

Byzantina Symmeikta

Vol 26, No 2 (2016)

BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA 26



Review Article: Ἡπειρόνδε. Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium of Byzantine Sigillography (Ioannina, 1-3 October 2009), eds. CHRISTOS STAVRAKOS and BARBARA PAPADOPOULOU, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011 (360 p.).

Olga KARAGIORGOU

doi: [10.12681/byzsym.10778](https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.10778)

Copyright © 2016, Olga KARAGIORGOU



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

KARAGIORGOU, O. (2016). Review Article: Ἡπειρόνδε. Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium of Byzantine Sigillography (Ioannina, 1-3 October 2009), eds. CHRISTOS STAVRAKOS and BARBARA PAPADOPOULOU, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011 (360 p.). *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 26(2), 375–394.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.10778>

REVIEW ARTICLE

CH. STAVRAKOS and B. PAPADOPOULOU (eds.), *Ἡπειρόνδε. Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium of Byzantine Sigillography* (Ioannina, 1-3 October 2009), Wiesbaden 2011, 360 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-06608-2

The 10th International Symposium of Byzantine Sigillography took place at Ioannina at the beginning of October 2009. A total of 35 scholars responded to the invitation of the organisers, offering 32 communications (three of them were authored by a pair of scholars). The volume of the Proceedings of the Symposium (henceforward *Epeironde*), which came out in November 2011, presents 17 of these communications in addition to two papers (by Stavrakos and Klonaris, see below, Table of Contents: nos. 13 and 19) that were not part of the official program of the Symposium¹. Thus, the Table of Contents was formed as follows:

1. Werner Seibt, Zukunftsperspektiven der byzantinischen Siegelkunde – Auf welchen Gebieten sind die bedeutendsten Wissenszuwächse zu erwarten? (17 pages, plus 3 pages with 8 figures)
2. Ivan Jordanov, Corpus of Byzantine Seals from the Territory of Modern Bulgaria (10 pages)
3. Victoria Bulgakova, “Der Siegelfund vom Seraskerat” in Konstantinopel: Ein historiographischer Mythos? (18 pages, including one map)
4. Andreas Rhoby, Epigrams, Epigraphy and Sigillography (12 pages, plus 2 pages with 7 figures)
5. Béatrice Caseau, Saint Mark, a family saint? The Iconography of the Xeroi seals (29 pages with photos of 36 seals integrated in the text)

1. D. KLONARIS was not included in the list of speakers, while the paper presented by CH. STAVRAKOS during the Conference did not deal with the question of the *basilica kommerkia* of the Southern Aegean islands, but with “The sigillographic profile of Epirus”, see *Epeironde*, 241, fn. 20.

6. Martin Schaller, *Alte und neue Überlegungen zur Herkunft des Monogramms Karls des Großen* (65 pages, plus 2 pages with 21 figures)
7. Theodoros Kourempas, *The Seal of the First known Katepano of Italy* (4 pages, including one figure)
8. Afrim Hoti and Damianos Komatas, *Byzantine Epigraphs of Early Medieval Period in Albania (7th-11th c.)* (5 pages, including a map, plus 2 pages with 4 figures)
9. Andreas Gkoutzioukostas, *Some Remarks on *Mystographos* and *Mystolektes** (29 pages, including 16 pages of catalogues)
10. Alexandra-Kyriaki Wassiliou-Seibt, *Πρώιμα βυζαντινά μολυβδόβουλλα με έμμετρες επιγραφές* (12 pages, plus 4 pages with photos of 10 seals)
11. Ioanna Koltsida-Makri, *Μολυβδόβουλλα από ανασκαφές και γενικότερα γνωστής προέλευσης στον ελληνικό χώρο* (10 pages, plus 9 pages of tables)
12. Barbara N. Papadopoulou, *Lead Seal from the Basilica of Alkisson at Nikopolis* (4 pages including the photos of one seal)
13. Christos Stavrakos, *The *Basilika Kommerkia* of the Islands of the Southern Aegean Sea* (16 pages with the photo of one seal integrated in the text)
14. Vera Bulgurlu, *Seals from the Kadikalesi/Anaia Excavation* (15 pages with the photos of 8 seals and one blank integrated in the text)
15. Elena Stepanova, *Seals of Eparchoi of Thessalonica from the Hermitage Collection* (4 pages)
16. Ioannes G. Leontiadis, *Byzantine Lead Seals with Family Names* (20 pages with the photos of 18 seals integrated in the text)
17. Valery Stepanenko, *The Sts. Apostles Sts. Peter and Paul in Byzantine Sigillography* (5 pages, plus 2 pages with 5 figures)
18. Krystallia Mantzana and Konstantinos Tsodoulos, *Ανέκδοτα πατριαρχικά σιγίλλια από την Ι. Μ. Αγίου Στεφάνου Μετεώρων* (20 pages, plus 2 pages with 7 figures)
19. Dionysis Klonaris, *Μία σπάνια σφραγίδα του Κωνσταντίνου Κλωνάρη με προτομή του Αγίου Κωνσταντίνου* (14 pages)

The reviewer was fortunate enough to be one of the participants of this Symposium and is thus able to attest first-hand to the excellent organisation and the warmest of hospitalities that Prof. Stavrakos and Dr. Papadopoulou offered to all their guests, as well as to the lively and fruitful scientific discussions that developed at the end of each one of the six sessions, entitled (1) General, (2) Seals and Prosopography, (3) Notes-Remarks-Problems and Solutions, (4) Seals and the provinces of Byzantium, (5) Seals from Collections in Museums and (6) Seals, Religions and Iconography.

The Symposium, as noted in both Prof. Seibt's preface and the editors' prologue (*Epeironde*, 9 and 11, respectively) focused on "the importance of seals for archaeologists" and "the common ground between Sigillography and Archaeology".

This is, indeed, a subject of great importance and it is indicative that almost one third of the 32 communications delivered at the Symposium dealt specifically with seals as archaeological finds. Unfortunately, this focus was not clearly defined during the Conference (there was no special session entitled, for example, “Excavated seals” or “Sigillography and Archaeology”), nor is it reflected in the volume under review, where one would have naturally expected all papers dealing with excavated seals (grouped together and accompanied by an appropriate introduction to the topic) to take precedence over all other contributions. Instead, it was decided (for what reasons?) that the volume of the Proceedings would include “papers which had a synthetic nature (while) the rest, which included new sigillographic findings, will be published in the next volume of the *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* series” (*Epeironde*, 12). Contrary to this clearly expressed intention, the volume under review includes two papers (Bulgurlu, Papadopoulou) dealing with new sigillographic finds from on-going excavations (Kadikalesi/Anaia and Nikopolis, respectively)². Furthermore, the reader is presented with a Table of Contents where the arrangement of the papers does not obey any obvious rules, i.e. thematic, alphabetic, chronological, etc. In our presentation of these papers, therefore, we will not follow their order of appearance in the Table of Contents, but rather a thematic arrangement which offers to the reader a clear hint of what is to be expected.

