Not even thyself knowest how many houses dedicated to God thy hand hath made; for thou alone, I ween, didst build innumerable temples all over the world, ever fearing the servants of God in Heaven. Following by her good works all the footsteps of her parents she made the fame of her race immortal, always walking in the whole path of piety. Therefore, all ye servants of the Heavenly King to whom she gave gifts or built temples, preserve her gladly with her son and his daughters, and may the immeasurable glory of the most beneficent family survive as long as the Sun drives his burning chariot.

At the Entrance of the same Church, outside the Narthex towards the Apse

What quire is sufficient to chant the works of Juliana, who after Constantine, the adorer of his Rome, and after the holy golden light of Theodosius, and after so many royal ancestors, in a few years accomplished a work worthy of her race, yea, more than worthy? She alone did violence 

\footnote{i.e. vestibule.}
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καὶ σοφίην παρέλασεν ἁειδομένου Σολομῶν, 

νεόν ἀναστήσασα θεοδόχον, οὐ μέγας αἰῶν 

οὐ δύναται μελήσαι χαρίτων πολυδαιδαλον αἰγήν. 50

όλος μὲν προβέβηκε βαθυρήξοις θεμέλωσι, 

νέρθεν ἀναθρόσωκοι καὶ αἰθέρος ἀστρα διώκαν. 

όλος δ' ἀντολής μυκίνεται ἐς δύσιν ἔρπον, 

ἀρρήτως Φαέθοντος ἱπαστράτων ἁμαρναίσ, 

τῇ καὶ τῇ πλευρῇ: μέσης δ' ἐκάτερθε πορείας 

κίονες ἀρρηκτοίς ἐπὶ κίοσιν ἐστησάτε 

χρυσοφόρον ἀκτίνας ἀερτάζουσι καλύπτρης. 

κολποί δ' ἁμφοτέρωθεν ἐπὶ ἀψίδοςας χυθέντες 

φέγγος ἁειδίνητον ἐμαυέσαστο σελήνης. 

τοῦχοι δ' ἀντιπέρθεν ἀμετρήτους κελεύθοις 

θεστεσίους λειμώνας ἀνεξώσαντο μετάλλων, 

οὐς φύσις ἀνθήσασα μέσους ἐνι βένθεις πέτρης 

ἀγλαίην ἐκλεπτε, θεοῦ δ' ἐφύλασσε μελάθροις, 

δώρων Ἰουλιάνης, ἦνα θέσκελα ἐργα τελέσῃ 

ἀχράντως κραδίης ὑπὸ νεώμασι ταῦτα καμοῦσα. 

τὸς δὲ φέρων θοῦν ἵχνος ἐπὶ ξεφυρηθαίς αὖρας 

ὑμνοτόλος σοφίς, ἐκατὸν βλεφάρωι πεποιθώς, 

τοξεύει εἰκάτερθε πολύτροπα δὴνεα τέχνης, 

οἴκον ἰδών λάμποντα, περίδρομον, ἄλλον ἔπι ἄλλῳ, 

ἐνθω ἦν καὶ γραφίδων ἱερῶν ὑπὲρ ἀντύγος αὐλῆς 

ἐστὶν ἰδεῖν μέγα θαῦμα, πολύφρονα Κωνσταντῖνον, 

πῶς προφυγόν εἰδωλα θεμάχων ἐσβείε λύσην, 

καὶ Τριάδος φάος εὐρεν ἐν ὑδάει γυμα καθήρας. 

