Reconsidering Late Antique Funerary Habits
Trends, Debates and Perspectives

In current scholarship on the ancient world, Late Antiquity can certainly be labeled as a thriving research field. The past 50 years saw an ever-increasing number of projects, conferences, publications and several voluminous compendia dedicated to the period. More recently, the scale of projects about Late Antique necropoleis has increased dramatically.\(^1\) It is not hard to understand why a considerable proportion of material culture known from Late Antiquity derives from funerary contexts. The total number of Late Antique epitaphs reaches several tens of thousands, even though it is impossible to determine the exact number more precisely.\(^2\) As in the Classical Greek, Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods, epitaphs by far make up the majority of all inscriptions, but the disproportional dominance of (predominantly) funerary over honorific or dedicatory inscriptions even increased in Late Antiquity.\(^3\) There have been attempts to link this phenomenon, as well as

\(^1\) This volume originated in Collaborative Research Centre 933 “Material Text Cultures. Materiality and Presence of Writing in Non-Typographic Societies” (subproject A01 “Lettered and Inscribed. Inscriptions in Urban Space in the Greco-Roman Period and Middle Ages”), funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). On the growing number of projects about the period from the mid-1st millennium AD: PEARCE 2015, 445–450, 472.
\(^2\) Rome alone provides a body of ca. 42,000 ‘Christian inscriptions’, most of which are clearly funerary: http://www.edb.uniba.it (accessed 03/02/2023); a query in the Claussslaby (EDCS) database for ‘Christian’ funerary inscriptions (though not only funerary and only Latin texts, doublets are not extracted) results in a total amount of 60,000 hits: https://db.edcs.eu/epigr/ (accessed 03/02/2023); MERKT 2012, 17 mentions a number of over 60,000 Early Christian epitaphs. Late Antique epitaphs from the Greek provinces are impossible to count as similar databases do not exist so far or do not allow such search queries, such as the database of the Packard Humanities Institute Greek Inscriptions (PHI: https://inscriptions.packhum.org/ [accessed 03/02/2023]); the amount of Greek Late Antique funerary inscriptions should nonetheless reach a five-digit-number based on the published corpora.
\(^3\) Already observed by DE ROSSI 1862, 370 and GALVÃO-SOBRINHO 1995; see also SMITH/WARD-PERKINS 2016; BOLLE/MACHADO/WITSCHEL 2017a and several regional case studies in NAWOTA 2021. It should be noted that in some specific urban cases (e.g. in Carthage, the cities of Histria et Venetia, Salona, Leptis Magna, Sagalassos and Aphrodisias), the number of civic inscriptions remained proportionally high throughout the 4th and
the change from cremation to inhumation during the 2nd–3rd c. AD,4 ‘respectful’ neonate and infant burials,5 the shift towards West-East alignment of tombs in the 4th c. AD and the increasing paucity of grave goods6 to the spread of Christianity. However, the process of ‘Christianization’ was certainly not the only reason for those transformations. There must have been a wide range of other factors of a social and economic nature that promoted these changes.

It is well-known today that Late Antique city- and landscapes underwent a wide range of transformations: maintenance of monumental urbanism and central administrative functions, urban extension and agricultural/economic peaks often occurred at the same time as urban contraction, abandonment of civic life, urban destruction and collapse of villa systems.7 These shifts had major consequences for the development of burial patterns. In many towns, new city walls reframed the urban fabric and significantly affected traditional burial zones, e.g. by reusing their monuments as spoliation material, but also by destroying and reshaping the delimitation patterns of burial grounds. The cura pro mortuis, a genuine Late Antique innovation requiring the burial of all dead within a community at any cost, added a profound mental change to traditional ideas of death and afterlife. The phenomenon of intra-urban burials created a permanent presence of the dead amongst the everyday spaces of the living. Burial in churches and the cult of martyrs, often linked to the debated phenomenon of burial ad sanctos, were other new funerary characteristics, which spread across the oecumene from the late 4th c. AD onwards. As also urban epigraphy radically changed in nature,8 mortuary landscapes had seen a radical shift in many places by the 8th c. AD.

5th c. AD: see several contributions in Donati 1988, Gauthier/Marin/Prévot 2010 and Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a.
5 Watts 1989; Huber 2018; critical Pearce 2001; for a diachronic overview, see: Nenna 2012.
6 The scarcity of grave goods and East-West alignment as putative signs of ‘standard Christian burial practices’ were long accepted (Kollwitz 1954, 216 f.) and are still repeated in recent years: Mion et al. 2016, 3; Huber 2018, 223; Sweetman 2019, 520; for more differentiated interpretations see: Schmidt 2000, 274, 282; Volp 2002, 118 f., 198–202; Theuws 2009; Fox/Tritsaroli 2018; Brather 2016, 35 has recently stated that Late Antique grave furnishing was more common in the “periphery” (Northern Italy, Northern Gaul, Pannonia, Iberian Peninsula), from the point of view of the Italian peninsula as the centre.
8 On ‘classical’ urban epigraphy Corbier 1987; Sears/Keegan/Laurence 2015; on shifts during Late Antiquity: Eastmond 2015; Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a.
At the same time, each region and even each city preserved some of its previous funerary traditions, and there are many examples that prove how local funerary habits were conservatively maintained until and even beyond the end of Antiquity. The cemeteries and churches equipped with the relics of saints, of local or trans-regional significance, became new central focal points of many cityscapes. These new public centers took over many traits of the former sanctuaries and fora, since they were regularly frequented at the dies natales by significant parts of the local communities and, in some cases by massive amounts of pilgrims from outside. We know of spectacular funeral processions for distinguished personalities crossing entire cityscapes and therefore staging the sepulchral acts as highly public events. In many areas, the cura pro mortuis also led to calendrical frequentation and commemoration of individual or collective burial places not associated to saints. Social status and representation were often negotiated in those new topoi epiphanes-tatoi or loci celeberrimi. Also, burial places in rural areas could gain transregional importance, as is shown by many remote pilgrim complexes (often with central burials for one or more saints), but also by monuments for families, clans or smallscaled communities. These nuclei reshaped the funerary landscapes of entire cities and regions, which is why we chose this programmatic term for the title of our volume. As recent work on landscape archaeology has stated, we understand landscape (not only rural, but also urban spaces) as an area of human interaction, deeply rooted in social or human practices. This means that also a funerary basilica or a catacomb can be labelled as funerary landscapes. As in former periods, tombs and necropoleis, and the social and religious practices performed within/around them, actively shaped the various townscape, but also their wider landscapes as markers of territorial claims, of commemoration, of ancestry, of kinship, of economic and social status. We chose the term funerary (and not burial) landscapes in order to acknowledge such human activities linked to burial, and to emphasize the social construction of funerary landscapes, their perception within various surroundings.

9 See e.g. Imperial and bishop burials: Velkovska 2001; Johnson 2009; but also senatorial burials, such as that of Junius Bassus described in his proper epitaph: GRIG 2017, 440 f.; for eventually numerous participants in funerary processions, see VOLP 2002, 101–184.
10 GRIG 2018; fortunately, there are also excellent contemporary metatexts reporting these commemorative mechanics: Ntedika 1971; Kotila 1992; Rebillard 2003; Rebillard 2009.
11 Ucko/Layton 1999, esp. 86 and Daróczi 2012, esp. 200–202; on the role of burials within rural landscapes; for Late Antique landscape studies, partly with integration of funerary evidence: Christie 2004; Ebanista/Rotili 2016; Diarte-Blasco/Christie 2018; on ideological implications of Late Antique urbanism: Brogiolo/Ward-Perkins 1999; for the perception of Late Antique architecturally structured spaces as ‘activity spaces’ or ‘human spatiality’ (though with little reference to burial contexts), see: Lavan/Bowden 2003; Haug 2003; on urban ‘aesthetics’ during Late Antiquity, see: Jacobs 2013, esp. 4–6.
12 See e.g. for the occupation of deserted landscapes by burials with hunting weapons in 4th to 7th c. AD-Northern Gaul: Theuws 2019, 128–132.
Fig. 1: Map of the Late Antique oecumene with regions discussed in this volume highlighted.
(including townscapes) over the *longue durée*, their commemorative character and their perpetuated ritualization. Funerary landscapes were not only used for the dead, but also frequented, framed and manipulated by the living. As in earlier periods, death, afterlife, burial and *memoria* remained important topics of daily life performed in essential spaces of human interaction.

Questions and Aims, Chronological and Geographical Scope of This Volume

This volume aims to offer a first *transregional panorama* of Late Antique funerary epigraphy and archaeology, with the explicit purpose of showing the high diversity of general, regional and local developments (Fig. 1). As the title suggests, we wanted to bring together archaeologists and epigraphists working on different themes within Late Antique funerary culture, in order to show the high potential of such interdisciplinary approaches to the materiality, spatial context and perception of tombs and epitaphs. Therefore, our first priority was to bring together a representative range of regional case studies from the Late Antique *oecumene*; the regions and settlements discussed are shown in fig. 1. It will become obvious at once that a holistic synopsis is, for several reasons, impossible. If our geographical selection is necessarily arbitrary, this is primarily due to the uneven state of documentation and availability of data (see below). This imbalance becomes strikingly evident when comparing the two dominating centers of the Late Antique *oecumene*, Rome and Constantinople. Rome alone would present enough published material for a week-long conference on this topic, while the re-contextualization of Late Antique funerary monuments and epitaphs is particularly challenging for Constantinople. Another example of such an imbalance is Britain, which counts among the best-studied regions in Late Antique funerary archaeology (with chronologies based on substantial sequences of radiocarbon dating), but on the other hand only

---

13 On the social experiences and emotions linked to death and burial, see Chapman 2003, esp. 311.

14 Preliminary approaches on micro-regional developments – including also non-funerary material – are presented in Donati 1988; Tabbernee 2014; Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a; Pettigrew/Caragher/Davis 2019.

15 The epigraphic syntheses I. Byzantion and Rhoby 2015 contain only few Late Antique epitaphs from Constantinople and there is still no updated corpus of Late Antique inscriptions from the capital; the particular preservation conditions in modern Istanbul have lead to very few excavations in burial spaces; on Late Antique urbanism of Constantinople, with special references to burial zones, see: Fıratlı 1966; Müller-Wiener 1977, 219–222; Mango 2004², 47 f, 57 f; on Late Antique sarcophagi: Rep. V; on Imperial burials: Velkovska 2001; Johnson 2009; Fiocchi Nicolai 2016, 633; on first anthropological analyses: Fox/Tritsarioli 2018.
produced small numbers of 5th–7th c. AD epitaphs.\textsuperscript{16} By choosing a non-conventional order, starting our journey in the Westernmost region of the \textit{oecumene} (the Iberian Peninsula) and moving counter-clockwise from the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean to the Balkans, the central Mediterranean and, finally, the Northwestern provinces, we deliberately want to break free from centrist approaches that are common even to most recent syntheses (see below). Late Antique funerary inscriptions and mortuary practices did not spread from the Imperial centers to the peripheries, and we shall mirror this reality in our scholarly setup. With this ‘panoramic’ structure we also hope to avoid the problematic ‘East vs. West’ dichotomy still operative in many Late Antique studies.\textsuperscript{17}

Of course, this volume also has significant ‘blank spots’, and we are aware of the fact that important regions and projects with very interesting material have been excluded. Hundreds of Late Antique so-called ‘row-grave cemeteries’ (‘Reihengräberfelder’ in German) formed funerary landscapes of Britain, Gaul, the Iberian and Balkan Peninsulas, parts of Italy, North Africa and the Black Sea from the 5th to the 10th c. AD (Fig. 2).\textsuperscript{18} Although some of the papers in this volume partly integrate data from this class of burial evidence (\textit{Prien, Valeva}), the dataset of row-grave cemeteries seemed far too large and challenging to integrate into our volume in a more prominent way because of two reasons. Firstly, most of such cemeteries did not reveal contemporary epitaphs, although their ‘managed’ appearance suggests the existence of tomb markers. Secondly, many of them fall outside our chronological scope. Admittedly, however, recent archaeological excavations of row-grave cemeteries employing natural science methods have provided magnificent data, as some of these burial fields could be excavated almost entirely and according to modern interdisciplinary standards, providing a totally new basis for statistical analyses, social hierarchies and migration theories. These examinations also generated innovative models, techniques and theories of funerary archaeology that are yet to be applied to the ‘Classical’ Mediterranean area of Late Antique funerary studies on a wider scale.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16} Petts 2019, 611–613.
\textsuperscript{17} See, most recently, e.g. the statement on East-West differences of epitaphic curves in Nawotka et al. 2021, 230: “This markedly lower proportion of epitaphs highlights an enormous distinction between the epigraphic culture in the East and the epigraphic habit in the West”. As most of our regional contributions show, an East-West-dichotomy is – at least in Late Antique funerary epigraphy – neither useful nor representative of the epigraphic reality. On the pitfalls of East-West comparisons and the advantages of ‘global’ studies, see: Guidetti/Meinecke 2020b, 3–5.
\textsuperscript{19} Schuh/Makarewicz 2016; Baron 2018; Veeramah et al. 2018; Brather-Walter 2019; Krausse et al. 2020.
The second criterium for the composition of this book was chronology. This volume concentrates on funerary evidence from the middle of the 3rd to the 8th c. AD (the timespan of what is called ‘Long Late Antiquity’) but considers these limits

20 Cameron 2001; Marcone 2008; a recent overview of problems of periodization can be found in Humphries 2017 and Guidetti/Meinecke 2020a, 2-5.
flexible rather than firm. The papers dealing partly with Early Medieval evidence (Arbeiter, Gatier, Merten, Osnabrügge, Ott, Prien, Uberti) were also a welcome reminder of how important the achievements of Late Antiquity were for the funerary developments of the next centuries.21

Our third criterium of selection was the material quality of case studies and their potential for new contextual analyses. Questions on the materiality of epitaphs and tombs, their visibility, their accessibility and their interaction with iconographic elements and spatial setting are central to this volume, in order to highlight certain underestimated facets of mortuary habits and the commemoration of the dead. How were inscriptions, grave goods and corpses positioned, presented, treated, used and perceived in ceremonial acts and what consequences did these practices have in the course of the deceased’s commemoration? In what kind of funerary spaces were these practices performed and to what extent did rituals create, shape or manipulate such spaces? What role did writing, funerary objects and the treatment of the body play in ritual practices or liturgies during Late Antiquity? One may wonder whether it is possible to determine their function as communicators within social practices and to use funerary topographies as meaningful elements of social hierarchical negotiation. In order to prepare the ground for these questions this chapter will try to give a short overview of the history, problems and challenges of research on Late Antique funerary culture. Finally, it will present some central themes of this volume, in order to pave the way for future trans-regional approaches to the topic.