INTRODUCTION: *Epeironde* begins with the highly informative essay by Prof. Werner SEIBT (1), one of the leading experts on issues of Byzantine sigillography, who discusses the progress of Sigillographic Studies in recent years and the most important future perspectives in the field. Using a number of carefully selected and telling sigillographic examples, as well as a wealth of references to the relevant literature, Prof. Seibt manages to underline clearly the paramount contribution of seals in the fields of historical geography, political and military history, as well as the history of the administration of the Byzantine State, Byzantine prosopography (with special reference to the names of Byzantine families) and the history of art. Sigillography has, therefore, rightly won an equal position next to other scholarly disciplines, such as Numismatics, Palaeography and Diplomatics. Worth noting is

2. Three of the papers presented at the 10th International Symposium of Byzantine Sigillography, namely those by V. PENNA (Δύο σπάνια βυζαντινά μολυβδόβουλλα. Εικονογραφικά και ζητήματα διοικητικής οργάνωσης), E. GEROUI (Δύο μολυβδόβουλλα του 9ου αιώνα από την περιοχή της βυζαντινής συνοικίας του Πυθαγορείου στη Σάμο) and P. PAPADOPOULOU (Lead Seals from the Byzantine Butrint, Albania) were published in *SBS* 11 (2012).

Prof. Seibt's comment that all this progress relies not just on the far larger number of seals that have been published in recent years, but also on the scholarly revision of many of the already published specimens, resulting to more accurate readings and more precise dates for the specimens under examination. In connection to all this, Prof. Seibt quite rightly stresses the importance of in-depth reviews on published sigillographic collections by experts. Possibly the most important of the future perspectives in the field is the project initiated by Prof. Charlotte Roueché, which inspires to gather and present all the known sigillographic material (in state and private collections) in an international database that all scholars could access. The essay concludes with a brief paragraph directly linked to the scientific focus of this Conference, where Prof. Seibt comments that next to excavated coins (traditionally among the most highly praised finds), excavated seals (provided that they receive a scholarly interpretation) can offer to the archaeologists very important information concerning the date of an archaeological context and the history of the excavated site, in general.

SEALS AND ARCHAEOLOGY (including new finds from excavations): The paper by Prof. Ivan JORDANOV (2) gives an overview of his life-long work on the documentation of seals discovered in Bulgaria, which started in 1979 with the sensational discovery of the archive of the strategos at Preslav (more than 500 seals, 250 lead blanks and 4 moulds for casting seals were excavated) and culminated in the publication of the *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, v. 3. 1-2 (Sofia 2009), which encompasses over 3,200 specimens. Based on this vast experience, Prof. Jordanov offers certain observations (concerning the iconography of seals, the appearance of certain ligatures and secondary decorative elements and the mention of specific titles in their legends), which can help in the more precise dating of the seals. Prof. Jordanov's contribution, together with those by BULGAKOVA, KOLTSIDA-MAKRE, PAPADOPOULOU and BULGURLU could have been grouped together, as they all deal with seals discovered during excavations or with a fairly secure provenance. In other words, these five papers are directly linked to the scientific focus of the Conference and this is why, in our view, they should have been grouped together and taken precedence over all other papers. BULGAKOVA (3) takes up the role of the devil's advocate as she tries to challenge the so-called "Archiv-Hypothese" that considers the large number of seals discovered along the Marmara coast from the 1860s onwards, as the remains of the imperial chancery, located (allegedly) on the site where the Ministry for War was built in 1866-1870 (today occupied by the central building of Istanbul University). Motivated by two more, great

sigillographic discoveries at the ports of Sougdaia (where nearly 400 seals were discovered) and Cherson, Bulgakova claims that it is more appropriate to associate the seals retrieved from the Marmara coast with sealed merchandise arriving at the Theodosian and (especially) the Julian harbors. Her paper is admittedly very well researched and offers an excellent overview of the evidence surrounding the “Siegelfund vom Seraskerat”. We would also admit to the fact that some of the recovered seals may be directly (however, not exclusively) linked to commercial activity in Constantinople’s harbours. At the same time, however, let us not forget that also post (private, as well as official) was circulating by sea. If some of the recipients opted to open their letters as soon as these reached the capital, where else would they have discarded the seals other than the port? Furthermore, if the majority of the seals found along the Marmara coast is to be associated exclusively with the circulation of goods in the Julian and the Theodosian harbor, why did these seals appear there suddenly only after 1866, when large quantities of earth from the construction site of the Seraskerat were dumped in this area, and not before? The fact (*Epeironde*, 51) that contemporary archaeological accounts from the site of Seraskerat do not mention any seals among the archaeological finds (only architectural remains, inscriptions and capitals are reported) is probably indicative of an era when archaeology was not contacted with hand hoes, trowels, brushes and metal sifters. Finally, the very bad state of preservation of the “Siegelfund vom Seraskerat” (*Epeironde*, 53) may not be exclusively caused by the prolonged contact of these seals with sea-water; it may be also explained by specific conditions prevailing in those seals’ original context (e.g. proximity to water, destruction caused by fire, etc.). KOLTSIDA-MAKRE (11) emphasizes how important it is to know the secure find spot of a seal in order to reconstruct the correspondence network in Byzantium and then presents a clear and very useful overview in what concerns the find spot (in an excavation context or as stray finds) of a total of 558 seals from Greece. PAPADOPOULOU (12) publishes a seal of the late 6th-first half of the 7th century discovered during the excavation of the Basilica of Alkisson at Nicopolis. The seal bears monograms on both sides which are admittedly difficult to decipher with certainty, but the author proposes the satisfactory reading of *Ἰανουαρίου διακόνου*. This specimen is the earliest (so far) sigillographic find at Nicopolis. BULGURLU (14) publishes eight seals and one blank from the excavation of the fort of Anaia (mod. Kadikalesi), which elucidate further the history of this important port city, especially during the 12th and the 13th centuries. Of all the exciting sigillographic material that she presents we would like to draw attention to the seal

of Constantine, bishop (*Epeironde*, 288-289, no. 6), which we would prefer to place in the first half of the 13th century (rather than in the 12th century). Furthermore, the author suggests that this seal “could belong to Constantine Mesopotamites, kanikleios (our no. 2), from the time when he was bishop at Thessalonica”. Still, the depiction of St. Ioannes the Theologian on the obverse would moreover direct us towards the supposition that the owner of this specimen was either a metropolitan of Ephesos or the bishop of one of the suffragan bishoprics, see P. CULERRIER, *Les évêchés suffragants d’Éphèse aux 5e-13e siècles*, *RÉB* 45 (1987), 139-164. On the representation of St. Ioannes the Theologian on seals, see also J. COTSONIS, *The contribution of Byzantine Lead Seals to the Study of the Cult of the Saints (sixth-twelfth century)*, *Byz.* 75 (2005), 383-497, esp. 422-425.