τοῦν Ἰουλιάνη, μετὰ μυρίων ἑσμῶν ἀέθλων, 

ὕψωτο τοῦτον ἄθελον ὑπὲρ φυχῆς γενετήρας, 

καὶ σφετέρου βιότοιο, καὶ ἐσσομένων καὶ ἑόντων.
to Time and surpassed the wisdom of renowned Solomon by raising a habitation for God, whose glittering and elaborate beauty the ages cannot celebrate—how it rises from its deep-rooted foundations, running up from the ground and aspiring to the stars of heaven, and how from east to west it extends itself glittering with unspeakable brightness in the sunlight on both its sides! On either side of its aisle columns standing on firm columns support the rays of the golden dome, while on each side arched recesses scattered on the dome reproduce the ever-revolving light of the moon. The opposite walls in innumerable paths are clothed in marvellous metallic veins of colour, like flowery meadows which Nature made to flower in the depth of the rock, and hid their glory, keeping them for the House of God, to be the gift of Juliana, so that she might produce a divine work, following in her toil the stainless dictates of her heart. What singer of skilful works shall now hasten to the west, armed with a hundred eyes, and read aright the various devices on the walls, gazing on the circle of the shining house, one story set on another? There you may see a marvellous creation of the holy pencils above the centre of the porch, the wise Constantine, how escaping from the idols he quenched the impious fury of the heathen and found the light of the Trinity by cleansing his limbs in water. Such is the labour that Juliana, after a countless swarm of labours, accomplished for the souls of her parents, and for her own life, and for that of those who are and shall be.

1 i.e. the west façade.

102. The martyr Polyeuctus.

The martyr Polyeuctus, although he is noted for great miracles, is venerated with a great cult at Constantinople for this reason especially, that he takes immediate vengeance against perjurers. For whoever commits, as often happens, a secret crime and, after being put under suspicion, is brought to this church, either he is frightened by the power of the martyr and immediately confesses what he did, or, if he commits perjury, he is immediately struck down by divine vengeance. Juliana, a woman from Constantinople, covered the ceiling of this church with pure gold, in this fashion. When a report of her wealth was recounted by many people and reached the emperor Justinian, he did not hesitate to hurry swiftly to meet her. He said: "O venerable mother, I think that you are not unaware how the public treasuries are empty of gold coins at a time when we wish you to be at peace, when we intend to defend the country, when we reconcile the barbarians to ourselves, and when we seek to compensate various people with gifts. Therefore, because the power of the divine majesty has given you much gold, I ask that you extend your hand to us and donate some money. Then, when the total of the public taxes is announced, what you have lent will be instantly returned to you. In the future, when the fame of your renown spreads, people will chant that the matron Juliana has supported Constantinople with her wealth." But she saw through the deception of the emperor and wisely concealed what she had dedicated to God. She said: "My small income, both what is expected from rents as well as what is expected from harvests, remains still at my homes. If therefore you in your glory will permit a delay in receiving it, it will be presented for your inspection once it has been collected. And when you have seen everything with your own eyes, you may discard or take whatever is pleasing. I will do whatever the desire of your heart decides." The emperor was tricked by these words. He happily returned
to his palace and thought that he already had this money in the public treasuries. But Juliana gathered some craftsmen and secretly gave them whatever gold she could find in her storerooms. She said: "Go, construct plates to fit the measure of the beams, and decorate the ceiling [of the church] of the blessed martyr Polyeuctus with this gold, so that the hand of this greedy emperor cannot touch these things." The craftsmen completed everything that the woman ordered by attaching [the plates] to the ceiling and covering it with pure gold. Once the task was finished, the woman summoned the emperor and said: "The little bit of my money that I could collect is here. Come to see it, and do what you wish." The emperor happily rose from his throne; but he was to receive none of the gold. He came to the woman's house intending to transport great treasures back to his palace. When the woman humbly met him, she invited him to pray in the church of the martyr that was next to her house. For she had dedicated whatever she could possess to that holy place. The emperor took Juliana's hand because she was an old woman, entered the church, and knelt for prayer. When his prayer was over, the woman said: "Most glorious Augustus, I ask that you look at the ceiling of this church and realize that my poorness is kept there in this craftsmanship. But you now do what you wish. I will not oppose you." The emperor looked up, was surprised, and then was embarrassed. In order to conceal his shame he praised the craftsmanship, gave thanks, and prepared to leave. But so that the emperor not return empty-handed, the woman removed a ring from her finger but concealed the jewel in her palm. The ring contained no more than half an ounce of gold. Juliana offered the ring to the emperor and said: "Most hallowed emperor, receive from my hand this small gift that is assessed at more than the value of this gold." For in the ring was a Neronian emerald, very green and shiny. When the emerald was exposed, it seemed that the beauty of the jewel had somehow transformed all the gold [on the ceiling] into greenness. The emperor received the ring, repeatedly gave thanks and praised the woman, and then returned to his palace. As a result there is no doubt that the power of the martyr had intervened in this affair to prevent the wealth that had been given to this holy place and to the poor from being transferred to the control of this emperor who had not exerted himself in collecting it.115
Polyeuctus was thought to have been martyred in the mid-third century. Anicia Juliana was a member of a most distinguished family; from the late fourth to the mid-fifth century several of her ancestors had been emperors in the West: see PLRE II:635-6. Much of this church dedicated to St Polyeuctus was constructed during the period from 524 to 527, that is, before Justinian became emperor in 527 and during the reign of his uncle, Justin I: see Harrison (1986). At the time patronage for this church may have been intended as a reaffirmation of the importance of Juliana’s family in the face of these upstart emperors. But by passing on this ring to Justinian Juliana may also have been tacitly conceding the transfer of imperial power to another dynasty: see Harrison (1983). King Childebert and king Guntram once guaranteed a treaty by invoking the names of St Hilary and St Martin, two great Gallic saints, and of St Polyeuctus, who was noted for his vengeance on perjurers [HF VII.6].