Disciplinary Challenges for Epigraphic and Archaeological Syntheses on Late Antique Funerary Evidence: A Critical Survey of Previous Scholarship

Research on Late Antique burials and funerary inscriptions is unevenly distributed. The value of Late Antique tombs and epitaphs was recognized early, but too often, they have been and are still used only as sources for the discussion of continuities or discontinuities of human occupation, of urban decay (especially when found in former public and housing areas of towns), of demographic or onomastic developments and of the degree of ‘Christianization’. Today, there are some regions with magnificent overviews of their Late Antique funerary culture(s). For some of these regions, excellent regional epigraphic corpora were assembled as early as the mid-19th c., when ‘Christian epigraphy’ first emerged as a scholarly discipline.22

21 Février 1978; Sicard 1978; Treffort 1996; several contributions in López Quiroga 2009, Pinar Gil/Juárez 2010, Giostra 2019 and De Vingo/Marano/Pinar Gil 2021 also underline the transitional character of the distinction between both eras.

Other regions still lack epigraphic or/and archaeological syntheses at all. As individual chapters of the volume will present many microregional case studies, what follows here will mainly focus on regions underrepresented in the chapters. Of course, we cannot address all geographical lacunae exhaustively in this way, but we hope the complementary bibliographical hints for these regions may provide a useful starting point.

*Asia Minor*²³ and the *Palaestinae/Arabia*,²⁴ as well as many parts of Gaul,²⁵ the Iberian Peninsula²⁶ and Italy²⁷ have both a strong tradition in epigraphic studies...

---

²³ Epigraphic corpora with a specific Late Antique (or Christian) focus were established early: *Cumont* 1895; *I.Chr.Asie Mineure*; *Johnson* 1995 (particularly on Early Christian epitaphs from Anatolia); see also e.g. *I.Ephesos*; *SGO*; *Ameling* 2017; recently, a new database on Early Christian inscriptions of Asia Minor and Greece, *Inscriptions Christianae Asiae Minoris* (ICAM), was launched as part of *Inscriptions Christianae Graecae* (ICG): [http://www.epigraph.topoi.org/](http://www.epigraph.topoi.org/) (accessed 03/02/2023). Local databases on Late Antique epigraphy, including epitaphs, are still rare; for Aphrodisias, see: [http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/ala2004/](http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/ala2004/) (accessed 03/02/2023). For an epigraphic overview, see *Mitchell* 2017 and the contribution *Destephen* in this volume; for recent archaeological overviews, see: *Henry* 2011; *Brandt* et al. 2017; *Ivison* 2017; Rep. V (sarcophagi); *Rousseau* 2019; *Nováček* et al. 2020; see also the contribution *Cubas Díaz* in this volume.

²⁴ Epigraphic corpora and regional overviews: *Di Segni* 2017. The *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* (IGLS), with its first volume launched in 1929, has no specific Late Antique focus, but incorporates Late Antique inscriptions from modern Syria, Lebanon and Jordan: [https://www.hisoma.mom.fr/recherche-et-activites/inscriptions-grecques-et-latines-de-la-syrie](https://www.hisoma.mom.fr/recherche-et-activites/inscriptions-grecques-et-latines-de-la-syrie) (accessed 03/02/2023). The *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae* (CIIP) contains also Late Antique inscriptions; for the four volumes published so far, see: [https://alte-geschichte.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/501.html](https://alte-geschichte.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/501.html) (accessed 03/02/2023); see also e.g. *I.Moab*; *I.Jordanie*; *I.Zoora*; partly also *I.Syrie* (references in the contribution *Gatier* in this volume). Archaeological overviews: *Michaeli* 1996; *Goldfus* 1997; *Sanmori* 1998; *Sartre-Fauriat* 2001; *Konrad* 2013 (*Arabia*); Rep. V (sarcophagi); several papers in *Eger/Mackensen* 2018 and the contribution *Bianchi* in this volume.

²⁵ Epigraphic corpora/syntheses: *ICG*; *NICG*; *RICG*; *Knight* 1992; *Guyon* 1997; *Handley* 2003. Archaeological overviews: *Young/Périn* 1991; *Dierkens/Périn* 1997; *Young* 2001; Rep. III; *López Quiroga/Martínez Tejera/Morín de Pablos* 2006; *Raynaud* 2006; *Theuws* 2009; *Halsall* 2010; *Carreron/Henrion/Scuiller* 2015; *Fort/Kasprzyk/Achard-Cormont* 2016; *De Larminat* et al. 2017; *Blaizot* 2018; *Theuws* 2019; several contributions in *Effros/Morreira* 2020; for two more regional overviews in Gaul see the contributions *Merten* and *Uberti* in this volume.


²⁷ The first volume of the *Inscriptions Christianae Vrbis Romae* (ICVR) appeared in 1861. The *Inscriptiones Christianae Italae septimo saeculo antiquiores* (ICI, 17 volumes so far), launched in 1985, are accessible in various open-access databases: *Epigraphic Database Rome* (EDR): [http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php](http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php) (accessed 03/02/2023); on mosaic
(developed early on) and important overviews of Late Antique funerary archaeology. Britain, Egypt, the large islands of the Mediterranean, Greece and the provinces along the Rhine and the Danube saw increasing activity during the last inscriptions from churches in Venetia et Histria, see: https://mosaikinschriften.materiale-textkulturen.de/ (accessed 03/02/2023); on Late Antique inscriptions from Tuscia et Umbria, see: https://tusciaetumbria.materiale-textkulturen.de/ (accessed 03/02/2023); both databases emerged from the work of Bolle 2019, esp. 64–74, who extensively exploits Late Antique epitaphs and their materiality from Tuscia, Umbria, Venetia, Histria, Apulia and Calabria as well as Ostia and Rome; for the study of inscriptions from the Roman catacombs, the Epigraphic Database Bari (EDB) has already become an indispensable working tool: https://www.edb.uniba.it/ (accessed 03/02/2023); a large collection of loculi from the catacombs including colored images is: Ehler 2012; for further epigraphic overviews in Italy, see also: ICNapletana and the contributions Felle and Mainardis in this volume. Archaeological overviews of Late Antique funerary material from Italy (regional or nation-wide): Rep. I and Rep. II (sarcophagi); Fiocchi Nicolai 1988; Bierbrauer 1975; Dannheimer 1989 (Sicily); Brogiolo/Cantino Wataghin 1998; Cantino Wataghin 1999; Riemer 2000; Haug 2003, 273–288 (Northern Italy); Fiocchi Nicolai 2009; Possenti 2014; Chavarría Arnau 2015; Ebanista/Rotili 2016 (Italy and Adriatic area); Chavarría Arnau 2018; Maxwell 2019; Riccomi 2021; see also the contributions Nuzzo and Zimmermann in this volume.


30 For the central Mediterranean islands, see: Martorelli/Piras/Spanu 2015; for Sardinia and Sicilia, see: ICS; SIPscllia; NGICS; Giuntella/Borghini/Staffinii 1985; Dannheimer 1989; Carra Bonacasa et al. 2015; for the islands of the Aegean Sea, see: Michaelis/Perkola/Zanini 2013; Sweetman 2019, 519f.; for Cyprus and Crete, see: I.Chr. Crete; Fox et al. 2012; Papageorgiou/Foulias 2013; Fox/Tritsaroli 2018; for Rhodes, see: Volanakis 1998.

31 Epigraphic corpora: I.Byz.Attica; I.Chr.Cyclades. For archaeological overviews, see Kourkoutidou-Nicolaidou 1997; Laskaris 2000; Marano 2018; Sweetman 2019, esp. 520–524 and the contribution Ott in this volume.

32 For the Rhine-provinces, see Deutsche Inschriften online-database (DIO): http://www.inschriften.net/inschriftensuche.html (accessed 03/02/2023) and the contributions Osnbrügge and Prien in this volume with extensive bibliographies; for the Alpine region, see: Bierbrauer/Mor 1986; Glaser 1997; Hebert/Steinklauber 2003; Schmidt 2000, 273–283. For archaeological overviews of funerary evidence from the Late Antique Balkans, see: Nikolajević 1980; Snively 1984; Cooke 1998; Rep. II (Dalmatia); Schmidt 2000, 283–309; Valeva 2001; Schmauder 2002; Boyadjiev 2003; Fehr 2008; Born 2012, esp. 36–42, 78–86, 115–123; Yasin 2012; Achim 2015; Vida 2015; Rep. V (sarcophagi, Thracia); Bowden 2019, esp. 540–542; Heinrich-Tamáška/Straub 2015; Koch/Prien/Drauschke 2016; Ivanišević/Bugarški 2018; Knipper et al. 2020; see also the contribution Valeva in this volume. Epigraphic corpora of Late Antique inscriptions from the Balkan Peninsula are still rare, present only collections bound by past and current national borders and
decades. It is no surprise that in areas with a long tradition of Late Antique funerary research – e.g. Britain, Spain, Italy, France, Hungary, Greece and Germany – the latest standards and methods of tomb excavation and documentation derived from the natural sciences have been implemented on a large scale. In other areas, such as North Africa (including Cyrenaica and Tripolitania), and the Near East (Syriæ, Mesopotamia, Osrhoene), either an updated epigraphic overview or an archaeological overview – or, in some cases, both – is lacking, or being developed only recently. This is partially to be explained by the problematic geopolitical situation currently affecting some of these regions, but also by extensive looting, stagnating administrative and preservation processing, extremely fragmented publication traditions, and scholarly disinterest in certain (e.g. Early Christian) material evidence. The proceedings of our conference will try address some of these lacunae in a synthesizing way (e.g. Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Destephen, Gatier, Mainardis, Nuzzo, Osnabrügge, Prien, Uberti, Valeva), but we feel that more of such regional summaries are required.

Surprisingly, Late Antiquity has so far played only a marginal role in handbooks and general overviews of ancient death and burial (Tab. 1). Jocelyn Toynbee’s often-cited book on “Death and Burial in the Roman World” dedicates a limited number of pages to Late Antique funerary monuments, exclusively devoted to elite mausolea, Rome’s catacombs and Early Christian sarcophagi. Some early landmark-compendia on ancient burial integrating Late Antique topics present a welcome development for our purposes, but there are still many recent compendia on ancient death and burial with a diachronic outlook that tend to exclude

require new approaches according to recent documentarian standards: RICM. The corpora ILJug (particularly vols. 1 and 3), ILLPRON, IMS, ISCm and RIU also integrated many Late Antique epitaphs, although they are diachronically broad collections. Late Antique epitaphs have also been published in other collections: I.Chr.Bulgarien; IIFDR (Dacia/Romania); BARNEA 1977 (Romania); BARNEA 1980 (Eastern Illyricum); MIGOTTI 1997 (Pannonia); Conrad (Moesia Inferior); GAUTHIER/MARIN/PRÉVOT 2010 (Salona); LIA (Albania); HANDLEY 2003, 18–20 (Balkans).

For an updated synthesis from Mauretania Caesariensis to Byzacena, including extensive bibliography, see the contribution Ardeleanu in this volume; for Tripolitania, see: ILAfr and Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania (IRT), also available in: https://inslib.kcl.ac.uk/irt2009/search/index.html (accessed 03/02/2023); WARD PERKINS/GOODCHILD 1953; for Cyrenaica, see: Inscriptions of Roman Cyrenaica: https://ircyr2020.inslib.kcl.ac.uk/en/search/ (accessed 03/02/2023).

Epigraphic corpora: e.g. I.Syria, IGLS; Briquel-Chatonnet/Debié/Desreuaxa 2004. Archaeological (mostly regionally constrained) overviews: Griesheimer 1997 (Northern Syria); Sarte-Fauriat 2001 (Southern Syria); Konrad 2013 (Syriæ); De Jong 2017 (with some useful prospects into Late Antiquity); Rep. V (sarcophagi); Eger/Mackensen 2018 (several local/regional case studies).