SEALS AND ICONOGRAPHY: The contributions by CASEAU, STEPANENKO and KLONARIS form another distinct group as they deal primarily with issues concerning the iconography of seals. CASEAU’s article (5) is a very original and thought-provoking study that attempts to define why the Byzantines chose to depict a certain saint (or saints) on their seals. Her case study, the well-known family of Xeroi, is the only family “as far as we know (that) chose (*principally*, we would add here) Saint Mark as a family saint” (*Epeironde*, 87). Caseau brings into the discussion a good number of seals issued by members of the Xeroi family, as well as seals with St. Mark on their obverse (an indication that their owners might be members of the same family, although the family name is not given in the legends of these seals) and explains convincingly the reasons that dictated these iconographic choices (apart from St. Mark, a smaller number of seals of the Xeroi family depict also the Theotokos, St. Niketas, Sts. Demetrios and Theodoros, the *manus Dei*)³. Caseau dismisses, rightly in our view, a possible connection of the Xeroi family either with Alexandria or Venice (both renowned centres for the cult of St. Mark), and puts forward the ingenious hypothesis that the choice of this particular saint in the case of the Xeroi may have been dictated by the family’s loyalty to a neighbourhood church (possibly the church of St. Mark the Evangelist near the Forum of Taurus). STEPANENKO (17), triggered by a 17th-century icon of Sts. Peter and Paul kept in a private collection in Ekaterinburg, studies the popularity of the image of these two apostles in Byzantine art, with emphasis on seals. STEPANENKO’s contribution is of importance

3. The article is richly illustrated with the photos of 36 seals. The reviewer would have wished that these were accompanied by appropriate legends stating clearly their inventory number and the collection where they are kept.

as it brings to our attention six more seals with the portraits of Sts. Peter and Paul, kept in Russian collections (mainly at the Hermitage). His catalogue of “eight seals” depicting Sts. Peter and Paul may be complemented by the seals of Tornikios, proedros, and of Daniel(?) Opos, spatharokandidatos⁴. The author proposes that the “small popularity of the cult (of these saints) in Byzantium can be explained by the opposition of New and Old Rome after the schism of 1054”; however, one should bear in mind that modern scholarship disputes the allegedly serious repercussions of this event⁵. Finally, KLONARIS (19) examines the iconography of a published seal, kept at the Archaeological Museum of Varna, issued by a certain Konstantinos Klonaris. Using as starting point the depiction of St. Constantine (in bust, dressed in imperial costume) on the obverse of this seal, the author attempts an overview of the known representations of St. Constantine (alone or together with St. Helena) on seals, coins, manuscripts, icons and frescoes. Although useful in its own right, this overview does not put emphasis (as it should) on these works of art that are very closely dated to the seal under examination in order to extract relevant conclusions on the popularity of this iconographic type during this specific period of time. Having said that, it is indeed strange that the date of the specimen in question (end of the 12th century, according to Jordanov; end of the 12th-beginning of the 13th century, according to Wassiliou-Seibt⁶) is nowhere mentioned in the article and that the paper (principally a study on iconography) is accompanied by no photos.

SEALS AND EPIGRAPHY: Three contributions, those by RHOBY, SCHALLER and WASSILIOU-SEIBT focus on issues that relate to the epigraphy of seals. SCHALLER (6) offers a thorough and well-structured study on the origins of the monogram of Charlemagne. He revisits critically all the views that other scholars (Georg Wolfram, Johann Lechner, Harry Bresslau) have expressed, so far, on this issue and contrary to them he concludes that what should be regarded as the most likely model for the

4. On the seal of Tornikios, proedros (second half of the 11th century), and its parallels, see Chr. STAVRAKOS, *Die Byzantinischen Bleisiegel der Sammlung Savvas Kophopoulos*, Turnhout 2010, 47-48 (where, however, the scene of the ἀσπασμός is erroneously described as the “dextrarum iunctio”, see *BZ* 105.2 (2012), 893; Stavrakos 2.1.I.22. On the seal of Daniel(?) Opos (11th century), see *SBS* 3 (1993), 194, no. 493.

5. See J. RYDER, Changing Perspectives on 1054, *BMGS* 35 (2011), 20-37.

6. I. JORDANOV, *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, v. 3.2, Sofia 2009, no. 1929; A.-K. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, *Corpus der byzantinischen Siegel mit metrischen Legenden*, Teil 1: Einleitung, Siegellegenden von Alpha bis inklusive My (henceforward *CByzMetrSiegel1*), Vienna 2011, no. 421.

monogram of Charlemagne is the 8th-century cruciform monogram of “Laurent, type V”. WASSILIOU-SEIBT (10) groups together eleven metrical legends on seals which can be dated well before the middle of the 11th century, the date that (under the influence of V. Laurent’s studies) was traditionally held as the starting point for the appearance of verses on seals⁷. Worth noting among the examined specimens is the seal of Georgios, kept at the National History Museum of Bucharest (no. 5), whose obverse is to be dated to the first half of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century, while its reverse (where the metrical legend appears) falls better within the first third of the 11th century (is this the case of a *boulloterion* whose two matrices present a different level of use or are of different dates?). Taking into account that all entries in this paper are arranged chronologically, the metrical legend under no. 5 should have been presented last. RHOBY (4) draws on the vast experience he has accumulated during his work on the research project “Byzantine epigrams on objects (600 A.D.–1500 A.D.)” of the Institute for Byzantine Studies at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, in order to present a very well researched comparison between inscriptions (especially metrical ones) on seals (as well as coins) and inscriptions on other “objects” (frescoes and mosaics, icons, objects of minor art, stone, manuscripts). He concludes that although very few identical verses are preserved both on a seal and on another object, one is able to detect a lot of similarities in what concerns the structure and the content of these inscriptions such as, the use of common phrases (*Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ*) and/or verbs (*σκέπειν/σώζειν*), the metre (mostly the dodecasyllable), some unsuccessful attempts to compose rhythmic patterns, as well as, the direct address to the beholder. His paper, which is enriched further with unpublished comparative material (the 12th-century silver-gilt cross in the Cattedrale di San Pietro in Alessandria/Italy and a silver-gilt pendant cross in the private collection of Dr. Schmidt, Munich) offers, indeed, a very

7. The author discusses the same topic in the second chapter (Chronologische Eingrenzung, p. 33-35) of her *CByzMetrsiegel*1, published a few months before the *Epeironde* volume. The list of the 13 metrical legends on seals given in the *CByzMetrsiegel*1, however, does not include three verses that she discusses in *Epeironde* under nos. 3, 5 and 9. Both lists should be complemented with the metrical legend discussed in *CByzMetrsiegel*1, no. 750, which is dated between 720 and 741. It is worth noting, that thanks to Wassiliou’s on-going research on metrical legends on seals we now know that the earliest (so far, known) verse on a seal is to be dated in the late 7th-early 8th century, see A.-K. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, *Corpus der byzantinischen Siegel mit metrischen Legenden*, Teil 2: N – Sphragis (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2015), no. 2275.

fresh and highly interesting approach in what concerns the impact of inscriptions on the cultural life of Byzantium. Finally, the contribution by HOTI and KOMATAS (8) could also be added to this thematic group, as it focuses on epigraphy, although their material is not sigillographic. Their paper brings together already published and well-known inscriptions on works of art discovered in Albania (vessels of the Vrap treasure, the Ballsh inscription, the mosaics of the Amphitheatre's Chapel in Durres, rings discovered during excavations in cemeteries, the gold medallion discovered in Shkoder). The authors do not make any attempt to clarify what links their paper to sigillography (is it maybe some formal similarities between the inscriptions that they discuss and some legends on seals?). Furthermore, the scientific analysis and the literary style of the presentation of the objects under discussion leaves, unfortunately, much to be desired (see below: Blemishes that should have been remedied before publication, p. 183-187).