234. Gregory of Tours: Glory of the Martyrs (Liverpool University Press - Translated Texts for Historians) by Raymond Van Dam (Nov 1, 1988) 124-126.
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From the *Palatine Anthology* AP 1.12:
Folios of the Epigram on St. Euphemia of Olybrius
Appendix 6
From the Palatine Anthology AP 1.12:
Translation of the Epigram on St. Euphemia of Olybrius as per W.R. Paton
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11.—Eis tois agious Ἀναργύρους tois eis tā
Βασιλισκον
Τοῖς σοίς θεράπουσιν ἡ θεράπαινα προσφέρω
Σοφία τὸ δόρον. Χριστὲ, προσδέχου τὰ σά,
καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ μου μισθὸν Ἰουστίνῳ δίδου,
νίκαις ἐπὶ νίκαις κατὰ νόσσων καὶ βαρβάρων.

12.—Εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν Εὐφημίαν τὴν Ὀλυβρίον
Εἰμὶ δόμος Τριάδος, τρισθῇ δὲ με τεῦχε γενέθλην·
πρὸτη μὲν πολέμους καὶ βάρβαρα φίλα φυγοῦσα
tεύξατο καὶ μ’ ἀνέθηκε θεῷ ζωὰγρα μόχθων
Θεοσοφίαν θυγάτηρ Εὐδοξίαν· ἐκ δὲ με κείης
Πλακιδίη κόσμησε σὺν ὀλβίστῳ παρακοήν·
ei de pou aglathē epedeveito kállos emeio,
tín de moi olbiodoros υπὲρ μνήμης γενετήρων
dōkein Ἰουλιανῆ, kal ὑπερτατὸν ὡπασε κύδος
mptēri kai genētē kai ἀγακλεὶ metri tekouśης,
kósmon aexēsasa palaițeron. ὡδ’ emon ērygon.

13.—Εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ναὸν ἐνδοθέν τοῦ περιδρόμου
Κάλλος ἔχου καὶ πρόσθεν ἑπτήρατον· ἅλλ’ ἐπὶ μορφῇ
τῇ πρὶν ἄρειστηρῃ νῦν λάχου ἄγλαθην.

14.—"Αλλο
Οὕτω γῆρας ἐμὸν μετὰ μητέρα καὶ μετὰ τηθῆν
ξύσεν Ἰουλιανῆ, καὶ νέον ἀνθός ἔχω.

15.—"Αλλο
Ἡν ἄρα καὶ κάλλους ἐτὶ κάλλουν· εἰτ’ ἐμὸν ἑργον,
καὶ πρὶν ἐν περίπτυστον, αοίδιμον εἰς χθόνα πάσαν,
ἀγλαθῆς προτέρης ἐς ὑπέρτερον ἡγάγη κάλλος
τὸσσον Ἰουλιανῆ, ὅσον ἀστρασίν ἀντιφερίζειν.
CHRISTIAN EPIGRAMS

11.—On the Church of the Saints Cosmas and Damian in the district of Basiliscus

I, thy servant Sophia, O Christ, offer this gift to thy servants. Receive thine own, and to my emperor Justin give in payment therefor victory on victory over diseases and the barbarians.