Struck 1993; Pearce/Millet/Struck 2000; Vaquerizo Gil 2002; cf. also later some transregional compendia: Faber 2007; Brink/Green 2008; Brandt/Prusac/Roland 2015; Ameling 2016; Pearce/Weekes 2017.
Late Antique evidence from the discussion, in contrast to the Classical or Imperial periods.³⁷

Epigraphic and archaeological studies on Late Antique funerary evidence have only recently made their appearance in handbooks dealing explicitly with Late Antiquity as a distinct period (Tab. 2). It is surely not exaggerated to state that current scholarship on Late Antique urbanism or material culture prefers other topics, such as debates on ‘decline’, on barbaric invasions/migration, on religious transformation, on spolia, on sculpture, on new urban foundations, on city walls, on military forts, on the cult of saints or on sacred architecture.³⁸ Burial data has been increasingly integrated in such compendia on Late Antiquity only in most recent times, which is surely also due to the potential of newly established methods in burial archaeology and funerary epigraphy (see below) for the examination of social and demographic developments of Late Antique communities.³⁹ Despite this long overdue appreciation, a closer look on many recent compendia, which did integrate Late Antique funerary case studies, reveals other challenges: (modern) national academic traditions and scholarly preferences for certain topics still dominate the picture (Tab. 1, 2). A certain fascination for the Roman catacombs and spectacular Late Antique (Imperial) mausolea is more than obvious.⁴⁰ Late Antique sarcophagi have always attracted significant scholarly attention because of their pivotal status for the development of Early Christian art and iconography.¹¹ Our

³⁸ See e.g. Christie/Loseby 1996; Webster/Brown 1997; Brogiolo/Ward-Perkins 1999; Lavan 2001; Liebeschuetz 2001; Lavan/Bowden 2003; Krause/Witschel 2006; Bauer 2008; Yasin 2009; Sami/Speed 2010; Lavan/Mulryan 2011; Schatzmann 2011; Intagliata/Barker/Courault 2020; Jacobs 2013; Parello/Rizzo 2016; Smith/Ward-Perkins 2016; Rizos 2017; Carneiro/Christie/Diarte-Blasco 2020; Lavan 2020; Lätzer-Lasar/Urcioli 2021; for a reflection on the dominating topics of Late Antique urban research, see: Loseby 2009, Grig 2013 and Humphries 2019, 11–14 (all with almost complete exclusion of burial contexts).
³⁹ Tabbernee 2014; Lavan/Mulryan 2015; Martorelli/Piras/Spanu 2015; Parello/Rizzo 2016; Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a; Diarte-Blasco/Christie 2018; Pettegrew/Caragher/Davis 2019; Carneiro/Christie/Diarte-Blasco 2020; Guidetti/Meinecke 2020a.
⁴⁰ On Late Antique Imperial funerals and mausolea, see: Kollwitz 1954, 210–215; Toynbee 1976, 159–163; Johnson 2009; Pettegrew/Caragher/Davis 2019 present only one chapter on catacombs by Vincenzo Fiocchi Nicolai.
⁴¹ As it is impossible to give an overall bibliographical overview on Late Antique sarcophagi here, we concentrate on the most important compendia: Koch 2000; Studer-Karlen 2012; Cartron/Henrion/Scuiller 2015 (only Galliae). A very useful tool for the study of Late Antique sarcophagi is the Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage, launched in the 1960’s. Rep. I (Rome and Ostia); Rep. II (Italy, Dalmatia, world museums); Rep. III (France, Tunisia, Algeria); Rep. IV (Spain, Portugal, Morocco); Rep. V (Constantinople,
brief bibliographical survey, illustrated in Tab. 1, 2 also shows that some trans-regional compendia are (despite their promising titles) actually micro-regional overviews of those geographic areas with which their editors are familiar or where they come from.

Currently, the record of transregional comparisons on Late Antique funerary cultures is actually pretty sparse. Despite the high number of published Late Antique epitaphs and recent excavation projects in Late Antique burial sites, only few conferences and volumes so far have dealt with this topic from a broader, comparative perspective. Given the fact that archaeological and epigraphic material from around tombs is an indispensable source for the study of Late Antiquity, and considering that in many Mediterranean regions and adjoining territories the earliest ‘Christian’ evidence in physical form comes mostly from burial contexts, it is astonishing that there is no handbook or companion providing an updated overview of Late Antique ‘epitaphic cultures’ and mortuary habits until this day. Studies on Late Antique funerary material always were (and still are) quite insular. Compendia such as Paul Styger’s “Altchristliche Grabeskunst” from 1927, Alfred Rush’s “Death and Burial in Christian Antiquity” from 1941 and André Grabar’s seminal work “Martyrium”, completed in 1946, paved the way for modern scholarship on Late Antique funerary practices.42 One could add further studies on ‘burial ad sanctos’, on privileged burials and on burials in churches,43 on funerary liturgy and on mortuary rituals.44 However, a particular characteristic of Late Antique townscapes, i.e. intra-urban burials, came into scholarly focus only from the late 1990’s onwards.45

Asia Minor, Thracia, Palaestina, Arabia). For burials in sarcophagi in the Late Roman West, see: Dresken-Weiland 2003; generally on Early Christian iconography within burial contexts: Styger 1927; Stuiber 1957; Murray 1981; Bisconti 2000; Dresken-Weiland 2010; Dresken-Weiland 2011; Dresken-Weiland/Angerstorfer/Merkt 2012.

42 Styger 1927; Rush 1941; Grabar 1943–1946.


44 Saxe 1970 and Kyriakakis 1974 (both mainly literary sources); Février 1978; Sicard 1978; Février 1987; Paxton 1990, 32–44 (mainly literary sources); Treffort 1996; Johnson 1997; Cooke 1998; Sanmori 1998; Schmidt 2000; Swift 2000; Velkovska 2001; Samellas 2002 (mainly literary sources); Konrad 2013, 210; Spera 2005; some contributions in Rüpek/Scheid 2010 and Thür 2014; Ivison 2017; there are still no lemmata in the relevant lexic on Late Antique material culture (RAC, DACL) for keywords such as “funerary rituals” or “mortuary customs”; on some reflexes of funerary rituals in epitaphs and on ‘Christian burial’ in general, see: Kollwitz 1954; Pfohl 1983, 473–481; Pietri 1983, 531–535; Merkt 2012, 21–25.

45 On intra-urban (or ‘intra-mural’) burials, increasing from the late 3rd c. AD onwards in the West, see: Dyggve 1952; Meneghini/Santangeli Valenzani 1995; Cantino Wataghin/Lambert 1998; Volp 2002, 115–118 (all with the now outdated explanation of a
In 2002, Ulrich Volp published a very useful handbook on Early Christian funerary rituals with lots of archaeological, literary and epigraphic sources from the entire *oecumene*.\(^{46}\) Eric Rebillard’s groundbreaking works also applied a pan-Mediterranean perspective, even if some of his hypotheses that question the ‘Christian character’ of much known evidence have been nuanced in recent scholarship.\(^{47}\) One can tell from the titles of these works alone that the main focus was driven by what the authors argued to be ‘Christian funerary culture(s)’ or ‘Christian cemeteries’ (*coemeteria*) – concepts that are still current in many national research traditions, although they have been repeatedly challenged.\(^{48}\)

The lack of transregional syntheses is also apparent if we zoom out to consider the two relevant disciplines combined in this volume, funerary archaeology and funerary epigraphy. *Archaeological overviews* with a similarly broad geographical outlook, such as the conferences “L’archéologie du cimetière chrétien” and “L’inhumation privilégiée”, the long-term project *Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage*, as well as Yvette Duval’s central book on ‘*ad sanctos*-burials’ from 1988, remain exceptions and are thematically restricted.\(^{49}\) An innovative and highly important book for our purposes is Ann Marie Yasin’s “Saints and Church Spaces in the Late Antique Mediterranean” from 2009, which deals with a lot of funerary material across the *oecumene* and convincingly illustrates the potential of combining epigraphic, iconographic, architectural, spatial and ritual analysis.\(^{50}\)

---

46 Volp 2002; cf. also a very useful pan-Mediterranean survey of Late Antique burial grounds (though with exclusive ‘Christian’ focus): Fiocchi Nicolai 2016; another brief overview on ‘Christian’ cemeteries from the entire *oecumene* was provided already by Leclercq 1914; the Near East (with exclusion of Greece and Egypt) is covered by Samel-las 2002.

47 Rebillard 1993; Rebillard 2003; Rebillard 2009; differing opinions, especially concerning the ‘Christian character’ of burial *areae* are: Yasin 2009, 59; Fiocchi Nicolai 2016, 619.


50 Yasin 2009; for other studies of funerary spaces combining ritual, epigraphic, decorative and architectural data, see: Davis 2005; Zimmermann 2012; Meinecke 2014; Rousseau 2019; Dally/Fabricius/von Hesberg 2018.
2021, four conferences in Pella, London and Aix-en-Provence explicitly dealt with the archaeology of Late Antique burials from a Mediterranean-wide perspective, clearly illustrating the desire of synthesizing the rich and growing dataset. Once again, Rome, Italy, Britain and Gaul dominated with several papers each, while the Eastern provinces were represented only with few case studies. In general, the Western provinces have been the subject of several transregional overviews, gathering and confronting archaeological material from Late Antique tombs. Overviews of this kind are much needed for the Eastern Mediterranean, especially, where the overall picture is still largely dominated by isolated studies, micro-regional or local analyses and publications dealing with specific, geographically limited regions. This gap was partially closed by two volumes on burial practices in the Near East, edited in 2012 and 2018. However, a general problem of these recent conferences with a specific archaeological focus was the marginal role awarded to funerary epigraphy.

It is needless to underline that natural sciences have deeply changed any approach to funerary interpretations of the Late Antique era. From the 1960’s onwards, anthropological and aDNA analysis started to influence funerary archaeology, nuancing the hard-fought debates about identity and ethnicity, traditionally discussed only on the basis of grave goods and epitaphs. Recently, palaeogenetics entered the funerary sciences and has influenced the ‘ethnic identity debates’


53 Samellas 2002 is a welcome first step in gathering primary sources on burial practices of the 4th to 6th c. AD, although archaeological data is underrepresented here; for complementary, though regionally-restricted, archaeological overviews, see: Goldfus 1997; Griesheimer 1997; Sanmori 1998; Sartre Fauriat 2001; Konrad 2013; Eger 2018; Schick 2018.

54 Perry 2012; Eger/Mackensen 2018. Though of a diachronic nature, both volumes have a strong focus on Late Antiquity.

ever since. Despite an increasing application of such methods during the last two decades, still only few Late Antique necropoleis have been excavated by modern standards, which include ‘holistic’ analysis of funerary data, and there is no Late Antique cemetery that has been excavated entirely. Nevertheless, with the help of anthropological and stable isotope/nitrogen analyses, we can now discuss an impressive range of human habits, such as diet customs, fasting practices, funeral rituals, health and hygienic status, mortality rates, demographic changes, mobility and group migrations, kinship, gender-specific patterns, and even the economic and agrarian exploitation of territories. The treatment of bodies, their prepara-

2008; Pearce 2010; Handley 2011 (epitaphs); on recent reflections about aDNA analyses in burial archaeology, see now: Brather 2016; Hollard/Keyser 2019.

Especially the ‘Lombard question’ continues to produce much discussion, but also vast amounts of new genetic data from burials, see e.g.: Bedini et al. 2012; Bedini/Petiti 2014; Mazzucchelli et al. 2014; Vai et al. 2015; Giostra 2019. For a critical review of the recent developments and risks of applying genetic research to historical narratives, see: von Rummel 2018.

On more recent developments and problems of funerary archaeology, with a particular focus on excavations of Late Antique burials, see: Pearce 2015.

On faunal evidence from Late Antique funerary contexts, see: Baron 2018; several contributions in Deschler-Erb et al. 2021. Stable isotope and nitrogen analysis from Late Antique tomb excavations has exploded recently, and with this footnote we want to facilitate comparative studies in this field: Pearce 2015 (general); case studies: Al-Shorman 2004 (Sa‘ad, Yasilleh/Jordan); Prowse et al. 2004 (Ostia); Fuller et al. 2006 (Britain); Bedini/Bartoli 2007 (Northern Italy); Redfern 2008 (Britain); Bourbou/Tsilipakou 2009 (Greece); Eckardt et al. 2009 (Britain); Keenleyside et al. 2009; Rutgers et al. 2009 (Rome); Hackenbeck et al. 2010 (Bavaria); Vargiu/Paine 2010 (Elaiussa Sebaste); Al-Shorman/El-Khouri 2011 (Barsinija/Palaestina); Bourbou et al. 2011 (Greece); Heinrich-Tamáška/Schwiessing 2011 (Keszthely-Fenékpusztá/Pannonia); Van Strydonck et al. 2011 (Egypt); Fuller et al. 2012 (Turkey); MoleS 2012 (Mesambronia/Bulgaria); Lösch/Hower-Tilmann/Zink 2012 (Deir el-Bachit/Egypt); Perry et al. 2012 (Phaeno/Jordan); Gregoricka/Sheridan 2013 (Jerusalem); Knipper et al. 2013 (Central Germany); Bedini/Petiti 2014 (Piedmont); Mazzucchelli et al. 2014 (Lombardy); Salesse et al. 2014 (Rome); Sandias/Mühlen 2015 (Yâmun/Jordan); Vai et al. 2015 (Piedmont); Marinato 2016 (Northern Italy); Mion et al. 2016 (Amiens/Gaul); Risseur et al. 2016 (Barcino); Saragoça et al. 2016 (Portugal); Schuh/Makarewicz 2016 (upper Rhine valley); Kieiewetter 2017 (Hierapolis/Phrygia); Hackenbeck et al. 2017 (Pannonia); Herrscher et al. 2017 (Northern Gaul); Wong et al. 2017; Emery et al. 2018 (Vagnari/Italy); Chavarría Arnau 2018 (Northern Italy); Fox/Tritsaroli 2018 (Greece, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Palestine); Redfern et al. 2019 (Britain); Veeramah et al. 2018 (Bavaria); Alaica et al. 2019 (Ibiza); Brather-Walter 2019 (Germaniae, Galliae); Milella et al. 2019 (Bologna/Italy); Crowder et al. 2020 (Britain, Transylvania); Knipper et al. 2020 (Mözs-Icsei dűlő/Pannonia); Maxwell 2019 (Northern Italy); several contributions in Effros/Morreira 2020 (Galliae); Ma et al. 2021 (Carthage); Nabulsi et al. 2020 (Khirbet es-Samrā/Syria); Nováček et al. 2020 (Ephesos); Riccomi 2021 (Tuscia); on further data from North Africa, Arabia and Palaestina, as well as Cilicia, see the contributions Ardeleanu, Bianchi and Cubas Díaz in this volume; a first transregional synthesis (though with a focus on central-Eastern Europe) on stable isotopes and genetic archaeology in Late Antique and Early Medieval times is now available in Giostra 2019. For a very useful (diachronic) database on strontium isotope
tion and presentation during funerals and processions (including rich clothes and goods designed for deposition in the graves), and the reception of disposed dead by contemporary audiences of funerary rituals have become increasingly important in recent scholarship. 59 New methods and bioarchaeological excavation techniques, e.g. geophysics, computer tomography of burial blocks in laboratories, as well as analyses of textiles, faunal and organic materials, made it possible to exploit many so far underrepresented facets of mortuary practices and cemetery organization. 60 From the 1970’s onwards, the social meaning, as well as the commemorative and communicative potential of burials, came into the focus of post-processual archaeology, a field that in more recent times seems to experience a growing importance. 61 During the 1980’s, Henri Duday established his influential concept of archaeothanatology. This concept, which includes the management and development of corpse treatment and its decay, for the first time tried to apply as many traditional archaeological excavation techniques as possible together with natural sciences during the proper excavation of burials. 62