SEALS AND BYZANTINE ADMINISTRATION: The contributions by GKOUTZIOUKOSTAS and STAVRAKOS rely on sigillographic evidence in order to clear questions related to the administrative organisation of the Byzantine State. GKOUTZIOUKOSTAS (9) offers a very clear and in-depth study on the offices of *mystographos* and *mystolektes*. The author brings together all the available sigillographic and non-sigillographic evidence on these two offices and concludes, contrary to previously held views, that the *mystographos* and the *mystolektes* were not related to the judicial system. On the contrary, the *mystographos* was most probably a special secretary, responsible for the recording of the proceedings of the emperor's "secret sessions", while the *mystolektes* was a messenger, who announced the emperor's secret decisions or orders. The role of these two officers, as well as the difficult question of their relation to the *mystikos*, are being treated further in the author's monograph, *Το αξίωμα του μυστικού. Θεσμικά και προσωπογραφικά προβλήματα*, Thessaloniki 2011 (esp. 117-125, on *mystographos*, and 127-131, on *mystolektes*). The *Epeironde* paper ends with two very useful prosopographic lists of all the known *mystographoi* and *mystolektai* for the period between the 10th and the 13th centuries. In his paper on the *imperial kommerkia* of the islands of the Southern Aegean, STAVRAKOS (13) accepts the conclusions of recent scholarship on the main role of this institution (as well as that of the earlier *apothekai*), regarded now primarily as centres for the provisioning of the Byzantine armed forces. He wishes, however, using the area of the Southern Aegean as a case-study, to contradict the view that the existence of *imperial kommerkia* in a specific area indicates "the non-existence (there) of a steady administrative organisation" (*Epeironde*, 272). Next to the, so far, known

seals of the *imperial kommerkia* of some Cycladic islands (all dated between 730 and 739), Stavrakos brings into the discussion further historical, archaeological and numismatic evidence from the area during the 8th and 9th centuries, in order to underline the central administration's vivid interest in this part of the Aegean. It is a pity that much of the argumentation in this paper is quite often undermined by poor literary style (see below: Blemishes that should have been remedied before publication, p. 261-276). Further than that, we would like to make the following remarks. Of the abovementioned seals of the *imperial kommerkia* the author discusses at length the IFEB specimen, issued by the *imperial kommerkia* of Melos, Thera, Anaphe, Ios and Amorgos⁸. After commenting on the erroneous date (711-712) offered to this lead seal by H. Antoniadis-Bibicou (in 1963) [and repeated by M. Oikonomidou (in 1964)], he concludes (*Epeironde*, 265) that "through the notation of the indiction we can accurately date the seal to the years 738/739". In this instance, it is rather awkward, that Stavrakos fails to mention that the correct date for this specimen had already been proposed by G. Zacos and A. Veglery in 1972⁹. We would also like to draw attention to the author's statements that "... the islands, already depopulated after the plague of the 6th century, were increasingly used as a destination for exile of political adversaries (perhaps even common criminals)" (*Epeironde*, 263). First of all, the "depopulation of the islands due to the 6th-century plague" is a crucial statement that demands appropriate supporting references, especially since (a) the available, so far, evidence is not conclusive¹⁰ and (b) what the author himself mentions further down contradicts such a negative picture, see *Epeironde*, 271: "For the period from the 6th to the first half of the 7th century the Aegean was a part of the sea lane through which a large amount of high-quality pottery was exported from Africa to Constantinople". In fact, the prosperous and peaceful period that the Cyclades experienced from the 3rd until the first half of the 7th century is well established in the scholarly literature¹¹. Furthermore, the statement that "... (the islands) were

8. The inventory number of this specimen (not stated in the article) is IFEB 886.

9. G. ZACOS and A. VEGLERY, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, Basel 1972, v. 1, 194, table 34. This date is duly acknowledged also in W. BRANDES, *Finanzverwaltung in Krisenzeiten*, Frankfurt 2002, a work that the author cites nearly 40 times in his article.

10. J. KODER, *Aigaion Pelagos Die nördliche Ägäis* [TIB 10], Wien 1998 (henceforward KODER, TIB 10), 74-75.

11. See (for example) the work by G. KIOURTZIAN, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes des Cyclades, de la fin du IIIe au VIIe siècle après J.-C.* (Paris, 2000), esp. 14-

increasingly used as a destination for exile of political adversaries (perhaps even common criminals)” needs to be further explained, as it does not, in fact, relate to the history of the Southern Aegean islands/Cyclades which is the author’s area of interest. The available evidence on Aegean islands used as areas of exile dates between the 8th and the 12th century and concerns specifically Chios, Imbros, Kos, Lemnos, Lesbos, Rhodes, Samos, Skyros, Samothrace, Tenedos and Thasos¹². Based on the above list, some scholars have even connected the use of ‘prison’ islands to central authority and have argued that the exclusion of any Cycladic island from this list serves as additional evidence that the Cyclades in the above period were the frontier between the Arab threat and the world of Byzantine sovereignty, and therefore “they did not fit exactly the profile of islands under central control”¹³. The reader would have expected Stavrakos to comment rigorously on these views, especially since they are at the opposite end of his own conclusions. In that case, he would have had the opportunity to offer his own thoughts on what constitutes the most crucial and intriguing question concerning the area of the Southern Aegean during the 8th and 9th centuries, namely the impact of the Arab influence and the exact nature of the Arab-Byzantine relations in the area. Scholarly work has already indicated a differentiation in the picture offered by specific Cycladic islands in specific periods and this is why it is important to place any conclusions on the political and economic situation of this area within a specific and well-argued spatial and time framework¹⁴. In this respect, the author’s conclusion that certain of the Cycladic islands (Melos, at the beginning, followed by Ios, Amorgos, Thera and Anaphe) formed an important tax-collection point whose revenues covered the needs of the Byzantine navy especially during its military operations in the Aegean

18 and fn. 31 concerning specifically the impact of plague. Much more similar literature, concerning mainly archaeological finds, has been produced after the publication of the *Epeironde* volume.