12.—On St. Euphemia of Olybrius

I am the House of the Trinity, and three generations built me. First Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius, having escaped from war and the barbarians, erected and dedicated me to God in acknowledgement of her rescue from distress. Next her daughter Placidia with her most blessed husband adorned me. Thirdly, if perchance my beauty was at all deficient in splendour, munificent Juliana invested me with it in memory of her parents, and bestowed the height of glory on her mother and father and her mother’s illustrious mother by augmenting my former adornment. Thus was I made.

13.—In the same Church, inside the Gallery

I had loveliness before, but now in addition to my former beauty I have acquired greater splendour.

14.—Another

Thus did Juliana, after her mother and grandmother, scrape off my coat of old age, and I have new bloom.

15.—Another

There was then something more beautiful than beauty, since my fabric, even formerly of world-wide celebrity, was advanced to a beauty greater than its former splendour by Juliana, so that now it rivals the stars.

1 Physicians, called *Avdpyvpoi* because they refused fees from sick folk who were willing to become Christians.
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16.—"Αλλο
Αὐτὴν ἑργοπόνουσιν ἐπιπνεύσαν ἀραγήν ἐιχεν Ἰουλιανὴ μάρτυρα νηστόλουν
οὔποτε γὰρ τοῖς τε τόσον τ᾽ εὖδαίδαλον ἔργον ἴμνον, οὐρανίας ἐμπλεον ἀγαθῆς.

17.—"Αλλο
Οὐκετὶ θαυμάξεις προτέρων κλέος· οὐ διὰ τέχνης εὐχος ἐν ὠψιγόνους λίπους ἀσπετον, ὀσσάτιον περ
κύδος Ἰουλιανῆς πινυτόφρονος, ἢ χάριν ἔργων ἀρχεγόνων νίκης νοήματα πάνσοφα φωτών.

18.—Εἰς Ἀκούβιτον. Εἰς Βαῦν
Τῆς ἁγαθῆς ἁγαθὸς μὲν ἐγὼ κύκλος Ἀγαθουνίκης

19.—ΚΛΑΤΔΙΑΝΟΤ
Εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα
"Ο πυρὸς ἀενάοιο σοφῆν ὀδὼν φυλάσσειν, ἐμβεβαίως κόσμου παλανδίνητον ἀνάγκην,
Χριστε, θεορήτω σαίν φυσίζει πηγὴ,

Εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα
"Ο πυρὸς ἀενάοιο σοφῆν ὀδὼν φυλάσσειν, ἐμβεβαίως κόσμου παλανδίνητον ἀνάγκην,
Χριστε, θεορήτω σαίν φυσίζει πηγὴ,
πατρὸς ἀσημάντου θεοῦ πρωτόσπορε φωνή,
ὅς μετὰ μητρόφων τοκετῶν ἐγκύμονα φόρτων
καὶ γόνων αὐτοτέλεστον ἀνυμφεύτων ὑμεναίων
στήσεις Ἀστυρίης γενεῆς ἑτερόφρονα λύσσαν,
ὅργα δ᾽ εἰδώλων κενεῖν ψευδώνυμα λύσας,
αιθέρος ἀμφιβέβηκας ἐφ᾽ ἑπτάξων ὀχῆς,
ἀγγελικαῖς πετρύγεσται ἐν ἀρρήτωσι θαάσσων
"Ω θεοῦ, παγγενετόν βενίτα πρεσβήιον ὄμμα,
φρουρὲ βίου, σῶτερ μερόπων, αἰῶνος ἀνάσσων.
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16.—Another

Juliana had the Martyr herself, the Patroness of the church, to inspire and help the artificers. For never would she have accomplished otherwise so vast and beautiful a work, full of heavenly splendour.

17.—Another

No longer dost thou marvel at the glory of them who are passed away: by their art they did not leave a fame so great as is the glory of wise Juliana, who by her work surpassed the skilled design of her ancestors.