Like Late Antique funerary archaeology, the study of Late Antique funerary epigraphy has suffered from very different biases. From the late 19th century onwards, there have been many attempts to synthesize the abundant material. Yet again, transregional compendia are extremely rare. The corpus Inscriptio\n\nnes Latinae Christianae Veteres (ILCV) was initiated in 1925 in order to cover the Western Roman Empire (except Rome, Spain and Britain), while the Inscriptio\n\nnes Christi\n\nanae Graecae (ICG) started in 2008 to deal with at least two central regions of the East (Asia Minor and Greece). However, both corpora explicitly focus on ‘Christian inscriptions’ and exclude other Late Antique data. From the 1980’s onwards,

analyses from the Mediterranean, see: https://isoarch.eu/database/ (accessed 03/02/2023); an ERC-project (HistOGenes) launched in 2020 will analyze high volumes of genetic data from Late Antique and Early Medieval burials (AD 400–900) in Eastern Europe: https://www.histogenes.org/ (accessed 03/02/2023).


60 Davis 2005; Rutgers et al. 2007; de Moor/Fluck 2007; de Moor/Fluck 2011; Van Struydonck et al. 2011; Lösch/Hower-Tilmann/Zink 2012; Reifarth 2013; Baron 2018; Huber 2018; Eichner 2018; Brather-Walter 2019; Krausse et al. 2020; on geophysics, which allow spectacular insights in delimitation of burial plots and whole cemeteries, and might also detect grave markers without excavation: Konrad 2013, 205; Pearce 2015, 449, 452.


62 Duday 2009, with references to and development of his former studies; see Baray/Bruneau/Testart 2007; Réveillas 2019.
Late Antique funerary epigraphy was also integrated in several influential overviews. The conference “La terza età dell’epigrafia” in 1988 was a landmark and a decisive step towards the consolidation of Late Antique epigraphy as an autonomous ‘discipline’, which ever since has had its own sessions at the international conferences on Greek and Latin epigraphy. Over the last three decades, digital editing of inscriptions in databases with specific query tools (allowing researchers to search for an inscriptions’ materiality, supports and find context) enable new interdisciplinary research endeavors. These documentation instruments as well as a new methodological approach to inscriptions, have stimulated new reflections on how inscriptions were produced, set up, perceived and treated. The ‘sociological’ or ‘contextual’ value of inscriptions, applied in epigraphic scholarship, also provoked new methodological approaches for the study of funerary epigraphy. From the 1980’s and 1990’s onwards, epitaphs were increasingly studied with a new focus on their archaeological and spatial contexts, their supports, their materiality, their iconography and decoration, their appearance as well as their communicative and commemorative potential. Ricardo Galvão-Sobrinho’s article from 1995 presented a first statistical survey on ‘Early Christian’ funerary epigraphy in the West, and more recent works discussed the question of differing (Latin) epigraphic habits in Late Antiquity. The concept of the endurance of very heterogeneous, but still vital ‘epitaphic habits’ (later ‘epigraphic cultures’) across the Late Antique oecumene was established during the last three decades. In 2015, a volume on “Spätantike Grabinschriften im Westen des Römischen Reiches” continued this trend with several mi-

63 MacMullen 1982; Shaw 1984; the two lemmata in the Reallexicon für Antike und Chris-
tentum on Greek and Latin funerary inscriptions were written in 1983: Pfohl 1983; Pietri 1983.
64 Donati 1988.
65 For specific databases, see the footnotes above and the contributions Ardeleanu, Felle, Osnabrügge, Überti and Zimmermann in this volume.
66 Epitaphs: MacMullen 1982, 239–242; Shaw 1984; Meyer 1990, esp. 81–94; Sartori 1997; epitaphs and inscriptions in Late Antique funerary contexts: Tulloch 2006; Mazzoleni 2002; Handley 2003, 35–88; Brink/Green 2008; Dresken-Weiland/Angerstorfer/Merkt 2012; Bolle 2019; more generally on Late antique inscriptions (not only funer-
67 Galvão-Sobrinho 1995; more recently: Clemens/Merten/Schäfer 2015. For the Greek East, comparable transregional overviews of Late Antique funerary epigraphy are lack-
ing or have been developed only for thematically restricted evidence (SGO) or broad diachronic overviews with no particular Late Antique focus (Nowotka 2021). Mazzo-
cro-regional overviews on the West. For the East, until recently one could only rely on a myriad of local and micro-regional (but mostly diachronic) corpora and two recent conferences with several case studies from Constantinople and its wider regional environment, which on the other hand presented only limited data on funerary epigraphy. The 2021 handbook “Epigraphic Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity” finally presents a much-needed transregional, diachronic and statistical overview of epigraphic practices in the regions still dominated by Greek epigraphy. Additionally, “The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity”, published in 2017, navigates through the entire Mediterranean and heavily builds on epitaphs as a main source of discussion. However, in all of these the clear epigraphic focus led to the fact that funerary archaeology did not play a significant role.

Methodological Problems of Late Antique Funerary Research: Some Attempts at a Solution

The aforementioned narrow disciplinary approaches as well as a set of other methodological problems is characteristic for studies on Late Antique funerary material. Scholarship on Late Antique tombs has always been and still is interwoven with the problematic terms of a ‘Christian epigraphy’ or ‘Christian burials’. Enough has been said about the risks, but also about the legitimation of such terms. We have clear evidence for Christian funerary areae and Jewish dominated burial grounds (Ardeleanu, Felle, Nuzzo, Zimmermann) from the early 4th c. AD onwards, but in most regions of the oecumene, Christians did not physically separate their dead from deceased Jews or pagans, neither did they bury them according to differing customs (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Osnabrügge, Ott, Prien, Valeva). The formulae of funerary inscriptions start showing clear references to Christianity only from the late 3rd c. AD onwards, but even later it is often simply impossible to differentiate between Christian, Jewish or pagan, since the formulae are often

69 Clemens/Merten/Schäfer 2015; earlier epigraphic syntheses on the Late Antique West were presented in ILCV and IGCVO; see also later: Carletti 2008; Handley 2011; Witschel 2017.
70 Rhoby 2015; Lauxtermann/Toth 2020, which, however, integrates the whole Byzantine period.
71 Almost all contributions in Nawotka 2021 expand on funerary epigraphy until the 7th c. AD, even if explanations for curve peaks or falls are only rarely provided for the timespan of our interest (3rd–8th c. AD); see also the conclusions Nawotka et al. 2021, esp. 232–240, where Late Antique dynamics of epigraphic practices are discussed in detail, but emphasis is attributed almost exclusively to non-funerary inscriptions.
72 Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a.
73 On the problems, see Salway 2015; Roueché/Sotinel 2017.
75 Fiocchi Nicolai 2016.
nearly identical (Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Nuzzo). The burial habit of inhumation spread across the oecumene from the late 2nd c. AD onwards, but it was neither a Christian custom nor did it totally displace cremation everywhere (Ardeleanu, Mainardis, Prien) (Fig. 3). In many regions, the transition from ‘pagan’ to ‘Christian’ was slow and complex. This is best demonstrated by continuities in funerary art or formulae such as \( D(is) \, M(anibus) \, S(acrum) \) which survive into the 5th and 6th c. AD (Fig. 4). On the other hand, it has been recognized that putatively ‘Christian’ formulae such as \( \epsilonν\theta\alpha\deltaε \, κιτε/κειται \) were used already in pagan times (Cubas Díaz, Gatier). Neither should one forget the persistence of pagan funeral rituals such as mummification (Merten, Nauerth) (Fig. 5) or the ‘Charon’s obol’ (Mainardis, Ott, Prien). Libation, funerary feasting, funerary banquet scenes and ‘pagan’ motives are still well-documented in many 4th to 6th c. AD-burial contexts, funerary mosaics, stelae, funerary mensae, sarcophagi and paintings (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Merten, Ott, Prien, Uberti, Valeva) (Figs. 3, 4, 6).

77 In general: Murray 1981 and many references in Mulryan 2011; the century-old and ‘global’ motif of the funerary banquet (‘Totenmahl’) is still present in 4th–5th c. AD funerary monuments across and beyond the oecumene: on literary and archaeological evidence, see: Schmidt 2000, 234–246; for numerous Late Antique funerary stelai with ‘Totenmahl’ scenes from Italy, the Balkans and the Aegean Sea: AE 1987, 804; AE 2010, 1299;
This is not to say that religious affiliation was not an important facet of funerary representation in Late Antiquity, as is best demonstrated by the wide distribution of unambiguous symbols such as crosses, menoroth, Christian and Jewish epigraphic formulae or onomastics from the 4th c. AD onwards (Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Felle, Zimmermann). What matters more in this discussion, in our view, is the syncretic, multivalent character and the social context of such religious ostentation. Well-attested textiles from Egypt with richly enwoven Christian motives produced explicitly for burial were probably used as divine protection in death, but they were also part of an inherited, pre-Christian funerary culture and of ‘public showings’, e.g. in processions, in order to enhance the social status of the deceased and their heirs (see also Ott). In other words: there may have been multiple reasons for the geographically uneven evidence at our disposal, and geopolitical as well as chronological circumstances have to be taken into account. Strong and enduring local facets of epitaphic habits as well as kinship traditions may have rendered religious affiliation during the 3rd and 4th c. less important than previously thought. The discretion of Christians before the peace of the Church might explain the lack of pre-4th c. AD religious ostentation. Conversely, in the 5th–7th c. AD the demonstration of ‘Christianness’ in burial practices was no longer required in many regions.

Conrad, nos. 194, 195, 274; RIU 368, 1010, 1179; RIU III 906; RIU V 1164; IScM V 43; CIL III 10611; CIL XI 3800; I.Chr.Cyclades, p. 251, pl. 53; several 4th c. AD-sarcophagi with diners in relief or sculpture from the Eastern provinces: ILJug 2762; for Tyros, see: DE JONG 2010, 668; Rep. V; for banquet scenes and syncretic motifs in funerary paintings, see: FIRATLI 1966; MICHAELI 1996; VALEVA 2001; DAVIS 2005; DRESKEN-WEILAND 2010, 181–212; ZIMMERMANN 2012; ROUSSEAU 2019; several contributions in GUIDETTI/MEINECKE 2020a.

78 DAVIS 2005, 362; see further examples and useful bibliography in MULKYAN 2011.
As we have seen in the last section, Late Antique funerary studies have always been dominated by a predilection for certain research topics. The interest in spectacular elite burials is striking, while ordinary burials have long been overlooked or excavated without proper documentation. However, it is obvious that middle-and lower-status burials have their legitimate value for the reconstruction of funerary topographies, of social hierarchies, of demography and mobility. This is perfectly shown by their balanced integration into most contributions to this volume (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Felle, Mainardis, Gatier, Ott, Osnabrügge, Prien, Uberti, Zimmermann). The much-needed, stronger adaption of isotope and aDNA analysis of burials could mark a huge progress in the discussion about recognizing burial habits among Late Antique groups of lower or higher social status or of professional or monastic affiliation.

But also the dominant topics in Late Antique funerary studies have their problems. The leading role of Rome and Constantinople in the production and distribution of elaborate relief sarcophagi has been well-studied by art historians, but the archaeological contexts of myriads of other provincial sarcophagi have only re-

---

79 Grig 2013, 564ff. rightly criticizes the general focus of Late Antique research on elite material culture.

cently been considered in depth (Arbeiter, Cubas Díaz). There are still too few studies on the finding conditions and the contextual integration of elaborate sarcophagi within various funerary spaces (Fig. 7). The opposition between urban and rural necropoleis remains a strongly felt dichotomy in current scholarship, but some case studies in this volume try to give more balanced overviews of the differences and similarities between these two funerary worlds (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Destephen, Gatier, Prien, Osnabrügge).