12. KODER, TIB 10, 76, fn. 45.

13. E. MALAMUT, *Les îles de l'Empire Byzantin; VIIIe-XIIe siècles*; vols. I-II, Paris 1988, 175-177, esp. 176; Christy CONSTANTAKOPOULOU (*The Dance of the Islands: Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire, and the Aegean World*, Oxford/New York 2007, 133.

14. V. PENNA, Νομισματικές νύξεις για τη ζωή στις Κυκλάδες κατά τους 8ο και 9ο αιώνες in: *Οι σκοτεινοί αιώνες του Βυζαντίου (7ος-9ος αι.)*, Athens 2001, 399-410 offers an excellent overview of the available evidence on Cyclades during that period, touches upon the most important questions concerning the Arab-Byzantine relations in the area and underlines the different picture that each island offers in a specific period of time.

(*Epeironde*, 276) must be urgently refined with specific chronological indications (when exactly did this start happening and how long did it last?).

NEW SEALS FROM COLLECTIONS: The contributions by KOUREMPANAS, STEPANOVA, LEONTIADES and by MANTZANA and TSODOULOS introduce new sigillographic material. KOUREMPANAS (7) presents the unpublished seal of Michael, patrikios and katepano of Italy, which was found on Sicily and is now kept in a private collection (the information on the present location of this seal is not mentioned in the paper, but it was given in the summary that circulated during the Conference at Ioannina). The author proposes to identify the owner of this specimen with Michael Abidelas, the earliest (so far) known katepano of Italy, attested in the *Chronicon Salernitanum*¹⁵, although he does not exclude the possibility that the seal in question may belong to a homonymous katepano, not recorded in other sources. Provided that the identification of the owner of this seal with Abidelas is correct, this specimen could be fairly accurately dated in the 970s. STEPANOVA (15) publishes (unfortunately without photos) the seals of three eparchoi of Thessalonica from the 8th and 9th centuries, kept in the sigillographic collection of the Hermitage¹⁶. LEONTIADES (16) discusses 18 seals, all kept at Dumbarton Oaks, which record family names and present a total of 17 individuals (Niketas Choneiates, under no. 3, is attested on two specimens). MANTZANA and TSODOULOS (18) describe four patriarchal documents, dated in 1605, 1720, 1743 and 1838, kept in the archive of the Monastery of St. Stephen on Meteora. The authors analyse the content of these documents (they all refer to the privileges granted to the monastery) and they describe the bullae still attached to them: three of them are made of lead, while the fourth one is made of wax.

Most of the papers are written in English (11), but there are also papers in Greek (4), German (3) and French (1). Their length varies between 67 pages (Martin

15. On Michael Abidelas see now V. VLYSSIDOU and S. LAMPAKIS, in *Βυζαντινά Στρατεύματα στην Δύση (5ος-11ος αι.)*, Athens 2008, 391-392 and 393-394 respectively.

16. The reader who wishes to consult the photographic record of these seals should refer to E. STEPANOVA, Печати эпархов Фессалоники, in: *The Legacy of Nikolay Petrovich Likhachev: text and image interpretation* (based upon the proceedings of the conference commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Academician Nikolay Petrovich Likhachev), Transactions of the State Hermitage Museum LXX, St. Petersburg: The State Hermitage Publishers, 2014, 329-334. This important evidence has already been included in the study by A. GKOUTZIOUKOSTAS, The prefect of Illyricum and the prefect of Thessaloniki, *Βυζαντιακά* 30 (2012-2013), 45-80.

Schaller's study on the monogram of Charlemagne occupies almost one sixth of the volume) to four or five pages (papers by Hoti and Komatas, Papadopoulou, Stepanova, Stepanenko). Admittedly, the length of the submitted papers depends quite often on the nature of the presented material (i.e. publication of a single find) and is, therefore, a parameter that the editors (and especially the editors of a volume concerning the Proceedings of a Conference) are not able to control. The reader regrets, however, the lack of a unifying framework that would justify the arrangement of all these papers (a point that has already been made above), promote consciously an internal scientific dialogue among all the authors and secure an elegant literary style (conspicuously absent in some of the papers). The afore-mentioned "internal scientific dialogue" is, for example, obvious in the case of Koltsida-Makre (who refers to the papers by Papadopoulou, Stavrakos, Penna and Gerousi delivered at the Conference, see *Epeironde*, 241, 243 and 244, fns. 19, 20, 34, 41, respectively) and A.-K. Wassiliou-Seibt (who refers to the study by A. Rhoby, see *Epeironde*, 223, fn. 6), but is absent in the case of Leontiades, who does not mention the seal of Constantine Mesopotamites found at Anaia (*Epeironde*, 283-284) in his commentary of the seal of Theodoros Mesopotamites (*Epeironde*, 309-310). Also, the work by A.-K. Wassiliou on metrical legends on seals (*CByzMetrsiegel*1) is duly referred to in the studies by Rhoby and Bulgurlu, but not in the papers by Leontiades and Klonaris¹⁷, while J. Cotsonis's important study on the iconography of saints on seals (acknowledged, as expected, in the paper by Caseau and Stepanenko) is surprisingly absent in the paper by Klonaris¹⁸. Finally, the content of at least six

17. In the article by Leontiades, eight of the 17 legends under investigation (nos. 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14) are included also in the *CByzMetrsiegel*1 (see nos. 469, 222, 573, 1351, 438, 897, 1233 and 742, respectively). The seal studied by Klonaris is commented in *CByzMetrsiegel*1, no. 421 (where however "JORDANOV, Corpus III 1921" should be corrected to JORDANOV, Corpus III 1929) and dated to the end of the 12th-beg. of the 13th century. The author of the *Epeironde* paper notes that the family name Klonaris is not known in Byzantine sources; if, he had taken into account the reference in the *CByzMetrsiegel*1 he, he would have won yet another testimony for the Klonaris family in the 14th-century Byzantium.