18.—On an Uncertain Object

I am the good circle of good Agathonike . . . . . and she dedicated me to the immaculate Martyr Trophimus.

19.—CLAUDIANUS

To the Saviour

O Thou Who guardest the wise womb of the everlasting fire, Who art enthroned on the revolving necessity of the Universe, Christ, vivifying Source of the divinely appointed life, first begotten Voice of God the ineffable Father, Who, after the burden of Thy Mother's pangs and the self-accomplished birth from a marriage without bridegroom, didst arrest the heterodox rage of the Syrian race, and dissolve the falsely named rites of empty idols, and then didst ascend the seven-zoned belt of heaven seated on the unspeakable angelic wings, have mercy on me, venerated Eye of God, the Maker of all things, Keeper of life, Saviour of men, Lord of Eternity.

1 The epigram is imperfect.
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Signs-of-Return
Annotations as Architectural Clues:
A Closer Examination of the Tie Marks of AP 1.10
By Ann Patrice Schnakenberg

Dividing up the poem up in the way Connor suggests appears to make sense, but upon further inspection, the tie marks, or signes-de-renvoi, and annotations found within the manuscript itself do not adequately support her argument. If one takes a closer look at the folios (Appendix 1, folios 50-52), it becomes clear that not all of the asterisks associated with the poem are alike, and that they are also accompanied by a variety of other symbols. These reference marks play an important role in pointing out the epigram’s physical whereabouts in relation to the church. They also serve to connect the verses of the poem to information conveyed within the scholia of its margins.

As of the tenth century, the most common method utilized by scribes to link the text of a manuscript with its glosses involved the employment of matching pairs of tie marks or signes-de-renvoi. This was a precursor to our modern day footnotes. These signs of return, or return signs, allowed the reader to swiftly locate and match corresponding points of information. The symbols took on a variety of forms, including letters, geometrical shapes, and decorative designs.236

The Greek word for asterisk (ἀστερίσκος) is ‘little star.’237 It was first used in conjunction with the obelus (ὁβελός), a slash or dotted slash similar to our division sign

237. Yin Liu, Medieval Codes: Asterisks in the Middle Ages. 2014.
and originally representative of a spit or dagger. These symbols were first invented by Aristarchus in the second century BC. He employed them as critical signs, marking verses inserted into Homer from other sources with asterisks, and utilizing a combination of the asterisk and obelus to indicate verses he felt belonged elsewhere in the text. In the third century AD, Origen used these symbols to add clarity to his extensive comparative study and collation of Greek translations with original Hebrew Scriptures, the Hexapla, to produce a reliable version of the Septuagint. Origen indicated the original Hebrew texts he had added to the Septuagint with the asterisk, and marked any he believed were not in the original Hebrew with an obelus. Jerome translated the Old Testament from Hebrew into Latin to create the Vulgate from 390 to 405 AD. In his Preface to the Pentateuch he states “But that I may have dared, the effort of Origen provoked me, who mixed the translation of Theodotion to the ancient edition, with asterisk and obelus, that is, star and spit, a work distinguishing everything, while he either makes to shine those things which were previously lacking, or he slays and pierces through everything superfluous.”

Up to this point the asterisk had been related to the process of textual correction. During the Middle Ages it evolved into a signe-de-renvoi. This natural progression occurred because of the symbol’s previous association with supplemental text. Asterisks also appeared less frequently until the rise of printed text, leaving scholars to wonder if their appearance during this period has been overlooked.

239. Liu, 2014.
A number of reference marks are found in AP 1.10. An analysis of their meaning and placement will help to clarify the intention of the scribes who originally incorporated these marks into the manuscript as signals. These cues were intended to assist the reader in visualizing the layout of the poem within the building and grounds of Saint Polyeuktos. As the church no longer stands, and exterior sections of its remaining footprint have been destroyed, these reference marks have taken on an even greater significance. They currently represent the best opportunity available for understanding the position of Juliana’s poem on the great entablature within the church and most importantly on the walls surrounding its outer courtyard.

Three particular types of reference marks stand out in AP 1.10, although they vary throughout the folios: the asterisk - a 'star-like' decorative 'X' surrounded by dots, some topped by a horizontal dash; a colon (or metobelus) consisting of two vertically placed dots, followed by a dash, with the dash at times piercing an asterisk; and a horizontal diamond-, or lozenge-shaped tie mark made up of four dots.