Another major methodological problem of funerary research in Late Antiquity remains that of absolute dating, and this is true for both epigraphy and archaeology. The bulk of Late Antique tombs and epitaphs is still impossible to date (or can only be dated roughly) by traditional approaches, such as linguistic, formulaic, onomastic, palaeographic, numismatic and typo-chronological analyses. Regional dating systems such as provincial or regnal eras (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Destephen, Gatier), consular dates (Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Nuzzo, Uberti), and indications do help to

81 Dresken-Weiland 2003; Meinecke 2014; Dally/Fabricius/von Hesberg 2018.
82 Only for Late Antique Britain, a high standard of excavation of both urban and rural necropoleis can be observed, though also here, the preference for urban funerary archaeology is evident: Pearce 2013; Pearce 2015, 448f.
83 The problem of dating Late Antique inscriptions was recognized as early as the first scientific corpora emerged in the mid-19th c.: De Rossi 1862.
establish relative chronologies in some regions, but mostly they are absent or only preserved in small numbers.\(^{84}\) However, there is great archaeological potential in stratigraphic, radiocarbon, dendrochronological (e.g. with preserved wood from coffins) or thermoluminescence dating.\(^{85}\) Several contributions to this volume present new approaches to the question of dating tombs and epitaphs as well as their long-term use after their original setting was abandoned (Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Felle, Gatier, Mainardis, Merten, Nuzzo, Ott, Prien). These approaches should be developed further in order to precise regional and local chronologies of funerary evidence.

A challenge for any epigraphic as well as archaeological project on Late Antique burials is the uneven state of preservation and archaeological visibility within tombs or necropoleis. From well-preserved contexts in arid or semi-arid areas we know that inscriptions on stone, on mosaics or as painting were not the only form of tomb signaling. The accurately organized rows of many Late Antique cemeteries suggest surface marking. Wooden markers and enclosure features (often preserved only as postholes, see Fig. 5), anepigraphic stone mounds, but also anepigraphic stele, tile roofs and cist tombs with simple symbols such as crosses or menoroth have to be taken into consideration (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Felle, Nauert, Nuzzo, Zimmermann). As well-excavated contexts from Egypt show, wooden stele and tomb covers could contain painted or plaster-incised epitaphs, and it is therefore possible that entire series of (today lost) markers that have been considered anepigraphic, were in fact inscribed.\(^{86}\) Finally, we have to bear in mind that tomb

\(^{84}\) Handley 2003, 122–138; for Palaestina/Arabia, see: Meimaris 1992.

\(^{85}\) On conventional dating by ‘epigraphic’ criteria: Knight 1992; Galvão-Sobrinho 1995; Handley 2003; Witschel 2017, 40; Nikitsch 2018; on 14C, typological and stratigraphic dating of tombs, which, however, require high funding reourses: de Moor/Fluck 2007; Rutgers et al. 2007 (with radiocarbonate dating of charcoal material scattered in the sealing mortars of tombs); Salesse 2014; Gerrard 2015; Heinrich-Tamáška/Straub 2015; Pearce 2015, 443.

\(^{86}\) Eichner 2018, 237ff.
markers did not always signal single tombs, even if the funerary stela or tabula from a mausoleum mentions only one name. As anthropological and contextual analyses have revealed, single epitaphs might have signaled collective tombs for whole familiae (Ardeleanu, Gatier, Mainardis, Uberti), specific social groups, such as monastic communities (Bianchi) and professional associations (Cubas Díaz) (Fig. 8), or age- and gender-related groups (Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Ott).

Ideological problems still dominate Late Antique funerary research: the identification of (literary-attested) famous sites of Early Christianity always was – and still is – a catalyst driving excavation projects and approaches, instead of developing stratigraphic sequences and dating, e.g. of church building phases (Fig. 9). The interest in the material evidence of a ‘Palaeochristian past’ in Western (Christian)

---

87 Yasin 2012 with deconstruction of the tenuous, literary-based development of monumentalization of Salona’s churches; contra: Gauthier/Marin/Prévot 2010; Fiocchi
countries deeply contrasts scholarly interests in the (Muslim) Near and Middle East and North Africa, where Late Antique monuments and material culture came into focus considerably later, mostly driven by Western scholars in the era of colonization.

This is not the place to critically evaluate varying approaches and national academic traditions to interpret material evidence. However, it seems obvious to us—and this is strongly supported also by our preceding overview of the history of scholarship—that there is one structural problem of disciplines dealing with funerary data. Late Antique archaeologists still come together to discuss funerary habits, tomb types and grave goods, while Late Antique epigraphists primarily deal with funerary inscriptions by privileging the content of the texts. This is why we wanted to unify both disciplines under the umbrella of a chronologically well-defined but geographically still wide enough topic: “Contextualizing Epigraphic and Archaeological Evidence of Mortuary Practices”.

### Localism, Micro-Regionalism and Pan-Mediterranism: Defining Shared Characteristics of a Late Antique ‘Funerary koiné’

The title of this book deliberately features the term *oecumene*, in order to stress an unbiased view of the way both regionalism and globalism may be represented in Late Antique material culture(s). In this case, *oecumene* should be regarded not as an ecclesiastical, but as a geographical term, as it was used in Late Antiquity itself: the *inhabited world*. Across this huge expanse, from the margins of the Sahara to *Arabia*, and from Trier to Egypt, funerary cultures emerged with very different regional characteristics. By taking these different regions into consideration in a balanced and comparative way, we hope to avoid centrist views on Late Antique capitals or the Mediterranean alone. Common or ‘global’ funerary habits, in fact, are known not only from regions without direct access to the Mediterranean, but also from the frontiers of the Late Roman Empire and even well beyond them.

Instead of concentrating on long-established (but problematic) models of acculturation, such as ‘Romanization’ and ‘Christianization’, recent scholarship has made considerable progress in identifying micro-regional identities and micro-regional biases of material culture, without neglecting global trends that were obviously at work. The concepts of ‘localism’ and ‘regionalism’, as well as ‘globalization’ or ‘glocalization’, have been established as powerful and useful tools to explain cultural transformation apart from problematic ethnic or religious affiliations.

88 For Late Antique funerary studies, the potential of ‘globalization’ theories
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**Nicolai** 2016, 624; for a critical view on the invention of holy spaces in Rome: **Denzey Lewis** 2020.

have not yet been applied systematically, although recently microlateral diversity
and localism became thriving fields of scientific work.89 As many of this volume’s
contributions show, both localisms and the presence of similar material evidence
from funerary contexts encountered far off, may have been the result of the cul-
tural, economic and political interconnectedness of the Late Antique World. Re-
cently-developed methods help in fact to better understand changes in material
culture as caused by a balanced mixture of local/regional and ‘global’ trends not
excluding each other – trends that, moreover, impacted and shaped each other on
different levels. The concept of the inseparable ‘entanglement’ of material culture
with its former users and its dialectic between local and global is the theoretical
background we try to apply in this volume. On the one hand, it was our aim to stress
the importance of local and regional developments influencing funerary and epi-
graphic cultures. On the other hand, this approach should not leave unconsidered
the transregional (or ‘global’) trends that can doubtlessly be traced in Late Antique
funerary customs. The volume’s structure shows this lockstep in a particular way.
Concentrating on their specific areas of research, the authors all provide important
case studies for regional or local traits of funerary and epigraphic developments.
Nevertheless, all contributions are also entangled with each other, as they discuss
funerary customs that appear in several regions of the Late Antique oeucumene.90

Despite all recent focus on regional and local particularities, it is important to
acknowledge that universally recognizable characteristics of a ‘funerary koiné’, vis-
ible in material culture for many centuries, persisted in Late Antiquity. One may
think of the numerous carmina, elogia and funerary epigrams known from across
the Late Antique oeucumene.91 This particular class of elite funerary inscriptions
was deeply rooted in classical culture and was applied – as in previous times –
to represent the παιδεία of the deceased. It is no surprise to find such elaborate
inscriptions attached to high-class tomb types, such as mausolea and hypogaea
(Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Gatier, Mainardis, Valeva). Exceptional tombs across the oe-
cumene required exceptional epigraphic and decorative signaling, such as color-
ful mosaics or paintings in underground burials (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Felle, Nuzzo,
Valeva, Zimmermann) and the use of precious materials, such as glass, gold or exotic

89 ‘Globalization’ theories, in general, have become increasingly applied only in recent
Late Antique studies: Wickham 2005; Humphries 2017; Preiser-Kapeller 2018; Gui-
detti/Meinecke 2020a; for ‘global’ trade, see: Harris 2007; for growing appreciation
of regional and local approaches in Late Antique studies, see: Mulryan 2011; Grig 2013,
557 ff.; Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a (several chapters on regional features of Late
Antique epigraphic cultures); Michaelidis/Pergola/Zanini 2013; Gnoli/Neri 2019 (on
regional identities); Humphries 2019, 12 ff.; on the idea of ‘Mediterranean cities’ in Late
Antiquity, see: Loseby 2009; on regionality of dress accessories from Late Antique buri-
als, see: Swift 2000.
90 Every contribution therefore bares cross-linking references to comparative examples
within this volume in the footnotes.
91 SGO; see also Grig 2017.
marbles. Funerary paintings (including painted tituli) remained en vogue across the oecumene. They can mostly be encountered in underground burial contexts, such as barrel-vaulted tombs or hypogaea, and it is astonishing to find ‘timeless’ iconographic schemes, such as funerary banquet scenes and established patterns of floral and geometric motives, not only in the Roman catacombs, but also in tombs along the Danube and in the Eastern and African provinces (Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Gatiere, Nuzzo, Ott, Valeva, Zimmermann) (Fig. 8).

Supra-regional similarities also become evident in the material culture presented in this book. The sudden and widely attested spread of mosaic epitaphs in the central and Southwestern Mediterranean (to which one may add some sparse examples from the Dioecesis Orientis) from the 4th c. AD onwards probably responded to a new idea of their communicative and commemorative potential. These colorful inscriptions attracted viewers in a much more direct way than their predecessors in stone, and it is not surprising to find them clustered in ‘visit-able’ funerary contexts, such as churches or areae. Despite some local particularities in their production, there are many cross-references (style, format, motifs, topics) between mosaic epitaphs in North Africa, Sardinia, the Adriatic area and the Iberian Peninsula (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu). This new trend of highlighting epitaphs in colors and adopting them to increase the tombs’ architectural and decorative affordance is also evident in the increasing number of painted inscriptions in funerary contexts (Ardeleanu, Felle, Nuzzo, Valeva, Zimmermann). Furthermore, we can trace some transregional or ‘global’ similarities of top-elite burials, such as their use of exorbitantly decorated relief sarcophagi, gold-thread textiles, luxurious dress-accessories (e.g. crossbow brooches), spectacular glass wares (diatreta glasses or ‘cage cups’; Fig. 10) or ‘gypsum burials’ (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Merten, Ott, Prien). These extremely rich ensembles point to well-orchestrated, public burial ceremonies and a shared language of elite funerary representation across the
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92 For an even wider geographical and chronological context, see: Guidetti/Meinecke 2020b, 15f.

93 Duval 1976; Carrabo Nacasa et al. 2015; Quattrocchi; cf. also some remarks in Witschel 2017, 48f.

94 On top-elite (including Imperial) sarcophagi, see entries in the volumes of the Repertoire; on gold-thread finds (Galliae, North Africa, Britain, Iberian Peninsula, Italy, Noricum, Pannonia, Moesia, Scythia Minor, Greece, Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria); Schmidt 2000; Dresken-Weiland 2003; Born 2012, 82; Reifarth 2013, 478–491; Salesse et al. 2014; Pearce 2015, 454; Grig 2017, 428; on ‘gypsum’ or ‘plaster burials’, well distributed along the Rhine provinces, Galliae, Britain, but also known from Italy, North Africa, Egypt and Pannonia: Reifarth 2013, 433–477; Pearce 2015, 453; Salesse et al. 2014, 43; on similar finds of luxurious dress accessories across the Empire: Schmauder 2002; von Rummel 2007; de Moor/Fluck 2011; Eger 2015; on the ca. 80 Late Antique diatreta with concentrations in the Rhine zone, Gaul, Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean: Whitehouse 2015; on crossbow brooches as possible markers of high military positions in the Late Roman state, see: Swift 2000.
In some cases, the lavishness of burials and their furnishing could be associated with members of the Imperial court (Merten), with military aristocrats or with royal commissioners, who wanted to present themselves as members of a Mediterranean-wide upper elite class (Fig. 8).

On the other hand, regional, and local heterogeneity was the rule in Late Antique burial customs. This is reflected by the regionally differentiated structure of this book. The epitaphic and mortuary habits could vary enormously, even between neighboring towns within a 10 km distance. This heterogeneity becomes very obvious in the materiality of tomb markers, showing a wide panorama of variety. While in some funerary landscapes the ‘classical’ grave stele was still dominant, with characteristic variations in form, scale, decoration and script (Ardeleanu, Gatier, Nauerth), other such landscapes were marked by their own traditions, e.g. in the predominant use of sarcophagi, developed only in Late Antiquity (Arbeiter,

---

95 Cf. Pearce 2015, 458.
97 See also Moesia and Thracia: Conrad.
Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Mainardis, Osnabrügge, Prien, Uberti). Specific natural pre
condsitions, such as soil and stone quality, also influenced the emergence of local
unery types, such as catacombs and underground or rock-carved burials (Cubas
Díaz, Felle, Gatier, Zimmermann). Since a variegated collection of different local and
regional characteristics will be presented in the single contributions, it is not neces
sary to outline them in this chapter. Instead, the following sections will summarize
some central, and repeatedly addressed themes and phenomena discussed in the
various chapters of this book. We believe that these results can be of value for gen-
eral future studies on Late Antique funerary customs.