18. *Epeironde*, 82, fn. 4 (Caseau) and 319, fn. 17 (Stepanenko). The seal of Konstantinos Klonaris is not among the 11 seals with St. Constantine on their obverse listed in Cotsonis' chart III: Chronological Frequency of Images of Saints on Seals [see *Byz.* 75 (2005), 394 and 496-497 (APPENDIX: Catalogues and Publications of Seals Employed)]. According to this chart, there is an obvious preference for the portrait of St. Constantine on seals of the 12th and the 13th century, a fact that should have received the comments of the author of the *Epeironde* contribution.

papers is regrettably undermined by serious grammatical and/or syntactical errors and the incorrect use of well-established *termini technici*. For the sake of argument we list below a (non-exhaustive list) of serious blemishes that should have been remedied before publication¹⁹:

p. 9: “The idea of summoning (not collecting) the experts ...”

pp. 42-46: the article exhibits a number of mistakes (mainly) in the orthography and/or transliteration of names and other *termini technici*, e.g. p. 41: parakoimomenos (not parakimomenos); p. 42: trapezes (not trapeses), strategos (not starategos); p. 43: Hikanatoi (not Hikanaton), Ioannoupoleos (not Ioanopoleos), of Dorostolon (not Dorostolou); p. 44: epi tou Chrysotriklinou (not epi tou chrisotrilkinou), genikos logothetes (not logothete), of the scholai of the West (not of the Scholos of the West), Komnene, panhypersebaste (not Komnene panypersebastes), protonobelissimos (not protonobelisimos); p. 45: Kourtikes (not Kourtikies), anagrapheus of Peloponnesos and Hellas (not anagrapheus Peloponesos and Hellas), nobelissimos (not vobelissimos), protonobelissimos (not protnobelissimos), protokouropalates (not protkourpalates), Philippoupolis (not Philipopolis), Humbertopoulos (not Humbertopolos); p. 46: panhypersebastos (not panypersebstos), daughter of the Sebastokrator (not daughter of sebatokrator).

p. 45: Nikephoros Dekanos, kouropalates, doux and anagrapheus (not anagpheus and doux) of Nisos.

p. 56: George (not Gregory) Zacos.

p. 73: The translation of the verse *Γραφή δηλοῖ σοι οὗτινος σφραγὶς πέλω* is translated as “The script reveals whose seal I am”. A more accurate translation would be “The script reveals to you whose seal I am”.

p. 75: The translation of the verse *Παρθένε σοι πολὺαῖνε ὃς ἥλπιε πάντα κατορθοῖ* is translated as “He who places his hope on you, much-praised Virgin, is accomplishing successfully”. A more accurate translation would be “He who places his hope on you, much-praised Virgin, accomplishes everything”.

p. 102, fn. 62: The reference given here is repeated in fn. 61, while the content of fn. 61 is already included in the main text on the same page.

p. 180 and fn. 5: *Syllabus graecorum membrarum*, should change to *Syllabus graecarum membranarum*.

19. In the list that follows we have not included a number of errors that are obviously typing mistakes, e.g. p. 16: ZACOS- VEGLERY (not VECLERY); p. 240, fn. 13: συμπλήρωσης του (not τον) χάριτι; p. 264: the subject of a sedulous (or even better, meticulous) study (not sedulitious study); p. 266: Emperor Leon III (not II); p. 279 (third line from the top): Anaia (not Anai); p. 279 (fifth line from the top): 1253/1254 (not 253/254); p. 321: Manuel Philes (not Phillos); p. 321: Eustathios (not Eustaphios), bishop; p. 325 (fn. 2) and p. 327: κωδίκων (not κωδικών); p. 327, fn. 12: φυλάσσονταν (not φυλασσόταν); p. 358: η απεικόνιση των αγίων (not Αγίων) Κωνσταντίνου και Ελένης απαντάται (not απαντώνται).

p. 182: *Chronicon Salernitatum* should change to *Chronicon Salernitanum*.

p. 183-187: the paper does not include important information on the artifacts under examination, such as the date of their discovery and their present location.

p. 183: the authors announce that they will mention “three” vessels from the Vrap treasure; further down, however, they discuss four of them: two silver plates, a silver ewer and a gold goblet.

p. 183: Byzantine inscriptions (not epigraphs) of early medieval period in Albania.

p. 183: “... with the control stamp (not seal) of Emperor Constans II (not Konstant II)...”

p. 183: a silver ewer or jug (not kettle).

p. 183: “... a golden cup with Eucharistic motifs and the images of four cities in a niello...” should change to “... a gold goblet with the female personifications of four major ecclesiastical centres in niello...”. In general, in what concerns the Vrap treasure (its description, date and significance) we would direct the reader to the work *From Attila to Charlemagne: Arts of the Early Medieval Period in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, eds. K. REYNOLDS BROWN – D. KIDD – CH. T. LITTLE, The Metropolitan Museum of Art 2000, 170-187 (with further bibliography).

p. 184: the reconstruction (and consequently the translation) of the first line of the Ballsh inscription is wrong. It is safer for the reader to consult K. BESHEVLIEV's *Parvobalgarski nadpisi*, Sofia 1979, 139 (including previous literature on this inscription which was discovered in 1918 and its present location is unknown).

p. 187: ο άγιος Δημήτριος ο Ελεήμων should be translated as “St. Demetrios the Almsgiver”.

p. 187: “Looking at the sound of the iconographic face of the three saints...” does not make sense. Possibly what is meant here is “Looking at the facial characteristics of the three saints...”.

p. 222, fn. 6: Ο εμπροσθότυπος φέρει παράσταση (not στήλη) της Θεοτόκου στον τύπο της Οδηγήτριας.

p. 222-223: “Ο Laurent συσχέτισε την εμφάνιση βυζαντινών μολυβδοβούλλων με το πρόσωπο του Κωνσταντίνου Μονομάχου...” should change to “Ο Laurent τοποθέτησε την εμφάνιση βυζαντινών μολυβδοβούλλων με έμμετρες επιγραφές κατά τη διάρκεια της βασιλείας του Κωνσταντίνου Μονομάχου...”.

p. 223: “Αθήνα, Εθνικό Μουσείο” should change to “Αθήνα, Νομισματικό Μουσείο”.

p. 224: “(α) Νομισματικό Μουσείο Αθηνών 122” should change to “Νομισματικό Μουσείο Αθηνών, Α.Ε. 1986”.

p. 224: “Ο εμπροσθότυπος αποτελείται από έναν κύκλο κι έναν εξωτερικό δακτύλιο. Ο κύκλος φέρει λατινικό σταυρό με μη εφαπτόμενο μαργαριτάρι στις απολήξεις των κεραιών, ο δακτύλιος την τμηματικά σωζόμενη επιγραφή... που ανασκευάζεται ως εξής...” should change to “Ο εμπροσθότυπος κοσμεύεται από δύο ομόκεντρους κύκλους. Στον μικρότερο εξ' αυτών εγγράφεται λατινικός σταυρός με μη εφαπτόμενο μαργαριτάρι στις απολήξεις των κεραιών του, ενώ στη ζώνη που δημιουργείται στην περιφέρεια ανάμεσα στους δύο ομόκεντρους κύκλους υπάρχει τμηματικά σωζόμενη επιγραφή... που αποκαθίσταται ως εξής...”.

p. 225: “στο αθηναϊκό (not αθηναίο) τεμάχιο (ή καλύτερα μολυβδόβουλλο)”.

p. 226: “Ο Schlumberger, ό.π., δεν παραθέτει πρόταση ανασκευής, υποθέτει όμως...” should change to “Ο Schlumberger, ό.π., δεν παραθέτει πρόταση ανάγνωσης (ή αποκατάστασης) της επιγραφής, υποθέτει όμως...”. Similar mistake also on p. 229: “Ως συνολική αποκατάσταση (not ανασκευή) της επιγραφής προτείνουμε...”.