The combined colon and dash symbols of AP 1.10 appear to be a form of paragraphos used to mark the end of a division of text.242 The paragraphos, often a simple dash placed between lines of text and out into a margin, was a precursor to our modern pilcrow, or paragraph mark. In this case the dash may function to draw attention to the colon, the colon being a type of end marker called a metobelus or “end of an obelus,” so named because it was a critical mark often used in conjunction with an obelus. The obelus or dagger generally indicated the beginning of a word or passage in

question and the metabolus marked its end. Here it appears that the combined symbols of metabolus and paragraphos have been used to mark textual endings. Although the location of the two horizontal dots differ in that they precede the dash, they bear a similarity to our modern division mark, as well as the ancient obelus, spit or dagger.

Regarding some of the other symbols present, the dash above two of the asterisks may also be a form of paragraphos and signify separation. As for the more elaborate marks consisting of a colon or metabolus followed by an asterisk and a horizontal dash (that in one instance pierces the asterisk), these may be a kind of flourished paragraphos. They may also be related to an even earlier form of a decorative end mark, the coronus.

In the earlier cited quote by Jerome he points to the use of the star or asterisk to make something shine or stand out, and the spit or obelus to slay, pierce, or in effect divide. AP 1.10 is filled with these textual symbols, highlighting and dividing it into sections that reflect its placement throughout the church of Saint Polyeuktos. The poem is divided into two sections, lines 1-41 running from the south-east towards the west and then back around to the north-east inside the nave. Lines 42-76 were situated somewhere outside.

Folio 50

Figure 45. AP 1.10, Folio 50, Gloss 1, Epigram Lines 1-2.

244. Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia, “Coronis,” 2016 <http://www.finedictionary.com/Coronis.html>. In paleography, a curve, double curve, or flourish, used to mark the end of a paragraph, a section, or a whole book.
Folio 50 includes lines 1-30. Line one of our poem begins with an asterisk in front of the first word Eudocia, (fig. 45) and ends on folio 52 at line 76 with a colon and dash (fig. 46). These two symbols, the star and the dagger, mark the beginning and end of the poem. Perhaps it should also be noted that there are two dots in the right hand margin, one next to line 10 of the poem, and another at line twenty.

Directly to the left of that first asterisk by line 1 of folio 50, is the first margin note or scholion of the poem (Folio 50, Gloss 1). It says, “On the church of the Holy Martyr Polyeuctos” (fig. 45).\(^{245}\) The note ends with a colon and a dash mark.

In the center of the poem is a second scholion or gloss (Folio 50, Gloss 2). It is a short comment that may indicate where the epigram begins on the north side of the nave (fig. 47). It also may say that the church was built in three years, as Mango and Ševčenko state that this was found in a scholion.\(^ {246}\)

On the bottom left of the folio is the third and last scholion of the page (Folio 50, Gloss 3). It states, "All these things [ie. verses] remain today in excellent condition [?] after five hundred years" (fig. 48). This gloss is preceded by a horizontal diamond-shaped tie mark or lozenge composed of four dots. It should also be pointed out that further up, on the other side in the right margin at the end of line 10, another matching lozenge-shaped tie mark can be seen on the following page at the beginning of line 42 on folio 51 (fig. 48). It is possible that the small curved mark to its left was placed there to direct the reader to this tie.

Folio 51

Figure 49. AP 1.10, Folio 51, Gloss 1.

Figure 50. AP 1.10, Folio 51, Epigram Lines 41-42, Gloss 2.

Figure 51. AP 1.10, Folio 51, Gloss 2.

Figure 52. *AP* 1.10, Folio 51, Gloss 3.

Figure 53. *AP* 1.10, Folio 51, Gloss 4.