Collective and Individual Traits in Funerary Ownership
and Social Representation

Recent work has shown that, in the course of Late Antiquity, a predominantly in-
dividual self-presentation in and around tombs was slowly replaced by collective
representation. In some regions, we have firm evidence for Christian author-
ities taking care of the dead, managing cemeterial organization and – more im-
portantly – paying burial plots also for the poor (Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Cubas Díaz,
Zimmermann). It is generally accepted that this caritative cura pro mortuis (along-
side with the doctrine of resurrection of the body) was one of the most signifi-
cant facets of the success of Christianity, since in other religions such widespread
care for the dead was absent. Some inscriptions indicate that organized colle-
gia (not necessarily of exclusively Christian or Jewish character) were responsi-
ble for selling and administrating burial plots. However, the indications discussed
in almost every contribution to this volume show that individual representation
at tombs remained significant throughout Late Antiquity: spectacular mauso-
leum built all over the oecumene (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Mainardis,
Uberti, Valeva), innumerable Early Christian sarcophagi, luxurious grave goods as
well as highly elaborate decorative and epigraphic furnishings of tombs (also in
churches). Status, παιδεία and wealth of the dead, as well as individual tomb
ownership, were still expressed by adding personal traits to the presentation of
the body, by written messages (e.g. through ostentatious addition of burial prices:

98 Yasin 2005; Yasin 2009; Fiocchi Nicolai 2016, 626–639 even states that the collective
Eucharist in (burial) churches replaced any form of individual rituals and self-represen-
tation by the 5th c. AD; on the importance of collective burials already in Imperial times,
99 Tert. apol. 39; see also Dresken-Weiland 2012, 79–81.
100 Brandenburg 1994; Rebillard 2009.
101 For mausolea, often attached to churches in Late Antiquity, see: Chevalier/Sapin 2012;
for sarcophagi, see: Repertorium; for grave goods, see: Volp 2002, 198; for the East: Kon-
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Ott, Felle, Zimmermann), but also by including private portraits in tomb paintings, mosaics or on relief sarcophagi (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Felle, Gatier, Zimmermann, Valeva). During the second half of the 3rd c. AD, the popular habit of individual representation in funerary statues (life-sized or over-life-sized) in/on top of tombs, as well as the custom of staging deceased persons in ronde-bosse on top of sarcophagi decreased sensibly, but both were still perpetuated regionally throughout the 4th c. AD (Valeva). Rich garments and staged processions enhanced virtues such as dignitas, auctoritas, pietas, nobilitas and honor. These century-old norms, gradually enriched by new ‘Christian’ virtues, such as devotio or religiositas were still praised in many epitaphs for men, as were pudicitia, castitas and fides for women or innocentia for children. Professions were still proudly on display in epitaphs and images, and they never lost their function as markers of socio-economic distinction. While a general trend of decreasing display of professional affiliation (with local exceptions in Ardeleanu, Felle, Zimmermann) is visible in the West, such display flourished and even peaked during Late Antiquity in several Eastern regions (Cubas Diaz, Destephen, Gatier). Moreover, in enclosures sub divo and within churches, families were still active in purchasing privileged burial plots and in proudly demonstrating kinship in their funerary inscriptions (Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Gatier, Mainardis).

New Funerary Spaces of Social Negotiation and the Interiorization of Inscriptions

Most contributions to this book focus on the topology of funerary epigraphy, i.e. the examination of the exact setting and use of inscriptions and tombs within their original spatial context. Three broad types of funerary spaces dominated during

---


103 See also examples of statuary on top of Late Antique sarcophagi from Tyros: I.Tyr nécropole.

104 For Berytos: Mouterde 1929; for Hierapolis in Phrygia see: SEG XLVI 1656, 1671 adn; SEG XXXIII 1139; SEG XXXIV 1139; I.Hierapolis Judeich 133, 222; for Tyros, see I.Tyr nécropole, De Jong 2010, 627 and the contribution Cubas Diaz in this volume. For a comprehensive account on professions in inscriptions and papyri in the Eastern Mediterranean, and especially in Egypt, see Ruffing 2008. Some exceptions in the West might be Aquileia and Rome, where symbols such as tools or attributes placed on epitaphs might have signaled professional affiliation: Ehler 2012, 175–181, 229–290; Bolle 2019, 72.

105 On the importance of familial responsibilities in burials, see Shaw 1984, 497 and more explicitly for Late Antiquity: Samellas 2002; Rebillard 2003; Tulloch 2006; for Late Antique Tyros, see De Jong 2010, esp. 623; cf. also from archaeo-biological perspective: Theuws 2019, 138.
Late Antiquity: 1. churches with burials and funerary chapels, 2. underground burial systems such as catacombs or hypogaea, and 3. necropoleis *sub divo*, which also featured burial in enclosures (*areae*) and monumental tombs. The new phenomenon of burials in churches is a recurring topic within this volume. Starting in the 4th c. AD, it was mostly first implemented in pre-existing necropoleis *extra muros*, a fact from which derives the debated term of ‘cemetery churches’. As early as the late 4th c. AD, such churches with burials were built in the cities’ *suburbia*, and increasingly began to penetrate the urban fabric.\(^{106}\) Many of these churches were multifunctional, e.g. hosting both congregational and funerary activities or martyr-related pilgrimage. By the 5th c. AD, burial in and associated to *basilicae* was distributed across the *oecumene* (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Mainardis, Merten, Osnabrügge, Ott, Prien, Valeva). Although we still lack a comparative study on his phenomenon,\(^{107}\) the primary function of many of these churches was to embody burials. In fact, dozens of urban and rural churches or chapels featuring pavements more or less entirely pierced with tombs have been documented across the *oecumene*. The dense ‘palimpsests’ of tomb markers within such basilica-spaces (on stone and mosaics, painted or carved), developing on the churches’ circulation levels over the course of time, even raises questions about the practicability of liturgical acts (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Merten). In the East, burial associated to churches often appears in a spatially more restricted fashion than in the West, where tomb-filled *basilicae* are widespread. It was often clustered only in certain areas attached to or within churches, e.g. in hypogaea, annexes, chapels, crypts or *atria*. Such separate burial rooms obviously served to demonstrate social hierarchies, as they may be interpreted as burial grounds for church donors, clerics, elite families or monastic communities. On the other hand, burial beneath the floors of the *sanctuaria*, choirs, apses and naves is not attested as frequently in the East as in the West, where epitaphs help to understand hierarchical tomb setting.\(^{108}\) Another striking characteristic of the East is that only very few of these church burials seem to have been equipped with ‘real’ epitaphs, marking particularly prestigious tombs (Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Destephen, Gatier, Valeva). The exceptionally high (and obviously restricted) honor of basilica-associated burials is further exemplified by the fact that the vast cemeteries around such ‘burial churches’ (very characteristic in the West, and partially present in Asia Minor and Greece as well) are almost lacking in the Near East.

It is obvious that different types of enclosed funerary spaces preconditioned and produced different ways of using funerary inscriptions. In North Africa, Italy, the
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\(^{106}\) Cantino-Wataghin 2003, 243–245.

\(^{107}\) Some general thoughts on the concept of burial within churches can be found in: Dresken-Weiland 2003, 113–178; Yasin 2009, 69–100; Fiocchi Nicolai 2016, 627–642.

\(^{108}\) Goldfus 1997; Sanmori 1998; Griesheimer 1997, 205–210; Laskaris 2000, 24–51; Fiocchi Nicolai 2016, 634; Eger 2018; Huber 2018; Schick 2018; but see some exceptions in the contributions Bianchi, Cubas Díaz and Gatier in this volume.
Moselle region, the Balkans, and on the Iberian Peninsula, the abundance of funerary epigraphy is clearly linked to the concentration of built and enclosed funerary spaces, and often to the veneration of local saints (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Felle, Merten, Nuzzo, Valeva, Zimmermann). In these regions, Late Antique funerary epigraphy followed a new trend of ‘interiorization’, in contrast to the long-established principles of epigraphy’s exterior and frontal orientation. As civic inscriptions were increasingly set up in enclosed ensembles (on walls, pavements, columns, vaults, interior architraves etc.), funerary inscriptions also developed in the wake of the emergence of new such funerary spaces, like churches or chapels with burials, accessible crypts, catacombs ad hypogaea (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Felle, Merten, Nuzzo, Ott, Uberti, Valeva, Zimmermann). Along with this new trend of interiorization, not only the mise-en-page, but also the materiality of inscriptions changed significantly. Paintings and mosaics, as well as plaster and tiles, were often used as supports of writing in such enclosed funerary spaces. The setting contributed actively to new opportunities for visual effects, e.g. through the play of light and shadow or the use of color, crafting spaces full of aura. Iconographic themes (biblical, bucolic) and texts (psalms, prayers) furthermore contributed to creating a paradisiacal sphere (Arbeiter, Nuzzo, Valeva) and surely helped mourners to imagine their relatives in safe and peaceful places (Fig. 8).

Tombs and epitaphs were often clustered in highly frequented zones (e.g. near the sanctuarium or martyr graves), re-shaping such ‘sacred areas’ by their mere accumulation, but also usurping the particular aura of such privileged zones for themselves like ‘parasites’. It is no surprise to find these sacralized areas occupied by highly privileged burials. The spatial distribution of epitaphs clearly shows that civic elites, clerics and magistrates deliberately chose (and rivalled in obtaining) the physical proximity of such particular ‘hot spots’. Now that – only as of recent – epitaphs have been accurately mapped within contextual plans of such enclosed burial areas, it is possible to better understand local social hierarchies and collective movements during commemorative acts (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Felle, Merten, Zimmermann). Interiorized spaces (churches, monasteries, chapels, hypogaea and catacombs) afforded enhanced opportunities of collective perception and commemoration, as is underlined by the fact that they were all designed for repeated frequentation by ‘living audiences’ after the actual burial had taken place. The new trend of interiorized epigraphy was even carried to the point that certain tomb types, such as sarcophagi, were themselves inscribed on the inside (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Uberti, Valeva, Zimmermann).

109 On this very Late Antique epigraphic trend, which can also be observed in decorative systems: Bauer 2008, 187f.; Witschel 2017, 34.

110 For epitaphs with hints to the hope of attending the Elysium, see: Merkt 2012; Dresken-Weiland 2012; for the crafting of paradisiacal spheres in (not only Christian!) tombs evoked by painting and art, see: Kourkoutidou-Nicolaidou 1997; Valeva 2001; Denzey Lewis 2018; Rousseau 2019; for biblical motives, see: Dresken-Weiland 2011.

who uses the term ‘endotaphes’, Valeva). It is still debated who would have been addressed in such inscriptions, i.e. the deceased themselves, their heirs or even God – or whether the inscriptions were designed to be seen and read only once, during the funeral at the open sarcophagus, or in the framework of a splendid public procession. Such restricted visibility of inscriptions is a typical characteristic of funerary epigraphy in Late Antiquity, and can be encountered before only on a marginal level.113

The Persistence of Publicly-Oriented Representation in Open Necropoleis

Despite the new trend of setting up inscriptions in the interior of funerary spaces, myriads of ostentatious and publicly-oriented inscriptions were still set up in open necropoleis: as stelae, but also on mensae, cupae, sarcophasi and mausolea (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Destephen, Gatier, Mainardis, Nauerth, Osnabrügge, Ott, Prien, Uberti). It seems that the traditional extra-mural cemeteries were still considered to be the most important burial grounds throughout Late Antiquity, especially in the East: intra-urban burial, seemingly, was far less common there (Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Destephen, Gatier, Nauerth, Valeva; note that Ardeleanu, Mainardis, Merten, Prien and Uberti also discuss examples from the West). Isolated intra-mural cemeteries associated to small neighborhoods, workshops and religious buildings occurred as a new feature in many smaller settlements and larger towns (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Mainardis, Nuzzo, Ott).114 At the same time, burial in the suburbia of towns often took place in close physical proximity to both elite houses and artisanal quarters as well as extra-urban sanctuaries (Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Mainardis, Merten). Rural cemeteries, e.g. next to villages, villae, estates or non-urban sites of worship mostly remained an above-ground phenomenon and a constant feature of funerary landscapes (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Prien, Valeva). The bulk of Late Antique epitaphs in the East comes from open cemeteries, evidencing that social hierarchization and funerary representation took place on a spatial level completely different from church-associated burial in the West.

Accurate mapping of epitaphs in open necropoleis has produced interesting results as well.115 Old excavation reports and archival material, surprisingly often, aren't enough to trace the movement and life of this people in the past. However, this is the only way to understand the history of this area.

113 For earlier examples, see: Toynbee 1996, 264, 281; Meinecke 2014; on the phenomenon in general see also: Frese/Keil/Krüger 2014.
114 Cf. for other similar examples: Meneghini/Santangeli Valenzani 1995; Cantino Wataghin/Lambert 1998.
115 Lavan 2015, 72f. underlines the importance of epigraphic plotting in digital maps, but mainly names examples of civic inscriptions (Aphrodisias, Sagalassos, Ephesos); cf. also the ‘Last Statues of Late Antiquity’-project: Smith/Ward-Perkins 2016. For accurate epitaph mapping in plans of buildings and open necropoleis, see: Yasin 2009, 69–100;
show quite exact locations of epigraphic findspots, hitherto neglected by traditional linguistic approaches of epigraphic corpora. The ensuing plotting activity, which has to be undertaken in situ, allows us to reflect not only about spatial and diachronic developments of funerary activity within a town, but also about movement patterns during ceremonies, and the social hierarchies there were thereby negotiated within these necropoleis. Using this approach, several case studies in this volume enable us to locate particular zones for elite burial, familial or middle-class burial, and cemeteries of the poor. Furthermore, we can now assess the varying dynamics burial zones experienced over time and space within one and the same town (Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Mainardis, Ott, Uberti). Inscriptions now directed commemorative and processional movement, and in certain cases even formed the backbone of orientation in vast necropoleis. Epitaphs were set up and perceived as ‘actants’ of social communication. As several papers in this volume show, it is important to take the topographic characteristics of necropoleis into account, such as valleys, rivers, hills, geological preconditions (e.g. soil quality) and streets, in order to appropriately consider the setting and perception of tombs, as well as the visibility and accessibility of epitaphs (Cubas Díaz, Gatier, Mainardis, Nuzzo, Ott, Uberti, Valeva, Zimmermann).