p. 226: There is no apparent reason to replace the well-established term μονόγραμμα with the term μονογράφημα (used by the author again on p. 230). The word μονογράφημα appears in Greek much later (1892) than the word μονόγραμμα (first appearance in 1863)²⁰. Besides, the term μονόγραμμα leads one directly to its etymological prototype (γράμμα) in contrast to μονογράφημα, directly linked to the word γράφημα, which does not describe the result of the verb μονογραφώ.

p. 227: Πλαίσιο «Schachtelhalmrand» («φτέρη»). This phrase (without verb) is repeated twice in the commentary of the metrical legend no. 4, while its proper place should have been in the description of the obverse of the seal in question.

p. 230, fn. 17: “Οι προτάσεις... ήταν ελλιπείς (not ελλειπής)...”.

p. 232: The phrase “Προτομή του αγίου Παντελεήμονος, ως κυκλοτερής επιγραφή” should change to “Προτομή του αγίου Παντελεήμονος με κυκλοτερή επιγραφή που αρχίζει και τελειώνει πάνω από τους ώμους του αγίου”.

p. 240, fn. 13: “The seal was found in the south of the basilica, in Sector A, towards the construction of storage space in order to protect it and other monument’s architectural members from the elements”. The poor literary style deprives this sentence of its meaning. What the author wishes to say (we suspect) is that “The seal was found to the south of the basilica, in Sector A, during the construction of an outbuilding where the architectural members of this and other excavated monuments could be stored and protected against weather conditions”.

p. 258, fn. 10: Reference to the Dumbarton Oaks specimen should have been made by using its proper inventory number, not the number of the negative of its photo.

p. 258-260: The proposed date of the lead seal in question is repeated three times but, while on p. 258 and p. 259 it is given as “first third of the 7th century”, on p. 260 the proposed date is “late 6th-first half of the 7th centuries”. Furthermore, it would be useful to accompany the proposed solutions for the analysis of the monograms on the obverse and the reverse of this specimen with references to the analysis of similar monograms that have already been published. For example, the box monogram on the Nicopolis seal looks, in our opinion, very similar to the box monogram on the reverse of a seal published in P. SPECK, *Byzantinische Bleisiegel in Berlin (West)*, *Ποικίλα Βυζαντινά* 5, Bonn 1986, no. 7.

p. 259: The reference to an inscription from Drymos that mentions the deaconess Theoprepeia should have been accompanied by the relevant reference or the note “unpublished”, accordingly.

20. Σ. ΚΟΥΜΑΝΟΥΔΗΣ, *Συναγωγή Νέων Λέξεων υπό των λογίων πλασθειςών από της άλώσεως μέχρι των καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνων*, vols 1-2, Ἀθήναι, 1900. For this reference and for all the relevant linguistic information we would like to thank Dr. Georgia Katsouda (Academy of Athens).

p. 261: The opening paragraph reads: “The lead seals, besides their importance as a security measure, and a guarantee of quality and secrecy of every type of correspondence, are of themselves small works of greater art, but also a historical source of indisputable importance, seeing as each official who sealed a document wanted his titles and administrative position to be clearly and accurately stated. They were (*sic!*) important for the composition of the administration of the Byzantine state. For example, *themes*, *dioceses*, κομμέτρια etc.” The poor literary style does not bring forward in a clear way the importance of seals in modern times, in contrast to their role during the period when they were actually used. We would, therefore, propose the following: “The Byzantines used seals in order to secure and authenticate their correspondence, whether private or official. For the modern scholar of Byzantium, the importance of seals is no less. Since seals are (very often) carriers of inscriptions containing the personal data of their owner, such as name, title(s), office(s), area of jurisdiction, they form a historical source of paramount importance for the administrative structure of the Byzantine State. At the same time, they are also regarded as important works of art, since the study of their decorative motives contributes greatly to our understanding of Byzantine iconography”.

p. 261: “The term Αἰγαίοπελαγῖται for the description of its inhabitants is found for the first time in the 12th century in Eustathios’ observations in Dionysios,...”, should change to “The term Αἰγαίοπελαγῖται as a designation of the inhabitants of the Aigaion Pelagos is encountered for the first time in the 12th-century commentary of Eustathios on the works of Dionysius Periegetes,...”. However, in this passage the author is paraphrasing erroneously the information offered in KODER, *TIB* 10, 50 and fn. 11-12. What Koder simply states, in fact, is that in the middle of the 12th century (with reference to the work of Niketas Choniates) the geographical location for the Αἰγαίοπελαγῖται is being confused with the coast of Dalmatia. In what concerns the first ever encounter of the term Αἰγαίοπελαγῖται, this is to be found (as far as we know) in the 9th-century biography of Theophanes the Confessor by Methodios I, where we are informed that during the reign of Constantine V (741-775) the father of Theophanes was a naval commander of the Aegean Sea (τῷ κατὰ σάρκα πατρὶ ἐν τῇ διεπομένῃ αὐτῷ τῶν Αἰγαίοπελαγιτῶν ἀρχῇ).

p. 262: “This is due to the ignorance of written sources...” should change to “This is due to the lack of appropriate written sources...”.

p. 262: “Administration-wise, during the 6th century the islands of the Aegean Sea were divided into two provinces. On the one hand, those islands situated west of the hypothetical line between the islands Delos to Imbros belonged to the province of Hellas, while those east of the hypothetical line between Rhodes and Tenedos belonged to the province of Nesoi.” The use of “hypothetical lines” obscures the description. The reader should better consult the relevant passage in *DOSeals* 2, 110 (second paragraph): “In the VIth century there was no provincial navy and the islands of the Aegean were divided between the province of Hellas (to the west, including Delos and Imbros) and the province of the Islands (Nesoi), which included all the islands from Rhodes to Tenedos”.

p. 264: “A lead seal which was published by M. Oikonomidou in 1964 and H. Antoniadès-Bibicou is of ...”. More caution is required here. The first to publish this seal (with a photo)

was H. Antoniadis-Bibicou in her book on *Recherches sur les douanes à Byzance*, Paris 1963 (p. 7), where she proposed a date in 711-712. In 1964, M. Oikonomidou published a seal of the *imperial kommerkia of Melos*, which she dated in the reign of Leo III and Constantine V, or Constantine V and Leo IV. In that publication she made just a quick (and slightly erroneous) reference to the seal of the *imperial kommerkia of Milos, Thera, Anaphe, Chios (sic!) and Amorgos* discussed by H. Antoniadis-Bibicou a year earlier.

p. 264: in the transcription of the legend of the seal the indiction sign should have been rendered as † (not as K).

p. 264: fn. 13: “The letters with a dot (not period) underneath them ...”

p. 265: “anonymous-ness” should better change to anonymity.

p. 265: “The introduction or establishment (not initiation) of the βασιλικά κομμέρκια is connected with ...”

p. 266: “which the Syrian or, even better, Isaurian (not Syric) Dynasty introduced ...”