Figure 54. *AP* 1.10, Folio 51, The Four Plaques, Epigram Lines 42-61.
Of the three folios, folio 51 is the most complex. It includes lines 30-62 of the poem. Attention should be paid to the fact that line 30 appears twice, once on the bottom of folio 50 and again on the top of 51 where it seems a different scribe may have taken over. The first scholion (Folio 51, Gloss 1) in the right margin at line 30 states either “These things are written round in a circle inside the church” or “all around inside the naos” (fig. 49).²⁴⁸

A second scholion (Folio 51, Gloss 2) is found at the end of line 41 (figs. 50-51). It translates as either “At the entrance of the same church, outside the narthex,” followed

by an abbreviated phrase which includes the word ‘arch’ or ‘arches’ or “At the entrance of the same church, outside the narthex, in the direction of the arch.”249

At the end of line 41 a special decorative end mark consisting of a colon, followed by an asterisk, pierced by a horizontal dash, marks the end of the first interior half of the poem (figs. 50-51). It is adjacent to the first line of the second scholion. This flourished reference is unique and therefore must mark an important division. It is more pronounced than any other end mark present, including the one at the end of the poem on folio 52 line 76 (figs. 46 and 63).

Another unique reference marks the beginning of the second half of the poem at line 42 (figs. 54-55). It is differentiated by the diamond-shaped tie mark noted earlier, and further distinguished by the outdenting of its first word. Here the Greek letter Pi is enlarged and employed as a literatae notabiliores, or noticeable letter.250 The special treatment of this initial indicates that the scribe was drawing attention to the important transition of the poem to the exterior of the structure.

Two asterisks mark the end of the third scholion (Folio 51, Gloss 3) which is found at line 46 (fig. 52). The fourth and final scholion (Folio 51, Gloss 4) is found by line 59, at what appears to be the end of the first plaque (fig. 53). It begins with a third diamond-shaped tie mark and ends with an asterisk. This either states “four plaques on which five or six lines each are inscribed” or “four slabs on which these things were inscribed all around with five or rather six verses on each.”251

249. Whitby 2006, 160; and also Connor 1999, 495.
251. Whitby 2006, 160; and also Connor 1999, 495.
From lines 42-61 a series of reference marks divide our poem into four sections representing the four plaques of the epigram that are discussed in the marginal comments to their right (fig. 54). Their use is similar to the function of quotations or brackets. Scholars have made use of these asterisks to develop theories about the way the text of the poem should be divided. However, it appears that some may have been viewing them as simple diple marks, the diple being another ancient textual mark in the shape of a small angle used to highlight noteworthy features of text. More attention should be paid to the way the various asterisks of the manuscript interact with the other reference marks throughout the manuscript. This examination hopes to shed light on the deeper meaning of these textual marks. Thanks to the digitizing of AP 1.10, we now have an opportunity magnify the text and take a closer look at them.

Section one, lines 42-46, begins with the diamond-shaped tie mark next to the outdented initial and ends with what may be a colon followed by an asterisk and a dash (fig. 55). Section two, lines 47-50, begins with an asterisk topped by a dash and ends with a colon followed by an asterisk and a dash (fig. 56). Section three, lines 51-56, begins with the same type of dash topped asterisk as the plaque before it, and also ends with an asterisk and dash, but no colon is visible and the dash is faint and further to the right (fig. 57).

It is important to note that line 50 is the location of the only strong grammatical break recognized by Whitby. Due to the distinctly different dash topped asterisks

placed in front of the two sections that frame this break, I believe it is possible for these plaques to have been placed on the façade of the church narthex on either side of the grand staircase that led to the main entrance of the church. In this configuration the four plaques would have coincided with the four entrances leading down under the narthex and into the crypt.

It is also necessary to note that section four, lines 57-61, differs from the rest in that it begins and ends with an asterisk, instead of an end-note like a colon and dash to indicate its end (fig. 58). Keeping in mind Jerome’s comment about an asterisk shedding light on a subject, it makes sense that this change in pattern, and consequent replacement of an end mark with an asterisk, could very well indicate something different is occurring here. This may include a continuation of text. This is an indication that lines 62-76 of the epigram form a fifth section that continues on to an adjacent location.

Folio 52

Figure 59. AP 1.10, Folio 52, Gloss 1, Epigram Lines 63-66.