The Many Facets of Burial ‘ad sanctos’

Several contributions to this volume discuss the much-debated phenomenon of so-called ‘burials ad sanctos’, a trend that started in the 4th c. AD and subsequently spread across the entire oecumene (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Felle, Gatier, Mainardis, Merten, Prien, Valeva, Zimmermann). The Italic, Gallic, Iberian, African, Germanic and Adriatic provinces are particularly rich in such burial contexts, while burial associated with saints is more isolated in the East. Still, examples are extensively distributed, with some highlights in Asia Minor, the Palaestinae, Arabia and Greece (Bianchi, Gatier, Ott). In recent times, the old narrative of a linear development of such ‘ad sanctos’-burials, starting from a holy tomb figuring as a focal point of massive burial, has rightly been questioned. Intensive burial activity within or around a church is not necessarily proof for the presence of enshrined relics. In most cases, it remains unclear what such burial spaces looked like initially.

---


Often, it may be that a saint's tomb and its veneration as a martyr shrine was introduced in an already heavily frequented necropolis, a church or a chapel with pre-existing burials, at a moment in time significantly later than the literary tradition about these sites suggests. Therefore, such ‘landmark tombs’ did not always initiate massive burial activity, but rather used and manipulated pre-existing prominent burials for the construction of their own prestigious legacy (Ardeleanu, Merten). Nevertheless, one cannot neglect the clear attraction that tombs of martyrs and saints, as divine places where heaven and earth met, exerted on the faithful with regard to burial and hope for resurrection. Even if clear martyr presence – in general attested by ‘authentic’ martyr inscriptions or inscribed relics – is missing in many places, concentrated mass-burial around a church/chapel/mausoleum might still have been linked to desire for a burial spot ad sanctos.

The ‘Problem’ of Tomb Reuse

Ever since the new toolkit of natural sciences (as discussed above) became available to Late Antique funerary studies, the subjects of reuse, spoliation, opening and violation of tombs, as well as the redeposition of skeletal remains, have gained considerable popularity.118 As several contributions show, multiple and sequential deposition in the very same tomb was a widely distributed burial practice across the Late Antique oecumene (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Mainardis, Ott, Uberti, Valeva). It is also attested in tombs marked by only a single epitaph. Uberti suggests that single names on tombs might have been considered as familial burial grounds by observers. Although Late Antique curse inscriptions (defixiones) or fines (multae) (Destephen, Cubas Díaz, Mainardis, Ott), inscriptions intended to protect tombs (Arbeiter, Bianchi) or apotropaic/prophylactic grave goods (Bianchi, Prien, Zimmermann) are known,119 tombs were exhumated, and even destroyed, at any given time. Especially the rivalry in gaining burial plots around presumed saints’ burials led, eventually, to chaotic ensembles of multiple burials superimposed on each other (Ardeleanu, Merten). In some cases, however, polisomatic tombs and ossuaries were planned and executed from the outset as places for continuous burial of specific groups, e.g. of a monastical, clerical or familial nature (Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Mainardis).


119 On Late Antique multae, see also Pfohl 1983, 497–500; Février 1978, 319–322; Pietri 1983, 534; Volp 2002, 88, 124; De Jong 2010, 608; on protective or magical grave goods, such as amulets, quite still common in Late Antique tombs of the Near East and Egypt, see: Russell 1995; Davis 2005; Eger 2018; Huber 2018.
The ‘Epitaphic Renaissance’ of the 5th–7th c. AD: Various Explanations

An important observation drawn from the many regional overviews mentioned above is the general trend of a regional revival of funerary epigraphy in the 5th to 7th c. AD. The fact that the number of epitaphs increases during the 5th and 6th c. AD, after a massive drop visible across most regions in the late 3rd and 4th c. AD, shows that epigraphic commemoration – especially in funerary contexts – regained importance (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Destephen, Merten, Nauerth, Nuzzo, Osnabrügge, Uberti) or even peaked (Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Gatier) in this period. Only a few cities and regions provide substantial evidence of epitaphs from the late 3rd and 4th c. AD (Ardeleanu, Destephen, Felle, Mainardis, Zimmermann), and in some areas the epitaphic habit became inexistent. There are different regional explanations for both the trend of decline in the late 3rd/4th c. AD, and rebound in the 5th/6th c. AD. For Elisabeth Meyer, the Empire-wide awards of Roman citizenship following the constitutio Antoniniana were responsible for the diminished interest in epigraphic commemoration at tombs. In some regions, economic, agricultural and political crises or revolts were obvious factors, as well as, possibly, the geographic location of individual sites and their limited access to wider economic and civic networks. As has been stated in recent scholarship, scenarios of crisis and decline in the 3rd/4th c. AD have to be nuanced in some regions, and

120 MacMullen 1982, esp. 237–244; Galvão-Sobrinho 1995; see also Mitchell 2017, 271–282, who observes an enormous decrease in most regions of Asia Minor’s epigraphy after 300 AD; cf. several case studies in Nawotka 2012 (e.g. Boiotia, Chersonnesos, Pontos and Thrace, Asia Minor); see also the contributions Ardeleanu, Nuzzo and Uberti in this volume; however, at certain sites and regions 4th c. AD epitaphs are still numerous, e.g. in Mauretania Sitifensis and Caesariensis, in Trier and in Laodikeia (Phrygia): see the contributions Ardeleanu, Merten and Destephen in this volume.

121 On the ‘rebound’ of epigraphic practices in the 5th/6th c. AD: Galvão-Sobrinho 1995; Handley 2003, 20–22; Salway 2015; Roueché/Sotinel 2017, 512; Witschel 2017, 34; Petts 2019, 61; for ratio developments between epitaphs and other inscriptions in the provinces of Arabia and Palaestina, see: Di Segni 2017, 288–299. Tab. 2 notes an epigraphic peak during the 5th to 7th c. AD, but also observes a decline of epitaphic commemoration in the Western part of her research area; cf. several contributions in Nawotka 2021 including comparable statistical data and analysis of many regions showing a general recovery in the 5th/6th c. AD (parts of Asia Minor, Phoenicia, Egypt); see also the contribution Gatier in this volume with several cities in Arabia presenting rich epitaph series of the 7th c. AD.

122 For ‘Christian’ burials, cemeteries and epitaphs before and during the Constantinian dynasty, see Carletti 2008; Fiocchi Nicolai 2016; for regions with almost no Late Antique epitaphic evidence later than 250 AD (such as Raetia, Noricum, Thrace, Boiotia, Mauretania Tingitana and parts of Asia Minor), see entries in ILCV and Nawotka 2021.

123 Meyer 1990.

124 E.g. in many cities of the Dioecesis Thraciae (except Tomis and Serdica): Poruznik 2021, 86, 89, 96.
even revised entirely for others. Religious change, e.g. ‘Christianization’, could have prompted some transformations in the epigraphic culture as well, but should not be overestimated as a catalyst of a declining trend, given the high importance awarded to funerary epigraphy already in our earliest material evidence for Christian communities. Moreover, the visible decrease was often only the final phase of a longer-term shift in the epigraphic praxis.

The ‘epigraphic renaissance’ of the 5th and 6th c. AD also has to be explained in multicausal terms. It is worth noting that it is attested almost exclusively in urban contexts, such as in Apulia, Calabria, Aquitania, and the Rhine and Danube frontier zone (Nuzzo, Osnabrügge, Prien, Uberti, Valeva), indicating the continuous vitality of urban networks and their importance for epigraphic production. Furthermore, the rise of epigraphic placement in spatial contexts such as catacombs or churches during that time surely had a positive effect on preconditions of physical preservation. Nonetheless, there are other areas where rural epitaphic habits thrived and sometimes even showed complex traits, such as carmina and epigrams (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Destephen, Gatier, Nauerth). In Southern Italy, the epigraphic abundance is obviously linked to particular religious customs, as Jewish burials dominate the epigraphic record (Nuzzo). In the Iberian, Gallic, Balkan, African and other Italic provinces, the long-neglected agricultural prosperity, the economic interconnectivity and the spread of the cult of the saints were surely driving catalysts of a blossoming funerary epigraphy (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Felle, Merten, Nuzzo, Valeva, Zimmermann). The existence of a martyr shrine with pilgrim and mass-burial activity produced high amounts of epitaphs at several sites. This fact can be observed most strikingly along the Rhine, where the absence of such prominent cult centers may have accelerated epigraphic decline significantly (Osnabrügge, Prien). This explanation cannot be taken for granted for the whole oecumene, since we know of huge pilgrimage sites centered around martyrs’ tombs with almost no funerary epigraphy, e.g. Abu Mina in Egypt or Qal’at Sim’an in Syria. Nevertheless, in many Eastern provinces numbers of epitaphs increase or even peak during the 5th and 7th c. AD (Bianchi, Cubas Díaz, Gatier). There, economic wealth and cultural connectivity, both of which are also reflected in spectacular contemporary building programs, ceramic deposits and thriving rural settlements, may have promoted the resilience of the epitaphic practice as a side effect.

125 See e.g. Lavan 2001; Liebeschuetz 2001; Jacobs 2013; Parello/Rizzo 2016; Witschel 2017.
126 See several regional case studies in Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a and Nawotka 2021.
Reconsidering Late Antique Funerary Habits

A New ‘Physical’ Perception of Tombs and Funerary Markers

A recent shift in the methodological approach to inscriptions (and their material supports) has made it possible to advance new interpretations of the Late Antique perception of burials and their epigraphic as well as decorative marking. Several of our contributors expand on this tendency with splendid examples. It seems that a general shift from ‘vertical’ to ‘horizontal’ or ‘upright’ to ‘flat’-perception took place during the 4th and 5th c. AD (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Merten, Mainardis, Nuzzo, Osnabrügge, Ott, Uberti). This trend was not only a consequence of the phenomenon of increasing burial within basilicae, but rather a reaction, probably, to the spread of inhumation and its characteristic preservation of bodies for the afterlife in their entirety (Uberti suggests speaking about the ‘corporeality of inscriptions’). It also went along with a material shift, if we consider the contemporaneous spread of mosaic markers: from then on, conventional scenes and motives from standing, frontal representations were literally ‘laid down’ on the floor. But this trend is also visible in some open cemeteries and funerary enclosures sub divo (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Mainardis, Merten), as inscriptions were increasingly positioned horizontally, on or slightly over circulation level. This resulted in a shift in the observer’s perception of spatial environments around tombs and their inscriptions. The accessibility of tombs and the legibility of epitaphs might have been related to patterns of movement during commemorative rituals. While street-oriented frontality of inscriptions, in the Imperial period, was part of an architecturally well-orchestrated ensemble, in which the tomb itself was mostly invisible, the horizontal layout of Late Antique epitaphs manipulated the spectator’s view by focusing his or her main attention on the very tomb itself. In some cases, epitaphs could only be read by literally bowing over the dead, and therefore created a close bonding between the observer and the deceased. This new ‘physical union’ between the dead and the living, emphasized by repetitive commemorative rituals, might also be one possible explanation for the entry of tombs into the urban fabrics. Nonetheless, several open cemeteries from the Hellenistic and Roman period were occupied until Late Antiquity, all across the oecumene. This shows that the old concepts of street-oriented frontality, roadside tomb monumentalization and extrovert orientation of epitaphs remained valuable features of funerary representation, although also in several of these cases, direct access to tombs and into funerary districts was intended (Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Uberti) (Fig. 11). Similar mechanisms were at work in underground galleries using loculi with frontally-oriented tituli (Felle, Zimmermann). Interestingly, in these cases an increasing physical approximation of frontally exercised epitaphs (and their readers) to the dead can also be observed, e.g. inscriptions set on sarcophagus cases and loculi, directly next to the inhumated bodies.127

127 A very striking example is the al-Bass cemetery of Tyros, where the epitaphs were often placed on the short sides of loculi closing slabs, directly between iron rings that allowed to re-open the tombs for sequential burial: De Jong 2010, 611–622.
Fig. 11: Tyros, al-Bass cemetery, 4th to 7th c. AD-phase with increasing Late antique burial activities expanding alongside the ‘funerary road’.
The Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence of Funerary Commemoration

The close physical proximity between the living and the dead, as a characteristic of Late Antique funerary customs, is well-illustrated by a vast range of commemorative rituals, such as funerary feasting and collective remembrance of the communities’ dead. We want to stress the importance of differentiating funeral-related and posthumous rituals, although they resemble each other in their material evidence and it is therefore not always easy to make an archaeological distinction between them.128 Recent analyses have shed new light on the character of these commemorative rituals, especially on dining and drinking, but also on offerings regularly performed at the tombs (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Bianchi, Felle, Merten, Ott, Prien, Uberti, Valeva, Zimmermann).129 The West is particularly rich in such contexts, but recurring examples from the Eastern provinces show that these rituals were perhaps more widely distributed than hitherto believed.130 Despite the sharp critiques these rituals triggered among contemporary Christian authors, archaeological artefact assemblages (such as glass and ceramics around the surface of closed tombs), but also epigraphy (mensae, piscinae) and funerary art (banquet scenes and ‘Totenmahl’-stelae), clearly attest their longevity. Non-funerary botanical and faunal deposits, as well as rich literary evidence, illustrate the complexity and popularity of the commemoration of the dead in Late Antiquity. Many tombs were planned and designed for repeated frequentation by the surviving descendants according to the ritual calendar. This is suggested not only by the many architectural features intended to guarantee the accessibility of tombs (mensae, stairs, lockable doors, removable entry slabs, benches, facilities for crowded gatherings and hydraulic installations). Also, the communicative frontality of decorative elements (mosaics, reliefs, paintings), the strategic setting and the acclamatory character of epitaphs turned the tombs and necropoleis into veritable ‘theaters’ of interactive commemoration (Fig. 8).131 Imagery, architectural décor, light and inscriptions demanded attention and invited the audience to participate actively in commemorative rituals.