p. 272: “... the Byzantines could not find an experienced shipmaster [or naval officer (not pilot)] to guide the fleet to Crete”. It should be remarked that in this instance, the author takes at face value the information recorded in Michael Attaleiates [*Historia* (ed. E. TSOLAKIS), Athens 2012, 172-173] that when the Byzantine fleet under the command of Nikephoros Phokas stopped at Ios, no one knew the route from Ios to Crete because of the long absence of Byzantine ships from these waters. This information, however, has been characterized as “obviously fictitious” and moreover a “transformation into legend of the more realistic information recorded in Theophanes Cont., 476”²¹.

p. 276: “The disappearance and sudden reappearance of the βασιλικά κομμέρκια τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν (758/759 and 760/761), even though they had disappeared for about a quarter of a century, can be explained similarly”. It is imperative to offer chronological indications for the “disappearance” and the “sudden reappearance” of the βασιλικά κομμέρκια τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν in order to convey the meaning of this phrase in a clearer way. We would suggest the following: “The disappearance of the βασιλικά κομμέρκια τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν after ca. 730 and their sudden reappearance more than a quarter of a century later (in 758/759 and 760/761), as attested in the known sigillographic record, so far [see BRANDES, *Finanzverwaltung* (n. 14), 384-385 and in Appendix I, 553 (no. 212) and 560 (nos. 254, 255)], could be explained on similar terms”.

p. 276: The concluding paragraph reads: “I believe that all the above lead to one conclusion. In the case of the βασιλικά κομμέρκια of the islands of the Southern Aegean, Ios included, we cannot simply and exclusively accept the non-existence of a steady administration in the Aegean, but in fact, exactly the opposite. We must review a center, which collected taxes, began in Melos and quickly included a number of islands (Ios, Amorgos, Thera, and Anaphe), obviously for ease of operations, which included servicing the Byzantine navy for its operations in this area”. Poor literary style affects negatively the author’s conclusions. We

21. D. TSUGARAKIS, *Byzantine Crete. From the 5th Century to the Venetian Conquest*, Athens 1988, 63-64.

would rephrase, as follows: “All the afore-mentioned evidence underlines, in our view, the great interest that the imperial government showed in the administration of the Southern Aegean islands. It seems that Melos (at the beginning), as well as Ios, Amorgos, Thera, and Anaphe (soon afterwards) formed an area where taxes were collected, intended obviously to cover the needs of the Byzantine navy especially during its military operations in the Aegean”.

p. 277 and 278: The information provided in the last phrase of the first paragraph on p. 277 is repeated in the first sentence of the second paragraph on p. 278.

p. 293, fn. 3: a specific bibliographic reference to the views by W. Seibt and A. Wassiliou is missing.

p. 293, fn. 4: the reference to the work by P. Lemerle does not include page numbers.

p. 297: Under “Ed.” it would have been sufficient to refer just to *Hell* 7 (1934), 278, no. 590, rather than to give all the volumes of the «*Ελληνικά*» where Laurent published his “Bulles métriques”. The same policy is followed in fn. 31 for the edition of the seals at the museum of Warsaw by A. Szemioth and T. Wasilewski.

p. 299: The inventory number for the second seal of Niketas Choneiates is DO 58.106.5737 (not 58.106.5337).

p. 305: The inventory number of the seal of Nikephoros Lachanas is DO 58.106.1379 (not 58.106.1349).

p. 318: “These are (not It’s) the icons of St. Sophia”.

p. 318: “after y. 325 Nicaean counsel” should change to “after the Council of Nicaea in 325”.

p. 319: “in Western Europe (Italy?), by Ernst Kitzinger as it is believed” should change to “in Western Europe (Italy?), as proposed by Ernst Kitzinger”.

p. 328: “Φέρουν μολυβδόβουλλα,...” should change to “Τα τρία ἐξ’ αὐτῶν φέρουν μολυβδόβουλλα καὶ τὸ τέταρτο βούλλα ἀπὸ κεῖ”. This information is given correctly on p. 344.

p. 328: “στον εμπροσθότυπο απεικονίζεται η Παναγία Βρεφοκρατούσα” should change to “στον εμπροσθότυπο απεικονίζεται η Παναγία Βρεφοκρατούσα, στον ιδιαίτερα διαδεδομένο τύπο της Οδηγήτριας”. The same error leads the authors to a number of mistakes in the description of the type of Theotokos Hodegetria (*Epeironde*, 333, 340 and 342), in what concerns the gesture of the right hand of the Theotokos and the alleged eye-contact between the Theotokos and Christ. For the correct interpretation of this iconographic type, see I. KOLTSIDA-MAKRE, The iconography of the Virgin through inscriptions on byzantine lead seals of the Athens Numismatic Museum collections, *SBS* 8 (2003), 27-38, esp. 27-28 (including the relevant bibliography).

p. 344: The conclusion that “Τα πατριαρχικά αυτά μολυβδόβουλλα ακολουθούν έναν τύπο, ο οποίος είχε καθιερωθεί και χρησιμοποιούνταν από το τέλος της εικονομαχίας (843) και εἰς...” is far too simplistic and needs further elaboration, especially if one takes into account that the iconographic type depicted *par excellence* on patriarchal seals from ca. 1054 onwards was that of the Theotokos ἐνθρονη Βρεφοκρατούσα, see W. SEIBT, Die Darstellung der Theotokos auf byzantinischen Bleisiegeln, besonders im 11. Jahrhundert, *SBS* 1 (1987), 63.

pp. 347-360: The authors write the word *Άγιος* consistently with a capital A; this however, is so only when this word refers to a cult site (church, monastery, etc.), e.g. Ο ναός του Αγίου Κωνσταντίνου, but Ο άγιος Κωνσταντίνος και η αγία Ελένη τιμούνται... etc.

p. 358: The conclusion of the author that the seal under discussion should be regarded as a private one, since its legend does not include any title(s) or office(s) is unsubstantiated. The absence of title(s) and/or office(s) on the seals of important officials and/or members of the Byzantine society is not uncommon from the 12th century onwards, especially if the content of the legend has to obey the rules of the metre. A number of similar cases are listed in M. CAMPAGNOLO-POTHITOU and J.-Cl. CHEYNET, *Sceaux de la collection George Zacos au Musée d'Art et d'Histoire de Genève*, Geneva 2016, 350-430 (Les patronymes).

In conclusion, we would like to stress that the *Epeironde* volume includes very important and exciting new material. This, however, is given in papers of diverse scientific and literary merit that reflects directly on the abilities of each one of the authors and betrays the lack of overall rigorous editing. The editors of the *Epeironde* volume are once again to be congratulated warmly for organizing one of the most successful Conferences on Byzantine Sigillography and for publishing the Proceedings within a very reasonable time after its conclusion. However, expected quality of editorial work should never be compromised to meet deadlines ...

OLGA KARAGIORGOU
Academy of Athens
Research Centre for Byzantine
and Post-Byzantine Art