Figure 60. AP 1.10, Folio 52, Gloss 1.
Folio 52 includes lines 63-76. The last plaque begins with line 62 on Folio 51 and ends where the poem concludes on folio 52 (fig. 61, 63). At the top of the page in the left margin at line 63 we find the last scholion of the poem (Folio 52, Gloss 1) (figs. 59-60). It ends with two marks, the fourth and last diamond-shaped tie mark of the poem, and a diagonal slash. The comment instructs us about the last plaque, and translates to either
“Last plaque on the right-hand side of the entrance, on which these things are inscribed” or “Last is the slab to the right of the entrance on which these things are inscribed.”

There are four diamond or lozenge-shaped tie marks within AP 1.10 (figs. 48, 53, 59-60). Three are associated with the three longest scholia or comments, and these in turn are distributed one per page throughout the margins of the manuscript (Folio 50 Gloss 3, Folio 51 Gloss 4, and Folio 52 Gloss 1). The fourth is located to the left of line 42 (figs. 54-55). These tie marks serve as visual markers and are used to communicate connections between corresponding annotations and references. In this case they provide an opportunity for the scribes who were able to visit the Church of Saint Polyeuktos and study its epigram to convey their observations and descriptions to those of us who have not enjoyed the privilege of seeing it at its best. This tour of Juliana’s church begins within the nave in the church’s southeast corner, and will then move outside to its entrance.

Looking back to our manuscript (Appendix 1) we find that the first tie mark begins a comment in the left margin at the bottom of folio 50. It discusses the age and condition of the church. We find that “all these things” remain in excellent condition after 500 years. We can then look to the three other tie marks for more information in order to learn what all these things are. These appear to inform us that the interior and exterior epigram and most likely the church as a whole is in very good shape. We turn the page to find the second tie mark situated at the beginning of line 42 on folio 51 of the manuscript. It assists in marking the place where the transition to the entrance of the church occurs and the exterior location of the epigram begins. Putting our knowledge of the architectural remains of the church aside, we look to the third tie mark to be our guide. It

is also located on folio 51, at the beginning of the last comment on the page. This tie mark places us at the entrance of the church, outside the narthex, again observing the epigram as it moves in the direction of an arch or arches on four plaques, all around us, with four or five lines on each. Here we can look at the placement of the tie mark at the top left of the comment and also look towards the upper left of the page to find its counterpart at the beginning of line 42. Here we see that the poem has been divided up into four sections as outlined in the comment. A series of various asterisks and end marks are employed to clarify their arrangement. It’s also possible that the asterisk at the end of this comment may function as a tie mark to the asterisks found at beginning of most of the plaques.

We turn the page to folio 52 and find the fourth and final lozenge-shaped tie mark at the bottom of the first comment located at the top of the page. Here at the end of our tour, the scribe tells us of a fifth plaque, a last inscribed plaque situated somewhere to the right of the entrance. Here we can also take note of another mark, a diagonal slash just to the right of the tie mark between it and the poem.

The diamond-shaped tie mark and slash at the end of the final comment, or scholion, on folio 52 are two of the most significant clues in this study. Their close proximity to the beginning of line 66 is also the likely cause of some confusion. Magnification has afforded a greater opportunity to see explore this manuscript in greater detail. Conner appears to have mistaken this lozenge-shaped tie mark for an asterisk marking the epigram’s fifth plaque just as described in the very comment that the mark followed. From there she went on to form her theory of the fifth plaque beginning at line
66, and her placement of it outside the atrium to be viewed from the street.\textsuperscript{256} I also believe that the slash mark next to it may have been placed there as a divider or separation mark in an attempt to avoid exactly this kind of confusion. Recognition of this makes it easier to understand how lines 62-76 could form the content of the last plaque, regardless of its location within the grounds of the church. Therefore since this tie mark at the end of the comment is not the asterisk it was thought to be, I conclude that there is really no mark at all in front of line 66. Based upon this, and the observation that the scribes placed an asterisk rather than an end mark at the end of line 61 (fig. 54, 58), I propose the true beginning of the last plaque lies with the asterisk in front of line 62. This fifth plaque consisting of lines 62-76 of \textit{AP} 1.10 concludes the poem.

\textsuperscript{256} Connor 1999, 495-496.