129 Cf. already Stuber 1957; Février 1978, 337–347; Spera 2005; Brink/Green 2008; Pearce 2015, 450, 463-465, who correctly notes that commemorative rituals have not been exhaustively been studied compared to funeral-associated rituals; cf. Blaizot 2018, esp. 533–535.
130 For Eastern examples in Tyros, Resafa and the Syrian central massif: Griesheimer 1997, 119–193; Konrad 2013, 210; De Jong 2010, 608f. fig. 12; 612 with an early 4th c. AD-inscription in an annex of a funerary enclosure that invites to celebrate the festival of Maioumas; on funerary mensae from Crete, see: I.Chr.Crete 77, 83, 104.
131 On the communicative potential of decoration and inscriptions in Late Antique funerary contexts, see Tulloch 2006; Zimmermann 2012; Denzey Lewis 2018 uses the interesting
Taste, smell and sound locked these memories into the participants’ minds. In doing so, these media promoted a tight personal relationship between the buried and the tomb-visitors, commonly shared in the performative act of commemorative rituals. It seems that the slow expiration of these rituals during the 6th and 7th c. AD – again with considerable regional differences – also provoked the end of epigraphic and decorative self-representation and communication in funerary contexts. In other words: as soon as commemorative rituals were abandoned, epigraphic, architectural and decorative articulation of these formerly ‘ritualized spaces’ were no longer required.

The Materiality of Late Antique Epitaphs as a Key Approach in Contextual Funerary Studies

Despite their sheer quantity and their contentious simplicity, Late Antique epitaphs are a subclass of inscriptions perfectly suited to the current trend of reconsidering the materiality of inscriptions. Attentive autopsy of the material supports, including their rear and lateral sides (along with the necessary publication of photographic documentation), allows for spectacular new insights into (and the reconstruction of) the original topological and praxeological context of inscriptions. As shown by Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Osnabrügge and Uberti in this volume, the existence of buildings with integrated burials below floor level can be sometimes reconstructed based on the material aspects of the epitaphs’ supports alone (special preparation of lateral sides, signs of wear by circulation), even if we have no other evidence for such burial buildings. Since Late Antique epitaphs, obviously, were generally placed above the head of the deceased on circulation level (Mainardis, Ott), while all other parts of the same tomb were entirely buried, a re-examination of the visibility of tomb markers in open cemeteries was possible, e.g. in Aquileia and Corinth. Attentive autopsy of fragmentary inscription supports, such as plaques with tabulae ansatae, large-scaled plates or the spatial composition of inscriptions on their supports also helps to restrict the possibilities of reconstructing their original position and perception – as parts of mausolea, as loculus slabs within catacombs/hypogaea or as parts of a sarcophagus’ front (Arbeiter, Ardeleanu, Cubas Díaz, Uberti). Such materiality-based approaches, in deposits with hundreds or thousands of fragmented and decontextualized inscriptions, have the potential to lead to astonishing results. The materiality of inscriptions tells its own story and future scholarship should integrate this aspect more systematically into the classic, linguistic way to study and document funerary inscriptions.

term “memory theatres”; ROUSSEAU 2019; for the general increasing acclamatory character of Late Antique inscriptions, see: WITSCHEL 2017, 50.
132 See several case studies in TSAMAKDA/ZIMMERMANN 2020.
Final Remarks

Preparing, organizing and publishing Funerary landscapes of the Late Antique oecumene was a long, but (hopefully) fruitful attempt to better understand one of the most important fields of Late Antique material culture. As editors, we feel that more ‘holistic’ approaches to Late Antique funerary customs and epitaphs (involving contemporary evidence from regions well beyond the frames of the oecumene) are required to increase our understanding of a class of material that is too often considered a mere illustration of daily life. Funerary contexts and inscriptions have the potential to help us reconstruct central aspects of this transformative period, such as urban and demographic development, social hierarchization, health and diet, kinship and migration processes, individual and collective commemoration, but also specific rituals and the perception of religious and social spaces. In this respect, we hope to promote further comparative studies on this fascinating period and topic. If as a community of scholars we manage to combine the possibilities of recent approaches and to put together different expertise over the course of the next years, we are convinced that this volume can mark some progress in our knowledge about mortuary habits in the transitional phase of Long Late Antiquity as well as about conceptualizations of death and burial in general.
### Tab. 1: Late Antique case studies in recent compendia/conferences on ancient burial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>On Late Antiquity</th>
<th>Regions, topics concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Struck 1993</td>
<td>12 out of 37</td>
<td>Britain (7), <em>Germaniae</em> (3), <em>Galliae</em> (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce/Millet/Struck 2000</td>
<td>8 out of 28</td>
<td>Italy (4 of 5 on Roman catacombs), Britain (2), <em>Galliae</em> (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinzelmann 2001</td>
<td>7 out of 25</td>
<td>Rome and Ostia (4), Italy (3), grave goods (4), coins in burials (1), sarcophagi (1), amphora burials (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaquerizo Gil 2002</td>
<td>15 out of 34</td>
<td>Italy (2 on Rome+Ostia, 1 on sarcophagi), <em>Hispaniae</em> (12, 2 on sarcophagi), West (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrumpf 2006</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baray/Brun/Testart 2007</td>
<td>0 out of 26</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brink/Green 2008</td>
<td>7 out of 9</td>
<td>Rome (3, all on catacombs), North Africa (2), epitaphs (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheid 2008</td>
<td>3 out of 22</td>
<td>Britain (1), Italy (3), Rome (1), rural burial (1), burial rites (1), epitaphs (1), funerary feasting (1), tomb reuse (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowland/Knüsel 2009</td>
<td>1 out of 20</td>
<td>Britain (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rüpe/Scheid 2010</td>
<td>2 out of 14</td>
<td>Egypt (1), Italy (1), North Africa (1), funerary feasting (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinar Gil/Juárez 2010</td>
<td>22 out of 22</td>
<td><em>Hispaniae</em> (13), Northern Italy (4), Southern Italy (1), <em>Galliae</em> (2), burial in/around churches (5), reliquaries (1), Mediterranean (1), grave goods (16), palaeoanthropology (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll/Rempel 2011</td>
<td>2 out of 9</td>
<td><em>Germaniae</em> (1), <em>Pannonia</em> (1), Britain (1), tomb reuse (1), tomb markers (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope/Huskinson 2011</td>
<td>0 out of 10</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castex 2011</td>
<td>2 out of 18</td>
<td>Rome (2, both on catacombs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenna 2012</td>
<td>2 out of 24</td>
<td>Egypt (2), child burials (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thür 2014</td>
<td>2 out of 11</td>
<td>Italy (1), <em>Noricum</em> (1), <em>Pannonia</em> (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameling 2016</td>
<td>7 out of 12</td>
<td>Literary/epigraphic sources on Late Antique burial (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt/Prusac/Roland 2015</td>
<td>3 out of 14</td>
<td>Caucasus (1), North Africa (1), <em>Scythia Minor/Moesia Secunda</em> (1), Albania (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devlin/Graham 2015</td>
<td>1 out of 8</td>
<td>Britain (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson 2015</td>
<td>1 out of 12</td>
<td>Britain (1), cremation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce/Weekes 2017</td>
<td>4 out of 11</td>
<td>Britain (3), Italy (2), <em>Galliae</em> (1), <em>Germaniae</em> (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Larminat et al. 2017</td>
<td>3 out of 33</td>
<td><em>Galliae</em> (2), Roman catacombs (1), isotope analyses (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eger/Mackensen 2018</td>
<td>10 out of 15</td>
<td>Emesa (1), Egypt (2), Jordan/Arabia (2), Daraya (1), Chisphins (1), Beirut (1), <em>Gerasa</em> (1), burials in churches (2), grave goods (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenna/Huber/Van Andringa 2018</td>
<td>2 out of 18</td>
<td><em>Galliae</em> (2), burials in/around churches (1), commemorative rituals (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Late Antiquity</td>
<td>Late Antique regions, topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster/Brown 1997</td>
<td>4 out of 13</td>
<td>Galliae (2), Greece (1), Germaniae (2), funerary painting (1), grave goods (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie/Loseby 1996</td>
<td>5 out of 13</td>
<td>Greece (1), Hispaniae (1), Galliae (2), North Africa (1), intra-urban burials (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brogiolo/Ward-Perkins 1999</td>
<td>4 out of 11</td>
<td>Northern Italy (1), Italy (1), Galliae (1), intra-urban burials (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavan 2001</td>
<td>3 out of 13</td>
<td>Thessaly (1), Asia Minor (1), Late Antique burial in general (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavan/Bowden 2003</td>
<td>3 out of 17</td>
<td>Albania (1), Late Antique burial in general (1), West (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krause/Witschel 2006</td>
<td>5 out of 16</td>
<td>Galliae (2), Hispaniae (1), Southwest Anatolia (1), Venetia et Histria (1), burial ad sanctos (2), intra-urban burials (3), epitaphs (1), sarcophagi (2), burial in churches (1), martyria (3), hypogaea (1), rural burials (1), funerary art (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousseau 2009</td>
<td>10 out of 44</td>
<td>North Africa (2), Galliae (2), Britain (1), Italy (1), Rome &amp; Ostia (3), burial ad sanctos (1), epitaphs (3), kinship (1), funerary painting (2), funerary art (2), Roman catacombs (3), commemoration (2), sarcophagi (1), intra-urban burial (1), burial in/around churches (1), monumental tombs (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sami/Speed 2010</td>
<td>6 out of 16</td>
<td>Transylvania (1), Britain (2), Gaelicia (1), Sicilia (1), Ravenna (1), cremation (2), child burials (1), grave goods (1), epitaphs (2), catacombs (1), hypogaea (1), burials in churches (1), mausolea (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schatzmann 2011</td>
<td>4 out of 17</td>
<td>Germaniae (2), Galliae (2), epitaphs (1), cremation (2), grave goods (3), lead sarcophagi (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabbernee 2014</td>
<td>1 out of 10</td>
<td>Balkans, Greece and the Aegean (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavan/Mulryan 2015</td>
<td>7 out of 19</td>
<td>Late Antique burial in general (3), Pannonia (1), Greece (1), Noricum (1), West (1), grave goods (3), intra-urban burials (2), child burial (1), epitaphs (1), burial ad sanctos (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoby 2015</td>
<td>3 out of 20</td>
<td>Constantinople (1), Bulgaria (1), Black Sea area (1), epitaphs (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martorelli/Piras/Spanu 2015</td>
<td>34 out of 83</td>
<td>Martyr cult (3), Sardinia (19), Sicily (10), Italy (11), Pantelleria (1), Britain (1), catacombs (1), child burials (4), epitaphs (6), funerary mosaics (2), grave goods (11), sarcophagi (4), funerary painting (2), rural burials (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parello/Rizzo 2016</td>
<td>12 out of 42</td>
<td>Sicily (9), Italy (2), anthropology (1), grave goods (2), commemorative rituals (2), rural burials (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolle/Machado/Witschel 2017a</td>
<td>11 out of 17</td>
<td>West (1), East (1), Galliae (2), Hispaniae (1), Tuscia et Umbria (1), Asia Minor (2), Aegean (1), Rome (3), epitaphs (11), sarcophagi (5), catacombs (2), formulae (5), burial ad sanctos (2), funerary painting (1), materiality of epitaphs (4), metrical epitaphs (3), history of research on Late Antique epigraphy (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarte-Blasco/Christie 2018</td>
<td>11 out of 18</td>
<td>Northern Italy (2), Southern Italy (1), Rome (1), Galliae (1), Britain (2), Germaniae (1), Hispaniae (2), intra-urban burials (2), suburban burials (1), rural burials (6), burial in churches (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettegrew/Caragher/Davis 2019</td>
<td>21 out of 34</td>
<td>Jordan (1), Cyprus (1), Asia Minor (1), Illyricum, Greece and Cyclades (1), Balkans (1), Galliae (1), Britain/Ireland (1), Hispaniae (1), North Africa (1), Egypt (1), general (1), catacombs (2), martyria and burials ad sanctos (2), burial rites in the East (1), monastic burial customs (1), mosaics in burials (1), ceramics, lamps, amulets from burials (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Late Antiquity</td>
<td>Late Antique regions, topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNEIRO/CHRISTIE/DIARTE-BLASCO 2020</td>
<td>10 out of 15</td>
<td>Butrint (1), Northern Italy (1), Britain (1), Hispaniae (6), Galliae (1), child burials (1), intra-urban burials (4), aDNA analysis (1), spoliation (2), rural burials (1), burials in/around churches (2), monumental tombs (2), sarcophagi (3), epitaphs (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDETTI/MEINECKE 2020</td>
<td>9 out of 15</td>
<td>Funerary banquet (1), funerary paintings in Serbia (1), funerary amulets (1), ‘child with grape’ motif, global (1), gold glasses (1), Asian influences in burials of Gaul (1), funerary reliefs in South Arabia (1), obolus coins along the Silk Road (1), funerary objects Middle and Far East (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUXTERMANN/TOTH 2020</td>
<td>4 out of 18</td>
<td>Asia Minor (2), Italy (1), Greece (1), epitaphs (4), funerary rituals (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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